

Staff Paper Series

Staff Paper P69-23

October 1969

MINNESOTA'S REGIONAL SYSTEMS

By

John S. Hoyt, Jr.

Department of Agricultural Economics

University of Minnesota
Institute of Agriculture
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108

MINNESOTA'S REGIONAL SYSTEMS

John S. Hoyt, Jr.*

Minnesota State Planning Agency Regional Meetings

Hunt Hotel, Montevideo	September 10, 1969
American Legion Hall, Pipestone	September 11, 1969
Sheridan Rock Hotel, Rochester	September 17, 1969
Mankato State College, Mankato	September 18, 1969
State Hospital, Fergus Falls	September 22, 1969
City Hall, Thief River Falls	September 23, 1969
Bemidji State College, Bemidji	September 24, 1969
Arena Auditorium, Duluth	September 29, 1969
State Hospital, Brainerd	September 30, 1969
St. Cloud State College, St. Cloud	October 1, 1969

*Professor and Program Leader for Special Project Development
Department of Agricultural Economics and Agricultural Extension
Service, University of Minnesota; and Consultant, Minnesota
State Planning Agency

MINNESOTA'S REGIONAL SYSTEMS

For virtually everyone of us the ideals of cooperation and coexistence are appealing and acceptable. All too often, however, the actual act of implementing these ideals is littered with the debris of misunderstanding, misjudgment, and individual or local parochialism.

For some strange reason, a policy of directed change for the general welfare is less acceptable than one of undirected drift--even when the trend of this drift clearly spells economic and/or social illness for a portion of our contemporary society.

By way of example, in the 20 years from 1940 to 1960, outstate Minnesota experienced a total net population increase of only five percent while the Metropolitan Region grew over ten times as fast. And, by 1985, under a continuation of current trends, outstate Minnesota will lose one percent of its current population while the Metropolitan area will grow by another 52 percent.

I do not know--nor do I think anyone knows--what the relative changes would have been had there been a "rural-urban balance" in the past; neither do I pretend to know what it "should" be in the future.

I do know, however--and so do you--that an imbalance exists and that the social and economic problems of the rural disadvantaged and the urban ghetto residents epitomize the negative effects of that imbalance.

Net outmigration, it should be clearly understood, is a symptom of the problem. It is not the cause, and only by getting at the cause can we hope to eliminate, or modify, the symptom.

The search, then, for a policy of directed change is legitimate--indeed--it is vital. Regional Development is one such directed policy of change. It is the only one I know of which offers the framework for a socially desirable, economically efficient, and, hopefully, politically acceptable structure for non-metropolitan growth.

THE REASONS FOR REGIONALIZATION IN MINNESOTA

The reasons (or rationale) for regionalization are not complex. Three stand out with compelling logic. We will examine them from the point of view of the rural, or "outstate" citizen.

First, from a social point of view, the implementation of a structure of regionalization in Minnesota can be demonstrated to yield an increase in welfare; that is, in the "quality of life" available to the citizens of the state.

From the broadest possible viewpoint--or at least until the recent moon landing the broadest possible viewpoint--we can begin with the world ecosystem. By "ecosystem" I mean the physical (that is environmental) world in which we live. Before the advent of technology--the process by which man has altered his own environment--the world ecosystem was in balance.

Energy received from our sun was converted--by biological process--into plant and animal life and the waste products were, in too simple a description, converted to air, soil, and water, and to fossil fuels.

With the coming of human civilization and human organization, several factors were added to this "natural" ecological system. Social and economic organizations evolved. So too, did sets of political and ethical systems and concepts. Each of these has had, over the very long run, a positive net impact on human welfare.

More importantly, technology has impact on the system--gradually at first, and more recently, at a pace which has seen rapid rises in human welfare and concomitant threats to various components of our resource base.

In the rural midwest the technological impact has been most spectacular in agricultural and transportation technology. Economic, social, ethical, and political systems have altered but little, relatively, in the past four or five decades. As a result, as the impact of technological change has caused rural out-migration, under employment, unemployment, and the decline--in a variety of forms--of many small rural communities; these systems have been unable to adapt to the changing structure.

Just as cooperative agricultural insitutions have adapted to and, in many cases, thrived in the midst of this technological change, so too does the adoption of a policy of regional cooperation and coordination offer a viable alternative for rural--or, if you prefer, outstate--Minnesota. The answer lies within a simple economic principal--economies of scale. Existing social, political, and economic (business, commerce, and industry) institutions have the capability, in cooperation with one another, not only to survive but to do so at lower public and private costs. This conclusion is logically deductible. It is also obvious in examples that exist already--regional hospitals, school consolidation, Area Technical Action Panels, and a host of other cooperative and coordinating institutions and structures that have grown up around us.

