

February 16, 2022 – 2:00-4:00 PM ET  
NATIONAL FAIR HOUSING FORUM  
Housing Segregation Is Not an Accident: A Black History Month Event  
\*\*\*

Speakers: Demetria McCain, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, HUD

Moderator: Cashauna Hill, Executive Director, Louisiana Fair Housing Action Center

Panelists: Richard Rothstein, Economic Policy Institute, and author of *The Color of Law: [A Forgotten History of How Our Government Segregated America](#)*, Lisa Rice, President and CEO National Fair Housing Alliance, Kenneth Scott, Managing Director-Consumer Fairness, Citi  
\*\*\*

CASHAUNA HILL [0:00:00]: Good afternoon, and welcome, everyone. We'll get started in just a few moments. While we are waiting for everyone to continue logging in, we would like to ask that each of you please respond to a couple of poll questions. Please take a moment to respond to these poll questions that have popped up on your screen:

The first poll question is what are you the most interested in learning about today? The choices are: Comprehending the long history of housing discrimination and segregation. Describing government policies that established a discriminatory housing market. Increasing understanding of how current discriminatory housing policies and practices perpetuate segregation. Identifying the connections between costs of segregation to individuals, communities, and the entire nation. Recognizing how fair housing laws and practices that affirmatively further fair housing may be used to reverse discriminatory housing policies and decrease the racial gaps in homeownership and wealth.

The second poll question we are asking you to answer today is what HUD region are you located in? And if you are unsure of which HUD region you are in, please reference the map on your screen.

If you are just joining us, welcome. We are asking that everyone please take a moment to answer two quick poll questions that have popped up on your screen. And we will get started very shortly.

Thanks to everyone who took the time to answer the poll questions. As you can see today, about 12% of today's participants are most interested in learning about comprehending the long history of housing discrimination and segregation. About 9% are most interested in learning about describing government policies that established a discriminatory housing market. 30% of today's attendees are most interested in learning about increasing understanding of how current discriminatory housing policies and practices perpetuates segregation. 8% are most interested in learning about identifying the connections between the costs of segregation to individuals, communities, and the entire nation. 41% are most interested in learning about, today, recognizing how fair housing laws and practices that affirmatively further fair housing may be used to reverse discriminatory housing policies and decrease the racial gaps in homeownership and wealth.

We'll move on to a little recap of where everyone is located today. 11% of today's attendees are located in HUD Region 1. 8% of you are located in HUD Region 2. 17% of you are located in HUD Region 3. 21% are located in HUD Region 4. 15% are located in HUD Region 5. 9% are located in HUD Region 6. 5% located in HUD Region 7. 2% located in HUD Region 8. 8% are located in HUD Region 9. And 4% of our attendees are located in HUD Region 10.

Thank you all again for joining us today. We are looking forward to a very exciting conversation. I would like to welcome you all to the National Fair Housing Training Academy National Fair Housing Forum titled housing segregation is not an accident: A Black History Month Event.

My name is Cashauna Hill, and I am the Executive Director of the Louisiana Fair Housing Action Center, where I lead a team working to end discriminatory housing policies and practices across the State of Louisiana.

As always, I am honored to have been invited by HUD to serve as is the moderator of this conversation. Please note that today's forum features information and examples that represent the experiences of the speakers. The comments do not necessarily reflect the policies of HUD.

Before we get started, let's review some technical tips and instructions regarding today's event. TJ, over to you.

TJ WINFIELD [0:00:53]: Thanks, Cashauna. If any of you have technical difficulties with audio or video, we recommend that you first sign out of the webinar and then sign in. If you are still having trouble after that, you can request help in the Q&A box located on the Zoom panel section at the bottom of your screen. Or you can send an email to [NFHTA@Cloudburstgroup.com](mailto:NFHTA@Cloudburstgroup.com). We encourage you to ask questions. You can enter your questions at any time by selecting the same Q&A button on your Zoom screen, but please note that due to time constraints, we might not be able to answer every question today.

The webinar is scheduled for two hours and is being recorded. The recording and the transcript will be made available on the NFHTA website on HUD Exchange, along with resources to supplement today's conversation.

Back to you, Cashauna.

CASHAUNA HILL [0:01:44]: Thank you, TJ.

I'll now introduce Demetria McCain, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of HUD's Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity. Demetria is very well known across the fair housing community, as she has long been a champion of the movement. Demetria, it is great to have you join us today.

DEMETRIA McCAIN [0:02:06]: Thank you. Thank you so much, Cashauna. Thank you. Good to be with friends once again. I am excited to join you again for today's NFHTA Forum, occurring this time in a month when we should all challenge ourselves to

understand the significant contributions that really have amplified and celebrated during Black History Month and beyond Black History Month; right? Because it's pretty much the shortest month of the year.

As the Secretary said earlier this month, our history is a long and often arduous journey. Simultaneously, our history is also filled with great triumphs. So, let's take a moment to observe these historic successes and how the fabric of our nation is enriched for all people because of pioneers who dared to dream and did not quit.

Just as important, let's not forget how Black communities have inspired us to never stop marching, never stop reaching, and never stop achieving along our collective journey, despite challenging times.

The unwavering commitment of civil rights leaders, the community of people who were willing to follow the call to action and justice should encourage us. Now, as we assemble today, I ask you to commit to understanding this very history. I ask you to commit to building our cultural competencies regarding the experiences of marginalized communities in this nation. And starting in February, with the Black History Experience, couldn't be more fitting. So, I challenge you to recognize also your own biases. Myself included. We all have them. This will serve you and the fair housing movement very well, as together we combat inequities in systems that, by design, mind you, have led to significant gaps in opportunities for far, far too many.

Now, today we have a dynamic panel of speakers to get us started. We've got Lisa, Richard, Ken. Thank you for joining us today, you three, for sharing your expertise with us and imparting wisdom. We are hungry for it. Secretary Fletcher and I are encouraged by this unprecedented attention that this administration has on focusing on fair housing. So, we are excited about this, and today is part of that excitement.

Days after the President was sworn in, he issued a memo to HUD Secretary declaring that diverse and inclusive communities strengthen our democracy. And he went on. He went on to say and outline our nation's history of struggling towards this ideal. You'll hear some of that history today. And more specifically, as my friend, Richard Rothstein walks us through details from his book *The Color of Law*, you will hear that very theme.

As I close, I want to shine a light on the final part of the President's memo, in which he said: The federal government has a critical role to play in overcoming and redressing this history of discrimination by applying and enforcing the federal civil rights and fair housing laws. Let me restate that. The federal government has a critical role to play in overcoming and redressing this history of discrimination by applying and enforcing federal civil rights and fair housing laws.

So, we've got work to do; right?

And President Biden directed us to achieve this by working with all of you. Our team is working nonstop to bring forth a revised affirmative housing rule. And as we prepare our next steps and prepare for our next steps, NFHTA will create training to help meaningfully engage your neighbors around how your community invests federal funds in a way that ensures equity and choice.

In December, HUD released guidance related to special purpose credit programs. You may have heard about that or read about that. That's a tool that some entities in the credit industry can use to better serve communities -- often Black and brown communities -- that have been historically prevented from accessing credit. Very poignant topic today we will be discussing.

Knowing how to navigate this new tool, special purpose credit programs, is an emerging issue. Knowing how to navigate that is something that NFHTA will help you with, and we'll be soon providing some foundational training so that you can understand that tool.

Finally, Secretary Fudge chairs, along with domestic policy advisor Susan Rice, the Interagency Task Force on property appraisal and evaluation. HUD, the White House, and 12 other cabinet-level and independent agencies will very soon -- wait for it -- deliver to the President an action plan. This task force we call PAVE. The PAVE action plan will detail the real changes that the federal government will quickly take to combat the legacy of generational wealth and homeownership gaps that remain today because of how the federal government systemically supported discrimination in housing and mortgage lending. HUD's National Fair Housing Training Academy will be here for you to ensure you have the knowledge to understand the connection of the PAVE Action Plan to your work. This includes how you will process complaints regarding racial bias in appraisals. As always, I want to thank you for your commitment to doing this work. I want to thank you for being the change you wish to see cliché but true -- and for honoring Black history by being warriors in the pursuit of justice and equity for all. For being here today.

So Cashauna, my friend, I turn it back over to you.

CASHAUNA HILL [0:08:28]: Thank you, Demetria, and thank you for being with us today.

As we move on, I'll share the learning objectives for today's forum. Together, we will: Comprehend the long history of housing discrimination and segregation. Describe government policies that established a discriminatory housing market. Increase understanding of how current discriminatory housing policies and practices perpetuate segregation. Identify the connections between the costs of segregation to individuals, communities, and the entire nation. Recognize how fair housing laws and practices that affirmatively further fair housing may be used to reverse discriminatory housing policies and decrease the racial gaps in homeownership and wealth.

At this time, I'll introduce our panel speakers who are all extremely accomplished and experienced. Please note that you can find each of their biographies on the Forum page of the NFHTA website. Joining us today are Richard Rothstein, Lisa Rice, and Ken Scott.

Later in today's conversation, we'll open things up for questions. You will all have the opportunity to submit questions that we will do our best to address. However, please note that not all questions will be able to be answered, and personal questions will not be able to be addressed. If at any time during today's event you have questions, please submit them via the Q&A box. Also, as a reminder -- because we've already gotten this question several times in the Q&A box, and I will say this several times throughout the

event, so please bear with me -- this event is being recorded, and the materials, including the slide deck and event recording, will be available on the Forum page on HUD Exchange soon after the event.

With that, I will now hand things over to Richard. Richard?

