



Peter Dreier, *Occidental College*

Saqib Bhatti, *Nathan Cummings Foundation*

Rob Call, *Massachusetts Institute of Technology*

Alex Schwartz, *The New School*

Gregory Squires, *George Washington University*

UNDERWATER AMERICA

HOW THE SO-CALLED
HOUSING “RECOVERY”
IS BYPASSING MANY
AMERICAN COMMUNITIES



This report is published by the
Haas Institute for a Fair and Inclusive Society
at the University of California, Berkeley

The Haas Institute for a Fair and Inclusive Society at UC Berkeley brings together researchers, community stakeholders, policymakers and communicators to identify and challenge the barriers to an inclusive, just and sustainable society and create transformative change.

The Institute serves as a national hub of a vibrant network of researchers and community partners and will take a leadership role in translating, communicating and facilitating research, policy and strategic engagement. The Haas Institute advances research and policy related to marginalized people while essentially touching all who benefit from a truly diverse, fair and inclusive society.

DIRECTORS

John A. Powell

Director, Haas Institute for a Fair and Inclusive Society
Robert D. Haas Chancellor's Chair in Equity and Inclusion
University of California, Berkeley

Michael Omi

Associate Director, Haas Institute for a Fair and Inclusive Society
Associate Professor of Comparative Ethnic Studies
University of California, Berkeley

Stephen Menendian

Assistant Director & Research Director,
Haas Institute for a Fair and Inclusive Society

CONTACT

Haas Institute for a Fair and Inclusive Society
University of California, Berkeley
460 Stephens Hall
Berkeley, CA 94720-2330
Tel: 510-642-3011
<http://diversity.berkeley.edu/haas-institute>
facebook.com/haas-institute
twitter.com/HaasInstitute

MEDIA

For media inquiries or questions about this report contact
Rachelle Galloway-Popotas at haasinstitute@gmail.com.

About the Authors

Peter Dreier

Chair of the Urban and
Environmental Policy Department
and Professor of Politics
Occidental College

Saqib Bhatti

Fellow, Nathan Cummings Foundation

Rob Call

Graduate Student, Urban Planning
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Alex Schwartz

Professor of Urban Policy
Milano School of International Affairs,
Management, and Urban Policy
The New School

Gregory Squires

Chair, Department of Sociology
Professor of Sociology and
Public Policy & Public Administration
George Washington University

Acknowledgments

The authors gratefully acknowledge **Rachel Atkins**, a graduate student at The New School, for the data analysis of underwater mortgages in this report; **Americans for Financial Reform** and its partner organizations for the data analysis of foreclosure trends published and provided for this report; **Chris Huang** at the Center for Popular Democracy and **Alison Miller**, a graduate student at The New School, and **Samir Gambhir** at the Haas Institute for their assistance with maps; and **Dan Immergluck**, Professor of City and Regional Planning at the Georgia Institute of Technology, for his help on this report.

This report was supported in part by a grant from the Nathan Cummings Foundation. The opinions, conclusions and recommendations expressed in this report at those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Nathan Cummings Foundation.



UNDERWATER AMERICA

HOW THE SO-CALLED HOUSING “RECOVERY” IS BYPASSING MANY AMERICAN COMMUNITIES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|------------------------------|----|
| Executive Summary..... | 5 |
| Introduction | 7 |
| The Hot Spots | 11 |
| Recommendations | 20 |
| Appendices..... | 22 |
| A Note on Data Sources | 37 |
| References | 37 |

LET'S DO THE NUMBERS

HARDEST-HIT CITIES

In 57 cities, at least 30% of all mortgaged homes are still underwater.

Nearly 1 in 10 Americans live in the 100 hardest-hit cities (28.7 million).

34% of the 100 hardest-hit cities have median household incomes below \$40,000.

The 100 hardest-hit cities are in 27 states.

HARDEST-HIT NEIGHBORHOODS

In 151 ZIP Codes, at least 50% of all mortgaged homes are still underwater.

10.4 million people live in the 395 hardest-hit ZIP codes.

43% of the 395 hardest-hit ZIP codes have median household incomes below \$40,000.

HARDEST-HIT PEOPLE: COMMUNITIES OF COLOR

In 71 of the 100 hardest-hit cities, African Americans and Latinos account for at least 40% of the population.

In 146 of the 395 hardest-hit ZIP codes, African Americans and Latinos account for at least 75% of the population.

In 64% of the 395 hardest-hit ZIP codes, African Americans and Latinos accounted for at least half of the population.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

CONTRARY TO THE CLAIMS OF MANY observers that the recent rise in housing prices is solving the nation's foreclosure and related economic crises, millions of families continue to face financial devastation from which many may never recover. This report examines national trends that are leaving many families behind and identifies the most troubled geographic “hot spots”—metro areas, cities, and neighborhoods in all regions of the country—where a significant portion of families are still “underwater,” which means they owe more on their mortgages than their homes are worth.

Despite home prices rising in many parts of the country, the total value of owner-occupied housing still remains \$3.2 trillion below 2006 levels. Despite rising home prices, there are still some 9.8 million households underwater, representing 19.4 percent of all mortgaged homes—nearly one out of every five such homes. Underwater homeowners are significantly more likely to default on their mortgages than homeowners with positive equity.

In the first report of its kind, we analyze negative equity and foreclosure data together with race and income data, at the ZIP code level, the city level and the metropolitan area level. The report shows that if we drill down to the neighborhood level, a startling number of communities across the country still face very high underwater rates.

The report also clearly shows that the legacy of predatory lending has resulted in a disproportionately negative impact on African American and Latino communities. For example, of the 100 cities with the highest underwater rates, in 71 of them the population is more than 40 percent African American and Latino.

Almost five million families have lost their homes to foreclosure since 2008, and foreclosures continue at rates higher than prior to the Great Recession. For African Americans and Latinos specifically, between 2005 and 2009, they experienced a decline in household wealth of 52 percent and 66 percent, respectively, compared to 16 percent for whites. This reflects, in large part, disparities in foreclosure rates among these groups, since for most Americans, and particularly for people of color, their homes are their largest source of wealth. Homeownership constituted 92 percent of the net worth for African Americans and 67 percent for Latinos, compared to 58 percent for whites.

While some communities across the country have benefited from rising home prices, this upward trend is expected to slow down dramatically in 2014, which means the hot spots that have been left behind by the recovery are not likely to see their fortunes substantially improve any time soon. Market forces alone will not bring the recovery to these severely impacted communities.



KEY FINDINGS

- In the 15 hardest-hit metropolitan areas with populations over one million, between 23 percent and 35 percent of homeowners are underwater.
- One in ten Americans live in the 100 hardest-hit cities where the number of underwater homeowners ranges from 22 percent to 56 percent.
- More than 10 million Americans live in the 395 ZIP codes where between 43 percent and 76 percent of homeowners are underwater.
- In those metropolitan areas, cities, and zip codes that have been hardest-hit, African Americans and Latinos constitute a far higher share of the population than they represent in the total population in the US.
- In the 100 hardest-hit cities with populations over 100,000, the number of underwater homeowners ranges from 22 percent to 56 percent.
 - In 71 of these cities, African Americans and Latinos account for at least 40 percent of the population.
 - In 66 of these cities the median household income is below \$50,000 (the national median is \$51,371).
 - In 2013, more than 320,000 homeowners in these cities went into default or foreclosure.
- In the 395 hardest-hit ZIP codes with populations over 5,000, between 43 percent and 76 percent of homeowners are underwater.
 - In almost two-thirds of these ZIP codes, African Americans and Latinos account for at least half of the residents.
 - In 71 percent the median household income is below \$50,000.
 - In 2013, nearly 113,000 homeowners in these ZIP codes went into default or foreclosure.
- The eleven states with the highest number of hardest-hit ZIP codes

are (in order): Georgia, Florida, Illinois, Michigan, Ohio, New Jersey, Maryland, Missouri, California, Nevada, and North Carolina.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The housing crisis is far from over for the families living in these hot spots. Despite a wide variety of federal initiatives and some voluntary programs, the crisis in hard-hit communities has not been resolved, primarily because one of the most effective tools—principal reduction to bring mortgages to their current market values—has been little utilized. We need bold intervention to make up for the shortcomings and inadequacies at the federal level.

Here are some key steps that should be taken immediately to address this crisis and ensure an equitable recovery for all homeowners:

1. Loan holders—banks, government sponsored enterprises (i.e., Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, which are regulated by the Federal Housing Finance Agency, FHFA), and investors—should reduce the principal on underwater mortgages to current market values.
2. If loan holders are unwilling or unable to reduce the principal on underwater mortgages to current market values, they should allow these loans to be purchased by publicly-owned or nonprofit entities that are willing to restructure them with fair and affordable terms.
3. Local municipalities should use all options at their disposal to facilitate the goal of resetting mortgages to current market values, including the use of “reverse eminent domain” (the program proposed in Richmond, California and elsewhere) to acquire mortgages in order to restructure them with fair and affordable terms.

4. Banks, government sponsored enterprises like Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and investors that own vacant homes that have already been foreclosed upon should sell them to publicly-owned or nonprofit entities that can convert them to affordable housing units for residents of the community instead of selling them to speculators.
5. Local municipalities should use all options at their disposal to facilitate the goal of turning vacant, foreclosed homes into affordable housing. This includes the use of “reverse eminent domain” to acquire properties in order to convert them to affordable housing units for residents of the community and to prevent them from being purchased by speculators.

INTRODUCTION

THE GREAT RECESSION—the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression—formally ended in June 2009, but the recovery has been extremely slow. Unemployment rates remained above 8 percent from February 2009 through August 2012, and did not drop below 7 percent until December 2013. Moreover, the number of people unemployed six months or longer has remained unprecedentedly high. Home prices did not bottom out until early 2012. Mortgage delinquencies and foreclosures did not start to diminish until 2012.

Now, foreclosures and mortgage delinquencies are down compared to the worst months of the crisis. Nationally, unemployment has dropped. But many places throughout the country have seen little improvement. Resi-

dents in those places are still living in recession conditions.

In fact, the overall “post-recession” narrative is misleading. Foreclosures and mortgage delinquencies may be down since the peak in 2009, but they have yet to return to pre-crisis levels (Orton 2013). For millions of families who have lost their homes to foreclosure, are currently behind on their mortgage payments, or remain underwater, the nightmare persists.

Many journalists and pundits tout the fact that housing prices are once again rising as evidence that the housing market is recovering. “Rising home prices rescue underwater homeowners,” proclaimed a headline in *USA Today*. (Schmit 2013). “The strength of the housing recovery is benefiting the distressed portion of the market, clearing it up more quickly,” claimed an article in *Bloomberg* (Gopal 2013). An op-ed column in the *Los Angeles Times* recommended “A free-market fix to the nation’s housing hangover,” (Gelinas 2011). These are all housing versions of the cliché that “a rising tide lifts all boats.”

This report documents that this celebration is premature and misleading. Many boats are not rising. They are **UNDERWATER**. They are more likely to drown than to be rescued by a rising tide. The so-called “recovery” has bypassed many parts of the country. In those places, housing prices are still dangerously below where they were when the housing bubble burst in 2007.

There are still many metropolitan areas, cities, and communities where a significant portion of homeowners owe more on their mortgages than their homes are worth. Not surprisingly, many of these places—which we call **“HOT SPOTS”**—have a significant proportion of African American and Latino families, since banks and other mortgage lenders had targeted communities of color with high-risk predatory loans during the peak years of the housing bubble. This report identifies the nation’s most troubled hot spots in order to draw attention to a serious problem that will not be fixed by waiting for market forces to save families from drowning.

This report examines the 15 metropolitan areas, 100 cities, and 395 ZIP codes with the worst “underwater” housing problem. These are the hot spots where housing prices have fallen the most, where the highest proportion of homeowners has “negative equity,” and where entire communities are at risk, fiscally and socially, because of these conditions. It is in these areas that public officials must act boldly before the disaster gets any worse.

THE UNDERWATER MORTGAGE CRISIS

“Underwater” homes are those where the homeowners have negative equity, which means they owe more on their mortgages than the market value of their homes. Underwater homeowners are 150 percent to 200 percent more likely to default on their mortgages than those with positive equity in their homes (Ocwen Financial 2011).

According to Zillow, more than 9.8 million American households, representing 19.4 percent of all mortgaged homes, were still underwater on their mortgages as of December 31, 2013 (Gudell 2014). Zillow looks at current outstanding loan amounts for individual owner-occupied homes and compares them to those homes’ current estimated values.¹

Depressed home prices combined with the most severe recession since the 1930s caused millions of families to lose their homes, and millions more are still at risk of foreclosure because they owe far more on their mortgages than what their homes are worth. Furthermore, many of these homeowners are locked into predatory “adjustable rate” loans with interest rates that will jump up, putting them at even greater risk of eventually defaulting on their mortgages.

¹ Zillow is the only data source that uses current outstanding loan balances on all mortgages when calculating negative equity. Other reports estimate current outstanding loan balance based on the most recent loan on a property (i.e., the original loan amount at time of purchase or refinancing).

From September 2008 through the end of 2013, approximately 4.9 million families lost their homes to foreclosure. Between 2010 and 2013, another 1.3 million families lost their homes to short sales. American households lost an estimated \$7 trillion in household wealth between 2006 and 2011 as a result of the housing crisis (Federal Reserve 2012). In 2012 the national homeownership rate fell for the eighth year in a row (Joint Center for Housing Studies 2013: 3).

In 2011, 31 percent of all homeowners (23.6 million owner households) were cost-burdened—they paid more than 30 percent of their income for housing. Among those, 13.6 percent of homeowners (9.3 million) were severely cost-burdened, paying more than 50 percent of their income for housing (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development 2013). All of these families are hanging by a thread and remain vulnerable to default and foreclosure.

Although recent increases in home prices have reduced the ranks of underwater homeowners over the past year, there is little likelihood that market forces, on their own, will solve the problem. The idea that all these families need to do is wait for the housing recovery to come to their city or neighborhood is a false premise. More direct action must be taken.

