
September 2015

**Grouping Minnesota
Cities**

Using Cluster Analysis

Research Department
Minnesota House of Representatives

The Research Department of the Minnesota House of Representatives is a nonpartisan professional office serving the entire membership of the House and its committees. The department assists all members and committees in developing, analyzing, drafting, and amending legislation.

The department also conducts in-depth research studies and collects, analyzes, and publishes information regarding public policy issues for use by all House members.

Research Department
Minnesota House of Representatives
600 State Office Building, St. Paul, MN 55155
651-296-6753

September 2015

Grouping Minnesota Cities

Using Cluster Analysis

This technical paper describes a method used for public finance analysis by the House Research Department to group Minnesota cities into classes with similar characteristics. These groupings are called “clusters.” This is the fourth grouping of cities for analysis purposes used by the House Research Department since the original groupings published in January 1988.

This report was prepared by **Pat Dalton** and **Sean Williams**, legislative analysts in the House Research Department. Special thanks to **Jim Cleary**, former legislative analyst, for his help with methodology.

Questions may be addressed to **Pat Dalton** at 651-296-7434.

Scott Kulzer provided graphics and production assistance.

Copies of this publication may be obtained by calling 651-296-6753. This document can be made available in alternative formats for people with disabilities by calling 651-296-6753 or the Minnesota State Relay Service at 711 or 1-800-627-3529 (TTY). Many House Research Department publications are also available on the Internet at: www.house.mn/hrd/.

Contents

- Introduction to Clustering 4
 - Purpose of clustering 4
 - What is Cluster Analysis? 4
- Clustering Minnesota Cities 5
 - Clustering Method 5
 - Summary of the Resulting Clusters 6
 - Cluster Descriptions 8
 - Metropolitan Cities 8
 - Nonmetropolitan City Clusters 12
- Appendix A: Classification Methodology 16
 - What is Cluster Analysis? 16
- Appendix B-1: City Clusters and Cluster Variables 23
- Appendix B-2: City Clusters Listed by County 48

Introduction to Clustering

Purpose of Clustering

Since 1988 the House Research Department has used a strategy for grouping cities into classes called “clusters.” The clustering methodology assigns cities to groups based on their similarities and differences across several characteristics. Minnesota has 853 cities, and without a classification scheme, it is hard to analyze and draw conclusions regarding the effect of different policies on different “kinds” of cities.¹

Clusters, which are based on multiple characteristics of cities, can show meaningful patterns of effects that are not apparent in cities grouped by size or location alone. Clusters help legislators to evaluate, from a broader perspective, the proposals and policies that affect city finances. This department, the League of Minnesota Cities, the Minnesota Department of Revenue, and several other groups regularly used the city clusters to analyze city aid and city spending.

The first set of city clusters was developed and used by the House Research Department in 1988. However, cities grow and change over time, therefore the groupings need to change over time as well. In 1996 this office developed updated groups, and in 2002 the League of Minnesota Cities, in consultation with House Research, updated the city grouping again using the same methodology. In 2013 House Research completed and unveiled a fourth updated set of city clusters in time to be used in the analysis of a major reform of the local government aid program for cities. The publication explains how the new city clusters were developed and describes the resulting groups.

The aim of the cluster analysis of cities is utility rather than statistical elegance. The purpose of the grouping is to help legislators understand and evaluate how a policy proposal impacts different types of cities. For that reason, a cluster analysis must not only be based on relevant characteristics, but the policymakers must be able to form a mental picture of the cities in each group.

What is Cluster Analysis?

The method used to classify cities is a statistical technique called cluster analysis. The method is summarized briefly in this section and explained in more detail in Appendix A.

Cluster analysis is a method of grouping similar objects together based on common characteristics. The characteristics used in the analysis determine the groups or “clusters” that result. Because objects have many characteristics, there is no one “correct” or perfect cluster. Meaningful clusters result from grouping based on characteristics that are relevant to the given purpose.

¹ The city of Thomson merged with the city of Carlton since the analysis. However the report shows results for all 853 cities that existed at the time of analysis.

