



# Economic and Market Watch Report

4<sup>th</sup> Quarter, 2010



\*Click on a County to view economic and real estate information at the county and zip code level

© 2010 MLSListings Inc.

and NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REALTORS®

Reproduction, reprinting, or retransmission in any form is prohibited without written permission.

# MLSListings Economic and Market Watch Report

Located in Campbell, California, in the heart of Silicon Valley, MLSListings is the multiple listing service (MLS) for five California counties. MLSListings provides the listing database and related services for more than 20,000 real estate professionals. Its database includes 8,000+ active listings and more than a half-million historical records. Formed in 1994, MLSListings is wholly owned by the real estate community.

## Index

### Local Report

#### MLSListings Service Area

Monterey County .....	1
San Benito County .....	3
San Mateo County .....	4
Santa Clara County .....	6
Santa Cruz County .....	9


#### Additional Bay Area Counties

Alameda County .....	11
Contra Costa County .....	13
San Francisco County .....	15
Others .....	17

Trends .....	20
Chief Economist's Commentary* .....	21
Economic Monitor* .....	23

\*Reprinted from [Real Estate Outlook: Market Trends and Insights](#). ©2010 NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REALTORS ®. Used with permission. Reproduction, reprinting, or retransmission of this article in any form (electronic media included) is prohibited without permission. For subscription information please call 1-800-874-6500.

## Monterey County, CA



### Labor Market :

In the first two months of the second quarter, 18,885 jobs were added to the payrolls of Monterey County. As a result of these new jobs, the average monthly unemployment rate fell from 17.4% during the first quarter to 11.8% for April and May. This steady job creation may help to maintain demand for home purchases. Favorable mortgage rates should support this trend.

### Housing Market :

	Q1' 10	Q2' 10	Q3' 10 (Forecast)
Average Price	\$368,000	\$423,000	↓
# Homes on the Market *	1,634	1,749	↑
# Homes Sold **	985	1,048	↓
# New Homes Built	28	18 ***	↑
Avg # of Days on Market	63	68	↑

\* Available as of Jun. 30, 2010.

\*\* May not add to total of zip codes.

\*\*\* During the first two months of 2nd quarter.

### Data by Zip Codes for Q2 2010

Zip Code	Average Price	Price Change ****	Total # Homes Sold (Quarter)	% Change in # Homes Sold ****	Average Days on Market	% of Asking Price (Sold/List Price)
93450	\$57,500	N/A	2	N/A	64	99.2%
93901	\$289,700	6.31%	53	15.22%	69	96.6%
93905	\$185,500	10.42%	139	-50.36%	38	102.7%
93906	\$228,200	19.41%	173	-39.93%	43	102.1%
93907	\$300,100	4.53%	71	-19.32%	42	100.2%
93908	\$603,300	-4.98%	41	-6.82%	70	98.7%
93921	\$1,554,400	-0.42%	18	80.00%	133	92.4%
93923	\$1,094,800	30.27%	58	107.14%	185	88.9%
93924	\$667,300	-0.13%	22	57.14%	95	91.3%
93926	\$193,900	5.38%	25	-30.56%	49	100.4%

\*\*\*\* % Change of current quarter compared to the same quarter to year ago.


## Monterey County, CA

### Data by Zip Codes for Q2 2010

Zip Code	Average Price	Price Change ****	Total # Homes Sold (Quarter)	% Change in # Homes Sold ****	Average Days on Market	% of Asking Price (Sold/List Price)
93927	\$162,800	13.61%	58	-38.30%	79	98.7%
93930	\$144,300	-8.79%	50	-10.71%	56	98.0%
93933	\$327,600	9.05%	43	7.50%	44	100.6%
93940	\$639,400	0.02%	70	59.09%	98	95.1%
93950	\$734,700	6.63%	50	100.00%	97	93.0%
93953	\$2,084,800	11.55%	25	78.57%	142	89.7%
93955	\$336,500	7.78%	62	-4.62%	50	97.6%
93960	\$177,900	13.10%	58	-45.28%	59	101.4%
93962	\$352,300	-31.06%	3	50.00%	32	90.1%
95004	\$366,500	-12.84%	6	20.00%	77	99.3%
95012	\$246,800	23.28%	8	-60.00%	35	92.2%
95039	\$260,500	-47.30%	2	0.00%	152	93.6%
OTHER	\$384,300	39.64%	11	-56.00%	42	99.0%

\*\*\*\* % Change of current quarter compared to the same quarter to year ago.

## San Benito County, CA



### Labor Market :

In the first two months of the second quarter, 184 jobs were added to the payrolls of San Benito County. As a result of these new jobs, the average monthly unemployment rate fell from 21.4% during the first quarter to 18.3% for April and May. This steady job creation may help to maintain demand for home purchases. Favorable mortgage rates should support this trend.

### Housing Market :

	Q1' 10	Q2' 10	Q3' 10 (Forecast)
Average Price	\$317,600	\$319,600	↔
# Homes on the Market *	259	276	↑
# Homes Sold **	180	199	↔
# New Homes Built	6	4 ***	↑
Avg # of Days on Market	61	53	↑

\* Available as of Jun. 30, 2010.

\*\* May not add to total of zip codes.


\*\*\* During the first two months of 2nd quarter.

### Data by Zip Codes for Q2 2010

Zip Code	Average Price	Price Change ****	Total # Homes Sold (Quarter)	% Change in # Homes Sold ****	Average Days on Market	% of Asking Price (Sold/List Price)
95023	\$316,900	20.68%	180	2.27%	51	99.3%
95045	\$329,600	-21.47%	11	57.14%	78	96.8%
95075	\$505,000	-32.66%	3	200.00%	63	99.7%
OTHER	\$283,700	-39.41%	5	66.67%	90	99.7%

\*\*\*\* % Change of current quarter compared to the same quarter to year ago.