RISING HOME PRICES

Nationally, after adjusting for differences in home size and quality, housing prices increased by 103 percent from March 2000 to their peak in July 2006. Once the housing bubble burst, one year later, home prices plummeted and did not show any sign of recovery until mid-2012. Not since the Great Depression did home prices fall so dramatically. At their lowest point, in March 2012, prices had declined by 35 percent from their peak levels. Prices have recovered somewhat since then, but as of January 2014, the most recent date for which data are available, they were still 20 percent below their peak levels (S&P/Case-Shiller Home Price Indexes 2014).

The total value of owner-occupied housing in the U.S. decreased from \$22.6 trillion in 2006 to \$15.9 trillion in 2011, a drop of \$6.7 trillion. As of 2013 the total value had rebounded to \$19.4 trillion, but it is still \$3.2 trillion below the 2006 level.

Equally important, the rise in home prices that has been occurring recently is expected to slow down dramatically in 2014. Clear Capital forecasts that home prices nationally will rise by only 3.4 percent in 2014, about the historical average (Clear Capital 2014). *Kiplinger's Personal Finance* expects an increase of 4 percent. (Esswein 2014)

These are the national trends. In many local areas, the downturn was more severe and the recovery has either been far slower or hollow, including metro areas as varied as Detroit, Miami, Las Vegas, Atlanta, and Chicago (S&P/Case-Shiller Home Price Indexes 2013). As the so-called recovery slows in 2014, these hot spots are not likely to see their fortunes change in the near future.

Furthermore, in some of these metro areas, cities, and ZIP codes, housing prices may have risen, but not primarily as a result of market forces, as that concept is traditionally understood. That is, it is not a matter of individual homebuyers re-entering the market and engaging in voluntary exchanges with willing sellers, resulting in higher prices commensurate with the growing demand. Instead, large investment firms and hedge funds have been purchasing properties in the hardest-hit areas in large quantities, often at fire-sale prices, pushing up home prices in those markets. The largest private equity firm in the world, the Blackstone Group, is now the nation's largest owner of single-family rental homes. It bought 1,400 houses in Atlanta in a single day.

These practices may have artificially boosted home prices, but they have also made local housing markets even more volatile. The investors are making a large profit renting the properties, but continuing to drain wealth from these communities (Gottesdiener 2013; Gittelson and Perl-

Table 1

Total Value of U.S. Owner-Occupied Housing

| | |
|------|-----------------|
| 2006 | \$22.6 trillion |
| 2011 | \$15.9 trillion |
| 2013 | \$19.4 trillion |

Source: Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, "Table B.100: Balance Sheet of Households and Nonprofit Organizations"

berg 2013). As prices rise, ordinary buyers have been priced out of the market. Consequently, demand and prices have increased in rental units, particularly in the nation's hardest-hit communities.

PREDATORY LENDING, RACIAL DISCRIMINATION, AND LOST WEALTH

These losses in housing are not randomly distributed across the population. There are geographic hot spots where the problem is particularly dire. Many of these hot spots are areas with a significant population of African American and Latino homeowners who were targets of abusive and reckless banking practices, including an epidemic of subprime loans with predatory features. Banks, private mortgage companies, and mortgage brokers preyed on homeowners in low-income and minority areas. They did not just target low-income African American and Latino families; they also targeted middle-class African American and Latino families who lived in neighborhoods with high proportions of minority families.

As **TABLE 2** reveals, at the height of the housing bubble in 2007, African Americans and Latinos were much more likely to be rejected for conventional mortgage loans than whites. These differences cannot be explained by income differences among the racial groups. African Americans and Latinos with similar incomes as whites were nevertheless rejected for conventional loans at a much higher rate.²

As **TABLE 3** reveals, African Americans and Latinos were also much more likely to receive high-priced (subprime) loans. These differences, too, cannot be explained by the fact that, overall, whites have higher incomes than African Americans and Latinos because African Americans and Latinos with similar incomes as whites were much more likely to have subprime loans.³ This pattern suggests that lenders often rejected African American and Latino consumers for conventional mortgages at a much higher rate than they rejected white consumers, even when they were eligible for conventional loans. Once this occurred, lenders often steered many African Americans and Latinos into taking subprime mortgages (Kochar, Gonzalez-Barrera, and Dockterman 2009).

These patterns and practices occurred in cities across the country and were carried out by a wide variety of lenders. In 2012, for example, the U.S. Department of Justice reached a \$175 million settlement with Wells Fargo over its discriminatory lending practices. That settlement set aside \$125 million in compensation to African American and Latino borrowers whom the lender had steered into subprime mortgages or to whom it had charged higher fees and interest rates than comparable white borrowers,

2 Tables 2 and 3 are based on data from Rakesh Kochar, [Ana Gonzalez-Barrera](#), and [Daniel Dockterman](#). 2009. "Loans for Home Purchase in 2007." Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center, May 12. <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2009/05/12/iv-loans-for-home-purchase-in-2007>

3 Some have argued that the reason that African Americans and Latinos were more likely than whites to be rejected for conventional loans is that they were less credit worthy than whites, even those with comparable incomes. However the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston conducted a study of mortgage lending that took credit-worthiness into account and concluded that lenders practiced racial discrimination even when credit worthiness was comparable. Munnell (1996), Ards (2001) and Carr (1993).

Table 2

Loans Originated or Denied as a Percentage of Loan Applications for Home Purchase, 2007

| | RATIO OF INCOME TO MEDIAN INCOME IN METRO AREA | | | | | | |
|--|--|------|----------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|------|
| | ALL | <0.5 | 0.5 TO 0.75 | 0.75 TO 1 | 1 TO 1.25 | 1.25 TO 1.5 | >1.5 |
| Loans Originated as Percent of Applications | | | | | | | |
| Total | 63.7 | 57.7 | 65.3 | 65.6 | 65.4 | 65.8 | 63.4 |
| Hispanic | 50.4 | 53.6 | 58.0 | 54.7 | 52.2 | 50.5 | 57.1 |
| White | 70.5 | 64.6 | 72.0 | 72.6 | 72.8 | 73.5 | 71.2 |
| Black | 46.9 | 45.8 | 51.7 | 50.2 | 47.7 | 47.5 | 43.8 |
| Loans Denied as Percent of Applications | | | | | | | |
| Total | 16.6 | 24.8 | 17.3 | 16.0 | 15.5 | 14.8 | 15.7 |
| Hispanic | 26.1 | 29.0 | 23.1 | 24.0 | 25.2 | 26.0 | 27.7 |
| White | 12.1 | 19.7 | 12.9 | 11.6 | 10.9 | 10.0 | 10.8 |
| Black | 30.4 | 34.5 | 28.1 | 28.0 | 29.4 | 29.3 | 32.0 |

Note: Sample includes conventional loans for 1-to-4-family home purchase for owner occupancy, first liens only. The total includes racial and ethnic groups not shown separately. Source: Pew Hispanic Center tabulations of Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) data.

Table 3

Higher-Priced Loans as Percent of All Loans Originated, 2006 and 2007

| | RATIO OF INCOME TO MEDIAN INCOME IN METRO AREA | | | | | | |
|-------------|--|------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-------|
| | All | <0.5 | 0.5 to 0.75 | 0.75 to 1 | 1 to 1.25 | 1.25 to 1.5 | >=1.5 |
| 2007 | | | | | | | |
| Total | 14.2 | 20.2 | 16.2 | 15.0 | 14.1 | 12.8 | 10.9 |
| Hispanic | 27.6 | 26.8 | 25.8 | 27.2 | 28.1 | 28.0 | 26.6 |
| White | 10.5 | 16.8 | 12.6 | 11.3 | 10.5 | 9.3 | 7.6 |
| Black | 33.5 | 35.5 | 32.4 | 34.0 | 35.1 | 33.8 | 30.6 |
| 2006 | | | | | | | |
| Total | 25.3 | 30.4 | 28.8 | 28.0 | 26.3 | 24.2 | 20.8 |
| Hispanic | 44.9 | 39.7 | 43.6 | 47.8 | 49.5 | 48.6 | 43.8 |
| White | 17.5 | 24.3 | 21.9 | 20.4 | 18.2 | 15.8 | 12.8 |
| Black | 52.8 | 55.0 | 56.2 | 56.5 | 55.9 | 53.1 | 48.5 |

Note: Higher-priced loans have annual percentage rates that exceed the rate on U.S. Treasury securities of comparable maturity by a specified threshold (3 percentage points for first-lien loans).

Sample includes conventional loans for 1-to-4-family home purchase for owner occupancy, first liens only. The total includes racial and ethnic groups not shown separately. Source: Pew Hispanic Center tabulations of Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) data.

and \$50 million for down payment assistance to borrowers in communities where the Department identified large numbers of discrimination victims. Among the evidence cited in this case were statements by Wells Fargo loan officers who referred to subprime loans as “ghetto loans” for “mud people.” (U.S. Department of Justice 2012; Relman 2013.)

Between 2005 and 2009, overall wealth among African Americans and Latinos declined by 53 percent and 66 percent, respectively, compared to 16 percent for whites (Kochar, Fry, and Taylor 2011). Among the vast majority of Americans, and particularly for people of color, their homes are their biggest asset and the largest source of wealth. Homeownership constitutes 92 percent of the net worth for African Americans and 67 percent for Latinos, compared to 58 percent for whites (Tippet et al. 2014: 4). The disparities in foreclosure rates among home loan borrowers between 2004 and 2008 – 11 percent for African Americans, 14 percent for Latinos, and 6 percent for whites (Bocian et al. 2012) – therefore likely helped contribute to this discrepancy in wealth loss.

THE HOT SPOTS

THIS REPORT DOCUMENTS where the most serious housing crises persist. It identifies those metropolitan areas, cities, and ZIP codes that face the most extreme levels of lost equity, where the most underwater homes are located, and where families are most acutely vulnerable to foreclosure. In brief, below are the hot spots that are under the greatest stress.

HARDEST-HIT METROPOLITAN AREAS

We first examined the 15 hardest-hit major metropolitan areas with populations over one million. The 15 metropolitan areas span across 16 states. In these 15 areas—Las Vegas, Atlanta, Jacksonville, Orlando, Chicago, Tampa, Detroit, Miami, Memphis, Virginia Beach, Riverside, Kansas City, St. Louis, Cleveland, Milwaukee—between 23 percent and 35 percent of homeowners have negative equity (see **TABLE 4**). In these troubled metropolitan areas, home prices remain up to 45 percent below their peak levels.

HARDEST-HIT CITIES

In the 100 hardest-hit cities (those with populations over 100,000), between 22 percent and 56 percent of homeowners have negative equity.

A full 57 of these cites still have at least 30 percent of mortgaged homes **UNDERWATER**.

Almost one in ten Americans (28.7 million) lives in these 100 cities. There are more than 320,000 homes in these cities that went into default or foreclosure in 2013. Home prices in these cities remain up to 57 percent below their peak levels. In eight of these cities, home prices are still more than 50 percent below their peak levels. In another 23 cities, home prices are between 40 percent and 49 percent below their peak. In other words, in 31 out of the 100 hardest-hit cities, home prices are still at least 40 percent below their peak levels.

TABLE 5 lists the 10 hardest-hit cities in the U.S. with populations over 100,000. Appendix B has the full list of the top 100 hardest-hit cities.

The 100 hardest-hit cities are located in 27 states, but some states have more troubled cities than others. Eighteen cities in California—Richmond, Sacramento, Stockton, Vallejo, Antioch, Victorville, Lancaster, San

Table 4

15 Hardest-Hit Major Metropolitan Areas

| Metro Area | Percent of Homes Underwater |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Las Vegas, NV | 35% |
| Atlanta, GA | 35% |
| Jacksonville, FL | 34% |
| Orlando, FL | 30% |
| Chicago, IL-IN-WI | 30% |
| Tampa, FL | 29% |
| Detroit, MI | 28% |
| Miami, FL | 27% |
| Memphis, TN-MS-AR | 27% |
| Virginia Beach, VA-NC | 25% |
| Riverside, CA | 24% |
| Kansas City, MO-KS | 24% |
| St. Louis, MO-IL | 24% |
| Cleveland, OH | 24% |
| Milwaukee, WI | 23% |

THE 15 HARDEST HIT-MAJOR METROPOLITAN AREAS



These are the 15 metropolitan areas with more than 1 million residents that have the highest share of underwater mortgages in the country.


Table 5**The Ten Hardest-Hit Cities**

| City | Percent of Homes Underwater | # of Homes in Foreclosure or Default in 2013 |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Hartford, CT | 56% | 723 |
| Newark, NJ | 54% | 1,346 |
| Elizabeth, NJ | 53% | 567 |
| Paterson, NJ | 49% | 858 |
| Detroit, MI | 47% | 4,830 |
| Warren, MI | 44% | 927 |
| Dayton, OH | 43% | 3,399 |
| Miami Gardens, FL | 43% | 726 |
| North Las Vegas, NV | 43% | 2,648 |
| Bridgeport, CT | 42% | 1,571 |


The data on underwater homes is based on Zillow's Negative Equity Report for the end of 2013. The default and foreclosure data was prepared by Americans for Financial Reform and is based on data from RealtyTrac. It includes the total number of unique properties that received a notice of default, lis pendens, notice of trustee sale, or a notice of foreclosure sale in 2013, or that became a real-estate owned property following foreclosure. Because ZIP code boundaries are not always fully aligned with city limits, these numbers should be treated as estimates rather than precise figures.

Bernardino, Palmdale, Visalia, Fresno, Moreno Valley, Modesto, Fairfield, Bakersfield, Rialto, Fontana, and Salinas—are among the nation's 100 hardest-hit cities. Sixteen cities in Florida are among the 100 hardest-hit. These are Miami Gardens, Palm Bay, Jacksonville, Port Saint Lucie, Hialeah, Miramar, Orlando, Tampa, Brandon, Tallahassee, Gainesville, Saint Petersburg, Miami, Pompano Beach, Clearwater, and Fort Lauderdale. Ohio has six of the nation's hardest-hit cities. Five cities in both Illinois and Arizona rank among the nation's underwater hot spots.

The overwhelming majority of these cities are lower-income communities, with median household incomes below the national median of \$51,371. In fact, as **FIGURE 1** illustrates, two-thirds of the 100 hardest-hit cities have median incomes below \$50,000, and 34 percent have median incomes below \$40,000. The hardest-hit city of all, Hartford, CT, is also one of the poorest, with a median household income of just \$28,931. The so-called recovery has left behind lower-income communities.

