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Chapter 1: Local Governance, Finance and Growth Trends

The Twin Cities is an excellent case study of the (usually negative) effects of highly fragmented systems of local governance on growth patterns.

It also illustrates the potential mitigating effects of strong regional governance systems.
Political Fragmentation

The 11 county metropolitan area includes 172 cities, 97 townships, 76 school districts, and more than 100 special districts.

This structure results in more than 1,700 potential combinations and more than 500 actual taxing districts.
Figure 1.3. Location of Twin Cities local governments. Source: U.S. Census Bureau.
Metropolitan Urban Service Area
Watershed Districts
FIGURE 3.4. Twin Cities local government boundaries: cities, townships, school districts, watershed districts, counties, and the metropolitan urban service area. Source: U.S. Census Bureau.
Fragmentation and Sprawl

- Highly fragmented regions like the Twin Cities tend to sprawl more than less fragmented metros.
Fragmentation and Sprawl

• Highly fragmented regions like the Twin Cities tend to sprawl more than less fragmented metros.

• At least partly as a result of this, the 7-county area is urbanizing rapidly.
MINNEAPOLIS-ST. PAUL SEVEN-COUNTY REGION:
Urbanized Land, 1986

Legend
- Urbanized 1986

Data Source: Remote Sensing and Geospatial Analysis Laboratory, University of Minnesota.
MINNEAPOLIS-ST. PAUL SEVEN-COUNTY REGION:
Urbanized Land, 1991

Legend
- Urbanized 1991

Data Source: Remote Sensing and Geospatial Analysis Laboratory, University of Minnesota.
MINNEAPOLIS-ST. PAUL SEVEN-COUNTY REGION:
Urbanized Land, 1998

Legend
- Urbanized 1998

Data Source: Remote Sensing and Geospatial Analysis Laboratory, University of Minnesota.
MINNEAPOLIS-ST. PAUL SEVEN-COUNTY REGION:
Urbanized Land, 2002

Legend
- Urbanized 2002

Data Source: Remote Sensing and Geospatial Analysis Laboratory, University of Minnesota.
Land is being urbanized (converted from undeveloped to developed) significantly more quickly than population is growing
Growth in Urbanized Land, Population and Households
Twin Cities 7 County Metro: 1986-2002


- Red: Urbanized Land
- Blue: Households
- Black: Population
Fragmentation and Sprawl

• Highly fragmented regions like the Twin Cities tend to sprawl more than less fragmented metros.

• At least partly as a result of this, the 7-county area is urbanizing rapidly.

• But strong regional planning can mitigate the relationship between fragmentation and sprawl. The regions with the strongest regional planning systems—Portland and the Twin Cities—fare better than predicted, given their fragmentation.
Fragmentation and Fiscal Inequality, Segregation, Job Growth

• Highly fragmented regions like the Twin Cities also tend to show greater fiscal inequality, greater segregation rates, and less job growth than less fragmented metros.
Fragmentation and Fiscal Inequality, Segregation, Job Growth

• But, as with sprawl, strong regional planning mitigates the effects of fragmentation on fiscal inequality, segregation and job growth. The regions with the strongest regional planning systems—Portland and the Twin Cities—fare better than predicted, given their fragmentation.

• Portland is typically a leader among less-fragmented regions while the Twin Cities lead the way among highly-fragmented areas.
Chapter 2: Governing the Twin Cities

The Twin Cities has a unique and one of the most powerful regional governments in the country—the Metropolitan Council.

Originally formed in 1967, the Council has steadily gained powers, but its governance structure has not evolved with its powers.
• The Council now spends more per year than every other general purpose government in the metro, except Hennepin County and Minneapolis
• Unlike state agencies, it provides direct services to residents and municipalities in several dimensions, including transit, sewers and water treatment
• Unlike state agencies, it serves only a portion of the state
Met Council Bonded Debt

• The Council has more bonded debt than every other general purpose government in the metro, except Minneapolis

• It has more bonded debt than all of the county governments in its seven-county service area combined
Met Council Bonded Debt: 1991-2005

- The Council’s bonded debt is increasing steadily from about $500 million in 1991 to more $1 billion in 2005
The Scope of the Met Council