RICHARD ROTHSTEIN [0:10:42]: Thank you very much. Thanks to all of you for being with me today. It was with some hesitation I accepted this invitation because I don't normally agree to speak on Black History Month. What I am going to talk to you about today is white history. Actually, it's all of our history, and it's a history that we all need to take responsibility for redressing.

As you know, in the 20th century, we had the Civil Rights Movement in this country. It began by challenging segregation in law schools, then in colleges and universities, and then in 1954, the civil rights litigators succeeded in persuading the Supreme Court to prohibit legal segregation in elementary and secondary schools. And that *Brown v. Board of education* decision gave impetus, stimulus, to a movement of actions, biracial movement engaged in marches, civil disobedience. Some people lost their lives in that struggle. Most particularly, the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., but others as well.

In the course of that struggle, in which many were injured, even those who did not lose their lives, the civil rights movement succeeded in ending segregation and lunch counters and public accommodations and transportation. For the most part in employment. And then in the wake of Dr. King's assassination in 1968, succeeded in getting a Fair Housing Act passed that prohibited ongoing discrimination in the sale and rental of housing.

And then, at the end of the 1960s, that civil rights movement pretty much ended. And it left untouched the biggest segregation of all, which is that every metropolitan area in this country is residentially segregated. I have lived in many of them. Many of you, I am sure, have lived in more than one. Everyone that I lived in had clearly defined areas that were all white or mostly white. Clearly defined areas that were all black or mostly black.

During the 1950s and 60s, during the civil rights movement, we pretty much persuaded the country that racial segregation was wrong, immoral, harmful to both Blacks and Whites, incompatible with our self-conception as a constitutional democracy, and yet we left untouched the biggest segregation of all. How could that be?

Well, partly it's because ending residential segregation is hard. If we pass an ordinance prohibiting segregation in restaurants or in buses, the next day anybody can go to any restaurant or sit anywhere they want on a bus. We pass an ordinance prohibiting segregation in neighborhoods, and the next day things wouldn't look much different. So, it's hard.

And what we've done, all of us -- and I mean all of us, Blacks and Whites, liberals, conservatives, northerners, southerners -- is we've adopted a rationalization, an excuse we give ourselves to not continue the struggle to end the segregation of neighborhoods. And that excuse goes something like this: We tell ourselves that the segregation forms that we abolished in the 1930s, '40s, '50s, and '60s, colleges, schools, public accommodations, public transportation, those forms of segregation were acquired by

government. If the federal government was requiring it, that was a violation of the 5th Amendment to the Constitution. It was a civil rights violation. As Americans, we all have an obligation to fix civil rights violations. If state and local governments were doing it, it was a violation of the 14th Amendment, also a civil rights violation, also something that we, as Americans, have an obligation to redress.

But residential segregation, we tell ourselves that's something entirely different. That wasn't done by government. It wasn't done by law, by ordinance, by public policy. That just sort of happened naturally. The reason we have residential segregation, we tell ourselves, is bigoted white homeowners or landlords wouldn't sell or rent. Private banks, realtors, developers discriminated on the basis of race when they carried out their private sector activities. Or maybe we tell ourselves it's because people just like to live with each other of the same race. That's why we have segregation. Or maybe it's just an income thing. On average, African Americans have lower incomes than Whites. Not all, but on average. So many African Americans just can't afford to move to middleclass neighborhoods. All of these individual, bigoted, discriminatory private sector activities, chef choice, self-segregation is what created segregation. And we tell ourselves what happened naturally can only unhappen naturally. It's too bad. Many of us think it's too bad. But we don't feel an obligation to do anything about it because it's not a civil rights violation. It doesn't violate the Constitution.

Well, I spent many years before getting involved in this topic as an education policy writer. I was the education columnist at the New York Times for a while and wrote on education policy for think tanks in Washington. And I came to understand that the education policy we are following in the 1990s and early 2000s made no sense. We had a national view, really supported by civil rights groups as well as by conservatives, that the reason that African American children achieved at a lower level, on average, than White children was because teachers were bigoted, had low expectations of Black children, and they just didn't try very hard to teach them. They were lazy. If only we could force teachers to try harder, the achievement gap between Black and White children would disappear. I thought this was a ludicrous theory. Of course, there are some teachers who are lazy, but there are many hardworking teachers. Most teachers are very hardworking. That's not the reason we have an achievement gap. The reason we have an achievement gap between Black and White children is because so many Black children come to school with serious social and economic challenges that inhibit their ability to learn. Lazy teachers play a very small part in this gap. And I remember writing one column about asthma. As you may know, African American children in urban neighborhoods have asthma sometimes at four times the rate of middleclass children in suburban neighborhoods. It's an enormous difference. They have asthma at such a high rate because they live in more polluted neighborhoods, more industry nearby, more dilapidated buildings, more vermin in the environment. And when the child has asthma, that child is more likely than the child who -doesn't - again, I am only talking about averages. It's not true in every case. But the child with asthma is more likely than the child without to be up at night wheezing. And then coming to school drowsy the next day. If you have two groups of children who are identical in every respect, same racial composition, same social and economic background, same family structure, but one group has a higher rate of asthma than the other, that group is going to have slightly lower achievement simply because it's a drowsier group on -test taking- day, as well as on the learning that leads up to testing.

Well, asthma plays a very small part in the achievement gap, but you begin to think of all of the other things, all of the other challenges that so many children from low-income African American neighborhoods face. Lead poisoning has a measurable impact on IQ. African American children have much higher rates of lead poisoning than White children because they live in more dilapidated buildings, more peeling paint that exposes lead, more pipes bringing water to their homes that are lead lined. Lead poisoning, homelessness, economic insecurity, you begin to add all of these up, and you begin to explain the achievement gap, leaving very little explanation left for lazy teachers.

Well, it's one thing if a child has asthma or lead poisoning or homelessness or economic insecurity. It's another thing if you have a school where every child has one or more of these challenges. How can a school like that ever be expected to achieve at the same level as a school where children come healthy, well rested, well-nourished from economically secure homes? You can't have that expectation. Although we passed a law in 2001 saying that if we simply made teachers try harder, the achievement gap would disappear in seven years and do nothing about any of these underlying conditions.

Well, we call schools, we concentrate children with these disadvantages, we call them segregated schools. Schools today are more segregated than have been at any time in the last 45 years. The reason they are more segregated is because the neighborhoods in which they are located are segregated. I began to think as an education policy writer that neighborhood segregation was an educational issue I ought to be concerned about. That's how I got into this topic that led to *The Color of Law*.

Then in 2007, I read a Supreme Court decision that evaluated two school districts -- Seattle, Washington, and Louisville, Kentucky. Both of them had very, very trivial school desegregation plans. They allowed parents the choice of which school their child would end, but if it was going to exacerbate segregation, it wouldn't be honored. So, if you had an all-white and mostly white school where the black and white child applied for the last remaining place, the black child would be given some preference, help to desegregate the school, it was a trivial program.

The Supreme Court announced they couldn't do that. They said it's true, the schools are segregated, but it's because the neighborhoods in which they are located are segregated. That's true. It's a true fact.

Then they went on to explain that the neighborhoods in these cities were segregated de facto, the term he used, not reasons I described before, and he said we have de facto segregation, something that wasn't created by government. Government is prohibited from doing anything to fix it.

Well, I read this decision, and I remembered something that happened in Louisville, Kentucky, some years before. In Louisville, Kentucky, there was a White homeowner in a single-family home in an all White suburb outside the center of Louisville. Suburb was called Shively. This white homeowner had an African American friend living in the center city of Louisville. That African American friend was a decorated Navy Veteran. He had a wife and a child. Good job. Wanted to move to a single-family home. Nobody would sell him one.

So, the White homeowner in this all White suburbs of Shively bought a second home in his suburb and resold it to his African American friend. When the African American family moved in, an angry mob surrounded the home, protected by the police. They threw rocks through the windows. The police made no effort to stop it. They dynamited and firebombed the home. Police made no effort to stop that. But when this riot was all over, the State of Kentucky arrested, tried, convicted, and jailed with a 15 year sentence the white homeowner for sedition, for having sold a home to a Black family in a White neighborhood.

And I said to myself, this doesn't sound to me much like de facto segregation. If the police, the prosecutors, the entire criminal justice system are mobilized in an unconstitutional 14th Amendment violation to preserve segregation in the community of Louisville.

I began to look into it further, and I am not exaggerating here, there were hundreds and hundreds of cases of police protected, sometimes police organized and led mob violence that drove African Americans out of homes that they had legitimately purchased or rented in previously all White neighborhoods. Not just in border states like Kentucky. In New York and Chicago and Baltimore and Washington, Kansas City, Denver, Los Angeles and San Francisco, cases of this kind of police protected mob violence all over the country, that not only drove African Americans out of neighborhoods in which they have moved but terrorized other African Americans into not daring to do so.

Well, I began, then, to look into it further, and I found there were many, many policies, not just police protected mob violence, that ensured that we'd be a segregated society, policies enacted by federal, state, and local governments, all in violation of the Constitution, that created the segregated landscape that we know today.