So many, in fact, that we are now faced with another problem. Here in Minnesota we have:

1. Political regions - 4 in number;
2. Economic regions - 10 in number;
3. Federal agency regions - 24 in number;
4. State Agency regions - 88 in number;
5. Higher education regions - 32 in number; and,
6. Many other public and private regions.^{1/}

^{1/}John S. Hoyt, Jr., Regional Development Systems in Minnesota, Consultant report to the State Planning Agency, January 1969, Appendix D, pages 185-233.

One hundred and sixty plus regional delineations for one state--and most of them different!

This is a second reason for regionalization--the need to find a common geographical denominator for the coordination and implementation of Federal, State, and Local government public service programs and, perhaps, for some rationalization of private decisions.

"It is generally agreed that the wholesale multiplication of differing regions for varying state and federal planning and program purposes within states has introduced an element of confusion, complexity, and lack of coordination which can frequently thwart the whole concept of de-centralized government. A number of different approaches to correcting this condition are possible, but the basic goal should be maximum conformance to state-designated regional borders and a minimum number of differing organizational structures." This statement, taken from an Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations report, succinctly states the second reason for a program of regionalization for Minnesota.

The federal government and its departments and agencies have been active in regional programs for many years. In fact, it was because of this very multiplicity of planning regions that grew from these activities that the Bureau of the Budget, in January of 1967, issued an Executive Order that directed all federal agencies to coordinate programs in each of the states in terms of regional delineations determined by the states. Subsequent to the issuance of that order, a number of federal agencies have issued internal memoranda directing both their own headquarters components and their regional offices to follow the directions of this order.

In addition, recent federal legislation has provided the vehicle for the provision of "701" planning funds for multi-county planning purposes. The report of the President's Commission on Rural Poverty, "The People Left Behind," devotes a rather considerable proportion of its total content to the need for multi-county development programs in rural areas. The programs of the Economic Development Administration and the Upper Great Lakes Regional Development Commission are both inter-state and intra-state in regional character. Other federal programs also reflect this emphasis on regional considerations. Included in this group are the programs of the State Technical Action Panels; the Resource Conservation and Development Districts; the Office of Economic Opportunity Community Action Programs; and the Comprehensive Health Planning and Criminal Apprehension and justice systems.

After the January 1967 Budget Bureau Order the Minnesota Economic Regions delineation which had been developed by the University was reviewed by the staff of the State Planning Agency, by senior officials of selected state departments and agencies; and by the State Planning Advisory Committee and was recommended for use in Minnesota.

Thus in November of 1967 Governor LeVander issued Executive Order Number 9 which designated eleven regions and seven "Planning Areas" as vehicles for state-wide planning during the year 1968. The Order also directed the review and evaluation of these Regions over the following year for the purpose of the "establishment of regional entities which can be used for state-wide functional and program planning purposes; for aggregation of statistical data; for local intergovernmental cooperation; and, to the greatest extent possible, for administrative purposes."

The third reason for a policy of regionalization flows implicitly from the advantages obtainable through cooperation and coordination on a relatively common geographical basis and, explicitly, from an objective awareness of the problems of many of our rural communities.

In all parts of this nation, including Minnesota, there are today whole communities that are depressed and bypassed by growth--poor. Many of these are rural communities caught in this swirl of our nation's growth and technical change. Some, more than others, have borne the brunt of these forces but have garnered few of the benefits. These are the depressed rural communities. Few of these communities have had any control over the forces buffeting them; they have been unable to alter the forces for the better.

The problems of these rural communities include a lack of employment opportunities, inadequate public facilities and services, and fragmented planning, which is frequently of poor quality. It is held by most regional scientists that, to varying degrees, rural areas are now parts of larger economic communities with dominant groups towns or cities as centers; the community encompassing several counties. The linking of rural to urban areas is continuing and, indeed, the rural-urban distinction is becoming meaningless. Rural poverty is concentrated in communities where the process is moving slowly and where the centers are weak and under-developed. If these centers can be stimulated sufficiently and the rural periphery can be more closely linked to the center, jobs for the presently unemployed and underemployed may be developed. And the flow of people from poverty-stricken rural areas to the nation's metropolises can be replaced, in good part, by employment near their homes and in the nation's smaller cities and towns.

Both national and state regional programs are based, tacitly or otherwise, on the following assumptions:

1. As a result of appropriate measures, the nation will consist of several hundred adjoining sub-regions, each with a "central city" (of some disputed size) and a series of satellite cities of varying lesser sizes;
2. Each such sub-region will be able to conduct its own needed programs for economic and social regeneration and perpetuation;
3. It will provide, on a "competitive" basis its needed share of goods and services so that all can have a comparable good life;
4. Farm families will share the same economic opportunities as non-farm families.