Cluster analysis is as much an art as it is a statistical method since there is no one correct result. Successful clusters are determined more by their intuitive sense than their statistical rigor. For this reason, some clusters may be determined outside of the analysis to account for factors that are judged to be important in the classification scheme, even if these factors do not lend themselves to statistical analysis.

Clustering Minnesota Cities

Clustering Method

Although we originally looked at a number of possible city characteristics on which to base the groupings, the city characteristics used to develop the new city clusters are the same or similar to ones used by the League of Minnesota for the 2002 cluster analysis. The characteristics were updated to reflect the passage of time. The variables are listed below.

Twin Cities metropolitan area cities were clustered based on the following characteristics:

- Current (2010 census) population
- Population growth for the previous ten years (2000-2010)
- Median household income for 2010
- Percent of total property market value classified as commercial/industrial property for 2011²

Greater Minnesota cities were clustered based on the following characteristics:

- Current (2010 census) population
- Population growth for the previous ten years (2000-2010)
- Median household income for 2010
- Per capita commercial/industrial property market value for 2011

As in the earlier analyses, Minnesota cities have been separated into two groups for clustering purposes. One group consists of all cities in the seven-county Twin Cities metropolitan area; the second group consists of all other cities. Segregating the metro and nonmetro cities reflects historical perspective in the way decision-makers view the state. In addition, metro area cities can be defined vis-a-vis their role within the urbanized metropolitan area while nonmetro cities are defined by their role in their regional economies.

² The variable used in the 2002 analysis was per capita commercial/industrial property value in 2001, but the substitution of the percentage for that variable resulted in more consistent city groups.

Summary of the Resulting Clusters

After adjustments for cities with extreme values for the chosen variables, we tried the cluster analysis using various numbers of groups. A complete description of the methodology used in developing the groups can be found in Appendix A. The result was 15 clusters, each named for its dominant characteristic or characteristics. A complete list is found in Table 1. There are seven clusters of cities in the seven-county metropolitan area and eight clusters of cities in the nonmetropolitan or Greater Minnesota region.

We defined most of the clusters using the statistical clustering technique. However, we defined two clusters using criteria outside of the analysis. The word “predetermined” under the dominant characteristic listing in Table 1 indicates these clusters. Two other clusters in Greater Minnesota—Sub-regional Centers and Urban Fringe—began as one large cluster but were subdivided into two groups post-analysis based on each city’s proximity to the seven-county metropolitan area. Appendix A provides a more complete explanation of the rationale behind these choices.

Table 1
Final Categorization of Cities

City Cluster Name	Number of Cities in Cluster	Dominant Characteristics
Metropolitan Clusters		
Center Cities	2	Major economic centers for the state and the Twin Cities metropolitan area (predetermined)
Established Cities	23	Developed cities with lower growth rates and median household incomes and above average concentrations of commercial/industrial property
Large Cities	15	The largest suburbs in the metropolitan area with significant commercial/industrial property
Fast Growing Suburbs	15	Suburbs with highest population growth rates
Growing High Income Cities	29	Growing suburbs with high median household incomes
High Income Suburbs	23	Cities with very high median incomes and little commercial/industrial property
Small Residential Cities	32	Cities with very small population size and below average amount of commercial/industrial property
Nonmetropolitan Clusters		
Major Cities	3	Major economic centers for large sub-regions of the state, the largest cities in Greater Minnesota
Regional Centers	20	Very large cities with high commercial/industrial property value per capita
Sub-Regional Centers	29	Larger than average cities with very high commercial/industrial property value per capita
Urban Fringe	26	Cities with very high population growth rate and median household income located adjacent to the seven-county metropolitan area
High Growth Cities	18	Cities similar to Urban Fringe cities but not adjacent to the seven-county metropolitan area
Residential Communities	87	Cities with above average median incomes and below average amounts of commercial/industrial property per capita
Rural Cities	186	Smaller cities with below average median household incomes and amounts of commercial/industrial property values per capita and stable or declining population growth
Cities With a Population Under 500	345	Population under 500 (predetermined)

Cluster Descriptions

This section presents:

- Variable profiles for the city clusters in each region for the four variables used in the analysis for that region, and
- A verbal description of each cluster.