In the few minutes I have with you left this morning, or this afternoon, I guess, for some of you, let me describe a few of the most important policies. Perhaps the most important -- and I am sure you are all familiar with this -- was a policy of the federal Housing Administration and -- Federal Housing Administration and Veterans Administration in the immediate post -World War II period, to suburbanize the entire White population into single -family homes in all -White suburbs like that one outside Louisville that I described before. It was a program for Whites only. The government attempted to move all -White families who were living in urban areas into suburbs, prohibiting African Americans from following. We were not a suburban country at this time in the immediate post World War II period. The suburbs were a new thing. Most Whites and Blacks were living in center cities because for the most part, we were a manufacturing economy, and businesses had to be located near the factories that were getting their parts and shipping their final products by rail or by ship. So, the federal government decided to move all of- these White, working-class families, who were living, many of them, in integrated neighborhoods in downtown areas. We were a much more integrated country then- than we are today. Move the Whites out. In my book, *The Color of Law*, I describe the biggest one, Levittown, east of New York City, I am sure many of you have heard of it. 70,000 homes in one place. The builder, William Levitt, could never have assembled this on his own. No bank would have been crazy enough to lend him the money to buy the land and build 17,000 homes that he didn't have any buyers for yet. The only way that Levitt could build this development was to go to the

Federal Housing Administration and Veterans Administrations, submit his plans for the development in order to request and get a federal bank guaranty for the loans he needed to build it. In order to get that guaranty, he had to commit never to sell a home to an African American. He had to further agree - and this was a Federal Housing Administration -requirement - to- place a clause in the deed of every home prohibiting resale or rental to African Americans.

I want to emphasize this was a federal requirement. This notion of de facto segregation is utter nonsense. There's no basis in reality to it whatsoever.

Now, Levitt himself was a bigot. He would never have sold a home to an African American if he had a choice. He admitted as much. He said as much. He said he wouldn't sell to Blacks. But this doesn't make the segregation of Levittown a private sector activity. Because Levitt -- it was not Levitt. Levitt couldn't have built the home on his own and excluded African Americans from it. The only way you could build a development was to get a federal bank guaranty, and if the federal government had followed its constitutional responsibilities by saying to Levitt, yeah, we'll guarantee your bank loans, but only if you agree to sell homes on a nondiscriminatory basis, Levittown and the entire rest of the country would look very differently today because these kinds of suburbs that were financed in every metropolitan area by the Federal Housing and Veterans Administrations were all White everywhere by federal requirement.

Well, that particular policy - and there were many, many others that the federal, state, and local governments -followed - created- something that I know that we have had a lot of discussion about in the last couple years, the wealth gap, or at least substantially is responsible for that wealth gap. Because the White families who were subsidized by the federal government to move into these single-family homes didn't expect to get wealthy when they did. They were just looking for a place to live. But unbeknownst or unexpected to them, or to the federal government, suddenly these homes started to appreciate in value-. At the time, homes in Levittown and all these homes sold in today's money to about \$100,000, any working -class family, Black or White, could have afforded them. African Americans with jobs in the postwar -boom - and many of them had -them - could- have afforded homes like that just like White working-class families can. But today those homes no longer sell for \$100,000. Depending on the part of the country, they sell for \$300,000, \$400,000, \$500,000, in some places a million dollars or more. The White families who bought those homes saw their equity increasing as they lived in those homes. Over the next couple of generations, they gained wealth. If a home now sells for \$400,000, the owners of that home gained from 100 to 400, 300 thousand dollars in wealth that they had nothing to do with creating. They used that wealth to send their children to college. They used it had- to take care of emergencies, perhaps. Perhaps medical emergencies, perhaps temporary unemployment. They used it to subsidize their retirements. And they used it to bequeath wealth to their children and grandchildren, who then had down payments for their own homes. African Americans were prohibited - prohibited- - from explicit racial policy of the federal government from participating in this program that generated this wealth. And the result is that today, although African American incomes, on average, are about 60% of White -incomes - family -incomes - African- American wealth is not 60% of White wealth. African American household wealth is today about 5% of White household wealth, and that enormous disparity between the 60% income ratio and a 5% wealth ratio is entirely attributable to unconstitutional federal housing policy that was practiced

in the mid20s century. And then -we - none of -us - have taken the responsibility the responsibility to -remedy - excuse -me - besotted as we are by this myth of de facto segregation. Of course, we do a great deal to try to prohibit ongoing discrimination, but prohibited ongoing discrimination, as the Fair Housing Act -did - excuse- me, I am sorry.

Prohibited ongoing discrimination does nothing to undo the segregation it's created. Levittown, for example, to use that example I gave a few minutes ago, it is now about 1%, 2% African American. The Fair Housing Act says okay, African Americans, you can now buy homes there. You can't be stopped anymore. But how many African Americans or Whites, for that matter, working class families, have \$400,000 to buy a home? Unless they have down payments from their parents. Levittown itself is in a broader neighborhood that's about, oh, a little bit less than 15% African American, so that difference between the 15% African American population of Levittown that you would expect were it not for this unconstitutional policy and the 1% to 2% that exists because of the Fair Housing Act is the segregation that we have not remedied. And we've not taken an obligation to remedy. What does the Constitution require? In my judgment, the Constitution requires the federal government to begin buying up homes at market rates in Levittown and reselling them to African Americans at deeply discounted rates in order to remedy the unconstitutional system that the government created. But the government's not going to do that. We all know that. And the reason the government is not going to do that is because there's no civil rights movement today that's going to force them to do it in the same way that the civil rights movement in the 1960s forced communities to desegregate their public accommodations and their public transportation. Firms all over the country to desegregate their employment.

Let me mention in the few minutes I have of one other important policy that the federal government followed. That's public housing, something we all misunderstand. I know all of us - I did before I began doing this -research - think of public housing as a place where poor people live. Lots of single parents, single mothers with children, lots of young men without jobs in the formal economy. That's not how public housing began in this country. Public housing began during The New Deal, the Depression, by the Roosevelt Administration. It was not for poor people. We had an enormous unemployment rate in the 1930s during the Depression, about 25% unemployment. Public housing was not for that 25%. Public housing was for the 75% that was employed, had good jobs, could pay the full cost of -rent - it wasn't subsidized at that -time - could build it, put up the money to build it, and market rates were charged to -working class- families who could afford housing, but no housing was being built for them during the Depression.

The federal government built this housing, and everywhere it built it, it segregated it, separate projects for Blacks, separate projects for Whites, everywhere in the country it did it. The great African American poet novelist, play write describes that he grew up in an integrated downtown Cleveland neighborhood. I explained before we had many integrated neighborhoods downtown in those days. Not everyone, but many. He said his best friend in high school was Polish, he said he dated a Jewish girl. That's what you would expect to happen in an integrated high school, integrated neighborhood. Public works Administration, the first New Deal agency, went into that neighborhood, demolished some of the integrated housing to build two separate projects, one for Whites, one for African Americans, creating segregation that hadn't previously existed, reinforcing it with other projects elsewhere in the city, and doing so around the country.

In my book, *The Color of Law*, I like to, where I can, pick on places that are smug, think they are better than everybody else. One I talk about is Cambridge, Massachusetts. The area between Harvard and MIT called the Central Square neighborhood was a fully integrated neighborhood in the 1930s. But the federal government segregated it. -- segregated it, separate projects for Whites, separate projects for Blacks, creating segregation that hadn't previously existed.

There are many, many programs that the federal, state, and local governments followed to create this segregation. There are many ideas for desegregating it, for redressing segregation, both for reinvesting and improving the quality of low-income African American neighborhoods and for opening up opportunities for African Americans if they choose to move to higher opportunity neighborhoods. We have no lack of policy ideas. What we lack is a new civil rights movement that's going to be as aggressive, as determined as the civil rights movement of the 1960s was to redress this most powerful form of segregation that we have in this country today. We are an apartheid society. We all accept it. Uncomfortable though we are about it. Besotted, as I say, by this myth of de facto segregation.

Well, I think my time is up, but I hope that the discussion and I'd be glad to answer any questions that may arise. Thank you.

CASHAUNA HILL [0:37:11]: Thank you, Richard, and I know we are all so glad you made an exception to your policy to join us today. Thank you very much.

As we move to our next panelist, another reminder that this event is being recorded and that all materials will be available on the forum page of the NFHTA website. Please do continue to submit questions for today's panelists via the Q&A box if you have them.

Our next panelist, Lisa Rice, will discuss the current policies and practices that perpetuate segregation. Lisa?

LISA RICE [0:37:45]: Cashauna, thank you so very much, and I am going to share my screen. I hope that I do this correctly and that what you all are seeing is a PowerPoint presentation. Okay. Great. Wonderful.

One of the arguments that we have heard is that these historical issues that Richard has been talking about were all a part of history; right? They were something that was done in the past, and they don't really impact us today, so why bother even talking about them? Why bother researching and delving into these issues? But I think what I am here to talk about is the fact that nothing could be further from the truth. That the discrimination and disparities that Richard talked about created systems and structures that still exist today and that are impacting us today, and forbidding and foreclosing opportunities, important opportunities for so many people.

As you heard Richard say, we have passed literally thousands of laws and policies and rules that perpetuated segregation and other unfair and inequitable systems, and what we did was we passed fair housing laws and fair lending laws, like the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, like the Community Reinvestment Act, we pass these laws that really focused on addressing sort of situational issues. These laws said look, going forward, you cannot base a transactional decision on whether or not a person is a member of a

protected class. And that was a good thing. But the challenge and problem for us today is that we left the systems of inequality in place, and those systems of inequality are still doing what they were originally designed to do. So, we left segregation in place. We left the dual credit market in place. We left restrictive zoning ordinances in place. We left the racial wealth gap in place. Right? And all of these systems which were designed to create and perpetuate inequality, and in particular, racial inequality, they are doing what they were designed to do.

So, our challenge is how to understand these underlying structural issues, how to lift them up, how to tease them out, and then how to dismantle them and then replace them with systems and structures that are fair and that promote equitable opportunities for people.

