

**DIVERSITY AMONG ELECTED OFFICIALS
IN THE PITTSBURGH REGION IN 2002**

February 2003

Monique Constance-Huggins, M.A.
Ralph L. Bangs, Ph.D.
University Center for Social and Urban Research
University of Pittsburgh

Funded by
Sustainable Pittsburgh
Executive Women's Council
The Pittsburgh Foundation

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this study is to examine the level of diversity of African Americans and women in elected offices in the Pittsburgh MSA. The study has three specific aims:

1. Measure the share of African Americans and women among different types of elected officials in the Pittsburgh MSA.
2. Identify cities, among the 52 largest US cities, that have high levels of African American or women elected officials compared to population shares and identify reasons for the success
3. Make recommendations for increasing the level of diversity among elected officials in the Pittsburgh region

Between June and November 2002 we collected data on the diversity among US elected officials for the Pittsburgh area; state elected officials for the Pittsburgh area; county elected officials for the region; major city mayors; mayors, council presidents and council members in the Pittsburgh MSA; school board members in the Pittsburgh MSA and council members for the 52 largest US cities. We used faxes and the telephone to obtain local data and web searches followed by telephone confirmation to obtain information for other cities.

Our primary method for determining level of diversity is to compare the ratio of African Americans and women among elected officials to the share of African Americans and women in the population. If the ratio of African Americans among elected officials is greater than or equal to the share of African Americans and women in the population, then the representation is judged to be “fair”.

The study’s positive findings about African American and women representation in 2002 are:

- Ten municipalities and one county in the region had fair levels of African Americans on their councils. They were Scottdale borough, North Belle Vernon borough, Brackenridge borough, Finleyville borough, Coraopolis borough, Leetsdale borough, Washington city, Homestead borough, Beaver Falls city, McKeesport city and Allegheny County.
- There were seven municipalities in the region with fair levels of female representation on their councils. They were Finleyville borough, Frazier township, Whitaker borough, Aleppo township, Marianna borough, Delmont borough, and East McKeesport borough.
- Eight school districts had fair levels of African American representation on their school boards. They were Big Beaver Falls, New Kensington Arnold, Cornel, Gateway, East Allegheny, Rochester Area, Pittsburgh and Midland.

- Fifteen school districts in the region had fair levels of women representation on their school boards. These were Penn Hills, Chartiers Valley, East Allegheny, Wilkinsburg, Franklin Regional, Monessen, Trinity Area, Black Hawk, Riverside Beaver County, Avonworth, Highlands, North Hills, Plum, Quaker Valley, and South Fayette.
- Among the 52 largest US cities, 20 had fair levels of African American representation on their city councils. Las Vegas exhibits the highest level of African American representation. The city had 33.3% (2 out of 6) blacks on its council compared to 10.8% in the population.
- Eight of the 52 largest US cities had fair levels of women representation among their city council members. These cities were Detroit, Denver, Santa Ana, Atlanta, Jacksonville, Baltimore, Virginia, and Tucson.
- Denver was the only city that had fair levels of representation for both African Americans and women.

We also found many instances of under-representation in 2002:

- Of the four US representatives from the Pittsburgh MSA, none were African American and one was a female.
- Neither of the two US senators from Pennsylvania were African American or women.
- Out of the 43 state representatives from this region, 5% were African Americans, and 1 was a female. There were no African Americans, and 4 females (19%) among the 21 state senators from the Pittsburgh MSA.
- There were no African American mayors among the 99 city and borough mayors for which race data was reported in the region.
- The representation of women as mayors (17.4%) was significantly lower than the representation of women in the 2000 population (52.2%).
- African Americans who accounted for 8% of the population made up less than 1% of the council presidents in the Pittsburgh MSA.
- Women represented 11% (19 out of 167) of council presidents. This was well below women's share of the 2000 population (52.2%).
- African Americans made up 2.5% (27 out of 1040) of municipal and county council members in the region, which was well below their share of the 2000 population (8%).

- Women held 203 (17.8%) of the 1138 county and municipality council positions for which sex was reported. This was well below women share of the 2000 population (52.3%)
- African Americans, who comprised 8% of the population in the region, accounted for 4.1% of the school board members throughout the region.
- Women made up 36.6% of the school board members in the Pittsburgh MSA, which was well below the share of women in the 2000 population (52.2%).
- African Americans represented 23.9% (161 out of 673) of all council members in the 52 largest cities in the US. This was lower than the average proportion of African Americans in these cities' population in 2000.
- Women held 31.9% (215 out of 673) of the total city council positions, within the 52 largest cities, which was well below the average share of women in their population (51.3%).

In November 2002 we conducted a literature search of books, electronic journals, local newspapers and websites to identify factors that may affect the number of African Americans and women elected officials. The main factors are:

Small number of African American and women candidates African Americans and women generally make up a smaller percentage of election candidates than whites and males, especially for higher office. This limits the opportunity for voters to elect African Americans and women to represent them in public offices.

Inadequate campaign funds Many African Americans and women can rarely come up with enough funds needed to execute an effective election campaign, thereby reducing their chances of getting elected.

Incumbency Most of the incumbents seeking reelection are white men. They can employ large staffs and secure huge financing necessary to promote their reelection

Electoral systems The current winner-take-all system leaves minorities underrepresented because it awards 100% of the representation to a 50.1% majority.

Run-off elections Research shows that if there is racial polarization in voting, the run-off between a black and white candidate will ensure the election of the white candidate unless blacks make up a majority of the voters.

City size Many political scientists believe that since ‘women tend to be found in offices for which there is less prestige, fewer candidates and a steeper path to higher elective office,’ they are more likely to be elected in smaller towns where the prestige of the position and the number of candidates competing for the position are lower.

During December 2002 we also conducted a survey of cities with diversity among city council members to determine their reasons for success. Twenty-seven cities were contacted, and ten cities completed the survey. Adequate campaign finance for African Americans and women and low incumbent re-election were most frequently mentioned as explanations for diversity in the cities that responded. Increasing the number of single member districts was indicated as a major factor in two cities.

Denver, which has a fair level of both African Americans and women on the city council, noted that the council staff positions provide the impetus for many women to run for public office. According to John Bennett of the Denver City Council, candidates who have worked as council staff (most of whom are women) have the advantage of knowing their constituents for years and the issues that concern them. The city also noted that the exceptional high percentage of African Americans running for public office plays a positive role in their representation in elected office. A spokesperson for the city council reported that in the last election (1999) 7 of the 31 candidates (23%) that ran for council positions were black. This percentage exceeds the proportion of blacks in the population (11.6%). Furthermore, in that same year, there were 3 African Americans among the 4 candidates running in the mayoral race. The spokesperson, however, could not identify reasons for the high percentage of African American candidates.

In addition, we identified local and national programs that help African Americans and women run for public office:

- **Program for Emerging Leaders in Public Affairs** The program is being developed by CORO Center for Civic Leadership of Pittsburgh. Its mission is to position participants for increased involvement in the electoral process as ethical and effective candidates, campaign staffers, board members, appointees or community advocates. This two-month training program will target African Americans, women and youths (age 21 - 40). The training will focus on the areas of strategic thinking, civic leadership, networking, public speaking, consensus-building, individual leadership development problem-solving, boards and commissions, and effective fundraising and campaigning.
- **Institute for Public Leadership** This initiative is co-sponsored by the YWCA and the Institute for Women in Politics at Chatham College. The mission of the program is to increase the number of women in Pennsylvania who are in public leadership. The two-day conference will be held on April 5th and 6th 2003 at Chatham College. According to a spokesperson at the Pittsburgh YWCA, the program will focus on educating women on issues they need to be aware of before running for office, and provide interested female candidates with tools necessary to orchestrate an effective campaign.

- **Winning with Women in Pennsylvania** This program was initiated by the Republican Party to enhance the role of women in Pennsylvania politics, government and public policy. The statewide effort is part of a national program coordinated by the Republican National Committee.
- **Early Money Is Like Yeast (EMILY’s List)** This is a large grassroots political network, that raises campaign contributions for Democratic women running for the House, the Senate and for governor; helps women candidates build strong, winning campaigns; and helps mobilize women voters.
- **Ready to Run** This program was established in 1998 to encourage women in New Jersey to seek public office. It is a joint project of the Center for American Women and Politics and the Institute for Women’s Leadership. This annual conference addresses topics such as Putting Your Campaign Together, Raising Money for Campaigns, Running as an outsider or Challenger, Media Strategy for New Jersey Candidates, Appointive Office: How to Position Yourself and What to Expect from the Process, and Conquering the Camera.

Finally, based on the findings of the paper, we recommend the following actions for increasing African American and women representation among elected officials in the Pittsburgh region:

1. To increase the number of African American and women candidates, local organizations that help minorities and women run for elected office should:
 - a. Create and maintain a directory of minorities and women qualified for and interested in staff positions with elected officials, encourage local elected officials to have these people as staff, and encourage minority and women staff to run for public office.
 - b. Create a directory of all local programs to help minorities and women run for public office.
2. To increase the number of African American and women candidates, local and state political parties should:
 - a. Appoint more minorities and women as ward chairpersons and as members and heads of political party committees.
 - b. Commit to having their lists of candidates reflect the racial and gender diversity in the population.
3. As a solution to the campaign finance problem, we recommend consideration of laws that provide for the public financing of local election campaigns.

4. In dealing with the factor of high incumbent reelection, we recommend the continual mobilization of resources such as money, voter turnout, and favorable media coverage for African American and women candidates.
5. Regarding the barrier of electoral system, we recommend consideration of an alternative system such as proportional representation, which would result in more African Americans and women being elected to public offices.
6. No solution was identified to deal with the barriers posed by run-off elections and city size.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....i

Introduction.....1

Importance of African American and Women Elected Officials1

Methods.....1

Findings

 African American and Women Representation among:

 US Congressional Members.....3

 Pennsylvania Legislature Members.....3

 Local elected Officials

 Mayors.....4

 Council Presidents.....5

 Council Members.....6

 School Board Members.....10

 52 Largest US cities.....14

Factors Affecting the Representation of African Americans and Women in Elected Offices.....18

Local and National Programs that Encourage and Prepare African Americans and Women to Run for Public Office22

Recommendations.....24

References.....25

List of Tables

- Table 1: Elected Federal Legislative Officials
- Table 2: Elected State Senators and Members of the House of Representatives
- Table 3: Elected Mayors in the Pittsburgh MSA
- Table 4: Elected Council Presidents/Chairmen in the Pittsburgh MSA
- Table 5: African American Elected Council Members/Supervisors/Commissioners in the Pittsburgh MSA
- Table 6: Regions in the Pittsburgh MSA with Fair Levels of African American Representation Among Elected Officials
- Table 7: Municipalities with Low levels of African Americans among the 10 largest African American Population in the MSA
- Table 8: Female Elected Council Members/Supervisors/Commissioners in the Pittsburgh MSA
- Table 9: Municipalities in the Pittsburgh MSA with Fair Levels of Women Representation Among Elected Officials
- Table 10: African American School Board Members in the Pittsburgh MSA
- Table 11: School Districts with Fair Levels of African American Representation in the Pittsburgh MSA
- Table 12: School Districts with Low levels of African Americans in the Pittsburgh MSA
- Table 13: Women share of School Board Members in the Pittsburgh MSA
- Table 14: School Districts with Fair Levels of Women Representation in the Pittsburgh MSA
- Table 15: African American Council Members in the 52 Largest Cities in the US
- Table 16: Cities with Fair Levels of African American Representation among Council Members
- Table 17: Cities with Low levels of African American Population Representation
- Table 18: Female Council Members in the 52 Largest Cities in the US
- Table 19: Cities with Fair Levels of Female Representation among their Council Members

Appendices

Appendix 1: Number of Municipalities in the Pittsburgh MSA

Appendix 2: Cities with High Levels of African American and Women contacted

Appendix 3: African American Mayors in the Pittsburgh MSA

Appendix 4: Female Mayor in the Pittsburgh MSA

Appendix 5: African American Council Presidents in the Pittsburgh MSA

Appendix 6: Female Council Presidents in the Pittsburgh MSA

Appendix 7: African American Council Members in the Pittsburgh MSA

Appendix 8: Female Council Members in the Pittsburgh MSA

Appendix 9: African American School Board Members in the Pittsburgh MSA

Appendix 10: Female School Board Members in the Pittsburgh MSA

Appendix 11: African American Population in School Districts in the Pittsburgh MSA

Appendix 12: African American Council Members in the 52 largest cities in the US

Appendix 13: African American Share of Population in the 52 Largest Cities in the US

Appendix 14: Female Council Members in the 52 largest Cities in the US

Appendix 15: Female Share of Population in the 52 largest Cities in the US

Appendix 16: Survey Instrument

INTRODUCTION

This report provides findings from our study of diversity of elected officials in the Pittsburgh Metropolitan Statistical Area (which includes Allegheny, Beaver, Butler, Fayette, Washington and Westmoreland County). The project has three main aims:

1. Measure the share of African Americans and women among different types of elected officials in the Pittsburgh region
2. Identify cities that have high levels of African American and women elected officials compared to population shares and identify reasons for the success
3. Make recommendations for increasing the level of diversity among its elected officials in the Pittsburgh region

The project was funded by Sustainable Pittsburgh, Executive Women's Council, and The Pittsburgh Foundation.

IMPORTANCE OF AFRICAN AMERICANS AND WOMEN AMONG ELECTED OFFICIALS

African Americans and women are needed in decision-making positions in order for their interests to be adequately and accurately addressed. According to Rule and Zimmerman, the lack of women and minorities on governing bodies means that important issues receive little or no consideration during the policy making process (Rule and Zimmerman, 1994). They also state that minorities become alienated from the political system and show less respect for laws enacted without their direct input by legislative bodies they view as illegitimate.

Being an elected official is therefore one of the best ways that African Americans and women can contribute to the advancement of these groups. This type of study is necessary to boost the representation of African Americans and women among elected officials and increase their participation in decision-making processes throughout the Pittsburgh MSA.

METHODS

From June to November 2002 the followings steps were completed:

- Gathered data on diversity among US elected officials for the Pittsburgh area and for all of the US by telephoning national organizations
- Conducted web searches and telephoned national and state organizations to collect data on diversity among state elected officials for the Pittsburgh area and for all of the US (average diversity rates)
- Collected data on county elected officials for the Pittsburgh area and all of the US (average diversity rates) by telephoning local counties and national organizations

- Gathered data on diversity among major city mayors, council members, and school board members by doing web searches and telephoning local, state and national organizations
- Gathered data, with the help of the Local Government Academy, on all mayors, presidents of council, and council members/chairmen/supervisors in the Pittsburgh MSA to determine the level of diversity. A total of 363 of the 416 municipalities in the Pittsburgh MSA were contacted (Appendix 1). We were unable to obtain contact information on the remaining 53 municipalities within the time frame for this project. We however feel that enough municipalities were included in the study for us to draw accurate conclusions about the diversity of elected officials.

Of the 363 municipalities and 6 counties that were contacted by fax in July, 65% (235 out of 363) of municipalities and all 6 counties responded. A second fax was sent in September to the 128 non-responding municipalities and those that had missing sex or race data in the first response. By the end of our data collection period in November a total of 286 municipalities (78.8%) and all 6 counties had responded. Of the 286 municipalities 184 (64%) provided information on race while 202 (71%) provided information on sex. Of the six counties, all provided data on race and sex.

- Collected data on diversity among elected officials (mayors and council members) from the 52 largest cities in the US to determine areas of high African American and women representation. We checked the web site of each city to determine the sex and race of each mayor and council member. Where it was difficult to decipher such information, we contacted an official in that city by phone and inquired about the race and gender of the elected officials. In addition, we contacted those cities, which appeared to have had fair levels¹ of African Americans and women representation to confirm the accuracy of our data (see Appendix 2).
- Attempted to survey 27 cities with fair levels of African American and female representation to determine factors that play a role in the election of these two groups to their city council. As of December only 4 of the cities had completed the survey.
- Gathered data from the 2000 census on the African American and women shares of population in municipalities in the Pittsburgh region.
- Gathered data on the African American and women share of population in school districts in the Pittsburgh area.

¹ We assume that a “fair level” means the ratio of African Americans and women among elected officials is 1.0 or more times the share of African Americans and women in the population.

- Contacted 102 school districts in the Pittsburgh MSA by fax in October, to determine levels of diversity among the elected school board members. Of the 102 school districts, 57 (56%) responded. In November a second fax was sent to the non-responding school districts and telephone calls were made to three school districts with missing data. By the end of our data collecting period a total of 76 (74.5%) school districts had responded, three of which had missing data on sex and race of board members.
- Conducted literature search to determine the factors that influence the election of African Americans and women
- Identified some strategies that communities can use to increase representation

FINDINGS

African American and Women Representation in the Pittsburgh MSA

Our study reveals that African Americans and women were not well represented among most types of elected officials in the Pittsburgh MSA in 2000. Below we detail the representation of African American and women among elected officials within the region and compare the data to state and national averages.

US Congressional Members (Table 1)

- Of the four US representatives from the Pittsburgh MSA in June 2002, none were African American and one was a female.
- Neither of the two US senators from Pennsylvania in June 2002 were African American or women.

Table 1. Elected Federal Legislative Officials

| Elected Officials | Total Number | Black | | Female | |
|--|--------------|--------|---------|--------|---------|
| | | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| US Representatives from the *Pittsburgh Area | 4 | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 25.0% |
| US Representatives from Pennsylvania | 21 | 1 | 4.8% | 1 | 4.8% |
| US House of Representatives | 435 | 39 | 9.0% | 62 | 14.3% |
| US Senators from Pennsylvania | 2 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| US Senators | 100 | 0 | 0.0% | 13 | 13.0% |

**Pittsburgh 6-county region*

Source: Legislative Resource Center, Office of the Clerk, US House of Representatives, <http://www.senate.gov> and <http://www.house.gov>

Pennsylvania Legislature Members (Table 2)

- Out of the 43 representatives from this region, two (5%) were African American. The African American share of representatives from the Pittsburgh area was less than the

state average of African American representatives (7.4%) and less than the national average of African American among representatives (7.8%).

- One of the 43 state representatives (2.3%) from the Pittsburgh area was female. This average pales in comparison to the overall percentage (13.8%) of women in the Pennsylvania House of Representatives and the national average of women state representatives (23.5%).
- Out of the 21 state senators from the Pittsburgh MSA, there were no African Americans. This is noticeably less than the state average of African American senators (6.0%) and the national average of 7.1%.
- Women had higher representation than African Americans among the 21 senators from the Pittsburgh MSA. Out of the 21 officials there were four (19.0%) women compared to 0% of African Americans. This percentage of women senators from the Pittsburgh MSA was higher than Pennsylvania’s average of women senators (16.0%), however, it was lower than the national average (20.4%) of state senators.

Table 2. Elected State Senators and Members of the House of Representatives

| Elected State Officials | Total Number | Black | | Female | |
|--|--------------|--------|---------|--------|---------|
| | | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Pennsylvania Representatives from the Pittsburgh Area* | 43 | 2 | 4.7% | 1 | 2.3% |
| Pennsylvania Representatives | 203 | 15 | 7.4% | 28 | 13.8% |
| State Representatives in the US | 5,440 | 426 | 7.8% | 1,277 | 23.5% |
| | | | | | |
| Pennsylvania Senators from the Pittsburgh Area* | 21 | 0 | 0.0% | 4 | 19.0% |
| Pennsylvania Senators | 50 | 3 | 6.0% | 8 | 16.0% |
| State Senators in the US | 1,984 | 140 | 7.1% | 404 | 20.4% |

Sources: <http://www.nga.gov/governors>, *Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies*, *Center for American Women and Politics*, http://www.nbcs1.com/legislative_directory/index.htm, <http://www.state.pa.us>, <http://www.pcntv.com/leg>, followed by telephone confirmation of race and gender

Local Elected Officials

Mayors (Table 3)

- In November 2002 there were no African American mayors among the 99 city and borough mayors for which race were reported, in the Pittsburgh MSA. This was not consistent with the African American share of population in the Pittsburgh MSA in 2000 (8.0 %). It was also not consistent with the average percentage of African American mayors (18%) in the 100 most populated cities in the US in June 2002.
- The overall percentage of women mayors in the Pittsburgh area (17.4%) was low when compared to the women share of population in the region (52.2%). This however, exceeded the average percentage of women mayors (13%) in the 100 most populated cities in the US in June 2002.

- The majority of female mayors were from local governments within Allegheny County.

Table 3. Elected Mayors in the Pittsburgh MSA*

| Mayors | Black | | | Female | | |
|--|----------------------|--------|---------|---------------------|--------|---------|
| | Units reporting race | Number | Percent | Units reporting sex | Number | Percent |
| City | 17 | 0 | 0.0% | 17 | 1 | 5.9% |
| Borough | 82 | 0 | 0.0% | 98 | 19 | 19.3% |
| Total | 99 | 0 | 0.0% | 115 | 20 | 17.4% |
| US Mayors in 100 most populated Cities | 100 | 18 | 18.0% | 100 | 13 | 13.0% |

See Appendices 3 & 4

Source: Counties and Municipalities in the Pittsburgh MSA, with the help of Local Government Academy

*Includes Allegheny, Beaver, Butler, Fayette, Westmoreland and Washington County

Council Presidents/Chairmen (Table 4)

- Overall, there was a lack of diversity among council presidents /chairmen in the Pittsburgh MSA. African Americans, who accounted for 8% of the population in the region in 2000, represented less than 1% (1 out of 153) of the council presidents/chairmen for which race was reported. The lone African American council president was from Homestead borough in Allegheny County.
- There was also a low percentage of women functioning as council president/chairmen in the region. Women represented 11% (19 out of 167) of the elected council presidents/chairmen in the Pittsburgh region. This was substantially lower than the representation of women in the population (52.2%).
- At the borough level, there were 17 female council presidents/chairmen out of the 84 presidents (20.2%) for which (borough level) data were collected. This percentage almost doubled the average percentage of women presidents/chairmen for the county, city, borough and townships combined in the MSA (11.3%). Furthermore, the majority of these female council presidents were from boroughs within Allegheny County.
- Townships also performed poorly in terms of the number of female council presidents. Of the 75 presidents/chairmen for whom data were reported, one (2.6%) was female.

Table 4. Elected Council Presidents/Chairmen in the Pittsburgh MSA*

| President/ Chairman | African American | | | Women | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|----------|-------------|---------------------|-----------|--------------|
| | Units Reporting Race | Number | Percent | Units Reporting Sex | Number | Percent |
| County | 6 | 0 | 0.0% | 6 | 0 | 0.0% |
| City | 2 | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Borough | 74 | 1 | 1.3% | 84 | 17 | 20.2% |
| 1st & 2nd Class Township | 71 | 0 | 0.0% | 75 | 2 | 2.6% |
| Total | 153 | 1 | 0.6% | 167 | 19 | 11.3% |

See Appendices 5 & 6

Source: *Counties and Municipalities in the Pittsburgh MSA with the help of Local Government Academy*

*Includes Allegheny, Beaver, Butler, Fayette, Westmoreland and Washington County

African American Council Members/Supervisors/Commissioners (Tables 5-7)

- Most councils throughout the Pittsburgh MSA had no African Americans. They made up 2.5% (27 out of 1040) of council members of government throughout the Pittsburgh MSA, which pales in comparison to the share of African Americans in the region's population (8%).
- Forty percent (11 out of 27) of the African Americans council men were women.
- At the County level there were 2 (6.6%) African Americans out of 30 council members. These 2 African Americans were from the 15-member Allegheny County council. This percentage compares fairly with the percentage of African American elected county officials (of which council members comprise a big portion) in Pennsylvania and the US African Americans accounted for 1% (6 out of 478) of the elected county officials in the Pennsylvania, and 4.2% of (961 out of 36,511) of elected county officials throughout the US
- At the Borough level, African Americans accounted for 2.6% (16 out of 593) of the commissioners/supervisor. In fact, borough governments alone accounted for more than half of the African American council members in the Pittsburgh MSA (16 out of 27)
- At the level of city government, African Americans made up 11.6% (9 out of 77) of city council members.
- There was no African American council member/commissioner at the township level.
- Scottdale Borough in Westmoreland County exhibited the highest level of diversity among its council members. African Americans who made up only 1.1% of the population accounted for 12.5% (1 out of 8) of the council members. This represented a ratio of 11.4 blacks in council to blacks in the population. Ten other

municipality governments and 1 county government had fair levels of African American representation among their council members relative to share of African Americans in the population. These include North Belle Vernon borough, Brackenridge borough, Finleyville borough, Coraopolis, Leetsdale borough, Washington City, Homestead borough, Beaver Falls city, McKeesport city and Allegheny county.

