LOCAL SOLUTIONS, LASTING CHANGE:
The Greater Cleveland Residential Housing and Mortgage Credit Project
The Federal Reserve System is responsible for formulating and implementing U.S. monetary policy. It also supervises banks and bank holding companies, and provides financial services to depository institutions and the federal government.

The Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland is one of twelve regional Reserve Banks in the United States that, together with the Board of Governors in Washington, D.C., comprise the Federal Reserve System.

The Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland, including its branch offices in Cincinnati and Pittsburgh and its check processing center in Columbus, serves the Fourth Federal Reserve District. The Fourth District includes Ohio, western Pennsylvania, the northern panhandle of West Virginia, and eastern Kentucky.

It is the policy of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland to provide equal employment opportunities for qualified persons regardless of race, creed, color, national origin, age, gender, or disability.

The brick home pictured on the cover, located in Cleveland's Hough neighborhood, was the subject of an appraisal test project that illustrated the potentially discriminatory practices that can occur in mortgage lending. If we are to revitalize our distressed communities, we must ensure fair and equal access to home mortgage credit. To that end, a group of Cleveland-area housing, real estate, and lending professionals participated in the Greater Cleveland Residential Housing and Mortgage Credit Project, a community-based effort to eliminate discrimination and disparate treatment in the home buying process. Concluded in April 1997, the Cleveland project is being modeled in cities across the nation.
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With passage of the landmark Community Reinvestment and Home Mortgage Disclosure Acts in the 1970s, Congress called on financial institutions to identify and meet the credit needs of their local communities, including low- and moderate-income neighborhoods.

We've learned since then that the economic problems of our depressed inner-city communities cannot be solved by the lending institutions alone. If banks are to contribute fully to the economic development and revitalization of neighborhoods, they must be joined by nonbank institutions, governmental entities, local businesses, and community leaders.

Clearly, the most viable and lasting solutions to stemming the blight of inner-city neighborhoods will come from those closest to the problem. We must trust and encourage people in the states, cities, and communities across the nation to explore opportunities to improve local conditions. Recent trends have led to partnerships in which nonprofit agencies and local governments team up with for-profit banks and developers not merely in a spirit of altruism, but to create lasting change through mutual self-interest.

Federal Reserve Banks are in a strong position to facilitate community-based partnerships through their involvement with banking and civic organizations. Reserve Banks evaluate commercial banks’ fair lending performance, support the activities of community affairs and economic development professionals, and directly partner with local banks and community-based organizations to improve neighborhood economic conditions.

The Greater Cleveland Residential Housing and Mortgage Credit Project, the subject of this year’s annual report essay, is a fine example of the Federal Reserve’s ability to build alliances among diverse constituencies.
A. William Reynolds, chairman; Jerry L. Jordan, president; Sandra Pianalto, first vice president; and G. Watts Humphrey, Jr., deputy chairman.
Like many good ideas, the “Cleveland project”—designed to ensure equal access to credit in the home buying process—started from a conversation between two individuals from different organizations but with a common goal in mind. From there, it blossomed into a successful partnership among the Cuyahoga County Department of Development, the Greater Cleveland Roundtable, the Ohio Civil Rights Commission, and the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland. Bringing together 140 representatives from the real estate, housing, and lending industries, the Cleveland project inspired candid dialogue about discrimination in the home buying process.

Those who conceived the Cleveland project realized that such a large gathering of racially and functionally diverse participants could engender vigorous, possibly discordant, debate about unequal treatment and access to credit. But it seemed to us that the process of well-intentioned people coming together could ultimately inspire tangible strategies for addressing the daunting problems of discrimination and disparate treatment in the mortgage lending and housing markets.

The Cleveland project did indeed generate numerous practical recommendations. To all those who participated, we thank you for your commitment and energy. As a result of your efforts, we have taken an important step toward improving the fairness of the lending process and the prosperity of our community. The project has also served as a model for programs in Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky and in five other Reserve Bank cities. We like to think of this groundbreaking effort as creating local solutions to effect lasting change, and we’re proud to highlight its history in the 1996 annual report essay.

In performing our central banking functions and providing financial services, the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland is guided by our 23 directors, to whom we extend our deepest gratitude. Our directors represent a variety of banking, business, labor, and consumer interests from throughout the District. Their valuable and dedicated service and guidance, as well as that of our Community Bank and Business Advisory Councils, are very much appreciated.

We are especially grateful for the leadership of A. William Reynolds, chief executive of Old Mill Group, who served as chairman of our Board of Directors from 1993 until his retirement at the end of 1996. Bill, who joined the Board in 1991, made far-reaching contributions to the Bank and leaves us in a stronger position to meet the challenges of the
future. We are indebted to him for his wise counsel, leadership, and dedication. G. Watts Humphrey, Jr., president of GWH Holdings, Inc., and a member of our Board since 1993, has been appointed chairman.

We also extend special thanks to those directors who have completed their terms of service on our Boards: Alfred C. Leist (chairman, president, and chief executive officer of The Apple Creek Banking Company) and Thomas M. Nies (president of Cincom Systems, Inc.), who served on our Cleveland Board; John N. Taylor, Jr. (chairman and chief executive officer of Kurz-Kasch, Inc.), who served as chairman of our Cincinnati Board; and Randall L.C. Russell (president and chief executive officer of Ranbar Technology, Inc.), Wesley W. von Schack (former chairman, president, and chief executive officer of DQE), and Sandra L. Phillips (former executive director of the Pittsburgh Partnership for Neighborhood Development), who served on our Pittsburgh Board.

The insight and dedication of our member of the Federal Advisory Council, Frank V. Cahouet (chairman, president, and chief executive officer of Mellon Bank Corporation and Mellon Bank, N.A.), will also be missed. Frank represented the Fourth District on the Advisory Council since 1994. Our directors have chosen Robert W. Gillespie (chairman, president, and chief executive officer of KeyCorp) to represent the District during 1997.

The officers and staff of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland worked together to realize many accomplishments and innovations over the past year (outlined in the “Operational Highlights” section on pages 26-27). None of these achievements would have been possible without their energy, creativity, and commitment. I wish to extend my personal gratitude to all employees of this Bank for making 1996 a successful year.

Sincerely,

Jerry L. Jordan
President
In late 1993, the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland joined with the Greater Cleveland Roundtable, the Cuyahoga County Department of Development, and the Ohio Civil Rights Commission in a groundbreaking effort to identify and eliminate potentially discriminatory practices in the home buying process.

