



University of Pittsburgh
Department of Economics
April 2025

MQE Capstone for the Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy

A guide to assist the Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy in their effort to prioritize public investment needs on a park-by-park basis using analyses and visualizations of data characterizing the demographics, environment, public health, crime, and other attributes of Pittsburgh parks and their surrounding walkshed areas.

Authors

Lap Pham

Patrick Swain

José de los Ríos

Maxwell Snodgrass

Advisor

Randall Walsh, Ph.D.



Outline

I.	Introduction	2
II.	Data and Methodology	3
	A. Census	4
	1. Race	5
	2. Age	11
	3. Poverty	13
	4. Vacancy	15
	B. Environment	17
	1. Tree Canopy	18
	2. Pollution	22
	3. Sewershed Priority	25
	C. Crime	27
	1. Variables	#
	D. Public Health	#
	1. Variables	#
III.	Analysis	#
IV.	Conclusion	#
V.	References	#
VI.	Appendix	#

I. Introduction

As candidates for a Master of Science in Quantitative Economics at the University of Pittsburgh, we have developed an analytical acumen that enables us to harness data to bolster public utility. For our capstone project, we dedicated the spring semester to analyzing data for the Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy and uncovering patterns and disparities affecting Pittsburgh's public parks and their surrounding communities, or "walksheds." After rigorous quantitative analyses of statistics describing relevant factors including demographic data, environmental metrics, public health outcomes, and crime rates, we produced this document and the accompanying datasets and visualizations as a guide for the Conservancy to quantify dimensions of community need on a park-by-park basis. This project is a resource to enable the Conservancy to make data-driven decisions in its efforts to allocate park budgets, secure public and private investment, and engage stakeholders across the communities of its footprint effectively and equitably.

We analyzed data from an array of public sector sources from federal bodies like the U.S. Census Bureau to local entities like the Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority. We targeted variables that offered broad descriptions of the population and environment of the walksheds, such that we could concisely characterize the demographics, environment, health, and crime of a given walkshed. After downloading and cleaning data into concise datasets preserving selected relevant variables, we used the technique of areal interpolation to attach data from geographic identifiers like Census tracts to the walksheds. After attachment and additional calculations scaling and standardizing the data, we produced datasets that displayed selected variables as raw counts, percentages, and z-scores.

We employed a technical toolkit that included R packages `sf`, `ggplot2`, and `tmap`, geographic information systems software QGIS, and Python packages `seaborn` and `matplotlib` to analyze and visualize our cleaned and attached datasets. We used racial indexes to model relative diversity of walksheds, analyzed the relationships between poverty, age, and vacancy, **more analysis**

II. Data and Methodology

A “walkshed” refers to the area where a typical resident lives within a five-minute walk of a given park. We let the walksheds represent the surrounding community of a park – and hence, we sought to synthesize and transform data to analytically describe those communities. With in-depth profiles of the parks and their respective walksheds, detailing their demographic characteristics, environmental factors, and other descriptive statistics, we could robustly answer comparative questions about patterns and disparities in the urban communities where the Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy operates.

We selected an array of metrics that offered broad characterizations of the parks and walksheds, falling into four main categories: socioeconomic demographics, ecology and pollution, public health, and crime. We drew from a variety of data sources to obtain raw datasets to begin our analysis – most of them were public, including data exported from the U.S. Census Bureau, the Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority, the U.S. Forest Service, and reports from other public sector data providers. The diversity of our sources made data cleaning a lengthy stage of the process, with significant time and energy dedicated towards selecting relevant columns, standardizing numerical identifiers, and merging smaller tables into large datasets for wider analysis of the trends and relationships between selected variables.

The shapefiles of the walksheds, giving us precise geospatial data on the size and shape of walksheds, came from a 2019 report conducted for the Conservancy by Interface Studio LLC. Using QGIS, we separated parks from their walksheds. To attach data collected at the census tract level and other geographic identifiers to the walksheds, we employed a technique called areal interpolation using R’s spatial features package. This process uses geometric information of two intersecting polygons and estimates the data within the intersection – effectively, it allows us to predict the characteristics of a walkshed based on the areas like census tracts, whose characteristics we know, with which it intersects.

After interpolation, we summarized all the intersections for a given walkshed to create datasets with a single row describing each park’s walkshed. For variables measured in counts, we transformed them into proportions using total walkshed population and scaled them with z-scores. This is a measurement that describes how many standard deviations a datapoint lies away from the average, giving us a way to analyze walksheds relative to each other.

