

1400

*An Atlas of the Manchester Neighborhood
of Pittsburgh 1977*



MANCHESTER

UNIVERSITY CENTER FOR URBAN RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH
249 NORTH CRAIG STREET
PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA 15260

1209-D, Cathedral of Learning
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260
Phone: (412) 624-3465

PITTSBURGH NEIGHBORHOOD ATLAS

GOVERNING BOARD

ROGER AHLBRANDT, JR.
University of Pittsburgh, School of Social Work

Chairperson

JAMES VALLAS

Shadyside

Vice-Chairperson

BARBARA KELLY

Perry-Hilltop

Secretary

TERRY WOODCOCK

Squirrel Hill

Treasurer

RICHARD ARMSTEAD

Hill District

JOSEPH BORKOWSKI

Lawerenceville

DANIEL CHAPPELL

Hill District

MARY COYNE

West End

JIM CUNNINGHAM

Shadyside

MARY LOU DANIEL

West End

JESE DEL GRE

Hill District

WILLIAM P. GALLAGHER

Greenfield

MARY HALL

Squirrel Hill

ROSE JEWELL

Shadyside

GABOR KISH

Elliott

ROBERT "BLUE" MARTIN

Hazelwood

THOMAS MURPHY

Perry Hilltop

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

WENDELL D. JORDAN

AGENCIES

Action-Housing, Inc.

U.S. Bureau of the Census

Carnegie-Mellon University

Christian Associates

City Council

Community Action Pittsburgh

County Planning Department

Health & Welfare

Planning Association

National Institute of Neighborhood Studies

University of Pittsburgh School of Social Work

Southwestern Pennsylvania

Regional Planning Commission

State Department of

Community Affairs

United Way

Urban and Community Affairs - University of Pittsburgh

CONSULTANTS

University of Pittsburgh Center for Urban Research

City Planning Department

OZ SCHMIDT - Geography Dept.,

University of Pittsburgh

JOHN YORIO - Highland Park

STAFF

Wendell D. Jordan (East Liberty-Lemington-Lincoln)

Margaret K. Charny (Squirrel Hill)

Julia Whitener (Mexican War Streets)

Millofred Russell (Homestead, Pa.)

Gerald S. Oswalt (Schenley Heights)

Katherine Knorr (East Liberty)

John Zingaro (Shadyside)

Dan Baskin

Vicky Leap

Howard Williams

Ronald Madzy

Tony Gary

Mary Shea

SUPPORTIVE INSTITUTIONS

Pittsburgh Neighborhood Alliance

Center for Urban Research of the Univ. of Pgh.

School of Social Work of the Univ. of Pgh.

Architect Workshop

City Council of the City of Pgh.

Allegheny County Department of Elections

ACTION-Housing, Inc.

Department of City Planning of the City of Pgh.

Southwestern Penna. Regional Planning Commission

ACTION-Vista (Volunteers in Service to America)

Valley View Presbyterian Church

FUNDING SOURCES

Alcoa Foundation

Allegheny Conference on Community Development

Howard Heinz Endowment

Jones and Laughlin Steel Corporation

Koppers Company

Richard King Mellon Foundation

City Council of the City of Pittsburgh

The Pittsburgh Foundation

Henry Oliver Rea Charitable Trust

Sarah Scaife Foundation, Inc.

Weld Tooling Company

University of Pittsburgh (In Kind)

INTRODUCTION

The Pittsburgh Neighborhood Alliance was formed in 1969 by a number of neighborhood organizations that were concerned with improving the city's neighborhoods and their relations with city government. The members of the Alliance recognized that in order to negotiate effectively with city government about such major concerns as public service needs, capital improvements and transportation, it was necessary to obtain accurate, up-to-date information about the neighborhoods. Unfortunately, this information was not available.

To remedy this situation, the Alliance developed its Pittsburgh Neighborhood Atlas project. First, the boundaries of the city's neighborhoods had to be determined. The Pittsburgh Neighborhood Atlas asked people attending community meetings to name and describe the boundaries of the neighborhoods in which they lived. This information was also provided by an Atlas-initiated survey. Responses from every voting district of the city were analyzed to assure citizen involvement at the neighborhood level. Seventy-eight neighborhoods were thus identified, each made up of one or more whole voting districts in order to comply with provisions in Pittsburgh's home rule charter relating to the election of community advisory boards.

