

HUD-2007-0066 – Public Comments

Public Comment_HUD-2007-0066-0024_attachment_10.pdf

Summary of Comment (Expanded)

CNMIGA.ORG submits a formal comment that supports renewal of HUD 903 while detailing how the current form and intake process fail complainants in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI). The submission states the Hawaii HUD District Office repeatedly refused to accept or investigate HUD-903 complaints involving CNMI entities, citing CNMI's block grant designation, which allegedly results in premature administrative closures with no federal review. It describes systemic integrity problems at the Northern Marianas Housing Corporation (NMHC)—including sole source awards, bid rigging, kickbacks, and family-connected housing and real-estate transactions—arguing that these program wide patterns are not solicited or captured by the form. It further alleges discrimination in HUD- and USDA-funded employment/contracting where familial, political, or ethnic preference displaces merit. As legal backdrop, the comment highlights Article 12 of the CNMI Constitution, which restricts permanent and long-term real-property interests to persons of Northern Marianas descent, contending this ancestry-based classification conflicts with the Fair Housing Act and with the 5th/14th Amendments. To remedy these gaps, CNMIGA proposes concrete revisions: add a Territorial/Block-Grant Jurisdiction section; include a Systemic/Program-Wide Violations checklist that triggers OIG/DOJ referral; add fields to report discrimination in HUD-funded employment/contracting (with Title VI references) and discrimination enabled by local law (mandatory OGC review); explicitly invite constitutional claims tied to federal funding with automatic DOJ forwarding; require written closure explanations with appeal rights to FHEO HQ; and mandate intake staff training about CNMI's unique legal status and Article 12. The commenter offers prior dismissed complaints, congressional correspondence, and audit excerpts to support implementation.

Comment Responses

1. Add a Territorial/Block-Grant Jurisdiction section with mandatory fields.

Response: Declined. The proposed HUD-903 is designed to collect only the information necessary for HUD to efficiently open and properly assess a fair-housing inquiry. Adding a dedicated Territorial / Block-Grant Jurisdiction prompt that asks filers to identify associated federal funding would place a specialized research task on the filer and, based on staff experience, would likely increase form confusion among users without reliably improving HUD's ability to process them. Moreover, the existence of

federal funding is not applicable to the vast majority of issues reported on, and laws covered by, the HUD-903.

2. Provide explicit block-grant guidance and auto-escalation.

Response: Declined. HUD reviews every HUD-903 submission to determine jurisdiction and next steps; the presence or identification of federal funding does result in prioritization. All submissions are reviewed and processed using consistent criteria aligned with Departmental protocols.

3. Add a Systemic/Program-Wide Violations section.

Response: Declined: HUD declines to add any field that would require the submitter to indicate or select a conclusion of law; legal determinations under the Fair Housing Act and related authorities are made by HUD based on an independent analysis of the facts and evidence, not by the filer.

4. Add checkbox for discrimination in HUD-funded employment/contracting.

Response: Declined: The HUD-903 is designed to report housing discrimination under the laws enforced by the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity; its scope is intentionally limited to information filers can readily provide for intake and routing. While there are limited situations where allegations connected to HUD-funded employment or contracting could implicate those housing laws (e.g., when the conduct directly affects access to or terms and conditions of housing), adding a dedicated checkbox would likely invite confusion and extraneous submissions. On balance, HUD favors a concise, streamlined form focused on the applicable statutory authorities and relies on the filer's narrative plus intake review to capture and appropriately route any such allegations.

5. Add field for discrimination enabled by local law.

Response: Declined. The HUD-903 is intentionally scoped to collect facts about housing discrimination so the Department can determine jurisdiction and next steps under the federal civil-rights laws it enforces. Asking filers to check a box or otherwise indicate that conduct is "authorized or enabled by local law" would require the submitter to make a legal characterization. Filers can already describe ordinances, policies, or statutes in the narrative for departmental review.

6. Invite constitutional claims with DOJ forwarding.

Response: Declined. The HUD-903 is tailored for the submitter to provide the information necessary to file an inquiry alleging discrimination under the laws enforced by the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, and the form is structured to address the Department's statutory obligations within its purview. Accordingly, the form does **not** ask filers to characterize allegations as constitutional violations or trigger automatic forwarding to the Department of Justice.

