### APPENDIX A: OPENSPECPGH INVENTORY

(Park classifications and acres current as of Dec. 2011. Park facilities inventory current as of March 2011.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGIONAL PARK</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Garden</th>
<th>Stairs</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Shelter</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
<th>Center</th>
<th>Senior Center</th>
<th>Pool</th>
<th>Spray Park</th>
<th>Spray Pool</th>
<th>Play Area</th>
<th>Tennis Court</th>
<th>Tennis Court</th>
<th>Basketball Court Full</th>
<th>Basketball Court Half</th>
<th>Basketball Court Half Lights</th>
<th>Basketball Court Half No Lights</th>
<th>Basketball Court Full No Lights</th>
<th>Basketball Court Full Lights</th>
<th>Basketball Court Full No Lights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emerald View Regional Park</td>
<td>257.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigelow Field</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duquesne Heights Greenway*</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen McCoy Parklet</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandview Overlook</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandview Park</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Washington Park</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duquesne Heights Greenway*</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandview Overlook</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandview Park</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Park</td>
<td>377.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverview Park</td>
<td>258.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schenley Park</td>
<td>434.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REGIONAL PARK subtotal** | 1,971.7 | 2 | 3 | 37 | 24 | 2 | - | 4 | - | 1 | 17 | 15 | 11 | 2 | 2 | 2 | - | 4 |

### COMMUNITY PARK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY PARK</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Garden</th>
<th>Stairs</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Shelter</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
<th>Center</th>
<th>Senior Center</th>
<th>Pool</th>
<th>Spray Park</th>
<th>Spray Pool</th>
<th>Play Area</th>
<th>Tennis Court</th>
<th>Tennis Court</th>
<th>Basketball Court Full</th>
<th>Basketball Court Half</th>
<th>Basketball Court Half Lights</th>
<th>Basketball Court Half No Lights</th>
<th>Basketball Court Full No Lights</th>
<th>Basketball Court Full Lights</th>
<th>Basketball Court Full No Lights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allegheny Center Park Plaza (Public Square)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegheny Commons Park</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Common Park</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Common Park</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arsenal Park</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banksville Park</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Heights Park</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookline Memorial Park</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinan Park</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hills Park</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euclid Park</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herschel Park</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Square Park</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McBride Park</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinley and Upper McKinley Park</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mellon Park</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mellon Square Park</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore Park</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips Park</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheraden Park</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside Park</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End Park</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Penn Park</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMUNITY PARK subtotal** | 552.3 | 3 | 2 | 69 | 12 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 20 | 26 | 6 | 16 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |

OpenSpacePGH - Adopted 07/09/2013
APPENDIX A: OPENSACEPGH INVENTORY
(Park classifications and acreages current as of Dec. 2011. Park facilities inventory current as of March 2011.)

**REGIONAL PARK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Classification</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Basketball</th>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Baseball Field Widths</th>
<th>Baseball Field No Lights</th>
<th>Rectangular Fields - No Lights</th>
<th>Rectangular Fields - Overview</th>
<th>Volleyball</th>
<th>Hockey</th>
<th>Bocce</th>
<th>Horsehoe</th>
<th>Drinking Fountain</th>
<th>Bleachers</th>
<th>Benches</th>
<th>Tables</th>
<th>Grill</th>
<th>Decorative Fountain</th>
<th>Flag Pole</th>
<th>Grandstand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emerald View Regional Park</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bigbee Field</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duquesne Heights Greenway*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eileen McCoy Parklet</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grandview Overlook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grandview Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mt. Washington Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Olympia Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Undesignated Property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ream Parklet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frick Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highland Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riverview Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schenley Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>regional park subtotal</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMUNITY PARK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Classification</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Basketball</th>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Baseball Field Widths</th>
<th>Baseball Field No Lights</th>
<th>Rectangular Fields - No Lights</th>
<th>Rectangular Fields - Overview</th>
<th>Volleyball</th>
<th>Hockey</th>
<th>Bocce</th>
<th>Horsehoe</th>
<th>Drinking Fountain</th>
<th>Bleachers</th>
<th>Benches</th>
<th>Tables</th>
<th>Grill</th>
<th>Decorative Fountain</th>
<th>Flag Pole</th>
<th>Grandstand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allegheny Center Park Plaza (Public Square)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allegheny Commons Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Common Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Common Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arsenal Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Banksville Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brighton Heights Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brookline Memorial Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dinan Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Hills Park</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fowler Park</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Herschel Park</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market Square Park</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McBride Park</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McKinley and Upper McKinley Park</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mellon Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mellon Square Park</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moore Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phillips Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheraden Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southside Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West End Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Penn Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community park subtotal</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX A: OPENSPACEPGH INVENTORY
(Park classifications and acreages current as of Dec. 2011. Park facilities inventory current as of March 2011.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Park</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Community Gardens</th>
<th>Stairs</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Shelter</th>
<th>Recreation Center</th>
<th>Senior Center</th>
<th>Pool</th>
<th>Spray Park</th>
<th>Spray Pool</th>
<th>Play Area</th>
<th>Tennis Court w/Lights</th>
<th>Tennis Court No Lights</th>
<th>Basketball Court Full w/Lights</th>
<th>Basketball Court Full No Lights</th>
<th>Basketball Court Half w/Lights</th>
<th>Basketball Court Half No Lights</th>
<th>Basketball</th>
<th>Court Half</th>
<th>Court Half No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Able Long Park</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert &quot;Turk&quot; Graham Park</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine Gardens Park</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alton Park</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammon Park</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Park</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong Park</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baxter Park</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blair St. Park</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomfield Park</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bork Park</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary St. Park</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bud Hamme Park</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgen Park</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalano Park</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadwick Park</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlers Park</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafee Park</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron St. Park</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowley Park</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafton Heights Park</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross and Strauss Park</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas Park</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis Park</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denny Park</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devlin Field</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumber Park</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan Park</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunseith Park (Shalane's Play Yard)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Carnegie Park</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Liberty Park</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor Street Park</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enright Park</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espin Park</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forty Wood Park</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifty Seventh Street Park</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finisview North Park</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finisview South Park</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Pitt Park</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OpenSpacePGH - Adopted 07/09/2013
### APPENDIX A: OPENSPACEPGH INVENTORY

(Park classifications and acreages current as of Dec. 2011. Park facilities inventory current as of March 2011.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEIGHBORHOOD PARK</th>
<th>Basketball</th>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Baseball Field Lights</th>
<th>Baseball Field No Lights</th>
<th>Rectangular Fields</th>
<th>Rectangular Overlay</th>
<th>Volleyball</th>
<th>Hockey</th>
<th>Bocce</th>
<th>Horseshoe</th>
<th>Drinking Fountain</th>
<th>Bleachers</th>
<th>Benches</th>
<th>Tables</th>
<th>Grill</th>
<th>Decorative Fountain</th>
<th>Flag Pole</th>
<th>Grandstand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Able Long Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert &quot;Turk&quot; Graham Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine Gardens Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alton Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammon Park</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baxter Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blair St. Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomfield Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bon Air Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary St. Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bud Hammer Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgwin Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalano Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadwick Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlams Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliffside Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton St. Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowley Park</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafton Heights Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross and Strauss Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis Park</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denny Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devlin Field</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunbar Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunseith Park (Shalane’s Play Yard)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Carnegie Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Liberty Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor Street Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enright Park</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esplen Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifty Seventh Street Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fineview North Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fineview South Park</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Pitt Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX A: OPENSPACEPGH INVENTORY

(Park classifications and acreages current as of Dec. 2011. Park facilities inventory current as of March 2011.)

| Acres | Community Garden | Stairs | Division | Shelter | Recreation Center | Senior Center | Pool | Spray Park | Spray Pool | Play Area | Tennis Court w/Lights | Tennis Court No Lights | Basketball Court Full w/Lights | Basketball Court Full No Lights | Basketball Court Half w/Lights | Basketball Court Half No Lights | BasketBall Court Half | Basketball Court Half No Lights |
|-------|------------------|--------|----------|---------|-------------------|---------------|------|------------|-----------|-----------|----------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1.8   | -                | -      | 3        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 1.9   | -                | -      | 3        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 2.0   | -                | -      | 3        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 2.2   | -                | -      | 3        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 2.3   | -                | -      | 3        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 5.1   | -                | -      | 3        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 7.2   | -                | -      | 3        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 3.4   | -                | -      | 3        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 3.2   | -                | -      | 3        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 3.3   | -                | -      | 3        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 0.6   | -                | -      | 3        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 1.3   | -                | -      | 3        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 5.1   | -                | -      | 3        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 5.4   | -                | -      | 3        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 13.4  | -                | -      | 3        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 0.9   | -                | -      | 2        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 1.5   | -                | -      | 2        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 1.7   | -                | -      | 2        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 0.6   | -                | -      | 2        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 0.9   | -                | -      | 2        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 1.9   | -                | -      | 2        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 0.6   | -                | -      | 3        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 0.3   | -                | -      | 1        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 5.3   | -                | -      | 1        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 2.7   | -                | -      | 1        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 1.6   | -                | -      | 1        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 0.9   | -                | -      | 1        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 1.8   | -                | -      | 1        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 0.3   | -                | -      | 1        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 3.6   | -                | -      | 1        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 0.3   | -                | -      | 1        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 0.6   | -                | -      | 1        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 0.9   | -                | -      | 1        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 0.6   | -                | -      | 1        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 1.3   | -                | -      | 1        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 0.2   | -                | -      | 1        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 0.2   | -                | -      | 1        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 0.6   | -                | -      | 1        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 0.2   | -                | -      | 1        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 0.6   | -                | -      | 1        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 0.2   | -                | -      | 1        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
| 0.6   | -                | -      | 1        |         |                   |               |      |            |           |           |                      |                        |                               |                                |                               |                                |                               |
## OpenSpacePGH Inventory


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Classification</th>
<th>Basketball Standards</th>
<th>Soccer Ball</th>
<th>Baseball Field Dimensions</th>
<th>Baseball Field No Lights</th>
<th>Rectangular Fields</th>
<th>Rectangular Overtry</th>
<th>Volleyball</th>
<th>Hockey</th>
<th>Bocce</th>
<th>Horse Shoe</th>
<th>Drinking Fountain</th>
<th>Bleachers</th>
<th>Benches</th>
<th>Tables</th>
<th>Grill</th>
<th>Decorative Fountain</th>
<th>Flag Pole</th>
<th>Grandstand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four Mile Run Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Curto Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frazier Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardiner Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garland Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granville Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hays Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedd's Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homewood Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Park</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Natoli Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennard Park</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kite Hill Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larimer Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawn and Ophelia Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lister Street Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leolyn Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesser Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis Park</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Place Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lookout Street Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magee Park</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester Park (School)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mannsclups Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall-California Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Luther King Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCandless Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGregor Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKnight Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monongahela Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Mandela Peace Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakwood Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ormsby Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osceola Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overbrook Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panorama Field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Name</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Community Garden</td>
<td>Stairs</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>Recreation Center</td>
<td>Senior Center</td>
<td>Pool</td>
<td>Spray Park</td>
<td>Spray Pool</td>
<td>Play Area</td>
<td>Tennis Court w/Lights</td>
<td>Tennis Court No Lights</td>
<td>Basketball Court Full w/Lights</td>
<td>Basketball Court Full No Lights</td>
<td>Basketball Court Half w/Lights</td>
<td>Basketball Court Half No Lights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauline Park</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulson Park</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Murray Park</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Park</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert E. Williams (Herren Hill) Park</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saline Street Park</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scherer Field</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Garden Park (** See Greenways**)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Hill Park</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratmore Park</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan Park</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swisshelm Park</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsend Park</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropical Park (** See Greenways**)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tusin Park</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanucci Park (** See Greenways**)</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincennes Park</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers Park</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabash Park</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrington Park</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End-Elliot Overlook Park</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westinghouse Park</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrightman Park</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winters Park</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods Run Park</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Park</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>neighborhood park subtotal</strong></td>
<td>307.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RIVERFRONT PARK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Community Garden</th>
<th>Stairs</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Shelter</th>
<th>Recreation Center</th>
<th>Senior Center</th>
<th>Pool</th>
<th>Spray Park</th>
<th>Spray Pool</th>
<th>Play Area</th>
<th>Tennis Court w/Lights</th>
<th>Tennis Court No Lights</th>
<th>Basketball Court Full w/Lights</th>
<th>Basketball Court Full No Lights</th>
<th>Basketball Court Half w/Lights</th>
<th>Basketball Court Half No Lights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcoa Park</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegheny Landing Park</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegheny Riverfront Park</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northshore Riverfront Park</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point State Park</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside Riverfront Park</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>riverfront park subtotal</strong></td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX A: OPENSPACEPGH INVENTORY
(Park classifications and acreages current as of Dec. 2011. Park facilities inventory current as of March 2011.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Basketball</th>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Funnel Ball</th>
<th>Baseball Field Lights</th>
<th>Baseball Field No Lights</th>
<th>Rectangular Fields</th>
<th>Rectangular Overlay</th>
<th>Volleyball</th>
<th>Hockey</th>
<th>Boxce</th>
<th>Horseshoe</th>
<th>Drinking Fountain</th>
<th>Bleachers</th>
<th>Benches</th>
<th>Tables</th>
<th>Grill</th>
<th>Decorative Fountain</th>
<th>Flag Pole</th>
<th>Grandstand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pauline Park</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulson Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip Murray Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert E. Williams (Herron Hill) Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scherer Field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Garden Park (See Greenways)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratmore Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swisshelm Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsend Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropical Park (See Greenways)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuscul Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanucci Park (See Greenways)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincennes Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabash Park</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrington Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End-Elliot Overlook Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westinghouse Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wightman Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winters Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods Run Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>neighborhood park subtotal</strong></td>
<td>149</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RIVERFRONT PARK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Basketball</th>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Funnel Ball</th>
<th>Baseball Field Lights</th>
<th>Baseball Field No Lights</th>
<th>Rectangular Fields</th>
<th>Rectangular Overlay</th>
<th>Volleyball</th>
<th>Hockey</th>
<th>Boxce</th>
<th>Horseshoe</th>
<th>Drinking Fountain</th>
<th>Bleachers</th>
<th>Benches</th>
<th>Tables</th>
<th>Grill</th>
<th>Decorative Fountain</th>
<th>Flag Pole</th>
<th>Grandstand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcoa Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegheny Landing Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegheny Riverfront Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northshore Riverfront Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point State Park</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside Riverfront Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>riverfront park subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX A: OPENSPACEPGH INVENTORY

(Park classifications and acreages current as of Dec. 2011. Park facilities inventory current as of March 2011.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Community Garden</th>
<th>Stairs</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Shelter</th>
<th>Recreation Center</th>
<th>Senior Center</th>
<th>Pool</th>
<th>Spray Park</th>
<th>Play Area</th>
<th>Tennis Court w/Lights</th>
<th>Tennis Court No Lights</th>
<th>Basketball Court Full w/Lights</th>
<th>Basketball Court Full No Lights</th>
<th>Basketball Court Half w/Lights</th>
<th>Basketball Court Half No Lights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SPECIAL USE PARK

- **Arlington Gym**: 0.6 acres, Community Garden, Stairs, Division, Shelter, Recreation Center, Senior Center, Pool, Spray Park, Play Area, Tennis Court w/Lights, Tennis Court No Lights, Basketball Court Full w/Lights, Basketball Court Full No Lights, Basketball Court Half w/Lights, Basketball Court Half No Lights
- **Hazelwood Senior Center**: 1.3 acres, Community Garden, Stairs, Division, Shelter, Recreation Center, Senior Center, Pool, Spray Park, Play Area, Tennis Court w/Lights, Tennis Court No Lights, Basketball Court Full w/Lights, Basketball Court Full No Lights, Basketball Court Half w/Lights, Basketball Court Half No Lights
- **Herron Hill Tennis Courts**: 0.8 acres, Community Garden, Stairs, Division, Shelter, Recreation Center, Senior Center, Pool, Spray Park, Play Area, Tennis Court w/Lights, Tennis Court No Lights, Basketball Court Full w/Lights, Basketball Court Full No Lights, Basketball Court Half w/Lights, Basketball Court Half No Lights
- **Oliver Bathhouse**: 0.1 acres, Community Garden, Stairs, Division, Shelter, Recreation Center, Senior Center, Pool, Spray Park, Play Area, Tennis Court w/Lights, Tennis Court No Lights, Basketball Court Full w/Lights, Basketball Court Full No Lights, Basketball Court Half w/Lights, Basketball Court Half No Lights
- **Sheraden Senior Center**: 0.4 acres, Community Garden, Stairs, Division, Shelter, Recreation Center, Senior Center, Pool, Spray Park, Play Area, Tennis Court w/Lights, Tennis Court No Lights, Basketball Court Full w/Lights, Basketball Court Full No Lights, Basketball Court Half w/Lights, Basketball Court Half No Lights

### BEAUTIFICATION SITE

- **Amber Triangle**: 0.1 acres, Community Garden, Stairs, Division, Shelter, Recreation Center, Senior Center, Pool, Spray Park, Play Area, Tennis Court w/Lights, Tennis Court No Lights, Basketball Court Full w/Lights, Basketball Court Full No Lights, Basketball Court Half w/Lights, Basketball Court Half No Lights
- **Bates St Triangle**: 0.3 acres, Community Garden, Stairs, Division, Shelter, Recreation Center, Senior Center, Pool, Spray Park, Play Area, Tennis Court w/Lights, Tennis Court No Lights, Basketball Court Full w/Lights, Basketball Court Full No Lights, Basketball Court Half w/Lights, Basketball Court Half No Lights
- **Baum Negley Triangle**: 0.3 acres, Community Garden, Stairs, Division, Shelter, Recreation Center, Senior Center, Pool, Spray Park, Play Area, Tennis Court w/Lights, Tennis Court No Lights, Basketball Court Full w/Lights, Basketball Court Full No Lights, Basketball Court Half w/Lights, Basketball Court Half No Lights
- **Bedford Strip**: 0.3 acres, Community Garden, Stairs, Division, Shelter, Recreation Center, Senior Center, Pool, Spray Park, Play Area, Tennis Court w/Lights, Tennis Court No Lights, Basketball Court Full w/Lights, Basketball Court Full No Lights, Basketball Court Half w/Lights, Basketball Court Half No Lights
- **Beechview Monument**: 0.2 acres, Community Garden, Stairs, Division, Shelter, Recreation Center, Senior Center, Pool, Spray Park, Play Area, Tennis Court w/Lights, Tennis Court No Lights, Basketball Court Full w/Lights, Basketball Court Full No Lights, Basketball Court Half w/Lights, Basketball Court Half No Lights
- **Brookline Monument**: 0.1 acres, Community Garden, Stairs, Division, Shelter, Recreation Center, Senior Center, Pool, Spray Park, Play Area, Tennis Court w/Lights, Tennis Court No Lights, Basketball Court Full w/Lights, Basketball Court Full No Lights, Basketball Court Half w/Lights, Basketball Court Half No Lights
- **Craft Triangle**: 0.1 acres, Community Garden, Stairs, Division, Shelter, Recreation Center, Senior Center, Pool, Spray Park, Play Area, Tennis Court w/Lights, Tennis Court No Lights, Basketball Court Full w/Lights, Basketball Court Full No Lights, Basketball Court Half w/Lights, Basketball Court Half No Lights
- **Crosstown**: 1.4 acres, Community Garden, Stairs, Division, Shelter, Recreation Center, Senior Center, Pool, Spray Park, Play Area, Tennis Court w/Lights, Tennis Court No Lights, Basketball Court Full w/Lights, Basketball Court Full No Lights, Basketball Court Half w/Lights, Basketball Court Half No Lights
- **East Liberty Mall**: 0.6 acres, Community Garden, Stairs, Division, Shelter, Recreation Center, Senior Center, Pool, Spray Park, Play Area, Tennis Court w/Lights, Tennis Court No Lights, Basketball Court Full w/Lights, Basketball Court Full No Lights, Basketball Court Half w/Lights, Basketball Court Half No Lights
- **East Liberty Strip**: 2.5 acres, Community Garden, Stairs, Division, Shelter, Recreation Center, Senior Center, Pool, Spray Park, Play Area, Tennis Court w/Lights, Tennis Court No Lights, Basketball Court Full w/Lights, Basketball Court Full No Lights, Basketball Court Half w/Lights, Basketball Court Half No Lights
- **Edgerton Circle**: 0.002 acres, Community Garden, Stairs, Division, Shelter, Recreation Center, Senior Center, Pool, Spray Park, Play Area, Tennis Court w/Lights, Tennis Court No Lights, Basketball Court Full w/Lights, Basketball Court Full No Lights, Basketball Court Half w/Lights, Basketball Court Half No Lights
- **Fort Duquesne Blvd Strip**: 2.6 acres, Community Garden, Stairs, Division, Shelter, Recreation Center, Senior Center, Pool, Spray Park, Play Area, Tennis Court w/Lights, Tennis Court No Lights, Basketball Court Full w/Lights, Basketball Court Full No Lights, Basketball Court Half w/Lights, Basketball Court Half No Lights
- **Frankstown Triangle 1 & 2**: 4.5 acres, Community Garden, Stairs, Division, Shelter, Recreation Center, Senior Center, Pool, Spray Park, Play Area, Tennis Court w/Lights, Tennis Court No Lights, Basketball Court Full w/Lights, Basketball Court Full No Lights, Basketball Court Half w/Lights, Basketball Court Half No Lights
- **Glen Arden Triangle**: 0.6 acres, Community Garden, Stairs, Division, Shelter, Recreation Center, Senior Center, Pool, Spray Park, Play Area, Tennis Court w/Lights, Tennis Court No Lights, Basketball Court Full w/Lights, Basketball Court Full No Lights, Basketball Court Half w/Lights, Basketball Court Half No Lights
- **Glen Arden Circle**: 0.001 acres, Community Garden, Stairs, Division, Shelter, Recreation Center, Senior Center, Pool, Spray Park, Play Area, Tennis Court w/Lights, Tennis Court No Lights, Basketball Court Full w/Lights, Basketball Court Full No Lights, Basketball Court Half w/Lights, Basketball Court Half No Lights
- **Grant Street Islands**: 0.1 acres, Community Garden, Stairs, Division, Shelter, Recreation Center, Senior Center, Pool, Spray Park, Play Area, Tennis Court w/Lights, Tennis Court No Lights, Basketball Court Full w/Lights, Basketball Court Full No Lights, Basketball Court Half w/Lights, Basketball Court Half No Lights
- **McPherson Blvd Strip**: 0.6 acres, Community Garden, Stairs, Division, Shelter, Recreation Center, Senior Center, Pool, Spray Park, Play Area, Tennis Court w/Lights, Tennis Court No Lights, Basketball Court Full w/Lights, Basketball Court Full No Lights, Basketball Court Half w/Lights, Basketball Court Half No Lights
- **Mellon Park Island**: 0.7 acres, Community Garden, Stairs, Division, Shelter, Recreation Center, Senior Center, Pool, Spray Park, Play Area, Tennis Court w/Lights, Tennis Court No Lights, Basketball Court Full w/Lights, Basketball Court Full No Lights, Basketball Court Half w/Lights, Basketball Court Half No Lights
- **Monitor St and St Phil Islands**: 0.1 acres, Community Garden, Stairs, Division, Shelter, Recreation Center, Senior Center, Pool, Spray Park, Play Area, Tennis Court w/Lights, Tennis Court No Lights, Basketball Court Full w/Lights, Basketball Court Full No Lights, Basketball Court Half w/Lights, Basketball Court Half No Lights
- **Morrow Triangle**: 0.6 acres, Community Garden, Stairs, Division, Shelter, Recreation Center, Senior Center, Pool, Spray Park, Play Area, Tennis Court w/Lights, Tennis Court No Lights, Basketball Court Full w/Lights, Basketball Court Full No Lights, Basketball Court Half w/Lights, Basketball Court Half No Lights
### Appendix A: OpenspacePGH Inventory

(Park classifications and acreages current as of Dec. 2011. Park facilities inventory current as of March 2011.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPECIAL USE PARK</th>
<th>Basketball</th>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Funnel Ball</th>
<th>Baseball Field</th>
<th>Baseball Field Lights</th>
<th>Rectangular Fields</th>
<th>Rectangular Overlay</th>
<th>Volleyball</th>
<th>Hockey</th>
<th>Boxxe</th>
<th>Bowlers</th>
<th>Drinking Fountain</th>
<th>Bleachers</th>
<th>Benches</th>
<th>Tables</th>
<th>Grill</th>
<th>Decorative Fountain</th>
<th>Flag Pole</th>
<th>Grandstand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Gym</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazelwood Senior Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herron Hill Tennis Courts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homewood Senior Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodge Potenza Senior Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver Bathhouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheraden Senior Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside Market House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>special use subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEAUTIFICATION SITE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber Triangle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bates St Triangle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baum Negley Triangle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford Strip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beechview Monument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookline Monument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft Triangle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosstown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Liberty Mall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eden Park Circle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Duquesne Blvd Strip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankstown Triangle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Arden Circle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Arden Triangle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Street Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris Triangle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Ave Plant Strip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail Triangle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Roi Rd Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legion Memorial Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Avenue Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McPherson Blvd Strip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mellon Park Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor St and St Phil Islands</td>
<td>375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrow Triangle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negley Run Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX A: OPENSPECPGH INVENTORY
(Park classifications and acreages current as of Dec. 2011. Park facilities inventory current as of March 2011.)

| Acres | Community Garden | Stairs | Division | Shelter | Recreation Center | Senior Center | Pool | Spray Park | Spray Pool | Play Area | Tennis Court w/Lights | Tennis Court No Lights | Basketball | Court Full w/Lights | Court Full No Lights | Basketball Court Half w/Lights | Court Half No Lights | Basketball Court | Court Half No Lights |
|-------|------------------|--------|----------|---------|------------------|--------------|------|------------|-----------|-----------|----------------------|----------------------|------------|-------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| Negley Run Strip | 0.3 | - | - | 2 |
| Negley-Collins Triangle | 0.2 | - | - | - | - |
| Oakland Square | 0.6 | - | - | 3 |
| Parkview Islands | 0.1 | - | - | 3 |
| Penn Circle S Triangle | 0.04 | - | - | 3 | - | - |
| Penn Circle W Square | 0.03 | - | - | 3 | - | - |
| Penn Circle W Triangle | 0.1 | - | - | 3 | - | - |
| Polish Hill Monument | 0.02 | - | - | 3 | - | - |
| Regent Square War Memorial | 0.02 | - | - | 3 | - | - |
| Reynolds St Planting Circle | 0.04 | - | - | 3 | - | - |
| Saline St Passive Area | 0.3 | - | - | 6 | - | - |
| Sharaden Monument | 0.1 | - | - | 3 | - | - |
| Swisshelm War Memorial | 0.01 | - | - | 3 | - | - |
| Thomas Blvd Planting Strip | 0.6 | - | - | 2 | - | - |
| Thomas Park | 0.3 | - | - | 6 | - | - |
| Vietnam Island | 0.2 | - | - | 3 | - | - |
| Westwood Island | 0.1 | - | - | 3 | - | - |
| Windermere Circle 1 & 2 | 0.1 | - | - | 3 | - | - |
| Zulema Passive Area | 0.7 | - | - | 3 | - | - |
| **beautification site subtotal** | **2.15** | - | - | 7 | 1 | 61 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

**TOTAL ALL** | **2,909** | **10** | **9** | **530** | **46** | **15** | **11** | **18** | **4** | **19** | **121** | **49** | **36** | **57** | **38** | **1** | **18**

## GREENWAYS

| Allegheny River Greenway | 34.9 |
| Beechview-Seldom Seen Greenway*** | 122.5 |
| (Includes Tropical & Kanacci Neighborhood Parks) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Duquesne Heights Greenway* | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| (see regional parks) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fairhaven Greenway | 30.7 |
| Hazlewood Greenway | 133.6 |
| Moore Greenway | 71.9 |
| Oskicff Greenway | 5.0 |
| Observatory Hill Hollows Greenway | 17.9 |
| Perry South Greenway | 12.7 |
| Spring Hill/Spring Garden Greenway** | 53.1 |
| (Includes Spring Garden Neighborhood Park) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **TOTAL GREENWAYS OUTSIDE OF PARKS** | **482.4** |
## APPENDIX A: OPENSPACEPGH INVENTORY

(Park classifications and acreages current as of Dec. 2011. Park facilities inventory current as of March 2011.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Classification</th>
<th>Basketball Standards</th>
<th>Funnel Ball</th>
<th>Baseball Field Weights</th>
<th>Baseball Field No Lights</th>
<th>Rectangular Fields</th>
<th>Rectangular Overfly</th>
<th>Volleyball</th>
<th>Hockey</th>
<th>Bocce</th>
<th>Horsehoe</th>
<th>Drinking Fountain</th>
<th>Bleachers</th>
<th>Bandsh</th>
<th>Tables</th>
<th>Grill</th>
<th>Decorative Fountain</th>
<th>Flag Pole</th>
<th>Grandstand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negley Run Strip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negley-Collins Triangle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Square</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkview Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn Circle S Triangle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn Circle W Square</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish Hill Monument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regent Square War Memorial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds St Planting Circle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saline St Passive Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharaden Monument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swisshelm War Memorial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Blvd Planting Strip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westwood Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windermere Circle 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zulema Passive Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| beautification site subtotal|                      |             |                        |                         |                    |                     |            |        |       |          |                   |           |        |        |      |                     |           |             |

**TOTAL ALL** | 207 | 4 | 55 | 49 | 9 | 17 | 7 | 33 | 8 | 18 | 129 | 249 | 1,517 | 386 | 411 | 8 | 57 | 10

## GREENWAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greenway</th>
<th>Allegheny River Greenway</th>
<th>Beechview-Seldom Seen Greenway***</th>
<th>Includes Tropical &amp; Vanucci Neighborhood Parks</th>
<th>Duquesne Heights Greenway*</th>
<th>Fairhaven Greenway</th>
<th>Hazelwood Greenway</th>
<th>Moore Greenway</th>
<th>Oskcliffe Greenway</th>
<th>Observatory Hill Hollows Greenway</th>
<th>Perry South Greenway</th>
<th>Spring Hill/Spring Garden Greenway**</th>
<th>Includes Spring Garden Neighborhood Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL GREENWAYS OUTSIDE OF PARKS**
## APPENDIX B: SUITABILITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suitability Analysis Criteria</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>#Parcels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public street on two (2) sides of property</td>
<td>4,232</td>
<td>30,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel size = .25 acre or more - aggregate within sector 14 and 16</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel size = .5 acre or more - aggregate</td>
<td>3,779</td>
<td>11,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel size = .75 acre or more - aggregate</td>
<td>3,385</td>
<td>8,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel size = 1 acre or more - aggregate</td>
<td>3,078</td>
<td>6,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel size = 10 acre or more - aggregate</td>
<td>1,358</td>
<td>903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel size = 30 acres or more - aggregate</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel size = 200 acres or more - aggregate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to regional park</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to riverfront park</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to riverfront (water)</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to greenway</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to transit line (urban)</td>
<td>1,443</td>
<td>6,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to transit line (rural)</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>3,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to transit center</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to or within a commercial district</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>3,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to or within an industrial land use</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>1,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to or within a Neighborhood Commercial District</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>2,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to or within URA Target Area (redevelop: GIS file)</td>
<td>1,334</td>
<td>11,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel has area of slope &lt; 5%</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>8,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel has area of slope &lt; 10%</td>
<td>2,438</td>
<td>17,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel has area of slope &gt; 25%</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>1,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building value on parcel &lt;= $1,000 (no building) or no building footprint</td>
<td>3,187</td>
<td>17,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel is within 200' of creek center line</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel has area of forested area</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>1,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel has area noted by the heritage inventory</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel has area indicated by the national wetlands inventory or is identified as wetland by USGS GAP Analysis Program data.</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel has area of impervious surface 50% or less</td>
<td>3,779</td>
<td>18,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel has area of impervious surface 25% or less</td>
<td>3,022</td>
<td>11,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat GAP landcover types</td>
<td>1,218</td>
<td>1,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stream habitat GAP landcover types</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>1,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Located between two: OS, Park, School, Street**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Brownfield****</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* On hold for later analysis
** Linkage criterion on hold for more site specific analysis
*** PASDA data provided only five data points and none of them overlapped with the opportunity parcel base.
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Background

MIG, Inc. was selected by the City of Pittsburgh as the primary consultant for addressing the Open Space, Parks and Recreation (OSPR) chapter of the city’s first Comprehensive Plan. The OSPR chapter includes but is not limited to parks, greenways, trails, urban farming, green lots (temporal open space), sensitive environmental areas, steep slopes, athletic fields, swimming pools, senior community centers, and other recreation facilities and programs. The goal of the OSPR Plan is to provide the city clear direction in land use and infrastructure decisions including those decisions related to our green infrastructure (parks, greenways, urban tree canopy, etc.), and in recreation facility infrastructure and associated programming.

A four-phase approach was outlined by MIG, Inc. for developing the OSPR Plan:

- **Phase 1 – Understanding the Context**: During this phase, we will define the baseline and begin engaging the community in the planning process.
- **Phase 2 – Assessing Community Needs**: During Phase 2, we will conduct a technical analysis using the baseline of information developed during Phase 1. We will also review best practices and their applicability to Pittsburgh, as well as continue the community engagement process.
- **Phase 3 – Developing a Plan of Action**: In this phase, the MIG Team will develop a plan of action, identifying draft recommendations and actions and building a model to evaluate economic impacts and return on investment.
- **Phase 4 – Refining and Adopting the Plan**: During the project’s final phase, the MIG team will work closely with City staff to obtain plan approval.

Although many of the tasks associated with each of the respective phases were/ will be performed by MIG, Inc., several tasks included in Phase 2 were dependent on quantitative polling of City of Pittsburgh residents. Consequently, Campos Inc was contracted by MIG Inc. to conduct a city-wide survey among a random sample mirroring the general population of the City of Pittsburgh.
Background and Methodology

Objectives

The objectives of the survey among City of Pittsburgh residents included:

- Determining the types of recreational activities being performed by city residents and/or their families.
- Measuring current usage of parks and other recreational facilities for such activities.
- Determining residents’ perceptions of the importance of parks to the quality of life in local communities and the Pittsburgh area.
- Determining residents’ perceptions on the quality of maintenance of the local and Pittsburgh area parks.
- Measuring levels of support for proposed initiatives to balance the quality and quantity of facilities at local and city area parks.
- Identifying residents’ priorities and perceived needs of parks, community and recreation facilities, programs, and services in the City of Pittsburgh.
- Developing a profile of participating residents based on demographic information such as age, gender, race, children, household income, etc.
Methodology

Campos Inc designed the survey instrument with input and approval from MIG, Inc. based on the learnings from Phase I: Understanding the Context. A random sample of respondents was recruited using Campos Inc’s Voice of the Region (VOR) panel.

In total, 410 interviews were conducted by Campos Inc from September 2 through September 21, 2010 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Completes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted above, a multi-modal data collection methodology was utilized and VOR panel members were invited to participate as follows:

- All respondents were initially sent an email—containing a link for the online survey and their unique password—inviting them to participate in the study at their own convenience. Approximately one week following the initial request, reminder email invitations were sent to those who had not yet completed the survey.

- After a second week had passed, the online sample did not match the census data with respect to African-American representation. Therefore, Campos Inc obtained additional targeted sample for African-American respondents and contacted them by telephone during regular business hours. Respondents were given the option to either complete the survey over the phone or, if they preferred, request to have a final email invitation re-sent so that they could complete the survey online.

The Campos Inc Voice of the Region sample, which targeted City of Pittsburgh wards/voting districts by zip code, yielded an overall incidence of 49.8% due to quota limits set for the purpose of obtaining a distribution representative of the population of the area according to U.S. Census statistics. The average interview length was 9.6 minutes both online and by phone.
A copy of the questionnaire can be found in the Appendix section of the report. All completed interviews were edited, coded, computer tabulated, and analyzed by Campos Inc.
**Analytical Notes**

- For this study, the total sample size of 410 yielded results with a statistical accuracy of ±4.84% at the 95% confidence level. This means that there is a 1 in 20 chance that the "true" measurement will fall outside of this range.

- In certain cases (noted in the report), caution should be used when interpreting the results of subgroup analysis due to small sample sizes. While subgroups may be too small to draw statistically valid conclusions, patterns may emerge that can be useful.

- Throughout the report, percentages may not add to 100% because of rounding and/or multiple responses.

- The term *net* is used in some tables in this report. *Net* is the summary of a group of related responses and represents the percentage of respondents who made one or more comments in that category/group.

- *Base* is the number of respondents who were asked a particular question. At times, questions are skipped by some respondents based on their answers to previous questions.

- A *top-two box score* refers to the two highest responses on a rating scale (for example, *excellent* and *very good*), that have been combined for reporting purposes.

- Several tables throughout the report show only the most frequently mentioned responses. For a complete listing of responses, please refer to Computer Tables, furnished under a separate cover.
Executive Summary
Executive Summary

Respondent Profile

As shown in the table below, the total respondent sample closely reflected the 2000 census data for the City of Pittsburgh (pittsburghareaconnect.com). Please note that while similar, the census data age category for those less than 35 years of age does not exactly match the one used in our study.

Sample and Census Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>City of Pittsburgh 2000 Census Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base:</strong></td>
<td>410</td>
<td>334,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-34 (Census Data: 15-34)</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-54</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian (non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African-American (non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children in Household</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

Key Findings

A random sample of Pittsburgh residents were interviewed regarding their usage, perceptions, and attitudes of open spaces, parks, and recreation services (OSPR) in the Pittsburgh Region and at their local parks. This summary highlights findings from the research across the following key areas:

- Perceptions of OSPR
- Usage of OSPR
- Maintenance of OSPR
- Changes to the OSPR System

Perceptions of OSPR

Nearly all Pittsburgh residents view OSPR as either extremely or somewhat important to the quality of life in the Pittsburgh region and/or their local community (95.3% and 96.4%, respectively).