The Atlas then gathered a body of useful and up-to-date information for every neighborhood. It is the beginning of a neighborhood information system that more closely reflects neighborhood boundaries as defined by residents instead of by public officials. In the past, statistics about sections of the city have been based on information published for relatively large areas such as census tracts. For the atlas, much of the material describing neighborhood characteristics came from figures compiled for smaller areas: voting districts or census blocks. As a result, detailed information is now available for neighborhoods whose boundaries differ substantially from census tract boundaries.

The information in this atlas provides an insight into current neighborhood conditions and the direction in which the neighborhood is moving. The best indicators showing the health of the neighborhood are provided by citizen satisfaction with the neighborhood, and changes in residential real estate transaction prices. Comparison of these statistics to those for the entire city provide a basis to begin understanding issues of neighborhood stability. In the years to come, as additional data are gathered for each of these indicators, trends will become more obvious.

It is important to recognize that neighborhood change is a complex process and that one indicator by itself may not be useful. Neighborhoods may be healthy regardless of their level of income, and therefore income-related statistics may not be useful guides by themselves. Neighborhoods must be viewed over time in terms of relative changes compared to the city as a whole, and any analysis of neighborhood conditions must focus upon all of the data in order to provide a comprehensive understanding.

To learn about specific sections of the neighborhood, figures by individual voting district or census tract may be obtained. Additional information on the neighborhood or the information system is available through the Center for Urban Research of the University of Pittsburgh, which has made an outstanding contribution to the development of this atlas.

NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION

Manchester is approximately 1.7 miles north of downtown. It is estimated to be 423.5 acres in size, containing 1.2% of the city's land and 0.8% of its 1974 population. When the neighborhood boundaries were determined, the voting districts in Manchester were #1 to #7 and #9, Ward 21. In October, 1976, the County Department of Elections changed the voting districts in the neighborhood, and two districts were eliminated. District #1 is now part of #2; #7 is part of #9. (See Appendix for a listing of the neighborhood's census tracts.)



NEIGHBORHOOD HISTORY
MANCHESTER

Manchester has an English manufacturing town as its namesake.

In 1832 John Sampson, C. L. Armstrong, Thomas Haigton, Samuel Hill and Thomas Barlow realized the potential of the area west of the young borough of Allegheny. Named by them, Manchester, situated on a rolling plain along the Ohio River, soon became very prominent in industry.

On November 2, 1843, it was incorporated as a borough.

In 1847 the Harris Pittsburgh Business Directory described Manchester as a "new and flourishing town". Its 500 inhabitants worked in industry. Among Manchester's first establishments were Marlatt and Hall's Plough Manufacturing (1852), Mr. Hall's Wagon and Cart Factory and the Union Paper Mill.

Population steadily increased over the next twenty years. Manchester and neighboring Allegheny began to converge. Common industrial and commercial interests dictated their merger. This was officially achieved by state legislation on March 12, 1869.

By 1872 both manufacture and population had expanded. The Pittsburgh Locomotive and Car Works, LaBelle Steel and Iron Works, the Union Salt Works, McCloy Nail and Keg Factory, Benson Pump Company and the Hutchinson Oil Works were among the new additions. Later in the decade, the Manchester Docks, operated by Issac Reed, were the scene of marine craft and machinery repair.

By 1901 Manchester was a center of industrial power. Crucible Steel, Rosedale Foundry and Machine Works, Pittsburgh Brass, Liggett Spring and Axle, Pittsburgh Clay Pot Company, Kiefer and Stifel Tannery and the Consumers' Ice Company were located there.

From its earliest days Manchester had a variety of religious denominations. German Presbyterians, Lutherans, Roman Catholics and Reformed Jews were all represented.

Manchester became a part of Pittsburgh in 1907, following the annexation of Allegheny. With the decline of industry and the subsequent exodus of many residents, the neighborhood was plagued by decay and neglect.

Manchester has been significantly affected by two urban renewal projects during the past twenty years. The Chateau Street West Industrial Renewal Project, begun in 1960, cleared housing, redeveloped land for industry and put relocation pressure on parts of the neighborhood to the east. To counter this pressure, the Federal Title I Renewal Project was placed before City Council in October 1970 by William Farkas, executive director of the Urban Redevelopment Authority (URA). With a projected cost of \$26 million, the project set a goal of helping Manchester move towards becoming a predominately residential district through relocation of most industrial and commercial properties, rehabilitation of old housing, construction of new housing and provision of necessary amenities.

