

“Inherited Inequality” Report: What it Means to Black People in Pittsburgh



Presented to
Pittsburgh City Council,
Pittsburgh Black Elected Officials Coalition, &
Pittsburgh’s 17 African American Neighborhoods

Prepared by
The Lower Marshall-Shadeland Development Initiative

September 2021

“Inherited Inequality” Report: What it Means to Black People in Pittsburgh

Table of Contents

| <u>Section</u> | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| I. Introduction | 3 |
| II. Main Conclusions | 4 |
| 1. Demographics: Nearly all of Pittsburgh’s population loss over the past decade can be attributed to the loss of African Americans. | 4 |
| 2. Race: Lending by race shows wide inequalities. | 4 |
| 3. Neighborhoods: Minority communities are more reliant on public funds than on wealth-building private dollars. | 5 |
| 4. Gentrification: White borrowers have a better chance of getting loans <i>in minority neighborhoods</i> than African American borrowers. | 5 |
| 5. The 2020 Data: An analysis of 2020 bank lending data shows trends are getting <i>worse</i> for African Americans. | 6 |
| 6. Branches: Bank branch locations reinforce the lack of wealth that exists in Pittsburgh’s minority neighborhoods. | 6 |
| 7. City Council Districts: The City Council District Analysis Shows a Pronounced Disparity. | 6 |
| 8. Private vs. Public Funds: Minority neighborhoods are <i>more</i> reliant on <i>public</i> funds (55.5% of all investment), than they are on <i>private</i> bank dollars (44.5% of all investment). | 11 |
| III. Solutions: LMSDI makes several key recommendations to improve wealth-building opportunities to African Americans in Pittsburgh | 15 |
| Table 1. Bank Lending in Pittsburgh by Race 2007-2019 | 4 |
| Table 2. Combined Bank Loans and Public Funds Disbursed in Pittsburgh 2007-2020, by City Council District (Ranked by Total Public and Private Investment) | 7 |
| Table 3. Comparative Bank Lending in Minority and Non-Minority Communities | 11 |
| Table 4: Percent of Private vs. Public Dollars in Each Pittsburgh Neighborhood | 12 |

“Inherited Inequality” Report: What it Means to Black People in Pittsburgh

I. Introduction

The report by the Lower Marshall-Shadeland Development Initiative (LMSDI) entitled, “Inherited Inequality: The State of Financing for Affordable Housing in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania,” details the home mortgage lending practices of more than 900 banks in the city of Pittsburgh between 2007 and 2020. It also summarizes public agency allocations for affordable housing in every city neighborhood made between 2010 and 2020.

For African Americans the report quantifies how few wealth-building opportunities exist in Pittsburgh. Moreover, the study challenges the long-held belief that more *public* funds are required to “fix” the problem. In fact, the opposite is true. “Inherited Inequality” underscores the importance of *private* capital in building wealth in the Black community.

What exactly is “affordable housing”? Quite simply, it is what people can afford. Each neighborhood has different levels of affordability based on a person’s income. For instance, buyers in Squirrel Hill may find a \$300,000 home “affordable,” whereas in Marshall-Shadeland, affordability might be closer to \$60,000. In each case, the private market—financial institutions—determines affordability.

When one considers the large amount of home mortgage lending that banks have done in Pittsburgh, the numbers are staggering: nearly **\$12 billion** in 13 years (2007 to 2019). An additional \$2 billion in home loans were approved in 2020 alone. Compare this to the **\$3.4 billion** in public funds for affordable housing between 2010 and 2020. Banks approved more than 71,000 home loans, while public dollars created 25,000 housing units. There really is no comparison.

Yet, when the race and neighborhood inequalities of affordable housing are examined, it begs the following questions: why do Whites receive so many more loan dollars than Blacks? Why do Shadyside and Squirrel Hill get the lion’s share of private capital, while East Liberty, Homewood, and the Hill rely more on public funds? More importantly, what can be done to change this situation? LMSDI makes several recommendations at the end of the report.

