To: All Owners and Managers  
From: Bob Conroy, Director of Asset Management  
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I. Quid Pro Quo and Hostile Environment Harassment and Liability for Discriminatory Housing Practices Under the Fair Housing Act  
II. FAQ Utility Allowances  
III. HUD Training for Owners: Family-Self Sufficiency Program Webinars  
IV. Asset Management Staff Changes

I. Quid Pro Quo and Hostile Environment Harassment and Liability for Discriminatory Housing Practices Under the Fair Housing Act

On September 14, 2016 HUD’s Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity issued its final rule concerning “Quid Pro Quo and Hostile Environment Harassment and Liability for Discriminatory Housing Practices Under the Fair Housing Act.” This final rule builds upon the 2015 proposed rule of the same name.

Through this final rule, HUD will amend its fair housing regulations to formalize standards for use in investigations and adjudications involving alleged harassment on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, familial status or disability under the Fair Housing Act. The rule specifies how HUD will evaluate complaints of quid pro quo (“this for that”) harassment and hostile environment harassment; it does so by defining “quid pro quo harassment” and “hostile environment harassment” and by specifying the standards to be used to evaluate whether particular conduct creates a quid pro quo or hostile environment.

The major provisions of this rule include:

- Formalized definitions of “quid pro quo harassment” and “hostile environment harassment” under the Fair Housing Act.
- Formalized standards for evaluating claims of quid pro quo and hostile environment harassment under the Fair Housing Act.
- Illustrations of prohibited quid pro quo and hostile environment harassment to HUD’s existing Fair Housing Act regulations; and
- Identifications of traditional principles of direct and vicarious liability applicable to all discriminatory housing practices under the Fair Housing Act, including quid pro quo and hostile environment harassment.

Upon issuing this rule, HUD’s Office of General Counsel (OGC) issued the following guidance: “Application of Fair Housing Act Standards to the Enforcement of Local Nuisance and Crime-Free Housing Ordinances Against Victims of Domestic Violence, Other Crime Victims, and Others Who Require Police or Emergency Services.”
This guidance was issued in order to explain how the Fair Housing Act applies to ensure that the growing number of local nuisance ordinances and crime free housing ordinances do not lead to discrimination in violation of the Fair Housing Act. It primarily focuses on the impact these ordinances may have on domestic violence victims. Both the final rule, as well as the OGC guidance, are attached to this notice.

II. Updated FAQs to Housing Notice 15-04 Methodology for Completing a Multifamily Housing Utility Analysis

The attached document contains updated responses to frequently asked questions (FAQs) regarding Housing Notice H-2015-04, Methodology for Completing a Multifamily Housing Utility Analysis. This file includes responses to ten additional questions and replaces the UA FAQs that were emailed in RHIIP Listserv #338. Notice 15-04 is also posted on HUDClips at http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/administration/hudclips/notices/hsg/2015

III. Training For Owners: Family-Self Sufficiency Program Webinars

HUD’s Office of Housing is pleased to announce a new webinar series focused on the Multifamily Family Self-Sufficiency (MF FSS) program. Through these webinars, attendees will learn about the basics of the multifamily FSS program, best practices for running a successful FSS program, and details of program compliance. There are three webinars in the series. Webinars #1 and #2 will be presented by industry stakeholders. Webinar #3, dealing with program requirements outlined in H Notice 2016-08, will be presented by HUD staff.

The attached document provides information for Owners on HUD Webinars focused on the Family- Self Sufficiency Program.

IV. Asset Management Staff Changes

We would like to welcome Eric Ross to the MaineHousing Asset Management team. Eric started with MaineHousing as an Asset Manager on September 19th.

Within the last few months we have also had some other staff changes. Rachel Boynton, formerly an Asset Operations Assistant, is now a Financial Officer in Asset Management. Cindy Wardwell, formerly a Financial Officer, is now a Financial Risk Officer in Asset Management.

Attachments:
- Quid pro quo final rule September 2016
- Local Nuisance and Crime Free Housing Ordinances Against Victims of Domestic Violence September 2016
- UA FAQs Update
- Training For Owners: Family-Self Sufficiency Program Webinars
Please note that MaineHousing provides notices as a service to our partners. Notices are not intended to replace ongoing training and do not encompass all compliance and regulatory changes that may occur on the wide range of housing programs in which we work. MaineHousing recommends partners establish an ongoing training program for their staff.

Maine State Housing Authority (“MaineHousing”) does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, national origin, ancestry, physical or mental disability, age, familial status or receipt of public assistance in the admission or access to or treatment in its programs and activities. In employment, MaineHousing does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, national origin, ancestry, age, physical or mental disability or genetic information. MaineHousing will provide appropriate communication auxiliary aids and services upon sufficient notice. MaineHousing will also provide this document in alternative formats upon sufficient notice. MaineHousing has designated the following person responsible for coordinating compliance with applicable federal and state nondiscrimination requirements and addressing grievances: Louise Patenaude, Maine State Housing Authority, 353 Water Street, Augusta, Maine 04330-4633, Telephone Number 1-800-452-4668 (voice in state only), (207) 626-4600 (voice) or Maine Relay 711.
The Agency has determined under 21 CFR 25.33(a) that this action is categorically excluded from the requirement to submit an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement because it is of a type that does not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment.

Elsewhere in this issue of the Federal Register, FDA gave notice that the approval of those parts of NADA 138–934 pertaining to the procaine penicillin component indications for growth promotion and increased feed efficiency in swine is withdrawn, effective September 14, 2016. As provided for in the regulatory text of this document, the animal drug regulations are amended to reflect this partial withdrawal of approval and subsequent product reformulation.

NADA 138–934 was identified as being affected by guidance for industry (GFI) #213 “New Animal Drugs and New Animal Drug Combination Products Administered in or on Medicated Feed or Drinking Water of Food-Producing Animals: Recommendations for Drug Sponsors for Voluntarily Aligning Product Use Conditions with GFI #209,” December 2013.

This rule does not meet the definition of “rule” in 5 U.S.C. 804(3)(A) because it is a rule of “particular applicability.” Therefore, it is not subject to the congressional review requirements in 5 U.S.C. 801–808.

List of Subjects in 21 CFR Part 558
Animal drugs, Animal feeds.

Therefore, under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and under authority delegated to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs and redelegated to the Director of the Center for Veterinary Medicine, 21 CFR part 558 is amended as follows:

PART 558—NEW ANIMAL DRUGS FOR USE IN ANIMAL FEEDS

§ 558.140 [Amended]

1. In §558.140, in paragraph (b)(2), remove “No. 054771” and in its place add “Nos. 054771 and 069254”.

§ 558.145 [Amended]

2. In §558.145, remove and reserve paragraph [a](2).

Dated: September 6, 2016.
William T. Flynn,
Acting Director, Center for Veterinary Medicine.
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Quid Pro Quo and Hostile Environment Harassment and Liability for Discriminatory Housing Practices Under the Fair Housing Act

AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, HUD.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This final rule amends HUD’s fair housing regulations to formalize standards for use in investigations and adjudications involving allegations of harassment on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, familial status, or disability. The rule specifies how HUD will evaluate complaints of quid pro quo (“this for that”) harassment and hostile environment harassment under the Fair Housing Act. It will also provide for uniform treatment of Fair Housing Act claims raising allegations of quid pro quo and hostile environment harassment in judicial and administrative forums. This rule defines “quid pro quo” and “hostile environment harassment,” as prohibited under the Fair Housing Act, and provides illustrations of discriminatory housing practices that constitute such harassment. In addition, this rule clarifies the operation of traditional principles of direct and vicarious liability in the Fair Housing Act context.

DATES: Effective date: October 14, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lynn Grosso, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Programs, Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street SW., Room 5204, Washington DC 20410–2000; telephone number 202–402–5361 (this is not a toll-free number). Persons with hearing or speech impairments may contact this number via TTY by calling the toll-free Federal Relay Service at 800–877–8339.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Executive Summary

A. Purpose of the Regulatory Action

Both HUD and the courts have long recognized that Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, as amended, (42 U.S.C. 3601 et seq.) (Fair Housing Act or Act) prohibits harassment in housing and housing-related transactions because of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, disability,1 and familial status, just as Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.) (Title VII) prohibits such harassment in employment. But no standards had been formalized for assessing claims of harassment under the Fair Housing Act. Courts have often applied standards first adopted under Title VII to evaluate claims of harassment under the Fair Housing Act, but there are differences between the Fair Housing Act and Title VII, and between harassment in the workplace and harassment in or around one’s home, that warrant this rulemaking. This rule formalizes standards for evaluating claims of quid pro quo and hostile environment harassment in the housing context. The rule does so by defining “quid pro quo harassment” and “hostile environment harassment” as conduct prohibited under the Fair Housing Act, and by specifying the standards to be used to evaluate whether particular conduct creates a quid pro quo or hostile environment in violation of the Act. Such standards will apply both in administrative adjudications and in cases brought in federal and state courts under the Fair Housing Act. This rule also adds to HUD’s existing Fair Housing Act regulations illustrations of discriminatory housing practices that may constitute illegal quid pro quo and hostile environment harassment.

By establishing consistent standards for evaluating claims of quid pro quo and hostile environment harassment, this rule provides guidance to providers of housing or housing-related services seeking to ensure that their properties or businesses are free of unlawful harassment. The rule also provides clarity to victims of harassment and their representatives regarding how to assess potential claims of illegal harassment under the Fair Housing Act.

In addition, this final rule clarifies when housing providers and other entities or individuals covered by the Fair Housing Act may be held directly or vicariously liable under the Act for...

1 This rule uses the term “disability” to refer to what the Fair Housing Act and its implementing regulations refer to as “handicap.” Both terms have the same legal meaning. See Bragdon v. Abbott, 524 U.S. 624, 631 (1998).
illegal harassment, as well as for other discriminatory housing practices that violate the Act. This rule sets forth how these traditional liability standards apply in the housing context because, in HUD’s experience, there has been significant misunderstanding among public and private housing providers as to the circumstances under which they will be subject to liability under the Fair Housing Act for discriminatory housing practices undertaken by others.

B. Legal Authority for the Regulation

The legal authority for this regulation is found in the Fair Housing Act, which gives the Secretary of HUD the “authority and responsibility for administering this Act.” 42 U.S.C. 3608(a). In addition, the Act provides that “[t]he Secretary may make rules (including rules for the collection, maintenance, and analysis of appropriate data) to carry out this title. The Secretary shall give public notice and opportunity for comment with respect to all rules made under this section.” 42 U.S.C. 3614a. HUD also has general rulemaking authority under the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out its functions, powers and duties. See 42 U.S.C. 3535(d).

C. Summary of Major Provisions

The major provisions of this rule:

• Formalize definitions of “quid pro quo harassment” and “hostile environment harassment” under the Fair Housing Act.
• Formalize standards for evaluating claims of quid pro quo and hostile environment harassment under the Fair Housing Act.
• Add illustrations of prohibited quid pro quo and hostile environment harassment to HUD’s existing Fair Housing Act regulations.
• Identify traditional principles of direct and vicarious liability applicable to all discriminatory housing practices under the Fair Housing Act, including quid pro quo and hostile environment harassment.

Please refer to section III of this preamble, entitled “This Final Rule,” for a discussion of the changes made to HUD’s regulations by this final rule.

D. Costs and Benefits

This rule formalizes clear, consistent, nationwide standards for evaluating harassment claims under the Fair Housing Act. The rule does not create any new liability under the Fair Housing Act and thus adds no additional costs for housing providers and others engaged in housing transactions.

The benefits of the rule are that it will assist in ensuring compliance with the Fair Housing Act by defining quid pro quo and hostile environment harassment that violates the Act and by specifying traditional principles of direct and vicarious liability, consistent with Supreme Court precedent. Articulating clear standards enables entities subject to the Fair Housing Act’s prohibitions and persons protected by its terms to understand the types of conduct that constitute actionable quid pro quo and hostile environment harassment. As a result, HUD expects this rule to facilitate more effective training to avoid discriminatory harassment in housing and decrease the need for protracted litigation to resolve disputed claims.

II. Background

Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, as amended (the Fair Housing Act or Act), prohibits discrimination in the availability and enjoyment of housing and housing-related services, facilities, and transactions because of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, disability, and familial status. 42 U.S.C. 3601–19. The Act prohibits a wide range of discriminatory housing and housing-related practices, including, among other things, making discriminatory statements, refusing to rent or sell, denying access to services, setting different terms or conditions, refusing to make reasonable modifications or accommodations, discriminating in residential real estate-related transactions, and retaliating. See 42 U.S.C. 3604, 3605, 3606 and 3617.

In 1989, HUD promulgated formal housing regulations at 24 CFR part 100 that address discriminatory conduct in housing generally. The 1989 regulations include examples of discriminatory housing practices that cover quid pro quo sexual harassment and hostile environment harassment generally. Section 100.65(b)(5) identifies, as an example of unlawful conduct, denying or limiting housing-related services or facilities because a person refused to provide sexual favors. Section 100.400(c)(2) offers an example of illegal conduct “...interfering with persons in their enjoyment of a dwelling because of race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status, or national origin of such persons, or of visitors or associates of such persons.” The 1989 regulations do not, however, expressly define quid pro quo or hostile environment harassment, specify standards for examining such claims, or provide illustrations of other types of quid pro quo or hostile environment harassment prohibited by the Act. The 1989 regulations also do not discuss liability standards for prohibited harassment or other discriminatory housing practices.

Over time, forms of harassment that violate civil rights laws have coalesced into two legal doctrines—quid pro quo and hostile environment. Although HUD and the courts have recognized that the Fair Housing Act prohibits harassment because of race or color, disability, religion, national origin, familial status, and sex, the doctrines of quid pro quo and hostile environment harassment are not well developed under the Fair Housing Act. As a result, when deciding harassment cases under the Fair Housing Act, courts have often looked to case law decided under Title VII, which prohibits employment discrimination because of race, color, religion, sex, and national origin. But the home and the workplace are significantly different environments such that strict reliance on Title VII case law is not always appropriate. One’s home is a place of privacy, security, and refuge (or should be), and harassment that occurs in or around one’s home can be far more intrusive, violent and threatening than harassment in the more public environment of one’s work place. Consistent with this reality, the
Supreme Court has recognized that individuals have heightened expectations of privacy within the home.10 This rule therefore formalizes standards to address harassment in and around one’s home and identifies some of the differences between harassment in the home and harassment in the workplace. While Title VII and Fair Housing Act case law contain many similar concepts, this regulation describes the appropriate analytical framework for harassment claims under the Fair Housing Act.

The rule addresses only quid pro quo and hostile environment harassment, and not conduct generally referred to as harassment that, for different reasons, may violate section 818 or other provisions of the Fair Housing Act. For example, a racially hostile statement by a housing provider could indicate a discriminatory preference in violation of section 804(c) of the Act, or it could evidence intent to deny housing or discriminate in the terms or conditions of housing in violation of sections 804(a) or 804(b), even if the statement does not create a hostile environment or establish a quid pro quo. Section 818, which makes it unlawful to “coerce, intimidate, threaten, or interfere with any person in the exercise or enjoyment of” rights protected by the Act, or on account of a person having aided others in exercising or enjoying rights protected by the Act, could be violated by conduct that creates a quid pro quo or hostile environment. It is not, however, limited to quid pro quo or hostile environment claims and could be violated by other conduct that constitutes retaliation or another form of coercion, intimidation, threats, or interference because of a protected characteristic. In sum, this rule provides standards that are uniformly applicable to claims of quid pro quo and hostile environment harassment under the Fair Housing Act, regardless of the section of the Act that is alleged to have been violated, and the same discriminatory conduct could violate more than one provision of the Act whether or not it also constitutes quid pro quo or hostile environment harassment.

III. Changes Made at the Final Rule Stage

A. Overview of Changes Made at the Final Rule Stage

In response to public comment and upon further consideration by HUD of the issues presented in this rulemaking, HUD makes the following changes at this final rule stage:

- Rewords proposed § 100.600(a)(2)(i)(ii) to clarify that proof of hostile environment would not require demonstrating psychological or physical harm to avoid any confusion on that point. Proposed § 100.600(a)(2)(i)(ii) stated “Evidence of psychological or physical harm is relevant in determining whether a hostile environment was created, as well as the amount of damages to which an aggrieved person may be entitled. Neither psychological nor physical harm, however, must be demonstrated to prove that a hostile environment exists.” Section 100.600(a)(2)(i)(ii) in this final rule provides: “Neither psychological nor physical harm must be demonstrated to prove that a hostile environment exists. Evidence of psychological or physical harm may, however, be relevant in determining whether a hostile environment existed and, if so, the amount of damages to which an aggrieved person may be entitled.”

- Rewords proposed § 100.600(c) to clarify that a single incident may constitute either quid pro quo or hostile environment harassment if the incident meets the standards for either type of harassment under § 100.600(a)(1) or (a)(2). Proposed § 100.600(c) provided “A single incident of harassment because of race, color, religion, sex, familial status, national origin, or handicap may constitute a discriminatory housing practice, where the incident is severe, or evidences a quid pro quo.” Section 100.600(c) in this final rule provides “A single incident of harassment because of race, color, religion, sex, familial status, national origin, or handicap may constitute a discriminatory housing practice, where the incident is sufficiently severe to create a hostile environment, or evidences a quid pro quo.”

- Corrects the illustration in proposed § 100.65(b)(7) to fix a typographical error in the proposed rule. In the final rule, the word “service” is corrected and made plural.
IV. The Public Comments

On October 21, 2015, at 80 FR 63720, HUD published for public comment a proposed rule on Quid Pro Quo and Hostile Environment Harassment and Liability for Discriminatory Housing Practices Under the Fair Housing Act. The public comment period closed on December 21, 2015. HUD received 63 comments. The comments were submitted by public housing agencies (PHAs) and other government agencies; private housing providers and their representatives; nonprofit organizations, including fair housing, civil rights, housing advocacy, and legal groups; tenants and other individuals. This section of the preamble addresses significant issues raised in the public comments and provides HUD’s responses. All public comments can be viewed at: http://www.regulations.gov/#docketDetail;D=HUD-2015-0095.

The majority of the commenters were generally supportive of the rule, with some urging HUD to publish the rule quickly. This summary does not provide responses to comments that expressed support for the proposed rule without suggesting any modifications to the rule. General supportive comments included statements of the importance of the rule in addressing and preventing sexual assault of tenants by landlords and descriptions of how the rule would empower housing providers, renters, and other consumers to understand and avoid illegal housing practices by defining and illustrating quid pro quo and hostile environment harassment.

Some commenters stated that this rule may help providers focus on the importance of eliminating harassment on their properties, and some commenters identified provisions of the rule that would provide useful guidance to housing providers, tenants, residents, and others involved in housing transactions. More specifically, commenters expressed appreciation that the rule would apply not solely to sexual harassment but to harassment because of all protected characteristics, with some commenters sharing anecdotes of harassment based on a variety of protected characteristics that they believe the rule may help remedy. Other commenters supported the proposed rule’s distinction between the Fair Housing Act and Title VII, with commenters endorsing the Department’s proposal not to adopt the Title VII affirmative defense to an employer’s vicarious liability.

A number of commenters assessed the rule to be in accord with case law, and approved of the balance the rule strikes between the rights and obligations of the parties in a fair housing matter. Some commenters noted that the proposed standard for determining whether conduct constitutes a hostile environment is appropriately individualized to the facts of each case. Some commenters specifically identified the benefits provided by the rule in establishing a uniform framework for fairly evaluating and appropriately responding to alleged harassment, which minimizes the subjective nature of adjudicating such claims. Other commenters expressed appreciation for the proposed rule’s recognition that a single incident may establish hostile environment harassment. Some commenters expressed support for the rule’s acknowledgement of the fear of retaliation many individuals with disabilities experience when trying to address issues of harassment in their housing.

Many commenters stated that the rule’s description of traditional principles of agency liability is accurate and not an expansion of existing liability. Some commenters expressed appreciation that the rule would incorporate traditional liability principles for any type of discriminatory housing practice, not just harassment, and would rely on negligence principles and distinguish between direct and vicarious liability. Other commenters stated that the rule would not burden housing providers because the direct liability standard is aligned with established provider business practice. Some commenters expressed appreciation that the rule would place landlords on notice that they should take corrective action early on, once they know or should have known of the discrimination.

