Tenant Selection Plan Guidance

Each property that receives a commitment from Minnesota Housing and that is required to have a tenant selection plan shall use the information below to create the plan.\(^1\) Project funding sources and jurisdictions may also impose additional tenant selection plan requirements. This guidance is not intended to be a complete list or to supersede those requirements. Consult with an attorney to make sure your tenant selection plan complies with all applicable laws and regulations, program requirements, the Fair Housing Act, and the Minnesota Human Rights Act.\(^2\)

### General Considerations

1. **Written Tenant Selection Plan.** Housing providers must have a written tenant selection plan. The plan must be readable and accessible to applicants and must be made available to applicants before they apply and/or pay an application fee. The owner must provide meaningful access to the information for people with limited English proficiency, which may include providing interpreter services and/or written materials translated into other languages.

2. **Waiting List.** The tenant selection plan must describe any waiting list process.

3. **Eligibility.** The tenant selection plan must provide clear information on eligibility criteria such as income restrictions and any program-specific requirements. It must also clearly state the processes and criteria that will be used to evaluate applications. If the development receives funding to serve a specific population, such as individuals eligible for supportive housing or senior housing, the tenant selection plan’s evaluation criteria must be structured in a way to take into account the specific barriers faced by these households.

4. **Tenant Background/Credit Reports.** Many housing providers use consumer reports, such as tenant background or credit reports, as part of the application process. The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) provides guidance for housing providers who use such reports.\(^3\) The FTC notes that when a housing provider takes an adverse action based on information in a consumer report, the housing provider must provide a notice to the applicant that includes:

   a. The name, address and telephone number of the credit reporting agency (CRA) that supplied the consumer report, including a toll-free telephone number for CRAs that maintain files nationwide;

   b. A statement that the CRA that supplied the report did not make the decision to take the adverse action and cannot give the specific reasons for it; and

   c. A notice of the applicant’s right to dispute the accuracy or completeness of any information the CRA furnished, and the applicant’s right to a free report from the CRA

---

\(^1\) A link will be provided to the projects and funding sources that will be subject to this guidance once finalized.

\(^2\) It is Minnesota Housing’s policy to affirmatively further fair housing in all programs so that individuals of similar income levels have equal access to its programs, regardless of race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, marital status, status with regard to public assistance, disability, familial status, or sexual orientation. Property owners and managers are expected to comply with laws and regulations prohibiting housing discrimination when creating and implementing a tenant selection plan.

upon request within 60 days.⁴

5. **Notice of Denial.** Housing providers must give applicants a prompt written notice of denial that states the criteria the applicant failed to meet and the process to appeal.⁵

6. **Appeal Process.** Minnesota Housing requires that all housing providers offer an appeal process. The appeal process must allow an opportunity for applicants to provide information of mitigating circumstances or information that would demonstrate their ability to be a successful tenant, or correct inaccurate background check results. Housing providers must review all information provided to determine if the grounds for denial are a reliable indication of future tenancy performance. The appeal process and timeline must be clearly stated in the tenant selection plan. The housing provider must notify the applicant of the outcome of the appeal in writing.

7. **Domestic Violence.** A number of federal programs, including HOME, Section 811 and the Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) program, are subject to the restrictions outlined in the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA). VAWA provides that an applicant “may not be denied admission...on the basis that the applicant...is or has been a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, if the applicant or tenant otherwise qualifies for admission.”⁶ Similarly, adverse eligibility factors such as criminal activity or other adverse credit or rental history related to the abuse should not be considered.

   Housing providers that aren’t subject to VAWA restrictions are encouraged to adopt similar terms. In addition to VAWA protections, because the overwhelming majority of domestic violence survivors are women, they are protected by the federal Fair Housing Act’s prohibition on sex discrimination; therefore, policies and practices that target or otherwise discriminate against women because of their status as domestic violence survivors are likely unlawful under federal law. Examples of circumstances that are related to abuse include:

   a. Poor credit history resulting from the perpetrator using the victim’s name to open credit card accounts, loans, utilities, and failing to pay unpaid medical bills resulting from the abuse, or forcing the victim to work without pay.

   b. Poor rental history attributable to the perpetrator’s actions such as property damage, noise complaints, missed or late rent or utilities, or drug activity.

   c. Criminal grounds due to the perpetrator forcing the victim to engage in criminal behavior such as sex work, drug use or sale, or crimes committed by the victim to defend themselves or a third party from the abuse.⁷

8. **Applicants with Disabilities and Reasonable Accommodations.** Housing providers must make sure that tenant selection plans do not raise barriers for individuals with disabilities, such as imposing requirements that applicants be able to “live independently.” Additionally, housing providers must have a written reasonable accommodation policy and process for handling accommodation requests at application. The housing provider’s tenant screening plan must state that the policy

---

⁴ If the rejection is based on a credit score, the housing provider must also inform the applicant of the numerical score used as well as information on the basis of the score. For more information, see 15 U.S.C. §§ 1681m(a), 1681g(f).

⁵ See Minn. Stat. § 504B.173.

⁶ 42 USC § 14043e(b)(1); 24 CFR § 5.2001. Housing providers subject to VAWA should review HUD regulations and policies regarding how to fully comply with the requirements.

will be made available to applicants upon request.8

9. Tenant-based Rental Assistance. As a condition of receipt of funding through Minnesota Housing, housing providers are not permitted to refuse to lease a unit to, or discriminate against, a prospective resident because the prospective resident has a housing choice voucher (HCV) or any other form of tenant-based rental assistance, including income supplements meant to support payment of rent, such as Housing Support or Minnesota Supplemental Aid. In addition, research has shown that tenant-based rental assistance improves housing outcomes.9 This requirement must be reflected in the tenant selection plan.