II. Main Conclusions

1. Demographics: Nearly all of Pittsburgh’s population loss over the past decade can be attributed to the loss of African Americans.

The city’s African American population *declined* by more than 10,000 people, a 13% drop in ten years (2010 to 2019). The city as a whole only lost 1.1% of its population, while nearly every racial category gained population over the past decade. The other declines were seen among American Indians, which decreased by 35 people, or 6%, and some other race, -507 people, or a decrease of 21.1%.

2. Race: Lending by race shows wide inequalities.

Home mortgage lending by **race** between 2007 and 2019 shows that Whites in Pittsburgh, which are 66% of the total population, received 65% of the \$11.8 billion in loan dollars, or \$7.6 billion in 13 years. But **African Americans**, which are nearly 25% of the city’s total population, received just **3.5%** of the loan dollars over the 13-year period, or \$417 million. Asian Americans, which are only 5.3% of the total population, received the same amount, 3.5%, or \$411 million. In other words, a disproportionate share of the city’s loan dollars over the past 13 years were approved to Whites and Asians.

Table 1. Bank Lending in Pittsburgh by Race 2007-2019

| Racial Category | 2015 Population | Percent of Total | Total Loans | Percent of Total | Total Loan Dollars | Percent of Total | Average Loan Size |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------|------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| White | 204,671 | 66.2% | 53,406 | 75.0% | \$7,627,360,000 | 64.6% | \$142,818 |
| Race Missing | | | 10,389 | 14.6% | \$3,327,816,000 | 28.2% | \$320,321 |
| African American | 76,397 | 24.7% | 5,116 | 7.2% | \$417,224,000 | 3.5% | \$81,553 |
| Asian Americans | 16,317 | 5.3% | 2,084 | 2.9% | \$411,290,000 | 3.5% | \$197,356 |
| American Indian/Alaska Native | 559 | 0.2% | 152 | 0.2% | \$17,563,000 | 0.1% | \$115,546 |
| Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | 84 | 0.0% | 96 | 0.1% | \$10,448,000 | 0.1% | \$108,833 |
| Some other race + two or more races | 11,299 | 3.7% | | | | | |
| Total Minority Population | 104,656 | 33.8% | | | | | |
| City Total | 309,327 | 100% | 71,243 | 100% | \$11,811,701,000 | 100% | \$165,795 |

3. Neighborhoods: Minority communities are more reliant on public funds than on wealth-building private dollars.

Affordable housing in Pittsburgh is financed almost entirely by banks. In 13 years, 78% of bank loan dollars went to Pittsburgh neighborhoods, while just 22% of public funds were allocated in the city's communities. But for Pittsburgh's **minority neighborhoods**, 55% of all funds came from public sources. In the city's non-minority areas, just 8% of public dollars financed affordable housing.

In Pittsburgh's 17 **minority neighborhoods**, just 6.8% of all bank dollars were approved, meaning that nearly 94% of banks financed affordable housing in Pittsburgh's non-minority neighborhoods. Lending by individual neighborhoods also shows the wide disparities. In the city's **Shadyside** neighborhood, a non-minority community, *more loan dollars were approved* (\$1,054,017,000) *than in all minority neighborhoods combined* (\$807 million). Additional neighborhood data is below:

- **East Liberty**, a 68% minority community with a population of 5,537, tops the list, with the most bank loan dollars (\$186,588,000) out of all minority communities.
- The **Hill District Combined** (the city's largest minority community, with 9,510 residents) is number two (\$112.5 million), while **Manchester** (with just 1,944 residents) is number three, with \$69.7 million in loan dollars.
- **Homewood Combined**, with nearly 6,500 residents, the city's second largest Black community, was ranked #10 among minority neighborhoods for loan dollars approved in the city, just \$28.6 million.
- In 2014, **Larimer** received a \$30 million of federal Choice Neighborhood grant, which was celebrated in the press, by politicians, and by the city's Urban Redevelopment Authority. Yet, when one examines private capital flows into Larimer, it received just \$66.3 million in bank loan dollars in thirteen years, a minuscule fraction of the \$11.8 billion approved citywide. Larimer, which is nearly 90% minority, received just 102 loans in thirteen years, 1.5% percent of the total loans approved citywide over the 13-year period.