Public Comment_HUD-2007-0066-0024_attachment_2.pdf

Summary of Comment (Expanded)

This memorandum analyzes the constitutionality and fair housing implications of CNMI Article 12, which restricts permanent and long-term interests in real property to persons of Northern Marianas descent (NMD). It argues Article 12 is an ancestry based classification that triggers strict scrutiny under the Equal Protection Clause and likely fails narrow tailoring because less restrictive, non-racial mechanisms could preserve culture and land tenure. The memorandum asserts Article 12 conflicts with the Federal Fair Housing Act's prohibitions on discrimination in housing (42 U.S.C. § 3604) and undermines the 'substantial equivalence' requirement under § 816, hampering HUD's ability to refer enforcement to local authorities. Additional claims sound in the 5th Amendment's Due Process protections, contending that non-NMD U.S. citizens are arbitrarily deprived of property rights without meaningful procedural recourse, and in the Supremacy Clause, arguing federal civil rights law preempts territorial laws that sanction discrimination. Practical impacts are described: non-NMD Americans—including military personnel, federal workers, and transplants—face second-class treatment, constrained economic liberty, and barriers to investment and business development. While acknowledging Ninth Circuit precedent in *Wabot v. Villacrusis* upholding Article 12 within the Covenant's unique context, the memorandum argues that modern FHA enforcement trends and contemporary jurisprudence warrant renewed scrutiny and potentially federal litigation or legislative reform to reconcile territorial autonomy with national civil-rights mandates.

Response: The HUD-903 information collection is tailored for filers to report facts of alleged housing discrimination under laws enforced by the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity. While the commenter raises broader constitutional questions regarding CNMI Article 12, those legal determinations fall outside the scope of this form and the underlying collection

Public Comment_HUD-2007-0066-0024_attachment_11.pdf

Summary of Comment (Expanded)

Dated March 10, 2026, this letter to PRAC (Pandemic Response Accountability Committee) leadership and the SBA Inspector General alleges overt theft and misuse of federal pandemic-relief funds in the CNMI, spanning CARES Act and ARPA programs and SBA's PPP/EIDL. The author reports submitting a 32GB USB drive containing records, emails, audits, and supporting materials, and credits a Treasury employee's referral with prompting an FBI-Saipan raid of the Bank of Saipan, with those records now available for cross-reference. The letter describes an interlinked, RICO-like scheme and asserts repeated

threats and retaliation by CNMI entities and officials, including NMC, NMHC, CEDA, former Delegate Gregorio Kilili Sablan, the CNMI judiciary, and a federal judge (Ramona Manglona). The author claims a 'Persona Non Grata' designation via a 'Bill of Attainder,' leading to exclusion from employment and programs and an inability to work for over six years. He requests participation in whistleblower reward programs (noting an IRS Form 211 claim) and asks that any benefits be directed to his four children if harm occurs. The letter urges PRAC to initiate a full audit, conduct data-driven analysis, coordinate interagency action, recover misappropriated funds, and protect vulnerable citizens. It notes that materials have been sent to multiple named officials and agencies and includes CNMIGA links to public posts for context and corroboration.

Response: The HUD-903 is tailored for the submitter to provide the information necessary to file an inquiry alleging discrimination under the laws enforced by the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, and the form is structured to address the Department's statutory obligations within its purview. In practice, intake staff use HUD-903 to capture facts of alleged housing discrimination and assess jurisdiction under Title VIII and related authorities; issues outside that scope are handled through other channels. While the commenter's letter describes alleged pandemic-relief fund misuse, retaliation, and whistleblower reward matters directed to PRAC and other oversight bodies, those topics are beyond the HUD-903 collection's purpose and do not warrant changes to the form.