A cluster profile provides scores for the variables used in the analysis; each score represents the mean (average) value for that variable for the cities contained in that cluster. Another way to describe and compare city clusters is by z-scores, which measure how many standard deviations a cluster mean is from the regional mean (unweighted average for all cities in the region). The first table for each region shows the mean values of each variable for each cluster while the second table uses z-scores to rank cities as high or low on the various grouping characteristics

For example, the Fast Growing Suburbs cluster has a standardized score of 2.03 for population growth. This means that the average value for population growth for all cities in that cluster is 2.03 standard deviations above the regional average. The Central Cities cluster has a standardized score of -1.20 for median household income, which is 1.20 standard deviations below the regional average for this characteristic.

A complete list of Minnesota cities and their values for the variables used in the final analysis is found in Appendix B at the end of the report. Appendix B-1 presents this information with cities sorted by cluster group. Appendix B-2 lists cities sorted alphabetically by county and the cluster to which they are assigned.

Metropolitan Cities

There are seven city clusters for the metropolitan area. Variable profiles for the clusters of cities are given in Tables 2a and 2b. The variables used in the metropolitan area clusters are 2010 population, percent change in population from 2000 to 2010, 2010 median household income, and the percent of the city's total property value classified as commercial/industrial property.

Table 2a
Cluster Profiles for Metropolitan Cities

Cluster Name	2010 Population	Population Growth Rate 2000-2010	Median Household Income	% of Property Classified Comm./Ind.	No. of Cities
Center Cities	333,823	-0.4%	\$45,757	20.3%	2
Established Cities	14,189	-1.0%	\$54,496	29.7%	23
Large Cities	60,314	10.0%	\$76,534	19.9%	15
Fast Growing Suburbs	10,076	112.3%	\$80,846	11.2%	15
Growing High Income Suburbs	14,982	17.2%	\$80,768	9.7%	29
High Income Suburbs	2,631	2.8%	\$113,931	2.7%	23
Smaller Residential Cities	6,828	-1.1%	\$58,828	12.9%	32
Metro Unweighted Average*	19,880	16.8%	\$75,905	14.0%	139
Standard Deviation	42,832	47.2%	\$24,995	11.0%	

*This is not equal to the regional average since cities were not weighted by size.

House Research Department

Table 2b
Characteristics Ranks for Metropolitan City Clusters

Cluster Name	2010 Population	Population Growth Rate 2000-2010	Median Household Income	% of Property Classified Comm./Ind.
Center Cities	Very High	Low	Very Low	High
Established Cities	Medium	Low	Low	Very High
Large Cities	High	Medium	Medium	High
Fast Growing Suburbs	Low	Very High	High	Low
Growing High Income Suburbs	Medium	Medium	High	Low
High Income Suburbs	Low	Low	Very High	Very Low
Smaller Residential Cities	Low	Low	Low	Medium

Note on Ranks:

Very High = the cluster mean is more than 1 standard deviation above the regional mean
 High = the cluster mean is between 0.2 and 1.0 standard deviation above the regional mean
 Medium = the cluster mean is within plus or minus 0.2 standard deviation of the regional mean
 Low = the cluster mean is between 0.2 and 1.0 standard deviation below the regional mean
 Very Low = the cluster mean is more than 1.0 standard deviation below the regional mean

1. Center Cities (Number of cities = 2)

The “Center Cities” cluster consists of Minneapolis and St. Paul. These two cities clearly stand apart from others in the metropolitan area because of their role as the economic nucleus for the region and the state. Minneapolis and St. Paul are much larger than the other metropolitan cities based on their population. The median household income is only about 60 percent of the average for metropolitan area cities.