II. Data and Methodology → A. Census

We sourced demographic data from the 2020 decennial Census and the 2023 American Community Survey. Our analysis focused on four main factors: race and ethnicity, age, poverty, and vacancy. After downloading four large .csv files from the U.S. Census Bureau specified to Census tracts in Allegheny County, PA, we cleaned the datasets in R to eliminate extraneous columns, standardize numerical tract identifiers, and combine them into a single file grouped by tract.

The raw data represented counts of column variables per tract – for instance, we could see the number of residents between 20 and 24 years of age, were below the poverty line, or were Hispanic/Latino in a given Census tract. We performed aerial interpolation with the spatial features package in R using a shapefile of parks and their walksheds. This produced a dataset that contained the interpolated counts of each variable in the polygons representing the intersection of each Census tract and walkshed. Summarizing by walkshed and weighting by population, we created a dataset that showed the counts of each variable for selected relevant variables in each walkshed.

We used midpoints to transform the many age columns into a single median age column and converted counts into percentages by dividing each count by the total population of the walksheds. Using those new variables, we standardized the values using z-scores to create an index of each variable and assigned each z-score a rank. Hence, we produced datasets of raw counts, percentages, scaled index scores, and ranks of each park walkshed for the characteristics of total population, Hispanic/Latino, White, Black, Asian, occupied parcels, vacant parcels, residents below the poverty line, and age variables, among several others.


Using R packages including ggplot2, we visualized the indexed data using bar graphs (exported as .png files), choropleth maps (exported as interactive web-based .html files), and other methods for selected variables to compare walksheds to each other through rankings and illuminate geospatial patterns that reveal socioeconomic disparities and trends across Pittsburgh neighborhoods.


II. Data and Methodology → A. Census → 1. Race

We broke down race and ethnicity by four main categories – Hispanic/Latino, Black, White, and Asian. The raw datasets included counts for other races including Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander and American Indian, but in almost all cases, the counts were too low for any meaningful analysis or visualization. We also preserved a column that described the count of residents who identified with two or more races. We visualized those four racial categories using interactive geospatial .html maps (created with the R package tmap) and bar graphs showing the walksheds with the top and bottom 10 ranked percentages (created with the R package ggplot2).

Hispanic/Latino Population


The first ethnicity we analyzed was Hispanic/Latino. This variable was unique in that the Census recognizes Hispanic/Latino not as a racial category, but as an ethnic identifier, such that anyone of any race can identify as Hispanic/Latino without necessarily falling into the “two or more races” column. A map of the Hispanic/Latino index on walksheds in Pittsburgh shows that there are a relatively low count of Hispanic/Latino residents across the city apart from a major cluster in Beechview and a smaller concentration in Downtown and the Bluff. Likewise, the walksheds with the highest proportion of Hispanic/Latino residents were Vanucci, Tropical, and Alton Parks – all within a few blocks in Beechview. The lowest proportion appeared in areas with especially high concentrations of Black residents such as the Hill District and Homewood.






Black/African American Population


We created the same visualizations for Black/African American residents. Similarly, we found clusters of Black residents in a few key park walksheds concentrated in a handful of Pittsburgh neighborhoods – namely Homewood, the Hill District, the North Side, and Knoxville. Walksheds with lower proportions appeared in largely White neighborhoods in Lawrenceville, Greenfield, the Strip District, and Swisshelm Park and the largely White and Asian neighborhood of Squirrel Hill. The parks with the walksheds whose Black population proportions were the highest were overwhelmingly in northeast Pittsburgh, with the top eight walksheds in the predominantly Black neighborhoods of Homewood and Lincoln-Lemington-Belmar, followed by several parks in historically Black communities of the Hill District.






White Population

White residents, the largest ethnic group in Pittsburgh, are distinctly common among the four racial categories we visualized – unlike the three racial minority groups in our dataset, White residents had high proportions in most walksheds apart from a few key neighborhoods. Visually, there seems to be a strong negative association between walksheds with high White and Black population proportions – the only park walksheds with very low White proportions appeared in Homewood, Lincoln-Lemington-Belmar, Knoxville, the Hill District, Garfield, and parts of the North Side. As we found through visualizations of the Black population, most of those areas fall into walksheds with the largest concentrations of Black residents, and the walksheds with the lowest White population (overwhelmingly in northeast Pittsburgh) are nearly identical to the top walksheds for the Black population. The opposite is not as stark – many of the walksheds with the highest White population proportions are lower on the list of Black population, but several notable walksheds in the latter also have large concentrations of Asian residents.





