# Foreclosure-Related Consent Orders Status Report: Observations, Payments, and Foreclosure Prevention Assistance 
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## Executive Summary

In 2013, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC) and the Federal Reserve Board (FRB) amended consent orders against 15 mortgage servicers for deficient practices in mortgage servicing and foreclosure processing. In total, these Independent Foreclosure Review (IFR) Payment Agreements require the servicers to provide $\$ 3.9$ billion in payments to 4.4 million eligible borrowers and $\$ 6.1$ billion in other loss mitigation and foreclosure prevention assistance. ${ }^{1}$

Servicers covered by these amendments to the consent orders include: Aurora Bank FSB, ${ }^{2}$ Bank of America, N.A., Citibank, N.A., EverBank, GMAC Mortgage, Goldman Sachs, HSBC Bank USA, N.A., JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A., MetLife Bank, ${ }^{3}$ N.A., Morgan Stanley, PNC Bank, N.A., Sovereign Bank, ${ }^{4}$ SunTrust Bank, ${ }^{5}$ U.S. Bank, N.A., and Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. The amendments effectively ended requirements for these servicers to have an independent review of the files of their borrowers who were in the process of foreclosure at any time in 2009 and 2010. The independent review had been required by consent orders issued in 2011. ${ }^{6}$

In addition to these 15 servicers, OneWest Bank, FSB, ${ }^{7}$ which includes Financial Freedom and IndyMac Mortgage Services, has operated under a consent order since April 2011 that also required an independent review of its foreclosure activity in 2009 and 2010. That review is nearing completion. Where the independent consultant found errors that resulted in financial harm in reviews that have been completed, borrowers began to receive remediation in March 2014. Notifications to borrowers regarding the results of the OneWest Bank reviews will continue through the summer of 2014. This report provides data on the volume and categories of OneWest remediation determined thus far. OneWest is not subject to an amended consent order.

## Payment Summary

Because servicers entered agreements at different times, regulators directed the creation of four separate settlement funds. This report focuses on Qualified Settlement Fund 1, which includes payments from Aurora, Bank of America, Citibank, HSBC, JPMorgan Chase, MetLife Bank, PNC, Sovereign, SunTrust, U.S. Bank, and Wells Fargo. As of January 24, 2014, Qualified Settlement Fund 1 had disbursed 3,948,415 checks, totaling $\$ 3,385,814,432$. Of those checks,

[^0]3,280,458 ( 83 percent), totaling $\$ 2,903,932,623$ ( 86 percent), have been cashed or deposited as of April 8, 2014. Reissued checks will affect the value of checks cashed, but do not count toward the total number and value issued.

Payments also have been made to eligible borrowers whose mortgages were serviced by Goldman Sachs and Morgan Stanley (Qualified Settlement Fund 2), as well as eligible borrowers whose mortgages were serviced by GMAC Mortgage (Qualified Settlement Fund 3). ${ }^{8}$ Payments to eligible borrowers serviced by EverBank are expected to begin in the second quarter of 2014 (Qualified Settlement Fund 4). ${ }^{9}$

Eligible borrowers whose mortgages were serviced by Aurora, Bank of America, Citibank, Goldman Sachs, GMAC Mortgage, HSBC, JPMorgan Chase, MetLife Bank, Morgan Stanley, PNC, Sovereign, SunTrust, U.S. Bank, and Wells Fargo, and who have questions regarding payments should contact Rust Consulting, Inc., at 1-888-952-9105, Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. - 10 p.m. ET or Saturday, 8 a.m. -5 p.m. ET.

Eligible borrowers whose mortgages were serviced by EverBank with questions regarding payments can contact Epiq Systems at 1-877-819-9754, send an e-mail to:
info@EverBankIndependentForeclosureReview.com, or send a letter to: EverBank IFR Payment Agreement, PO Box 2730, Portland, OR 97208-2730.

Eligible borrowers with questions about remediation from Financial Freedom (OneWest) and IndyMac Mortgage Services may call 1-800-500-6097, Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. - 8 p.m. CT.

## Loss Mitigation and Foreclosure Prevention Activity Summary

In addition to direct payments to eligible borrowers, the amended consent orders obligated covered servicers to provide $\$ 6,061,000,000$ in other foreclosure prevention assistance. Aurora, EverBank, GMAC Mortgage, MetLife Bank, Morgan Stanley, and PNC Bank met their obligations by paying collectively an additional $\$ 92$ million to the qualified settlement funds or to U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)-approved nonprofit organizations providing borrower counseling or education services. Of this amount, $\$ 63$ million went to the qualified settlement funds and $\$ 29$ million went to HUD-approved borrower counseling and education.

Bank of America, Citibank, HSBC, JPMorgan Chase, Sovereign, U.S. Bank, and Wells Fargo submitted foreclosure prevention assistance activities for credit under the amended consent orders on 16,362 mortgages with a total unpaid balance of $\$ 4,045,726,584$ through January 24 , 2014. The average mortgage that received assistance from these servicers had an unpaid balance of $\$ 247,264$. The average deficiency waived was $\$ 104,909$ and the average reduction in monthly principal and interest payment was $\$ 614$. Data presented here reflect the servicers' submissions, but regulators have not validated submissions nor have they awarded credit toward

[^1]the obligations under the amended consent orders. Part 2 of this report discusses those submissions in greater detail. Validation of the submissions is underway.

The amended consent orders included principles servicers should consider when evaluating the effectiveness of loss mitigation and foreclosure prevention programs. As the activities submitted for credit under the amended consent orders represent a small portion of the total activities undertaken by a servicer, the actions cannot be viewed in isolation to evaluate the overall effectiveness of a servicer's loss mitigation and foreclosure prevention programs. The OCC will be reviewing the loss mitigation and foreclosure prevention activities undertaken by servicers since the consent orders were executed in 2011 to assess the effectiveness of those programs. Regulators encourage borrowers needing foreclosure prevention assistance to work directly with their servicer or contact the Homeowner's HOPE Hotline at 888-995-HOPE (4673) to be put in touch with a HUD-approved nonprofit organization that can provide free assistance.

## Observations from the Independent Foreclosure Reviews Summary

In general, independent consultant findings regarding the reviews that were complete or had a significant portion of the work finished at the termination of the IFR were consistent with the deficiencies and weaknesses examiners identified during the 2010 horizontal review of large and midsized mortgage servicers. Besides those deficiencies and weaknesses, the findings identified additional loss mitigation related errors. ${ }^{10}$

Errors and process weaknesses identified most often by the consultants during the IFR included:

- Improper loan modification denials and untimely execution, aggravated by rapidly increasing modification request volume without adequate staffing and changing program guidelines during 2009 and 2010;
- Untimely communication and inadequate recognition of bankruptcy protection by servicing departments;
- Violations of Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (SCRA) protections; and
- Fee errors arising from servicer process weaknesses, especially servicers’ lack of oversight of external parties who provided services such as legal representation and property management.

When the IFR payment agreement was negotiated between the participating servicers and the regulators at the end of 2012, 14 percent, or 103,820, of the files identified for review were complete, 8.9 percent of the completed file reviews had some type of servicer error, and 4.5 percent of the mortgages qualified for financial remediation under the 2012 financial remediation framework. Where ICs identified errors resulting in financial harm, the rate of error varied by servicer from a high of 23.9 percent at one servicer and a low of 0.6 percent at another. Of the errors with financial harm, many were relatively small fee errors.

[^2]The consultant for EverBank completed a substantial number of its reviews, including all files in the sample population and all requests-for-reviews, before EverBank entered into a similar IFR payment agreement with its regulator in August 2013. In total, the EverBank consultant found compensable errors in 22 percent of servicer's in-scope population of mortgages, and 97 percent of those errors involved relatively small fee errors.

The consultant for OneWest is nearing completion of the IFR process. By the end of February 2014, a substantial number of files were completed, and OneWest began remediation on March 3, 2014. At that time, the consultant had confirmed a total of 10,781 borrowers ( 5.6 percent of the in-scope population of 192,199 ) were due remediation in the aggregate amount of $\$ 8,520,105$. As the independent consultant completes the remaining independent reviews, OneWest will continue to deliver remediation checks through the third quarter of 2014.

All servicers covered by the consent orders continue to take action to correct deficiencies in mortgage servicing and foreclosure processes as directed by the OCC and FRB enforcement actions. While servicers report that much of that work is complete, federal examiners are in the process of verifying and testing that work. This report does not discuss the status of corrective actions required by the original consent orders.

## Part 1: Payment Status

The amended consent orders issued by the OCC and FRB in 2013 require 15 mortgage servicers to pay $\$ 3.9$ billion to approximately 4.4 million eligible borrowers. Payments began on April 12, 2013 and were sent in waves. Because servicers entered agreements at different times, regulators directed the creation of four different payment funds. The largest of these, Qualified Settlement Fund 1, includes 10 OCC-supervised servicers (Aurora, Bank of America, Citibank, HSBC, JPMorgan Chase, MetLife Bank, PNC, Sovereign, U.S. Bank, and Wells Fargo) and one FRBsupervised servicer (SunTrust).

This report provides data on payments made by Qualified Settlement Fund 1 through January 24, 2014. As of that date, Qualified Settlement Fund 1 issued 3,948,415 checks for a total of $\$ 3,385,814,432$. Of those checks, $3,280,458$ ( 83 percent), totaling \$2,903,932,623 (86 percent) have been cashed or deposited as of April 8, 2014.

Of the total number of initial checks in Qualified Settlement Fund issued through January 24, 2014, 500,335 (11.7 percent) were initially returned as undeliverable. The paying agent performed additional research to identify alternative addresses for all borrowers on the loans so that the returned checks could be reissued. The paying agent conducted similar address searches for eligible borrowers who did not cash their checks before the check expired and sent checks to updated addresses where available. Almost all returned and expired checks were reissued at least once. The remaining checks are being reissued as case-specific issues (e.g., splitting payments, change of payee, etc.) are resolved. Reissued checks will affect the value of checks cashed, but do not count toward the total number and value issued.

Payments will begin in the second quarter of 2014 for Qualified Settlement Fund 4, which includes OCC-supervised EverBank.