Richard talked about how our nation, at one time we weren't this hyper segregated nation, but we are now. In fact, we are more segregated today than we were a hundred years ago. But not only are we residentially segregated in -- segregated in terms of where we live, but we are also segregated based on our resources. Our resources and amenities are segregated. You look at education for school districts that predominantly educate White children, those school districts receive \$23 billion every year more than school districts that predominantly educate children of color, even though they both educate the same number of students. When we look at environmental issues, race, because of segregation, race is the most significant predictor of whether a person will live in a neighborhood that has contaminated land, air, or water. When we look at healthcare issues, we see that communities of color, in particular Native communities, Latino communities, and Black communities, disproportionately do not have hospitals, healthcare facilities, physicians' offices. In fact, one researcher said your ZIP code is a better determinant of health than your genetic code.

Access to banks. We find banks are sparsely located in communities of color. Subversively, subprime lenders, payday lenders and check cashers, are hyper concentrated in those communities. In fact, today, banks are closing their branches in affluent, high income Black neighborhoods at a higher rate than they are closing their branches in low-income White communities. So, we are segregated based on race and national origin, but our resources are also segregated as well.

And we are faced with a plethora of systems that are perpetuating discrimination and biases. And part of the challenge is to understand how these systems are perpetuating bias so that we can use our laws to, again, mitigate against those biases, dismantle those systems, and then come up with more fair structures.

And I want to tease up two areas where we were seeing a lot of structural elements, a lot of structural impediments. That's in the area of appraisals and also technology. Now, these certainly aren't the only areas where we are seeing a lot of structural impediments, but I want to lift up these two areas because they are receiving a lot of attention in the media.

Many of you may know that NFHA just did a wonderful analysis. We did it in conjunction with Steve Dane, a noted fair lending expert, and Peter Christianson, who is a noted appraisal legal expert. But this analysis teed up some areas that I don't think we've paid a lot of attention to in terms of understanding how the appraisal system is perpetuating

discrimination and contributing toward the racial wealth and homeownership gaps.

Freddie Mac recently completed some research that showed that appraisers were more likely to find that the appraised value of a home fell below the contract price or the purchase price in Black and Latino census tracts, and they also found that this proclivity, the proclivity for this disparity, wasn't a one off. Right? It wasn't some isolated event. In fact, their research found that the majority of appraisers showed a statistically significant Black versus White appraisal gap. That is, the majority of appraisers in the sample that they analyzed were more likely to determine that appraised value was below the contract value or the purchase price in a Black -neighborhood - in Black neighborhoods in which they worked than in the White neighborhoods in which they worked. So- this is a systemic issue, not a one -off or an isolated event.

Fannie Mae also recently conducted research, and they focused their research on the refinancing market. And their research showed that homes in predominantly White communities were -- I am sorry. White -owned homes, so owners -- White owners who lived in Black neighborhoods were much more likely, more frequently, to have their home values over -assessed. And in fact, what they found was Black homeowners in those same communities were more likely to have their homes under-assessed.

They found that the number one reason that White owned homes were more likely to have appraised values that were over assessed is because of the selection of the comparables. That is appraisers were more likely to assess comparables to assess the value of a home in the instance where a White homeowner is living in a Black neighborhood, appraisers were more likely to use comparables that were outside of that neighborhood or community in order to determine the value of that home.

The federal housing finance agency also conducted recent research in which it found literally thousands of appraisal reports that contained inappropriate race language, such as storefronts in this neighborhood are supplying Jewish households. This is a predominantly Hispanic neighborhood. This neighborhood has more of an Asian influence. So, these are all comments that are highly inappropriate, yet they were contained in the appraisal report. And the notion that these kinds of assessments, this kind of data would be contained in the appraisal report but that the appraiser would not use it to assess that information, to assess the value of the appraisal is just nonsensical. The data is there for a reason.

One of the other things that I wanted to lift up is that our analysis showed that the current system, the current structure for assessing appraisals, which is the sales comparison approach, allows room for very broad discretion. So, you heard me talk about the comparable selection issue related to the Fannie Mae research. Well, the comparable selection function on the appraisal report and in the appraisal process is one that gives appraisers very broad discretion. It's highly subjective.

The adjustments that appraisers make based on different features of the home -- the square footage, the number of bedrooms, how built up the house -is - the- adjustments that appraisers make for each of these features is a highly subjective process as well. The neighborhood's description, describing what the neighborhood's boundaries are, all of those are highly subjective components of the appraisal process and present very real fair housing risks when the appraiser is conducting the appraisal analysis.

Research by Dr. Andre Perry at the Brookings Institute revealed that on average -- on average -- homeowners in predominantly Black neighborhoods are losing \$48,000 in home equity, in the value of their home. If you aggregate that, it amounts to a cumulative loss of \$156 billion -- this is \$156 billion -- of lost wealth for homeowners in Black neighborhoods. And of course, that lost wealth contributes to the racial wealth gap that we are still grappling with today.

A recent study by researchers at Northwestern University called A Penny on the Dollar, shows that for households with children -- so these are families with children -- for every dollar of wealth held by a White family, Black families have 1 cent, and Latino families have 8 cents. So, it's a very disturbing reality; right? How appraisal bias and the gaps in the appraisal sector drive and feed into the racial wealth gap that we are still grappling with today.

Now, I mentioned another area I wanted to focus on is the area of algorithmic bias. This is another area where we see systemic issues, and you are hearing in the news almost on a daily basis, right, where researchers are finding new technologies that perpetuate bias and discrimination against protected classes. In the employment space, Amazon had to, not too long ago, abandon the use of an algorithmic based system it had adopted to recruit people in management because it found that that system was discriminating against women. It was actually kicking women out of the applicant pool.

In the healthcare sector, we were all, I think, astonished to learn that an algorithmic system that has been used for over 10 years in the healthcare space was discriminating against Black patients who were actually sicker than their White patient counterparts.

In the credit scoring space, we see time after time, research after research, lifting up the fact that credit scoring systems are perpetuating discrimination and bias.

We see it with other systems as well. And one of the reasons why these systems are all perpetuating bias -- and there are many reasons that are contributing to the discriminatory outputs that we see. But one of the challenges is that these systems are built using data that is highly discriminatory. So, the bias is baked into the data. And you have heard the old adage, junk in, junk out. Well, the same thing applies to these technologies in the housing and financial services space. Biased data in means biased outcomes.

And this is a real issue; right? Because we say tech is the new civil rights frontier. And we say that because the technology is just growing in the housing and financial services space. Credit scoring systems, automated underwriting systems, risk-based pricing systems, revenue management software systems. We are seeing the uptick of use of technology in the housing and financial services space. And the problem is that people think that because it's a technological solution that it's safe, that it isn't discriminating. But the reality is we now know that these computer-based systems, these algorithmic systems, can oftentimes see race, see gender, see other protected class characteristics, sometimes quicker than the human eye can detect those kinds of characteristics. And these systems are manifesting the bias that is reflected in the marketplace. It's not mitigating the bias. It's reflecting the bias, oftentimes.

Now, I am going to stop here and just lift up a couple of other concerns that we have. Again, these are modern day concerns, but they very much are predicated, they are very much founded on the kinds of issues that Richard talked about. And one of the areas that I wanted to lift up for you today is around COVID, the COVID pandemic, and economic crisis. Because we are seeing fallouts related to the COVID crisis that we believe will just perpetuate and exacerbate some of these issues that we talk about. So increased discrimination against people with disabilities and Asian American populations; challenges related to the foreclosures that we are seeing connected to the COVID pandemic. The evictions challenges that we are seeing. These are all issues, long-term issues, that we are going to be dealing with for decades to come that we have to use our fair housing laws in order to craft solutions around to provide protections to people.

So, I am going to stop there and turn it back over to Cashauna.

CASHAUNA HILL [0:55:25]: Thank you so much, Lisa.

We will now move on to our final panelist, Ken Scott, to review solutions to reverse the legacy and costs of housing discrimination and segregation and the role of the government in affirmatively furthering fair housing.

Ken?

KENNETH SCOTT [0:55:44]: Thanks, Cashauna, and thanks, Richard and Lisa, for your remarks and teeing this up. I hope I can provide some insight and kind of pulling us, how do we get out of the challenges that we are seeing.

As I think about it, all of us collectively work every day toward leveling the playing field. I think there were 1800 people that registered for this webinar, and each of us every day are looking for ways to provide additional access to credit, thinking about housing, how can we level the playing field, thinking about housing integration, thinking about how we can help, you know, folks that are in tough situations coming out of COVID from a rental perspective. How do we manage all of those issues that are out there?

And I talk about leveling the playing field. Leveling the playing field means different things for different people. I think if you are starting out with a dollar, it's going to look one way. If you are starting out with one cent, it's going to look another way. We think about that chart that Lisa just showed. So, when I think about leveling the playing field, we really need to say if you are a group particularly that has been disadvantaged and has a wealth gap, they need additional funds to be able to purchase a home, how can we get them those funds?

So, before I get into that, though, what I'd like to talk a little bit about is some research that Citi did. We call it our Citi action for racial equity. And you know, when you look at this, it's -- Citi invested basically a billion dollars in strategic initiatives by the end of 2023 across four pillars of activity. And the reason for doing that is we did a GPS report, and it stands for Global Perspectives and Solutions. And when we looked at it just for Black Americans, so not if you add on top of that Hispanics and other disadvantaged groups, but if you just focus on Black Americans, right, if you look at the lost wages, housing, and investments, and we were able to close that gap, we would add an

additional \$5 trillion to the US GDP. Think about that. That's \$5 trillion if we are able to level the playing field in a meaningful way where we can get more people benefitting from all of the wages, housing, and building wealth in a way that moves the economy forward.