Parks Ranked by % White Population (Top and Bottom 10)



Asian Population

The Census racial category “Asian” is very broad, encompassing residents from the Indian subcontinent to east Asia and Oceania. We found very low proportions of Asian residents in almost all neighborhoods of Pittsburgh apart from several clusters across the East End and smaller concentrations in the West End and Oakland. The highest proportions by far appeared in the corridor from East Liberty to Squirrel Hill, namely the walkshed of Davis Park in Squirrel Hill South. Walksheds in Bloomfield, Shadyside, Point Breeze, and Squirrel Hill North including Morrow Triangle, Osceola, Mellon, Enright, and Wightman also had higher proportions. Several Oakland walksheds including Lawn and Ophelia Park and Frazier Park also appeared in the top 10 Asian population walksheds. The walksheds with the three lowest Asian populations mirror the top three walksheds for the Black population.






The geospatial distributions of racial categories across park walksheds reveal significant socioeconomic patterns and disparities. For instance, the strong negative association between more White and Black walksheds reflects the legacy of past and present de facto racial and economic segregation in Pittsburgh, a phenomena common in many American urban centers. Black, Hispanic/Latino, and Asian residents are overwhelmingly clustered in a few walksheds and neighborhoods. With surface-level analysis, park walksheds do not appear to be very racially diverse – there were no parks whose index scores appeared in the top half of all four racial population indexes. In the Analysis section, we used more robust techniques to analyze and visualize the racial diversity of the walksheds and the relationships between racial categories and other demographic data.

II. Data and Methodology → A. Census → 2. Age


After summarizing age columns into a single median age metric, we could characterize the middle value of ages in each walkshed, and thus, the age of a typical resident. This ranged from around 45 for the Glen Hazel Senior Center and Burgwin Park's walksheds in Hazelwood to about 22 for Albert Turk Graham Park in Crawford-Roberts at the junction of the Hill District and the Bluff.

The locations of universities are likely a significant factor in this spatial distribution – many of the youngest walksheds are located in Oakland, Squirrel Hill, the South Side Flats, and Downtown around the “studentified” neighborhoods near the University of Pittsburgh, Duquesne University, Carnegie Mellon University, and others. The four youngest walksheds – Albert Turk Graham, the Cap, Tustin, and Martin Luther King – are all within half a mile of Duquesne’s campus. Zulema, Frazier, and Niagara Parks in Oakland near Pitt also appeared in the top 10 youngest walksheds.




On the other end of the median age range, two of the oldest walksheds belonged to senior centers – Glen Hazel and Overbrook. There were a few distinct clusters of older residents. The walksheds surrounding Frick Park – most notably Swisselm Park – Hazelwood and Glen Hazel, several areas of the North Side, Lawrenceville, Mount Washington, and the South Hills all had median ages above 40.

Interestingly, the three significantly Hispanic/Latino walksheds we identified through our racial data visualization – Vanucci, Tropical, and Alton in Beechview – not only appear in the top 10 oldest walksheds, but appear in the same order as their Hispanic/Latino population ranks. Since the Beechview walksheds have such high Hispanic/Latino proportions compared to the next most Hispanic/Latino walkshed, we should not treat them as representative of the greater relationship between age and Hispanic/Latino population, but the pattern reveals intriguing characteristics of the Beechview community nonetheless.




II. Data and Methodology → A. Census → 3. Poverty

The raw Census datasets contained a multitude of columns related to income and poverty, but the most concise was residents below the poverty line. In the cleaned dataset, we preserved counts of residents for whom the poverty status was known and the count of residents below the poverty line. The Census Bureau does not have a single threshold for poverty, rather a series of thresholds for each individual based on age, size of household unit, and number of children. For instance, in the 2020 Census, the poverty line for one person under 65 years with no children was \$13,465. Thus, the count represented the number of people in each tract who had been individually determined to experience poverty via the respective threshold according to their demographic characteristics.



Similar to the race indexes, we summarized the interpolated poverty counts by park, divided them by walkshed population, standardized them into an index with z-scores, and ranked the z-scores. We produced a single column that contained scaled values describing the relative poverty of each walkshed.




The watershed that stands out the most from this ranking is East Hills Park – it is extremely poor relative to the rest of the walksheds, with a percent below the poverty line far above the second poorest watershed of Frazier Park. The interpolated counts suggested out of the roughly 646 residents of the East Hills Park watershed, an estimated 70% lived below the poverty line. No other watershed comes close to that proportion, but poverty tends to be concentrated in walksheds in the Hill District, Oakland, Knoxville, and Homewood.

