The Legacy of Industrial Rivers

By Edward K. Muller

A "clear" day, 1891. As Pittsburgh developed into a manufacturing giant, its rivers — Monongahela on the right, Allegheny to the left, and Ohio — were harnessed in the service of the economy. A century of industrial use left the rivers fouled and largely forgotten in the public's mind as resources to enjoy. Views of the rivers' potential are changing, but the steel experience remains fundamental to the city's identity.
PITTSBURGH is a river city. Its three rivers complexly dissect the region, separating communities, obstructing movement, and requiring innumerable bridges. The river flood plains provide a great deal of the
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area's flat land, and riverfront lands on the shores opposite downtown have become prime development sites in the 1980s. Despite their apparent omnipresence, the rivers and their adjacent lands are neither easily accessible to the public nor an integral part of the everyday lives of Pittsburghers. Pittsburgh has rediscovered the commercial value of the rivers in the 1980s, but the industrial legacy of the rivers blunts the ability to envision their value as daily amenities.

Development of the riverfront seems to be going on everywhere in Pittsburgh. The successful Station Square complex lies on the Monongahela's southern shore. The new Buhl Science Center will rise along the Ohio just below the Point, while the Allegheny River's north shore anchors what city officials believe will be a series of new developments from Three Rivers Stadium up river to the Heinz plant or perhaps as far as Herr's Island. The Allegheny's southern shore in the Strip District, adjacent to downtown, has also been the focus of intense speculation for a festival market, although it no longer seems to be a viable project.
Point State Park commands the key site at the junction of the Monongahela and Allegheny rivers and appropriately celebrates the birth of the Ohio River and the city. The Park accommodates individual recreation and public programming that attracts thousands of spectators. The Three Rivers Regatta has become an annual festival, while boaters enjoy cruising the waterways around the Point and throughout the urban river basins or pools.

Numerous marinas provide dock space for the boats at sites outside the City of Pittsburgh. A few offer restaurants, water sports, and night life. Construction of a waterslide park on the West Homestead riverfront, plans for waterfront development in other Monongahela River towns, Allegheny County’s initiation of a Riverfront Policies Study, and the City’s recently completed waterfront comprehensive plan signal the diffusion of riverfront interest away from the downtown district.

For a river city, it is appropriate that the rivers share the focus of development activity. This, however, has not always been the case. For most of the twentieth century, Pittsburghers paid little attention to their rivers. The development of Point State Park after World War II recognized the historical and symbolic value of the three rivers’ convergence. Unfortunately, this major redevelopment of riverfront space was not generally extended to the improvement of other river areas. Although urban America began to rediscover the amenity and developmental qualities of waterfronts in the 1960s and 1970s, Pittsburgh’s recognition of its river resources lagged behind. Once the leader in urban redevelopment, Pittsburgh pursued only modest improvements such as Roberto Clemente Park and the early phase of privately developed Station Square, both of which scarcely tapped the
rivers’ potential. The recent interest in riverfronts imitates successful commercial ventures of other cities but undervalues the scenic and recreational resources of rivers for the public, despite the unqualified success of the small South Side Riverside Park that encourages recreational uses.

Many reasons explain the city’s slow recognition of the rivers’ tremendous potential. With the region’s industrial restructuring, population decline, and slow pace of economic growth since the 1960s, there was little pressure for the expansion of downtown to nearby riverfronts, inhibiting plans for innovative and costly commercial projects. Even though the decline of industries yielded river land at reasonable prices, large scale projects still faced substantial obstacles, including operating railroads, fragmented property ownership, the perceived need for expensive river edge reinforcements, the presence of toxic wastes at some sites, and the desire to replace former plants and warehouses with activities that restored jobs and tax revenues.