Appendix 1 presents the number of eligible borrowers, payment amounts and other foreclosure prevention assistance by each servicer covered by the IFR payment agreements. Appendix 2 presents state-level data on the volume and amount of payments made under Qualified Settlement 1. Appendix 4 presents the number and value of checks issued and paid by Qualified Settlement Fund 1 by payment category.

## Part 2: Other Loss Mitigation and Foreclosure Prevention Assistance

The amended consent orders issued in 2013 also direct participating servicers to provide $\$ 6.1$ billion in other loss mitigation and foreclosure prevention assistance. Activities that can receive credit toward that amount include loan modifications, short sales, and other forms of assistance subject to regulatory non-objection. The amended consent orders stipulate the amount of credit a servicer can receive for each type of activity. ${ }^{11}$

In providing foreclosure prevention assistance, regulators expect the servicers to undertake wellstructured loss mitigation efforts focused on foreclosure prevention, with preference given to activities designed to keep eligible borrowers in their homes through affordable, sustainable, and meaningful home preservation actions.

## Payments to the Qualified Settlement Funds and to HUD-Approved Counselors

Six servicers-Aurora, EverBank, GMAC Mortgage, MetLife Bank, Morgan Stanley, and PNC—met their obligations to provide additional foreclosure assistance by paying collectively $\$ 92,000,000$ to the qualified settlement funds or HUD-approved nonprofit organizations providing borrower counseling and/or education services.

## Table 1: Payments Made to Meet Foreclosure Prevention Assistance Obligation

| Payments to the Qualified Settlement Funds | $\$ 63,000,000$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Cash to Borrower Counseling or Education $^{\text {Total }}{ }^{1}$ | $\$ 29,000,000$ |

1. Amounts rounded to nearest million.

Servicers that fully satisfied their obligation to provide additional foreclosure prevention assistance by paying into the qualified settlement funds or providing cash to borrower counseling and education will not report additional loss mitigation and foreclosure prevention activities.

## Reported Additional Loss Mitigation and Foreclosure Prevention Assistance

The remaining servicers covered by the amended consent orders (Bank of America, Citibank, HSBC, JPMorgan Chase, Sovereign, U.S. Bank, and Wells Fargo) are fulfilling their loss mitigation and foreclosure prevention assistance obligations by providing assistance allowable under the amended consent orders directly to eligible borrowers.

Servicers may meet their commitments through three specific consumer relief activities set forth in the National Mortgage Settlement (NMS): $:^{12}$ first lien modifications, second lien modifications, and short sales/deeds in lieu of foreclosure. The amendments to the consent

[^3]orders describe how these activities will be credited. ${ }^{13}$ Servicers may also meet their commitments by providing other foreclosure prevention actions, subject to regulatory nonobjection. The amount of foreclosure prevention assistance each servicer is obligated to provide is included in appendix 1 . Appendix 5 presents activity submitted for regulator consideration by each covered servicer.

Table 2 presents the gross value of activities reported by covered servicers. Regulators are validating submissions and have not determined the amount of activity that servicers will receive credit for toward their obligations. Table 2 excludes other activities that servicers have submitted for regulatory non-objection, but have not yet received a determination.

| Table 2: Foreclosure Prevention Assistance Activity Submitted by Covered Servicers |  |
| :--- | ---: |
|  |  |
| \# of Loans | Total |
| Unpaid Balance (UPB) Before Action | 16,362 |
| Average UPB Before Action | $\$ 4,045,726,584$ |
| Average Sales Price (Short Sales) | $\$ 247,264$ |
| Deficiency Waived | $\$ 147,798$ |
| Average Deficiency Waived | $\$ 147,186,774$ |
| Transition Assistance Provided | $\$ 104,909$ |
| Average Interest Rate Before Action ${ }^{1}$ | $\$ 1,437,339$ |
| Average Interest Rate After Action | $5.97 \%$ |
| Average Debt-to-Income (DTI) Before Action | $4.01 \%$ |
| Average DTI After Action | $42 \%$ |
| Average Payment Reduction (If Applicable) ${ }^{2}$ | $27 \%$ |

1. Calculations performed on interest rates and DTI include only those records with before and after values.
2. Average payment reduction reflects the straight average of all the differences between principal and interest on loans with both a before and after amount.

Bank of America, Citibank, JPMorgan Chase, and Wells Fargo are also part of the NMS. The NMS monitor issued a report on March 18, 2014, announcing that these servicers had fulfilled their consumer relief obligations under the NMS. Servicers covered by the NMS and the IFR Payment Agreement must meet obligations of both settlements. Servicers cannot use actions taken to fulfill NMS obligations to fulfill the servicers' obligations under the amended consent orders.

The regulators recognize that the assistance reported here represents a portion of the total consumer assistance and loss mitigation activity by each servicer. Regulators will continue to monitor each servicer's compliance with the original consent orders to ensure effective loss mitigation and foreclosure prevention activities.

[^4]
## Part 3: Observations from the Independent Foreclosure Reviews

While the IFR was terminated before reaching its conclusion for 15 of 16 servicers required to retain an independent consultant to conduct a review of their foreclosure activity in 2009 and 2010, the reviews that were complete provide insight into the type and quantity of weaknesses and errors in foreclosure and loss mitigation processes that were present at those servicers, supervised by the OCC.

In general, independent consultant findings regarding the reviews that were complete or had a significant portion of the work finished were consistent with the deficiencies and weaknesses examiners identified during the 2010 horizontal review of large and midsized mortgage servicers and identified additional loss mitigation related errors. The findings of that horizontal review were published in April 2011. ${ }^{14}$

Errors and process weaknesses identified most often by the consultants during the IFR included:

- Loan modification denials and untimely execution, aggravated by rapidly increasing modification request volume without adequate staffing and changing program guidelines during 2009 and 2010;
- Untimely communication and recognition of bankruptcy protection by servicing departments;
- Violations of SCRA protections; and
- Fee errors arising from servicer process weaknesses, especially servicers’ lack of oversight of external parties who provided services such as legal representation and property management.

Error rates identified by consultants varied greatly, but were primarily low dollar, fee-related errors. Of the errors that were found to result in financial injury, the most common were general errors, ${ }^{15}$ followed by errors in denying modifications, bankruptcy-related errors, notice errors, and SCRA-related errors (see table 3).

| Table 3. Most Common Errors With Financial Harm Found by Independent Consultants |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Category | Percent of total <br> financial harm errors found |
| General error | 51.2 |
| Modification denied in error | 9.1 |
| Bankruptcy | 9.1 |
| Servicer failed to provide legally sufficient notice | 8.4 |
| SCRA-related errors | 8.2 |

When the IFR payment agreement was negotiated between the participating servicers and the regulators at the end of 2012, 14 percent, or 103,820, of the files identified for review were complete, 8.9 percent of the completed file reviews had some type of error, and 4.5 percent of the mortgages qualified for financial remediation under the 2012 financial remediation

[^5]framework. ${ }^{16}$ Many errors were technical in nature, did not have a monetary impact for borrowers, and very few of these invalidated foreclosure actions. Where ICs identified errors resulting in financial harm, the rate of error varied from a high of 23.9 percent at one servicer and a low of 0.6 percent at another. ${ }^{17}$ Of the errors with financial harm, many were small dollar fee errors. The types of findings were generally consistent across all servicers, including those that entered amended consent orders terminating the IFR in January 2013 and those that did not.

On December 31, 2012, regulators required servicers to provide data on the categorization of errors found as of that date. See appendix 3.

In January 2013, 10 OCC-regulated servicers entered the IFR Payment Agreement, which terminated their IFR processes. Table 4 presents data on the status of reviews completed for those servicers at the time their reviews were terminated. ${ }^{18}$

| Table 4. Completion and Error Rates at 10 OCC-Regulated Servicers Entering IFR Payment Agreement in January 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sample Revie | eclosur <br> File <br> ws | in Progress Request Revie | d File vs $\qquad$ | Sampl Revi | reclosur <br> File <br> s | Complete <br> Request Revie | File <br> v | Total |  |
| Servicer | Reviews Complete | Error <br> Rate | Reviews Complete | Error <br> Rate | Reviews Complete | Error <br> Rate | Reviews Complete | Error <br> Rate | Reviews Complete | Error <br> Rate |
| MetLife | 0.0\% | N/A | 0.0\% | N/A | 0.0\% | N/A | 0.0\% | N/A | 0.0\% | N/A |
| HSBC | 1.3\% | 0.0\% | 2.0\% | 0.0\% | 1.7\% | 0.0\% | 1.0\% | 0.0\% | 1.3\% | 0.0\% |
| Aurora | 1.3\% | 2.7\% | 0.4\% | 5.3\% | 1.7\% | 15.5\% | 0.3\% | 3.6\% | 0.9\% | 8.9\% |
| Bank of America | 12.1\% | 10.9\% | 4.3\% | 0.0\% | 21.7\% | 22.7\% | 1.2\% | 0.0\% | 6.0\% | 8.9\% |
| Citibank | 19.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.2\% | 0.0\% | 19.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.0\% | 4.2\% | 0.0\% |
| Sovereign ${ }^{1}$ | 30.9\% | 10.1\% | 0.6\% | 0.0\% | 36.2\% | 2.6\% | 4.5\% | 18.2\% | 25.9\% | 6.3\% |
| Wells Fargo | 33.6\% | 19.3\% | 3.7\% | 0.5\% | 38.3\% | 24.6\% | 7.3\% | 0.8\% | 9.6\% | 11.4\% |
| U.S. Bank | 42.0\% | 2.0\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 55.5\% | 0.9\% | 0.3\% | 0.0\% | 27.1\% | 1.2\% |
| JPMorgan Chase | 47.7\% | 0.2\% | 1.7\% | 9.9\% | 14.6\% | 1.1\% | 1.7\% | 17.2\% | 22.9\% | 0.6\% |
| PNC | 49.5\% | 26.7\% | 27.5\% | 32.1\% | 49.8\% | 15.6\% | 33.4\% | 17.8\% | 40.9\% | 23.9\% |

1. Now Santander Bank, N.A.
[^6]
## Observations from the Review of EverBank Mortgage Servicing and Foreclosure Processes

At the time other servicers entered the IFR Payment Agreement, EverBank concluded that their independent consultant was making sufficient progress in their IFR and did not enter into the agreement with regulators. However, EverBank and the OCC later agreed that it was in the best interest of EverBank's in-scope borrowers that EverBank enter into an amended consent order on August 23, 2013. ${ }^{19}$ Payments to in-scope EverBank borrowers are expected to begin in the second quarter of 2014, more than a year later than payments to borrowers whose mortgages were serviced by the companies that entered amended consent orders earlier. Because payments to EverBank borrowers have not commenced, this report does not discuss distribution of those payments.