4. Gentrification: White borrowers have a better chance of getting loans in minority neighborhoods than African American borrowers.

There were *777 more* loans approved to Whites than to Blacks, and \$171 million *more* loan dollars approved to Whites than to Blacks *in minority neighborhoods*. In non-minority neighborhoods, 47,513 more loans were approved to Whites than to Blacks, and \$7 billion more loan dollars were approved to Whites than to Blacks. This suggests that gentrification of minority communities has taken place since the Great Recession of 2008.

5. The 2020 Data: An analysis of 2020 bank lending data shows trends are getting *worse* for African Americans.

In 2020, a total of 329 financial institutions approved 7,812 loans for \$2 billion in Pittsburgh neighborhoods. In 2020, just 3% of all loan dollars were approved to African Americans, less than Asian-Americans (4%), even though there are far more African Americans in Pittsburgh. In contrast, 60% of the loan dollars were approved to Whites. Just 5% of all loan dollars in 2020 were approved to minority neighborhoods.

6. Branches: Bank branch locations reinforce the lack of wealth that exists in Pittsburgh's minority neighborhoods.

Within the city of Pittsburgh **only 14 branches**, or 12%, are located in minority communities. These minority branches collectively hold \$579,338,000 in deposits, less than a half-percent (0.45%) of all branch deposits in Pittsburgh.

7. City Council Districts: The City Council District Analysis Shows a Pronounced Disparity.

In District 8, represented by **Councilwoman Erika Strassburger**, just four neighborhoods commanded nearly \$2.8 billion in loan dollars from banks, 23.7% of the city total, over the thirteen-year period from 2007 to 2019. Meanwhile in District 9, represented by **Councilman Ricky Burgess**, \$451 million in loan dollars was approved over the same period, a scant 3.8% of the city total. Councilwoman Strassburger's district has no minority neighborhoods, while Councilman Burgess's district has eight minority neighborhoods. So, while elected officials advocate for more public dollars to be expended in minority neighborhoods, these same communities are being virtually ignored by banks.

But when only **public funds** are examined by district, the opposite is true: **Councilman Dan Lavelle** (District 6) is first, followed by **Councilman Ricky Burgess** (District 9). Councilman Burgess's district was the only one which was *more* reliant on public funds (which comprised 56.8% of all investment) than bank financing (43.2%). In a city with more than 70,000 African Americans who only received 3.5% of the total dollar volume of loans, some banks are missing a huge market opportunity by not lending to minorities and minority communities.

Table 2. Combined Bank Loans and Public Funds Disbursed in Pittsburgh 2007-2020, by City Council District (Ranked by Total Public and Private Investment)

| City Council District | Number Of Neighborhoods | Number of Minority Neighborhoods | Total Bank Loans Dollars | Total Public Investment | Total Public and Private Investment | Percent Private Investment | Percent Public Investment |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| District 8, Erika Strassburger | 4 | 0 | \$2,798,604,000 | \$42,445,605 | \$2,841,049,605 | 98.5% | 1.5% |
| District 7, Deb Gross | 10 | 0 | \$2,312,964,000 | \$161,863,052 | \$2,474,827,052 | 93.5% | 6.5% |
| District 5, Corey O'Connor | 9 | 0 | \$1,636,728,000 | \$213,290,875 | \$1,850,018,875 | 88.5% | 11.5% |
| District 6, R. Daniel Lavelle | 13 | 8 | \$770,594,000 | \$655,212,804 | \$1,425,806,804 | 54.0% | 46.0% |
| District 1, Bobby Wilson | 14 | 3 | \$1,092,539,000 | \$117,162,063 | \$1,209,701,063 | 90.3% | 9.7% |
| District 2, Theresa Kail- | 16 | 2 | \$1,075,804,000 | \$43,225,339 | \$1,119,029,339 | 96.1% | 3.9% |
| District 9, Ricky Burgess | 9 | 9 | \$451,704,000 | \$593,903,991 | \$1,045,607,991 | 43.2% | 56.8% |
| District 3, Bruce Kraus | 11 | 3 | \$878,716,000 | \$138,971,592 | \$1,017,687,592 | 86.3% | 13.7% |
| District 4, Anthony Coghill | 4 | 0 | \$794,048,000 | \$12,240,458 | \$806,288,458 | 98.5% | 1.5% |
| Totals | 90 | 25 | \$11,811,701,000 | \$1,978,315,780 | \$13,790,016,780 | 85.7% | 14.3% |
| Multiple Neighborhoods | | | | \$323,152,206 | | | |
| Citywide | | | | \$442,631,909 | | | |
| Unknown N'hoods | | | | \$658,049,225 | | | |
| Totals | | | \$11,811,701,000 | \$3,402,149,119 | \$15,213,850,119 | 77.6% | 22.4% |