Known as the Greater Cleveland Residential Housing and Mortgage Credit Project, the three-year effort involved nearly 140 representatives of various home buying industries, including real estate firms, lending institutions, appraisal companies, credit bureaus, and property and mortgage insurance firms.
While discrimination against minority mortgage loan applicants is clearly a national issue, the initiators of the Cleveland project shared the belief that America's best prospect of eliminating discrimination lies in the development of local solutions.

By bringing together a group of multidisciplinary, racially diverse professionals, the project's planners hoped to spark an open discussion that would spawn action steps for eliminating discrimination—whether inadvertent or intentional—in all phases of home purchasing. The project, through its seven task groups, produced 29 practical recommendations and strategies for combating potentially discriminatory actions. The Cleveland project's most enduring achievement, however, may have been its success in fostering ongoing dialogue among its various and disparate constituencies.

As the project participants searched for solutions to the complex issue of discrimination, they occasionally found themselves in seemingly unresolvable conflict. At those times, the Cleveland Fed, positioning itself as a facilitator, was called upon to restore a positive, constructive atmosphere.

Jerry L. Jordan, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland, explained that the Bank served as a catalyst for action. "In no way were we an architect or engineer of the project. We didn't dictate the solutions. But we felt that our public/private role made it incumbent upon us to be part of the search for solutions. In a sense, we were like a gardener. We could prepare the soil, we could make sure there was adequate moisture, we could try to keep the crows out of the cornfield, but we couldn't guarantee anything else. Beyond that, nature had to take its course."

Formally concluded in April 1997, the Greater Cleveland Residential Housing and Mortgage Credit Project has earned widespread national recognition. Malcolm Bush, president of the Chicago-based Woodstock Institute, a nonprofit group that promotes economic development in low-income communities, has called the Cleveland project "a major achievement in promoting debate and action about disparate treatment in the housing market." According to Bush, the project was unique because "It was the first time, in the absence of racial strife in the community, that the civic leadership of a major city decided to tackle the problems of discrimination. There are very few examples of such intensive voluntary debate in American civic life."

This essay examines the genesis, process, and outcomes of the Greater Cleveland Residential Housing and Mortgage Credit Project, a community-based approach to achieving equality and fairness throughout the home buying process.
Equal access to home mortgage credit is a fundamental economic goal in the United States. The proper flow of housing credit contributes significantly to the social and economic vitality of individual communities and to the health of the country’s economy.

Historically, the primary capital asset for most people has been the equity in their homes, which can be used to finance children’s college tuitions, fund retirements, and start businesses. In fact, the leading source of business start-up capital is loans against primary residences. Fair and equal treatment of all mortgage loan applicants is a precondition for a well-functioning marketplace. Lending bias, while patently unfair to individuals, is harmful in a much larger sense in that discrimination precludes a portion of our society from accumulating wealth in the form of home equity, thus hindering potential growth of our economy.

The presence of disparity in mortgage lending patterns has been documented in data made available through the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act. Recent data show that in 1995, 40.5 percent of all black and 29.5 percent of all Hispanic mortgage applicants were denied loans, compared with 20.6 percent of whites. And, in a 1992 study, the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston found that black and Hispanic applicants in the Boston area were more than 50 percent more likely to be denied a mortgage loan than whites, even if the minority applicants had the same income, wealth, and credit histories.

The controversial findings of the Boston study inspired housing advocates across the nation to call for similar studies in their cities. In Cleveland, representatives of the Greater Cleveland Roundtable and the Cuyahoga County Department of Development approached Donna Cotton, a community affairs director at the Cleveland Fed, about partnering with the Bank to replicate the Boston study.

Jerry Jordan, however, was not certain that replicating the Boston study in Cleveland would be particularly useful. “Many people, especially neighborhood and community groups, were saying that we needed to have a Cleveland study,” Jordan recalled. “But we didn’t need any more Boston-type studies. We needed action. It was obvious we had similar issues to address in Cleveland. I didn’t want our economists to go out and spend a lot of time collecting and torturing data. All that would do is shift the focus from the real issue and delay the resolution of our problems. Rather than commission a similar study, I believed it made more sense to move forward and develop methods of identifying and eliminating discriminatory practices in our community.”

Bolstered by Jordan’s pledge of support, the Cleveland project’s four sponsors came together in a unique alliance of free-market advocacy, corporate civic responsibility, and community activism.
In designing the Cleveland project, the sponsors recognized that there are numerous steps in the process of buying a house, and that discrimination at any step of the process could negatively impact a loan request. The project leaders, therefore, decided to address all aspects of the home buying process, not just the mortgage loan origination.

“One of the problems of the discrimination issue is that there are a lot of players in the home purchase process besides the lenders,” said Andrew “Bud” Burkle, Jr., a vice president at the Cleveland Fed. Burkle, who managed the Bank’s community affairs function when the Cleveland project was conceived, noted, “Since banks are highly regulated, they most often get the blame for discrimination.”

**REGULATORY FRAMEWORK** While many industries are involved in the purchase of a home, only lending institutions are overseen by federal regulators. During the 1970s, housing policy advocates became concerned that mortgage lenders were not adequately serving all segments of their markets. Addressing this problem, Congress passed the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) in 1975, which requires certain lenders to report, census tract by census tract, the number and dollar value of home loans they make in their communities each year.

Legislators next enacted the Community Reinvestment Act of 1977 (CRA), which encourages banks, through regulation, to meet “the credit needs of their entire community, including low- and moderate-income neighborhoods.”

In 1989, HMDA was amended to require certain urban-based lenders to collect and report loan applicants’ annual income, loan amount requested, gender, race, and census tract of the desired property. This expanded information is used to prepare public disclosure reports and to monitor lenders for compliance with both CRA and fair lending laws.

While annual HMDA data routinely show disparities in mortgage lending to minority neighborhoods versus white neighborhoods, HMDA data alone are inadequate to draw any meaningful conclusions about the presence of discrimination in the mortgage markets. Nevertheless, banks are often targets of criticism by community activists, who argue that HMDA data are evidence that banks neglect minority neighborhoods. In response, banking defenders attribute disparities in credit flows to differences in applicants’ creditworthiness.
SECURING PARTICIPATION To attract the participation of lenders, as well as other industry professionals who might be especially sensitive to criticism, the sponsors resolved to maintain a nonjudgmental atmosphere throughout the project. “One of the project’s key elements was that we were going to concentrate on solving issues, instead of placing blame and pointing fingers at individual industries or entities,” said Burkle. “We couldn’t let it turn into a blame process. It had to be an improvement opportunity where everybody would win. If we got into shouting matches or finger-pointing, people would have walked away from the table.”