Several commenters stated that housing providers are already in possession of the tools they need to create living environments free from harassment. In particular, the commenters stated that housing providers are familiar with the corrective actions they may take in order to enforce their own rules. Another commenter stated that housing providers are in the best position to select, train, oversee, and assure the correct behavior of their agents, noting that effective enforcement of the rule depends on the potential for liability on the part of housing providers. Some commenters expressed support for the proposed rule while seeking modifications at the final rule stage. For example, a commenter encouraged broad application of the rule so that intervention and corrective action would occur before victims of housing discrimination are forced out of their homes. Another commenter sought an expansive reading of the rule in order to prevent all forms of bullying. Some commenters sought to add factors to the totality of circumstances consideration, while other commenters sought to add to the classes protected by the rule.

Following are HUD’s responses to commenters’ suggested modifications to the rule and the other significant issues raised in the public comments.

A. Quid Pro Quo and Hostile Environment Harassment: § 100.600

a. General: § 100.600(a)

Issue: A commenter requested that HUD add seniors as a protected class under the rule. Other commenters stated that elderly persons often have disabilities, which make them particularly vulnerable to harassment. These commenters requested that the final rule make clear that the rule protects elderly persons from harassment because of disability.

HUD Response: HUD shares the commenters’ concern for elderly persons but does not have the authority to add a new protected class to the Fair Housing Act and therefore is unable to adopt the commenters’ recommendation to expand the scope of the rule in this way. Neither age nor senior status is a protected characteristic under the Act, although persons who are discriminated against because of their disabilities are protected under the Act without regard to their age. Therefore, elderly individuals who are subjected to quid pro quo or hostile environment harassment on the basis of disability or another protected characteristic are protected under the Act and this final rule.

Issue: A commenter suggested that HUD include a clause in the final rule to protect whistleblowers who experience harassment for reporting quid pro quo or hostile environment harassment. The commenter reported having witnessed such harassment and explained that whistleblowers are particularly vulnerable to quid pro quo and hostile environment harassment, but because they are not harassed on the basis of their race, color, religion, national origin, sex, familial status, or disability, they are not directly protected by the proposed regulation.

HUD Response: Anyone who is harassed for reporting discriminatory harassment in housing is protected by the Fair Housing Act. Section 818 of the Act makes it unlawful to coerce, intimidate, threaten, or interfere with a person on account of his or her having
aided or encouraged another person in the exercise or enjoyment of any right granted or protected by sections 803–806 of the Act. To highlight the essential role whistleblower protection plays in ensuring fair housing, HUD is adding to § 100.400 a new paragraph (c)(6), which provides the following example of a discriminatory housing practice—“Retaliating against any person because that person reported a discriminatory housing practice to a housing provider or other authority.’’

Issue: Several commenters urged HUD to state in the final rule that harassment against persons who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender (LGBT), or because of pregnancy, violates the Fair Housing Act. They asked HUD to define harassment because of sex to include harassment based on sexual orientation, gender identity, sex stereotyping, or pregnancy. The commenters referenced studies about the pervasive harassment and discrimination such persons face in housing. They also noted that a number of federal courts and federal agencies have interpreted Title VII and other laws prohibiting discrimination because of sex to include discrimination on the basis of gender identity, gender transition, or transgender status. The commenters also pointed to HUD’s “Equal Access to Housing in HUD Programs Regardless of Sexual Orientation or Gender Identity” rule, which provides that persons may not be denied access to HUD programs because of sexual orientation or gender identity.

HUD Response: The Fair Housing Act already explicitly prohibits discrimination based on pregnancy as part of its prohibition of discrimination because of familial status (42 U.S.C. 3602(k)), and HUD’s Equal Access Rule applies only to HUD programs. HUD agrees with the commenters’ view that the Fair Housing Act’s prohibition on sex discrimination prohibits discrimination because of gender identity. In Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins, the Supreme Court interpreted Title VII’s prohibition of sex discrimination to encompass discrimination based on non-conformity with sex stereotypes, stating that “[i]n forbidding employers to discriminate against individuals because of their sex, Congress intended to strike at the entire spectrum of disparate treatment of men and women resulting from sex stereotypes.”

Taking note of Price Waterhouse and its progeny, in 2010, HUD issued a memorandum recognizing that sex discrimination prohibited by the Fair Housing Act includes discrimination because of gender identity. In 2012, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) reached the same conclusion, “clarifying that claims of discrimination based on transgender status, also referred to as claims of discrimination based on gender identity, are cognizable under Title VII’s sex discrimination prohibition.” Following the EEOC’s decision, the Attorney General also concluded that: the best reading of Title VII’s prohibition of sex discrimination is that it encompasses discrimination based on gender identity, including transgender status. The most straightforward reading of Title VII is that discrimination “because of . . . sex” includes discrimination because an employee’s gender identification is as a member of a particular sex, or because the employee is transvestite, transgender, or has transitioned, to another sex.

HUD reaffirms its view that under the Fair Housing Act, discrimination based on gender identity is sex discrimination. Accordingly, quid pro quo or hostile environment harassment in housing because of a person’s gender identity is indistinguishable from harassment because of sex.

HUD, in its 2010 memorandum, also advised that claims of housing discrimination because of sexual orientation can be investigated under the Price Waterhouse sex-stereotyping theory. Over the past two decades, an increasing number of Federal courts, building on the Price Waterhouse rationale, have found protections under Title VII for those asserting discrimination claims related to their sexual orientation. Many Federal-sector EEOC decisions have found the same. Although some Federal

13 See, e.g., Prowel v. Wise Bus. Forms, Inc., 579 F.3d 285, 291–92 (3rd Cir. 2009) (harassment of a plaintiff because of his “effeminate traits and behaviors could constitute sufficient evidence that he ‘was harassed because he did not conform to [the employer’s] vision of how a man should look, speak, and act—rather than harassment based solely on his sexual orientation’”); Nichols v. Asteca Rest. Enter., Inc., 256 F.3d 864, 874–75 (9th Cir. 2001) (coworkers’ and supervisors’ harassment of a gay male because he did not conform to gender norms created a hostile work environment in violation of Title VII); Hall v. BNSF Ry. Co., No. C13–2160 RSM, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 139616 (W.D. Wash., September 22, 2014) (plaintiff’s allegation that he “(as a male who married a male) was treated differently in comparison to his female coworkers who also married males” for a sex discrimination claim under Title VII); Terveer v. Billington, 34 F. Supp. 3d 100, 116 (D.D.C. 2014) (Title VII claim based on sex stated when plaintiff’s “orientation as a homosexual male” was based on the employer’s preconceived definition of male); Heller v. Columbia Edgewater Country Club, 195 F. Supp. 2d 1212, 1224 (D. Ore. 2002) (“Sexual orientation harassment is often, if not always, motivated by a desire to enforce heterosexually defined gender norms. In fact, stereotypes about homosexuality are directly related to our stereotype about the proper roles of men and women.”). Cf. Videdick v. Pepperdine Univ., 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 167672, *16 (C.D. Cal. 2015) (“It is impossible to categorically separate ‘sexual orientation discrimination’ from other claims based on the basis of sex or from gender stereotypes; to do so would result in a false choice. Simply put, to allege discrimination on the basis of sexuality is to state an IX claim on the basis of sex or gender.”).

14 Baldwin v. Dept. of Transp., EEOC Appeal No. 0120130380, slip op. at 9–11 (July 16, 2015); Complainant v. Dept of Homeland Sec., EEOC Appeal No. 0120110576, slip op. at 1 (Aug. 20, 2014) (“While Title VII’s prohibition of discrimination does not explicitly include sexual orientation as a basis, Title VII prohibits sex discrimination, including sex-stereotyping discrimination and gender discrimination” and “sex discrimination claims may intersect with claims of sexual orientation discrimination” from discrimination on the basis of sex or gender stereotypes; to do so would result in a false choice. Simply put, to allege discrimination on the basis of sexuality is to state an IX claim on the basis of sex or gender.”).

15 Couch v. Dept of Energy, EEOC Appeal No. 0120131136, slip op. at 1 (Aug. 13, 2013) (finding harassment claim based on perceived sexual orientation is a discrimination claim based on failure to conform to gender stereotypes); Culp v. Dept of Homeland Sec., EEOC Appeal 07201300012, slip op. at 1 (May 7, 2013) (Title VII covers discrimination based on association with a homosexual colleague); Castello v. U.S. Postal Serv., EEOC Appeal No. 0520110649, slip op. at 1 (Dec. 1, 2011) (vacating prior decision and holding that complaint stated claim based on sex-stereotyping through evidence of offensive comments by manager about female subordinate’s relationships with women); Veretto v. U.S. Postal Serv., EEOC Appeal No. 0120110873, slip op. at 1 (June 16, 2015).
appeal of discrimination under Title VII based on the sole fact of the person’s sexual orientation, those courts nonetheless recognized the Price Waterhouse sex-stereotyping theory may be used to find discrimination based on sex.17 These Title VII legal authorities are consistent with HUD’s 2010 memorandum, in which HUD interprets the Fair Housing Act’s prohibition on sex discrimination to include, at a minimum, discrimination related to an individual’s sexual orientation where the evidence establishes that the discrimination is based on sex stereotypes. HUD’s interpretation of sex discrimination under the Fair Housing Act is also consistent with the Department of Health and Human Services’ rule interpreting sex discrimination under Section 1557 the Affordable Care Act18 and the Department of Labor’s rule interpreting sex discrimination under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.19

Issue: Some commenters asked HUD to provide a definition of harassment. A commenter noted that the proposed rule defines two types of harassment—quid pro quo and hostile environment, but does not define the general term “harassment.” Another commenter stated that if HUD believes that other

[July 1, 2011] (court found that “Complainant has alleged a plausible sex-stereotyping claim of harassment because he made a sexual orientation claim under Title VII”); "Andersen v. City of Milwaukee, 762 F.3d 751, 757 (7th Cir. 2014) (acknowledging the validity of a sex-stereotyping claim “based on gender identity” even if observed at work or affecting job performance); "plead with respect to discrimination based on sexual orientation, nothing more. He does not make a single allegation that anyone discriminated against him based on his appearance or mannerisms or for his gender non-conformity.”); (quoting Vickers v. Fairfield Med. Ctr., 453 F.3d 757, 763 (6th Cir. 2006); Pagan v. Gonzalez, 430 F. App’x 179, 171–72 (3d Cir. 2011) (recognizing that “discrimination based on a failure to conform to gender stereotypes is cognizable” but affirming dismissal of the plaintiff’s sex discrimination claim based on “the absence of any evidence to show that the discrimination was based on Pagan’s acting in a masculine manner”); Dawson v. Bumble & Bumble, 396 F.3d 211, 221, 222–23 (2d Cir. 2006) (observing that “one can fail to conform to gender stereotypes in two ways: (1) Through behavior or (2) through appearance, but dismissing the plaintiff’s sex discrimination claim because she “has produced no substantial evidence from which we may plausibly infer that her alleged failure to conform to her appearance to feminine stereotypes resulted from any adverse employment action.”); See also Hively v. Ivy Tech Community College, 2016 U.S. App. LEXIS 13746, *16–25 (7th Cir. 2016) [reviewing this line of cases].

17 Non-discrimination in Health Programs and Activities, 81 FR 31376, 31388–90 (May 18, 2016) (to be codified at 45 CFR part 92).

18 Discrimination Because of Sex, 81 FR 39108, 39137–40 (June 15, 2016) (to be codified at 41 CFR part 60–20).

19 See, e.g., Bloch v. Frischholz, 587 F.3d at 779–81 (quoting that post-sale conduct by a homeowner’s association could violate section 804(b) of the Act and allowing section 3604(b) claims to address post-acquisition conduct was consistent with HUD’s regulations (citing 24 CFR 100.50(b)(4)); Comm. Concerning Cnty. Improvement v. City of Modesto, 583 F.3d 690, 713 (9th Cir. 2009) (concluding that the Act covers post-acquisition discrimination); Neudecker v. Roseland Corp., 351 F.3d at 364 (finding plaintiff’s post-acquisition harassment claim valid under the Act); Dicienso v. Cisneros, 96 F.3d 1004, 1008 (7th Cir. 1996) (recognizing claim for sexual harassment in housing environment under the Act); Hunce v. Vigil, 1 F.3d at 1089–90 (recognizing that the Act prohibits both quid pro quo and hostile housing harassment because it affects access to housing and severely interferes with the enjoyment of a dwelling).
environment sexual harassment); Woods-Drake v. Lundy, 667 F.2d 1198, 1201 (5th Cir. 1982) (finding that a landlord’s discriminatory conduct against current tenants violated section 3604(b) of the Act); Richards v. Bono, No. 5:04CV484–OC–10GRJ, 2005 WL 1065141, at *3 (M.D. Fla. May 2, 2005) ("[T]he plain meaning of ‘rental’ contemplates an ongoing relationship, the use of that term in § 3604(b) means that the statute prohibits discrimination at any time during the landlord/tenant relationship, including after the tenant takes possession of the property"); United States v. Koch, 352 F. Supp. 2d 970, 976 (D. Neb. 2004) ("[I]t is difficult to imagine a privilege that flows more naturally from the purchase or rental of a dwelling than the privilege of residing therein."); United States v. Hilltop Realty, Inc., 948 F.3d 771, 779 (8th Cir. 2019).

A commenter asked whether the proposed rule would implicate constitutional protections of free speech or free exercise of religion if the housing provider evicts a tenant where, for example, two tenants are having heated religious arguments about the other’s choice of religious attire. Another commenter stated that the proposed rule properly balanced the competing rights at issue and did not interfere with constitutionally protected speech because the rule would not encompass speech that is merely offensive or that causes nothing more than hurt feelings.

HUD Response: As discussed elsewhere in this preamble, not every dispute between neighbors is a violation of the Fair Housing Act. Moreover, speech that is protected by the First Amendment is not within the Act’s prohibitions, First Amendment protections do not extend to certain acts of coercion, intimidation, or threats of bodily harm proscribed by section 818 of the Act. As the Supreme Court has stated, “true threats” have no First Amendment protection. In Notice FHEO–2015–01, HUD has set out substantive and procedural guidelines regarding the filing and investigation of Fair Housing Act complaints that may implicate the First Amendment. The Notice discusses how HUD handles complaints against persons who are not otherwise covered by the Act, but who are alleged to have violated Section 818 of the Act.

Issue: A commenter suggested that the rule is unnecessary because other administrative and legal remedies already exist for victims of harassment under state and local law. Another commenter suggested that the rule is unnecessary because HUD has already charged cases involving harassment under the Act.

HUD Response: This final rule formalizes and provides uniform standards for evaluating complaints of quid pro quo and hostile environment harassment under the Fair Housing Act. While other administrative and legal causes of action may exist for victims of quid pro quo and hostile environment harassment under landlord-tenant law, tort law, or other state law, they do not substitute for the protections against discrimination and the remedies provided under the Act. Moreover, the fact that HUD has previously issued charges of discrimination involving quid pro quo or hostile environment harassment does not negate the need for this rule.

Issue: A commenter asked HUD to abandon the rulemaking process and instead provide specific, clear guidance to the regulated community so that housing providers can ascertain the types of behavior that do and do not constitute harassment under the Fair Housing Act. Other commenters requested that HUD provide technical assistance on various aspects of the rule to residents, housing providers, and practitioners to ensure all parties know their rights under the law.

HUD Response: HUD declines to abandon this rulemaking. This regulation is needed to formalize standards for assessing claims of harassment under the Fair Housing Act and to clarify when housing providers and others covered by the Act may be liable for illegal harassment or other discriminatory housing practices. It has been HUD’s experience that there is significant misunderstanding among public and private housing providers about the circumstances under which they may be liable. This regulation provides greater clarity in making that assessment. HUD will continue to offer guidance and training on the Fair Housing Act generally and on this final rule, as needed.

Issue: A commenter recommended that the rule expand the limits for damages in cases that establish sexual harassment in housing.

HUD Response: HUD declines to make this change because it is unnecessary. The Act contains no limit on damages that may be awarded, specifically authorizing an award of “actual damages.”

Issue: A commenter asked HUD to consider expanding the time for filing sexual harassment complaints where a hostile environment case includes subsequent harassment that occurs many months after the initial act of sexual harassment.

HUD Response: HUD declines to adopt this recommendation because the Fair Housing Act specifically defines the statute of limitations for filing complaints. It is one year after an alleged discriminatory housing practice occurred or terminated for a complaint with HUD and two years after an alleged discriminatory housing practice occurred or terminated for a civil action in federal district court or state court. See 42 U.S.C. 3610; 3613. If a violation is continuing, the limitations period runs from the date of the last occurrence or termination of the discriminatory act.

1. Quid Pro Quo Harassment: § 100.600(a)(1)

Issue: A commenter asked how the rule would “differentiate between a situation of involuntary quid pro quo that genuinely must be governed by the Act and a situation where one party is manipulating the rule following a mutually beneficial and agreed upon transaction.”

HUD Response: The rule’s definition of quid pro quo harassment requires a request or demand that is “unwelcome.” A mutually beneficial and agreed upon transaction is not unwelcome and would not constitute quid pro quo harassment under the rule or the Act. It is important to note, however, that, as the states rules, if an individual


acquiesces to an unwelcome request or demand, unlawful quid pro quo harassment may have occurred.

Moreover, if a housing provider regularly or routinely confers housing benefits based upon the granting of sexual favors, such conduct may constitute quid pro quo harassment or hostile environment harassment against others who do not welcome such conduct, regardless of whether any objectionable conduct is directed at them and regardless of whether the individuals who received favorable treatment willingly granted the sexual favors. Liability in all situations involving allegations of harassment must be determined on a case-by-case basis.

Issue: A commenter stated that the preamble to the proposed rule was vague in stating that “a person is aggrieved if that person is denied or delayed in receiving a housing-related opportunity or benefit because another received the benefit.” The commenter was concerned that this statement would require a PHA to identify, investigate, and document a defense to any tenant-perceived delay in receiving benefits.

HUD Response: The quoted phrase is not vague when read in context, which explains the meaning of quid pro quo harassment under the Fair Housing Act. The phrase refers to a person who is aggrieved because he or she is denied a benefit that went to another in exchange for sexual favors, for example. Aggrieved persons under the Act and HUD’s regulation are limited to those who were injured (or are about to be injured) by a discriminatory housing practice as defined in the Act. Neither the Fair Housing Act nor this final rule prohibits delays in receiving housing-related opportunities or benefits for nondiscriminatory reasons. If, however, an applicant or tenant alleges that he or she has been denied or delayed in receiving a benefit because others submitted to requests for sexual favors, the PHA should investigate to determine if quid pro quo or hostile environment harassment has occurred.

2. Hostile Environment Harassment: § 100.600(a)(2)

Issue: Several commenters recommended that HUD ensure consistency of the discussion of hostile environment harassment throughout the preamble in order to prevent any unintentional barriers for harassment victims seeking to bring claims under the Fair Housing Act. The commenters specifically stated that in one section of the preamble to the proposed rule, HUD defines “hostile environment harassment” to require unwelcome conduct because of a protected characteristic, whereas in another section it omits the “unreasonably” qualifier when discussing hostile environment harassment. The commenters requested that the word “unreasonably” be removed from the discussion in the preamble because it is unnecessary and will create confusion. They stated that unwelcome conduct that is “sufficiently severe or pervasive” as to interfere with one’s enjoyment of rights protected under the Act is in itself unreasonable.

HUD Response: The term “unreasonably” does not appear in the definition of “hostile environment harassment” in the regulatory text of the proposed rule. The term “unreasonably” was used in the preamble to the proposed rule to convey how a claim of hostile environment harassment would be evaluated; that is, from the perspective of a reasonable person in the aggrieved person’s position. HUD agrees that the use of the term “unreasonably” in the preamble may have caused confusion by conflating the substantive standard with the method of proof. In this final rule, as was the case in the proposed rule, the definition of “hostile environment harassment” in § 100.600(a)(2) is not phrased as requiring proof that unwelcome conduct “unreasonably” interferes with a right protected by the Fair Housing Act. But it remains that whether unwelcome conduct is sufficiently severe or pervasive as to interfere with rights protected under the Act, and therefore constitute hostile environment harassment, is evaluated from the perspective of a reasonable person in the aggrieved person’s position.