As detrimental to redevelopment as these factors were, however, a fundamentally negative attitude toward the rivers, based on generations of everyday life in Pittsburgh and held by the general public as well as civic leaders, deterred riverfront renewal for at least a decade after other cities were moving forward. It still retards a fresh, innovative examination of possibilities. Since the late nineteenth century, the three rivers have been the blighted backyards and handmaidens of our industries. They were urban rivers, or working rivers — dirty, polluted, dangerous, and made inaccessible by railroads, industries, and refuse which have lined the shores. They are viewed as neither scenic nor recreationally desirable as the “real” rivers that course through the countryside on their way to the city that will defile them. When Pittburghers turned their backs on the rivers in pursuit of industrial wealth, they began a long process of discounting their value, other than in economic terms, to their lives. After generations of neglect and repulsion, except by children fascinated by working things or rivermen who understood their mysteries, the city’s rivers could not easily be viewed as water amenities in the same manner as oceans, bays, and lakes are perceived. Years after dramatic improvement in the quality of the rivers’ water and major new riverfront developments, this generally negative, or at best blase attitude toward the rivers and riverfront lands continues today.

THE RIVERS BEFORE INDUSTRIALIZATION

The first white explorers and settlers in southwestern Pennsylvania during the eighteenth century valued both the three rivers and triangular site at their junction for frontier and trade advantage. The importance of the rivers shifted from military considerations to commerce in the 1780s when the Ohio Valley frontier opened for permanent settlement. Like other interior towns, Pittsburgh saw its future in the pursuit of western frontier markets. Sloping mudflats on the north shore of the Monongahela provided a natural wharf, and this wharf became the heart of development in frontier Pittsburgh. The original rectangular street plan was oriented to the wharf, and growth spread outward from this initial focus along the shores and back into the triangular area.

By the 1830s hundreds of steamboats annually called at the Monongahela Wharf. As trade burgeoned, blocks adjacent to the Wharf became densely developed. Wagons and drays crowded Water Street and the flats; goods were piled high, while teamsters, carters, stevedores, laborers, agents, merchants, and numerous others hurried amidst the clutter. Merchants’ warehouses, artisan shops, inns, and taverns lined the block fronts near the Wharf. Manufacturers also claimed riverfront sites at the edges of the trade center below Ferry (now Stanwix) and above Smithfield streets.

While the rivers and adjacent lands were essential to the city’s economic life, they were also a public resource in other ways. Residents had ready access to the rivers for fishing, boating, or leisurely walks along the banks. Before the years when smoke hung heavily over the town, visitors noted the beauty of the riverine location. In the 1780s Hugh Henry Brackenridge portrayed a picturesque Pittsburgh for his newspaper readers.

You will see in a spring evening the banks of the rivers lined with men fishing at intervals, from one another. This, with the streams gently gliding, the woods, at a distance green, and the shadows lengthening towards the town, forms a delightful scene...
To observe any river event during the industrializing era — here, from the Mon Wharf at the downtown Wabash Bridge, c. 1910 — Pittsburghers overlooked coal barges and smoky mills that dominated the riverfront. Industry and railroads owned nearly all the flat land, cutting off residential areas from the rivers, as at Homestead in 1959. U.S. Steel’s Carrie Furnaces, its many smokestacks belching, supplied iron via a railroad river bridge to the firm’s Homestead works since Carnegie’s day. Today, a park with a beach and marina are near completion downstream of the idled plants on the Monongahela.

Some of the larger houses were built on sites back from the river but with a view of and access to the water. In her description of Captain O’Hara’s home, Mrs. Mary Dewes noted that “they have a full view of the Monongahela, and the Ohio Rivers; it is impossible for the most lively imagination to paint a situation and prospects more delightful.”