- The Council is committed to provide sewer, water treatment and transportation infrastructure to 31% of the area in the 7 county region.
- This is expected to increase to 40% by 2030.
MINNEAPOLIS - SAINT PAUL REGION
Projected Spending for Highway Improvement Projects, 2005 - 2010
(for projects over $1,000,000 in total cost)

Legend

- $1,009,000 to $3,507,440
- $4,972,760 to $8,806,000
- $9,110,750 to $22,444,400
- $28,660,000 to $38,700,000
- $80,160,999 to $199,200,000
- $183,845,000 or more

Data Source: Metropolitan Council, Transportation Improvement Programs 2005-2008 and 2007-2010.
Policy Recommendations: the structure of the Met Council

- The current structure (appointments by the Governor) makes the Council unrepresentative and unstable.
  - The council is almost always composed of members from only one party, despite the fact its service area is fairly evenly split between the two parties.
  - It can shift from being composed of members from one party alone to being entirely from the other party virtually over night when a new governor is elected.
Alternative Governance Structures: Direct Election of 16 Council Members

• Based on recent elections and current district boundaries, an elected council would usually be fairly evenly balanced between Democrats and Republicans.
  • In 2002, when Republicans carried the House and Senate, Met Council districts split 9 Republican to 7 Democratic
  • In 2004 and 2006, Met Council districts split 10 Democratic to 6 Republican
  • The actual split on the appointed Council from 2002 – 2006 was 16 Republicans and 0 Democrats
Recommended Alternative Governance Structure: Direct Election of 16 Council Members

• Over a longer period from 1992 to 2006, the Council would have had relatively balanced representation, with a Democratic majority in 5 of 8 election years (or during 10 of the 16 years).
Met Council Districts with Democratic Representatives,
1992 - 2006

Projected Election Result
Actual Appointments
Other recommendations

• More explicit development guidelines—such as housing density—for policy areas.
• Better coordination between land use and transportation planning (especially transit), with greater emphasis on job clustering and TOD.
• Reconstitute the State Planning Agency, to guide development at the metropolitan-rural transition.
Other recommendations

• Expand the Council’s service area to include the entire metropolitan economy—add the four collar counties.
• More aggressive use of the Councils powers in housing policy—to pursue region-wide, affordable housing policies directing more affordable housing to areas near growing job centers and good schools, in particular.
Chapter 3: Neighborhood and School Segregation

The region is rapidly becoming more racially diverse. At the same time, its neighborhoods and schools are becoming more segregated. Research shows that policies to promote more integrated neighborhoods and schools have a wide variety of potential benefits—academic outcomes; opportunities for minority residents and students; and community benefits.
Academic Benefits

- Attending racially integrated schools and classrooms improves the academic achievement of minority students measured by test scores (Mickelson 2006; Rumberger and Palardy 2005; Mickelson 2003; Borman et al., 2004: Borman and Dowling, 2006).

- The diverse learning environment provided by integrated school and classroom settings enhances critical thinking skills among all students (Antonio et al., 2004).
Improved Opportunities for Minority Students

• Minority students who attended integrated schools have higher incomes than their peers in segregated schools (Boozer et al., 1992; Ashenfelter et al, 2005).
• Minority students graduating from desegregated schools tend to complete more years of education, have higher college attendance rates, and tend to choose more lucrative occupations in which minorities are historically underrepresented (Crain and Strauss, 1985; Braddock and McPartland, 1987).
• Integrated schools enable minority students to have access to social networks associated with opportunity (Granovetter 1986).
Social and Community Benefits

- Students who experience interracial contact in integrated school settings are more likely to live, work, and attend college in more integrated settings (Braddock, Crain, and McPartland, 1984).

- Interracial contact in desegregated settings decreases racial prejudice among students and facilitates more positive interracial relations (Pettigrew and Tropp, 2006; Killen and McKown, 2005; Holme et al., 2005).

- Students who attend integrated schools report an increased sense of civic engagement compared to their segregated peers (Kurlaender and Yun, 2005)
Social and Community Benefits (cont.)

• Integrated classrooms improve the stability of interracial friendships and increase the likelihood of interracial friendships as adults (Hallinan and Williams, 1987; Kahlenberg 2001).

• Attending racially integrated schools and classrooms improves the academic achievement of minority students measured by test scores (Mickelson 2006; Rumberger and Palardy 2005; Mickelson 2003; Borman et al., 2004: Borman and Dowling, 2006).