## Table 5. EverBank Consultant Findings and Approved Remediation

| Category | Borrowers to be Compensated | Total Compensation |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | ---: |
| 1 | SCRA-related errors (Sections 533 \& 521) | 9 | $\$ 908,572$ |
| 1 | SCRA-related errors (Section 527) | 34 | $\$ 114,113^{1}$ |
| 2 | Borrower not in default | 5 | $\$ 25,000$ |
| 3a | Error after trial loan modification completed | 1 | $\$ 35,000$ |
| 3b | Error after trial loan modification approved | 2 | $\$ 140,000$ |
| 4 | Forbearance Plan | 1 | $\$ 15,000$ |
| 5 | Modification denied in error | 113 | $\$ 2,240,909$ |
| 6 | No Follow Up on Loan Modification Application | 4 | $\$ 12,200$ |
| 7 | Never solicited loan modification | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | Failed to approve modification in prescribed <br> timeframe | 0 |  |
| 9 | Used wrong interest rate in an approved <br> modification | 9 | 0 |
| 10 | Bankruptcy | 7 | $\$ 54,983$ |
| 11 | Servicer did not have standing to foreclose | 3 | $\$ 15,487$ |
| 12 | Servicer failed to provide legally sufficient notice | 5 | $\$ 9,728$ |
| 13 | General Errors | 6,992 | $\$ 20,517$ |
|  | Payments to Remaining in-Scope Borrowers With <br> No Harm Identified | 25,389 | $\$ 9,681,592$ |
|  | Total | 32,574 | $\$ 26,658,450$ |

1. Amount to be adjusted upward to ensure each borrower in the category receives a minimum of $\$ 1,050$.
2. Amounts are rounded to the nearest dollar. Total is calculated from unrounded amounts.

Before EverBank entered its amended consent order, the EverBank consultant finished a significant portion of its reviews. The consultant completed review of all of the initial samples, requests for reviews, and all deeper dives except for those involving potential errors related to fees. In total, the EverBank consultant found compensable errors in 22 percent of the servicer's in-scope portfolio, and 97 percent of those errors involved relatively small errors related to fees. Conducting additional reviews to determine fee errors would have significantly delayed

[^7]completion of the review and remediation. As a result, the amended consent order with EverBank required the servicer to provide compensation to 100 percent of its in-scope population. A minimum payment of $\$ 1,050$ was determined based on an analysis of completed reviews that showed the vast majority of fee errors fell below that amount.

Compensating 100 percent of the 32,574 eligible EverBank borrowers meant providing compensation to 25,389 borrowers whose reviews found no errors with harm.

Payments to the entire in-scope population for EverBank borrowers followed these guidelines:
(a) borrowers whose files were not reviewed by the EverBank consultant and borrowers whose files were reviewed by the consultant with no finding of error will receive $\$ 1,050$;
(b) borrowers whose file reviews were completed by the consultant with a finding of error with financial harm for categories 1 through 4 of the published 2012 financial remediation framework (2012 framework) will receive amount listed in the relevant category of the framework, including equity and interest amounts where applicable;
(c) borrowers whose file reviews were completed by the consultant with a finding of error with financial harm for categories 5 through 12 of the framework will receive the amount listed in the relevant category of the 2012 framework, including equity and interest amounts where applicable and a payment equal to the amount of financial harm as determined by the consultant for each finding of error for categories that do not have amounts listed in the 2012 framework; and
(d) borrowers not covered under (a) and (b) will receive either the higher of either $\$ 1,050$ or the amount of actual harm determined by the consultant under category 13.

## Observations from the Review of OneWest Mortgage Servicing and Foreclosure Processes

OneWest did not enter into the IFR Payment Agreement with regulators and decided to complete its IFR for two key reasons. First, OneWest had a relatively small population of 192,199 inscope borrowers, and OneWest believed that their consultant would complete the IFR engagement sooner than most. Second, OneWest also considered the unique circumstances of OneWest's previous ownership by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) and expressed concern that signing an amended consent order would obligate them for a period of activity that they had no control over and could subject the bank to additional liability. ${ }^{20}$

|  | Category | Number of Mortgages Recommended by Consultant For Remediation | Number of Mortgages Tested from In-scope Population | Error Rate as \% of Number of Mortgages Tested | Amount of Remediation Recommended by Consultant | Borrowers with Compensation in Progress | Total Compensation in Progress |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | SCRA-related errors ${ }^{1}$ | 54 | 892 | 6.0538 | \$2,946,986 | 54 | \$2,946,986 |
| 2 | Borrower not in default | 23 | 178,886 | . 00129 | \$730,719 | 23 | \$730,719 |
| 3a | Error after trial loan modification completed | 1 | 26,964 | . 00371 | \$345,072 | 1 | \$345,072 |
| 3b | Error after trial loan modification approved | 1 | 26,964 | . 00371 | \$125,000 | 1 | \$125,000 |
| 4 | Forbearance plan | 0 | 26,964 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | Modification denied in error | 43 | 26,964 | . 15947 | \$641,444 | 43 | \$641,444 |
| 6 | No Follow Up on Loan Modification Application | 34 | 26,964 | . 12609 | \$68,185 | 34 | \$68,185 |
| 7 | Never solicited loan modification | 56 | 26,964 | . 20768 | \$58,729 | 56 | \$58,729 |
| 8 | Failed to approve modification in prescribed time frame | 19 | 26,964 | . 07046 | \$16,415 | 19 | \$16,415 |
| 9 | Used wrong interest rate in an approved modification | 0 | 26,964 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | Bankruptcy | 3 | 8,171 | . 03672 | \$7,533 | 3 | \$7,533 |
| 11 | Servicer did not have standing to foreclose | 0 | 3,836 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | Servicer failed to provide legally sufficient notice | 0 | 21,564 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | General issues | 10,547 | 192,199 | 5.4875 | \$3,580,022 | 10,547 | \$3,580,022 |
|  | Total | 10,781 |  |  | \$8,520,105 ${ }^{2}$ | 10,781 | \$8,520,105 ${ }^{2}$ |

1. Includes both errors relating to sections 521,527 , and 533 of the SCRA.
2. Amounts are rounded to the nearest dollar. Total is calculated from unrounded amounts.
[^8]The consultant for OneWest is finalizing its IFR process. By the end of February 2014, a substantial number of file reviews were completed, and OneWest began remediation on March 3, 2014. At that time, the consultant had confirmed 10,781 borrowers ( 5.6 percent of the in-scope population of 192,199 ) were due remediation in the aggregate amount of $\$ 8,520,105$. As the independent consultant completes the remaining independent reviews, OneWest will continue to deliver remediation checks and review results through the summer of 2014. Remediation will follow the regulators' financial remediation framework published in June 2012. ${ }^{21}$ Because remediation began in March, this report does not discuss its distribution.

[^9]
## Appendix 1: Independent Foreclosure Review Agreement Amounts

Table 7 provides a summary of the amount of payments to eligible borrowers and other foreclosure prevention assistance that the OCC and FRB amended consent orders require from each participating servicer. Servicers have satisfied the amount to be paid to eligible borrowers by depositing the requisite amount into qualified settlement funds. Servicer activities to satisfy the required amount of additional foreclosure prevention assistance are underway.

|  | In-scope Borrowers | Required Amount to be Paid into the Qualified Settlement Funds | Required Amount of Other Foreclosure Prevention Assistance | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aurora | 109,408 | \$108,000,000 ${ }^{1}$ | \$149,000,000 ${ }^{2}$ | \$257,000,000 |
| Bank of America | 1,290,131 | \$1,128,000,000 | \$1,759,000,000 | \$2,887,000,000 |
| Citibank | 357,103 | \$307,000,000 | \$487,000,000 | \$794,000,000 |
| EverBank | 32,574 | \$40,000,000 | \$44,000,000 ${ }^{2}$ | \$84,000,000 |
| GMAC <br> Mortgage | $232,000^{3}$ | \$198,000,000 | \$317,000,000 ${ }^{2}$ | \$515,000,000 |
| Goldman Sachs | 128,826 | \$135,000,000 | \$195,000,000 | \$330,000,000 |
| HSBC | 112,474 | \$97,000,000 | \$153,000,000 | \$250,000,000 |
| JPMorgan Chase | 883,886 | \$757,000,000 | \$1,205,000,000 | \$1,962,000,000 |
| MetLife | 35,445 | \$37,000,000 | \$48,000,000 ${ }^{2}$ | \$85,000,000 |
| Morgan Stanley | 95,542 | \$114,000,000 | \$130,000,000 ${ }^{2}$ | \$244,000,000 |
| PNC | 81,475 | \$69,000,000 | \$111,000,000 ${ }^{2}$ | \$180,000,000 |
| Sovereign | 7,260 | \$6,000,000 | \$10,000,000 | \$16,000,000 |
| SunTrust | 73,405 | \$63,000,000 | \$100,000,000 | \$163,000,000 |
| U.S. Bank | 93,945 | \$80,000,000 | \$128,000,000 | \$208,000,000 |
| Wells Fargo | 898,640 | \$766,000,000 | \$1,225,000,000 | \$1,991,000,000 |
| Totals | 4,432,114 | \$3,905,000,000 | \$6,061,000,000 | \$9,966,000,000 |

1. All dollar amounts rounded to nearest million.
2. Satisfied by payment of a lesser amount to the qualified settlement funds or a HUD-certified organization.
3. Approximate