## San Mateo County, CA



### Labor Market :

In the first two months of the second quarter, 2,388 jobs were added to the payrolls of San Mateo County. As a result of these new jobs, the average monthly unemployment rate fell from 9.6% during the first quarter to 9% for April and May. This steady job creation may help to maintain demand for home purchases. Favorable mortgage rates should support this trend.

### Housing Market :

	Q1' 10	Q2' 10	Q3' 10 (Forecast)
Average Price	\$797,900	\$847,600	↔
# Homes on the Market *	2,041	2,399	↑
# Homes Sold **	1,172	1,596	↔
# New Homes Built	40	62 ***	↑
Avg # of Days on Market	57	49	↑

\* Available as of Jun. 30, 2010.

\*\* May not add to total of zip codes.

\*\*\* During the first two months of 2nd quarter.

### Data by Zip Codes for Q2 2010

Zip Code	Average Price	Price Change ****	Total # Homes Sold (Quarter)	% Change in # Homes Sold ****	Average Days on Market	% of Asking Price (Sold/List Price)
94002	\$889,900	9.26%	77	35.09%	31	99.2%
94005	\$525,300	-19.49%	16	166.67%	54	98.9%
94010	\$1,618,700	-4.56%	104	35.06%	61	95.7%
94014	\$457,800	2.62%	63	-1.56%	78	101.6%
94015	\$482,600	1.90%	87	10.13%	42	101.4%
94018	\$761,300	-11.48%	13	225.00%	51	98.3%
94019	\$663,900	-8.84%	45	73.08%	94	96.5%
94020	\$250,000	-62.33%	1	-66.67%	28	86.8%
94025	\$1,270,600	-2.37%	128	8.47%	44	98.7%
94027	\$3,672,100	10.50%	20	17.65%	109	96.1%

\*\*\*\* % Change of current quarter compared to the same quarter to year ago.


## San Mateo County, CA

### Data by Zip Codes for Q2 2010

Zip Code	Average Price	Price Change ****	Total # Homes Sold (Quarter)	% Change in # Homes Sold ****	Average Days on Market	% of Asking Price (Sold/List Price)
94028	\$2,014,400	-12.93%	19	18.75%	47	98.4%
94030	\$861,600	-1.81%	39	11.43%	52	98.0%
94037	\$905,000	36.30%	3	-40.00%	115	96.5%
94038	\$649,700	-5.50%	3	50.00%	135	96.6%
94044	\$600,300	5.63%	68	0.00%	47	98.7%
94060	\$1,950,000	N/A	1	N/A	658	102.7%
94061	\$732,100	-3.92%	76	35.71%	39	99.3%
94062	\$1,240,300	1.78%	77	54.00%	43	96.8%
94063	\$443,100	31.41%	34	-12.82%	50	101.5%
94065	\$811,900	-0.28%	47	62.07%	31	98.2%
94066	\$445,400	1.69%	85	21.43%	47	100.6%
94070	\$912,200	9.13%	94	16.05%	39	100.2%
94080	\$488,800	-2.40%	112	-11.81%	46	100.0%
94401	\$529,500	12.59%	87	74.00%	63	97.2%
94402	\$1,083,700	-1.85%	77	42.59%	32	98.4%
94403	\$665,500	-5.15%	82	32.26%	47	98.7%
94404	\$778,400	8.62%	74	5.71%	36	98.9%
OTHER	\$263,200	5.53%	64	-1.54%	47	100.1%

\*\*\*\* % Change of current quarter compared to the same quarter to year ago.

## Santa Clara County, CA



### Labor Market :

In the first two months of the second quarter, 6,668 jobs were added to the payrolls of Santa Clara County. As a result of these new jobs, the average monthly unemployment rate fell from 12% during the first quarter to 11.2% for April and May. This steady job creation may help to maintain demand for home purchases. Favorable mortgage rates should support this trend.

### Housing Market :

	Q1' 10	Q2' 10	Q3' 10 (Forecast)
Average Price	\$622,600	\$678,500	↔
# Homes on the Market *	5,306	5,848	↑
# Homes Sold **	3,381	4,529	↔
# New Homes Built	257	113 ***	↑
Avg # of Days on Market	50	46	↑

\* Available as of Jun. 30, 2010.

\*\* May not add to total of zip codes.

\*\*\* During the first two months of 2nd quarter.

### Data by Zip Codes for Q2 2010

Zip Code	Average Price	Price Change ****	Total # Homes Sold (Quarter)	% Change in # Homes Sold ****	Average Days on Market	% of Asking Price (Sold/List Price)
94022	\$1,780,100	3.30%	61	19.61%	64	97.2%
94024	\$1,633,400	0.92%	67	19.64%	38	97.5%
94040	\$919,000	10.01%	83	20.29%	40	99.9%
94041	\$848,800	10.42%	19	5.56%	15	99.5%
94043	\$620,500	5.85%	73	12.31%	29	99.9%
94085	\$452,200	0.69%	47	51.61%	39	100.2%
94086	\$646,800	9.02%	54	8.00%	48	99.8%
94087	\$902,300	12.14%	129	55.42%	29	100.9%
94089	\$477,500	11.77%	23	-4.17%	46	99.2%
94301	\$2,073,400	24.23%	49	2.08%	48	100.2%

\*\*\*\* % Change of current quarter compared to the same quarter to year ago.

