



APARTMENT ASSOCIATION
OF NEW MEXICO

6755 Academy Rd. NE Suite B
Albuquerque, NM 87109
Phone: 505.822.1114 or 800.687.0993
Fax: 505.822.8557 or 866.693.4395
www.aanm.org • info@aanm.org

2018 Board of Directors

President

Bobby Griffith, NAHP-e,
HCCP, HCM-H, HCM-R
JL Gray Company Inc.

Immediate Past-President

Chuck Sheldon, CCIM, CPM®
T & C Management

Vice- President of Membership

Sara Minnick-Lujan
Xfinity Communities

Treasurer

Joshua Smith
Washington Federal

Secretary

Gene Vance, Esq.
AANM Legal Counsel
Vance, Chavez & Associates

Primary Directors

Rose Armijo-Jasler
N.A.L.S.

Rosy Piña

Apartment Management Consultants

Kristin Crutchfield

Affinity at Albuquerque

Kathleen Danuser

Greystar Real Estate Partners

Jack MacGillivray

Monarch Properties, Inc.

Steve Ross

Supportive Housing Coalition of NM

Karie Taylor

Elevated Management Group

Associate Directors

Renee Ulibarri
RentPath

Jeff Thomas, CAS

HD Supply

AANM Staff

Kelle Senyé, ARM®
Katrina Soto

July 31, 2018

The Honorable Ben Carson
Secretary
United States Department of Housing and Urban Development
451 7th Street S.W.
Washington, DC 20410

Dear Secretary Carson,

I am writing on behalf of the **Apartment Association of New Mexico**. We represent **695 owner/managers, 117 supplier companies, 61,000 units**, and we are writing to share our views on [FR-6111-A-01, "Reconsideration of HUD's Implementation of the Fair Housing Act's Disparate Impact Standard."](#) Your review of HUD's disparate impact rule is critically important in light of the 2015 Supreme Court decision in *Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs v. The Inclusive Communities Project, Inc. (Inclusive Communities)*. We urge HUD to revise the Final Rule to reflect the analysis in the *Inclusive Communities* decision.

As currently written, the HUD disparate impact rule contradicts the Supreme Court's analysis in *Inclusive Communities*. The inconsistencies between the rule and *Inclusive Communities* create uncertainty for apartment housing providers, and leave unaddressed specific concerns cited by the Court. The decision was quite explicit in its reasoning that disparate impact liability should be both "properly limited" and focused on rooting out "artificial barriers to housing." Specifically, the *Inclusive Communities* decision says that a *specific* policy must be identified which is demonstrably *illegitimate, unnecessary* and *arbitrary* and has an *actual* (not potential), *substantial, negative* impact on a protected class. Further, plaintiffs must produce *statistical evidence* that establishes a causal connection between the policy and the discrimination. Finally, facts are required to illustrate how the impact on the protected class is quantitatively and qualitatively different than any other population.

Conforming the HUD disparate impact rule with the *Inclusive Communities* decision and resolving the issues identified above would remove legal uncertainty in the marketplace and mitigate needless litigation. Moreover, it would address concerns raised by the Supreme Court regarding overly expansive interpretation of disparate impact liability and the negative effects on affordable housing development and practical business processes.

Thank you for soliciting these comments on the disparate impact rule and for considering our views.

Regards,

Kelle Senyé, ARM®
Executive Director