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In May 2013, Cook County amended its human rights ordinance to prohibit discrimination against Housing Choice Voucher holders. Specifically, the amended ordinance prohibits landlords from denying housing applications on the basis that an applicant pays rent with a Housing Choice Voucher (HCV). This prohibition will have positive implications for all HCV holders, particularly HCV holders who are people of color, because landlords in Cook
County may have been using lawful discrimination against HCV holders as a proxy for unlawful race discrimination. Moreover, source of income (SOI) discrimination disparately impacts people of color. Therefore, in order to promote fair housing choice, Illinois should prohibit SOI discrimination, without exception, in all Illinois municipalities, most of which have a legal obligation to promote fair housing choice under the federal Fair Housing Act and Department of Housing and Urban Development regulations.

**Source of Income Discrimination and its Effects on HCV Holders**

When landlords refuse to screen HCV holders on the same basis as non-HCV holders, they discriminate based on SOI. In jurisdictions with complete SOI protection, landlords may not refuse to process an application simply because the applicant pays rent with an HCV. That being said, HCV holders must still meet the landlord’s legitimate criteria in order to be eligible to rent a particular unit. For instance, even in jurisdictions with SOI protection, HCV holders must meet a landlord’s credit and criminal background standards.

SOI discrimination limits housing choice for HCV holders—people whose low-income already narrows their housing options—and relegates HCV holders to disadvantaged neighborhoods. HCV holders who want to leave high-poverty, distressed neighborhoods are prevented from doing so when landlords in higher opportunity neighborhoods categorically refuse to rent to HCV holders. Landlords who do rent to HCV holders often steer HCV holders away from opportunity neighborhoods. There are significant negative effects associated with forcing people to stay in high-poverty neighborhoods with failing schools, distressed housing, high crime and no work. People living in disadvantaged neighborhoods with high levels of poverty generally have poorer health outcomes, lower levels of academic achievement, fewer employment opportunities, heightened vulnerability to gang recruitment, and greater exposure to violence relative to otherwise-comparable people living in more advantaged neighborhoods. Hence, in the absence of true revitalization efforts for high-poverty neighborhoods, housing mobility for HCV holders is crucial for their well-being.

Although SOI discrimination is often difficult to detect, municipal ordinances which ban SOI discrimination make it harder for landlords to discriminate based on SOI. Fair housing advocacy organizations in Cook County,
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which include Metropolitan Tenants Organization, Open Communities, and Chicago Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, monitor Cook County landlords for SOI discrimination and help HCV holders file complaints against landlords who discriminate based on SOI.19

ILLINOIS SHOULD FORBID SOI DISCRIMINATION BECAUSE SOI DISCRIMINATION IS OFTEN USED AS A PROXY FOR RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Housing advocates suspect many landlords refuse HCV applications as a proxy for intentional race discrimination.20 Advocates believe many landlords categorically refuse HCV holders in order to prevent African Americans from moving into their building, community or municipality.21 But even if landlords refuse to rent to HCV for non-discriminatory reasons, the effect of many landlords categorically refusing to rent to HCV holders has a disparate impact on minorities.22 Moreover, housing advocates believe Illinois and its municipalities have effectively allowed SOI discrimination to act as a proxy for race discrimination by permitting SOI discrimination to occur.23 Hence, outlawing SOI discrimination throughout all of Illinois may be necessary to effectively outlaw and prevent race discrimination in specific Illinois municipalities.

For instance, Glenview, a Cook County suburb, has attempted to nullify the County’s recently amended ordinance by adopting its own ordinance.24 Glenview’s ordinance repeals protection for HCV holders.25 Glenview claims this is necessary to restore choice for landlords who may not want to rent to HCV holders because it would require the landlord to participate in the HCV program.26 However, the premise of Glenview’s retaliatory ordinance may be paradoxical, since discrimination against HCV holders restricts housing choice for people trying to leave high poverty areas, often resulting in poorer outcomes in the areas of health, employment and education, to name a few.27

Toni Preckwinkle, President of Cook County’s Board of Commissioners, contends that Glenview’s move is not supported by Illinois law.28 She notes that Glenview purports to be exercising its home rule authority, but she claims the Illinois Human Rights Act has explicitly prohibited Glenview from enacting an ordinance that limits housing choice.29 If it remains in effect, Glenview’s ordinance would allow Glenview landlords—those who intend to discriminate—to continue preventing African Americans from moving into Glenview, which is currently only one percent black.30
In order to prevent race discrimination by way of HCV discrimination, Illinois should adopt SOI protection statewide. Although Chicago and Cook County have taken steps to prevent landlords from engaging in by-proxy race discrimination, SOI discrimination is likely just as prevalent in other counties in Illinois as well. Furthermore, Illinois has considered adopting SOI protection state-wide, but the bill remains indefinitely stalled in the Illinois House.

Illinois should adopt SOI protection in order to promote fair housing for African Americans. Jurisdictions that receive funding from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) have a responsibility to affirmatively further fair housing for classes of people who are protected under the Fair Housing Act (FHA). African Americans are part of a protected class under the FHA. Furthermore, Illinois and many of its municipalities receive HUD funding. In furtherance of this duty, HUD has required some HUD funded municipalities to adopt SOI protection where SOI discrimination has impeded fair housing choice for FHA protected classes in that municipality. Furthermore, when HUD finds a municipality noncompliant with this duty, HUD may cut-off funding to that municipality.

Hence, to promote fair housing for racial minorities, and to prevent unnecessary but justifiable HUD intervention, Illinois should adopt SOI protection. If Illinois were to follow Cook County’s lead—prohibiting SOI discrimination without exceptions—Illinois would deter unlawful racial discrimination statewide and thereby aid many municipalities in meeting their fair housing obligations.
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