One lending professional, David Fynn, of National City Bank, commended the project organizers for their astute assessment of lenders’ sensitivity to criticism. “We wouldn’t have participated if we thought that we were going to be backed into a corner,” stated Fynn. “Discrimination is a complex issue involving various industries. It’s a problem that banks can’t solve by themselves. The organizers had exactly the right idea in inviting a wide range of industry representatives.”

For assistance in garnering broad-based participation, the project’s planning committee turned to the chief executive officers of Cleveland-area banks, real estate firms, mortgage companies, and other home-buying-affiliated industries. “From our standpoint, it was important to get the senior-level executives on board, because that would send an encouraging signal down through the rank and file,” said Melvin Pye, Jr., who was the executive director of the Greater Cleveland Roundtable during the Cleveland project.

Barbara Grothe, Greater Cleveland Roundtable program manager, organized a breakfast meeting for 65 Cleveland-area CEOs. At the meeting, which was led by Lyman Phillips (at the time, chair of the Roundtable’s race relations committee), project planners explained the economic merits of addressing bias in mortgage lending. “We needed to sell the goals of the project in a pro-business light,” said Grothe. “We made a strong case that reducing discrimination would free up the marketplace, thus creating more opportunities and business for everybody.”

However, the commitment of business leaders was not finalized until the planning committee agreed to eschew publicizing the Cleveland project during its early phases. “There was a concern among the business sector that informing the media could have been risky,” said Burkle. “If we went out and tooted our own horn, the community might view the project as a self-promoting sham, and it would die a quick death from the resulting skepticism.”
Cleveland Project Principals

Mary Davis, fair housing officer, Cuyahoga County Department of Development;
Barbara Grothe, program manager, Greater Cleveland Roundtable;
Francis Smith, executive director, Ohio Civil Rights Commission;
Andrew "Bud" Burkle, Jr., vice president, Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland.

Robert Morgan, Real Estate and Property Insurance Task Groups;
Rosita Motton, Property Insurance Task Group;
Rick Edlund, Planning Committee and Appraisal and Lender Task Groups.
Anda Cook, Private Mortgage Insurance Task Group;
David Fynn, Planning Committee and Real Estate and Credit Bureau Task Groups;
Tony Willis, Appraisal Task Group.

Lionel Lewis, Planning Committee and Private Mortgage Insurance and Real Estate Task Groups;
Marie Gerace, Lender Task Group.
— THE PROCESS —

By design, the Cleveland project had three phases. The initial phase began in October 1993 with a two-day conference facilitated by Malcolm Bush and attended by nearly 100 representatives of housing-related industries. During the conference, attendees—through plenary sessions and breakout groups—discussed likely areas of discrimination throughout the home buying process. Participants then established task groups to examine potentially discriminatory business practices in the following four home buying steps: the home purchaser’s initial contact with the real estate agent; the home purchaser’s initial contact with the lender; the lending institutions’ interface with the secondary market; and the appraisal process.

Each task group was responsible for developing recommendations to reduce the occurrences of discrimination in its respective stage of the home buying process. The project’s first phase concluded in mid-1994 when the four task groups reported their findings and recommendations to the full group of participants.

In the project’s second phase, three additional task groups were formed. These groups developed strategies for eliminating potentially discriminatory business practices in the areas of property insurance, private mortgage insurance, and purchasers’ interaction with credit bureaus. Like the original four task groups, these groups comprised representatives from various housing-related industries, including the industry targeted for scrutiny.

In November 1995, after the second set of task groups released its strategies for eliminating discrimination, the project leaders reviewed the recommendations of the seven task groups and initiated the final phase of the project: the cross-industry adoption and implementation of the strategies.

TRUE COLORS On day one of the initial two-day conference in 1993, participants gathered to watch the video “True Colors,” a hidden-camera investigation of racial discrimination. Produced by the ABC newsmagazine Prime Time Live, “True Colors” tracks two young men—one white and one black—as they set out to establish themselves in St. Louis. The documentary reveals the vastly different treatment each received when applying for a job, buying a car, shopping in a mall, and renting an apartment.

The video’s unabashed portrayal of discrimination markedly altered the tone of the conference. “Before the presentation of ‘True Colors,’ participants were engaged mainly in small talk,” said Mary Davis, fair housing officer for the Cuyahoga County Department of Development. “After seeing the tape, people began to open up and share their thoughts about this sensitive issue.”

“...WE DIDN’T NEED ANY MORE BOSTON-TYPE STUDIES. WE NEEDED ACTION. IT WAS OBVIOUS WE HAD SIMILAR ISSUES TO ADDRESS IN CLEVELAND. RATHER THAN COMMISSION A SIMILAR STUDY, I BELIEVED IT MADE MORE SENSE TO MOVE FORWARD AND DEVELOP METHODS OF IDENTIFYING AND ELIMINATING DISCRIMINATORY PRACTICES IN OUR COMMUNITY.”

— Jerry Jordan, president, Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland
Marie Gerace, an account executive with Prospect Title Agency, added, “When the conference began, I suspected it was going to be just another boring two-day meeting. But after viewing the video, my attitude changed. As I looked around the auditorium, I saw that some people were shocked. The tape was very effective in showing that discrimination is often subtle. People rarely come right out and say, ‘I’m not going to rent to you because you’re black.’”

**Dialogue** After the video presentation, conference participants broke into multi-industry, racially diverse groups to discuss disparate treatment of minorities. “By showing ‘True Colors,’ we opened the door to a discussion of unfair treatment,” Burkle recalled. “The tape was a wake-up call. There was no longer a need to explain what the issues were.”

Although some individuals seemed unwilling to acknowledge the existence of unfair business practices, several black participants spoke openly about specific instances of racial discrimination. “Although I’ve experienced some discrimination as a woman in a corporate atmosphere,” said Gerace, “I was both surprised and sad to hear a black person say, ‘This is what happens all the time to me.’”

The openness and candor of the minority participants was crucial to the project’s success, noted Malcolm Bush. “Because the minorities spoke honestly about the issue of discrimination, the other participants, in turn, responded with openness and honesty. This was very important because it was the first time, that I was aware of, where different ethnic groups came together to discuss discriminatory actions in terms of their own behavior and their own business practices. In a sense, they were putting their bread and butter on the line.”