In 2020, as calls for racial justice intensified, Citi responded, again, as I said, with our Action for Racial Equity. We have strategic initiatives. They are based on four pillars. One is to expand housing and access to credit in communities of color. The other is invest in affordable housing and promote the growth of Black homeownership. The third is invest in Black entrepreneurship, and the fourth is looking within and strengthening our own policies and practices in order to become what we term an anti-racist institution. What that really means is looking at our company and thinking about where we may have our own systemic issues and making sure that we are addressing them as a firm, which will help us in achieving the first three goals that I laid out.

In doing that, we leveraged \$550 million for leveraging homeownership for people of color. We added another \$50 million in additional impacts on breaking down this billion, over a billion that we spent. \$350 million in procurement opportunities, and that goes directly to Black-owned businesses. \$100 million to support minority deposit institutions growth and revenue. And we gave a bunch of grants to various institutions to assist them in performing their very important work that's out there.

So, pulling that all together, we want to be part of the solution. I'll focus a little bit on some of the stuff we did in goal #3, which is the one that's invest in affordable housing and promote the growth of homeownership, Black homeownership. As I talked about, we committed \$200 million of equity to the preservation of affordable and workforce housing projects, with a goal to -- and I am looking at this, you know, to make sure we have Black investment managers. The co-managers were identified by Citi Community Capital, and those folks are going through an RFP process, where we are -- and they have an advisory committee where they are reaching out and thinking through what are the things that we can do to ensure that there's affordable housing and that we are committed to making sure we put this \$200 million where it should go.

Then we expanded our U.S. Consumer Banks Community Lending team and network of corresponding lenders to support Black and Hispanic homeownership. And Citi continues to invest in its digital mortgage capabilities to better reach all communities, including underserved markets.

Now, I am talking a little bit about what Citi is doing, but there are many other institutions out there that are doing similar things. We are not the only group that's out there. I am sure if you look at JPMorgan, they are doing it. If you are looking at Wells, they may be doing it. There are other institutions doing similar things. I think my more point is we need to all work together. We are all cogs in this wheel, and if we all work together, we can level this playing field in a meaningful way and narrow the wealth gap for all communities.

So, shifting gears, you know, thinking through what are some more things that we can do that are targeted, and particularly for the group that's on this webinar, first is, you know, I think we can have more effective investigation and enforcement of the fair housing laws. The fair housing laws are an important tool, both the Fair Housing Act,

the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, you have the local/state laws that are out there as well. And we can do this by continuing to increase support for the fair housing assistance programs, state and local fair housing agencies. Each of you that are out there on the ground, I have worked with many of you. You are all out there pushing the boundaries, ensuring people are getting access to housing, access to credit, and challenging the status quo. I think we need to continue to challenge the status quo at every level.

Increase support for private housing organizations to investigate complaints. But also to conduct systemic regional and national investigations. Right? The more investigations we have out there, you know, and the more look at the systemic underlying issues that are causing some of these disparities that we are seeing -- Lisa went through one focused on the appraisal industry. We need to look at each aspect of what may be driving these wealth disparities and think about how do we improve them and challenge some of the things that are going on in the system to open it up to more people.

Another one is improving increased training for HUD and FHAP investigators, and we are doing that today. Then improve outcomes in HUD and FHAP cases. I think that's an important one. These cases, I worked with them when I was at DOJ. People submit cases to HUD, fair housing cases. I have looked at them. The injunctive relief. We need to get it out there that if you discriminate, there are going to be penalties for it. And I think about one of my favorite cases that I did when I was at Justice. The lady, I won't call her name or mention the name of the case. But this lady was aware of her rights, and she called to get a home that was advertised, African American woman, and was told it wasn't. She felt a little suspicious about it, and she had one of her White coworkers call, and a house was available. She had a Black coworker call, and the house was unavailable. She did her own testing, similar to what you guys do. She filed her HUD complaint, it ended up on my desk, and when we investigated it, it ended up settling for \$35,000 for her, which was meaningful money, allowed her to buy a home for her and her daughter. I mean, that changes lives. The work we do changes lives. It sent a significant message within that community to the landlords that, listen, you cannot discriminate. So, the work we are doing is very important.

The other piece of this is things change year to year. HUD has historically done their housing discrimination study -- I know last year we didn't get that done because of COVID. I think it's important we continue to do these studies. Look at the changing environment year over year so we can be very targeted in how we think about what we need to do, not only from a fair housing group perspective, but also from our financial institutions that are out there. The more we understand about what's going on, the more we can be targeted also in how we work to address some of the inequalities that are out there.

Next is, you know, this -- I can't overemphasize. Richard talked about this. A lot of what happened was really driven by decisions made by the government many years ago that created the segregation that we continue to see today. And this is where the affirmative housing act, the FFAH, where we hold local communities, governments, and you've got to have that plan, if we see segregation, we see zoning laws that are out there, they need to think about it. Those local communities that have federally funded programs, we need to put their feet to the fire and make sure they are thinking about how do they address any systemic issues within their areas that may create the segregation that we

have seen.

Lastly, what are some of the solutions that the financial industry can do? And I talked a little bit about that, but ensuring we have banking services and credit in communities of color. I know there is a lot of talk about bank branches, and they are an important tool, but there's also digital. I mean, not many of us actually walk into branches anymore, but making sure, you know, we are creating products and access, not only in our branches, but through digital and other places, all institutions should be thinking about that.

Then looking at our credit policies, and you know, the ECOA, HUD has come out and talked about special purpose credit programs, that it does not create a conflict with the Fair Housing Act. The OCC has come out and said it. Institutions that may have been reluctant in the past. I think you are going to see a plethora of them come out with special purpose credit programs. Those programs will provide additional access to credit. And we are not only seeing it in the mortgage space. There's a lot of discussion in the small business space and among all of the institutions.

And then thinking about you need that down payment. Where's that funding for down payment coming from, and how can we create programs that are targeted to the historically disadvantaged groups and ensuring that they have those ability to have the down payment and closing costs to be able to get into homes. Because we know once they get into the home, that builds wealth and builds communities.

And then the other piece is continue to look at our processes. Look at the appraisal process. How can we improve it? Look at our underwriting process. Look at our origination processes, challenge it along the way, and see how we can improve those to improve access.

And then lastly, Lisa talked about technology. Technology and AI, great tools. I am a huge fan of them. But you can't just put them out there without monitoring what's going on and using, looking at the outcomes. And if you see outcomes that are unintended, make sure you course correct.

You know, I think Lisa said it best, garbage in, garbage out. But we can definitely look at it and make sure that we are using it in a way that's meaningful.

With that, I will turn it back over to Cashauna.

CASHAUNA HILL [1:09:19]: Thanks so much, Ken, and thanks to all of our panelists for your words today.

So, we are going to move into our question-and-answer session, and actually, Ken, I will stick with you and/or Lisa for the first question, then I'd love to have Richard address this lastly because I think it will tie nicely into a follow up question that we have.

So, the first question is something I think that's very common in conversations like this, and we have an attendee asking what they, as one individual person, learning all of this, what can they do to help make a difference?

KENNETH SCOTT [1:10:08]: I think look in your communities where you are today.

Look at the things that are creating challenges for you. And you see the people walking into your doors and talk to folks. And when you -- if it's a housing -related issue, figure out a way to escalate it and make a change within each of your communities. And don't be afraid to use the system to do it. Right? If it is a credit related issue and it impacts an institution that is doing a lot of work in your area, reach out to those institutions and have the conversation with them and say these are the things we are seeing that you may be doing that may be impacting our communities negatively. I know we want to hear it. When I get those calls, I -get - you know, Lisa will pick up the phone and call me and say Ken, I am hearing this, or I am hearing that. What do you think? And when I get those calls, I love to get them because it means -that - you know, I can't be in every community. All the banks can't be everywhere every day. So- all of you are our ears on the ground. And coming back to us and letting us know what's going on, it creates some opportunities for us to shape how we respond to those things going forward.

CASHAUNA HILL: [1:11:24]: Lisa?

LISA RICE [1:11:25]: Yeah, Cashauna, thank you for the question. And I know that these issues can seem daunting, right, because we are talking about systemic challenges. And we have this questioner asking: What can I do as an individual person to help advance the ball on these systemic issues?

And I appreciate everything that Ken has laid out and agree with it wholeheartedly. I would add that people can become a part of organizations that are change agents. You can join NAFA. You can be a tester. You can individually sign up to engage in activities, volunteer for a local fair housing organization, or participate in testing activities in another way. You can spread the word about fair housing issues. You can direct people on where to go if they raise concerns about fair housing issues, directing them, either to a local fair housing organization or to the Department of just or the Department of HUD to get assistance. And you can also speak up and speak out. Oftentimes you have heard civil rights leaders like Dr. King and others talk about how silence is really being a part of the problem, that complacency is really being a part of the problem. And so, if you don't speak out when you see something happening that is discriminatory – discriminatory, then you are being part of the problem. Sometimes it's hard to find your voice, especially if you are the only person in the room speaking out, but there are ways to do it. And I think that oftentimes -- and I have been there. Trust me, I have been there. Even though I am a civil rights activist, I have been in rooms where I felt like I was the only person. But when I spoke out, I found other people found their strength and their courage to speak out as well.

So appreciate that question, and again, realize that we are dealing with specific issues, but there are ways that we, as individuals, can push back.

CASHAUNA HILL [1:13:58]: Thanks, Richard. I would like to pose the question to you as well. Just because I have some knowledge of some of your thoughts around this, I would like to ask you to also share, you know, do you have any ideas about long-term solutions to the kinds of inequities that we are talking about today and how can individuals engage in some of those solutions?

RICHARD ROTHSTEIN [1:14:24]: Cashauna, you could answer this question as well as I can from the work we are doing together.

CASHAUNA HILL [1:14:29]: That's why I asked you.