- Homestead borough had the highest percentage (77.8%) of African Americans on its council (77.8%), which exceeded the share of African Americans in its population (51.3 %). However it placed 8th in terms of the ratio of percentage of blacks on the council to the percentage of blacks in the population (1.5)
- Of the 6 county governments, Allegheny County was the only one that exhibited a fair level of representation among its council members. While the proportion of African Americans in the population was 12.3%, it was 13.3% on the county council.
- The city of Pittsburgh ranked 13th in terms of the ratio of percent African Americans in council (22%) to African Americans in the population (27%).
- Among the 10 municipalities in the region with the largest African American population there were 4 which demonstrated rather poor levels (a ratio less than 1.0) of diversity. These were Clairton city, Pittsburgh city, Aliquippa city, and Duquesne city.

Table 5. African American Elected Council Members/Supervisors/Commissioners in the Pittsburgh MSA*

| Members of Councils / Supervisors/Commissioners | African Americans | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|-----------|-------------|
| | Total Mbrs for Units Reporting Race | Number | Percent |
| County Council Members/ Commissioners | 30 | 2 | 6.6% |
| City Council Member | 77 | 9 | 11.6% |
| Borough Commissioner | 593 | 16 | 2.6% |
| 1st & 2nd Class Township Commissioners/Supervisors | 340 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Total Members | 1040 | 27 | 2.5% |
| Elected County Officials in PA | 478 | 6 | 1.3% |
| Elected County Officials in the US | 22,672 | 961 | 4.2% |

See Appendix 7

Source: Counties and municipalities in the Pittsburgh MSA, with the help of Local Government Academy

*Includes Allegheny, Beaver, Butler, Fayette, Westmoreland and Washington County

Note: National and state wide data on city and borough council members could not be obtained

Table 6. Regions in the Pittsburgh MSA with *Fair Levels of African American Representation Among Council Members

| Rank | Counties & Municipalities | County | Total Council Mbrs | African American | | | Ratio of % Blacks as council mbrs to % Blacks in Pop |
|------|---------------------------|--------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------|---------------|--|
| | | | | Number | % of council | % of 2000 Pop | |
| 1 | Scottdale boro | Westmoreland | 8 | 1 | 12.5% | 1.1% | 11.4 |
| 2 | North Belle Vernon boro | Westmoreland | 7 | 1 | 14.3% | 1.3% | 11.0 |
| 3 | Brackenridge boro | Allegheny | 6 | 1 | 16.7% | 3.4% | 4.9 |
| 4 | Finleyville boro | Washington | 7 | 1 | 14.3% | 5.9% | 2.4 |
| 5 | Coraopolis boro | Allegheny | 8 | 2 | 25.0% | 12.4% | 2.0 |
| 5 | Leetsdale boro | Allegheny | 7 | 1 | 14.3% | 7.3% | 2.0 |
| 7 | Washington city | Washington | 4 | 1 | 25.0% | 14.6% | 1.7 |
| 8 | Homestead boro | Allegheny | 9 | 7 | 77.8% | 51.3% | 1.5 |
| 9 | Beaver Falls city | Beaver | 4 | 1 | 25.0% | 17.5% | 1.4 |
| 10 | McKeesport city | Allegheny | 7 | 2 | 28.6% | 24.5% | 1.2 |
| 11 | Allegheny County | Allegheny | 15 | 2 | 13.3% | 12.3% | 1.1 |

See Appendix 7

Source: Counties and municipalities in the Pittsburgh MSA, with the help of Local Government Academy

*Fair level means the ratio of African Americans and women among elected council members is 1.0 or more times the share of African Americans and women in the population.

Table 7. Municipalities* with Low levels of African Americans Representation in the Pittsburgh MSA Ranked by % Black Population

| Counties & Municipalities | County | Total Council Members | African American | | | Ratio of % Blacks as council mbrs to % Blacks in Pop |
|---------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------|------------------|--|
| | | | Number | % of Council | % of 2000 of Pop | |
| Duquesne city | Allegheny | 4 | 1 | 25.0% | 47.7% | 0.5 |
| Aliquippa city | Beaver | 4 | 1 | 25.0% | 35.5% | 0.7 |
| Clairton city | Allegheny | 4 | 1 | 25.0% | 28.3% | 0.9 |
| Pittsburgh city | Allegheny | 9 | 2 | 22.2% | 27.1% | 0.8 |

*Among the top 10 municipalities in terms of African American population

See Appendix 7

Source: Pittsburgh MSA counties and US census bureau

Female Council Members/Supervisors/Commissioners (Tables 8-9)

- Women held a total of 203 (17.8%) of the 1138 positions of council members/commissioners/supervisors for which sex was reported, in the Pittsburgh MSA. This percentage was significantly lower than the proportion of women in the region (52.3%).
- Among the different types of jurisdictions, county councils had the lowest level of female representation. Our data show that there were only 3 women (10.0%) out of the 30 county council members. This was significantly less than the percentage of

women elected county officials (of which council members comprise a big part) in Pennsylvania and the US (30.0% and 25.8%, respectively).

- Women accounted for 23.0% (151 out of 654) of borough council members in the Pittsburgh MSA. This percentage was well below women’s share of the region’s population (52.3%).
- Finleyville of Washington County exhibited the highest level of female representation among its council members. Five of its 7-member council were women, who represented 52.1% of the borough’s population. In fact, Finleyville is the only community that exhibits fair levels of representation for both African Americans and women among its council members.
- Six other municipalities had fair levels of women representation. They were Findley borough, Frazier Township, Whitaker borough, Allepo Township, Marianna borough, Delmont borough and East McKeesport.
- The city of Pittsburg performed poorly ranking 68th overall in terms of the ratio of percent women in council to percent women in the population. Women who made up 52.4% of the city’s population comprised 22.2% (2 out of 9) of city council.

Two hundred and eighty five (285) municipalities reporting council member by sex did not have a fair level of woman representation.

Table 8. Female Elected Council Members/Supervisors/Commissioners in the Pittsburgh MSA*

| Members of Councils / Supervisors/Commissioners | Women | | |
|--|------------------------------------|------------|--------------|
| | Total Mbrs for Units reporting Sex | Number | Percent |
| County Council Members/ Commissioners | 30 | 3 | 10.0% |
| City Council Member | 77 | 13 | 16.9% |
| Borough Commissioner | 654 | 151 | 23.0% |
| 1st & 2nd Class Township Commissioners/Supervisors | 377 | 36 | 9.5% |
| Total members | 1138 | 203 | 17.8% |
| Elected County Officials in PA | 665 | 186 | 30.0% |
| Elected County Officials in the US | 36,511 | 9,404 | 25.8% |

See Appendix 8

Source: Counties and municipalities in the Pittsburgh MSA, with the help of Local Government Academy

*Includes Allegheny, Beaver, Butler, Fayette, Westmoreland and Washington County

Table 9. Municipalities in the Pittsburgh MSA with *Fair Levels of Women Representation Among Council Members

| Rank | Counties & Municipalities | County | Total Council Members | Women | | | Ratio of % women as council mbrs to % women in Pop |
|------|---------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|--------|---------------------|----------|--|
| | | | | Number | % of Council member | % of Pop | |
| 1 | Finleyville boro | Washington | 7 | 5 | 71.4% | 52.1% | 1.4 |
| 2 | Frazier twn | Allegheny | 3 | 2 | 66.7% | 49.6% | 1.3 |
| 3 | Whitaker boro | Allegheny | 7 | 4 | 57.1% | 49.7% | 1.1 |
| 3 | Aleppo twn | Allegheny | 5 | 3 | 60.0% | 52.5% | 1.1 |
| 3 | Marianna boro | Washington | 5 | 3 | 60.0% | 53.8% | 1.1 |
| 3 | Delmont boro | Westmoreland | 7 | 4 | 57.1% | 52.0% | 1.1 |
| 3 | East McKeesport boro | Allegheny | 7 | 4 | 57.1% | 52.2% | 1.1 |

See Appendix 8

Source: Counties and municipalities in the Pittsburgh MSA, with the help of Local Government Academy

*Fair level means the proportion of women council member is 1.0 times or more the proportion of women in the population

African American School Board Members (Tables 10-11)

According to the data we collected in October and November 2002, School boards throughout the Pittsburgh MSA lack diversity. The findings are presented below.

- African Americans which comprised 8.2% of the population in the region, accounted for 4.3% (29 out of 666) of the school board members throughout the Pittsburgh MSA. While this was more than the representation of minorities (the majority of which are African Americans) on school boards in Pennsylvania (1.4%), it did not exceed the representation of minorities at the national level (14.5%) [PBSA Bulletin, 2002].
- African Americans were more widely represented on school boards on Beaver County than on any other county in the MSA. African Americans represented 7.7% of all school board members in the county and 6.5% of the (school district) population.
- Allegheny County which had the highest proportion of African Americans (11.7%) among the six counties had 6.0% of African Americans on school boards.
- There were 8 school districts with fair levels of African American representation throughout the Pittsburgh MSA. These were Big Beaver Falls, New Kensington Arnold, Gateway, East Allegheny, Rochester Area, Pittsburgh, Midland borough, and Wilksburg borough.
- Pittsburgh school district, with the 5th largest African American population ranked 6th in terms of the ratio of African American board members to African American in the population.

- Among the 10 school districts in the region with the largest African American population four of them demonstrated low levels of African American representation on their school boards. These were Duquesne, Aliquippa, Penn Hills, Monessen, Washington and Sto Rox school districts.

Table 10. African American School Board Members in the Pittsburgh MSA

| Region | Total Mbrs for Units Reporting Race | African American | | | Ratio of % in School District to % in Pop |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| | | School Board Mbrs | % of School Board Mbrs | % of 2000 County Population | |
| Allegheny County | 279 | 17 | 6.0% | 12.30% | 0.5 |
| Beaver County | 117 | 9 | 7.7% | 5.90% | 1.3 |
| Butler County | 36 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.80% | 0 |
| Fayette County | 45 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.40% | 0 |
| Washington County | 99 | 1 | 1.0% | 3.20% | 0.3 |
| Westmoreland County | 90 | 2 | 2.2% | 1.90% | 1.2 |
| Total | 666 | 29 | 4.4% | 8.0% | 0.6 |

See Appendices 9&11

Source: School districts in the Pittsburgh region and Pennsylvania State Data Center

Table 11. School Districts with Fair Levels of African American Representation in the Pittsburgh MSA

| Rank | School District | County | Total Board Mbrs. | African American | | | Ratio of % Blacks as Board Mbrs to % Blacks in Pop |
|------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|--|
| | | | | No. of Board Mbrs. | As % of Board Mbrs | As % of 2000 Sch Dist Pop | |
| 1 | Big Beaver Falls | Beaver | 9 | 3 | 33.3% | 12.6% | 2.7 |
| 2 | New Kensington Arnold | Westmoreland | 9 | 2 | 22.2% | 10.7% | 2.1 |
| 2 | Cornell | Allegheny | 9 | 2 | 22.2% | 10.6% | 2.1 |
| 4 | Gateway | Allegheny | 9 | 1 | 11.1% | 7.4% | 1.5 |
| 5 | East Allegheny | Allegheny | 9 | 1 | 11.1% | 8.0% | 1.4 |
| 5 | Rochester Area | Beaver | 9 | 1 | 11.1% | 8.7% | 1.3 |
| 6 | Pittsburgh | Allegheny | 9 | 3 | 33.3% | 26.9% | 1.2 |
| 7 | Midland Boro | Beaver | 9 | 2 | 22.2% | 20.8% | 1.1 |
| 8 | Wilksburg Boro | Allegheny | 9 | 6 | 66.7% | 66.5% | 1.0 |

See Appendix 9

Source: School districts in the Pittsburgh MSA; US Census Bureau

Table 12. School Districts* with Low levels of African Americans in the Pittsburgh MSA
Ranked by % of African American Population

| School District | County | Total Board Mbrs | African American | | | Ratio of % Blacks as Board Mbrs to % Blacks in Pop |
|-----------------|--------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|--|
| | | | No. Board Mbrs | % of Board Mbrs | % of 2000 SD Pop | |
| Duquesne City | Allegheny | 9 | 2 | 22.2% | 47.7% | 0.5 |
| Aliquippa | Beaver | 9 | 3 | 33.3% | 35.5% | 0.9 |
| Penn Hills | Allegheny | 9 | 2 | 22.2% | 24.2% | 0.9 |
| Monessen City | Westmoreland | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 14.0% | 0.0 |

Among the top 10 school districts in terms of African American population

Sources: School districts in the region and State data Center

See Appendix 9

Women School Board Members (Tables 13-14)

- Women made up 37.2% (248 out of 666) of school boards in the Pittsburgh MSA, which was below the share of women in the population (52.2%). It was however consistent with the state average of women representation (38%) as well as the national average of women representation 39% (PSBA Bulletin, 2002).
- None of the six counties had a fair level of representation where proportion of women on the school board was equal to or exceeded the proportion of women in the population.
- Penn Hills school district of Allegheny County demonstrated the highest level of gender diversity among its board of directors. Women who made up 52.6% of the population accounted for 77.8% (7 out of 9) of school board members.
- Fifteen school districts exhibited fair levels of women representation on the school boards. The majority (10) were within Allegheny County.
- Appendix 10 shows 59 of the school districts had less than fair levels of women representation.

Table 13. Women Share of School Board Members in the Pittsburgh MSA

| Region | Total Mbrs for Units Reporting Sex | Women | | % of 2000 County Population | Ratio of % on board to % in Pop |
|---------------------|------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | | No. Board Mbrs | % of School Board | | |
| Allegheny County | 279 | 120 | 43.0% | 52.6% | 0.8 |
| Beaver County | 117 | 36 | 30.8% | 52.1% | 0.6 |
| Butler County | 36 | 10 | 27.7% | 51.2% | 0.5 |
| Fayette County | 45 | 13 | 28.9% | 52.1% | 0.5 |
| Washington County | 99 | 36 | 36.3% | 52.0% | 0.6 |
| Westmoreland County | 90 | 33 | 36.6% | 51.8% | 0.7 |
| Total | 666 | 248 | 37.2% | 52.3% | 0.7 |

See Appendix 10

Source: School districts in the region and Pennsylvania state Data Center, 2000

Table 14. School Districts with *Fair Levels of Women Representation in the Pittsburgh MSA

| School District | County | Total Number | Women | | | Ratio of % Women as Directors to % Women in County Pop |
|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------|--------------------|-------------------------|--|
| | | | Number | As % of board Mbrs | As % of 2000 County Pop | |
| Penn Hills | Allegheny | 9 | 7 | 77.8% | 52.6% | 1.5 |
| Chartiers Valley | Allegheny | 9 | 6 | 66.7% | 52.6% | 1.3 |
| East Allegheny | Allegheny | 9 | 6 | 66.7% | 52.6% | 1.3 |
| Wilksburgh borough | Allegheny | 9 | 6 | 66.7% | 52.6% | 1.3 |
| Franklin Regional | Westmoreland | 9 | 5 | 55.6% | 51.8% | 1.1 |
| Monessen City | Westmoreland | 9 | 5 | 55.6% | 51.8% | 1.1 |
| Trinity Area | Washington | 9 | 5 | 55.6% | 52.0% | 1.1 |
| Black Hawk | Beaver | 9 | 5 | 55.6% | 52.1% | 1.1 |
| Riverside Beaver County | Beaver | 9 | 5 | 55.6% | 52.1% | 1.1 |
| Avonworth | Allegheny | 9 | 5 | 55.6% | 52.6% | 1.1 |
| Highlands | Allegheny | 9 | 5 | 55.6% | 52.6% | 1.1 |
| North Hills | Allegheny | 9 | 5 | 55.6% | 52.6% | 1.1 |
| Plum borough | Allegheny | 9 | 5 | 55.6% | 52.6% | 1.1 |
| Quaker Valley | Allegheny | 9 | 5 | 55.6% | 52.6% | 1.1 |
| South Fayette Township | Allegheny | 9 | 5 | 55.6% | 52.6% | 1.1 |

See Appendix 10

Source: School Districts in Pittsburgh MSA; US Census Bureau

*Fair level of representation means that the proportion of women on school boards is 1.0 or more times the proportion of women in the population

US Cities with High Levels of African Americans and Women among Council Members

In this section we concentrated on city council members, as they often comprise the largest group of elected officials in city government. Our study reveals that the level of diversity among elected council members varied throughout the 52 cities with no distinctive pattern. Our results are detailed below.

African American Council Members (Tables 15-16)

- In August 2002 African Americans held 161 of the 673 council member positions in the 52 largest cities in the US. This represented 23.9% of the total council members in these cities, which was less than the average African American share of population (25%) for these 52 cities.
- As shown in table 16, twenty of the 52 largest US cities had a fair representation of African American on city council.
- Las Vegas, which is the 32nd largest city in the US, had the highest level of black representation among its elected council members when compared to the percentage of African Americans in the population. The city had 33.3% (2 out of 6) African Americans participation on council, which was 3.1 times the percentage of African Americans in its population.
- Several cities had high percentages of African Americans on their councils, but the percentages were neither consistent with nor above the percentage of African Americans in the population. For example, Baltimore had the highest percentage of African Americans (57 %) on its council. However, this percentage was well below the share of African Americans in the city (64.8%).
- As shown in Appendix 12, Pittsburgh had an average (ranks 27th) of 22.2% (2 out of 9) African American on its council. This is slightly lower than the share of African Americans in the population (27.8%).
- Ten of the 52 cities that we studied in August had zero percent African Americans on their city councils.
- None of the 10 cities with the largest African American percentage of population had fair levels of racial diversity among their council members. These were Detroit, New Orleans, Baltimore, Atlanta, Memphis, Washington, Cleveland, St. Louis, Philadelphia and Milwaukee.

Table 15. African American Council Members in the 52 Largest Cities in the US

| Total Council Members | Black | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| | Council Members | Percent of Council | Percent of 2000 Pop |
| 673 | 161 | 23.9% | 24.7% |

See Appendices 11-14

Source: US Census Bureau, 2000

Table 16. Cities with *Fair Levels of African American Representation among Council Members

| Rank | Cities | Total Council Members | Blacks | | | Ratio of % Blacks in Council to % Blacks in Pop |
|------|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| | | | Council Mbrs | Blacks as % of Council | Blacks as % of 2000 Pop | |
| 1 | Las Vegas, NV | 6 | 2 | 33.3% | 10.8% | 3.1 |
| 2 | San Jose, CA | 10 | 1 | 10.0% | 3.8% | 2.6 |
| 3 | Phoenix, AZ | 8 | 1 | 12.5% | 5.3% | 2.4 |
| 4 | Los Angeles, CA | 15 | 3 | 20.0% | 11.4% | 1.8 |
| 5 | Colorado Springs, CO | 8 | 1 | 12.5% | 7.3% | 1.7 |
| 5 | Columbus, OH | 7 | 3 | 42.9% | 25.8% | 1.7 |
| 7 | Austin, TX | 6 | 1 | 16.7% | 10.2% | 1.6 |
| 8 | Sacramento, CA | 8 | 2 | 25.0% | 16.4% | 1.5 |
| 8 | San Diego, CA | 8 | 1 | 12.5% | 8.5% | 1.5 |
| 10 | San Antonio, TX | 10 | 1 | 10.0% | 6.9% | 1.4 |
| 10 | Wichita, KA | 6 | 1 | 16.7% | 12.1% | 1.4 |
| 12 | Denver, CO | 13 | 2 | 15.4% | 11.6% | 1.3 |
| 12 | New York, NY | 51 | 17 | 33.3% | 25.6% | 1.3 |
| 14 | Fort Worth, TX | 8 | 2 | 25.0% | 20.5% | 1.2 |
| 14 | Seattle, WA | 9 | 1 | 11.1% | 9.6% | 1.2 |
| 16 | San Francisco, CA | 11 | 1 | 9.1% | 8.2% | 1.1 |
| 16 | Dallas, TX | 14 | 4 | 28.6% | 26.1% | 1.1 |
| 18 | Kansas City, MO | 12 | 4 | 33.3% | 32.0% | 1.0 |
| 18 | Chicago, IL | 50 | 19 | 38.0% | 36.9% | 1.0 |
| 18 | Omaha, NE | 7 | 1 | 14.3% | 14.0% | 1.0 |

Source: US Census Bureau; Cities' websites

See Appendices 12 & 13

*Fair level of representation means that the proportion of African American on the council is 1.0 or greater than the proportion of African American in the population

Table 17. Cities* with Low levels of African American Population Representation
Ranked by the % of African American Population

| Cities | Council Members | # of Blacks | Blacks as % of council | Blacks as % of 2000 Pop | Ratio of % Blacks in Council to % Blacks in Pop |
|------------------|-----------------|-------------|------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| Detroit, MI | 9 | 3 | 33.3% | 82.3% | 0.4 |
| New Orleans, LA | 7 | 2 | 28.6% | 67.3% | 0.4 |
| Baltimore, MD | 19 | 11 | 57.9% | 64.8% | 0.9 |
| Atlanta, GA | 16 | 9 | 56.3% | 61.6% | 0.9 |
| Memphis, TN | 13 | 5 | 38.5% | 61.6% | 0.6 |
| Washington, DC | 13 | 5 | 38.5% | 60.5% | 0.6 |
| Cleveland, OH | 21 | 9 | 42.9% | 51.4% | 0.8 |
| St. Louis, MO | 28 | *10 | 35.7% | 51.4% | 0.7 |
| Philadelphia, PA | 17 | 7 | 41.2% | 43.4% | 0.9 |
| Milwaukee, WI | 17 | 5 | 29.4% | 38.0% | 0.8 |

*Among the top 10 cities in terms of African American population

See Appendix 12 & 13

Source: US Census Bureau; Cities' websites

Women Council Members (Tables 18- 19)

- Women had a higher level of representation on city councils than African Americans do. For the 52 cities studied, women held 31.9% (215 out of 673) of the total city council positions compared to 23.9% held by African Americans. This however was still below the average share of women in the population for the 52 cities (51.3%).
- When compared to the percentage of women in the population, Detroit, Michigan had the highest level of women representation among its council members. This city, which is the 9th largest in the US, had 7 women on its nine-member council (77.8%) compared to 52.9% of women in its population.
- Denver, Colorado had the second highest level of women representation on its council. Women made up 69.2% (9 out of 13) of the council and 49.5% of the population.
- Santa Ana, California (which has the 52nd largest female population) also had a high level of women representation on its council. This city had a council that was 66.7% women.
- Pittsburgh performed poorly (tied for 38th) in terms of its percentage of women council members compared to women share of the population. Pittsburgh city council had 2 (22.2%) women on its nine-member council. Women made up 52.4% of the population in the city of Pittsburgh.
- There were fewer cities that had zero women on their council (5) than cities that had no African Americans (10).