Citywide: William Peduto, Mayor of Pittsburgh

| | |
|--|------------------|
| City Population (2019): | 302,205 |
| Minority Population (2019): | 100,338 (33.2%) |
| African American Population (2019): | 69,589 |
| African American Population Decrease, 2010-2019: | -12.7% |
| Bank Financing 2007-2019: | \$11,811,701,000 |
| Public Funding 2010-2020: | \$3,402,149,120 |
| Total Combined Public & Bank Funding: | \$15,213,850,120 |
| Total Bank Financing in Minority Communities: | \$807,477,000 |
| Total Public Funding in Minority Communities: | \$1,006,735,353 |
| Total Combined Minority Public & Private Investment: | \$1,814,212,353 |



1. Councilwoman Erika Strassburger, District 8 (Shadyside-Squirrel Hill)

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| District Population: | 40,609 |
| District Minority Population (% of Total): | 10,292 (25.3%) |
| Bank Financing: | \$2,798,604,000 (Rank: 1) |
| Public Funding: | \$42,445,605 (Rank: 8) |
| Combined Public & Bank Funding: | \$2,841,049,605 (Rank: 1) |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Total Bank Financing in Minority Communities: | \$0 |
| Total Public Funding in Minority Communities: | \$0 |



2. Councilwoman Deb Gross, District 7 (Lawrenceville-Highland Park)

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| District Population: | 36,621 |
| District Minority Population (% of Total): | 7,214 (19.7%) |
| Bank Financing: | \$2,312,964,000 (Rank: 2) |
| Public Funding: | \$161,863,052 (Rank: 4) |
| Total Combined Public & Bank Funding: | \$2,474,827,052 (Rank: 2) |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Total Bank Financing in Minority Communities: | \$0 |
| Total Public Funding in Minority Communities: | \$0 |



3. Councilman Corey O'Connor, District 5 (East End)

| | |
|---|---------------------------|
| District Population: | 34,015 |
| District Minority Population (% of Total): | 7,156 (21%) |
| Bank Financing: | \$1,636,728,000 (Rank: 3) |
| Public Funding: | \$213,290,875 (Rank: 3) |
| Total Public & Bank Funding: | \$1,850,018,875 (Rank: 3) |
| Total Bank Financing in Minority Communities: | \$0 |
| Total Public Funding in Minority Communities: | \$0 |



4. Councilman Bobby Wilson, District 1 (North Side)

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| District Population: | 32,586 |
| District Minority Population (% of Total): | 12,526 (38.4%) |
| African American Population Loss/Gain in District: | +357 (+8%) |
| Bank Financing: | \$1,092,539,000 (Rank: 4) |
| Public Funding: | \$117,162,063 (Rank: 6) |
| Total Combined Public & Bank Funding: | \$1,209,701,063 (Rank: 5) |
| Total Bank Financing in Minority Communities: | \$65,622,000 |

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Total Public Funding in Minority Communities: | \$61,867,545 |
| Total Combined Minority Public & Private Investment: | \$127,489,545 |