Importance to Quality of Life

Base = All Respondents (410)

- Importance of OSPR to quality of life in Pittsburgh: 95.3%
  - Extremely Important: 70.8%
  - Somewhat Important: 24.5%

- Importance of neighborhood parks to quality of life in community: 96.1%
  - Extremely Important: 72.5%
  - Somewhat Important: 23.6%
Executive Summary

Usage of OSPR

Local park access and usage is extremely high among respondents. Of the 87.3% of respondents with a park in their neighborhood, 79.9% used their neighborhood park.

- Although there were significant differences within some demographic groups, usage is high across the board with close to three out of four respondents in every demographic category having used their local park.

Usage of Local Park by Demographics

- Among respondents who didn’t use the local park for specific activities a lack of awareness may be to blame; 48.8% don’t know where any are and 14.6% don’t know what’s available at them.
Three activities/facilities rose to the top as the most vital to the small/neighborhood parks. These were playgrounds, picnic areas, and ball fields (81.7%, 60.5%, and 50.2%; respectively) indicating that these were the most important activities/facilities to be available at every small/neighborhood park.

- Fewer than one-fourth each selected swimming pools (25.4%), spray parks (fountains) (15.6%) and tennis courts (11.0%) as most important.

### Important Activity/Facility Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity/Facility</th>
<th>Total Bases</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Playground</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Area</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball field (baseball/softball,etc.)</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball Court</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pool</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spray Park (Fountains)</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Court</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In fact, swimming was one of the activities in which a majority of respondents was willing to travel a relatively further distance to participate.

- For swimming close to home, the majority were willing to travel 15-30 minutes (32.9%) or 30+ minutes (22.4%).

- Similarly, of those who participate elsewhere in the region the majority were willing to travel 30–60 minutes (43.4%) or 60+ minutes (8.4%)

### Willingness to Travel for Swimming

![Willingness to Travel for Swimming](chart.png)
Executive Summary

Maintaining the OSPR

In general, respondents are relatively satisfied with the level of maintenance of local and regional OSPR.

- While not shown below, top-two box ratings were driven primarily by very good ratings for both regional OSPR and local parks (42.8% and 46.3%, respectively) with far fewer excellent ratings (8.7% and 12.0%, respectively).

Satisfaction with Overall Quality of Maintenance

- The most commonly cited reasons for poor or low quality of maintenance ratings were appearance/environment related (open ended responses). Commonly cited reasons included litter, graffiti, and dirtiness.
**Executive Summary**

**Changes to the OSPRS System**

Respondents were not favorable to the notion of closing facilities at small parks to maintain major facilities at larger parks nor reducing the number of facilities at smaller/neighborhood parks to maintain the entire park.

**Support of Changes to OSPR System**

![Bar chart showing support for changes to OSPR System.](chart.png)

Base = All Respondents (410)

Respondents were most favorable to the ideas of *park sponsorship* (58.0%) and *volunteer maintenance crews* (52.2%) as ways to support facilities at smaller/neighborhood parks.

- For the vacant, under-used and abandoned properties in the city, *agricultural uses* were the most commonly selected idea for redevelopment (51.2%).
Conclusions and Recommendations

The park system is valued by the Pittsburgh community and, as a result, individuals will be resistant to major changes to the OSPR system and neighborhood parks. When modifying the current OSPR system the City of Pittsburgh should consider the following recommendations:

- Create a public dialogue. Over half of respondents stated that their support or opposition to changes in facilities would depend on which parks/facilities were impacted. Keep the public informed about proposed changes.

- Take advantage of public enthusiasm for the OSPRS system. Respondents favored park sponsorship and volunteer maintenance crews as ways to maintain the current park system. Reach out to residents as volunteers and businesses as sources of sponsorship as a way to support local parks.

- When possible, maintain playgrounds, picnic areas, and ball fields at local neighborhood parks. Respondents consider these as the most important facilities and activities for neighborhood parks.

- Swimming pools, tennis courts, and spray fountains are facilities which are seen as less essential to neighborhood parks. Consider these as opportunities for cost savings and as facilities that could potentially be removed from smaller parks and centralized at larger parks.
Detailed Findings
Question 5. In the past year, which of the following recreational activities, if any, have you and/or your family members participated in?

**Total Participation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Total Participation</th>
<th>Have Children</th>
<th>No Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardening</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming (Pool)</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnicking</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Walking/Dog Parks</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground (Visit/Play)</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jogging/Running</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biking (Road/Street/Paved trails)</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature walking/Birdwatching</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoga/Pilates</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking (Off-Road/Mountain)</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball/Softball</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Skating/Ice Hockey</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Field Sports</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sled Riding</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing/Paddling/Canoeing</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biking (Off-road/Mountain)</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateboarding</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biking (BMX)</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings**

Participation in recreation activities in the past year varied from a high of 73.7% of respondents participating in walking to a low of 2.4% of respondents participating in biking (BMX). For ease of discussion, the rest of this report will only speak to the activities in which greater than 15% of the respondents indicated participation.
**Detailed Findings**

- The most commonly selected activities included walking (73.7%), gardening (45.9%), swimming (45.5%), and picnicking (41.0%).

**Differences by Group**

- As shown on the previous table, respondents that indicated having children in their household were significantly more likely to have participated in a number of activities relative to respondents without children in their household. These included swimming, picnicking, dog walking/dog parks, and playground (visit/play).

- Additionally, females were significantly more likely than males to have participated in walking (78.2 % vs. 65.3 %, respectively) and yoga (27.8% vs. 13.9%, respectively). Males were significantly more likely to have participated in baseball/softball than females with 27.1% and 14.3% indicating participation, respectively.
Question 6. When participating in these activities, do you and/or your family members primarily use parks/sites close to home, elsewhere in the city or region, or a combination of the two?

### Participation Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>% of Total (From Q5: Bases)</th>
<th>Close to Home</th>
<th>Elsewhere</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>73.7% 302</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardening</td>
<td>45.9% 188</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming (Pool)</td>
<td>45.4% 186</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnicking</td>
<td>41.0% 168</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Walking/Dog Parks</td>
<td>38.3% 157</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground (Visit/Play)</td>
<td>35.9% 147</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jogging/Running</td>
<td>35.4% 145</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biking (Road/Street/Paved trails)</td>
<td>35.1% 144</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature walking/Birdwatching</td>
<td>34.6% 142</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoga/Pilates</td>
<td>22.9% 94</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking (Off-road/Mountain)</td>
<td>22.2% 91</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball/Softball</td>
<td>18.8% 77</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>18.5% 76</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>58.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>33.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Above average for column

#### Findings

In general, respondents participated in activities close to home more than elsewhere in the city or region.

- For two activities, *gardening* (94.1%) and *yoga/pilates* (90.4%), over 90% of respondents indicated that they participated close to home. Other activities with greater than average participation close to home included *jogging/running* (74.5%), *basketball* (65.8%), *dog walking/dog parks* (67.5%), and *playground (visit/play)* (60.5%).

- Hiking (off-road/mountain) was the one activity with a greater percentage of respondents indicating that they participated elsewhere in the city or region than indicated that they participated close to home (30.8% vs. 19.8%, respectively). Other activities with greater than average participation elsewhere in the city/region were *picnicking* (15.5%), *swimming* (13.4%), *nature walking/birdwatching* (13.4%), and *baseball/softball* (9.1%).
Walking, picnicking, biking (road/street/paved trails), nature walking/birdwatching, and hiking (off-road/mountain) were the five activities with greater than 40% of respondents indicating that they participated both close to home and elsewhere in the region.
Detailed Findings

Question 7. For what reasons do you not use parks/sites close to home for [INSERT ACTIVITY]? Select all that apply.

Reasons for Lack of Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Lack of Use</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Use Local Park</th>
<th>Don't Use Local Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't know where any are</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack necessary features/facilities</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know what's available at them</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too crowded</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety concerns</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly maintained</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too far away</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reason in particular</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significantly greater

Findings

Don’t know where any are (36.3%) and lack necessary features/facilities (33.9%) were the most commonly cited reasons for not using parks/sites close to home for particular activities.

Differences by Group

- Individuals who indicated that they did not use their local park were significantly more likely to indicate that they don’t know where any are than individuals who did use their local park (48.8% vs. 30.1%, respectively).
In general, the distance that respondents were willing to travel varied by activity.

- The vast majority of participants in gardening (85.3%) were willing to travel only 0-15 minutes to participate. Similarly, over 60% of participants in dog walking/dog parks (64.0%), jogging/running (67.4%), and yoga/pilates (64.1%) were willing to travel only 0-15 minutes.
- In contrast, the vast majority of participants in hiking and picnicking were willing to travel 15-30+ minutes to participate (87.3% and 83.8%, respectively). Other activities with over 60% of participants willing to travel 15-30+ minutes included nature walking/birdwatching (70.7%), biking (61.4%), and baseball/softball (60.0%).
Question 9. How long are you willing to travel to reach parks/sites elsewhere in the city or region for [INSERT ACTIVITY]?

Distance Willing to Travel (Elsewhere in City/Region)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>% of total (elsewhere in region or both)</th>
<th>Bases</th>
<th>0-30 mins</th>
<th>30-60 mins</th>
<th>60+ mins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnicking</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature walking/Birdwatching</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming (Pool)</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biking (Road/Street/Paved trails)</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking (Off-road/Mountain)</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Q9 was asked for activities in Q5 where elsewhere in region or both was selected in Q6. The base sizes shown reflect the number of respondents who answered for each activity. Less than 15 minutes and 15-30 minutes combined.

For activities participated elsewhere in the region or both, the distance that respondents were willing to travel also varied by activity.

- The majority of individuals who participated in walking (52.8%) were willing to travel 0-30 minutes for participation.
- Close to half of the respondents who participated in picnicking said they were willing to travel 30-60 minutes.
- Participants in nature walking/birdwatching were split with close to one third of respondents selecting each of the three time periods.
- Both swimming and biking were activities with over 40% of respondents indicating that they were willing to travel 0-30 minutes (48.2% and 44.7%, respectively).
- Hiking was the one activity with over half of the respondents indicating a willingness to travel 60+ minutes (57.5%).
**Question 10.  Do you have a park in your neighborhood?**

*Park in Neighborhood*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings**

The vast majority of respondents (87.3%) indicated there was a park in their neighborhood.

**Note:**
Q10 was asked of all respondents.
**Detailed Findings**

**Question 10a. Do you use it?**

*Use Neighborhood Park*

Of the participants with a park in their neighborhood, 79.9% indicated that they use their park.

**Differences by Group**

- Males (85.6%) were significantly more likely to indicate using their neighborhood park than females (76.8%).
- Respondents with children in the home (87.0%) were significantly more likely to use their park than respondents without children (77.1%).
- Individuals with a post-graduate education (90.5%) were significantly more likely to use their park than those with a college degree (77.4%) or those with less than a college degree (71.6%).
- Individuals with a household income above $75K (88.9%) were significantly more likely to use the park than individuals with a household income below $75K (74.5%).

**Findings**

Of the participants with a park in their neighborhood, 79.9% indicated that they use their park.
**Question 11.** How important are the open spaces, parks and recreation services to the quality of life in the Pittsburgh Area?

**Importance to Quality of Life-OSPRS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Use Local Park</th>
<th>Don't Use Local Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bases:</strong></td>
<td>408</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely important</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top-Two Box</strong></td>
<td>95.3%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very important</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important at all</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significantly greater

**Findings**

The vast majority of respondents (95.3%) indicated that the open spaces, parks, and recreation services were either *extremely* or *somewhat important* to the quality of life in the Pittsburgh area. Of these respondents, 70.8% indicated that the parks were *extremely important*.

**Differences by Group**

- Individuals who used their local park were significantly more likely to choose *extremely important* than those who didn’t use their local park (79.0% vs. 51.6%, respectively).

**Note:**
Q11 was asked of all respondents. Don’t know responses were removed from analysis.
Detailed Findings

Question 12. How would you rate the overall quality of maintenance of the open spaces, parks and recreation services in the Pittsburgh Area?

Overall Maintenance Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Use Local Park</th>
<th>Don't Use Local Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bases:</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top-Two Box</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very good</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Q12 was asked of all respondents. Don’t know responses were removed from analysis.

Findings

Over half of respondents gave a top-two box rating (51.5%) for the overall quality of maintenance of Pittsburgh open spaces, parks, and recreation services compared to slightly less than half that selected satisfactory (38.8%), not very good (8.0%), or poor (1.7%).

Differences by Group

- Individuals who used their local parks were significantly more likely to indicate that the quality of maintenance was excellent than individuals who did not use their local park (10.5% vs. 4.3%, respectively).
- A small but significantly greater percentage of respondents who do not use their local park selected poor (4.3%) than those who do use their park (0.7%)
- In addition, respondents without children felt that the level of maintenance was better than individuals without children; a significantly greater number of respondents without children in the home indicated a top-two box rating than did respondents with children in the home (56.3% vs. 38.5%).
- Respondents with children were significantly more likely to indicate satisfactory than those without children (48.6% vs. 56.3%).
**Question 12a. Why do you feel this way?**

**Open Ended Reason for Poor Maintenance**

- **Appearance/Environment (Net)**: 56.4%
- **Facilities (Net)**: 30.8%
- **Safety (Net)**: 5.1%
- **Improvements are unfunded/low priority**: 5.1%

*Base = 39*

**Findings**

Responses to the open ended questions were coded and classified into categories.

- For the few people who indicated that the overall maintenance of the parks/services in the Pittsburgh area was *not very good* or *poor*, the most commonly cited reasons was that the appearance/environment of the parks (56.4%). This included mentions of *litter*, *graffiti*, and *poor landscaping*.

Three in ten respondents (30.8%) mentioned facilities as the reason for the *not very good* or *poor* maintenance. This included mentions of *old equipment*, *poorly maintained trails*, and *old signage*.

*Please refer to the computer tables for a complete list of responses.*
Detailed Findings

Question 13. How important are neighborhood parks to the quality of life in local communities?

Importance to Quality of Life - Neighborhood Parks

The vast majority (96.1%) of respondents indicated that the neighborhood parks were either extremely important (72.5%) or somewhat important (23.6%) to the quality of life in local communities.

Differences by Group

- Individuals who use their local parks were more likely to indicate that the neighborhood parks were extremely important than those who did not use their parks (78.3% vs. 58.7%, respectively).

- Conversely, individuals who did not use their local parks were more likely to indicate that the neighborhood parks were somewhat important (33.9% vs. 19.2%, respectively) or not important at all (0.8% vs. 0.0%, respectively) than those who did not use their local park.

Note: Q13 was asked of all respondents. Don’t know responses were removed from analysis.
**Question 14.** How would you rate the overall quality of maintenance of the parks near your home?

**Quality of Maintenance-Neighborhood Parks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bases:</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Use Local Park</th>
<th>Don't Use Local Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>350</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top-Two Box</strong></td>
<td><strong>58.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>60.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>49.2%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very good</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Q14 was asked of all respondents who indicated having a park in their neighborhood in Q10.

**Findings**

Nearly six in ten (58.3%) respondents indicated that the quality of maintenance in their neighborhood parks was either excellent (12%) or very good (46.3%).

**Differences by Group**

- Individuals who did not use their local park were significantly more likely to indicate that the quality of maintenance was Poor than those who did use the park (6.2% vs. 0.7%, respectively).
- In addition, respondents without children felt that the level of maintenance was better than individuals with children; a significantly greater number of respondents without children in home indicated a top-two box rating than did respondents with children in the home (63.6% vs. 44.3%, respectively).
- Respondents with children were significantly more likely to indicate satisfactory than those without children (45.4% vs. 28.5%, respectively).
Detailed Findings

Question 14a. Why do you feel this way?

Reason for Low Maintenance Opinion

Note:
Q 14a was asked, in an open ended format, to respondents who selected not very good or poor in Q14.
*Caution: Small sample size

Findings

Responses to the open-ended questions were coded and classified into categories.

- For the few people who indicated that the overall maintenance of their neighborhood parks/services was not very good or poor, the most commonly cited reasons was that the appearance/environment of the parks (56.7%). This included mentions of litter, dirtiness, and graffiti.

- One in five respondents (20.0%) mentioned facilities as the reason for the not very good or poor maintenance. This included mentions of old and outdated equipment.

- Please refer to the computer tables for a complete list of responses.
Question 15. Would you support or oppose the closing of major facilities (i.e., swimming pools, tennis courts, etc.) at smaller/neighborhood parks so that major facilities at larger recreational areas/parks in the city could be improved and sufficiently maintained?

Support Closing Facilities

There was limited support for the closing of major facilities at smaller parks to maintain larger parks; 14.1% of respondents chose support, while 50.0% indicated that it depended on which parks/facilities would be closed.

Differences by Group

- Significantly more respondents who used their local park indicated oppose than those who didn’t use the neighborhood park (35.7% vs. 25.0%, respectively).
**Detailed Findings**

**Question 16.** Would you support or oppose a reduction in the number of facilities at smaller/neighborhood parks so that the money and labor saved by the reductions could be used to maintain the entire park and its remaining facilities even better?

### Support Reducing Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bases:</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Use Local Park</th>
<th>Don't Use Local Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
<td>410</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depends on which parks/facilities</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significantly greater

### One in five respondents (21.0%) supported reducing the number of facilities at smaller parks to maintain the entire park, while the majority indicated that it depends on which parks/facilities (48.8%).

### Differences by Group

- Significantly more individuals who use their local park stated that it depends than those who use their local park (56.5% vs. 45.5%, respectively)
- One in four respondents (26.0%) opposed a reduction in the number of facilities with a significantly greater percentage of individuals who used their local parks voicing opposition (29.4%) than those who did not use their local park (19.4%).
Question 16a. How would you suggest supporting facilities at either smaller/neighborhood or larger recreational areas/parks in the city so that reductions do not have to occur and they remain properly maintained?

Support Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park Sponsorships/ &quot;Adopt-a-park&quot;</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer maintenance crews</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User fees</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising Events</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased taxes</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base = 410

Findings

When presented with options for how to support park facilities, over 50% each of respondents selected park sponsorships (58.0%) and volunteer maintenance crews (52.2%).

- *User fees* and *fundraising events* were selected by approximately one in five respondents (22.2% and 20.0%, respectively) while *increased taxes* was selected by only 11.7% of respondents.
- Please refer to the computer tables for a complete list of other responses.
Question 17. In addition to open-space/green-space, what do you feel are the three most important activities/facilities that should be available at every small/neighborhood park?

Most important activities/facilities

- Playgrounds (81.7%)
- Picnic areas (60.5%)
- Ball fields (50.2%)
- Basketball Court (30.5%)
- Swimming Pool (25.4%)
- Spray Park (Fountains) (15.6%)
- Tennis Court (11.0%)
- Walking/Hiking/Biking trails (4.6%)

Findings

Playgrounds (81.7%) were by far the most important activity/facility to respondents.

- Picnic areas (60.5%) and ball fields (50.2%) followed playgrounds as the next most important activities/facilities that should be available in small/neighborhood parks.
Question 18. Keeping in mind the limited resources available for proper maintenance, of the following ideas (generated from public input so far) for improving/redeveloping the many vacant, under-used and abandoned properties in the city, which three do you feel would be the most beneficial to the region as a whole?

Uses for Under-used and Open Space

The greatest percentage of respondents selected agricultural uses (51.2%) as the most beneficial usage of under-used space, while the fewest percentage of respondents selected managed natural sites (17.1%).

- All other responses were selected by close to 30% of respondents.
Question 19. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about open space, parks and recreation in the Pittsburgh area?

Please refer to the appendix section of this report for a complete list of responses.

Note: Q19 was asked of all respondents.
### Detailed Findings

**Questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 20.**

### Respondent Profile

**Note:**  
Q1–4, 20 were asked of all respondents. On Q20, a response was not required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>410</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-54</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian (non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African-American (non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian/ Chinese/ Japanese</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children in Household</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with Partner</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondent Profile (continued)

Note:
Q22–26 were asked of all respondents. A response was not required.

### Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base:</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than College Graduate</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate Studies/Degree</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base:</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed full-time</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed part-time</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base:</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to $50,000</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50K - $100K</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100K+</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Zip Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base:</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15206</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15212</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15217</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15213</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15221</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15201</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15224</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15210</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15216</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15220</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15203</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15218</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15208</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15232</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15214</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15227</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15205</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15236</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15226</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15207</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15219</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15211</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15222</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15204</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15147</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15233</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15234</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15136</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15215</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 21. What is the name of the neighborhood that you live in?

Neighborhood

- Allegheny (1 respondent)
- Allentown (1 respondent)
- Arlington (3 respondents)
- Avalon (1 respondent)
- Baldwin (6 respondents)
- Banksville (5 respondents)
- Beechview (8 respondents)
- Beechwood (1 respondent)
- Bellevue (1 respondent)
- Blackridge (1 respondent)
- Bloomfield (8 respondents)
- Bon Air (1 respondent)
- Brentwood (4 respondents)
- Brighton Heights (9 respondents)
- Brookline (8 respondents)
- California-Kirkbride (1 respondent)
- Carrick (7 respondents)
- Castle Shannon (1 respondent)
- Charles Street area (1 respondent)
- Churchill (2 respondents)
- Dormont (5 respondents)
- Crafton (5 respondents)
- Danton Heights (1 respondent)
- Downtown (4 respondents)
- Duquesne Heights (1 respondent)
- Duquesne Place (1 respondent)
- East Hills (1 respondent)
- East Liberty (7 respondents)
- Edgewood (4 respondents)
- Fineview (1 respondent)

Note:
Q21 was asked of all respondents. A response was not required.
Detailed Findings

- Forest Hills (4 respondents)
- Frick Park (1 respondent)
- Friendship (7 respondents)
- Garfield (2 respondents)
- Green Tree (5 respondents)
- Greenfield (11 respondents)
- Hazelwood (1 respondent)
- Highland Park (18 respondents)
- Hill District (4 respondents)
- Homewood (4 respondents)
- Ingram (1 respondent)
- Kennedy Township (1 respondent)
- Knoxville (1 respondent)
- Lawrenceville (7 respondents)
- Lincoln Place (1 respondent)
- Manchester (4 respondents)
- Marshall-Shadeland (3 respondents)
- McKees Rocks (1 respondent)
- Mexican War Streets (1 respondent)
- Morningside (8 respondents)
- Mt. Washington (1 respondent)
- Mt. Lebanon (4 respondents)
- Mt. Washington (6 respondents)
- Mt. Oliver City (1 respondent)
- Murdoch Farms (1 respondent)
- North Hills (1 respondent)
- Oakland (21 respondents)
- Point Breeze (12 respondents)
- North Shore (3 respondents)
- North Side (7 respondents)
- Oak Hill (1 respondent)
- Observatory Hill (5 respondents)
- O'Hara (1 respondent)
Detailed Findings

- Overbrook (1 respondent)
- Penn Hills (3 respondents)
- Pennsbury (1 respondent)
- Perry (3 respondents)
- Pittsburgh (4 respondents)
- Pleasant Hills (3 respondents)
- Polish Hill (2 respondents)
- Regent Square (3 respondents)
- Reserve (3 respondents)
- Robinson (3 respondents)
- Schenley Farms (1 respondent)
- Scott Township (1 respondent)
- Shadyside (20 respondents)
- Sheraden (4 respondents)
- Schenley Heights (1 respondent)
- South Park (1 respondent)
- South Side (12 respondents)
- Squirrel Hill (29 respondents)
- Stanton Heights (7 respondents)
- Strip District (2 respondents)
- Summerset at Frick Park (1 respondent)
- Swisshelm Park (1 respondent)
- Swissvale (6 respondents)
- The fringe (1 respondent)
- Troy Hill (3 respondents)
- Urban City (1 respondent)
- Verona (2 respondents)
- Wallace Park (1 respondent)
- West End (3 respondents)
- Westwood (3 respondents)
- Whitehall (5 respondents)
- Wilkinsburg (8 respondents)
- Wind Gap (2 respondents)
- No answer/Refused (20 respondents)
Appendix A – Questionnaire
Section 1: Tell us about yourself.

S1. Are you a full-time resident of the City of Pittsburgh (i.e., are you eligible to vote in mayoral elections based on where you live)?
   Yes ............................................................................................................... 1
   No................................................................................................................ 2
   Don’t know .............................................................................................. 3

1. What is your age?
   18 to 24...................................................................................................... 1
   25 to 34...................................................................................................... 2
   35 to 44...................................................................................................... 3
   45 to 54...................................................................................................... 4
   55 to 64...................................................................................................... 5
   65 to 74...................................................................................................... 6
   75 or older ................................................................................................ 7

2. Are you a…?
   Male............................................................................................................. 1
   Female ........................................................................................................ 2

3. Which of the following best describes your race/ethnicity?
   White/Caucasian (non-Hispanic).......................................................... 1
   Black/African-American (non-Hispanic).............................................. 2
   Hispanic/Latino ....................................................................................... 3
   East Asian/Chinese/Japanese................................................................. 4
   West Asian/Indian/Egyptian ................................................................... 5
   Native American/American Indian/Alaskan Native ......................... 6
   Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander .......................................................... 7
   Other (SPECIFY)___________________________________________________ 8

4. Do you have children living in your household for three or more months in the year in the following age groups? Select All That Apply
   Under the age of 5................................................................................... 1
   5 to 10 years old.................................................................................... 2
   11 to 15 years old................................................................................... 3
   16 to 18 years old................................................................................... 4
   No children in the household ............................................................... 5
Section 2: Usage of Parks

5. In the past year, which of the following recreational activities, if any, have you and/or your family members participated in?

Select All That Apply

- Baseball/Softball......................................................................................... 01
- Basketball.................................................................................................... 02
- Biking (BMX).............................................................................................. 03
- Biking (Off-road/Mountain) .................................................................... 04
- Biking (Road/Street/Paved trails)........................................................... 05
- Dog walking/Dog parks........................................................................... 06
- Fishing.......................................................................................................... 07
- Gardening................................................................................................... 08
- Hiking (Off-road/Mountain).................................................................. 09
- Ice skating/Ice Hockey............................................................................ 10
- Jogging/Running..................................................................................... 11
- Nature walking/Birdwatching............................................................... 12
- Other field sports (Rugby, Football, Kickball, Ultimate)............. 13
- Picnicking................................................................................................. 14
- Playground (Visit/Play)........................................................................ 15
- Rowing/Paddling/Canoeing .................................................................... 16
- Skateboarding........................................................................................... 17
- Sled riding................................................................................................ 18
- Soccer....................................................................................................... 19
- Swimming (Pool)...................................................................................... 20
- Tennis....................................................................................................... 21
- Yoga/Pilates............................................................................................. 22
- Walking....................................................................................................... 23
- Other (Specify)____________________________________________________ 24
- Other (Specify)____________________________________________________ 25
- Other (Specify)____________________________________________________ 26

**EXC** -- None, I do not participate in any recreational activities ............. 27  SKIP to Q10
**Programmer Note: For Q6, use an Answer Grid and ONLY ask for activities selected in Q5.**

6. When participating in these activities, do you and/or your family members primarily use parks/sites close to home, elsewhere in the city or region, or a combination of the two?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Close to Home</th>
<th>Elsewhere in Region</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball/Softball</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biking (BMX)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biking (Off-road/Mountain)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biking (Road/Street/Paved trails)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog walking/Dog parks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardening</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking (Off-road/Mountain)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice skating/Ice Hockey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jogging/Running</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature walking/Birdwatching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other field sports (Rugby, Football, Kickball, Ultimate)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnicking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground (Visit/Play)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing/Paddling/Canoeing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateboarding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sled riding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming (Pool)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoga/Pilates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. For what reasons do you not use parks/sites close to home for [INSERT ACTIVITY]?

Select All That Apply

Don’t know where any are ................................................................. 1
Don’t know what’s available at them ............................................... 2
Lack necessary features/facilities ....................................................... 3
Poorly maintained (i.e., trash/litter, sanitation, etc.) ........................ 4
Safety concerns (i.e., crime, equipment/facilities, etc.) ................. 5
Too crowded ....................................................................................... 6
Too far away/difficult to get to .......................................................... 7
Other (Specify) .................................................................................. 8
EXC --No reason in particular .......................................................... 9

Programmer Note: For Q7, ONLY ask for activities selected in Q5 where ELSEWHERE IN REGION (2) was selected in Q6, otherwise SKIP to Q8a.

8. How long are you willing to travel to reach parks/sites close to home for [INSERT ACTIVITY]?

5 minutes or less ................................................................................ 1
5 to 15 minutes ................................................................................. 2
15 to 30 minutes .............................................................................. 3
30 minutes or more .......................................................................... 4

Programmer Note: For Q8, ONLY ask for activities selected in Q5 where either CLOSE TO HOME (1) or BOTH (3) was selected, otherwise SKIP to Q9.

9. How long are you willing to travel to reach parks/sites elsewhere in the city or region for [INSERT ACTIVITY]?

15 minutes or less ............................................................................. 1
15 to 30 minutes ............................................................................... 2
30 to 60 minutes ........................................................................ ...... 3
60 minutes or more .......................................................................... 4

Programmer Note: For Q9, ONLY ask for activities selected in Q5 where either ELSEWHERE IN REGION (2) or BOTH (3) was selected, otherwise SKIP to Q10.

10. Do you have a park in your neighborhood?

Yes ....................................................................................................... 1
No ......................................................................................................... 2
Don’t know ........................................................................................ 3

10a. Do you use it?

Yes ....................................................................................................... 1
No ......................................................................................................... 2
Don’t know ........................................................................................ 3
Section 3: Perceptions of Parks

Now we are going to explore open spaces, parks and recreation in Pittsburgh on a broader level.

11. How important are the open spaces, parks and recreation services to the quality of life in the Pittsburgh Area?
   Extremely important................................................................. 5
   Somewhat important.............................................................. 4
   No opinion ................................................................................. 3
   Not very important................................................................. 2
   Not important at all................................................................. 1
   Don’t know ............................................................................... 6

12. How would you rate the overall quality of maintenance of the open spaces, parks and recreation services in the Pittsburgh Area?
   Excellent................................................................................... 5 SKIP to Q13
   Very good.................................................................................. 4 SKIP to Q13
   Satisfactory .............................................................................. 3 SKIP to Q13
   Not very good.......................................................................... 2
   Poor .......................................................................................... 1
   Don’t know ............................................................................... 6 SKIP to Q13

12a. Why do you feel this way?

13. How important are neighborhood parks to the quality of life in local communities?
   Extremely important................................................................. 5
   Somewhat important.............................................................. 4
   No opinion ................................................................................. 3
   Not very important................................................................. 2
   Not important at all................................................................. 1
   Don’t know ............................................................................... 6

Programmer Note: ONLY ask Q14 if selected YES (1) in Q10, otherwise SKIP to Q15.

14. How would you rate the overall quality of maintenance of the parks near your home?
   Excellent................................................................................... 5 SKIP to Q15
   Very good.................................................................................. 4 SKIP to Q15
   Satisfactory .............................................................................. 3 SKIP to Q15
   Not very good.......................................................................... 2
   Poor .......................................................................................... 1
   Don’t know ............................................................................... 6 SKIP to Q15

14a. Why do you feel this way?
Section 4: Impact of Changes to the Park System

Due to the fact that the population of the City of Pittsburgh is now half as large as it once was, the city’s resources are no longer adequate enough to sustain the open spaces, parks and recreation services of the past. Therefore, difficult decisions must be made regarding the number and distribution of many recreational facilities/activities across the entire park system to create a sustainable system that best serves the community. Decisions about this balance of quantity and quality will be guided by public input.

15. Would you support or oppose the closing of major facilities (i.e., swimming pools, tennis courts, etc.) at smaller/neighborhood parks so that major facilities at larger recreational areas/parks in the city could be improved and sufficiently maintained?

Support ............................................................................................................... 1
Oppose ............................................................................................................... 2
Depends on which parks/facilities would be affected ........................................ 3
Don’t know .......................................................................................................... 4

16. Would you support or oppose a reduction in the number of facilities at smaller/neighborhood parks so that the money and labor saved by the reductions could be used to maintain the entire park and its remaining facilities even better?

Support ............................................................................................................... 1
Oppose ............................................................................................................... 2
Depends on what facilities would be removed ..................................................... 3
Don’t know .......................................................................................................... 4

Programmer Note: ONLY ask Q16a if did NOT select SUPPORT (1) in both Q15 and Q16; otherwise SKIP to Q17.

16a. How would you suggest supporting facilities at either smaller/neighborhood or larger recreational areas/parks in the city so that reductions do not have to occur and they remain properly maintained? Select All That Apply

Increased taxes ........................................................................................................ 1
Park sponsorships/“Adopt-a-Park” ........................................................................ 2
User fees .................................................................................................................. 3
Volunteer maintenance crews .................................................................................. 4
Other (Specify) ........................................................................................................ 5
EXC --- Don’t know ................................................................................................ 6
17. In addition to open-space/green-space, what do you feel are the three most important activities/facilities that should be available at every small/neighborhood park?

Please Select Three (3)

Ball Field (baseball/softball, soccer, etc.) ............................................. 01
Basketball Court ....................................................................................... 02
Hockey Court ........................................................................................... 03
Picnic Area ................................................................................................. 04
Playground .................................................................................................. 05
Skate Park ................................................................................................... 06
Spray Park (Fountains) ............................................................................. 07
Swimming Pool .......................................................................................... 08
Tennis Court ............................................................................................. 09
Other (Specify) ........................................................................................ 10
Other (Specify) ........................................................................................ 11
Other (Specify) ........................................................................................ 12
EXC -- Don’t know .................................................................................. 13

18. Keeping in mind the limited resources available for proper maintenance, of the following ideas (generated from public input so far) for improving/redeveloping the many vacant, under-used and abandoned properties in the city, which three do you feel would be the most beneficial to the region as a whole?

Please Select Three (3)

Agricultural uses (i.e., community gardens, farms, etc.) ......................01
Habitat restoration (i.e., forests, streams, etc.) .....................................02
Homestead program to bring in new homeowners .............................03
Incubate local businesses, entrepreneurs, and non-profits .................04
Keep/Landbank property with future development potential ............05
New park/recreation facilities .................................................................06
Parking for neighborhood business districts that need it .................07
Managed natural sites that contain/clean stormwater or run-off ....08
Support existing programs/uses to work faster/better.........................09
Trail network expansion (walking, hiking, and/or biking) .................10
Other (Specify) ........................................................................................ 11
Other (Specify) ........................................................................................ 12
Other (Specify) ........................................................................................ 13

19. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about open space, parks and recreation in the Pittsburgh Area?
Section 5: Demographics

Programmer Note: Program Q20–Q25 as “Not Required”

20. What is your Zip Code? ____________________

21. What is the name of the neighborhood that you live in?

22. Are you…?
   Single........................................................................................................... 1
   Married....................................................................................................... 2
   Living with partner................................................................................... 3
   Divorced .................................................................................................... 4
   Widowed................................................................................................... 5

23. What is the highest level of education that you have completed?
   Less than high school.............................................................................. 1
   High school graduate .............................................................................. 2
   Some college/technical or trade school.............................................. 3
   College graduate ...................................................................................... 4
   Post graduate studies/degree ............................................................... 5

24. Which of the following best describes your employment status?
   Employed full-time................................................................................... 1
   Employed part-time................................................................................. 2
   Self-employed............................................................................................ 3
   Unemployed.............................................................................................. 4
   Retired........................................................................................................ 5

25. Which of the following contains your household’s total income?
   Less than $25,000 .................................................................................... 1
   $25,000-$50,000 ...................................................................................... 2
   $50,000-$75,000 ...................................................................................... 3
   $75,000-$100,000 .................................................................................... 4
   $100,000-$125,000 .................................................................................. 5
   $125,000 or more ................................................................................... 6

Thank you for taking the time to complete the survey!
Appendix B – Open-End Responses
Q19. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about open space, parks and recreation in the Pittsburgh Area?

I appreciate all the efforts made to maintain them - there are a lot of acres out there.

City can't maintain roads, roadsides, bridges. Mayor going to sacrifice parking structures to prevent state from taking over bloated pension plan for city workers so he can get reelected. Don't see a lot of hope for parks.

Survey useless without knowing what demand and use is for parks.

The parks are one of the best reasons to stay in Pittsburgh. If you want people to stay, keep the parks open. I live in Squirrel Hill between Frick and Schenley Parks. It's hard to consider even moving as far as Shadyside because the parks are such a major part of the quality of life in Squirrel Hill. The smaller parks in other neighborhoods must stay open too. In my answer to the last question, I listed homesteading and entrepreneurship as the things that I think would be most beneficial to the region. I think those would be most financially beneficial and would bring more people into Pittsburgh. However, the things I would enjoy most would be more parks, trails, and community gardens.

I frequently visit local parks in the East End of Pittsburgh for exercise and recreational use. I highly enjoy the time that I spend at these parks and feel that they are beneficial to the community.

It's important for families. We need to all help out on this one.

Maintain weed control and trash.

I feel it extremely important to have local parks for the children. There are too few vents for the children as it is.

Even if some facilities have to be closed, maintain the open spaces as parks.

VISITED BY UNDESIRABLES

If I won a big lottery, I would donate funds for rehabbing the major city parks.

THE AREAS HAVE A LOT OF CRIME,

Try to keep them from being dump sights!

Overall, I think most of them are in pretty good shape, but there is room for improvement.

We have a number of spaces to relax. Scrap the small ones that need a lot of help and ask that the businesses help with the maintaince if possible. A buy in plan.

It is very important!

It is very necessary to have open spaces in order to keep attracting newcomers to our area.