The rivers also provided a convenient source of water and a handy means of waste disposal. While cooking water came most often from wells, individuals and private carriers drew river water for other purposes. In 1828 the first waterworks was constructed, pumping water from the Allegheny to a reservoir for gravity distribution. Storm and waste water running in street gutters carried away sewage, animal offal, slop water, dirt, trash, and other refuse to the runs and rivers, which obliquely sent them downstream. Private refuse collectors sometimes dumped their loads in the rivers, and in 1844 a barge served as a public dump that was emptied downstream. River water, with its cleansing capacity, was free, and as long as there was easy access to the rivers, residents could adopt the common American frontier attitude of viewing physical resources as both inexhaustible and available for private use or assets. In this manner, residents took for granted the river’s beauty and value as an amenity, while exploiting it for municipal and private needs.

Commercial and industrial growth between the 1840s and 1870s generated development that consumed enormous amounts of riverfront acreage. Transportation improvements from steamboats and canals to railroads, which vastly enhanced Pittsburgh’s commercial prospects, typically occupied the floodplains of the rivers. Western frontier and regional markets encouraged the expansion of important iron and glass industries. By 1872 this industrialization had followed the railroads along Pittsburgh’s riverfronts. Foundries, boiler works, machine shops, and planing mills occupied the Point area and a few blocks up the Allegheny shore. From 10th Street to 48th Street in Lawrenceville the waterfront was the home of iron mills, including some of the area’s most notable ones, lumberyards, foundries, forges, a few glass houses, and several oil refineries at the upriver end. With all the refineries and the rafts laden with wooden barrels of oil, petroleum frequently befouled the Allegheny River. In Allegheny City, textile mills, tanneries and at the eastern end oil refineries added variety to the profusion of iron, glass, and lumber works. The south shore of the Mon from the mouth of Saw Mill Run to 28th Street contained the familiar array of iron, glass, and lumber operations.

Despite the factories, warehouses, and railroads that lined the shores, Pittsburghers retained access to the rivers. Streets still ran to the rivers’ edges so that residents could reach the shores. Clusters of workers’ houses mingled with industries on many riverfronts; and a few wealthy families still lived on their riverfront properties, although their homes seemed increasingly incongruent amidst the industrial landscape. Rowing was a popular sport, particularly among working class men. Nearly two dozen boathouses stored the racing shells and doubled as social clubs. Races attracted thousands of spectators, although boats were also rented for more leisurely rows.

Beyond the city limits, wealthy families owned river estates for permanent homes or rural retreats. New suburban residences appeared in river communities such as Sewickley, Hazelwood, and even Homestead, where railroads provided reasonable commuting to Pittsburgh. At Glenwood, a public hotel and private club provided a bucolic environment for well-heeled urban visitors.
Even as Hazelwood enjoyed a brief period as an elite suburban community, industrialization was slowly taking over its riverfront, an omen of Hazelwood’s and the region’s future. In 1859 James Laughlin built two blast furnaces and some coke ovens. By 1872 a few additional industrial enterprises operated in Hazelwood. River floodplains were becoming too valuable to remain available for residences and public access. Moreover, the deteriorating quality of river water diminished the river’s attraction. Pittsburgh’s failure to build adequate sewage and storm water systems only added to the pollution of the rivers, which were already carrying the effluent of upriver communities. The numerous bridges erected in the mid-century era, along with an increasing reliance on railroads instead of river movement, reflected the city’s growing detachment from its traditional well-spring of the rivers.