RICHARD ROTHSTEIN [1:14:31]: As I mentioned earlier, there's no political support to really do the things that need to be done to make a big change. The only way to build that political support is with a civil rights movement. Like we had in the 1960s. Of course, the tactics aren't going to be identical. But let me give you an example.

One of the important causes of ongoing impoverishment of Black homeowners in Black neighborhoods is the fact that our property assessment system I-- am not talking about appraisals; I am talking about assessments done by county assessors. Our property assessment system is discriminatory in effect. Not in intent, but in effect.

For example, when assessments aren't done on a regular basis, really annually, it's inevitable that African American homeowners are going to pay more property tax on homes of similar value than White homeowners will for the simple reason that homes in White neighborhoods appreciate in value faster than homes in Black neighborhoods do. What that means is if you don't do an assessment on an annual basis, the difference between the market value of a home and the assessed value on which taxes are paid is going to be greater in a White neighborhood than it is in a Black neighborhood. African American assessments are going to be closer to their real market value, their real assessed value as market value, they are going to be closer.

In White neighborhoods, the assessed value is going to be lower than the actual market value simply because the values, the market values, are rising faster.

Well, this has been going on for years. In *The Color of Law*, I wrote about this being documented by the federal government in the 1970s, that African Americans were paying more property tax than they should be, paying a bigger burden to finance schools and libraries and fire departments, all things that are financed by property tax.

Well, how do you fix this? I am not talking about how you fix it going forward. I am saying how do you get compensation to all of the African Americans in neighborhoods which have been over assessed relative to their property value for the excess property taxes that they have paid, in many cases people have lost their homes because they couldn't pay the excess property taxes that they should not have paid. Well, again, the tactics may be different, but - and we'll have to see in different neighborhoods how it develops, but there should be marches on city halls demanding refunds to African American homeowners. It can't be done legally. There's no legal basis for doing this. You can't sue. There's nobody to sue and no way to prove that any individual -home - all you know is averages, and there have been lots of recent academic studies to do it. So- we need a new civil rights movement. And that's going to engage tactics that are appropriate now. There's lots of stuff that I don't understand about all this Internet stuff and social media that we couldn't do in the 1960s. But we need a civil rights movement that's going to take aggressive action to demand that kind of compensation.

Well, as Cashauna alluded to, she and I are working with a group of national civil rights leaders to try to create something we call a Redress Movement that will send organizers -- not policy experts. We know what the policies are. Send organizers into communities to create biracial committees of people who want to redress segregation to

engage in active work to achieve some of these remedies. And I just picked that one at random. It's no secret, I am writing a new book about what we can do to redress segregation. It's not going to be about national policy. What the book is about is what local activists can do, actions like the one I just described, to try to narrow racial inequality.

CASHAUNA HILL [1:18:57]: Thanks, Richard.

I'd like to open this one, this next question, up to anyone on the panel, and it's a question about source of income discrimination when it comes to housing choice vouchers. And for attendees, the housing choice voucher program used to be referred to as Section 8, so that may be a name that you are more familiar with. But we are talking about voucher holders. And the question is how do we address the lack of access that voucher holders have to housing? And the attendee who posed the question has noted that housing providers and governments regularly accept federally subsidized, federally insured mortgages, tax credits, and other form of assistance to build or rehabilitate housing, but it's still perfectly legal in some places for landlords to not accept housing choice vouchers when these are all government subsidies. And so how do we address the lack of access that housing choice voucher holders have?

LISA RICE [1:20:06]: I can kick that off.

There are a number of ways to do it. You are finding that a number of jurisdictions are adding source of income protections to their fair housing laws to prohibit discrimination. We do that here in the District of Columbia. They have just done it in Virginia. So, there are a number of states that have these protections on the books. And I think that those states can be growing.

Unfortunately, we do have some states, like Texas, that have passed ordinances that would prohibit the state or even prohibiting a local jurisdiction from passing source of income protection legislation. And there, you know, I yield to my friend, Richard, who says we need to get out in the streets and start marching and protesting these prohibitive actions.

But the other thing we can do is call on our industry friends to help us out here too. I mean, you think about it from this perspective, most of the mortgages -- most people who are buying multifamily homes are getting mortgages to do that. Because most folks just can't go out and pay cash in order to buy an asset. Even if you are a company, you are getting a mortgage to go out and buy a multifamily unit. So, what if all lenders -- what if the GSEs -- Fannie and Freddie -- placed a requirement in their contract stating that if you get a loan from us, you have to accept housing choice vouchers? You can't discriminate against people who use housing choice vouchers? That would go a long way to opening and expanding opportunities for people.

And then the last thing that I will say is that we can, in some limited fashion, use existing fair housing laws, like the Federal Fair Housing Act, to tackle discrimination against people who use housing choice vouchers. And the best way we have been able to do that is using the disparate impact component, the disparate impact provisions that are allowable under the Federal Fair Housing Act.

CASHAUNA HILL [1:22:36]: Thank you, Lisa. Ken or Richard, anything to add?

KENNETH SCOTT [1:22:39]: I think Lisa covered it very well. I see a lot of this in the news right now.

RICHARD ROTHSTEIN [1:22:52]: Well, I have one thing. We shouldn't forget that no matter how much we reform the existing housing choice voucher system, only one quarter of the households that are eligible for housing choice vouchers and that should get them get them because it's not an entitlement. It's based on an annual appropriation.

When it comes to deduction of property taxes and state taxes on homes, that's a middleclass entitlement, and if you own a home, you are entitled to deduct your property taxes from your federal income tax. When we come to lower income families and we have a subsidy, you are not entitled to get a section 8 voucher, even if your income qualifies you for it. The Congress decides to appropriate a certain amount of money, and they only appropriate enough for one quarter of the eligible families, and that's what they do. That's a political issue. It's not something that can be changed by administrative rules. And we need much more education in communities about this and much more mobilization, and I want to emphasize, it takes mobilization of both Whites and Blacks. Because African Americans in this country do not have sufficient political power to accomplish these changes on their own.

We had 20 million Americans participate in Black Lives Matter demonstrations in 2020. 20 million. Unheard of. And most of these people were White. They were often led by African Americans. They were White. What did they do? They went home and put Black Lives Matter signs on their lawns and windows. That's our failure. Those people who demonstrated, 20 million of them for Black Lives Matter, are an enormous potential political force that needs to be organized. And maybe we could expand the number of housing choice vouchers, the number of families that can get them, limited though the regulations are.

CASHAUNA HILL [1:24:03]: Thank you. Relatedly, there are a few questions and comments in the Q&A box around the topic of affordable housing, subsidized housing, public housing developments, mixed number developments. And the question is how can advocates nudge, you know, statewide agencies that fund affordable housing through primarily the low-income housing tax credit program, how can advocates nudge those agencies to fund affordable or subsidized housing in well-resourced neighborhoods of opportunity and not just in high poverty communities of color, as many agencies continue to do across the country?

Richard, would you like to start?

RICHARD ROTHSTEIN [1:26:02]: No, because - well-, I am just going to repeat myself. This, again, is a political issue. You know, if you want me to, I'll take a minute to do this, but you know, I gave a talk once in Kansas City. I have given a lot of talks. And I was on a panel at the end of the talk with the Mayor of Kansas City talking about the zoning rules in Kansas City that prohibit exactly what you are talking about, the placement of affordable housing units, LITEC units, in the higher opportunity neighborhoods of Kansas City. And I said to him, well, why don't you change the zoning rules? He says,

well, I don't have the votes. There are 13 members of the City Council, and I think only 4 of them would support a change in the voting rules. And maybe 5, but 4 probably. And I said, well, if you had to list which of the remaining City Council districts might be willing to switch the Council people and vote for the change in the voting rules, I said which ones would it be? I might be remiss remembering, District 4 and District 6. This was before the pandemic when I was actually going to meetings. It was a meeting of about 300 supporters of affordable housing. So, I turned to them, and I said, well, how many of you live in District 4 and District 6? And about 50 people raised their hands. Well, those 50 people, instead of - not instead of. I don't want to minimize what they -do - but instead of writing proposals about affordable housing should be working towards changing the Council. If they did that, it might be possible to get more affordable housing in -higher opportunity neighborhoods. You asked me to do it, so I am doing it. I am repeating myself. Fundamentally, this is a political problem we face, and we have the potential to take advantage of the political opportunities that we are not taking advantage of. We are having a more accurate and passionate discussion about race that we have ever had before in American history. More passionate, more accurate than ever before. And it's a shame that the only thing that the people are doing about -it - this is an -exaggeration - the only thing that multiple sclerosis people are doing about -it - I am not talking about policy experts, but ordinary -citizens - is- putting signs in their windows and maybe complaining about what their deeds say, which doesn't create a single opportunity for a single African American family.

CASHAUNA HILL [1:28:50]: Lisa, any thoughts on that question of how advocates can engage with state housing finance agencies that are making decisions on where affordable housing will be placed to ensure that affordable housing is spread across neighborhoods in an equitable manner?

LISA RICE [1:29:10]: Yeah, it's a great question, and I think there are myriad options that people can use. I don't think that there's one panacea. Right, Cashauna? Because every situation is different, and Richard has talked about how important it is to engage community stakeholders to get some of this work done. So, I would be remiss if I didn't say that we haven't had success using the law in order to open up and expand opportunities in communities who did not want to do that. The Yonkers case is a great example. The Westchester case is another great example of that. But I will also share -- and we should use the law. But I will also share that there is a component of the Fair Housing Act that Ken talked about, the affirmatively furthering fair housing provision of the law is very underutilized and can be used to leverage political power and give people voice to engage in these kinds of activities that Richard was talking about.