Figure 1**Median Household Incomes of the 100 Hardest-Hit Cities**

100 HARDEST-HIT CITIES



These are the 100 cities with more than 100,000 residents that have the highest share of underwater mortgages in the country.

What also distinguishes the 100 hardest-hit cities is that almost all of them have African American and Latino populations that are significantly higher than their representation in the nation as a whole or in their metropolitan areas. As **FIGURE 2** shows, in 14 of the 100 hardest-hit cities, African Americans and Latinos comprise more than 75 percent of population. In another 38 cities, these two groups comprise between 50 percent and 75 percent of the city populations. In another 19 cities, they make up between 40 percent and 50 percent of city populations. In other words, in 71 of the 100 hardest-hit cities, African Americans and Latinos account for at least 40 percent of the residents. This is not surprising because—as noted earlier—banks and mortgage brokers targeted African American and Latino neighborhoods, homebuyers, and mortgage consumers with predatory and subprime mortgages.


Even in those hard-hit cities with the highest median household incomes, African Americans and Latinos comprise a significant proportion of the city population. In Chesapeake, VA, with a median household income of \$70,244, African Americans and Latinos account for 36 percent of residents. In Fairfield, CA (\$66,363), these two groups comprise 44 percent of the population. In Henderson, NV, a suburb of Las Vegas with a median household income of \$66,141, they constitute 21 percent of residents. In Antioch, CA (\$65,494), 53 percent of residents are African American and Latino. In Fontana, CA (\$64,195), 78 percent of residents fit that description. African Americans and Latinos account for 84 percent of the population of Miramar, Florida, whose median household income of \$63,898 is substantially higher than the national figure.

HARDEST-HIT ZIP CODES

Within every city, however, some neighborhoods are worse than others and many have been particularly hard-hit by the housing crash and not lifted up by the broader recent trend of rising home prices. These communities were the most devastated victims of Wall Street's predatory and

Figure 2

Percentage of African Americans and Latinos in the 100 Hardest-Hit Cities




subprime lending practices. They are now among the worst hot spots in terms of the proportion of families who are underwater and unlikely to survive without assistance.

To identify the hardest-hit neighborhoods, we examined the 500 ZIP codes with the highest percentage of homes with negative equity. There are 29,762 general ZIP codes in the entire country. ZIP codes vary in size from a handful of residents to more than 100,000 residents. The average population size is roughly 7,500. To remove ZIP codes that are in primarily commercial areas, we eliminated the ZIP codes with fewer than 5,000 residents. That left 395 residential ZIP codes with the highest percentage of homes with negative equity. These 395 ZIP codes are home to more than 10.4 million people.

In the 395 hardest-hit ZIP codes, between 43 percent and 76 percent of

395 HARDEST-HIT ZIP CODES



These are the 395 ZIP codes with more than 5,000 residents that have the highest share of underwater mortgages in the country

homeowners have negative equity. Home prices in these 395 ZIP codes remain up to 66 percent below their peak levels. Among these 395 ZIP codes, the median decline of home prices is 41 percent. There nearly 113,000 homes in just these 395 ZIP codes that went into default or foreclosure in 2013. Appendix C contains the full list of the 395 hardest-hit ZIP codes.

The median household incomes of the 395 hardest-hit ZIP codes range from \$9,895 (ZIP code 43604 in Toledo, OH) to \$118,622 (ZIP code 20607 in Accokeek, Maryland near Washington, DC), but the vast majority of hardest-hit ZIP codes have median household incomes significantly below the national figure of \$51,371. As **FIGURE 3** shows, 32 (8 percent) of the 395 ZIP codes had median household incomes below \$25,000. Another 137 (35 percent) ZIP codes had median household incomes between \$25,000 and \$40,000. Another 111 (28 percent) ZIP codes had median household incomes between \$40,000 and \$50,000.⁴ In total, 71 percent of the hardest-hit ZIP codes had median household incomes below \$50,000.

Again, not surprisingly, what distinguishes the 395 hardest-hit ZIP codes is that almost all of them have African American and Latino populations significantly higher than their representation in the nation as a whole or in their metropolitan areas. They represent an even higher proportion of residents than that in the hardest-hit 100 cities.

As **FIGURE 4** shows, in 146 of the 395 hardest-hit ZIP codes, African Americans and Latinos comprise more than 75 percent of the population. In another 107 ZIP codes, these two groups comprise between 50 percent and 75 percent of the populations. In other words, in almost two-thirds (64 percent) of the 395 hardest-hit ZIP codes, African Americans and Latinos account for at least half of the residents. Once again we see the severe consequences of the banking industry's predatory practices of targeting African American and Latino neighborhoods,

⁴ We could not identify the median household incomes for two of the ZIP codes.

Figure 3

Median Household Income in the 395 Hardest-Hit ZIP Codes




Figure 4

Percentage of African Americans and Latinos in the 395 Hardest-Hit ZIP Codes




Table 6**States with Large Numbers of Hardest-Hit ZIP Codes**

| | |
|----------------|----|
| Georgia | 61 |
| Florida | 55 |
| Illinois | 47 |
| Michigan | 38 |
| Ohio | 33 |
| New Jersey | 32 |
| Maryland | 24 |
| Missouri | 21 |
| California | 17 |
| Nevada | 10 |
| North Carolina | 10 |



homebuyers, and mortgage consumers.

The 395 hardest-hit ZIP codes are found in 23 states. They are not all located in central cities. Quite a few are found in suburbs and in small towns in rural areas. **TABLE 6** shows the states with particularly high numbers of hardest-hit ZIP codes.

These 395 hardest-hit ZIP codes, however, are just the tip of the iceberg. There are thousands of neighborhoods in hundreds of cities that have been devastated by the housing crash and have no prospects of significant improvement. It is in these neighborhoods that the epidemic of foreclosures and the tide of underwater mortgages have had the worst impact. These are just some of the nation's hot spots that continue to suffer in the wake of the recession and ongoing housing problems in the U.S. These findings reveal that these crises are hardly over. Market forces and federal initiatives are clearly not solving the problems. Local actors are understandably trying to address what the federal government and other forces have been unable to resolve. The findings, unfortunately, demonstrate why such local actions are necessary.

RECOMMENDATIONS

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS LAUNCHED several programs in efforts to ameliorate the foreclosure and delinquency rates and the costs associated with the bursting of the housing bubble. They include an alphabet soup of anti-foreclosure efforts and Federal Reserve lending programs.⁵ The Justice Department and other federal and state law enforcement agencies have also settled several cases totaling billions of dollars, most notably a \$13 billion settlement with JPMorgan Chase. One projection estimates that the total cost of these settlements will exceed \$50 billion (Silver-Greenberg and Eavis 2014).

But these efforts have been woefully insufficient, and with widespread reports of a housing recovery, there is a real danger that the political will to take steps to fix the housing crisis will quickly dissipate. However, the crisis is far from over in the areas that have been hit the hardest.

Consequently several local communities have started to take matters into their own hands. In a growing number of cities, local officials and community residents are considering using the tool of eminent domain to purchase, at fair market value, mortgages on selected underwater homes and refinancing those loans to current market value for existing occupants so that more families can stay in their homes (Hockett 2013; Dewan 2014).

These efforts are understandable given the continued hardships faced by millions of families and the communities in which they reside. As the

Joint Center for Housing Studies recently observed,

[T]he foreclosure crisis has exacerbated the distress in many low-income neighborhoods, spreading blight and straining the ability of local governments to invest in those areas. Indeed, governments at all levels face difficult choices between bringing budgets into balance in response to short-term economic woes and addressing longer-term structural challenges. In making these choices, however, policymakers cannot lose sight of the important role that housing plays in ensuring the health and well-being of a nation's households and communities. (Joint Center for Housing Studies 2013: 6).

We need bold action to ensure that any recovery does not leave behind the communities living in these hot spots. There are steps that local communities, in conjunction with public and private financial service organizations and government regulators, could take to more effectively address the crisis and ensure an equitable recovery for all homeowners. We need bold action to ensure that any recovery does not leave behind the communities living in these hot spots. There are steps that local communities, in conjunction with public and private financial service organizations and government regulators, could take to more effectively address the crisis and ensure an equitable recovery for all homeowners. Here are some key steps that should be taken immediately to address the crisis and ensure and equitable recovery for all homeowners:

1. Loan holders—banks, government sponsored enterprises (i.e., Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, which are regulated by the Federal Housing Finance Agency, FHFA), and investors—should reduce the principal on underwater mortgages to current market values.
2. If loan holders are unwilling or unable to reduce the principal on underwater mortgages to current market values, they

⁵ These include Home Affordable Modification Program (HAMP), Home Affordable Refinance Program (HARP), Home Affordable Unemployment Program (HAUP), Hardest Hit Funds (HHF), Term Auction Facility (TAF), Term Asset-Backed Securities Loan Facility (TALF), Asset-Backed Commercial Paper Money Market Mutual Fund Liquidity Facility (AMLF), Commercial Paper Funding Facility (CPFF), and the Primary Dealer Credit Facility (PDCF), among others.

should allow these loans to be purchased by publicly-owned or nonprofit entities that are willing to restructure them with fair and affordable terms.

3. Local municipalities should use all options at their disposal to facilitate the goal of resetting mortgages to current market values, including the use of “reverse eminent domain” (the program proposed in Richmond, California and elsewhere) to acquire mortgages in order to restructure them with fair and affordable terms.
4. Banks, government sponsored enterprises like Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and investors that own vacant homes that have already been foreclosed upon should sell them to publicly-owned or nonprofit entities that can convert them to affordable housing units for residents of the community instead of selling them to speculators.
5. Local municipalities should use all options at their disposal to facilitate the goal of turning vacant, foreclosed homes into affordable housing. This includes the use of “reverse eminent domain” to acquire properties in order to convert them to affordable housing units for residents of the community and to prevent them from being purchased by speculators.

The financial challenges that millions of families continue to face in the wake of the foreclosure crisis will not fade with rising prices in the nation’s housing markets. These problems persist particularly, but not only, in low-income and minority communities throughout all regions of the U.S. Predictions are difficult. The future depends largely on those policy decisions that are made, and sometimes not made. But there are steps that communities can take, preferably in partnership with private and nonprofit organizations and government agencies at all levels, to ameliorate these costs.



15 Metro Areas with the Highest Incidence of Negative Equity (see Data Source Notes on p. 37)

| Rank | Metro Area | Percent of Homes Underwater | Percent Below Peak Home Prices | Population | Percent African American and Latino | Median Household Income |
|------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 | Las Vegas, NV | 35% | 45% | 2,000,000 | 41% | \$54,218 |
| 2 | Atlanta, GA | 35% | 22% | 5,300,000 | 44% | \$57,470 |
| 3 | Jacksonville, FL | 34% | 31% | 1,300,000 | 30% | \$52,881 |
| 4 | Orlando, FL | 30% | 42% | 2,100,000 | 43% | \$49,263 |
| 5 | Chicago, IL-IN-WI | 30% | 27% | 9,500,000 | 39% | \$61,367 |
| 6 | Tampa, FL | 29% | 38% | 2,800,000 | 29% | \$46,606 |
| 7 | Detroit, MI | 28% | 33% | 4,300,000 | 28% | \$51,903 |
| 8 | Miami, FL | 27% | 41% | 5,600,000 | 63% | \$48,582 |
| 9 | Memphis, TN-MS-AR | 27% | 10% | 1,300,000 | 51% | \$47,477 |
| 10 | Virginia Beach, VA-NC | 25% | 15% | 1,700,000 | 38% | \$59,293 |
| 11 | Riverside, CA | 24% | 36% | 4,200,000 | 56% | \$55,928 |
| 12 | Kansas City, MO-KS | 24% | 11% | 2,000,000 | 22% | \$56,826 |
| 13 | St. Louis, MO-IL | 24% | 16% | 2,800,000 | 22% | \$54,109 |
| 14 | Cleveland, OH | 24% | 19% | 2,100,000 | 26% | \$48,952 |
| 15 | Milwaukee, WI | 23% | 12% | 1,600,000 | 27% | \$53,966 |

100 Cities with the Highest Incidence of Negative Equity (see Data Source Notes on p. 37)

| Rank | City | State | Percent Of Homes Underwater | Percent Below Peak Home Prices | Homes In Default or Foreclosure 2013 | Population | Percent African American and Latino | Median Household Income |
|------|------------------|-------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|------------|---|-------------------------------|
| 1 | Hartford | CT | 56% | 35% | 723 | 124,879 | 83% | \$28,931 |
| 2 | Newark | NJ | 54% | N/A | 1,346 | 276,478 | 89% | \$34,387 |
| 3 | Elizabeth | NJ | 52% | 49% | 567 | 124,795 | 81% | \$43,590 |
| 4 | Paterson | NJ | 49% | 40% | 858 | 145,655 | 92% | \$33,583 |
| 5 | Detroit | MI | 47% | 57% | 4,830 | 721,459 | 90% | \$26,955 |
| 6 | Warren | MI | 44% | 45% | 927 | 134,550 | 16% | \$44,982 |
| 7 | Dayton | OH | 43% | 32% | 3,399 | 142,670 | 46% | \$28,595 |
| 8 | Miami Gardens | FL | 43% | 51% | 726 | 107,884 | 100% | \$42,742 |
| 9 | North Las Vegas | NV | 43% | 49% | 2,648 | 215,762 | 61% | \$55,466 |
| 10 | Bridgeport | CT | 42% | 39% | 1,571 | 144,446 | 75% | \$39,822 |
| 11 | Cleveland | OH | 41% | 38% | 8,060 | 397,972 | 64% | \$26,556 |
| 12 | Palm Bay | FL | 41% | 52% | 2,300 | 102,814 | 34% | \$44,470 |
| 13 | Joliet | IL | 40% | 29% | 1,816 | 147,098 | 44% | \$61,948 |
| 14 | Toledo | OH | 40% | 34% | 3,199 | 287,487 | 37% | \$33,374 |
| 15 | Jacksonville | FL | 40% | 36% | 13,982 | 823,652 | 40% | \$48,143 |
| 16 | Milwaukee | WI | 40% | 32% | 4,998 | 594,328 | 59% | \$35,823 |
| 17 | Killeen | TX | 40% | 18% | 697 | 127,995 | 61% | \$44,799 |
| 18 | Victorville | CA | 40% | 52% | 1,005 | 115,069 | 66% | \$52,165 |
| 19 | Elgin | IL | 39% | 39% | 1,646 | 109,513 | 53% | \$58,487 |
| 20 | Waterbury | CT | 39% | 32% | 1,190 | 110,074 | 55% | \$40,867 |
| 21 | Aurora | IL | 38% | 33% | 2,355 | 196,569 | 53% | \$62,589 |
| 22 | Rockford | IL | 36% | 33% | 2,206 | 152,948 | 39% | \$38,157 |
| 23 | Hampton | VA | 36% | 17% | 694 | 137,471 | 57% | \$51,584 |
| 24 | Providence | RI | 36% | 40% | 890 | 178,185 | 57% | \$38,243 |
| 25 | Vallejo | CA | 36% | 53% | 792 | 116,417 | 47% | \$60,764 |
| 26 | Atlanta | GA | 36% | 27% | 5,439 | 425,931 | 60% | \$46,146 |
| 27 | Las Vegas | NV | 35% | 46% | 14,399 | 587,699 | 44% | \$52,601 |
| 28 | Port Saint Lucie | FL | 35% | 52% | 3,902 | 163,748 | 36% | \$49,236 |
| 29 | Stockton | CA | 35% | 55% | 2,234 | 292,262 | 54% | \$47,246 |
| 30 | Chicago | IL | 34% | 28% | 22,842 | 2,702,471 | 62% | \$47,408 |
| 31 | Tucson | AZ | 34% | 34% | 3,897 | 521,695 | 48% | \$36,939 |