In summary, the three compelling reasons for pursuing a policy of regionalization in Minnesota are:

1. To effectively bring the forces of technological change to bear on our total society in such a way as to realize the greatest gains possible in human welfare. More loosely--but perhaps more meaningfully--stated, to improve the "Quality of Life" in this state;
2. To create a system of geographic identities which can serve as a framework for the coordination and cooperation that must be found if the chaos and disorder of the multiplicity of overlapping and contradictory structures is to be clarified and made efficient; and,
3. To slow down and (optimistically perhaps) even reverse the trend of rising per capita costs for public services while providing a vehicle which can assist in the realization of sound programs for outstate economic growth.

THE METHOD OF REGIONALIZATION IN MINNESOTA

At least a brief summary of how the Regional Systems in Minnesota were delineated is in order.

The set of eleven "Economic Regions" for Minnesota were first delineated by the author in the early summer of 1966. They came from a research program designed to identify and explain, in a systematic manner, the locational characteristics of rural-located industry in Minnesota. It quickly became clear that neither a state-wide nor a county-by-county framework of study was adequate. At a state-wide level of focus, two considerations mitigated against the possibility of a successful effort. First, the extremely heavy concentration of industrial activity in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area meant that any research at the state-wide level would be grossly over weighted by the metropolitan influence of the Twin Cities. Second, even when the 7-county metropolitan area was netted out of consideration, significant difficulties remained. The remaining 80 counties accounted for roughly 32 percent of the total manufacturing employment of the state; or approximately 0.4 percent per county on an average basis. The distribution is extremely uneven, however, varying from less than 0.02 percent of out-state manufacturing employment in Traverse County to almost 13 percent in St. Louis County.

It was also evident that any meaningful analysis of industry location would necessarily include detailed consideration of other economic activity as well as a careful analysis of demographic, social, governmental, and natural resource factors, all of which influence the location of industrial activity. Thus, the effort to identify and analyze the location of industrial activity in Minnesota was initially focussed upon the need for the establishment of a geographic framework for research.

Thus, a purpose of this research effort was to identify homogeneous subregions of the state that possess similarities in the characteristics associated with them, for the purpose of providing locational guidelines for developing economic adjustment action programs at regional and local levels across the state.

Therefore this delineation of a sub-state spatial framework encompassed a consideration of a broad spectrum of economic and other data going far beyond the subject matter of industrial activity per se.

Adequately defined the resultant set of sub-state "regions" would have application in other policy-development research and analysis studies relating to the overall development concerns of the state.

The initial phase of the research effort therefore was concentrated in two related directions. First, an investigation of the available regional concepts and methodologies applicable to the problem of the identification and delineation of small area regions was undertaken. At the same time, a comprehensive data collection and collation program was organized in order to provide a statistical base to support the application of appropriate techniques of delineation.

Of the several sets of criteria and methodology for delineating sub-state regions examined, the concept of Functional Economic Areas (FEA's) as developed and applied in Iowa by Professor Karl A. Fox stands head and shoulders above others. It is Fox's concept, adopted and adapted for Minnesota, that was used to delineate the original Minnesota Economic Regions.

Since 1961, Karl Fox has written widely on the concept of functional economic areas. He has suggested that typical counties are too small to comprise relatively self-contained economic areas, and that the importance to all residents of a several-county area of some of the services which only its central cities could provide is such that the consideration of a spatial area larger than the county is appropriate. In his analysis he brings into consideration commuting patterns, leadership pools, and central places (or trading centers) as supporting evidence for his delineations. He concludes with the following statement:

"As an intellectual construct, the general notion of the functional economic area should not be surprising or particularly novel to geographers or to human ecologists.this concept should be used as a major (probably the major) subnational building block in the nation's network of economic and social data and it should be used explicitly for analyzing and implementing economic development programs of a type which rely heavily on local initiative and local recognition of mutual interests."

Brian J. L. Berry reflects perhaps the best appraisal of Fox's concept: He states, "Functional Economic Areas represent ideal economic units into which the entire country can be divided but counties represent good approximations to a proper functional breakdown of Functional Economic Areas. Counties are the next step down in the various levels of human organization in the geographical area. Karl Fox is really urging us to recognize that the scale of our society is changing--that the central, critical, scale or organization has shifted upwards from the county to the Functional Economic Area."

The delineation of sub-state regions in Minnesota thus was predicated on acceptance of the applicable concepts of Fox with respect to delineating Economic Regions. It was also predicated on the assumption that counties represent the best possible approximations to a functional breakdown of these regions.

Thus the criteria and methodology utilized was based upon the following major considerations:

1. The concepts developed by Karl A. Fox with respect to the delineation of Functional Economic Areas; and,
2. The geographic area of the state of Minnesota; its economic status and change over time; the practical constraints of county and state boundaries; various economic measures such as population size and change, city size and location; agricultural, manufacturing, and wholesale and retail trade location, growth, and change; transportation and commuting patterns; and a variety of other measures.