Additionally, the Pittsburgh Historical and Landmarks Foundation has been instrumental in the encouragement and direction of the restoration of individual dwellings.

MANCHESTER
SUMMARY STATISTICS

	<u>Neighborhood</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
Population (1974)	3,714	479,276
% Change (1970-1974)	-32%	-8%
% Black population (1970)	69%	20%
Housing units (1974)	1,870	166,625
% Vacant	32%	6%
% Owner-occupied housing Units (1974)	34%	54%
Average sales price of owner-occupied dwellings (1975)	\$16,543	\$23,518
% Residential real estate transactions with mortgages provided by financial institutions (1975)	17%	59%
Crime rate (1975)	0.138	0.053
Average family income (1969)	\$ 6,500	\$10,500
Income index as % of city index (1974)	84%	
% Satisfied with neighborhood (1976)	23%	41%
Major neighborhood problems (1976)	Vacant buildings Trash and litter Drug abuse	Poor roads Dog litter Burglary

CITIZEN SURVEY

The purpose of the citizen survey was to obtain attitudes about the quality of the neighborhood environment. Citizens were asked to respond to questions concerning the neighborhood as a whole, neighborhood problems, and public services. The attitudinal data, heretofore not available, are key indicators of the relative health of the neighborhood. By specifying neighborhood problems or public service needs, the information may be a useful guide for public investment or service delivery decisions.

The city-wide survey was mailed to a randomly selected sample of registered voters. Of approximately 35,000 households contacted 9,767 responded. The sample provides a 5% response rate for each of the city's 423 voting districts. (See Appendix for a profile of the respondents as well as for statistics on voter registration.)

I. Neighborhood Satisfaction

Manchester residents are generally less satisfied with their neighborhood than residents city-wide. Table 1 shows that 23% of the citizens responding to the survey were satisfied with their neighborhood compared to 41% in all city neighborhoods. When asked to state whether the neighborhood is better or worse than two years ago, 35% said that it was better which exceeded the city-wide response of 12%. Given the opportunity to move from the neighborhood, 38% said they would continue to live there compared to a response of 45% for the city as a whole. The responses to these satisfaction questions indicate a mixed attitude of residents toward their neighborhood compared to citizens city-wide.

TABLE 1

Neighborhood Satisfaction
Manchester

Question 1: Generally, how satisfied are you with conditions in this neighborhood?

	Satisfied (%)	Dissatisfied (%)	Neither (%)
Manchester	23	61	12
All neighborhoods	41	37	21

Question 2: Do you think this neighborhood has gotten better or worse over the past two years?

	Better (%)	Worse (%)	Not Changed (%)
Manchester	35	52	10
All neighborhoods	12	49	36

Question 3: If you had your choice of where to live, would you continue living in this neighborhood?

	Yes (%)	No (%)	Not Sure (%)
Manchester	38	38	15
All neighborhoods	45	32	18

SOURCE: Citizen Survey, 1976.

NOTE: The percent responses to each question do not add up to 100%. The difference is accounted for by the following: "don't know", "unable to evaluate", or no answer.

II. Neighborhood Problems

In order to identify specific neighborhood problems, residents were asked to consider twelve problems usually associated with urban communities and rate them for the neighborhood. Table 2 compares the problem ratings of the respondents from Manchester to those from all city neighborhoods. Areas of particular concern for the neighborhood include vandalism, vacant buildings, trash and litter, and drug abuse.

III. Satisfaction with Public Services

Table 3 shows the satisfaction of Manchester residents with their public services and compares the responses to data for all city neighborhoods. City-wide, residents are least satisfied with street and alley maintenance. Manchester residents are more satisfied with respect to garbage collection and the fire department, and less satisfied with respect with street and alley maintenance and police.

The Citizen Survey also asked the respondents to list the services with which they were the least satisfied and to explain the reasons for their dissatisfaction. Residents from Manchester gave the greatest number of reasons for dissatisfaction to the services listed below. Included is a summary of the major reasons for their dissatisfaction.

1. Street and alley maintenance: Poor maintenance; need for a better street repair program; poor quality street cleaning services; problems with dirty street sidewalks.
2. Police: Insufficient police services; not enough police protection.
3. Public transportation: Need for more efficient transportation system; need for better bus scheduling.