| Rank | City | State | Percent Of Homes Undewater | Percent Below Peak Home Prices | Homes In Default or Foreclosure 2013 | Population | Percent African American and Latino | Median Household Income |
|------|----------------|-------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|------------|---|-------------------------------|
| 32 | Jersey City | NJ | 34% | 26% | 979 | 248,435 | 55% | \$58,308 |
| 33 | Hialeah | FL | 34% | 48% | 5,597 | 226,837 | 98% | \$30,883 |
| 34 | Lancaster | CA | 33% | 47% | 1,405 | 155,496 | 59% | \$51,719 |
| 35 | San Bernardino | CA | 33% | 49% | 1,266 | 210,624 | 76% | \$39,097 |
| 36 | Memphis | TN | 33% | 25% | 3,242 | 651,050 | 70% | \$36,817 |
| 37 | Allentown | PA | 33% | 28% | 1,313 | 117,942 | 57% | \$35,549 |
| 38 | Miramar | FL | 33% | 42% | N/A | 121,447 | 84% | \$63,898 |
| 39 | Akron | OH | 33% | 25% | 3,305 | 199,955 | 36% | \$33,598 |
| 40 | Palmdale | CA | 32% | 49% | 1,287 | 151,841 | 71% | \$54,277 |
| 41 | Baltimore | MD | 32% | 22% | 6,523 | 620,644 | 69% | \$40,803 |
| 42 | Birmingham | AL | 32% | 16% | 2,105 | 213,180 | 77% | \$31,467 |
| 43 | Augusta | GA | 32% | 17% | 917 | 195,646 | 61% | \$38,714 |
| 44 | Saint Louis | MO | 31% | 23% | 4,511 | 318,527 | 54% | \$34,384 |
| 45 | Tacoma | WA | 31% | 27% | 3,021 | 200,013 | 26% | \$50,439 |
| 46 | Orlando | FL | 31% | 47% | 11,520 | 240,185 | 56% | \$42,418 |
| 47 | Visalia | CA | 31% | 41% | 695 | 123,905 | 48% | \$53,718 |
| 48 | Columbus | OH | 31% | 19% | 7,316 | 790,168 | 35% | \$43,992 |
| 49 | Fresno | CA | 31% | 44% | 2,589 | 495,777 | 56% | \$42,276 |
| 50 | Henderson | NV | 31% | 41% | 2,766 | 258,270 | 21% | \$66,141 |
| 51 | Tampa | FL | 30% | 39% | 10,521 | 339,391 | 51% | \$43,514 |
| 52 | Brandon | FL | 30% | 36% | 1,154 | 102,555 | 41% | \$54,904 |
| 53 | Savannah | GA | 30% | 20% | 1,228 | 137,690 | 61% | \$34,888 |
| 54 | Springfield | MA | 30% | 19% | 443 | 153,278 | 64% | \$35,163 |
| 55 | Moreno Valley | CA | 30% | 45% | 1,160 | 193,758 | 74% | \$55,872 |
| 56 | Fayetteville | NC | 30% | 7% | 757 | 200,439 | 54% | \$44,756 |
| 57 | Tallahassee | FL | 30% | 23% | 2,049 | 181,821 | 42% | \$39,649 |
| 58 | Gainesville | FL | 29% | 30% | 1,305 | 124,981 | 34% | \$32,145 |
| 59 | New Haven | CT | 29% | 26% | 687 | 129,898 | 63% | \$38,482 |
| 60 | Independence | MO | 29% | 16% | 797 | 116,513 | 16% | \$44,847 |
| 61 | Kent | WA | 29% | 27% | 1,046 | 108,700 | 30% | \$58,477 |
| 62 | Modesto | CA | 29% | 49% | 1,302 | 201,986 | 42% | \$49,205 |
| 63 | Fairfield | CA | 29% | 43% | 552 | 105,407 | 44% | \$66,363 |
| 64 | Bakersfield | CA | 29% | 41% | 2,399 | 347,091 | 55% | \$54,265 |
| 65 | Antioch | CA | 29% | 47% | 807 | 102,575 | 53% | \$65,494 |
| 66 | Richmond | CA | 28% | 48% | 468 | 104,225 | 67% | \$54,657 |

100 Cities with the Highest Incidence of Negative Equity (cont.)

| Rank | City | State | Percent Of Homes Undewater | Percent Below Peak Home Prices | Homes In Default or Foreclosure 2013 | Population | Percent African American and Latino | Median Household Income |
|------|------------------|-------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|------------|---|-------------------------------|
| 67 | Mobile | AL | 28% | 26% | 1,349 | 195,239 | 54% | \$38,722 |
| 68 | Reno | NV | 28% | 42% | 1,724 | 226,305 | 28% | \$47,814 |
| 69 | Saint Petersburg | FL | 28% | 35% | 4,732 | 245,363 | 32% | \$44,756 |
| 70 | Worcester | MA | 28% | 26% | 443 | 181,473 | 33% | \$45,679 |
| 71 | Montgomery | AL | 27% | 18% | 990 | 205,516 | 61% | \$43,390 |
| 72 | Cincinnati | OH | 27% | 17% | 5,581 | 297,314 | 49% | \$33,708 |
| 73 | Everett | WA | 27% | 22% | 1,191 | 103,135 | 23% | \$47,491 |
| 74 | Miami | FL | 27% | 31% | 31,122 | 401,927 | 91% | \$29,762 |
| 75 | Richmond | VA | 27% | 9% | 1,582 | 205,348 | 58% | \$39,445 |
| 76 | Charlotte | NC | 27% | 10% | 5,920 | 740,931 | 49% | \$52,916 |
| 77 | Chesapeake | VA | 26% | 15% | 995 | 223,233 | 36% | \$70,244 |
| 78 | Philadelphia | PA | 26% | 13% | 10,140 | 1,525,811 | 57% | \$37,016 |
| 79 | Virginia Beach | VA | 26% | 14% | 2,100 | 439,528 | 28% | \$65,980 |
| 80 | Columbia | SC | 26% | N/A | 2,288 | 129,757 | 49% | \$40,550 |
| 81 | Salem | OR | 26% | 20% | 366 | 154,835 | 22% | \$45,564 |
| 82 | Pompano Beach | FL | 26% | 48% | 7,123 | 100,819 | 48% | \$39,656 |
| 83 | Sacramento | CA | 26% | 35% | 3,820 | 467,467 | 43% | \$50,661 |
| 84 | Rialto | CA | 25% | 39% | 562 | 100,009 | 85% | \$49,428 |
| 85 | Clarksville | TN | 25% | 3% | 645 | 133,583 | 35% | \$47,305 |
| 86 | Kansas City | MO | 25% | N/A | 2,200 | 459,772 | 42% | \$45,150 |
| 87 | Glendale | AZ | 25% | 37% | 1,678 | 229,331 | 44% | \$50,567 |
| 88 | Athens | GA | 25% | 14% | 385 | 116,353 | 38% | \$33,596 |
| 89 | Clearwater | FL | 25% | 35% | 1,964 | 108,138 | 24% | \$42,427 |
| 90 | Surprise | AZ | 24% | 36% | 952 | 115,007 | 24% | \$59,973 |
| 91 | Fontana | CA | 24% | 37% | 1,181 | 196,129 | 78% | \$64,195 |
| 92 | Phoenix | AZ | 24% | 34% | 7,180 | 1,462,368 | 47% | \$47,866 |
| 93 | West Valley City | UT | 24% | 17% | N/A | 129,123 | 36% | \$52,524 |
| 94 | Salinas | CA | 24% | 50% | 476 | 150,634 | 77% | \$50,587 |
| 95 | Pueblo | CO | 24% | 13% | 1,010 | 106,944 | 54% | \$35,176 |
| 96 | Grand Rapids | MI | 23% | 18% | 1,389 | 189,340 | 40% | \$39,070 |
| 97 | Fort Lauderdale | FL | 23% | 33% | 12,784 | 167,370 | 46% | \$50,191 |
| 98 | Peoria | AZ | 23% | 33% | 918 | 154,566 | 25% | \$63,940 |
| 99 | Lowell | MA | 22% | 21% | 217 | 106,739 | 25% | \$51,714 |
| 100 | Saint Paul | MN | 22% | 21% | 2,836 | 286,171 | 27% | \$46,305 |

395 ZIP Codes with the Highest Incidence of Negative Equity (see Data Source Notes on p. 37)

| Rank | ZIP Code | City/State | Percent of Homes Underwater | Percent Below Peak Home Prices | Homes In Default or Foreclosure | Population | Percent African American and Latino | Median Household Income |
|------|----------|---------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 | 30273 | Rex, GA | 76% | 56% | 252 | 15,462 | 81% | \$49,321 |
| 2 | 30296 | Riverdale, GA | 76% | 58% | 394 | 28,047 | 89% | \$47,564 |
| 3 | 30274 | Riverdale, GA | 75% | 59% | 366 | 32,386 | 85% | \$39,989 |
| 4 | 30238 | Irondale, GA | 73% | N/A | 702 | 35,570 | 82% | \$46,109 |
| 5 | 48201 | Detroit, MI | 71% | 23% | 13 | 9,980 | 67% | \$14,017 |
| 6 | 30297 | Forest Park, GA | 71% | 61% | 215 | 27,019 | 69% | \$31,599 |
| 7 | 30058 | Lithonia, GA | 71% | 48% | 778 | 53,870 | 95% | \$47,237 |
| 8 | 30291 | Union City, GA | 69% | 49% | 247 | 18,329 | 89% | \$40,598 |
| 9 | 30294 | Conley, GA | 69% | 48% | 588 | 37,865 | 85% | \$59,634 |
| 10 | 30035 | Stone Mountain, GA | 68% | 56% | 253 | 20,106 | 92% | \$45,008 |
| 11 | 30038 | Lithonia, GA | 67% | 46% | 577 | 37,554 | 95% | \$48,310 |
| 12 | 78252 | San Antonio, TX | 67% | 25% | 57 | 8,308 | 83% | \$44,379 |
| 13 | 30349 | Riverdale, GA | 67% | 51% | 874 | 66,760 | 95% | \$44,873 |
| 14 | 30260 | Morrow, GA | 66% | 57% | 201 | 25,697 | 65% | \$43,432 |
| 15 | 30088 | Stone Mountain, GA | 66% | 49% | 348 | 28,058 | 92% | \$51,394 |
| 16 | 30288 | Conley, GA | 66% | N/A | 98 | 10,593 | 87% | \$50,428 |
| 17 | 30016 | Covington, GA | 65% | 45% | 363 | 51,113 | 52% | \$50,072 |
| 18 | 30034 | Panthersville, GA | 65% | 52% | 505 | 44,338 | 95% | \$50,100 |
| 19 | 48240 | Redford, MI | 65% | 63% | 217 | 17,533 | 22% | \$51,942 |
| 20 | 07114 | Newark, NJ | 63% | N/A | 47 | 12,667 | 88% | \$17,251 |
| 21 | 06114 | Hartford, CT | 63% | 35% | 177 | 28,516 | 75% | \$33,210 |
| 22 | 48207 | Detroit, MI | 63% | N/A | 50 | 18,580 | 88% | \$23,662 |
| 23 | 30168 | Austell, GA | 63% | 39% | 202 | 27,797 | 84% | \$40,230 |
| 24 | 30213 | Fairburn, GA | 63% | 43% | 428 | 28,337 | 85% | \$55,941 |
| 25 | 48239 | Redford, MI | 62% | 57% | 415 | 36,005 | 40% | \$53,692 |
| 26 | 48225 | Harper Woods, MI | 62% | 61% | 178 | 14,685 | 42% | \$43,727 |
| 27 | 89030 | North Las Vegas, NV | 61% | N/A | 369 | 49,513 | 87% | \$33,148 |
| 28 | 07107 | Newark, NJ | 61% | N/A | 195 | 36,211 | 91% | \$34,197 |
| 29 | 06106 | Hartford, CT | 61% | 35% | 219 | 36,969 | 81% | \$26,640 |
| 30 | 30228 | Hampton, GA | 61% | 44% | 565 | 36,799 | 58% | \$58,341 |
| 31 | 43215 | Columbus, OH | 60% | 7% | 26 | 12,082 | 20% | \$37,275 |
| 32 | 48021 | Eastpointe, MI | 60% | 58% | 347 | 32,599 | 32% | \$44,312 |