INDUSTRIALIZED RIVERS

In 1872, at the same time as Hazelwood’s elite residents began moving away, Andrew Carnegie chose Braddock, a few miles further up the Monongahela, for his new, large Bessemer steel works. While Carnegie and his associates planned the Edgar Thomson Works, across the river at Homestead Abdiel McClure subdivided his farm in hopes of attracting suburban buyers. However, rivals of Carnegie built the Pittsburgh Bessemer Steel Company on Homestead’s riverfront in 1880, dashing forever its suburban prospects. With these projects Pittsburgh’s iron and steel masters embarked on an era of unprecedented indus-
These new large mills turned their backs on the rivers. They faced the communities that developed around them; the rivers became their backyards. The rivers provided water for industrial processes, flushed away their wastes, and moved some of their bulk materials and products. Industries dumped slag, sludge, and debris on neglected riverlands. They built large concrete bulkheads, pumping and power stations, and load-
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trial expansion. Between 1880 and World War I, large integrated steel mills and smaller specialty works were built for miles along the rivers, wherever enough flat land existed.\textsuperscript{14} If there were not a mill on a floodplain, then railroad yards, fuel storage tanks, barge loading facilities, boatyards, chemical plants, or numerous other industries occupied the site.
ing cranes along the banks. Railroad tracks multiplied with the increase in industrial activity. The railroads and giant mills — noisy, filthy, dangerous, and off-limits to strangers — blocked public access to the rivers. Some adventurous individuals ignored the dangers of busy railroads, trespassed on factory property, breached security fences to reach the shorelines, or risked their health by swimming in the rivers, but most residents lost interest. The rivers were no longer an amenity, no longer central to Pittsburgh’s life. Both industries and communities polluted the waters. The water’s appearance and smell were repugnant. The association at the turn of the century of polluted water with fatal diseases such as typhoid exacerbated the rivers’ negative image. Flora and fauna deteriorated, leaving an unattractive scarred landscape. Towboat traffic intimidated recreational users. Vast fleets of coal barges plied the water, and when tied up along the shore further barred access. Industrial smoke mixed with fog to enshroud the river valleys. Frequent damaging floods ravaged river communities. While Pittsburghers built small cottage retreats along the rivers in rural areas of Pennsylvania and West Virginia, they ignored the working segments of the rivers in the metropolitan area, which were inaccessible and dangerous.

In downtown Pittsburgh, where the Monongahela Wharf had long reigned as its heart, high value development moved away from the riverfronts with the emergence of the financial district on Fourth Avenue and new skyscrapers and fashionable retail district of department stores and theaters between Stanwix and Grant streets. Obsolescence spread along Water Street and the Wharf as river traffic steadily declined. Railroad yards and decrepit warehouses dogged the Point, and the once elegant Exposition Halls faded with time and neglect. The City vacated the ends of dozens of streets that had originally abutted the rivers’ edges, turning them over to businesses to expand their facilities. Municipal services such as the Western Penitentiary, the water treatment plant, and electric power utilities were placed on the riverfronts and islands. Flooding damped any remaining enthusiasm for living near rivers; along the shores shanty boats formed transient communities, some of which sported unsavory reputations for vice.

Rather than generating economic growth, the rivers now required costly management to support urban life. The Flood Commission deliberated for years on controlling their devastating power. The state-of-the-art Aspinwall water filtration facility was necessary to check disease. More and larger bridges necessitated vast expenditures, and civic leaders periodically considered ways to eliminate blighted waterfront buildings. Peripatetic showboats, river excursions, and occasional civic celebrations at the Wharf retained some recreational aspects of the rivers, but they were tawdry events in comparison to the newer mass leisure pursuits of the early twentieth century. In 1910 Frederick Law Olmstead, Jr., principal of one of the nation’s distinguished planning firms by the same name, described Pittsburgh’s waterfront as “a great public asset which now lies undeveloped both from the point of view of transportation and from that of recreation and civic beauty.” He envisioned the construction of a modern quay with a wide, landscaped boulevard and promenade on an overlooking embankment, where people could enjoy the natural beauty and fascinating activity of the river in a manner similar to the riverscapes at Lyons, Berlin, Frankfurt, and even Paris. Moreover, Olmstead urged turning the Point into a monument worthy of its “historical and topographical significance.” Olmstead’s proposal fell on deaf ears. It would be three decades before his view of the Point would be addressed, but his characterization of the riverfront so conflicted with Pittsburgh’s perception of its rivers that the ideal opportunity for rebuilding would even be squandered during urban renewal after 1945.