Minneapolis and St. Paul serve as the major government and economic centers for the region and the state. This increased economic activity translates into a significant amount of commercial/industrial property in the city. In addition these cities provide services to a larger population than residents alone. The extended population served by these cities affects the kinds and amounts of government services needed, as does the fact that these cities have a larger share of low-income households. The increased commercial/industrial tax base enhances their ability to meet some of those additional needs.

2. Established Cities (Number of cities = 23) (Examples: Anoka, Maplewood)

The “Established Cities” consists of 23 of the most established communities in the metropolitan area. The cluster is characterized by lower than average population growth rates and median household income. However, the percentage of their total property value classified as commercial/industrial property is very high.

Many cities in this cluster, such as Anoka or Maple Plain, were established and “freestanding” cities before the development of surrounding suburbs. Others, such as Golden Valley and Maplewood, were early bedroom communities for the central cities. These cities often have established business areas. The age and size of these communities indicate cities with established infrastructure and developed delivery systems for government services. These cities have limited opportunity for further growth and development.

3. Large Cities (Number of cities = 15) (Examples: Bloomington, Woodbury)

“Large Cities” have a cluster profile score above the average for per capita commercial/industrial property value and population. These cities have average scores for population growth rates and median household income, although the rates for individual cities on each of the last two characteristics are mixed.

The cities are the largest cities in the metropolitan area outside of the Central Cities and are the sub-economic centers of the region. They are major locations for jobs and often contain major shopping hubs. These cities need to provide city services to commuters who work or shop in the city as well as to city residents.

4. Fast Growing Suburbs (Number of cities = 15) (Examples: Farmington, Shakopee)

Cities classified as “fast growing” show a mean population growth rate for 2000 to 2010 that is more than six times larger than the growth rate for all metropolitan area cities. The profile

scores for population, median household income, and percent of property value classified as commercial/industrial property for this cluster are below the means for metropolitan area cities, while the profile score for median household income for this group is slightly higher than for all cities in the region

The Fast Growing Suburbs are located in areas that were relatively rural until recently and would be considered third-ring suburbs or located on the fringe of the urban area. These cities are highly dependent on the freeway system to allow residents access to jobs in other areas. Many of these cities are along the transportation corridors to St. Cloud and Rochester, two nearby major cities. The rapid growth of cities in this cluster raise special difficulties for these communities in providing necessary government services and infrastructure.

The cities in this cluster are essentially small bedroom communities. With few exceptions, they have minimal commercial/industrial development. This means that these cities have little in-commuting and mainly serve their resident population. The higher than average household incomes indicate an increased ability to pay for city services with less need to provide services to low income groups.

5. Growing High Income Cities (Number of cities = 29) (Examples: Chanhassen, Cottage Grove)

Cities classified in the “Growing High Income” cluster are similar to the cities in the previous cluster but they are slightly larger and their growth has slowed to near the regional average. Roughly half of these cities were classified as high growth cities in the 2002 analysis.

Like fast growing suburbs, the growing high income cities are generally located in the outer rings of the Twin Cities metropolitan area. They are generally bedroom communities with below average commercial/industrial development.

6. High Income Suburbs (Number of cities = 23) (Examples: Minnetonka Beach, North Oaks)

The predominant characteristic for the “High Income Suburbs” cluster is its profile score for median household income, which is 50 percent higher than the average for all cities in the region. The scores for the other three factors—population, population growth, and percent of property classified as commercial/industrial—are significantly below the regional averages.

High Income Suburbs tend to be very small bedroom communities with virtually no commercial development. This means that the cities have little in-commuting and primarily provide services to their resident populations. The extremely high median household incomes indicate an ability to fund city services internally with little outside help.

7. Small Cities (Number of cities = 32) (Examples: St. Anthony, Willernie)

The “Small Cities” cluster includes cities that are smaller than average for the metropolitan area with an average population of about one-third of the average population for all metropolitan cities. The cluster’s profile on other cluster variables (per capita

commercial/industrial market value, population growth, and median household income) is also below the average for metropolitan area cities.