Delineation of the sub-state regions was based on judgments with respect to both of these considerations. Not all of the economic measures used by Fox and, similarly, not all of the data which was accumulated on a county basis for Minnesota, were individually subjected to a detailed statistical analysis for each of the economic regions. On the other hand, all of the judgments that have been made with respect to Minnesota and to the delineation of the eleven economic regions, have been made on the basis of actual data observation and are supported in detail.

Using Fox's basic concept of 50 mile north-south and east-west dimensions preliminary Functional Economic Areas for Minnesota were identified; focussed on the major cities in the state. Because of differences in the distribution of population and because of the lack of an even distribution of central cities of comparable size, Fox's approach was necessarily modified somewhat. The FEA's therefore are centered about cities, but are subject to the dual conditions that the cities were selected in descending size order and, where possible, the overlap of areas is kept to a minimum. They are also subject to the additional constraint that regional boundaries must fall on county lines and within state borders. The study therefore was concerned with an examination of aggregations of economic data for each of these regions as a means of testing whether or not the initially derived delineations were

logical and meaningful. This is not to say that other regional boundaries could not be found which could also be justified. What it does suggest is that these regions, as delineated, are meaningful insofar as the concept of Functional Economic Areas as defined by Fox is concerned.

The choice of Central Cities in each of the regions was based on several considerations. Whenever the Region contained a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area the central city designated was the central city of the SMSA. The consideration outside of Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas for the choice of central city was based on the judgment that the city chosen should be the largest in the region and/or should be located at or near the center of the Region.

This choice of central cities was reinforced by the examination of retail trade data. Without exception, each of the counties which contain the FEA central city accounts for the largest volume of total retail sales in 1963 within that Region. Furthermore, without any exception, each has the highest value of retail trade sales per establishment in 1963. Again, without significant exception, each of the Minnesota FEA central cities accounts for the majority of retail trade sales within the county in which it is located and the value of retail trade sales per establishment is significantly higher in the central city than it is elsewhere in the region.

The distribution of employment by type of occupation within these regions provides further insight into the stage of economic development of the counties of each region and the rate at which this pattern of development is changing.

A "County Labor Profile" was calculated and diagrammed for each of Minnesota's 87 counties. Without exception, the patterns of employment distribution fell on, or immediately on either side of, the patterns of the county in which the identified central city was to be found. This coincidence of employment patterns lends considerable support to a judgment that the county aggregations represent relatively homogenous groupings.

Intuitively, as well as methodologically, the application of the Functional Economic Area concept suggests that regions should be focussed upon central cities. Regional boundaries, therefore, should tend towards areas of less dense population concentrations. The regional boundaries, when overlaid on a population distribution map of Minnesota do not generally fall closely adjacent to the larger incorporated places in the state.

Fox's concept further suggests that, for a given state, the area surrounding a given regional center should be within roughly one hour's time of the center (approximately 60 miles). Population distribution and road network patterns in Minnesota make the strict application of this criteria difficult. In the case of Regions 2, 3, 4, 7, and 8 the inclusion of sub-centers as a secondary point of focus is necessary. With these inclusions of International Falls, Virginia, Two Harbors, Moorhead, Grand Rapids, Morris, Mora, and Worthington as secondary focii virtually the entire population of the state falls within the given criteria.

Subsequent to the original delineation, during the course of the following two years, it has been possible to bring to bear other forms of evaluative criteria.

During the course of continued research and analysis into the question of regional delineation in Minnesota a great many maps of other delineations of the state became available. Their numbers were too great and their differences too many to attempt any map-by-map comparison or reconciliation.

Means were sought therefore, to aggregate the total of all of the delineations thus obtained in order to outline an unweighted "average" delineation for the state.

The technique was relatively simple, although slow and painstaking. A 3' x 4' county outline map of Minnesota was used and each discrete interval of county boundary was identified. Using the individual delineation maps that had been collected, a dot (.) was placed alongside each interval of boundary each time that particular interval was used as part of a sub-state regional delineation. After all of the maps had been so entered on the master map, the number of "dots" on each boundary interval was counted. The net effect of the technique was to produce a map which indicates the frequency with which specific county boundary intervals are, in fact, used by state departments and agencies and by other organizations for regionalization purposes within the state. When such a procedure is followed a general sub-state regional delineation begins to take shape on the map.

The consistency of the resultant map with the "Economic Regions" is quite striking; only Martin, Koochiching, Itasca, and Rice Counties are indeterminate in terms of regional specificity.

As another means of carrying out the mandate of evaluating and testing the regions designated in Executive Order No. 9, a questionnaire on the subject of regionalization for the State of Minnesota was developed and distributed to two broad audiences. The first audience was a group of fifty State Executive Department Agencies, and the second, a group of thirty-three other agencies including components of the University of Minnesota, Federal Agencies, Quasi-Governmental Agencies, private regional agencies, and individuals in the fields of Planning and Regional Science.