- Denver, Colorado was the only city that demonstrated high levels of both African American and women representation. There were 15.4% of African Americans on the city council compared to 11.6% in the population, and 69.2% of females on the council compared to 49.5% in the population.
- As Appendix 14 shows, 44 of the 52 cities did not have a fair level of women representation

Table 18. Female Council Members in the 52 Largest Cities in the US

| Total Council Members | Female | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| | Council Members | Percent of Council | Percent of 2000 Pop |
| 673 | 215 | 31.9% | 51.3% |

Source: US Census Bureau; Cities' websites
See Appendix: 12 & 13

Table 19. Cities with *Fair Levels of Female Representation among their Council Members

| Rank | Cities | Total Council Mbrs | Women | | | Ratio of % Women in Council to Women in Pop |
|------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|---|
| | | | No. Council Mbrs | Women as % of Council | Women as % of 2000 Pop | |
| 1 | Detroit, MI | 9 | 7 | 77.8% | 52.9% | 1.5 |
| 2 | Denver, CO | 13 | 9 | 69.2% | 49.5% | 1.4 |
| 3 | Santa Ana, CA | 6 | 4 | 66.7% | 49.9% | 1.3 |
| 4 | Atlanta, GA | 16 | 9 | 56.3% | 50.5% | 1.1 |
| 5 | Jacksonville, FL | 19 | 10 | 52.6% | 51.5% | 1.0 |
| 6 | Baltimore, MD | 19 | 10 | 52.6% | 51.7% | 1.0 |
| 6 | Virginia Beach, VA | 10 | 5 | 50.0% | 50.5% | 1.0 |
| 6 | Tucson, AZ | 6 | 3 | 50.0% | 51.1% | 1.0 |

See Appendices 14 & 15

Source: US Census Bureau; Cities' websites

*Fair level or representation means the proportion of women on council is 1.0 or greater than the proportion of women in the population

FACTORS AFFECTING THE REPRESENTATION OF AFRICAN AMERICANS AND WOMEN IN ELECTED OFFICES

We conducted a literature search of books, electronic journals, local newspapers and websites to identify factors that may affect the number of African Americans and women elected officials. From our literature search we identified a number of factors that impact the representation the groups. These factors include electoral systems, small number of African American and women candidates, inadequate campaign fund, incumbency, run-off elections and city size.

Small Number of African American and Women Candidates

The low percentage of minority and women running for election affects the representation of these groups in elected offices. Bledsoe and Herring strongly believe that the paucity of women candidate is the most serious obstacle to increasing women representation (Bledsoe and Herring, 1990). Newman states that women have made up an extremely low percentage of general election candidates, especially for higher office (Newman, 1995). Furthermore, Newman believes that when women run for office they win as often as men do. Zimmerman and Rule also add that even in open seat elections, which offer the best opportunities for non-incumbent candidates, women often make up a small percentage of the candidates. For example, 32 seats were open in the primaries in the 1998 for the US House. Of these contests women constituted only 17% and 10% of all of the Democratic and Republican primary candidates, respectively (Zimmerman and Rule, 2000). These percentages suggest there is limited opportunity for voters to elect women to represent them in public offices.

Campaign Finance

Inadequate campaign finance is another factor that impacts the number of African Americans and women to elected positions. According to Zimmerman and Rule, candidates running for election usually require large sums of money to finance their campaign, which rely heavily on expensive television and print media. Many of the larger contributors tend to donate money to the probable winners of election, who are often white incumbents. As a consequence challengers rarely come up with enough funds needed to execute an effective campaign against the incumbent. In addition, in the case of a two-year term many incumbents may not separate the fund raising activities from regular activities. Although most states have laws that govern the amount of money that are donated to candidates or expended by them, the laws are typically lax and may involve little more than the release of unaudited campaign receipts.

Incumbency

Another factor which affects the election of women to public offices is the high percentage of incumbents seeking reelection. In fact, Zimmerman and Rule believe that it is the main barrier to equal representation of women in the US congress, state legislature as well as governors (Zimmerman and Rule, 2000). They believe that the vast majority of incumbents are men who tend to run for reelection and usually win. Jody

Newman in her article 'Women Candidates can Win When They Run' supports the view of Zimmerman and Rule. According to Newman one of the reasons for the perception that women have a harder time winning elections than men is that most incumbents are men, and incumbents by far, win more often than challengers and open seat candidates (Newman, 1995). Furthermore, Newman purports that when comparing men to women running as incumbents, challenger or for an open seat, men had no advantage over women.

A 1994 study conducted by the National Women's Political Caucus (NWPC) on the success of women and men candidates in elections from 1986-1992 show a huge disparity between success rate for incumbents and challengers. The study found that US House members won 95% of their re-election bids (nearly sixteen times as often as challengers); US senators 82% (almost four times as often as challengers); state representatives 94% (more than ten times as often as challengers); state senators 92% (almost eight times as often as challengers) and governors 77% (more than three times as often as challengers). According to the study candidates for open seats (where there is no incumbent) were anywhere from 2 to 9 times as likely to win as a challenger (Newman, 1994).

Electoral System

The electoral system appears to be a major causal factor in the election of racial minorities and women in the US. Many political scientists believe that the commonly used winner-take-all system in the US is unjust because it leaves minorities unrepresented. Steven Hill in his Book 'Fixing Elections' argues that the "Winner-Take-All electoral system is a mug's game that makes losers of us all" (Hill, 2002). This system awards 100% of the representation to a 50.1% majority. According to Hill this principle is archaic and lies at the root of many of our worst, seemingly intractable problems.

A common form of the winner-take-all system is the single-member districts system, by which all members of congress and most members of state legislature as well as local governing bodies are elected. Under the single-member district only one representative is elected in each district. There are varying views on how this system affects different groups. Zimmerman and Rule believe that this method produces representational distortion when votes are split by three candidates and a candidate with a minority of the votes is allowed to be elected. Furthermore they claim it limits the opportunity for white and minority women candidates to be elected to state legislatures and the US congress (Zimmerman and Rule, 1994). DeSantis and Renner purport that district elections at the county level do not strongly promote the election of black men to county legislatures, and does not appear to have an impact on the number of women who are elected. Meanwhile, Herrick and Welch explain that the single-member district promotes the election of blacks to office because they tend to be geographically concentrated. According to them, a district with a combined minority population of 65%, would nearly guarantee the election of a black candidate (Zimmerman and Rule, 2000).

These authors however all agree that multi-member districts are more advantageous to the election of black women to city councils and state legislature than single member districts. Zimmerman and Rule for example noted that the percentage of women members of state legislatures nearly double in states that utilize the multimember district system as oppose to the single-member district system.

Another form of the winner-take-all system is the at-Large² voting system. According to many, this also impedes the election of blacks, especially male. Zimmerman and Rule purport, that in this system, if whites make up the majority of voters in a county, candidates supported by African Americans tend not to get elected.

Run-off Elections

Another factor that has been suggested to affect the election of racial minorities and women is run-off elections³. Bullock and Johnson present mixed evidence on the impact of runoffs on black electoral success. On one hand, they conclude that the presence of a runoff requirement in local elections has no effect on the percentage of city councilors who are African Americans. On the contrary, they claimed that whites were much more likely to win runoffs between black and white candidates in primaries for both state and local offices. Black candidates who led in the first round won only 50% of the time against white candidates, but white candidates who led in the first round won 84% of the runoffs against African American candidates (Bullock and Johnson). Rule and Zimmerman claims that if there is racial polarization in voting, the run-off between a black and white candidate will ensure the election of the white candidate unless blacks make up a majority of the voters. Richie and Caleb of the Center for Voting and Democracy however feel that the success of black candidates in US House primary runoffs in black-majority districts may be linked more to the question of whether blacks or whites are a majority in the primary electorate rather than the demands of winning a runoff election (<http://www.fairvote.org>)

In terms of the impact on women, Bullock and Johnson suggest that the presence of a runoff requirement generally does not affect the percentage of women in local elections, however the evidence is more mixed for state elections. Furthermore the authors purported that based on a relatively few instances, runoffs have had a clear adverse impact against women candidates in runoffs for the most prestigious offices (Bullock III and Johnson 1992).

City Size

Some political scientists claim that the size of the city affects the election of minorities. Bullock III and MacManus state that based on the theory that ‘women tend to be found in offices for which there is less prestige, fewer candidates and a steeper path to higher elective office,’ they are more likely to be elected in smaller towns where the prestige of

² All residents vote on all council members

³ Election method where the top two candidates face off in a second round of voting if no candidate wins a majority (lower prescribed threshold) in the first round.

the position and the number of candidates competing for the position are lower (Bullock and MacManus, 1991). Furthermore the authors suggest that it might be easier for a relative newcomer to win a seat in a small town than in a larger one where it takes a longer time to develop name recognition and a sizable campaign network.

Other factors

Other factors that were suggested as impacting the election of African Americans and women includes council size, timing of the municipal elections and length of the council term. We were however unable to find any literatures on these.

Further research needs to be done to discover more barriers to the election of African Americans and women to public office as well as to measure the real impact of the barriers on the two groups at different levels of government.

Factors Identified through City Survey

The presence of a winner-take-all type of electoral system does not appear to hinder the election of African Americans and women to city council as most of the responding cities (7 out of 10) indicated they have no form of proportional representation.

The high number of incumbent re-election also does not appear to be a major factor limiting the number of elected African Americans and women in the cities that responded. Three of the 10 cities– New York, Denver and Baltimore indicated that they have had very high rates of incumbent re-election in the past, while the other seven cities claimed that the presence of term limits for council members dissipates the barrier of high incumbent re-election, hence African Americans and women have more opportunity to participate in open-seat elections.

In terms of the number of African American candidates, the response was also varied. Two cities (Denver and New York) indicated that an impressive number of African Americans do run for public offices. Denver reported that in its last election (1999) 7 of the 31 candidates (23%) that ran for council positions were black. This percentage exceeds the proportion of blacks on the population (11.6%). In addition, 4 of the 31 candidates (12.9%) running for city council were Hispanics. Furthermore, in the 1999 election, there were 3 African Americans among the 4 candidates running in the mayoral race. The spokesperson of the Denver city council, however, could not identify reasons for the high percentage of African American candidates. The city of New York did not provide supporting data. The other 8 cities indicated that not many African Americans run for election. However, all of the cities with fair representation of women indicated that there is a substantial amount of women candidates.

The majority of cities (6) claim they do not have a problem with inadequate campaign finance for African Americans and women. In fact, New York claims it has the best campaign finance formula in the U.S. For every dollar raised by a candidate the city

gives four dollars. This formula according to Lupe Todd, City council spokesperson, allows more minorities to run for public offices.

Although 5 of the 10 cities that responded have run-off elections, they claim it does not appear to play a role in the election of African Americans and women.

In terms of other factors, 2 cities (Dallas and New York) mentioned that the number of single member voting districts is the most important factor influencing the election of minorities to their city councils. These cities indicated that since the number of districts increased, the representation of African Americans elected to their city council has also increased. Currently, Dallas has 14 single member districts while New York has 51.

Colorado Springs indicated that the presence of their city-wide integrated diversity program encourages the election of African Americans and women to public offices.

Denver, which had a fair level of both African Americans and women on the city council noted that the council staff positions provided the impetus for many women to run for public office. According to John Bennett of the Denver City Council, candidates who have worked as council staff have the advantage of knowing their constituents for years and the issues that face. Currently 4 of the council members were once council aids. Twenty-one of the 23 council staff members are women.

LOCAL AND NATIONAL PROGRAMS THAT ENCOURAGE AND PREPARE AFRICAN AMERICANS AND WOMEN TO RUN FOR PUBLIC OFFICE

Local Programs

Program for Emerging Leaders in Public Affairs The program is being developed by CORO Center for Civic Leadership and funded by Heinz Endowments and R.K Mellon Foundation. The mission of the Emerging Leaders in Public Affairs program is to position participants for increased involvement in the electoral process as ethical and effective candidates, campaign staffers, board members, appointees or community advocates. This two-month training initiative targets 3 main groups - women, minorities and youths (between ages 21 and 40) in the Pittsburgh region, and will be limited to 25 participants. According to a spokesperson of CORO, the program is schedule to begin in April 2003

The goals of the program are to;

- Have a more diverse pool of local political leaders
- Prepare and train budding leaders to be effective and ethical candidates, office holders and appointees and advocates.
- Present fundamental components of running a successful campaign
- Emphasize strategic thinking to facilitate professional objectives in political environments
- Develop emerging leadership to have greater impact upon the local electoral process

The program would focus on the areas of strategic thinking, civic leadership, networking, public speaking, consensus-building, individual leadership development problem-solving, boards and commissions and effective fundraising and campaigning.

Institute for Public Leadership This is an initiative co-sponsored by the YWCA and the Institute for Women in Politics at Chatham College. The mission of the program is to increase the number of women in Pennsylvania who are in public leadership. The program will be held on April 5th and 6th 2003 at the Chatham College. According to a spokesperson of program the organizers would like it to be an annual event.

The goals of the program are:

- Educate women on issues they need to be aware of before running for office
- Provide interested female candidates with the tools such as fundraising, networking opportunities that are necessary to engage in an effective campaign.

Winning with Women in Pennsylvania This program was initiated by the Republican Party to enhance the role of women in Pennsylvania politics, government and public policy. The statewide effort is part of a national program coordinated by the Republican National Committee.

The Winning with Women in Pennsylvania program has 3 main goals:

- To increase the role of Republican women in the political process in Pennsylvania through various capacity building programs and services;
- To establish an interactive network of Republican women to work toward eliminating the gender gap; and,
- To create an open-dialogue with women and leaders at the local, state and national level in order to effectively serve the needs of women and to advance the Party (www.pagop.org).

One of the strategies of the program is the establishment of the Anne Anstine Excellence in Public Service Series, a statewide training program that prepares women for greater political involvement.

National Programs

Early Money Is Like Yeast (EMILY's List), This is a large grassroots political network, that raise campaign contributions for Democratic women running for the House, the Senate and for governor; help women candidates build strong, winning campaigns; and help mobilize women voters. There are two types of training programs-1) that provides

campaign workers with the essential tools needed to execute an effective campaign and 2) that trains women who are interested in running for US and state legislative positions. According to a spokesperson of EMILY'S List, no such training has yet been held in Pennsylvania.

In terms of its success, in the nine elections since EMILY's List began, they have helped elect 11 Democratic women senators, 54 congresswomen and seven governors. Prior to its establishment, no Democratic woman had ever been elected to the U.S. Senate in her own right, no woman had ever been elected governor of a large state, and the number of Democratic women in the U.S. House was on the decline. EMILY's List has become the largest financial resource for minority women seeking federal office. Almost one-third of the women EMILY's List has helped to elect have been women of color.

In the 2002 elections, 71,000 EMILY's List members contributed nearly \$9.4 million directly to pro-choice Democratic women running for the Senate, the House and governor.

Ready to Run This program was established on 1998 to encourage women in New Jersey to seek public office. It is a joint project of the Center for American Women and Politics and the Institute for Women's Leadership. This one-day, yearly program has 7 different focus areas:

- Positioning Yourself for Public Office
- Putting Your Campaign Together
- Raising Money for Campaigns
- Media Strategy for New Jersey Candidates
- Running as an outsider or Challenger
- Appointive Office: How to Position Yourself and What to Expect from the process
- Conquering the Camera

A spokesperson of the program, Amy Bain, the organizers of the Ready to Run are now looking to expand the program to other states that have under representation of minority and women among elected officials.

In terms of the success of the program, Amy Bain states that the program has so far been successful as many women who participated in the program have gone on to win legislative, mayoral and cit council races. The spokesperson was however unable to provide concrete data.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of the paper, we recommend the following specific actions for increasing African American and women representation among elected officials in the Pittsburgh region:

1. To increase the number of African American and women candidates, local

organizations that help minorities and women run for elected office should:

- a. Create and maintain a directory of minorities and women qualified for and interested in staff positions with elected officials, encourage local elected officials to have these people as staff, and encourage minority and women staff to run for public office.
 - b. Create a directory of all local programs to help minorities and women run for public office.
2. To increase the number of African American and women candidates, local and state political parties should:
 - b. Appoint more minorities and women as ward chairpersons and as members and heads of political party committees.
 - c. Commit to having their lists of candidates reflect the racial and gender diversity in the population.
 3. As a solution to the campaign finance problem, we recommend consideration of laws that provide for the public financing of election campaigns.
 4. In dealing with the factor of high incumbent reelection, we recommend the continual mobilization of resources such as money, voter turnout and favorable media coverage for African American and women candidates
 5. Regarding the barrier of electoral system, we recommend consideration of an alternative system such as proportional representation, which would result in more African Americans and women being elected to public offices.
 6. No solution was identified to deal with the barriers posed by run-off elections and city size.

REFERENCES

Bledsoe, Timothy and Mary Herring. "Victims of Circumstances: Women in Pursuit of Political Office." *American Political Science Review*, 1990

Bullock, Charles and Loch K Johnson. "Runoff elections in the United States". Chapel Hill 1992

Bullock Charles and Susan Mac Manus "Municipal Electoral Structure and the Election of Council women." *Journal of Politics*, February 1991.

Hill, Steven. "Fixing Elections: The Failure of America's Winner Take All Politics." New York 2002

Richie Rob, and Steven Hill. "Redistricting abuses voter trust" *Christian Science Monitor*, January 7, 2002

Rule, Wilma and Joseph Zimmerman. "Electoral Systems in Comparative Perspective: Their Impact on Women and Minorities" 1994

Welch, Susan "The Impact of At-Large Elections on the Representation of Blacks and Hispanic." *Journal of Politics*, November 1990, pp. 1050-76

Zimmerman, Joseph and Wilma Rule. "The US House of Representatives: Reform or Rebuild?" 2000

**Appendix 1: Number of Municipalities in the
Pittsburgh MSA, 2002**

| County | Total Number of Municipalities | Number of Municipalities Contacted |
|---------------|---|---|
| Allegheny | 130 | 115 |
| Beaver | 54 | 52 |
| Butler | 57 | 57 |
| Fayette | 43 | 32 |
| Washington | 67 | 54 |
| Westmoreland | 65 | 53 |
| Total | 416 | 363 |

**Appendix 2. Cities with High Levels of African American
and Women Elected Officials**

| Cities | Contact Number |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| High African American Representation | |
| Las Vegas, NV | 702-229-6405 |
| San Jose, CA | 408-277-4000 |
| Phoenix , AZ | 602-262-7777 |
| Los Angeles, CA | 213-485-331 |
| Colorado Springs, CO | 719-385-2489 |
| Columbus, OH | 614-645-8580 |
| Austin, TX | 512-974-2266 |
| Sacramento, CA | 916-264-5407 |
| San Diego, CA | 619-533-4045 |
| San Antonio, TX | 210-207-7253 |
| Wichita, KA | 316-268-4331 |
| Denver, CO | 720-865-9534 |
| New York, NY | 212-788-7100 |
| Fort Worth, TX | 817-871-8805 |
| Seattle, WA | 206-684-888 |
| San Francisco, CA | 415-554-6141 |
| Dallas, TX | 214-671-0512 |
| Kansas City, MO | 816-513-1368 |
| Chicago, IL | 312-744-6805 |
| Omaha, NE | 402-444-5520 |
| High Women Representation | |
| Detroit, MI | 313-224-3443 |
| Denver, CO | 720-865-9534 |
| Santa Ana, CA | 714-647-6900 |
| Atlanta, GA | 404-330-6100 |
| Baltimore, MD | 410-396-4804 |
| Virginia Beach, VA | 757-427-4581 |
| Tucson, AZ | 520-791-4213 |

Appendix 3. African American Mayors in the Pittsburgh Area*

| City & Borough | County | Total Number | African American | | | Ratio of % Blacks as mayors to % Blacks in Pop |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------|------------------|---------------|-------------|--|
| | | | Number | As % of Mayor | As % of Pop | |
| Aliquippa City | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 35.5% | 0.0 |
| Ambridge Boro | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 11.4% | 0.0 |
| Arnold City | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 12.8% | 0.0 |
| Aspinwall Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.3% | 0.0 |
| Avalon Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 4.9% | 0.0 |
| Avonmore Boro | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.2% | 0.0 |
| Baden Boro | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.7% | 0.0 |
| Baldwin Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.4% | 0.0 |
| Beallsville Boro | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.8% | 0.0 |
| Beaver Falls City | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 17.5% | 0.0 |
| Bellevue Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 4.4% | 0.0 |
| Bethel Park Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.0% | 0.0 |
| Big Beaver Boro | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.7% | 0.0 |
| Blawnox Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.0% | 0.0 |
| Brackenridge Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.4% | 0.0 |
| Butler City | Butler | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.2% | 0.0 |
| Carnegie Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 5.6% | 0.0 |
| Castle Shanon Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.3% | 0.0 |
| Centerville Boro | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.0 |
| Cheswick Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.3% | 0.0 |
| Churchill Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 8.4% | 0.0 |
| Clairton City | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 28.3% | 0.0 |
| Cokeburgh Boro | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0 |
| Connellsville City | Fayette | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.9% | 0.0 |
| Connoquenessing Boro | Butler | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.0 |
| Conway Boro | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.3% | 0.0 |
| Coraopolis Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 12.4% | 0.0 |
| Deemston Boro | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.4% | 0.0 |
| Delmont Boro | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.5% | 0.0 |
| Donara Boro | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 14.8% | 0.0 |
| Dravosburg Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.5% | 0.0 |
| Duquesne City | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 47.7% | 0.0 |
| East McKeesport Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.9% | 0.0 |
| East Rochester Boro | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.4% | 0.0 |
| Economy Boro | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.7% | 0.0 |
| Edgewood Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 7.9% | 0.0 |
| Edgeworth Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.0% | 0.0 |
| Emsworth Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.6% | 0.0 |
| Etna Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.8% | 0.0 |
| Finleyville Boro | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 5.9% | 0.0 |
| Forest Hills Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.0% | 0.0 |
| Franklin Park Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.0% | 0.0 |
| Greensburg City | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.9% | 0.0 |
| Harmony Boro | Butler | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.5% | 0.0 |