As Gerace listened to accounts of discrimination and disparate treatment, she began to understand that, “We all are guilty of discrimination. I used to think it was other people who discriminated, but now I realize that everyone does. Sometimes in the lending process, applicants are judged by their clothes or looks. A lot of discrimination is unintentional. If a lender is insensitive, then ‘business as usual’ could be discriminatory.”

On the second day of the conference, participants identified areas of the home buying process where discriminatory acts were most likely to occur. Typically, the purchase of a home involves the actions of about 20 allied industries. Because each of the industries has a role in gathering and sharing information with the others, discrimination and disparate treatment at any stage of the transaction can impact the outcome of the loan application. During their work sessions, participants considered potential areas of discrimination within their respective industries, as well as the consequences of discriminatory practices. After prioritizing the problem areas, participants selected seven of the areas for investigation by the task groups of phase 1 and phase 2.
THE APPRAISAL TASK GROUP Among the seven task groups, the Appraisal group members were especially successful at identifying potential areas of discrimination in their industry. When the group first met, several participants expressed uncertainty about the existence of discrimination in the appraisal process. To address this issue, the members decided to conduct a test project to determine if properties in low-income neighborhoods were appraised accurately. Group members commissioned lending institutions to solicit four appraisals for a single-family house in Cleveland’s Hough neighborhood. The results of the test project were startling: The appraised value of the property ranged from $36,000 to $83,500.

“This experiment revealed that appraisers may make mistakes because of perceived notions and lack of knowledge about Cleveland's neighborhoods,” said Tony Willis, chair of the Appraisal task group. “Appraisers must be in touch with the neighborhoods they are appraising. The appraisers must also know which cycle a neighborhood is in. Vacant houses don’t necessarily mean that a neighborhood is in dire shape. Next month, those houses may be gone, and a community rehabilitation project may have begun.”

In Donna Cotton’s view, a fair and consistent appraisal process is a crucial element of wealth creation. “If I can get the true value for my home, then I can pass that value on to whoever may come after me. But if I can’t get a fair appraisal, then you have, in effect, taken away from my wealth.”

THE REAL ESTATE AGENT TASK GROUP Several Cleveland project leaders, when queried, said that their most difficult challenge—and most gratifying accomplishment—was facilitating discussions between feuding representatives of Cleveland’s minority and white real estate agencies.

There are two major associations of real estate professionals in the Cleveland area: The Cleveland Area Board of Realtors (CABOR), comprised mostly of white real estate agents, and the Cleveland Association of Real Estate Brokers (CAREB), which represents mainly minority agents. Historically, the two groups have maintained a discordant relationship. At the start of the Cleveland project, the members of CAREB (who are known as “realtists”) were involved in a lawsuit against CABOR over access to the Multiple Listing Service (MLS), which is controlled by CABOR and lists all properties currently for sale by members of the Board of Realtors. 

In conducting the test project, the task group selected a well-kept, newly renovated, single-family home in the Hough area of Cleveland’s East Side. Appraisers were not given a target housing value; however, they were informed that they were participating in a study.

The task group reported that the appraisals varied from $36,000 (originally $28,000 until a lender, in a phone conversation with the appraiser, expressed surprise at the low amount) to $83,500. The task group also found that the appraisers’ turnaround time was longer than average and, in one instance, the fee was considerably higher than the customary rate for nonurban appraisals.

In response to the task group’s findings, an appraiser subcommittee, led by Rick Edlund, developed an industry-wide continuing education program. “It’s important that appraisers be knowledgeable about the specific markets they are analyzing,” said Edlund. “The test project helped reinforce the reality that the urban markets are constantly changing. We need to update our neighborhood data continuously to understand the values within that submarket.”
The minority agents were displeased because, in order to receive the MLS, the CAREB members (who pay dues to that organization) also had to become dues-paying members of CABOR. (The two associations have since resolved their dispute, and the MLS is now available to members of CAREB.)

In addition to this conflict, the two groups clashed over the minority real estate agents' practice of pulling the credit reports of prospective home buyers before showing them properties. In discussions at the two-day conference, several nonminority real estate agents expressed their view that pulling a potential buyer's credit report at an early stage in the buying process was potentially discriminatory. The nonminority agents claimed that the practice could be used to identify and screen out financially undesirable house seekers. Minority agents, however, argued that they use the credit reports to provide credit counseling to prospective buyers who may have infrequent contact with lending institutions. Saying that their actions were being misconstrued as racist, the minority agents decided to boycott the task group sessions.

In response to the boycott, Bud Burkle, along with Mary Davis and Barbara Grothe, visited Robert Morgan, who was then president of CAREB. "Morgan felt that the nonminority agents were unfairly judging the African-American agents," explained Burkle. "I assured him that, 'If you come to the next task group meeting and anybody becomes accusatory or confrontational, I'll walk out of the meeting with you and we'll never go back.' Well, he and his group came back. And immediately, the meetings became extremely productive. He had a lot of experience with discriminatory issues, and I think he felt that the Cleveland project was a vehicle where he could finally express those frustrations."

"OUR GOAL, AS A COMMUNITY, IS TO MAKE MORTGAGE CREDIT AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING AVAILABLE TO ALL CREDITWORTHY INDIVIDUALS. THE CLEVELAND PROJECT, BY REDUCING DISCRIMINATORY PRACTICES IN THE HOME BUYING PROCESS, WILL HELP US TO REACH THAT GOAL. IF AMERICA IS GOING TO LIVE UP TO ITS IDEALS AND ELIMINATE DISCRIMINATION, THEN WE WILL NEED MORE COMMUNITY-BASED EFFORTS SUCH AS THIS."
— Tim Hagan, Cuyahoga County Commissioner
When the Cleveland project was conceived in 1993, the sponsors realized that its success would require a concerted effort by the city’s private and public sectors. “Without this partnership, the Cleveland project could not have worked,” said Malcolm Bush. “One of the impressive things about the project was that the Cleveland Fed was in genuine participation with the Greater Cleveland Roundtable and Cuyahoga County. The Fed and the County brought the power of regulatory authorities, and the Roundtable brought the practice of activism. It was a very good combination. There was some good work done.”

In terms of deliverable products, the Cleveland project’s accomplishments are noteworthy: The seven task groups have overseen the development of continuing education programs for appraisers, real estate agents, and lenders; as well as four consumer education brochures and a reference directory for appraisers. The task groups also generated 29 recommendations for reducing discrimination in the housing market.