## Appendix 2: State-Level Payment Data for Qualified Settlement Fund 1

Table 8 provides the volume and value of checks that have been issued and paid (cashed or deposited by the recipient) for payments made by Qualified Settlement Fund 1 of the IFR Payment Agreement in each state through January 24, 2014. The table includes data from Rust Consulting, Inc., and may vary from other published numbers because of timing of check clearance, processing, and reporting. Qualified Settlement Fund 1 includes 11 of the banks that have entered into the IFR Payment Agreement-Aurora, Bank of America, Citibank, HSBC, JPMorgan Chase, MetLife Bank, PNC, Sovereign, SunTrust, U.S. Bank, and Wells Fargo. This table excludes payments to borrowers whose mortgages were serviced by EverBank, GMAC Mortgage, Goldman Sachs, and Morgan Stanley, which entered IFR payment agreements later, and OneWest that did not enter a payment agreement. Payments to OneWest borrowers began in March 2014.

| Table 8: State-Level Payment Data as of January 24, 2014 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State | Issued Dollars | Issued Quantity | Paid Dollars | Paid Quantity |
| Alabama | \$37,440,887 | 38,907 | \$31,171,506 | 31,808 |
| Alaska | \$2,619,981 | 3,494 | \$2,138,666 | 2,714 |
| Arizona | \$184,222,656 | 180,997 | \$156,527,443 | 150,670 |
| Arkansas | \$14,744,048 | 19,001 | \$11,892,394 | 15,234 |
| California | \$643,701,405 | 652,031 | \$549,911,504 | 539,162 |
| Colorado | \$57,062,022 | 66,833 | \$47,803,335 | 54,299 |
| Connecticut | \$23,777,714 | 33,957 | \$19,861,758 | 27,557 |
| Delaware | \$8,978,131 | 11,171 | \$6,887,740 | 8,967 |
| District of Columbia | \$4,067,182 | 5,716 | \$3,109,654 | 4,274 |
| Florida | \$449,627,787 | 612,137 | \$369,366,333 | 490,025 |
| Georgia | \$161,742,719 | 161,671 | \$133,410,152 | 132,400 |
| Guam | \$5,700 | 11 | \$2,600 | 3 |
| Hawaii | \$8,348,025 | 11,060 | \$6,762,045 | 8,663 |
| Idaho | \$18,681,122 | 20,985 | \$16,433,351 | 18,041 |
| Illinois | \$143,009,364 | 183,129 | \$119,014,570 | 146,742 |
| Indiana | \$60,384,456 | 76,098 | \$51,257,859 | 63,615 |
| Iowa | \$16,165,713 | 21,398 | \$14,147,835 | 18,222 |
| Kansas | \$19,902,977 | 20,734 | \$16,681,113 | 17,040 |
| Kentucky | \$26,736,000 | 31,689 | \$22,492,560 | 26,252 |


| State | Issued Dollars | Issued Quantity | Paid Dollars | Paid Quantity |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Louisiana | \$25,795,497 | 32,258 | \$20,904,877 | 25,602 |
| Maine | \$7,103,861 | 9,797 | \$5,835,877 | 8,125 |
| Maryland | \$58,371,875 | 74,503 | \$47,249,352 | 58,428 |
| Massachusetts | \$40,989,646 | 50,946 | \$33,932,778 | 40,964 |
| Michigan | \$144,616,896 | 157,638 | \$127,251,848 | 134,749 |
| Minnesota | \$59,981,507 | 68,993 | \$53,765,380 | 59,948 |
| Mississippi | \$17,569,797 | 19,327 | \$14,810,454 | 15,813 |
| Missouri | \$54,485,090 | 59,458 | \$45,661,353 | 48,978 |
| Montana | \$5,156,722 | 6,074 | \$4,504,072 | 5,153 |
| Nebraska | \$9,788,040 | 11,327 | \$8,368,450 | 9,567 |
| Nevada | \$107,222,382 | 112,314 | \$91,689,595 | 93,361 |
| New Hampshire | \$11,197,669 | 11,820 | \$9,769,589 | 10,041 |
| New Jersey | \$73,896,610 | 116,664 | \$56,895,483 | 86,499 |
| New Mexico | \$11,962,393 | 16,012 | \$9,809,283 | 12,736 |
| New York | \$91,800,896 | 126,347 | \$70,632,285 | 94,448 |
| North Carolina | \$70,826,126 | 82,135 | \$59,319,358 | 67,718 |
| North Dakota | \$1,172,680 | 1,484 | \$922,360 | 1,259 |
| Ohio | \$110,005,776 | 133,335 | \$92,277,863 | 110,392 |
| Oklahoma | \$28,148,312 | 28,019 | \$22,162,439 | 21,738 |
| Oregon | \$40,371,226 | 45,048 | \$35,062,549 | 37,756 |
| Pennsylvania | \$68,468,197 | 86,517 | \$55,998,407 | 68,958 |
| Puerto Rico | \$1,732,720 | 2,764 | \$1,289,540 | 1,911 |
| Rhode Island | \$8,900,743 | 11,420 | \$7,524,781 | 9,383 |
| South Carolina | \$36,621,806 | 43,986 | \$30,317,606 | 35,852 |
| South Dakota | \$2,429,410 | 3,264 | \$2,114,390 | 2,789 |
| Tennessee | \$54,674,215 | 59,883 | \$45,193,711 | 48,510 |
| Texas | \$143,535,693 | 181,071 | \$113,469,881 | 139,522 |
| Utah | \$30,851,624 | 33,930 | \$26,433,098 | 28,218 |
| Vermont | \$1,817,146 | 2,737 | \$1,582,993 | 2,314 |
| Virgin Islands | \$156,172 | 314 | \$98,710 | 197 |
| Virginia | \$76,398,957 | 82,854 | \$63,782,359 | 66,774 |
| Washington | \$57,983,878 | 66,773 | \$48,773,890 | 54,369 |
| West Virginia | \$8,027,939 | 8,563 | \$6,746,988 | 7,092 |
| Wisconsin | \$39,838,918 | 46,495 | \$35,199,909 | 40,346 |
| Wyoming | \$2,423,480 | 2,840 | \$2,087,130 | 2,310 |
| Others | \$272,642 | 486 | \$212,002 | 346 |
| Total | \$3,385,814,432 | 3,948,415 | \$2,830,523,060 | 3,207,854 |

## Appendix 3: Aggregate Findings of Consultants as of December 31, 2012

The following table presents data provide by consultants as of December 31, 2012, on the categorization of all errors found as of that date.
Table 9. Aggregate Findings of Consultants as of December 31, 2012


1. Total Sample, which includes internal and referred complaints subject to 100 percent review.
2. Includes only those files with errors not resulting in financial injury. This count is mutually exclusive from the "Files with Financial Injury Errors" count.
3. Includes only those files where the IC completed an initial review, but final decision of financial injury/no injury pended for receipt of additional documents from the servicer or for IC's quality control review.
4. Includes only those files where the IC rendered the final decision of financial injury/no injury.
5. Outreach file totals do not include 271 files received through the request for review process as of December 31, 2012, that were out of scope.

Office of the
Comptroller of the Currency

## Appendix 4: Payments by Category

Table 10 provides the number of eligible borrowers and payment amounts in each payment category for borrowers covered by Qualified Settlement Fund 1 of the IFR Payment Agreement through January 24, 2014. Qualified Settlement Fund 1 includes 11 of the banks that have entered into the IFR Payment Agreement—Aurora, Bank of America, Citibank, HSBC, JPMorgan Chase, MetLife Bank, PNC, Sovereign, SunTrust, U.S. Bank, and Wells Fargo. This table excludes payments to borrowers whose mortgages were serviced by EverBank, GMAC Mortgage, Goldman Sachs, and Morgan Stanley, which entered IFR payment agreements later, and a third category, OneWest, which did not enter a payment agreement.

The table contains only standard payout amounts; it does not include amounts for lost equity, which borrowers in the first and third categories may receive in addition to the standard payout amounts, nor the payments calculated on a case-by-case basis in the second category. Throughout the table below the "number of borrowers paid" represents the number of borrowers who cashed or deposited checks. Total amount received by borrowers in the first and third categories listed here may differ from amount shown because of offsets resulting from other legal settlements. Servicemembers who were charged interest rates higher than limits allowed by the SCRA Section 527 will receive payments of $\$ 300$ or the amount overcharged and paid by the borrower, whichever is greater.

| Category | Foreclosure Stage | Borrowers Who Requested a Review |  |  |  | All Other Borrowers |  |  |  | Total Borrowers in Category | Total Borrowers Paid |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number of Borrowers In Category | Payment | Number of Borrowers Paid | Dollar Amount of Checks Cashed | Number of Borrowers In Category | Payment | Number of Borrowers Paid | Dollar Amount of Checks Cashed |  |  |
| Servicer foreclosed on borrower eligible for Servicemembers | Rescinded | 8 | \$15,000 | 6 | \$90,000 | 108 | \$15,000 | 80 | \$1,137,650 | 116 | 86 |
| Civil Relief Act (SCRA) protection (applies only to rescinded or completed foreclosures)* | Completed | 123 | \$125,000 | 113 | \$12,697,425 | 959 | \$125,000 | 729 | \$85,544,935 | 1,082 | 842 |
| Servicer charged servicemembers | In process | 33 | >=\$300 | 26 | \$136,518 | 317 | >=\$300 | 260 | \$1,329,332 | 350 | 286 |
| exceed SCRA Section 527 limits** | Completed | 11 | >=\$300 | 11 | \$17,047 | 63 | >=\$300 | 53 | \$85,103 | 74 | 64 |