Issue: A commenter suggested that HUD include definitions and descriptions of “bullying” in this final rule because bullying is very similar to hostile environment harassment.

HUD Response: HUD does not agree that it is necessary to add the word “bullying” to the final rule in order to clarify the definition of harassment under the Act. The commenters have conflated the substantive standard with the causal elements of harassment. Other commenters stated that they appreciated the rule’s emphasis on the totality of the circumstances, which will ensure that mere disagreements, mistaken remarks, or isolated words spoken in the heat of the moment will not result in liability unless the totality of the circumstances establishes hostile environment harassment.

HUD Response: HUD agrees that not every disagreement between persons involved in a housing transaction constitutes unlawful harassment because of a protected characteristic in violation of the Act and believes the rule appropriately captures the distinction. Section 100.600(a)(2) of the proposed rule and of this final rule defining hostile environment harassment requires that the unwelcome conduct be “sufficiently severe or pervasive” as to interfere with defined features of the housing transaction: The availability, sale, rental, or use or enjoyment of a dwelling; the terms, conditions, or privileges of the sale or rental, or the provision or enjoyment of services or facilities in connection therewith; or the availability, terms or conditions of a residential real estate-related transaction.
Issue: A commenter recommended that the final rule recognize the role of preferential treatment for services and living arrangements, except when provided because of disability, as a type of discrimination. The commenter said that preferential treatment is a means through which to encourage and reward secondary actors for their role in creating a hostile environment, and the rule should recognize it as such. The commenter also recommended that HUD request and make available data regarding repairs or upgrades so any non-monetary favor in exchange for harassment, by an agent not directly employed by the management or owner, may be determined.

HUD Response: HUD declines to adopt the commenter’s suggestions because the rule as currently proposed already accommodates the commenter’s concerns. Providing preferential treatment that creates a hostile environment because of race, color, religion, sex, familial status, or national origin already violates the Fair Housing Act under the standards proposed in the rule. Moreover, HUD’s regulations already contain illustrations as to this type of violation. Therefore, additional language regarding preferential treatment is not needed. In addition, processes for requesting and making available data regarding repairs or upgrades are outside the scope of this rule. HUD notes that in investigations, it requests data regarding repairs or upgrades as appropriate to determine whether a violation of the Fair Housing Act has occurred.

Issue: Two commenters asked whether the rule would apply to situations in which residential property managers or other employees of a housing provider are harassed by the housing provider’s tenants. One of the commenters explained that she was a resident of the building she managed, that she had a disability, and that she had suffered harassment and threats by other residents.

HUD Response: The proposed standards generally would not apply to situations in which a property manager or other housing provider employee is harassed by the housing provider’s tenants because such situations ordinarily do not involve a housing-related transaction covered by the Act. Where, however, a property manager is also a resident of the building that the property manager manages (e.g., a resident-manager), the property manager is entitled to the same protection from discrimination harassment under the Act and under this final rule as any other resident. Additionally, Section 818 of the Act makes it unlawful to coerce, intimidate, threaten, or interfere with any person on account of the person having assisted others in enjoying or exercising their fair housing rights. Therefore, to the extent that a property manager or other housing provider employee (whether a resident or not) is subjected to coercion, intimidation, threats, or interference because he or she aided or encouraged other people in exercising or enjoying a right protected by the Act—e.g., by receiving and responding to one tenant’s complaint of discriminatory harassment by another tenant—the manager or employee may be entitled to protection under the Act.25

Issue: Some commenters requested that HUD clarify the definition of “totality of the circumstances” in § 100.600(a)(2)(i) because, in the commenters’ view, the proposed rule does not sufficiently explain the showing required to prove hostile environment harassment in violation of the Fair Housing Act. Other commenters supported HUD’s standard for determining whether conduct constitutes a hostile environment, stating that the standard and its factors are clear and permit an appropriately individualized assessment of the facts of each case. These commenters stated that the rule’s explanation of hostile environment harassment provides meaningful guidance to both housing providers and potential claimants.

HUD Response: HUD believes the “totality of the circumstances” standard in this final rule is an appropriate standard for assessing claims of hostile environment harassment, while also providing courts with the flexibility to consider the numerous and varied factual circumstances that may be relevant when assessing a specific claim. HUD therefore chooses not to alter the definition of the term “totality of the circumstances,” although it will add to the final rule the standard by which the evidence is to be evaluated, which is from the perspective of a reasonable person in the aggrieved person’s position. Section 100.600(a)(2) defines what constitutes hostile environment harassment under the Act. In accordance with this provision, establishing a hostile environment harassment violation requires proving that: A person was subjected to unwelcome spoken, written, or physical conduct; the conduct was because of a protected characteristic; and the conduct was, considering the totality of the circumstances, sufficiently severe or pervasive as to interfere with or deprive the victim of his or her right to use and enjoy the housing or to exercise other rights protected by the Act. Whether a hostile environment harassment violation has occurred is a fact-specific inquiry, and the rule supplies a non-exhaustive list of factors that must be considered in making that determination. It would be impossible to quantify in the rule the amount of evidence necessary to make such a showing in every case involving a claim of hostile environment harassment. The additional instruction in the rule text, and not just the preamble, that the “totality of the circumstances” is to be evaluated from the perspective of a reasonable person in the aggrieved person’s position will aid all parties in assessing whether a “hostile environment” has been created.

Issue: HUD received several comments regarding the explanation in the preamble to the proposed rule that hostile environment harassment should be assessed from the perspective of a reasonable person in the aggrieved person’s position. A commenter expressed concern that this standard is too subjective, stating that one reasonable person’s measure may be different from another reasonable person’s measure. Another commenter asked HUD to provide a definition of the term “reasonable person.” Other commenters approved of the standard articulated in the preamble to the proposed rule and commended HUD for recognizing that the reasonable person standard must take into account the circumstances of the aggrieved person. A commenter recommended that the rule text itself explicitly state this objective standard. Another commenter, however, recommended that HUD not add the standard to the rule text itself because such addition may invite courts to second-guess the rationality and behavior of the actual victim, rather than focusing on the conduct and its surrounding circumstances.

HUD Response: As HUD explained in the preamble to the proposed rule, whether unwelcome conduct is sufficiently severe or pervasive to create a hostile housing environment is evaluated from the perspective of a reasonable person in the aggrieved person’s position. This standard is an objective one, but ensures that an assessment of the totality of the circumstances includes consideration of whether persons of the same protected class and of like personal experience as

25 A property manager may also be protected by Title VII, whether or not he or she resides at the housing.
with evidence during the adjudication of a claim of hostile environment harassment under the Act. Evidence regarding the “location of the conduct,” as explicitly identified in § 100.600(a)(2)(i)(A), is a critical factor for consideration and will allow courts to take into account the heightened privacy and other rights that exist within the home when determining whether hostile environment harassment occurred. For similar reasons, HUD also declines to add language stating that harassing conduct may result in a violation of the Fair Housing Act even though such conduct might not violate Title VII. HUD believes that by establishing a hostile environment harassment standard tailored to the specific rights protected by the Fair Housing Act and by directing that hostile environment claims under the Act are to be evaluated by assessing the totality of the circumstances—including the location of the unwelcome conduct and the context in which it occurred—the final rule ensures that courts consider factors unique to the housing context when making the fact-specific determination of whether the particular conduct at issue violates the Act. Therefore, while HUD agrees that unwelcome conduct in or around the home can be particularly intrusive, violative, and threatening than harassment in the more public environment of one’s workplace. Some commenters said these considerations should be explicitly incorporated into the text of the rule itself. Commenters specifically requested that HUD revise proposed § 100.600(a)(2)(i)(A) by adding as a factor to be considered in determining whether hostile environment harassment exists “the heightened rights in or around one’s home for privacy and freedom from unwelcome speech and conduct. Many commenters agreed with HUD that harassment in or around one’s home can be far more intrusive, violative, and threatening than harassment in the more public environment of one’s workplace. Some commenters said these considerations should be explicitly incorporated into the text of the rule itself. Commenters specifically requested that HUD revise proposed § 100.600(a)(2)(i)(A) by adding as a factor to be considered in determining whether hostile environment harassment exists “the heightened rights in or around one’s home for privacy and freedom from harassment” or “the heightened reasonable expectation of privacy and freedom from harassment in one’s home.” Another commenter said that § 100.600(a)(2)(i)(A) should expressly state that conduct occurring in one’s home may result in a violation of the Fair Housing Act even though the same conduct in one’s place of employment may not violate Title VII. HUD Response: HUD declines to add language regarding individuals’ heightened rights within the home for privacy and freedom from unwelcome speech and conduct to the rule text in § 100.600(a)(2)(i)(A). The non-exhaustive factors included in § 100.600(a)(2)(i)(A) identifies circumstances that can be demonstrated with evidence during the adjudication of a claim of hostile environment harassment under the Act. Evidence regarding the “location of the conduct,” as explicitly identified in § 100.600(a)(2)(i)(A), is a critical factor for consideration and will allow courts to take into account the heightened privacy and other rights that exist within the home when determining whether hostile environment harassment occurred. For similar reasons, HUD also declines to add language stating that harassing conduct may result in a violation of the Fair Housing Act even though such conduct might not violate Title VII. HUD believes that by establishing a hostile environment harassment standard tailored to the specific rights protected by the Fair Housing Act and by directing that hostile environment claims under the Act are to be evaluated by assessing the totality of the circumstances—including the location of the unwelcome conduct and the context in which it occurred—the final rule ensures that courts consider factors unique to the housing context when making the fact-specific determination of whether the particular conduct at issue violates the Act. Therefore, while HUD agrees that unwelcome conduct in or around the home can be particularly intrusive, violative, and threatening than harassment in the more public environment of one’s workplace. Some commenters said these considerations should be explicitly incorporated into the text of the rule itself. Commenters specifically requested that HUD revise proposed § 100.600(a)(2)(i)(A) by adding as a factor to be considered in determining whether hostile environment harassment exists “the heightened rights in or around one’s home for privacy and freedom from harassment” or “the heightened reasonable expectation of privacy and freedom from harassment in one’s home.” Another commenter said that § 100.600(a)(2)(i)(A) should expressly state that conduct occurring in one’s home may result in a violation of the Fair Housing Act even though the same conduct in one’s place of employment may not violate Title VII. HUD Response: HUD declines to add language regarding individuals’ heightened rights within the home for privacy and freedom from unwelcome speech and conduct to the rule text in § 100.600(a)(2)(i)(A). The non-exhaustive factors included in § 100.600(a)(2)(i)(A) identifies circumstances that can be demonstrated
Title VII affirmative defense to an employer’s vicarious liability for hostile environment harassment by a supervisor does not apply to claims brought pursuant to the Fair Housing Act. Several commenters commended HUD’s decision not to extend the Title VII affirmative defense to the Fair Housing Act and agreed with HUD that such a defense would be inappropriate in the housing context, in part because of the lack of an exhaustion requirement under the Fair Housing Act, as well as the differences between an agent in the employment context versus an agent in the housing context.

Other commenters recommended that HUD apply the judicially-created Title VII affirmative defense to Fair Housing Act claims. One such commenter stated that HUD, by rule, cannot import a Title VII cause of action onto the Fair Housing Act without the judicially-created limitations on a Title VII employer’s liability under that cause of action. Another commenter believed that HUD eliminated an existing affirmative defense for housing providers that is available in the employment context. Given the scope of potential harassment claims, this commenter found unwarranted HUD’s position that the Title VII affirmative defense is not relevant to harassment in the housing context because, in HUD’s view, a housing agent who harasses residents is inevitably aided by his or her agency relationship with the housing provider. In the commenter’s view, a responsible housing provider who exercises reasonable care to prevent harassment, and who provides a complaint mechanism that a resident unreasonably fails to invoke, should be afforded the same affirmative defense available to employers in analogous situations. Another commenter asked HUD to reconsider its decision to reject the affirmative defense as it appears unfair and based on an assertion that agents of housing providers are equivalent to a supervisory employer in terms of their power over applicants and/or tenants.

HUD Response: After carefully considering the analysis provided by the commenters on both sides of the issue, HUD has retained its view that the Title VII affirmative defense is not appropriate to include as a defense under the Fair Housing Act. HUD has never found occasion to employ such a defense and remains unaware of any court having extended the Title VII affirmative defense to fair housing claims, and commenters did not identify any such case law. Moreover, unlike Title VII, which requires employees to exhaust their administrative remedies before filing an action in court, the Fair Housing Act has no exhaustion requirement, and nothing in the text of the Fair Housing Act otherwise indicates that Congress intended to permit a housing provider to avoid vicarious liability for discriminatory harassment perpetrated by its agents by establishing its own complaint process or procedure. To the contrary, the Act authorizes any aggrieved person to directly commence a civil action in federal or state court, whether or not the individual has previously chosen to file an administrative complaint with HUD. Therefore, as explained in the preamble to the proposed rule, the Title VII affirmative defense is not appropriately applied to harassment in the housing context because its adoption would impose burdens on victims of discriminatory harassment that are incompatible with the broad protections and streamlined enforcement mechanisms afforded by the Fair Housing Act.

HUD notes that some comments on this issue demonstrated a misunderstanding of the potential scope of the Title VII affirmative defense. The Title VII affirmative defense does not apply to harassment claims based on direct liability. Thus, contrary to the perceptions of some commenters, the affirmative defense does not apply to cases in which an employer—or housing provider—knew or should have known of an agent or third-party’s harassment and failed to stop it, because such cases involve direct rather than vicarious liability.

Therefore, in exercising its power to promulgate rules to interpret and carry out the Act, HUD believes it would be inappropriate to add, for the first time, an affirmative defense that would require victims of hostile environment harassment—who are often housing insecure or otherwise especially vulnerable—to choose between the risk of retaliation by the perpetrator and the risk of losing their right to hold a housing provider liable for the acts of its agents. Instead, the traditional principles of vicarious liability—including those standards that hold a principal liable for an agent’s conduct that is taken within the scope of employment, with the apparent authority of the principal, or that is otherwise aided by the agency relationship—will continue to govern a housing provider’s liability for harassment. While HUD declines to extend the Title VII affirmative defense to the Fair Housing Act, the development and dissemination of anti-harassment policies will still assist housing providers to avoid litigation by identifying and quickly addressing improper conduct by employees or other agents.

Issue: A commenter requested that HUD create safe harbors from liability for housing providers for harassment by their agents and third-parties. Specifically, the commenter stated that liability for unknown and unintended harassment by an agent or third-party should not be imposed on a housing provider where the housing provider: (1) Provides periodic mandatory fair housing training for its employees and agents (including training related to harassment claims); (2) requires unaffiliated management companies to conduct similar training of their employees, report to the property owner on a regular basis about the steps it is taking to avoid fair housing claims generally, and promptly report any potential fair housing claim to a designated official of the housing provider; and (3) implements and publicizes a hotline or other secure communication mechanism whereby a tenant can confidentially notify the housing provider about possible harassment by employees or other tenants.

Another commenter expressed concern that the rule as proposed would expand a PHA’s exposure to liability by making the PHA liable for perceived hostile environment harassment that occurs beyond its knowledge or control and fails to create or incentivize any new remedies to protect tenants against hostile environment harassment. As a result, according to the commenter, the proposed rule raises the possibility that future litigation over alleged harassment might be driven by plaintiff attorneys’ fees rather than the merit of the allegations or effective remedies. In light of these concerns, the commenter suggested that HUD revise the proposed rule to adopt defenses similar to those applicable to public agencies under California state law for injuries caused by dangerous conditions on the public agency’s property. As described by the commenter, the State law defense provides that liability attaches to the public agency if the plaintiff establishes that: (1) The public employee’s negligence or wrongful act or omission created the dangerous condition; or (2) the public entity had actual or constructive notice of the dangerous condition before the injury occurred. The commenter believes this standard incentivizes the public agency to maintain its property and train its staff in order to limit its exposure to liability and reduce the risk of injuries.

See 42 U.S.C. 3614(a).
training for their staff and to ensure the Act will encourage housing standards for assessing liability under where the harassment was aided by the acts of an employee or agent regardless vicariously liable for the discriminatory housing provider may be held traditional principles of agency law, a Housing Act claims under also impose a harbor or state law-derived defense from harassment by the provider's agent,HUD does not believe the requested safe harbor or state law-derived defense from liability is appropriate.The California State law identified by the commenter essentially imposes a negligence standard for public agency liability, which is akin to the standard of direct liability that governs Fair Housing Act claims under § 100.7(a)(1)(ii). In addition, under traditional principles of agency law, a housing provider may be held vicariously liable for the discriminatory acts of an employee or agent regardless of whether the housing provider knew of or intended the discriminatory conduct where the employee was acting within scope of his or her agency, or where the harassment was aided by the agency relationship. HUD believes that traditional tort and agency law standards for assessing liability under the Act will encourage housing providers to provide appropriate training for their staff and to ensure compliance with the Act.

Issue: A commenter asserted that the proposed rule, including HUD’s decision not to adopt the Title VII affirmative defense, raises Federalism implications. The commenter stated that the proposed rule creates a cause of action based on Title VII law that could, ostensibly, be brought against a State, even when the actions are performed by a city or other sub-recipient of funds, and obviates the State’s sovereign immunity despite its ongoing assertion that it has not waived such sovereign immunity. The commenter said that the rule would do so while removing the judicially-created Title VII affirmative defense. The commenter recommended that HUD withdraw the rule or create a specific carve-out for actions against a State that limits and defines the extent of vicarious liability, including a safe-haven for conduct or policy akin to an affirmative defense.

HUD Response: Executive Order 13132 (entitled “Federalism”) prohibits an agency from publishing any rule that has federalism implications if the rule either (1) imposes substantial, direct compliance costs on state and local governments and is not required by statute, or (2) preempts state law, unless the agency meets the consultation and funding requirements of section 6 of the Executive Order. Under the Executive Order, Federalism implications are those having substantial direct effects on states or local governments (individually or collectively), on the relationship between the national government and the states, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. This final rule does not have such implications. As discussed elsewhere, the rule creates no new cause of action, liability or obligation on the part of any housing provider, including a State. The rule interprets the Fair Housing Act’s prohibition on discriminatory harassment, and in doing so, neither alters the substantive prohibitions against discrimination in the Act nor creates enhanced liability or compliance costs for States or any other entities or individuals. Similarly, the rule does not alter any sovereign immunity protections that a State may have under the Eleventh Amendment. In addition, the rule does not remove a pre-existing affirmative defense, because no court of which HUD is aware has ever applied the Title VII affirmative defense or any other affirmative defense or safe harbor to Fair Housing Act claims; nor has HUD ever applied such a standard. HUD notes further that creating an affirmative defense or safe harbor for States would not be consistent with Congressional intent, for the reasons discussed above.

b. Type of Conduct: § 100.600(b)

Issue: A commenter inquired whether a verbal or written account from an aggrieved tenant was enough to prove a claim of hostile environment harassment under the Act.

HUD Response: A verbal or written account from an aggrieved tenant may be enough to provide notice to a housing provider that a hostile environment may be occurring, but whether such a verbal or written account constitutes a quid pro quo. Other practice, where the incident is severe, or evidences a quid pro quo. Other commenters stated that in some cases a single act can be so severe as to deprive individuals of their right to use and enjoy their housing.

HUD Response: HUD did not intend to propose two different standards for determining whether hostile environment harassment has occurred. To avoid confusion and better clarify the relationship between § 100.600(c) and § 100.600(a)(2), HUD is revising § 100.600(c) at this final rule stage. Section 100.600(a)(2) of the rule provides the only standard that must be met to prove a claim of hostile environment harassment under the Act—namely, that: a person was subjected to unwelcome spoken, written, or physical conduct; the conduct was because of a protected characteristic; and the conduct was sufficiently severe or pervasive as to interfere with or deprive the victim of his or her right to use and enjoy the housing or to exercise other rights protected by the Act. As provided in § 100.600(a)(2), a determination of whether this standard has been met is to be based on the totality of the circumstances. Section 100.600(c) is included in the rule to make clear that a single incident of harassment because of a protected characteristic, if sufficiently severe, can constitute a hostile environment harassment violation (as defined in § 100.600(a)(2)). Whether a claim of hostile environment harassment is based on a single incident or repeated incidents of unwelcome conduct, an assessment of the totality of the circumstances is still required. For example, the nature of the conduct (e.g., whether it was spoken, written and/or physical) and the location of the conduct (e.g., whether it occurred inside the victim’s apartment or in a common space), among other potential considerations, would factor into an assessment of whether a single incident of harassment was sufficiently severe to interfere with or deprive the victim of his or her right to use and enjoy the housing or to exercise other rights protected by the Act.