Public Comment_HUD-2007-0066-0025.pdf

Summary of Comment (Expanded)

A resident's firsthand account alleges denial of reasonable accommodations despite medical documentation—specifically, the need for a ramp due to steps impeding safe egress with a wheelchair or even a small basket. The commenter states that staff asserted accommodations were not required and notes that some units do have ramps, suggesting inconsistent treatment. The account further alleges uneven enforcement of policies (aggressive dogs permitted; unauthorized occupants residing with tenants) and inconsistent financial practices (some tenants allegedly pay no gas, electricity, or rent and are instructed to keep it secret). The commenter also questions hiring/vetting standards by citing employment of a staff member with an adult felony. Collectively, the allegations raise accessibility, safety, fairness, and program-integrity issues at the property level that may warrant follow-up by the relevant housing authority or oversight body.

Response: The HUD-903 is tailored for the submitter to provide the information necessary to file an inquiry alleging housing discrimination under laws enforced by FHEO, and the form is structured to address the Department's statutory obligations within its purview. The narrative here—alleged denial of a reasonable accommodation (wheelchair ramp), inconsistent treatment, and uneven policy enforcement—describes facts that can be reported on the HUD-903 for intake and jurisdiction review; it is not a comment about the proposed information collection itself.

Public Comment HUD-2007-0066-0026_attachment_1

Summary of Comment (Expanded)

The commenter argues that while HUD-903 currently captures disability allegations via narrative, it does not record critical reasonable accommodation/modification and physical-accessibility facts as structured, persistent data that can be searched, routed, audited, and reported within HEMS, even though HUD-903 feeds that system. He recommends six changes: publish a public HUD-903/HEMS disability field map and taxonomy; add structured fields for the accommodation/modification request-response chain; add structured physical-accessibility fields (e.g., parking, entrances, routes/ramps/curb cuts, doors/hallways, elevators/lifts/stairs, bathrooms, kitchens, unit/common areas, communication access, accessible-unit transfer/availability, obstructions); add factual markers to help HUD route to the right disability authority (FHA, Section 504, ADA Title II, ABA, Section 109) without asking filers to select statutes; preserve disability fields at inquiry closure; and publish de-identified aggregate disability data (including missingness and closure metrics). He cites OIG findings on documentation gaps and timeliness to underscore the practical utility of disability-specific structure, and proposes conditional prompts to limit burden and privacy risk (e.g., no medical records unless later requested).

Response: The HUD-903 information collection is tailored for submitters to provide the facts needed to open and route housing-discrimination inquiries under laws enforced by FHEO, and its public fields are structured around the Department's statutory purview. We acknowledge the commenter's interest in disability-specific structured prompts for reasonable accommodations/modifications and physical-access features; however, the public form's concise, user-focused design relies on the filer's narrative plus core fields (basis, parties, location, date, event) for intake and jurisdiction review. Additionally, based on the public HEMS materials cited in the comment, the specific disability "request-response chain" and feature-level fields the commenter seeks are not surfaced as structured HEMS fields, and portions of the online HUD-903 narrative are attached rather than pushed into discrete HEMS fields, making any new public checklists of limited benefit unless and until HEMS capabilities are expanded to capture, persist, and report those data in structured form.

Public Comment Email 5-26-2026

Summary of Comment (Expanded)

The commenter, Keith Maywether of 5610 Duck Creek Dr., Apt. 5610J, Garland, TX, alleges housing discrimination and harassment, including his first-floor apartment window being shattered by 18 rocks in October. 1 He describes being followed by groups of cars displaying three-letter license plates with abbreviated harmful phrases and identifies an upstairs neighbor who gave the name “RAMBO.” He further alleges tenants may be using software to access and monitor his devices and that synchronized noises and electronic interference (TV, lights, microwave) are disrupting his privacy. Relevant dates noted are the external email sent May 24, 2026, the commenter’s sign-off dated May 26, 2026, and the internal forward on June 3, 2026.

Response: The HUD Form 903 is designed for individuals to provide the information necessary to file an inquiry alleging housing discrimination under laws enforced by FHEO, and the form is structured to address the Department’s statutory obligations within its purview. In this submission, the commenter reports alleged discriminatory harassment and safety concerns at a residential property—describing property damage, perceived stalking, and intrusive monitoring/electronic interference—facts that are most appropriately reported on HUD 903 for intake and jurisdiction review. Accordingly, this narrative is not a comment on the proposed information collection for OMB Control No. 2529-0011; it is an individual complaint that should be filed using HUD 903 so the Department can assess and route it consistent with FHEO procedures.