Maintain Westinghouse Park. All parks should be equally well-maintained. Preserve open spaces. Plant and maintain trees along neighborhood streets.

I would like to see a significant increase in dog park type resources. I've seen a large number of dog owners without nearby facilities

Good parks are essential to city living.

Some seem to be over run with family reunions and day care center children. Parking is an issue with the in city parks -- where can you park without getting a ticket in Schenley Park -- it's so close to CMU and Pitt that going there is a big parking nightmare. Mellon Park gets kind of creepy at night -- lighting should be more pronounced.

Clean up the litter and debris in the parks and hillsides of Pittsburgh.

Most are nice some are shit holes...

I stringly believe the areas with the lowest economic population absolutely need good open spaces/parks for recreation.

keep folks in oownnihborhoods and make them clean up after themselves

I think having open space for our children to play in and learn about nature is a wonderful way to learn about the world around us.

Increase calls for volunteer help to maintain them.

Please find a way to keep them open! We need them!

Pittsburgh has good parks for a city its size. I especially appreciate parks with trails and woods areas (e.g. Schenley Park/ Riverview Park). I like to be able to have chances to be in nature while in the city, since I don't get outside of the city much.

They are most important for our youth and senior populations. Transportation is an issue so local facilities must be maintained.
Q19. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about open space, parks and recreation in the Pittsburgh Area?

It vastly improves the neighborhood.

I really like the chance to get away from the urban city sprawl by going to places like South Park - it is close, but offers such enjoyment and stress relief.

I think these areas should also have cameras or police presence to keep the parks safe and drug free.

More green space and more parking and less vacant lots will make Pittsburgh an even better city.

More police surveillance

Having open space and parks and recreation in the Pittsburgh area is very important especially when you have grandchildren. I'm glad the Pittsburgh area has plenty of parks that I can take my grandchildren to.

One of the great statements about Pittsburgh is the fact that it is so green. Many visitors comment about the fact that there is so much green in a city. Please, let's not lose that to illegal activity.

the areas that are maintained are LOVELY and Pittsburgh offers many many nice things for the residents. however, the city needs to make this more equitable. if we can only have one or two major parks then the city need to operate shuttles and patrol people to bring residents there. if I'm working i can't take my child to the pool. if there isn't a pool in beechview my child can't go swimming or can't do art cart or movies in the park.

Less sleeping areas for the City of Pittsburgh parks and recreation workers to sleep!

Frick Park is wonderfully maintained and a great place to hike, walk your dog, play at the playground, etc.

Open spaces need to be used more efficiently

Local park and recreation areas are very important to the community.

Open space and parks need to be maintained, especially in the city where people don't have ready access to nature. Perhaps sponsorship by major (and minor) corporations could be elicited.

Thank you for getting public input on the problems of maintenance.

YOU NEED TO HAVE PLACES FOR THE FAMILIES TO TAKE THEIR KIDS AND BE MAINTAINED. IF POLITICIANS WOULD GET THEIR HANDS OUTTA THE COOKIE JAR THEN THERE WOULD BE ENOUGH MONEY TO GO AROUND TO TAKE CARE OF THE PARKS ETC.

I would love to see more organized, designated dog parks in the Pittsburgh Area.

Plant more trees.

Greater commitment from the Mayor's Office and greater emphasis on maintenance/renewal in disadvantaged neighborhoods. For example, the section of Mellon Park next to PCA is well-maintained but the part along Penn Avenue needs much improvement.

it is so important, sometimes on a bad day it is the only thing that keeps me going. keep the parks beautiful!

As trees are lost, please replace them, especially lining streets. Also, be sure there are plenty of trashcans available on the streets/parks to help us keep the place picked up. Could urban versions of homeowners associations be helpful or are there too many rentals to make it work? Neighborhood sponsorship of their local mini-parks (e.g. playgrounds and such that are smaller than 1 acre).

There needs to be more recreation centers located centrally to communities

Need more trash cans

I would like to see some public spaces/parks better policed. I sometimes do not feel safe walking my dog. There are often people sleeping in these spaces, and while mostly they seem harmless, they sometimes seem to be mentally ill and in need of help. They often ask me for money. The police seem to just ignore these people.
Q19. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about open space, parks and recreation in the Pittsburgh Area?

The green space is important to the health of the city residence. Pittsburgh’s parks and hiking trails allow people an opportunity to relax, to let go of their stresses and helps contribute to an overall healthier city. There is a nice sense of community and a social atmosphere enjoyed by residents who use the parks to keep physically fit. We have become a society where people come home from work, watch TV and never even interact with their neighbors. Individuals that use the park regularly develop a sense of community that has been lost by most neighborhoods. I am grateful that the city of Pittsburgh has so many wonderful green spaces. I believe the city parks are part of the reason people find it desirable to move back into the city. People leave cities that are devoid of nature and green space. The city parks make the city of Pittsburgh an amazing place to live.

I DO BELIEVE THE PARKS SHOULD STAY BECAUSE MOST OF THE KIDS WANT TO PLAY ON PLAYGROUND AND ENJOY THEMSELVES. ALSO MOST OF PEOPLE LIKE TO TAKE LONG WALK. IT IS BEST ENVIRONMENT FOR ALL OF FAMILIES AT THE PARKS

I enjoy them and hope that at least some remain open to the public.

I think Pittsburgh is very fortunate to have so many park options and really appreciate having them, as a city dweller. I would be sad if some of the spaces had to close but if that meant that our larger parks (Frick, Schenley) could be on a par with, for example, Central Park in NYC, I could be in favor of it.

It seems difficult to classify the best uses for all vacant/abandoned/underused properties, given that the surrounding environment of each means that it would be more useful situationally. For example, a vacant building with little to recommend to it's rehabilitation, situated next to an emerging business, may be a prime space for a parking lot or other business development, but not an urban farm or neighborhood garden. A focus on the best use of each space, assuming the house/property is not supported by the housing market or the market for business development could slowly improve each neighborhood/business district.

Even though I rated the parks only satisfactory on facilities and maintenance, it has improved markedly from the poor condition found when the PPC first started and the City was running them. My comments only related to city parks not county parks which I don’t really use but feel that both North and South Parks are very important to the community.

Keep the parks and keep them free. No taxes to pay for parks!

most are poorly maintained, with very little police protection, also most people walking their pets ignore leash laws and let their dogs run free which could be very unsafe to those have their pets leashed. the public facilities are littered with garbage and evidence of drug use in the public restrooms which are extremely unattended to. How sad for these parks were beautiful once and properly maintained.

We enjoy them very much

I think the parks and public spaces are an important part of the region and provide and outlet and recreation for children and adults.

Giving fines to people who litter and also ticket events that leave the park a mess.

There are many parks in Pittsburgh, some are better maintained than others and some are under used because of safety concerns, but to close smaller parks is unacceptable. When the swimming pools were closed a few years ago there seemed to be an increase in crime & mischief because the children didn't have any where to go. Not all parents are able to drive their children to the park during the day. Many of us have to work.

I swam at city pools this summer and they were very cold. the same thing last year. overly cold water is not refreshing. for that reason alone i did not swim as much as in prior years.

Please do not chop trees, let the beauty of Pittsburgh remain

we need a dog park downtown. we need to clean point park and get the fountain back on. we need trails from highland park, through the strip district to downtown,and out to the south side and beyond

letting the Neville rink go was a travesty

Please try to keep the parks as nice as they are. thank you

I love how GREEN Pittsburgh is - even in a span of seven years, there are more and more opportunities to bike or walk my way around the city.
Q19. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about open space, parks and recreation in the Pittsburgh Area?

Maintain the existing ones before embarking on new!

The city should focus on open space, parks, and trails and stop doing more development or funding of private developers. And then PROMOTE these assets to the city and the country. Work with local news media to include things like boating for rowing/kayaking or golfing so people know that there is an active lifestyle here.

we need more fenced-in dog park areas

I think the trails in Frick and Schenley Park (the two parks I frequent most often) are kept up very well. I really enjoy the frisbee golf course in Schenley as well. I don't have any complaints.

Property owners are probably willing to pay to develop and maintain local neighborhood open space including tree plantings, underground utilities etc. But this planning must be done at a local level and not be mandated by Grant Street.

Rather than take away from smaller parks and add facilities to major (larger) city parks, why not try to stretch the resources so that everyone can enjoy. For example, eliminate some facilities from larger parks and move (or maintain) them in smaller parks.

I get that the trails in Schenley need basic maintenance, but their rustic quality is also a major benefit, we don't need to be spending resources on paving trails there or anything. I strongly support turning old parks into community gardens, which are not only fun to be a part of, but provide fresh, healthy food to local residents who may not otherwise regularly consume such food.

I understand the need to balance a reduction in population and funds to support parks/recreation, but I also think that the city needs to keep these things in place, as well as make better use of abandoned/under-used property, as a way to attract more people back to the city.

Schenley Park is amazing

They are necessary. Pittsburgh is far behind other cities such as Minneapolis. Minneapolis has unlimited bike trails that are highly respected and utilized. It is time for Pittsburgh to catch up with health conscious cities.

Start early with the kids on environmental stewardship, litter free spaces, etc

clean

There is not enough open space and too many abandoned and run down buildings.

There is a large number of families that live in apartments, townhouses or urban developments which do not have yards and/or green space. Even worse, many school districts are cutting after school programs that could usually compensate for sporting and other recreational activities. These areas are also vital to socialization and the health of children. Children learn many skills from outdoor recreational activities.

I am glad that there are many parks and open spaces to go. Being in a city sometimes offers limited spaces for certain events so it's important to have places to go. America is getting fat and too connected to machines and should enjoy the outside from time to time.

I love our parks.

keep the play area clean and secured

Maintain public safety a first priority

parks and recreational centers need to be more taken care of. more playgrounds and spray parks need to be built in more local neighborhoods and areas.

Underused, vacant and abandoned properties should be made available to private citizens and/or non profits to annex as side yards or use to improve the quality of life in neighborhoods, particularly low-income neighborhoods.

Employ young people. As soon as you can get a work permit offer them a job. Give them a couple dollars to clean up and give them a better life

The green space is very important, as much as possible without concrete and pavement. Natural green space is important.

The use of parks is uplifting and gives the kids a lot to do in the summer. It is something they can look forward to doing. Dogwalking is a big thing around here.
Q19. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about open space, parks and recreation in the Pittsburgh Area?

They could use the color blue in those areas (flower arrangement gardens, etc) and blue backgrounds etc because blue is the most coherent with the environment and has a coherent effect on the people. By this I mean using color therapy. Use blue colored flora. You might be able to benefit and make a positive impact on people.

I think that they should just have better cleanup of all the parks. Some are messier than others. Educate the people in the neighborhood to keep their parks clean, send out flyers or something to tell them how to take care of the parks. I like my parks and I like to see them clean.

Recently in Downtown Pittsburgh they have put in more green spaces and now there are several which is very important because they combat pollution. They produce oxygen which we need. The one thing I think is not very important is solar energy because it doesn't work at night.

It would be nice to see either the parks that are close to peoples home restored or have something like an arena. I'm sure a lot of people wouldn't mine travelling to it and they could turn it into a park/recreation area.

We need more open spaces to make a happier world as a whole. It is a place for children to go to keep them out of trouble.

I would really like to see it be cleaned up, meaning all these empty spaces as they are empty and neglected with just weeds and trees growing up all wild. Also like to see the streets cleaned on at least monthly basis.

I think there should be more exercise spots for seniors where they can walk and sit and play checkers etc and bocce ball. Something that doesn't need much supervision.

There are older teens in the parks and the parks are not made for them and the little kids, when they go there, are kinda pushed away by the older ones who are smoking and such. Then the little ones start copying off of the older ones. I think the senior citizens should become more involved in the parks. They have something like generation ‘something or other’ which doesn't seem to be doing much and I'd like to see them doing something about it. Also they cut down weeds and just leave them staying on the side of the sidewalks. A couple of people in motorized wheelchairs have to go out in the streets because of the sticks and leaves laying in the sidewalks.

I hope if they do cut back that they cut as little as possible. Try not to cut too drastically.

They need to clean up those areas. They are doing a decent job now but they need to do a better job of cleaning up the area. It would be beneficial to people looking to move in to the area. I would like to see some of these vacant lots built on with new decent homes which people could move in to. I own properties where the gas bills that people get are astronomical because of the size of the houses. These homes that are vacant are vacant because the people can't keep them maintained and the bills paid. The next thing you know the house is abandoned and people go in and tear it to pieces. They need to build some more greener newer homes for people to move into because the people in this newer generation are not having a lot of kids and they don't need a large home.

I have enjoyed the parks since I lived here, It is a place you can escape the rushing around of the city. I think it attracts a lot of people to the city, it is one of our biggest attractions. They help with reducing pollution (open/green spaces)

Put more money into the parks and cleanup a lot of the old stuff out of here. We need to clean up some of the garbage around and put more stuff in the parks for the kids to do.

I just hope we can preserve them availability and parking are sometimes limited

if we have to remove some things to improve the quality of what we have I'm all for it
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1. Focus Groups

INTRODUCTION

PLANPGH will guide the process of making Pittsburgh an even better place to live, work, learn, play, and thrive over the next 25 years. The Open Space, Parks and Recreation Plan (OpenSpacePGH) is a component of the City of Pittsburgh’s first ever comprehensive plan, and is one of the first two elements being addressed. OpenSpacePGH will define how Pittsburgh's open spaces shape the urban form; identify the best use for vacant, green and recreational spaces; and describe how best to manage, program and maintain these lands.

OpenSpacePGH is organized into four phases, with each phase incorporating community outreach activities to incorporate the ideas and feedback of community constituents. As part of the outreach effort in the first phase of OpenSpacePGH, the planning team held a series of focus groups. These eight focus groups were designed to address several already known key issues related to open space, and to draw many of the people already thinking about each of these topics into the planning process. The eight focus group themes are described below, in alphabetical order.

- **Connectivity:** Getting around Pittsburgh has been an ongoing topic of discussion and action in recent years. The Connectivity focus group was convened to bring together people working to advance bicycle, pedestrian, and other non-motorized transportation modes to discuss the use of the City’s parks, open spaces, and vacant land for connectivity purposes; to increase the accessibility of the City and its residents to parks and recreation activities; and to help connect people to places to live, work, shop, and play.

- **Maintenance, Management, & Programming:** Many organizations are involved in managing, maintaining and incorporating programs and activities into Pittsburgh’s parks, open spaces, and land resources. This focus group was designed to discuss the maintenance of parks and open space resources; the management of parks, facilities, greenways, and vacant lots; and the programming of park and recreational facilities with activities, sports, special events, and recreational programs.

- **Natural Environment:** This group focused on the natural environment within Pittsburgh, including the utilization of vacant land and natural areas for stormwater management purposes; development and protection of steep slopes, hillsides, undermined areas, and landslide-prone soils; and the restoration and connection of habitat areas.

- **Re-Thinking Active Spaces:** Pittsburgh’s park system incorporates many traditional active park features, with an inventory of facilities that was designed for a population twice as great as today’s. The Active Spaces focus group included many of the groups using these popular and traditional elements, to discuss how active uses fit into spaces within the City, what needs exist, and where there may be new opportunities for athletic fields and other active recreational uses.
- **Re-Thinking Vacant Properties**: Throughout Pittsburgh, there are vacant lots and open space assets that are in passive use. The purpose of the Vacant Properties focus group was to begin looking at how to use this land resource most effectively, including reforesting or renaturalizing, incorporating temporary uses and solutions, land banking and economic development.

- **Riverfronts**: Pittsburgh is a river city. In recent years, a variety of groups and advocates have been working to reorient the focus of Pittsburgh’s riverfronts. The Riverfronts focus group was a forum to discuss open space and recreational topics for the City’s rivers and riverfronts, including recreational uses (such as boating, kayaking, biking, and walking), how to create economic benefit to the City from riverfront development of parks and recreation facilities, and flood control measures that could occur in the open spaces along the rivers.

- **Special Populations**: For this focus group, special populations included people with disabilities, children and associated child development and play issues, and older adults/the elderly. The Special Populations focus group explored how these populations interact with the City’s park, open space, and recreation areas and how to reconfigure public spaces to better meet their needs.

- **Urban Agriculture and Gardening**: This focus group explored how vacant and underutilized lands can be used for urban agriculture and gardening purposes throughout the City, including crop production, biofuel generation, animal husbandry, apiaries, and individual floral, and vegetable, and plant gardens.

**OVERVIEW OF THE FOCUS GROUPS**
The focus groups were scheduled in March, May and July 2010, at locations throughout Pittsburgh. Each focus group was structured to include introductions, a brief description of the overall PLANPGH project and the OpenSpacePGH planning process, a facilitated group discussion to consider both overarching and topic-specific questions, an around-the-table opportunity for participants to provide final thoughts, and a brief overview of next steps in the planning process. Section A includes the invitee and attendee lists for each focus group. Section B includes the agendas and discussion questions developed for each focus group, and Section C includes detailed notes from each group.

**FOCUS GROUP COMMON THEMES**
Several comments cross-cut the focus group discussions, representing commonalities among the eight theme areas.

Open space, parks and recreation was highlighted during each of the focus groups as the cornerstone of quality of life and health and wellness. A common topic within all of the focus groups was discussion about the need for a unified vision or plan that presents an overall concept for parks, open space and green infrastructure, addresses multiple objectives, and provides for equity. OpenSpacePGH should fulfill this role.

Each of the focus groups included discussion of the riverfronts and Pittsburgh’s topography as being key signatures of Pittsburgh that define the character of the city. These should be emphasized within the
open space system, including the development of connections from neighborhoods to these signature places as well as the reservation and enhancement of the city’s steps. Focus group participants of all backgrounds also emphasized the need for greater connectivity throughout the city, from a broad-based perspective that considers transportation, ADA accessibility, habitat, geographical linkages, equity and other views of connectivity.

Multiple participants in each of the focus groups discussed the diversity of government entities, organizations, and individuals who are moving projects and visions ahead. The role for the City, identified across most of the focus groups, is to bring these efforts together and facilitate change. On a similar theme, participants remarked on the need for more streamlined policies and approval processes around use of land and implementation of projects to make it easier for people to implement creative and community-supported ideas. Multiple examples were given in the different focus groups about how current approvals are hindering community efforts.

Finally, all of the focus groups included a discussion of financial resources, or the lack thereof, and the need for long term stewardship of open space and park resources.

Looking at the individual focus group summaries in Section C, one can see that each of these groups had a wealth of ideas to share around their specific theme. Of corresponding importance is the observation that, while these groups were organized around specific themes, there was consistent cross-pollination and awareness of broader community issues among participants. For example, the Special Populations focus group discussed accessibility for people with mobility constraints, and so did any other groups, including the Connectivity group that specifically called out ADA accessibility as critical. These focus groups demonstrated that while people in Pittsburgh devote time to projects and issues they feel strongly about, they also are attuned to broader communitywide concerns and value integration and cross-disciplinary problem-solving.

**Section A: Focus Group Invitees and Attendees**

This appendix includes lists of invitees and attendees for each focus group. Attendees are indicated in bold text.

**Connectivity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invitees</th>
<th>Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joy Abbott</td>
<td>Department of City Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Alcorn</td>
<td>Riverlife Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terri Baltimore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Baxter</td>
<td>Friends of the Riverfront</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Berger</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Biber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda McKenna Boxx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Brady</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Bricker</td>
<td>Bike Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Butcher</td>
<td>GTech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses Carper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin Copeland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Ann Dailey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Andrew Dash  Department of City Planning
Joyce Driben  Blind Outdoor Leisure Activities
Megan Driscoll  Riverlife Task Force
Janie French
Mike Gable  Department of Public Works
Debra Gibson
David Hance
Hannah Hardy
Noor Ismail  Department of City Planning
Chris Koch  GTech
Louis Liss
Ilyssa Manspeizer  Mount Washington CDC
Richard Meritzer  Department of City Planning
Stephen Patchan
Chris Popovic  Allegheny Cycling Association
John Radcliffe
Susan Rademacher  Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy
Catherine Rassman
Patrick Roberts  Department of City Planning
Dan Sentz  Department of City Planning
Dick Skrinjar  CitiParks

Consultant Team Attendees:
Ron Porter, RDP Consulting

Maintenance, Management and Programming
Joy Abbott  Department of City Planning
Chuck Alcorn  Riverlife Task Force
Alida Baker  Allegheny Commons
Susan Bassett  Carnegie Mellon University
Tom Baxter  Friends of the Riverfront
John Buck  CDC, Inc.
Don Coffelt  Carnegie Mellon University
Andrew Dash  Department of City Planning
Megan Driscoll  Riverlife Task Force
Mike Gable  Department of Public Works
Jim Griffin  Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy
Phil Gruszka  Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy
Noor Ismail  Department of City Planning
Rebekah Keating  Mount Washington CDC
Nancy Knauss  Penn State Cooperative Extension
Ilyssa Manspeizer  Mount Washington CDC
Mike Radley  CitiParks
Representative  CitiParks
Dan Sentz  Department of City Planning

Consultant Team Attendees:
Ryan Mottau, MIG, Lauren Schmitt, MIG, Ron Porter, RDP Consulting
Natural Environment

Joy Abbott  Department of City Planning
Lena Andrews  Bike Pittsburgh
Andrew Baechle
Dan Bain
Darlene Batko
Sue Baumgart
Tom Baxter  Friends of the Riverfront
Christine Berger  Mayor’s Office
Jim Bonner
Fred Brown
Danielle Crumrine

Andrew Dash  Department of City Planning
Matthew Erb  Friends of the Pittsburgh Urban Forest
Grant Ervin  10,000 Friends of Pennsylvania
Janie French
Mike Gable
Don Gibbon
Debra Gibson
Kim Graziani  Mayor’s Office
Phil Gruszka  Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy

Noor Ismail  Department of City Planning
Todd Katzner
Barton Kirk
Roy Kraynyk  Allegheny Land Trust
Louis Liss
Robert McKinley
Ilyssa Manspeizer  Mount Washington CDC
Mike Masiuk  Penn State Cooperative Extension
Andrew Maul
Jan Oliver
Susan Rademacher  Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy
Mike Radley  CitiParks
Catherine Rassman  Department of City Planning
John Schombert
Dan Sentz  Department of City Planning
Dick Skrinjar  CitiParks
Brenda Smith
Matthew Smuts  Student Conservation Assoc
Christopher Tracey
Judy Wagner  Western Pennsylvania Conservancy
Nathan Wildfire  East Liberty Development, Inc.
Arleta Scott Williams

Consultant Team Attendees:
Tracy Zinn, T&B Planning

Re-Thinking Active Spaces

Joy Abbott  Department of City Planning
Chuck Alcorn  Riverlife Task Force
Alida Baker  Allegheny Commons
Fred Bonci  LaQuatra Bonci Landscape Architects
Andrew Dash  Department of City Planning
Randy Frankel  Squirrel Hill Baseball
Mike Gable  Department of Public Works
Ralph Horgan  Carnegie Mellon University
Noor Ismail  Department of City Planning
Hank Jedema  PGH Dynamo
Erin Molchany  PUMP
Chris Popovic  Allegheny Cycling Association
Susan Rademacher  Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy
Mike Radley  CitiParks
Becky Reitmeyer  PGH Sports League, PUMP
Bob Reppe  Carnegie Mellon University
Dan Sentz  Department of City Planning
John Walluck  University of Pittsburgh

Consultant Team Attendees:
Ryan Mottau, MIG, Lauren Schmitt, MIG, Robin Barber, T&B Planning

Re-Thinking Vacant Properties
Joy Abbott  Department of City Planning
Malik Bankston  Kingsley Associates
Tom Bartnik  Community Design Center of Pittsburgh
Andrew Butcher  GTech
Christine Berger  Mayor’s Office
Don Carter  Carnegie Mellon University
Andrew Dash  Department of City Planning
Brandon Davis  PA House of Representatives
Bethany Davidson  PCRG
Craig Dunham  Rubinoff Company
Matthew Erb  Friends of the Pittsburgh Urban Forest
Grant Ervin  10,000 Friends of PA
Carlos Gasca  Kingsley Associates
Elise Gatti  Carnegie Mellon University
Court Gould  Sustainable Pittsburgh
Kim Graziani  Mayor’s Office
Janet Gunter  Friends of the Pittsburgh Urban Forest
David Hance  Perkins Eastman
Ernie Hogan  PCRG
Noor Ismail  Department of City Planning
Edward Jacob Jr.  City of Pittsburgh, Finance Department
Juliette Jones  Pgh Food Forests
Sallyann Kluz  LK Architects
Chris Koch  Gtech
Roy Kranyky  Allegheny Land Trust
Bonnie Laing  Hill District Consensus Group
Joe McCarthy  Penn State Cooperative Extension
Ilyssa Manspiezer  Mount Washington CDC
Mike Masiuk  Penn State Cooperative Extension
Susan Rademacher  Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy
Dan Sentz  Department of City Planning
Matthew Smuts  Urban Redevelopment Authority
Rob Stephany  Urban Redevelopment Authority
Michael Stern  Strata
Paul Svoboda  Pennsylvania Senate
Judy Wagner  Western Pennsylvania Conservancy
William Waddell  City of Pittsburgh, Finance Department

Consultant Team Attendees:
Sally McIntyre, MIG, Ryan Mottau, MIG, Lauren Schmitt, MIG

Riverfronts
Joy Abbott  Department of City Planning
Chuck Alcorn  Riverlife Task Force
Lena Andrews  Bike Pittsburgh
Ron Baraff
Tom Baxter  Friends of the Riverfront
Sean Brady
Rick Brown
Andy Clientelle
Andrew Dash  Department of City Planning
JD Fogarty
Kathy Frankel
Mike Gable  Department of Public Works
Debra Gibson
Noor Ismail  Department of City Planning
Jason Kobeda  Sports and Exhibition Authority
Suzanne Krug  Gateway Clipper Fleet
Louis Liss
Robert McKinley  Allegheny Clean Way
Russ Peterson
Shayna Pitt  Riverquest
Ollie Poppenberg  Three Rivers Rowing
Catherine Rassman  Department of City Planning
Mark Schiller
Dan Sentz  Department of City Planning
Dick Skrinjar  CitiParks
Doug Straley
Andrew Talento

Consultant Team Attendees:
Ron Porter, RDP Consulting

Special Populations
Joy Abbott  Department of City Planning
Victoria Campbell
Rory Cooper
Andrew Dash Department of City Planning
Dee Delaney
Joyce Driben Blind Outdoor Leisure Activities
Diane Gallegher
Amy Hart
Liz Healey
Fran Jolly
Noor Ismail Department of City Planning
Mara Kaplan Let Kids Play
Chaz Kellem
Louis Liss
Rich McGann
Richard Meritzer Department of City Planning
Anne Nalepa
Chris Noschese
Catherine Rassman Department of City Planning
Donald Rhoten
Ron Ruppen
Eva Simms Duquesne University, Child Psychology
Dick Skrinjar CitiParks
Lucy Spruill United Cerebral Palsy of Pittsburgh

Consultant Team Attendees:
Ron Porter, RDP Consulting
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**Section B: Agendas**

Agendas and key questions developed for each focus group are contained in the following Section.
Section C: Detailed Summaries

CONNECTIVITY
July 6, 2010
Focus group participants attending the Connectivity focus group want a priority of thought and resources given to the parks, trails, waterways and vacant land in Pittsburgh to create and parks, recreation and open space system that is:
- Widely used and accessible
- High quality
- An economic generator
- A model system of parks, recreation and open space that is recognized internationally

A holistic, green approach should be used to achieve connectivity.

Key Issues Related to Connectivity
Key issues related to connectivity and open space include:
- Bikes/auto conflicts in shared right-of-way
- Major gaps in connectivity
- Hub-type public transit system is inefficient for riders
- Some routes are unpleasant, e.g., too close to traffic, dying streams, ugly
- Separation of recreation and transportation; e.g., incomplete and underfunded Rack and Roll
- Inadequate maintenance
- Inadequate consideration of ADA accessibility
- Spread of invasive species (insects, fish, plants)
- Deer and geese issues
- Slow implementation of green stormwater management strategy
- Low hanging fruit has been picked and future projects may be challenging to implement
- No “big idea” that links all park resources – park system has not been effectively united in practice or concept

Priorities for Increased Connectivity
The following are priority improvements for increasing connectivity:
- Safety
- Choice
- Signage
- Simplicity
- Maintenance
- Aesthetics

Additional improvements noted included:
- Provide safe routes to school using parks
- Complete river corridors and connections to riverfront
- Connect Oakland with zero infringement on natural environments
- Create destination points
- Provide safe, well marked access
- Support recreational events related to transportation, e.g., car free day, bike ride through city
- Ecological, holistic approach to connectedness
Topographical Challenges
Participants had the following comments regarding considering Pittsburgh’s challenging topography as we improve connectivity:

- Consider railroads which are more challenging than rivers
- Create connections from bridges to trails
- View topography an asset, adding character to the city
- Restore and make use of pedestrian stairs up hillsides
- Create a theme around the attractiveness of Pittsburgh topography
- Develop the least invasive approach, producing the least amount of carbon dioxide and fostering good stewardship of the future

Approach to the Comprehensive Plan
The following should be considered as the City develops its comprehensive plan:

- Pittsburgh is a city within a park and surrounded by a park
- Open space should be starting point for City planning and design, and be well integrated with transportation and urban design
- The comprehensive plan should “look over the horizon” to consider economic, social, demographic, and scientific challenges that may arise
- The Plan should document and publicize benefits to diverse community constituents to enhance buy-in
- The economic benefits of open space should be acknowledged
- The allocation of scarce resources should be prioritized to achieve maximum benefit

MAINTENANCE, MANAGEMENT AND PROGRAMMING
March 18, 2010

Maintenance, Management and Programming focus group participants want a comprehensive plan that creates a green future for the City and provides a wide variety of enjoyable amenities and programs. As part of this vision, the future parks and recreation system will be adequately funded and improvements will be prioritized. Recognizing past successes and disappointments, participants identified a number of challenges faced to create a successful future for parks, recreation and open space in Pittsburgh.

Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan
Maintenance, Management and Programming participants defined a successful open space, parks, and recreation plan as one that:

- Thinks about stormwater and surfaces for all types of locations (vacant land, trails, etc.)
- Provides aesthetic and enjoyable amenities
- Includes green infrastructure
- Encourages habitat and biodiversity
- Includes design standards for landscape and amenities
- Fosters good communication among multiple groups
- Has consistent signage
- Decreases visual competition
- Identifies funding sources and prioritizes improvements
- Provides for maintenance
- Utilizes university volunteers
• Identifies funding sources for volunteer transportation and materials

Greatest Successes
Maintenance, Management and Programming participants identified the greatest successes in the last five years for open space, parks, and recreation as:

• Schenley Plaza
• Maintenance, programs, aesthetics
• Bike trails and riverfront trails
• City has dedicated pedestrian/bike coordinator
• Litter pick-up
• Tree education, awareness and tree canopy
• Specific dedicated funding for trees in public spaces
• Building partnerships
• Increasing communication between organizations
• City’s greenway program
• Allegheny Commons Park

Missed Opportunities/Biggest Disappointments
According to participants, the greatest disappointments were:

• Building it and walking away
• Lack of consistency in staffing
• Mellon Park
• Lack of park security
• No sports complex
• Potential loss of green space in Hays Woods
• Green space is undervalued
• More dog parks and irresponsible dog owners
• Park visitors can be disrespectful of other users, but no policing available
• Need to be comprehensive in our management and development of facilities
• Lack of resources for dealing with blighted areas

Challenges
The following were identified as the biggest challenges facing parks, recreation and open space:

• Engaging a broad spectrum of the community
• Educating residents on the health benefits of active living
• Preventing traffic congestion in neighborhoods where there is a desirable facility
• Providing transit connections and bicycle facilities
• Relying on motor vehicles for transportation
• Negotiating with unions
• Duplicating facilities
• Considering regional and non-city resources
• Providing swimming opportunities
• Addressing challenging topography
• Engaging a strong environmental community
• Negotiating with developers who benefit from parks and recreation’s contributions to economic development
• Involving the university community, such as the Penn State master naturalist program
Increasing security, such as a parks ranger program
Reinventing recreation centers to increase participation
Providing accessible information on recreation resources
Obtaining adequate funding
Applying the Schenley Plaza model to smaller neighborhood/community parks
Creating a sports commission
Expanding recreation programs
Engaging the school district
Incorporating natural areas into the school curriculum
Collaborating with school to create facilities
Expanding community gardens and urban farming
Creating flexible and coordinated recreation programs
Developing park advocates
Reducing the size of roadways in the City to create complete streets
Providing excellent maintenance and stewardship
Managing deer
Addressing the issue of quantity vs. quality
Evaluating resources strategically citywide, not by neighborhood
Promoting connections and access
Addressing vacant lands and distressed areas
Preserving and utilizing City steps
Building a sports complex (Larimer / Ltd site 2nd Ave)
Having a plan rather than reacting with a plan for funding

NATURAL ENVIRONMENT
July 13, 2010

Natural Environment focus group participants want a comprehensive plan that builds on past successes and expands green spaces in the City. The Plan should support restoration of ecological health, improve connectivity, and protect and restore habitat. The City should focus on the ecosystem services provided by open space as it plans for infrastructure needs. Pittsburgh’s goal should be to achieve environmental, economic, and social sustainability. To a large part, this effort will depend on informing and involving residents of all ages to build an understanding of the importance of the environment and to enhance stewardship.

Defining Natural Areas
Natural areas were defined by this group as:

- Terrestrial systems and the rivers
- Ridge to River continuum (natural complement to the iconic view of the built environment in the Golden Triangle)
- Larger land and river areas that support ecosystems that are undisturbed by development (large parks, greenways, protected areas)
- Air and sky
- Private natural areas
- Nature; biodiversity; animals
- Not a pristine wilderness due to human impact
- Geology/soils
- Flora, fauna, and the soils and water on which they are based
- Acoustic environment / noise level
Successful Plan
Participants thought that a successful Open Space, Parks and Recreation Plan should do the following for the City:

- Implemented by the City and accepted by stakeholders
- Defines users, and their desires and needs
- Matches with reality and budget
- Protects quality open space
- Provides more greenspace than we already have
- Incorporates adjacent vacant land into existing open space
- Reduces the intrusion of vehicles into the open space, removes concrete/asphalt and expands green spaces, i.e., removes old playgrounds, parking lots, old swimming pools
- Promotes development where want it and protect greenspace elsewhere through Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) incentives. (Note that the City does not currently have TDR for open space, but does have it for historic structures Downtown)
- Identifies and articulates the City’s pattern and natural assets
- Protects natural areas with common sense and visionary ways – out of the box ideas
- Is prescriptive, not just descriptive
- Defines objectives but doesn’t necessarily give details to inspire creative thinking
- Transcends politics to inspire leadership not subject to the whim of politicians
- Includes measurable results and accountability

Greatest Successes
According to participants, the greatest successes for open space, parks, and recreation in the last five years were:

- Nine Mile Run (NMR) stream restoration
- Parks Conservancy
- MWCDC – Emerald View park
- Hillside Study
- Policies and support of the City
- East Liberty Development (ELDI) and Green Vision Plan doing urban renewal that considers open space, green infrastructure, community needs, etc.
- Friends of the Riverfront – creating launches for boats; physical restorations
- “Redding Up” – accountability and responsibility for caring for the environment – provided focus
- The trail system
- Increased Awareness of why natural environment is important
- The URA recognizing the value of green and building that into their model as they go forward
- Riverlife Taskforce and Venture Outdoors bringing people back to the rivers for recreational activities
- Cooperation and planning between organizations

Missed Opportunities/Greatest Disappointments
According to participants, the greatest disappointments were:

- Cycle/consideration of funding loss – RAD funding frustrations and working with Public Works
- Communication issues related to view preservation, e.g., Keating; Mt. Washington CDC
- Lack of litter law enforcement
- Casino construction only did bare minimum regarding trails, green infrastructure approaches, etc
- Impacts of development
- Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) smell along rivers
- Loss of Frick Park Environmental Center

Meeting Environmental Goals
When asked how well the current open space, parks and recreation system does in helping Pittsburgh meet its natural environment goals, participants had the following comments:

- Current open spaces are not ecologically healthy
- A lot of the parks are not “green” – only recreational
- Not every trail can be pristine; there’s a uniqueness to urban recreation that should be allowed, but other places need to be improved
- Need for more connectivity between green spaces and transportation
- Ecological functionality can be improved with habitat connections; however don’t connect degraded areas to pristine areas (Japanese knotweed, raccoons preying on songbirds, etc.)
- Consider ecological improvements to the Golden Triangle — rooftops provide opportunity (have green value — don’t need to be just wasted space)
- Provide more trails for quality of life experience (running, biking, rollerblading)
- Improvements are not necessarily orderly

Partnerships
Participants identified the following ways to use partnerships to advance the preservation and management of the natural environment or to expand programming:

- Avoid duplication of efforts
- Connect with educational systems and universities
- Partnerships that aren’t so obvious, i.e., Bike Pittsburgh and Friends of the Urban Forest working together to promote trees/traffic calming
- More collaboration with utilities, stormwater, Duquesne Light, gas line management of rights of way, railroads, greening areas along those ROWs to create connections between places
- Corporations that would benefit from natural assets provided to their employees
- PennDOT for stormwater and wetland mitigation sites
- Work with schools (ecology partnerships) to count birds, etc.
- Alcosan and PWSA — developing wet weather plan and looking for sites for facilities; need green infrastructure approach
- Develop a Park Partners program
- Evaluate where funding could be put to best use by organizations and to create equity

Geographic Areas That Need Improvement
The geographic areas with the greatest potential benefit to improve the natural environment were identified as:

- Hazelwood
- Use URA funding on the riverfront
- Fairywood
- Hays Woods
- Areas not publicly held but still provide spaces for recreation
- Areas identified in the 1994 WPC Allegheny County Natural Heritage Inventory
- Reduce road-width citywide
- Greenways distributed throughout the City
- Aging infrastructure areas

**Stormwater Management**
Participants noted the following ways that the open space and parks system could be used for managing stormwater:

- Use vacant lots for stormwater management
- Use all green space as part of the stormwater system
- Provide best practices for stormwater management in the plan
- Develop a geographically distributed system to deal with stormwater
- Provide green infrastructure along trails and use permeable pavement
- Provide breaks in impervious pavement to infiltrate runoff and reduce impervious space
- Use replacement opportunities, e.g., when a trail or playground needs to be repaved, do it with permeable pavement
- Incorporate green infrastructure requirements in development agreements
- Analyze watersheds by flood issues and prioritize areas of improvement (floods and highest volume of sewer overflows)
- Look across boundaries – for example boundary between Greentree Borough and City
- Recognize that cobble/brick streets aren’t better than blacktop except for historical value

**Areas Without Natural Area Opportunities**
Participants identified the following areas as places that lack opportunities to interact with the natural environment:

- Lack of riverfront access (for example Lawrenceville and the Strip District)
- Inequity in distribution of resources in the City (quality of interaction with the environment)
- Overgrowth of invasive species along stairs
- Hill District – scrub over vacant lots in many cases isn’t natural environment
- Recognize the resource provided by city steps
- Improve park access and safety
- Opportunities exist, but the quality of natural areas needs improvement

**Highest Priorities**
When asked what the highest priority opportunities were to improve the natural environment, participants identified the following:

- Address City infrastructure needs to accommodate current and future population
- Protect our open space; you can always get some land back for development in the future if overprotected now, but it’s much harder to get open space back after it is developed
- Provide better maintenance
- Provide better allocation of resources, e.g., closing underused schools
- Plant more trees (have old trees but not many young ones)
- Address collapse of populations – emerald ash, black locust, black cherry trees
- Manage deer issues which prevent native species from growing
- Hire a City ecologist
- Be a squeaky wheel
- Prioritize building river trail or conserving hundreds of acres of green space, recognizing that river trails are expensive
Require developers to provide open space and recreation space to meet BOTH created and existing demand (more than they are now)

RE-THINKING ACTIVE SPACES
March 18, 2010

Re-thinking Active Spaces focus group participants want to maximize the number of residents who participate in active recreation. By providing a financially sustainable system of parks and open spaces, including both close-to-home and accessible centralized recreation facilities and activities, residents can achieve physical, social, emotional and spiritual health.