HUD is revising proposed § 100.600(c) at this final rule stage as follows.
Proposed § 100.600(c) provided that: “A single incident of harassment because of race, color, religion, sex, familial status, national origin, or handicap may constitute a discriminatory housing practice, where the incident is severe, or evidences a quid pro quo.” Final § 100.600(c) now provides: “A single incident of harassment because of race, color, religion, sex, familial status, national origin, or handicap may constitute a discriminatory housing practice, where the incident is sufficiently severe to create a hostile environment, or evidences a quid pro quo.”

B. Illustrations: §§ 100.60, 100.65, 100.80, 100.90, 100.120, 100.130, and 100.135

Issue: Several commenters supported the illustrations included throughout the proposed rule and asked HUD to provide additional examples of prohibited practices in the final rule. They requested more examples of: Unwelcome conduct; how quid pro quo harassment occurs with respect to protected classes other than sex; single incidents that constitute a hostile environment; and when direct liability exists. Commenters also recommended that HUD add to the final rule examples clarifying the relationship between age and disability and add examples of harassment of pregnant women, Muslims, persons with limited English proficiency, persons with mental health-related disabilities or HIV/AIDS, and persons who assert their rights to organize. Another commenter stated that HUD has provided useful illustrations of what does not violate the Act in other fair housing contexts, and requested that HUD do the same here, citing 24 CFR 100.205(b) (concerning the impracticality of meeting the Act’s design and construction standards).

HUD Response: HUD retains the illustrations contained in the proposed rule, but otherwise declines to add more illustrations to the final rule. The rule contains numerous illustrations of possible quid pro quo and hostile environment harassment referencing all protected classes. But whether illegal harassment has or has not occurred in a particular situation is fact-specific and must be determined on a case-by-case basis. For this reason, the illustrations provided are simply more specific descriptions of the legal standard, e.g., conditioning the availability of housing on a person’s response to sexual harassment illustrates an unlawful refusal to sell or rent. Providing illustrations that do not violate the Act would not be appropriate because of the necessarily fact-specific nature of such an inquiry. HUD notes that § 100.205(b), which the commenter cited, does not describe conduct that does not violate the Act, but rather provides examples of when the impracticality exception to the Act’s design and construction requirements is applicable. Lastly, some of the suggested examples are outside the scope of the Act, e.g., the right to organize, but HUD notes that persons would be protected by the Act to the extent the harassment is because of their race, color, religion, sex, familial status, national origin, or disability.

C. Liability for Discriminatory Housing Practices: § 100.7

a. Direct Liability for One’s Own Discriminatory Conduct: § 100.7(a)(1)(i)

Issue: A commenter stated that the language in § 100.7(a)(1)(i), which states that a person is directly liable for the person’s own conduct that results in a discriminatory housing practice, may lead to the liability of innocent actors and third-parties who somehow contributed to an illegal discriminatory action. The commenter gave as an example a situation in which a person supplied the pen that a housing provider used to make notes on an application that the housing provider later rejected because of a protected characteristic of the applicant.

HUD Response: The rule creates no new or enhanced forms of liability. As discussed in the preamble of the proposed rule, § 100.7(a)(1)(i) does nothing more than restate the most basic form of direct liability, i.e., that a person is directly liable for his or her own discriminatory housing practices, as defined by the Act. Whether a person’s conduct constitutes a discriminatory housing practice under sections 804–806 or 818 of the Act depends upon the specific facts.

b. Direct Liability for Negligent Failure To Correct and End Discrimination: § 100.7(a)(1)(ii) and (iii)

Issue: Several commenters expressed concern about the “should have known” standard in proposed § 100.7(a)(1)(ii) and (iii), which states that a person is directly liable for “(ii) failing to take prompt action to correct and end a discriminatory housing practice by that person’s employee or agent, where the person knew or should have known of the discriminatory conduct,” and “(iii) failing to fulfill a duty to take prompt action to correct and end a discriminatory housing practice by a third-party, where the person knew or should have known of the discriminatory conduct . . .” (emphasis added).

Some commenters stated that this standard creates almost certain liability for landlords and that requiring actual knowledge would be more fair to property owners because liability would only attach for failing to act on known discrimination. A commenter stated that the final rule should limit liability where a housing provider has limited knowledge of misconduct. In contrast, other commenters stated that the “knew or should have known” standard is reasonable and consistent with the Fair Housing Act, legal negligence principles, and business practices of housing providers. One commenter complained that the proposed rule appears to require actual knowledge, even though the standard only requires that a defendant “should have known” of the harassment.

Commenters asked HUD to clarify how a housing provider “should have known” about harassment, especially in the context of tenant-on-tenant harassment. A commenter questioned what the housing provider needs to know before liability attaches and whether the housing provider needs to know that the harasser’s actions violate the Fair Housing Act or only that the harasser took some action toward the victim. Several commenters expressed concern that a PHA might be liable when a housing voucher holder is harassed but neither the apartment owner nor voucher holder informs the housing agency about the harassment. One commenter expressed a similar concern that owners living in another city or state may not learn that harassment is taking place on their property unless the tenant tells the owner, and another commenter asked about a PHA’s potential liability when harassment occurs over the internet but is unknown to the housing agency.

HUD Response: The “knew or should have known” standard is well established in civil rights and tort law. A housing provider “should have known” of the harassment of one resident by another when the housing provider had knowledge from which a reasonable person would conclude that the harassment was occurring. Such knowledge can come from, for example, the harassed resident, another resident, another resident,
or a friend of the harassed resident.\(^{29}\) There is no requirement that the resident contact the housing provider about the harassment, only that the housing provider have knowledge from which a reasonable person would conclude that harassment was occurring. If the housing provider has no information from which a reasonable person would conclude that one resident or a third-party was harassing another resident, the housing provider is not liable for failing to take action to correct and end the harassment. If the knowledge component is not met, a housing provider cannot be held liable for a resident’s or third-party’s discriminatory conduct. HUD disagrees that this standard will subject landlords to certain liability. Application of this standard to the liability provisions of the rule helps clarify the Act’s coverage for residents and housing providers. It is intended to help guide housing providers in their assessment of when to intervene to prevent or end discriminatory conduct. HUD encourages housing providers to create safe, welcoming, and responsive housing environments by regularly training staff, developing and publicizing anti-discrimination policies, and acting quickly to resolve complaints once sufficient information exists that would lead a reasonable person to conclude that harassment was occurring.

**Issue:** A commenter was concerned that § 100.7(a)(1)(ii) is seeking to hold the agent liable for the actions of its principal, contrary to Supreme Court precedent, and asked why this provision is necessary in light of proposed § 100.7(b) (vicarious liability), which states that the housing provider is already liable for the unlawful actions of the agent, whether known or not.

**HUD Response:** Section 100.7(a)(1)(ii) addresses a principal’s direct liability for the principal’s own negligent conduct in overseeing (or failing to oversee) its agent or employee. Under the negligence theory of direct liability, the principal is liable only if the principal knew or should have known of the agent’s discriminatory conduct and failed to take corrective action to end it. Section 100.7(b), by contrast, holds the principal vicariously liable for the discriminatory conduct of its agent, regardless of whether the principal knew or should have known of the agent’s conduct. As the commenter noted, an agent is not vicariously liable for the principal’s conduct, but is directly liable for his or her own actions. Section 100.7 does not create liability that does not already exist; it does not hold the agent liable for the conduct of the principal, and it is entirely consistent with traditional agency principles and Supreme Court precedent.

**Issue:** A commenter asked for clarification of the term “third-party” in § 100.7(a)(1)(iii). The commenter was concerned that if left undefined, the term would include everyone. The commenter asked HUD to limit the term to what the commenter perceived to be HUD’s primary concern—“liability resulting from a landlord’s failure to assist a tenant subject to another tenant’s harassment.”

**HUD Response:** HUD does not agree that its use of the term “third-party” requires further clarification in the text of the rule. In the context of the rule, liability for discriminatory conduct by a “third-party” is appropriately limited to a non-employee or non-agent who engaged in quid pro quo or hostile environment harassment of which the housing provider knew or should have known and had the power to correct.

**Issue:** A commenter stated that it is unclear from the proposed rule whether the obligation in proposed § 100.7(a)(1)(iii) to take action to end a discriminatory housing practice by a third-party must be derived from a contract, lease, or law, or whether it could be derived from these sources. The commenter also requested that HUD clarify in the rule whether generic lease provisions related to the use and enjoyment of one’s home that are found in almost every lease would be enough to create the obligation and related liability contemplated in § 100.7(a)(1)(iii). Another commenter expressed a concern that housing providers would take steps to minimize their liability for failing to take corrective action by revising their leases and other documents so that they do not create a duty to protect tenants. A commenter expressed concern that the term “duty,” incorporated from other legal responsibilities or the operation of law, is difficult to fully assess and therefore bound to create unanticipated consequences.

**HUD Response:** HUD recognizes that proposed § 100.7(a)(1)(iii) may have caused some confusion, so HUD has reworded the provision in the final rule. Proposed § 100.7(a)(1)(iii) now states that a person is directly liable for “failing to fulfill a duty to take prompt action to correct and end a discriminatory housing practice by a third-party, where the person knew or should have known of the discriminatory conduct. The duty to take prompt action to correct and end a discriminatory housing practice by a third-party derives from an obligation to the aggrieved person created by contract or lease (including bylaws or other rules of a homeowner’s association, condominium or cooperative), or by federal, state or local law.” Revised section 100.7(a)(1)(iii) of this final rule provides that a person is directly liable for “failing to take prompt action to correct and end a discriminatory housing practice by a third-party, where the person knew or should have known of the discriminatory conduct and had the power to correct it. The power to take prompt action to correct a discriminatory housing practice by a third-party depends upon the extent of control or any other legal responsibility the person may have with respect to the conduct of such third-party.” The final rule does not use the term “duty,” and no longer identifies specific categories of potential sources for such a duty. A housing provider’s obligation to take prompt action to correct and end a discriminatory housing practice by a third-party derives from the Fair Housing Act itself, and its liability for not correcting the discriminatory conduct of which it knew or should have known depends upon the extent of the housing provider’s control or any other legal responsibility the provider may have with respect to the conduct of such third-party.\(^{29}\) For example, when a housing provider enters into a lease agreement with a tenant, the lease typically obligates the housing provider to exercise reasonable care to protect the residents’ safety and curtail unlawful conduct in areas under the housing provider’s control, whether or not the lease contains specific language creating that responsibility. Even if the lease does not expressly create such obligations, the power to act may derive from other legal responsibilities or the operation of law.\(^{30}\)

\(^{29}\) See, e.g., Neudecker v. Boisclair Corp., 351 F. 3d at 364 (owner may be liable for acts of tenants and management’s children after failing to respond to plaintiff’s complaints of harassment); Carydale Enterprises, 707 F. Supp. 217 (E.D. Va. 1989) (finding that owners and managers’ failure to address one tenant’s complaints of racial harassment by another tenant stated a claim under 42 U.S.C. 1981 and 1982).

Issue: A commenter expressed concern that proposed § 100.7(a)(1)(iii) creates liability on the part of a community association (homeowner association, condominium or cooperative) for the illegal acts of residents over whom they have no control. The commenter urged HUD to remove or revise the proposed rule’s extension of direct liability to community associations for the discriminatory actions of non-agents. The commenter stated that community associations generally lack legal authority to mandate that residents take actions described in the preamble of the proposed rule because the associations cannot evict homeowners or otherwise impose conditions not specifically authorized by the association’s covenants, conditions, and restrictions (CC&Rs) or state law. The commenter suggested that if the language in § 100.7(a)(1)(iii) remains, it should be modified to clearly state which terms and conditions in association bylaws and regulations constitute a duty on the part of an association or its agents to investigate and punish residents for illegal discriminatory housing practices.

HUD Response: As noted above, HUD has slightly revised § 100.7(a)(1)(iii) to clarify that a housing provider is liable under the Fair Housing Act for third-party conduct if the provider knew or should have known of the discriminatory conduct, has the power to correct it, and failed to do so. HUD also notes that the rule does not add any new forms of liability under the Act or create obligations that do not otherwise exist. The rule does not impose vicarious liability (see §100.7(b)(i)) on a community association for the actions of persons who are not its agents. Section 100.7(a)(1)(ii) describes a community association’s liability for its own negligent supervision of its agents, and §100.7(a)(1)(iii) describes a community association’s liability for its own negligence for failing to take prompt action to correct and end a discriminatory housing practice by a third-party. With respect to §100.7(a)(1)(iii), the rule requires that when a community association has the power to act to correct a discriminatory housing practice by a third-party of which it knows or should have known, the community association must do so.

As the commenter recognizes, a community association generally has the power to respond to third-party harassment by imposing conditions authorized by the association’s CC&Rs or by other legal authority. Community associations regularly require residents to comply with CC&Rs and community rules through such mechanisms as notices of violations, threats of fines, and fines. HUD understands that community associations may not always have the ability to deny a unit owner access to his or her dwelling; the rule merely requires the community association to take whatever actions it legally can take to end the harassing conduct.

Issue: A few commenters suggested that HUD should reconsider imposing liability on a landlord for tenant-on-tenant harassment because the law in this area is not well-settled. The commenters expressed concern that proposed § 100.7(a)(1)(iii) exceeds the scope of the Act by expanding liability for housing providers to include liability for third-party harassment of a resident when the housing provider did not act with discriminatory intent. One commenter, relying on Title VII case law and an interpretation of the phrase “because of,” stated that a landlord must have acted with discriminatory intent in order to be liable under the Fair Housing Act. Another commenter stated that although section 804(a) of the Fair Housing Act does not require a showing of intentional discrimination, claims brought under sections 804(b) and 817 of the Act do, citing Francis v. King Park Manor, Inc., 91 F. Supp. 3d 420 (E.D.N.Y. 2015). Another comment stated that to establish a housing provider’s liability for failing to take action to correct third-party harassment, the plaintiff must show not just that the housing provider failed to correct the harassment but also that the housing provider did so because of animus against the victim due to a protected characteristic. A commenter pointed to Lawrence v. Courtyards of Deerwood Ass’n, Inc., 318 F. Supp. 2d 1133 (S.D. Fla. 2004), as an example of a case in which the court dismissed the fair housing claim against the housing provider because the plaintiffs failed to establish that the housing provider’s ineffective response to the harassment was due to racial animus. Commenters also pointed to Ohio Civil Rights Comm’n v. Akron Metro. Hous. Auth., 892 NE.2d 415, 420 (Ohio 2008), in which the court declined to impose liability on landlords for failing to take corrective action in response to discriminatory harassment committed by the landlord’s tenants. A commenter also suggested that the proposed rule is not addressing discriminatory animus on the part of the housing provider would amount to strict liability. The commenters proposed that in light of these contrary federal and state court decisions, HUD should require proof of some degree of animus by the housing provider before subjecting the provider to direct liability for the acts of third parties.

HUD Response: HUD does not agree that a housing provider’s failure to act to correct third-party harassment must be motivated by a discriminatory intent or animus before the provider can be held liable for a Fair Housing Act violation. In reaching this conclusion, HUD considered its own experience in administering and enforcing the Fair Housing Act, the broad remedial purposes of the Act, relevant case law including the Supreme Court’s recent ruling in Texas Department of Community Affairs v. Inclusive Communities Project, Inc. holding that the Fair Housing Act is not limited to claims of intentional discrimination, and the views of the EEOC regarding Title VII. The case law cited by the commenters fail to support the proposition that the Fair Housing Act requires discriminatory intent in order to find a housing provider liable for its negligent failure to correct resident-on-resident or other third-party discriminatory conduct. The district court decision in Francis v. Kings Park Manor is the sole exception to that principle, and HUD disagrees with its ruling. HUD notes that this decision is on appeal to the Second Circuit.

Section 100.7(a)(1)(iii) sets out a negligence standard of liability, which does not require proof of discriminatory

\[\text{Footnotes:} \]

31 See, e.g., Wilstein v. San Tropai Condo. Master Ass’n, supra*28–33; Reeves v. Carrollburg Condo. Unit Owners Ass’n, 1997 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21762, *26. See also Freeman v. Del-Tile Corp., 750 F. 3d 413, 422–23 (4th Cir. 2014) (holding that “an employer is liable under Title VII for third parties creating a hostile work environment if the employer knew or should have known of the harassment and failed to take prompt remedial action reasonably calculated to end it.”) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted); Goldhammer v. Potter, 415 F. 3d 1015, 1022 (9th Cir. 2005) (stating that an employer may be held liable for the actionable third-party harassment of its employees where it ratifies or condones the conduct by failing to investigate and remedy it after learning of it.).

32 See e.g., Havens Realty Corp. v. Coleman, 455 U.S. 363, 380 (1982) (Congress intended Fair Housing Act to be broadly remedial); cf. Jones v. Alfred H. Mayer Co., 392 U.S. 409, 413 (1968) (describing the Fair Housing Act’s comprehensive open housing law”). 42 U.S.C. 3601 (“It is the policy of the United States to provide, within constitutional limitations, for fair housing throughout the United States.”).
intent or animus on the part of the provider, but is far from strict liability. Under this standard, a plaintiff or the charging party must prove three elements to establish a housing provider’s liability for third-party harassment: (1) The third-party created a hostile environment for the plaintiff or complainant; (2) the housing provider knew or should have known about the conduct creating the hostile environment; and (3) the housing provider failed to take prompt action to correct and end the harassment while having the power to do so. HUD does not agree that a fourth element—that the housing provider’s failure to act was more than negligent, and was motivated by discriminatory intent—is necessary or appropriate.

Contrary to one comment, the Supreme Court in Inclusive Communities Project has already ruled that the “because of” clause in the Fair Housing Act does not require proof of discriminatory intent. While not addressing every aspect of the cited decisions, HUD notes the following: In Lawrence v. Courtyards of Deerwood Ass’n, cited by another commenter, the court dismissed the discriminatory harassment claim not for lack of discriminatory intent on the part of the landlord, but because it found, inter alia, that the dispute did not involve discriminatory harassment of one tenant by another but instead reflected mutual antagonism between two tenants. The court in Lawrence distinguished Reeves v. Carrollsburg Condo. Unit Owners Ass’n, 1997 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21762, *22 (D.D.C. 1997), which held the landlord liable under the Fair Housing Act for its failure to adequately address sexual harassment of one tenant by another because “the Carrollsburg Condo association’s by-laws specifically authorized the association to curtail conduct that contravened the law” and provided that a violation of local or federal law was a violation of the association rules. 33

Finally, the state court decision cited by one commenter did not involve claims under the Fair Housing Act and does not provide reason for HUD to alter § 100.7(a)(1)(iii) at the final rule stage. In Ohio Civil Rights Commission v. Akron Metropolitan Housing Authority, the Ohio Supreme Court’s refusal to hold a landlord liable under a state civil rights law for failing to take corrective action in response to one tenant’s racial harassment of another tenant was premised on an incorrect reading of Title VII jurisprudence. The court misconstrued Title VII case law to require an agency relationship between an employer and a perpetrator of harassment in order to hold the employer liable for negligently failing to stop sexual harassment by the perpetrator. 34 In fact, under Title VII, an agency relationship is not required in order to hold employers liable for negligently failing to stop discriminatory harassment of which the employer knew or should have known. Both the EEOC and the federal courts have recognized that an employer may be held liable for negligently failing to stop discriminatory harassment in the workplace by non-employees or non-agents. 35 The principle of liability codified in § 100.7(a)(1)(iii) of this final rule is consistent with these Title VII authorities and, in HUD’s view, appropriately serves the Fair Housing Act’s parallel antidiscrimination objectives in the housing context. In sum, the proposed rule and this final rule reflect HUD’s considered judgment, consistent with prevailing precedent and EEOC regulations, that a housing provider (including a homeowner’s association) or property manager is liable under the Act for negligently failing to take corrective action against a third-party harasser when the provider or manager knew or should have known of the harassment and had the power to end it. In light of the above, HUD declines to make the proposed revisions to the final rule.