This group of cities is made up of two types: small cities in developed areas that have no room for growth (i.e., Falcon Heights); and small cities in the exurban area that have yet to be affected by exurban growth (i.e., Hamburg). Small cities may face unique problems in delivering government services to their communities due to economies of scale. These problems may require special solutions such as contracting with other governmental units to provide services.

Greater Minnesota City Clusters

There are eight clusters of Minnesota cities located in Greater Minnesota, which consists of the 80 counties outside of the Twin Cities metropolitan area. Variable profiles for these city clusters are contained in Tables 3a and 3b. The variables used to construct nonmetropolitan clusters are 2010 population, rate of change in population from 2000 to 2010, median household income in 2010, and the 2010 commercial/industrial property value per capita in the city.

Table 3a

Variable Profiles for Nonmetropolitan City Clusters

Cluster Name	2010 Population	Population Growth from 2000-2010	Median Household Income	Comm./Ind. Market Value Per Capita	No. of Cities
Major Cities	86,292	11.7%	\$47,041	\$14,859	3
Regional Centers	19,309	7.1%	\$43,013	\$12,574	20
Sub-Regional	3,112	6.0%	\$39,989	\$22,997	29
Urban Fringe	6,265	86.7%	\$63,380	\$11,158	26
High Growth Cities	2,901	52.7%	\$53,811	\$8,708	18
Residential Communities	2,719	10.5%	\$55,220	\$6,721	87
Rural Cities	1,705	1.5%	\$36,852	\$6,089	186
Cities with a population under 500	207	-0.7%	\$39,610	\$6,217	345
Nonmetro Unweighted Average*	4,076	12.9%	\$44,542	\$8,476	714
Standard Deviation	6,861	20.6%	\$12,374	\$7,206	

*This average only includes the cities in Greater Minnesota with a population above 500; these smaller cities were excluded before the analysis and designated as a separate cluster.

Table 3b

Characteristic Ranks for Nonmetropolitan City clusters

Cluster Name	2010 Population	Population Growth Rate 2000-2010	Median Household Income	Comm./Ind. Market Value Per Capita
Major Cities	Very High	Medium	Medium	High
Regional Centers	Very High	Low	Medium	High
Sub-regional Centers	Medium	Low	Low	Very High
Urban Fringe	High	Very High	Very High	High
High Growth Cities	Medium	Very High	High	Medium
Residential Communities	Medium	Medium	High	Low
Rural Cities	Low	Low	Low	Low
Cities with a pop. under 500	--	--	--	--

Note on Ranks:

Very High = the cluster mean is more than 1 standard deviation above the regional mean³

High = the cluster mean is between 0.2 and 1.0 standard deviation above the regional mean³

Medium = the cluster mean is within plus or minus 0.2 standard deviation of the regional mean³

Low = the cluster mean is between 0.2 and 1.0 standard deviation below the regional mean³

Very Low = the cluster mean is more than 1.0 standard deviation below the regional mean³

8. Major Cities (Number of cities = 3) (Examples: Duluth, Rochester)

The cluster called “Major Cities” consists of the three largest nonmetropolitan cities. Their population is 20 times larger than the average of all nonmetropolitan cities included in the analysis. Except for number of households, these cities—Duluth, Rochester, and St. Cloud—have a profile similar to the cities in the “Regional Centers” cluster. The average amount of per capita commercial/industrial property per capita for these cities is almost twice the nonmetropolitan average. These cities have a higher than average median household income. Their population has been stable or growing over the ten-year period.

Cities in this group are the major economic centers outside of the metropolitan area for large regions. They serve as the focus for government services, education, medical services, and trade for their regions. The area served by a major city may include several regional and sub-regional centers and even areas outside of the state. These cities are surrounded by smaller communities that act like suburbs for these cities. Like the central cities in the metropolitan area, their higher than average commercial/industrial base indicates a larger tax base from which to fund those services. However, the age and amount of established infrastructure, the extra service demands of nonresidents, and their established government structure and spending patterns of these cities may lead to higher costs in providing city services.

³ Regional mean for cities with a population over 500 only.