• The diverse learning environment provided by integrated school and classroom settings enhances critical thinking skills among all students (Antonio et al., 2004).
Social and Community Benefits (cont.)

• When implemented on a metro-wide scale, school integration can promote residential integration and enhance neighborhood stability (Frankenberg, 2005; Orfield, 2001; Orfield and Luce, 2005).
Integrated neighborhoods can be fragile—a neighborhood that is integrated at a point in time may actually be in transition.
Conclusion: When the Black population share was 29% or greater in 1980, the tract was more likely to resegregate during the next 20 years than it was to remain integrated.
Racially stable schools can stabilize neighborhoods. Integrated neighborhoods are much more stable in metropolitan areas with region-wide (or central county-wide) school integration programs.
2000 Distribution of 633 Tracts that were White/Black Integrated in 1980 in 15 Metro Areas with County- or Metro-wide Busing in the 1980's and 1990's

Conclusion: Tracts were more likely to remain integrated than to resegregate during the next 20 years from all starting points.
Important Trends in the Twin Cities

• Non-white segregated schools* are rapidly increasing in number. In 1992, there were only 9 non-white segregated elementary schools in the Twin Cities metro area. By 2008, this number jumped to 108.

*: Non-white segregated schools are defined either as schools where the share of blacks, Hispanics or Asian students exceeds 50 percent or as schools with varying combinations of black, Hispanic, and Asian students, where the relative share of white students in the schools does not exceed 30 percent. In predominantly white schools, the share of each non-white group is smaller than 10 percent. Any school that is neither non-white segregated nor predominantly white is considered integrated.
Northwest Suburban Public Elementary Schools Race and Ethnicity, 1995-1996

Legend

Scale:
- 1,400 Students

- American Indian
- Asian
- Hispanic
- Black
- White

Data Source: Minnesota Department of Children Families and Learning, Data Center (10/25/04)
Important Trends (cont.)

- A new type of segregation is emerging in schools. Students of color are increasingly attending segregated schools with other students of color and not with whites. As white students experience further integration, more and more students of color attend segregated schools.
Important Trends (cont.)

- Attending racially segregated schools hurts students of color because these schools have high concentrations of poverty. In 2008, the average poverty rate in the non-white segregated schools in the Twin Cities metro was more than seven times the rate in predominantly white schools and three times the rate in integrated schools.

![The Percentage Share of Free Lunch Eligible Elementary School Students in the Twin Cities Region](chart.png)
Important Trends (cont.)

- Students of color in the Twin Cities metro are more than five times more likely to attend schools with high concentrations of poverty than white students.

![Percentage of Students Attending Schools with High Poverty Rates (Free and Reduced Price Lunch Rates Greater than 40%), 2008](image-url)
Important Trends (cont.)
• Students of color in the Twin Cities metro area are nearly thirty times more likely to attend schools with very high concentrations of poverty than white students.

Percentage of Students Attending Schools with Very High Poverty Rates (Free and Reduced Price Lunch Rates Greater than 75%), 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-White</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Important Trends (cont.)

• Housing policy and school policy are closely related—neighborhood demographics shape school demographics and school characteristics are an important consideration when deciding where to live.

• Affordable housing policies in the Twin Cities do less now to promote integrated neighborhoods than in the past.
MINNEAPOLIS - SAINT PAUL REGION
Schools With Minority Shares > 50% in 2005

Legend
- >= 50% Minority Students*
- < 50% Minority Students*

Segregation Attendance Area**

* Minorities are all students, except non-Hispanic whites.

** Areas are derived from contiguous elementary attendance boundaries with schools that have 50% or greater minority student enrollment. Small pockets of areas with schools that had less than 50% minority students that were surrounded by the segregation attendance area were included within it.

Data Source: Minnesota Department of Education, Minnesota Land Management Information Center
MINNEAPOLIS – SAINT PAUL REGION
Schools With Minority Shares > 35% in 2005

Legend
- >= 35% Minority Students*
- < 35% Minority Students*

Segregation Attendance Area**

* Minorities are all students, except non-Hispanic whites.
** Areas are derived from contiguous elementary attendance boundaries with schools that have 20% or greater minority student enrollment. Small pockets of areas with schools that had less than 30% minority students that were surrounded by the segregation attendance area were included within it.