395 ZIP Codes with the Highest Incidence of Negative Equity (cont.)

| Rank | ZIP Code | City/State | Percent of Homes Underwater | Percent Below Peak Home Prices | Homes In Default or Foreclosure | Population | Percent African American and Latino | Median Household Income |
|------|----------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 33 | 30083 | Stone Mountain, GA | 60% | 51% | 512 | 49,707 | 83% | \$43,666 |
| 34 | 30236 | Jonesboro, GA | 60% | 47% | 414 | 42,978 | 69% | \$45,907 |
| 35 | 28574 | Richlands, NC | 59% | 13% | 113 | 13,162 | 18% | \$43,659 |
| 36 | 63137 | Bellefontaine Neighbors, MO | 59% | 46% | 219 | 20,635 | 76% | \$36,121 |
| 37 | 30344 | East Point, GA | 59% | 51% | 303 | 32,510 | 86% | \$40,751 |
| 38 | 08611 | Trenton, NJ | 59% | 40% | 224 | 28,143 | 80% | \$42,732 |
| 39 | 07102 | Newark, NJ | 58% | N/A | 23 | 9,917 | 79% | \$24,438 |
| 40 | 89101 | Las Vegas, NV | 58% | N/A | 222 | 43,572 | 75% | \$26,082 |
| 41 | 18466 | Coolbaugh, PA | 58% | 48% | 234 | 18,375 | 55% | \$56,752 |
| 42 | 30310 | Atlanta, GA | 58% | 57% | 305 | 24,465 | 92% | \$25,307 |
| 43 | 07206 | Elizabeth, NJ | 58% | 53% | 198 | 25,223 | 90% | \$39,851 |
| 44 | 20747 | District Heights, MD | 58% | 46% | 344 | 39,589 | 95% | \$59,812 |
| 45 | 32808 | Pine Hills, FL | 58% | 60% | 775 | 51,315 | 81% | \$36,252 |
| 46 | 30032 | Candler-McAfee, GA | 57% | 60% | 363 | 46,855 | 91% | \$36,230 |
| 47 | 60409 | Calumet City, IL | 57% | 48% | 772 | 36,687 | 84% | \$42,332 |
| 48 | 48141 | Inkster, MI | 57% | 57% | 204 | 25,869 | 79% | \$29,141 |
| 49 | 48340 | Pontiac, MI | 56% | 53% | 135 | 25,413 | 58% | \$30,820 |
| 50 | 30179 | Temple, GA | 56% | 31% | 174 | 17,655 | 9% | \$54,280 |
| 51 | 32811 | Orlando, FL | 56% | 60% | 418 | 37,066 | 78% | \$35,255 |
| 52 | 08629 | Trenton, NJ | 56% | 43% | 134 | 12,621 | 69% | \$57,261 |
| 53 | 32219 | Jacksonville, FL | 56% | 40% | 238 | 12,069 | 55% | \$46,836 |
| 54 | 30311 | Atlanta, GA | 56% | 55% | 227 | 34,267 | 97% | \$29,947 |
| 55 | 30122 | Lithia Springs, GA | 56% | 37% | 177 | 24,520 | 62% | \$46,394 |
| 56 | 48030 | Hazel Park, MI | 55% | 56% | 152 | 16,676 | 11% | \$35,042 |
| 57 | 07108 | Newark, NJ | 55% | N/A | 162 | 25,362 | 98% | \$29,040 |
| 58 | 33605 | Tampa, FL | 55% | 57% | 338 | 16,543 | 89% | \$28,636 |
| 59 | 30313 | Atlanta, GA | 55% | 39% | 40 | 6,269 | 55% | \$27,762 |
| 60 | 98597 | Yelm, WA | 55% | 28% | 248 | 20,007 | 8% | \$60,847 |
| 61 | 07202 | Elizabeth, NJ | 55% | 54% | 133 | 41,500 | 75% | \$44,349 |
| 62 | 85756 | Tucson, AZ | 55% | 40% | 157 | 32,801 | 63% | \$48,142 |
| 63 | 48146 | Lincoln Park, MI | 55% | 54% | 372 | 38,202 | 19% | \$42,433 |
| 64 | 07112 | Newark, NJ | 55% | N/A | 179 | 25,202 | 99% | \$39,689 |
| 65 | 48184 | Wayne, MI | 55% | 55% | 124 | 17,708 | 20% | \$41,325 |
| 66 | 48202 | Detroit, MI | 55% | 51% | 79 | 16,407 | 84% | \$19,992 |
| 67 | 48089 | Warren, MI | 55% | 53% | 290 | 30,803 | 17% | \$38,755 |
| 68 | 30331 | Atlanta, GA | 55% | 46% | 636 | 55,950 | 97% | \$44,962 |
| 69 | 43612 | Toledo, OH | 55% | 39% | 428 | 30,605 | 17% | \$40,372 |

395 ZIP Codes with the Highest Incidence of Negative Equity (cont.)

| Rank | ZIP Code | City/State | Percent of Homes Underwater | Percent Below Peak Home Prices | Homes In Default or Foreclosure | Population | Percent African American and Latino | Median Household Income |
|------|----------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 70 | 30314 | Atlanta, GA | 55% | 54% | 134 | 21,627 | 90% | \$23,657 |
| 71 | 44137 | Maple Heights, OH | 55% | 45% | 533 | 23,304 | 70% | \$38,388 |
| 72 | 62206 | Cahokia, IL | 54% | 43% | 187 | 16,888 | 64% | \$32,252 |
| 73 | 06112 | Hartford, CT | 54% | 38% | 171 | 23,853 | 88% | \$31,754 |
| 74 | 33815 | Lakeland, FL | 54% | 49% | 86 | 14,566 | 48% | \$31,180 |
| 75 | 30134 | Douglasville, GA | 54% | 39% | 440 | 43,509 | 48% | \$53,936 |
| 76 | 30106 | Austell, GA | 54% | 35% | 191 | 18,452 | 61% | \$53,160 |
| 77 | 30354 | Atlanta, GA | 54% | 50% | 106 | 14,171 | 81% | \$27,514 |
| 78 | 20743 | Coral Hills, MD | 54% | 43% | 405 | 36,992 | 97% | \$58,748 |
| 79 | 20746 | Suitland-Silver Hill, MD | 54% | 41% | 191 | 28,278 | 92% | \$61,246 |
| 80 | 60073 | Round Lake Beach, IL | 54% | 44% | 1045 | 56,468 | 45% | \$64,528 |
| 81 | 53218 | Milwaukee, WI | 54% | 43% | 476 | 40,752 | 70% | \$34,356 |
| 82 | 31407 | Port Wentworth, GA | 54% | 25% | 88 | 9,052 | 41% | \$60,631 |
| 83 | 48066 | Roseville, MI | 54% | 55% | 373 | 47,590 | 13% | \$41,668 |
| 84 | 48015 | Center Line, MI | 54% | 53% | 61 | 8,448 | 13% | \$34,049 |
| 85 | 07201 | Elizabeth, NJ | 54% | 52% | 128 | 24,689 | 78% | \$46,031 |
| 86 | 60443 | Matteson, IL | 54% | 38% | 460 | 20,259 | 76% | \$64,709 |
| 87 | 48122 | Melvindale, MI | 54% | 58% | 81 | 10,699 | 31% | \$38,282 |
| 88 | 07203 | Roselle, NJ | 54% | 48% | 218 | 20,990 | 81% | \$56,098 |
| 89 | 33035 | Homestead, FL | 53% | N/A | 633 | 8,481 | 68% | \$60,193 |
| 90 | 07106 | Newark, NJ | 53% | N/A | 205 | 31,908 | 91% | \$46,347 |
| 91 | 13202 | Syracuse, NY | 53% | N/A | 1 | 5,134 | 61% | \$13,920 |
| 92 | 48125 | Dearborn Heights, MI | 53% | 54% | 168 | 20,953 | 13% | \$47,674 |
| 93 | 07513 | Paterson, NJ | 53% | 44% | 68 | 11,787 | 96% | \$41,241 |
| 94 | 32208 | Jacksonville, FL | 53% | 49% | 671 | 32,195 | 80% | \$33,168 |
| 95 | 32218 | Jacksonville, FL | 53% | 39% | 1019 | 54,714 | 51% | \$52,638 |
| 96 | 33610 | Tampa, FL | 53% | 54% | 534 | 38,475 | 76% | \$31,721 |
| 97 | 48221 | Detroit, MI | 53% | 60% | 384 | 41,732 | 95% | \$41,362 |
| 98 | 28546 | Jacksonville, NC | 53% | 12% | 244 | 41,932 | 34% | \$48,614 |
| 99 | 34690 | Holiday, FL | 53% | 58% | 295 | 12,501 | 8% | \$36,307 |
| 100 | 89115 | Las Vegas, NV | 53% | N/A | 366 | 62,458 | 71% | \$35,974 |
| 101 | 30281 | Stockbridge, GA | 53% | 33% | 545 | 61,970 | 48% | \$56,794 |
| 102 | 30337 | College Park, GA | 53% | 43% | 62 | 11,750 | 87% | \$34,739 |
| 103 | 89106 | Las Vegas, NV | 53% | 60% | 217 | 27,905 | 81% | \$30,211 |
| 104 | 63138 | Spanish Lake, MO | 53% | 40% | 177 | 21,647 | 76% | \$34,790 |
| 105 | 60653 | Chicago, IL | 53% | 34% | 397 | 30,072 | 94% | \$25,222 |
| 106 | 08232 | Pleasantville, NJ | 53% | 50% | 236 | 18,776 | 77% | \$41,796 |

395 ZIP Codes with the Highest Incidence of Negative Equity (cont.)

| Rank | ZIP Code | City/State | Percent of Homes Underwater | Percent Below Peak Home Prices | Homes In Default or Foreclosure | Population | Percent African American and Latino | Median Household Income |
|------|----------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 107 | 48091 | Warren, MI | 53% | 54% | 260 | 30,860 | 19% | \$37,943 |
| 108 | 93505 | California City, CA | 52% | N/A | 152 | 14,006 | 40% | \$49,699 |
| 109 | 45405 | Dayton, OH | 52% | 39% | 219 | 19,247 | 64% | \$28,959 |
| 110 | 07104 | Newark, NJ | 52% | N/A | 204 | 51,506 | 96% | \$37,364 |
| 111 | 20774 | Kettering, MD | 52% | 40% | 445 | 45,087 | 90% | \$93,265 |
| 112 | 28539 | Hubert, NC | 52% | 12% | 88 | 14,627 | 16% | \$47,114 |
| 113 | 20616 | Bryans Road, MD | 52% | 35% | 85 | 5,978 | 55% | \$88,730 |
| 114 | 60099 | Zion, IL | 52% | 41% | 520 | 31,996 | 49% | \$57,356 |
| 115 | 07502 | Paterson, NJ | 52% | 37% | 115 | 16,248 | 73% | \$50,267 |
| 116 | 60085 | Waukegan, IL | 52% | 47% | 783 | 69,607 | 76% | \$42,020 |
| 117 | 60654 | Chicago, IL | 52% | 12% | 99 | 13,425 | 12% | \$93,406 |
| 118 | 44110 | Cleveland, OH | 52% | 37% | 291 | 20,852 | 82% | \$23,351 |
| 119 | 32254 | Jacksonville, FL | 51% | 51% | 280 | 14,426 | 68% | \$29,042 |
| 120 | 60466 | Park Forest, IL | 51% | 40% | 513 | 22,555 | 64% | \$47,621 |
| 121 | 60545 | Plano, IL | 51% | 34% | 284 | 12,834 | 32% | \$66,801 |
| 122 | 07105 | Newark, NJ | 51% | N/A | 132 | 49,768 | 49% | \$42,361 |
| 123 | 33619 | Palm River-Clair Mel, FL | 51% | 51% | 581 | 34,222 | 66% | \$35,469 |
| 124 | 20603 | Waldorf, MD | 51% | 35% | 260 | 28,842 | 55% | \$100,655 |
| 125 | 30093 | Norcross, GA | 51% | 38% | 246 | 53,602 | 77% | \$37,233 |
| 126 | 32244 | Jacksonville, FL | 51% | 41% | 1264 | 61,617 | 45% | \$48,425 |
| 127 | 53209 | Milwaukee, WI | 51% | 42% | 468 | 46,083 | 69% | \$33,656 |
| 128 | 61104 | Rockford, IL | 51% | 56% | 276 | 16,992 | 38% | \$23,862 |
| 129 | 30012 | Conyers, GA | 51% | 40% | 269 | 28,467 | 58% | \$46,051 |
| 130 | 93701 | Fresno, CA | 51% | 58% | 43 | 11,133 | 79% | \$19,928 |
| 131 | 07503 | Paterson, NJ | 51% | 40% | 105 | 19,961 | 68% | \$40,455 |
| 132 | 92277 | Twentynine Palms, CA | 51% | 45% | 201 | 23,623 | 25% | \$43,471 |
| 133 | 20785 | Greater Landover, MD | 51% | 42% | 288 | 36,269 | 90% | \$64,054 |
| 134 | 63147 | Saint Louis, MO | 51% | 43% | 90 | 12,048 | 95% | \$33,035 |
| 135 | 30554 | Lula, GA | 51% | 39% | 92 | 7,720 | 12% | \$46,067 |
| 136 | 93721 | Fresno, CA | 51% | N/A | 21 | 6,837 | 76% | \$20,132 |
| 137 | 63134 | Berkeley, MO | 50% | 34% | 111 | 14,296 | 66% | \$34,646 |
| 138 | 44123 | Euclid, OH | 50% | 45% | 341 | 16,091 | 47% | \$41,442 |
| 139 | 95422 | Clearlake, CA | 50% | 59% | 159 | 15,302 | 29% | \$28,501 |
| 140 | 60087 | Waukegan, IL | 50% | 44% | 366 | 28,563 | 58% | \$59,476 |
| 141 | 07018 | East Orange, NJ | 50% | N/A | 178 | 28,717 | 96% | \$38,132 |
| 142 | 60471 | Richton Park, IL | 50% | 34% | 309 | 13,294 | 81% | \$60,186 |
| 143 | 63136 | Jennings, MO | 50% | 38% | 430 | 47,431 | 87% | \$33,657 |