10. Supportive Housing. The tenant selection plan must clearly state the intended population for supportive housing units, and if applicable, the referral source for these units.

Supportive housing programs are intended to house people who often have poor credit histories, poor rental histories, criminal histories, or other barriers that may prevent them from accessing housing. Such programs are successful in serving the people for whom they are designed only when these issues do not raise insurmountable barriers to accessing housing. To the extent permitted by the rules and regulations related to the type of housing, housing providers are encouraged to adopt lenient and flexible criteria regarding these common barriers when creating a tenant selection plan. In addition, in the course of tenant screening, consideration of mitigating factors either before or during an appeals process should also consider the extent to which supportive services will help alleviate the real or perceived risk of the negative screening factors.

11. Records Retention. Minnesota Housing encourages records retention as a best practice. Providers have found it beneficial to track outcomes to help ensure the process is effective for tenant success. To help ensure that tenancy determinations and appeal processes are being conducted in a non-discriminatory manner, housing providers should retain records regarding applicant denials and appeals in addition to tenant records. Housing providers are encouraged to periodically review such records for consistency and to identify areas where their retention process could be improved.

**Tenant Screening Criteria**

For all supportive housing units, units at or below 30% MTSP rent limits, and units with any form of rental assistance, tenant selection plans must demonstrate the following:

1. Adherence to Housing First principles, including addressing how tenant screening criteria reduces barriers to accessing housing.

2. Applicants cannot be screened out based on housing history. This includes eviction history, references from previous landlords and others, as well as money owed to previous landlords or money owed for utilities.

3. Applicants cannot be screened out based on credit history, including credit score.

---


4. An income to rent ratio cannot be required (e.g., “income must be two or three times the rent amount”).

Criminal Background Screening

In 2016, HUD issued guidance that provides considerations for housing providers related to the use of criminal history in tenant screening and the Fair Housing Act.\(^\text{10}\) The guidance includes the following considerations, which are relevant to all properties funded by Minnesota Housing.\(^\text{11}\)

1. **Arrests.** HUD makes it clear that a policy that rejects applicants because of arrests (without conviction) is not valid under fair housing laws.

2. **Convictions.**
   a. While a conviction is usually evidence of criminal conduct, HUD states that a housing provider’s screening policy cannot simply exclude all applicants with convictions. Instead, in order to avoid liability under fair housing laws, the policy must accurately distinguish between convictions for criminal conduct that indicate a demonstrable risk to resident safety and/or property and those that do not.\(^\text{12}\)

   In addition, HUD recommends a tenant screening policy take into account:
   i. The nature and severity of a conviction; and
   ii. The amount of time that has passed since the criminal conduct occurred.\(^\text{13}\)

3. **Mitigating Factors.** The HUD guidance advises a policy that considers mitigating information (as opposed to a policy with blanket exclusions) is less likely to be in violation of fair housing laws.\(^\text{14}\) HUD suggests that housing providers consider the following factors:
   a. The facts or circumstances surrounding the criminal conduct;
   b. The age of the individual at the time of the conduct;
   c. Evidence that the individual has maintained a good tenant history before and/or after the conviction or conduct; and
   d. Evidence of rehabilitation efforts.

4. **Consistent Application of Tenant Screening Policy.** HUD stresses the importance of applying the standards consistently to all applicants.\(^\text{15}\)


\(^{11}\) Some funding sources incorporate additional criminal screening requirements. Housing providers should consult with an attorney to ensure their plan complies with all program requirements.

\(^{12}\) HUD makes clear that the Fair Housing Act does not prohibit housing providers from rejecting applicants with convictions of the illegal manufacture or distribution of the controlled substances listed in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act, 21 U.S.C. HUD Guidance at 8. HUD stresses that the limitation applies only to convictions for manufacturing or distribution of those substances, and does not apply to arrests (without conviction) for those offenses or to convictions for drug possession. Id

\(^{13}\) The HUD Guidance cites research “reporting that after six or seven years without reoffending, the risk of new offenses by persons with a prior criminal history begins to approximate the risk of new offenses among persons with no criminal record.” HUD Guidance at 7 fn 34, citing Megan C. Kurycheck et al., Scarlet Letters and Recidivism: Does an Old Criminal Record Predict Future Offending?, 5 CRIMINOLOGY & PUB. POL’Y 483 (2006). That research also refers to studies showing that recidivism decreased significantly if the individual avoided engaging in criminal activity for two years. Kurycheck at 7

\(^{14}\) HUD notes that by “delaying consideration of criminal history until after an individual’s financial and other qualifications are verified, a housing provider may be able to minimize any additional costs that such individualized assessment might add to the applicant screening process.” HUD Guidance at 7

\(^{15}\) HUD Guidance at 9 ("For example, the fact that a housing provider acted upon comparable criminal history information differently for one or more individuals of a different protected class . . . is strong evidence that a housing provider was not considering criminal history information in an individualized and consistent manner.")
In addition to HUD guidance, recent research by the Wilder Foundation that examines over 10,000 households in affordable housing properties found:

a. Eleven of 15 criminal offense categories examined have no significant effect on housing outcomes;

b. The effect of a prior criminal offense on a resident’s housing outcome declines over time. Felonies that occurred more than five years prior to move-in have no significant effect on housing outcomes; for misdemeanors, there are no significant effects after only two years; and

c. The level of impact that criminal backgrounds may have on housing success is small in comparison to other factors such as the make-up of the household and the presence of a rental subsidy.16

Minnesota Housing encourages housing providers to read and consider both the HUD guidance and the Wilder Foundation study before developing and submitting a tenant screening policy for review.