RIVERFRONTS AND URBAN RENEWAL

In the two decades following World War II, Pittsburgh tackled the renewal of its blighted downtown areas and spoiled environment in hopes of maintaining its economic vitality and rekindling community spirit. Pittsburgh’s Renaissance largely met these goals, but by 1960s, at the height of its national acclaim, critics charged Renaissance with an elitist approach to planning that overlooked or even exacerbated social problems. Few critics lamented the similar neglect or obliteration of the riverfronts during this period. The longstanding utilitarian perception of the rivers remained intact, and the riverfronts were recycled to work for the city. We had so lost contact with them that their potential as an amenity was ignored, even when in the 1970s new values more sympathetic to riverfront renewal came into vogue across urban America.

The rivers were, nevertheless, critical to the success of Renaissance: flood control and Point State Park were linchpins. Flood control encouraged new investment in flood prone downtown and the agreement to build Point State Park leveraged private investment for adjacent Gateway Center, generating momentum for urban renewal. Conceived as a symbolic statement commemorating the three rivers, the Park opened visually at its western end to the Ohio River’s wide channel, prompting users to reflect on the river’s majesty. Despite new bulkheads and filled land that extended into the
In many neighborhoods, a river could be a thousand miles away. At Sarah Street on the South Side, 27th Street ends at Jones & Laughlin Steel’s Pittsburgh Works on Carson Street. Beyond the fence and buildings, c. 1950, flows the Monongahela. Some city dwellers carved out their own access. In the “Painter’s Row” section of South Side, across from the Point, residents fashioned a beach from steep river bank below the railroad tracks, behind Carnegie Steel’s Painter Mill. Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph photographer Frank Bingaman took the picture in 1908.

rivers, the Park’s formal layout and remoteness from downtown invited passive use rather than active participation. Special events brought participation, but the Park remained aloof from downtown’s daily activities.

The interest in the rivers at the Point did not extend beyond Point State Park. Except for the forks of the Ohio, the rivers were not considered an asset upon which to launch Renaissance. Renaissance looked inside the Golden Triangle and not at the edges. The most dramatic projects, such as Gateway Center, Mellon Square, or the Civic Arena, rejuvenated interior spaces that were unrelated to the rivers, while the riverfronts were reshaped to aid the success of this interior. The planners charged with ameliorating Pittsburgh’s problems faced none more critical than traffic congestion in the confined downtown. The riverfronts presented an obvious opportunity to build highways that would funnel vehicles around downtown. Moreover, the Monongahela Wharf offered underused land for parking. The construction of the Penn–Lincoln Parkway, Fort Pitt Boulevard and Wharf parking along the Mon, and the 10th Street Bypass and Duquesne Boulevard along the Allegheny, effectively cut off the riverfronts from downtown.

Urban renewal and civic improvement crossed the rivers in the 1960s without much better results for the riverfronts. Spreading blight and the pressures of decentralization weakened wholesaling and manufacturing firms along the rivers’ shores, making land available for redevelopment. Some of these lands were vacated or repackaged for industrial expansion; other sites accommodated new utilities like Alcosan’s sewage treatment plant or other municipal services. Three Rivers Stadium was built on one such site with a potentially dramatic view of downtown, but despite advice to the contrary, its builders chose a closed circular design, and surrounding parking lots and multi-lane highways ignored the rivers. The construction of Roberto Clemente Park improved this section of the shore, but it could not overcome the insular design of the stadium. Site acquisition for the North Shore expressway and urban renewal project cleared acres of riverfront land further up the Allegheny that remained undeveloped for years. In the late 1970s, the Convention Center rose near the south shore of the Allegheny in downtown, but planners again turned it inward without a glance at the adjacent river landscape.

As Pittsburgh’s initial Renaissance was losing momentum in the 1960s, new social trends began to influence the character of urban redevelopment across the nation. Citizen groups in many cities, including Pittsburgh, demanded more influential roles and projects that addressed a broader set of concerns than those of traditional downtown interests. Moreover, increases in environmental awareness, health and fitness activities, leisure time, and historic preservation sparked, among other things, reconsideration of harbors and waterfront land as resources for improving the quality of life in cities. Innovative commercial and public projects slowly took shape, and by 1980 waterfront development had become a fashionable means of reviving deteriorating industrial and wholesale districts across America.