Data Source: Minnesota Department of Education, Minnesota Land Management Information Center
Important Trends (cont.)

• School boundary decisions can also have important effects on segregation.
• Many regional school districts, including suburban districts like St. Louis Park, Eden Prairie, Hopkins, Bloomington, Osseo, Chaska/Chanhassen, Burnsville and Anoka-Hennepin, are struggling with these issues.
• Some of these districts, along with several others in the Twin Cities are at risk of re-segregating if nothing is done.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Elementary Students Non-white in 2008</th>
<th>Number of Districts</th>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>% of Students NW (% of Elem. Schools NW Seg.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70-100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>St. Paul, Brooklyn Center, Minneapolis</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Columbia Heights, Richfield, Robbinsdale, Osseo</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fridley, Bloomington, West St. Paul/ Mendota Heights/Eagan, St. Louis Park, Roseville, Burnsville, North St. Paul/Maplewood, Shakopee</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend
- 0.0 to 4.9%
- 5.0 to 9.9%
- 10.0 to 14.9%
- 15.0% or more

Data Source: U.S. Census Bureau
Policy Recommendations

• Enforce fair housing laws.
• Pursue regional fair share housing plan.
• Promote pro-integrative local policies like inclusionary zoning.
• Reduce hyper-fragmentation (narrowly defined neighborhood jurisdictions) in the advocacy and implementation community.
• Link housing choices and programs to school choice options (like the Choice is Yours program).
## Metropolitan School Integration Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of black students that would have to change schools in order to achieve racial balance.</td>
<td>12,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of additional black students that would already be in a racially integrated school if:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- LITHC units were assigned randomly by race.</td>
<td>738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Section 8 project units were assigned randomly by race.</td>
<td>789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of additional black students that would already be in a racially integrated school if:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- LIHTC units were distributed across the region in proportion to school enrollment.</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Section 8 project units were distributed across the region in proportion to school enrollment.</td>
<td>1,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Section 8 vouchers in the suburbs if they were distributed in same proportions as school enrollment.</td>
<td>4,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional black households in suburbs (at 2000 shares in voucher program).</td>
<td>2,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children aged 6-17 in the added suburban black households (at 2000 average).</td>
<td>1,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total additional black school-age children in the suburbs</td>
<td>5,271  (42%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy Recommendations

• Promote pro-integrative inter-district choice programs (like the Choice is Yours program, integration district magnets, and strengthened integration districts).
Twin Cities Metropolitan Area
Hypothetical Integration Districts and Segregated and Integrated Public Schools, 2007-2008

% Minority Students in school
- 0.0 to 22.5
- 22.6 to 42.4
- 42.5 to 100.0

Racial Demographics of Hypothetical Integration Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Minority</th>
<th>Minority %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>96,379</td>
<td>66,279</td>
<td>30,791</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>71,406</td>
<td>44,866</td>
<td>26,667</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>87,985</td>
<td>80,212</td>
<td>7,773</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>64,266</td>
<td>45,193</td>
<td>19,087</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>88,411</td>
<td>46,037</td>
<td>22,374</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>388,415</td>
<td>262,583</td>
<td>125,832</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: MN Department of Education
Policy Recommendations

• Link school programs like magnets to regional job patterns.
Map 1: MINNEAPOLIS - SAINT PAUL REGION EMPLOYMENT CENTERS