The project’s final phase—implementation of the 29 recommendations—is a work in progress. “At this point, 16 of the recommendations have been implemented,” said Barbara Grothe. “It’s important that Cleveland civic and business organizations step forward to adopt the remaining recommendations and monitor their implementation. It’s clear to me that we’ve started a process, but now that the Cleveland project has ended, we need some entities to follow through. I think that the individuals who participated in the Cleveland project took ownership of the issues, but that’s a small percentage of all the people who are involved in the process of allocating mortgage credit. That’s why it’s so important for these recommendations to be integrated into the agendas of corporations and trade associations.”

While acknowledging the Cleveland project’s tangible accomplishments, many participants said the project’s most significant benefit may have been its actual process. “There was tremendous value in the amount of discussion and learning that took place,” said David Fynn. “Some participants had been business partners for years, but had never talked about how they did business. Overwhelmingly, the project was about gaining insight and understanding discrimination.”

Robert Morgan credited the project with opening the lines of communication between Cleveland’s minority and white real estate agents. “We’re in the same industry, but we have different philosophies,” said Morgan. “The Cleveland project brought us together for the first time. It created a situation where there was a consistent dialogue. It’s important for real estate professionals to be proactive and deal with industry problems on our own, rather than having the solutions mandated to us by a governmental authority. But there are regulatory issues, economic issues, and political issues. We need to have the Federal Reserve involved in the process of eliminating discrimination. The Fed can help with its resources, expertise, and ability to create dialogue among the lending community that it regulates.”
TASK GROUP ACCOMPLISHMENTS

After identifying seven likely areas of potential discrimination in the home buying process, participants formed task groups to study each area. The groups were expected to review and evaluate industry standards and practices, recommend methods and strategies for reducing discrimination, and develop educational resources for consumers, professionals, and industries.

[1] THE HOME PURCHASER’S INITIAL CONTACT WITH THE REAL ESTATE AGENT

— Task group members recommended that the term “conventional financing only” be omitted from Multiple Listing Service information because it may discourage buyers who are planning to utilize VA, FHA, and other nonconventional financing methods.

— The group agreed to urge the Ohio Real Estate Commission to adopt an additional article in its Canon of Ethics, stating that licensees shall not market property in a manner that indicates a preference for “conventional financing only.”

— The task group oversaw the development of a “Fairness in Lending” continuing education class for real estate professionals.

— As a result of the task group’s suggestion, the Cuyahoga Plan of Ohio, a nonprofit organization that promotes fair housing practices, has offered to facilitate future meetings between white and minority real estate organizations.

[2] THE HOME PURCHASER’S INITIAL CONTACT WITH THE LENDER

— The “initial contact with lender” is a critical area of potential discrimination. Because insensitive or inconsistent treatment by loan originators can significantly impact the loan application process, the task group recommended the development of an industrywide training and certification program for lenders. Program curricula will include case studies on discrimination, instruction on fair lending laws and community reinvestment, and multicultural awareness and sales training.

[3] THE LENDING INSTITUTIONS’ INTERFACE WITH THE SECONDARY MARKET

— Firms that participate in the secondary mortgage market purchase a large percentage of residential loans from primary lenders. Since secondary-firm underwriting guidelines may differ from bank underwriting policies, the task group recommended ongoing training in secondary-market underwriting guidelines for primary lending institutions, underwriters, real estate agents, and community groups.

— The task group proposed that high schools implement academic curricula that educate students about the home buying process, mortgage loan programs, and the importance of a good credit rating and job history.

[4] THE APPRAISAL PROCESS

— The task group proposed that lending institutions and professional appraisal associations coordinate the development of a training and evaluation program for appraisers of urban residential properties.

— The group oversaw the publication of a reference directory of Community Development Corporations (CDCs) and city planners.

[5] PROPERTY INSURANCE

— The task group recommended that insurers eliminate potentially discriminatory criteria from their underwriting requirements, including minimum insurance amounts, age of home, and location of home. Group members also proposed that insurance companies maintain uniform, consistent company practices regarding cancellation, nonrenewal, and rejection of policies.

— The task group developed an “Insurance Rights and Obligations” educational pamphlet for consumers.

— The group recommended elimination of credit reports as an underwriting consideration.

[6] PRIVATE MORTGAGE INSURANCE

— Private mortgage insurance is designed to protect lenders against foreclosure. Task group members developed a brochure for consumers that explains the purposes of mortgage insurance and the consumer’s options to cancel the coverage.

— The task group proposed the development of a mortgage-insurance continuing education course for real estate agents.

[7] CREDIT BUREAU

— The group commissioned a consumer-oriented pamphlet that explains the function of the credit bureau and the importance of maintaining a good credit history.

— The task group urged area public utilities to report credit information to credit repositories so that low- and moderate-income individuals can demonstrate the regularity of their payments.
Anne Lulow, director of career development at Realty One, concurred with Morgan, saying, “We definitely need to sustain the dialogue that was started three years ago if we truly hope to eliminate discriminatory practices from our industry. The Cleveland project was a big step forward in the process of bringing real estate agents together. Now it’s up to industry professionals to continue educating ourselves on the important issue of discrimination.”

CONCLUSION The Cleveland project participants recognized early on that the project’s success could not be measured in quantifiable terms. Given its often-subtle and complex nature, discrimination is sometimes difficult to detect, let alone eliminate.

Ruth Clevenger, who participated in the Cleveland project first as a representative of a commercial bank and then in her role as manager of the Cleveland Fed’s Community Affairs function, explained, “We all knew that we couldn’t assess the project’s accomplishments in a quantifiable way because there were too many variables. The only way to measure our success is by how many recommendations have been implemented, by how many new relationships have been formed, and by what we learned about each other. And one of the most important things we learned is that many of the participants were willing to stick with this project all the way to its conclusion.”

Applauding the participants’ commitment, Cuyahoga County Commissioner Tim Hagan called the project “an unqualified victory.” According to Hagan, “Our goal, as a community, is to make mortgage credit and affordable housing available to all creditworthy individuals. The Cleveland project, by reducing discriminatory practices in the home buying process, will help us to reach that goal. If America is going to live up to its ideals and eliminate discrimination, then we will need more community-based efforts such as this.”

When the Cleveland project formally ended, Jerry Jordan was asked if its accomplishments would endure. After a pause, Jordan said, “That’s always been a critical question: Whether this would be a one-time, flash-in-the-pan sort of thing, or whether our efforts would be sustaining. At this point, it looks like the project’s achievements will be sustaining. But we will have to help ensure that the momentum is maintained.”