| Table 10 continued. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Category | ForeclosureStage | Borrowers Who Requested a Review |  |  |  | All Other Borrowers |  |  |  |  | Total Borrowers Paid |
|  |  | Number of Borrowers In Category | Payment | Number of Borrowers Paid | Dollar Amount of Checked Cashed | Number of Borrowers In Category | Payment | Number of Borrowers Paid | Dollar Amount of Checked Cashed | Total Borrowers in Category |  |
| Servicer initiated or completed foreclosure on borrower who was not in default* | In process | 46 | \$5,000 | 42 | \$210,000 | 543 | \$5,000 | 444 | \$2,212,650 | 589 | 486 |
|  | Rescinded | 8 | \$15,000 | 9 | \$134,559 | 29 | \$15,000 | 19 | \$285,000 | 37 | 28 |
|  | Completed | 8 | \$125,000 | 8 | \$1,000,000 | 45 | \$125,000 | 32 | \$4,342,760 | 53 | 40 |
| Servicer initiated or completed foreclosure on borrower who was protected by federal bankruptcy law | In process | 2,401 | \$7,500 | 2,317 | \$17,336,025 | 19,860 | \$3,750 | 17,326 | \$64,789,013 | 22,261 | 19,643 |
|  | Rescinded | 28 | \$7,500 | 25 | \$185,400 | 160 | \$3,750 | 134 | \$496,200 | 188 | 159 |
|  | Completed | 763 | \$62,500 | 678 | \$42,357,500 | 5,075 | \$31,250 | 3,841 | \$119,564,063 | 5,838 | 4,519 |
| Servicer completed foreclosure on borrower who was meeting all requirements of documented forbearance plan (applies only to rescinded or completed foreclosures) | Rescinded | 50 | \$6,000 | 46 | \$276,000 | 185 | \$3,000 | 149 | \$446,160 | 235 | 195 |
|  | Completed | 162 | \$24,000 | 140 | \$3,360,000 | 684 | \$12,000 | 465 | \$5,559,840 | 846 | 605 |
| Servicer failed to convert borrower to permanent modification after three successful payments under a written trial-period plan | In process | 461 | \$6,000 | 438 | \$2,624,640 | 2,436 | \$3,000 | 2,110 | \$6,304,800 | 2,897 | 2,548 |
|  | Rescinded | 31 | \$6,000 | 29 | \$174,000 | 91 | \$3,000 | 78 | \$234,000 | 122 | 107 |
|  | Completed | 239 | \$50,000 | 219 | \$10,904,500 | 718 | \$25,000 | 551 | \$13,745,250 | 957 | 770 |


| Table 10 continued. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Foreclosure } \\ & \text { Stage } \end{aligned}$ | Borrowers Who Requested a Review |  |  |  | All Other Borrowers |  |  |  |  | Total Borrowers Paid |
|  |  | Number of Borrowers In Category | Payment | Number of Borrowers Paid | Dollar Amount of Checked Cashed | Number of Borrowers In Category | Payment | Number of Borrowers Paid | Dollar Amount of Checked Cashed | Total Borrowers in Category |  |
| Servicer completed foreclosure on borrower who was performing all requirements of the written trial-period plan | Rescinded | 29 | \$6,000 | 26 | \$156,000 | 126 | \$3,000 | 106 | \$314,640 | 155 | 132 |
|  | Completed | 163 | \$50,000 | 142 | \$7,086,000 | 477 | \$25,000 | 345 | \$8,586,500 | 640 | 487 |
| Modification request approved | In process | 118,177 | \$500 | 110,233 | \$55,114,100 | 746,894 | \$300 | 626,686 | \$187,991,760 | 865,071 | 736,919 |
|  | Rescinded | 2,617 | \$500 | 2,428 | \$1,213,850 | 9,229 | \$300 | 7,363 | \$2,208,810 | 11,846 | 9,791 |
|  | Completed | 39,368 | \$500 | 37,140 | \$18,570,000 | 195,448 | \$300 | 154,075 | \$46,219,980 | 234,816 | 191,215 |
| Modification request denied | In process | 62,557 | \$2,000 | 57,771 | \$115,234,260 | 432,595 | \$1,000 | 353,525 | \$351,906,993 | 495,152 | 411,296 |
|  | Rescinded | 1,539 | \$2,000 | 1,426 | \$2,839,820 | 6,007 | \$1,000 | 4,778 | \$4,744,290 | 7,546 | 6,204 |
|  | Completed | 60,251 | \$6,000 | 57,138 | \$341,870,700 | 309,597 | \$3,000 | 254,590 | \$759,560,893 | 369,848 | 311,728 |
| Modification request received but no underwriting decision made | In process | 21,153 | \$800 | 19,570 | \$15,623,800 | 200,596 | \$400 | 160,262 | \$64,100,720 | 221,749 | 179,832 |
|  | Rescinded | 709 | \$800 | 659 | \$525,744 | 3,757 | \$400 | 2,924 | \$1,169,480 | 4,466 | 3,583 |
|  | Completed | 27,152 | \$800 | 25,700 | \$20,506,056 | 168,479 | \$400 | 133,436 | \$53,367,080 | 195,631 | 159,136 |
| Servicer did not engage with borrower in a loan modification or other loss mitigation action | In process | 16,679 | \$600 | 15,386 | \$9,207,282 | 312,881 | \$300 | 223,756 | \$67,123,020 | 329,560 | 239,142 |
|  | Rescinded | 350 | \$600 | 329 | \$196,980 | 4,549 | \$300 | 3,184 | \$955,020 | 4,899 | 3,513 |
|  | Completed | 36,564 | \$600 | 34,647 | \$20,734,392 | 531,912 | \$300 | 394,563 | \$118,350,630 | 568,476 | 429,210 |


| Table 10 continued. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Category | ForeclosureStage | Borrowers Who Requested a Review |  |  |  | All Other Borrowers |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Number of Borrowers In Category | Payment | Number of Borrowers Paid | Dollar Amount of Checked Cashed | Number of Borrowers In Category | Payment | Number of Borrowers Paid | Dollar Amount of Checked Cashed | Total Borrowers in Category | Total Borrowers Paid |
| All other loans | In process | 21,459 | \$500 | 20,236 | \$10,118,000 | 334,630 | \$300 | 272,649 | \$81,780,300 | 356,089 | 292,885 |
|  | Rescinded | 450 | \$500 | 428 | \$214,000 | 4,161 | \$300 | 3,246 | \$973,620 | 4,611 | 3,674 |
|  | Completed | 24,959 | \$500 | 23,816 | \$11,907,850 | 218,737 | \$300 | 174,913 | \$52,470,120 | 243,696 | 198,729 |
| Totals |  | 438,548 |  | 411,182 | \$722,622,448 | 3,511,348 |  | 2,796,672 | \$2,107,900,611 | 3,949,896* | 3,207,854 |

${ }^{* " T o t a l ~ B o r r o w e r s ~ i n ~ C a t e g o r y " ~ r e p r e s e n t s ~} 100$ percent of eligible borrowers for servicers included in Qualified Settlement Fund 1. The 1,481 difference between this total and the "Issued Quantity" total from table 8 represents the remaining checks to be issued under Qualified Settlement Fund 1.