The cluster of residents living below the poverty line in Oakland in the walksheds of Niagara, Lawn and Ophelia, and Frazier Parks could be less indicative of socioeconomic disparities – as could be the case in Homewood and other economically depressed communities – but the large student population in the University of Pittsburgh’s footprint, many of whom have little to no annual income as full-time university students.


The smallest proportions of residents below the poverty line appeared in the watershed of Marmaduke Park, a playground in the affluent Brighton Heights neighborhood. Downtown, Stanton Heights, Swisselm Park, and a few pockets of the South Hills made up the rest of the bottom 10 walksheds in poverty.

II. Data and Methodology → A. Census → 4. Vacancy

After cleaning the Census data, we preserved three columns: total parcels, count of occupied parcels, and count of vacant parcels. These described the number of property parcels that were legally considered vacant – i.e. at the time of the Census record, there was nobody permanently living in the parcel or it was occupied entirely by individuals who maintained full-time residences elsewhere. After summarizing across walksheds, dividing the count of vacant parcels by total parcels to obtain a proportion, standardizing via z-score, and ranking the walksheds, we had a column describing parks by scaled vacancy.



The walkshed with the highest rate of vacancy was Robert E. Williams Park in the Upper Hill District, while the following three were in Homewood and the remainder of the top 10, apart from Catalano Parklet in Troy Hill, were in Downtown Pittsburgh. The Hill District and Homewood have historically experienced economic disinvestment, leading to deteriorating residential infrastructure that renders many property parcels uninhabitable. The culprit of Downtown's high vacancy rates is likely the high density of commercially-zoned parcels, hotels, and office buildings with no legal residents.



Vacancy rates were lowest in Banksville Park's walkshed in the South Hills, at just 5% unoccupied parcels. Many of the walksheds with the least vacancy are clustered in the corridor from Friendship to Swisshelm Park, encompassing areas of Shadyside, Point Breeze, Squirrel Hill, and assorted walksheds surrounding Frick Park. Another noticeable hotspot of low vacancy rates is the heavily residential South Hills, home to Banksville Park, as well as several other walksheds from Crafton Heights to Brookline Memorial Parks. As we will see in the Analysis section, there seems to be some correlation between walksheds' proportion of residents below the poverty line and unoccupied parcels – the high-vacancy walksheds in the Hill District and Homewood are also among the poorest on average – but that association is not statistically strong due to the high vacancy and low poverty of areas like Downtown Pittsburgh and Troy Hill.

After cleaning, indexing, and visualizing Census data related to race, age, poverty, and vacancy, we considered other factors to statistically describe the parks and their walksheds – namely the environment, public health, and crime – and further analyze these metrics and the relationships between them.

II. Data and Methodology → B. Environment

For our analysis of the parks' environmental data, we used three variables: tree canopy coverage, pollution, and sewershed priority. The tree canopy coverage data was sourced from the U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service's 2021 Conterminous United States (CONUS) Tree Canopy Cover (TCC) dataset. This report uses satellite imagery to calculate the tree canopy coverage percentage of 30×30 meter areas across the Conterminous United States. The pollution data was sourced from a study of annual North American pm2.5 concentrations completed by Washington University of St. Louis. This particular dataset measures the pm2.5 concentrations in $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ within $0.01^\circ \times 0.01^\circ$ areas in the year of 2022. The sewershed priority data was sourced from the 2024 updated dataset describing combined sewershed priority ratings completed by the Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority (PWSA). Priority of a sewershed is measured based on the need for intervention in mitigating overflowing of sewers and storm drains. Specific tracts of land within Pittsburgh's city limits were given one of three ratings by the PWSA: high priority, secondary priority, and low priority.

Each dataset was attached to individual parks and their walksheds through the use of geospatial analysis software. The tree canopy and pollution data were loaded as raster files, and therefore a technique called zonal averaging was used to calculate the average tree canopy coverage and pollution levels for each park and walkshed. The sewershed priority rating data was loaded as a vector layer, therefore areal interpolation was used to calculate an aggregated score of priority. Two additional variables were calculated for sewershed priority measuring the percentage of each park contained within a secondary priority and high priority sewershed boundary.

After we calculated tree canopy averages, pm2.5 concentration averages, and aggregated sewershed priority rankings for each park and walkshed, we created additional z-score variables for each. These z-scores variables represent a more standardized form of the data and measure the amount of standard deviations above or below the mean each park and walkshed is for the respective variable.


Using Python packages including seaborn and matplotlib, we visualized the environmental data using bar graphs, scatterplots, and other methods to highlight specific parks with a need for environmental intervention.