## Santa Clara County, CA

### Data by Zip Codes for Q2 2010

Zip Code	Average Price	Price Change ****	Total # Homes Sold (Quarter)	% Change in # Homes Sold ****	Average Days on Market	% of Asking Price (Sold/List Price)
94303	\$1,240,000	-6.38%	49	11.36%	25	98.9%
94304	\$2,625,000	N/A	1	N/A	10	97.4%
94305	\$1,975,000	19.21%	2	-33.33%	20	101.5%
94306	\$1,320,600	10.27%	57	18.75%	42	100.2%
95002	\$402,500	-19.10%	2	0.00%	60	102.3%
95008	\$611,400	-5.46%	114	18.75%	39	99.8%
95014	\$1,036,500	1.56%	156	30.00%	25	100.6%
95020	\$427,200	8.10%	133	-32.49%	50	100.8%
95030	\$1,695,700	13.57%	42	61.54%	56	96.2%
95032	\$1,139,300	25.23%	104	35.06%	61	96.5%
95035	\$491,400	12.01%	156	11.43%	62	99.7%
95037	\$567,600	-1.65%	126	-6.67%	63	99.0%
95046	\$747,600	-5.40%	13	-7.14%	128	98.6%
95050	\$535,700	12.57%	55	-11.29%	35	99.2%
95051	\$556,900	5.83%	117	44.44%	41	100.6%
95054	\$563,000	2.72%	53	10.42%	42	101.1%
95070	\$1,514,500	5.50%	120	79.10%	48	97.3%
95110	\$312,100	15.08%	54	28.57%	53	99.3%
95111	\$308,700	11.73%	140	-39.13%	46	103.1%
95112	\$356,500	2.89%	76	-2.56%	44	100.7%
95113	\$442,100	-8.28%	2	0.00%	98	98.5%
95116	\$285,500	16.10%	110	-29.94%	64	101.5%
95117	\$488,600	-14.40%	43	16.22%	63	100.1%
95118	\$525,200	9.94%	93	4.49%	28	101.0%
95119	\$473,000	3.14%	25	-3.85%	34	100.7%
95120	\$941,300	7.49%	123	59.74%	35	98.6%
95121	\$433,400	25.70%	103	-11.97%	45	100.9%
95122	\$282,000	11.82%	156	-32.76%	56	103.7%
95123	\$385,900	10.01%	219	1.39%	54	100.7%
95124	\$646,700	9.87%	135	36.36%	41	100.0%
95125	\$702,600	13.38%	168	15.07%	49	98.3%
95126	\$487,600	0.06%	75	10.29%	43	99.5%
95127	\$390,000	27.24%	177	-18.81%	45	101.1%
95128	\$473,500	-1.31%	86	115.00%	50	101.0%
95129	\$847,100	11.12%	122	58.44%	21	101.3%
95130	\$688,700	0.63%	28	0.00%	21	99.2%
95131	\$511,500	8.85%	85	77.08%	47	101.8%

\*\*\*\* % Change of current quarter compared to the same quarter to year ago.


## Santa Clara County, CA

### Data by Zip Codes for Q2 2010

Zip Code	Average Price	Price Change ****	Total # Homes Sold (Quarter)	% Change in # Homes Sold ****	Average Days on Market	% of Asking Price (Sold/List Price)
95132	\$506,300	12.56%	108	83.05%	44	101.3%
95133	\$356,900	14.69%	69	2.99%	37	102.3%
95134	\$546,700	21.71%	13	-13.33%	18	99.7%
95135	\$657,100	6.71%	81	32.79%	55	99.2%
95136	\$463,700	1.84%	109	9.00%	44	100.8%
95138	\$818,700	1.31%	80	60.00%	64	98.6%
95139	\$490,700	4.69%	26	0.00%	56	100.2%
95140	\$958,600	N/A	3	N/A	51	99.0%
95148	\$554,700	14.84%	103	-11.21%	64	101.5%
OTHER	\$872,800	39.38%	12	50.00%	122	93.8%

\*\*\*\* % Change of current quarter compared to the same quarter to year ago.

## Santa Cruz County, CA



### Labor Market :

In the first two months of the second quarter, 5,290 jobs were added to the payrolls of Santa Cruz County. As a result of these new jobs, the average monthly unemployment rate fell from 15.2% during the first quarter to 12.5% for April and May. This steady job creation may help to maintain demand for home purchases. Favorable mortgage rates should support this trend.

### Housing Market :

	Q1' 10	Q2' 10	Q3' 10 (Forecast)
Average Price	\$542,300	\$518,700	↓
# Homes on the Market *	1,049	1,278	↑
# Homes Sold **	440	550	↓
# New Homes Built	12	13 ***	↑
Avg # of Days on Market	83	71	↑

\* Available as of Jun. 30, 2010.

\*\* May not add to total of zip codes.

\*\*\* During the first two months of 2nd quarter.

### Data by Zip Codes for Q2 2010

Zip Code	Average Price	Price Change ****	Total # Homes Sold (Quarter)	% Change in # Homes Sold ****	Average Days on Market	% of Asking Price (Sold/List Price)
95003	\$575,200	-25.52%	77	4.05%	90	96.7%
95005	\$435,300	20.92%	14	40.00%	118	98.8%
95006	\$312,600	-1.23%	30	25.00%	91	96.5%
95007	\$271,500	N/A	7	N/A	79	97.4%
95010	\$491,200	-12.36%	16	-20.00%	62	95.7%
95018	\$427,500	31.09%	29	52.63%	54	97.8%
95019	\$299,100	32.82%	9	-43.75%	33	100.1%
95033	\$680,800	10.93%	23	228.57%	73	98.0%
95060	\$677,900	10.21%	80	21.21%	66	98.1%
95062	\$583,700	-16.90%	77	4.05%	53	97.0%

\*\*\*\* % Change of current quarter compared to the same quarter to year ago.