## Appendix 5: Servicer Foreclosure Prevention Activity Reported by State

The following data provide an overview of the loss mitigation and foreclosure prevention assistance in each state as reported by participating servicers through January 24, 2014. Regulators are in the process of verifying the reported activity for the purpose of crediting servicers toward fulfilling their obligations under the amended consent orders. This data represent foreclosure prevention activity reported by Bank of America, Citibank, HSBC, JPMorgan Chase, Sovereign, U.S. Bank, and Wells Fargo. In the table below, servicers are ordered by the volume of loss mitigation and foreclosure activity from largest to smallest (left to right).
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| State | Action | Bank of America First Lien Modifications | JPMorgan Chase First Lien Modifications | Wells Farg <br> First Lien Modifications $\qquad$ |  | Citibank |  | US Bank |  | HSBC |  | Sovereign |  |  | State Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Short Sale | First Lien Modifications | Junior Lien Modifications | Short Sale | Deeds-in-Lieu | First Lien Modifications | Short Sale | First Lien Modifications | Short Sale | Deeds in Lieu |  |
| Maryland | \# of Loans | 233 | 121 | 65 | 10 | 53 | 42 | 3 |  | 9 | 7 |  | 2 | 1 | 546 |
|  | UPB Before Action | \$71,633,428 | \$39,422,531 | \$18,305,584 | \$1,702,591 | \$15,583,767 | \$3,368,673 | \$761,392 |  | \$2,054,510 | \$2,376,198 |  | \$454,521 | \$177,513 | \$155,840,708 |
|  | Avg. UPB Before Action | \$307,440 | \$325,806 | \$281,624 | \$170,259 | \$294,033 | \$80,207 | \$253,797 |  | \$228,279 | \$339,457 |  | \$227,260 | \$177,513 | \$285,423 |
|  | Avg. Sales Price (Short Sales only) |  |  |  | \$91,700 |  |  | \$149,000 |  |  | \$205,143 |  | \$187,500 |  | \$144,318 |
|  | Deficiency Waived |  |  |  | \$943,125 |  |  | \$368,255 |  |  | \$1,174,722 |  | \$135,471 |  | \$2,621,572 |
|  | Avg. Deficiency Waived |  |  |  | \$94,313 |  |  | \$122,752 |  |  | \$167,817 |  | \$67,735 |  | \$119,162 |
|  | Transition Assistance Provided |  |  |  | \$24,500 |  |  |  |  |  | \$7,500 |  |  |  | \$32,000 |
|  | Avg. Interest Rate Before Action | 5.57\% | 5.75\% | 5.28\% |  | 5.61\% | 6.93\% |  |  | 8.15\% |  |  |  |  | 5.73\% |
|  | Avg. Interest Rate After Action | 3.810 | 4.08\% | 3.21\% |  | 4.21\% | 6.41\% |  |  | 6.02\% |  |  |  |  | 4.09\% |
|  | Avg. DTI Before Action | 45\% | 40\% | 48\% |  | 30\% | 9\% |  |  | 41\% |  |  |  |  | 40\% |
|  | Avg. DTI After Action | 300 | 26\% | 30\% |  | 22\% | 5\% |  |  | 29\% |  |  |  |  | 26\% |
|  | Avg. Payment Reduction (if applicable) | \$654.63 | \$721.34 | \$689.40 |  | \$635.29 | \$171.05 |  |  | \$489.74 |  |  |  |  | \$630.75 |
| Massachusetts | \# of Loans | 132 | 66 | 25 | 3 | 15 | 42 | 5 |  |  | 3 | 10 | 41 |  | 342 |
|  | UPB Before Action | \$38,020,958 | \$19,402,096 | \$7,204,688 | \$449,401 | \$3,517,907 | \$3,174,932 | \$1,857,982 |  |  | \$1,220,671 | \$2,135,358 | \$9,081,744 |  | \$86,065,735 |
|  | Avg. UPB Before Action | \$288,038 | \$293,971 | \$288,188 | \$149,800 | \$234,527 | \$75,594 | \$371,596 |  |  | \$406,890 | \$213,536 | \$221,506 |  | \$251,654 |
|  | Avg. Sales Price (Short Sales only) |  |  |  | \$94,600 |  |  | \$299,780 |  |  | \$229,667 |  | \$192,640 |  | \$199,422 |
|  | Deficiency Waived |  |  |  | \$231,953 |  |  | \$512,756 |  |  | \$649,974 |  | \$3,108,343 |  | \$4,503,027 |
|  | Avg. Deficiency Waived |  |  |  | \$77,318 |  |  | \$102,551 |  |  | \$216,658 |  | \$75,813 |  | \$86,597 |
|  | Transition Assistance Provided |  |  |  | \$6,000 |  |  |  |  |  | \$2,500 |  |  |  | \$8,500 |
|  | Avg. Interest Rate Before Action | 6.019 | 5.63\% | 5.40\% |  | 5.50\% | 6.89\% |  |  |  |  | 5.92\% |  |  | 5.97\% |
|  | Avg. Interest Rate Atter Action | 3.48\% | 3.53\% | 2.73\% |  | 4.32\% | 5.30\% |  |  |  |  | 3.75\% |  |  | 3.74\% |
|  | Avg. DTI Before Action | 46\% | 42\% | 48\% |  | 30\% | 8\% |  |  |  |  | 35\% |  |  | 38\% |
|  | Avg. DTI After Action | $31 \%$ | 27\% | 31\% |  | 23\% | 5\% |  |  |  |  | 25\% |  |  | 26\% |
|  | Avg. Payment Reduction (ff applicable) | \$714.63 | \$723.35 | \$713.23 |  | \$438.76 | \$159.64 |  |  |  |  | \$485.37 |  |  | \$613.94 |
| Michigan | \# of Loans | 158 | 101 | 19 | 2 | 69 | 24 | 13 |  | 2 | 3 | 2 | 9 |  | 402 |
|  | UPB Before Action | \$25,712,585 | \$13,068,941 | \$2,842,481 | \$245,941 | \$9,082,534 | \$1,122,775 | \$2,536,561 |  | \$354,611 | \$428,999 | \$282,495 | \$997,864 |  | \$56,675,787 |
|  | Avg. UPB Before Action | \$162,738 | \$129,395 | \$149,604 | \$122,971 | \$131,631 | \$46,782 | \$195,120 |  | \$177,306 | \$143,000 | \$141,247 | \$110,874 |  | \$140,985 |
|  | Avg. Sales Price (Short Sales only) |  |  |  | \$70,500 |  |  | \$103,108 |  |  | \$48,667 |  | \$74,835 |  | \$85,219 |
|  | Deficiency Waived |  |  |  | \$124,607 |  |  | \$1,348,285 |  |  | \$332,116 |  | \$493,439 |  | \$2,298,448 |
|  | Avg. Deficiency Waived |  |  |  | \$62,304 |  |  | \$103,714 |  |  | \$110,705 |  | \$54,827 |  | \$85,128 |
|  | Transition Assistance Provided |  |  |  | \$6,000 |  |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$6,000 |
|  | Avg. Interest Rate Before Action | 6.890 | 6.92\% | 6.94\% |  | 6.63\% | 8.10\% |  |  | 9.96\% |  | 6.56\% |  |  | 6.94\% |
|  | Avg. Interest Rate After Action | 5.460 | 5.20\% | 4.25\% |  | 4.22\% | 6.80\% |  |  | 7.46\% |  | 3.31\% |  |  | 5.19\% |
|  | Avg. DTI Before Action | 430\% | 38\% | 50\% |  | 29\% | 9\% |  |  | 47\% |  | 26\% |  |  | 37\% |
|  | Avg. DTI After Action | 2901 | 24\% | 30\% |  | 18\% | 5\% |  |  | 26\% |  | 23\% |  |  | 24\% |
|  | Avg. Payment Reduction (if applicable) | \$462.20 | \$389.45 | \$514.42 |  | \$445.88 | \$140.32 |  |  | \$622.84 |  | \$366.17 |  |  | \$421.99 |
| Minnesota | \# of Loans | 65 | 32 | 11 | 2 | 27 | 21 | 30 |  | 4 | 2 |  |  |  | 194 |
|  | UPB Before Action | \$13,783,126 | \$6,804,917 | \$2,139,552 | \$298,984 | \$5,437,179 | \$1,115,257 | \$6,854,824 |  | \$697,447 | \$466,827 |  |  |  | \$37,598,113 |
|  | Avg. UPB Before Action | \$212,048 | \$212,654 | \$194,505 | \$149,492 | \$201,377 | \$53,107 | \$228,494 |  | \$174,362 | \$233,414 |  |  |  | \$193,805 |
|  | Avg. Sales Price (Short Sales only) |  |  |  | \$73,250 |  |  | \$147,950 |  |  | \$131,500 |  |  |  | \$142,588 |
|  | Deficiency Waived |  |  |  | \$168,676 |  |  | \$2,887,165 |  |  | \$237,140 |  |  |  | \$3,292,981 |
|  | Avg. Deficiency Waived |  |  |  | \$84,338 |  |  | \$96,239 |  |  | \$118,570 |  |  |  | \$96,852 |
|  | Transition Assistance Provided |  |  |  | \$3,000 |  |  | \$4,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$7,000 |
|  | Avg. Interest Rate Before Action | 6.410 | 5.84\% | 5.80\% |  | 6.32\% | 7.13\% |  |  | 7.11\% |  |  |  |  | 6.35\% |
|  | Avg. Interest Rate After Action | 4.57\% | 4.12\% | 3.69\% |  | 4.42\% | 5.72\% |  |  | 5.10\% |  |  |  |  | 4.56\% |
|  | Avg. DTI Before Action | 4401 | 38\% | 46\% |  | 31\% | 7\% |  |  | 39\% |  |  |  |  | 36\% |
|  | Avg. DTI After Action | 30\% | 26\% | 31\% |  | 20\% | 4\% |  |  | 30\% |  |  |  |  | 24\% |
|  | Avg. Payment Reduction (if applicable) | \$535.66 | \$489.17 | \$514.83 |  | \$548.71 | \$146.34 |  |  | \$375.86 |  |  |  |  | \$472.04 |
| Mississippi | \# of Loans | 27 | 13 | 1 |  | 22 | 4 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  | 69 |
|  | UPB Before Action | \$4,138,805 | \$1,381,397 | \$92,994 |  | \$2,293,629 | \$152,942 |  |  | \$186,118 |  |  |  |  | \$8,245,885 |
|  | Avg. UPB Before Action | \$153,289 | \$106,261 | \$92,994 |  | \$104,256 | \$38,235 |  |  | \$93,059 |  |  |  |  | \$119,506 |
|  | Avg. Sales Price (Short Sales only) Deficiency Waived |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg. Deficiency Waived |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Transition Assistance Provided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg. Interest Rate Before Action | 7.310 | 8.75\% | 7.13\% |  | 7.67\% | 10.40\% |  |  | 9.35\% |  |  |  |  | 7.93\% |
|  | Avg. Interest Rate Atter Action | 4.62\% | 6.70\% | 6.00\% |  | 4.11\% | 8.25\% |  |  | 7.60\% |  |  |  |  | 5.16\% |
|  | Avg. DTI Before Action | 440 | 39\% | 58\% |  | 31\% | 14\% |  |  | 40\% |  |  |  |  | 38\% |
|  | Avg. DTI Atter Action | 3001 | 26\% | $31 \%$ |  | 23\% | 7\% |  |  | 30\% |  |  |  |  | 26\% |
|  | Avg. Payment Reduction (if applicable) | \$410.42 | \$316.85 | \$363.63 |  | \$270.07 | \$164.47 |  |  | \$188.67 |  |  |  |  | \$326.68 |
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| State | Action | Bank of America First Lien Modifications | JPMorgan Chase <br> First Lien Modifications | Wells Far <br> First Lien Modifications |  | Citibank |  | US Bank |  | HSBC |  | Sovereign |  |  | State Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Short Sale | First Lien Modifications | Junior Lien Modifications | Short Sale | Deeds-in-Lieu | First Lien Modifications | Short Sale | First Lien Modifications | Short Sale | Deeds in Lieu |  |
| New Jersey | \# of Loans | 309 | 112 | 78 | 13 | 40 | 38 |  |  | 3 | 12 | 15 | 25 | 4 | 649 |
|  | UPB Before Action | \$98,593,431 | \$35,403,173 | \$22,782,270 | \$2,257,958 | \$11,017,349 | \$2,591,675 |  |  | \$597,886 | \$3,334,151 | \$3,630,606 | \$6,112,034 | \$1,043,111 | \$187,363,645 |
|  | Avg. UPB Before Action | \$319,073 | \$316,100 | \$292,080 | \$173,689 | \$275,434 | \$68,202 |  |  | \$199,295 | \$277,846 | \$242,040 | \$24,481 | \$260,778 | \$288,696 |
|  | Avg. Sales Price (Short Sales only) |  |  |  | \$91,627 |  |  |  |  |  | \$140,008 |  | \$167,836 |  | \$141,343 |
|  | Deficiency Waived |  |  |  | \$1,289,155 |  |  |  |  |  | \$2,205,581 |  | \$2,489,109 |  | \$5,983,845 |
|  | Avg. Deficiency Waived |  |  |  | \$99,166 |  |  |  |  |  | \$183,798 |  | \$99,564 |  | \$119,677 |
|  | Transition Assistance Provided |  |  |  | \$44,431 |  |  |  |  |  | \$12,500 |  |  |  | \$56,931 |
|  | Avg. Interest Rate Before Action | 6.210 | 5.39\% | 5.28\% |  | 6.48\% | 7.25\% |  |  | 6.29\% |  | 5.77\% |  |  | 6.01\% |
|  | Avg. Interest Rate After Action | 3.410, | 3.06\% | 2.92\% |  | 4.33\% | 6.09\% |  |  | 3.46\% |  | 3.72\% |  |  | 3.52\% |
|  | Avg. DTI Before Action | 480 | 43\% | 47\% |  | 30\% | 7\% |  |  | 58\% |  | 48\% |  |  | 43\% |
|  | Avg. DTI After Action | 32\% | 28\% | 31\% |  | 22\% | 4\% |  |  | 31\% |  | 37\% |  |  | 29\% |
|  | Avg. Payment Reduction (if applicable) | \$908.04 | \$850.92 | \$754.94 |  | \$730.68 | \$149.66 |  |  | \$455.67 |  | \$501.24 |  |  | \$804.32 |
| New Mexico | \# of Loans | 28 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 |  | 2 | 1 |  |  |  | 45 |
|  | UPB Before Action | \$5,218,856 | \$646,307 | \$941,114 | \$164,162 | \$33,790 | \$205,794 | \$900,000 |  | \$270,285 | \$238,000 |  |  |  | \$8,618,308 |
|  | Avg. UPB Before Action | \$186,388 | \$215,436 | \$188,223 | \$164,162 | \$33,790 | \$68,598 | \$900,000 |  | \$135,143 | \$238,000 |  |  |  | \$191,518 |
|  | Avg. Sales Price (Short Sales only) |  |  |  | \$132,500 |  |  | \$625,000 |  |  | \$146,200 |  |  |  | \$301,233 |
|  | Deficiency Waived |  |  |  | \$48,996 |  |  | \$320,774 |  |  | \$115,716 |  |  |  | \$485,487 |
|  | Avg. Deficiency Waived |  |  |  | \$48,996 |  |  | \$320,774 |  |  | \$115,716 |  |  |  | \$161,829 |
|  | Transition Assistance Provided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$2,500 |  |  |  | \$2,500 |
|  | Avg. Interest Rate Before Action | 7.290 | 8.89\% | 6.61\% |  | 10.00\% | 6.46\% |  |  | 9.24\% |  |  |  |  | 7.42\% |
|  | Avg. Interest Rate After Action | 4.770 | 2.96\% | 3.06\% |  | 2.00\% | 3.38\% |  |  | 4.77\% |  |  |  |  | 4.27\% |
|  | Avg. DTI Before Action | 44\% | 53\% | 56\% |  | 52\% | 9\% |  |  | 47\% |  |  |  |  | 44\% |
|  | Avg. DTI After Action | 319 | 28\% | 30\% |  | 31\% | 4\% |  |  | 30\% |  |  |  |  | 29\% |
|  | Avg. Payment Reduction (if applicable) | \$474.73 | \$808.37 | \$660.40 |  | \$192.56 | \$124.49 |  |  | \$500.18 |  |  |  |  | \$490.14 |
| New York | \# of Loans | 354 | 128 | 56 | 1 | 50 | 119 | 2 |  | 7 | 9 | 10 | 13 | 6 | 755 |
|  | UPB Before Action | \$136,656,016 | \$49,432,050 | \$18,445,210 | \$175,797 | \$15,556,908 | \$12,171,048 | \$1,179,099 |  | \$1,926,828 | \$3,072,762 | \$1,841,387 | \$2,741,614 | \$1,245,371 | \$244,444,088 |
|  | Avg. UPB Before Action | \$386,034 | \$386,188 | \$329,379 | \$175,797 | \$311,138 | \$102,278 | \$589,550 |  | \$275,261 | \$341,418 | \$184,139 | \$210,893 | \$207,562 | \$323,767 |
|  | Avg. Sales Price (Short Sales only) |  |  |  | \$100,000 |  |  | \$450,000 |  |  | \$204,718 |  | \$142,800 |  | \$187,955 |