II. Data and Methodology → B. Environment → 1. Tree Canopy


The technique of zonal averaging was used to calculate the average percentage of tree canopy coverage within each park. This technique involves averaging all of the tree canopy coverage percentages (each being calculated in 30 × 30 meter areas) contained within each park and walkshed boundary. The variables of “Tree_Canopy_Park” and “Tree_Canopy_Walkshed” represent average percentages and serve as an accurate indicator for tree canopy distribution among the entire park or walkshed.




This graphic showcases each Pittsburgh park layered on top of a raster layer sourced from the U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service’s calculation of tree canopy coverage percentages in the Conterminous United States. Areas with darker green colors represent a higher percentage of tree canopy coverage. Through calculating the zonal tree canopy coverage averages of each park, we were able to compute the mean and median tree canopy coverage for each park in Pittsburgh and rank each park from most to least tree canopy coverage. The mean and median tree canopy coverage percentage across all parks within Pittsburgh is 26.43% and 20.42% respectively. This indicates a right skew in the distribution across all parks and is showcased in the histogram below.




Parks in Pittsburgh significantly vary in their tree canopy coverage with a standard deviation of 17.37% and a range of 76.57%. There is a high concentration of parks below the mean, especially those with around 10%-20% coverage, and a less concentrated and more dispersed collection of parks that exceed the mean. Below is a bar graph that showcases the top 10 best and worst parks for tree canopy coverage.



On the high side of the extreme is Hays Woods, Riverview Park, and Sheraden Park. Parks on the extreme low end include Southside Market House, Thomas Park, and Denny Park. It is important to analyze the underlying reasons of why these parks are on the extreme ends of the dataset. For example, Southside Market House is a historic building that happens to be listed as a park and should have an expected tree canopy coverage of nearly zero. Additionally, parks that are specifically limited to sports fields, like Manchester School Park and Homewood Park, are expected to have low tree canopy. On the other side of the spectrum, Hays Woods is known to be an undeveloped tract of land that lies within city boundaries and it only became a park in 2023, and is therefore expected to have high tree canopy coverage. Three neighborhood parks in the bottom ten that are not buildings and are not specifically limited to sports fields are Denny Park, Enright Park, and Larimer Park. Below is a bar graph representing the bottom 10 parks for tree canopy coverage in parks categorized as neighborhood parks. Neighborhood parks tend to have less tree canopy coverage on average than community parks. All parks specifically limited to sports fields were manually excluded from this bar graph. This includes parks where the entirety of its area comprises a sports field and parking lot. No intervention on tree canopy would be viable in these parks which include Manchester Field and Homewood Park.



While community parks have a higher tree canopy coverage on average than neighborhood parks, some of these parks still struggle with low tree canopy. Below is a bar graph representing the bottom five community parks for tree canopy coverage.




A point of notice is that park acreage is moderately positively correlated with park tree canopy coverage. Smaller parks tend to have lower tree canopy coverage while larger parks have higher tree canopy coverage. This relationship will be explored further in the analysis section of this report. Additionally, relationships between park tree canopy coverage and other factors like depression will be analyzed.


Tree canopy coverage percentages were also calculated for each walkshed. This allowed us to see the differences between a park's tree canopy and its surrounding area's tree canopy. The same method of zonal averaging was used to calculate each walkshed's tree canopy coverage percentage.

II. Data and Methodology → B. Environment → 2. Pollution


Pollution of a park in this report is measured by the average pm2.5 concentration measured in micrograms per cubic meter ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$). The technique of zonal averaging was used to calculate the average pollution within each park. This technique involves averaging all of the pm2.5 concentration levels (each being calculated in $0.01^\circ \times 0.01^\circ$ or $\sim 1.11 \times .844$ km areas) contained within each park and walkshed boundary. The variables of “Pollution_Park” and “Pollution_Walkshed” represent average pm2.5 concentrations and serve as an accurate indicator for pollution levels across the entire park or walkshed.



This graphic showcases each Pittsburgh park layered on top of a raster layer sourced from the Washington University of St. Louis' calculation of pm2.5 concentrations in North America. Areas with darker blue colors represent a higher concentration of pollution. Through calculating the zonal pollution averages of each park, we were able to compute the mean and median pollution levels for each park in Pittsburgh and rank each park from best to worst in terms of their air quality. The mean and median pm2.5 concentration levels across all parks within Pittsburgh is $8.45 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and $8.47 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ respectively. This indicates a relatively normal distribution across all parks and is showcased in the histogram below.



