

*An Atlas of the Shadyside Neighborhood  
of Pittsburgh 1977*



**SHADYSIDE**

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

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

# PITTSBURGH NEIGHBORHOOD ATLAS

## GOVERNING BOARD

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

JAMES VALLAS  
Shadyside  
Vice-Chairperson

BARBARA KELLY  
Perry-Hilltop  
Secretary

TERRY WOODCOCK  
Squirrel Hill  
Treasurer

RICHARD ARMSTEAD  
Hill District

JOSEPH BORKOWSKI  
Lawrenceville

DANIEL CHAPPELL  
Hill District

MARY COYNE  
West End

JIM CUNNINGHAM  
Shadyside

MARY LOU DANIEL  
West End

JESE DEL GRE  
Hill District

WILLIAM P. GALLAGHER  
Greenfield

MARY HALL  
Squirrel Hill

ROSE JEWELL  
Shadyside

GABOR KISH  
Elliott

ROBERT "BLUE" MARTIN  
Hazelwood

THOMAS MURPHY  
Perry Hilltop

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR  
WENDELL D. JORDAN

## AGENCIES

Action-Housing, Inc.  
U.S. Bureau of the Census  
Carnegie-Mellon University  
Christian Associates  
City Council  
Community Action Pittsburgh  
County Planning Department  
Health & Welfare  
Planning Association  
National Institute of Neighborhood Studies  
University of Pittsburgh School of Social Work  
Southwestern Pennsylvania  
Regional Planning Commission  
State Department of Community Affairs  
United Way  
Urban and Community Affairs - University of Pittsburgh

## CONSULTANTS

University of Pittsburgh Center for Urban Research  
City Planning Department  
OZ SCHMIDT - Geography Dept., University of Pittsburgh  
JOHN YORIO - Highland Park

## STAFF

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

Margaret K. Charny (Squirrel Hill)

Julia Whitener (Mexican War Streets)

Millofred Russell (Homestead, Pa.)

Gerald S. Oswalt (Schenley Heights)

Katherine Knorr (East Liberty)

John Zingaro (Shadyside)

Dan Baskin

Vicky Leap

Howard Williams

Ronald Madzy

Tony Gary

Mary Shea

## SUPPORTIVE INSTITUTIONS

Pittsburgh Neighborhood Alliance

Center for Urban Research of the Univ. of Pgh.

School of Social Work of the Univ. of Pgh.

Architect Workshop

City Council of the City of Pgh.

Allegheny County Department of Elections

ACTION-Housing, Inc.

Department of City Planning of the City of Pgh.

Southwestern Penna. Regional Planning Commission

ACTION-Vista (Volunteers in Service to America)

Valley View Presbyterian Church

## FUNDING SOURCES

Alcoa Foundation

Allegheny Conference on Community Development

Howard Heinz Endowment

Jones and Laughlin Steel Corporation

Koppers Company

Richard King Mellon Foundation

City Council of the City of Pittsburgh

The Pittsburgh Foundation

Henry Oliver Rea Charitable Trust

Sarah Scaife Foundation, Inc.

Weld Tooling Company

University of Pittsburgh (In Kind)

## INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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


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

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

NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION

Shadyside is approximately 3.6 miles east of downtown. It is estimated to be 753.7 acres in size, containing 2.2% of the city's land and 4.2% of its 1974 population. The voting districts in the neighborhood are #1 to #13, Ward 7; and #1, #30 and #31, Ward 14. (See Appendix for a listing of the neighborhood's census tracts.)

In some neighborhoods a significant proportion of the residents identified a section of the neighborhood by another name, therefore this section is called a sub-neighborhood. The sub-neighborhood in Shadyside is Bellefield.



NEIGHBORHOOD HISTORY  
SHADYSIDE

Shadyside was the original name of the Pennsylvania Railroad Station in that area. The Railroad asked David Aiken, donator of the land for the building, to name it. His wife Caroline suggested "Shady Side", supposedly the title of a book she had been reading. Wood and farmland, replete with shady lanes at the time of its development in the mid-19th century, the neighborhood had been named appropriately.

During the 1700's, George Anshutz bought 286 acres in the area. In 1792, Anshutz established an iron furnace in the vicinity of Bayard and Amberson. Anshutz later sold some of his land to David Ekin, who farmed this purchase.