The response of State Agencies was generally very positive towards the concept of regionalization for Minnesota. Of the thirty-six responding agencies, eight indicated that they had either adopted the regions of the Executive Order or expressed an intent to adopt them in some form in the very near future. An additional eight agencies indicated that they could possibly adopt these regions in the short run and another seven suggested they could possibly do so in the longer run. Only two agencies seemed unwilling to change from their existing regions.

The net result of the evaluation indicated clearly that the Economic Regions of Minnesota, as developed, required refinement or, perhaps more appropriately put, required "loosening." Even though a rationally defined and delimited set of discrete regions has been established and, in general, accepted by many there still remains a problem which might be labeled "forcing." It is both a conceptual and a practical problem.

From the conceptual point of view the difficulty is that such a discrete set of regional boundaries implies economic closure. It tends to suggest, at best only subconsciously and at worst openly, that each region is relatively self-contained. Depending on the observers' major concerns this self-containment may be conceived of as economic, social, political, or administrative.

Such a conception, whether or not intended by the fact of regional delineation, is clearly inconsistent with reality. The people and the places in one region are, of necessity, interrelated with those in adjacent regions and in distant regions. Stated simply, just as the economic, social, and political posture of the nation is related to international events, and the posture of the State of Minnesota to national policies established by the federal government, so too are the postures of any set of sub-state regions related to state, federal, and local situations and events. These spatial interrelationships apply at the county, township, and community level as well.

The net result of the evaluation indicated clearly that "Economic Regions" of Minnesota as developed require refinement or, perhaps more appropriately put, require "loosening." Even though a rationally defined and delimited set of discrete regions has been established and, in general, accepted by many there still remains a problem which might be labeled "forcing." It is both a conceptual and a practical problem.

From the conceptual point of view the difficulty is that such a discrete set of regional boundaries implies what might be termed economic closure. It tends to suggest, at best only subconsciously and at worst openly, that each region is relatively self-contained. Depending on the observer's major concerns this self-containment may be conceived of as economic, social, political, or administrative.

Such a conception, whether or not intended by the fact of regional delineation, is clearly inconsistent with reality. The people, the places, and the "things" in one region are of necessity interrelated with these factors in adjacent regions and in distant regions. Stated simply, just as the economic, social, and political posture of the nation is related to international events, and the posture of the State of Minnesota to national policies established by the federal government, so too are the postures of any set of sub-state regions related to state, federal, and international situations and events. These spatial interrelationships, of course, apply at the county, township, and community level as well.

Secondly, from a state administrative point of view the suggestion of a discrete "set" of regions, presumably applicable for all purposes, raises similar concerns. Long-standing administrative and organizational structures are perhaps as difficult to alter, regardless of rationale, as suggesting that an overnight conversion to the metric system of weights and measures be made tomorrow. And this does not imply that these difficulties are, at least in every case, irrational.

From a practical, political, point of view the difficulties are perhaps even more evident. Power, prestige, pride, and even autonomy all appear immediately to be at stake. Threaten one of these and a hue and cry is raised. Threaten a group of them and some of the real social and economic problems of today shrink to mere child's play.

What is needed, then, for an acceptable and workable set of sub-state "regions" that can effectively form a basis for realistic economic, social, and political adjustment problems is a framework which accommodates to these concerns and, at the same time, provides a guide for both policy formulation and program implementation that is truly useful. The spatial interrelationships need both emphasis and clarity; the nodal points (or "growth" points) need justified identification; and the linkages between both areas and nodes needs to be established and recognized.

It has been suggested that a specifically delineated set of regions with "solid" boundaries places both conceptual as well as practical, political and administrative constraints that are, at least relatively, unacceptable. The "Core County-Transitional County" groupings contained in the new Executive Order have been designed to meet that problem.

Thus, the Regional Development Systems concept, consisting of identified sets of "core counties" grouped around regional centers, sub-centers, and nodes combines the advantages of a generally accepted set of "common" regions with the requirements for boundary flexibility and future change. The administrative and organizational flexibility provided through the identification of a relatively large number of "transitional" counties whose future geographic orientation will be locally recommended suggests the possibility of relative ease of accommodation not only for state departments and agencies, but more importantly, for purposes of promoting inter-governmental cooperative arrangements between units of local general government.

The concept of regional centers and sub-centers is central to the regional development systems framework. State and regional level development planning and programming can be considerably enhanced, over the long run, through the implementation of a system of Regional Education, Research and Service Centers. Such centers might be most appropriately located at institutions of higher education. Such a system would include appropriate components of the University, state college, and state junior college systems.

CENTRAL CITIES, REGIONAL CENTERS
AND REGIONAL GROWTH NODES

Explicit clarification of several points is in order at this point.