9. Regional Centers (Number of cities = 20) (Examples: Moorhead, Winona)

Cities in the “Regional Centers” cluster share many of the same characteristics as “Major Cities.” These cities have a higher than average per capita commercial/industrial property value. The profile scores for this cluster are almost five times the regional average for population, but are below the regional average for growth rate and median household income.

“Regional Centers” cities, such as Hutchinson or Bemidji, are economic centers for sub-regions of outstate Minnesota. Many of the cities in this cluster are county seats. These cities are the focus for nonagricultural employment in their local regions and act as trade centers for the local economy as indicated by above average commercial/industrial property value per capita.

10. Sub-Regional Centers (Number of cities = 29) (Examples: Hinkley, Granite Falls)

The profile of the “Sub-Regional Centers” cluster is similar to the regional centers profile except the cities are, on average, significantly smaller. They have similar population growth rates and median household incomes as the regional centers, however they have almost double the per capita amount of commercial/industrial property.

Although “Sub-Regional Center” cities are smaller than the cities in the “Regional Centers” cluster, they serve as employment centers for county and sub-county areas.

11. Urban Fringe (Number of cities = 26) (Examples: Monticello, New Prague)

The cities in the “Urban Fringe” cluster are located in counties directly adjacent to the seven-county metropolitan area. Most of these cities are located on or near major highways that allow easy access to the nearby seven-county metropolitan area. These cities have a mean population and population growth rate significantly above the regional norm. The cluster profile for median household income is the highest of all nonmetropolitan clusters; it is closer to the region average for the seven-county metropolitan area.

Cities classified as “Urban Fringe” have been affected by increasing numbers of people who want to live in a rural setting but still have access to amenities and services of larger urban areas. Like all communities that encounter rapid growth, cities in this cluster face special difficulties in providing needed government services and infrastructure.

12. High Growth Cities (Number of cities = 18) (Examples: Breezy Point, Sartell)

The cities in the “High Growth City” cluster are often located on major roads near major cities and regional centers in Greater Minnesota. Like cities in the “Urban Fringe” cluster, these cities have a mean population and population growth rate significantly above the regional norm.

Like the cities classified as “Urban Fringe,” the high growth cities have been affected by increasing numbers of people who want to live in a more rural setting but still have access to

amenities and services of larger urban areas. These cities do provide the necessary services to residents such as the local grocery store, gas station, post office, etc. They also provide some local employment.

13. Residential Communities (Number of cities = 87) (Examples: Crookston, Le Sueur)

Cities in the “Residential Communities” cluster have a profile score above the regional average for median household income and below the regional average for the value of commercial/industrial property per capita.

Cities in this cluster often act as bedroom communities for nearby regional and sub-regional centers. For the most part these cities have not experienced the mass rural exodus and decline that have characterized other small rural communities.

14. Rural Cities (Number of cities = 186) (Examples: Bagley, Parker’s Prairie)

The “Rural Cities” cluster has below average scores on all four of the characteristics used to classify cities in Greater Minnesota. This group has the lowest median household income and amount of commercial/industrial property per capita for all nonmetro clusters. Many of the cities in this group have declining populations.

Cities in this cluster are, or were, providers of services to the immediate rural/farm population. However, these cities, with low household incomes and declining populations, may have difficulty in the future maintaining their current levels of government services.

15. Under 500 Cities (Number of cities = 345) (Examples: Campbell, Zumbro Falls)

Cities in the “Under 500” cluster were selected *a priori* based on their population. The average population for cities in this cluster is 207, less than 5 percent of the average population for the other cities in Greater Minnesota. This cluster has profile scores below the regional average for commercial/industrial property value per capita and median household income. This cluster exhibits the greatest average population decline of all nonmetropolitan communities. However some of these cities, such as ones located around larger cities, have experienced population growth over the last decade.

The cities represented in the “Under 500” cluster are small population centers that serve only residents of the immediate local area. Some, like Darwin, surround the local grain elevator. Others, like Askov, are at the junctions of major roads. Most cities in this cluster have limited commercial services, such as the local gas station or diner. Cities with populations under 500 face special difficulties in providing local government services due to their size. These difficulties may lead to special solutions such as contracting with the county to provide services, or a city limiting the number of services provided.