The Ekin or Aiken Farm lay within what is today Shadyside West. David Ekin married Rachel Castlemen and their daughter, the wife of Thomas Aiken, inherited the farm. Following Mrs. Aiken's death, Thomas divided the farm with his son, David. Thomas took the eastern part, from Amberson Avenue to Aiken; his son, the western, from Amberson to Neville. From 1854 to 1855, the elder Aiken built a home at what is today Ellsworth and St. James. David, who had married Caroline Jones, built "The Homestead," surveyed by a man named Amberson, on the avenue of that name in 1865.

A district school was established in 1838 in the vicinity of Aiken and Fifth Avenue. It was not, however, until the opening of the Pennsylvania Railroad to through traffic in 1852 that Shadyside became a desirable suburb. Robert Pitcairn, for whom Pitcairn Street is named, bought land from Thomas Aiken. Judge Thomas Mellon bought the McFarland farm east of Aiken Avenue. Another big land buyer was a Mr. Barton. Much of the elder Aiken's farm was divided into residential lots following his death in 1873.

Following its annexation from Peebles Township to the City of Pittsburgh in 1868, Shadyside grew rapidly. Shadyside Presbyterian Church, for which Thomas Aiken had donated land in 1866, had as its first minister Dr. William Beatty. Located at Westminster and Amberson, the church long served as the community center. In 1869, church elders built the Pennsylvania College for Women for their daughters. (The Pennsylvania College for Women is now Chatham College.)

Since the 1920's, professionals, artists, students and apartment dwellers have settled in Shadyside. Walnut Street, the neighborhood commercial district, is a popular and prosperous area, housing a unique variety of specialty shops.

SHADYSIDE

SUMMARY STATISTICS

	<u>Neighborhood</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
Population (1974)	20,277	479,276
% Change (1970-1974)	+2%	-8%
% Black population (1970)	4%	20%
Housing units (1974)	8,648	166,625
% Vacant	5%	6%
% Owner-occupied housing units (1974)	28%	54%
Average sales price of owner-occupied dwellings (1975)	\$47,960	\$23,518
% Residential real estate transactions with mortgages provided by financial institutions (1975)	65%	59%
Crime rate (1975)	0.076	0.053
Average family income (1969)	\$17,800	\$10,500
Income index as % of city index (1974)	118%	
% Satisfied with neighborhood (1976)	59%	41%
Major neighborhood problems (1976)	Burglary Dog litter Poor roads	Poor roads Dog litter Burglary

CITIZEN SURVEY

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

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

I. Neighborhood Satisfaction

Shadyside residents are generally more satisfied with their neighborhood than residents city-wide. Table 1 shows that 59% of the citizens responding to the survey were satisfied with their neighborhood compared to 41% in all city neighborhoods. When asked to state whether the neighborhood is better or worse than two years ago, 21% said that it was better which exceeded the city-wide response of 12%. Given the opportunity to move from the neighborhood, 71% said they would continue to live there compared to a response of 45% for the city as a whole. The responses to these satisfaction questions indicate a more positive attitude of residents toward their neighborhood compared to citizens city-wide.

TABLE 1

Neighborhood Satisfaction  
Shadyside

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

	Satisfied (%)	Dissatisfied (%)	Neither (%)
Shadyside	59	20	19
All neighborhoods	41	37	21

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

	Better (%)	Worse (%)	Not Changed (%)
Shadyside	21	33	40
All neighborhoods	12	49	36

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

	Yes (%)	No (%)	Not Sure (%)
Shadyside	71	16	11
All neighborhoods	45	32	18

SOURCE: Citizen Survey, 1976.

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

## II. Neighborhood Problems

In order to identify specific neighborhood problems, residents were asked to consider twelve problems usually associated with urban communities and rate them for the neighborhood. Table 2 compares the problem ratings of the respondents from Shadyside to those from all city neighborhoods. Areas of particular concern for the neighborhood include burglary, poor roads, and dog litter.

## III. Satisfaction with Public Services

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

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

1. Street and alley maintenance: Poor maintenance; need for better street repair program; problems with potholes.
2. Police: Insufficient police services; not enough police protection.
3. Condition and cost of housing: Cost of housing is too high; problems with high rents; housing in neighborhood in bad condition; problems with absentee landlords; vacant buildings.