See Table 1 for job center codes.
### Table 4.1: Employment Center Jobs and Job Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Minneapolis CBD</td>
<td>128,395</td>
<td>140,930</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Edina</td>
<td>43,963</td>
<td>53,490</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>St. Paul - Midway</td>
<td>43,183</td>
<td>48,245</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>St. Paul Center</td>
<td>40,402</td>
<td>45,150</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Golden Valley - I-394</td>
<td>40,913</td>
<td>43,710</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Minneapolis - University of MN</td>
<td>48,276</td>
<td>42,645</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>St. Paul CBD</td>
<td>40,278</td>
<td>38,140</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Eden Prairie - Hwy 169</td>
<td>23,002</td>
<td>33,730</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Minneapolis - Phillips / Whittier</td>
<td>33,361</td>
<td>29,305</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Roseville</td>
<td>23,080</td>
<td>26,580</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Eagan</td>
<td>18,466</td>
<td>25,715</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Plymouth - I-494</td>
<td>19,088</td>
<td>25,255</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Airport / Ft. Snelling</td>
<td>12,769</td>
<td>24,415</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Bloomington - MOA</td>
<td>30,870</td>
<td>21,060</td>
<td>-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Fridley / Coon Rapids</td>
<td>14,524</td>
<td>21,005</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Minneapolis - Northeast</td>
<td>14,301</td>
<td>19,900</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Bloomington - I-35W</td>
<td>17,407</td>
<td>19,785</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>St. Louis Park</td>
<td>13,604</td>
<td>17,905</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Eden Prairie</td>
<td>11,335</td>
<td>14,715</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Minnetonka / Hopkins</td>
<td>10,947</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Shakopee</td>
<td>7,089</td>
<td>12,965</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Shoreview / Arden Hills</td>
<td>9,190</td>
<td>11,475</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Stillwater - Hwy 36</td>
<td>8,082</td>
<td>10,910</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>White Bear</td>
<td>9,689</td>
<td>10,650</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Burnsville Center</td>
<td>7,280</td>
<td>9,940</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Anoka</td>
<td>9,516</td>
<td>8,995</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Maplewood - 3M</td>
<td>9,674</td>
<td>8,855</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Brooklyn Park</td>
<td>4,831</td>
<td>8,755</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Brooklyn Center</td>
<td>8,756</td>
<td>8,660</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Minneapolis Saint Anthony</td>
<td>7,726</td>
<td>8,475</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Minneapolis - North</td>
<td>6,886</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Saint Paul - Highland</td>
<td>3,294</td>
<td>5,140</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>New Hope</td>
<td>4,430</td>
<td>4,325</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Maplewood - I-694</td>
<td>2,693</td>
<td>3,875</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Robbinsdale</td>
<td>3,918</td>
<td>3,815</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Woodbury</td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>3,805</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Richfield - Crosstown</td>
<td>4,252</td>
<td>3,260</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Wayzata</td>
<td>2,809</td>
<td>3,175</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Maple Grove</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>2,815</td>
<td>895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Burnsville - Hwy 13</td>
<td>2,560</td>
<td>2,305</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**: 743,223 
**2000**: 845,075 
**% Growth 1990-2000**: 14
Policy Recommendations

• Develop and enforce a stronger state desegregation rule.
• Bring the charter system into the process by removing their waiver from state desegregation rules.
MINNEAPOLIS - SAINT PAUL (CENTRAL REGION)
Race and Ethnicity
Charter Schools, 2007-2008

Legend

Size of Circle =
500 Students
250 Students
100 Students

American Indian
Asian
Hispanic
Black
White

Note: Schools are approximately located.
Their locations are staggered for viewing
and labeling purposes.

Data Source: Minnesota Department of Education
Poverty and Reading Proficiency Rates in Twin Cities
Elementary Schools, 2007-08
(simple correlation = -0.91)

School Performance by School Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>% Performing Better Than Expected Given Poverty Rate</th>
<th>% Performing Worse Than Expected Given Poverty Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice is Yours</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 4: Transportation and Jobs

As in most metropolitan areas, jobs are decentralizing in the Twin Cities—suburban job centers are growing more rapidly than those in core areas.

Jobs are also de-concentrating—scattered-site jobs are growing more rapidly than those in job centers.
Job clustering is important because clustering:

- Enables more efficient use of infrastructure (highways, trunk roads, sewer and water lines)
- Facilitates provision of supportive services like day care near job sites, reducing commute miles and time
- Increases the efficiency of the economy via agglomeration effects
- Makes transit a more feasible option, enhancing access to jobs for lower-income workers without cars, and making smart growth options (TOD) more viable.
The Twin Cities compare relatively well to other areas in the share of regional jobs in job centers in the core (central cities and inner suburbs) and in job centers (rather than scattered-site locations).