If the Cleveland project has a permanent legacy, stated Jordan, it will be the participants’ success in breaking down the barriers of communication. “The greatest value is in the community dynamics that were created. People got to know each other and communicate with each other in a different way. The Cleveland project enabled that process of interaction to occur, and, clearly, that process will be enduring.”

As of this writing, the Greater Cleveland Residential Housing and Mortgage Credit Project is being emulated by Federal Reserve Banks in Chicago, Boston, St. Louis, San Francisco, and New York. The Cleveland project is being used as a model for a similar program in Greater Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky. And in Akron, Ohio, a public/private partnership is planning to use the Cleveland project’s methodology to identify and remove the impediments to small business financing.
TASK GROUP MEMBERS
(includes employment at time of Cleveland project)

THE HOME PURCHASER’S INITIAL CONTACT WITH THE REAL ESTATE AGENT

Anne Lulow, Realty One, chair; Andrew Burkle, Jr., Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland; Chris Burnett, First Nationwide Bank; Mary Davis, Cuyahoga County Department of Development; David Fynn, National City Corporation; Barbara Grothe, Greater Cleveland Roundtable; Mary Hudson, Realty One; Marion Johnson, Bank One; Lionel Lewis, A.J. Lewis & Associates; Terry McCafferty, Trans Union Corporation; Jeff Mills, Society Mortgage Company; Robert Morgan, Integrity Escrow & Title Agency; Christy Penney, Neighborhood Housing Services of Cleveland; Jennifer Sladky, First Nationwide Bank; Maria Thompson, Hillcrest Housing; David Wilcox, Cuyahoga Savings Association.

THE HOME PURCHASER’S INITIAL CONTACT WITH THE LENDER

Marie Gerace, Prospect Title Agency, chair; Hector Allen, Huntington National Bank; Andrew Burkle, Jr., Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland; Ruth Cleveinger, Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland; Robert Dukdak, Commonwealth Mortgage Assurance Company; Donald Dalton, Dalton Mortgage Company; Mary Davis, Cuyahoga County Department of Development; Rick Edlund, Ohio Savings Bank; Ron Goodin, MOC, Barbara Grothe, Greater Cleveland Roundtable; Doris Honsa, Living in Cleveland Center; Al Lieberman, First Choice Mortgage Corporation; Connie Mykytuk, Realty One; Jan O’Donnell, MOC, Bobbe Perry, Lutheran Housing Corporation; Susie Rivers, Urban League of Greater Cleveland; Sue Roehl, CBC Credit Services; Renee Smith, Trans Union Corporation; Alex Stanef, Charter One Bank; Barb Stettinich, Park View Federal Savings Bank; Stephanie Turner, National City Bank; Henry West, Charter One Bank.

THE LENDING INSTITUTIONS’ INTERFACE WITH THE SECONDARY MARKET

Dale Babin, Fifth Third Bank, chair; Frank Bologna, Ohio Savings Bank; Andrew Burkle, Jr., Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland; James Caldwell, Buckholz Caldwell & Associates; Reese Dailey, Prospect Title Agency; Donald Dalton, Dalton Mortgage Corporation; Barbara Grothe, Greater Cleveland Roundtable; Ron Hongs, National City Bank; Ernestine Jackson, Bank One Mortgage Corporation; Paula Jones, Bank One Mortgage Corporation; Loretta Kennelly, Federal National Mortgage Association; Lucy J. Lougheed, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development; Lisa Marshall, National City Bank; Jeff Mills, Society Mortgage Company; Connie Mykytuk, Realty One; Derek Parks, Society Mortgage Corporation; Lorraine A. Poe, National City Bank; John Price, Huntington National Bank; Mary Jo Rawlins, Cuyahoga County Department of Development; Alan Reichert, Cleveland State University; Terry Robbins, Horizon Savings Bank; John Sabal, Leader Mortgage Corporation; Donald Willis, Ohio Civil Rights Commission.

THE APPRAISAL PROCESS

Tony Willis, Tony Willis Real Estate Training Center, chair; Andrew Burkle, Jr., Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland; Rick Edlund, Ohio Savings Bank; Maxine Greene, Cleveland Neighborhood Development Corp.; Barbara Grothe, Greater Cleveland Roundtable; Doris Honsa, Living in Cleveland Center; Jan Kearney-King, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development; Loretta Kennelly, Federal National Mortgage Association; Bucky Lewis, Bank One; Estella Loar, City of Cleveland; John Lynch, Lynch & Company; Joseph Pawlitsch, Society Mortgage Bank; Patricia Ramsey, Star Bank; Alan Reichert, Cleveland State University; John Sabal, Leader Mortgage Corporation; Mary Schwegler, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development; Gia Scianquadera, Ohio Civil Rights Commission; Henry Slodermire; MCMat Realy; Annette Strawbridge, Accurate Home Inspections; Charles Tregge, Third Federal Savings & Loan.

PROPERTY INSURANCE

Rosita Motton, RECA Realty, co-chair; Sue Taylor, Allstate Insurance Company, co-chair; Mary Bonelli, Ohio Insurance Institute; Andrew Burkle, Jr., Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland; Rico Cora, State Farm Insurance; Donna Coffin, Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland; Mary Davis, Cuyahoga County Department of Development; Tom Dawson, State Farm Insurance; Barbara Grothe, Greater Cleveland Roundtable; Roderick Hirsch, Society Mortgage Company; Doris Honsa, Living in Cleveland Center; Dan Kelso, Ohio Insurance Institute; Robert Kloepfer, Insurance Board of Greater Cleveland; Ellen Leslie, Chio Fair Plan; Tony Love, Ohio CityNear West Housing Corporation; Terry McCafferty, Trans Union Corporation; Jim McIndoe, JMI Reports; Robert Morgan, Integrity Escrow & Title Agency; Andrea Faye, State Farm Insurance; Christy Penney, Neighborhood Housing Services of Cleveland; Melvin Pye, Jr., Greater Cleveland Roundtable; Terry Robbins, Horizon Savings Bank; Rosemary Schneider, September & Associates; Phil Starr, Center Neighborhood; Brian Walters, Nationwide Insurance; Ted Wammes, Ohio Civil Rights Commission; Diana Woodbridge, FHA Housing Corporation.