TABLE 2

Neighborhood Problems  
Shadyside

Problem Category	Problem Rating - Percent Response		
	<u>Not a Problem</u>	<u>Minor or Moderate</u>	<u>Big or Very Serious</u>
Unsafe streets			
Shadyside	13	52	28
All neighborhoods	25	45	21
Vandalism			
Shadyside	11	53	26
All neighborhoods	13	49	28
Rats			
Shadyside	44	23	4
All neighborhoods	34	33	12
Burglary			
Shadyside	3	41	45
All neighborhoods	14	44	29
Poor roads			
Shadyside	15	47	32
All neighborhoods	17	41	33
Trash and litter			
Shadyside	26	49	18
All neighborhoods	27	41	24
Vacant buildings			
Shadyside	54	27	3
All neighborhoods	49	24	13
Undesirable people moving into the neighborhood			
Shadyside	42	28	11
All neighborhoods	42	28	15
Stray dogs			
Shadyside	32	41	13
All neighborhoods	25	38	18
Dog litter			
Shadyside	19	38	36
All neighborhoods	21	38	32

SOURCE: Citizen Survey, 1976.

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

TABLE 3

Satisfaction with Public Services  
Shadyside

Service	Percent Response		
	<u>Satisfied</u>	<u>Neither</u>	<u>Dissatisfied</u>
Parks and Recreation			
Shadyside	55	16	14
All neighborhoods	51	15	23
Schools			
Shadyside	33	11	15
All neighborhoods	46	12	21
Street maintenance			
Shadyside	29	17	51
All neighborhoods	32	15	49
Alley maintenance			
Shadyside	14	15	34
All neighborhoods	20	13	39
Garbage collection			
Shadyside	66	13	14
All neighborhoods	74	10	13
Police			
Shadyside	54	21	16
All neighborhoods	51	17	23
Public transportation			
Shadyside	74	8	15
All neighborhoods	61	11	23
Fire Department			
Shadyside	69	6	1
All neighborhoods	78	7	3
Sewage system			
Shadyside	56	11	8
All neighborhoods	63	10	13
Condition and cost of housing			
Shadyside	41	20	25
All neighborhoods	44	17	22

SOURCE: Citizen Survey, 1976.

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

CRIME RATE

The crime rate for major crimes has increased over the last three years (Table 4). In 1973 the number of major crimes per capita was .053 compared to .076 in 1975. The crime rate in the neighborhood is greater than the city per capita rate of .053 in 1975.

---

TABLE 4

Crime Rate: Major Crimes  
Shadyside

---

<u>Year</u>	<u>Major Crimes</u>	<u>Crime Rate</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Neighborhood</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
1973	1,083	.053	.043
1974	1,347	.066	.047
1975	1,533	.076	.053

---

SOURCE: City of Pittsburgh, Bureau of Police.

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

THE PEOPLE

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

In 1974, the estimated population of Shadyside was 20,277, up by 2% since 1970. This compares to a city-wide population decline of 8% during the same period. Information on the racial composition of the neighborhood is not available for 1974; however, the number of Black households in the neighborhood increased during the decade of the sixties, and the Black population was 4.2% of the neighborhood's population in 1970, compared to 20.2% for the city.

The average household size in the neighborhood was 1.99 persons in 1974, up from 1.95 in 1970. The percentage of the population 65 years and older was 18.9% in 1970, compared to 13.5% for the city as a whole.

TABLE 5

Population and Household Characteristics, 1970 and 1974  
Shadyside

	<u>Neighborhood</u>		<u>Pittsburgh</u>	
	<u>1970</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1974</u>
Population				
% Black	4.2%	....	20.2%	....
% 65 years and over	18.9%	....	13.5%	....
Households				
% One-person households	43.8%	43.9%	25.4%	25.5%
% Retired head-of-household	....	25.3%	....	26.3%
% Households with children	....	14.7%	....	32.7%
% Female head-of-household with children	....	1.7%	....	6.4%
% In owner-occupied housing unit	18.9%	28.2%	50.3%	54.2%
% Households changing place of residence within past year	....	39.8%	....	27.0%
Average household size	1.95	1.99	2.82	2.67

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

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

The turnover rate of households in the neighborhood exceeds that for all of the city's neighborhoods. During 1973, 39.8% of the households in the neighborhood changed their place of residence compared to a rate of 27.0% for the city. (The figures represent households who have moved within the neighborhood or city as well as those moving into or out of the neighborhood or city.)

Female-headed households with children in 1974 comprised 1.7% of the total households in the neighborhood compared to 6.4% for the city as a whole. In 1974, one-person households consisted of 43.9% of the total households in the neighborhood compared to 25.5% city-wide and to 43.8% for the neighborhood in 1970.