Issue: A commenter stated that the imposition of liability on private landlords for tenant-on-tenant harassment is inappropriate and will have several negative consequences. The commenter stated that private owners do not have the expertise or resources to undertake what is essentially a social services function to mediate disputes between neighbors. In addition, the commenter expressed concern that the proposed rule could make it more difficult and risky for property owners to take affirmative steps to operate racially integrated housing. The commenter stated that the rule will be an economic disincentive for individuals, companies, and other investors to engage in the business of renting residential real estate and that the Section 8 voucher program depends on the participation of these private entities in order to achieve other fair housing goals. The commenter expressed concern that the effect of the proposed rule will be to reduce the supply of available affordable units, thus disproportionately harming low-income families. Other commenters raised concerns that landlords, when confronted by tenants who mutually accuse each other of harassment, will be unable to take necessary corrective actions because of the rule’s prohibition against moving or causing injury to a complaining tenant, or will reprimand the wrong tenant because they lack expertise with investigations.

Numerous other commenters supported the rule’s recognition that a housing provider may be directly liable for harassment of a tenant by the housing provider’s employee or a third-party. These commenters stated that any suggestion that this rule will unduly burden housing providers is exaggerated, that the rule is wholly consistent with the ordinary responsibilities of housing providers to ensure habitability, and that housing providers are familiar with the tools they have to enforce their own rules—tools they frequently wield.

HUD Response: The rule does not create new or enhanced liabilities for housing providers, including those who participate in the Section 8 program. HUD believes that this rule will help clarify the obligations that housing providers already have in offering and maintaining housing environments free from discrimination and that comply with the Fair Housing Act. We are long past the time when racial harassment is a tolerable price for integrated housing; a housing provider is responsible for maintaining its properties free from all discrimination prohibited by the Fair Housing Act. Under the Act, discriminatory practices are those that violate sections 804, 805, 806, or 818. Such practices do not encompass all incivilities, and thus it is important to note that not every quarrel among neighbors amounts to a violation of the Fair Housing Act. 36 Ending harassing or


Apartments, only harasser). (finding landlord liable for violating Act by evicting another’s home may violate Act).

996 F. Supp. 238, 243 (E.D.N.Y. 1998) (neighbors skirmishes in an unfortunate war between neighbors); [ ] impose a code of civility’’ on neighbors); [ ] engage in the conduct, not the necessity evicting the tenant who has raised this particularly vulnerable population.

Another commenter stated that because tenants with mental illness often have difficulty finding housing, the proposed rule might result in an increased rate of homelessness among persons with mental disabilities. A commenter asked HUD to revisit the proposed rule’s third-party liability provision to avoid harming this particularly vulnerable population.

Other commenters stated that the rule would help protect many vulnerable persons from eviction. These commenters supported the statement in the proposed rule’s preamble that eviction is only one of the many corrective actions housing providers may utilize to address harassment.

HUD Response: The rule neither changes a housing provider’s responsibilities toward tenants with mental disabilities nor incentivizes evictions of such persons. It is not uncommon for the behavior of one tenant to frustrate, displease, or annoy another tenant. This is true for behavior by tenants with and without psychiatric disabilities. The rule does not require a housing provider to take action whenever one tenant engages in behavior that another tenant finds objectionable. The Act prohibits discrimination against applicants and tenants with disabilities, including evicting individuals with disabilities because other tenants find them frustrating, displeasing, or annoying.

The Act does not, however, require that a dwelling be made available to a person whose tenancy would constitute a direct threat to the health or safety of others or would result in substantial physical damage to the property of others. The housing provider must make an individualized assessment as to whether such a threat exists based on reliable objective evidence that considers: (1) The nature, duration, and severity of the risk of injury; (2) the probability that injury will actually occur; and (3) whether there are any reasonable accommodations that will eliminate the direct threat. In evaluating a recent history of overt acts, a housing provider must take into account whether the individual has received intervening treatment or medication that has eliminated the direct threat. Reasonable accommodations must be made when they may be necessary to afford such persons an equal opportunity to use and enjoy a dwelling. HUD refers the reader to the Joint Statement of HUD and DOJ on Reasonable Accommodations under the Fair Housing Act for further information. 39

1. Corrective Action: § 100.7(a)(2)

Issue: A commenter asked HUD to remove the prohibition against causing injury to a complaining party.

HUD Response: HUD declines to remove the prohibition on causing additional injury to a person who has already been injured by illegal harassment. Permitting such additional injury would be inconsistent with the Act’s purposes to prevent unlawful discrimination and remedy discrimination that has already occurred.

Issue: One commenter requested further guidance as to what constitutes appropriate corrective action by a housing provider to stop tenant-on-tenant harassment. The commenter specifically inquired whether a single verbal statement by a landlord to a tenant who allegedly engaged in harassing conduct would be sufficient corrective action to relieve a landlord from liability under the rule. Another commenter asked HUD to impose realistic and reasonable limitations on housing providers’ obligation to take corrective action.

HUD Response: There is no one way that a housing provider must respond to complaints of third-party harassment,
although the rule makes clear that a provider that fails to effectively respond may be subject to liability under the Act. Section 100.7(a)(2) provides that corrective actions must be effective in ending the discrimination, but may not injure the aggrieved persons. For example, corrective actions appropriate for a housing provider to utilize to stop tenant-on-tenant harassment or other third-party harassment might include verbal and written warnings; enforcing lease provisions to move, evict, or otherwise sanction tenants who harass or permit guests to harass; issuing no-trespass orders against guests; or reporting conduct to the police. What constitutes appropriate and effective corrective action will depend on the nature, frequency, and severity of the harassment. While in some cases a single verbal reprimand by a housing provider may be sufficient to effectively end discriminatory harassment of one tenant by another, the housing provider should notify the victim that such action was taken, and it is advisable for the housing provider to document this action in its records. Additionally, the housing provider should follow up with the victim of the harassment after the corrective action is taken to ensure that it was effective. If the housing provider knows or should have known that the corrective action was ineffective, the provider has a responsibility to take additional corrective actions within its power. If, however, corrective action is effective in ending the discriminatory conduct, a housing provider is not required to take additional action simply because the victim believes further action should have been taken. HUD does not agree that there is a need to add a specific limitation on a housing provider’s responsibility to take corrective action within its power to act in response to discriminatory harassment of which the provider knew or should have known.

***Issue:*** A commenter stated that because tenants are not agents or employees, landlords cannot simply compel tenants to take or avoid particular action and do not have the ability to shape or alter tenants’ behavior beyond threatening and carrying out evictions. Another commenter asked HUD to consider that there are substantial practical differences between the ability of housing providers to take corrective action to end tenant-on-tenant harassment and their ability to control the actions of their employees because there is no agency relationship in the former. Another commenter stated that most homeowners would be very concerned if association board members, employees, or agents injected themselves into the interpersonal relationships of homeowners and residents to investigate their interactions and relationships for discriminatory elements. This commenter also said that for PHAs, eviction is often unavailable as a remedy for alleged tenant-on-tenant harassment because the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 and federal regulations limit the ability of PHAs to carry out evictions, except for specified causes. In addition, the commenter stated that the result of these restrictions and the proposed rule would be to create significant new liability for PHAs for tenant-on-tenant harassment without creating any new mechanisms for PHAs to mitigate this liability.

In contrast, other commenters stated that the rule does not create any new liability because landlords have an obligation to protect tenants’ rights to quiet enjoyment and generally have the right to take actions against renters and occupants who disturb the quiet enjoyment of others. **HUD Response:** Neither the proposed rule nor this final rule create new liability for housing providers, including PHAs or homeowner’s associations, regarding resident-on-resident harassment. Nor does the rule require a housing provider to take action that is beyond the scope of its power to act. HUD recognizes that specific remedies that may be available to employers to stop an employee’s illegal practices will be distinct from those that a housing provider may use to stop residents who are engaging in discriminatory conduct. Creating and posting policy statements against harassment and establishing complaint procedures, offering fair housing training to residents and mediating disputes before they escalate, issuing verbal and written warnings and notices of rule violations, enforcing bylaws prohibiting illegal or disruptive conduct, issuing and enforcing notices to quit, issuing threats of eviction and, if necessary, enforcing evictions and involving the police are powerful tools available to a housing provider to control or remedy a tenant’s illegal conduct. These tools are also available to PHAs, and, contrary to one commenter’s concern, eviction is available to a PHA to correct a tenant’s discriminatory conduct as the PHA may terminate a tenancy for “serious or repeated violation of material terms of the lease.” 24 CFR 966.4(f)(2)(i), which includes the PHA on the PHA List tenants must “act . . . in a manner which will not disturb other residents’ peaceful enjoyment of their accommodations. . . .” 24 CFR 966.4(f)(11).

***Issue:*** A commenter expressed concern that a PHA may be held directly liable for failing to correct actions by third-parties over whom they have little or no control. As an example, the commenter cited harassment of a voucher-holding tenant by neighbors who are not also voucher-holders and not otherwise affiliated with the PHA. Similarly, another commenter stated that the rule could be interpreted to make landlords liable for conduct that occurs off their property or that has nothing to do with a tenant’s home.

**HUD Response:** This rule describes the standard for assessing liability under the Fair Housing Act. These fair housing standards apply to private and public landlords alike and do not turn on whether a tenant holds a Housing Choice Voucher or receives other government rental assistance. HUD also reiterated that a housing provider is not responsible for correcting evictions or other corrective action by any third-party. Rather, the third-party action must constitute a discriminatory housing practice as defined by the Act, and the housing provider must have the power to correct it. As provided in the final rule and discussed elsewhere in this preamble, whether a housing provider has the power to take corrective measures in a specific situation—and what corrective measures are appropriate—is dependent on the facts, including the extent of control or any other legal responsibility the person may have with respect to the conduct of such third-party. There may be instances where the ability to correct the unlawful conduct is beyond a housing provider’s control. Thus, when confronted with discriminatory harassment of one of its Housing Choice Voucher-holders or other tenants, the housing agency should explore what corrective actions are within its power and are appropriate to take.

***Issue:*** A commenter suggested that an unintended consequence of the proposed rule could be that property owners would remove security devices, such as video cameras and other surveillance mechanisms, for fear that such measures may create a duty on the part of the property owner to correct neighbor-on-neighbor harassment. In contrast, other commenters stated that housing providers may feel the need to provide for more oversight of residences which may interfere with residents’ right to peaceful enjoyment of their dwelling.

**HUD Response:** Removing security devices will not relieve a housing provider of its obligation to take the
actions within its power to promptly correct and end a discriminatory housing practice. Elsewhere in the preamble, HUD discusses various options that may be available to housing providers to address neighbor-on-neighbor harassment.

**Issue:** A commenter stated that owners should be encouraged to use positive incentives, such as promoting better communication with—and healthy relationships among—tenants, and educating tenants about their rights to prevent harassment, instead of taking corrective actions that may harm tenants, such as ending a lease or evicting a tenant—.

**HUD Response:** HUD agrees that positive incentives are useful tools for preventing harassment. HUD believes, however, that warnings, threats of evictions, evictions, and lease terminations may also be necessary corrective actions to end harassment. The preamble and rule make clear that there is no one way to prevent or correct harassment, only that the methods need to be effective at ending it.

**c. Vicarious Liability: § 100.7(b)**

**Issue:** Several commenters questioned the description of vicarious liability at § 100.7(b) of the proposed rule. One commenter said § 100.7(b) could be interpreted to impose vicarious liability on an organization’s directors, officers, or owners and suggested HUD clarify, consistent with Meyer v. Holley, that it is the organization—not the individual directors, officers, or board members—who are the “principal or employer” subject to vicarious liability under the Fair Housing Act. The commenter asked HUD to issue clarification that the proposed regulations do not contravene or attempt to reverse Meyer v. Holley, 537 U.S. 280 (2003). In contrast, other commenters applauded the description of vicarious liability in the rule, stated that the description follows well-established common law tort and agency principles, and expressed support for the proposed rule’s reliance on Meyer v. Holley.

**HUD Response:** Subsection 100.7(b) merely describes the well-established concept of vicarious liability, under which principals may be held liable for the discriminatory acts of their agents or employees whether or not they knew of the discriminatory conduct. As articulated in Meyer v. Holley, and as explained in the preambles to the proposed rule and this final rule, traditional agency principles apply to the Fair Housing Act. Under agency principles, a principal is vicariously liable for the actions of his or her agents taken within the scope of their relationship or employment, or for actions taken outside the scope of their relationship or employment when the agent is aided in the commission of such acts by the existence of the agency relationship. Determining whether an agency relationship exists is a factual determination that looks to an agent’s responsibilities, duties, and functions; whether the discriminatory conduct of the agent was within the scope of the agency relationship or aided by the existence of the agency relationship is also a fact-specific inquiry.

**Issue:** Some commenters questioned the statement in the proposed rule’s preamble that a principal is vicariously liable for the actions of an agent or employee taken outside the scope of the agency relationship or employment when the agent or employee is aided in the commission of such acts by the existence of the agency relationship. A commenter agreed that a principal is vicariously liable for the acts of its agents, but believes that, in adopting the “aided in agency” standard, the proposed rule goes beyond traditional tort concepts and does not reflect the limited concepts of vicarious liability endorsed in Meyer v. Holley. The commenter considered it acceptable to hold a real estate company liable for discriminatory acts or statements made by its brokers in the scope of their agency, but disagreed that a housing provider should be liable for misconduct of a janitorial employee outside the scope of that employee’s duty because he wore a badge uniform or possessed keys or passes to tenants’ dwellings. Another commenter asked for clarity on the reasoning behind the assertion in the preamble to the proposed rule that an agent who harasses residents or applicants is necessarily aided by his or her agency relationship with the housing provider.

**HUD Response:** As discussed throughout this preamble, the proposed and final rule do not create new forms of liability. Instead, HUD has decided to adopt well-established principles of agency law, including that a principal may be vicariously liable for the actions of an agent or employee that are taken outside the scope of the employment or agency relationship if the agent or employee is aided in committing the acts by the existence of the employment or agency relationship. Agency law must be applied to the specific facts at issue to determine whether such a situation exists and gives rise to a principal’s liability. The statement in the proposed rule that an agent who engages in hostile environment harassment of residents or applicants is aided by the agency relationship with the housing provider was not intended to suggest the agent is necessarily so aided with respect to every discriminatory housing practice. It was intended to explain one of the reasons HUD chose not to import into the Fair Housing Act the Title VII affirmative defense to an employer’s vicarious liability for hostile environment harassment. As explained in that context, a housing provider’s agent who engages in harassment holds a position of power and authority over the victimized resident or applicant, regardless of the agent’s specific duties. This is because a resident or applicant has only an arms-length economic relationship with the housing provider, while an agent-perpetrator is clothed with the authority of the housing provider. Given this inherent imbalance of power and control over the terms or conditions of the housing environment, the distinction between harassment by supervisory and non-supervisory employees that supported the creation of the affirmative defense in the employment context do not extend to the housing context.

**D. Other Issues**

**Issue:** A commenter stated that HUD should apply the proposed rule only to its own investigative and administrative
actions and should not purport to preempt court-established rules. The commenter stated that in some instances it may be appropriate for federal courts to defer to agency rules, but that this is not a case where *Chevron* deference is appropriate because HUD is not basing the rule on its own experience, but largely on interpretations of federal court decisions. The commenter stated that HUD has no particular expertise in tort law and no authority to interpret tort laws. Another commenter stated that HUD appears to be using the administrative rule-making process to substitute its views for those of the courts, and that HUD must pursue the change it seeks through Congress and/or courts, and that HUD must pursue the change it seeks through Congress and/or courts, and that HUD must pursue the change it seeks through Congress and/or courts, and that HUD must pursue the change it seeks through Congress and/or courts, and that HUD must pursue the change it seeks through Congress and/or courts.

**HUD Response:** The commenters misconstrue both the rule and HUD’s authority under the Act. The Act specifically grants the Secretary of HUD the authority and responsibility to administer and enforce the Act, including promulgating rules to carry out the Act. This rule-making authority is not limited to HUD’s investigations or administrative proceedings. Moreover, the rule does not construe tort law, but rather clarifies standards for liability under this part based on traditional principles of tort liability. It imposes no new legal obligations or duties of care. In addition, the introductory portion of this preamble describes the grounds for *Chevron* deference.

**Issue:** Some commenters disagreed with HUD’s statement in the preamble to the proposed rule that the rule does not create additional costs for housing providers and others covered by the Fair Housing Act. They stated that the proposed rule would lead to increased costs for and litigation against housing providers. Among the other costs cited by commenters are costs for compliance and training, increased insurance premiums, and increased liability because many housing providers would not have the ability to remain diligent to address all harassment claims, leaving them vulnerable to litigation.

Another commenter said that the proposed rule creates the possibility for substantial judgments for money damages that PHAs have little ability to pay, because they may not use federal funds to pay judgments for damages.

**HUD Response:** As noted throughout this preamble, this final rule does not impose any new or enhanced liabilities. Rather, it clarifies existing law under the Fair Housing Act and well-established common law tort and agency principles as they apply under the Act. The rule does not change substantive obligations, but merely formalizes them in a regulation. Because the standards articulated in the rule are already law, the risks of liability and costs of complying will not increase with issuance of the rule. HUD presumes that the vast majority of housing providers are in compliance with the law. Any costs incurred by housing providers to come into compliance as a result of this rulemaking will simply be the costs of compliance with a preexisting statute, administrative practice, and case law. In fact, by formalizing uniform standards for investigations and adjudications under the Fair Housing Act, the rule serves to reduce costs for housing providers by establishing greater clarity with respect to how a determination of liability is to be made.

**V. Findings and Certifications**

**Regulatory Review—Executive Orders 12866 and 13563**

Under Executive Order 12866 (Regulatory Planning and Review), a determination must be made whether a regulatory action is significant and therefore, subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in accordance with the requirements of the order.

Executive Order 13563 (Improving Regulations and Regulatory Review) directs executive agencies to analyze regulations that are “outmoded, ineffective, insufficient, or excessively burdensome, and to modify, streamline, expand, or repeal them in accordance with what has been learned.” Executive Order 13563 also directs that, where relevant, feasible, and consistent with regulatory objectives, and to the extent permitted by law, agencies are to identify and consider regulatory approaches that reduce burdens and maintain flexibility and freedom of choice for the public. This rule was determined to be a “significant regulatory action” as defined in section 3(f) of Executive Order (although not an economically significant regulatory action, as provided under section 3(f)(1) of the Executive Order).

This rule establishes uniform standards for use in investigations and processing cases involving harassment and liability under the Fair Housing Act. In establishing such standards, HUD is exercising its rulemaking authority to bring uniformity, clarity, and certainty to an area of legal practice.

The dockets for this rule are available for public inspection between the hours of 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. weekdays in the Regulations Division, Office of General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Room 10276, 451 7th Street SW., Washington, DC 20410–0500. Due to security measures at the HUD Headquarters building, please schedule an appointment to review the docket file by calling the Regulations Division at 202–708–3055 (this is not a toll-free number). Persons with hearing or speech impairments may access the above telephone number via TTY by calling the toll-free Federal Relay Service at 800–877–8339.

**Environmental Impact**

This rule does not direct, provide for assistance or loan and mortgage insurance for, or otherwise govern or regulate, real property acquisition, disposition, leasing, rehabilitation, alteration, demolition or new construction, or establish, revise, or provide for standards for construction or construction materials, manufactured housing, or occupancy. This rule is limited to the procedures governing fair housing enforcement. Accordingly, under 24 CFR 50.19(c)(3), this rule is categorically excluded from environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4321).

**Regulatory Flexibility Act**

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 4321, et seq.) generally requires an agency to conduct a regulatory flexibility analysis of any rule subject to notice and comment rulemaking requirements, unless the agency certifies that the rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The rule establishes standards for evaluating claims of harassment and liability under the Fair Housing Act. The scope of the rule is procedural, and the regulatory changes do not establish any substantive regulatory burdens on small entities. Accordingly, the undersigned certifies that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

**Unfunded Mandates Reform Act**

Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1531–1538) (UMRA) establishes requirements for federal agencies to assess the effects of their regulatory actions on state, local, and tribal governments and the private sector. This rule does not impose any federal mandates on any state, local, or tribal governments or the private sector within the meaning of UMRA.