Parks in Pittsburgh vary slightly in their pollution levels with a standard deviation of $.31 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and a range of $1.51 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. All parks are within two standard deviations of the mean with the exception of Warrington Park. Warrington Park is a statistical outlier in low pollution levels. As shown in the raster layer graphic, the area of Mt. Washington has the least amount of pollution and therefore parks close-by like Warrington Park, Lodge Potenza Senior Center, Venson Park, and McKinley Park are among the parks with the best air quality. Below is a bar graph that showcases the top 10 best and worst parks for air quality.






As shown in the raster layer graphic, parks on the North Side are within the area with the worst pollution levels in Pittsburgh's city limits. All ten of the parks with the worst air quality are located north of the Allegheny River.

Pittsburgh as a whole is a city that is below average in terms of their air quality. As of February 7th, 2024, the United States Environmental Protection Agency has set “the level of the primary (health-based) annual PM2.5 standard at 9.0 micrograms per cubic meter to provide increased public health protection, consistent with the available health science.” The top three parks for worst air quality in Pittsburgh barely exceed this new standard of $9.0 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$.


Pollution levels were also calculated for each walkshed. This allowed us to see the differences between a park’s pollution level and its surrounding area’s pollution level. The same method of zonal averaging was used to calculate each walkshed’s pm2.5 concentration average.

II. Data and Methodology → B. Environment → 3. Sewersheds Priority

The technique of aerial interpolation was used to calculate the aggregated sewersheds priority score within each park. The Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority (PWSA) has rated tracts of land within Pittsburgh based on their sewersheds's need for intervention. The PWSA assigns a 2 to areas with high priority, a 1 to areas with secondary priority, and a 0 to areas with low priority. Through aerial interpolation, sewersheds priority scores are attached to the parks and are weighted depending on how much of the park intersects with the boundaries created by the PWSA. The resulting weighted average of all intersections represent the final sewersheds priority score, with the minimum of 0 being low priority and the maximum of 2 being high priority. Below is a pie chart representing three groups of sewersheds ratings. Parks with an aggregated priority score of 0-.66 are labelled as “lower priority,” .66-1.33 are labelled as “~secondary priority,” and 1.33-2 are “higher priority.”



The mean of .70 reveals that parks on average in Pittsburgh are located within areas with lower priority ratings. However, there are 24 parks, making up 14.3% of all parks, that exceed an aggregated score of 1.33 and can be labelled as “higher priority.” Below is a bar graph that showcases all of the parks that fall within this category of “higher priority.”



Among the 24 parks that are categorized as “higher priority,” 19 of them have a priority rating of exactly 2. This means they are located fully within a PWSA sewershed boundary with the “high priority” rating. 5 of the parks have a rating greater than 1.33 but less than 2. This means the park intersects with a “high priority” boundary and one of the lower rated sewershed priority boundaries. However, all of these parks intersect the most with the “high priority” boundaries.

Two additional variables were calculated for explaining the parks’ sewershed priorities. These two variables, labelled as “percent_rank1” and “percent_rank2,” measure the percentage of the area of the park that exists within the sewershed priority boundaries of “secondary priority” and “high priority” respectively. These variables are especially useful in interpreting the aggregated priority rating. They show exactly what comprises each rating for a park by giving exact percentages of the parks’ intersected areas with all three types of sewershed rating boundaries.

II. Data and Methodology → C. Crime

The development of the crime data began with the collection of Pittsburgh police blotter data. This crime data was then combined with the walkshed and park data provided by the Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy to produce charts and statistics to provide insights into the relationships between parks and different crime statistics.

The police blotter data came with crime hierarchy descriptions, when the crimes took place as well as where. The crimes were each associated with a longitude and latitude point, making attachment of each crime to a park or walkshed simple after the data was cleaned. Using geospatial analysis software, we attached counts of longitude and latitude points that fall within each park's boundaries, as well as each park's walksheds without the parks within them. This separation is crucial as it effectively allows the analysis of which parks have higher crimes per acre within the park versus crimes per acre within the walkshed for each park specifically and across other parks.



II. Data and Methodology → C. Crime → 1. Variables

II. Data and Methodology → D. Health

Health metrics were obtained from Census Data collected by CDC: PLACES, which provides health and health-related data using small area estimation for counties, incorporated and census designated places, census tracts, and ZIP Code Tabulation areas. Health metrics analyzed in this dataset of park metrics include: Diabetes, Depression, Obesity and Asthma. The data was obtained from the dataset, PLACES: Census Tract Data. Crude Prevalence of each disease was presented as a percentage of the population in each census tract, along with the total number of residents, parsed by adults (18 years or older) or children.


Walkshed data was provided by the organization that previously worked on this project for the Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy. This dataset included outdated metrics for each park, as well as the geological coordinates of each park's walkshed.