I will never forget when I lived in Ohio, the heartland, and there was an affordable housing developer who wanted to develop an affordable housing unit in a very, very well-resourced community in a city in Ohio. And there was widespread opposition to it. All of the neighbors came out to all of the City Council meetings, they came out to the county commissioner meetings to oppose the building and development of this unit. And one of the county commissioners reached out to me and said hey, you -know - he- was a Republican, and he said I don't want to see you again.

Now, here is the power of engagement and relationship. He said I don't want to see you and you call me a racist. Right? So that was about the relationship that he and I had.

He said I don't want you to call me a racist because I am not a racist. I want to meet with you, and I want to talk with you about why I don't want this development in my neighborhood.

We met. We talked. And I more I was able to give him facts about the development, talk to him about what it really meant in terms of expanding opportunities for people in our community, but also for the residents in his district, he began to get it. He understood it. And he then supported the measure. And once he supported the measure, it turned the tide, and that development now exists in Lucas County, Ohio.

So, I think what I am trying to convey is that we have to use every single tool in the toolbox. We did not get to where we are by people who were opposed to racial equality and equity. They didn't just use one way, one tool, one means of creating these systemic inequities that we had. They used multiple means. And we have to use multiple means to fight back.

CASHAUNA HILL [1:32:47]: Thanks, Lisa.

Ken, did you have any thoughts on that?

KENNETH SCOTT [1:32:50]: No, I think that covered it. Thank you.

CASHAUNA HILL [1:32:52]: Okay. Thanks.

So, we have several questions about appraisals, so we'll just take a moment to move into that topic. And the first question on appraisals I'd like to start with for anyone is the wealth gap won't be narrowed just by increasing the numbers of Black and brown homeowners if the homes that they own are undervalued when appraised. So, what can be done regarding the appraisal industry and discriminatory appraisals other than individuals filing complaints?

KENNETH SCOTT [1:33:32]: I mean, I think I can take. From an institution standpoint, one of the things that institutions like the one I work for and that we do is make sure you are looking at the appraisals that are done within your institution and looking for language, like Lisa pointed out, on those appraisals. If you see it, make sure you are reprimanding those appraisers and perhaps not even using appraisers like that if we were to ever see them.

And the other piece of it is thinking through, you know, not just from one appraisal, looking at the comps that people are using and seeing if you are seeing a situation in certain communities where you are seeing some appraisers using comps a mile away, some appraisers using comps very closely, and seeing if you are seeing a racial disparity in how that's playing out. I think that's what we can do as an institution.

But this really is a broader issue. It's not an institution -by institution issue that we can ever really address. You know, individual institutions can try to do some of the things, like I laid out, but it really comes down to looking at the appraisal process and speaking to appraisers, who I believe many of them are actually well intentioned. They may not even realize, you know, unconscious bias plays a huge part in a lot of things that happen in the industry. And thinking through how do we have those conversations, like

Lisa just talked about that she had with that Republican council member and getting folks to understand that perhaps they may not even be realizing they are doing something that's impacting a group negatively. And do you that through training and other things that happen within the industry. So those are some of my initial thoughts on it.

CASHAUNA HILL [1:35:15]: Thanks, Ken.

KENNETH SCOTT [1:35:16]: I am sure she has ten more things to add to that.

LISA RICE [1:35:21]: No. What I would really love to do -- can I share my screen again, Cashauna?

CASHAUNA HILL [1:35:26]: Sure. Yep.

LISA RICE [1:35:28]: Okay. Thank you. Because I want to tee up an issue that Richard and Ken and I were talking about in the green room. What I hope you see is a graphic that attempts to depict some research that we did in the aftermath of our investigation into how financial institutions were maintaining and marketing their foreclosed units. So these are called real estate owned properties or REO properties. So, these are properties that have gone through the foreclosure process, and the bank now owns the property and has to maintain the property. And of course, in the aftermath of the foreclosure crisis, the REO inventory of financial institutions swelled. I mean, it grew voluminously. And what we found was that there were differences in the way that banks were managing and marketing their foreclosed units. There were huge discrepancies based on the racial composition of the neighborhood. And that is that assets that were located in predominantly African American and Latino neighborhoods were poorly maintained, while assets that were -owned - that were located in predominantly White communities were very well maintained. And this fed very much into -the - some- of the appraisal issues that we are noting because the appraised values of homes in predominantly African American and Latino communities really dropped precipitously in the aftermath of the foreclosure crisis. And we are seeing those communities are just now beginning to gain back some of that equity that they lost.

Homeowners in communities of color were disproportionately upside down. That is, they owed more money on their mortgages than what their houses were worth because of some of this. But one of the challenges we saw is that poorly maintained homes had a much higher chance of selling to investors, while well maintained homes had a much higher chance to sell to owner occupants. And you can see this is the City of Memphis. You can see the disposition of outcomes for REOs in predominantly Black and Latino neighborhoods. 70% of those homes were sold to investors. Conversely, in White neighborhoods, 78% were sold to owner occupants. That's a huge discrepancy. And that very much fed into some of the discrepancies that the challenges that we saw related to this whole appraisal bias issue, but it also fed into this phenomenon that we are seeing where investors are just buying up properties in communities of color and really making it challenging for hardworking families to be able to buy those homes. So, all of this is really interrelated, and I just wanted to share that, you know, that piece of information to maybe help our audience understand how all of this is intersectional and interrelated, and how resolving these issues isn't, you know, isn't -- it will require a complex and a multifaceted strategy.

CASHAUNA HILL [1:39:41]: Thanks, Lisa

Richard, did you want to add anything about discriminatory appraisals and how there's still going to be an issue in terms of the racial wealth gap if we have more black and brown homeowners whose homes are not being appraised properly, so I don't know if you had any insight to add on that issue as well?

RICHARD ROTHSTEIN [1:40:07]: Well, let me say this. We have all these anecdotes about the African American homeowners who put up pictures of Whites on their walls and take down family pictures and get a higher appraisal. I don't think we should pay too much attention to these because these all take place in diverse and desegregated neighborhoods. It's hard to believe -- and in fact, we don't have anecdotes to suggest -- that the appraiser who goes into a Black neighborhood is going to be fooled by White pictures on the wall into lowering the appraisal. This is something that's happened. But we know that systematically, from that Freddie Mac study that Lisa referred to, we know that appraisals are discriminatory overall. Black neighborhoods, homes in Black neighborhoods are appraised at a lower share of their actual selling prices than homes in White neighborhoods. And this is the first -- this is a recent study. It's the first, I think, credible confirmation of the fact of what everybody suspects.

Well, given the fact that we now have as close proof as we can expect from this Freddie Mac study that appraisals are discriminatory, it seems to me that any African American homeowner should be able to get a reappraisal on demand. Banks should automatically get a second appraisal for any home in the neighborhood that we know is being systematically under appraised. And from that kind of reappraisal system, we can begin to develop a list of appraisers who are less discriminatory in their approach, and we should begin to draw from that list when we assign appraisers to neighborhoods where they are going to do appraisals. So, appraisers shouldn't be sent to neighborhoods that they don't feel comfortable in.

CASHAUNA HILL [1:42:12]: We'll move on. Thank you, Richard. We'll move on to a question about social media and discrimination using social media. And so Lisa, I'd love to have you start with this, if you don't mind. question is that landlords who are using social media -- you know, Facebook, Instagram -- they have the ability to discriminate prior to speaking to potential tenants maybe by looking at the potential tenants' social media, using Facebook Marketplace. The landlord can hide their identity. And so how do we meet this ability to discriminate head on as some advocates are seeing that social media has become, really, an additional way for landlords to pretty easily discriminate?

LISA RICE [1:43:12]: Yeah, it's a huge challenge. And we are working with some of these social media companies, like Facebook, et cetera, to try and develop new systems and mechanisms for mitigating discrimination. The reality is, though, that the determined housing provider that wants to engage in discrimination and use these utilities to discriminate will often find a way to do so. Now, I will lift up the power of the corporate voice here and give a shout-out to our friends in the corporate sector who actually reached out to companies like Facebook to say we are not going to advertise on your site as long as you are enabling, you are willingly enabling advertisers to discriminate against communities of color.

That move compelled Facebook to go even further than it had done as a result of the settlement of our lawsuit with Facebook. So, one of the challenges -- and you are seeing this with sites like Airbnb, you know, where users on Airbnb are trying to circumvent that process and come up with ways to forgo their -- forgo the ability of housing providers to assess their identity. You know? So instead of having your face on your Airbnb profile, a picture of a flower or something like that. And that compelled Airbnb to actually change the way that it enables housing providers to look at and see consumers on the site. So, when you go to Airbnb site now, if you are a consumer and you want to rent a space, that housing provider can't see who you are. They don't know that you are a Black woman or a Latino man. They don't know that until after the deal is sealed, then they can see your full profile that you have made available to the public.

So, you know, I think as we continue to go, we'll continue to have to come up with new ways and mechanisms to mitigate and stave off discrimination on these sites.

KENNETH SCOTT [1:45:48]: Yes, so let me chime in on this. I think, you know, with regards to social media, I think it's here to stay. I think that institutions that utilize social media have a responsibility to understand how those social media sites work. And that can be really difficult to really get behind how they go about doing their targeting. And if you cannot get the information you need to make an informed decision as to whether or not a particular social media company is complying with the Equal Credit Opportunity Act or the fair housing Act, I think we as an industry have an obligation not to utilize them until we get that level of comfort as part of our third party management, as we would do with any other third party that we would work with. I think you are seeing more and more of that as people really get under and kick the tires of many of the social media companies. There are many out there that are stepping up and doing the right thing and changing their algorithms. And there are some that are in the learning process. And as they learn, they are moving along the pendulum that they need to get to where they can get the comfort that we all need to be able to utilize them.