---


*42 U.S.C. 3608(a), 3610, 3615.*
Executive Order 13132, Federalism

Executive Order 13132 (entitled “Federalism”) prohibits an agency from publishing any rule that has federalism implications if the rule either (1) imposes substantial, direct compliance costs on state and local governments, and is not required by statute, or (2) preempts state law, unless the agency meets the consultation and funding requirements of section 6 of the Executive Order. This rule does not have federalism implications and does not impose substantial direct compliance costs on state and local governments or preempt state law within the meaning of the Executive Order.

Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance

The Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance Number for the equal opportunity in housing program is 14.400.

List of Subjects in 24 CFR Part 100

Aged, Fair housing. Individuals with disabilities, Mortgages, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Accordingly, for the reasons stated in the preamble, and in accordance with HUD’s authority in 42 U.S.C. 3535(d), HUD amends 24 CFR part 100 as follows:

PART 100—DISCRIMINATORY CONDUCT UNDER THE FAIR HOUSING ACT

1. The authority citation for 24 CFR part 100 continues to read as follows:
   Authority: 42 U.S.C. 3535(d), 3600–3620.

2. Add § 100.7 to read as follows:

§ 100.7 Liability for discriminatory housing practices.
   (a) Direct liability. (1) A person is directly liable for:
   (i) The person’s own conduct that results in a discriminatory housing practice.
   (ii) Failing to take prompt action to correct and end a discriminatory housing practice by that person’s employee or agent, where the person knew or should have known of the discriminatory conduct.
   (iii) Failing to take prompt action to correct and end a discriminatory housing practice by a third-party, where the person knew or should have known of the discriminatory conduct and had the power to correct it. The power to take prompt action to correct and end a discriminatory housing practice by a third-party depends upon the extent of the person’s control or any other legal responsibility the person may have with respect to the conduct of such third-party.
   (2) For purposes of determining liability under paragraphs (a)(1)(ii) and (iii) of this section, prompt action to correct and end the discriminatory housing practice may not include any action that penalizes or harms the aggrieved person, such as eviction of the aggrieved person.
   (b) Vicarious liability. A person is vicariously liable for a discriminatory housing practice by the person’s agent or employee, regardless of whether the person knew or should have known of the conduct that resulted in a discriminatory housing practice, consistent with agency law.
   ■ 3. In § 100.60, add paragraphs (b)(6) and (7) to read as follows:

§ 100.60 Unlawful refusal to sell or rent or to negotiate for the sale or rental.
   * * * * *
   (b) * * *
   (6) Conditioning the availability of a dwelling, including the price, qualification criteria, or standards or procedures for securing the dwelling, on a person’s response to harassment because of race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status, or national origin.
   (7) Subjecting a person to harassment because of race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status, or national origin that causes the person to vacate a dwelling or abandon efforts to secure the dwelling.
   ■ 4. In § 100.65, add paragraphs (b)(6) and (7) to read as follows:

§ 100.65 Discrimination in terms, conditions and privileges in services and facilities.
   * * * * *
   (b) * * *
   (6) Conditioning the terms, conditions, or privileges relating to the sale or rental of a dwelling, or denying or limiting the services or facilities in connection therewith, on a person’s response to harassment because of race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status, or national origin.
   (7) Subjecting a person to harassment because of race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status, or national origin that has the effect of imposing different terms, conditions, or privileges relating to the sale or rental of a dwelling or denying or limiting services or facilities in connection with the sale or rental of a dwelling.
   ■ 5. In § 100.80, add paragraph (b)(6) to read as follows:

§ 100.80 Discriminatory representation on the availability of dwellings.
   * * * * *
   (b) * * *
   (6) Representing to an applicant that a unit is unavailable because of the applicant’s response to a request for a sexual favor or other harassment because of race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status, or national origin.
   ■ 6. In § 100.90, add paragraphs (b)(5) and (6) to read as follows:

§ 100.90 Discrimination in the provision of brokerage services.
   * * * * *
   (b) * * *
   (5) Conditioning access to brokerage services on a person’s response to harassment because of race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status, or national origin that has the effect of discouraging or denying access to brokerage services.
   ■ 7. In § 100.120, add paragraphs (b)(3) and (4) to read as follows:

§ 100.120 Discrimination in the making of loans and in the provision of other financial assistance.
   * * * * *
   (b) * * *
   (3) Conditioning the availability of a loan or other financial assistance on a person’s response to harassment because of race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status, or national origin that affects the availability of a loan or other financial assistance.
   (4) Subjecting a person to harassment because of race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status, or national origin.
   ■ 8. In § 100.130, add paragraphs (b)(4) and (5) to read as follows:

§ 100.130 Discrimination in the terms and conditions for making available loans or other financial assistance.
   * * * * *
   (b) * * *
   (4) Conditioning an aspect of a loan or other financial assistance to be provided with respect to a dwelling, or the terms or conditions thereof, on a person’s response to harassment because of race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status, or national origin.
   (5) Subjecting a person to harassment because of race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status, or national origin that has the effect of imposing different terms or conditions for the availability of such loans or other financial assistance.
§ 100.600 Quid pro quo and hostile environment harassment.

(a) General. Quid pro quo harassment is conduct that is sufficiently severe or pervasive as to create a hostile environment. 

(b) Type of conduct. Harassment can be written, verbal, or other conduct, and does not require physical contact. 

(c) Number of incidents. A single incident of harassment because of race, color, religion, sex, familial status, national origin, or handicap may not, in and of itself, be sufficient to create a hostile environment; however, harassment that is sufficiently severe or pervasive may, in and of itself, constitute a hostile environment.

(d) Title VII affirmative defense. The affirmative defense to an employer’s vicarious liability for hostile environment harassment by a supervisor under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 does not apply to cases brought pursuant to the Fair Housing Act.

Subpart H—Quid Pro Quo and Hostile Environment Harassment

§ 100.600 Quid pro quo and hostile environment harassment.

(a) General. Quid pro quo harassment is conduct that is sufficiently severe or pervasive as to create a hostile environment. 

(b) Type of conduct. Harassment can be written, verbal, or other conduct, and does not require physical contact. 

(c) Number of incidents. A single incident of harassment because of race, color, religion, sex, familial status, national origin, or handicap may not, in and of itself, be sufficient to create a hostile environment; however, harassment that is sufficiently severe or pervasive may, in and of itself, constitute a hostile environment.

(d) Title VII affirmative defense. The affirmative defense to an employer’s vicarious liability for hostile environment harassment by a supervisor under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 does not apply to cases brought pursuant to the Fair Housing Act.

§ 100.601 Hostile environment harassment.

(a) General. Hostile environment harassment refers to unwelcome conduct that is sufficiently severe or pervasive as to interfere with: The availability, sale, rental, or use or enjoyment of a dwelling; the terms, conditions, or privileges of the sale or rental; or the provision or enjoyment of services or facilities in connection therewith; or the availability, terms, or conditions of a residential real-estate-related transaction. Hostile environment harassment does not require a change in the economic benefits, terms, or conditions of the dwelling or housing-related services or facilities, or of the residential real-estate transaction.

(b) Totality of the circumstances. Whether hostile environment harassment exists depends upon the totality of the circumstances.

(1) Factors to be considered to determine whether hostile environment harassment exists include, but are not limited to, the nature of the conduct, the context in which the incident(s) occurred, the severity, scope, frequency, duration, and location of the conduct, and the relationships of the persons involved.

(2) Whether psychological or physical harm must be demonstrated to prove that a hostile environment exists.

(3) Evidence of psychological or physical harm may, however, be relevant in determining whether a hostile environment existed and, if so, the amount of damages to which an aggrieved person may be entitled.

(4) Whether unwelcome conduct is sufficiently severe or pervasive as to create a hostile environment is evaluated from the perspective of a reasonable person in the aggrieved person’s position.

(5) The listing of events that informs the public of regularly scheduled marine parades, regattas, other organized water events, and fireworks displays that require additional safety measures provided by regulations. Under this rule, the list of recurring marine events requiring special local regulations or safety zones is updated with revisions, additional events, and removal of events that no longer take place in the Fifth Coast Guard District.

DATES: This rule is effective October 14, 2016.

ADDRESSES: To view documents mentioned in this preamble as being available in the docket, go to http://www.regulations.gov, type USCG–2015–0854 in the “SEARCH” box and click “SEARCH”. Click on Open Docket Folder on the line associated with this rule.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions about this rulemaking, call or email Dennis Sens,
SEPTEMBER 13, 2016

Office of General Counsel Guidance on
Application of Fair Housing Act Standards to the
Enforcement of Local Nuisance and Crime-Free Housing Ordinances Against Victims of Domestic Violence, Other Crime Victims, and Others Who Require Police or Emergency Services

I. Introduction

The Fair Housing Act (or the Act) prohibits discrimination in the sale, rental or financing of dwellings and in other housing-related activities on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, disability, familial status, or national origin. The Department of Housing and Urban Development’s (HUD’s) Office of General Counsel issues this guidance to explain how the Fair Housing Act applies to ensure that the growing number of local nuisance ordinances and crime-free housing ordinances do not lead to discrimination in violation of the Act.

This guidance primarily focuses on the impact these ordinances may have on domestic violence victims, but the Act and the standards described herein apply equally to victims of domestic violence and other crimes and to those in need of emergency services who may be subjected to discrimination prohibited by the Act due to the operation of these ordinances. This guidance therefore addresses both the discriminatory effects and disparate treatment methods of proof under the Act, and briefly describes the obligation of HUD fund recipients to consider the impacts of these ordinances in assessing how they will fulfill their affirmative obligation to further fair housing.

HUD will issue subsequent guidance addressing more specifically how the Fair Housing Act applies to ensure that local nuisance or crime-free housing ordinances do not lead to discrimination because of disability.

---

2 State and local governments use a variety of terms, including “nuisance,” “chronic nuisance,” “crime-free,” or “disorderly behavior” to describe the types of ordinances addressed by this guidance.
3 Local governments and landlords who receive federal funding may also violate the Violence Against Women Act, which, among other things, prohibits them from denying “assistance, tenancy, or occupancy” to any person because of domestic violence-related activity committed by a household member, guest or “other person in control” of the tenant if the tenant or an “affiliated individual” is the victim. 42 U.S.C. § 14043e-11(b)(3)(A).
4 Discrimination prohibited by the Fair Housing Act includes “a refusal to make a reasonable accommodation in rules, policies, practices, and services, when such accommodation may be necessary to afford a person with a disability an equal opportunity to use and enjoy a dwelling.” 42 U.S.C. § 3604(f)(3)(B).
II. Background

A. Nuisance Ordinances

A growing number of local governments are enacting a variety of nuisance ordinances that can affect housing in potentially discriminatory ways. For example, in Illinois alone, more than 100 such ordinances have been adopted. These ordinances often label various types of conduct associated with a property—whether the conduct is by a resident, guest or other person—a “nuisance” and require the landlord or homeowner to abate the nuisance under the threat of a variety of penalties. The conduct defined as a nuisance varies by ordinance and has ranged from conduct affecting the appearance of the property—such as littering, failing to tend to one’s lawn or abandoning a vehicle, to general prohibitions related to the conduct of a tenant or guest—such as disorderly or disruptive conduct, disrupting the quiet use and enjoyment of neighboring properties, or any criminal conduct occurring on or near the property. Nuisance conduct often


6 Although nuisance ordinances have been enacted that apply to both owner-occupied and rental housing, this guidance focuses on the application of the Fair Housing Act to a local government’s enactment and enforcement of nuisance and crime-free ordinances against persons who reside in rental housing. Much of the legal analysis in this guidance applies equally to owner-occupied housing as well.


includes what is characterized by the ordinance as an “excessive” number of calls for emergency police or ambulance services, typically defined as just a few calls within a specified period of time by a tenant, neighbor, or other third party, whether or not directly associated with the property.\footnote{See Werth, supra note 5, at 4, 18 n.70.}

In some jurisdictions, an incident of domestic violence is defined as a nuisance without regard to whether the resident is the victim or the perpetrator of the domestic violence.\footnote{See, e.g., SPOKANE, WASH., CODE § 10.08A.20(H)(2)(q) (2016), \url{https://my.spokanecity.org/smc/?Section=10.08A.020; see also Silenced, supra note 12, at 12; Anna Kastner, The Other War at Home: Chronic Nuisance Laws and the Revictimization of Survivors of Domestic Violence, 103 CALIF. L. REV. 1047, 1058 (2015); News Release, supra note 5.} In other jurisdictions, incidents of domestic violence are not specifically defined as nuisances, but may still be categorized as such because the ordinance broadly defines nuisance activity as the violation of any federal, state or local law, or includes conduct such as disturbing the peace, excessive noise, disorderly conduct, or calls for emergency services that exceed a specified number within a given timeframe.\footnote{See Kastner, supra note 14, at 1058 (“Similarly, the ordinance could cause survivors to be evicted either because the 911 call was not coded as ‘domestic violence’ or because the landlord was not aware that domestic violence was occurring and could not create a plan to remediate the issue properly.”).} Some ordinances specifically define “excessive” calls for police or emergency services as nuisances, even when the person in need of services is a victim of domestic violence or another crime or otherwise in need of police, medical or other emergency assistance.\footnote{See Gretchen Arnold & Megan Slusser, Silencing Women's Voices: Nuisance Property Laws and Battered Women, L. & SOC. INQ. 15-17 (2015), \url{http://nhip.org/files/001_%20Silencing%20Women's%20Voices-%20Nuisance%20Property%20Laws%20and%20Battered%20Women-%20%20G%20Arnold%20and%20M%20Slusser.pdf}.} Even where ordinances expressly exclude victims of domestic violence or other crimes, victims are still frequently deemed to have committed nuisance conduct because police and other emergency service providers may not log the call as domestic violence, instead categorizing it incorrectly as property damage, disturbing the peace or another type of nuisance conduct.\footnote{See, e.g., BEACON, N.Y., CODE § 159-3(A)(20) (2011) (exempting domestic violence victims from being penalized under nuisance ordinance where a police officer properly “observes evidence that a domestic dispute occurred”).} Some victims also are hesitant or afraid to identify themselves as victims of abuse.\footnote{See, e.g., Arnold & Slusser, supra note 16, at 15–16.}

The ordinances generally require housing providers either to abate the alleged nuisance or risk penalties, such as fines, loss of their rental permits, condemnation of their properties and, in some extreme instances, incarceration.\footnote{See, e.g., Desmond & Valdez (online supplement), supra note 5, at 4-18; Cari Fais, Denying Access to Justice: The Cost of Applying Chronic Nuisance Laws to Domestic Violence, 108 COLUM. L. REV. 1181, 1189 (2008).} Some ordinances may require the housing provider to evict the resident and his or her household after a specified number of alleged nuisance...
violations—often quite low—within a specific timeframe.\textsuperscript{20} For example, in at least one jurisdiction, three calls for emergency police or medical help within a 30-day period is considered to be a nuisance,\textsuperscript{21} and in another jurisdiction, two calls for such services within one year qualify as a nuisance.\textsuperscript{22} Even when nuisance ordinances do not explicitly require evictions, a number of landlords resort to evicting the household to avoid penalties.\textsuperscript{23}

In many jurisdictions, domestic-violence-related calls are the largest category of calls received by police.\textsuperscript{24} “Intimate partner violence, sexual violence, and stalking are widespread” and impact millions of Americans each year.\textsuperscript{25} “On average, 24 people per minute are victims of rape, physical violence, or stalking by an intimate partner in the United States” — more than 12 million individuals over the course of a year.\textsuperscript{26} From 1994 to 2010, approximately 80 percent of the victims of intimate partner violence in the nation were women.\textsuperscript{27} Women with disabilities are more likely to be subjected to domestic violence than women without disabilities.\textsuperscript{28}

Studies have found that victims of domestic violence often do not report their initial incident of domestic violence and instead suffer multiple assaults before contacting the police or seeking a protective order or other assistance.\textsuperscript{29} Victims of domestic violence often are reluctant to

\textsuperscript{20} See Werth, supra note 5 at 4 n.9.
\textsuperscript{22} See ST. LOUIS, MO., CODE § 15.42.020(G) (2014), https://www.municode.com/library/mo/st._louis/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=TIT15PUPEMOWE_DIVIVOAGPUPU_CH15.42PUNUNI!.
\textsuperscript{27} See SUSAN CASTALANO, BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS, U.S. DEP’T. OF JUSTICE, Intimate Partner Violence, 1993–2010 1 (2015), http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ipv9310.pdf. See also NATIONAL LAW CENTER ON HOMELESSNESS & POVERTY, There’s No Place Like Home: State Laws that Protect Housing Rights for Survivors of Domestic and Sexual Violence 5 (2012) [hereinafter No Place Like Home], https://www.nlchp.org/Theres_No_Place_Like_Home (“In some areas of the country 1 in 4 homeless adults reported that domestic violence was a cause of their homelessness, and between 50% and 100% of homeless women have experienced domestic or sexual violence at some point in their lives.”).
\textsuperscript{29} KLEIN, supra note 24, at 6.
seek assistance because of, among other things, fear of reprisal from their attackers. Nuisance ordinances (and crime-free housing ordinances) are becoming an additional factor that operates to discourage victims from reporting domestic violence and obtaining the emergency police and medical assistance they need.

For example, a woman in Norristown, Pennsylvania who had been subjected to domestic violence by her ex-boyfriend was warned by police that if she made one more 911 call, she and her young daughter would be evicted from their home pursuant to the local nuisance ordinance. The ordinance operated under a “three strike” policy, allowing her no more than two calls to 911 for help. As a result, the woman was too afraid to call the police when her ex-boyfriend returned to her home and stabbed her. Rather than call for an ambulance, she ran out of her house in the hope she would not lose her housing. A neighbor called the police and, due to the serious nature of her injuries, the woman was airlifted to the hospital. A few days after she returned home from the hospital, she was served with eviction papers pursuant to the local nuisance ordinance.

B. Crime-Free Lease Ordinances and Crime-Free Housing Programs

A number of local governments enforce crime-free lease ordinances or promote crime-free housing programs that incorporate the use of crime-free lease addenda. Some of these ordinances operate like nuisance ordinances and penalize housing providers who fail to evict tenants when a tenant, resident or other person has allegedly engaged in a violation of a federal, state and/or local law, regardless of whether the tenant or resident was the victim of the crime at issue. Others mandate or strongly encourage housing providers to include lease provisions that require or permit housing providers to evict tenants where a tenant or resident has allegedly engaged in a single incident of criminal activity, regardless of whether the activity occurred on or off the property.