II. Data and Methodology → D. Health → 1. Variables




III. Analysis






Top 10 Parks by Diversity Score



Diversity Score Components by Park







Poverty vs. Vacancy in Park Walksheds



Poverty Levels vs. Median Age in Park Walksheds







IV. Conclusion

V. References

Environmental links:

<https://data.fs.usda.gov/geodata/rastergateway/treecanopycover/#table1>

<https://data.wprdc.org/dataset/combined-sewershed>

<https://www.epa.gov/pm-pollution/national-ambient-air-quality-standards-naaqs-pm>

<https://sites.wustl.edu/acag/datasets/surface-pm2-5/>

Interface Studio LLC. (2019). *Restoring Pittsburgh Parks Investment Strategy – Walksheds*. Retrieved February 3, 2025.

United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service. (2021). *The National Land Cover Database (NLCD) Tree Canopy Cover (TCC), PA*. U.S. Department of Agriculture. Retrieved January 28, 2025, from

<https://data.fs.usda.gov/geodata/rastergateway/treecanopycover/#table1>

U.S. Census Bureau. (2023). *American Community Survey 5-year Estimate of Age and Sex by Tract in Allegheny County, PA*. U.S. Department of Commerce. Retrieved February 3, 2025, from <https://data.census.gov/>

U.S. Census Bureau. (2023). *American Community Survey 5-year Estimate of Poverty by Tract in Allegheny County, PA*. U.S. Department of Commerce. Retrieved February 3, 2025, from <https://data.census.gov/>

U.S. Census Bureau. (2020). *Race and Ethnicity by Tract in Allegheny County, PA*. U.S. Department of Commerce. Retrieved February 3, 2025, from <https://data.census.gov/>

U.S. Census Bureau. (2020). *Vacancy by Block Group in Allegheny County, PA*. U.S. Department of Commerce. Retrieved February 3, 2025, from <https://data.census.gov/>

VI. Appendix

II A. 1-4 Census

In Deliverable → Datasets

Parks_Master.csv: cleaned and spatially attached data including counts and proportions of demographic, environmental, health, and crime data in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania

1. objectid: a unique numerical identifier for each park and their walkshed
2. updatepknm: name of the park to whom the park or walkshed data corresponds
3. Tree_Canopy_Park: averaged percentage of tree canopy coverage for a given park
4. Tree_Canopy_Walkshed: averaged percentage of tree canopy coverage for a given walkshed
5. Pollution_Park: averaged pm2.5 concentration level measured in $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ for a given park
6. Pollution_Walkshed: averaged pm2.5 concentration level measured in $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ for a given walkshed
7. Sewersheds_Park: aggregated priority score based off PWSA ratings for a given park
8. Sewersheds_Walkshed: aggregated priority score based off PWSA ratings for a given walkshed
9. percent_rank1: percentage of the park that falls within secondary priority sewersheds boundary
10. percent_rank2: percentage of the park that falls within high priority sewersheds boundary
11. **Total_population_18plus**
12. **Total_asthma**
13. **Total_obesity**
14. **Total_depression**
15. **Total_diabetes**
16. **Asthma_rate**
17. **Obesity_rate**
18. **Depression_rate**
19. **Diabetes_rate**
20. **Park_Acreage:** total acreage of the park
21. **TotalCrimesInParks**
22. **ViolentCrimesInParks**
23. **NonViolentCrimeCount_Parks**
24. **TotalCrimeDensity_Parks**
25. **ViolentCrimeDensity_Parks**
26. **NonViolentCrimeDensity_Parks**
27. **TotalCrimesInWalkshedDifferences**
28. **Walkshed_Acreage:** total acreage of the park's walkshed
29. **ViolentCrimeCountsInWalksheds**
30. **NonViolentCrimeCount_Walksheds**
31. **TotalCrimeDensity_Walksheds**
32. **ViolentCrimeDensity_Walksheds**
33. **NonViolentCrimeDensity_Walksheds**
34. sum_Total: count of walkshed residents
35. sum_Hispanic.or.Latino: count of Hispanic/Latino residents
36. sum_Not.Hispanic.or.Latino: count of non-Hispanic/Latino residents
37. sum_Population.of.one.race: count of single race category residents
38. sum_White.alone: count of White residents
39. sum_Black.or.African.American.alone: count of Black residents
40. sum_American.Indian.and.Alaska.Native.alone: count of Native American residents
41. sum_Asian.alone: count of Asian residents
42. sum_Native.Hawaiian.and.Other.Pacific.Islander.alone: count of Pacific Islander residents