What Works
The following were identified as the greatest successes for open space, parks and recreation in Pittsburgh:

- Schenley Oval
- Paddler community planning
- Park facility improvements
- Field lighting improvements
- Permitting process that helps eliminate undesirable use
- The riverfront trails and trail system within parks
- Maintenance improvements
- User groups that help maintain facilities
- Connectivity and access
- “Parks are Free” website

What’s Missing/Needed
The following active space needs were identified:

- Sports fields
- Better sports field management
- Upgrading the sports field quality
- Field space for emerging sports, e.g., Ultimate Frisbee
- Multi-use fields
- Coach training and clearance
- Animal control
- Trail maintenance
- Basic park amenities
- Restrooms
- Recreation centers located throughout the city
- Ways to incorporate vacant properties to meet identified needs
- Nearby green space and facilities
- Transportation access
- Equitable resources
- Sustainable open space and parks
- Balance of specialized facilities
- Consolidated information source
- Improved signage
- Safe play spaces
- Access for diverse residents
- Funding for program ideas
- Bike parking
- Bike sharing

**Defining Active Spaces**
Participants defined active spaces as parks and open space that encourages an active life. These accessible spaces have few barriers, and may include a diversity of elements, such as:

- Trails/steps
- Sports fields
- Dog parks
- Outdoor amphitheatres
- Fountains for social gathering and ice skating
- Space accessible with few barriers
- Informal play opportunities
- Programs/activities
- Community gardens

**Quality and Quantity**
Participants raised the following issues when asked where the balance of quality vs. quantity should fall:

- Residents, especially those of low incomes, have access and transportation issues to reach centralized facilities
- Trail connections are key to successful centralized facilities
- Neighborhood-based facilities create parking issues and the size of neighborhood parks can’t accommodate many facilities
- Neighborhood-based parks and facilities must be well distributed
- A mix of dedicated fields and more accessible multi-use fields is a successful blend
- Preservation of natural areas must be achieved along with the accommodation of more active uses

**RE-THINKING VACANT LAND**

**May 26, 2010**

Participants in the Re-thinking Vacant Land focus group contributed many ideas for projects that would make better use of existing vacant properties. Participants wanted shorter City approval time to facilitate the many community-driven projects and ideas. They identified policies that the City should consider in rethinking vacant land as well as potential funding sources for projects.

**A Successful Plan**
Participants identified the following as evidence of success in rethinking vacant land in Pittsburgh:

- Shorter approval time for projects
- Harness community efforts
- Clear process
- Connectivity and support for the emerging cycling city concept
- Connect with the rivers
- A full array of green assets for all
- The greenways preserved and expanded
- Recognize that not all projects work
- Adequate maintenance
- An ongoing dialogue with residents

Potential Policies
The following policies should be considered when rethinking vacant land:

- Develop green stormwater management practices
- Unleash developer creativity
- Mandate salvage of materials
- Utilize “reorganizing” vs. the term “right sizing” which provokes fear
- Educate residents about what makes a successful neighborhood and how density helps
- Capture the neighborhood visions
- Recognize the opportunity to grow neighborhood assets and increase livability
- Provide interim zoning for temporary or experimental uses
- Integrate City and neighbors’ efforts
- Recognize the value of natural and unmanicured landscape
- Make vacant properties easier to acquire
- Maintain historical/cultural resources
- Consider all costs/benefits and think systematically about what is missing from neighborhoods, considering existing jobs, connectivity, and ecology, etc.

Funding
The following ideas were generated for funding re-use projects:

- Develop a building green bond
- Connect the future economic benefit to those who will benefit
- Identify land that should be on tax rolls
- Expand the regional asset district (RAD)
- Utilize parks conservation/supporting organizations
- Use Urban Renewal Agency funds
- Initiate a pervious surface tax

Potential Projects
The following reuses should be considered:

- Urban agriculture
- Needs fertile land
- No building/foundation on property
- Water sheds/ green stormwater
- Restoration opportunity
- Appropriate location
- Greenway
- Steep
- Unbuildable
- Consolidate properties adjacent to existing greenways
- Develop a typology of green spaces and assign priority levels for implementation
- Reevaluate whether current parks and other public facilities, such as schools, are appropriately located.
- Green and consolidate properties, e.g., expand vacant school properties, – some will be developed in the future as larger tracts are needed
Create a repurposing center
- Relocate housing to support a business district
- Address mini-brownfields, learning from industrial experience
- Provide additional systems within existing ROW
- Be open to community generated ideas

**RIVERFRONTS**
**July 8, 2010**

The Riverfronts focus group attendees believed that Pittsburgh’s riverfronts should be embraced regionally and nationally by citizens for the benefits they provide:

- Quality of life (health and recreation from walking, running, cycling and boating)
- A unique City identity (three rivers within the city)
- Attractiveness to people (appeal to large diversity of people)

Participants felt that the City should continue to be fiscally responsible while making greater use of the riverfronts.

**OpenSpacePGH**

An effective OpenSpacePGH for the City of Pittsburgh would:

- Align conservation, preservation and development around one set of principles/common theme
- Provide open space opportunity/access for all
- Connect people to the natural amenities – rivers, parks and trails
- Clearly align the mission of the City and nonprofits
- Emphasize the City’s unique qualities and the recreational aspect of rivers as a major part of the City’s identity
- Identify unique and creative financing and maintenance strategies
- Recognize the importance of riverfronts as ecological habitat

**Missed Opportunities/Greatest Disappointments**

In the past five years, the greatest disappointment for open space, parks and recreation has been:

- Lack of input – “two vertical sea walls which prevents the waves from dissipating”
- Difficulty in scheduling events due to need for multiple approvals, i.e., Exhibition Authority, Steelers, Pitt Football, Pirates
- Lack of parking availability – especially on the Northside
- Extremely slow progress of development
- Railroad right of ways
- Gaps in trail system
- Lack of detours for trail closures

**Greatest Successes**

According to participants, the greatest successes of past riverfront efforts have been:

- Volunteer efforts for clean-ups
- Trail system
- Riverfront events
- State/foundation funding support
- Top three locations in the country for boat registration/licensing
- Dedicated bike/pedestrian bridges
- Well-done housing development
- Water quality improvements

**Advancing Past Efforts**
According to participants, the OSPR Plan can best advance the past efforts to enhance Pittsburgh’s waterfront by:

- Filling in gaps (trails, monosite, Carrie furnace)
- Identifying maintenance strategies for public and private open spaces
- Obtaining financial support from multiple government and private resources
- Getting more public input
- Beautifying the riverfront through urban design
- Considering the riverfront and open spaces early in all planning processes
- Giving the riverfront area high priority for improvements
- Boosting economic development
- Identifying new launch locations for water transit
- Focusing on the quantity and quality of riverfront vegetation
- Educating the public about natural plantings and native species
- Connecting neighborhoods to riverfronts
- Repairing locks which are in disrepair, preventing easy access to the City
- Incorporating the study of rivers within school curriculum to foster an appreciation and understanding of the rivers and their roles in the lives of residents
- Be a model for green strategies

**Areas Needing Additional Attention**
Riverfront areas that need additional attention include:

- Identify additional areas of the riverfront that is suitable for development
- Maintain trails
- Upgrade the sewer system
- Implement green strategies for stormwater management
- Consider stricter waterway preservation policies to lead the way as role models in riverfront preservation
- Clean the water as the City once cleaned the air
- Improve the North/East bank of the Ohio River

**Support for Economic Development**
The riverfront improvements or programming that would support economic development, recreation, environmental, or health and wellness efforts are:

- Recognize Allegheny Cleanways’ role in removing a significant amount of debris and litter from riverfronts
- Expand Kayak Pittsburgh’s kayak rental service
- Recognize the role of riverfront amenities in attracting businesses to the community
- Incorporate the river into the physical education curriculum of downtown schools via kayaking, biking, and hiking
- Explore riverfront docking as a possible revenue source for the city
Role of the City
According to participants, the role of the City of Pittsburgh in regards to the riverfronts, in relation to the other organizations, partners and agencies should be:

- Lobby for agencies’ and organizations’ needs
- Bring property owners together
- Develop zoning that protects the riverfronts, and supports development and full river utilization
- Expedite and facilitate planning processes
- Partner with nonprofits aggressively

Other Needs
Other concerns that need to be addressed included:

- Consider modular docking (floating docks) to create boater access in multiple locations
- Create aesthetic docks and peers
- Prioritize demolition to facilitate park development

Most Important Issues
Focus group participants identified the following as the most important issues facing the riverfront:

- Develop a riverfront master calendar and coordinated scheduling
- Showcase the City’s scenic appeal
- Zone for building and assuring riverfronts frame the City
- Convert vacant lots into open space systems
- Obtain funding for maintenance
- Preserve, protect and prudently advance the legacy that we have been handed
- Complete trail systems, providing connections to parks and communities
- Acknowledge the rivers as an eco-system

SPECIAL POPULATIONS
July 14, 2010

The Special Populations focus group participants noted the need for universally designed parks and facilities that are accessible for the use and enjoyment of all residents. The particular needs of the elderly, and people with physical, sensory and mental disabilities, as well as other residents, such as veterans, small children, pet lovers, etc., should be considered. Participants expressed many ideas for modern, nature-driven, creative and accessible parks, recreation facilities, and open spaces.

Greatest Barriers
Participants noted that the greatest barriers to accessibility in Pittsburgh’s parks and open spaces are lack of connectivity between parks and neighborhoods, as well as a lack of information about accessibility.

Current Needs
The following is needed to improve accessibility in parks, recreation and open spaces:

- Accessible playgrounds
- Benches and tables
- Addressing the needs of special populations beyond wheelchair users, such as autistic children, seniors, etc.
- Information about access (maps, signage, web-based information, audible, large print)
- Accessible path of travel, e.g., wheelchair users cannot access the trail around Highland Park reservoir
- Major, multi-generational destination park
- Year-round destination water park
- Access to natural areas and trails
- Use of vacant land for gardens and recreation
- Financial support of private sector for improvements

Simple Fixes
Several simple fixes were suggested to improve accessibility in parks, recreation and open spaces:

- Nature playgrounds
- Signage that includes accessibility information
- Enhance volunteerism
- Provide access information (e.g., hiking and biking maps)
- Address safety issues

URBAN AGRICULTURE
May 26, 2010

Urban Agriculture focus group participants noted the variety of ways that agriculture can be incorporated into the urban environment. While a successful use of Pittsburgh’s vacant land, the urban agriculture movement is hindered by difficulties in acquiring vacant land and securing liability insurance. More support from the City was desired to ensure success of Pittsburgh’s many efforts in this area. With its many vacant properties, dedicated urban agriculture advocates, and many efforts already underway, Pittsburgh could be a nationwide leader in incorporating agriculture in the urban environment.

Defining Urban Agriculture
Urban agriculture can take many forms in the City. Participants identified the following as potential urban agricultural endeavors:

- Large-scale, permanent farms
- Garden cooperatives
- Patchwork farming
- Network of backyard gardens
- Community gardens
- On-site farm stands
- Back yard/front yard gardens
- Edible schoolyards
- Children’s gardens
- Chicken co-op
- Bio-energy crops
- Intermediate products
- Composting
- Farmers markets
- Apiary/honey
- Small animal farming, e.g., goats
- Nursery, e.g., annuals, native plants, urban trees
- Greenhouses
- U-Pick
- Gleaning
- Fruit trees

**Needed Improvements**
The following issues should be addressed to promote urban agriculture as a successful use of open space in Pittsburgh:

- Consider changing the policy that prohibits for-profit ventures on vacant land
- Make it easier to acquire the deed to vacant properties to put properties back on the tax rolls, e.g., how to acquire deeds of unknown owners
- Consider enacting a homesteading program
- Provide education on acquiring vacant properties
- Address soil contamination and soil building issues
- Provide education on how to revitalize demolished lots
- Promote raised-bed gardening which can help address poor soils and contamination
- Update the inventory of existing urban agriculture efforts
- Make informational resources available to the public, e.g., use Penn State Extension and on-line resources
- Eliminate federal and city restrictions, such as City restrictions on small animal ownership
- Institute a “right to farm” protocol
- Allow the use of food stamps to purchase products from urban farmers
- Ensure that low income and culturally diverse residents have education about and access to urban agricultural opportunities
- Enhance funding for urban agricultural endeavors
- Provide access to water
- Address the removal of invasive species
- Consider establishing an umbrella insurance policy for farming enterprises to address liability issues
- Utilize land banking to acquire vacant land
- Explore profit-sharing between the City and urban farmers on City-owned properties
- Develop a farming network to share expertise
- Establish a tool library Make Pittsburgh a leader in promoting urban agriculture
2. Adult Questionnaire Summary

Introduction

PLANPGH will guide the process of making Pittsburgh an even better place to live, work, learn, play and thrive over the next 25 years. The Open Space, Parks and Recreation Plan is a component of the City of Pittsburgh’s first ever comprehensive plan, and is one of the first two elements being addressed. The OSPR Plan will define how Pittsburgh’s open spaces shape the urban form; identify the best use for vacant, green and recreational spaces; and describe how best to manage, program and maintain these lands.

The OSPR Plan is organized into four phases, with each phase incorporating community outreach activities to incorporate the ideas and feedback of community constituents. This report summarizes the findings of the Open Space PGH questionnaire for adults, which was developed by MIG, Inc. The questionnaire made available to any member of the community an opportunity to provide feedback on existing park facilities and services, as well as input on their priorities for future improvements of open spaces, parks, recreation facilities and services.

MIG, Inc. and the City of Pittsburgh administered the questionnaire online using the City’s PLANPGH.COM web page from the first week of July 2010 through the first week of September 2010. The questionnaire was advertised in City publications, through multiple electronic mail lists and social networking websites and news feeds. The City also made available paper questionnaires at community intercept events, presentations and community facilities.

The response to the questionnaire was high compared to similar exercises in other communities, with a return of 1,329 questionnaires. The large number of questionnaire returns gives the City a look at the priorities and ideas of a large number of residents, however the responses should not necessarily be considered representative of the City as a whole. The patterns here do provide insight into the desires of over 1,000 Pittsburgh residents and hundreds of other users of the park system. For the most part, responses showed the same patterns across age, gender, race/ethnicity and location within the city. However, in some cases differences have been identified in the summary results below.

This document presents key findings of the adult open space, parks and recreation questionnaire. A set of summary tables and a copy of the questionnaire (as distributed on paper) are included. Open ended responses are documented in Appendix A to this summary.
Key Findings

Demographics

- The majority of questionnaire respondents (55%) are between the ages 25 and 44. The percentage of respondents ages 25-34 is 35% with those ages 35-55 representing 20% of respondents. The age distribution is similar to the age characteristics of the City.

- The results included a slightly larger proportion of females, at 61%, than is shown by the latest census data. According to the 2006-08 ACS Demographics the City of Pittsburgh population is 53% female and 47% male. This is not uncommon in survey efforts.

- The majority of respondents (87%) identified their ethnicity/race as White, with only 8% identifying themselves as African American/Black. The questionnaire respondents underrepresent the racial/ethnic diversity of the City with 27% of the City's population being African American/Black and 67% White.

- The geographic distribution of questionnaire respondents is similar to the population distribution across the City. The eastern portion of the City has the highest response rate with 56% (with 52% of the City's population), the southwest rate of response 20% (with 32% of the population) and the northern area at 15% response (with 14% of the population).

- 78% of respondents identified themselves as living within Pittsburgh. Of the remaining 22% of respondents, most currently work or go to school within the City but live in a neighboring community. Only 1% of respondents identified themselves as visitors.

Character and Identity

- When asked what is the most important in defining the identity of Pittsburgh as a whole, 47% selected 'our neighborhoods' and 20% selected 'the three rivers.' Cultural life, including the symphony, libraries and museums was indicated as more important than the three rivers by African American respondents.

- Respondents were also asked to identify the most important characteristic of their neighborhoods. Residential homes were identified by 27%, the local business district by 22%, the people and our local culture by 18% and parks and recreation facilities by 16%.

Focus

- Well maintained parks are a high priority for Pittsburgh residents. When asked where the City should focus its efforts and rank its importance, park maintenance ranked the highest overall. A higher priority was placed on this response by female respondents.

- Among African American responses, maintenance was second to providing youth with positive ways to fill their time.

- Similar to maintenance, providing a city that is attractive to professionals, entrepreneurs and artists was highly ranked by all respondents.
Satisfaction

- Respondents are generally satisfied with the level of park maintenance in Pittsburgh; 73% indicated that they are somewhat satisfied to very satisfied with the maintenance of parks near their home. 23% of respondents indicated that they are very satisfied.

- Of the general geographic regions, respondents living in the east were most satisfied with maintenance. Respondents living in the Golden Triangle were much less likely to report that they were very satisfied with the maintenance of parks near their home.

- African American responses show a lower satisfaction with the maintenance of parks near home. The total of somewhat and very satisfied is reduced to 48%.

- Male respondents across all ethnicity and locations in the city were less satisfied with maintenance than females.

- When asked to rate the recreation activities and programs provided by CityParks the majority of respondents are generally satisfied with the activities and programs provided: 37% of respondents rate them as excellent or very good, 30% rate them as satisfactory and 25% indicated they were not sure or not aware of what is offered.

- Younger respondents (under 35) responded ‘not sure/don’t know what is offered’ at a much higher rate than older respondents.
Park Usage

- Parks near home are popular among respondents with 82% of those responding using these types of parks at least once a month or more.

- Of those indicating that they seldom use parks; difficulty in accessing parks (too far away; too difficult to get to), lack of desirable features and poor maintenance were the most often cited reasons. Many respondents indicated ‘other’ as well indicating a range of reasons from too busy to lacking specific facilities.

- In addition to parks close to home, the next most frequently used park facilities for respondents as a whole are trails, greenways, natural areas and woods. Frequent users (once a month or more) are 74% for greenways and natural areas and 73% for trails. Other frequently used facilities are the riverfront parks and trails with 68% and large regional /destination parks with 63%.

- Among African American responses, parks with special facilities and sports fields were used more than trails, greenways and natural areas.

Open Space/Trails

- Respondents were asked to pick their highest priority stewardship; cleaning up toxic materials and illegal dumps ranked the highest with 29%, preventing pollution from reaching the rivers 24%, and restoring watersheds and creeks 18%. These responses were consistent across the city, ethnicity, age and gender.

- A wide variety of reasons for expanding the trail network were selected, with no clear front-runner. The reasons selected by respondent area as follows: experiencing nature 27%, exercising 21%, getting to other areas of the city 19%, and commuting to work or school 18%.

Priorities

- When asked to identify the top two priorities for improvement, expansion of the trail network was identified by 23% of the respondents, followed by restore or protect creeks, forests and hillsides with 19%, and improve maintenance of existing parks and facilities 18%.

- Of these priorities, looking at the only the first priorities selected, expansion of the trails system was identified by 30%, improvement of existing parks and facilities 20%, and restore or protect creeks, forests and hillsides 15%.
Participation

- Walking, gardening and cycling ranked as the most popular activities among respondents. The overall popularity of these activities reflects the high frequency of participation, for example walking for pleasure is participated in several times per week for most respondents. Other activities, even at the height of their season, are often participated in less than once a week on average.

- Given adequate time and resources respondents indicated that cycling and dog walking/dog parks would be the two most popular activities. Other popular activities include walking, fairs and festivals, jogging and swimming.

Open Ended Responses

In addition to several “other” response opportunities, the questionnaire asked for respondents’ ideas about using vacant and underused and abandoned properties. With nearly 1000 responses the visualization below provides one way to analyze the results. The size of a word in the image below is proportional to the number of times it was mentioned in the responses.

Some of the themes identified in the responses include:

- community gardens
- perennial gardens
- urban farming and agriculture
- green spaces, greenways, trails
- infill development
- keep architecturally salvageable properties
- playgrounds and recreation
- dog parks
- green economy projects
- contamination clean up
- neighborhood involvement
The questionnaire also provided an opportunity for respondents to comment on any additional information they'd like to share and 35% of the respondents replied.

- love the parks but they could be better
- more courts and fields
- more trails
- better maintenance
- improve safety
- more trails
- dog parks
- more riverside parks
- lots of like, loves, and thanks
3. Community Workshop Summary

In an effort to gather information on parks and recreation projects that are most important to the community, the city conducted five community workshops over the course of a two week period in April and May of 2011. The workshops were geographically spread throughout the city. As part of the workshops, city staff and consultants facilitated groups of participants through a prioritization exercise in the form of a decision-making game.

The game was designed to help participants understand the challenge of funding projects with a limited amount of capital funds (for construction) and operations funds (for maintenance and staffing). The game also provided the project team the opportunity to gain valuable feedback from participants about their priorities. A variety of projects were presented in the game, reflecting the different preferences noted during the public involvement process and the different community needs noted in the Needs Assessment and Suitability Analysis, March 2011.

Participants

A total of 105 individuals participated in the workshop process. The number of participants by meeting location that turned in comment forms are as follows: (8) Brookline, (14) Greenfield, (20) Lawrenceville, (16) Mt. Washington, and (21) Northside. At each workshop participants were asked to provide some information about themselves. The response rate for this task varied from question to question:

- **Area.** Of the 79 responses, 57 (72%) respondents indicated the area in which they live and 22 left their response blank. The most represented area of the city indicated by these results were Mt. Washington/Hilltop West and South Pittsburgh.
- **Age.** Of the 77 responses, the 51 participants indicated their age from 25-44 (66%).
- **Live/Work.** The majority of participants noted that they live and work in Pittsburgh.
- **Children.** Of the 75 responses, 54 (72%) had no children.
- **Ethnicity.** Of the 77 responses, 70 (91%) indicated they were White/Caucasian, with the rest of the responses distributed among the other choices.
Project Priorities

As part the workshop, participants were asked to select the projects and funding based on the importance of the project to them as an individual and within a group. There were 18 capital projects and four operating cost savings projects to choose from. The top five selected projects by individual participants across all workshops are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use Trail Network</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reforestation</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater and Natural Drainage Systems</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title Clearing</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking Trails</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were 12 group exercise responses, representing the projects generally agreed to during the group exercise. The top 5 group responses are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use Trail Network</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater and Natural Drainage Systems</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access &amp; Equity Improvements</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reforestation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Agriculture</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Looking at the individual participant project selections by workshop location, the three top ranked projects are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brookline</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reforestation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Leash Dog Areas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use Trail Network</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater and Natural Drainage Systems</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reforestation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrenceville</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater and Natural Drainage Systems</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reforestation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use Trail Network</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Washington</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use Trail Network</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reforestation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title Clearing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northside</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use Trail Network</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title Clearing</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure Recreation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Capital and Operations Choices
The project selections summarized above were each offered with a corresponding capital and operation costs (or cost savings in some cases). These reference figures, based on assumptions developed by the consulting team from actual costs and savings in Pittsburgh and other communities, helped participants connect public spending implications to their decisions as they were considering them. When working individually, participants varied widely in the number and total cost of projects. The total package of projects selected by each individual ranged from nearly all of the potential projects to only a small set of low cost options. The average total package costs are presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Type</th>
<th>Average Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$202,369,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Savings¹</td>
<td>$5,183,228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The averages of individual results by workshop location varies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Type</th>
<th>Average Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brookline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$185,426,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Savings¹</td>
<td>$(4,553,125)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$193,724,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Savings¹</td>
<td>$925,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrenceville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Participants were offered choices that added cost as well as projects that could reduce the operating cost of the system. The overall average came out on the cost savings side of this balance; negative numbers (in parentheses) indicate additional operating costs.
For the group exercise, results reflect the responses that represent a general consensus. Group results of this exercise also varied, but generally groups in Brookline and Greenfield spent less in capital and added to the operating costs, while most groups in Lawrenceville, Mt. Washington and Northside had higher capital cost totals but were more likely to select the major operating cost saving options.

In both individual and group responses, operating cost averages were heavily influenced by the selection of one of four options that assumed relatively large operating savings. Of these four (repurposing park land, title clearing, divesting swimming pools and divest recreation and senior centers), the most popular was title clearing, followed by repurposing park land. The largest operating cost saving option (divest recreation and community centers) was only selected by 18% of all participants. It is also important to note that the averages are impacted by a several large ticket items (including the improvements to community and historic regional parks which are each over $100 million in capital costs) that were in the middle range of selection popularity. Additionally, the calculations are based on an all-or-nothing accounting of these options the actual number of facilities or acres impacted would change the costs and savings.
4. Community Intercepts

The OpenSpacePGH planning process was extended to the community through six community intercept events, where staff hosted outreach booths geographically dispersed throughout the city. Community intercepts, particularly those at existing events, provided access to hundreds of people. These events were scheduled to involve community members of all ages in the plan development process, and captured the ideas of residents who may not normally participate through other, more conventional public involvement activities. The Community Intercept events were designed to be interactive, with displays to inform residents about their community resources, and allow residents to identify community needs and priorities. Residents were also directed to the web-based questionnaires and other public outreach opportunities for the Plan, helping to encourage further involvement with the OpenSpacePGH planning process.

Intercept Events

The display boards and questions were brought to 11 intercept events. These events included: the Venture Outdoors Family Outdoor Festival (3 separate events), Rachel’s Sustainable Feast, the Shadyside Arts Festival, Little Italy Days, the Home Renovation and Preservation Weekend, the East Allegheny Pumpkinfest, Three Rivers BioNeers Conference, and the four Regional Parks Master Plan Meetings. These events were chosen to reach out to a variety of open space interests and age groups while attempting to be balanced geographically across the City.

Questions Asked and Findings

Q1. Which of the following open space, parks, and recreation benefits are most important to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preserving natural areas &amp; environment</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving physical health and wellness</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing crime</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving mental health &amp; reducing stress</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering youth development</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting historic resources</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attracting new residents &amp; businesses</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting city as a recreation destination</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing property values</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>663</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q2. Why do you go to parks and open spaces in Pittsburgh?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walk or bike</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace / Solitude</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience nature</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Outside</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend special events/concerts</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family activities</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A specific park feature (playground, basketball court, etc.)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hang out with friends</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play team sports / attend sporting events</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>881</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3. Which types of amenities are most needed near your home?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trails and Pathways</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Gardens</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Play Areas</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenways/Woods</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pools/Water Play Areas</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Fields</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-leash Dog Areas</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts (basketball, volleyball, tennis)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Tables &amp; Shelters</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4. How would you use the money if you were in charge? Use a dot to indicate your top two priorities for improving open space, parks, and recreation in Pittsburgh.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protect additional land for open space or parks</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore creeks, forests, and hillsides</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve maintenance of existing parks and facilities</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand the trail network</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add new recreation facilities in existing parks</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer more programs and activities</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance Pittsburgh’s regional parks</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>852</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q5. Pittsburgh is now half the population that it once was, and the city contains many vacant, under-used and abandoned properties. How should these properties be repurposed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th># of votes</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural uses (community garden, farms, beekeeping)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raingardens, stormwater infiltration</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat, forest and creek restoration</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incubate local businesses, entrepreneurs, and non-profits</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail network expansion</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make existing programs work faster (e.g. sideyards)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park recreation facilities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homestead program to bring in new homeowners</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep/landbank property with development potential</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking for neighborhood business districts that need it</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E
PARK QUALITY ANALYSIS

OpenSpacePGH
Appendix E: Park Quality Analysis

Pittsburgh’s park and recreation system is made of many types of parks, with different settings and characteristics. One of the best ways of evaluating the existing park and recreation system is an analysis of park quality. When coupled with the suitability analysis, the review of park system quality establishes the groundwork for basing capital investment decisions. During the as part of the Needs Assessment and Suitability Analysis, March 2011 [link], the City’s park inventory was evaluated using criterion developed to determine the quality of parks within the City. The following is park quality analysis tool used to evaluate park quality. The results of the analysis are included in the March 2011 report.

Defining Quality for the Purpose of Analysis
There are many ways that quality is discussed in terms of parks: design, materials used, condition, level of maintenance, among others. For the purpose of evaluating quality at the citywide scale as a factor in a multi-layered planning assessment, we use Joseph Juran’s definition of quality as “fitness for use.”

Criteria
The following criteria represent those that address “fitness for use” and can be objectively evaluated. At each park, a score of 0, 1, or 2 will be given for each criterion, with 2 representing highest ranking. When tree canopy prevents evaluation, a 99 will be placed in the criterion’s scoring column.

A. Surrounding Environment
The surrounding environment impacts the quality of the user experience at a park. It has an impact on perceptions of safety as well actual use of a site, and is an indicator of whether the park is woven into its local context. For this criterion, existing land use and transportation can be scored as follows.

0 – Poor quality surrounding environment: Industrial or auto-oriented retail uses, adjacent highways or wide streets with poor crossings.

1 – Mixed or neutral quality surrounding environment.

2 – Good quality surrounding environment. Residential, mixed use, or downtown/neighborhood commercial district land uses and streets with good crossings.

B. Visibility
Visibility into activity areas from adjacent streets is an indicator of the quality of the site design. Theory about people’s perceptions of space indicates that “prospect” – the opportunity to see – is a key factor in whether people like a place. From a safety standpoint, visibility into a site is a critical component of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design or CPTED. Visibility allows “eyes

1 Land use is defined as a zoning category. The quality of construction and the condition of the structures is not evaluated for this criteria.
on the park” and surveillance from surrounding neighbors and businesses as well as police. The intent of this criterion is to provide coarse screening, as visibility and views can be difficult to determine using aerial photography only. Note: not all elements of a park need to be visible for this criterion to be met, but at least one key activity area should be visible.

0 – View of key activity area(s) from surrounding streets are impeded.
1 – Neutral: air photo does not allow a determination.
2 – Views of key activity area(s) from surrounding streets appear to be unobstructed.

C. Variety of Experience
Parks that offer a variety of recreation opportunities provide a better user experience. Through the public involvement activities of the OpenSpacePGH process, input on preferences for the basic features parks in Pittsburgh should include, and have incorporated these preferences into the scoring.

0 – Missing one or more of:
- a picnic area (picnic table or shelter structure),
- children's play area
- level grass area at least 100’ by 100’ (can be a ball field), or
- ball field or sports court.

1 – Includes a picnic area (picnic table or shelter structure), playground, a level grass area at least 100’ by 100’, and at least one ball field (diamond or rectangular) or sports court.

2 – Includes one or more additional activity areas and features than those include in score 1.

D. Site Layout
The layout of a site affects the quality of the park user’s experience. A site should have a rational circulation system that connects activity areas. Within the activity areas, compatible features and amenities should be grouped to create nodes of activity.

0 – No circulation system, no nodes of activity.
1 – Partial auto or pedestrian circulation system, partially developed nodes of activity.
2 – Circulation system, nodes of activity. Some additional activity areas may be dispersed throughout the park.
E. Additional Consideration: Parking

The availability of parking is a factor in the ability of a particular site to accommodate amenities, park features and activities that draw people in. This criterion addresses site capacity as well as the presence of a user amenity. Only two ratings are available for this criterion. The evaluator will determine the presence or absence of on-street parking by street frontage and road width.

Scoring for all parks EXCEPT neighborhood parks:

0 – No off-street parking at the park and on-street parking is not available adjacent to the park.

1 – On-street parking appears to be available adjacent to the park, or the park contains off-street parking.

Scoring for neighborhood parks:

0 – On-street parking appears to be available adjacent to the park, or the park contains off-street parking.

1 – No off-street parking at the park and on-street parking is not available adjacent to the park.

Methodology

1. The evaluator will use columns on the inventory spreadsheet to record evaluation scores.

2. The evaluator will use Google Earth and a file based on the current GIS inventory to view the GIS data overlaid on air photos.

3. The evaluator will work park by park through the entire city park inventory, using the following process:

   A. The evaluator will check that the GIS file depicts the park in the right location. If incorrect, the evaluator will flag the park in the inventory spreadsheet for incorrect location.

   B. If correct, the evaluator will compare the inventory with the air photo. If the inventory and photo are not consistent, the evaluator will flag that park in the inventory spreadsheet.

   C. The evaluator will evaluate the site for each of the five criteria, placing a score in the appropriate column on the inventory spreadsheet. If tree canopy prevents evaluation for a particular criterion, the evaluator will place a “99” in that column. The spreadsheet will calculate a total score per park.

2 Neighborhood parks are designed to serve local residents with a ¼ and ½ mile walking service area. Destination facilities that attract people from farther distances and require the use of a car and the need for vehicle parking are undesirable for this park classification (see Park Design Guidelines). Therefore, the presence of a parking lot in a neighborhood park requires different scoring.
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Appendix F: Economic Calculators

The Open Space, Parks and Recreation (OSPR) system in the City of Pittsburgh provides significant economic benefits to local residents and businesses and also contributes to the overall economic vitality of the city and the broader region. The role of the OSPR system in contributing to quality of life in the city is broadly understood, but has never been defined in strictly quantitative terms. In order to bridge this gap in applied research related to the economic benefits of the Pittsburgh OSPR system, an economic model has been created to quantify current economic benefits based on available data and research, as well as to provide an economic decision-making tool for considering future investments in the OSPR system.

The types of economic factors that have been quantified for the OpenSpacePGH Plan include: clean air, property values, property tax revenues, stormwater maintenance, and vacant property reuse. Additional factors that could be considered in the future based on additional primary research include direct use value, community cohesion, and general public health\(^1\).

This document serves as an instructional manual for using the *Valuation_Calculators.xls* file supplied to the City in a digital format.

**Model Design**

The model is structured as series of linked Excel spreadsheets consisting of specific economic calculators designed to receive inputs (acres, square feet, percentage of pervious land, etc.) and generate outputs (economic value, tax revenues, hedonic price factors, etc.). The model serves as a predicative tool but also provides a baseline 2011 assessment of economic impacts at the citywide level. The model is designed to be consistent with PGHSNAP to facilitate the thematic mapping of certain economic outputs at later stages of the OpenSpacePGH process or for future planning purposes.

**Summary of Existing Benefits**

The existing economic benefits calculated for this process include:

1) Increased property values based on proximity to large (30+ acre) parks

2) Property tax receipts associated with increased property values from park proximity

3) Cost savings to the City government from stormwater mitigation

4) Cost savings to the City government from air pollution removal

\(^1\) These types of economic impacts have been calculated by the Trust for Public Land (TPL) and others in a variety of jurisdictions across the United States. The economic impacts summarized here are based on economic research and analysis conducted by BAE Urban Economics using available secondary data and research for the City of Pittsburgh.
In addition, the summary of existing economic impacts includes a cost to the City of Pittsburgh of city services needed for the maintenance of its large inventory of vacant and abandoned properties.

Taking into account these various economic factors, the total economic value of the OSPR system is approximately $2 billion, with the majority of the economic benefits accruing to individual homeowners in the form of increased property values associated with park amenities. Specific details and the methodology for determining each of the factors displayed in the following table are provided below.