5. Councilwoman Theresa Kail-Smith, City Council President, District 2 (West End)

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| District Population: | 34,441 |
| District Minority Population (% of Total): | 9,331 (27.1%) |
| African American Population Loss/Gain in District: | +96 (+4%) |
| Bank Financing: | \$1,075,804,000 (Rank: 5) |
| Public Funding: | \$43,225,339 (Rank: 7) |
| Total Combined Public & Bank Funding: | \$1,119,029,339 (Rank: 6) |

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Total Bank Financing in Minority Communities: | \$55,636,000 |
| Total Public Funding in Minority Communities: | \$3,136,801 |
| Total Combined Minority Public & Private Investment: | \$58,772,801 |



6. Councilman Bruce Kraus, District 3 (South Side)

District Population: 26,152
 District Minority Population (% of Total): 8,375 (32%)
 African American Population Loss/Gain in District: -603 (-17%)
 Bank Financing: \$878,716,000 (Rank: 6)
 Public Funding: \$138,971,592 (Rank: 5)
 Total Combined Public & Bank Funding: \$1,017,687,592 (Rank: 8)

Total Bank Financing in Minority Communities: \$45,696,000

Total Public Funding in Minority Communities: \$1,360,002

Total Combined Minority Public & Private Investment: \$47,056,002



7. Councilman Anthony Coghill, District 4 (South Hills)

District Population: 34,915
 District Minority Population (% of Total): 6,657 (19.1%)
 Bank Financing: \$794,048,000 (Rank: 7)
 Public Funding: \$12,240,458 (Rank: 9)
 Total Combined Public & Bank Funding: \$806,288,458 (Rank: 9)

Total Bank Financing in Minority Communities: \$0

Total Public Funding in Minority Communities: \$0



8. Councilman R. Daniel Lavelle, District 6 (Hill-Manchester)

District Population: 35,850
 District Minority Population (% of Total): 17,984 (50.2%)
 African American Population Loss/Gain in District: -1,344 (-9%)
 Bank Financing: \$770,594,000 (Rank: 8)
 Public Funding: \$655,212,804 (Rank: 1)
 Total Combined Public & Bank Funding: \$1,425,806,804 (Rank: 4)

Total Bank Financing in Minority Communities: \$268,844,000

Total Public Funding in Minority Communities: \$379,420,234

Total Combined Minority Public & Private Investment: \$648,264,234



9. Councilman Rev. Ricky Burgess, District 9 (East Liberty-Homewood)

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| District Population: | 27,016 |
| District Minority Population (% of Total): | 20,803 (77%) |
| African American Population Loss/Gain in District: | -3,794 (-17%) |
| Bank Financing: | \$451,704,000 (Rank: 9) |
| Public Funding: | \$593,903,991 (Rank: 2) |
| Total Combined Public & Bank Funding: | \$1,045,607,991 (Rank: 7) |
| Total Bank Financing in Minority Communities: | \$371,679,000 |
| Total Public Funding in Minority Communities: | \$560,950,770 |
| Total Combined Minority Public & Private Investment: | \$932,629,770 |

8. Private vs. Public Funds: Minority neighborhoods are *more* reliant on *public* funds (55.5% of all investment), than they are on *private* bank dollars (44.5% of all investment).

Over more than a decade, banks have all but ignored these neighborhoods. These communities include the following (see table at the end of this report):

- **Northview Heights** (with a population of 1,627 Black people): 98% reliant on public funds.
- **Hill District** (7,195 Black people): 75.4% reliant on public funds.
- **Homewood** (5,684 Black people): 68% reliant on public funds.
- **Larimer** (1,223 Black people): 64.8% reliant on public funds.
- **East Liberty** (2,575 Black people): 64% reliant on public funds.
- **Lincoln-Lemington-Belmar** (3,492 Black people): 59.8% reliant on public funds.