## Santa Cruz County, CA

### Data by Zip Codes for Q2 2010

Zip Code	Average Price	Price Change ****	Total # Homes Sold (Quarter)	% Change in # Homes Sold ****	Average Days on Market	% of Asking Price (Sold/List Price)
95065	\$633,700	23.62%	11	-26.67%	65	91.3%
95066	\$629,400	-0.29%	35	52.17%	64	98.5%
95073	\$666,200	5.18%	17	-19.05%	76	93.7%
95076	\$364,000	26.74%	125	-26.90%	75	97.5%

\*\*\*\* % Change of current quarter compared to the same quarter to year ago.

## Alameda County, CA



### Labor Market :

In the first two months of the second quarter, 2,994 jobs were added to the payrolls of Alameda County. As a result of these new jobs, the average monthly unemployment rate fell from 11.8% during the first quarter to 11.3% for April and May. This steady job creation may help to maintain demand for home purchases. Favorable mortgage rates should support this trend.

### Housing Market :

	Q1' 10	Q2' 10	Q3' 10 (Forecast)
Average Price	\$449,500	\$473,900	↓
# Homes on the Market *	511	556	↑
# Homes Sold **	296	333	↓
# New Homes Built	240	196 ***	↑
Avg # of Days on Market	60	49	↑

\* Available as of Jun. 30, 2010.

\*\* May not add to total of zip codes.

\*\*\* During the first two months of 2nd quarter.

### Data by Zip Codes for Q2 2010

Zip Code	Average Price	Price Change ****	Total # Homes Sold (Quarter)	% Change in # Homes Sold ****	Average Days on Market	% of Asking Price (Sold/List Price)
94501	\$552,300	6.21%	3	200.00%	24	96.4%
94536	\$507,600	0.89%	46	0.00%	53	99.6%
94538	\$405,600	0.37%	38	100.00%	31	102.4%
94539	\$747,500	-12.75%	52	67.74%	29	100.0%
94541	\$236,300	-21.44%	9	-25.00%	101	102.9%
94542	\$323,000	-20.25%	1	-50.00%	15	100.9%
94544	\$298,800	15.19%	24	33.33%	45	104.7%
94545	\$268,900	7.22%	9	-10.00%	20	101.3%
94546	\$343,800	-35.47%	5	0.00%	102	96.4%
94550	\$636,000	96.30%	5	25.00%	15	99.7%

\*\*\*\* % Change of current quarter compared to the same quarter to year ago.


## Alameda County, CA

### Data by Zip Codes for Q2 2010

Zip Code	Average Price	Price Change ****	Total # Homes Sold (Quarter)	% Change in # Homes Sold ****	Average Days on Market	% of Asking Price (Sold/List Price)
94551	\$332,400	-9.13%	6	0.00%	44	101.9%
94555	\$619,600	13.21%	35	191.67%	34	101.4%
94560	\$398,800	20.85%	24	-17.24%	44	100.2%
94566	\$1,058,300	7.16%	3	-40.00%	54	98.5%
94568	\$517,100	-3.00%	5	-37.50%	19	99.4%
94577	\$298,300	9.99%	3	-40.00%	43	97.4%
94578	\$309,200	13.76%	3	-25.00%	92	101.0%
94579	\$400,000	-4.72%	3	-25.00%	51	104.9%
94580	\$322,500	-1.16%	2	-50.00%	102	100.0%
94587	\$400,600	-5.30%	29	16.00%	108	97.8%
94588	\$584,800	-13.18%	4	-20.00%	69	97.2%
94601	\$120,000	N/A	1	N/A	48	93.2%
94602	\$621,000	24.20%	1	0.00%	147	95.7%
94603	\$102,800	-15.67%	5	-37.50%	35	112.4%
94605	\$192,800	11.96%	5	-28.57%	102	92.9%
94606	\$174,500	2.65%	2	100.00%	163	98.1%
94607	\$145,000	29.46%	1	-50.00%	64	100.0%
94608	\$226,300	-41.97%	3	200.00%	1	108.7%
94609	\$338,000	40.83%	2	100.00%	62	115.0%
94621	\$78,400	-9.47%	2	-60.00%	5	107.4%
94702	\$320,000	N/A	1	N/A	17	100.3%
94710	\$390,000	N/A	1	N/A	91	98.7%

\*\*\*\* % Change of current quarter compared to the same quarter to year ago.

## Contra Costa County, CA



### Labor Market :

In the first two months of the second quarter, 2,071 jobs were added to the payrolls of Contra Costa County. As a result of these new jobs, the average monthly unemployment rate fell from 11.9% during the first quarter to 11.1% for April and May. This steady job creation may help to maintain demand for home purchases. Favorable mortgage rates should support this trend.

### Housing Market :

	Q1' 10	Q2' 10	Q3' 10 (Forecast)
<b>Average Price</b>	\$272,800	\$284,900	↓
<b># Homes on the Market *</b>	132	150	↑
<b># Homes Sold **</b>	48	47	↓
<b># New Homes Built</b>	280	174 ***	↑
<b>Avg # of Days on Market</b>	70	72	↑

\* Available as of Jun. 30, 2010.

\*\* May not add to total of zip codes.

\*\*\* During the first two months of 2nd quarter.

### Data by Zip Codes for Q2 2010

Zip Code	Average Price	Price Change ****	Total # Homes Sold (Quarter)	% Change in # Homes Sold ****	Average Days on Market	% of Asking Price (Sold/List Price)
94505	\$310,000	24.50%	2	0.00%	7	99.2%
94506	\$652,000	-55.11%	2	0.00%	101	98.9%
94509	\$104,500	N/A	4	N/A	96	111.6%
94511	\$535,000	N/A	1	N/A	262	89.3%
94513	\$247,200	-22.82%	6	20.00%	24	101.2%
94518	\$96,000	N/A	1	N/A	137	101.1%
94520	\$110,000	-54.49%	1	-66.67%	79	84.7%
94521	\$143,800	22.59%	1	-50.00%	32	94.0%
94523	\$277,000	-20.86%	1	0.00%	78	100.7%
94526	\$445,000	N/A	1	N/A	66	96.9%

\*\*\*\* % Change of current quarter compared to the same quarter to year ago.