### Estimated Value of the Pittsburgh Open Space, Parks and Recreation System - Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax Receipts from Increased Property Value</td>
<td>$48,789,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Savings Factors for City Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management Value</td>
<td>$3,010,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Pollution Mitigation Value</td>
<td>$397,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Total, Municipal Cost Savings</td>
<td>$3,407,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Value from Park Proximity</td>
<td>$1,951,590,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimated Value</td>
<td>$2,003,787,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Maintaining Vacant/Abandoned Properties</td>
<td>-$20,457,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Economic Impacts of All Open Space</td>
<td>$1,983,330,674</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Calculator Methodology

Like the summary of existing benefits, the predicative calculator focuses on property values, property tax receipts, stormwater management value, air pollution mitigation value, and the disposal of vacant and abandoned properties. For each type of economic factor, the predicative calculator requires an input such as acres of new park land, number of single family homes within 500 feet of the new or renovated park, and number of vacant and abandoned sites to be transferred to private or nonprofit ownership. Depending on the project being designed, the predicative calculator will provide a series of outputs with dollar values associated with each factor and also the total economic impact of the proposed OpenSpacePGH project. Values, unless otherwise noted, are provided in 2010 dollars, but can be inflated using the consumer price index or a similar index in the future, as needed.

---

2 Figures are represented in uninflated 2010 dollars unless otherwise noted.
Specific detailed descriptions of each calculator follow below, including a description of the existing base data and how it might be updated in the future.

**Hedonic Property Values and Property Taxes**

The hedonic property value calculator quantifies the increase in the value of single-family residences (SFRs) that would result from the development of new park land in Pittsburgh and calculates the increase in municipal tax revenue to follow.

The hedonic value calculator takes the number of non-vacant SFRs that fall within each buffer zone by sector and applies the “green premium” determined by Carnegie Mellon Heinz College researchers through their regression analysis of residential property values. The green premium is the segment of a property’s value that can be attributed to its proximity to a public park. By applying the green premium, which is in 2000 dollars, the calculator estimates the gross value of residential property that can be attributed to Pittsburgh parks by sector. Finally, by applying the average residential property tax rate, the calculator yields the estimated annual boost in SFR property tax revenue that is created by the park system.

Note that this calculator differs from the others in that it only applies to park land, and not other types of open space covered in the OSPR system. This is because research on the relationship between open space and property values in Pittsburgh has only been conducted regarding parks. In addition, the results are further constrained by the fact that the calculator only pertains to SFRs, and therefore does not capture the effect that park land may have on the value of other housing types and/or commercial properties.

**Data source.** The hedonic value calculator utilizes the parcel database provided by the City of Pittsburgh. Each parcel is coded with a use description (“USEDESC”). For the purposes of this calculator, the database was pared down to SFRs only.

**Data extraction.** Using ArcMap, MIG exported all parcels coded as SFRs and then coded those that were designated as vacant by the City, as well as those that were designated vacant by the Community Technical Assistance Center (CTAC). Then, BAE removed all parcel records designated vacant by either the City, CTAC, or both. Next, BAE created a shapefile with buffers drawn around each large park at five distance ranges tailored to match the Heinz research. (Note that BAE has used the following protocols dictated by the Heinz report: the hedonic value analysis is limited to SFRs located within certain distances of parks that are 30 acres or larger.) Finally, each eligible parcel that fell within one of the buffer distances was coded with its distance from a city park.

**Predicative calculator methodology.** The hedonic value predictive calculator takes the number of non-vacant SFRs that fall within 500 feet of any new or renovated park and applies a “green premium” of five percent. Unlike the summary of existing economic benefits, this calculator assumes that economic benefits will accrue from any new park regardless of size. By applying a relatively conservative\(^3\) green

---

\(^3\) Standard green premiums in other major US cities range from 5 to 15 percent. The premium is calculated as five percent of the total number of SFRs within 500 feet of a park amenity based on a median home value of approximately $83,100 as provided by the US Census American Community Survey. Future research into home
premium of five percent to SFRs within a 500 foot buffer range of any new park project, the calculator estimates the gross value of residential property that can be attributed to Pittsburgh parks by sector. Finally, by applying the average residential property tax rate, the calculator yields the estimated annual boost in SFR property tax revenue that is created by the park system.

**Removal of Air Pollution**

The air pollution calculator quantifies the amount of airborne pollutants sequestered by the creation of new, vegetated open space in Pittsburgh and calculates what it would otherwise cost the City to remove those pollutants by other means.

**Data source.** The pollution removal calculator utilizes a comprehensive tree canopy dataset produced as part of the National Land Cover Database (NLCD) by the Multi-Resolution Land Characteristics (MRLC) Consortium—a partnership of federal agencies, including the EPA, USGS, USFS, NOAA, and NPS. The dataset, which dates from 2001, was produced by analyzing satellite imagery at a one meter squared resolution and coding each pixel either “canopied” or “not canopied.” Then, those pixels were summed within 30 meter squared zones to determine the percent canopied. The dataset, therefore, consists of 30 meter squared pixels that are coded with a percent canopy ranging from zero to 100. By “cross-validating” the dataset with samples of on-the-ground tree surveys, the MRLC determined that its canopy data was 90 percent accurate.

**Data extraction.** In order to utilize the NLCD data, BAE matched the canopy data to the boundaries of Pittsburgh’s OSPR system. This was performed in ArcMap by “clipping” the canopy shapefile so that it matched perfectly the spaces in question. As many of the 30 meter squared pixels were altered in the process, BAE used ArcMap to calculate the area of the remaining shapes. By exporting the clipped data, BAE produced a dataset that broke the City’s OSPR into small zones that were coded with both their area (in square meters) and their percent canopy.

**Data analysis.** BAE separated the OSPR canopy dataset by sector. Then, the area of each shape was converted to square feet and multiplied by its percent canopy to create a “weighted area,” or the square feet of canopy within each shape. By summing the weighted areas and converting that figure to acres, BAE obtained the estimated acreage of tree canopy that exists within the OSPR in each sector of the city.

**Predicative calculator methodology.** The pollution removal calculator follows the method provided by the Trust for Public Land (TPL). First, the calculator tabulates and sums the acres of canopy within the OSPR by sector to find the total acres of tree canopy that can be attributed to Pittsburgh’s public open space. Next, the calculator applies “pollutant flux values” for five airborne pollutants identified in the TPL report as having adverse environmental impacts. The flux values estimate the amount of each pollutant removed from the atmosphere annually on a per canopy area basis. David Nowak at the U.S. Forest Service produced the flux values by researching the pollutant concentration and their “rate of deposition” in many American cities, including Pittsburgh, making these flux values location-specific. BAE values by sector of the City could result in more refined estimates of hedonic value associated with new park amenities.
translated Nowak’s figures into pounds sequestered per acre of canopy. Multiplying the acres of canopy throughout the OSPR by the flux values yields the pounds of each pollutant removed annually by the open space system.

Finally, the calculator applies the “median U.S. externality value” for the removal of each airborne pollutant—or the median cost of preventing a pound of that pollutant from entering the atmosphere by other means—to the pounds removed in order to determine the market value of pollution removal provided by the OSPR each year. The user operates the model by inputting proposed acreage of new public open space into the green highlighted cells. Then, the model applies the average percent canopy to this figure to predict how many acres of new canopy would result. Finally, by applying the pollutant flux and externality values (described above), the model outputs the estimated annual value of pollution removal that would be created by adding to the OSPR.

**Stormwater Management**

The stormwater management calculator quantifies the reduction in runoff that would result from the development of new open space in Pittsburgh over a baseline scenario and calculates what the City would save in municipal expenditures on stormwater maintenance.

**Data source.** The stormwater management calculator utilizes another NLCD dataset that provides information on impervious surfaces. The impervious surface data was produced using the same methodology as the tree canopy data: the MRLC coded one meter squared pixels of satellite imagery either “pervious” or “impervious” and aggregated that data to produce 30 meter squared pixels that are coded with a percent impervious ranging from zero to 100. The MRLC has determined that its impervious surface data is 87 percent accurate.

**Data extraction.** BAE created two “clipped” datasets to use for analysis in the calculator. The first was produced by clipping the impervious surface dataset to the boundaries of the OSPR. The other was created by removing all impervious surface data that fell within the boundaries of the OSPR and clipping the remaining data to the boundaries of the city in order to obtain information on the impervious surfaces that fall outside of the OSPR.

**Data analysis.** BAE separated the clipped OSPR data by sector and according to category and calculated the weighted area in order to obtain the acres of impervious surface within each OSPR category that exist in each sector of the city. In addition, BAE took the dataset clipped to all remaining land and calculated the weighted area in order to obtain the acres of impervious surface that exist outside of the OSPR within each sector.

**Predictive calculator methodology.** In order to predict fluctuations in the volume of runoff that would result from changes to the OSPR, the predictive model calculates the average percent impervious surface of each park category by dividing the acres of impervious land by the total acres of land within that category (from the citywide inventory). The user operates the model by inputting the acres of proposed new open space according to category and sector in the green highlighted cells. Then, the model applies the annual rainfall and the average percent impervious surface to the proposed new acres to calculate the amount of runoff that would result from those facilities.
Next, the model applies the acres of proposed new open space and annual rainfall to the average percent impervious of all remaining land by sector in order to estimate how much runoff is currently produced by the land in question. By subtracting the estimated runoff from any and all additions to the OSPR from the amount of runoff currently produced by that land, the model calculates the runoff reduction that would result from the proposed changes. Finally, by applying the per cubic foot cost of stormwater treatment described above, the model estimates the annual cost savings that would result from the proposed changes by sector.

**Disposition of Vacant and Abandoned Residential Properties**

The property disposition calculator estimates the cost savings that would result from the sale of vacant and abandoned residential properties for use as open space in Pittsburgh.

The calculator operates by taking (1) the number of vacant and abandoned residential properties proposed for sale and applying (2) a municipal costs multiplier. This multiplier provides an approximate estimate of the costs borne by the City to maintain and protect each property, as well as the loss of tax revenue resulting from delinquency. The model thus predicts the positive fiscal impact on the City of Pittsburgh as a factor of decreased costs and increased revenues.

As the per property multiplier is based on residential scaled lots in Ohio, its application to larger properties likely underestimates the true fiscal impact. Further research and analysis would be needed to provide more refined estimates of costs associated with larger, commercial lots in Pittsburgh.

**Data source.** The vacant and abandoned properties calculator utilizes the vacant parcel database provided by the City, which includes all those records from the City’s comprehensive database that were coded as vacant during the last citywide survey.

**Data extraction.** Using ArcMap, BAE selected and exported those vacant parcel records that fell within each sector in order to regroup the database by sector.

**Data analysis.** Each parcel in the database is coded with what appears to be—and, for the purposes of this analysis, is treated as—a land use designation (“STATEDESC”). BAE tabulated the number of parcels that are listed as vacant within each sector according to their designation.

**Predictive calculator methodology.** The vacant and abandoned properties calculator takes the number of vacant properties that are coded as residential and applies a per property municipal cost multiplier in order to model the amount of money that the City of Pittsburgh spends annually providing services to those properties (fencing, trash removal, police and fire runs, etc.). These expenditures are calculated by sector.

BAE derived the cost multiplier from the 2008 report conducted by Community Research Partners (CRP) detailing the amount of money spent by eight Ohio cities to service and maintain vacant and abandoned residential properties. While the CRP report does not provide an analysis of direct municipal costs on a per acre basis, BAE used CRP’s data on gross annual expenditures and the number of vacant and abandoned residential properties surveyed to derive a rough per property cost estimate. BAE inflated that cost estimate to 2010 dollars.
Though the CRP report also detailed the fiscal impact of tax delinquency resulting from vacancy and abandonment, BAE chose not to utilize that data for two reasons. First, it is likely that the tax structure in Pittsburgh differs substantially from the Ohio study cities. Second, the City of Pittsburgh cannot regain tax value on these properties through the OSPR planning process, because if a vacant residential parcel were to be converted to public open space it would become permanently tax exempt. Also, note that while the calculator tabulates the number of vacant properties in Pittsburgh that are non-residential, those properties are not included in the estimate of municipal costs because the cost multiplier applies to residential properties only. The count of non-residential properties is merely provided as a point of interest.

The calculator is also designed to predict the municipal cost savings that would result from the disposition of vacant and abandoned residential properties. Assuming that, upon disposal, those properties will no longer be a public burden, the user inputs the number of proposed properties to be sold in the green highlighted cell. Then, the calculator applies the same municipal cost multiplier described above to predict the amount of money that the City of Pittsburgh will save annually in maintenance costs by pushing those properties back into private use.
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APPENDIX G
PARK EVALUATION AND PROJECT LIST
Appendix G:
Park Evaluation and Project List

This Appendix contains detailed recommendations for each of Pittsburgh's existing community and neighborhood parks. There are six categories of treatment for existing sites:

- **INVEST** - Make capital replacement or capital improvement projects at the site. This includes implementation of existing master plans, upgrading or capital replacement of existing amenities and facilities, the addition of new features and facilities into the existing site. This category also includes new development of a park.

- **REDEVELOP** - Redevelop the site completely, making a major capital investment. This is intended to signify a wholesale re-do of a site that is poorly designed, targeted for a change of use or function, or in very poor condition.

- **RELOCATE** - Move the park to a better location. This category is intended to signify that a park is needed in the area, but that the existing location is subpar. Relocation means that the existing site will be changed to a different use and a new site will be developed to replace its function more effectively.

- **EXPAND** - Acquire property to expand an existing park or open space, or acquire a new site to fill an identified gap in the system.

- **NATURALIZE** - Revegetate the property with appropriate species (riparian or upland), restore ecosystem or riparian processes, or remove invasive species or non-native vegetation (including turf grass). This may include development of low impact trails and other compatible features (viewing blinds, environmental education features, etc.).

- **DIVEST** - Transfer all or part of the property to another city department, sell the property, or transfer ownership to another non-city entity.

The process for determining site-specific recommendations across the entire system was intensive, involving remote analysis as well as site visits and “ground truths” by city staff. Preliminary recommendations were reviewed for consistency with the design guidelines contained within OpenSpacePGH, as well as with the OpenSpacePGH vision and goals, and, in turn, the design guidelines were refined to better accommodate site-specific issues.

Recommendations for Community Parks are presented first, organized alphabetically. Neighborhood Parks are further categorized, with recommendations for Neighborhood Parks in areas with high density low-income and/or minor-majority populations presented first that were identified as poor to fair quality during the Needs Assessments [link], followed by recommendations for the remaining Neighborhood Parks by neighborhood sector. Each park is indicated by name, and the sector number is

---

1 All aerial images were supplied using Google Earth™
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provided. For additional reference, ZIP Codes are provided for orientation. Figure F-1 depicts the sector boundaries.

In addition to the individual park recommendations, parks with a recommendation to DIVEST or NATURALIZE include the identification of the PGHSNAP Action Planning Strategy recommendations. The complete document of PGHSNAP can be found here [link]. In brief, there are four scales of action (intervention) strategies: Preserve, Enhance, Stabilize, and Reinvent. The scale of action is coupled with a social stability indicator of one through four, with one being stable and four indicating instability.

- Preserve (P) - very targeted strategies
- Enhance (E) – targeted strategies
- Stabilize (S) – broad strategies
- Reinvent (R) – very broad strategies

Figure G1: Planning Sectors

- Allegheny Hills (1)
- Upper Northside (2)
- Lower Northside (3)
- West Pittsburgh (4)
- South Pittsburgh (5)
- Mt. Washington/Hilltop West (6)
- South Side/Hilltop East (7)
- Thirty-First Ward (8)
- Monongahela River Valley (9)
- Lower East End (10)
- Northeast Pittsburgh (11)
- Upper East End (12)
- Allegheny River Valley (13)
- Oakland (14)
- Hill District & Uptown (15)
- Downtown Pittsburgh (16)
Community Parks

Pittsburgh’s community parks vary in size, character and level of development. Investment is needed at many of the community parks to make them more relevant to today’s population, function better, and replace aging amenities. Some community parks are designated as “signature” community parks, meaning that these sites are targeted for a higher level of capital and operations investment than standard community parks. The “signature” designation is given to sites with strong potential to serve a larger population and provide “green premium” benefits to areas not benefitting from proximity to the city’s five regional parks. Table F1 identifies the recommended treatment for each of the city’s 21 community parks, and indicates if a park is designated as a signature site.

Table G1: Project List for Community Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park &amp; Sector</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Divest</th>
<th>Invest</th>
<th>Redevelop</th>
<th>Relocate</th>
<th>Expand</th>
<th>Naturalize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allegheny Center Park Plaza (Public Square)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegheny Commons Park</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arsenal Park</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banksville Park</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Heights Park</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookline Memorial Park</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinan Park</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hills Park</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fowler Park</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herschel Park</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Square Park</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McBride Park</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinley and Upper McKinley Park</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mellon Park</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mellon Square Park</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore Park</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips Park</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheraden Park</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside Park</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End Park</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Penn Park</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Allegheny Center Park Plaza (Public Square)

Figure G2: Allegheny Center Park Plaza

Sector 3 – Lower Northside

Allegheny Center Park Plaza (1.0 ac), also known as Buhl Community Park, is located in the neighborhood of Allegheny Center (15212) across Ohio Street from the Children’s Museum of Pittsburgh. The plaza includes pedestrian rights-of-ways and is bordered by Children’s Way to the west and buildings that are part of the Allegheny Center complex on all other sides. The park once marked the center of Allegheny City as a community public green, laid out by John Redick in 1787 as part of the 36 block area that made up Allegheny City and formerly known as Diamond Park. In 1965, as part of the urban renewal program for Allegheny Center, the park was redesigned as a sunken plaza which due to its design sat isolated and practically unused. In 2012, due to a partnership with the Children’s Museum of Pittsburgh, the park underwent a $6.1 million revitalization which created an open central plaza for the buildings and institutions that frame the edges of the park.

Today, the park contains a central plaza with tables and chairs, a large meadow with native grasses, benches, natural bluestone walls for seating, rain gardens and bioswales for storm water mitigation, bike racks and drinking fountains for both visitors and their pets. The park also includes a new piece of public art by Ned Kahn, Cloud Arbor, which is an assembly of 64 stainless steel poles measuring 32’ in height which, due to water nozzles being located on the poles, emit a "cloud" of mist that rises, swirls, and is in constant motion.

Recommendation:

INVEST

- This park was redeveloped during the OpenSpacePGH planning process and renamed as Buhl Community Park near the completion of the Plan. This site should continue to be maintained and programmed to a high level in partnership with the Children’s Museum of Pittsburgh and other adjacent institutions.
Allegheny Commons Park

Figure G3: Allegheny Commons Park

Sector 3 - Lower Northside

Allegheny Commons Park (59.9 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Allegheny Center (15212). Dating back to 1867, Allegheny Commons is Pittsburgh’s oldest park. Prior to its designation as a public park, it was the commons for Allegheny, once a separate city from Pittsburgh. Noted modernist landscape architect John Ormsbee Simonds developed a plan for Allegheny Commons Park in 1966, including the treatment of Lake Elizabeth. Today, the park has a variety of facilities including ball fields, sports courts, children’s play areas, a swimming pool, and the man-made lake. It is also home to the National Aviary and Kayak Pittsburgh.

In 2002, a the Allegheny Commons Master Plan was completed through a collaborative effort of the Northside Leadership Conference, the Garden Club of Allegheny County, the City of Pittsburgh, The National Aviary, the Buhl Foundation, and the Richard King Mellon Foundation. The Master Plan aims to protect the historic integrity of the park, while providing a place that evolves in design and use over time. Long term maintenance and management of the park is guided by the following goals:

- Promote stewardship of Allegheny Commons.
- Preserve and respect the historic landscape, as well as the continuum of that landscape.
- Enhance public safety and improve universal accessibility and circulation.
- Minimize alterations and additions to historic fabric while recognizing current community priorities and needs.
- Provide a framework for on-going management and maintenance.
- Enhance visitor services and use of the Commons.
- Respect and enhance ecological vitality and integrity of the Commons.
- Nominate the Commons to the National Register of Historic Places.

Recommendation:

INVEST

- Designate this site as a signature community park. Continue to support renovations in accordance with the Allegheny Commons Master Plan.
Arsenal Park

Figure G4: Arsenal Park

Sector 13 - Allegheny River Valley
Arsenal Park (8.8 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Central Lawrenceville (15201) between 39th and 40th streets behind Arsenal School on Butler Street. The park was originally established as a military arsenal in 1814, and served as a weapons storage and supply site during the American Civil War. The arsenal on the site was destroyed in an explosion in 1862, killing a number of civilians. The maintenance shed present on the site may incorporate parts of the original arsenal.

Today, the park contains two ball fields, multiple sports courts and a defunct wading pool (developed in the early part of the twentieth century). Visibility into the site is poor due to the grade of the site, even though there is street frontage on two sides. Overall, the facilities are in poor condition and their layout has filled up the park without providing unprogrammed passive space.

Recommendation:
REDEVELOP

- Redevelop the park completely to create a site with a better balance of active and passive space and incorporate references to the site's history.
  - Develop a new master plan for the site, using the community park design guidelines as a starting point.
  - Remove the wading pool and evaluate adaptive reuse possibilities for the structure associated with the wading pool.
  - Retain one of the ball fields on the site, and reconfigure the layout so there is greater flexibility in use of the park.
  - Consider eliminating the tennis courts since the City is over supplied with this type of facility.
  - Reconfigure the circulation system, keeping in mind that most existing paths within the park are in poor condition and well beyond their design life.
  - Interpret the history of the site in its design, including incorporating the cannons.
  - Incorporate picnic areas and open lawn, and consider a community scale spray park for this site.
Banksville Park

Figure G5: Banksville Park

Banksville Park (16.6 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Banksville (15216) and accessed from Crane Avenue. The site incorporates a slope. The highest elevation of the site is fully developed, and contains a ball field, playground, sports courts, an all season rentable shelter, and a swimming pool. Approximately half the site is a wooded hillside sloping away from the developed portion of the park. The wooded area contains trails that have not been formally developed.

Recommendation:

INVEST

- Enhance the park entry, including the addition of a park identification sign and improved pedestrian access.
- Retain the wooded area, removing invasive species and replanting as needed for a healthy urban forest. Create a better ecological transition between the wooded area and the developed park through a planted buffer.
- Formalize the trails in the wooded area, and integrate them into the overall circulation system of the park to provide looped walking routes.
- Explore feasibility of adding a second pedestrian access to the site off Chappel or Greenside Avenues.
Brighton Heights Park

Figure G6: Brighton Heights Park

Sector 2 - Upper Northside
Brighton Heights Park (32.0 ac.) is located in the Brighton Heights neighborhood (15212) off Benton Ave at Brighton Woods Road. Nearby parks and schools include the historic Riverview Park and St. Cyril of Alexandria School. The park has six ball fields, a basketball court, children’s play area and swimming pool. The southern half of the property is wooded hillside.

Recommendation:
INVEST

- Retain ball fields as a major component of this site, as this park has one of Pittsburgh’s largest concentrations of fields. Consider incorporating some additional rectangular field space, potentially reconfiguring existing diamond fields to support this.
- Add a secondary pedestrian access and provide overall pedestrian access enhancements.
Brookline Memorial Park

Figure G7: Brookline Memorial Park

Sector 5 - South Pittsburgh

Brookline Memorial Park (54.4 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Brookline (15226). It is very close to Carmalt Elementary School and Carmalt Park. Access to the park is through a parking lot that connects to Oakridge St. and Brookline Blvd. The upland portion of the park is developed, with wooded slopes constituting about half the site. The developed portion of the park has a year round recreation center, two lighted ball fields, two unlighted ball fields, a rectangular field, a children's play area, and swimming pool.

Recommendation:

INVEST

• Provide better integration of the wooded area into the overall site through a formally developed pathway network.
• Add sidewalks on Brookline Boulevard to improve pedestrian access.
• Provide a direct pathway connection to Carmalt Elementary to create stronger linkages between the two sites.
Dinan Park

Figure G8: Dinan Park

Sector 13 - Allegheny River Valley

Dinan Park (16.4 ac.) is located in the Stanton Heights neighborhood (15201) adjacent to Sunnyside Elementary School. Access to the park is off Farmington Street with secondary access provided through the school grounds off Stanton Ave. The park has two sports courts, one ball field and a playground, with a wooded hillside along the eastern portion.

Recommendation:

INVEST

- Enhance pedestrian access, including continuing the sidewalks up Farmington Street and adding a second pedestrian entrance on the south side of the park.
- Provide better on-site pedestrian circulation, including creating a better connection between Sunnyside Elementary and the park, repaving paths, and adding new paths to connect site elements and create loops. Work with PPS to encourage shared usage of both the ball field in the Park and the ball field on PPS property.
- Retain sports courts at this site – preferred court type should be determined with input from the surrounding neighborhoods. The existing tennis courts are in need of resurfacing – confirm sports court preferences for this site rather than automatically reinvesting in tennis courts.
- Add a children’s play area and picnic area to the site, locating these features near a neighborhood entrance.
**East Hills Park**

*Figure G9: East Hills Park*

**Sector 11 - Northeast Pittsburgh**

East Hills Park (11.1 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of East Hills (15221) in close proximity to Imani Christian Academy. Access to the park is from Wilner Drive. Located on the periphery of Pittsburgh, East Hills Park is the only park in the area. Because of its location and configuration, it functions more as a large neighborhood park for nearby residents than as a community park, and will continue to function this way in the future. The park has a spray park, a lighted ball field, and sports courts. This site has very limited street frontage, with little opportunity for expansion.

**Recommendation:**

**INVEST**

- Create additional pedestrian access points to the park from the southwest and east sides of the park. Develop these as gateways to the site, to increase visibility of the park and improve connection to the surrounding neighborhood.
- Create a more prominent entrance off Wilner Drive.
- Provide better internal site circulation, especially to the ball field.
- Provide multiple picnic areas in proximity to the spray park.
Fowler Park

Figure G10: Fowler Park

Sector 2 - Upper Northside

Fowler Park (12.7 ac.) is located in Perry South (15214), and is accessed from North Charles St. via two entries along the west and north boundaries. The park has a swimming pool, sports courts, children’s play area, and two ball fields. The Pittsburgh Project, a non-profit community development organization, started construction of a gymnasium on the park site scheduled for completion in the Spring of 2012 after years of involvement and advocacy for this site.

Recommendation:
INVEST, EXPAND

- This park lacks strong presence along public streets. Opportunity-based expansion should be pursued to increase its street frontage and enhance connections to the neighborhood. There are already opportunities to expand the park onto vacant parcels on North Charles St.:
  - 46-A-88 (2000 sq. ft.): City of Pittsburgh (municipal)
  - 46-A-91 (2000 sq. ft.): City of PGH (vacant)
  - 46-A-92 (2000 sq. ft.): City of PGH (municipal)
- Collaborate with the Pittsburgh Project to develop a master plan for further improvement of the park.
- Create a more prominent entrance off North Charles and Kimberlin Streets, and investigate adding secondary accesses to the east and south sides of the park.
- Improve visibility into the park and “curb appeal”, especially from Kenwood and Canter Way.
Herschel Park

Figure G11: Herschel Park

Sector 4 - West Pittsburgh

Herschel Park (20.4 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Elliott (15220). The site is located off Herschel Street at the top of the hill. The area used as park land is approximately seven acres while the rest of the site contains a steep wooded hillside, a community recycling center and a Public Works yard. The flat park space is completely developed with basketball courts, ball fields, deck hockey, and a children’s play area. Herschel Park is four blocks (1/2 mile) west of West End Park, which provides an open grassy area and shelter.

Recommendation:

INVEST

- Connect Herschel Park with West End Park so that the two sites can function together as a full-service community park. Explore creating a physical pathway/promenade connection within the public R.O.W. between the two sites. At minimum, include information about both parks at each site and highlight walking routes between the two.
- In the long-term, consider relocating the maintenance yard and Public Works functions from Herschel Park if suitable replacement sites can be found. If this occurs, Herschel Park should be reconsidered in a master planning effort that includes the entire site.
Market Square Park

Figure G12: Market Square Park

Sector 16 - Downtown Pittsburgh

Newly renovated Market Square Park (0.5 ac.), located in the Central Business District (15222), is one of Pittsburgh’s signature community parks. The park site was part of the original 1784 plan of streets and lots for Pittsburgh and is within a designated City historic district. Market Square is an urban plaza that serves as a “living room” for Pittsburgh. Designed with high quality materials to accommodate a range of uses, Market Square hosts programs and events such as Tuesday’s Reading Room, Thursdays in the Square, which includes a farmers’ market and concert series, and Friday’s Kidsplay. The park is surrounded by restaurants, bars, and cafes, which contribute to Market Square as a vibrant city space.

Recommendation:

INVEST

- Designate this site as a signature community park.
- Market Square was redeveloped during the OpenSpacePGH planning process. This site should continue to be maintained and programmed to a high level in keeping with its status as one of Pittsburgh’s signature community park sites.
McBride Park

Figure G13: McBride Park

**Sector 8 - Thirty-First Ward**

McBride Park (22.7 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Lincoln Place (15147) and is close to Mifflin School and Lincoln Place Park. The park site is primarily wooded hillsides with a developed upland area off McBride Street. The flat developed area along the western portion of the park contains a ball field, sports courts, playground and swimming pool.

Located on the outskirts of Pittsburgh, this park is accessed via a neighborhood street. Though the topography is less extreme than at many other parks, the location is remote enough that McBride Park will continue to serve a more limited audience and should not be a location for high cost facilities.

**Recommendation:**

*INVEST*

- Renovate the grounds and site amenities, including an improved entrance.
- Consider adventure recreation activities at this location – for example, a paintball group is already using the park for paintball games.
- Repurpose the swimming pool due to its small size and McBride Park’s isolated location.
**McKinley Park**

*Figure G14: McKinley Park*

**Sector 6 - Mt. Washington/Hilltop West**

McKinley Park (78.5 ac.) are located in Beltzhoover (15210) in close proximity to the Bon Air Early Childhood Center and Bon Air Park. Bausman Street runs east-west through the property and bisects it. The park contains two steep ridges, with developed park facilities (a skate park, sports courts, ball field, and children’s play area) located in the lowlands along Bausman Street. Along Amesbury and Delmont Streets, on the upland northwest portion of the site, are a second children’s play area, a senior center, and a sports court. Upper McKinley Park, the upland area, appears to function primarily as a neighborhood park for the nearby residents, and is not connected to the lowland community park features.

**Recommendation:**

**INVEST**

- Develop a site master plan addressing the overall site and its constrained topography. Address refinement of the park’s identity, improving connections and visibility across the site and providing a more cohesive park experience.
- Incorporate more trails into the hillsides, providing hiking trails within the park and creating connections between Upper McKinley and McKinley.
- Selectively remove and replant trees to increase visibility between sections of the park and enhance forest health.
- Upgrade the park facilities along Bausman Street, including providing better circulation among the elements via a pathway system.
Mellon Park
Figure G15: Mellon Park

Sector 10 - Lower East End
Mellon Park (32.5 ac.) is located in the neighborhoods of Shadyside and Point Breeze (15206). The park is home to the Phipps Garden Center and the Pittsburgh Center of the Arts. The park was originally the estate of Richard Beatty Mellon, and the Walled Garden still present (and recently renovated) was designed for Mr. Mellon in 1929. During the 1940s and 50s, the estate was transitioned to a public park. After a period of neglect, the park has been under restoration following the recommendations contained in the Mellon Park Preservation and Management Plan, 2001. The Walled Garden was restored in 2010 through a partnership between the city, local foundations, and the Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy.

The park is primarily a historically maintained landscape south of Fifth Avenue. North of Fifth Avenue, the park is home to the Mellon Tennis Center, sports courts, three ball fields, a play area, and an open lawn area with an internal pathway system. A spray park is currently under development. The unique nature of the historic landscape at Mellon Park, combined with its sports facilities and top quality regional scale tennis center, make this a signature community park for Pittsburgh.

Recommendation:
INVEST
- Designate this site as a signature community park.
- Continue to make renovations and manage the historic landscape within the park in accordance with the Master Plan.
- On the north side of the park, retain a sports and active recreation focus. Continue to invest in the Mellon Tennis Center, upgrade other sports facilities, and if feasible, add more active recreation and sports elements and supporting elements (concessions, café, etc).
Mellon Square Park

Figure G16: Mellon Square Park

Sector 16 - Downtown Pittsburgh

Mellon Square Park (1.4 ac.), a mid-century landscape of note, is located in the Central Business District (15222). This park, designed by John Ormsbee Simonds, was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1985 for its modernist design and its status as one of the earliest parks to be placed on top of a parking structure. In 2008, it was named one of 10 “American Planning Association (APA) Great Public Spaces in America” and cited as a “forerunner of today’s green roof designs, providing pervious surfaces to absorb water and decrease polluted runoff.”

Currently, the Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy is overseeing a project to rehabilitate the square. Work began in June 2011 and is expected to be completed in mid to late 2013.

Recommendation:

INVEST

• Continue to support the renovation of Mellon Square Park in collaboration with the Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy.
Moore Park

Figure G17: Moore Park

Sector 5 - South Pittsburgh

Originally developed in 1939, Moore Park (10.1 ac.) is located in the Brookline neighborhood (15226), near Our Lady of Loretto School, the Pioneer Education Center, South Brook Middle School, and West Liberty Elementary School. It is adjacent to the Moore Greenway on its north and east boundaries. The park is fully developed with two ball fields, a swimming pool, sports courts and children’s play area.

Recommendation:

INVEST

- Provide pathway connections to and through the Moore Greenway, and increase pedestrian connections to the north and south neighborhoods.
- Integrate passive space (such as picnic areas or spaces for casual enjoyment) with the existing facilities, as the site lacks these types of opportunities. Due to the highly programmed nature of Moore Park, this will be challenging.
- Though there is currently no vacant land adjacent to Moore Park, if developable land around the park becomes available, it should be pursued and considered for expansion.
Phillips Park

Figure G18: Phillips Park

Sector 5 - South Pittsburgh

Phillips Park (23.4 ac.) is located in Carrick (15210) adjacent to Carrick High School, off Parkfield Street and Spokane Ave. The park site follows the slope of the hillside. The southern portion has a play area and sports courts, located on a small flat upland area. The grassy hill due west of the school has a disc golf course. The northern portion of the site has a cluster of facilities, consisting of a recreation center, pool and a rectangular sports field with seating built into the hillside.

Recommendation:
INVEST

- Provide on-site circulation to link the disparate clusters of park facilities and enhance neighborhood connections.
- Add sidewalks around the Sinton Ave. side of the park.
- Add secondary pedestrian access points on the west and north sides of the park.
- Enhance the urban forest at this site. Manage the tree canopy for forest health and visibility.
- If off-site parking can be secured, and there is a demand for additional competitive quality rectangular field space, consider upgrading the field.
Sheraden Park

Figure G19: Sheraden Park

Sector 4 - West Pittsburgh
Sheraden Park (51.2 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Sheraden (15204). The park facilities are located in the lowlands between two hillsides. Surban Street runs through the central lowland, dead ending in the park and providing access to two ball fields, sports courts, and a playground.

Recommendation:
EXPAND, REDEVELOP

- Designate this site as a signature community park.
- Sheraden Park has enormous potential to be expanded and redeveloped to become one of Pittsburgh’s signature community parks, with its forests, hills and valleys defining its character.
- Expand Sheraden Park to include the series of public parcels that connect to McGonigle Park on the west and further south from McGonigle to the skate park:
  - 41-A-6
  - 42-A-10
  - 42-N-320
  - 42-N-354
  - 42-N-44
  - 42-N-49
  - 70-D-48
  - 70-D-52
  - 70-D-64
  - 71-M-111
  - 71-M-114
  - 71-M-212
  - 71-M-260
  - 71-M-263
  - 71-M-267
  - 71-M-274
  - 71-M-276
  - 71-M-278
  - 71-M-316
  - 71-M-339
  - 71-M-342
  - 71-S-272
  - 71-S-320
  - 71-S-324
  - 71-S-325
  - 71-S-350
  - 71-S-355
• Work with the Alcosan team pursuing acquisition of the Duquesne Light Property to determine if further expansion or river access is feasible.
• Develop a new master plan that provides a vision for the expanded site (Sheraden Park, McGonigle Park, public parcels) and that uses the community park design guidelines as a starting point.
• In the master plan, address the relationship of the scattered facilities, and evaluate elimination of defunct or remote facilities.
• Consider new facilities for this site in the master plan with the purpose of creating a critical mass of outdoor recreation facilities that take advantage of the site’s expansiveness and sinuous character.
• Consider the addition of a dog park.
• Implement the new master plan.
Southside Park

Figure G20: Southside Park

Sector 7 - Southside/Hilltop East
Southside Park (57.5 ac.) is located in the South Side Slopes neighborhood (15203), and is mostly undeveloped forested hillside. The site contains upper and lower areas of flat land: the lower area has a lighted rectangular field and the upper area has a ball field. The park lacks a formal entrance and parking, and has unrealized potential given its location and large size.

Recommendation:
REDVELOP

- Designate this site as a signature community park.
- Develop a master plan for future development of this park as a community park with a trails and outdoor recreation focus. Consider incorporating Arlington Park into this master plan effort.
- Develop a network of multi-use trails with varying levels of difficulty and multiple trailheads.
- Adventure recreation should be considered at the lower section of this park due to its topography, entrance, and proximity to the Carson Street business district.
- Provide on-site parking – consider locating it off South 21st Street.
West End Park

Figure G21: West End Park

Sector 4 - West Pittsburgh

West End Park (17.0 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of West End (15220). It is tucked back into a neighborhood toward the top of a hill. At the back of the park, the grade slopes down steeply. This park is mostly an open lawn area, and does not contain fields. There is a year-round shelter in the park which can be rented for events. This site should be considered in conjunction with Herschel Park, as the usable land of West End Park cannot support the full range of community park amenities.