PRIVATE MORTGAGE INSURANCE

Greg Fynn, Federal National Mortgage Association, co-chair; Sue Ann Osterman, PMI Mortgage Insurance Company, co-chair; Roger Bosch, MOC; Andrew Burkle, Jr., Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland; Beverly Banks, Garfield Square Neighborhood Development; Diane Buxton, Midland Title Agency; James Colabianchi, Republic Mortgage Insurance; Anda Cook, Living in Cleveland Center; Don Dalton, Dalton Mortgage Company; Margie Deliz, United Guarantee; Mary Dennis, Federal National Mortgage Association; Cheryl DePalmi, United Guaranty; Barbara Grothe, Greater Cleveland Roundtable; Eric Gunderson, Metco Mortgage; Ernestine Jackson, Bank One; Lionel Lewis, A.J. Lewis & Associates; Lucy Lougheed, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development; Bryon McKinney, First National Bank of Ohio; Marcia Nolan, National City Bank; Christy Penney, Neighborhood Housing Services of Cleveland; Margo Pettey, National City Bank; Sheila Powell, United Guarantee; Denise Redmond, Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp.; Julie Ribar, Bellevue-Puritas Development Corp.; John Sabal, Leader Mortgage Company; Jeffrey Skellin, G.E. Mortgage Insurance; Alex Stanef, Charter One Bank; Barb Stettinich, Park View Federal Savings Bank; Walter Stinson, City of University Heights; Sharon Sisko, Triad Guaranty Insurance; Ronald Thomas, Cleveland Action to Support Housing; Ginger Walters, Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp.; Myra White, Smythe, Cramer Company.

CREDIT BUREAU

Sue Roehl, CBC Credit Services, chair; Estella Benton, Estran Realty; Gregory Brown, Cuyahoga County; Andrew Burkle, Jr., Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland; Chris Burnett, First Nationwide Bank; Iris Choi, Ohio Civil Rights Commission; Jeanne Ciammichella, Consumer Credit Counseling Service; Dorothy Carlisle, Dollar Bank; Carmela Dalton, Dalton Mortgage Company; Charlotte Drotar, My Mortgage Services, David Fynn, National City Corporation; Barbara Grothe, Greater Cleveland Roundtable; John Hranicka, Geotech; Mylford Boston Howell, Mylford Boston Howell Realty; Gail Jackson, Neighborhood Housing Services of Cleveland; Paula Jones, Bank One Mortgage Corporation; Ken Lumpkin, Federal National Mortgage Association; Jeffrey Male, Park View Federal Savings Bank; Byron McKinney, First National Bank of Ohio; Maetlene Myers, Hough Area Partners in Progress; Sheri Porter, Creddo; John Price, Third Federal Savings; Mary Jo Rawlins, Cuyahoga County; Roland Somerville, Oasis Realty Company; Michael Szaj, Trans Union Corporation; Joanie Toner, Cuyahoga Plan of Ohio.
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### Comparative Financial Statement

**Statement of Condition** (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>December 31, 1996</th>
<th>December 31, 1995</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold certificates</td>
<td>$ 624</td>
<td>$ 621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special drawing rights certificates</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coin</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items in process of collection</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. government and federal agency securities, net</td>
<td>23,173</td>
<td>22,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments denominated in foreign currencies</td>
<td>1,257</td>
<td>1,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued interest receivable</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdistrict settlement account</td>
<td>5,007</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank premises and equipment, net</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other assets</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets</strong></td>
<td>$ 31,680</td>
<td>$ 25,534</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **LIABILITIES AND CAPITAL**                            |                   |                   |
| Liabilities:                                           |                   |                   |
| Federal Reserve notes outstanding, net                 | $ 29,861          | $ 23,524          |
| Deposits:                                              |                   |                   |
| Depository institutions                                | 856               | 1,161             |
| Other deposits                                         | 15                | 11                |
| Deferred credit items                                  | 280               | 232               |
| Statutory surplus transfer due U.S. Treasury           | 37                | 0                 |
| Interest on Federal Reserve notes due U.S. Treasury    | 0                 | 39                |
| Accrued benefit cost                                   | 43                | 40                |
| Other liabilities                                      | 10                | 9                 |
| **Total liabilities**                                  | 31,102            | 25,016            |

**Capital:**

| Item                                                   |                   |                   |
| Capital paid in                                        | 292               | 259               |
| Surplus                                                | 286               | 259               |
| **Total capital**                                      | 578               | 518               |

| **Total liabilities and capital**                      |                   |                   |
|                                                        | $ 31,680          | $ 25,534          |
### STATEMENT OF INCOME
(in millions)

**For the years ended:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>December 31, 1996</th>
<th>December 31, 1995</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interest income:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on U.S. government securities</td>
<td>$1,382</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on foreign currencies</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total interest income</strong></td>
<td>1,411</td>
<td>1,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other operating income:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from services</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursable services to government agencies</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign currency gains (losses), net</td>
<td>(109)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government securities gains, net</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other income</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total other operating income (loss)</strong></td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and other benefits</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy expense</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment expense</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of unreimbursed Treasury services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments by Board of Governors</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other expenses</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total operating expenses</strong></td>
<td>164</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income before cumulative effect of accounting change</strong></td>
<td>1,214</td>
<td>1,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative effect of change in accounting principle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net income prior to distribution</strong></td>
<td>$1,214</td>
<td>$1,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distribution of net income:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividends paid to member banks</td>
<td>$16</td>
<td>$16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred to surplus</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments to U.S. Treasury as interest on Federal Reserve notes</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>1,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments to U.S. Treasury as required by statute</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total distributed income</strong></td>
<td>$1,214</td>
<td>$1,432</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Capital Paid in Surplus Total Capital**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Capital Paid in</th>
<th>Surplus</th>
<th>Total Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance at January 1, 1995 (5,150,561 shares)</td>
<td>$258</td>
<td>$258</td>
<td>$516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net income transferred to surplus</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net change in capital stock issued (24,775 shares)</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance at December 31, 1995 (5,175,336 shares)</td>
<td>$259</td>
<td>$259</td>
<td>$518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net income transferred to surplus</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory surplus transfer to the U.S. Treasury</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net change in capital stock issued (674,545 shares)</td>
<td>$33</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance at December 31, 1996 (5,849,881 shares)</td>
<td>$292</td>
<td>$286</td>
<td>$578</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These statements are prepared by Bank management. Copies of full and final financial statements, complete with footnotes, are available by writing the Corporate Communications & Community Affairs Department of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland, P.O. Box 6387, Cleveland, OH 44101, or by calling (216) 579-2001 (key in 1-5-3).
CLEVELAND BUILDING PROJECT

— Progress continued on the Bank’s Operations Center, with occupancy scheduled for the first quarter of 1997. Approximately half of the employees at the Cleveland office were relocated to temporary leased space in late 1996 for a two-year period while the historic main office building undergoes renovation.