395 ZIP Codes with the Highest Incidence of Negative Equity (cont.)

| Rank | ZIP Code | City/State | Percent of Homes Underwater | Percent Below Peak Home Prices | Homes In Default or Foreclosure | Population | Percent African American and Latino | Median Household Income |
|------|----------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|---|-------------------------------|
| 144 | 32210 | Jacksonville, FL | 50% | 46% | 1087 | 57,150 | 36% | \$47,186 |
| 145 | 20772 | Greater Upper Marlboro, MD | 50% | 38% | 423 | 43,292 | 83% | \$100,077 |
| 146 | 60804 | Cicero, IL | 50% | 53% | 892 | 84,135 | 90% | \$44,699 |
| 147 | 43604 | Toledo, OH | 50% | 21% | 19 | 7,797 | 71% | \$9,895 |
| 148 | 30253 | McDonough, GA | 50% | 27% | 526 | 49,326 | 50% | \$62,151 |
| 149 | 75134 | Lancaster, TX | 50% | 30% | 132 | 19,925 | 88% | \$48,884 |
| 150 | 60626 | Chicago, IL | 50% | 38% | 413 | 52,045 | 49% | \$41,427 |
| 151 | 60411 | Chicago Heights, IL | 50% | 40% | 984 | 58,198 | 72% | \$45,075 |
| 152 | 81635 | Parachute, CO | 49% | 45% | 62 | 6,544 | 18% | \$59,173 |
| 153 | 85629 | Sahuarita, AZ | 49% | 36% | 178 | 20,879 | 30% | \$72,925 |
| 154 | 07514 | Paterson, NJ | 49% | 41% | 102 | 19,746 | 91% | \$40,085 |
| 155 | 63103 | Saint Louis, MO | 49% | 27% | 32 | 5,235 | 44% | \$31,421 |
| 156 | 20602 | Waldorf, MD | 49% | 37% | 311 | 24,604 | 56% | \$78,794 |
| 157 | 60406 | Blue Island, IL | 49% | 44% | 283 | 25,495 | 76% | \$42,432 |
| 158 | 44117 | Euclid, OH | 49% | 43% | 164 | 11,006 | 69% | \$28,484 |
| 159 | 43227 | Columbus, OH | 49% | 33% | 403 | 22,856 | 68% | \$38,431 |
| 160 | 31548 | Kingsland, GA | 49% | 27% | 188 | 19,205 | 23% | \$51,939 |
| 161 | 33128 | Miami, FL | 49% | 48% | 74 | 7,921 | 98% | \$20,495 |
| 162 | 33142 | Miami, FL | 49% | 61% | 739 | 53,146 | 102% | \$24,227 |
| 163 | 30153 | Rockmart, GA | 49% | 41% | 153 | 17,694 | 16% | \$45,051 |
| 164 | 20640 | Indian Head, MD | 49% | 38% | 120 | 9,478 | 38% | \$69,899 |
| 165 | 34668 | Port Richey, FL | 49% | 57% | 1083 | 43,251 | 12% | \$32,871 |
| 166 | 34472 | Ocala, FL | 49% | 54% | 716 | 26,959 | 37% | \$37,272 |
| 167 | 93702 | Fresno, CA | 49% | 61% | 185 | 45,889 | 78% | \$30,454 |
| 168 | 63031 | Florissant, MO | 49% | 39% | 397 | 49,068 | 28% | \$54,881 |
| 169 | 60473 | South Holland, IL | 49% | 36% | 473 | 21,809 | 81% | \$60,378 |
| 170 | 63135 | Ferguson, MO | 49% | 38% | 218 | 22,563 | 59% | \$39,053 |
| 171 | 60469 | Posen, IL | 49% | 46% | 102 | 5,752 | 76% | \$55,015 |
| 172 | 34474 | Ocala, FL | 49% | 48% | 184 | 15,053 | 30% | \$40,627 |
| 173 | 07524 | Paterson, NJ | 48% | 42% | 79 | 12,365 | 96% | \$37,705 |
| 174 | 48215 | Detroit, MI | 48% | N/A | 72 | 15,243 | 93% | \$21,777 |
| 175 | 02909 | Providence, RI | 48% | 47% | 244 | 40,431 | 68% | \$33,583 |
| 176 | 92233 | Calipatria, CA | 48% | N/A | 12 | 10,029 | 83% | \$33,821 |
| 177 | 60160 | Melrose Park, IL | 48% | 51% | 241 | 25,180 | 76% | \$43,429 |
| 178 | 63033 | Florissant, MO | 48% | 37% | 318 | 41,678 | 58% | \$54,540 |
| 179 | 32211 | Jacksonville, FL | 48% | 44% | 539 | 31,113 | 43% | \$41,453 |
| 180 | 60136 | Gilberts, IL | 48% | 34% | 108 | 6,275 | 22% | \$90,512 |

395 ZIP Codes with the Highest Incidence of Negative Equity (cont.)

| Rank | ZIP Code | City/State | Percent of Homes Underwater | Percent Below Peak Home Prices | Homes In Default or Foreclosure | Population | Percent African American and Latino | Median Household Income |
|------|----------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|---|-------------------------------|
| 181 | 53216 | Milwaukee, WI | 48% | 43% | 368 | 32,117 | 85% | \$32,756 |
| 182 | 89403 | Dayton, NV | 48% | 52% | 235 | 13,600 | 15% | \$52,462 |
| 183 | 98424 | Fife, WA | 48% | 29% | 107 | 10,358 | 23% | \$59,646 |
| 184 | 60661 | Chicago, IL | 48% | 14% | 40 | 6,792 | 14% | \$89,114 |
| 185 | 45416 | Trotwood, OH | 48% | 37% | 82 | 6,075 | 76% | \$36,048 |
| 186 | 30021 | Clarkston, GA | 48% | 42% | 84 | 21,561 | 67% | \$32,004 |
| 187 | 20613 | Brandywine, MD | 48% | 38% | 112 | 12,733 | 62% | \$106,103 |
| 188 | 30039 | Snellville, GA | 48% | 30% | 581 | 40,043 | 61% | \$67,310 |
| 189 | 44119 | Cleveland, OH | 48% | 39% | 216 | 12,631 | 47% | \$40,346 |
| 190 | 32202 | Jacksonville, FL | 48% | N/A | 62 | 5,945 | 64% | \$14,504 |
| 191 | 33313 | Lauderhill, FL | 48% | 55% | 1107 | 54,656 | 89% | \$35,464 |
| 192 | 33716 | Saint Petersburg, FL | 48% | 59% | 75 | 13,236 | 21% | \$46,602 |
| 193 | 30008 | Marietta, GA | 48% | 33% | 244 | 31,038 | 69% | \$43,392 |
| 194 | 48033 | Southfield, MI | 48% | 49% | 116 | 16,275 | 70% | \$44,558 |
| 195 | 32304 | Tallahassee, FL | 48% | 37% | 169 | 39,232 | 49% | \$19,688 |
| 196 | 27505 | Broadway, NC | 48% | 4% | 7 | 6,116 | 25% | \$42,420 |
| 197 | 30529 | Commerce, GA | 48% | 25% | 77 | 11,683 | 15% | \$44,736 |
| 198 | 48602 | Saginaw, MI | 48% | 42% | 290 | 29,846 | 36% | \$34,811 |
| 199 | 32222 | Jacksonville, FL | 48% | 33% | 172 | 9,169 | 32% | \$61,025 |
| 200 | 33032 | Princeton, FL | 48% | 55% | 1039 | 32,837 | 84% | \$46,072 |
| 201 | 07111 | Irvington, NJ | 48% | N/A | 458 | 54,449 | 96% | \$41,959 |
| 202 | 48186 | Westland, MI | 48% | 42% | 343 | 37,119 | 19% | \$48,624 |
| 203 | 20601 | Waldorf, MD | 48% | 35% | 270 | 25,497 | 54% | \$93,671 |
| 204 | 53204 | Milwaukee, WI | 48% | 45% | 169 | 41,452 | 82% | \$26,265 |
| 205 | 20695 | White Plains, MD | 48% | 31% | 81 | 7,342 | 49% | \$99,434 |
| 206 | 32305 | Tallahassee, FL | 48% | 38% | 283 | 19,196 | 55% | \$36,715 |
| 207 | 33801 | Lakeland, FL | 48% | 52% | 287 | 34,002 | 30% | \$35,023 |
| 208 | 64130 | Kansas City, MO | 48% | 37% | 141 | 21,104 | 93% | \$26,656 |
| 209 | 30620 | Bethlehem, GA | 48% | 24% | 115 | 11,550 | 24% | \$60,945 |
| 210 | 28540 | Jacksonville, NC | 47% | 13% | 223 | 52,065 | 31% | \$43,525 |
| 211 | 48135 | Garden City, MI | 47% | 47% | 255 | 27,523 | 8% | \$55,084 |
| 212 | 45406 | Dayton, OH | 47% | 38% | 223 | 21,342 | 84% | \$30,799 |
| 213 | 44132 | Euclid, OH | 47% | 41% | 240 | 15,105 | 55% | \$39,196 |
| 214 | 48204 | Detroit, MI | 47% | 53% | 167 | 29,003 | 98% | \$24,343 |
| 215 | 43219 | Columbus, OH | 47% | 32% | 363 | 26,679 | 80% | \$33,462 |
| 216 | 60162 | Hillside, IL | 47% | 43% | 139 | 8,203 | 68% | \$55,994 |

395 ZIP Codes with the Highest Incidence of Negative Equity (cont.)

| Rank | ZIP Code | City/State | Percent of Homes Underwater | Percent Below Peak Home Prices | Homes In Default or Foreclosure | Population | Percent African American and Latino | Median Household Income |
|------|----------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 217 | 64134 | Kansas City, MO | 47% | 26% | 244 | 21,552 | 67% | \$40,196 |
| 218 | 30507 | Gainesville, GA | 47% | 41% | 196 | 29,487 | 53% | \$49,026 |
| 219 | 30680 | Winder, GA | 47% | 23% | 385 | 37,586 | 21% | \$50,565 |
| 220 | 20735 | Clinton, MD | 47% | 39% | 397 | 35,692 | 84% | \$98,117 |
| 221 | 20710 | Bladensburg, MD | 47% | 47% | 46 | 9,523 | 94% | \$46,497 |
| 222 | 63074 | Saint Ann, MO | 47% | 34% | 100 | 15,588 | 27% | \$39,745 |
| 223 | 28555 | Maysville, NC | 47% | 12% | 41 | 5,659 | 28% | \$43,871 |
| 224 | 89110 | Las Vegas, NV | 47% | N/A | 644 | 76,905 | 66% | \$47,375 |
| 225 | 64132 | Kansas City, MO | 47% | 37% | 101 | 12,963 | 85% | \$26,452 |
| 226 | 33805 | Lakeland, FL | 47% | 52% | 194 | 23,016 | 59% | \$33,786 |
| 227 | 33147 | West Little River, FL | 47% | 62% | 806 | 42,683 | 100% | \$29,545 |
| 228 | 43609 | Toledo, OH | 47% | 30% | 262 | 23,720 | 39% | \$29,675 |
| 229 | 33033 | Homestead, FL | 47% | 57% | 1452 | 49,481 | 82% | \$42,443 |
| 230 | 89104 | Las Vegas, NV | 47% | 59% | 338 | 33,059 | 56% | \$38,431 |
| 231 | 53225 | Milwaukee, WI | 47% | 37% | 173 | 23,745 | 56% | \$39,125 |
| 232 | 48237 | Oak Park, MI | 47% | 50% | 185 | 29,642 | 55% | \$46,168 |
| 233 | 33054 | Miami Gardens, FL | 47% | 56% | 581 | 29,424 | 99% | \$27,241 |
| 234 | 33190 | Cutler Bay, FL | 47% | 44% | 399 | 8,977 | 80% | \$46,435 |
| 235 | 48210 | Detroit, MI | 47% | 42% | 93 | 29,938 | 76% | \$25,161 |
| 236 | 75241 | Dallas, TX | 47% | 29% | 154 | 26,668 | 97% | \$29,079 |
| 237 | 48214 | Detroit, MI | 47% | 52% | 108 | 22,769 | 91% | \$25,613 |
| 238 | 07501 | Paterson, NJ | 47% | 41% | 160 | 30,362 | 91% | \$24,353 |
| 239 | 34473 | Ocala, FL | 47% | 50% | 430 | 16,739 | 51% | \$39,443 |
| 240 | 92311 | Barstow, CA | 47% | 55% | 247 | 32,887 | 53% | \$48,111 |
| 241 | 48341 | Pontiac, MI | 47% | 47% | 110 | 17,112 | 71% | \$37,117 |
| 242 | 64124 | Kansas City, MO | 47% | N/A | 57 | 11,990 | 63% | \$27,357 |
| 243 | 33169 | Miami Gardens, FL | 47% | 51% | 1048 | 38,392 | 96% | \$47,084 |
| 244 | 30013 | Conyers, GA | 47% | 34% | 307 | 25,011 | 62% | \$57,110 |
| 245 | 30220 | Grantville, GA | 47% | 27% | 62 | 5,566 | 28% | \$50,220 |
| 246 | 33415 | Greenacres, FL | 46% | 63% | 1029 | 42,478 | 60% | \$36,020 |
| 247 | 07055 | Passaic, NJ | 46% | 43% | 194 | 69,143 | 79% | \$31,032 |
| 248 | 44105 | Cleveland, OH | 46% | 45% | 654 | 40,672 | 74% | \$28,916 |
| 249 | 30071 | Norcross, GA | 46% | 38% | 122 | 20,951 | 66% | \$46,001 |
| 250 | 44109 | Cleveland, OH | 46% | 39% | 507 | 43,045 | 39% | \$32,110 |
| 251 | 53223 | Milwaukee, WI | 46% | 37% | 263 | 29,749 | 52% | \$44,394 |
| 252 | 07062 | Plainfield, NJ | 46% | 39% | 130 | 12,423 | 82% | \$55,698 |