Recommendation:

INVEST

- See Herschel Park recommendations.
- Remove the half basketball court and add a children’s play area.
West Penn Park
Figure G22: West Penn Park

Sector 13 - Allegheny River Valley
West Penn Park (22.5 ac.) is located in Polish Hill (15219) off Bigelow Blvd and Paulowna St. This site is nestled into the hillside on the outer edge of the Hill District Green Print plan area. It contains a recreation center, a pool, a skate park and playground at the top of the hill, with a lighted ball field. There is a back entrance to the park along Kenney Way past Haran Street.

Recommendation:
INVEST

- Add signage along Bigelow, Paulowna, and Kenney.
- Develop a pathway system throughout the park, including a connection to the southwest end of the park.
- Explore the feasibility of linking West Penn Park to downtown through the Pennsylvania Railroad Company property via a trail and the proposed Bigelow Greenway.
Neighborhood Parks in High Density Low-Income and Minority-Majority Census Tracts

Throughout OpenSpacePGH, many participants raised the issue of equity in the park system. Because of this concern, the Needs Assessment and Suitability Analysis included specific analysis aimed at highlighting inequities or gaps. This included screening the quality of parks, identifying specific areas of Pittsburgh with higher densities of low income and/or minority-majority populations through census data, and assessing whether target areas were underserved with quality parks and open spaces. After the Needs Assessment, fieldwork was conducted to review specific parks identified through the screening process and determine the best course of action to address inequities. Table F2 identifies the sites studied in detail.

Table G2: Project List for High Density Low-Income and Minority-Majority Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park &amp; Sector</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Divest</th>
<th>Invest</th>
<th>Redevelop</th>
<th>Relocate</th>
<th>Expand</th>
<th>Naturalize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burgwin Park (NP)</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliffside Park (NP)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>●●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross and Strauss Park (NP)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denny Park (NP)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan Park (NP)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fineview North Park (NP)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fineview South Park (NP)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship Park (NP)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herron Hill Tennis Courts (SU)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homewood Park (NP)</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Park (NP)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kite Hill Park (NP)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larimer Park (NP)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester Park and Manchester Park School (NP)</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Luther King Park (NP)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCandless Park (NP)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKnight Park (NP)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Burgwin Park

Figure G23: Burgwin Park

Burgwin Park (6.8 ac.) is a neighborhood park located in the Hazelwood neighborhood (15207) at the intersection of Mansion Street and Johnston Ave. The entrance is off Mansion Street. The pool on the site is closed. There is a children's play area, a tennis court, a basketball court, two hockey courts and a lighted ball field. This neighborhood is not served by a community park. This means that Burgwin Park also needs to fulfill some community park functions and can do so because of its size and location.

Recommendation:

REDEVELOP

- Redevelop this park to improve its quality, function and variety of features.
  - Develop a master plan to guide redevelopment. The master plan should provide a greater variety of experiences and create a more inviting site layout.
  - As part of the master plan, assess the feasibility of adaptive reuse for the school building on the site. If reuse is feasible, renovate the building. If no suitable reuse can be identified, the building should be demolished.
  - Remove the decommissioned pool structure.
  - Add an internal pathway system.
  - Add a spray park feature.
  - Retain children’s play at the site, though the master plan may relocate it from its current placement.
  - Add picnic areas and an open lawn for flexible use and unprogrammed activities.
  - Retain active recreation facilities, including a ball field. The amount and mix of other active recreation facilities should be determined in consultation with the neighborhood during the master planning process.
Cliffside Park

Figure G24: Cliffside Park

Sector 15 - Hill District & Uptown

Cliffside Park (1.1 ac.) is located in Crawford-Roberts, a residential neighborhood (15219) that is near the Miller African-Centered Academy. Nearby park resources include Ammon Park and Frank Curto Park.

Cliffside Park is located on a hillside, with very narrow street frontage. The entrance to the park is to the north of the corner of Cliff and Cassatt streets, and there is little to no visibility because of its narrowness and configuration. The site is aging and in poor condition, and includes a children’s play area and sports court. The northern portion of the property has a steep slope that runs into Bigelow Boulevard below. Cliffside Park was addressed in the Hill District Green Print Concept.

Recommendation:
REDEVELOP and/or RELOCATE

- Redevelop Cliffside Park per the Green Print proposal, or retain/redevelop Cliffside Park but relocate the active recreation to another more visible and accessible location. The neighborhood should be consulted about the preferred direction.

- The Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy has developed a concept plan\(^2\) for this park that integrates the existing park site into the Hill District Green Print concept. The Green Print aims to connect and strengthen the social ties of the Hill District with the greater Pittsburgh area. The site concept plan moves forward the ideas for Cliffside Park articulated in the Concept Plan\(^3\), including an amphitheater/ performance space with a river overlook, sports court, a water feature, a picnic area, and an interconnected pathway.

---

\(^2\) [http://www.pittsburghparks.org/cliffsideproject](http://www.pittsburghparks.org/cliffsideproject).

• Alternatively, Cliffside Park could be redeveloped, keeping the more passive elements of the Conceptual Site Plan, and relocating with active recreation facilities such as the sports court and children's play area to a more visible location at a new neighborhood park. This direction would be consistent with the Green Print goals, if the new site is properly selected. The following properties are available as of 2011 in the vicinity of Cliffside Park. All are more visible, and various combinations of these parcels could be suitable locations for a supplemental neighborhood park with a playground and sports court:

**Tax Delinquent Properties:**
- 9-M-250 (535 sq. ft.): since 2008
- 9-M-205 (720 sq. ft.): since 2008
- 9-M-201 (1,430 sq. ft.): since 2011
- 9-M-200 (1,034 sq. ft.): since 2011
- 9-M-200-A (1,672 sq. ft.): since 2008
- 9-M-199 (2,745 sq. ft.): since 2011
- 9-M-196 (2,684 sq. ft.): since 2008
- 9-M-195 (1,143 sq. ft.): since 2008

**Housing Authority Properties:**
- 9-M-251+251A (2,280 sq. ft.)
- 9-M-246 (2,910 sq. ft.)
- 9-M-207 (720 sq. ft.)
- 9-M-206 (660 sq. ft.)
- 9-M-204 (660 sq. ft.)
- 9-M-203 (1,440 sq. ft.)
- 9-M-202 (1,311 sq. ft.)
- 9-M-195 A, B (2,998 sq. ft)
- 9-M-194 (2,757 sq. ft.)

**City of Pittsburgh Property:**
- 9-M-249 (900 sq. ft.)

• Planning and development of these parcels would need to involve the integration of the site into the greater Hill District Concept, creating and enhancing connections within the envisioned green network.
Cross and Strauss Park

Sector 2 - Upper Northside
Cross and Strauss Park (0.3 ac.) is a neighborhood park located in Perry South (15214) at the corner of Cross and Strauss Streets, and consists of a playground. This park is located in a low-density area that, due to topography, is isolated from the surrounding neighborhood to the east and west. Fowler Park is a half a mile away, up North Charles Street with sidewalks along the entire route.

Recommendation:
DIVEST or NATURALIZE
PGHsnap Action Planning Strategy: Reinvent (R1)

- Cross and Strauss Park should not remain a neighborhood park. This site should be divested or naturalized, and removed from the neighborhood park inventory. Divestment could occur if another entity took over ownership (this could include a neighboring property owner). Otherwise, the site should be naturalized to reduce the need for routine maintenance. The operational cost savings and capital replacement funding should be redirected to Fowler Park. If naturalized, in the future if PLANPGH calls for increased population and density in the area, the site could be re-evaluated as a park site.
Denny Park

Figure G28: Denny Park

Sector 13 - Allegheny River Valley
Denny Park (1.1 ac.) is a neighborhood park located in the Strip District. The park is on Liberty Ave across from the studios of the Pittsburgh Ballet Theater (PBT). The park has a children’s play area and a half-court basketball standard, with half the site dedicated to parking. There are no residences in the immediate vicinity. The nearest park (West Penn Park) is located across Liberty Avenue (a 4-lane road), the East Busway, railroad tracks, and a steep grade.

Recommendation:
REDEVELOP

- Denny Park should be reenvisioned as an urban neighborhood park for the Strip District. A new master plan should be developed that considers how this site can help catalyze long term plans in the Strip District.
- The site should be designed to support the cultural institutions in the Strip District and Lower Lawrenceville (including the adjacent ballet studios) and provide urban outdoor space for employees, residents and cultural institution visitors.
- Include trees and ample seating to provide greening in an area of Pittsburgh lacking green space.
- Eliminate the parking or reduce its footprint significantly.
- Consider incorporating a more customized children’s play area that reflects the district’s industrial heritage and urban character.
Duncan Park

Figure G29: Duncan Park

Sector 13 - Allegheny River Valley
Duncan Park (0.8 ac.) is a neighborhood park located in Upper Lawrenceville (15201) at 54th St and Duncan St. It is situated at the top of a hill at the edge of the neighborhood, and serves much of the same surrounding neighborhood that is served by either McCandless or Fifty-Seventh Street Park. The park is terraced with a hockey court on the top portion and a playground on the lower half. The area below is slated for redevelopment.

Recommendation:
NATURALIZE, INVEST
PGHSnap Action Planning Strategy: Enhance (E3)

- Naturalize the lower portion of the site and create a transition from the developed park to the wooded hillslope.
- Depave the hockey court and create an open lawn area for informal play.
- Provide a replacement children’s play area if desired, relocating it to the upper area and new open lawn. Incorporate nature play elements.
Fineview North Park

*Figure G30: Fineview North Park*

**Sector 3 - Lower Northside**

Fineview North Park (1.8 ac.) is a neighborhood park located in the Fineview neighborhood (15212), one block north of Fineview South Park. The park is on Fineview Ave between Edenvale and Lanark Streets, with its main access off Fineview Ave. The site contains a hockey court, a tennis court, and a playground. Adjacent to the park is a broadcast tower, a very visible piece of infrastructure.

**Recommendation:**

**REDEVELOP**

- Add an additional 0.18 ac. to the site with tax parcel 23-D-72, which has been tax delinquent since 2007.
- See Fineview South Park recommendations. Develop a site master plan for Fineview North Park concurrently with the Fineview South Park master plan.
- Incorporate recommendations for Lanark Street as proposed in the plan completed by the Community Design Center of Pittsburgh and Pfaffman + Associates, and use the street design to link the two sites.
- Eliminate perimeter fencing where possible.
- Fineview North Park should include site elements focused on serving nearby neighbors, with picnic and gathering areas located at Fineview South Park to take advantage of views. Fineview North Park should include a children’s play area, at least some open lawn area (depaving will be needed), and active recreation features as prioritized by neighbors (not necessarily retaining the existing courts if the neighbors prefer other types).
Fineview South Park

Figure G31: Fineview South Park

Sector 3 - Lower Northside
Fineview South Park (3.1 ac.) is neighborhood park located in the Fineview neighborhood (15212), a tenth of a mile from Fineview Park to the north. There is one lighted ball field and an overlook. Visibility of this park is blocked by a large change in topography. Access to the site is not provided from Catoma, the more major road, but from Jay St. where there is a small parking lot.

Recommendation:
REDEVELOP

- Develop site master plans for Fineview South and Fineview North Parks, considering both sites working together to provide a complete park experience.
- Connect the two parks through street design treatments along Lanark Street.
- Fineview South Park has a spectacular view of Pittsburgh, which should be emphasized and capitalized upon in the site plan.
- Add reservable picnic areas that take advantage of the panoramic views. Retain parking and access from Jay Street to serve the picnic areas.
- Relocate the ball field to another site.
- Add an internal pathway system.
Friendship Park

In the neighborhood of Bloomfield (15232), situated across Friendship Avenue from Western Pennsylvania Hospital. The park is a landscaped green space forming a wide median in the Friendship Ave. couplet. Friendship Park is formal in layout, with an internal pathway system, seating and plazas. The Bloomfield Development Corporation completed a Neighborhood Vision Plan in October 2010, which noted the small amount of land devoted to park uses in the area. Friendship Park is located in close proximity to high density low income households and serves as their only neighborhood park. Though it is an attractive space, it does not currently fulfill the neighborhood park function with active recreation spaces. Since there are no opportunity sites in the ¼ mile vicinity to provide a new neighborhood park, Friendship Park needs to fulfill this function.

Recommendation:
INVEST

- Add appropriately designed urban neighborhood park features to improve the variety of experiences at Friendship Park. Any new features should be designed and laid out to respect the formal, urban character of the site. Urban parks such as Madison Square Park in New York City, the North Park Blocks in Portland, or even private squares in the South End of Boston provide examples of formal urban park spaces that gracefully incorporate active recreation features in a context-appropriate manner.
- Include a children’s play area, customized for this formal space.
- Consider adding basketball (unfenced), bocce or other small scale active recreation facilities.
- A spray park could be considered as an option for this site. Due to the formal park layout, a spray park at this location should take the form of a plaza with water jets that can be turned off and on.
- Develop and implement a tree replacement plan in advance of the eventual decline of the existing mature canopy.
- Address the issues identified in the Neighborhood Vision Plan.
Herron Hills Tennis Courts

Figure G33: Herron Hills Tennis Courts

Sector 12 - Upper East End
The Herron Hills Tennis Courts (0.8 ac.) are a special use facility located in the Upper Hills neighborhood (15219), on the site of Milliones Junior High School. Though they appear to be part of the school site, the courts are considered public, as the city provides for their upkeep and maintenance.

There are two access points to the tennis courts, neither of which are easy to find. The first entrance is through the driveway to the school from Ewart Drive which turns into Iowa Street. The other is at the end of Lyon St. at Shawnee St.; this entrance is overgrown by shrubs and trees and barely recognizable as an entrance to a passerby.

**Recommendation:**
**DIVEST**

*PGHSnap Action Planning Strategy: Stabilize (S4)*

- This park is a special use facility that is difficult to access and is located within the school grounds. The tennis courts should be divested to the School District to be maintained as part of their facility.
**Homewood Park**

*Figure G34: Homewood Park*

**Sector I I - Northeast Pittsburgh**

Homewood Park (2.7 ac.) is located in Homewood South (15208). There are two schools nearby, Homewood Early Childhood Center and Holy Rosary School. The park is fully developed with two ball fields and a swimming pool, which take up all available space. The Homewood neighborhood was identified during the Needs Assessment and Suitability Analysis as underserved by neighborhood park land. The other available parks are Baxter and Dallas, both around the periphery of the neighborhood. Neither of these meets the minimum design guidelines for a neighborhood park. Westinghouse Park is located to the south and is connected to Homewood Park via a pedestrian bridge over the East Busway, but the busway and rail tracks create a physical barrier for the neighborhood around Homewood Park.

**Recommendation:**

*INVEST, RELOCATE*

- Invest in the recreation facilities at this site, emphasizing the sports uses that attract many park visitors. Improve the ball fields, add support amenities such as bleachers, concessions, and upgraded spectator areas.
- Improve the curb appeal of Homewood Park, including signage and improvements to the appearance and function of the pedestrian bridge passing over the busway.
- Relocate the neighborhood park function to another site in Homewood, one more centrally located and suitable to develop with the full range of neighborhood park amenities.
- Actively pursue the new neighborhood park. A review of publicly owned properties and properties that are two or more years tax delinquent reveals a concentration of parcels more centrally located within the neighborhood. The properties are located on the east end of three blocks west of Lang Street, and south of Fielding Way and north of Frankstown Ave. The three parcel areas total approximately three acres (not including rights-of-way):
The following properties could be combined by the city to create a neighborhood park for the Homewood community:

**Tax Delinquent Two or More Years:**
- 125-H-18 (9,065 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-137 (2,032 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-138 (2,525 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-139 (2,209 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-140 (2,528 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-141 (2,491 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-142 (2,180 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-157 (3,241 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-159 (3,876 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-160 (1,817 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-161-1 (991 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-167 (5,184 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-168 (14,148 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-172-3 (1,208 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-173 (1,174 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-175 (1,134 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-176 (1,212 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-177 (1,358 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-186 (2,248 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-187 (3,085 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-189 (1,166 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-189-1 (1,705 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-189-2 (1,119 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-189-3 (1,553 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-269 (923 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-270 (783 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-274 (705 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-275 (793 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-276 (801 sq. ft.)

**Tax Delinquent Two or More Years (cont.):**
- 174-E-277 (696 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-278 (787 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-279 (2,250 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-281 (3,673 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-282 (5,373 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-284 (4,060 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-286 (4,103 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-288 (7,516 sq. ft.)

**Vacant or Other Property:**
- 174-E-148 (1,479 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-155 (3,616 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-158-A (1,551 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-172-2 (834 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-177-A (1,088 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-271 (614 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-290 (2,827 sq. ft.)

**City of Pittsburgh Property:**
- 174-E-156 (3,426 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-158 (1,814 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-161 (1,247 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-162 (5,629 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-172 (1,358 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-174-A (928 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-175-A (866 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-192 (2,535 sq. ft.)
- 174-E-268 (1,156 sq. ft.)
Jefferson Park

Figure G35: Jefferson Park

**Sector 3 - Lower Northside**

Jefferson Park (0.6 ac.) is located in the Central Northside neighborhood (15212) at W. Jefferson and Monterey streets. The entrance to the park is along Ehlers Way. The Propel Northside Charter School is nearby, but does not have sidewalk access to the park. Ehlers Way slopes down to the street on the south side, W. Jefferson St., and has a mural painted on the retaining wall of the park facing the street. The park includes a small recreation center, two lighted basketball courts, and a playground.

**Recommendation:**

*EXPAND, REDEVELOP*

- Develop a new master plan for the site, incorporating the additional land and providing strong pedestrian entrances at both Monterey Street and Ehlers Way.
- Regrade the site to eliminate the streetside retaining wall, which presents an extremely unwelcoming public face despite the attempt to soften it with a mural.
- Remove fencing along ‘at grade’ areas of the park.
- Provide an open lawn area, children’s play area, and picnicking and seating.
- The following tax delinquent and city owned properties could be combined to expand the park east adding additional acre to the site:
  - 23-E-81
  - 23-E-82
  - 23-E-83
  - 23-E-84
  - 23-E-85
  - 23-E-86
  - 23-E-87
  - 23-E-89
  - 23-E-90
  - 23-E-91
  - 23-E-92
  - 23-E-93
  - 23-E-94
  - 23-E-95
  - 23-E-96
Kite Hill Park

Figure G36: Kite Hill Park

Sector 12 - Upper East End
Kite Hill Park (0.9 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Garfield (15224) between two residential blocks, Rosetta and Hillcrest Streets. The park itself is at the top of a steep hill that extends up from both Rosetta and Hillcrest. There is basketball court in poor condition at the top of the hill, representing the entirety of the usable park space. The Garfield neighborhood recently completed their 2030 Plan, which provides a neighborhood vision that includes developing a network of open spaces and increasing the amount of park space.

Recommendation:
RELOCATE, DIVEST or NATURALIZE

PGHSnap Action Planning Strategy: Reinvent (R1)

- Relocate the neighborhood park function to another site with less steep topography. The existing Kite Hill Park should be divested, if another entity can be found to take ownership, or be naturalized (and depaved).

- Within a few blocks of Kite Hill are vacant lots, some already owned by the City, which have potential to become a new neighborhood park for Garfield. The following plots of land (0.7 ac.) are located between Columbo and Hillcrest to the north and south, and Elora and Aiken to the west and east. In combination, these sites would form a park that is more accessible to the surrounding community:

  City of Pittsburgh properties:
  - 50-H-167 (2,178 sq. ft.)
  - 50-H-169 (2,178 sq. ft.)
  - 50-H-170 (2,178 sq. ft.)
  - 50-H-171 (2,2614 sq. ft.)

  Tax delinquent properties:
  - 50-H-156 (.53 ac.): since 2008

Other properties:
- 50-H-168 (.05 ac.)
Larimer Park

Figure G37: Larimer Park

Sector 12 - Upper East End
Larimer Park (1.5 acre) is located in Larimer (15206), off Larimer Ave. between Meadow St. and Washington Blvd. The park consists of a playground, an open lawn and a basketball court. The entire park is surrounded by an 8’ tall chain link fence.

Recommendation:

INVEST or RELOCATE

- The Larimer Consensus Group developed a preliminary land use plan in 2010, which illustrates a ring of green space linking into Highland Park. The plan identifies the centralization of the residential neighborhood, bringing the developed northern edge of the neighborhood inward to Larimer Ave.
- Were the plan to be developed and implemented, the neighborhood park could be relocated to a more central area of the neighborhood. If the redevelopment plan does not move forward, Larimer Park should be redeveloped following the design guidelines for neighborhood parks.
- In the interim, remove the 8’ chain link fence to make the park edges more permeable and attractive.
- The following vacant and tax delinquent properties at the northeast and southeast corners of Lowell and Meadow could be used to develop a neighborhood park site that meets the minimum square footage requirement if the adjacent section of Lowell were closed to traffic:

**Tax delinquent properties along Paulson and Carver:**
- 124-N-170 (0.12 ac.)
- 124-N-172 (0.05 ac.)
- 125-A-150 (0.07 ac.)
- 125-A-151 (0.06 ac.)
- 125-A-186 (0.05 ac.)

**Tax delinquent properties along Meadow and Lowell:**
- 124-P-199 (0.22 ac.)
- 124-P-96 (0.07 ac.)
- 125-A-187 (0.06 ac.)
- 125-A-190 (0.14 ac.)
- 125-B-128 (0.04 ac.)
- 125-B-129 (0.07 ac.)
- 125-B-130 (0.06 ac.)
- 125-B-131 (0.04 ac.)
- 125-B-132 (0.05 ac.)
- 125-B-133 (0.05 ac.)
Manchester Park and Manchester Park (School)

Figure G38: Manchester Park and Manchester Park (School)

Sector 3 - Lower Northside
Manchester Park (2.3 ac.) and Manchester Park (School) (3.9 ac.) are located in the neighborhood of Manchester (15233), and separated by about 400’. Rail lines run adjacent to Manchester Park. Manchester Park (School) is east of Manchester Elementary. The northern park site has a decommissioned pool, two lighted tennis courts and a playground. The south park site adjacent to the school has a playground, two basketball courts and a full size lighted ball field. The 4.2 ac. property between the two park sites is being developed into Columbus Square, a 31-unit market rate single-family housing development.

Recommendation:
REDEVELOP

- Manchester Park (School) should be redeveloped as the primary neighborhood park, including recapturing the paved area adjacent to the school and designing it to work as part of the park.
  - Develop a site master plan. The full range of neighborhood park features should be included on the Manchester Park (School) site, oriented to relate to the surrounding residences including the new single family development.
  - Add trees to the site.
  - Eliminate the ball field.
  - Provide a better and larger children’s play area.
  - Incorporate an open lawn area.
  - Consider a spray park at this location.

- At Manchester Park, remove the decommissioned pool, playground and tennis courts. Locate a ball field here. Fields are needed in the vicinity. Due to the triangular configuration of the site, the field configuration will be constrained. A small youth field (diamond or rectangle) may be the best fit.
Martin Luther King Park

Figure G39: Martin Luther King Park

Sector 15 - Hill District & Uptown
Martin Luther King Park (3.5 ac.) is located off Kirkpatrick Street between Terrace Village and West Oakland neighborhoods. Falk School and Kennard Park are nearby. This site is in poor condition and not well-used.

Recommendation:
NATURALIZE

PGHSnap Action Planning Strategy: Reinvent (R2)

The park site is located within the Hill District GreenPrint study area. The concept plan recommends terraced edges along the park’s periphery and the slopes becoming rock climbing and scrambling areas.

- Relocate the ball field.
- Naturalize the site and consider incorporating informal climbing as suggested in the GreenPrint.

Figure G40: GreenPrint Proposal for Martin Luther King Park
McCandless Park

Figure G41: McCandless Park

Sector 13 - Allegheny River Valley

McCandless Park (0.2 ac.) is located in Upper Lawrenceville (15201) at the corner of McCandless Ave and Carnegie Street. This is a residential area, within walking distance of the McCleary Early Childhood Center. The park is very small and consists of a fenced children’s play area. While the site is small, a neighborhood park is needed in this area and there are no other readily available options.

Recommendation:
EXPAND, REDEVELOP

- Though McCandless Park is small, it is well-located within the neighborhood and should be redeveloped to maximize its potential. Work with the neighborhood to develop a new master plan to make the best use of the available site. McCandless should be developed as a flexible use urban neighborhood park with durable, high quality materials and finishes. Perimeter fencing should be minimized to increase permeability of the park’s edges.

- Explore expansion possibilities. In addition to tax delinquent properties nearby, there is also an empty lot at south corner of Natrona and McCandless streets, across from the existing park:
  - 80-D-175 (1,612 sq. ft.): City of Pittsburgh
  - 80-D-174 (1,537 sq. ft.): Lawrenceville United
  - 80-D-177 (1,269 sq. ft.): Lawrenceville United

- If an agreement can be reached with Lawrenceville United, the park site could be expanded by 0.1 ac. and redeveloped, crossing over Natrona.

- Coordinate with Public Works for installation of green street traffic calming measures near the park along McCandless Ave. and Carnegie St.
**McKnight Park**

*Figure G42: McKnight Park*

**Sector 3 - Lower Northside**

McKnight Park (1.6 ac.) is located in Manchester (15233) on one block of land bounded by Fulton and Fontella Streets to the west and east, and Faulsey Way and Page St. to the north and south. The park is an elongated rectangle, with half the site a rectangular sports field and the other half a large children’s play area and a basketball court. McKnight Park is well-located in a relatively dense neighborhood and has great potential to be an even better neighborhood park.

**Recommendation:**

*REDEVELOP*

- Develop a new master plan for the site to meet the neighborhood park design guidelines.
- Improve the curb appeal of this park, including selective removal of the perimeter fencing.
- Add trees to this site.
- Improve the sidewalks around the perimeter of the park.
- Resurface the basketball court, and incorporate benches and spectator seating.
- Develop an entry to this park that connects to an internal pathway system.
**Neighborhood Parks**

Pittsburgh’s neighborhood parks are discussed within this section, organized by sector. Those sites discussed in the previous section are noted in the summary tables for the sectors, and denoted with light gray shading.

**Sector 1 - Allegheny Hills**

Allegheny Hills has eight neighborhood parks (17.2 ac.) within its boundaries, with six diamond ball fields and no dedicated rectangular fields. A Housing Authority complex is located within this sector, and includes its own recreation facilities (two lighted ball fields, playground, sports courts). Sector 1 needs two additional neighborhood parks, but topography and land constraints pose a challenge to meeting these needs.

**Table G3: Project List for Neighborhood Parks Sector 1- Allegheny Hills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Park</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Divest</th>
<th>Invest</th>
<th>Redevelop</th>
<th>Relocate</th>
<th>Expand</th>
<th>Naturalize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring Garden Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalano Park</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Garden Park</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring Hill-City View Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leister Street Park</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scherer Field</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Hill Park</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Troy Hill Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowley Park</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner Park</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lookout Street Park</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Catalano Park**

Catalano Park (0.5 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Spring Garden (15212) and sits on the corner of Spring Garden Avenue and Arcola Way. It has a formal entry on the corner, and primarily consists of a play area.

**Recommendation:**

*INVEST*

- Catalano Park is needed to serve the surrounding neighborhood. Though it is smaller than desirable, it has good visibility and is well-located.
- Retain the edge treatment of the park, but remove the chain link fencing. If fencing is needed, use a higher quality type of fencing.
- Replant the hill slope, using low maintenance plants (not turf grass).
• Replant trees.
• Fenced off and landscaped city property across Arcola Way provides 0.2 ac. of green space. This area could be used for small footprint recreation uses if desired by the neighborhood, e.g., a community garden, an urban dog park, or a small active use such as bocce courts

**Cowley Park**

Cowley Park (4.2 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Troy Hill (15212) and is accessible via Goettmann Street off Troy Hill Road. It has a play area, the City's first new spray park, two full basketball courts and two ball fields.

**Recommendation:**

*INVEST*

• Add signage, including wayfinding signage from the city steps that lead to the park.
• Remove the former recreation center, providing better visibility into the spray park and play area. Develop an entry to the park from this southeast corner.
• Relocate the small building on the south end of the basketball courts.
• Consider the removal of one ball field diamond and the addition of a rectangular field to provide more flexibility in use.
• Selectively prune trees on the hillslope to open the park to the views of the river.
• Provide streetscape improvements in the narrow Goettmann right-of-way to enhance both the street and the park.

**Gardner Park**

Gardner Park (3.4 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Troy Hill (15212) on Gardner Street. The site has one lighted ball field, its primary feature.

**Recommendation:**

*INVEST*

• Cowley Park provides a better neighborhood park experience than Gardner Park, but the field at Gardner Park is important to the overall inventory of sports fields in Pittsburgh as well as within this specific sector. In addition to having lighting, it has potential to be used for multiple sports (diamond or rectangular field configuration). This site should be maintained as a ball field as long as there is a demand for it.
• Upgrade the fencing, and provide lower height fencing along the street.
• Provide street trees along the street frontage.
• Replace the bleachers with benches, a more appropriate seating option for a public sidewalk.
• Plant the area not needed for sports field with native trees, and develop a transitional vegetation buffer between the maintained field and the wooded hill slope to facilitate maintenance.

**Leister Street Park**

Leister Street Park (0.2 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Spring Hill-City View (15212) on Leister Street, tucked across an alley from the backyards of residents living on Yetta Avenue. It consists of a basketball court with poor visibility from the surrounding neighborhood, and is located on a hillside that
leads to East Street and Interstate 279. The park serves a small section of the surrounding neighborhood. A cemetery provides the only other nearby open space.

**Recommendation:**

**DIVEST or NATURALIZE**

**PGHSnap Action Planning Strategy: Enhance (E3)**

- This park space, due to its location, is underutilized and experiences heavy vandalism. If another entity can be found to take ownership, this site should be divested.
- If divestment is not possible, the site should be naturalized. Designation of a greenway including this site should be explored.
- There are no other publicly owned sites that could be developed as a neighborhood park to serve this area. A new neighborhood park should be targeted for this area.

**Lookout Street Park**

Lookout Street Park (0.3 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Troy Hill (15212) at the end of Lookout Street where it intersects Croft Street. It has a play area and a half-court basketball court. The park is located on the top of a forested hillside at the edge of the neighborhood. There are no other public parks in this area, and very little land is available.

**Recommendation:**

**EXPAND, INVEST**

- Incorporate the adjacent city owned lot 48-F-138 (0.25ac.) and recapture some or all of the adjacent right-of-way to add approximately 0.36 ac. of flat, usable area into this park, near the developed portion of the site. This would bring the total park acreage up to about 0.7 ac., still small but providing more options for this park.
- Invest in park upgrades following neighborhood park design guidelines. Focus development near the street and on the flatter area of the expanded site. Retain the wooded hillside.
- Update the park identification sign and remove the Andrew “Huck” Fenrich Playground sign.

**Scherer Field**

Scherer Field (0.9 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Spring Hill-City View (15212) off Royal Street. The park consists of a ball field, adjacent to I-279 and removed from residential areas. The park does not currently function as a neighborhood park.

**Recommendation:**

**DIVEST**

**PGHSnap Action Planning Strategy: Stabilize (S2)**

- Unless there is a specific need for this ball field, the park can be divested, as there is no surrounding neighborhood.
- If there is a short-term need for the ball field (e.g., until a better located field can be secured), off-street parking should be pursued for the site, using the PennDOT property across Royal Street or through a use agreement with the adjacent property owner.
Spring Garden Park
Spring Garden Park (1.3 ac.) is located in the Spring Garden neighborhood on the western border of the Troy Hill neighborhood (15212). Access is from Spring Garden Avenue and the park is adjacent to the Spring Hill/Spring Garden Greenway. Spring Garden Park has two tennis courts and a ball field, and is the only site serving the northern section of the Spring Garden neighborhood.

Recommendation:
NATURALIZE
PGHSnap Action Planning Strategy: Stabilize S4
- Spring Garden Park serves only a small area of residences, and should be naturalized to function as part of the Greenway even if it is not officially designated as such.
- Use Spring Garden Park to develop a trailhead entry to the Greenway, and develop looped hiking trails leading from Spring Garden through the Greenway. Provide a trail connection to Spring Hill Park.
- The Spring Garden school site and playground can help meet some of the need for neighborhood park amenities for the surrounding neighborhood.
- Explore taking ownership of the unused Port Authority park and ride next door, or securing a long-term agreement for use of the space.
- Connect the park to Spring Garden Avenue with a trail through the forested 26 acres of hillside property.

Spring Hill Park
Spring Hill Park (6.4 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Spring Hill-City View (15212) and can be accessed off Romanhoff Street and South Side Avenue. The developed part of the park contains approximately four terraced and level acres, with the northern and eastern part of the property a forested hillside adjacent to the Spring Hill/Spring Garden Greenway. The park has a play area, sports courts, and a lighted ball field on the terraces.

Recommendation:
REDEVELOP
- Spring Hill Park is well-situated and relatively large, in an area without other parks. It is has a large wooded area and is strategically located near a Greenway. All these public lands in combination offer an expansive open space. This site should be redeveloped, with a new master plan that considers neighborhood park design guidelines and connections to the Spring Hill Greenway, and the surrounding neighborhoods. Keep the developed area of the park to no more than four to five acres, about the size it is now, to retain the neighborhood park function.
- Eliminate the significant amount of paving in existence at the park, and remove fencing where feasible.
- Develop a design solution for the sloped southern edge of the property that preserves views into the park but eliminates mowed turf.
- Provide a pathway through the site with a looped connection into the Greenway. Include mileage markers and route maps in the park.
- Consider converting the ball field to a rectangular field, to increase sports field variety within this sector.
• Add trees, picnicking facilities, and more passive neighborhood-serving features.
• Improve the curb appeal, including sidewalk and street tree improvements along the park’s perimeter.

Sector 2 - Upper Northside
The Upper Northside is home to two community parks – Brighton Heights (32.0 ac.) and Fowler Park (12.7 ac.) -- and five neighborhood parks (6.8 ac.), one of which was previously discussed (Cross and Strauss Park). Riverview Park is also located in this sector, and is a significant feature and asset. Three to four areas of this sector lack access to neighborhood parks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Park</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Divest</th>
<th>Invest</th>
<th>Redevelop</th>
<th>Relocate</th>
<th>Expand</th>
<th>Naturalize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brighton Heights Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marmaduke Park</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marshall-Shadeland Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall-California Park</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods Run Park</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Park</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perry South Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross and Strauss Park</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marmaduke Park
Marmaduke Park (2.8 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Brighton Heights (15212) and is accessible from Hiawatha Street, Bonaventure Way and Oswald St. The park consists of a play area, a deck hockey court and a ball field with parking.

**INVEST**
• Increase visibility into the park.
• Depave portions of the site. Consider eliminating the ball field, as it is unused and overgrown, or shrinking its footprint to make it an informal field.
• Remove fencing.
• Retain the open lawn area, and develop a looped pathway throughout the site.
• A local deck hockey group uses the site. This use is welcome, but the deck hockey use should not grow to dominate the park or attract players from across the city. A community scale recreation facility is not appropriate at this site, and would conflict with its function as a neighborhood park. Consider Brighton Heights or Fowler Park as an alternative location for a deck hockey hub.
Marshall-California Park
Marshall-California Park (0.3 ac.) is located at the border of two neighborhoods Marshall-Shadeland and California-Kirkbride (15212). Accessibility to this park is off Colorado Street. The park consists of a play area and a basketball court. The park is located at an interchange off PA 65, an elevated highway, and US 19 (Marshall Avenue).

Recommendation:
RELOCATE, DIVEST or NATURALIZE
PGH Snap Action Planning Strategy: Stabilize S4

- Marshall-California Park is not well-located. Washburn Square Park, under development by the Urban Redevelopment Authority, is located on Hodgkiss Street about ½ mile north of Marshall-California and can be considered as a replacement park for some of the park’s service area.
- There are multiple tax delinquent properties north and northeast of this park site that could provide additional relocation sites.
- Divest the site if an alternative owner can be secured. If another owner cannot be secured, naturalize the site to develop it as a beautification area and buffer residential properties from PA 65.

Woods Run Park
Woods Run Park (0.3 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Marshall-Shadeland (15212) off Woods Run Avenue. It has just one play area.

Recommendation:
INVEST

- Increase pedestrian connectivity to this park from the surrounding neighborhood, including improving the sidewalk network along Central Avenue.
- Remove fencing to create a more accessible and attractive park.
- Add trees to the slopes.
- Create a stronger connection to the library located on Woods Avenue, including making use of the outdoor space to the east of the library building for additional recreation features.
- If additional adjacent land becomes available, expand this site.

Young Park
Young Park (3.1 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Marshall-Shadeland (15212) off Complete Street and Shadeland Avenue. The park consists of just one ball field.

Recommendation:
INVEST

- Remove the ball field and develop this park as a neighborhood park. There is a ball field located ¼ mile away (Horace Mann Field).
- Eliminate the fencing, increase access and views into the site, and develop the park with neighborhood park facilities. Repurpose the parking area and recapture it as recreation space.
- Investment in this space should facilitate the City's divesting of the responsibility to maintain Horace Mann Field.
Sector 3 - Lower Northside

The Lower Northside is home to two community parks (Allegheny Center Plaza Park and Allegheny Commons Park) and seven neighborhood parks (13.4 ac. in total) with all but one of these discussed in the earlier section on parks in low income/minority-majority neighborhoods.

Table G5: Project List for Neighborhood Parks Sector 3- Lower Northside

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Park</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Divest</th>
<th>Invest</th>
<th>Redevelop</th>
<th>Relocate</th>
<th>Expand</th>
<th>Naturalize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Northside Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine Gardens Park</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Park</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fineview Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fineview North Park</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fineview South Field</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manchester Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester Park and School</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKnight Park</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpine Gardens Park

Alpine Gardens Park is a 0.1 acre site located in the Central Northside neighborhood (15212) on Alpine Street between Garfield Ave and Monterey Street. It contains playground equipment and has no space for other features. The surrounding neighborhood is high density, and is served by both Allegheny Commons Park and Jefferson Park.