TABLE 6

Neighborhood Change: 1960-1970 and 1970-1974  
Shadyside

	<u>Number</u> <u>Neighborhood</u>	<u>Percent Change</u>	
		<u>Neighborhood</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
Population			
1960	22,068		
1970	19,846	-10	-14
1974	20,277	+ 2	- 8
Households <sup>1</sup>			
1960	8,756		
1970	9,074	+ 4	- 6
1974	8,211	-10	-12
Black households <sup>2</sup>			
1960	290		
1970	300	+ 3	+15
1974	(not available)		
Housing units			
1960	9,144		
1970	9,869	+ 8	- 3
1974	8,648	-11	-12

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

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

<sup>1</sup>The number of occupied housing units equals the number of households.

<sup>2</sup>Non-white households in 1960.

NEIGHBORHOOD INCOME

The average family income in Shadyside was \$17,800, 170% of the city average, for the year 1969. R. L. Polk and Company computes an income index for each city census tract. This index, derived from the occupation of heads of households, was used to calculate the income index of the neighborhood. In 1974, the index for Shadyside was 118% of the figure for the city as a whole.

Table 7 shows the number of neighborhood households receiving cash grants in 1974, 1975 and 1976 under the public assistance program of the Pennsylvania Department of Welfare. Public assistance in the form of food stamps, Medicaid, and various social services are also available to these households, as well as to other households in need. Public assistance payments were made to 5.8% of the neighborhood households in 1976, a lower proportion than for the city overall and an increase since 1974.

---

TABLE 7

Public Assistance: Households Receiving Cash Grants  
Shadyside

---

<u>Year</u>	<u>Neighborhood</u>		<u>Pittsburgh</u>
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1974	308	3.8	16.0
1975	383	4.7	17.2
1976	474	5.8	18.0

---

SOURCE: Allegheny County Board of Assistance.

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

HOUSING

Table 6 shows that the number of housing units in Shadyside increased during the decade of the sixties and decreased from 1970 to 1974. Of the occupied housing units, 28.2% were owner-occupied in 1974, compared to a city-wide rate of 54.2%. The vacancy rate for the neighborhood was 5.0% which was less than the rate for the city as a whole. (See Table 8.)

The average value of owner-occupied housing in the neighborhood was \$32,100 in 1970, compared to a city-wide average of \$14,800.

A housing expenditure greater than 25% of household income is often considered to be excessive and a problem associated with low income households. In 1970, for the city as a whole, less than 1% of renter households earning \$10,000 or more a year spent 25% or more of this income for rent; of those earning less than \$10,000, 43.7% spent 25% or more of their income on rent. In Shadyside, 41.4% paid out 25% or more of their income on rent.\* These percentages suggest a lack of housing choice for renters with limited incomes, both in the neighborhood and the city.

TABLE 8

Housing Characteristics, 1970 and 1974  
Shadyside

	<u>Neighborhood</u>		<u>Pittsburgh</u>	
	<u>1970</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1974</u>
Housing units				
% Vacant	8.1	5.0	6.2	6.2
% One-unit structures	17.5	....	52.9	....
Occupied housing units				
% Owner-occupied	18.9	28.2	50.3	54.2
Average value: owner-occupied units <sup>1</sup>	\$32,100	....	\$14,800	....

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

<sup>1</sup>Average value rounded to nearest one hundred dollars.

\*Percentage calculated only for the part of Shadyside made up of census tracts #701 - #708, which contained 88% of the neighborhood's renter-occupied housing units in 1970.

REAL ESTATE AND MORTGAGE LOAN TRANSACTIONS

The average sales price of owner-occupied housing was \$47,960 in 1975. (See Table 9.) Although the average price was greater than the city-wide average, the implications of this divergence are difficult to judge because of variations in the quality and size of the structures among city neighborhoods. As additional data are obtained, however, the trend in real estate prices for the neighborhood can be compared to the trend for the city as a whole in order to determine relative differences.

In order to evaluate the extent to which private lenders are involved in the neighborhood, the number of mortgage loans made on residential property each year must be divided by the number of residential real estate transactions for that year. The percentage of residential real estate transactions financed through financial institutions was 65% in Shadyside compared to a city-wide rate of 59%. The implications of the difference between the two rates are difficult to discern because of variations in risk factors and income levels among city neighborhoods. However, as additional data become available, trends in lending activity within the neighborhood compared to other neighborhoods or to the city as a whole can be assessed.