395 ZIP Codes with the Highest Incidence of Negative Equity (cont.)

| Rank | ZIP Code | City/State | Percent of Homes Underwater | Percent Below Peak Home Prices | Homes In Default or Foreclosure | Population | Percent African American and Latino | Median Household Income |
|------|----------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|---|-------------------------------|
| 253 | 20745 | Forest Heights, MD | 46% | 44% | 190 | 27,423 | 91% | \$61,011 |
| 254 | 60064 | North Chicago, IL | 46% | 42% | 198 | 18,420 | 81% | \$38,405 |
| 255 | 48180 | Taylor, MI | 46% | 51% | 425 | 63,231 | 22% | \$43,559 |
| 256 | 28544 | Midway Park, NC | 46% | 17% | 17 | 5,527 | 36% | \$35,242 |
| 257 | 07103 | Newark, NJ | 46% | N/A | 199 | 32,307 | 91% | \$29,824 |
| 258 | 19032 | Folcroft, PA | 46% | 34% | 100 | 6,623 | 26% | \$57,462 |
| 259 | 60436 | Joliet, IL | 46% | 33% | 233 | 18,760 | 49% | \$41,194 |
| 260 | 60538 | Montgomery, IL | 46% | 30% | 438 | 25,208 | 32% | \$71,458 |
| 261 | 34691 | Holiday, FL | 46% | 57% | 526 | 21,415 | 15% | \$40,297 |
| 262 | 07208 | Elizabeth, NJ | 46% | 42% | 108 | 32,588 | 74% | \$49,007 |
| 263 | 45205 | Cincinnati, OH | 46% | 32% | 213 | 21,783 | 48% | \$28,826 |
| 264 | 33440 | Clewiston, FL | 46% | 60% | 129 | 19,671 | 67% | \$37,665 |
| 265 | 60020 | Fox Lake, IL | 46% | 39% | 214 | 6,882 | 6% | \$52,216 |
| 266 | 85123 | Casa Grande, AZ | 46% | 46% | 30 | 6,060 | 34% | \$46,771 |
| 267 | 30135 | Douglasville, GA | 46% | 32% | 661 | 58,058 | 39% | \$65,450 |
| 268 | 32805 | Orlando, FL | 46% | 53% | 215 | 23,098 | 85% | \$25,911 |
| 269 | 60505 | Aurora, IL | 46% | 40% | 799 | 68,751 | 79% | \$45,230 |
| 270 | 30157 | Dallas, GA | 46% | 28% | 415 | 41,459 | 20% | \$60,670 |
| 271 | 44055 | Lorain, OH | 46% | 35% | 220 | 19,313 | 52% | \$29,755 |
| 272 | 32209 | Jacksonville, FL | 46% | 51% | 495 | 35,289 | 97% | \$23,621 |
| 273 | 95205 | Stockton, CA | 46% | N/A | 215 | 36,990 | 73% | \$32,172 |
| 274 | 44128 | Cleveland, OH | 46% | 42% | 433 | 29,210 | 96% | \$34,945 |
| 275 | 32839 | Oak Ridge, FL | 46% | 59% | 473 | 44,224 | 70% | \$34,179 |
| 276 | 63115 | Saint Louis, MO | 46% | 38% | 129 | 23,252 | 99% | \$26,435 |
| 277 | 32327 | Crawfordville, FL | 46% | 30% | 353 | 26,319 | 19% | \$53,988 |
| 278 | 60110 | Carpentersville, IL | 46% | 35% | 626 | 37,937 | 56% | \$57,850 |
| 279 | 93560 | Rosamond, CA | 45% | 49% | 129 | 18,603 | 46% | \$54,151 |
| 280 | 93615 | Cutler, CA | 45% | N/A | 10 | 5,743 | 95% | \$30,946 |
| 281 | 44113 | Cleveland, OH | 45% | 15% | 80 | 17,997 | 44% | \$28,794 |
| 282 | 63114 | Overland, MO | 45% | 35% | 295 | 36,489 | 32% | \$40,047 |
| 283 | 18324 | Lehman Township, PA | 45% | N/A | 61 | 7,853 | 45% | \$60,105 |
| 284 | 30558 | Maysville, GA | 45% | N/A | 50 | 6,258 | 12% | \$39,900 |
| 285 | 48034 | Southfield, MI | 45% | 45% | 58 | 13,080 | 72% | \$42,489 |
| 286 | 38115 | Memphis, TN | 45% | 30% | 163 | 38,545 | 89% | \$30,160 |
| 287 | 20748 | Temple Hills, MD | 45% | 40% | 376 | 38,798 | 93% | \$67,046 |
| 288 | 44125 | Garfield Heights, OH | 45% | 43% | 491 | 28,591 | 27% | \$45,138 |

395 ZIP Codes with the Highest Incidence of Negative Equity (cont.)

| Rank | ZIP Code | City/State | Percent of Homes Underwater | Percent Below Peak Home Prices | Homes In Default or Foreclosure | Population | Percent African American and Latino | Median Household Income |
|------|----------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|---|-------------------------------|
| 289 | 60438 | Lansing, IL | 45% | 39% | 452 | 28,592 | 42% | \$51,993 |
| 290 | 60616 | Chicago, IL | 45% | 22% | 284 | 49,469 | 37% | \$43,815 |
| 291 | 73538 | Elgin, OK | 45% | 1% | 7 | 5,127 | 10% | \$52,769 |
| 292 | 45404 | Dayton, OH | 45% | 34% | 92 | 11,084 | 16% | \$27,202 |
| 293 | 32221 | Jacksonville, FL | 45% | 36% | 464 | 26,748 | 30% | \$56,894 |
| 294 | 60097 | Wonder Lake, IL | 45% | 37% | 190 | 10,732 | 12% | \$72,916 |
| 295 | 89156 | Las Vegas, NV | 45% | 54% | 421 | 28,374 | 54% | \$52,252 |
| 296 | 32763 | Orange City, FL | 45% | 54% | 313 | 20,531 | 20% | \$38,413 |
| 297 | 06606 | Bridgeport, CT | 45% | 39% | 607 | 49,281 | 62% | \$54,800 |
| 298 | 48238 | Detroit, MI | 45% | 60% | 176 | 33,842 | 96% | \$24,836 |
| 299 | 30011 | Auburn, GA | 45% | 23% | 157 | 14,530 | 20% | \$52,604 |
| 300 | 43232 | Columbus, OH | 45% | 26% | 630 | 41,697 | 58% | \$40,366 |
| 301 | 20707 | Laurel, MD | 45% | 37% | 220 | 31,206 | 59% | \$75,676 |
| 302 | 98409 | Tacoma, WA | 45% | 31% | 309 | 24,548 | 31% | \$43,755 |
| 303 | 64126 | Kansas City, MO | 45% | 32% | 31 | 6,000 | 65% | \$24,563 |
| 304 | 43605 | Toledo, OH | 45% | 33% | 279 | 29,325 | 28% | \$26,066 |
| 305 | 20770 | Greenbelt, MD | 45% | 42% | 124 | 25,063 | 62% | \$64,427 |
| 306 | 12754 | Town of Liberty, NY | 45% | 46% | 51 | 7,595 | 24% | \$43,270 |
| 307 | 32908 | Palm Bay, FL | 45% | 51% | 304 | 10,905 | 32% | \$43,618 |
| 308 | 53143 | Kenosha, WI | 45% | 28% | 277 | 22,590 | 29% | \$45,417 |
| 309 | 20784 | New Carrollton, MD | 45% | 46% | 222 | 26,101 | 87% | \$58,852 |
| 310 | 93210 | Coalinga, CA | 45% | 45% | 73 | 18,708 | 65% | \$45,976 |
| 311 | 30180 | Villa Rica, GA | 45% | 25% | 402 | 30,959 | 27% | \$58,750 |
| 312 | 85635 | Sierra Vista, AZ | 45% | 30% | 175 | 35,023 | 28% | \$51,740 |
| 313 | 02903 | Providence, RI | 45% | 39% | 18 | 9,859 | 28% | \$22,964 |
| 314 | 32065 | Orange Park, FL | 45% | 33% | 552 | 33,712 | 24% | \$63,052 |
| 315 | 92227 | Brawley, CA | 45% | 52% | 101 | 26,053 | 83% | \$37,198 |
| 316 | 60425 | Glenwood, IL | 45% | 35% | 190 | 9,083 | 72% | \$60,081 |
| 317 | 32818 | Pine Hills, FL | 45% | 52% | 682 | 45,899 | 75% | \$44,985 |
| 318 | 07504 | Paterson, NJ | 45% | 42% | 89 | 12,875 | 95% | \$44,279 |
| 319 | 08015 | Browns Mills, NJ | 45% | 30% | 186 | 20,736 | 32% | \$66,788 |
| 320 | 60415 | Chicago Ridge, IL | 45% | 42% | 206 | 14,310 | 20% | \$48,983 |
| 321 | 48043 | Mount Clemens, MI | 45% | 49% | 112 | 14,801 | 27% | \$33,258 |
| 322 | 48075 | Southfield, MI | 45% | 49% | 168 | 21,852 | 77% | \$58,542 |
| 323 | 30087 | Stone Mountain, GA | 45% | 33% | 433 | 36,753 | 70% | \$70,927 |
| 324 | 76549 | Killeen, TX | 45% | 20% | 282 | 40,061 | 56% | \$51,010 |

395 ZIP Codes with the Highest Incidence of Negative Equity (cont.)

| Rank | ZIP Code | City/State | Percent of Homes Underwater | Percent Below Peak Home Prices | Homes In Default or Foreclosure | Population | Percent African American and Latino | Median Household Income |
|------|----------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|---|-------------------------------|
| 325 | 44052 | Lorain, OH | 45% | 30% | 276 | 30,901 | 45% | \$33,655 |
| 326 | 21213 | Baltimore, MD | 45% | 16% | 539 | 31,067 | 91% | \$34,584 |
| 327 | 45426 | Trotwood, OH | 45% | 35% | 173 | 15,366 | 75% | \$39,908 |
| 328 | 33319 | Lauderhill, FL | 45% | 57% | 1190 | 45,392 | 67% | \$38,935 |
| 329 | 34947 | Fort Pierce, FL | 45% | 67% | 114 | 12,732 | 79% | \$33,010 |
| 330 | 06105 | Hartford, CT | 45% | 31% | 77 | 20,583 | 67% | \$28,707 |
| 331 | 64129 | Kansas City, MO | 45% | 19% | 65 | 9,707 | 56% | \$32,954 |
| 332 | 64128 | Kansas City, MO | 45% | 36% | 71 | 11,878 | 95% | \$23,213 |
| 333 | 60652 | Chicago, IL | 45% | 39% | 691 | 42,334 | 82% | \$64,284 |
| 334 | 85653 | Marana, AZ | 44% | 35% | 191 | 14,353 | 36% | \$51,272 |
| 335 | 60042 | Island Lake, IL | 44% | 38% | 153 | 8,719 | 15% | \$67,944 |
| 336 | 07063 | Plainfield, NJ | 44% | 41% | 126 | 14,693 | 80% | \$63,707 |
| 337 | 45403 | Dayton, OH | 44% | 35% | 155 | 15,236 | 22% | \$24,803 |
| 338 | 45410 | Dayton, OH | 44% | 30% | 168 | 15,851 | 13% | \$33,747 |
| 339 | 60140 | Hampshire, IL | 44% | 30% | 243 | 14,830 | 16% | \$78,547 |
| 340 | 33880 | Winter Haven, FL | 44% | 50% | 393 | 36,127 | 34% | \$40,015 |
| 341 | 85706 | Tucson, AZ | 44% | 43% | 277 | 57,076 | 85% | \$29,556 |
| 342 | 93268 | Taft, CA | 44% | 41% | 98 | 18,924 | 33% | \$41,598 |
| 343 | 63042 | Hazelwood, MO | 44% | 37% | 137 | 19,008 | 37% | \$43,276 |
| 344 | 20716 | Bowie, MD | 44% | 33% | 170 | 20,400 | 65% | \$94,476 |
| 345 | 06610 | Bridgeport, CT | 44% | 41% | 313 | 22,780 | 77% | \$39,267 |
| 346 | 30223 | Griffin, GA | 44% | 39% | 298 | 35,539 | 42% | \$37,704 |
| 347 | 33127 | Miami, FL | 44% | 62% | 409 | 31,810 | 96% | \$25,913 |
| 348 | 28216 | Charlotte, NC | 44% | 22% | 561 | 46,880 | 68% | \$47,953 |
| 349 | 92356 | Lucerne Valley, CA | 44% | 56% | 61 | 7,174 | 37% | \$27,137 |
| 350 | 28326 | Sanford, NC | 44% | 5% | 34 | 17,199 | 35% | \$42,272 |
| 351 | 61101 | Rockford, IL | 44% | 59% | 292 | 23,425 | 54% | \$28,560 |
| 352 | 30046 | Lawrenceville, GA | 44% | 33% | 156 | 34,482 | 54% | \$50,250 |
| 353 | 96130 | Susanville, CA | 44% | 43% | 159 | 22,769 | 26% | \$53,684 |
| 354 | 33461 | Palm Springs, FL | 44% | 63% | 648 | 40,192 | 63% | \$36,169 |
| 355 | 43203 | Columbus, OH | 44% | 33% | 82 | 8,058 | 82% | \$18,129 |
| 356 | 48216 | Detroit, MI | 44% | N/A | 18 | 5,190 | 76% | \$23,691 |
| 357 | 18210 | Penn Forest Township, PA | 44% | 29% | 108 | 7,044 | 21% | \$57,405 |
| 358 | 18302 | Middle Smithfield Township, PA | 44% | 41% | 159 | 17,667 | 34% | \$61,151 |
| 359 | 60629 | Chicago, IL | 44% | 46% | 1349 | 113,864 | 89% | \$41,982 |
| 360 | 07522 | Paterson, NJ | 44% | 44% | 133 | 20,212 | 91% | \$31,388 |