Table 3. Comparative Bank Lending in Minority and Non-Minority Communities

| Neighborhood | 2015 Population | Percent Minority | Total Loans | Percent of Total | Total Loan Dollars | Percent of Total |
|---|-----------------|------------------|---------------|------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Total, 17 Minority Neighborhoods | 64,707 | | 6,844 | 9.6% | \$807,477,000 | 6.8% |
| Total, 54 Non-Minority Neighborhoods | 247,416 | | 64,399 | 90.4% | \$11,004,224,000 | 93.2% |
| Total City | 309,327 | 33.8% | 71,243 | 100.0% | \$11,811,701,000 | 100.0% |

Table 4: Percent of Private vs. Public Dollars in Each Pittsburgh Neighborhood

| Percent of Private vs. Public Dollars in Each Pittsburgh Neighborhood (bank dollars cover years 2007-2019; public funds cover years 2010-2020) | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| No. | Neighborhood | Percent of Bank Loan Dollars in the Neighborhood | Percent of Public Dollars in the Neighborhood |
| 1 | Northview Heights | 2.0% | 98.0% |
| 2 | South Shore | 3.5% | 96.5% |
| 3 | Chateau | 21.3% | 78.7% |
| 4 | Hill District Combined (Bedford Dwellings, Crawford-Roberts, Middle Hill, Terrace Village, and Upper Hill) | 24.6% | 75.4% |
| 5 | Hazelwood, Hays, Glen Hazel | 27.9% | 72.1% |
| 6 | Homewood Combined (North, South, and West) | 32.0% | 68.0% |
| 7 | Larimer | 35.2% | 64.8% |
| 8 | East Liberty | 36.0% | 64.0% |
| 9 | Lincoln-Lemington-Belmar | 40.2% | 59.8% |
| 10 | Bluff | 41.5% | 58.5% |
| 11 | Fineview | 56.2% | 43.8% |
| 12 | Central Business District | 63.1% | 36.9% |
| 13 | Point Breeze North | 70.8% | 29.2% |
| 14 | Allentown | 72.5% | 27.5% |
| 15 | Garfield | 74.2% | 25.8% |
| 16 | Citywide* | 77.6% | 22.4% |
| 17 | Windgap, Chartiers City, Fairywood | 78.3% | 21.7% |
| 18 | West Oakland | 80.1% | 19.9% |
| 19 | Perry South | 80.5% | 19.5% |
| 20 | Manchester | 81.2% | 18.8% |
| 21 | Strip District | 82.1% | 17.9% |
| 22 | South Side Flats | 82.4% | 17.6% |
| 23 | Lower Lawrenceville | 84.3% | 15.7% |
| 24 | South Oakland | 85.6% | 14.4% |
| 25 | Central Northside | 86.3% | 13.7% |

Percent of Private vs. Public Dollars in Each Pittsburgh Neighborhood (bank dollars cover years 2007-2019; public funds cover years 2010-2020)

| No. | Neighborhood | Percent of Bank Loan Dollars in the Neighborhood | Percent of Public Dollars in the Neighborhood |
|-----|----------------------------------|--|---|
| 26 | Elliott, West End | 89.9% | 10.1% |
| 27 | East Allegheny, North Shore | 92.3% | 7.7% |
| 28 | Squirrel Hill South | 92.6% | 7.4% |
| 29 | Marshall-Shadeland | 92.8% | 7.2% |
| 30 | Knoxville | 93.2% | 6.8% |
| 31 | North Oakland | 93.5% | 6.5% |
| 32 | Beechview | 94.1% | 5.9% |
| 33 | Sheraden, Esplen | 94.7% | 5.3% |
| 34 | Highland Park | 96.0% | 4.0% |
| 35 | Central Lawrenceville | 96.2% | 3.8% |
| 36 | Arlington, Arlington Heights | 96.3% | 3.7% |
| 37 | Allegheny West, Allegheny Center | 96.8% | 3.2% |
| 38 | Polish Hill | 97.0% | 3.0% |
| 39 | Upper Lawrenceville | 97.1% | 2.9% |
| 40 | Shadyside | 97.5% | 2.5% |
| 41 | Stanton Heights | 97.6% | 2.4% |
| 42 | Morningside | 98.0% | 2.0% |
| 43 | Carrick | 98.1% | 1.9% |
| 44 | East Hills | 98.2% | 1.8% |
| 45 | Troy Hill | 98.4% | 1.6% |
| 46 | Perry North | 98.5% | 1.5% |
| 47 | California-Kirkbride | 98.6% | 1.4% |
| 48 | Mount Washington | 98.7% | 1.3% |
| 49 | Westwood, Ridgemont | 98.8% | 1.2% |
| 50 | Lincoln Place | 98.8% | 1.2% |
| 51 | St. Clair, Mt. Oliver | 99.1% | 0.9% |