In Pittsburgh in the 1960s, a few reports and small organizations urged greater attention to the rivers. In the late 1970s the Station Square development successfully capitalized on preservation, leisure, and waterfront trends in redeveloping the blighted river-
Social trends that involve lifestyle commitments and deep-seated values are powerful agents of change. Water-oriented activities and amenities, which have proven to be significant lifestyle attributes in other cities, continue to grow in Pittsburgh. While pleasure boaters cavort on the three rivers, determined joggers and other recreational users have adopted Point State Park. The Three Rivers Regatta and Gateway Clipper fleet have both capitalized on the phenomenon. Rowing has reappeared and is attracting a small, loyal following. The City's South Side Riverfront Park has exceeded expectations of the public's use. The Western Pennsylvania Conservancy's purchase of several islands in the Allegheny River within the metropolitan area underlines the improving river ecology and recognition of recreational potential. Even sport fishing has increased markedly during the past 10 years. Public riverside parks in a few suburban communities have also emerged, and a special international plan-
ning team, which assessed redevelopment strategies for Monongahela River valley communities, argued for creating public access to the rivers. Commercial developers have also recognized the recreational potential of the rivers in a few suburban towns by building (or planning to build) yacht clubs, marinas, and a large waterslide park.

Public leaders have not ignored these trends in the 1980s. The City’s Department of Planning, for example, is encouraging private development of the Allegheny’s north shore and Herr’s Island in a way that may create a usable shore for local residents. They have even proposed residences on the island. Moreover, their recently published strategy for minimal riverfront development throughout the city still recognizes the need for greater public access and participation. The slow economic recovery, municipal budgetary constraints, and the expense of riverfront development have predisposed most governments in the region to let the private sector develop the shorelines under their scrutiny. However, leaving the initiative to the private sector risks redevelopment that could continue the history of restricted extensive public recreation.

The reluctance of the general public and civic leaders to embrace the idea of the rivers as an amenity for improving the quality of daily life reflects not only competing economic priorities, fiscal constraints, and the traditional pro-growth bricks-and-mortar view of planning, but also the historically ingrained negative perception of our working rivers. It still seems remote to many that Pittsburgh’s rivers can provide visual, ecological, and recreational pleasures similar to those commonly associated with water resources elsewhere in the country and the world, or as envisioned by some for Pittsburgh. Perhaps it may be faulted for its insistence on the ideal, but no better description of the rivers’ potential exists than this one, made in 1963:

A location whose landscape permits water to be glimpsed between hills or looked down upon from a variety of positions, giving different combinations of reflections and juxtapositions, possesses a continuing source of enchantment season by season. There is no scene of human contrivance not improved by association with water.... Water is so alive by both day and night that its presence sets the quality of the place, and its existence must be recognized by all who plan and build.

In Pittsburgh, public leaders have not provided, and the public has not demanded, easy access to the rivers for neighborhoods within walking distance of them. Riverside paths offer residents opportunities for walking, biking, or jogging along the banks or for simply watching the ever changing moods of the riverine landscape. Water habitats hold a special beauty and attraction for people, and the plants, fish, mammals, and waterfowl that have recolonized the rivers beckon us to appreciate again our environmental heritage while enjoying evening walks, weekend jogs, and summer picnics. With its rivers, Pittsburgh has an exceptional urban environment to be experienced, but most people just do not believe it.
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The men behind the Renaissance and Point State Park. Park Martin, executive director of the Allegheny Conference on Community Development, is the second to the left from Mayor David Lawrence, whose back is turned, c. 1955. With automobile access to downtown a major issue, planners took a route well-traveled in twentieth century America by insisting that land use be segregated. The result, a concrete highway that cuts off downtown from its finest green space, promotes passive rather than active use by Point Park-goers.