These provisions often allow housing providers to evict tenants when a guest or other person allowed onto the property by the tenant or resident allegedly engages in criminal activity on

---

30 See Arnold & Slusser, supra note 16, at 15.
31 Id. at 22; Fais, supra note 19, at 1202; Werth, supra note 5, at 8.
36 See Werth, supra note 5, at 3 n.8.
or near the property, regardless of whether the resident was a victim of the criminal activity or a party to it.\textsuperscript{38} The criminal activity that constitutes a lease violation is frequently broadly and ambiguously defined and may include any violation of federal, state or local laws, however minor.\textsuperscript{39} Thus, disorderly conduct, excessive noise and similar activity may constitute a crime resulting in eviction.\textsuperscript{40} Crime-free lease addenda often do not provide exceptions for cases where a resident or tenant is the victim of domestic violence or another crime.\textsuperscript{41} And, as previously noted, even where exceptions do exist, victims of domestic violence and other crimes may be mistakenly categorized and face eviction despite the exception.\textsuperscript{42} For example, police often arrest both the victim and the perpetrator under “dual arrest” policies when a victim has defended herself or himself from the perpetrator.\textsuperscript{43}

Furthermore, some crime-free housing ordinances mandate or strongly encourage housing providers to implement lease provisions that require eviction based on an arrest alone, or do not require an arrest or conviction to evict a tenant, but rather allow housing providers to rely on a preponderance of the evidence standard while remaining silent on who is responsible for determining that this standard has been met.\textsuperscript{44} The principles discussed in HUD’s “Office of General Counsel Guidance on Application of Fair Housing Act Standards to the Use of Criminal Records by Providers of Housing and Real Estate-Related Transactions”\textsuperscript{45} are instructive in

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item See, e.g., \textsc{Hesperia, Cal.}, \textsc{Health and Safety Code} § 8.20.50 (2015), https://www.municode.com/library/ca/hesperia/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=TIT8HESA_CH8.20CRFRREHOPR\textunderscore 8.20.050CRFRREHOPR (mandating that all landlords include the Hesperia Crime-Free Lease Addendum, which requires that a single violation of the addendum, whether committed by resident, guest, or other person, provides good cause for termination of tenancy); Hesperia Crime-Free Lease Addendum, http://www.cityofhesperia.us/DocumentCenter/View/13394.
\item See \textsc{Werth}, supra note 5, at 17.
\item See \textsc{Werth}, supra note 5, at 8.
\item See, e.g., \textsc{Kastner}, supra note 14, at 1065; see \textsc{Werth}, supra note 5, at 21.
\item See, e.g., \textsc{Werth}, supra note 5, at 12 (noting that some ordinances allow evictions based on arrests or citations alone); \textsc{Las Vegas, Nev.}, \textsc{Code} § 6.09.20 (2012) (requiring landlords to complete training encouraging use of Crime-Free Addendum, which permits eviction based on single alleged violation, as shown by preponderance of evidence, rather than criminal conviction); \textsc{Las Vegas Crime Free Multi-Housing Program Crime-Free Addendum} (2014), http://www.lvmpd.com/Portals/0/pdf/prevention/English\_CFAddendum01_2014.pdf; \textsc{San Bernardino, Cal.}, \textsc{Health and Safety Code} § 15.27.050 (2011), https://www.ci.sanbernardino.ca.us/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=19233 (requiring landlords to use Crime-Free Lease Addendum, which permits eviction based on single alleged violation of addendum as shown by preponderance of evidence, rather than criminal conviction); City of San Bernardino Crime Free Multi-Housing Program Crime-Free Lease Addendum, https://www.ci.sanbernardino.ca.us/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=11259; Hesperia, \textsc{Cal.}, \textsc{Health and Safety Code} § 8.20.50 (2015), https://www.municode.com/library/ca/hesperia/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=TIT8HESA_CH8.20CRFRREHOPR\textunderscore 8.20.050CRFRREHOPR (providing chief of police discretion as to whether or not to notify the landlord of the evidence or documents, if any, used to determine that a resident engaged in criminal activity); see also \textsc{Werth}, supra note 5, at 4.
\item See \textsc{Helen R. Kanovsky, General Counsel, U.S. Dep’t of hous. & Urban Dev.}, \textsc{Application of Fair Housing Act Standards to the Use of Criminal Records by Providers of Housing and Real Estate-Related Transactions} (2016), https://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=HUD\_OGCGuidAppFHASTandCR.pdf.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
III. Discriminatory Effects Liability and Enforcement of Nuisance Ordinances and Crime-Free Housing Ordinances

A local government’s policies and practices to address nuisances, including enactment or enforcement of a nuisance or crime-free housing ordinance, violate the Fair Housing Act when they have an unjustified discriminatory effect, even when the local government had no intent to discriminate. Under this standard, a facially-neutral policy or practice that has a discriminatory effect violates the Act if it is not supported by a legally sufficient justification. Thus, where a policy or practice that restricts the availability of housing on the basis of nuisance conduct has a disparate impact on individuals of a particular protected class, the policy or practice is unlawful under the Fair Housing Act if it is not necessary to serve a substantial, legitimate, nondiscriminatory interest of the local government, or if such interest could be served by another practice that has a less discriminatory effect.

Discriminatory effects liability is assessed under a three-step, burden-shifting standard requiring a fact-specific analysis. The following sections discuss the three steps used to analyze whether a local government’s enforcement of a nuisance or crime-free housing ordinance results in a discriminatory effect in violation of the Act. As explained in Section IV, below, a different analytical framework is used to evaluate claims of intentional discrimination.

A. Evaluating Whether the Challenged Nuisance Ordinance or Crime-Free Housing Ordinance Policy or Practice Has a Discriminatory Effect

In the first step of the analysis, a plaintiff (or HUD in an administrative enforcement action) has the burden to prove that a local government’s enforcement of its nuisance or crime-free housing ordinance has a discriminatory effect, that is, that the local government’s nuisance or crime-free housing ordinance policy or practice results or predictably will result in a disparate impact on a group of persons because of a protected characteristic. This is also true for a local

---

46 In addition to being liable for their own discriminatory conduct, housing providers may have a cause of action under the Fair Housing Act against a locality if a locality’s ordinance requires housing providers to discriminate based on a protected characteristic. See, e.g., Waterhouse v. City of Am. Canyon, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 60065, *1, 13–15 (N.D. Cal. 2011) (concluding that “forcing the owners of a mobile-home park to discriminate on the basis of familial status through a series of city ordinances . . . violates the federal Fair Housing Act.”).


48 For purposes of this guidance, the term “policy or practice” encompasses governments’ nuisance and crime-free ordinances as well as their enforcement of the ordinances. It also includes government activities related to crime-free housing programs that may not be specified by ordinance.


50 See 24 C.F.R. § 100.500.

51 24 C.F.R. § 100.500(c)(1). A discriminatory effect can also be proven with evidence that the policy or practice creates, increases, reinforces, or perpetuates segregated housing patterns. See 24 C.F.R. § 100.500(a). This guidance addresses only the method for analyzing disparate impact claims, which in HUD’s experience are more commonly asserted in this context.
government’s policy or practice encouraging or incentivizing housing providers to adopt crime-free lease addenda (and the discussion throughout the guidance applies equally to such actions). This burden is satisfied by presenting evidence proving that the challenged policy or practice actually or predictably results in a disparate impact.

Different data sources may be available and useful to demonstrate that a government’s ordinance actually or predictably results in a disparate impact, which is ultimately a fact-specific and case-specific inquiry. While state or local statistics typically are presented where available and appropriate based on the local government’s jurisdiction or other facts particular to a given case, national statistics may be relevant and appropriate, depending on the specific case and the nature of the claim.

Local statistics are likely to be available for use in establishing whether a local government’s enforcement of its nuisance or crime-free ordinance has a disparate impact. Other evidence—for example, resident data and files, demographic data, city and police records including data on enforcement of nuisance or crime-free ordinances, citations and correspondence between housing providers and city officials and court records regarding nuisance abatement—may also be relevant in determining whether a challenged nuisance or crime-free housing ordinance policy or practice causes a disparate impact.

Evidence of nationwide disparities in the enforcement of nuisance or crime-free ordinances based on protected characteristics may be relevant to consider, depending on the specific case and the nature of the claim. Also, in some cases, national statistics may provide grounds for HUD to investigate complaints challenging the enforcement of nuisance ordinances. For example, nationally, women comprise approximately 80 percent of all individuals subjected to domestic violence each year, which may provide grounds for HUD to investigate under the Fair Housing Act allegations that the adverse effects of a nuisance ordinance fall more heavily on victims of domestic violence.

Whether in the context of an investigation or administrative enforcement action by HUD or private litigation, a local government will have the opportunity to offer evidence to refute the claim that its nuisance ordinance causes a disparate impact on one or more protected classes.

B. Evaluating Whether the Challenged Nuisance Ordinance or Crime-Free Housing Ordinance is Necessary to Achieve a Substantial, Legitimate, Nondiscriminatory Interest

In the second step of the discriminatory effects analysis, the burden shifts to the local government to prove that the challenged nuisance or crime-free housing ordinance is necessary

52 Compare Dothard v. Rawlinson, 433 U.S. 321, 330 (1977) (“Reliance on general population demographic data was not misplaced where there was no reason to suppose that physical height and weight characteristics of Alabama men and women differ markedly from those of the national population.”), with Mountain Side Mobile Estates P’ship v. Sec’y of Hous. & Urban Dev., 56 F.3d 1243, 1253 (10th Cir. 1995) (“In some cases national statistics may be the appropriate comparable population. However, those cases are the rare exception and this case is not such an exception.”) (citation omitted).

53 See CASTALANO, supra note 27, at 1.
to achieve a substantial, legitimate, nondiscriminatory interest of the local government. The interest of the local government may not be hypothetical or speculative, meaning the local government must be able to prove with evidence what the government interest is, that its interest is legitimate, substantial and nondiscriminatory, and that the challenged practice is necessary to achieve that interest. Assertions based on generalizations or stereotypes about persons deemed to engage in nuisance or criminal conduct are not sufficient to prove that an ordinance or its enforcement is necessary to achieve the local government’s substantial, legitimate, nondiscriminatory interest.

As explained in the preamble to HUD’s 2013 Discriminatory Effects Final Rule, a “substantial” interest is a core interest of the organization that has a direct relationship to the function of that organization. The requirement that an interest be “legitimate” means that the local government’s justification must be genuine and not false or fabricated. A number of local governments have nuisance or crime-free ordinances that encourage, require or are likely to result in housing providers evicting or taking other adverse housing actions against residents, including victims of domestic violence and other crimes, because the residents requested police, medical or other emergency assistance, without regard to whether the calls were reasonable under the circumstances. Where such a practice is challenged and proven to have a disparate impact, the local government would have the difficult burden to prove that cutting off access to emergency services for those in grave need of such services, including victims of domestic violence or other crimes, thereby potentially endangering their lives, safety and security, in fact achieves a core interest of the local government and was not undertaken for discriminatory reasons or in a discriminatory manner. Similarly, if the local government’s policy or practice requires or encourages housing providers to evict victims of domestic violence or other crimes or others in need of emergency services, the local government would have the burden to prove that such a policy or practice in fact is necessary to achieve the local government’s substantial, legitimate, nondiscriminatory interest.

C. Evaluating Whether There Is a Less Discriminatory Alternative

The third step of the discriminatory effects analysis is applicable only if a local government successfully proves that its nuisance or crime-free housing ordinance, policy or practice is necessary to achieve a substantial, legitimate, nondiscriminatory interest. If the analysis reaches the third step, the burden shifts back to the plaintiff or HUD to prove that such interest could be served by another policy or practice that has a less discriminatory effect.

54 24 C.F.R. § 100.500(c)(2).
57 Id.
58 See Werth, supra note 5, at 8.
59 When domestic violence victims are evicted on the basis of a nuisance citation, they may often lack alternative housing and experience homelessness. See, e.g., Amanda Gavin, Chronic Nuisance Ordinances: Turning Victims of Domestic Violence into “Nuisances” in the Eyes of Municipalities, 119 PENN ST. L. REV. 257, 260 (“on any given day, over 3000 people face homelessness because they are unable to find shelter away from their abusers . . . making domestic violence a leading cause of homelessness in the United States”).
60 24 C.F.R. § 100.500(c)(3); accord Inclusive Cmtys. Project, 135 S. Ct. at 2515.
The identification of a less discriminatory alternative will depend on the particulars of the policy or practice at issue, as well as the specific nature of the underlying problem the ordinance seeks to address.

IV. Intentional Discrimination and Enforcement of Nuisance Ordinances or Crime-Free Housing Ordinances

A local government may also violate the Fair Housing Act if it intentionally discriminates in its adoption or enforcement of a nuisance or crime-free housing ordinance. This occurs when the local government treats a resident differently because of sex, race or another protected characteristic. The analysis is the same as is used to analyze whether any housing ordinance was enacted or enforced for intentionally discriminatory reasons.

Generally, two types of claims of intentional discrimination may arise. One type of intentional discrimination claim arises where a local government enacts a nuisance ordinance or crime-free housing ordinance for discriminatory reasons. Another type is where a government selectively enforces a nuisance or crime-free housing ordinance in a discriminatory manner. For the first type of claim, in determining whether a facially neutral ordinance was enacted for discriminatory reasons, courts generally look to certain factors. The factors, all of which need not be satisfied, include, but are not limited to: (1) the impact of the ordinance at issue, such as whether the ordinance disproportionately impacts women compared to men, minority residents compared to white residents, or residents with disabilities or a certain type of disability compared to residents without disabilities; (2) the historical background of the ordinance, such as whether there is a history of discriminatory conduct by the local government; (3) the specific sequence of events, such as whether the locality adopted the ordinance only after significant community opposition motivated by race or another protected characteristic; (4) departures from the normal procedural sequence, such as whether the locality deviated from normal procedures for enacting a nuisance ordinance; (5) substantive departures, such as whether the factors usually considered important suggest that a local government should have reached a different result; and (6) the legislative or administrative record, such as any statements by members of the local decision-making body.\textsuperscript{61}

For the second type of intentional discrimination claim, selective enforcement, where there is no “smoking gun” proving that a local government is selectively enforcing a nuisance or crime-free housing ordinance in a discriminatory way, courts look for evidence from which such an inference can be drawn. The evidence might be direct or circumstantial. For example, courts have noted that an inference of intentional sex discrimination could arise directly from evidence

that a housing provider seeks to evict female residents shortly after incidents of domestic violence.\textsuperscript{62}

A common method of establishing intentional discrimination indirectly, through circumstantial evidence, is through the familiar burden-shifting method of proving intentional discrimination originally established by the Supreme Court in the employment context.\textsuperscript{63} In the standard complaint alleging selective enforcement of a nuisance or crime-free ordinance for disparate treatment, the plaintiff first must produce evidence to establish a prima facie case of disparate treatment. This may be shown, for example, by evidence that: (1) the plaintiff (or complainant) is a member of a protected class; (2) a local government official (or housing provider, depending on the circumstances) took action to enforce the nuisance or crime-free ordinance or lease addendum against the plaintiff or complainant because the plaintiff or complainant was of a protected class; (3) the local government official or housing provider did not take action to enforce the nuisance or crime-free ordinance or lease addendum against a similarly-situated resident not of the plaintiff or complainant’s protected class who engaged in comparable conduct; and (4) the local government or housing provider subjected the plaintiff or complainant to an adverse housing action as a result of the enforcement of the nuisance or crime-free ordinance or lease addendum. It is then the burden of the local government and/or housing provider, depending on the circumstances, to offer evidence of a legitimate, nondiscriminatory reason for the adverse housing action.\textsuperscript{64} The proffered nondiscriminatory reason for the challenged decision must be clear, reasonably specific and supported by admissible evidence.\textsuperscript{65} Purely subjective or arbitrary reasons will not be sufficient to demonstrate a legitimate, nondiscriminatory basis for differential treatment.\textsuperscript{66}


\textsuperscript{64} See, \textit{e.g., Lindsay v. Yates}, 578 F.3d at 415 (articulating that if plaintiff presents evidence from which a reasonable jury could conclude that there exists a prima facie case of housing discrimination, then the burden shifts to the defendant to offer evidence of a legitimate, nondiscriminatory reason for the adverse housing decision); \textit{Bouley}, 394 F. Supp. 2d at 678 (explaining that once a plaintiff has established a prima facie case of discrimination, the burden then shifts to the defendant to assert a legitimate, nondiscriminatory rationale for the challenged decision).

\textsuperscript{65} See, \textit{e.g., Robinson v. 12 Lofts Realty, Inc.}, 610 F.2d 1032, 1040 (2d Cir. 1979) (“A prima facie case having been established, a Fair Housing Act claim cannot be defeated by a defendant which relies on merely hypothetical reasons for the plaintiff’s rejection.”).

\textsuperscript{66} See, \textit{e.g., Soules v. U.S. Dep’t of Hous. and Urban Dev.}, 967 F.2d 817, 822 (2d Cir. 1992) (“In examining the defendant’s reason, we view skeptically subjective rationales concerning why he denied housing to members or protected groups. Our reasoning, in part, is that ‘clever men may easily conceal their [discriminatory] motivations.’” (quoting \textit{United States v. City of Black Jack}, 508 F.2d 1179, 1185 (8th Cir. 1974))).
If the defendant (or respondent in a HUD administrative enforcement action) establishes a legitimate, nondiscriminatory reason for the adverse housing action, a plaintiff or HUD may still prevail by showing that the proffered reason was not the true reason for the adverse housing decision, and was instead a mere pretext for unlawful discrimination. For example, the fact that the defendant (or respondent) acted upon comparable nuisance or criminal conduct differently for one or more individuals of a different protected class than the plaintiff or complainant is strong evidence that the defendant (or respondent) was not considering such conduct uniformly. Additionally, shifting or inconsistent explanations offered by the defendant (or respondent) for the adverse housing action may provide evidence of pretext. Similarly, a local government’s claim that its nuisance citations would not cause tenant evictions because the citations were issued to the housing provider and not the residents could be evidence of pretext. Ultimately, the evidence that may be offered to show that defendant’s or respondent’s stated justification is pretext for intentional discrimination will depend on the facts of a particular case.

V. Assessment of Nuisance Ordinances and Crime-Free Housing Ordinances as Part of the Duty to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing

In addition to prohibiting discrimination, the Fair Housing Act requires HUD to administer programs and activities relating to housing and urban development in a manner that affirmatively furthers the policies of the Act. The purpose of the Act’s affirmatively furthering fair housing (AFFH) mandate is to ensure that recipients of Federal housing and urban development funds do more than simply not discriminate: recipients also must take meaningful action to overcome fair housing issues and related barriers to fair housing choice and disparities in access to opportunity based on sex, race, national origin, disability, and other characteristics protected by the Act. Congress has repeatedly reaffirmed the AFFH mandate by requiring HUD program participants to certify that they will affirmatively further fair housing as a condition of receiving Federal funds.

In 2015, HUD issued a rule on affirmatively furthering fair housing which requires grantees who receive Community Development Block Grant, HOME, Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS, or Emergency Solutions Grant funding to conduct an assessment of fair housing for purposes of setting goals to affirmatively further fair housing. In conducting their assessments of fair housing, state and local governments should assess their nuisance ordinances, crime-free housing ordinances and related policies or practices, including the processes by which nuisance ordinance and crime-free housing ordinances are enforced, and consider how these ordinances, policies or practices may affect access to housing and access to police, medical and other governmental services based on sex, race, national origin, disability, and other characteristics protected by the Act. One step a local government may take toward meeting its duty to affirmatively further fair housing is to eliminate disparities by repealing a nuisance or

---

67 See, e.g., Bouley, 394 F. Supp. 2d at 678.
68 See Hidden Vill., 867 F. Supp. 2d at 952 (noting that “[d]efendants appear blind to the possibility that repeatedly issuing citations to a landlord, based upon the actions of its tenants, would logically create an incentive for the landlord to evict his problem tenant . . . produce[ing] the same result—the eviction of [predominantly African American youth] but by different means.”).
69 42 U.S.C. § 3608(d), (e)(5).
crime-free ordinance that requires or encourages evictions for use of emergency services, including 911 calls, by domestic violence or other crime victims.

VI. Conclusion

The Fair Housing Act prohibits both intentional housing discrimination and housing ordinances, policies or practices that have an unjustified discriminatory effect because of protected characteristics. While the Act does not prohibit local governments from appropriately considering nuisance or criminal conduct when enacting laws related to housing, governments should ensure that such ordinances and related policies or practices do not discriminate in violation of the Fair Housing Act.

Eighty percent of domestic violence victims are women, and in some communities, racial or ethnic minorities are disproportionately victimized by crime. Where the enforcement of a nuisance or crime-free ordinance penalizes individuals for use of emergency services or for being a victim of domestic violence or other crime, a local government bears the burden of proving that any discriminatory effect caused by such policy or practice is supported by a legally sufficient justification. Such a determination cannot be based on generalizations or stereotypes.

Selective use of nuisance or criminal conduct as a pretext for unequal treatment of individuals based on protected characteristics violates the Act. Repealing ordinances that deny access to housing by requiring or encouraging evictions or that create disparities in access to emergency services because of a protected characteristic is one step local governments can take to avoid Fair Housing Act violations and as part of a strategy to affirmatively further fair housing.

Helen R. Kanovsky, General Counsel
Implementation Period

1. **Question:** What is the effective date of this notice?

   **Answer:** The implementation schedule is based on the contract anniversary date. If that date falls within the first 180 days after the publication of the notice (6/22/15), then the owner has a choice—s/he can choose to follow the new methodology, or follow the existing methodology. If the contract anniversary date is more than 180 days after the publication of the notice, s/he must follow the methodology in the notice.

Baseline Analysis

2. **Question:** What documentation will an O/A be required to submit with a utility analysis and request for approval of a U/A?