Percent of Private vs. Public Dollars in Each Pittsburgh Neighborhood (bank dollars cover years 2007-2019; public funds cover years 2010-2020)

| No. | Neighborhood | Percent of Bank Loan Dollars in the Neighborhood | Percent of Public Dollars in the Neighborhood |
|-----|------------------------|--|---|
| 52 | Bloomfield | 99.2% | 0.8% |
| 53 | Friendship | 99.3% | 0.7% |
| 54 | Brighton Heights | 99.3% | 0.7% |
| 55 | Central Oakland | 99.5% | 0.5% |
| 56 | Beltzhoover, Bon Air | 99.5% | 0.5% |
| 57 | Point Breeze | 99.8% | 0.2% |
| 58 | South Side Slopes | 99.9% | 0.1% |
| 59 | Overbrook | 99.9% | 0.1% |
| 60 | Greenfield | 99.9% | 0.1% |
| 61 | Squirrel Hill North | 99.9% | 0.1% |
| 62 | Crafton Heights | 100.0% | 0.0% |
| 63 | Swisshelm Park | 100.0% | 0.0% |
| 64 | Brookline | 100.0% | 0.0% |
| 65 | Banksville | 100.0% | 0.0% |
| 66 | Duquesne Heights | 100.0% | 0.0% |
| 67 | New Homestead | 100.0% | 0.0% |
| 68 | Oakwood, East Carnegie | 100.0% | 0.0% |
| 69 | Regent Square | 100.0% | 0.0% |
| 70 | Spring Garden | 100.0% | 0.0% |
| 71 | Spring Hill-City View | 100.0% | 0.0% |
| 72 | Summer Hill | 100.0% | 0.0% |

Minority neighborhoods are highlighted in blue.

“Citywide” includes public funds disbursed citywide, multiple neighborhoods, and unknown neighborhoods.

III. Solutions: LMSDI makes several key recommendations to improve wealth-building opportunities to African Americans in Pittsburgh:

1. The first recommendation is for for bank regulators to strengthen enforcement of the **Community Reinvestment Act (CRA)** by including finance companies, independent mortgage companies, and internet banks under CRA, among other regulatory enhancements;
2. LMSDI encourages banks to make stronger, comprehensive **commitments** to minorities and minority communities;
3. LMSDI requests greater **government transparency** in the reporting of which neighborhoods public affordable housing funds are allocated.
4. LMSDI calls upon the city of Pittsburgh to enforce its own **Community Reinvestment Depository Policy** (Codified into law as Ord. No. 8-2012, § 1, effective April 25, 2012). This policy evaluates the community reinvestment policies of financial institutions to determine into which institutions the city should deposit its funds. On the books since 2012, there has been no report issued, no hearings held, and no information about which banks the city deposits its funds.
5. LMSDI advocates for the implementation of a **statewide CRA law for Pennsylvania**. A statewide CRA law would assist the governor, state legislators, and local leaders to evaluate the performance of the 176 financial institutions chartered to do business in Pennsylvania.
6. A final recommendation is to enhance **minority financial education** to strengthen community knowledge of wealth-building opportunities. But knowledge is only good if the city and financial institutions are following the law. It is up to community leaders, corporate and university chiefs, regulators, and politicians to hold banks accountable to reinvestment opportunities in Black neighborhoods.