TABLE 2

Neighborhood Problems
Manchester

Problem Category	Problem Rating - Percent Response		
	<u>Not a Problem</u>	<u>Minor or Moderate</u>	<u>Big or Very Serious</u>
Unsafe streets			
Manchester	10	25	39
All neighborhoods	25	45	21
Vandalism			
Manchester	5	26	48
All neighborhoods	13	49	28
Rats			
Manchester	8	21	43
All neighborhoods	34	33	12
Burglary			
Manchester	8	23	43
All neighborhoods	14	44	29
Poor roads			
Manchester	15	38	23
All neighborhoods	17	41	33
Trash and litter			
Manchester	10	20	54
All neighborhoods	27	41	24
Vacant buildings			
Manchester	7	8	71
All neighborhoods	49	24	13
Undesirable people moving into the neighborhood			
Manchester	20	20	26
All neighborhoods	42	18	15
Stray dogs			
Manchester	16	30	39
All neighborhoods	25	38	18
Dog litter			
Manchester	16	28	33
All neighborhoods	21	38	32

SOURCE: Citizen Survey, 1976.

NOTE: The percent responses to each question do not add up to 100%. The difference is accounted for by the following: "don't know", "unable to evaluate", or no answer. The problem categories of alcoholism and drug abuse are not included in the table because the response rates to these questions were low.

TABLE 3

Satisfaction with Public Services
Manchester

Service	Percent Response		
	<u>Satisfied</u>	<u>Neither</u>	<u>Dissatisfied</u>
Parks and Recreation			
Manchester	41	10	30
All neighborhoods	51	15	23
Schools			
Manchester	39	13	20
All neighborhoods	46	12	21
Street maintenance			
Manchester	28	12	52
All neighborhoods	32	15	49
Alley maintenance			
Manchester	3	12	69
All neighborhoods	20	13	39
Garbage collection			
Manchester	64	7	20
All neighborhoods	74	10	13
Police			
Manchester	26	15	36
All neighborhoods	51	17	23
Public transportation			
Manchester	48	12	26
All neighborhoods	61	11	23
Fire Department			
Manchester	75	8	5
All neighborhoods	78	7	3
Sewage system			
Manchester	43	7	31
All neighborhoods	63	10	13
Condition and cost of housing			
Manchester	28	15	33
All neighborhoods	44	17	22

SOURCE: Citizen Survey, 1976.

NOTE: The percent responses to each question do not add up to 100%. The difference is accounted for by the following: "don't know", "unable to evaluate", or no answer. Public health and mental health/mental retardation services are not included in the table because the response rates to these questions were low.

CRIME RATE

The crime rate for major crimes has increased over the last three years (Table 4). In 1973 the number of major crimes per capita was .132 compared to .138 in 1975. The crime rate in the neighborhood was greater than the city per capita rate of .053 in 1975.

TABLE 4

Crime Rate: Major Crimes
Manchester

Year	Major Crimes		Crime Rate	
	Number	Neighborhood	Pittsburgh	
1973	491	.132	.043	
1974	508	.137	.047	
1975	512	.138	.053	

SOURCE: City of Pittsburgh, Bureau of Police.

NOTE: Major crimes are murder, rape, robbery, assault, burglary, and theft. The neighborhood crime rate is computed by dividing the number of crimes committed in the neighborhood by its adjusted population for 1974.

THE PEOPLE

Table 5 and Table 6 present data on the characteristics of the neighborhood population and compare them to city-wide statistics.

In 1974, the estimated population of Manchester was 3,714, down by 32% since 1970. This compares to a city-wide population decline of 8% during the same period. Information on the racial composition of the neighborhood is not available for 1974; however, the number of Black households in the neighborhood decreased during the decade of the sixties, and the Black population was 68.6% of the neighborhood's population in 1970, compared to 20.2% for the city.

The average household size in the neighborhood was 2.60 persons in 1974, down from 1970. The percentage of the population 65 years and older was 12.5% in 1970, compared to 13.5% for the city as a whole.

TABLE 5

Population and Housing Characteristics, 1970 and 1974 Manchester

	Neighborhood		Pittsburgh	
	1970	1974	1970	1974
Population				
% Black	68.6%	20.2%
% 65 years and over	12.5%	13.5%
Households				
% One-person households	31.9%	35.5%	25.4%	25.5%
% Retired head-of-household	34.6%	26.3%
% Households with children	35.1%	32.7%
% Female head-of-household with children	17.1%	6.4%
% In owner-occupied housing unit	36.1%	33.7%	50.3%	54.2%
% Households changing place of residence within past year	41.0%	27.0%
Average household size	2.90	2.60	2.82	2.67

SOURCES: U. S. Census (1970) and R. L. Polk & Co. (1974).