   **Answer:** The O/A shall submit backup information that demonstrates how s/he calculated the new utility allowance(s). HUD/CA has discretion to determine the documentation needed to support the utility allowances.

   Some examples of backup information include:
   1. Copies of the tenant data received from utility providers, this is typically in summary format; or
   2. Copies of the printouts indicating a summary of monthly data if the tenant was able to obtain data online from their utility provider for the previous 12 months, or 10 months if the case may be; or
   3. If the O/A obtained actual monthly utility bills from a tenant, the O/A may submit a spreadsheet summarizing the average of the monthly bills. Actual utility bills may be requested at the discretion of HUD/CA. These bills, regardless of whether they are provided to HUD/CA, must be retained by the owner for three years;
   4. At the discretion of HUD/CA, there may be cases where a combination of the above will need to be performed.

3. **Question:** When completing a baseline analysis, is there a limit to the age of data used to make the analysis?

   **Answer:** A utility analysis should be prepared four to six months prior to the anniversary date of the contracts, with submitted data covering the prior 12-month period. Thus, at the time of contract renewal, the data used in the utility analysis to support the utility allowance would generally be no more than 18 months old.
4. **Question:** We have some residents whose utility accounts are in a relative’s name and the utility company will not provide the information based on the resident’s signature. What do we do then?

   **Answer:** Have the relative obtain the info, or if possible, use other units for your sample.

5. **Question:** If an apartment is only occupied by a resident for 10 months, how do we handle the other 2 months and any partial months?

   **Answer:** Get an average for the unit for the 10 months; do not use the partial months.

6. **Question:** When a resident vacates an apartment and another resident moves in, the utility company will only release the information for the current resident. Even if the apartment was vacant for only a few days, we may not have 10 months of usage for the new resident. How do we handle that?

   **Answer:** In years when UA baseline calculations are anticipated, make every effort to collect information for the vacating resident prior to their departure. While you need 10 months of utility data for the same unit, the resident can change. In other words, you could have 5 months for one resident and 5 months for another resident. If you cannot obtain the information for at least 10 months, you should not use the unit in the sample.

7. **Question:** Can an O/A combine methods of data collection (some bills from residents, some information from the utility provider)?

   **Answer:** You can use either method, or both. There may be cases in which the O/A has no choice but to combine methods.

8. **Question:** Some CAs/HUD offices require that estimated amounts for certain appliance usage be removed from the total utility bill. For example, owner/agents may be required to remove costs to run AC or to use washer/dryers installed in the units. Is this a HUD requirement or are individual agencies allowed to implement such requirements?

   **Answer:** This is not a HUD requirement nor should any agency or HUD office impose such a requirement.

9. **Question:** Please clarify the rounding to the nearest whole dollar – in some cases there have been differences due to rounding.

   **Answer:** Collect the data and calculate the average in dollars and cents, and then round the resulting U/A to the nearest dollar (>=.50 round up, <=.49 round down)
Sample Size

10. **Question:** If the owner is unable to obtain the minimal sample size despite best efforts, will the analysis be accepted based on available data?

**Answer:** The owner must demonstrate that every effort has been made to obtain the required sample and to otherwise meet the requirements of the analysis. It is an owner’s responsibility to provide an analysis that follows the protocol outlined in the notice as closely as possible, recognizing that the “perfect” sample may not always be available. It will be HUD’s or the CA’s responsibility, as appropriate, to make sure that the analysis justifies the resulting U/As, with whatever compromises in the sampling were necessary to achieve that analysis. The CA, in consultation with HUD, may require the owner to complete another baseline the following year.

11. **Question:** For smaller properties, especially senior properties, that may have to use 100% sampling, certain circumstances will skew the resulting U/A up or down, e.g. residents spending weeks or months in a hospital, residents spending (colder) months with relatives, residents with medical conditions who need their apartments to be exceptionally warm, cold, or where they use medical equipment that uses a lot of energy. In most cases, the resident has not requested a reasonable accommodation to increase the U/A.

**Answer:** Smaller properties will necessarily require a proportionately larger sample size (including 100% sampling) in order to ensure statistically valid results. Management should encourage residents with medical equipment who have extraordinary utility bills to seek a reasonable accommodation for a higher utility allowance.

12. **Question:** If the property has 20 or fewer apartments and information is not available for at least 10 months in any number of units, does the sample size get reduced? For example: Property has 15 units so all the units must be included in the sample. However, 2 units are vacant and 2 units have only been occupied by the current resident for 5 or 6 months.

**Answer:** Even if 100% sampling is required, owners must exclude units that have not been occupied for at least 10 months. (see also question 9).

13. **Question:** Can you clarify the instruction on excluding units with less than 12 months of occupancy? The instructions indicate that a unit must be excluded if it has been vacant for 2 or more months, but then indicate that a unit with only 10 months of occupancy may be included.

**Answer:** The notice should have said to exclude units that have been vacant more than 2 months; units with only 10 months of occupancy may be included.

14. **Question:** Can you elaborate on sample sizes when the property has multiple floor plans for same bedroom size?

**Answer:** You would treat them as two different unit sizes if they appear on your rent
schedule that way and sample for both sizes. For example, your rent schedule may indicate both a One Bedroom Unit and then a One Bedroom Unit (Large). This indicates that the unit size is different but the number of bedrooms is the same. It is likely that the U/A is different as well. If this is the case, these unit types should be considered individually. (If you are using the HUD worksheet attachment to the notice, you would amend it to include this additional unit type.)

15. **Question:** Can you use the usage amount for residents paying a flat rate, especially if most residents are paying a flat rate?

   **Answer:** Generally, you would exclude the units of residents paying a flat rate, but this rule assumes that those units are the minority of units. If most residents pay a flat rate, including them in the sampling will give you a sample more representative of the whole. If you do so, document your reasons for doing so to help the CA/HUD determine if your approach was reasonable. And if you include these units, calculate the average based on the flat rate, not on the usage.

16. **Question:** Is the UA Analysis for all units at the property or just Section 8 units?

   **Answer:** The U/A analysis covers only those units that receive a U/A; only HUD-assisted units will be included in the analysis.

17. **Question:** Is the flat utility rate exclusion meant to apply to any unit receiving any kind of subsidy or just units that receive a flat utility rate? We have a variety of low income assistance programs that are not rate-based but result in lower utility bill amounts and would skew the average.

   **Answer:** For now, the exclusion applies only to units with flat utility rates. We will review this policy and determine the best treatment of units receiving varying forms of subsidies. We welcome your feedback on this issue.

**HUD’s Utility Analysis Excel Worksheet**

18. **Question:** Must an owner use the HUD-provided worksheet that was attached to the notice?

   **Answer:** No, owners may develop their own worksheets to suit their needs, as long as they provide HUD/CA with adequate documentation.

19. **Question:** With the worksheet protected - how can we change to accommodate the same unit type i.e. 3 BR & 3 BR TH?

   **Answer:** An unprotected version has been posted to HUDCLIPS. (Password is Sharkey)

20. **Question:** The HUD worksheet calculates averages based on the values entered. If you only have 10 months of data and enter 0 in the other two months, the average will calculate on all months that have data. Is this correct?
**Answer:** No, you should not enter any value for the months that are vacant (do not enter $0). Or, using the unprotected version of the worksheet that is now available, change the formula so that the average is calculated on only non-zero months. If you have only 10 months of data, the average must be calculated on only those 10 months.

**Release Forms**

21. **Question:** The utility company requests we use their form for the release of information; is this okay?

**Answer:** The release form included with the notice is a sample. Owner/agents may use their own release form or a release form provided by the utility provider.

22. **Question:** Can refusal to sign a tenant release form be considered a lease violation?

**Answer:** Yes. Tenants refusing to sign a release form constitutes material noncompliance with the lease agreement, as defined in the lease agreement, and repeated violations can result in termination of tenancy. Further, for properties other than 236 and 221(d)(3), not signing the release form is a violation of the regulatory obligations of the family found at 24 CFR 5.659(b)(1).

To add clarity to the requirement, owners are encouraged to include language in their House Rules advising tenants of their obligation to sign release forms and to provide any information deemed necessary in administration of the program, or face possible termination. Any changes to a property’s House Rules must be done according to the procedures outlined in HUD Handbook 4350.3, REV-1 paragraph 6-9.

**Mid-year U/A adjustments**

23. **Question:** When a change in utility rates results in a 10% or more increase in the U/A, how do you compute the new allowance? Do you simply apply the % increase to the existing U/A?

**Answer:** Yes, you would apply the utility rate increase to that component of the U/A allowance, e.g. electric rates go up 15% so if the U/A for the property comprises both electricity costs and gas costs, you would apply the 15% to the electricity component of the U/A.

24. **Question:** What would be the historical time period to use for the new analysis?

**Answer:** The notice indicates that when rate increases cause U/As to increase 10% or more, an owner can submit the following evidence of the change: (1) utility bills from the month prior to the rate change and the first month after, or (2) other verification of the increase from the utility provider. So in that case, the owner isn’t looking at historical data, but actually justifying the rate increase with the most current data.
Utility Assistance As Income

25. **Question:** Some tenants receive assistance under the Department of Health and Human Services Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP). According to Handbook 4350.3 Exhibit 5-1 Income Inclusions and Exclusions, this form of assistance is listed under Income Exclusions (e). The notice states that tenants must report this type of assistance as income and that it must be counted as income. Is it included or excluded?

**Answer:** Although the notice indicates that this type of assistance must be reported as income, assistance under this specific program is excluded from income. Please see the May 20, 2014 Federal Register for the current list of federally mandated exclusions from income, here: http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2014-05-20/pdf/2014-11688.pdf

26. **Question:** For properties in California, should the Climate Credit shown on some utility bills be included in the Utility Allowance calculation?

**Answer:** No. The California Climate Credit should not be used by owners in calculating utility allowances and should be removed from the cost totals. This is because, while the California climate credit is delivered to California residents through their utility bills, the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) has held that the climate credits “should not be considered a reduction in the individual customer’s electricity bill.” Instead of being used to offset utility allowances, California climate credits should be considered “income” for the purposes of recertification. This guidance applies only to the California Climate Credit. Questions about other similar benefits should be submitted to HUD for individual review.

The Factor-Based Utility Allowance Analysis

27. **Question:** Can you provide the link to the website referenced in the Notice regarding the factor-based increases and the UAF?

**Answer:** http://www.huduser.org/portal/datasets/muaf.html

28. **Question:** What is the timing of the issuance of the Utility Allowance Factor (UAF)?

**Answer:** The UAF is a component of the OCAF and so will typically be published yearly when the OCAF is published.

29. **Question:** When will the UAF be effective?

**Answer:** Going forward, Utility Allowance Factors will be effective on the same date as the OCAF, which is typically February 11 of each year. Factors for 2017 will be released at the same time as the FY 2017 OCAF.

30. **Question:** In the years in which you perform a factor-based analysis, do you take the previous utility allowance before rounding or after rounding and then apply the factor.
**Answer:** You apply the factor to the previous approved utility allowance, which was the utility allowance after rounding. For example, if the previous year’s baseline analysis yielded an average 2-bedroom utility allowance of $38.49 and the approved utility allowance was thus $38 (after rounding), then in second year, the factor would be applied to $38.

**31. Question:** For the two years after a baseline utility analysis is completed, the Utility Allowance Factor (UAF) can be used. According to the Notice, the O/A “should compare the adjusted utility analysis to their paid utilities over the previous twelve months. If the results indicate a “significant disparity” between the two, the OA should complete a baseline analysis.” Please clarify what constitutes a “significant disparity,” and whether the paid utilities analysis documentation needs to be provided to the CA/HUD in order to use the UAF. Please also clarify the “paid utilities” – does this represent the common area utilities paid by the property?

**Answer:** A new baseline analysis is not mandated. We do want owners to look closely at the results of a factor-based analysis, and expect that they will make an appropriate decision about further analysis if those results appear very different from what their own paid utilities suggest (i.e., their common area utilities). This analysis does not need to be provided to the CA/HUD. The comparison is intended to have owners take a “second look” at the factor-based results. If it is suspected that special circumstances cause year-to-year fluctuations that materially differ than the utility adjustment factor, owners and CAs may consider completion of a new baseline.

**32. Question:** Does the U/A have to be changed for all baseline transactions, even one dollar?

**Answer:** Yes, factor-based as well, whether it is an increase or a decrease.

**33. Question:** Will the UAF be applied automatically to the previous year’s utility allowance?

**Answer:** No, HUD systems will not automatically apply the UAF to the previous year’s utility allowance, nor is it the PBCA’s responsibility. Utility allowance regulations require an owner to “submit an analysis of the project’s utility allowances” for review and approval each year. This requirement extends to the factor-based years in which an owner will show how the factor was applied and identify the resulting utility allowance recommendation.

**Utility Allowance Decreases – Phase In**

**34. Question:** Are O/As required to phase-in a UA decrease?

**Answer:** Yes, but only in the initial implementation of the new methodology, and only if the decrease exceeds 15% AND is equal to or greater than $10.
35. **Question:** When is eligibility for a utility allowance phase-in determined?

**Answer:** Utility allowance phase-in eligibility is determined at the time of the first baseline analysis after implementation of Housing Notice 2015-04 only. At this time, the total decrease should be examined to determine if the decrease is more than 15% or $10 from the last utility allowance provided.

36. **Question:** Please provide an example of how phase-in of a very large utility allowance decrease would be implemented over three years.

**Answer:** Here is an example of this type of phase-in.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year One</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Utility Allowance</td>
<td>$90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in First Year</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Calculated Utility Allowance</td>
<td>$54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1 Utility Allowance*</td>
<td>$77*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* With a phase-in cap of 15% each year, the new capped utility allowance is $77 ($90 - 15%). This is the utility allowance that gets implemented in Year 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Two</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second Year UAF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(applied to calculated, uncapped new utility allowance)</td>
<td>+ 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Actual Utility Allowance</td>
<td>$55  ($54 + 2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant’s Second Year Capped Utility Allowance*</td>
<td>$65*  ($77 - 15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* The utility allowance that gets implemented in Year 2 is $65 even though the calculated utility allowance is $55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Three</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Third Year UAF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(applied to uncapped second year utility allowance)</td>
<td>+ 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Actual Utility Allowance</td>
<td>$56  ($55 + 2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant’s Third Year Utility Allowance*</td>
<td>$56*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Implement the actual calculated utility allowance as it is less than 15% lower than the previous year’s utility allowance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this example, the phase-in occurs over two years of the cycle (baseline year, plus first factor-adjusted year). In each of the factor adjusted years, the factor is applied to the previous year’s calculated utility allowance, i.e. what the utility allowance would have
been if there were not a cap put on it because of the requirement to phase it in. After that, there is a new baseline and phase-in requirements no longer apply.

Any year there is a decrease in the utility allowance, tenant notification must be provided.

**Miscellaneous**

37. **Question:** Does the data used in the analysis for each unit have to be from the same time period for each unit?

   **Answer:** Yes, to the greatest extent possible.

38. **Question:** I have 3 contracts on one property - is analysis by contract or property?

   **Answer:** By property (keeping in mind that if the property consists of multiple buildings, the buildings must be substantially similar in order for you to sample by unit size property wide).

39. **Question:** I completed a utility analysis for a 2015 contract renewal that was due prior to June 22, 2015. If this baseline analysis complied with the requirements described in the Notice, do I have to complete a new baseline for 2016?

   **Answer:** Yes, your next utility analysis must be a baseline in accordance with the requirements of the notice.

40. **Question:** May an owner offer residents monthly incentives to provide copies of their utility bills every month? For example, $1.00 or $2.00 per month per resident as “Additional Costs to Rent” in the budget.

   **Answer:** Owners may offer incentives but they may not pay for them out of project funds nor include them as an expense in the budget.

41. **Question:** Which utility allowance calculators are HFA approved?

   **Answer:** The notice intentionally does not identify pre-approved tools as the field is changing regularly. This is the pertinent language in the notice:

   “The energy consumption model must, at a minimum, take into account specific factors including, but not limited to, unit size, building orientation, design and materials, mechanical systems, appliances, and characteristics of the building location. Second, the utility estimates must be calculated by either (1) a properly licensed engineer or (2) a qualified professional approved by HUD. “

   One example, however, is the CUAC tool, which is available for use in California, from the website of the Tax Credit Allocation committee. For the specific question re: HFAs, owners would need to talk with an HFA directly.
42. **Question:** A Section 811 PRA property with a RAC that specifies use of the HUD Multifamily Housing policy for developing utility allowances will use the methodology outlined in the Notice. Do Section 811 PRA owners have to separate the PRA units from the project-based units or can all units be included in one analysis?

**Answer:** Section 811 PRA properties must complete an analysis which separates the PRA units from the project-based units.
HUD’s Office of Housing is pleased to announce a new webinar series focused on the Multifamily Family Self-Sufficiency (MF FSS) program. Through these webinars, attendees will learn about the basics of the multifamily FSS program, best practices for running a successful FSS program, and details of program compliance. There are three webinars in the series. Webinars #1 and #2 will be presented by industry stakeholders. Webinar #3, dealing with program requirements outlined in H Notice 2016-08, will be presented by HUD staff.

Please join us for one, two or all three of these valuable information sessions. To register for a session, click on the corresponding URL provided below and complete the registration form. You will need to separately register for each webinar you’d like to attend. All webinars are free of charge.

**Webinar #1: Launching a Multifamily FSS Program**

**Date:** Oct. 11, 1:00 – 2:30 p.m. ET

**Description:** Designed to introduce FSS to owners and staff of HUD-Assisted Multifamily Properties, this webinar will provide a basic overview of the Multifamily FSS program. During the webinar, Jeffrey Lubell and Melissa Vandawalker of Abt Associates will review the basic components of the FSS program and Aaron Gornstein, President and CEO of Preservation of Affordable Housing, Inc., and Debbie Nutter, President of The Caleb Group, will discuss why they offer FSS to residents of their properties.

Registration Link for Webinar #1: [https://abtassociates.webex.com/abtassociates/onstage/g.php?MTID=e0db7e15a1f004b4ed0d8a932c5469f9](https://abtassociates.webex.com/abtassociates/onstage/g.php?MTID=e0db7e15a1f004b4ed0d8a932c5469f9)

**Webinar #2: Best Practices in Running an FSS Program**

**Date:** Oct. 19, 12:30 – 2:00 p.m. ET.

**Description:** This webinar will highlight best practices for running an effective FSS program. The principal speakers will be Sherry Riva, Founder and Executive Director of Compass Working Capital, Ann Lentell, Compass’ Director of Programs, and Nancy Scull, former director of the FSS program of the Housing Opportunities Commission of Montgomery County, MD. Abt’s Jeffrey Lubell will moderate.
Webinar #3: Complying with MF FSS Program Requirements

**Date:** Oct. 26, 1:00 – 2:30 p.m. ET

**Description:** This webinar will review the principal steps that HUD-Assisted Multifamily properties must take to start and operate an FSS program, and to comply with reporting and other program requirements. The webinar will be led by Danielle Garcia, Branch Chief, Subsidy Oversight, Carissa Janis, Program Analyst, and A. Rahmaan Sharper, Multifamily Representative – from HUD’s Office of Asset Management and Portfolio Oversight.

Registration link for Webinar #3: https://abtassociates.webex.com/abtassociates/onstage/g.php?MTID=ea174c31b97d23d0191884863c7850491

Additional registration instructions:

- To register for a webinar, click on the registration link provided for that webinar now or at any time before the webinar starts. This will expedite the process of joining the webinar on the date of the event. The email confirmation of registration will include an Outlook calendar item that you can use to get the event on your calendar.

- If you have not used WebEx before, we suggest you install the WebEx Event Center ahead of time so you are ready to go when the event starts. You can do so by clicking on this link: https://abtassociates.webex.com/abtassociates/ecsetup.php?frommail=1

- If you haven’t installed the software ahead of time, it will automatically install when you start the webinar. Installing it ahead of time will allow you to trouble shoot any problems that may arise ahead of time.

- On the date of the webinar, click on the same registration link provided above to start the webinar.

- You have two options for audio. You can choose to access audio through the computer or by phone. After you have logged in to the Webinar, select the audio option you prefer and follow the instructions. All attendees will be muted but will have the opportunity to pose questions via a question box.