TABLE 9

Real Estate and Mortgage Loan Statistics  
Shadyside

	<u>Neighborhood</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
Average sales price: owner-occupied dwellings		
1974	\$42,714	\$21,582
1975	\$47,960	\$23,518
Number of residential mortgages		
1973	102	
1974	111	
1975	105	
% Residential real estate transactions with mortgages provided by financial institutions		
1974	62%	58%
1975	65%	59%

SOURCE: City of Pittsburgh, Department of City Planning.



APPENDIX

a. Data Sources: Information for the atlas was obtained from the 1960 and 1970 U. S. Census of Population and Housing; R. L. Polk and Company's "Profiles of Change" for Pittsburgh in 1974; Pittsburgh's Department of City Planning and Bureau of Police; the Allegheny County Board of Assistance, and Department of Elections and Voter Registration; Southwestern Pennsylvania Regional Planning Commission; and the Citizen Survey conducted by the Pittsburgh Neighborhood Atlas.

b. Neighborhood Census Tracts: 701 - 708, part of 1401, and part of 1402.

c. Methodology: The opinions and characteristics of survey respondents, as well as voter registration, were recorded by voting district and then compiled for Shadyside by the Pittsburgh Neighborhood Atlas in conjunction with the Center for Urban Research, University of Pittsburgh. Other material in the atlas was drawn from statistics tabulated for city census tracts or census blocks.

The neighborhood boundaries, which were determined on the basis of whole voting districts, do not conform exactly to census tract boundaries, so minor boundary adjustments were made wherever possible to simplify data collection efforts. In Shadyside and in other parts of the city where substantial portions of a census tract fall in more than one neighborhood, the neighborhood characteristics for 1960 and 1970 were arrived at by adding together data for the census blocks in the neighborhood, item by item. The statistics from sources other than the U. S. Census were made available only by census tract, not by census block; therefore a method for prorating the data among neighborhoods was developed. The procedure allocated data for each neighborhood containing partial census tracts on the basis of the proportion of total tract population, households, or housing units contained in each sub-section.

To compensate for under-reporting, the 1974 figure for the neighborhood population has been increased by 1.11, a factor that was derived from the U. S. Bureau of the Census 1973 population estimate for Pittsburgh. An additional adjustment has been made where applicable, since Polk and Co. does not count persons living in institutions or other group quarters. To arrive at the total estimated population for 1974, the neighborhood population was further increased by adding the number of persons in group quarters for the neighborhood according to the 1970 Census.

d. Characteristics of the Sample: In Shadyside, 411 citizens answered the questionnaires. Based on the number of replies to each question, the characteristics of the respondents can be generally described as follows: an average age of 48; 61% female; 2% Black; 97% with at least four years of high school education; 40% homeowners; and an average of 13 years in the neighborhood. The median household income falls in the range of \$15,000 to \$24,999; the average household size is 2.67 persons; and 72% of the households have no members under 18 years old living in the home.

The total sample (all respondents to the survey) was over-represented by homeowners (68% compared to 50% for Pittsburgh in 1970) and under-represented by Blacks (14% compared to a city Black population of 20% in 1970).

e. Voter Registration: In November, 1976, 11,150 residents of the neighborhood were registered to vote, an increase of 431 (+4.0%) since November, 1975. In this period, city registration increased by 1.3% to 233,028.

In the process of collecting data for this publication, the Pittsburgh Neighborhood Atlas staff was assisted by many community organizations. The following list reflects those organizations that we were able to make contact with in Shadyside:

7-11 Democratic Club  
P.O. Box 4945  
Pittsburgh, Pa. 15206 (January, 1969)  
661-6938

7th Ward Democratic Committee  
4924 Wallingford Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa. 15213 (1970)  
683-2651

Shadyside East Civic Association  
625 Frick Building  
Pittsburgh, Pa. 15219 (1963)  
281-2424

Shadyside West  
720 Amberson Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa. 15232 (November, 1975)

Shadyside Action Coalition  
c/o Calvary Episcopal Church  
315 Shady Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa. 15206 (1974)  
361-3771

Shadyside Neighbors Associated for Progress (SNAP)  
415 Devonshire Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa. 15213 (August, 1971)  
687-0835

Shadyside Owners Society  
5809 Walnut Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa. 15232 (1967)  
361-0401

Maripoe-Morewood-Enfield Association  
c/o Vincent Ruggiero  
4717 Maripoe Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa. 15213 (3 years)  
683-3270

Note: Dates in parenthesis indicate when organizations started.