## Contra Costa County, CA

### Data by Zip Codes for Q2 2010

Zip Code	Average Price	Price Change ****	Total # Homes Sold (Quarter)	% Change in # Homes Sold ****	Average Days on Market	% of Asking Price (Sold/List Price)
94530	\$410,000	N/A	1	N/A	7	102.5%
94531	\$193,800	-0.62%	3	50.00%	59	98.6%
94561	\$254,200	9.01%	3	-25.00%	103	93.0%
94564	\$273,000	-18.39%	1	-50.00%	4	109.2%
94565	\$146,300	21.92%	4	0.00%	148	96.1%
94582	\$856,000	8.38%	2	100.00%	104	103.9%
94583	\$499,000	8.13%	1	-80.00%	53	99.8%
94598	\$585,000	N/A	2	N/A	24	97.1%
94801	\$135,700	N/A	3	N/A	59	102.8%
94804	\$215,300	N/A	5	N/A	45	96.7%
94806	\$241,000	21.59%	2	-60.00%	100	103.9%

\*\*\*\* % Change of current quarter compared to the same quarter to year ago.

## San Francisco County, CA



### Labor Market :

In the first two months of the second quarter, 2,920 jobs were added to the payrolls of San Francisco County. As a result of these new jobs, the average monthly unemployment rate fell from 10.2% during the first quarter to 9.4% for April and May. This steady job creation may help to maintain demand for home purchases. Favorable mortgage rates should support this trend.

### Housing Market :

	Q1' 10	Q2' 10	Q3' 10 (Forecast)
Average Price	\$656,900	\$627,900	↔
# Homes on the Market *	96	115	↑
# Homes Sold **	63	56	↔
# New Homes Built	5	1 ***	↑
Avg # of Days on Market	75	78	↑

\* Available as of Jun. 30, 2010.

\*\* May not add to total of zip codes.

\*\*\* During the first two months of 2nd quarter.

### Data by Zip Codes for Q2 2010

Zip Code	Average Price	Price Change ****	Total # Homes Sold (Quarter)	% Change in # Homes Sold ****	Average Days on Market	% of Asking Price (Sold/List Price)
94103	\$785,000	N/A	1	N/A		93.6%
94107	\$632,500	4.98%	2	0.00%	108	98.2%
94109	\$454,900	N/A	1	N/A	13	102.2%
94110	\$704,500	20.12%	2	-60.00%	158	108.8%
94112	\$511,400	10.76%	11	0.00%	49	101.2%
94114	\$695,000	-18.33%	3	200.00%	105	104.3%
94116	\$724,300	-10.02%	4	300.00%	62	99.7%
94117	\$272,000	N/A	1	N/A	80	98.9%
94118	\$868,000	N/A	1	N/A	56	94.6%
94121	\$805,000	10.27%	1	-50.00%	8	96.3%

\*\*\*\* % Change of current quarter compared to the same quarter to year ago.

## San Francisco County, CA

### Data by Zip Codes for Q2 2010

Zip Code	Average Price	Price Change ****	Total # Homes Sold (Quarter)	% Change in # Homes Sold ****	Average Days on Market	% of Asking Price (Sold/List Price)
94122	\$639,600	-21.43%	5	66.67%	101	101.0%
94123	\$3,250,000	128.02%	1	-50.00%	38	76.5%
94124	\$314,000	-29.97%	6	50.00%	126	104.0%
94127	\$1,039,000	-21.56%	2	0.00%	109	95.4%
94132	\$611,000	43.26%	5	-16.67%	100	92.2%
94134	\$524,300	25.52%	9	50.00%	55	105.5%
94158	\$514,000	N/A	1	N/A	10	100.0%

\*\*\*\* % Change of current quarter compared to the same quarter to year ago.

## Others

Data by Zip Codes for Q2 2010						
Zip Code	Average Price	Price Change ****	Total # Homes Sold (Quarter)	% Change in # Homes Sold ****	Average Days on Market	% of Asking Price (Sold/List Price)
91356	\$160,000	N/A	1	N/A	237	88.9%
91744	\$250,000	N/A	1	N/A	15	100.0%
92557	\$116,000	N/A	1	N/A	32	74.8%
92585	\$175,000	N/A	1	N/A	40	100.0%
92804	\$303,000	N/A	1	N/A	58	86.6%
93291	\$204,000	N/A	1	N/A	9	93.9%
93426	\$260,000	-60.43%	2	0.00%	229	96.7%
93428	\$298,000	N/A	1	N/A	154	93.2%
93446	\$348,900	N/A	3	N/A	22	100.3%
93451	\$210,000	N/A	1	N/A	10	97.7%
93536	\$185,000	N/A	1	N/A	97	100.0%
93610	\$180,000	31.39%	1	-66.67%	218	100.0%
93618	\$128,500	N/A	2	N/A	37	86.9%
93620	\$66,800	N/A	2	N/A	48	140.7%
93631	\$207,500	N/A	2	N/A	56	96.6%
93635	\$127,500	1.19%	21	75.00%	97	99.0%
93657	\$164,500	N/A	3	N/A	54	100.7%
93703	\$75,000	N/A	1	N/A	24	95.5%
93711	\$243,000	N/A	1	N/A	83	97.6%
93722	\$168,500	N/A	1	N/A	168	102.2%
93725	\$110,000	N/A	1	N/A	108	84.6%
93923	\$1,813,800	-4.03%	4	33.33%	174	84.3%
94533	\$167,300	45.48%	3	200.00%	105	101.3%
94534	\$470,000	N/A	1	N/A	77	104.9%
94591	\$260,000	20.37%	1	-75.00%	82	104.4%
94920	\$3,327,500	315.42%	1	0.00%	36	99.3%
94949	\$550,000	N/A	1	N/A	140	100.0%
95204	\$95,000	40.12%	1	-66.67%	25	96.0%
95205	\$56,000	41.77%	1	-50.00%	56	101.8%
95206	\$139,300	27.56%	8	60.00%	47	100.7%
95207	\$142,000	N/A	1	N/A	93	94.7%
95209	\$217,800	33.37%	4	33.33%	79	97.4%
95210	\$94,700	6.05%	5	66.67%	53	99.9%
95212	\$194,800	29.87%	2	100.00%	21	98.4%