Central Cities were identified and utilized as a part of the methodology used to delineate the original eleven Economic Regions. They are necessary to the utilization of the Functional Economic Area concept of Fox. The eleven Central Cities have been neither identified nor labeled as the regional "growth centers" for Minnesota's regions.

Regional Centers or, to give them their full label, Regional Research, Service, and Education Centers have been suggested in the report prepared for the State Planning Agency. They are the eleven Central Cities plus another nine communities which have been suggested as sub-centers. Each of the twenty are the sites of State Colleges, State Junior Colleges, or 4-year components of the University of Minnesota and, as such, it has been suggested that they might serve as institutions which could provide the necessary research, service, and continuing education facilities to support the planning and action programs of the Regional Planning and Development Councils which are authorized by the Regional Development Act of 1969.

Furthermore, should State Government in general--or certain state agencies in particular--in the future adopt a policy of a focussed centralization of state services, the report suggests that, from an accessibility point of view, these twenty regional centers and sub-centers might serve as focal points for such a program. Alternative groups of communities might as well serve such a function or, alternatively, the focussing might assume a shared pattern. In my judgment these future decisions will be greatly influenced by the recommendations of the yet to be implemented Regional Planning Councils.

Regional Growth Nodes are numerous in number. The report to the State Planning Agency preliminary identifies a total of 169 such nodes--and suggests that further explicit research and analysis is needed before any final identification is made. But it is important to look at the facts.

In the ten out-state regions there are a total of 695 incorporated areas. The 169, preliminarily identified, regional growth nodes have an average population, per node, of 5,125 persons.

But--and this is a very large but--the remaining 526 small incorporated areas have an average population per area of only 399 persons. These are the communities which, in general, stand to benefit from a policy of regional development and cooperation. Which, without such a policy, can play no real role in a program of rural renaissance for alone they carry no political, economic, or social weight and their efforts to survive, attract industry, and grow are functions of chance only.

Let's look at each of the 10 regions in terms of this community structure:

In Region	1	there are	50	incorporated areas
" "	2	" "	26	" "
" "	3	" "	57	" "
" "	4	" "	80	" "
" "	5	" "	70	" "
" "	6	" "	76	" "
" "	7	" "	102	" "
" "	8	" "	73	" "
" "	9	" "	77	" "
" "	10	" "	84	" "

Of these,	9	have been	preliminarily	identified	as	regional	growth	nodes
" "	6	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "
" "	23	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "
" "	16	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "
" "	8	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "
" "	16	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "
" "	22	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "
" "	17	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "
" "	25	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "
" "	27	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "

These regional	growth	nodes	have an	average	population	of	3,667	persons
" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	4,200	" "
" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	9,160	" "
" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	4,750	" "
" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	4,525	" "
" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	2,950	" "
" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	3,559	" "
" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	3,441	" "
" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	5,132	" "
" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	6,418	" "

Communities of this average size are not, by most observers, considered as adequate sized communities to serve as full-service, economic base, entities for self-sustaining economic growth.

They do, however, offer a point of departure for future development efforts.

Let's look for a moment at the communities that remain.

In Region	1	there are	an	additional	41	small	incorporated	areas
" "	2	" "	" "	" "	20	" "	" "	" "
" "	3	" "	" "	" "	34	" "	" "	" "
" "	4	" "	" "	" "	64	" "	" "	" "
" "	5	" "	" "	" "	62	" "	" "	" "
" "	6	" "	" "	" "	60	" "	" "	" "
" "	7	" "	" "	" "	80	" "	" "	" "
" "	8	" "	" "	" "	56	" "	" "	" "
" "	9	" "	" "	" "	52	" "	" "	" "
" "	10	" "	" "	" "	57	" "	" "	" "

Their average population size is only 368 persons							
"	"	"	"	"	"	295	"
"	"	"	"	"	"	329	"
"	"	"	"	"	"	393	"
"	"	"	"	"	"	333	"
"	"	"	"	"	"	398	"
"	"	"	"	"	"	416	"
"	"	"	"	"	"	400	"
"	"	"	"	"	"	461	"
"	"	"	"	"	"	473	"

Surely a program or policy which offers an opportunity for cooperative and coordinated development planning suggests more, in the way of future for these communities than our present policy which says, in effect, "Your on your own against 525 other incorporated areas which are striving for the few opportunities that are available."

Perhaps I should conclude on a note of personal opinion, professional judgment, and direct challenge.

An implemented policy of regional development offers:

1. An opportunity for a general rise in human welfare in rural Minnesota;
2. A means of coordination and cooperation for the present confused and sometimes contradictory programs of federal, state, and local development programs;
3. A possibility--given true cooperation--of holding the line on the ever-rising costs of public services; and,
4. A framework within which small units of local government--and the rural citizen--can find common cause and common objectives and which offers--in my judgment--the one vehicle for the rural renaissance which so many of us would like to see.