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--------------|---|---|------|-------|-----|
| Heidelberg Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.0% | 0.0 |
| Homestead Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.3% | 0.0 |
| Ingram Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.1% | 0.0 |
| Jeannette City | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 5.2% | 0.0 |
| Leetsdale Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 7.3% | 0.0 |
| Lincoln Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.7% | 0.0 |
| Lower Burrell City | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.9% | 0.0 |
| Marianna Boro | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 8.8% | 0.0 |
| Masontown Boro | Fayette | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 5.6% | 0.0 |
| Mc Donald Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 6.3% | 0.0 |
| Mc Kees Rock Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 14.1% | 0.0 |
| Mckeesport City | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 24.5% | 0.0 |
| Midland Boro | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 20.8% | 0.0 |
| Midway Boro | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.5% | 0.0 |
| Millvale Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.0% | 0.0 |
| Monessen City | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 14.0% | 0.0 |
| Monongahela City | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.3% | 0.0 |
| Muni of Penn Hills | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 24.2% | 0.0 |
| Murrysville Boro | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0 |
| New Kensington City | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 9.8% | 0.0 |
| New Stanton Boro | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.9% | 0.0 |
| Newell Boro | Fayette | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.0 |
| North Belle Vernon Boro | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.3% | 0.0 |
| North Irwin Boro | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.1% | 0.0 |
| Oakdale Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.9% | 0.0 |
| Oakmont Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.9% | 0.0 |
| Ohioville Boro | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.0% | 0.0 |
| Pitcairn Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.4% | 0.0 |
| Pittsburgh City | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 27.1% | 0.0 |
| Pleasant Hills Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.3% | 0.0 |
| Saxonburg Boro | Butler | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.0 |
| Scottdale Boro | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.1% | 0.0 |
| Sewickley Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 9.6% | 0.0 |
| Sewickley Heights Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.9% | 0.0 |
| Sewickley Hills Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.5% | 0.0 |
| Sharpsburgh Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.8% | 0.0 |
| Smithton Boro | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0 |
| South Greensburgh Boro | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.7% | 0.0 |
| Southwest Greensburgh Boro | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.8% | 0.0 |
| Speers Boro | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.7% | 0.0 |
| Stockdale Boro | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.7% | 0.0 |
| Swissvale Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 22.1% | 0.0 |
| Turtle Creek Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 5.2% | 0.0 |
| Uniontown City | Fayette | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 13.6% | 0.0 |
| Versailles Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.6% | 0.0 |
| Washington City | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 14.6% | 0.0 |
| West Elizabeth Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.0 |
| West Homestead Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 8.8% | 0.0 |
| West Mifflin Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 8.8% | 0.0 |
| Whitaker Borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 5.0% | 0.0 |
| Whitehall Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.4% | 0.0 |

| | | | | | | |
|------------------------|--------------|---|-----|------|-------|-----|
| White Oak Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.9% | 0.0 |
| Wilmerding Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 6.3% | 0.0 |
| Zelienople Boro | Butler | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.4% | 0.0 |
| Beaver Boro | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 2.6% | n/p |
| Ben Avon Boro | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 2.5% | n/p |
| Boro of Springdale | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.2% | n/p |
| Braddock Boro | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 66.5% | n/p |
| Bradfordwoods Boro | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| Bridgeville Boro | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 4.4% | n/p |
| Bridgewater Boro | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 8.8% | n/p |
| Bruin Boro | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| Callery Boro | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| Cherry Valley Boro | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| Chicora Boro | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.2% | n/p |
| Claysville Boro | Washington | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.3% | n/p |
| Darling Boro | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| East Butler Boro | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| East Pittsburgh Boro | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 20.9% | n/p |
| Eastvale Boro | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 1.7% | n/p |
| Eau Claire Boro | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.3% | n/p |
| Evans City Boro | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.1% | n/p |
| Fairview Boro | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.5% | n/p |
| Fallston Boro | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 5.5% | n/p |
| Frankport Springs Boro | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| Freedom Boro | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 5.2% | n/p |
| Georgetown Boro | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| Glasgow Boro | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| Harrisville Boro | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.6% | n/p |
| Homewood Boro | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 2.0% | n/p |
| Hookstown Boro | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| Houston Boro | Washington | 1 | n/p | n/p | 3.7% | n/p |
| Industry Boro | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 1.9% | n/p |
| Irwin Boro | Westmoreland | 1 | n/p | n/p | 1.0% | n/p |
| Karns City Boro | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.4% | n/p |
| Koppel Boro | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.5% | n/p |
| Mars Boro | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.5% | n/p |
| Monaca Boro | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 1.9% | n/p |
| Mount Pleasant Boro | Westmoreland | 1 | n/p | n/p | 1.7% | n/p |
| Muni of Monroeville | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 8.3% | n/p |
| Munhall Boro | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 3.4% | n/p |
| New Brighton Boro | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 10.6% | n/p |
| New Galilee Boro | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 2.1% | n/p |
| Patterson Heights Boro | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.3% | n/p |
| Petrolia Boro | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| Portersville Boro | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| Prospect Boro | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| Rochester Boro | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 13.2% | n/p |
| Seven Fields Boro | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.7% | n/p |
| Shippingport Boro | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | n/p |
| Slippery Rock Boro | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 3.3% | n/p |
| South Heights Boro | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.7% | n/p |

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|-------------|---------------|------------|
| Tarentum Boro | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 3.6% | n/p |
| Trafford Boro | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.7% | n/p |
| Valencia Boro | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.5% | n/p |
| West Liberty Boro | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| West Sunbury Boro | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| Total | | 98 | 0 | 0.0% | **8.0% | 0.0 |

*6-County Region

**percentage of African American in Pittsburgh MSA

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000

Appendix 4. Female Mayors in the Pittsburgh Area*

| Rank | City & Borough | County | Total Number | Female | | | Ratio of % Female as mayor to % Female in Pop |
|------|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------|---------------|-------------|---|
| | | | | Number | As % of Mayor | As % of Pop | |
| 1 | West Liberty Boro | Butler | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 46.5% | 2.2 |
| 2 | Deemston Boro | Washington | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 48.9% | 2.0 |
| 2 | Economy Boro | Beaver | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 50.1% | 2.0 |
| 2 | Murrysville Boro | Westmoreland | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 50.5% | 2.0 |
| 5 | Eastvale Boro | Beaver | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 51.4% | 1.9 |
| 5 | Stockdale Boro | Washington | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 51.4% | 1.9 |
| 5 | Harmony Boro | Butler | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 51.5% | 1.9 |
| 5 | Newell Boro | Fayette | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 52.3% | 1.9 |
| 5 | Pitcairn Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 52.4% | 1.9 |
| 5 | Smithton Boro | Westmoreland | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 52.5% | 1.9 |
| 5 | Midway Boro | Washington | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 52.6% | 1.9 |
| 5 | Petrolia Boro | Butler | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 52.8% | 1.9 |
| 5 | Karns City Boro | Butler | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 52.9% | 1.9 |
| 5 | Connellsville City | Fayette | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 53.5% | 1.9 |
| 5 | Trafford Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 53.5% | 1.9 |
| 5 | Edgewood Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 53.8% | 1.9 |
| 5 | Marianna Boro | Washington | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 53.8% | 1.9 |
| 18 | North Belle Vernon Boro | Westmoreland | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 54.6% | 1.8 |
| 18 | Avonmore Boro | Westmoreland | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 54.6% | 1.8 |
| 18 | Homestead Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 55.5% | 1.8 |
| 21 | Aliquippa City | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 54.7% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Ambridge Boro | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.7% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Arnold City | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.6% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Aspinwall Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 56.7% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Avalon Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 54.2% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Baden Boro | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 54.4% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Baldwin Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.6% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Beallsville Boro | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.5% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Beaver Falls City | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 54.3% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Bellevue Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 55.3% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Ben Avon Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.4% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Bethel Park Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.1% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Big Beaver Boro | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.2% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Blawnox Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.5% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Boro Springdale | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.6% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Brackenridge Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 55.3% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Butler City | Butler | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.2% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Carnegie Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 54.0% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Castle Shannon Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.6% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Centerville Boro | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.8% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Cheswick Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 54.3% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Churchill Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.8% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Clairton City | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 54.4% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Cokeburgh | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 54.0% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Connoquenessing Boro | Butler | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.0% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Conway Boro | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.8% | 0.0 |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|------------------------|--------------|---|---|------|-------|-----|
| 21 | Coraopolis Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 54.3% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Delmont Boro | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.0% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Donara Boro | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 54.7% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Dravosburg Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 54.3% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Duquesne City | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 55.5% | 0.0 |
| 21 | East McKeesport Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.2% | 0.0 |
| 21 | East Pittsburgh Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 56.0% | 0.0 |
| 21 | East Rochester Boro | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.0% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Edgeworth Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.0% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Emsworth Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 49.6% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Etna Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 47.1% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Findleyville Boro | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.1% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Forest Hills Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.5% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Franklin Park Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.1% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Greensburg City | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 55.1% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Heidelberg Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.4% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Houston Boro | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.4% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Industry Boro | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.3% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Ingram Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.1% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Irwin Boro | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.2% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Jeannette City | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.3% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Koppel Boro | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.5% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Leetsdale Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 55.4% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Lincoln Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.1% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Lower Burrell City | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.9% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Masontown Boro | Fayette | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 54.6% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Mc Donald Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.3% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Mc Kees Rock Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.9% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Mckeesport City | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 54.1% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Midland Boro | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 54.8% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Millvale Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.1% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Monessen City | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 54.1% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Monongahela City | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 54.0% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Mount Pleasant Boro | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 54.5% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Muni of Monroeville | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.0% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Muni of Penn Hills | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.0% | 0.0 |
| 21 | New Brighton Boro | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.2% | 0.0 |
| 21 | New Kensington City | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.1% | 0.0 |
| 21 | New Stanton Boro | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.8% | 0.0 |
| 21 | North Irwin Boro | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.5% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Oakdale Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.8% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Oakmont Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 55.8% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Ohioville Boro | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.7% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Pittsburgh City | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.4% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Pleasant Hills Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.1% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Saxonburg Boro | Butler | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 58.0% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Scottdale Boro | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.5% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Sewickley Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 55.6% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Sewickley Heights Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 57.3% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Sewickley Hills Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 49.2% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Sharpsburgh Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 55.0% | 0.0 |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--------------|---|-----|------|-------|-----|
| 21 | Shippingport Boro | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.7% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Slippery Rock Boro | Butler | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 56.4% | 0.0 |
| 21 | South Greensburgh Boro | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.2% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Southwest Greensburgh Boro | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.8% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Speers Boro | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.3% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Swissvale Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 54.2% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Turtle Creek Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 55.1% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Uniontown City | Fayette | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.7% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Versailles Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 55.5% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Washington City | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.1% | 0.0 |
| 21 | West Elizabeth Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.6% | 0.0 |
| 21 | West Homestead Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.0% | 0.0 |
| 21 | West Mifflin Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.8% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Whitaker Borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 49.7% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Whitehall Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.6% | 0.0 |
| 21 | White Oak Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.7% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Wilmerding Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 54.7% | 0.0 |
| 21 | Zelienople Boro | Butler | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 54.2% | 0.0 |
| n/a | Beaver Boro | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 52.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Braddock Boro | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 54.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Bradfordwoods Boro | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 50.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Bridgeville Boro | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 53.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Bridgewater Boro | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 52.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Bruin Boro | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 51.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Callery Boro | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 50.9% | n/p |
| n/a | Cherry Valley Boro | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 43.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Chicora Boro | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 53.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Claysville Boro | Washington | 1 | n/p | n/p | 52.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Darlington Boro | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 54.5% | n/p |
| n/a | East Butler Boro | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 50.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Eau Claire Boro | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 50.4% | n/p |
| n/a | Evans City Boro | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 50.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Fairview Boro | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 49.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Fallston Boro | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 50.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Frankfort Springs Boro | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 49.4% | n/p |
| n/a | Freedom Boro | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 51.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Georgetown Boro | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 45.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Glasgow Boro | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 46.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Harrisville Boro | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 51.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Homewood Boro | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 51.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Hookstown Boro | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 55.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Mars Boro | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 58.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Monaca Boro | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 53.4% | n/p |
| n/a | Munhall Boro | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 54.1% | n/p |
| n/a | New Galilee Boro | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 53.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Patterson Heights Boro | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 52.2% | n/p |
| n/a | Portersville Boro | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 50.4% | n/p |
| n/a | Prospect Boro | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 49.9% | n/p |
| n/a | Rochester Boro | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 53.9% | n/p |
| n/a | Seven Fields Boro | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 51.8% | n/p |
| n/a | South Heights Boro | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 48.9% | n/p |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|----------------|-------------|
| n/a | Tarentum Boro | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 53.2% | n/p |
| n/a | Valencia Boro | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 58.6% | n/p |
| n/a | West Sunbury Boro | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 46.2% | n/p |
| | Total | | 115 | 20 | **% | ***52.2 | 0.34 |

*6-County Region

**Percent calculated from 88 female mayors

***percent of African American in Pittsburgh MSA

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000

Appendix 5. African American Council Presidents/Chairmen in the Pittsburgh MSA

| Rank | Counties & Municipality | County | Council Presidents/Chairmen | African American | | | Ratio of % Blacks as President to % Blacks in Pop |
|------|--------------------------|--------------|-----------------------------|------------------|-----------------|-------------|---|
| | | | | Number | As % of council | As % of Pop | |
| 1 | Homestead Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 51.3% | 1.9 |
| 2 | Aleppo township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.1% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Allegheny County | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 12.3% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Ambridge borough | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 11.4% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Amwell township | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Aspinwall borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.3% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Baldwin Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.4% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Baldwin township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.3% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Beallsville borough | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.8% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Beaver County | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 5.9% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Bellevue borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 4.4% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Ben Avon borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.5% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Bethel Park borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.0% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Big Beaver borough | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.7% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Blawnox borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.0% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Brighton township | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.1% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Buffalo township | Butler | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Butler County | Butler | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.8% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Canton township | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.3% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Carnegie borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 5.6% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Carroll township | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.1% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Center township | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.0% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Centerville Boro | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Cheswick Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.3% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Churchill borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 8.4% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Cokeburgh | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Connoquenessing borough | Butler | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Conway borough | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.3% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Coraopolis borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 12.4% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Cranberry township | Butler | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.9% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Cross Creek township | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.9% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Deemston borough | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.4% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Delmont borough | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.5% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Derry Twn | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.2% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Donegal township | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.1% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Donora borough | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 14.8% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Dravosburg borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.5% | 0.0 |
| 2 | East Deer township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.9% | 0.0 |
| 2 | East Huntingdon township | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.5% | 0.0 |
| 2 | East McKeesport borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.9% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Economy borough | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.7% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Edgewood Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 7.9% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Etna borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.8% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Fairfield township | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.4% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Fayette County | Fayette | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.4% | 0.0 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|--------------|---|---|------|-------|-----|
| 2 | Findlay township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.6% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Findleyville Boro | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 5.9% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Forest Hills borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.0% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Forward township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.1% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Franklin Park borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.0% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Frazer Twn | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.1% | 0.0 |
| 2 | German Twn | Fayette | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 7.2% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Greene township | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.3% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Hampton Twn | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.7% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Harmar township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.7% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Harmony borough | Butler | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.5% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Harrison township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.7% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Heidelberg borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.1% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Hemfield Twn | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.1% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Indiana township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.3% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Industry borough | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.9% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Ingram Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.1% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Jackson township | Butler | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.9% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Jefferson township | Butler | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Jefferson township | Fayette | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.5% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Kennedy township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.5% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Koppel borough | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.5% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Leetsdale borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 7.3% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Lincoln Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.7% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Marianna borough | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 8.8% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Marion township | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Masontown borough | Fayette | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 5.6% | 0.0 |
| 2 | McCandless township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.3% | 0.0 |
| 2 | McDonald borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 6.3% | 0.0 |
| 2 | McKees Rocks borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 14.1% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Midway borough | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.5% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Millvale borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.0% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Moon Twn | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.6% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Mount Pleasant township | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.3% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Mount Pleasant township | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.3% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Muddy Creek township | Butler | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Municipality of Murrysville boro | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0 |
| 2 | New Sewickley township | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.0 |
| 2 | New Stanton Boro | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.9% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Newell borough | Fayette | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.0 |
| 2 | North Belle Vernon | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.3% | 0.0 |
| 2 | North Fayette township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.6% | 0.0 |
| 2 | North Huntingdon township | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.3% | 0.0 |
| 2 | North Irwin borough | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.1% | 0.0 |
| 2 | North Strabane township | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.1% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Nottingham township | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Oakdale borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.9% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Oakmont Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.9% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Ohio township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.8% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Ohioville borough | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.0% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Patterson township | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.5% | 0.0 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|--------------|---|---|------|-------|-----|
| 2 | Penn Hills Mun | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 24.2% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Penn township | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.4% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Peters township | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.5% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Pine township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.8% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Pittsburgh city | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 27.1% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Pleasant Hills borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.3% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Pulaski township | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.2% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Raccoon township | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.4% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Reserve township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.3% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Robinson township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.9% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Robinson township | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.3% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Rochester township | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.6% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Ross township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.4% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Rostraver township | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.9% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Saxonburg borough | Butler | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Scottdale borough | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.1% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Sewickley Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 9.6% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Sewickley Twn | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Sewickley Heights borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.9% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Sewickley Hills borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.5% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Shaler township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.4% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Sharpsburg borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.8% | 0.0 |
| 2 | South Fayette Twn | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.5% | 0.0 |
| 2 | South Greensburg borough | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.7% | 0.0 |
| 2 | South Strabane township | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.6% | 0.0 |
| 2 | South Versailles | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Southwest Greensburgh | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.8% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Speers borough | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.7% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Stockdale Boro | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.7% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Summit township | Butler | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 4.0% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Swissvale borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 22.1% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Turtle Creek Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 5.2% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Unity Twn | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.3% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Upper Burrell township | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.8% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Upper St. Clair township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.7% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Vanport township | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.4% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Versailles Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.6% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Washington County | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.2% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Washington township | Butler | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.3% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Washington Twn | Fayette | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.1% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Washington Twn | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0 |
| 2 | West Deer township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.3% | 0.0 |
| 2 | West Elizabeth Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.0 |
| 2 | West Mifflin Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 8.8% | 0.0 |
| 2 | West Pike Run township | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.9% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Westmoreland County | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.9% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Wharton Twn | Fayette | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.1% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Whitaker borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 5.0% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Whitehall Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.4% | 0.0 |
| 2 | White Oak borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.9% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Wilkins township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 4.4% | 0.0 |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------------------------|--------------|---|-----|------|-------|-----|
| 2 | Wilmerding borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 6.3% | 0.0 |
| 2 | Zelienople borough | Butler | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.4% | 0.0 |
| n/a | Adams township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Allegheny township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 1.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Avonmore borough | Westmoreland | 1 | n/p | n/p | 1.2% | n/p |
| n/a | Baden borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.7% | n/p |
| n/a | Beaver borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 2.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Braddock Boro | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 66.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Bradford Woods Boro | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Brady township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Bridgeville borough | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 4.4% | n/p |
| n/a | Bridgewater borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 8.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Brownsville township | Fayette | 1 | n/p | n/p | 3.9% | n/p |
| n/a | Bruin borough | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Bullskin township | Fayette | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Butler township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Callery borough | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Castle Shannon Boro | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 1.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Cecil Twn | Washington | 1 | n/p | n/p | 1.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Center township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.4% | n/p |
| n/a | Cherry township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Cherry Valley borough | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Chicora borough | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.2% | n/p |
| n/a | Chippewa township | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.9% | n/p |
| n/a | Clay township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.2% | n/p |
| n/a | Claysville Boro | Washington | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Clearfield township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.2% | n/p |
| n/a | Clinton township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Collier township | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.7% | n/p |
| n/a | Concord township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Connellsville township | Fayette | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Connoquenessing township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Cook township | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Crescent township | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 1.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Darlington borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Darlington township | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Daugherty township | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 1.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Donegal township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Dormont borough | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 1.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Dunbar township | Fayette | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.4% | n/p |
| n/a | East Bethlehem township | Washington | 1 | n/p | n/p | 2.4% | n/p |
| n/a | East Butler borough | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | East Pittsburgh borough | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 20.9% | n/p |
| n/a | East Rochester borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 3.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Eastvale borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 1.7% | n/p |
| n/a | Eau Claire borough | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Edgeworth borough | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 2.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Elizabeth township | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 1.7% | n/p |
| n/a | Emsworth borough | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 3.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Evans City borough | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Fairview borough | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.5% | n/p |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------|--------------|---|-----|------|-------|-----|
| n/a | Fairview township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.2% | n/p |
| n/a | Fallowfield Twn | Westmoreland | 1 | n/p | n/p | 1.4% | n/p |
| n/a | Fallston borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 5.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Forward township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.2% | n/p |
| n/a | Frankfort Springs borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Franklin township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Franklin township | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Freedom borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 5.2% | n/p |
| n/a | Georgetown borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Glasgow borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Hanover township | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Harmony township | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 1.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Harrisville borough | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Homewood borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 2.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Hookstown borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Hopewell township | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 1.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Houston borough | Washington | 1 | n/p | n/p | 3.7% | n/p |
| n/a | Independence township | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.2% | n/p |
| n/a | Irwin borough | Westmoreland | 1 | n/p | n/p | 1.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Karns City borough | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.4% | n/p |
| n/a | Lancaster township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.2% | n/p |
| n/a | Loyalhanna township | Westmoreland | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.7% | n/p |
| n/a | Marion township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Mars borough | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Marshall Twn | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 1.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Mercer township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Middlesex township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Midland borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 20.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Monaca borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 1.9% | n/p |
| n/a | Mount Lebanon township | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Mount Pleasant borough | Westmoreland | 1 | n/p | n/p | 1.7% | n/p |
| n/a | Munhall Boro | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 3.4% | n/p |
| n/a | New Brighton borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 10.6% | n/p |
| n/a | New Galilee borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 2.1% | n/p |
| n/a | North Franklin Twn | Washington | 1 | n/p | n/p | 2.4% | n/p |
| n/a | North Sewickley township | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.9% | n/p |
| n/a | Oakland township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Parker township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Patterson Heights borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Penn township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.2% | n/p |
| n/a | Petrolia borough | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Pitcairn borough | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.4% | n/p |
| n/a | Portersville borough | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Potter township | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Prospect borough | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Richland township | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Rochester borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 13.4% | n/p |
| n/a | Seven Fields borough | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.7% | n/p |
| n/a | Shippingport borough | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Slippery Rock borough | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 3.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Slippery Rock township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 2.3% | n/p |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------|--------------|------------|----------|--------------|---------------|------------|
| n/a | Smith township | Washington | 1 | n/p | n/p | 1.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Smithton borough | Westmoreland | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Somerset township | Washington | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.2% | n/p |
| n/a | South Beaver township | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 1.2% | n/p |
| n/a | South Heights borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.7% | n/p |
| n/a | South Union township | Fayette | 1 | n/p | n/p | 3.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Springdale borough | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Springdale Twn | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.1% | n/p |
| n/a | St. Clair township | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Tarentum Boro | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 3.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Trafford borough | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.7% | n/p |
| n/a | Uniontown city | Fayette | n/p | n/p | n/p | 13.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Upper Tyrone township | Fayette | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Valencia borough | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Venango township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | West Liberty borough | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | West Sunbury borough | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Winfield township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 0.2% | n/p |
| n/a | Worth township | Butler | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | n/p |
| | Total | | 149 | 1 | *0.6% | **8.0% | 0.0 |