\*\*\*\* % Change of current quarter compared to the same quarter to year ago.

## Others

### Data by Zip Codes for Q2 2010

Zip Code	Average Price	Price Change ****	Total # Homes Sold (Quarter)	% Change in # Homes Sold ****	Average Days on Market	% of Asking Price (Sold/List Price)
95219	\$283,000	N/A	3	N/A	143	98.3%
95301	\$105,600	N/A	3	N/A	7	107.4%
95304	\$368,800	14.43%	4	-33.33%	27	100.3%
95316	\$199,000	N/A	1	N/A	1	95.2%
95320	\$65,000	-64.29%	1	0.00%	99	118.4%
95322	\$145,000	N/A	1	N/A	13	100.1%
95330	\$186,300	1.42%	15	0.00%	34	103.2%
95334	\$52,000	N/A	1	N/A	100	106.1%
95336	\$183,000	36.87%	2	-77.78%	9	103.1%
95337	\$297,500	53.51%	2	-33.33%	42	99.2%
95340	\$135,000	70.89%	2	100.00%	13	101.9%
95348	\$135,900	N/A	7	N/A	84	102.0%
95350	\$111,000	-20.88%	2	0.00%	61	111.0%
95351	\$122,000	N/A	3	N/A	197	109.9%
95355	\$207,000	-28.69%	1	0.00%	149	75.3%
95356	\$140,000	N/A	1	N/A	0	108.6%
95358	\$145,500	38.57%	2	100.00%	18	96.7%
95360	\$97,300	-55.26%	4	100.00%	44	114.5%
95361	\$230,000	N/A	2	N/A	96	96.2%
95363	\$170,700	18.54%	6	0.00%	215	101.1%
95367	\$210,000	N/A	1	N/A	9	95.5%
95376	\$205,100	21.87%	8	-74.19%	31	100.4%
95377	\$277,900	11.20%	13	-43.48%	65	102.9%
95382	\$184,400	N/A	4	N/A	149	98.5%
95391	\$302,200	2.54%	11	0.00%	64	101.5%
95404	\$200,000	-70.80%	1	0.00%	2	100.0%
95618	\$260,000	N/A	1	N/A	33	100.0%
95624	\$210,000	-8.70%	1	0.00%	153	100.0%
95642	\$195,000	N/A	1	N/A	98	85.2%
95650	\$180,000	N/A	1	N/A	16	94.8%
95660	\$76,000	N/A	1	N/A	8	104.3%
95687	\$205,000	N/A	1	N/A	204	93.2%
95691	\$250,000	N/A	1	N/A	87	100.0%
95742	\$231,500	-10.96%	2	100.00%	52	90.8%
95758	\$205,000	-2.33%	1	0.00%	146	97.9%
95762	\$375,000	N/A	1	N/A	229	100.0%
95823	\$81,500	N/A	2	N/A	189	73.8%

\*\*\*\* % Change of current quarter compared to the same quarter to year ago.

## Others

### Data by Zip Codes for Q2 2010


Zip Code	Average Price	Price Change ****	Total # Homes Sold (Quarter)	% Change in # Homes Sold ****	Average Days on Market	% of Asking Price (Sold/List Price)
95834	\$83,500	N/A	1	N/A	22	93.9%
95961	\$155,000	N/A	1	N/A	318	103.4%
95993	\$204,000	-18.40%	1	0.00%	29	102.0%
96118	\$92,000	N/A	1	N/A	82	94.4%

\*\*\*\* % Change of current quarter compared to the same quarter to year ago.

## Squeezing Every Sale from the Tax Credit

By Ken Fears  
Manager, Regional Economics

By most accounts the Federal tax credit succeeded at what it was intended to do; stop the precipitous decline in home prices. But not all would-be homebuyers are celebrating. Short sales continue to take longer than other properties to close and some contracts could fall through as a result of delays.



Nationally, there was a 5.1% decline in home sales from May to June, but the 2010 sales volume remains much higher than it was in 2009. Home sales were 9.8% higher in June of this year compared with the level 12 months earlier. Here in the area covered by MLS Listings Inc. there were 13.0% more home sales in the second quarter of 2010 than during the same period in 2009. This upward trajectory for sales has provided the basis for the confidence necessary to stimulate modest price growth in many markets around the country. The national median home prices was 1.0% higher in June than 12 months earlier, while locally there was a 18.7% increase in the average home price over the four quarters ending in June. This price growth in turn has helped to stabilize the credit markets and abate the flow of foreclosures from resetting loans.

Not all home sales have gone smoothly, though. Many Realtors® report problems closing short sales. Anecdotal information suggests that banks are under staffed. In addition, new Federal programs and requirements add to the litany of paperwork required to complete one of these transactions. In early May, just after the deadline for the home buyer tax credit, the NAR began a campaign to have Congress extend the time frame for homebuyers to complete their home sale and receive the tax credit, so long as they were under contract on April 30<sup>th</sup>. Near midnight on June 30<sup>th</sup>, Congress passed a stand-alone bill to extend this closing period. Such quick action is a true feat in Washington.