NOTE: Dotted lines (....) indicate data unavailable for that year.

The turnover rate of households in the neighborhood exceeds that for all of the city's neighborhoods. During 1973, 41.0% of the households in the neighborhood changed their place of residence compared to a rate of 27.0% for the city. (The figures represent households who have moved within the neighborhood or city as well as those moving into or out of the neighborhood or city.)

Female-headed households with children in 1974 comprised 17.1% of the total households in the neighborhood compared to 6.4% for the city as a whole. In 1974, one-person households consisted of 35.5% of the total households in the neighborhood compared to 25.5% city-wide and to 31.9% for the neighborhood in 1970.

TABLE 6

Neighborhood Change: 1960-1970 and 1970-1974
Manchester

	<u>Number</u> <u>Neighborhood</u>	<u>Percent Change</u> <u>Neighborhood</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
Population			
1960	13,784		
1970	5,465	-60	-14
1974	3,714	-32	- 8
Households¹			
1960	4,112		
1970	1,863	-55	- 6
1974	1,268	-32	-12
Black households²			
1960	1,322		
1970	1,084	-18	+15
1974	(not available)		
Housing units			
1960	4,434		
1970	2,305	-48	- 3
1974	1,870	-19	-12

SOURCES: U. S. Census (1960; 1970) and R. L. Polk & Co. (1974).

NOTE: The population figures reported by Polk are adjusted to account for under-reporting. Population includes persons living in institutions and other group quarters, such as nursing homes, dormitories or jails. Differences in the population, household, or housing unit count between 1970 and 1974 are due primarily to changes occurring in the neighborhood. A small percentage of the difference may be accounted for, however, by variations in data gathering techniques. Census statistics were compiled from information provided by all city households answering a standard questionnaire either by mail or interview on or about April 1, 1970. R. L. Polk collected its information by a door-to-door survey carried out over a period of several months. (See Appendix.)

¹The number of occupied housing units equals the number of households.

²Non-white households in 1960.

NEIGHBORHOOD INCOME

The average family income in Manchester was \$6,500, 62% of the city average, for the year 1969. R. L. Polk and Company computes an income index for each city census tract. This index, derived from the occupation of heads of households, was used to calculate the income index of the neighborhood. In 1974, the index for Manchester was 84% of the figure for the city as a whole.

Table 7 shows the number of neighborhood households receiving cash grants in 1974, 1975 and 1976 under the public assistance program of the Pennsylvania Department of Welfare. Public assistance in the form of food stamps, Medicaid, and various social services are also available to these households, as well as to other households in need. Public assistance payments were made to 49.9% of the neighborhood households in 1976, a higher proportion than for the city overall and a decrease since 1974.

TABLE 7

Public Assistance: Households Receiving Cash Grants
Manchester

<u>Year</u>	<u>Neighborhood</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1974	798	62.9
1975	697	55.0
1976	633	49.9

SOURCE: Allegheny County Board of Assistance.

NOTE: The percentages are based on 1974 Polk households. Only households receiving cash grants under Aid to Dependent Children, Aid to Dependent Children-Unemployed Parent; General Assistance, and State Blind Pension programs are tabulated. The count is of those on assistance as of April 5, 1974, February 28, 1975, and February 27, 1976; households whose grants were terminated between reporting dates are not included.

HOUSING

Table 6 shows that the number of housing units in Manchester decreased during the decade of the sixties and decreased from 1970 to 1974. Of the occupied housing units, 33.7% were owner-occupied in 1974, compared to a city-wide rate of 54.2%. The vacancy rate for the neighborhood was 32.2% which was greater than the rate for the city as a whole. (See Table 8.)

The average value of owner-occupied housing in the neighborhood was \$8,300 in 1970, compared to a city-wide average of \$14,800.

A housing expenditure greater than 25% of household income is often considered to be excessive and a problem associated with low income households. In 1970, for the city as a whole, less than 1% of renter households earning \$10,000 or more a year spent 25% or more of this income for rent; of those earning less than \$10,000, 43.7% spent 25% or more of their income on rent. In Manchester, 54.6% of renter households in the lower income category paid out 25% or more of their income on rent. These percentages suggest a lack of housing choice for renters with limited incomes, both in the neighborhood and the city.