Source: County and municipalities in the region; U.S. Census Bureau, 2000

Calculated out of 153

**Percent of African American in the Pittsburgh MSA

Appendix 6. Women Council Presidents/Chairmen in the Pittsburgh MSA

| Rank | Counties & Municipalities | County | Council Presidents/ Chmen | Women | | | Ratio of % Blacks as President to % Blacks in Pop |
|------|---------------------------|--------------|------------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|----------------|--|
| | | | | Number | As % of president/c hman | As % of Pop | |
| 1 | Emsworth borough | Allegheny | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 49.6% | 2.0 |
| 1 | Frazier Twn | Allegheny | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 49.6% | 2.0 |
| 1 | Whitaker borough | Allegheny | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 49.7% | 2.0 |
| 1 | Connoquenessing borough | Butler | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 50.0% | 2.0 |
| 1 | Industry borough | Beaver | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 50.3% | 2.0 |
| 1 | Ohioville borough | Beaver | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 50.7% | 2.0 |
| 7 | Delmont borough | Westmoreland | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 52.0% | 1.9 |
| 7 | East McKeesport borough | Allegheny | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 52.2% | 1.9 |
| 7 | McDonald borough | Allegheny | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 52.3% | 1.9 |
| 7 | Shippingport borough | Beaver | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 52.7% | 1.9 |
| 7 | McKees Rocks borough | Allegheny | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 52.9% | 1.9 |
| 7 | Springdale borough | Allegheny | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 52.9% | 1.9 |
| 7 | Penn Hills Mun | Allegheny | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 53.0% | 1.9 |
| 7 | Pulaski township | Beaver | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 53.0% | 1.9 |
| 7 | Irwin borough | Westmoreland | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 53.2% | 1.9 |
| 7 | Houston borough | Washington | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 53.4% | 1.9 |
| 16 | Coraopolis borough | Allegheny | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 54.3% | 1.8 |
| 16 | Masontown borough | Fayette | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 54.6% | 1.8 |
| 16 | Donora borough | Washington | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 54.7% | 1.8 |
| 19 | Aleppo township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.5% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Allegheny County | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.3% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Ambridge borough | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.7% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Amwell township | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.9% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Aspinwall borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 56.7% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Baldwin Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.6% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Baldwin township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.0% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Beallsville borough | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.5% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Beaver County | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.1% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Bellevue borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 55.3% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Ben Avon borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.4% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Bethel Park borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.1% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Big Beaver borough | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.2% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Blawnox borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.5% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Brighton township | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.2% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Buffalo township | Butler | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.3% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Butler County | Butler | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.1% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Canton township | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.8% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Carnegie borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 54.0% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Carroll township | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.8% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Castle Shannon Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.6% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Center township | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.3% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Centerville Boro | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.8% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Cheswick Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 54.3% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Churchill borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.8% | 0.0 |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|------------------------------------|--------------|---|---|------|-------|-----|
| 19 | Cokeburgh | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 54.0% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Conway borough | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.8% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Cook township | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 49.8% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Cranberry township | Butler | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.7% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Cross Creek township | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 49.7% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Deemston borough | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 48.9% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Derry Twn | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.5% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Donegal township | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 49.7% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Dravosburg borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 54.3% | 0.0 |
| 19 | East Deer township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 55.0% | 0.0 |
| 19 | East Huntingdon township | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.0% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Economy borough | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.1% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Edgewood Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.8% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Etna borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.9% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Fairfield township | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 49.1% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Fayette County | Fayette | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.3% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Findleyville Boro | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.1% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Findlay township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.9% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Forest Hills borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.5% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Forward township | Butler | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.4% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Franklin Park borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.6% | 0.0 |
| 19 | German Twn | Fayette | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.1% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Greene township | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 48.9% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Hampton Twn | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.1% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Harmar township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.7% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Harmony borough | Butler | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.5% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Harrison township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.8% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Heidelberg borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.4% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Hemfield Twn | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.7% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Homestead Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 55.5% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Indiana township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.8% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Ingram Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.1% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Jackson township | Butler | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.1% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Jefferson township | Butler | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 54.0% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Jefferson township | Fayette | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.6% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Kennedy township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.2% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Koppel borough | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.5% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Leetsdale borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 55.4% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Lincoln Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.1% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Marianna borough | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.8% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Marion township | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.3% | 0.0 |
| 19 | McCandless township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.4% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Midway borough | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.6% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Millvale borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.1% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Moon Twn | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.7% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Mount Pleasant township | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.0% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Mount Pleasant township | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.4% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Muddy Creek township | Butler | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 49.9% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Municipality of Murrysville boroug | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.5% | 0.0 |
| 19 | New Sewickley township | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 49.9% | 0.0 |
| 19 | New Stanton Boro | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.8% | 0.0 |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|---------------------------|--------------|---|---|------|-------|-----|
| 19 | Newell borough | Fayette | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.3% | 0.0 |
| 19 | North Belle Vernon | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 54.6% | 0.0 |
| 19 | North Fayette township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.9% | 0.0 |
| 19 | North Huntingdon township | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.6% | 0.0 |
| 19 | North Irwin borough | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.5% | 0.0 |
| 19 | North Strabane township | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.3% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Nottingham township | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 49.3% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Oakdale borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.8% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Oakmont Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 55.8% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Ohio township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.0% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Patterson township | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.2% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Penn township | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 55.0% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Peters township | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.5% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Pine township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.0% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Pittsburgh city | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.4% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Pleasant Hills borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.1% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Raccoon township | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.0% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Reserve township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.6% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Robinson township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.8% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Robinson township | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 49.9% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Rochester township | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 49.9% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Ross township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.4% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Rostraver township | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.2% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Saxonburg borough | Butler | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 58.0% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Scottdale borough | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.5% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Sewickley Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 55.5% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Sewickley Twn | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.1% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Sewickley Heights borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 57.3% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Sewickley Hills borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 49.2% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Shaler township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.3% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Sharpsburg borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 55.0% | 0.0 |
| 19 | South Fayette Twn | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.5% | 0.0 |
| 19 | South Greensburg borough | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.2% | 0.0 |
| 19 | South Strabane township | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.9% | 0.0 |
| 19 | South Versailles Twn | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.4% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Southwest Greensburgh | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.8% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Speers borough | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.3% | 0.0 |
| 19 | St. Clair township | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.4% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Stockdale Boro | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.4% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Summit township | Butler | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 46.4% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Swissvale borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.6% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Turtle Creek Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 55.1% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Unity Twn | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.8% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Upper Burrell township | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 49.5% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Upper St. Clair township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.6% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Vanport township | Beaver | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 57.1% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Versailles Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 55.5% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Washington County | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.9% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Washington township | Butler | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.3% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Washington Twn | Fayette | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.5% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Washington Twn | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.5% | 0.0 |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------------------------|--------------|---|-----|------|-------|-----|
| 19 | West Deer township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.2% | 0.0 |
| 19 | West Elizabeth Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.6% | 0.0 |
| 19 | West Mifflin Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.8% | 0.0 |
| 19 | West Pike Run township | Washington | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.6% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Westmoreland County | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.7% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Wharton twn | Fayette | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.6% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Whitehall Boro | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.6% | 0.0 |
| 19 | White Oak borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.7% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Wilkins township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.8% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Wilmerding borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 54.7% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Worth township | Butler | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.4% | 0.0 |
| 19 | Zelienople borough | Butler | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 54.2% | 0.0 |
| n/a | Adams township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 50.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Allegheny township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 50.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Avonmore borough | Westmoreland | 1 | 0 | n/p | 54.2% | n/p |
| n/a | Baden borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 52.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Beaver borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 52.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Braddock Boro | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 54.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Bradford Woods Boro | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 50.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Brady township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 50.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Bridgeville borough | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 53.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Bridgewater borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 52.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Brownsville township | Fayette | 1 | n/p | n/p | 54.7% | n/p |
| n/a | Bruin borough | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 51.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Bullskin township | Fayette | 1 | n/p | n/p | 49.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Butler township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 51.7% | n/p |
| n/a | Callery borough | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 50.9% | n/p |
| n/a | Cecil Twn | Washington | 1 | n/p | n/p | 51.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Center township | Butler | 1 | 0 | n/p | 51.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Cherry township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 47.7% | n/p |
| n/a | Cherry Valley borough | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 43.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Chicora borough | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 53.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Chippewa township | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 51.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Clay township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 49.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Claysville Boro | Washington | 1 | n/p | n/p | 52.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Clearfield township | Butler | 1 | 0 | n/p | 50.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Clinton township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 49.4% | n/p |
| n/a | Collier township | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | n/p | 52.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Concord township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 50.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Connellsville township | Fayette | 1 | n/p | n/p | 50.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Connoquenessing township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 49.4% | n/p |
| n/a | Crescent township | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 51.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Darlington borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 54.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Darlington township | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 50.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Daugherty township | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 50.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Donegal township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 50.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Dormont borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | n/p | 52.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Dunbar township | Fayette | 1 | n/p | n/p | 54.1% | n/p |
| n/a | East Bethlehem township | Washington | 1 | n/p | n/p | 53.6% | n/p |
| n/a | East Butler borough | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 50.5% | n/p |
| n/a | East Pittsburgh borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | n/p | 56.0% | n/p |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------|--------------|---|-----|-----|-------|-----|
| n/a | East Rochester borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 53.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Eastvale borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 50.9% | n/p |
| n/a | Eau Claire borough | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 50.4% | n/p |
| n/a | Edgeworth borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | n/p | 53.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Elizabeth township | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 52.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Evans City borough | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 50.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Fairview borough | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 49.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Fairview township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 50.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Fallowfield Twn | Washington | 1 | n/p | n/p | 51.2% | n/p |
| n/a | Fallston borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 50.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Forward township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 48.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Frankfort Springs borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 53.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Franklin township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 50.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Franklin township | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 50.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Freedom borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 51.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Georgetown borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 45.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Glasgow borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 46.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Hanover township | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 49.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Harmony township | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 52.4% | n/p |
| n/a | Harrisville borough | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 51.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Homewood borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 51.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Hookstown borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 55.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Hopewell township | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 52.9% | n/p |
| n/a | Independence township | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 49.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Karns City borough | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 52.9% | n/p |
| n/a | Lancaster township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 48.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Loyalhanna township | Westmoreland | 1 | n/p | n/p | 48.9% | n/p |
| n/a | Marion township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 49.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Mars borough | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 58.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Marshall Twn | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 49.9% | n/p |
| n/a | Mercer township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 49.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Middlesex township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 50.7% | n/p |
| n/a | Midland borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 54.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Monaca borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 53.4% | n/p |
| n/a | Mount Lebanon township | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 53.4% | n/p |
| n/a | Mount Pleasant borough | Westmoreland | 1 | n/p | n/p | 54.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Munhall Boro | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 54.1% | n/p |
| n/a | New Brighton borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 53.2% | n/p |
| n/a | New Galilee borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 53.8% | n/p |
| n/a | North Frabklin Twn | Washington | 1 | n/p | n/p | 54.7% | n/p |
| n/a | North Sewickley township | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 51.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Oakland township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 49.2% | n/p |
| n/a | Parker township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 49.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Patterson Heights borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 52.2% | n/p |
| n/a | Penn township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 49.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Petrolia borough | Buttler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 52.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Pitcairn borough | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 52.4% | n/p |
| n/a | Portersville borough | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 50.4% | n/p |
| n/a | Potter township | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 48.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Prospect borough | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 49.9% | n/p |
| n/a | Richland township | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 52.0% | n/p |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------------------|--------------|------------|-----------|---------------|----------------|------------|
| n/a | Rochester borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 53.9% | n/p |
| n/a | Seven Fields borough | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 51.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Slippery Rock borough | Butler | 1 | 0 | n/p | 56.4% | n/p |
| n/a | Slippery Rock township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 51.4% | n/p |
| n/a | Smith township | Washington | 1 | n/p | n/p | 50.4% | n/p |
| n/a | Smithton borough | Westmoreland | 1 | n/p | n/p | 52.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Somerset township | Washington | 1 | n/p | n/p | 49.9% | n/p |
| n/a | South Beaver township | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 51.9% | n/p |
| n/a | South Heights borough | Beaver | 1 | n/p | n/p | 48.9% | n/p |
| n/a | South Union township | Fayette | 1 | n/p | n/p | 54.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Springdale Twn | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 51.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Tarentum Boro | Allegheny | 1 | n/p | n/p | 53.2% | n/p |
| n/a | Trafford borough | Allegheny | 1 | 0 | n/p | 53.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Upper Tyrone township | Fayette | 1 | n/p | n/p | 50.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Valencia borough | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 58.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Venango township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 45.6% | n/p |
| n/a | West Liberty borough | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 46.5% | n/p |
| n/a | West Sunbury borough | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 46.2% | n/p |
| n/a | Winfield township | Butler | 1 | n/p | n/p | 51.1% | n/p |
| | Total | | 158 | 19 | 11.3%* | **52.2% | 0.2 |

Source County and municipalities in the Pittsburgh MSA; U.S. census Bureau, 2000

*Calculated from 167

**Women share of population in the region

Appendix 7. African American Council Members in the Pittsburgh MSA

| Rank | Counties & Municipalities | County | Total Council Members | African American | | | Ratio of % Blacks as council mbrs to % Blacks in Pop |
|------|---------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------|--|
| | | | | Number | As % of council | As % of Pop | |
| 1 | Scottdale borough | Westmoreland | 8 | 1 | 12.5% | 1.1% | 11.4 |
| 2 | North Belle Vernon Boro | Westmoreland | 7 | 1 | 14.3% | 1.3% | 11.0 |
| 3 | Brackenridge boro | Allegheny | 6 | 1 | 16.7% | 3.4% | 4.9 |
| 4 | Findleyville Boro | Washington | 7 | 1 | 14.3% | 5.9% | 2.4 |
| 5 | Corapolis borough | Allegheny | 8 | 2 | 25.0% | 12.4% | 2.0 |
| 5 | Leetsdale borough | Allegheny | 7 | 1 | 14.3% | 7.3% | 2.0 |
| 7 | Washington city | Washington | 4 | 1 | 25.0% | 14.6% | 1.7 |
| 8 | Homestead Boro | Allegheny | 9 | 7 | 77.8% | 51.3% | 1.5 |
| 9 | Beaver Falls city | Beaver | 4 | 1 | 25.0% | 17.5% | 1.4 |
| 10 | McKeesport city | Allegheny | 7 | 2 | 28.6% | 24.5% | 1.2 |
| 11 | Allegheny County | Allegheny | 15 | 2 | 13.3% | 12.3% | 1.1 |
| 12 | Clairton city | Allegheny | 4 | 1 | 25.0% | 28.3% | 0.0 |
| 13 | Pittsburgh city | Allegheny | 9 | 2 | 22.2% | 27.1% | 0.8 |
| 13 | McKees Rocks borough | Allegheny | 9 | 1 | 11.1% | 14.1% | 0.8 |
| 15 | Aliquippa city | Beaver | 4 | 1 | 25.0% | 35.5% | 0.7 |
| 16 | Swissvale borough | Allegheny | 8 | 1 | 12.5% | 22.1% | 0.6 |
| 17 | Duquesne city | Allegheny | 4 | 1 | 25.0% | 47.7% | 0.5 |
| 18 | Aleppo township | Allegheny | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.1% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Ambridge borough | Beaver | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 11.4% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Amwell township | Washington | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Arnold city | Westmoreland | 4 | 0 | 0.0% | 12.8% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Aspinwall borough | Allegheny | 6 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.3% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Avalon Boro | Allegheny | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 4.9% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Avonmore borough | Westmoreland | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.2% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Baden borough | Beaver | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.7% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Baldwin Boro | Allegheny | 6 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.4% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Baldwin township | Allegheny | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.4% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Beallsville borough | Washington | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.8% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Beaver County | Beaver | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 5.9% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Bellevue borough | Allegheny | 10 | 0 | 0.0% | 4.4% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Ben Avon borough | Allegheny | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.5% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Bethel Park borough | Allegheny | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.0% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Big Beaver borough | Beaver | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.7% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Blaine Twn | Washington | 2 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Blawnox borough | Allegheny | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.0% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Brighton township | Beaver | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.1% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Buffalo township | Butler | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Butler city | Butler | 4 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.2% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Butler County | Butler | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.8% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Canton township | Washington | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.3% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Carnegie borough | Allegheny | 6 | 0 | 0.0% | 5.6% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Carroll township | Washington | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.1% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Center township | Beaver | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.0% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Centerville Boro | Washington | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Cheswick Boro | Allegheny | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.3% | 0.0 |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------------------------|--------------|---|---|------|-------|-----|
| 18 | Churchill borough | Allegheny | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 8.4% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Clinton township | Butler | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.1% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Cokeburgh Boro | Washington | 6 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Connellsville city | Fayette | 4 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.9% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Connoquenessing borough | Butler | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Conway borough | Beaver | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.3% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Cook township | Westmoreland | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Cranberry township | Butler | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.9% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Cross Creek township | Washington | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.9% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Deemston borough | Washington | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.4% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Delmont borough | Westmoreland | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.5% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Derry Twn | Westmoreland | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.2% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Donegal township | Washington | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.1% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Donora borough | Washington | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 14.8% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Dravosburg borough | Allegheny | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.5% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Dunbar township | Fayette | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.4% | 0.0 |
| 18 | East Deer township | Allegheny | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.9% | 0.0 |
| 18 | East Huntingdon township | Westmoreland | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.5% | 0.0 |
| 18 | East McKeesport borough | Allegheny | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.9% | 0.0 |
| 18 | East Rochester borough | Beaver | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.5% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Economy borough | Beaver | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.7% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Edgeworth borough | Allegheny | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.0% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Edgewood borough | Allegheny | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 7.9% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Elizabeth township | Allegheny | 8 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.7% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Emsworth borough | Allegheny | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.6% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Etna borough | Allegheny | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.8% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Fairfield township | Westmoreland | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.4% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Fayette County | Fayette | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.4% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Findlay township | Allegheny | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.6% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Forest Hills borough | Allegheny | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.0% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Forward township | Allegheny | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.1% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Franklin Park borough | Allegheny | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.0% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Fraser Twn | Allegheny | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.1% | 0.0 |
| 18 | German Twn | Fayette | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 7.2% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Greene township | Beaver | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.3% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Greensburg city | Westmoreland | 4 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.9% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Hampton Twn | Allegheny | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.7% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Hanover township | Washington | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Harmar township | Allegheny | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.7% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Harmony borough | Butler | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.5% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Harrison township | Allegheny | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.7% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Heidelberg borough | Allegheny | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.1% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Hemfield Twn | Westmoreland | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.1% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Indiana township | Allegheny | 4 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.3% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Industry borough | Beaver | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.9% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Ingram Boro | Allegheny | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.1% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Jackson township | Butler | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.9% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Jeannette city | Westmoreland | 4 | 0 | 0.0% | 5.2% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Jefferson township | Butler | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Jefferson township | Fayette | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.5% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Kennedy township | Allegheny | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.5% | 0.0 |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|-----------------------------|--------------|----|---|------|-------|-----|
| 18 | Kilbuck Twn | Allegheny | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Koppel borough | Beaver | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.5% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Lincoln Boro | Allegheny | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.7% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Lower Burrell city | Westmoreland | 4 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.9% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Marianna borough | Washington | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 8.8% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Marion township | Beaver | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Masontown borough | Fayette | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 5.6% | 0.0 |
| 18 | McCandless township | Allegheny | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.3% | 0.0 |
| 18 | McDonald borough | Allegheny | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 6.3% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Midland borough | Beaver | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 20.8% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Midway borough | Washington | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.5% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Millvale borough | Allegheny | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.0% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Monessen city | Westmoreland | 4 | 0 | 0.0% | 14.0% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Monongahela city | Washington | 4 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.3% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Moon Twn | Allegheny | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.6% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Morris Twn | Washington | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.5% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Mount Lebanon township | Allegheny | 4 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Mount Pleasant township | Washington | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.3% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Mount Pleasant township | Westmoreland | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.3% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Muddy Creek township | Butler | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Muni of Murrysville borough | Westmoreland | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Neville Twn | Allegheny | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.2% | 0.0 |
| 18 | New Kensington city | Westmoreland | 4 | 0 | 0.0% | 9.8% | 0.0 |
| 18 | New Sewickley township | Beaver | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.0 |
| 18 | New Stanton Boro | Westmoreland | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.9% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Newell borough | Fayette | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.0 |
| 18 | North Fayette township | Allegheny | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.6% | 0.0 |
| 18 | North Huntingdon township | Westmoreland | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.3% | 0.0 |
| 18 | North Irwin borough | Westmoreland | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.1% | 0.0 |
| 18 | North Strabane township | Washington | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.1% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Nottingham township | Washington | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Oakdale borough | Allegheny | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.9% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Oakmont Boro | Allegheny | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.9% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Ohio township | Allegheny | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.8% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Ohioville borough | Beaver | 8 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.0% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Patterson township | Beaver | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.5% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Penn Hills Mun | Allegheny | 4 | 0 | 0.0% | 24.2% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Penn township | Westmoreland | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.4% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Peters township | Washington | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.5% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Pine township | Allegheny | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.8% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Pitcairn borough | Allegheny | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.4% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Pleasant Hills borough | Allegheny | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.3% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Pulaski township | Beaver | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.2% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Raccoon township | Beaver | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.4% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Redstone Twn | Fayette | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 8.1% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Reserve township | Allegheny | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.3% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Robinson township | Allegheny | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.9% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Robinson township | Washington | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.3% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Rochester township | Beaver | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.6% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Ross township | Allegheny | 10 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.4% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Rostraver township | Westmoreland | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.9% | 0.0 |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--------------|---|-----|------|-------|-----|
| 18 | Saxonburg borough | Butler | 6 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Sewickley Boro | Allegheny | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 9.6% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Sewickley Twn | Westmoreland | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Sewickley Heights borough | Allegheny | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.9% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Sewickley Hills borough | Allegheny | 8 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.5% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Shaler township | Allegheny | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.4% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Sharpsburg borough | Allegheny | 6 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.8% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Shippingport borough | Beaver | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Smithton borough | Westmoreland | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0 |
| 18 | South Fayette Twn | Allegheny | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.5% | 0.0 |
| 18 | South Greensburg borough | Westmoreland | 6 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.7% | 0.0 |
| 18 | South Strabane township | Washington | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.6% | 0.0 |
| 18 | South Versailles Twn | Allegheny | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Southwest Greensburgh Boro | Westmoreland | 6 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.8% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Speers borough | Washington | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.7% | 0.0 |
| 18 | St. Clair township | Westmoreland | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Stockdale Boro | Washington | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.7% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Summit township | Butler | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 4.0% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Turtle Creek Boro | Allegheny | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 5.2% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Uniontown city | Fayette | 4 | 0 | 0.0% | 13.6% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Unity Twn | Westmoreland | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.3% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Upper Burrell township | Westmoreland | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.8% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Upper St. Clair township | Allegheny | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.7% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Vanport township | Beaver | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.4% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Versailles Boro | Allegheny | 6 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.6% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Washington County | Washington | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.2% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Washington township | Butler | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.3% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Washington Twn | Westmoreland | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.1% | 0.0 |
| 18 | West Deer township | Allegheny | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.3% | 0.0 |
| 18 | West Elizabeth Boro | Allegheny | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.0 |
| 18 | West Homestead Boro | Allegheny | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 8.8% | 0.0 |
| 18 | West Mifflin Boro | Allegheny | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 8.8% | 0.0 |
| 18 | West Pike Run township | Washington | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.9% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Westmoreland County | Westmoreland | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.9% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Wharton Twn | Fayette | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.1% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Whitaker borough | Allegheny | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 5.0% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Whitehall Boro | Allegheny | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.4% | 0.0 |
| 18 | White Oak borough | Allegheny | 8 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.9% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Wilkins township | Allegheny | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 4.4% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Wilmerding borough | Allegheny | 8 | 0 | 0.0% | 6.3% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Winfield township | Butler | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Worth township | Butler | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0 |
| 18 | Zelienople borough | Butler | 8 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.4% | 0.0 |
| n/a | Adams township | Butler | 5 | n/p | n/p | 0.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Allegheny township | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 1.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Beaver borough | Beaver | 9 | n/p | n/p | 2.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Braddock Boro | Allegheny | 6 | n/p | n/p | 66.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Bradford Woods Boro | Allegheny | 7 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Brady township | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 0.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Bridgeville borough | Allegheny | 7 | n/p | n/p | 4.4% | n/p |
| n/a | Bridgewater borough | Beaver | 5 | n/p | n/p | 8.8% | n/p |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------|--------------|---|-----|-----|-------|-----|
| n/a | Brownsville township | Fayette | 3 | n/p | n/p | 3.9% | n/p |
| n/a | Bruin borough | Butler | 6 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Bullskin township | Fayette | 3 | n/p | n/p | 0.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Butler township | Butler | 5 | n/p | n/p | 0.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Callery borough | Butler | 4 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Castle Shannon | Allegheny | 6 | n/p | n/p | 1.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Cecil twn | Washington | 3 | n/p | n/p | 1.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Center township | Butler | 5 | n/p | n/p | 0.4% | n/p |
| n/a | Cherry township | Butler | 5 | n/p | n/p | 0.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Cherry Valley borough | Butler | 5 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Chicora borough | Butler | 6 | n/p | n/p | 0.2% | n/p |
| n/a | Chippewa township | Beaver | 3 | n/p | n/p | 0.9% | n/p |
| n/a | Clay township | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 0.2% | n/p |
| n/a | Claysville Boro | Washington | 7 | n/p | n/p | 0.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Clearfield township | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 0.2% | n/p |
| n/a | Collier township | Allegheny | 5 | n/p | n/p | 0.7% | n/p |
| n/a | Concord township | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 0.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Connellsville township | Fayette | 2 | n/p | n/p | 0.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Connoquenessing twn | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 0.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Crescent township | Allegheny | 5 | n/p | n/p | 1.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Darlington borough | Beaver | 5 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Darlington township | Beaver | 3 | n/p | n/p | 0.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Daugherty township | Beaver | 3 | n/p | n/p | 1.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Donegal township | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 0.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Dormont borough | Allegheny | 7 | n/p | n/p | 1.1% | n/p |
| n/a | East Bethlehem township | Washington | 5 | n/p | n/p | 2.4% | n/p |
| n/a | East Butler borough | Butler | 7 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | East Pittsburgh borough | Allegheny | 5 | n/p | n/p | 20.9% | n/p |
| n/a | Eastvale borough | Beaver | 4 | n/p | n/p | 1.7% | n/p |
| n/a | Eau Claire borough | Butler | 7 | n/p | n/p | 0.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Evans City borough | Butler | 7 | n/p | n/p | 0.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Fairview borough | Butler | 2 | n/p | n/p | 0.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Fairview township | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 0.2% | n/p |
| n/a | Fallowfield Twn | Washington | 3 | n/p | n/p | 1.4% | n/p |
| n/a | Fallston borough | Beaver | 5 | n/p | n/p | 5.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Forward township | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 0.2% | n/p |
| n/a | Frankfort Springs borough | Beaver | 7 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Franklin township | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 0.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Franklin township | Beaver | 3 | n/p | n/p | 0.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Freedom borough | Beaver | 7 | n/p | n/p | 5.2% | n/p |
| n/a | Georgetown borough | Beaver | 7 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Glasgow borough | Beaver | 5 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Hanover township | Beaver | 3 | n/p | n/p | 0.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Harmony township | Beaver | 5 | n/p | n/p | 1.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Harrisville borough | Butler | 7 | n/p | n/p | 0.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Homewood borough | Beaver | 6 | n/p | n/p | 2.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Hookstown borough | Beaver | 6 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Hopewell township | Beaver | 5 | n/p | n/p | 1.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Houston borough | Washington | 8 | n/p | n/p | 3.7% | n/p |
| n/a | Independence township | Beaver | 3 | n/p | n/p | 0.2% | n/p |
| n/a | Irwin borough | Westmoreland | 7 | n/p | n/p | 1.0% | n/p |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------|--------------|------|-----|-------|--------|-----|
| n/a | Karns City borough | Butler | 7 | n/p | n/p | 0.4% | n/p |
| n/a | Lancaster township | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 0.2% | n/p |
| n/a | Loyalhanna township | Westmoreland | 3 | n/p | n/p | 0.7% | n/p |
| n/a | Marion township | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 0.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Mars borough | Butler | 6 | n/p | n/p | 0.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Marshall Twn | Allegheny | 5 | n/p | n/p | 1.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Mercer township | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 0.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Middlesex township | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 0.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Monaca borough | Beaver | 10 | n/p | n/p | 1.9% | n/p |
| n/a | Mount Pleasant borough | Westmoreland | 9 | n/p | n/p | 1.7% | n/p |
| n/a | Muni of Monroeville borough | Allegheny | 7 | n/p | n/p | 8.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Munhall Boro | Allegheny | 7 | n/p | n/p | 3.4% | n/p |
| n/a | New Brighton borough | Beaver | 10 | n/p | n/p | 10.6% | n/p |
| n/a | New Galilee borough | Beaver | 7 | n/p | n/p | 2.1% | n/p |
| n/a | North Franklin Twn | Washington | 3 | n/p | n/p | 2.4% | n/p |
| n/a | North Sewickley township | Beaver | 3 | n/p | n/p | 0.9% | n/p |
| n/a | Oakland township | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 0.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Parker township | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Patterson Heights borough | Beaver | 7 | n/p | n/p | 0.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Penn township | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 0.2% | n/p |
| n/a | Petrolia borough | Butler | 2 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Portersville borough | Butler | 6 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Potter township | Beaver | 3 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Prospect borough | Butler | 7 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Richland township | Allegheny | 5 | n/p | n/p | 0.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Rochester borough | Beaver | 8 | n/p | n/p | 13.4% | n/p |
| n/a | Seven Fields borough | Butler | 4 | n/p | n/p | 0.7% | n/p |
| n/a | Slippery Rock borough | Butler | 6 | n/p | n/p | 3.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Slippery Rock township | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 2.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Smith township | Washington | 3 | n/p | n/p | 1.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Somerset township | Washington | 3 | n/p | n/p | 0.2% | n/p |
| n/a | South Beaver township | Beaver | 3 | n/p | n/p | 1.2% | n/p |
| n/a | South Heights borough | Beaver | 7 | n/p | n/p | 0.7% | n/p |
| n/a | South Union township | Fayette | 3 | n/p | n/p | 3.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Springdale borough | Allegheny | 7 | n/p | n/p | 0.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Springdale Twn | Allegheny | 5 | n/p | n/p | 0.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Tarentum Boro | Allegheny | 8 | n/p | n/p | 3.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Trafford borough | Allegheny | 7 | n/p | n/p | 0.7% | n/p |
| n/a | Upper Tyrone township | Fayette | 3 | n/p | n/p | 0.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Valencia borough | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 0.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Venango township | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | West Liberty borough | Butler | 4 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| n/a | West Sunbury borough | Butler | 6 | n/p | n/p | 0.0% | n/p |
| | | | 1532 | 27 | *1.8% | **8.0% | 0.2 |