-SELECTED STATISTICS-

MINNESOTA REGIONS AND INCORPORATED AREAS
(Regional Growth Nodes and Small Incorporated Areas)

Statistics	Minnesota	Region 11	Regions										
			1-10	Reg. 1	Reg. 2	Reg. 3	Reg. 4	Reg. 5	Reg. 6	Reg. 7	Reg. 8	Reg. 9	Reg. 10
1. 1960 Total Population (Census) ^{1/}	3,413,900	1,525,300	1,888,600	95,600	64,800	314,600	192,100	122,900	146,800	226,800	154,700	249,000	321,500
2. 1970 Total Population (Estimate) ^{2/}	3,640,000	1,789,400	1,850,600	89,000	58,100	279,805	183,000	121,100	135,300	253,300	140,700	253,400	318,400
3. Percent of 1960 Population	100.0	44.7	55.3	2.8	1.8	9.2	5.6	3.6	4.3	6.7	4.5	7.4	9.4
4. Percent of 1970 Population	100.0	49.2	50.8	2.5	1.7	8.3	5.0	3.3	3.7	6.9	3.8	6.9	8.7
5. Percent of Total Land Area ^{2/}	100.0	3.5	96.5	10.3	11.1	16.7	11.1	9.4	7.8	8.6	7.1	6.7	7.8
6. 1960 Urban Population ^{4/}	2,081,100	1,406,900	674,200	22,700	19,800	196,800	62,300	30,200	29,500	49,200	44,800	111,900	148,300
7. Percent of Urban Population	100.0	67.5	32.5	1.1	1.0	9.5	3.0	1.4	1.4	2.4	2.2	5.4	7.1
8. 1960 Inc. Area Population ^{5/}	2,600,900	1,525,300	1,075,600	48,200	31,200	221,900	101,300	56,900	71,000	111,800	80,800	152,300	200,300
9. Percent of Inc. Area Pop.	100.0	58.6	41.4	1.8	1.2	8.5	4.0	2.2	2.7	4.3	3.1	5.9	7.7
10. 1960 Total Number of Inc. Areas ^{5/}	834	139	695	50	26	57	80	70	76	102	73	77	84
11. 1960 Average Pop. of Inc. Areas	3,119	10,473	1,548	964	1,200	3,893	1,266	813	934	1,096	1,109	1,978	2,385
12. 1960 Number of Regional Growth Nodes ^{6/}	n.a.	n.a.	169	9	6	23	16	8	16	22	17	23	27
13. 1960 Total Population of RGN's	n.a.	n.a.	866,700	33,000	25,200	210,700	76,000	36,200	47,200	78,300	58,500	128,300	173,300
14. 1960 Average Population of RGN's	n.a.	n.a.	5,125	3,667	4,200	9,160	4,750	4,525	2,950	3,559	3,441	5,132	6,418
15. 1960 Number of Small Inc. Areas ^{6/}	n.a.	n.a.	526	41	20	34	64	62	60	80	56	52	57
16. 1960 Total Population of SIA's	n.a.	n.a.	208,900	15,100	5,900	11,200	25,200	20,700	23,900	33,400	22,400	24,000	27,000
17. 1960 Average Population of SIA's	n.a.	n.a.	399	368	295	329	393	333	398	416	400	461	473

^{1/}1960 Census of Population


^{2/}Minnesota Population Data Book, Vital Statistics Division, State Department of Health, December 1965

^{3/}Minnesota Economic Data, No. 3, February 1969, University of Minnesota

^{4/}Ibid, No. 1, October 1966

^{5/}Legislative Manual, State of Minnesota, 1967-68

^{6/}Regional Development Systems in Minnesota, John S. Hoyt, Jr., Agricultural Extension Service, University of Minnesota and Minnesota State Planning Agency



MINNESOTA
Region 1
(Northwest)

- Regional Growth Nodes
- Small Inc. Areas

Regional Statistics


Total Population, 1960	95,600
Total Population, 1970 (est)	89,000
Urban Population, 1960	22,700
Incorporated Area Population, 1960	48,200
Number of Incorporated Areas, 1960	50
Average Population per I.A., 1960	964
Number of Regional Growth Nodes, 1960	9
Average Population per R.G.N., 1960	3,667
Number of Small Incorporated Areas, 1960	41
Average Population per S.I.A., 1960	368

Numbers of State & Federal Agency Office Locations Indicated by Number

20 miles

MINNESOTA
Region 2
(North)

● Regional Growth Nodes
○ Small Incorporated Areas



Regional Statistics


Total Population, 1960	64,800
Total Population, 1970 (est)	58,100
Urban Population, 1960	19,800
Incorporated Area Population, 1960	31,200
Number of Incorporated Areas, 1960	26
Average Population per I.A., 1960	1,200
Number of Regional Growth Nodes, 1960	6
Average Population per R.G.N., 1960	4,200
Number of Small Incorporated Areas, 1960	20
Average Population per S.I.A., 1960	295
Numbers of State & Federal Agency Office Locations	Indicated by Number