But job centers in the core are growing more slowly than in outer areas—10% vs. 25%—and non-clustered jobs are growing more quickly than job centers overall—14% vs. 31%. (One result of this is that congestion is increasing more rapidly in suburban areas than in the core.)
An important result of this pattern is that workers of color are much more likely to work in declining or slow-growth job centers than white workers—48% of black workers work in these job centers, for instance, compared to 31% of white workers.
Policy Recommendations

• Greater emphasis is needed on focusing job growth in job clusters. This is vital to:
  – Enhancing the viability of transit;
  – Encouraging growth in core areas;
  – Increasing opportunities for low-income workers

• Better coordination of transit and transportation planning with land use planning
  – Without a strong focus on clustering jobs in transportation corridors, greater transit spending may be futile
  – Affordable housing shortfalls in suburban areas near growing job centers are a continuing problem
Chapter 5: The Environment and Growth

(Based on Growth Pressures on Sensitive Natural Areas, a joint project of MN DNR and Ameregis, funded by the Bush Foundation. The project also included extensive work in local areas across the region to improve local environmental planning.)

Recent and projected growth patterns put much of the region’s expected future growth just beyond the current MUSA in places with modest fiscal resources and much of the region’s remaining sensitive natural areas.

If this growth occurs at currently prevailing densities, either much of the region’s remaining sensitive natural areas will be lost, or sprawl will sky-rocket as sensitive areas are bypassed.
Percentage of Total Area Designated as Sensitive Natural Areas by Municipality

Legend
- 0.0 to 24.9% (54)
- 25.0 to 49.9% (138)
- 50.0 to 74.9% (55)
- 75.0% or more (24)

Data Source: MN Department of Natural Resources.
Impaired Lakes and Streams, 2006

Legend
- Impaired Lakes
- Impaired Streams
- Other Lakes
- Other Streams

Data Source: MN Department of Natural Resources; MN Pollution Control Agency
Impaired waters

- 37% of lakes (by area) impaired
- 27% of river/stream miles impaired
The Northern half of the region includes:

– most of the municipalities with high shares of unprotected sensitive natural areas

and

– most of the municipalities with lower-than-average tax capacities
Much of the growth projected for the region is expected to occur in a group of developing municipalities (developing job centers and bedroom developing communities) with modest fiscal resources.

These municipalities:

• Represent just **33% of current population** in the 7 counties
• But are projected to capture **67% of growth** (2000-2030)
• And contain **85% of the unprotected sensitive natural areas**
If projected growth occurs at current densities:

• Developing job centers would have a 106,000 acre shortfall of available land by 2030 (currently unprotected, undeveloped and non-sensitive land), an area equal to Minneapolis, St. Paul and Bloomington combined.

• Unprotected, sensitive natural areas in these communities: 123,000 acres.

• Actual growth patterns since 2000 show that an even larger share of growth than expected has occurred in these places – 83% (actual) compared to 51% (projected)
Put another way, if projected growth through 2030 occurs at current densities and the MUSA line is expanded to include all land in municipalities now split by the MUSA (an expansion more than twice what is currently planned)

- There would be a 119,000 acre shortfall of available land (currently unprotected, undeveloped and non-sensitive land), within the expanded MUSA.
- Unprotected, sensitive natural areas in these communities: about 180,000 acres.
Policy Recommendations:

• Reconstitute the State Planning Agency, to guide development at the metropolitan-rural transition.
• Expand the Met Council’s jurisdiction to include the four collar counties
• Combine this with expansion of the Fiscal Disparities program into the collar counties—78 of 88 collar county municipalities (and 80 percent of the population) would experience increases in tax base averaging 11 percent.
Chapter 7: The Politics of Regional Policy

The region has become more politically polarized in two ways.

• Geographically, the core—including the central cities, inner suburbs and parts of the middle suburbs—has become more solidly Democratic, while outlying areas have become more solidly Republican.

• Individually, voters have shown an increasing propensity to vote the “party line”—fewer voters split their ticket by voting for Democrats in some races and Republicans in others.
Geography
MAP 2: MINNEAPOLIS - SAINT PAUL REGION
Party Preferences by Municipality based on Election Results for the year 1992.

Data Source: State of Minnesota, Geographic Information Services.
MAP 3: MINNEAPOLIS - SAINT PAUL REGION
Party Preferences by Municipality based on Election Results for the year 1994.

Data Source: State of Minnesota, Geographic Information Services.
MAP 6: MINNEAPOLIS - SAINT PAUL REGION
Party Preferences by Municipality based on Election Results for the year 2000.