Source: County and municipalities in the region; U.S. Census Bureau

*Calculated out of 1430 council members

**Percentage of African American in the Pittsburgh MSA

Appendix 8. Female Council Members in the Pittsburgh MSA

| Rank | Counties & Municipalities | County | Total Council Members | Women | | | Ratio of % women as council mbrs to % women in Pop |
|------|---------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|--------|------------------------|-------------|--|
| | | | | Number | As % of Council member | As % of Pop | |
| 1 | Finleyville Boro | Washington | 7 | 5 | 71.4% | 52.1% | 1.4 |
| 2 | Frazier Twn | Allegheny | 3 | 2 | 66.7% | 49.6% | 1.3 |
| 3 | Whitaker borough | Allegheny | 7 | 4 | 57.1% | 49.7% | 1.1 |
| 4 | Aleppo township | Allegheny | 5 | 3 | 60.0% | 52.5% | 1.1 |
| 5 | Marianna borough | Washington | 5 | 3 | 60.0% | 53.8% | 1.1 |
| 6 | Delmont borough | Westmoreland | 7 | 4 | 57.1% | 52.0% | 1.1 |
| 7 | East McKeesport borough | Allegheny | 7 | 4 | 57.1% | 52.2% | 1.1 |
| 8 | Penn Hills Mun | Allegheny | 4 | 2 | 50.0% | 53.0% | 0.9 |
| 9 | Connellsville city | Fayette | 4 | 2 | 50.0% | 53.5% | 0.9 |
| 10 | Cokeburgh Boro | Washington | 6 | 3 | 50.0% | 54.0% | 0.9 |
| 11 | Beaver Falls city | Beaver | 4 | 2 | 50.0% | 54.3% | 0.9 |
| 12 | Versailles Boro | Allegheny | 6 | 3 | 50.0% | 55.5% | 0.9 |
| 13 | Emsworth borough | Allegheny | 7 | 3 | 42.9% | 49.6% | 0.9 |
| 14 | Industry borough | Beaver | 7 | 3 | 42.9% | 50.3% | 0.9 |
| 15 | Centerville Boro | Washington | 7 | 3 | 42.9% | 51.8% | 0.8 |
| 16 | Pitcairn borough | Allegheny | 7 | 3 | 42.9% | 52.4% | 0.8 |
| 17 | Shippingport borough | Beaver | 7 | 3 | 42.9% | 52.7% | 0.8 |
| 18 | Conway borough | Beaver | 7 | 3 | 42.9% | 52.8% | 0.8 |
| 19 | Ingram Boro | Allegheny | 7 | 3 | 42.9% | 53.1% | 0.8 |
| 20 | Irwin borough | Westmoreland | 7 | 3 | 42.9% | 53.2% | 0.8 |
| 21 | Buffalo township | Butler | 5 | 2 | 40.0% | 50.3% | 0.8 |
| 22 | Moon Twn | Allegheny | 5 | 2 | 40.0% | 50.7% | 0.8 |
| 23 | Hampton Twn | Allegheny | 5 | 2 | 40.0% | 51.1% | 0.8 |
| 24 | Collier township | Allegheny | 5 | 2 | 40.0% | 52.1% | 0.8 |
| 25 | Lincoln Boro | Allegheny | 5 | 2 | 40.0% | 52.1% | 0.8 |
| 26 | Baldwin township | Allegheny | 5 | 2 | 40.0% | 53.0% | 0.8 |
| 27 | East Rochester borough | Beaver | 5 | 2 | 40.0% | 53.0% | 0.8 |
| 28 | Elizabeth township | Allegheny | 8 | 3 | 37.5% | 52.0% | 0.7 |
| 29 | Houston borough | Washington | 8 | 3 | 37.5% | 53.4% | 0.7 |
| 30 | Scottdale borough | Westmoreland | 8 | 3 | 37.5% | 53.5% | 0.7 |
| 31 | Coraopolis borough | Allegheny | 8 | 3 | 37.5% | 54.3% | 0.7 |
| 32 | Loyalhanna township | Westmoreland | 3 | 1 | 33.3% | 48.9% | 0.7 |
| 33 | Raccoon township | Beaver | 3 | 1 | 33.3% | 50.0% | 0.7 |
| 34 | Findlay township | Allegheny | 3 | 1 | 33.3% | 50.9% | 0.7 |
| 35 | North Sewickley township | Beaver | 3 | 1 | 33.3% | 51.5% | 0.6 |
| 36 | Washington County | Washington | 3 | 1 | 33.3% | 51.9% | 0.6 |
| 37 | McKees Rocks borough | Allegheny | 9 | 3 | 33.3% | 52.9% | 0.6 |
| 38 | Pulaski township | Beaver | 3 | 1 | 33.3% | 53.0% | 0.6 |
| 39 | South Greensburg borough | Westmoreland | 6 | 2 | 33.3% | 53.2% | 0.6 |
| 40 | Mount Pleasant borough | Westmoreland | 9 | 3 | 33.3% | 54.5% | 0.6 |
| 41 | Homestead Boro | Allegheny | 9 | 3 | 33.3% | 55.5% | 0.6 |
| 42 | Slippery Rock borough | Butler | 6 | 2 | 33.3% | 56.4% | 0.6 |
| 43 | Connoquenessing borough | Butler | 7 | 2 | 28.6% | 50.0% | 0.6 |
| 44 | Economy borough | Beaver | 7 | 2 | 28.6% | 50.1% | 0.6 |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|-----------------------------|--------------|----|---|-------|-------|-----|
| 45 | Peters township | Washington | 7 | 2 | 28.6% | 51.5% | 0.6 |
| 46 | Upper St. Clair township | Allegheny | 7 | 2 | 28.6% | 51.6% | 0.6 |
| 47 | Churchill borough | Allegheny | 7 | 2 | 28.6% | 51.8% | 0.6 |
| 48 | Baden borough | Beaver | 7 | 2 | 28.6% | 52.6% | 0.5 |
| 49 | Dormont borough | Allegheny | 7 | 2 | 28.6% | 52.8% | 0.5 |
| 50 | Springdale borough | Allegheny | 7 | 2 | 28.6% | 52.9% | 0.5 |
| 51 | Blawnox borough | Allegheny | 7 | 2 | 28.6% | 53.5% | 0.5 |
| 52 | Forest Hills borough | Allegheny | 7 | 2 | 28.6% | 53.5% | 0.5 |
| 53 | West Elizabeth Boro | Allegheny | 7 | 2 | 28.6% | 53.6% | 0.5 |
| 54 | Whitehall Boro | Allegheny | 7 | 2 | 28.6% | 53.6% | 0.5 |
| 55 | Edgewood Boro | Allegheny | 7 | 2 | 28.6% | 53.8% | 0.5 |
| 56 | Avonmore borough | Westmoreland | 7 | 2 | 28.6% | 54.2% | 0.5 |
| 57 | Masontown borough | Fayette | 7 | 2 | 28.6% | 54.6% | 0.5 |
| 58 | Donora borough | Washington | 7 | 2 | 28.6% | 54.7% | 0.5 |
| 59 | Leetsdale borough | Allegheny | 7 | 2 | 28.6% | 55.4% | 0.5 |
| 60 | Sewickley Hills borough | Allegheny | 8 | 2 | 25.0% | 49.2% | 0.5 |
| 61 | Indiana township | Allegheny | 4 | 1 | 25.0% | 50.8% | 0.5 |
| 62 | Lower Burrell city | Westmoreland | 4 | 1 | 25.0% | 52.9% | 0.5 |
| 63 | New Kensington city | Westmoreland | 4 | 1 | 25.0% | 53.1% | 0.5 |
| 64 | Washington city | Washington | 4 | 1 | 25.0% | 53.1% | 0.5 |
| 65 | Aliquippa city | Beaver | 4 | 1 | 25.0% | 54.7% | 0.5 |
| 66 | Greensburg city | Westmoreland | 4 | 1 | 25.0% | 55.1% | 0.5 |
| 67 | Duquesne city | Allegheny | 4 | 1 | 25.0% | 55.5% | 0.5 |
| 68 | Pittsburgh city | Allegheny | 9 | 2 | 22.2% | 52.4% | 0.4 |
| 69 | Sewickley Boro | Allegheny | 9 | 2 | 22.2% | 55.6% | 0.4 |
| 70 | Hemfield Twn | Westmoreland | 5 | 1 | 20.0% | 51.7% | 0.4 |
| 71 | Newell borough | Fayette | 5 | 1 | 20.0% | 52.3% | 0.4 |
| 72 | South Fayette Twn | Allegheny | 5 | 1 | 20.0% | 52.5% | 0.4 |
| 73 | Wilkins township | Allegheny | 5 | 1 | 20.0% | 52.8% | 0.4 |
| 74 | Patterson township | Beaver | 5 | 1 | 20.0% | 53.2% | 0.4 |
| 75 | Heidelberg borough | Allegheny | 5 | 1 | 20.0% | 53.4% | 0.4 |
| 76 | Penn township | Westmoreland | 5 | 1 | 20.0% | 55.0% | 0.4 |
| 77 | Bellevue borough | Allegheny | 10 | 2 | 20.0% | 55.3% | 0.4 |
| 78 | East Pittsburgh borough | Allegheny | 5 | 1 | 20.0% | 56.0% | 0.4 |
| 79 | Vanport township | Beaver | 5 | 1 | 20.0% | 57.1% | 0.4 |
| 80 | Castle Shannon | Allegheny | 6 | 1 | 16.7% | 52.6% | 0.3 |
| 81 | Southwest Greensburgh Bor | Westmoreland | 6 | 1 | 16.7% | 52.8% | 0.3 |
| 82 | Carnegie borough | Allegheny | 6 | 1 | 16.7% | 54.0% | 0.3 |
| 83 | Sharpsburg borough | Allegheny | 6 | 1 | 16.7% | 55.0% | 0.3 |
| 84 | Brackenridge boro | Allegheny | 6 | 1 | 16.7% | 55.3% | 0.3 |
| 85 | Aspinwall borough | Allegheny | 6 | 1 | 16.7% | 56.7% | 0.3 |
| 86 | Saxonburg borough | Butler | 6 | 1 | 16.7% | 58.0% | 0.3 |
| 87 | Muni of Murrysville borough | Westmoreland | 7 | 1 | 14.3% | 50.5% | 0.3 |
| 88 | Franklin Park borough | Allegheny | 7 | 1 | 14.3% | 50.6% | 0.3 |
| 89 | New Stanton Boro | Westmoreland | 7 | 1 | 14.3% | 50.8% | 0.3 |
| 90 | Millvale borough | Allegheny | 7 | 1 | 14.3% | 51.1% | 0.3 |
| 91 | Big Beaver borough | Beaver | 7 | 1 | 14.3% | 51.2% | 0.3 |
| 92 | West Deer township | Allegheny | 7 | 1 | 14.3% | 51.2% | 0.3 |
| 93 | North Irwin borough | Westmoreland | 7 | 1 | 14.3% | 51.5% | 0.3 |
| 94 | Pleasant Hills borough | Allegheny | 7 | 1 | 14.3% | 52.1% | 0.3 |
| 95 | McDonald borough | Allegheny | 7 | 1 | 14.3% | 52.3% | 0.3 |
| 96 | Smithton borough | Westmoreland | 7 | 1 | 14.3% | 52.5% | 0.3 |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------------------------|--------------|----|---|-------|-------|-----|
| 97 | Midway borough | Washington | 7 | 1 | 14.3% | 52.6% | 0.3 |
| 98 | Ambridge borough | Beaver | 7 | 1 | 14.3% | 52.7% | 0.3 |
| 99 | West Mifflin Boro | Allegheny | 7 | 1 | 14.3% | 52.8% | 0.3 |
| 100 | Edgeworth borough | Allegheny | 7 | 1 | 14.3% | 53.0% | 0.3 |
| 101 | West Homestead Boro | Allegheny | 7 | 1 | 14.3% | 53.0% | 0.3 |
| 102 | Ben Avon borough | Allegheny | 7 | 1 | 14.3% | 53.4% | 0.3 |
| 103 | McKeesport city | Allegheny | 7 | 1 | 14.3% | 54.1% | 0.3 |
| 104 | Cheswick Boro | Washington | 7 | 1 | 14.3% | 54.3% | 0.3 |
| 105 | North Belle Vernon Boro | Westmoreland | 7 | 1 | 14.3% | 54.6% | 0.3 |
| 106 | Midland borough | Beaver | 7 | 1 | 14.3% | 54.8% | 0.3 |
| 107 | Oakmont Boro | Allegheny | 7 | 1 | 14.3% | 55.8% | 0.3 |
| 108 | Allegheny County | Allegheny | 15 | 2 | 13.3% | 52.3% | 0.3 |
| 109 | Ohioville borough | Beaver | 8 | 1 | 12.5% | 50.7% | 0.2 |
| 110 | Swissvale borough | Allegheny | 8 | 1 | 12.5% | 51.6% | 0.2 |
| 111 | White Oak borough | Allegheny | 8 | 1 | 12.5% | 52.7% | 0.2 |
| 112 | Zelienople borough | Butler | 8 | 1 | 12.5% | 54.2% | 0.2 |
| 113 | Wilmerding borough | Allegheny | 8 | 1 | 12.5% | 54.7% | 0.2 |
| 114 | Bethel Park borough | Allegheny | 9 | 1 | 11.1% | 52.1% | 0.2 |
| 115 | Etna borough | Allegheny | 9 | 1 | 11.1% | 52.9% | 0.2 |
| 116 | Turtle Creek Boro | Allegheny | 9 | 1 | 11.1% | 55.1% | 0.2 |
| 117 | Ross township | Allegheny | 10 | 1 | 10.0% | 53.4% | 0.2 |
| 118 | Amwell township | Washington | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.9% | 0 |
| 118 | Arnold city | Westmoreland | 4 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.6% | 0 |
| 118 | Avalon Boro | Allegheny | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 54.2% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Baldwin Boro | Allegheny | 6 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.6% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Beallsville borough | Washington | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.5% | 0 |
| 118 | Beaver County | Beaver | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.1% | 0 |
| 118 | Blaine Twn | Washington | 2 | 0 | 0.0% | 49.1% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Brighton township | Beaver | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.2% | 0 |
| 118 | Butler city | Butler | 4 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.2% | 0 |
| 118 | Butler County | Butler | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.1% | 0 |
| 118 | Canton township | Washington | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.8% | 0 |
| 118 | Carroll township | Washington | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.8% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Center township | Beaver | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.3% | 0 |
| 118 | Center township | Butler | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.8% | 0 |
| 118 | Clairton city | Allegheny | 4 | 0 | 0.0% | 54.4% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Clearfield township | Butler | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.3% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Clinton township | Butler | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 49.4% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Cook township | Westmoreland | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 49.8% | 0 |
| 118 | Cranberry township | Butler | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.7% | 0 |
| 118 | Cross Creek township | Washington | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 49.7% | 0 |
| 118 | Deemston borough | Washington | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 48.9% | 0 |
| 118 | Derry Twn | Westmoreland | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.5% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Donegal township | Butler | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.3% | 0 |
| 118 | Donegal township | Washington | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 49.7% | 0 |
| 118 | Dravosburg borough | Allegheny | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 54.3% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Dunbar township | Fayette | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 54.1% | 0.0 |
| 118 | East Deer township | Allegheny | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 55.0% | 0.0 |
| 118 | East Huntingdon township | Westmoreland | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.0% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Fairfield township | Westmoreland | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 49.1% | 0 |
| 118 | Fayette County | Fayette | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.3% | 0 |
| 118 | Forward township | Allegheny | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.4% | 0 |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------|--------------|----|---|------|-------|-----|
| 118 | German Twn | Fayette | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.1% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Greene township | Beaver | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 48.9% | 0 |
| 118 | Hanover township | Washington | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 48.8% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Harmar township | Allegheny | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.7% | 0 |
| 118 | Harmony borough | Butler | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.5% | 0 |
| 118 | Harrison township | Allegheny | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.8% | 0 |
| 118 | Jackson township | Butler | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.1% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Jeannette city | Westmoreland | 4 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.3% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Jefferson township | Butler | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 54.0% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Jefferson township | Fayette | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.6% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Kennedy township | Allegheny | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.2% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Kilbuck Twn | Allegheny | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 48.8% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Koppel borough | Beaver | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.5% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Marion township | Beaver | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.3% | 0 |
| 118 | McCandless township | Allegheny | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.4% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Middlesex township | Butler | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.7% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Monessen city | Westmoreland | 4 | 0 | 0.0% | 54.1% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Monongahela city | Washington | 4 | 0 | 0.0% | 54.0% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Morris Twn | Washington | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.7% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Mount Lebanon township | Allegheny | 4 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.4% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Mount Pleasant township | Washington | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.0% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Mount Pleasant township | Westmoreland | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.4% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Muddy Creek township | Butler | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 49.9% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Muni of Monroeville borough | Allegheny | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.0% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Neville Twn | Allegheny | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.3% | 0.0 |
| 118 | New Brighton borough | Beaver | 10 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.2% | 0.0 |
| 118 | New Sewickley township | Beaver | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 49.9% | 0.0 |
| 118 | North Fayette township | Allegheny | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.9% | 0.0 |
| 118 | North Huntingdon township | Westmoreland | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.6% | 0.0 |
| 118 | North Strabane township | Washington | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.3% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Nottingham township | Washington | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 49.3% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Oakdale borough | Allegheny | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.8% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Ohio township | Allegheny | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.0% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Pine township | Allegheny | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.0% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Redstone Twn | Fayette | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.7% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Reserve township | Allegheny | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.6% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Robinson township | Allegheny | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.8% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Robinson township | Washington | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 49.9% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Rochester township | Beaver | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 49.9% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Rostraver township | Westmoreland | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.2% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Sewickley Twn | Westmoreland | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.1% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Sewickley Heights borough | Allegheny | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 57.3% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Shaler township | Allegheny | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.3% | 0.0 |
| 118 | South Strabane township | Washington | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.9% | 0.0 |
| 118 | South Versailles Twn | Allegheny | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.4% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Speers borough | Washington | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.3% | 0.0 |
| 118 | St. Clair township | Westmoreland | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.4% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Stockdale Boro | Washington | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.4% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Summit township | Butler | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 46.4% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Trafford borough | Allegheny | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.5% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Uniontown city | Fayette | 4 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.7% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Unity Twn | Westmoreland | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.8% | 0.0 |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------|--------------|---|-----|------|-------|-----|
| 118 | Upper Burrell township | Westmoreland | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 49.5% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Washington township | Butler | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.3% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Washington Twn | Westmoreland | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.5% | 0.0 |
| 118 | West Pike Run township | Washington | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.6% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Westmoreland County | Westmoreland | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.7% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Wharton Twn | Fayette | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.6% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Winfield township | Butler | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.1% | 0.0 |
| 118 | Worth township | Butler | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.4% | 0.0 |
| n/a | Adams township | Butler | 5 | n/p | n/p | 50.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Allegheny township | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 50.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Beaver borough | Beaver | 9 | n/p | n/p | 52.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Braddock Boro | Allegheny | 6 | n/p | n/p | 54.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Bradford Woods | Allegheny | 7 | n/p | n/p | 50.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Brady township | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 50.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Bridgeville borough | Allegheny | 7 | n/p | n/p | 53.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Bridgewater borough | Beaver | 5 | n/p | n/p | 52.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Brownsville township | Fayette | 3 | n/p | n/p | 54.7% | n/p |
| n/a | Bruin borough | Butler | 6 | n/p | n/p | 51.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Bullskin township | Fayette | 3 | n/p | n/p | 49.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Butler township | Butler | 5 | n/p | n/p | 51.7% | n/p |
| n/a | Callery borough | Butler | 4 | n/p | n/p | 50.9% | n/p |
| n/a | Cecil Twn | Washington | 3 | n/p | n/p | 51.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Cherry township | Butler | 5 | n/p | n/p | 47.7% | n/p |
| n/a | Cherry Valley borough | Butler | 5 | n/p | n/p | 43.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Chicora borough | Butler | 6 | n/p | n/p | 53.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Chippewa township | Beaver | 3 | n/p | n/p | 51.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Clay township | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 49.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Claysville Boro | Washington | 7 | n/p | n/p | 52.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Concord township | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 50.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Connellsville township | Fayette | 2 | n/p | n/p | 50.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Connoquenessing township | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 49.4% | n/p |
| n/a | Crescent township | Allegheny | 5 | n/p | n/p | 51.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Darlington borough | Beaver | 5 | n/p | n/p | 54.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Darlington township | Beaver | 3 | n/p | n/p | 50.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Daugherty township | Beaver | 3 | n/p | n/p | 50.8% | n/p |
| n/a | East Bethlehem township | Washington | 5 | n/p | n/p | 53.6% | n/p |
| n/a | East Butler borough | Butler | 7 | n/p | n/p | 50.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Eastvale borough | Beaver | 4 | n/p | n/p | 50.9% | n/p |
| n/a | Eau Claire borough | Butler | 7 | n/p | n/p | 50.4% | n/p |
| n/a | Evans City borough | Butler | 7 | n/p | n/p | 50.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Fairview borough | Butler | 2 | n/p | n/p | 49.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Fairview township | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 50.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Fallowfield Twn | Washington | 3 | n/p | n/p | 51.2% | n/p |
| n/a | Fallston borough | Beaver | 5 | n/p | n/p | 50.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Forward township | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 48.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Frankfort Springs borough | Beaver | 7 | n/p | n/p | 53.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Franklin township | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 50.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Franklin township | Beaver | 3 | n/p | n/p | 50.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Freedom borough | Beaver | 7 | n/p | n/p | 51.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Georgetown borough | Beaver | 7 | n/p | n/p | 45.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Glasgow borough | Beaver | 5 | n/p | n/p | 46.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Hanover township | Beaver | 3 | n/p | n/p | 49.8% | n/p |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------|------------|-------------|------------|---------------|----------------|------------|
| n/a | Harmony township | Beaver | 5 | n/p | n/p | 52.4% | n/p |
| n/a | Harrisville borough | Butler | 7 | n/p | n/p | 51.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Homewood borough | Beaver | 6 | n/p | n/p | 51.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Hookstown borough | Beaver | 6 | n/p | n/p | 55.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Hopewell township | Beaver | 5 | n/p | n/p | 52.9% | n/p |
| n/a | Independence township | Beaver | 3 | n/p | n/p | 49.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Karns City borough | Butler | 7 | n/p | n/p | 52.9% | n/p |
| n/a | Lancaster township | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 48.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Marion township | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 49.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Mars borough | Butler | 6 | n/p | n/p | 58.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Marshall Twn | Allegheny | 5 | n/p | n/p | 49.9% | n/p |
| n/a | Mercer township | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 49.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Monaca borough | Beaver | 10 | n/p | n/p | 53.4% | n/p |
| n/a | Munhall Boro | Allegheny | 7 | n/p | n/p | 54.1% | n/p |
| n/a | New Galilee borough | Beaver | 7 | n/p | n/p | 53.8% | n/p |
| n/a | North Franklin Twn | Washington | 3 | n/p | n/p | 54.7% | n/p |
| n/a | Oakland township | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 49.2% | n/p |
| n/a | Parker township | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 49.3% | n/p |
| n/a | Patterson Heights borough | Beaver | 7 | n/p | n/p | 52.2% | n/p |
| n/a | Penn township | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 49.5% | n/p |
| n/a | Petrolia borough | Butler | 2 | n/p | n/p | 52.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Portersville borough | Butler | 6 | n/p | n/p | 50.4% | n/p |
| n/a | Potter township | Beaver | 3 | n/p | n/p | 48.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Prospect borough | Butler | 7 | n/p | n/p | 49.9% | n/p |
| n/a | Richland township | Allegheny | 5 | n/p | n/p | 52.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Rochester borough | Beaver | 8 | n/p | n/p | 53.9% | n/p |
| n/a | Seven Fields borough | Butler | 4 | n/p | n/p | 51.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Slippery Rock township | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 51.4% | n/p |
| n/a | Smith township | Washington | 3 | n/p | n/p | 50.4% | n/p |
| n/a | Somerset township | Washington | 3 | n/p | n/p | 49.9% | n/p |
| n/a | South Beaver township | Beaver | 3 | n/p | n/p | 51.9% | n/p |
| n/a | South Heights borough | Beaver | 7 | n/p | n/p | 48.9% | n/p |
| n/a | South Union township | Fayette | 3 | n/p | n/p | 54.0% | n/p |
| n/a | Springdale Twn | Allegheny | 5 | n/p | n/p | 51.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Tarentum Boro | Allegheny | 8 | n/p | n/p | 53.2% | n/p |
| n/a | Upper Tyrone township | Fayette | 3 | n/p | n/p | 50.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Valencia borough | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 58.6% | n/p |
| n/a | Venango township | Butler | 3 | n/p | n/p | 45.6% | n/p |
| n/a | West Liberty borough | Butler | 4 | n/p | n/p | 46.5% | n/p |
| n/a | West Sunbury borough | Butler | 6 | n/p | n/p | 46.2% | n/p |
| | Total | | 1532 | 203 | *17.8% | **52.2% | 0.3 |