Appendix A: Classification Methodology

What is Cluster Analysis?

Cluster analysis is a statistical method of classifying a set of objects into groups with similar characteristics. Using this technique, a researcher calculates which objects are statistically most similar to one another, and then sorts them into different “clusters” or groups of like objects. This technique is useful because it allows an analyst to create rigorous categorization schemes or typologies grounded in empirical data.

Cluster analysis differs from other statistical analysis techniques because there is not a single correct way to categorize a set of objects; it is more of an art than a science. While objects are always assigned to the group to which they are statistically most similar, there are typically a number of equally valid ways of grouping objects using different variables and numbers of groups. The “best” classification is the one that is most intuitively valid and analytically useful for the proposed use of the clusters.

The Minnesota city clusters are developed to allow analysis of the effects of property tax and local aid proposals on different types of cities. For this reason, the clusters are based on city characteristics related to local government spending needs and ability to pay. We ultimately classified all of Minnesota’s 853 cities into one of 15 different clusters, seven of which consisted of cities in the seven-county Twin Cities metropolitan area and eight of which consisted of cities in Greater Minnesota. The department then assigned these groups of cities intuitive names that describe the kinds of cities they contain, such as “Fast Growing Suburbs,” “Regional Centers,” or “Urban Fringe.”

The resulting classification scheme is useful because it allows legislators and policy analysts to quickly compare the outcomes of policy changes for similar cities, as well as to think more generally about how different kinds of cities fare relative to others. This typology is useful because it allows an analyst to think about policy changes with a scope that is narrower than looking at the state as a whole, but broader than looking at a particular city. It also provides a more nuanced analysis of policy changes than can be achieved by simply classifying cities based on one characteristic, such as geographic location

Data Collected and Characteristics Chosen for Analysis

At the start of the analysis, we collected data on more than 35 characteristics for each city in Minnesota. Our goal was to eventually use four to five characteristics to classify cities, but it began with the broader list of potential characteristics below. Demographic and housing data came from either the 2010 Decennial Census or from the Census Bureau’s American Community Survey.⁴ We used property value and tax capacity data for 2011, from the Minnesota Department of Revenue.

⁴ American Community Survey data were from five-year pooled samples from the years 2007 to 2011.

Table A-1: Characteristics Initially Examined

Demographic	Housing	Property Value/Tax Capacity (all values per capita)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average household size • Median household income • Natural logarithm of the population • Per capita income • Population • Population density per acre • Population growth (previous 10 years) • Population growth (previous 5 years) • Percent aged 18 or younger • Percent aged 65 or older • Percent change in median household income (previous 10 years) • Percent change in non-Hispanic, white only (previous 10 years) • Percent living in group quarters • Percent living in poverty • Percent non-Hispanic, white only • Percent over 25 with a bachelor's degree • Percent living in single parent households • Total households 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Median gross rent • Median home value • Percent of housing units built 1939 or earlier • Percent of housing units built 1949 or earlier • Percent of housing units built 1969 or earlier • Percent of housing units built 1979 or earlier • Percent of housing units built 2005 or later • Percent of housing units occupied by renters • Percent of housing units that were vacant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjusted net tax capacity • Percent of total property value represented by commercial/industrial property • Market value of commercial/industrial property • Market value of residential/apartment property • Market value of farm property • Market value of seasonal-recreational property. • Market value of public utility property • Market value of state-owned land • Market value of tax-exempt property

We eventually decided against using most of the above characteristics for a variety of reasons. Some characteristics were highly correlated with one another, such as college education and median household income, and the inclusion both would be redundant and add little analytical value. Others, such as market value of farm property, were irrelevant to many Minnesota cities, and were therefore an ineffective method for categorizing them.

