SpencerFane®

The Next Frontier of Fair Housing Risk: AI Chatbots and Early-Stage Applicant Interactions

Artificial intelligence-powered chatbots are rapidly becoming a primary point of contact between housing providers and prospective residents. Increasingly, questions about availability, pricing, screening criteria, and next steps are answered by automated systems before a human leasing agent is ever involved.

Fair housing risk at the earliest stages of a housing inquiry is not new. Initial conversations between leasing staff and prospective residents have always generated fair housing complaints and have long been a focus of fair housing enforcement and testing. What is changing, however, is the level of visibility housing providers have into those early interactions.

When leasing agents communicate directly with prospective residents, providers can train staff, monitor performance, and correct issues through supervision and policy enforcement. As more of these interactions shift to AI-driven platforms operated or supported by third-party vendors, that visibility can diminish. Communications that once occurred in person or over the phone are now generated through automated systems that operate continuously and at scale, often outside the day-to-day awareness of property management teams.

This shift does not create new fair housing obligations, but it does alter how risk manifests and how quickly it can expand. As regulators, fair housing organizations, and advocacy groups adapt to these technologies, AI-driven leasing tools are emerging as an area of growing scrutiny.

Early Communications Have Always Mattered

Fair housing complaints remain highly fact-specific and complaint-driven. Many investigations focus on whether prospective residents received different information, guidance, or access based on protected characteristics. Communications that occur before an application is submitted can become central to an investigation if they are perceived as discouraging, inconsistent, or limiting access to housing opportunities.

For housing providers, this means that the first interaction – whether with a leasing agent or an automated system – continues to carry legal significance. The increasing use of AI-driven communication tools does not change the underlying legal framework, but it does change how those interactions occur and how they may later be evaluated.

The Evolving Role of Fair Housing Testing

Fair housing testing has long been one of the primary mechanisms used to identify discriminatory housing practices. Testing typically involves comparative interactions designed to determine whether individuals receive different information or treatment based on protected characteristics. Organizations participating in the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's Fair Housing Initiatives Program (FHIP) receive federal funding to conduct testing and related enforcement activities across the country.

As housing providers adopt digital leasing tools, testing methodologies are adapting as well. Advocacy organizations are examining how automated systems respond to prospective residents across a range of common inquiries, including questions about housing vouchers, screening criteria, availability, and application procedures.

Automated leasing platforms present a particularly efficient testing environment. Chatbot interactions can be initiated repeatedly and preserved in transcript form, allowing testers to compare responses across multiple interactions. Rather than relying on recollections of conversations, testers and investigators may have verbatim records showing how an automated system responded to different users under similar circumstances. This capacity for replication and documentation has made AI-driven leasing tools an area of growing interest for testing organizations.

Tester Standing and the Expanding Pool of Potential Complainants

An important feature of fair housing enforcement is that testers themselves may have standing to bring claims under the Fair Housing Act. Courts have long recognized that individuals who encounter discriminatory barriers in the course of testing may qualify as "aggrieved persons," even where they did not intend to rent the housing at issue.

Historically, organized testing required coordination and resources. In the context of AI-driven leasing tools, however, the barrier to entry is considerably lower. Chatbot interactions can be conducted remotely, quickly, and anonymously. Anyone with access to a property's leasing platform can engage with an automated system and document the experience.

This dynamic has the potential to expand the number of individuals who may claim to have encountered discriminatory or discouraging messaging. A single issue in an automated system can generate numerous interactions in a short period of time, each creating a written record that may be preserved or shared. As a result, if an AI-driven tool produces responses that raise fair housing concerns, exposure may develop more quickly and across a broader group of individuals than in traditional leasing environments.

Generative AI and Variability in Communication

Many modern leasing chatbots combine scripted compliance guardrails with generative AI tools capable of responding conversationally and adapting to how inquiries are framed. These systems are designed to improve responsiveness and user experience, but they may also introduce variability in how information is communicated.

Even where underlying policies are consistent, automated systems may produce responses that differ in tone, detail, or clarity. Two prospective applicants asking similar questions may receive different explanations or levels of guidance depending on phrasing, follow-up questions, or how the system interprets the inquiry. These differences can influence whether a prospective applicant may have a viable housing discrimination claim. Therefore, automated systems that shape early-stage communications warrant the same level of attention historically applied to human leasing practices.

Vendor Management

As AI-driven leasing tools become more prevalent, housing providers should view vendors not simply as technology providers but as participants in regulated housing activity. Automated leasing platforms function as extensions of the leasing office, and housing providers remain responsible for how information is communicated to prospective residents regardless of whether those communications are generated internally or through third-party systems.

For that reason, strong vendor management and carefully structured contractual protections are essential. Agreements governing AI-driven leasing tools should address fair housing compliance explicitly and in operational terms. Housing providers should consider whether their vendor agreements:

1. Require compliance with federal, state, and local fair housing laws;
2. Provide transparency into how responses are generated and updated;
3. Include audit and monitoring rights sufficient to evaluate system outputs;
4. Require prompt correction of inaccurate or inconsistent responses;
5. Allocate responsibility for compliance failures and resulting claims; and
6. Address data inputs and training sources that may influence system outputs.

Providers should assume that regulators and investigators will view AI vendors as extensions of the leasing function rather than independent actors. Where gaps in oversight or contractual protections exist, those gaps may be treated as compliance failures attributable to the housing provider itself.

Ongoing monitoring is equally important. Vendor selection is only the first step. Housing providers should periodically review how automated systems respond to common inquiries and ensure that legal, compliance, and operational teams remain involved as these tools evolve.

Looking Ahead

AI-driven leasing tools will continue to expand across the housing industry. As they do, fair housing compliance will increasingly require attention to whether communications generated by AI-driven leasing tools could provide prospective residents with evidence of potential differences in information, guidance, or access

based on protected characteristics.

The use of automated communication tools does not alter existing fair housing obligations. It does, however, change how those obligations are carried out in practice. Housing providers that maintain visibility into automated interactions, implement strong vendor governance, and remain attentive to emerging testing trends will be best positioned to manage this evolving area of risk.

This blog was drafted by Yana Rusovski, an attorney in the Spencer Fane Real Estate Group and the Multi-Family and Affordable Housing Market Teams. For more information, visit spencerfane.com.

Click **here** to subscribe to Spencer Fane communications to ensure you receive timely updates like this directly in your inbox.