Here in the area covered by MLS Listings Inc. the time to close after a contract was signed increased over the 4-quarter period ending in June by 26.2% suggesting that banks are having trouble closing deals in this area. Nationally, an estimated 75,000 home buyers could not close by the July 1<sup>st</sup> deadline. This extension will help them and likely many local buyers.

The tax credit clearly had positive effects for the national and most local markets. Congress' extension of the closing date will sprinkle home sales over the subsequent three months, helping to smooth the decline from the tax-incentive-fueled period. Sales are likely to remain lower than during the credit period, but mortgage rates continue to skim along all-time lows and sellers desperate to move before autumn will make price adjustments. The result may be modest and localized price adjustments, but steadier sales as employment slowly begins to recover.

# Gearing up for the fight

by Lawrence Yun, NAR Chief Economist

It hasn't been a pretty sight in the first month without the tax credit. Pending sales for existing homes fell 30 percent in May. New home sales (which measures contracts and not closings) fell by 33 percent to its lowest level in nearly 50 years. Single-family housing starts also took a dip in May, falling 17 percent. The big declines should have been expected because consumers are rational when making purchase decisions and they respond to incentives. Why sign a contract in May when doing so in April will result in an \$8,000 check? Going forward, contract signings for June and July could also remain similarly weak.

However, even with these short-term setbacks the overall tax credit stimulus can only be called a success in terms having stabilized home prices. Stable home values lessen foreclosure pressure, improve bank balance sheets, and most importantly, help steadily revive consumer confidence about a home purchase. Currently there are signs of home price stabilization in nearly every market. Prices are, surprisingly, rising at a double digit pace in San Francisco and San Diego. Be mindful, however, that low sales activity over the short-term will cause housing inventory to rise, and the months' supply of homes available for sale could reach 10 months or higher. Provided such elevated inventory will only be for the short-term and not prolonged, then home prices will not undergo heavy pressure to fall. Experience shows, unlike sales, prices are far less immune to big month-to-month fluctuations.

The key test of a sustainable long-term recovery, without the stimulus medicine, will only start to show in the next several months. For this to happen, we need job growth. Not the artificial temporary Census jobs, but true private sector jobs. The net private sector jobs, expanded so far this year to June, were at 593,000. This is relatively small potatoes after the 8 million job cuts in the past two years, but it is nonetheless a start of an expansion. And the latest report from the Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that in June the economy lost jobs for the first time this year. Those temporary Census job additions are over, and state and local governments also cut payrolls. Businesses did add 83,000 payrolls, and – surprisingly — the unemployment rate declined. Expect one million job additions for the balance of the year and another 1.5 to 2.2 million in 2011.

Mortgage rates also need to remain favorable. Because of the uncertainty regarding the strength of overall economic expansion and of uncertainty regarding the future of the Euro, many investors have put money into the safe U.S. Treasury bond market. That has pushed down the 10-year Treasury yield to 3 percent as of this writing. The 30-year fixed rate mortgage then can be at around 4.8 percent. That is super favorable for consumers.

While jobs expand and rates remain low (fingers crossed), we need to assure that any unnecessary barrier to market recovery be taken down. One of these barriers was the lack of flood insurance. Because the private market has difficulty in providing national flood insurance, the federal government has been involved in the program. This is not a new or simulative federal program, but simply an old program that has been in existence for many decades. Nearly seven percent of all owner-occupied homes require flood insurance in the country. The figures are as high as one-third of all homes in Louisiana and Florida (which as we know are also now being negatively impacted from the oil spills). Without flood insurance, a homebuyer cannot obtain a mortgage. Fortunately, lawmakers listened and understood the damaging impact and a bill to reauthorize flood insurance passed with a strong majority.

Another barrier to recovery could have been the psychologically demoralizing impact of not getting the tax credit among those homebuyers who signed their contracts in April and earlier. They responded to government stimulus, yet they were unable to receive the benefit - through no fault of their own. Many homes require a 'short sale' approval from a bank. However, this process is far from being short; it often takes several months and is can be very messy. As a result many home purchases were not able to close by the June 30th deadline. Fortunately, Congress passed legislation on the very last day - June 30th- to extend the closing deadline to September 30th. It is estimated that up to 180,000 homes that were under contract could have fallen out had the extension not occurred.

The flood insurance and tax credit deadlines were short-term barriers and they were removed. But another much higher barrier to recovery which could arise is the elimination or a reduction in the mortgage interest deduction (MID). There has been increased chatter among opinion makers about the need to eliminate or trim this deduction, particularly in light of a very high U.S. budget deficit. In addition, after witnessing an unprecedented rise in foreclosures, some commentators are attacking the essence and societal value of homeownership, implying that housing should not get favored tax treatment.

As we have painfully learned from the recent housing market debacle, people who are not yet financially qualified should not become home owners, period. However, to blame the housing market collapse in any way or in any part on the mortgage interest deduction is equivalent to suggesting we need to completely scrap the free market system because of the banking crisis. Remember, mortgage interest deductions have been in place for many decades without bringing volatile swings to the housing market. Perhaps we should turn our attention to what was new in the recent unprecedented housing cycle; namely, the very lax mortgage underwriting standards and faulty work of credit rating agencies.

If we were to rewrite the tax code beginning with a blank slate, perhaps, a full discussion on the benefits and costs of having MID should take place. But the country is not starting from scratch and we have to contend with history. The mortgage interest deduction has been part of the U.S. tax code since the inception of the income tax nearly a century ago, when the U.S. income tax code came into existence.