**Recommendation:**

**DIVEST**

**PGHSnap Action Planning Strategy: Stabilize (54)**

- The park does not meet the minimum size standard for a neighborhood park and the area is already served by two parks identified for improvement. Divestment of this park could include selling the property for residential redevelopment.
Sector 4 - West Pittsburgh

West Pittsburgh is home to three community parks (Hershel Park, Sheraden Park and West End Park) and twelve neighborhood parks (42.2 ac.). As illustrated during the Needs Assessment and Suitability Analysis [link], this sector has several gaps in neighborhood park service.

Table G6: Project List for Neighborhood Parks Sector 4 - West Pittsburgh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Park</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Divest</th>
<th>Invest</th>
<th>Redevelop</th>
<th>Relocate</th>
<th>Expand</th>
<th>Naturalize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crafton Heights Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunbar Park</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratmore Park</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Carnegie Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Carnegie Park</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elliott Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End-Elliot Overlook Park</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsend Park</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Esplen Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esplen Park</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fairywood Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairywood Park</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oakwood Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakwood Park</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sheraden Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGonigle Park</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Park</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West End Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabash Park</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Westwood Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafton Heights Park</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Windgap Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chartiers Park</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chartiers Park
Chartiers Park (6.1 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Windgap (15204) at the southwest corner of Middletown and Chartiers Avenue. It is relatively central to the neighborhood it serves, and has a play area and a lighted ball field.

Recommendation:
INVEST
- Upgrade this park, including providing additional tree canopy.
- Consider adding a rectangular field overlaid on the existing lighted ball field.

Crafton Heights Park
Crafton Heights Park (0.3 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Westwood (15204) at the intersection of Dale Street, Preston Street and Crotzer Avenue. It consists of a fenced children’s play area and a sloped, wooded hillside.

Recommendation:
INVEST or RELOCATE
- This site is the only park serving the surrounding neighborhood. Though it does not provide the full range of neighborhood park experiences, it should be retained unless another more suitable site becomes available.
- If there is an opportunity to recapture some of the adjacent right-of-way for stormwater planters or other green infrastructure, this option should be pursued.

Dunbar & Stratmore Parks
Dunbar Park (6.7 ac.) and Stratmore Park (0.5 ac.) are located in the neighborhood of Crafton Heights (15205) and are within a residential block of one another. Dunbar has access off Clairhaven Street and Stratmore Park is located on Stratmore Street between Oakmont and Elmont Streets.

Dunbar Park consists of a play area, basketball court, and two ball fields. Schaeffer School, directly adjacent to Dunbar Park, is slated for closure in 2012. Dunbar Park currently lacks visibility due to the school and adjacent residences. There are opportunities to expand the park and address its poor visibility.

Stratmore Park is terraced between two neighborhood blocks and is bisected by Kiran Way. The park consists of a play area, lighted tennis court and basketball court and is primarily asphalt paving surrounded by fencing, with a small lawn area at the southern boundary.

Recommendation:
DUNBAR: EXPAND & REDEVELOP or DIVEST
PGHSnap Action Planning Strategy: Enhance (E2)
- Secure the school district property to provide street frontage on Clairhaven (School District lots 40-H-98, 40-H-99, and 40-H-100).
- Add City parcels 40-H-185, 40-H-184 on the east side toward Arnold St. and property 40-H-97 toward Clairhaven to the park.
• Master plan the expanded site, and implement the master plan.
• If this park site is not expanded and redeveloped, it should be divested and park redevelopment efforts should be focused on Stratmore Park.

STRATMORE: REDEVELOP or DIVEST
PGHSnap Action Planning Strategy: Enhance (E2)

• Divest this site, if Dunbar Park is expanded and redeveloped.
• If Dunbar Park is divested, redevelop this park. Prepare a site design that deemphasizes Kiran Way and implement improvements.

East Carnegie Park
East Carnegie Park (0.5 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of East Carnegie (15106) off Alter Street between Doolittle Street and Art Way. It has a play area, a deck hockey court and a basketball court, and the site is almost entirely paved.

Recommendation:
INVEST
• Depave a portion of this site and create an open grassy area to provide a place for unstructured play.
• Eliminate either the deck hockey court or the basketball court, depending on neighborhood preferences. Consider moving the basketball courts onto the deck hockey court, if the basketball is preferred.
• Remove fencing and consider replacing fence along southeast edge with a natural barrier to maintain separation between park and street. Planting trees along this edge could serve the dual purpose of creating shade and providing such a barrier.

Esplen Park
Esplen Park (0.2 ac.) is located in the Esplen neighborhood (15204) off Esplen Street between Plum Way and Frustum Street. It has a play area.

The park is located at the edge of the neighborhood, and there are industrial and commercial uses on Carson and Stafford Streets. This area is also served by Sheraden Park, which is accessible via Stafford Street to Sheraden.

Recommendation:
DIVEST or NATURALIZE
PGHSnap Action Planning Strategy: Stabilize (S3)

• Divest this site. It has potential to be used as a sideyard or for an urban garden plot.
• If divestment is not possible, naturalize the site.
• Serve the surrounding area by including neighborhood park features at Sheraden Park, and by developing neighborhood park features in a new riverfront park targeted for the Esplen neighborhood.
Fairywood Park
Fairywood Park (3.6 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Fairywood (15205) accessed off Broadhead Fording Road and Village Road. The park has a play area and two lighted basketball courts.

Recommendation:
INVEST
• Upgrade the park to incorporate more passive recreation space and seating areas.
• Improve pedestrian connections.
• Eliminate the pool and repurpose this area.
• Enhance the children’s play area. Consider relocating it to a more visible area of the site, closer to the school near the pool location.
• Consider addition of a spray park.

McGonigle Park
McGonigle Park (8.9 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Sheraden (15204). Access to the park is off Allendale Street west of the Allendale Circle cul-de-sac. The park consists of a play area, full and half-court basketball courts, and a ball field.

Recommendation:
REDEVELOP
• See Sheraden Park recommendations.

Mutual Park
Mutual Park (0.3 ac.) is located in the Sheraden neighborhood (15204) accessible from Mutual Street and Bowser Way. It has a play area and a half-court basketball court. Its elongated configuration limits its usability.

Recommendation:
RELOCATE or INVEST
• Mutual Park serves as the only park land within ½ mile for a number of Crafton Heights residents; however, they are on the fringe of that service area. Relocating the park away from Sheraden to Crafton Heights (near intersection of Straka & Shirley) would allow that neighborhood to have better access to open space. However, there are no City-owned parcels or vacant properties in that area at this time, limiting the options for relocating the park at this time.
• If another park site is identified, develop it to replace Mutual Park following the neighborhood park design guidelines.
• If no alternative site can be identified, invest in Mutual Park. Improve access to the park site by removing the fencing and retaining wall and adding sidewalks or pedestrian paths on Mutual Street.

Oakwood Park
Oakwood Park (4.9 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Oakwood (152) and is accessible from Noblestown Road. It has one play area, two tennis courts, a basketball court and a ball field.

Recommendation:
INVEST
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• Upgrade this park. Improve its appearance from the street frontages.
• Add more tree canopy, including within the parking lot.
• Add a pedestrian pathway system linking both sections of the park.

Townsend Park
Townsend Park (0.6ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Elliott (15220) with access off Chartiers Avenue. It consists of a play area and two basketball courts adjacent to a school (Stevens PreK-8) that is slated to be closed after the 2011-12 school year.

Recommendation:
EXPAND, REDEVELOP
• This park serves as the only neighborhood park for the neighborhood north of Chartiers Avenue and the park is also ½ mile north of Herschel Park. With Stevens K-8 school closing, Pittsburgh should pursue expansion of Townsend Park to include all or a portion of the school site.
• Redevelop the park following neighborhood park design guidelines to provide a larger variety of experiences and a less paved character.

Wabash Park
Wabash Park (2.4 ac.) is located in the West End neighborhood (15220) off Wabash Street. Saw Mill Run Creek passes along its eastern edge. It has a play area, two basketball courts, 5 horseshoe courts, and a ball field. The park is adjacent to the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh West End.

Recommendation:
INVEST, NATURALIZE
PGHSnap Action Planning Strategy: Stabilize (S2)
• Access in this neighborhood is constrained by topography. Wabash Park provides the only access to a neighborhood park for the residents located down slope. Invest in neighborhood park features near the existing playground, near the library.
• Eliminate the ball field and associated fencing. Relocate the basketball court to the north end of the park to the neighborhood park hub, or eliminate the courts completely if not a desired feature by the neighborhood.
• Naturalize the area now holding the ball field and courts, providing a demonstration area for rehabilitation of the Saw Mill Run. Include a looped pathway providing access to the creek.

West End-Elliott Overlook
West End-Elliott Overlook (4.7 ac.) is located in the Elliott neighborhood (15220) off Marlow Street. This park serves as a park overlook and an amphitheater for movies in the park in the summer for the surrounding community. It includes off-street parking and a natural, undeveloped area to the north.

Recommendation:
INVEST
• Retain the community gathering aspect of this park.
• Consider adding a non-traditional children’s play area to take advantage of the park’s setting and complement the community uses that take place here.
Sector 5 - South Pittsburgh

South Pittsburgh is home to four community parks (Banksville Park, Brookline Memorial Park, Moore Park and Philips Park) and eight neighborhood parks (29.1 ac.). This sector currently has more than 15% of Pittsburgh’s total ball field inventory.

Table G7: Project List for Neighborhood Parks Sector 5- South Pittsburgh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Park</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Divest</th>
<th>Invest</th>
<th>Redevelop</th>
<th>Relocate</th>
<th>Expand</th>
<th>Naturalize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beechview Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able Long Park</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alton Park</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauline Park</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropical Park</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanucci Park</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carrick Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leolyn Park</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers Park</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overbrook Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overbrook Park</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Able Long Park

Able Long Park (1.7 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Beechview (15216) tucked into a residential area on Coast Avenue between Banksville Road and Broadway Avenue. It has a play area and a grassy area which slopes up from the playground to woodlands behind. It is accessible via a path directly off the street.

Recommendation:

INVEST

- Invest in this park to provide additional neighborhood park features. Limit turf to usable areas.
- Integrate the slope into the children’s play area.
- If a Saw Mill Run Greenway is designated (an idea under discussion), provide a connection from this park to the greenway trail system.

Alton Park

Alton Park (4.0 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Beechview (15216) behind Beechwood Elementary School on Andick Way at Alton Street. The park is elevated above the street level, and includes a play area and one full and one half basketball court. The park is adjacent the Beechview-Seldom Seen Greenway, and connects to Vanucci Park via the greenway.
**Recommendation:**

**INVEST**
- Retain this site as a neighborhood park, connecting it to Vanucci through the Greenway with a trail.
- Upgrade the park to increase visibility from the surrounding neighborhood. Remove fencing and improve the appearance and function of the entry.
- Reduce the footprint of the parking lot and provide landscaping improvements to enhance the appearance.

**Leolyn Park**
Leolyn Park (0.5 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Carrick (15210) on the northeast corner of Leolyn and E Cherryhill Streets. It has a play area and a basketball court. A private single family home sits on the corner, and residences are also located to the north and east of the park.

**Recommendation:**

**INVEST or RELOCATE**
- A park is needed in this area. Though Leolyn Park is not ideal, there are few options in the area with a better configuration. Invest in minor upgrades at this site, keeping in mind that any improvements should avoid creating uses that would conflict with neighboring residences. Remove fencing from around the basketball court.
- If neighboring residences on Leolyn or E. Cherryhill go on the market, the City should consider purchasing them to expand the park. If another better site becomes available in the neighborhood, Leolyn Park should be relocated.

**Overbrook Park**
Overbrook Park (2.6 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Overbrook (15234) and backs to the South Busway. It consists of a basketball court and two lighted ball fields. The park is adjacent to the former Overbrook Elementary School, which now functions as School District offices. The area around the park is not residential in nature.

**Recommendation:**

**DIVEST**

*PGHSnap Action Planning Strategy: Enhance (E3)*
- This site is not serving as a neighborhood park, nor is it located to do so. Pittsburgh should divest the site from its neighborhood park inventory. If the baseball organizations that use the fields wish to continue to do so, they could negotiate with the Pittsburgh Public Schools to continue to upkeep the site, which is now the City’s responsibility.

**Pauline Park**
Pauline Park (1.9 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Beechview (15216) on Pauline Avenue at the intersection of Pauline Avenue and Lonergan Street. It has a play area and two lighted basketball courts, and a wooded hillside.

**Recommendation:**

**INVEST**
• Improve the Pauline Avenue frontage, including the addition of street trees and redesign of the sloping turf area to reduce mowed turf.
• Depave a portion of the developed park area to promote casual neighborhood use and make the park more attractive.
• Improve access to the park by creating trails into the park from Palm Beach Avenue.

**Tropical Park**
Tropical Park (1.5 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Beechview (15216) off Tropical Avenue. It connects to the Beechview-Seldom Seen Greenway, and has a play area and both full and half-court basketball courts. More than half the site is wooded.

**Recommendation:**
*INVEST*
• Create a welcoming entry at the southern entry of the park on Gladys Avenue.
• Enhance the entry from Tropical Avenue, including removing the guard rail.
• Remove fencing from park edges.

**Vanucci Park**
Vanucci Park (6.1 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Beechview (15216) off Andick Way. It has a play area, which includes a spray park, and two ball fields. It is downhill and east of Alton Park, and is adjacent to the Beechview-Seldom Seen Greenway. The service area for this park overlaps with Alton Park’s.

**Recommendation:**
*INVEST*
• Develop picnic facilities in conjunction with the popular spray park.
• Reconfigure the ball fields. Eliminate one of the fields, or provide a rectangular field.
• Naturalize the edge of the park that is adjacent to the Seldom Seen Greenway, including recontouring to provide an easier to maintain topographic and vegetative transition from the park to the greenway.
• Reduce the size of the parking lot to a size suitable for a neighborhood park.
• Provide a connection to the park through the former Beechview Pool site (now a community garden) to Beechwood School and Alton Park, allowing the two parks to function as one larger Neighborhood Park.

**Volunteers Park**
Volunteers Park (10.8 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Carrick (15210) at Strata and Riota Way. It has four ball fields (2 lighted).

**Recommendation:**
*NATURALIZE*

PGH_snap Action Planning Strategy: Stabilize (S2)

• This site does not currently function as a neighborhood park, as it is fully dedicated to baseball/softball uses.
• Maintain the ball fields as long as they are being used.
• Once the fields are no longer needed, the park should be naturalized and left as wooded hillside.
• A neighborhood park location needs to be identified for this neighborhood that is accessible and connected to the residential areas.

**Sector 6 - Mt. Washington/Hilltop West**

Washington/Hilltop West has one community park (the combined McKinley and Upper McKinley Parks) and two neighborhood parks (3.1 ac.). This sector is also home to Emerald View Regional Park. Though the number of parks is small, this area is well-served by the existing sites.

**Table G8: Project List for Neighborhood Parks Sector 6- Mt. Washington/Hilltop West**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Park</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Divest</th>
<th>Invest</th>
<th>Redevelop</th>
<th>Relocate</th>
<th>Expand</th>
<th>Naturalize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beltzhoover Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrington Park</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bon Air Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bon Air Park</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bon Air Park**

Bon Air Park (1.0 acre) is located in the residential neighborhood of Bon Air (15210). The park is on the corner of Calle and Conniston Avenues and consists of a play area and a hockey court.

**Recommendation:**

**INVEST**

• Make upgrades to this park, including improving the appearance of the eastern side and removing the guard rail.
• If a Saw Mill Run Greenway is designated, Bon Air Park should provide a trailhead and connect with the greenway trail system.

**Warrington Park**

Warrington Park (2.1 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Beltzhoover (15210) on the border of Beltzhoover and Mt. Washington off E Warrington Avenue along the light rail line. The park has a recreation center, a closed swimming pool, a lighted ball field, play area and basketball court.

**Recommendation:**

**REDEVELOP or RELOCATE**

• Remove the pool.
• Develop a new master plan for the site, re-envisioning this park without the pool and providing more flexible use, unprogrammed space for family recreation.
• Consider adding a spray park
• Remove fencing where feasible to improve access into the park.
• Implement TRID corridor study crossing improvements.
• Consider relocation of recreation center as noted in TRID corridor study.
• The TRID study makes recommendations to replace Warrington Park at a new park location. Should this move forward, the physical location of the new site should be north of Warrington and be capable of meeting minimum neighborhood park design guidelines.

**Sector 7 - Southside/Hilltop East**

Southside/Hilltop East has one community park (Southside Park) and nine neighborhood parks (31.4 ac.). The topography in this sector makes meeting park access goals very challenging. A neighborhood park is needed south of Arlington Avenue, north of Parkwood Rd and east of Clover St., but there is no land available aside from Devlin Field.

Table G9: Project List for Neighborhood Parks Sector 7- Southside/Hilltop East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Park</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Divest</th>
<th>Invest</th>
<th>Redevelop</th>
<th>Relocate</th>
<th>Expand</th>
<th>Naturalize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arlington Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devlin Field</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mt. Oliver Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip Murray Park</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southside Flats Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong Park</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ormsby Park</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southside Slopes Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Park</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobden St. Park</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor Street Park</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monongahela Park</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winters Park</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Arlington Park**

Arlington Park (4.2 ac.) is located in the Southside Slopes neighborhood (15203), on Salisbury Street between Fernleaf and Sterling Streets. There is a closed pool, a play area, basketball court and one lighted ball field with a T-ball outfield. Arlington Park, with Arlington Gym (a special use park), connects to Southside Park.

**Recommendation:**

**REDEVELOP**

• Include this site along with Arlington Gym in the master planning effort for Southside Park. Retain a neighborhood park function in the vicinity, but consider the relationship of all three sites. Include trail connections and access from Arlington Park into Southside Park.
• Remove the closed pool.

Armstrong Park
Armstrong Park (1.6 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Southside Flats (15203) on Sarah Way between 12th and 13th Streets. It has a play area, a basketball court, and a ball field. It is a highly programmed site, in a high density neighborhood lacking flexible, unprogrammed recreation space.

Recommendation:
REDEVELOP
• Redevelop the site to implement the plan completed in December of 2010 by the South Side Local Development Corporation (SSLDC). The Armstrong Park/Esser Plaza Master Plan includes a spray park, children's play area, sports court and open grassy area.

Cobden St. Park
Cobden St. Park (0.9 ac.) is located in the Southside Slopes (15203) neighborhood off Cobden Street. This park has an open field containing a single basketball court.

Recommendation:
NATURALIZE
PGHSnap Action Planning Strategy: Enhance (E3)

• This site does not currently serve a neighborhood park function, as its level of development is very low. It is adjacent to a swath of tax delinquent or publicly owned property, all of which could be naturalized. Combined, the sites could be placed on the market, though interest may be unlikely due to the isolation.

Devlin Field
Devlin Field (6.5 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Arlington (15210). It is accessible off Devlin Street, but the park itself is hidden by a commercial building off the street and is flanked by a cemetery to the east. The park consists of a ball field, and does not fulfill a neighborhood park function for those residing in its service area. The surrounding neighborhood is primarily low density.

Recommendation:
NATURALIZE
PGHSnap Action Planning Strategy: Stabilize (S3)

• Naturalize this site and connect it with the adjacent City-owned parcels to create a greenway for the hillside from Arlington down to Becks Run Road.
**Eleanor Street Park**

Eleanor Street Park (0.6 ac.) is located in the Southside Slopes (15203) on Eleanor Street between Sierra and Primrose Streets. It has a play area and a half-court basketball court. The topography changes between this park and Arlington are significant, hence the hand rails along all the sidewalks. Though this park is small and near Southside Park, it serves an area halfway up the hill that is not served by other neighborhood parks.

**Recommendation:**

**INVEST**

- Invest in this site to improve its appearance and function. Eliminate fencing at the perimeter, enhance pathways, and plant hillslopes with low maintenance shrubs and groundcover. Add trees.

**Monongahela Park**

Monongahela Park (6.5 ac.) is located in the Southside Slopes neighborhood (15203) accessible off Josephine Street. The park overlooks the neighborhood and more than half the site is steep hillside. Approximately 2.5 ac. is graded flat and developed with an informal rectangular field with a backstop and play area.

**Recommendation:**

**REDEVELOP**

- Redevelop the park to include a variety of neighborhood park elements.
- Improve the entry to the park.
- Develop the flat area at the southeast corner of the site as a formal park overlook, repurposing it from a serving as a gravel parking area.
- Connect this site with a trail through the publicly owned swath of land connecting to Cobden Park, a site that is recommended for naturalization.

**Ormsby Park**

Ormsby Park (2.7 ac.) is located in Southside Flats neighborhood (15203) at S 22nd and E Carson Streets. The Carnegie Library Southside and Ormsby Recreation Center occupy the southwest corner of the park. The usable park area is fully developed, with a pool, play area, sports courts, and a ball field.

**Recommendation:**

**INVEST**

- Like Armstrong Park, Ormsby Park should be an urban neighborhood park serving those residing in this high density neighborhood. The park should offer a contrast to the surrounding environment.
- Flexible use areas should be developed within the park, and more trees should be added to provide shade to activity areas and buffer the park from the Birmingham Bridge.
- Improve pedestrian connections to the neighborhood on the east side of the bridge.
- Enhance visibility from E. Carson Street.
- Reduce/remove fencing, where feasible.
• Connect this park to Southside Riverfront Park. If land cannot be acquired or easements cannot be secured to provide an off-street pathway connection, provide a connection via the S 22nd right-of-way.

**Phillip Murray Park**

Phillip Murray Park (5.7 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Mt. Oliver (15210) with access off Mountain Street. It has a play area and a lighted ball field. Murray Elementary, the school located adjacent to the park, is slated to close at the end of the 2011-12 school year.

**Recommendation:**

**RELOCATE**

- Philip Murray Park should be relocated. With the demolition of the St. Clair housing development and the forthcoming closing of Murray Elementary School, there are few surrounding homes near the park. In addition, there is a mix of ownership at this location (part of what is shown as park is owned by the school district, part is owned by the City, and part is under private ownership). The multiple ownerships should be consolidated to facilitate transfer and potential redevelopment.

- A replacement neighborhood park could be located on city-owned property at the corner of Mountain and Fisher (32-B-142 and 32-B-107, totaling .6 ac.). This site would be central to both the Mount Oliver and Saint Clair neighborhoods and would not be as topographically separated from residential areas. In addition to the two city properties, across Fisher St. to the south are two tax delinquent properties totaling 1.2 ac. The relocated park should be designed to meet neighborhood park design guidelines.

**Winters Park**

Winters Park (2.7 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of the Southside Slopes (15203) off Shamokin Street. It has a play area, basketball court, and ball field. The open field is separated from the play area and basketball court by a steep, undeveloped portion of the property. This is one of the steepest areas of Pittsburgh.

**Recommendation:**

**NATURALIZE**

*PGH*Snap Action Planning Strategy: Stabilize (S2)*

- This park would better serve the neighborhood if returned to its natural state because of its difficult location and its location in a Stabilize (S2) strategy area under *PGH*SNAP.


**Sector 8 - Thirty-First Ward**

The Thirty-First Ward has one community park (McBride Park) and four neighborhood parks (4.0 ac.). This sector is in the remote southeast portion of the City. Though topography is less steep in this area than in other neighborhoods in Pittsburgh, the area is sparsely developed. Given the sparse development, low density character and this Plan’s recommendation to invest in McBride Park, the developed park provision strategy for this area should be community park-focused. There are large swaths of wooded hillside, some publicly owned and some tax delinquent. This sector should be targeted for a new Greenway integrating some of this property.

**Table G10: Project List for Neighborhood Parks Sector 8- Thirty-First Ward**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Park</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Divest</th>
<th>Invest</th>
<th>Redevelop</th>
<th>Relocate</th>
<th>Expand</th>
<th>Naturalize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hays Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hays Park</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lincoln Place Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Place Park</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Homestead Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panorama Field</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Park</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hays Park**

Hays Park (1.3 ac.) is located in the low density neighborhood of Hays (15207) on Ganges Way off Mifflin Road. It has a play area and a half-court basketball court. The area surrounding the park has few households (20-30), and the service area is very small due to the topography and disconnected nature of the streets.

**Recommendation:**

NATURALIZE or DIVEST

PGHSnap Action Planning Strategy: Stabilize (S2)

- The park is located adjacent to a creek (Streets Run), and could be naturalized to address water quality and manage stormwater from the roads running adjacent to it.
- Given the site’s adjacency to Mifflin Road, consideration should also be given to divesting the property by selling it to another entity.
Lincoln Place Park
Lincoln Place Park (0.6 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Lincoln Place (15207) at the intersection of Elwell Street and Cox Avenue. It has a play area and is adjacent to Mifflin Elementary School, which has two ball fields.

Recommendation:
INVEST
- Based on neighborhood demand and the PGHSNAP designation of Lincoln Place as an area for preservation, upgrade the play equipment and facilities at the park.
- Strengthen the visual connection and access to the adjacent school fields.
- Consider adding community gardens to the park or at the school site.
- Open the park to the neighborhood by removing fencing on the periphery.

Panorama Field
Panorama Field (1.6 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of New Homestead (15120) at the end of Spike Way. It is very secluded and only has one ball field. The site is owned by the School District, and is in very poor condition. In addition, Panorama Drive, a City street, is closed to traffic.

Recommendation:
DIVEST or NATURALIZE
PGHSnap Action Planning Strategy: Enhance (E2)
- Return the property to the School District. Population demand (current and projected) does not merit reinvestment in this site.
- Alternatively, this site could become part of a new greenway in the area.

Revenue Park
Revenue Park (0.5 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of New Homestead (15120) off Revenue Street. It has a play area and a basketball court. The surrounding neighborhood is low density residential. In fact, only 17 homes appear to be within the ½ mile service area of the park and each has a private yard.

Recommendation:
DIVEST or NATURALIZE
PGHSnap Action Planning Strategy: Enhance (E2)
- There are a handful of houses served by the park. The section of New Homestead off Niceville Street, which has the heaviest concentration of residences, is directly adjacent to West Homestead’s Calhoun Community Park (the park ends at the City line).
- Consider incorporating this land into a new greenway for this area, affording residents of the neighborhood access to open space.
Sector 9 - Monongahela River Valley

The Monongahela River Valley is home to eight neighborhood parks (25.6 ac.), of which Burgwin Park (6.8 ac.) was previously discussed. Though there are no community or regional parks in this sector, Schenley Park is adjacent immediately adjacent to the north. This sector also has an abundance of greenway land. Access to park land is limited for residents in the northeastern portion of this sector, but there are not any opportunity lands available in the areas needing park service.

Table G11: Project List for Neighborhood Parks Sector 9- Monongahela River Valley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Park</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Divest</th>
<th>Invest</th>
<th>Redevelop</th>
<th>Relocate</th>
<th>Expand</th>
<th>Naturalize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greenfield Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Mile Run Park</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magee Park</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saline Street Park</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hazelwood Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blair St. Park</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bud Hammer Park</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgwin Park</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone Park</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis Park</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blair St. Park

Blair St. Park (1.7 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Hazelwood (15207) at the end of Chaplain Way. It consists of a play area, basketball court, and ball field. The park is poorly sited adjacent to industrial property, and is subject to extensive vandalism. All of the park amenities are in very poor condition. While a park is needed in this area, Blair Street Park is not providing adequate service due to its limitations.

Recommendation:

DIVEST

PGHsnap Action Planning Strategy: Reinvest (R2)

- Divest Blair Street Park and define a location for a more functional neighborhood park as part of the reinvention of the area. This location may be part of the ALMONO redevelopment proposed to the west.
- If a new riverfront park is acquired near the Scotch Bottom section of Hazelwood, neighborhood park amenities should be incorporated into its design and pedestrian access to Hazelwood should be provided.
Bud Hammer Park
Bud Hammer Park (4.4 ac.) is located in Hazelwood (15207) where it borders the Hazelwood Greenway along Bigelow Street. The site uses the uphill and flat portions of the property for park facilities. It has a play area, basketball court, hockey court, and ball field.

Recommendation:
INVEST
• The park is in good shape, well signed, and with adequate pedestrian connections.
• Provide trail connections from the park to the Hazelwood Greenway.
• Remove fencing to improve connectivity and access between site elements, particularly near/around the sport and basketball courts. Signage or an improved pathway/sidewalk between ball field and sports courts/children’s play lot could strengthen the connection between these two areas.
• Resurface/improve basketball court and consider adding picnic area and site amenities in grassy area adjacent to children’s play area.
• If a trail system is developed in the Hazelwood Greenway, develop connections from Bud Hammer Park to the greenway trails.

Four Mile Run
Four Mile Run Park (1.8 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Greenfield (15207) on the Panther Hollow Trail. The park is a collection of properties that run under the Parkway East (I-376). The site has a play area, basketball court, and a former ball field that has been naturalized.

Recommendation:
INVEST
• This area of the Greenfield neighborhood is isolated and this site provides park facilities to nearby residents. Access to other parks is challenging due to topography.
• Remove the ball field.
• Develop the site as an open lawn area.
• Create planted buffers to screen the site from the parkway, and add trees throughout the property.

Gladstone Park
Gladstone Park (3.3 ac.) is located in Hazelwood (15207) directly off Hazelwood Avenue. It consists of a ball field.

Recommendation:
REDEVELOP
• Redevelop this site to be a fully functional neighborhood park consistent with neighborhood park design guidelines.
• Create connections from this site to the Hazelwood Greenway.

Lewis Park
Lewis Park (0.9 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Hazelwood (15217) off Irvine Street between Minden and Berwick Streets. It has a play area, a hockey court, two basketball courts, and is predominantly paved. The surrounding area is lower density.
Recommendation:
INVEST or DIVEST

PGH Snap Action Planning Strategy: Stabilize (S2)

- Once the ALMONO site is completely redeveloped, this park location should be divested.
- If there are long term delays in the redevelopment of the ALMONO site, investments should be made to improve the quality of this neighborhood park
  - Remove fencing and walls from park perimeter and redevelop park edge to create a safe transition from the street/sidewalk.
  - Remove fencing separating different areas within the park and establish/improve the internal pathway system.
  - Depave this site and provide a larger grassy play area in the southwest corner, with trees, benches, and places to sit.
  - Retain the good visibility into the site from YMCA across Chatsworth Street, but improve the visibility into the park from the other three street frontages. However, maintain a buffer along Irvine Street.
  - Consider a spray park at this location, if the YMCA is interested in partnering with the City.

Magee Park
Magee Park (6.1 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Greenfield (15207) accessible off Greenfield Avenue by car, and there is also a pedestrian stair to the ball fields from McCaslin Street and Boulevard Drive. The park sits at the bottom of a slope from McCaslin St. and consists of a recreation center, pool, play area, two basketball courts, and two lighted ball fields with a rectangular field overlay that has stadium seating.

Recommendation:
INVEST

- Magee Park includes a wide variety of facilities, to the extent that it functions almost as a small community park. If the mix of facilities currently available is retained at this site, it should be redesignated as a community park. Since this area is not served by another community park, this may be the most desirable course of action for surrounding residents.
- Make general upgrades to the site, in particular adding seating areas, picnic areas, and unprogrammed play space.
- The parking at Magee Park is nearly inaccessible. Develop strategies to improve access to the parking from Greenfield Ave.

Saline Street Park
Saline Street Park (0.6 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Greenfield (15217) on Saline Street. It has no amenities, is located on a dead end road serving approximately 30 households. The site abuts Schenley Park.

Recommendation:
DIVEST or NATURALIZE

PGH Snap Action Planning Strategy: Stabilize (S2)
• This site should be divested or naturalized. It should not be considered a park, as there are no amenities at this park location.

Sector 10 - Lower East End
The Lower East End has one community park (Mellon Park) and three neighborhood parks (4.9 ac.). This sector also contains Frick Park and Schenley Park, two of the City's regional parks. Other open spaces include the Carnegie Mellon University campus and historic Homewood Cemetery. Though the area around Linden School is neighborhood park deficient, the possibilities of securing a suitable park site are very limited.

Table G12: Project List for Neighborhood Parks Sector 10- Lower East End

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Park</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Divest</th>
<th>Invest</th>
<th>Redevelop</th>
<th>Relocate</th>
<th>Expand</th>
<th>Naturalize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Squirrel Hill North Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wightman Park</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Squirrel Hill South Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis Park</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Swisshelm Park Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swisshelm Park</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Davis Park
Davis Park (1.5 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Squirrel Hill South (15217) on Hobart Street between Wightman and Murray Avenues. It consists of a play area, tennis court, a hockey court, one full and two half basketball courts.

Recommendation:
INVEST
• Davis Park is well-situated, and should receive minor upgrades to enhance its flexibility and potential for multiple uses.
• Decrease hardscape area of park by depaving the northern portion and possibly removing one of the courts to create informal play space.

Swisshelm Park
Swisshelm Park (1.2 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Swisshelm Park (15218) on Onondago Street. It is highly programmed, consisting of a play area, two sports courts, and a spray park. It is mostly paved.

Recommendation:
REDEVELOP
• Redevelop this site to meet neighborhood park guidelines, incorporating more unprogrammed and flexible use areas for family-oriented recreation. Eliminate some of the courts, which dominate the site currently.
• Consider a small spray park at this location.
Wightman Park

Wightman Park (2.2 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Squirrel Hill North (15217) at the corner of Wightman and Solway Streets. It consists of a play area, basketball court and ball field.

Recommendation:

INVEST

- Remove fencing to improve access and appearance.
- Evaluate options for reuse of the on-site structure (including potential removal) to strengthen park cohesiveness and improve play area and basketball court visibility and access.
- Enhance visibility to the playground, which is sunken in relation to the street and behind a fence which obscures visibility.

Sector II - Northeast Pittsburgh

North Pittsburgh has one community park (East Hills Park) and six neighborhood parks (27.7 ac.), one of which, Homewood Park (2.7 ac.), was discussed earlier in the section on park equity in low income and minority-majority areas of Pittsburgh. Highland Park, a regional park, forms the western boundary of this sector. Additional neighborhood parks are needed to serve this sector.

Table G13: Project List for Neighborhood Parks Sector II - Northeast Pittsburgh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Park</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Divest</th>
<th>Invest</th>
<th>Redevelop</th>
<th>Relocate</th>
<th>Expand</th>
<th>Naturalize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homewood North Neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baxter Park</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homewood South Neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homewood Park</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homewood West Neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas Park</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln-Lemington-Belmar Neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadwick Park</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulson Park</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Breeze North Neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westinghouse Park</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Baxter Park

Baxter Park (2.4 ac.) is located in the Homewood North neighborhood. The park is shared by the Student Achievement Center which uses the north half of the park site for parking. The southeast corner abuts commercial buildings. There is a playground with an open lawn area, which is elevated from the street and fenced. The Homewood neighborhood was identified during the Needs Assessment and Suitability Analysis as underserved with access to public park land.
Recommendation:
**INVEST, EXPAND**

- This neighborhood currently lacks access to a community park. Baxter Park is well-situated in the neighborhood and has expansion potential because adjacent blocks have scattered public ownership. Should expansion land become available, the entire site should be redesigned.
- Eliminate parking on the site, or at minimum redevelop the parking so it functions as park space when not being used by the school.
- Incorporate more family recreation amenities into the park.
- Remove fencing to enhance appearance and access.

**Chadwick Park**

Chadwick Park (6.8 ac.) is located in Lincoln-Lemington-Belmar (15206) and is accessed from the corner of Oberlin and Mingo Street. It has a play area, basketball court, and ball field and a closed recreation center.

**Recommendation:**
**INVEST, EXPAND**

- The former recreation center should be repurposed or removed, and a welcoming entry to the park be developed.
- Create pedestrian connections to the Belmar Gardens development by including sidewalks along Mingo Street to connect to Vann Road.
- Expand the park to the west, incorporating approximately eight acres of hillside. Include the hillside that exists on Gladefield Street and close/remove the street:
  - 173-J-266 through 173-J-269
  - 173-J-290 through 173-J-298
  - 173-K-92 through 173-K-96
  - 173-K-125 through 173-K-129
  - 173-K-141 through 173-K-144
  - 173-K-199 through 173-K-203
  - 173-K-205 through 173-K-211
  - 173-K-215 through 173-K-221
  - 173-N-28 through 173-N-34
  - 173-J-272
  - 173-J-274
  - 173-J-275
  - 173-J-276
  - 173-J-277
  - 173-J-280
  - 173-J-281
  - 173-J-282
  - 173-J-284
  - 173-J-286
  - 173-J-308
  - 173-J-309
  - 173-J-316
  - 173-J-320
  - 173-J-323
  - 173-J-325
  - 173-J-326
  - 173-J-370

**Dallas Park**

Dallas Park (0.4 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Homewood West (15208) at the end of N Dallas Avenue where it intersects Frankstown Avenue. It consists of a play area and a basketball court.

**Recommendation:**
**RELOCATE**
• The park site faces a major roadway and is fully developed with a basketball court and play area. While this area of town needs additional park land, the location and size of this park means that it does not serve a neighborhood park function.
• Several sites within ¼ mile are available, northwest of the intersection of Lang Avenue and Frankstown Avenue. If none of these are suitable, another relocation site should be identified and developed as a neighborhood park.
• It will be difficult to find another use for Dallas Park. If no other entity is willing to take ownership, the current park should be naturalized to reduce maintenance costs.

**Paulson Park**

Paulson Park (4.2 ac.) is located in Lincoln-Lemington-Belmar (15206) directly off Paulson Avenue, in a triangular parcel between Paulson Avenue, Brainard Street, and Olivant Street. It consists of a play area, a basketball court, a lighted ball field and a closed swimming pool.