|  | Deficiency Waived |  |  |  | \$85,200 |  |  | \$462,304 |  |  | \$1,687,365 |  | \$1,360,415 |  | \$3,595,284 |
|  | Avg. Deficiency Waived |  |  |  | \$85,200 |  |  | \$231,152 |  |  | \$187,485 |  | \$104,647 |  | \$143,811 |
|  | Transition Assistance Provided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$5,000 |  |  |  | \$5,000 |
|  | Avg. Interest Rate Before Action | 6.35\% | 5.74\% | 5.81\% |  |  | 6.28\% |  |  | 9.63\% |  | 6.45\% |  |  | 6.20\% |
|  | Avg. Interest Rate After Action | 2.930 | 3.08\% | 3.22\% |  | 3.32\% | 5.11\% |  |  | 5.19\% |  | 3.63\% |  |  | 3.39\% |
|  | Avg. DTI Before Action | 50\% | 44\% | 49\% |  | 38\% | 8\% |  |  | 49\% |  | 23\% |  |  | 41\% |
|  | Avg. DTI After Action | 32\% | 29\% | 31\% |  | 25\% | 5\% |  |  | $31 \%$ |  | 17\% |  |  | 26\% |
|  | Avg. Payment Reduction (if applicable) | \$1,089.37 | \$1,006.65 | \$927.43 |  | \$763.92 | \$193.96 |  |  | \$891.87 |  | \$455.87 |  |  | \$881.91 |
| North Carolina | \# of Loans | 132 | 36 | 9 |  | 34 | 11 | 2 |  | 16 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 247 |
|  | UPB Before Action | \$21,228,253 | \$4,751,564 | \$1,353,589 |  | \$3,383,471 | \$655,977 | \$492,949 |  | \$1,838,753 | \$392,620 | \$175,304 | \$202,631 | \$127,140 | \$34,602,249 |
|  | Avg. UPB Before Action | \$160,820 | \$131,988 | \$150,399 |  | \$99,514 | \$59,634 | \$246,475 |  | \$114,922 | \$130,873 | \$175,304 | \$101,315 | \$127,140 | \$140,090 |
|  | Avg. Sales Price (Short Sales only) |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$216,000 |  |  | \$104,333 |  | \$75,000 |  | \$127,857 |
|  | Deficiency Waived |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$102,808 |  |  | \$128,177 |  | \$67,277 |  | \$298,262 |
|  | Avg. Deficiency Waived |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$51,404 |  |  | \$42,726 |  | \$33,639 |  | \$42,609 |
|  | Transition Assistance Provided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$3,500 |  |  |  | \$3,500 |
|  | Avg. Interest Rate Before Action | 6.360 | 7.32\% | 7.17\% |  | 7.00\% | 8.67\% |  |  | 10.00\% |  | 5.00\% |  |  | 6.97\% |
|  | Avg. Interest Rate After Action | 3.980 | 5.26\% | 4.18\% |  | 4.64\% | 8.07\% |  |  | 6.40\% |  | 4.00\% |  |  | 4.62\% |
|  | Avg. DTI Before Action | 43\% | 39\% | 50\% |  | 32\% | 8\% |  |  | 45\% |  | 31\% |  |  | 40\% |
|  | Avg. DTI After Action | 30\% | 26\% | 29\% |  | 22\% | 5\% |  |  | 30\% |  | 24\% |  |  | 27\% |
|  | Avg. Payment Reduction (if applicable) | \$368.87 | \$327.62 | \$536.50 |  | \$292.11 | \$83.81 |  |  | \$353.44 |  | \$258.28 |  |  | \$343.44 |
| North Dakota | \# of Loans |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UPB Before Action | \$160,268 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$160,268 |
|  | Avg. UPB Before Action | \$160,268 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$160,268 |
|  | Avg. Sales Price (Short Sales only) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Deficiency Waived |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg. Deficiency Waived |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Transition Assistance Provided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg. Interest Rate Before Action | 7.880 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.88\% |
|  | Avg. Interest Rate After Action | 2.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.00\% |
|  | Avg. DTI Before Action | 510/ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 51\% |
|  | Avg. DTI After Action | 312\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 31\% |
|  | Avg. Payment Reduction (if applicable) | \$637.27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$637.27 |
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| State | Action | Bank of America First Lien Modifications | JPMorgan Chase <br> First Lien Modifications | Wells FargoFirst LienModifications $\quad$ Short Sale |  | Citibank |  | US Bank |  | HSBC |  | Sovereign |  |  | State Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | First Lien Modifications | Junior Lien Modifications | Short Sale | Deeds-in-Lieu | First Lien Modifications | Short Sale | First Lien Modifications | Short Sale | Deeds in Lieu | $\begin{gathered} \text { State Totals } \\ 102 \end{gathered}$ |
| South Carolina | \# of Loans | 40 | $\begin{array}{r} 13 \\ \$ 1,680,911 \\ \$ 129,301 \end{array}$ | 7 |  | 22.8 |  | 1 |  | 54 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |
|  | UPB Before Action | \$6,408,016 |  | \$1,081,448 |  | \$2,789,221 | \$510,469 | \$156,447 |  | \$684,685 | \$465,092 | \$151,717 | \$166,244 |  | \$14,094,250 |
|  | Avg. UPB Before Action | \$160,200 |  | \$154,493 |  | \$126,783 | \$63,809 | \$156,447 |  | \$136,937 | \$116,273 | \$151,717 | \$166,244 |  | \$138,179 |
|  | Avg. Sales Price (Short Sales only) |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$41,500 |  |  | \$93,875 |  | \$107,000 |  | \$87,333 |
|  | Deficiency Waived |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$120,143 |  |  | \$172,532 |  | \$71,675 |  | \$364,350 |
|  | Avg. Deficiency Waived |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$120,143 |  |  | \$43,133 |  | \$71,675 |  | \$60,725 |
|  | Transition Assistance Provided |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |  | \$2,500 |  |  |  | \$2,500 |
|  | Avg. Interest Rate Before Action | 7.520 | 7.29\% | 6.90\% |  | 7.53\% | 6.73\% |  |  | 8.68\% |  | 2.88\% |  |  | 7.39\% |
|  | Avg. Interest Rate After Action | 4.87\% | 4.06\% | 4.16\% |  | 4.74\% | 5.97\% |  |  | 6.01\% |  | 2.00\% |  |  | 4.80\% |
|  | Avg. DTI Before Action | 470, | 39\% | 45\% |  | 32\% | 13\% |  |  | 46\% |  | 51\% |  |  | 39\% |
|  | Avg. DTI After Action | 300 | 25\% | 26\% |  | 21\% | 7\% |  |  | $31 \%$ |  | 37\% |  |  | 25\% |
|  | Avg. Payment Reduction (if applicable) | \$459.91 | \$314.30 | \$354.37 |  | \$376.37 | \$212.59 |  |  | \$343.09 |  | \$287.87 |  |  | \$384.87 |
| South Dakota | \# of Loans |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UPB Before Action |  | \$129,296 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$129,296 |
|  | Avg. UPB Before Action |  | \$129,296 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$129,296 |
|  | Avg. Sales Price (Short Sales only) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Deficiency Waived |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg. Deficiency Waived |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Transition Assistance Provided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg. Interest Rate Before Action |  | 9.50\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9.50\% |
|  | Avg. Interest Rate After Action |  | 3.38\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.38\% |
|  | Avg. DTI Before Action |  | 57\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 57\% |
|  | Avg. DTI After Action |  | 31\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg. Payment Reduction (if applicable) |  | \$584.05 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$584.05 |
| Tennessee | \# of Loans | 79 | 37 | , |  | 34 | ${ }^{6}$ | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  |  |  | 170 |
|  | UPB Before Action | \$10,561,462 | \$4,265,801 | \$1,202,982 |  | \$4,176,381 | \$160,374 | \$400,203 |  | \$86,758 | \$596,586 |  |  |  | \$21,450,546 |
|  | Avg. UPB Before Action | \$133,689 | \$115,292 | \$133,665 |  | \$122,835 | \$26,729 | \$200,102 |  | \$86,758 | \$298,293 |  |  |  | \$126,180 |
|  | Avg. Sales Price (Short Sales only) |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$163,000 |  |  | \$207,500 |  |  |  | \$185,250 |
|  | Deficiency Waived |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$95,322 |  |  | \$244,114 |  |  |  | \$339,436 |
|  | Avg. Deficiency Waived |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$47,661 |  |  | \$122,057 |  |  |  | \$84,859 |
|  | Transition Assistance Provided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$2,500 |  |  |  | \$2,500 |
|  | Avg. Interest Rate Before Action | 7.52\% | 7.09\% | 7.82\% |  | 7.27\% | 9.23\% |  |  | 7.75\% |  |  |  |  | 7.45\% |
|  | Avg. Interest Rate After Action | 5.310 | 5.64\% | 5.33\% |  | 4.59\% | 8.09\% |  |  | 4.20\% |  |  |  |  | 5.33\% |
|  | Avg. DTI Before Action | 430 | 36\% | 44\% |  | 28\% | 6\% |  |  | 40\% |  |  |  |  | 37\% |
|  | Avg. DTI After Action | 2901 | 25\% | 29\% |  | 19\% | 5\% |  |  | 30\% |  |  |  |  | 25\% |
|  | Avg. Payment Reduction (if applicable) | \$360.71 | \$294.97 | \$411.90 |  | \$386.52 | \$41.97 |  |  | \$286.61 |  |  |  |  | \$342.15 |
| Texas | \# of Loans | 165 | 53 | 6 |  | 27 | 21 | 2 |  | 4 | 4 |  |  |  | 283 |
|  | UPB Before Action | \$22,278,880 | \$7,014,343 | \$756,842 | \$76,788 | \$3,049,908 | \$617,468 | \$384,698 |  | \$318,307 | \$567,152 |  |  |  | \$35,064,385 |
|  | Avg. UPB Before Action | \$135,024 | \$132,346 | \$126,140 | \$76,788 | \$112,960 | \$29,403 | \$192,349 |  | \$79,577 | \$141,788 |  |  |  | \$123,902 |
|  | Avg. Sales Price (Short Sales only) |  |  |  | \$45,000 |  |  | \$167,425 |  |  | \$111,975 |  |  |  | \$118,250 |
|  | Deficiency Waived |  |  |  | \$40,166 |  |  | \$90,441 |  |  | \$283,155 |  |  |  | \$413,762 |
|  | Avg. Deficiency Waived |  |  |  | \$40,166 |  |  | \$45,221 |  |  | \$70,789 |  |  |  | \$59,109 |
|  | Transition Assistance Provided |  |  |  | \$3,000 |  |  | \$0 |  |  | \$2,500 |  |  |  | \$5,500 |
|  | Avg. Interest Rate Before Action | 7.140 | 6.50\% | 6.68\% |  | 6.70\% | 8.67\% |  |  | 10.90\% |  |  |  |  | 7.14\% |
|  | Avg. Interest Rate After Action | 3.910 | 3.92\% | 4.97\% |  | 4.10\% | 7.16\% |  |  | 8.24\% |  |  |  |  | 4.27\% |
|  | Avg. DTI Before Action | 42\% | 36\% | 40\% |  | 34\% | 6\% |  |  | 39\% |  |  |  |  | 37\% |
|  | Avg. DTI After Action | 31\% | 26\% | 29\% |  | 24\% | 4\% |  |  | 29\% |  |  |  |  | 28\% |
|  | Avg. Payment Reduction (if applicable) | \$348.14 | \$304.45 | \$369.21 |  | \$297.54 | \$77.33 |  |  | \$227.79 |  |  |  |  | \$312.91 |
| Utah | \# of Loans | 62 |  | 5 | 6 | 8 |  | 2 |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 98 |
|  | UPB Before Action | \$15,589,401 | \$1,609,608 | \$1,469,892 | \$1,069,277 | \$1,998,099 | \$677,923 | \$462,869 |  |  | \$641,966 |  |  |  | \$23,519,037 |
|  | Avg. UPB Before Action | \$251,442 | \$321,922 | \$293,978 | \$178,213 | \$249,762 | \$96,846 | \$231,435 |  |  | \$213,989 |  |  |  | \$239,990 |
|  | Avg. Sales Price (Short Sales only) |  |  |  | \$139,343 |  |  | \$128,500 |  |  | \$180,667 |  |  |  | \$148,642 |
|  | Deficiency Waived |  |  |  | \$331,252 |  |  | \$229,958 |  |  | \$159,818 |  |  |  | \$721,028 |
|  | Avg. Deficiency Waived |  |  |  | \$55,209 |  |  | \$114,979 |  |  | \$53,273 |  |  |  | \$65,548 |
|  | Transition Assistance Provided |  |  |  | \$18,000 |  |  |  |  |  | \$2,500 |  |  |  | \$20,500 |
|  | Avg. Interest Rate Before Action | 7.22\% | 5.24\% | 6.14\% |  | 6.73\% | 8.03\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.06\% |
|  | Avg. Interest Rate After Action | 3.910 | 2.99\% | 3.45\% |  | 4.79\% | 7.31\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.18\% |
|  | Avg. DTI Before Action | 460 | 39\% | 43\% |  | 41\% | 15\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 43\% |
|  | Avg. DTI After Action | 320/ | 29\% | 31\% |  | 26\% | 7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 29\% |
|  | Avg. Payment Reduction (if applicable) | \$601.79 | \$422.49 | \$535.05 |  | \$616.46 | \$313.92 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$565.83 |
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ See http://www.occ.gov/news-issuances/news-releases/2013/nr-ia-2013-35.html, http://www.occ.gov/news-issuances/news-releases/2011/nr-occ-2011-47.html, http://www.federalreserve.gov/newsevents/press/enforcement/20130726a.htm, and http://www.occ.treas.gov/news-issuances/news-releases/2013/nr-occ-2013-126.html.
    ${ }^{2}$ Aurora Bank FSB is no longer a federal thrift.
    ${ }^{3}$ MetLife Bank, N.A., is no longer a national bank.
    ${ }^{4}$ Sovereign was purchased by Banco Santander SA in 2009 and changed its name to Santander Bank, N.A., in 2013.
    ${ }^{5}$ The FRB is the primary regulator of SunTrust. The OCC is the primary regulator of other servicers included in Qualified Settlement Fund 1.
    ${ }^{6}$ See http://www.occ.gov/news-issuances/news-releases/2011/nr-occ-2011-47.html.
    ${ }^{7}$ OneWest, FSB, converted to a national bank in 2014.