Under 17 U.S. Presidents and their administrations, hundreds of millions Americans have purchased their homes with the understanding of this important tax break. As a result, many hard-working, tax-paying citizens have been able to realize one of the sacred tenets of the American Dream – of owning a piece of America. Homeowners, aside from paying about 80 to 90 percent of all federal income tax, have been an important stabilizing force in the country as they are rooted in the community and the country. Homeowners are already taking on a massive burden of taxation, and to say they need to be taxed more is simply unjustified.

In my view, to eliminate or change the mortgage interest deduction – a long-running, settled portion of the U.S. tax code – would be to change the rules in the middle of a game. It would result in a massive, unexpected redistribution of wealth in the country. While in any particular year only about one-third of taxpayers itemize, most homeowners have resorted to claiming the mortgage interest deduction at some point in their homeownership life. In the most recently available data from IRS tax returns, 63 percent of the families who claim the mortgage interest deduction earn between \$50,000 and \$200,000 per year. That is only small part of the story, however. Because of the capitalization impact of the expected stream of future mortgage interest deductions, a removal of the mortgage interest deduction will lead to home values falling by 15 percent, equating to a destruction of housing wealth equivalent to \$2.5 trillion. That wealth destruction will be felt by all homeowners, including those who purchased homes with cash and those who have fully paid off their mortgages. Even in today's economy – that is a lot of dough. Because the mortgage interest deduction has been around for generations and generations, any changes may lead people to doubt about what is settled and what is not? Does a change mean future capricious changes to other 'well understood' contracts? For example, will future opinion makers start mentioning the need to tax ROTH IRA earnings in retirement for those who are able to pay (i.e., the rich) to help reduce future budget deficits? Even though the ROTH IRA was created with expressed purpose of providing tax free earnings (since this retirement contribution is made with after-tax dollars)?

A final and very important aspect to consider in the debate about the mortgage interest deduction is positive societal externalities. Academic studies have demonstrated the positive social benefits of ownership, including lower juvenile delinquency rates, lower teen pregnancy rates, and higher student achievement levels among children of homeowners versus those of non-owners who were of similar socioeconomic background. Yes, homeownership is not for everyone. However, for those who are financially qualified, have demonstrated financial responsibility, and are willing to purchase a home that is well within their budget, tilting the field in favor of ownership through the mortgage interest deduction—as America has done for the past century—can induce immeasurable societal benefits beyond the counting of the dollars. The fight over this well established tax benefit is coming. Be ready.

This table reflects data available through July 2, 2010.

Monthly Indicator	Recent Statistics	Likely Direction Over the Next Six Months	Forecast
<b>Existing Home Sales</b> remained at elevated levels in May, although they declined from the previous month. Resales posted a seasonally adjusted annual rate of 5.66 million units in May – 2.2% off April’s upwardly revised pace of 5.79 million units. May resales were 19.2% ahead of a year ago. The national median price for an existing home rose to \$179,600 – 2.7% higher than in May of 2009.	May 10 5,660 April 10 5,790 May 09 4,750	↓	Weak in the short term after the tax credit and a steady climb later
<b>New Home Sales</b> declined significantly in May to a seasonally adjusted annual rate of 300,000 units – 32.7% off April’s rate and 18.3% down from the level in May of 2009. The inventory of new homes available for sale at the end of May stood at 213,000 units – an 8-month supply at the current sales pace.	May 10 300 April 10 446 May 09 367	↑	Buyers of new homes are less influenced by the tax credit
<b>Housing Starts</b> also declined in May, posting a seasonally adjusted annual rate of 593,000 units – 10.0% off April’s level, but 7.8% ahead of that in May of 2009. Building permits – generally a reliable indicator of future starts – were down 5.9% from April, but up 4.4% from a year ago.	May 10 593 April 10 659 May 09 550	↑	High existing home inventory but very low new home inventory
<b>Housing Affordability</b> continued to dip, while remaining at healthy levels. NAR’s Housing Affordability Index posted a reading of 162.0 in May, off April’s reading of 168.3 but comparable to that in June of 2009. Increases in the median price of an existing home as well as an increase in the level of qualifying income helped contribute to the decline.	May 10 176.0 April 10 177.5 May 09 180.7	↔	To remain at historic highs
<b>Mortgage Rates</b> remain at historically low levels. The average rate on a 30 year fixed rate mortgage dropped 15 basis points in June from last month to 4.74% -- its lowest level since April of 1971 when Freddie Mac started its Primary Mortgage Market survey.	June 10 4.74% May 10 4.89% June 09 5.42%	↑	Any downward drift is short-term and is pure bonus
<b>Employment</b> The U.S. economy lost 125,000 jobs in June – the first job loss this year so far. Temporary Census jobs and cuts in state and local government payrolls contributed to the negative numbers. On the positive side, businesses did hire an additional 83,000 workers, and the federal government added 27,000 (non-Census) jobs. To many analysts’ surprise, the unemployment rate actually fell – from 9.7% in May to 9.5% in June, due primarily to “discouraged” workers who are no longer looking for jobs.	June 2010 -125 May 2010 +2 12-month total: -170	↑	Good revival signs in the manufacturing sector
<b>Economic Growth</b> The economy grew at 2.7% annual rate in the first quarter of 2010. This is the third and final estimate of GDP growth based on more complete data. GDP increased 5.6% in the fourth quarter of last year. Increased personal consumption expenditures – i.e., consumer spending – was offset by larger than previously estimated decline in state and local government spending.	2010:I +2.7% 2009:IV +5.6% 2009:I -6.4%	↔	Steady moderate uneventful expansion

Notes: All rate are seasonally adjusted. New home sales, existing home sales, and housing starts are shown in thousands. Employment growth is shown as month-to-month change in thousands. Inflation is shown as the month-to-month change in the Consumer Price Index. Sources: NAR, Bureau of the Census, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Freddie Mac, and the Mortgage Bankers Association