| Rank | ZIP Code | City/State | Percent of Homes Underwater | Percent Below Peak Home Prices | Homes In Default or Foreclosure | Population | Percent African American and Latino | Median Household Income |
|------|----------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 361 | 98402 | Tacoma, WA | 44% | 32% | 39 | 6,247 | 25% | \$26,338 |
| 362 | 08861 | Perth Amboy, NJ | 44% | 39% | 262 | 52,615 | 84% | \$48,477 |
| 363 | 06604 | Bridgeport, CT | 44% | 43% | 265 | 27,288 | 67% | \$34,475 |
| 364 | 43608 | Toledo, OH | 44% | 26% | 200 | 17,222 | 66% | \$23,718 |
| 365 | 62205 | East Saint Louis, IL | 44% | 34% | 25 | 9,060 | 98% | \$21,687 |
| 366 | 02907 | Providence, RI | 44% | 47% | 146 | 27,630 | 79% | \$33,067 |
| 367 | 32738 | Deltona, FL | 44% | 53% | 840 | 43,491 | 40% | \$55,098 |
| 368 | 48217 | Detroit, MI | 44% | 42% | 55 | 8,873 | 93% | \$29,426 |
| 369 | 60163 | Berkeley, IL | 44% | 44% | 93 | 5,176 | 59% | \$57,465 |
| 370 | 89142 | Las Vegas, NV | 44% | 57% | 395 | 30,863 | 52% | \$56,951 |
| 371 | 89169 | Las Vegas, NV | 44% | N/A | 170 | 24,200 | 58% | \$33,768 |
| 372 | 60632 | Chicago, IL | 44% | 45% | 663 | 87,144 | 84% | \$41,859 |
| 373 | 48076 | Southfield, MI | 44% | 41% | 203 | 25,268 | 58% | \$66,751 |
| 374 | 21017 | Belcamp, MD | 44% | 23% | 59 | 7,311 | 27% | \$81,100 |
| 375 | 60430 | Homewood, IL | 44% | 35% | 317 | 20,137 | 43% | \$69,579 |
| 376 | 60501 | Summit, IL | 44% | 54% | 132 | 11,501 | 74% | \$46,914 |
| 377 | 53206 | Milwaukee, WI | 44% | 25% | 189 | 29,193 | 96% | \$23,121 |
| 378 | 61103 | Rockford, IL | 43% | 41% | 357 | 24,995 | 34% | \$38,337 |
| 379 | 02863 | Central Falls, RI | 43% | 43% | 37 | 19,331 | 73% | \$32,509 |
| 380 | 93250 | Mc Farland, CA | 43% | 45% | 31 | 13,748 | 91% | \$36,211 |
| 381 | 60446 | Romeoville, IL | 43% | 30% | 729 | 38,271 | 42% | \$67,351 |
| 382 | 20607 | Accokeek, MD | 43% | 36% | 106 | 8,733 | 70% | \$118,022 |
| 383 | 32226 | Jacksonville, FL | 43% | 34% | 311 | 14,794 | 18% | \$74,686 |
| 384 | 18301 | Stroud Township, PA | 43% | 40% | 191 | 28,495 | 31% | \$59,265 |
| 385 | 48203 | Detroit, MI | 43% | 65% | 133 | 29,687 | 92% | \$22,753 |
| 386 | 85602 | Benson, AZ | 43% | 28% | 68 | 9,001 | 17% | \$40,898 |
| 387 | 63034 | Spanish Lake, MO | 43% | 35% | 150 | 18,562 | 57% | \$72,630 |
| 388 | 30141 | Hiram, GA | 43% | 24% | 189 | 22,192 | 23% | \$56,814 |
| 389 | 32725 | Deltona, FL | 43% | 54% | 813 | 44,502 | 40% | \$46,822 |
| 390 | 83647 | Mountain Home, ID | 43% | N/A | 33 | 19,780 | 18% | \$47,119 |
| 391 | 85017 | Phoenix, AZ | 43% | N/A | 166 | 42,017 | 73% | \$30,185 |
| 392 | 60083 | Wadsworth, IL | 43% | 33% | 121 | 8,593 | 19% | \$99,269 |
| 393 | 28460 | North Topsail Beach, NC | 43% | 22% | 62 | 7,874 | 4% | \$48,826 |
| 394 | 45204 | Cincinnati, OH | 43% | 30% | 60 | 6,083 | 37% | \$29,428 |
| 395 | 43205 | Columbus, OH | 43% | 37% | 146 | 12,017 | 74% | \$22,790 |

A NOTE ON DATA SOURCES

The data in this report on underwater homes and home prices is based on Zillow's Negative Equity Report for the end of 2013 (Gudell 2014). Zillow only reports data for ZIP codes for which it has a representative sample of homes, so its data set covers roughly 22,000 ZIP codes nationally. There are approximately 30,000 total ZIP codes in the country, excluding P.O. Box ZIP codes. The Zillow data can be accessed through this website: <http://www.zillow.com/research/2013-q4-negative-equity-6371>.

The default and foreclosure data in this report was prepared by Americans for Financial Reform and is based on proprietary data from RealtyTrac's 2013 Foreclosure Market Trend Report. It includes the total number of unique properties that received a notice of default, lis pendens, notice of trustee sale, or a notice of foreclosure sale in 2013, or that became a real-estate owned property following foreclosure. These are all different types of foreclosure filings. Because ZIP code boundaries are not always fully aligned with city limits, the statistics for the number of homes in default of foreclosure at the city level should be treated as estimates rather than precise figures.

The demographic data is from the Census Bureau's 2012 American Community Survey Five-Year Demographic and Housing Estimates. Because of the way that the Census Bureau defines race and ethnicity, individuals who are both African American and Latino may have been counted twice.

REFERENCES

- Ards, Sheila D. and Samuel L. Myers Jr. 2001. "The Color of Money: Bad Credit, Wealth, and Race." *American Behavioral Scientist*, 45(2), pp.223-239.
- Avery, Robert B., Kenneth P. Brevoort, and Glenn B. Canner. 2007. "The 2006 HMDA Data," *Federal Reserve Bulletin*. 93 (December) 73-109.
- Blinder, Alan S. 2013. *After the Music Stopped: The Financial Crisis, the Response, and the Work Ahead*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. *Financial Accounts of the United States, Historical Annual Tables, 2005-2013, Table B100: Balance Sheet of Households and Nonprofit Organizations*. <http://www.federalreserve.gov/releases/z1/Curent/annuals/a2005-2013.pdf>
- Bocian, Debbie, Wei Li, and Keith S. Ernst. 2010. "Foreclosures by Race and Ethnicity: The Demographics of a Crisis." Center for Responsible Lending, June 18. <http://www.responsiblelending.org/mortgage-lending/research-analysis/foreclosures-by-race-and-ethnicity.html>
- Bocian, Debbie, Delvin Davis, Sonia Garrison, and Bill Sermons. 2012. "The State of Lending in America & its Impact on U.S. Households." Center for Responsible Lending. December 13. <http://www.responsiblelending.org/state-of-lending>
- Carr, James H. and Isaac F. Megbolugbe. 1993. "The Federal Reserve Bank of Boston Study on Mortgage Lending Revisited." *Journal of Housing Research*, 4(2), pp.277-313.
- Clear Capital. 2014. "Does Slow and Steady Win the Race? The Tale of the Housing Recovery Continues." January 6. <http://www.clearcapital.com/company/MarketReport.cfm?month=January&year=2014>
- Ellen, Ingrid and Samuel Dastrup. 2012. *Housing and the Great Recession*, New York and Palo Alto: The Russell Sage Foundation and the Stanford Center on Poverty and Inequality. October.
- Emmons, William R. and Bryan J. Noeth. 2012. "Household Financial Stability: Who Suffered the Most from the Crisis?" *The Regional Economist*, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. July.
- Esswein, Pat Mertz. 2014. "Housing Outlook, 2014," *Kiplinger's Personal Finance*, January. <http://www.kiplinger.com/article/real-estate/T010-C000-S002-housing-outlook-2014.html#HkMsFD0skYA5gjK2.99>
- Federal Reserve System. 2012. "The U.S. Housing Market: Current Conditions and Policy Considerations." <http://federalreserve.gov/publications/other-reports/files/housing-white-paper-20120104.pdf> (last accessed June 4, 2013).
- Gelinas, Nicole. 2011. "A free-market fix to the nation's housing hangover," *Los Angeles Times*, July 31. <http://articles.latimes.com/2011/jul/31/opinion/la-oe-gelinas-foreclosure-california-20110731/2>
- Gopal, Prashant. 2013. "Mortgage Delinquencies Reach 5-Year Low as Housing Heals," *Bloomberg*. Nov. 7. <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-11-07/mortgage-delinquencies-reach-5-year-low-as-housing-heals.html>
- Gottesdiener, Laura. 2013. "The Next Big Housing Bubble?" *Utne Reader* (November 27) <http://www.utne.com/politics/the-next-big-housing-bubble.aspx#ixzz2nGvNhSZe>
- Gittelsohn, John and Heather Perlberg. 2013. "Blackstone Buys Atlanta Homes in Largest Rental Trade," *Bloomberg News* (April 25) <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-04-25/blackstone-buys-atlanta-homes-in-largest-bulk-rental-trade.html>
- Gudell, Svenja. 2014. "Negative Equity Crosses 20 Percent Threshold to End 2013." *Zillow Real Estate Research*. February 27. <http://www.zillow.com/research/2013-q4-negative-equity-6371>

Hockett, Robert. 2013. "Paying Paul and Robbing No One: An Eminent Domain Solution for Underwater Mortgage Debt," *Current Issues in Economics and Finance*. 19 (5). www.newyorkfed.org/research/current_issues.

Joint Center for Housing Studies. 2013. "The State of the Nation's Housing 2013," Cambridge: Harvard University.

Kochhar, Rakesh, [Ana Gonzalez-Barera](#), and [Daniel Dockterman](#). 2009. "Loans for Home Purchase in 2007." Washington, DC: Pew Research Center, May 12. <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2009/05/12/iv-loans-for-home-purchase-in-2007>

Kochhar, Rakesh, Richard Fry, and Paul Taylor. 2011. "Twenty-to-One: Wealth Gaps Rise to Record Highs Between Whites, Blacks and Hispanics." Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.

Leopold, Les. 2013a. "Our Most Powerful Weapon Against Wall Street? The Rise of Reverse Eminent Domain." *Alternet*. <http://www.alternet.org/economy/our-most-powerful-weapon-against-wall-street-rise-reverse-eminant-domain> (last accessed January 10, 2014).

Leopold, Les. 2013b. "Why Is Socialism Doing So Darn Well In Deep-Red North Dakota?" *Alternet*. http://www.alternet.org/corporate-accountability-and-workplace/why-socialism-doing-so-darn-well-deep-red-north-dakota?paging=off¤t_page=1#bookmark (last accessed

January 10, 2014).

Munnell, Alicia, Geoffrey M. B. Tootell, Lynne E. Browne, and James McEneaney. (1996), "Mortgage Lending in Boston: Interpreting the HMDA Data." *American Economic Review*, 86(1), pp.25-53.

Ocwen Financial. 2011. *Curing Underwater Mortgages, Preventing Foreclosures and Avoiding Moral Hazard through Principal Reduction, Shared Appreciation Modifications*. http://www.frbatlanta.org/documents/news/conferences/11rer/11rer_nesmith.pdf

Orton, Kathy. 2013. "Mortgage-assistance events not a cure-all for homeowners facing foreclosure," *The New York Times* (December 30): A 9.

Pfeffer, Fabian T., Sheldon Danziger, and Robert F. Schoeni. 2013. "Wealth Disparities before and after the Great Recession." Ann Arbor: University of Michigan. August.

Popper, Nathaniel. 2013. "Behind the Rise in House Prices, Wall Street Buyers," *The New York Times* (June 3) <http://dealbook.nytimes.com/2013/06/03/behind-the-rise-in-house-prices-wall-street-buyers/> (last accessed January 10, 2014).

Raskin, Sarah Bloom. 2013. "Aspects of Inequality in the Recent Business Cycle," speech delivered at the "Building a Financial Structure for a More Stable and Equitable Economy," 22nd Annual Hyman P. Minsky Conference on the State of the U.S. and World Economies, New York, N.Y. April 18. <http://www.federalreserve.gov/newsevents/speech/raskin20130418a.htm>

(last accessed April 23, 2013).

Reid, Carolina and Elizabeth Laderman. 2009. "The Untold Costs of Subprime Lending: Examining the Links among Higher Priced Lending, Foreclosures and Race in California." San Francisco: Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco. November. <http://www.frbsf.org/community-development/files/wp2009-09.pdf>

Relman, John. 2013. "Finding a Home for the Occupy Movement: Lessons from the Baltimore and Memphis Wells Fargo Litigation," in Chester Hartman and Gregory D. Squires (ed) 2013. *From Foreclosure to Fair Lending: Advocacy, Organizing, Occupy, and the Pursuit of Equitable Credit*. New York: New Village Press.

S&P/Case-Shiller Home Price Indexes. 2013. <http://us.spindices.com/index-family/real-estate/sp-case-shiller>

Saez, Emmanuel. 2013. *Striking it Richer: The Evolution of Top Incomes in the United States* (Updated with 2012 preliminary estimates). <http://elsa.berkeley.edu/~saez/saez-US-topincomes-2012.pdf>

Schmit, Julie. 2013. "Rising home prices rescue underwater homeowners," *USA Today*. (June 12, 2013.). <http://www.usatoday.com/story/money/business/2013/06/12/underwater-borrowers-lessen-home-prices-rise/2412847>

Silver-Greenberg, Jessica and Peter Eavis. 2014. "Wall Street Predicts \$50 Billion Bill to Settle U.S. Mortgage Suits," *The New York Times*. (January 10, 2014). A1, B6.

Smith, Marvin and Christy Hevener. 2010. "Subprime lending over time: the role of race." Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia. October <http://www.phil.frb.org/community-development/publications/discussion-papers/subprime-lending-over-time-the-role-of-race.pdf>

Tippett, Rebecca, Avis Jones-DeWeever, Maya Rockeymore, Darrick Hamilton, and William Darity Jr. 2014. *Beyond Broke: Why Closing the Racial Wealth Gap is a Priority for National Economic Security*. Executive Summary. Center for Global Policy Solutions http://globalpolicysolutions.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/BeyondBroke_Exec_Summary.pdf

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. 2013. *Worst-Case Housing Needs 2011: Report to Congress*. http://www.huduser.org/Publications/pdf/HUD-506_Worst-Case2011_reportv3.pdf

U.S. Department of Justice. 2012. *Justice Department Reaches Settlement with Wells Fargo Resulting in More Than \$175 Million in Relief for Homeowners to Resolve Fair Lending Claims*, press release, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice July 12.

Woodstock Institute. 2012. *Struggling to Stay Afloat: Negative Equity in Communities of Color in the Chicago Six County Region*. http://www.woodstockinst.org/sites/default/files/documents/stayingafloat_policy-brief_mar2012_0.pdf





haas institute
FOR A FAIR AND INCLUSIVE SOCIETY

Haas Institute for a Fair and Inclusive Society
University of California, Berkeley
<http://diversity.berkeley.edu/haas-institute>
facebook.com/haas-institute
twitter.com/HaasInstitute

UNDERWATER AMERICA

This report examines national trends that are leaving many families behind and identifies the most troubled geographic “**hot spots**”—metro areas, cities, and neighborhoods in all regions of the country—where a significant portion of families are “**underwater.**”