43. sum_Some.Other.Race.alone: count of residents of other races
 44. sum_Population.of.two.or.more.races: count of residents of two or more races
 45. sum_Total.parcels: count of property parcels in the walkshed
 46. sum_Occupied: count of occupied parcels
 47. sum_Vacant: count of vacant parcels
 48. sum_Poverty.status.determined.total: count of residents whose poverty status is known
 49. sum_Below.poverty.level.: count of residents below the poverty level
 50. sum_Under.5.years: count of residents under 5 years of age
 51. sum_X5.to.9.years: count of residents between 5 and 9 years of age
 52. sum_X10.to.14.years: count of residents between 10 and 14 years of age
 53. sum_X15.to.19.years: count of residents between 15 and 19 years of age
 54. sum_X20.to.24.years: count of residents between 20 and 24 years of age
 55. sum_X25.to.29.years: count of residents between 25 and 29 years of age
 56. sum_X30.to.34.years: count of residents between 30 and 34 years of age
 57. sum_X35.to.39.years: count of residents between 35 and 39 years of age
 58. sum_X40.to.44.years: count of residents between 40 and 44 years of age
 59. sum_X45.to.49.years: count of residents between 45 and 49 years of age
 60. sum_X50.to.54.years: count of residents between 50 and 54 years of age
 61. sum_X55.to.59.years: count of residents between 55 and 59 years of age
 62. sum_X60.to.64.years: count of residents between 60 and 64 years of age
 63. sum_X65.to.69.years: count of residents between 65 and 69 years of age
 64. sum_X70.to.74.years: count of residents between 70 and 74 years of age
 65. sum_X75.to.79.years: count of residents between 75 and 79 years of age
 66. sum_X80.to.84.years: count of residents between 80 and 84 years of age
 67. sum_X85.years.and.over: count of residents over 85 years of age
 68. sum_Total_pct: a check that %s are calculated correctly, should read 100
 69. sum_Hispanic.or.Latino_pct: % of Hispanic/Latino residents
 70. sum_Not.Hispanic.or.Latino_pct: % of non-Hispanic/Latino residents
 71. sum_Population.of.one.race_pct: % of residents of one race
 72. sum_White.alone_pct: % of White residents
 73. sum_Black.or.African.American.alone_pct: % of Black residents
 74. sum_American.Indian.and.Alaska.Native.alone_pct: % of Native American residents
 75. sum_Asian.alone_pct: % of Asian residents
 76. sum_Native.Hawaiian.and.Other.Pacific.Islander.alone_pct: % of Pacific Islander residents
 77. sum_Some.Other.Race.alone_pct: % of residents of other races
 78. sum_Population.of.two.or.more.races_pct: % of residents of two or more races
 79. sum_Poverty.status.determined.total_pct: % of residents whose poverty status is known
 80. sum_Below.poverty.level._pct: % of residents under the poverty level
 81. sum_Under.5.years_pct: % of residents under 5 years of age
 82. sum_X5.to.9.years_pct: % of residents between 5 and 9 years of age
 83. sum_X10.to.14.years_pct: % of residents between 10 and 14 years of age
 84. sum_X15.to.19.years_pct: % of residents between 15 and 19 years of age
 85. sum_X20.to.24.years_pct: % of residents between 20 and 24 years of age
 86. sum_X25.to.29.years_pct: % of residents between 25 and 29 years of age
 87. sum_X30.to.34.years_pct: % of residents between 30 and 34 years of age
 88. sum_X35.to.39.years_pct: % of residents between 35 and 39 years of age
 89. sum_X40.to.44.years_pct: % of residents between 40 and 44 years of age
 90. sum_X45.to.49.years_pct: % of residents between 45 and 49 years of age
 91. sum_X50.to.54.years_pct: % of residents between 50 and 54 years of age
 92. sum_X55.to.59.years_pct: % of residents between 55 and 59 years of age
 93. sum_X60.to.64.years_pct: % of residents between 60 and 64 years of age

- 
94. sum_X65.to.69.years_pct: % of residents between 65 and 69 years of age
 95. sum_X70.to.74.years_pct: % of residents between 70 and 74 years of age
 96. sum_X75.to.79.years_pct: % of residents between 75 and 79 years of age
 97. sum_X80.to.84.years_pct: % of residents between 80 and 84 years of age
 98. sum_X85.years.and.over_pct: % of residents over 85 years of age
 99. sum_Total.parcels_pct: a check that %s are calculated correctly, should read 100
 - 100.sum_Vacant_pct: % of parcels that are vacant
 - 101.sum_Occupied_pct: % of parcels that are occupied