CASHAUNA HILL [1:47:13]: Thanks, Ken. Richard, anything on social media and discrimination?

RICHARD ROTHSTEIN [1:47:19]: You are asking me about social media?

LISA RICE [1:47:21]: Yeah, Richard, tell us about all your social media sites.

CASHAUNA HILL [1:47:22]: I am just asking if you have anything to say on that topic, that's all.

RICHARD ROTHSTEIN [1:47:29]: No.

CASHAUNA HILL [1:47:30]: Okay. That's fine. Thank you.

So, there's now a question that I'd like to pose about credit. We have talked about this a little bit, and a couple of you mentioned that credit and credit scoring systems really are a major barrier for people of color who are trying to access housing. And so would love to hear from you, Ken, whether your institution is doing anything to address this issue; and then Lisa, whether NFHA is doing anything to raise awareness and address the

ways in which credit scores are barriers for people of color attempting to access housing.

KENNETH SCOTT [1:48:17]: I will talk about it from a lending perspective. We use credit scores, Fannie Mae using credit scores, Freddie Mac. That is part of the mortgage part of the process. But like any other product we offer, we do a fair lending analysis of those products, and the conversation we have is how can we minimize any impacts that those use of any aspect, whether it be a credit score, an appraisal, any aspect -- how can we minimize the disparate impact of the criteria that we use to create as much access as possible for our products in a safe and responsible manner. And it's a conversation that we continuously have. I don't believe it's a conversation that happens at Citi. I think it happens at other institutions because I speak to my counterparts.

Now, do we always get it right? Is there more that we could push the needle? I think that's where special purpose credit programs provide a significant opportunity for us to really look at our current underwriting guidelines and say what are aspects of that that may be impacting a particular group? And whereas in a traditional sense you cannot modify your underwriting guidelines for any -- based on any race or protected class criteria, a special purpose credit program gives us the opportunity to look for ways that we can target particular groups that we may see that are being disadvantaged and make those tweaks in our underwriting guidelines that further opens up the door to folks that traditionally would not have been approved. And it really helps those on the margin.

CASHAUNA HILL [1:50:13]: Thanks, Ken.

Lisa, would you like to address the steps that NFHA is taking to address things that are barriers to access to people of color?

LISA RICE [1:57:27]: I put a link in the Chat, I don't know if everyone can see it, but if not, if somebody could share the link with all the participants, that would be great.

We launched a tech equity initiative last year and have engaged in a lot of research around how to make technologies fairer for everyone, and that includes credit scoring systems. So, our research has shown that we can use artificial intelligence to force or excel credit scoring systems, and that does include legacy systems, to be fairer. But one of the challenges we do face, Cashauna, is, you know, using AI is -- you know, it's state o-f -the art stuff, and not all of our -regulators - and that includes state regulatory -agencies - have caught up to understanding these systems, artificially intelligent systems. And to be frank, most of the systems we are -seeing - most- of the utilities we are using are machine learning systems. Not getting a lot into neural networks and that kind of thing. But you know, even sew, there's a big learning curve, and the United States is behind the ball, quite frankly. I mean, our European counterparts are far more ahead of us in terms of thinking about how to regulate AI systems, algorithmic -based systems, and how to design examinations to make sure that these systems are fair. And our European counterparts are even recognizing that AI based systems or -algorithmic based- systems that harm consumers present systemic risk. Wow. That's - that's amazing. So, one of the things that we've been doing is really pushing. We've been writing a lot of groundbreaking policy -work - comments- to requests for information, comments to proposed

rulemaking, et cetera - that is really centered around this notion that technologies that harm consumers can end up causing systemic failures and disruptions to the marketplace. And that has been gaining a lot of traction and catching a lot of people's attention. And so- we are keeping up that work.

But I did put a link in the Chat so that people can go to our Tech Equity page, and you will just scroll down, you will see a ton of resources about this topic.

CASHAUNA HILL [1:53:34]: Thanks, Lisa.

And Richard, I am going to come to you for the final question, and it was posed to you by the attendee who asked it, and the question is: If this were a perfect world, what radical change could government deploy that would immediately get more property wealth into the hands of people of color?

RICHARD ROTHSTEIN [1:54:00]: Well, you know, Cashauna, that's not a question I really want to try to answer. It's not a perfect world, and I am grounded in reality. I want to figure out how we can make it a better world. And the more time we waste thinking about a perfect world, the less hard work we'll do to make it a better world.

I will say something, if I have a minute, about the credit issue, if I can.

CASHAUNA HILL [1:54:31]: Sure. You can do that.

RICHARD ROTHSTEIN [1:54:33]: As you know -- everybody, I am sure, knows here -- that one of the reasons that African Americans have lower credit scores is because the kinds of credit they have isn't counted in credit scoring; whereas the kind of credit that Whites have -- these are averages, of course -- is counted. For example, we know that African American homeownership is about 40%. White homeownership is about 70%. So, any credit system that counts whether you've previously owned a home is going to be discriminatory in effect no matter what it does. Well, rent is not counted. If you pay your rent on time, you don't get boost in your credit score unless, in very rare circumstances, you are paying rent to a giant corporation, a corporate landlord that's reporting it. Well, this is a clearly discriminatory effect because more African Americans are renters than are homeowners, so they are less likely to have credit from paying their mortgage on time. And more likely not to get credit from paying their rent on time.

Well, this was going to be, again, exposed in an article last August or last July, I think, and Fannie Mae learned it was going to be attacked again for it, so it suddenly came up with a scheme to permit applicants for mortgages to provide evidence of their faithful rent payments. And what's not as good as the normal credit scoring because you don't have to provide evidence of paying a mortgage. That's all done automatically by the mortgage companies and provided to the credit scoring agencies, but at least they were willing to consider it.

And what they said in their press release was that if this system had been in place; that is, if African Americans -- they didn't say that -- if homeowners, disproportionately African Americans -- had been permitted to consider their rent, as they are now going to be permitted to do, in the last three years, 7% of all those homeowners who had been refused mortgages would have been eligible if their faithful rent payments had been

counted. Well, Fannie Mae couldn't issue that press release unless they knew who that 7% were. They are not disclosing them, but every one of those 7%, every one of those homeowners who are discriminatorily denied a mortgage because their rent payments weren't counted, every one of them is entitled to compensation for denial of being able to buy a home. And again, as I keep on saying, unless local activists are going to identify in their communities who those 7% are and take direct action to demand compensation for them for the discrimination that they suffered, this issue will not be remedied.

CASHAUNA HILL [1:57:29]: Thank you, Richard.

I would argue that you actually did answer the question about how we could transfer more property wealth into the hands of Black and brown community members; right? So, thank you for that. And thank you to all of our panelists for your time today. As we close out today's conversation, I would like to quickly bring back Demetria McCain, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of HUD's Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, for some closing remarks. Demetria.

DEMETRIA McCAIN [1:58:05]: Wow! Well, there you have it. Discriminatory policies by federal, state, local governments, which violated the Constitution, occurred all over the country. And history shows that no part of our country was immune.

Thank you, Richard. Thank you, Lisa. Thank you, Ken. I mean, Richard walked us through the history of housing discrimination and how private industries' discriminatory activities were actually aided by the federal government's actions and policies and how today's wealth gap can be traced, in large part, back to this history.

Richard also informed us that everywhere the federal government built public housing, it segregated it. And in many places, this engineered segregation actually replaced communities that were not segregate segregated at all.

Then we had Lisa. Lisa shared how very relevant this history is today, with systems that have not died out but, instead, have perpetuated segregation and inequitable systems. We are not only segregated by where we live, she said, our resources are segregated as well. Now, these issues, in many regards, foretell whether a person has contaminated land, air, or water, she shared. And Lisa's description of NFHA's appraisal discrimination findings, illustrates these disparities. Mind you, look for our PAVE action plan. That's going to roll out in the coming weeks. You will read about it more. This is a critical topic to stay on top of. And finally, Lisa warned us about algorithmic biases and how they can play a role in discrimination. A topic covered in another NFHTA training, so make sure you don't miss that. The recording is available, that's available, and it's really important. And it's really a cutting-edge, modern-day issue.

And Ken. Ken spoke about what we may be able to do, ways we can level the playing field. And he gave us a really amazing figure. He figured that we would add \$5 trillion to the economy if we were able to level the playing field. My goodness. He also challenged us. He challenged us to conduct systemic investigation. He also spoke about holding local entities accountable under the affirmatively furthering fair housing mandate, which was law and is law and remains law. We are working on that rule now to implement that in a stronger way.

During the Q&A, we heard from you. But we also heard our panelists say a few things. We heard our panelists say that you are ears on the ground. They said speak out. They said engage. And they said use every tool.

So, the ball is in our court. We can do this. People are depending on us. So, let's go.

Thank you, panelists. Thank you, Cashauna. This has been really powerful and enlightening. Thank you so much, everyone.

CASHAUNA HILL [2:01:31]: Thank you again, Demetria, and thanks to all of the attendees for your participation in today's forum. We hope that you all will join us for our next event. Please check out the NFHTA website for a description and valuable information on registration for upcoming forums. Please also connect with the National Fair Housing Training Academy on LinkedIn for insights and information about upcoming events, including future forums and courses.

Thanks to everyone who made today's event possible, including our esteemed panelists and our hardworking interpreters and captioner.

Finally, please be on the lookout for a survey which will pop up when this training ends. The survey will allow you to provide feedback on today's event. Your feedback is critical to improving these forums. It shouldn't take very long to complete this anonymous survey, and we highly value your input.

Thank you again, and we look forward to seeing you for the next NFHTA Forum. Take care.