Data Source: State of Minnesota, Geographic Information Services.
MAP 7: MINNEAPOLIS - SAINT PAUL REGION
Party Preferences by Municipality based on Election Results for the year 2002.

Data Source: State of Minnesota, Geographic Information Services.
MAP 8: MINNEAPOLIS - SAINT PAUL REGION
Party Preferences by Municipality based on
Election Results for the year 2004.

Data Source: State of Minnesota, Geographic Information Services.
MAP 9: MINNEAPOLIS - SAINT PAUL REGION
Party Preferences by Municipality based on Election Results for the year 2006.

Data Source: State of Minnesota, Geographic Information Services.
Voter Volatility: The propensity of voters to split their tickets—vote for candidates from different parties in different races.
Making the Case for Regionalism

Regional approaches need not appeal to only one party or to one part of the region. Many of the Twin Cities regional institutions were first championed by Republicans and a case can be made for regional approaches to planning, housing, schools, and transportation to all types of communities, regardless of their political or economic status.
Making the Case for Regionalism

**Central Cities**: Social and economic segregation hurts central cities more than any other part of metropolitan areas.

- *Regional planning* directs growth inward, away from greenfield development on the fringe to infill in the core.
- A coordinated approach to *regional housing and school policy* would ensure that all parts of the region take on their share of affordable housing, easing fiscal and social burdens in city neighborhoods, increase access to high-performing schools for urban students, and strengthen housing markets in the core by improving schools.
- *A regional transportation policy* which prioritized transit would enhance the competitiveness of high-density job centers in the core and increase access to opportunity for many city residents.
Making the Case for Regionalism

**Stressed Suburbs**: Many suburban areas, especially fully-developed, inner suburbs now face the same social and economic challenges as central cities. (Examples: Richfield, Brooklyn Park, St. Louis Park, Burnsville, South St. Paul)

- *Regional planning* directs growth inward, away from greenfield development on the fringe to infill in the core.

- A coordinated approach to *regional housing and school policy* would ensure that all parts of the region take their share of affordable housing, easing fiscal and social burdens in transitioning neighborhoods in inner suburbs, increase access to high-performing schools for students, and strengthen housing markets by improving schools.

- A *regional transportation policy* which prioritized transit would enhance the competitiveness of high-density job centers in many of these suburbs and increase access to opportunity for many residents.
Making the Case for Regionalism

*Developing Job Centers*: These high-growth, middle income suburban areas face costs associated with growth and high education needs with modest fiscal resources. (Examples: Andover, Blaine, Shakopee, Woodbury)

- *Regional planning (and tax-base sharing)* would ease growth pressures and provide additional fiscal resources.
- A coordinated approach to *regional housing and school policy* would provide residents and students with the advantages of increasing diversity without the risks of neighborhood and school transition (or resegregation).
- A *regional transportation policy* which help these areas rationalize their development planning and zoning by emphasizing job clustering along transportation corridors, and also ease conflicts between residential and commercial-industrial land-uses.
Making the Case for Regionalism

*Developed Job Centers:* Many of these areas, often already fully developed, are now showing signs of increasing social segregation. (Examples: Eden Prairie, Bloomington, Eagan, Plymouth, Roseville)

- *Regional planning* would help these areas keep what they’ve developed in the past—a highly-diversified local economy serving as destinations for commuters from the rest of the region.
- A coordinated approach to *regional housing and school policy* would provide the policies needed to deal with increasingly diverse populations without the risks of neighborhood and school transition (or resegregation).
- A *regional transportation policy* would help these areas maintain and strengthen their large, relatively dense job centers against growing competition from newly-developing suburbs.
Making the Case for Regionalism

Bedroom Developing Suburbs: These areas face the costs of growth and high education needs with modest fiscal resources and few local jobs for residents. (Examples: Minnetrista, Corcoran, Oak Grove, Cottage Grove, Spring Lake)

- Regional planning would ease growth pressures and provide additional fiscal resources.
- A coordinated approach to regional housing and school policy would provide residents and students with the advantages of increasing diversity without the risks of neighborhood and school transition (or resegregation).
- A regional transportation policy would help residents of these areas commute to jobs in the rest of the region by increasing transportation options.
Contact Us:
http://www.irpumn.org