

LARRY HOGAN
Governor
BOYD K. RUTHERFORD
Lt. Governor
KENNETH C. HOLT
Secretary
OWEN McEVOY
Deputy Secretary

DATE: January 26, 2021

BILL NO.: House Bill 90

COMMITTEE: House Committee on Environment and Transportation

TITLE: State and Local Housing Programs – Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing

SPONSORS: Del. Lierman

Letter of Information

Description of Bill:

House Bill 90 establishes reporting requirements for the Department of Housing and Community Development that would require a significant data collection and analysis beyond the current scope of the agency's work, to include data collection from local governments, housing authorities, and private entities. House Bill 90 would also mandate that local governments undertake similar data collection and analysis as a part of their Consolidated Plan process and impose upon local governments, housing authorities, and other private entities and certification and data analysis process before they may receive financial assistance from DHCD.

Background and Analysis:

The required reporting standard in this bill is similar to a federal rule, also referred to as Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), promulgated by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). AFFH was never fully implemented for states and insular areas and was suspended in 2017 before being repealed last year. During the federal proposed rulemaking process, at one time, HUD estimated state compliance with their AFFH standard could be expected to take DHCD, as a state agency, approximately 1,000 hours of work over the five year reporting period, with most of that work in the final year or two of the five year cycle.

While the requested data is not as extensive as that of the proposed federal rule, the workload for this bill would certainly be greater overall due to the volume of information to be collected, much of it from third parties. As was noted earlier, the AFFH report was to be submitted to HUD on a five year cycle (replacing the Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing report); House Bill 90 requires an annual report. In addition, under the federal rule, DHCD was only required to report on its own activities in "non-entitlement" jurisdictions, that is, jurisdictions that do not receive program funds directly from HUD; House Bill 90 requires DHCD to report on all jurisdictions, as well as any applicants for DHCD funding (to include housing authorities and other private entities).

In Maryland, there are 14 "entitlement" jurisdictions that would have been tasked with completing their own AFFH reporting, including the top 7 jurisdictions by population, accounting for approximately 80% of the population of the State of Maryland. The administrative burden for DHCD to report on all jurisdictions would require significantly more personnel hours.





This bill also creates reporting requirements and certification processes for local governments to adhere to, and requires any entities receiving financial assistance from DHCD, whether housing-related or not, to submit their own detailed certification that they affirmatively further fair housing and the ways in which they do it. DHCD provides financial assistance to a significant number of borrowers who are not involved in housing at all, including small businesses, such as restaurants and entertainment venues.

Finally, it is important to note that under the current applicable standards of the Fair Housing Act, HUD program participants (which include States, housing authorities, and nearly all local jurisdictions) already have a duty to affirmatively further fair housing. The Fair Housing Act and subsequent related acts requiring certifications do not specify how HUD, or recipients of HUD funding, are to affirmatively further fair housing, though HUD imposes site and neighborhood standards for HUD-funded development through 24 CFR § 891.125, and requires affirmative marketing of housing units to promote integrated neighborhoods. For that reason, we do not anticipate that this legislation will result in any increased availability or access to affordable housing for Marylanders. Rather, the impact may ultimately be the opposite by taking resources that may otherwise be deployed in support of housing programs.

We understand that the sponsor has amendments that may address some of these issues raised and look forward to working with the delegate to ensure the continued highest and best use of State resources to support high quality, affordable housing for Marylanders in all corners of the state.