CONFERENCES AND PUBLIC PROGRAMS

— The Bank sponsored conferences, educational initiatives, and outreach programs on a variety of topics, including the Electronic Federal Tax Payment System, regionalization and emerging markets, the dynamic effects of monetary policy, the Community Reinvestment Act, and other laws and regulations.

— Mary Ellen Withrow, Treasurer of the United States, formally introduced the new 1995 series $2 bill in November. More than 1,000 people visited the Cleveland office over a two-day period for the opportunity to purchase uncut sheets of currency.

— President Jerry Jordan and other Cleveland Fed officers discussed issues of concern with bankers throughout Ohio and Pennsylvania as part of a bankers’ meeting series instituted in 1996. More than 100 financial-institution executives attended these meetings to discuss local business and economic conditions, plans for new payments services technologies, and recent changes in banking regulation.

MONETARY POLICY/RESEARCH

— Our staff of Research economists had 17 papers or articles published or accepted for publication in leading U.S. and international scholarly journals.

— All of the Bank’s Research publications, as well as information from our Banking Supervision and Regulation, Corporate Communications, Data Services, and Marketing areas, were made available to the general public on the Bank’s home page on the World Wide Web: http://www.clev.frb.org.

— The Financial Services Research Group, which contributes research and economic analysis in support of the Federal Reserve System’s Financial Services Policy Committee, continues to operate from the Cleveland Reserve Bank.

PAYMENTS SERVICES

— The Bank sponsored the World Series of Electronic Payments to update customers on pending changes in this area. Nearly 700 customers from throughout the District attended these sessions, where they received information on the electronic federal tax payment system, automated clearinghouse (ACH), wire transfer, and the Federal Reserve’s new national book-entry system.

— The Cleveland Fed successfully implemented FedACH, the new standard software for automated clearinghouse transactions, with no disruption in service to customers. The Bank also successfully migrated its mainframe data processing operations to a communal environment at FRAS, the Federal Reserve Automation Services site in Richmond, Virginia.

— In cooperation with ACH associations, the Bank continued to champion the utility direct payment program. The 1996 campaign yielded more than 90,000 payment agreements, resulting in additional ACH volume of 1.1 million items. The program serves as a model for similar efforts in other areas of the country.
— As one of five regional processing sites and one of two regional print sites for issuing savings bonds, the Pittsburgh office continued to serve the U.S. Treasury, our largest customer. The Bank began to accept payroll savings bonds via electronic telecommunication (bulkdata) connections in response to customer requests.

— As the Unisys/FRBIPS project office, the Cleveland Fed assumed a lead role in partnering with Unisys to set the strategic direction and develop the requirements for the next-generation check processing system.

— The Bank continues to work with customers to better understand their needs and expectations. A number of new products, such as check imaging, were introduced directly in response to customer needs. Another example is the Bank’s upgrade to a LAN-based operating system for Noncash items, which both reduced a lengthy backlog on return items and enhanced cost efficiencies.

QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS AND INTERNAL TRAINING

— Customers responded enthusiastically to the Bank’s heightened focus on quality. The Quality Assessment Survey conducted in the spring showed solid improvement in the Bank’s ability to meet and exceed customer expectations across all services.

— Employees’ customer service and communications skills were enhanced through attendance at 79 “Superior Service” classes held throughout the year at our four offices. Employee facilitation teams were formed and trained in each office to ensure timely problem identification and effective resolution.

— In February, the Bank adopted a functional management structure across the four offices to strengthen our ability to achieve strategic objectives and to provide superior service to customers.

SUPERVISION AND REGULATION

— The Bank successfully carried out its supervisory responsibilities, adopting a risk-based approach, and the condition of the District’s financial institutions remains superior.

— In conjunction with several other Reserve Banks, the Cleveland Fed actively participated in the development of the Joint Supervisory Protocol among the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and state banking agencies to promote seamless supervision and reduce the regulatory burden on state-chartered banks.

— The Bank contributed to the development and implementation of the Examiner Workstation, designed to allow examiners to download information from a bank’s computer system before and during commercial-bank field examinations.

— To ensure the Fourth District’s readiness to respond to sweeping changes in interstate banking and branching laws, the Bank provided internal communication and training and solicited banks’ input on the potential impact of the legislation. The Cleveland Fed continues its System leadership role in this initiative by helping to form and direct policy decisions and to provide useful tools for implementing those decisions.
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President & CEO  
The First National Bank of Slippery Rock  
Slippery Rock, Pennsylvania

Philip S. Swope  
President & CEO  
Chippewa Valley Bank  
Rittman, Ohio

Carlos E. Watkins  
President & CEO  
First-Knox Banc Corp.  
Mt. Vernon, Ohio

Paul G. Wreede  
President  
The Commercial Bank  
Delphos, Ohio

Robert W. Zapp  
President & CEO  
The Bank of Boone County, Inc.  
Florence, Kentucky
The Federal Reserve System is responsible for formulating and implementing U.S. monetary policy. It also supervises banks and bank holding companies, and provides financial services to depository institutions and the federal government.

The Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland is one of twelve regional Reserve Banks in the United States that, together with the Board of Governors in Washington, D.C., comprise the Federal Reserve System.

The Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland, including its branch offices in Cincinnati and Pittsburgh and its check processing center in Columbus, serves the Fourth District. The Fourth District includes Ohio, western Pennsylvania, the northern panhandle of West Virginia, and eastern Kentucky.

It is the policy of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland to provide equal employment opportunities for qualified persons regardless of race, creed, color, national origin, age, gender, or disability.

The annual report essay is also available electronically through the Cleveland Fed’s home page on the World Wide Web: http://www.clev.frb.org.
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The brick home pictured on the cover, located in Cleveland’s Hough neighborhood, was the subject of an appraisal test project that illustrated the potentially discriminatory practices that can occur in mortgage lending. If we are to realize our distressed communities, we must ensure fair and equal access to home mortgage credit. To that end, a group of Cleveland-area housing, real estate, and lending professionals participated in the Greater Cleveland Residential Housing and Mortgage Credit Project, a community-based effort to eliminate discrimination and disparate treatment in the home buying process. Concluded in April 1997, the Cleveland project is being modeled in cities across the nation.