**Recommendation:**

**INVEST**

• Remove the pool structure and create an attractive entry to the park on its northwest edge.
• Add an entry from the east side, connecting to the basketball court. This will require switchbacks to traverse the steep grade, but a path here will increase access to the park.
• Plant more trees.
• If properties within the triangular area between Paulson, Brainard and Olivant become available, the City should purchase them to provide more street frontage for the park.

**Westinghouse Park**

Westinghouse Park (10.8 ac.) is located in the Point Breeze North neighborhood. It is the former site of the mansion and private laboratory of George Westinghouse, whose memorial resides in Schenley Park. The park has a play structure, basketball court and an aging recreation building closed to the public. Nearby schools and parks include Homewood Montessori School and Homewood Park, which is connected to Westinghouse Park via a pedestrian bridge.

**Recommendation:**

**INVEST**

• Westinghouse Park is one of Pittsburgh’s larger neighborhood parks, and the site is mostly flat. In addition, this park is a part of Pittsburgh’s rich cultural history.
• Eliminate the structure in the park.
• Highlight science and Pittsburgh’s history of scientific innovation at this park, including in the play area.
• Retain the park’s open character, and develop a succession plan for the mature trees dotting its landscape.
**Sector 12 - Upper East End**

The Upper East End has eleven neighborhood parks (32.7 ac.), three of which (Friendship Park, Kite Hill Park, and Larimer Park) were discussed in the earlier section on equity. Highland Park is located within the Upper East End. The areas south of the busway in this sector lack access to neighborhood parks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Park</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Divest</th>
<th>Invest</th>
<th>Redevelop</th>
<th>Relocate</th>
<th>Expand</th>
<th>Naturalize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bloomfield Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship Park</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osceola Park</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Liberty Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Liberty Park</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enright Park</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garland Park</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Garfield Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Pitt Park</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kite Hill Park</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Mandela Peace Park</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highland Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heth’s Park</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Larimer Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larimer Park</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Morningside Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Natoli Park</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**East Liberty Park**

East Liberty Park (1.4 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of East Liberty (15206) on Larimer Avenue between E Liberty Boulevard and Broad Street. The park consists of a ball field.

**Recommendation:**

REDEVELOP

- Redevelop the park following neighborhood park design guidelines. Eliminate the ball field and incorporate a broad range of neighborhood park features into the redesigned site.
• This park should be designed in collaboration with the Urban Redevelopment Authority. Its character should be a quality urban neighborhood park that complements the redevelopment efforts in the surrounding neighborhood.

**Enright Park**

Enright Park (2.3 ac.) is located in the East Liberty neighborhood (15206) on Amber Street. It has a play area and two basketball courts. A grassy open lawn area is adjacent to the park, but is not part of the park property.

**Recommendation:**

*INVEST*

• There is no formal entry into the park, which would create an identifier. Because visibility to Enright Park is blocked by large buildings along Penn and Negley, and there is only access from side streets and ways (Amber, S St. Clair, Euclair, Stamar), a gateway is needed.
• Remove razor wire and fencing along the edges of the park, which is unsafe and uninviting.
• Work with the surrounding property owner to create access points to the park from the Penn Ave. and Penn Cir. W.

**Fort Pitt Park**

Fort Pitt Park (9.5 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Garfield (15224) and is accessible from Hillcrest or N Winebiddle Street. It has two play areas, a tennis court, basketball court, and a lighted ball field and is adjacent to Fort Pitt Elementary, which is scheduled to be closed after the 2011-12 school year. The Garfield Heights development is being built immediately to the north, on a parcel approximately 50’ lower in elevation than the park.

**Recommendation:**

*EXPAND*

• The top of the hill is identified in the Garfield 2030 Plan as a new 34 acre park comprised of Housing Authority and City properties, including this site.
• An alternative would be to investigate the possibility of obtaining the school properties (50-F-240 and 50-F-296) and creating a larger park, ball fields, and gardening/farming area (along the line of the “Hilltop Parks” recommended in Garfield 2030) with parking, making sure that there is an adequate connection to the Garfield Heights development. This expanded park could possibly serve as a Community Park for the residents of Garfield and the adjacent neighborhoods. The school building limits visibility to the activity areas (playground, courts). To improve visibility, demolition of the school building should be considered if a re-use cannot be found.

**Garland Park**

Garland Park (3.2 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of East Liberty (15206) accessible from Penn Circle West. It has a play area, two tennis courts, a basketball court and parking lot.

**Recommendation:**

*INVEST*

• The park is poorly signed, and would appear to many to belong to the New Pennley Place development, due to its location behind it and behind the City parking lot along Penn Circle West.
An entry feature and better signage off Penn Circle and N Saint Clair Street would help increase visibility and awareness of the park.

- Remove fencing.
- Add park identification signage.
- Remove parking and blacktop next to tennis courts, and depave the park to create more informal play areas.

**Heth’s Park**

Heth’s Park (5.1 ac.) is located on the border of Highland Park and Morningside (15206) with access off Hampton Street. It has a play area, a spray park, hockey court, tennis court, and three ball fields. In the northwest corner of the property there is a bocce court and eight garden plots which are disconnected to the rest of the park and only accessible off Bryant Street.

**Recommendation:**

**INVEST, EXPAND**

- Connect Heth’s Park following Heth’s Run to Highland Park, the Pittsburgh Zoo, and the Allegheny River along the Heths Avenue right-of-way and Parcels #82-B-125, 82-P-133, 82-P-53.
- Add signage and create an entry to the park. The park entry currently is an opening in the roadway guard railing.
- Connect the upper park (which includes the bocce courts and garden plots) to the lower park (which includes the playground, spray feature, and ball fields) via a pathway and wayfinding. This may involve removal of the north end ball fields that abut the hillside.
- Consider restoring Heth’s Run through this park.

**Joe Natoli Park**

Joe Natoli Park (5.4 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Morningside (15206) tucked behind a development with its only access off President Way. The property is adjacent to the western boundary of Highland Park and is up hill from the large parking lot. The park consists of a play area, basketball court and three ball fields.

**Recommendation:**

**REDEVELOP**

- The park is shoulder to shoulder courts and field. The courts face the roadway creating a fenced wall between the park and the neighborhood. The fields place a demand for parking in a neighborhood that has very little. Relocate the fields to the lower area of Highland Park where there is ample parking and the site is intended to attract visitors from a distance.
- Redevelop the park following neighborhood park design guidelines, establishing as many neighborhood pedestrian access points as possible, eliminating fencing and walls, and opening the park up to the neighborhood and creating more spaces for informal play.
- The Senior Center building, although also used for storage and as a polling place, could be eliminated or repurposed as part of the park’s redevelopment.
**Nelson Mandela Peace Park**

Nelson Mandela Peace Park (0.2 ac.) is located in Garfield (15224) at the corner of Broad Street and N Evaline Street.

**Recommendation:**
**RELOCATE**
- This park should continue to be maintained in its current location, until the area is redeveloped. At the time of redevelopment, a larger neighborhood park site should be identified and developed to relocate Nelson Mandela Peace Park. This could be combined with the relocation of Kite Hill Park previously discussed.

**Osceola Park**

Osceola Park (1.2 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Bloomfield (15224) at the corner of Osceola and Cypress Streets. The park is fully developed with a play area and hockey court.

**Recommendation:**
**INVEST**
- Continue to upgrade this park, addressing issues identified in the Bloomfield Vision Plan.
- Consider removal of the hockey court to create an open informal grassy play area.
- Remove the fencing to make the park more visible and accessible to the neighborhood.
Sector 13 - Allegheny River Valley

The Allegheny River Valley is home to three community parks (Arsenal Park, Dinan Park and West Penn Park). The sector has eight neighborhood parks (26.6 ac.), three of which Denny Park (1.1 ac.), Duncan Park (0.8 ac.), and McCandless Park (0.2 ac.) were discussed in the earlier section on equity.

Table G15: Project List for Neighborhood Parks Sector 13- Allegheny River Valley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Park</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Divest</th>
<th>Invest</th>
<th>Redevelop</th>
<th>Relocate</th>
<th>Expand</th>
<th>Naturalize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bloomfield Neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomfield Park</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Lawrenceville Neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Park</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Lawrenceville Neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan Park</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strip District Neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Curto Park</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denny Park</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Lawrenceville Neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan Park</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifty-Seventh Street Park</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCandless Park</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bloomfield Park

Bloomfield Park (5.8 ac.) is located on the border of Bloomfield and Lower Lawrenceville straddling the Bloomfield Bridge. The park site is very urban in nature since is located under the major roadway (Bloomfield Bridge). The park has a pool, play area, basketball court, and ball field, with very little unprogrammed space. The Liberty Avenue business district is nearby.

**Recommendation:**

**INVEST**

- Bloomfield Park is needed to meet the green space needs of two neighborhoods, but its location is challenging and it will always be impacted by the transportation infrastructure of Bloomfield Bridge. This site should be considered in conjunction with Sullivan Park, which is more suitable for passive recreation.
- Secure the steep public land south of Sassafras Street and develop a trail connection from Bloomfield Park to Sullivan Park.
- Address issues of park identification and visibility.
• Implement treatments under the Bloomfield Bridge to enhance linkages between the two sides of the park and make this space less of a barrier.

• Reconfigure the parking to create a visible park entry and recapture space for recreation.

**Fifty-Seventh Street Park**

Fifty-Seventh Street Park (2.1 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Upper Lawrenceville (15201) at the intersection of 57th and Harrison Streets. It has a play area, basketball court, and ball field. The park is quite close to the river, but an industrial building (Allegheny Cold Storage) lies between the park and river. Although identified and used as a City park, it is currently owned by Sunoco.

**Recommendation:**

RELOCATE or INVEST

• In the long term, a riverfront site should be secured in the area that includes neighborhood park space to serve this area of Lawrenceville. If a riverfront park is not feasible in Lawrenceville, then a neighborhood park more central to residential areas should be secured. When redevelopment is proposed, park space meeting neighborhood park guidelines should be reserved.

• In the short term, invest in Fifty-Seventh Street Park. Remove fencing, integrate the areas outside the field into a more cohesive park space. Reduce paving and add trees. Consider reducing the size of the parking lot, as the peak park and field use times occur after business hours for the surrounding industrial uses. Alternative parking should be available on the street or through arrangements with other property owners.

**Frank Curto Park**

Frank Curto Park (7.2 ac.) is located in the Strip District neighborhood (15222) off Bigelow Boulevard. It has no amenities, but is home to a collection of sculptures. The flat lawn space has a pathway and a view of the opposing riverbank. There is no surrounding neighborhood for this park, as it is cut off from residential areas by steep slopes and transportation infrastructure.

**Recommendation:**

INVEST

• Redesignate this site as a beautification area. This park exists as an area seen by thousands of motorists per day along Bigelow Boulevard, and it primarily is an overlook.

• Create better automobile access to the park to highlight the sculptures in the park and encourage use of it as an overlook to the Strip District and the Northside.

• Connect this park to West Penn Park and Ammon Park through trails and steps to encourage use by the neighborhoods.

**Leslie Park**

Leslie Park (6.0 ac.) is located in the Central Lawrenceville neighborhood (15201) adjacent to historic Allegheny Cemetery. It consists of a play area, basketball court, two lighted ball fields, and closed pool. The western portion of the site is shared with the Boys & Girls Club of Western Pennsylvania, which occupies about an acre of the site with a building they operate.

**Recommendation:**

REDEVELOP
• Remove the closed pool structure.
• Redevlop the site in collaboration with the Boys & Girls Club. Address the terracing and create outdoor areas with better linkages to the well-used Boys & Girls Club. Improve visibility to and from Butler Street.
• Reconfigure the site to provide greater flexibility of use. Relocate (and reduce the amount of) the parking, which bisects the site and forms one of the terraces. Consider reconfiguring the fields for greater flexibility.
• Reduce the amount of fencing at the park.
• Upgrade and expand the play area, but not necessarily in its current location – Relocate it if the site redesign identifies a better location.
• Consider a community garden at this location.

Sullivan Park
Sullivan Park (3.4 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Lower Lawrenceville (15201) at Liberty Avenue and 36th Street. The site contains a lighted ball field and parking lot.

Recommendation:
REDEVELOP
• Connect Sullivan Park to Bloomfield Park by a trail along the steep hillside. See Bloomfield Park recommendations.
• Re-envision this park, eliminating the ballfield and developing the site to be an urban neighborhood park with more passive space and neighborhood park features. Add trees that will mature to a large size.
• Make use of the existing ashlar block retaining walls, but enhance pedestrian connections around the perimeter of the park. Provide pedestrian connections from all sides.
• Develop a visually prominent park entry from Liberty Avenue.
• Reduce or eliminate on-site parking.
• Consider public art treatments along the street frontage of the substation to the east of the park to enhance the appearance of this facility (Seattle’s public art program has included substation treatments). Alternatively, provide screening at the east end of the park.
Sector 14 - Oakland

Oakland is home to five neighborhood parks (4.6 ac.). Schenley Park forms the east boundary of the sector, and the University of Pittsburgh is located within this area. Oakland is a high density area with very little available land, though parks are needed.

Table G16: Project List for Neighborhood Parks Sector 14- Oakland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Park</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Divest</th>
<th>Invest</th>
<th>Redevelop</th>
<th>Relocate</th>
<th>Expand</th>
<th>Naturalize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Oakland Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary St. Park</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Oakland Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frazier Park</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawn and Ophelia Park</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara Park</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Oakland Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunseith Park (Shalane’s Play Yard)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Boundary St. Park

Boundary St. Park (0.5 ac.) is located in Central Oakland (15213) off Boundary Street. The park has a play area and hockey deck. The park is separated somewhat from the surrounding neighborhood due to topography, and it is near some of the steep hillsides of Schenley Park.

Recommendation:
RELOCATE, DIVEST or NATURALIZE

PGH Snap Action Planning Strategy: Enhance (E2)

- This location is isolated from the nearby dense Oakland neighborhood due to its being in the Four Mile Run valley; therefore, the park does not serve much of the surrounding neighborhood, and there are only 15 or so houses on Boundary Street.
- Relocate the neighborhood park to another site: the Zulema passive area (0.7 ac.), designated as a beautification area, offers an alternative location that is better suited to serve more of the neighborhood. The Zulema site would require streetscape treatments to reduce the impacts of the surrounding major streets to be able to develop it as an attractive, urban neighborhood park.
- Divest the site if an alternate owner can be found. If divestment is not possible, naturalize the site.

Dunseith Park (Shalane’s Play Yard)

Dunseith Park (Shalane’s Play Yard) (0.1 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of West Oakland (15213) on Dunseith Street. It consists of a play area and a small grassy area separated from the play area with a fence. The site was dedicated in 2010 to Shalane Graham, a 20 year old who was gunned down in her
home in 2008. She grew up in the neighborhood, and the playground was replaced and updated as part of the dedication as Shalane’s Play Yard.

**Recommendation:**

**INVEST**

- Formally rename the park to Shalane’s Play Yard.
- Add more neighborhood park features to the site, including trees. Eliminate fencing to provide better access. Consider community gardens if there is interest from nearby neighbors.
- Additional locations should be investigated to provide open space and a variety of recreation experiences in the dense neighborhood of West Oakland.

**Frazier Park**

Frazier Park (3.4 ac.) is located in South Oakland (15213) off Frazier Street. It has a play area, basketball court, and a lighted ball field.

**Recommendation:**

**REDEVELOP**

- Located on the fringe of the neighborhood, Frazier Park serves a high-density area without access to any other park (Schenley & Niagara Parks are ½ mile away). The park is currently dominated by the field, with very little space devoted to flexible neighborhood uses. As such the park does not function as a neighborhood park but a fenced off ball field. In order to serve this neighborhood, redevelop the park and relocate the ball field (or reduce its formality and footprint).
- Eliminate fencing, provide better access into the site and stronger connections to the neighborhood including pedestrian access traversing the hillside from Whitney.

**Lawn and Ophelia Park**

Lawn and Ophelia Park (0.4 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of South Oakland (15213) at the intersection of Lawn and Ophelia Street. It consists of a play area that is adjacent to a Hwy 885 off ramp.

**Recommendation:**

**DIVEST or NATURALIZE**

**PGHSnap Action Planning Strategy: Stabilize (S2)**

- Focus investment at Niagara Park, and create better pedestrian connections from this area of South Oakland to Niagara Park.
- Due to its zoning (R1A-VH) and the development pressure in Oakland, it may be possible to market this site for the construction of townhouses. If an alternate owner cannot be secured, the site should be naturalized.
Niagara Park
Niagara Park (0.2 ac.) is located in South Oakland (15213) at the corner of Craft Avenue and Niagara Street. It has a play area and a half-court basketball court and sitting area arranged in a half circle facing Niagara St.

Recommendation:
INVEST
• Invest in improvements at Niagara Park. Remove fencing, enhance the play area including providing shaded seating. Green the site and add more neighborhood park features.
Sector 15 - Hill District & Uptown
The Hill District & Uptown has nine neighborhood parks (41.1 ac.) two of which—Cliffside Park (1.1 ac.) and Martin Luther King Field (3.5 ac.)—were discussed in the earlier section on equity. This area lacks a community park. Either Ammon Park or Kennard Park should be redesignated as a Community Park to serve the Hill. During 2009, the Hill District & Uptown area conducted an extensive planning process aimed at connecting this community to the rivers and greater Pittsburgh. The results of this planning effort are articulated in the planning document, The Hill: A Village in the Woods Conceptual Plan, Sept. 2009. This document, also referred to as the Green Print, aims to connect and strengthen the social ties of the Hill District with the greater Pittsburgh area.

Table G17: Project List for Neighborhood Parks Sector 15- Hill District & Uptown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Park</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Divest</th>
<th>Invest</th>
<th>Redevelop</th>
<th>Relocate</th>
<th>Expand</th>
<th>Naturalize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bedford Dwellings Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammon Park</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bluff Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tustin Park</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crawford-Roberts Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert &quot;Turk&quot; Graham Park</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliffside Park</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granville Park</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle Hill Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincennes Park</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terrace Village Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennard Park</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Luther King Park</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Hill Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert E. Williams (Herron Hill) Park</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Albert “Turk” Graham Park
Albert “Turk” Graham Park (0.4 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Crawford-Roberts (15219) on the corner of Vine Street and Foreside Place. The site has play area accessible with crosswalks going across both bordering streets.

Recommendation:
INVEST
• Implement the Hill District Green Print recommendations to make the park edges and access to the park permeable; remove fencing.
• Add trees and plantings to green the site above the retaining walls. Replace unusable turf with another type of vegetation.
• If opportunities to expand the site arise (such as incorporating the parking lot to the northeast or a portion of the church site to the south), they should be pursued. Alternatively, if the parking lot across Vine Street becomes available, this park should be expanded if possible.

Ammon Park
Ammon Park (8.1 ac.) is located in the Bedford Dwellings neighborhood (15219). It consists of a pool, play area, tennis court, two basketball courts, and two ball fields. Access and visibility into the park from the street is difficult with the recreation center, swimming pool and Macedonia Baptist Church fronting on Bedford Ave.

Recommendation:
REDEVELOP
• Implement the Hill District Green Print recommendations, including
  o Add vegetation to create a more park-like setting.
  o Add garden plots and green courtyards.
  o Add a running track.
• Determine whether Ammon or Kennard Park should be redesignated as a community park, through a neighborhood outreach process. If Ammon Park is preferred by local residents as the community park site, significant reconfiguring is needed to increase access. If Kennard is preferred as a community park site because of its larger area, the facility investments at Ammon should be refocused there.
• The main entry should be developed from Memory Lane, with wayfinding features added near the intersection of Memory Lane/Kirkpatrick/Bedford.
• Remove fencing. Upgrade and expand the play area, and consider moving it to a more visible location.
• Consider eliminating one of the ball fields, or reconfiguring the fields to provide more flexible use space.
• Develop pathway linkages to the hillside open space.

Granville Park
Granville Park (0.6 ac.) is located in the Crawford-Roberts neighborhood (15219) at the corner of Enoch and Granville Streets. It is near the Ozanam Cultural Center. The site has a play area and a basketball court with bleachers.

Recommendation:
EXPAND or DIVEST
PGHSnap Action Planning Strategy: Stabilize (S3)
• Granville Park is centrally located in the neighborhood, between Cliffside and Albert “Turk” Graham Parks. If the neighborhood opts to relocate neighborhood park facilities from Cliffside Park,
Granville Park could be expanded onto property across Enoch Street or onto other adjacent properties. The site should be upgraded, with trees and other greening incorporated throughout the site. A greater diversity of neighborhoods should be incorporated.

- If the neighborhood opts to retain Cliffside Park as a location for neighborhood park features, the walkshed for Granville Park would be duplicate with that of Cliffside, Ammon, and Albert “Turk” Graham Parks. The property, particularly with the Ozanam Center and other URA / City property, could be part of a 2.5 acre site for development that is adjacent to other development projects in the Hill District, as well as being adjacent to an Enhance (E1) strategy under PGHSNAP Action Planning.

Kennard Park
Kennard Park (13.4 ac.) is located in the neighborhood of Terrace Village (15219) and accessed at the corner of Reed and Kirkpatrick Streets. It has a play area, tennis court, four basketball courts, and a ball field. The surrounding neighborhood is primarily low density residential. Kennard Park is an option for conversion to a community park, if the neighborhood prefers this site to Ammon Park.

Recommendation: REDEVELOP
- This park has the size and facilities to be redesigned and improved to serve the functions of a community park for the Hill District, if visibility were improved and passive space were developed.
- Improve visibility and connections to the surrounding community to enhance the perception of safety – the park feels very isolated from the community. Regrade the area of the park near the Kirkpatrick/Reed intersection, creating a more prominent entry with views into the site. Initiate the pedestrian pathway system from this corner. Enhance the edge along Reed to provide views into the park.
- Create a secondary pedestrian entrance from Bentley Drive, linking this entrance to the park’s pedestrian pathway system.
- Incorporate the Hill District Green Print recommendations:
  - Add vegetation in the form of garden plots to Kirkpatrick Street
  - Add tree canopy along Center Avenue.
  - Add soccer fields to the south end of the park space.

Robert E. Williams (Herron Hill) Park
Robert E. Williams Park, also known as Herron Hill Park (12.3 ac.) is located in the Upper Hill (15219) neighborhood off Milwaukee and Adelaide Streets. It has a play area and a full basketball court. It is in a residential neighborhood at the top of the hill, and the site contains a reservoir.

Recommendation: INVEST
- Rename the park to Herron Hill Park, acknowledging the District’s identification of the park.
- Enhance the pathway system in the park that traverses the hillsides.
- Develop picnic facilities to take advantage of the excellent views afforded by this site.
• Implement the recommendations of the Hill District Green to the extent PWSA will allow to increase activity around the reservoir, and add vegetation along Milwaukee, Camp and Adelaide Streets.
• Plant a new generation of trees.
• Upgrade the playground and neighborhood park features.
• Consider vegetation and landscape treatments that don’t require regular mowing. Much of the turf at Herron Hill Park is unusable due to slopes.

**Tustin Park**

Tustin Park (0.1 ac.) is located in the Bluff neighborhood (15219) off Tustin Street between Jumonville and Seneca Streets and has play area. This is the only site functioning as a park in the eastern area of the Bluff neighborhood and was not included within the Green Print study area. The surrounding neighborhood is a mix of uses at a high or moderate density.

**Recommendation:**  
**EXPAND or RELOCATE**

• Tustin Park is quite small. The park should be expanded or relocated so it can provide the full range of neighborhood park experiences. There are a variety of vacant, tax delinquent and city owned properties nearby that could be assembled to create a larger park around existing Tustin Park or at another location central to the neighborhood.
• Once the site is determined, the expanded or relocated Tustin Park should be developed to meet neighborhood park design guidelines.

**Vincennes Park**

Vincennes Park (1.6 ac.) is located in the Middle Hill neighborhood (15219) off Wandless Street. It has a play area and a basketball court. The facilities are set back on the property out of view of the street and on the upland part of the lot.

**Recommendation:**  
**INVEST**

• As this area of the hill is reinvented, a neighborhood park site will need to be identified.
• If this site remains a neighborhood park location:
  o Reorient the park to Wandless Street, and create an entrance as recommended in the Hill District Green Print.
  o Close the dead-end access into the park along the Corbin right-of-way and develop this as part of the park site.
  o Create an entryway off the Crockett Way right-of-way connecting the park on both end of the street.
  o Pedestrian entries could also be created off Hollace Street (10-D-284) and Wylie Avenue (10-D-282) using city-owned properties.
  o Regrade the site to enhance views into it and encourage access.
  o Add trees and a looped pathway system throughout the park.
  o Expand the site if the opportunity arises.
Sector 16 - Downtown Pittsburgh

Downtown Pittsburgh has no neighborhood parks, but has two community parks (Market Square Park and Mellon Square Park), discussed in the Community Parks section of this document. There are also a number of small squares and public plazas provided throughout the sector as a result of land use requirements.
APPENDIX G
PARK EVALUATION AND PROJECT LIST
Appendix H:
Design and Development Guidelines

Two types of guidelines are provided: systemwide design and development guidelines and classificati- specific guidelines. Systemwide guidelines are provided first, and are applicable to all of Pittsburgh’s open space and park lands. Specific design and development guidelines for neighborhood, community, regional and riverfront parks, and greenways address size, layout, accessibility, recommended amenities, and other planning and development concerns.

Design and development guidelines are intended to provide guidance and direction. However, every site is different, and every neighborhood is different. The guidelines are not intended to override site-specific concerns or judgments. For example, during the design of neighborhood parks, if neighborhood preferences for the site program differ from the guidelines but are consistent with park function, historic preservation needs, and the overall guidance of OpenSpacePGH, then citizen preferences should be considered. These guidelines can be used to inform development code updates prepared as part of LandUsePGH.

In addition to the guidelines presented here, the Department of Public Works (DPW) has in place standards for benches, lighting, and other site furnishings, as well as standard specifications and construction details that specific site designs will need to incorporate.

SYSTEMWIDE DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES

- Design sites to provide nodes of activity by grouping site features, and provide an accessible on-site pathway system that links all activity areas within the site and to surrounding neighborhoods.
- Be responsive to local conditions, including topography and site context, when master planning or designing individual parks.
- Incorporate public input into park master planning and design to ensure that community needs and issues are addressed.
- Involve maintenance and recreation program staff in the design process so that maintenance and programming requirements are considered during the master planning and design processes.
- Involve historic preservation staff or consultants in the design process when appropriate to advance historic preservation goals and help maintain the historic integrity of parks and facilities.
- Incorporate art, in accordance with the Percent for Art program and the guidance of ArtPGH.
- In all park and open space contexts, incorporate surface water management best practices to improve ecosystem services contributions and to demonstrate these practices.
Amenities

- Follow Federal Access Board guidelines for all parks, open spaces, and recreation facilities.

- At all sites, provide:
  - A universal format of park identification signage in accessible formats at major access points. The signage guidance in the Regional Parks Master Plan should be adopted as a citywide standard.
  - Appropriate site furnishings (picnic tables, benches, bike racks, drinking fountains, shelter structures, trash and recycling receptacles, etc.) for the intended scale and use of the park. These furnishings should meet DPW standards and specifications to support a citywide identity and allow for efficient system management.

- Preserve significant or contributing historic landscape features where present in the open space system.

- When designing new parks or renovating existing ones, evaluate the use of turf versus other landscape types in order to use maintenance resources efficiently.

- Locate amenities, such as playground equipment and basketball courts, to be visible from adjoining streets in order to increase safety and visibility into the park. Consider site design solutions to minimize avoidable impacts on neighboring properties (e.g., glare from lighting above typical street light levels).

- Design lighting systems and select fixtures to minimize light pollution.

- In the development or renovation of parks, open spaces, and indoor facilities, pursue green building and site standards to demonstrate low impact development, water efficiency, and other standards of programs such as LEED, Sustainable Sites Initiative, the Living Building Challenge, and others that will emerge over time. This does not require certification.

Accessibility

- Connect parks and open spaces to surrounding neighborhoods with sidewalks, bicycle lanes, or off-street trails to provide multiple ways of accessing parks.

- Design parks and open spaces using universal access principles to facilitate access and movement within the sites for people of all ages and abilities.

Maintenance

- As they develop, incorporate new technologies into park designs to facilitate operational efficiency. Actively look for new technologies and test them on a small scale in Pittsburgh. Adopt new technologies as standard practice after they have been proven effective for Pittsburgh. Examples of past technological advances that are now adopted as standard practice in many urban open space systems are centrally controlled computerized irrigation systems, wireless internet, solar-powered parking meters, and centrally controlled building climate control systems.
• Involve maintenance staff at all levels of park design to ensure that creative design is also operationally efficient, sustainable, and compatible with Pittsburgh maintenance procedures.

• As a formal policy, give preference to local/regional and recycled materials for buildings, landscapes, and park furnishings to reduce the City’s carbon footprint and support the local economy.

CLASSIFICATION-SPECIFIC DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES

In this section, guidelines are provided for each park classification. For each park classification, an intent is defined, site characteristics (e.g., size, street access requirements) are defined, required and optional amenities are listed, and, where applicable, amenities or features to avoid are noted. As part of the LandUsePGH process, these guidelines should be used as a basis for developing updated or new land use standards.

When the term “provide” is used, it means that the City should incorporate the listed amenities unless a site-specific design issue or preference makes that amenity impractical or undesirable for a particular site. The amenities listed to “consider” are optional items that are appropriate to the function of the park and that may or may not be provided based on site capacity, community preferences and other design considerations. The amenities listed to “avoid” are those that are not consistent with the function of the park. As previously noted, these guidelines are intended to provide direction and a baseline for design and development, but should not supersede judgment about specific sites.
Neighborhood Park Design Guidelines

Intent
Provide close-to-home or business recreation opportunities for nearby residents, who typically live or work within walking and bicycle distance (¼ to ½ mile) of the park.

Site Characteristics
- At least 50% of the site should be relatively level and usable.
- Site should front a public street with at least 150' of frontage.
- Property should face the existing or anticipated front facades of adjacent development.
- Access to the site should be provided via a local street with sidewalks or trails.
- Minimum size 20,000 sq. ft.

Provide
- Park identification sign.
- Children’s play area.
- Picnic area.
- Minimum level grass area approximately 100’x100’.
- At least one neighborhood scale active recreation facility. Provide neighborhood scale facilities that are intended for casual use, drop-in activity and beginners. Neighborhood scale facilities are not designed for competitive or advanced skill levels, nor are they maintained to competitive quality.
- Internal pathway system.
- Site furnishings (trash receptacles, bike rack, etc.).
- General landscape improvements, including trees.

Consider
- Small shelter.
- Public art.
- Sports court lighting.
- Community gardens.
- Natural areas.
- Additional neighborhood scale sports fields or sports courts.
- Additional neighborhood scale, small footprint active recreation facility (skate spot, horseshoe pits, etc.).

Avoid
- Access from an arterial street.
- Off-street parking.
- Ornamental plantings/seasonal flowers/horticultural displays.
- Botanical gardens.
- Regional and community scale facilities, such as sports field complexes or recreation centers.
- Sports field lighting.
- Full service recreation centers.
- Swimming pools.
- Maintained grass in unusable areas, such as on steep slopes.
Community Park Design Guidelines

**Intent**
Provide opportunities for active recreation and organized play in a location that can accommodate increased traffic and demand, while also serving the neighborhood park function for nearby residents.

**Site Characteristics**
- Site access should front a higher order public street on at least one side for main park entry.
- Secondary access to the park from a public local access street or trail preferred.
- Transit stop should be nearby.
- Site size depends on the park site’s location and adjacent uses. More urban locations may be smaller (for example, Market Square), whereas more residential locations should be larger.

**Provide**
- Park identification signage at park access points.
- Children’s play area.
- Picnic area.
- Internal pathway system.
- Site furnishings (trash receptacles, bike racks, etc.).
- General landscape improvements, including trees.
- Public art.
- In highly urbanized or commercial areas, provide hardscape areas suitable for multiple types of uses.
- In more residential areas, provide an open turf area 100’ x 100’ in size.
- Infrastructure to support programs and community events (upgraded power, water service, etc.).
- Permanent restrooms.
- Retain historic buildings or features whenever possible. [Link PreservePGH]
- Signature community parks should incorporate additional features and amenities.

**Consider**
- Community scale recreation facilities of any type that serve advanced skill levels, competitive play, and specialized recreation activities. These facilities are intended to draw people from a distance, are designed for competition, and are maintained to support their level of use.
- Picnic shelters.
- Picnic tables and grills.
- Sports courts.
- Sports fields.
- Concessions, vendor space, or commercial lease space.
- Skate and/or BMX park.
• Outdoor adventure activity space.
• Spray park.
• Swimming pool.
• Full-service recreation center.
• Performance space, such as a stage or bandshell.
• Community gardens.
• Storage or maintenance buildings. If visible, these should be architecturally compatible with other park elements and any exterior work areas should be screened from view.
• On-or off-street parking, approximately five spaces per one acre of developed park area, except in highly urban areas.
• Regional scale facilities. Regional scale facilities are one-of-a-kind, state of the art features. These are intended to serve a large market area, drawing from the entire city or even the region.
• Ornamental plantings/seasonal flowers/horticultural displays.

Avoid

• Botanical gardens.
• Maintained grass in unusable areas, such as on steep slopes.
Regional Park Design Guidelines

Intent

Provide destination park locations that can accommodate communitywide and regional traffic and demand, while also fulfilling the function of a community and neighborhood park for nearby residents.

Site Characteristics

- Site size depends on the park site’s location and adjacent uses, but 200+ acres is the recognized threshold in Pittsburgh.
- Access from a higher order public street on at least one side for main park entry.
- If the park has multiple main entries, each of these should front a street with transit or bicycle route when possible.
- Secondary access points to the park from public local access streets and trails are encouraged.

Provide

- Park identification signage at park access points.
- Children’s play area with unique features themed to reflect site character.
- Picnic tables and grills.
- Picnic shelters.
- Permanent restrooms.
- Pathway system connecting site amenities.
- Site furnishings (trash receptacles, bike rack, etc.).
- One or more regional scale facilities - the one-of-a-kind, state of the art features. These are intended to serve a large market area, drawing from the entire city or even the region.
- Community scale recreation facilities of any type that serve advanced skill levels, competitive play, and specialized recreation activities. These facilities are intended to draw people from a distance, are designed for competition, and are maintained to support their level of use.
- General landscape improvements.
- Infrastructure to support large community events.
- Off-street parking.
- Large open turf area for events, sitting, and informal play.
- Pedestrian lighting.
- Public art.

Consider

- Concessions, vendor space, or commercial lease space.
- Unique specialty facility (zoo, aquarium, conservatory, etc.).
- Community scale recreation facilities that serve advanced skill levels, competitive play, and specialized recreation activities. These facilities are intended to draw people from a distance, are designed for competition, and are maintained to support their level of use. This includes community scale sports courts and
sports fields, which may be lighted.
- Skate park/BMX park.
- Spray park.
- Off-leash dog area.
- Historic structures or features.
- Performance space, such as a stage or bandshell.
- Amphitheater.
- Community gardens.
- Swimming pool.
- Golf course.
- Storage or maintenance buildings. If visible, these should be architecturally compatible with other park elements and any exterior work areas should be screened from view.
- Ornamental plantings/seasonal flowers/horticultural displays.
- Botanical garden.

**Avoid**

- Depends on the park site.
# Riverfront Park Design Guidelines

Riverfront parks sites focus on proximity or access to one or more of Pittsburgh’s rivers, even though some of these riverfront sites may also serve neighborhood, community, or regional park functions.

## Intent

Riverfront parks provide public connections to the rivers. Because of the importance in Pittsburgh of reconnecting to the rivers, these are particularly important sites.

## Site Characteristics

- The site is adjacent to one of Pittsburgh’s rivers.

## Provide

- Park identification sign at park access points.
- Physical or visual connection to the water’s edge.
- Connection to the riverfront trail system with trailhead facilities.
- Off-street parking.
- Permanent restrooms.
- Permeable paving materials for the construction of hardscape facilities.

## Consider

- Water-oriented recreation facilities (for example, non-motorized boat launch, rowing facility, fishing pier).
- Motorized boating facilities (for example, boat launch, marina).
- Concessions, vendor space, or commercial lease space.
- Regional, community or neighborhood scale recreation facilities, depending on site context.
- Infrastructure to support community events.
- Off-leash dog area.

## Avoid

- Uses that detract from the riverfront location or preclude river-oriented uses.
- Uncontrolled crossings of highways, railroads, and other transportation infrastructure.
Greenway Design Guidelines
Greenway design guidelines apply to greenways and to green network lands not otherwise classified as another park classification.

**Intent**
Protect environmentally sensitive lands. In addition, provide a connected green network and opportunities to experience nature. These lands are managed for conservation, environmental education, wildlife corridors, and low impact recreation opportunities such as walking or nature viewing.

**Site Characteristics**
- Site size variable.
- Greenways will include steep slopes.

**Provide**
- No requirements.

**Consider**
- Restoration of the natural resource values of the site, including management activities prescribed by a natural resource management plan for the site or for the specific resources on it.
- If amenities are considered for a site, the location and amount should be compatible with the overarching intent of retaining the resource value of the site.
- Identification signage at access points.
- Natural surface trail and pathway system with wayfinding signage.
- Paved regional trail segment.
- Trailhead.
- View points or viewing blinds.
- Seasonal or permanent restrooms.
- Outdoor recreation facilities that can be accommodated while retaining natural resource values.

**Avoid**
- Active recreation facilities.
- Ornamental plantings.
- Turf areas.
- Amenities that would conflict with the resources present on the site.