TABLE 8

Housing Characteristics, 1970 and 1974
Manchester

	Neighborhood		Pittsburgh	
	1970	1974	1970	1974
Housing units				
% Vacant	19.2	32.2	6.2	6.2
% One-unit structures	46.5	52.9
Occupied housing units				
% Owner-occupied	36.1	33.7	50.3	54.2
Average value: owner- occupied units ¹	\$8,300	\$14,800

SOURCES: U. S. Census (1970) and R. L. Polk & Co. (1974).

¹Average value rounded to nearest one hundred dollars.

REAL ESTATE AND MORTGAGE LOAN TRANSACTIONS

The average sales price of owner-occupied housing was \$16,543 in 1975. (See Table 9.) Although the average price was less than the city-wide average, the implications of this divergence are difficult to judge because of variations in the quality and size of the structures among city neighborhoods. As additional data are obtained, however, the trend in real estate prices for the neighborhood can be compared to the trend for the city as a whole in order to determine relative differences.

In order to evaluate the extent to which private lenders are involved in the neighborhood, the number of mortgage loans made on residential property each year must be divided by the number of residential real estate transactions for that year. The percentage of residential real estate transactions financed through financial institutions was 17% in 1975 in Manchester compared to a city-wide rate of 59%. The implications of the difference between the two rates are difficult to discern because of variations in risk factors and income levels among city neighborhoods. However, as additional data become available, trends in lending activity within the neighborhood compared to other neighborhoods or to the city as a whole can be assessed.

TABLE 9

Real Estate and Mortgage Loan Statistics
Manchester

	<u>Neighborhood</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
Average sales price: owner-occupied dwellings		
1974	\$ 8,367	\$21,582
1975	\$16,543	\$23,518
Number of residential mortgages		
1973	none	
1974		1
1975		7
% Residential real estate transactions with mortgages provided by financial institutions		
1974	6%	58%
1975	17%	59%

SOURCE: City of Pittsburgh, Department of City Planning.

APPENDIX

- a. Data Sources: Information for the atlas was obtained from the 1960 and 1970 U. S. Census of Population and Housing; R. L. Polk and Company's "Profiles of Change" for Pittsburgh in 1974; Pittsburgh's Department of City Planning and Bureau of Police; the Allegheny County Board of Assistance, and Department of Elections and Voter Registration; Southwestern Pennsylvania Regional Planning Commission; and the Citizen Survey conducted by the Pittsburgh Neighborhood Atlas.
- b. Neighborhood Census Tracts: 2101, 2103, 2104, and 2105.
- c. Methodology: The neighborhood boundaries were determined on the basis of whole voting districts. However, census tracts do not usually correspond exactly with voting district boundaries, and simplifications were made where necessary to facilitate data collection efforts.
- The opinions and characteristics of survey respondents, as well as voter registration, were recorded by voting district and then compiled for Manchester by the Pittsburgh Neighborhood Atlas in conjunction with the Center for Urban Research, University of Pittsburgh. All other statistics tabulated for the neighborhood were compiled from data available by census tract.
- To compensate for under-reporting, the 1974 figure for the neighborhood population has been increased by 1.11, a factor that was derived from the U. S. Bureau of the Census 1973 population estimate for Pittsburgh. An additional adjustment has been made where applicable, since Polk and Co. does not count persons living in institutions or other group quarters. To arrive at the total estimated population for 1974, the neighborhood population was further increased by adding the number of persons in group quarters for the neighborhood according to the 1970 Census.
- d. Characteristics of the Sample: In Manchester, 61 citizens answered the questionnaires. Based on the number of replies to each question, the characteristics of the respondents can be generally described as follows: an average age of 49; 63% female; 67% Black; 48% with at least four years of high school education; 49% homeowners; and an average of 22 years in the neighborhood. The median household income falls in the range of \$5,000 to \$6,999; the average household size is 3.46 persons; and 55% of the households have no members under 18 years old living in the home.
- The total sample (all respondents to the survey) was over-represented by homeowners (68% compared to 50% for Pittsburgh in 1970) and under-represented by Blacks (14% compared to a city Black population of 20% in 1970).
- e. Voter Registration: In November, 1976, 1,614 residents of the neighborhood were registered to vote, a decrease of 38 (-2.3%) since November, 1975. In this period, city registration increased by 1.3% to 233,028.