*Calculated out of 1138

**Women's share of population in the region

Sources: Counties and municipalities in the Pittsburgh MSA; US Census Bureau

Appendix 9. African American Share of School Board Members in the Pittsburgh MSA

| Rank | School District | County | Total Number | African American | | | Ratio of % Blacks as Board Mbrs to % Blacks in Pop |
|------|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|------------------|--------------------|----------------|--|
| | | | | Number | As % of Board Mbrs | As % of SD Pop | |
| 1 | Big Beaver Falls | Beaver | 9 | 3 | 33.3% | 12.6% | 2.7 |
| 2 | New Kensington Arnold | Westmoreland | 9 | 2 | 22.2% | 10.7% | 2.1 |
| 2 | Cornel | Allegheny | 9 | 2 | 22.2% | 10.6% | 2.1 |
| 4 | Gateway | Allegheny | 9 | 1 | 11.1% | 7.4% | 1.5 |
| 5 | East Allegheny | Allegheny | 9 | 1 | 11.1% | 8.0% | 1.4 |
| 6 | Rochester Area | Beaver | 9 | 1 | 11.1% | 8.7% | 1.3 |
| 7 | Pittsburgh | Allegheny | 9 | 3 | 33.3% | 26.9% | 1.2 |
| 8 | Midland Borough | Beaver | 9 | 2 | 22.2% | 20.8% | 1.1 |
| 9 | Wilkinsburgh Boro | Allegheny | 9 | 6 | 66.7% | 66.5% | 1.0 |
| 10 | Alliquippa | Beaver | 9 | 3 | 33.3% | 35.5% | 0.9 |
| 10 | Penn Hills | Allegheny | 9 | 2 | 22.2% | 24.2% | 0.9 |
| 12 | Washington | Washington | 9 | 1 | 11.1% | 13.4% | 0.8 |
| 13 | Duquesne City | Allegheny | 9 | 2 | 22.2% | 47.7% | 0.5 |
| 14 | Albert Gallatin Area | Fayette | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.0% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Ambridge Area | Beaver | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 4.1% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Avella Area | Washington | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.7% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Avonworth | Allegheny | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.0% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Beaver Area | Beaver | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.0% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Bethel Park | Allegheny | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.0% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Bethlehem Center | Washington | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.5% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Black Hawk | Beaver | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.0% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Brentwood Boro | Allegheny | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.5% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Brownsville Area | Fayette | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 6.9% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Burgettstown | Washington | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.3% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Burrell | Westmoreland | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.2% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Butler Area | Butler | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.2% | 0.0 |
| 14 | California Area | Washington | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.1% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Canon Mc Millan | Washington | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.3% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Charleroi Area | Washington | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.0% | 0.0 |
| 14 | ChartiersValley | Allegheny | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.7% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Connellsville Area | Fayette | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.4% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Deer Lakes | Allegheny | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.4% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Derry Area | Westmoreland | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.1% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Elizabeth Forward | Allegheny | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.7% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Fort Cherry | Washington | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.6% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Franklin Regional | Westmoreland | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Frazier | Fayette | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.5% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Greater Latrobe | Westmoreland | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.3% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Greensburg Salem | Westmoreland | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.7% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Hampton Twn | Allegheny | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.7% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Hempfield Area | Westmoreland | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.6% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Highlands | Allegheny | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.2% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Hopewell Area | Beaver | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.3% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Karns City Area | Butler | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.4% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Monaca | Beaver | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.9% | 0.0 |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------|--------------|------------|-----------|--------------|---------------|------------|
| 14 | Monessen City | Westmoreland | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 14.0% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Moniteau | Butler | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Montour | Allegheny | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.6% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Moon Area | Allegheny | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.4% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Mount Lebanon | Allegheny | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0 |
| 14 | New Brighton Area | Beaver | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 6.9% | 0.0 |
| 14 | North Hills | Allegheny | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.3% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Northgate | Allegheny | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 4.6% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Norwin | Westmoreland | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.4% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Peters Township | Washington | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.5% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Pine-Richland | Allegheny | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Plum Boro | Allegheny | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.8% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Quaker Valley | Allegheny | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 4.7% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Ringgold | Washington | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 4.3% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Riverside Beaver County | Beaver | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Riverview | Allegheny | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.6% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Seneca Valley | Butler | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.7% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Shaler Area | Allegheny | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0 |
| 14 | South Allegheny | Allegheny | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.8% | 0.0 |
| 14 | South Fayette Twn | Allegheny | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.5% | 0.0 |
| 14 | South Park | Allegheny | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.2% | 0.0 |
| 14 | South Side Area | Beaver | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.4% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Sto-Rox | Allegheny | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 11.0% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Trinity Area | Washington | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.1% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Uniontown Area | Fayette | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 6.9% | 0.0 |
| 14 | West Allegheny | Allegheny | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.2% | 0.0 |
| 14 | West Mifflin Area | Allegheny | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 8.6% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Western Beaver County | Beaver | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.0% | 0.0 |
| 14 | Yough | Westmoreland | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0 |
| n/a | Ligonier Valley | Westmoreland | 9 | n/p | n/p | 0.1% | n/p |
| n/a | Slippery Rock Area | Butler | 9 | n/p | n/p | 1.2% | n/p |
| n/a | Steel Valley | Allegheny | 9 | n/p | n/p | 13.5% | n/p |
| | Total | | 693 | 29 | *4.3% | **8.2% | 0.5 |

Sources: School Districts in the Pittsburgh MSA and Pennsylvania State Data Center

See Appendix 11

*Calculated out of 666

**Average black share of population in the region

Appendix 10. Women Share of School Board Members in the Pittsburgh MSA

| Rank | School District | County | Total Number | Women | | | Ratio of % Women as Directors to % Women in County Pop |
|------|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------|--------------------|--------------------|--|
| | | | | Number | As % of board Mbrs | As % of County Pop | |
| 1 | Penn Hills | Allegheny | 9 | 7 | 77.8% | 52.6% | 1.5 |
| 2 | Chartiers Valley | Allegheny | 9 | 6 | 66.7% | 52.6% | 1.3 |
| 2 | East Allegheny | Allegheny | 9 | 6 | 66.7% | 52.6% | 1.3 |
| 2 | Wilkinsburgh Boro | Allegheny | 9 | 6 | 66.7% | 52.6% | 1.3 |
| 5 | Franklin Regional | Westmoreland | 9 | 5 | 55.6% | 51.8% | 1.1 |
| 5 | Monessen City | Westmoreland | 9 | 5 | 55.6% | 51.8% | 1.1 |
| 5 | Trinity Area | Washington | 9 | 5 | 55.6% | 52.0% | 1.1 |
| 5 | Black Hawk | Beaver | 9 | 5 | 55.6% | 52.1% | 1.1 |
| 5 | Riverside Beaver County | Beaver | 9 | 5 | 55.6% | 52.1% | 1.1 |
| 5 | Avonworth | Allegheny | 9 | 5 | 55.6% | 52.6% | 1.1 |
| 5 | Highlands | Allegheny | 9 | 5 | 55.6% | 52.6% | 1.1 |
| 5 | North Hills | Allegheny | 9 | 5 | 55.6% | 52.6% | 1.1 |
| 5 | Plum Boro | Allegheny | 9 | 5 | 55.6% | 52.6% | 1.1 |
| 5 | Quaker Valley | Allegheny | 9 | 5 | 55.6% | 52.6% | 1.1 |
| 5 | South Fayette Twn | Allegheny | 9 | 5 | 55.6% | 52.6% | 1.1 |
| 16 | Butler Area | Butler | 9 | 4 | 44.4% | 51.2% | 0.9 |
| 16 | Greater Latrobe | Westmoreland | 9 | 4 | 44.4% | 51.8% | 0.9 |
| 16 | Hempfield Area | Westmoreland | 9 | 4 | 44.4% | 51.8% | 0.9 |
| 16 | Norwin | Westmoreland | 9 | 4 | 44.4% | 51.8% | 0.9 |
| 16 | Bethlehem Center | Washington | 9 | 4 | 44.4% | 52.0% | 0.9 |
| 16 | California Area | Washington | 9 | 4 | 44.4% | 52.0% | 0.9 |
| 16 | Charleroi Area | Washington | 9 | 4 | 44.4% | 52.0% | 0.9 |
| 16 | Peters Township | Washington | 9 | 4 | 44.4% | 52.0% | 0.9 |
| 16 | Ringgold | Washington | 9 | 4 | 44.4% | 52.0% | 0.9 |
| 16 | Big Beaver Falls | Beaver | 9 | 4 | 44.4% | 52.1% | 0.9 |
| 16 | Brownsville Area | Fayette | 9 | 4 | 44.4% | 52.1% | 0.9 |
| 16 | Uniontown Area | Fayette | 9 | 4 | 44.4% | 52.1% | 0.9 |
| 28 | Brentwood Boro | Allegheny | 9 | 4 | 44.4% | 52.6% | 0.8 |
| 28 | Cornell | Allegheny | 9 | 4 | 44.4% | 52.6% | 0.8 |
| 28 | Elizabeth Forward | Allegheny | 9 | 4 | 44.4% | 52.6% | 0.8 |
| 28 | Hampton Twn | Allegheny | 9 | 4 | 44.4% | 52.6% | 0.8 |
| 28 | Montour | Allegheny | 9 | 4 | 44.4% | 52.6% | 0.8 |
| 28 | Mount Lebanon | Allegheny | 9 | 4 | 44.4% | 52.6% | 0.8 |
| 28 | Northgate | Allegheny | 9 | 4 | 44.4% | 52.6% | 0.8 |
| 28 | Pittsburgh | Allegheny | 9 | 4 | 44.4% | 52.6% | 0.8 |
| 28 | Riverview | Allegheny | 9 | 4 | 44.4% | 52.6% | 0.8 |
| 28 | South Park | Allegheny | 9 | 4 | 44.4% | 52.6% | 0.8 |
| 38 | Moniteau | Butler | 9 | 3 | 33.3% | 51.2% | 0.7 |
| 39 | Greensburg Salem | Westmoreland | 9 | 3 | 33.3% | 51.8% | 0.6 |
| 39 | New Kensington Arnold | Westmoreland | 9 | 3 | 33.3% | 51.8% | 0.6 |
| 39 | Avella Area | Washington | 9 | 3 | 33.3% | 52.0% | 0.6 |
| 39 | Burgettstown | Washington | 9 | 3 | 33.3% | 52.0% | 0.6 |
| 39 | Beaver Area | Beaver | 9 | 3 | 33.3% | 52.1% | 0.6 |
| 39 | Connellsville Area | Fayette | 9 | 3 | 33.3% | 52.1% | 0.6 |
| 39 | Hopewell Area | Beaver | 9 | 3 | 33.3% | 52.1% | 0.6 |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------|--------------|------------|------------|---------------|--------------|------------|
| 39 | Rochester Area | Beaver | 9 | 3 | 33.3% | 52.1% | 0.6 |
| 39 | South Side Area | Beaver | 9 | 3 | 33.3% | 52.1% | 0.6 |
| 39 | Deer Lakes | Allegheny | 9 | 3 | 33.3% | 52.6% | 0.6 |
| 39 | Moon Area | Allegheny | 9 | 3 | 33.3% | 52.6% | 0.6 |
| 39 | Pine-Richland | Allegheny | 9 | 3 | 33.3% | 52.6% | 0.6 |
| 39 | Shaler Area | Allegheny | 9 | 3 | 33.3% | 52.6% | 0.6 |
| 39 | South Allegheny | Allegheny | 9 | 3 | 33.3% | 52.6% | 0.6 |
| 39 | Sto-Rox | Allegheny | 9 | 3 | 33.3% | 52.6% | 0.6 |
| 54 | Seneca Valley | Butler | 9 | 2 | 22.2% | 51.2% | 0.4 |
| 54 | Derry Area | Westmoreland | 9 | 2 | 22.2% | 51.8% | 0.4 |
| 54 | Yough | Westmoreland | 9 | 2 | 22.2% | 51.8% | 0.4 |
| 54 | Fort Cherry | Washington | 9 | 2 | 22.2% | 52.0% | 0.4 |
| 54 | Washington | Washington | 9 | 2 | 22.2% | 52.0% | 0.4 |
| 54 | Alliquippa | Beaver | 9 | 2 | 22.2% | 52.1% | 0.4 |
| 54 | Midland Borough | Beaver | 9 | 2 | 22.2% | 52.1% | 0.4 |
| 54 | Monaca | Beaver | 9 | 2 | 22.2% | 52.1% | 0.4 |
| 54 | New Brighton Area | Beaver | 9 | 2 | 22.2% | 52.1% | 0.4 |
| 54 | Bethel Park | Allegheny | 9 | 2 | 22.2% | 52.6% | 0.4 |
| 54 | Gateway | Allegheny | 9 | 2 | 22.2% | 52.6% | 0.4 |
| 54 | West Mifflin | Allegheny | 9 | 2 | 22.2% | 52.6% | 0.4 |
| 66 | Karns City Area | Butler | 9 | 1 | 11.1% | 51.2% | 0.2 |
| 66 | Burrell | Westmoreland | 9 | 1 | 11.1% | 51.8% | 0.2 |
| 66 | Canon Mc Millan | Washington | 9 | 1 | 11.1% | 52.0% | 0.2 |
| 66 | Albert Gallatin Area | Fayette | 9 | 1 | 11.1% | 52.1% | 0.2 |
| 66 | Ambridge Area | Beaver | 9 | 1 | 11.1% | 52.1% | 0.2 |
| 66 | Frazier | Fayette | 9 | 1 | 11.1% | 52.1% | 0.2 |
| 66 | Western Beaver County | Beaver | 9 | 1 | 11.1% | 52.1% | 0.2 |
| 66 | Duquesne City | Allegheny | 9 | 1 | 11.1% | 52.6% | 0.2 |
| 74 | West Allegheny | Allegheny | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 52.6% | 0.0 |
| n/a | Ligonier Valley | Westmoreland | 9 | n/p | n/p | 51.8% | n/p |
| n/a | Slippery Rock Area | Butler | 9 | n/p | n/p | 51.2% | n/p |
| n/a | Steel Valley | Allegheny | 9 | n/p | n/p | 52.6% | n/p |
| | Total | | 693 | 248 | 35.7*% | 52.2% | 0.7 |