20 miles

Regional Statistics


Total Pop., 1960	314,600
Total Pop., 1970 (est)	279,805
Urban Pop., 1960	196,800
Inc. Area Pop., 1960	221,900
No. of Inc. Areas, 1960	57
Ave. Pop., 1960	3,893
No. of R.G.N.'s, 1960	23
Ave. Pop., 1960	9,160
No. of S.I.A.'s, 1960	34
Ave. Pop., 1960	329
No. of State & Federal Agency Office Loc.	Indicated by Number

- Regional Growth Nodes
- Small Incorporated Areas



Regional Statistics

Total Population, 1960	192,100
Total Population, 1970 (est)	183,000
Urban Population, 1960	62,300
Incorporated Areas Population, 1960	101,300
Number of Incorporated Areas, 1960	80
Average Population per I.A., 1960	1,226
Number of Regional Growth Nodes, 1960	16
Average Population per R.G.N., 1960	4,750




MINNESOTA
Region 4
(West)

Number of Small Inc. Areas, 1960	64
Average Pop. per S.I.A., 1960	393
Numbers of State & Federal Agency Office Locations	Indicated by Number
● Regional Growth Nodes	
○ Small Incorporated Areas	

20 miles

MINNESOTA
Region 5
(North Central)




Regional Statistics

Total Population, 1960	122,900
Total Population, 1970 (est)	121,100
Urban Population, 1960	30,200
Incorporated Areas Population, 1960	56,900
Number of Incorporated Areas, 1960	70
Average Population per I.A., 1960	813
Number of Regional Growth Nodes, 1960	8
Average Population per R.G.N., 1960	4,525
Number of Small Incorporated Areas, 1960	62
Average Population per S.I.A., 1960	333
Number of State & Federal Agency Office Locations	Indicated by Number

20 miles

MINNESOTA
Region 6
(West Central)



Regional Statistics


Total Population, 1960	146,800
Total Population, 1970 (est)	135,300
Urban Population, 1960	29,500
Incorporated Areas Population, 1960	71,000
Number of Incorporated Areas, 1960	76
Average Population per I.A., 1960	934
Number of Regional Growth Nodes, 1960	16
Average Population per R.G.N., 1960	2,950
Number of Small Incorporated Areas, 1960	60
Average Population per S.I.A., 1960	398
Numbers of State & Federal Agency Office Locations	Indicated by Number

20 miles


Regional Statistics

Total Pop., 1960 226,800
 Total Pop., 1970 (est) 253,300
 Urban Pop. 1960 49,200
 Inc. Area Pop., 1960 111,800
 No. of Inc. Areas, 1960 102
 Ave. Pop. per I.A., 1960 1,096
 No. of Reg. Growth Nodes, 1960 22
 Ave. Pop. per R.G.N., 1960 3,559
 No. of S.I.A.'s, 1960 80
 Ave. Pop per S.I.A 416

No. of State & Federal Agency Office Locations Indicated by Number



MINNESOTA
Region 8
(Southwest)




Regional Statistics

Total Population, 1960	154,700
Total Population, 1970 (est)	140,700
Urban Population, 1960	44,800
Incorporated Area Population, 1960	80,800
Number of Incorporated Areas, 1960	73
Average Population per I.A., 1960	1,109
Number of Regional Growth Nodes, 1960	17
Average Population per R.G.N., 1960	3,441
Number of Small Incorporated Areas, 1960	56
Average Population per SIA	400
Numbers of State & Federal Agency Office Location	Indicated by Number

20 miles

MINNESOTA
 Region 9
 (South Central)




Regional Statistics

Total Population, 1960	249,000
Total Population, 1970 (est)	253,400
Urban Population, 1960	111,900
Incorporated Areas Population, 1960	152,300
Number of Incorporated Areas, 1960	77
Average Population per I.A., 1960	1,978
Number of Regional Growth Nodes, 1960	25
Average Population per R.G.N., 1960	5,132
Number of Small Incorporated Areas, 1960	52
Average Population per S.I.A., 1960	461
Numbers of State & Federal Agency Office Location	Indicated by Number

20 miles

MINNESOTA
Region 10
(Southeast)



Regional Statistics

Total Population, 1960	321,500
Total Population, 1970 (est)	318,400
Urban Population, 1960	148,400
Incorporated Area Population, 1960	200,300
Number of Incorporated Areas, 1960	84
Average Population per I.A., 1960	2,385
Number of Regional Growth Nodes, 1960	27
Average Population per R.G.N., 1960	6,418
Number of Small Incorporated Areas, 1960	57
Average Population per S.I.A., 1960	473
Numbers of State & Federal Agency Office Location	Indicated by Number

20 miles