[^1]:    ${ }^{8}$ The FRB is the primary regulator for Goldman Sachs, Morgan Stanley, and GMAC Mortgage.
    ${ }^{9}$ The OCC is the primary regulator of EverBank.

[^2]:    ${ }^{10}$ See http://www.occ.gov/news-issuances/news-releases/2011/nr-occ-2011-47a.pdf for a discussion of those findings.

[^3]:    ${ }^{11}$ See article IV of the amended consent orders. For example, see http://www.occ.gov/static/enforcement-actions/ea2013-127.pdf.
    ${ }^{12}$ In February 2012, 49 state attorneys general, the federal government, and five of the largest mortgage servicers entered into the NMS. See http://www.nationalmortgagesettlement.com.

[^4]:    ${ }^{13}$ See amendments to the consent orders included at the bottom of http://www.occ.gov/independentforeclosurereview and http://www.federalreserve.gov/newsevents/press/enforcement/20130228a.htm.

[^5]:    ${ }^{14}$ See http://www.occ.gov/news-issuances/news-releases/2011/nr-occ-2011-47a.pdf.
    ${ }^{15}$ Miscellaneous errors related to fees or other administrative action.

[^6]:    ${ }^{16}$ See the "June 21, 2012 Financial Remediation Framework" at http://www.occ.gov/topics/consumer-protection/foreclosure-prevention/financial-remediation-framework.pdf.
    ${ }^{17}$ JPMorgan Chase accounted for 61,181 of the 103,820 files completed ( 59 percent). A majority of these files involved the review of mortgages involving bankruptcies where no error was found.
    ${ }^{18}$ MetLife reported no completed files, and would not speculate on results.

[^7]:    ${ }^{19}$ See http://www.occ.gov/news-issuances/news-releases/2013/nr-occ-2013-126.html.

[^8]:    ${ }^{20}$ From July 14, 2008 to March 18, 2009, the FDIC acted as conservator IndyMac Federal Bank, FSB, and approved loss mitigation solutions under the "FDIC Loan Modification Program." On March 19, 2009, all deposits of IndyMac Federal Bank, FSB, were transferred to OneWest Bank, FSB, Pasadena, California.

[^9]:    ${ }^{21}$ See http://www.occ.gov/topics/consumer-protection/foreclosure-prevention/financial-remediation-framework.pdf.

[^10]:    - 29 -

[^11]:    - 31 -