Source: School districts in the MSA

*Calculated out of 666

**Women share of population in the region

Appendix 11. African American Population in School Districts in the MSA

| School District | County | Total School Dist. POP | Number African American | Percent African American |
|-------------------|-----------|------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Allegheny Valley | Allegheny | 10,771 | 39 | 0.4% |
| Avonworth | Allegheny | 8,716 | 171 | 2.0% |
| Baldwin-Whitehall | Allegheny | 36,721 | 694 | 1.9% |
| Bethel Park | Allegheny | 33,964 | 343 | 1.0% |
| Brentwood Boro | Allegheny | 10,466 | 56 | 0.5% |
| Carlynton | Allegheny | 15,559 | 654 | 4.2% |
| Chartiers Valley | Allegheny | 29,119 | 485 | 1.7% |
| Clairton City | Allegheny | 8,491 | 2,405 | 28.3% |
| Cornell | Allegheny | 7,363 | 777 | 10.6% |
| Deer Lakes | Allegheny | 14,211 | 61 | 0.4% |
| Duquesne City | Allegheny | 7,332 | 3,501 | 47.7% |
| East Allegheny | Allegheny | 16,340 | 1,305 | 8.0% |
| Elizabeth Forward | Allegheny | 19,219 | 333 | 1.7% |
| Fox Chappel Area | Allegheny | 29,205 | 353 | 1.2% |
| Gateway | Allegheny | 33,038 | 2,448 | 7.4% |
| Hampton Twn | Allegheny | 17,526 | 118 | 0.7% |
| Highlands | Allegheny | 21,974 | 713 | 3.2% |
| Keystone Oaks | Allegheny | 22,172 | 238 | 1.1% |
| McKeesport Area | Allegheny | 36,567 | 6,092 | 16.7% |
| Montour | Allegheny | 24,711 | 398 | 1.6% |
| Moon Area | Allegheny | 24,604 | 827 | 3.4% |
| Mount Lebanon | Allegheny | 33,017 | 202 | 0.6% |
| North Allegheny | Allegheny | 47,531 | 556 | 1.2% |
| North Hills | Allegheny | 39,828 | 531 | 1.3% |
| Northgate | Allegheny | 14,064 | 643 | 4.6% |
| Penn Hills | Allegheny | 46,809 | 11,347 | 24.2% |
| Pine-Richland | Allegheny | 16,914 | 104 | 0.6% |
| Pittsburgh | Allegheny | 338,499 | 91,216 | 26.9% |
| Plum Boro | Allegheny | 26,940 | 743 | 2.8% |
| Quaker Valley | Allegheny | 13,366 | 629 | 4.7% |
| Riverview | Allegheny | 10,035 | 158 | 1.6% |
| Shaler Area | Allegheny | 41,565 | 243 | 0.6% |
| South Allegheny | Allegheny | 13,109 | 104 | 0.8% |
| South Fayette Twn | Allegheny | 12,271 | 429 | 3.5% |
| South Park | Allegheny | 14,340 | 460 | 3.2% |
| Steel Valley | Allegheny | 18,030 | 2,440 | 13.5% |
| Sto-Rox | Allegheny | 13,328 | 1,470 | 11.0% |
| Upper Saint Clair | Allegheny | 20,053 | 136 | 0.7% |
| West Allegheny | Allegheny | 18,950 | 417 | 2.2% |
| West Jefferson | Allegheny | 18,628 | 238 | 1.3% |
| West Mifflin Area | Allegheny | 23,802 | 2,054 | 8.6% |
| Wilksburgh Boro | Allegheny | 19,196 | 12,768 | 66.5% |
| Woodland Hills | Allegheny | 52,876 | 1,013 | 1.9% |
| Total | | 1,281,220 | 149,912 | 11.7% |

Source: School Districts in the MSA and Pennsylvania State data Center

Appendix 12. African American Council Members in the 52 Largest U.S. Cities

| Rank | Cities | Council Members | Blacks | | | Ratio of % Blacks in Council to % Blacks in Pop |
|------|-----------------------|-----------------|-------------|------------------------|--------------------|---|
| | | | # of Blacks | Blacks as % of council | Blacks as % of Pop | |
| 1 | Las Vegas, NV | 6 | 2 | 33.3% | 10.8% | 3.1 |
| 2 | San Jose, CA | 10 | 1 | 10.0% | 3.8% | 2.6 |
| 3 | Phoenix , AZ | 8 | 1 | 12.5% | 5.3% | 2.4 |
| 4 | Los Angeles, CA | 15 | 3 | 20.0% | 11.4% | 1.8 |
| 5 | Colorado Springs, CO | 8 | 1 | 12.5% | 7.3% | 1.7 |
| 5 | Columbus, OH | 7 | 3 | 42.9% | 25.8% | 1.7 |
| 7 | Austin, TX | 6 | 1 | 16.7% | 10.2% | 1.6 |
| 8 | Sacramento, CA | 8 | 2 | 25.0% | 16.4% | 1.5 |
| 8 | San Diego, CA | 8 | 1 | 12.5% | 8.5% | 1.5 |
| 10 | San Antonio, TX | 10 | 1 | 10.0% | 6.9% | 1.4 |
| 10 | Wichita, KA | 6 | 1 | 16.7% | 12.1% | 1.4 |
| 12 | Denver, CO | 13 | 2 | 15.4% | 11.6% | 1.3 |
| 12 | New York, NY | 51 | 17 | 33.3% | 25.6% | 1.3 |
| 14 | Fort Worth, TX | 8 | 2 | 25.0% | 20.5% | 1.2 |
| 14 | Seattle, WA | 9 | 1 | 11.1% | 9.6% | 1.2 |
| 16 | San Francisco, CA | 11 | 1 | 9.1% | 8.2% | 1.1 |
| 16 | Dallas, TX | 14 | 4 | 28.6% | 26.1% | 1.1 |
| 18 | Kansas City, MO | 12 | 4 | 33.3% | 32.0% | 1.0 |
| 18 | Chicago, IL | 50 | 19 | 38.0% | 36.9% | 1.0 |
| 18 | Omaha, NE | 7 | 1 | 14.3% | 14.0% | 1.0 |
| 21 | Philadelphia, PA | 17 | 7 | 41.2% | 43.4% | 0.9 |
| 21 | Nashville-Davidson TN | 39 | 10 | 25.6% | 27.3% | 0.9 |
| 21 | Miami, FL | 5 | 1 | 20.0% | 21.3% | 0.9 |
| 21 | Atlanta, GA | 16 | 9 | 56.3% | 61.6% | 0.9 |
| 21 | Jacksonville FL | 19 | 5 | 26.3% | 29.3% | 0.9 |
| 21 | Baltimore, MD | 19 | 11 | 57.9% | 64.8% | 0.9 |
| 27 | Houston, TX | 14 | 3 | 21.4% | 25.4% | 0.8 |
| 27 | Cleveland, OH | 21 | 9 | 42.9% | 51.4% | 0.8 |
| 27 | Charlotte, NC | 11 | 3 | 27.3% | 33.0% | 0.8 |
| 27 | Pittsburgh, PA | 9 | 2 | 22.2% | 27.8% | 0.8 |
| 27 | Indianapolis, IN | 29 | 6 | 20.7% | 26.1% | 0.8 |
| 27 | Oklahoma City, OK | 8 | 1 | 12.5% | 16.1% | 0.8 |
| 27 | Milwaukee, WI | 17 | 5 | 29.4% | 38.0% | 0.8 |
| 34 | St. Louis, MO | 28 | *10 | 35.7% | 51.4% | 0.7 |
| 34 | Tulsa, OK | 9 | 1 | 11.1% | 16.3% | 0.7 |
| 34 | Oakland, CA | 8 | 2 | 25.0% | 36.7% | 0.7 |
| 37 | Boston, MA | 12 | 2 | 16.7% | 25.7% | 0.6 |
| 37 | Washington, DC | 13 | 5 | 38.5% | 60.5% | 0.6 |
| 37 | Memphis, TN | 13 | 5 | 38.5% | 61.6% | 0.6 |
| 40 | New Orleans, LA | 7 | 2 | 28.6% | 67.3% | 0.4 |
| 40 | Detriot, MI | 9 | 3 | 33.3% | 82.3% | 0.4 |
| 40 | Minneapolis, Mn | 13 | 1 | 7.7% | 20.0% | 0.4 |
| 43 | Virginia Beach, VA | 10 | 0 | 0.0% | 19.5% | 0.0 |
| 43 | Long Beach, CA | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 15.4% | 0.0 |
| 43 | Fresno, CA | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 8.6% | 0.0 |
| 43 | Portland, OR | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 7.6% | 0.0 |

| | | | | | | |
|----|-----------------|------------|------------|--------------|---------------|------------|
| 43 | Tucson, AZ | 6 | 0 | 0.0% | 4.6% | 0.0 |
| 43 | Albuquerque, NM | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.2% | 0.0 |
| 43 | El-Paso, TX | 8 | 0 | 0.0% | 3.0% | 0.0 |
| 43 | Mesa, AZ | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.8% | 0.0 |
| 43 | Honolulu, HI | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 2.2% | 0.0 |
| 43 | Santa Ana, CA | 6 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.4% | 0.0 |
| | Total | 673 | 161 | 23.9% | *24.7% | 1.0 |

Source: <http://censtats.census.gov/pub/Profiles.shtml>

*See Appendix 13

Appendix 13. African American Share of Population in the 52 largest Cities in the U.S in 2000

| Rank | City | African American | |
|------|------------------------|------------------|---------|
| | | Number | Percent |
| 1 | Detroit, Mi | 951,270 | 82.3% |
| 2 | New Orleans, LA | 484,674 | 67.3% |
| 3 | Baltimore, MD | 651,154 | 64.8% |
| 4 | Memphis, TN | 650,100 | 61.6% |
| 5 | Atlanta, GA | 416,474 | 61.6% |
| 6 | Washington , DC | 572,059 | 60.5% |
| 7 | St. Louis, MO | 348,189 | 51.8% |
| 8 | Cleveland, OH | 478,403 | 51.4% |
| 9 | Philadelphia, PA | 1,517,550 | 43.4% |
| 10 | Milwaukee, WI | 596,974 | 38.0% |
| 11 | Chicago, IL | 2,896,016 | 36.9% |
| 12 | Oakland, CA | 399,484 | 36.7% |
| 13 | Charlotte, NC | 540,828 | 33.0% |
| 14 | Kansas, MO | 441,545 | 32.0% |
| 15 | Jacksonville, FL | 735,617 | 29.3% |
| 16 | Pittsburgh, PA | 334,563 | 27.8% |
| 17 | Nashville-Davidson, TN | 545,524 | 27.3% |
| 18 | Indianapolis, IN | 781,870 | 26.1% |
| 19 | Dallas, TX | 1,188,580 | 26.1% |
| 20 | Columbus, OH | 711,470 | 25.8% |
| 21 | Boston, MA | 589,141 | 25.7% |
| 22 | New York, NY | 8,008,278 | 25.6% |
| 23 | Houston, TX | 1,953,631 | 25.4% |
| 24 | Miami, FL | 362,470 | 21.3% |
| 25 | Fort Worth, TX | 534,694 | 20.5% |
| 26 | Minneapolis, MN | 382,618 | 20.0% |
| 27 | Virginia Beach, VA | 425,257 | 19.5% |
| 28 | Sacramento, CA | 407,018 | 16.4% |
| 29 | Tulsa, OK | 393,049 | 16.3% |
| 30 | Oklahoma City, OK | 506,132 | 16.1% |
| 31 | Long Beach, CA | 461,522 | 15.4% |
| 32 | Omaha, NE | 390,007 | 14.0% |
| 33 | Wichita, KS | 344,284 | 12.1% |
| 34 | Denver, CO | 554,636 | 11.6% |
| 35 | Los Angeles, CA | 3,694,820 | 11.4% |
| 36 | Las Vegas, NV | 478,434 | 10.8% |
| 37 | Austin, TX | 656,562 | 10.2% |
| 38 | Seattle, WA | 563,374 | 9.6% |
| 39 | Fresno, CA | 427,652 | 8.6% |
| 40 | San Diego, CA | 1,223,400 | 8.5% |
| 41 | San Francisco, CA | 776,733 | 8.2% |
| 42 | Portland, OR | 529,121 | 7.6% |
| 43 | Colorado Springs, CO | 360,890 | 7.3% |
| 44 | San Antonio, TX | 1,144,646 | 6.9% |
| 45 | Phoenix, AZ | 1,321,045 | 5.3% |
| 46 | Tucson, AZ | 486,699 | 4.6% |
| 47 | San Jose, CA | 894,943 | 3.8% |

| | | | | |
|----|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------|
| 48 | Albuquerque, NM | 448,607 | 14,343 | 3.2% |
| 49 | El Paso, TX | 563,662 | 17,070 | 3.0% |
| 50 | Mesa, AZ | 396,375 | 11,103 | 2.8% |
| 51 | Honolulu, HI | 371,657 | 8,236 | 2.2% |
| 52 | Santa Ana, CA | 337,977 | 4,873 | 1.4% |
| | Total | 45,231,678 | 11,151,546 | 24.7% |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000

Appendix 14. Female Council Members in the 52 Largest U.S. Cities

| Rank | Cities | Council Members | Women | | | Ratio of % Women in Council to Women in Pop |
|------|-----------------------|-----------------|------------|-----------------------|-------------------|---|
| | | | # of women | Women as % of Council | Women as % of Pop | |
| 1 | Detroit, MI | 9 | 7 | 77.8% | 52.9% | 1.5 |
| 2 | Denver, CO | 13 | 9 | 69.2% | 49.5% | 1.4 |
| 3 | Santa Ana, CA | 6 | 4 | 66.7% | 49.9% | 1.3 |
| 4 | Atlanta, GA | 16 | 9 | 56.3% | 50.5% | 1.1 |
| 5 | Jacksonville FL | 19 | 10 | 52.6% | 51.5% | 1.0 |
| 5 | Baltimore, MD | 19 | 10 | 52.6% | 51.7% | 1.0 |
| 5 | Virginia Beach, VA | 10 | 5 | 50.0% | 50.5% | 1.0 |
| 5 | Tucson, AZ | 6 | 3 | 50.0% | 51.1% | 1.0 |
| 9 | Seattle, WA | 9 | 4 | 44.4% | 50.2% | 0.9 |
| 9 | Dallas, TX | 14 | 6 | 42.9% | 49.6% | 0.9 |
| 9 | Houston, TX | 14 | 6 | 42.9% | 50.1% | 0.9 |
| 12 | Columbus, OH | 7 | 3 | 42.9% | 51.4% | 0.8 |
| 12 | San Jose, CA | 10 | 4 | 40.0% | 49.3% | 0.8 |
| 12 | New Orleans, LA | 7 | 3 | 42.9% | 53.1% | 0.8 |
| 12 | Phoenix, AZ | 8 | 3 | 37.5% | 49.9% | 0.8 |
| 16 | Colorado Springs, CO | 8 | 3 | 37.5% | 50.5% | 0.7 |
| 16 | Oklahoma City, OK | 8 | 3 | 37.5% | 51.5% | 0.7 |
| 16 | Sacramento, CA | 8 | 3 | 37.5% | 51.5% | 0.7 |
| 16 | Washington, DC | 13 | 5 | 38.5% | 52.9% | 0.7 |
| 16 | Austin, TX | 6 | 2 | 33.3% | 48.6% | 0.7 |
| 16 | Los Angeles, CA | 15 | 5 | 33.3% | 49.3% | 0.7 |
| 16 | St. Louis, MO | 28 | 10 | 35.7% | 53.0% | 0.7 |
| 16 | Mesa, AZ | 3 | 1 | 33.3% | 50.5% | 0.7 |
| 16 | Philadelphia, PA | 17 | 6 | 35.3% | 53.5% | 0.7 |
| 16 | Long Beach, CA | 9 | 3 | 33.3% | 50.9% | 0.7 |
| 26 | Kansas City, MO | 12 | 4 | 33.3% | 51.7% | 0.6 |
| 26 | Minneapolis, Mn | 13 | 4 | 30.8% | 48.7% | 0.6 |
| 26 | Memphis, TN | 13 | 4 | 30.8% | 52.4% | 0.6 |
| 26 | Chicago, IL | 50 | 15 | 30.0% | 51.5% | 0.6 |
| 30 | Nashville-Davidson TN | 39 | 11 | 28.2% | 51.6% | 0.5 |
| 30 | Charlotte, NC | 11 | 3 | 27.3% | 51.0% | 0.5 |
| 30 | San Diego, CA | 8 | 2 | 25.0% | 49.9% | 0.5 |
| 30 | Fort Worth, TX | 8 | 2 | 25.0% | 50.8% | 0.5 |
| 30 | Oakland, CA | 8 | 2 | 25.0% | 51.7% | 0.5 |
| 30 | El-Paso, TX | 8 | 2 | 25.0% | 52.7% | 0.5 |
| 30 | Indianapolis, IN | 29 | 7 | 24.1% | 51.6% | 0.5 |
| 30 | Cleveland, OH | 21 | 5 | 23.8% | 52.6% | 0.5 |
| 38 | Albuquerque, NM | 9 | 2 | 22.2% | 51.3% | 0.4 |
| 38 | Tulsa, OK | 9 | 2 | 22.2% | 51.5% | 0.4 |
| 38 | Pittsburgh, PA | 9 | 2 | 22.2% | 52.4% | 0.4 |
| 38 | New York, NY | 51 | 11 | 21.6% | 52.6% | 0.4 |
| 38 | San Antonio, TX | 10 | 2 | 20.0% | 51.5% | 0.4 |
| 43 | Milwaukee, WI | 17 | 3 | 17.6% | 52.2% | 0.3 |
| 43 | Las Vegas, NV | 6 | 1 | 16.7% | 49.3% | 0.3 |
| 43 | Wichita, KA | 6 | 1 | 16.7% | 50.7% | 0.3 |

| | | | | | | |
|----|-------------------|------------|------------|--------------|---------------|------------|
| 43 | Boston, MA | 12 | 2 | 16.7% | 51.9% | 0.3 |
| 47 | San Francisco, CA | 11 | 1 | 9.1% | 49.2% | 0.2 |
| 48 | Portland, OR | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.5% | 0.0 |
| 48 | Fresno, CA | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.0% | 0.0 |
| 48 | Omaha, NE | 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.3% | 0.0 |
| 48 | Honolulu, HI | 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 50.9% | 0.0 |
| 48 | Miami, FL | 5 | 0 | 0.0% | 51.7% | 0.0 |
| | Total | 673 | 215 | 31.9% | *51.3% | 0.6 |

Sources: City web sites, followed by telephone confirmation of race and gender; Census Bureau 2000

*See Appendix 15

Appendix 15. Female Share of Population in the 52 largest Cities in the U.S.

| Rank | City | Total Population | Female | |
|------|------------------------|------------------|-----------|---------|
| | | Number | Number | Percent |
| 1 | Philadelphia, PA | 1,517,550 | 812,443 | 53.5% |
| 2 | Baltimore, MD | 651,154 | 347,467 | 53.4% |
| 3 | New Orleans, LA | 484,674 | 257,580 | 53.1% |
| 4 | St. Louis, MO | 348,189 | 184,622 | 53.0% |
| 5 | Washington , DC | 572,059 | 302,693 | 52.9% |
| 6 | Detroit, Mi | 951,270 | 502,951 | 52.9% |
| 7 | Memphis, TN | 650,100 | 342,457 | 52.7% |
| 8 | Cleveland, OH | 478,403 | 251,853 | 52.6% |
| 9 | New York, NY | 8,008,278 | 4,214,074 | 52.6% |
| 10 | El Paso, TX | 563,662 | 296,011 | 52.5% |
| 11 | Pittsburgh, PA | 334,563 | 175,444 | 52.4% |
| 12 | Milwaukee, WI | 596,974 | 311,611 | 52.2% |
| 13 | Boston, MA | 589,141 | 305,553 | 51.9% |
| 14 | Oakland, CA | 399,484 | 206,727 | 51.7% |
| 15 | Kansas, MO | 441,545 | 228,404 | 51.7% |
| 16 | Tulsa, OK | 393,049 | 203,112 | 51.7% |
| 17 | San Antonio, TX | 1,144,646 | 591,401 | 51.7% |
| 18 | Indianapolis, IN | 781,870 | 403,580 | 51.6% |
| 19 | Nashville-Davidson, TN | 545,524 | 281,429 | 51.6% |
| 20 | Jacksonville, FL | 735,617 | 379,333 | 51.6% |
| 21 | Chicago, IL | 2,896,016 | 1,490,909 | 51.5% |
| 22 | Albuquerque, NM | 448,607 | 230,720 | 51.4% |
| 23 | Sacramento, CA | 407,018 | 209,234 | 51.4% |
| 24 | Columbus, OH | 711,470 | 365,592 | 51.4% |
| 25 | Omaha, NE | 390,007 | 199,975 | 51.3% |
| 26 | Oklahoma City, OK | 506,132 | 258,819 | 51.1% |
| 27 | Tucson, AZ | 486,699 | 248,291 | 51.0% |
| 28 | Charlotte, NC | 540,828 | 275,850 | 51.0% |
| 29 | Long Beach, CA | 461,522 | 234,804 | 50.9% |
| 30 | Fresno, CA | 427,652 | 217,545 | 50.9% |
| 31 | Honolulu, HI | 371,657 | 189,029 | 50.9% |
| 32 | Wichita, KS | 344,284 | 174,680 | 50.7% |
| 33 | Fort Worth, TX | 534,694 | 270,974 | 50.7% |
| 34 | Portland, OR | 529,121 | 267,556 | 50.6% |
| 35 | Colorado Springs, CO | 360,890 | 182,421 | 50.5% |
| 36 | Virginia Beach, VA | 425,257 | 214,733 | 50.5% |
| 37 | Mesa, AZ | 396,375 | 199,997 | 50.5% |
| 38 | Atlanta, GA | 416,474 | 209,749 | 50.4% |
| 39 | Miami, FL | 362,470 | 182,276 | 50.3% |
| 40 | Los Angeles, CA | 3,694,820 | 1,853,015 | 50.2% |
| 41 | Seattle, WA | 563,374 | 282,401 | 50.1% |
| 42 | Houston, TX | 1,953,631 | 978,080 | 50.1% |
| 43 | Minneapolis, MN | 382,618 | 190,388 | 49.8% |
| 44 | Dallas, TX | 1,188,580 | 589,589 | 49.6% |
| 45 | San Diego, CA | 1,223,400 | 606,516 | 49.6% |
| 46 | Denver, CO | 554,636 | 274,429 | 49.5% |
| 47 | Las Vegas, NV | 478,434 | 235,357 | 49.2% |
| 48 | San Jose, CA | 894,943 | 440,145 | 49.2% |

| | | | | |
|----|-------------------|-------------------|------------|-------|
| 49 | San Francisco, CA | 776,733 | 381,905 | 49.2% |
| 50 | Phoenix, AZ | 1,321,045 | 649,285 | 49.1% |
| 51 | Austin, TX | 656,562 | 318,993 | 48.6% |
| 52 | Santa Ana, CA | 337,977 | 162,758 | 48.2% |
| | Total | 45,231,678 | 23,184,760 | 51.3% |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000

Appendix 16. Survey Instrument

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

UNIVERSITY CENTER FOR SOCIAL AND URBAN RESEARCH

A STUDY OF DIVERSITY AMONG ELECTED OFFICIALS

The University Center for Social and Urban Research at the University of Pittsburgh is currently conducting a study on diversity among elected officials in the Pittsburgh MSA and the 52 largest cities in the U.S.

Recent data show the city of ----- has substantial representation of African American or women among its city council (compared to the representation of African American in the population). Such high level of diversity, according to national data, is often explained by several factors. In light of this we would like you to indicate which of the following conditions characterizes your city:

A form of Proportional Representation (*Do you have a system that guarantees minorities representation in proportion to their voting strength?*).....
.....
.....

Small Number of Incumbent Candidates (*Do you have few incumbents running for election, hence more open-seat elections?*).....
.....
.....

High Number of Female Candidates (*Is there a substantial number (i.e. relative to their share of population) of African American or women running for public offices in general.*).....
.....
.....

Adequate Campaign Finance (*Is there adequate campaign finance for African Americans and women candidates?*).....
.....
.....

Absence of run-off elections (*Do you have a second round of voting between the top 2 candidates if no candidate wins a prescribed majority in the first round?*).....
.....

.....

Are there any other factors that you think may contribute to the high level of women representation on your city council?

.....
.....
.....

Contact Person..... Title..... Telephone No.....

Yours Sincerely,

.....
Monique Constance-Huggins
Research Assistant
University Center for Social and Urban Research
University of Pittsburgh