Table A-2: Characteristics Used in the Final Analysis

Twin Cities Metropolitan Area Analysis	Greater Minnesota Analysis
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Population (2010) • 10-year population growth (2000-2010) • Median household income (2010) • Percent of total property value made up by commercial/industrial property (2011) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Population (2010) • 10-year population growth (2000-2010) • Median household income (2010) • Commercial/industrial property value per capita (2011) • Location in a county adjacent to the seven-county Twin Cities metropolitan area

After running the analysis dozens of times with different variables and classification techniques, we decided on a version of the analysis that used population, 10-year population growth, median household income, and commercial/industrial property value to classify cities. We chose these characteristics primarily because they resulted in analytically useful groups of cities. In addition, these were the same variables used in the 1996 House Research and 2002 League of Minnesota Cities cluster analyses, which means that the results of this analysis will be more familiar to policymakers and analysts who have used the cluster results in the past. Although we used similar variables for this version of the report as for previous versions, results were different for many cities. The updated results reflect both changes in the underlying characteristics of Minnesota cities over the last ten years and minor changes in the methodology the department used.

Methodological Changes from Past Analyses

Although we used a similar list of variables as in previous analyses, this analysis differed from previous versions of the report because it incorporated geography into the Greater Minnesota analysis and used an alternate measure of commercial/industrial property value for the Twin Cities metropolitan area analysis.

For the Greater Minnesota analysis, we used geography to separate high growth and high income cities located adjacent to the Twin Cities metropolitan area from those located further away from the metropolitan area. Our preliminary results indicated that there were two clusters of cities in Greater Minnesota with high population growth and high median incomes. One cluster contained cities with extremely high growth and high income that were mostly located adjacent to the seven-county Twin Cities metropolitan area. A second cluster had higher than average incomes and growth for Greater Minnesota, but comparatively less income and growth than the first. Instead of using two redundant clusters or a single large cluster, we used geography to capture a more fundamental difference in these cities. After temporarily combining the two high growth clusters for the purposes of running the clustering algorithm, we ultimately separated these cities on the basis of geography⁵ post hoc.

⁵ We classified high growth cities located in the metro-adjacent counties of Chisago, Goodhue, Isanti, Le Sueur, McLeod, Rice, Sherburne, Sibley, and Wright counties as “Urban Fringe.” We classified cities located in other counties as “High Growth.” In addition, the cities of Pine Island, Rush City, and Braham were classified as “High Growth” rather than “Urban Fringe,” even though they were technically located either partially or wholly in metro-adjacent counties. These cities are all located on the county border line, and were located quite close to other

In addition to the use of geography for Greater Minnesota, we used a slightly different measure of commercial/industrial property value for the Twin Cities metropolitan area than we did for the rest of the state. For the Twin Cities metropolitan area, we used the share of total property value represented by commercial/industrial property, while for Greater Minnesota, we used commercial/industrial property value per capita.

We chose this alternate measure because in the Twin Cities metropolitan area, the use of commercial/industrial property per capita resulted in certain cities with high overall property values being improperly classified as commercial centers. We initially chose commercial/industrial property as a variable to capture the amount of commercial activity in a given city. When we ran our analysis using per capita commercial/industrial property, lake cities with high overall property values such as Wayzata ended up classified by the analysis as commercial centers, because all property in these areas was more valuable due to the city's location. By switching to commercial/industrial property as a share of total property, the analysis was able to better identify which cities actually contained a lot of commercial activity.

A Priori Separations

Before running any quantitative analysis, we made four a priori decisions about how to structure the clustering process.

First, as with previous versions of the cluster analysis, we ran two separate analyses for the seven-county Twin Cities metropolitan area and the rest of Greater Minnesota. This decision reflected a key frame that policymakers use when thinking about Minnesota cities. Moreover, it reflected statistically measureable differences between the two regions; cities in the metropolitan area are on average larger and have much higher median incomes than cities in Greater Minnesota.

We considered breaking with previous versions of the cluster analysis and running a single, combined cluster analysis for the state of Minnesota as a whole. To test the validity of such an approach, we ran several iterations of a combined cluster analysis. While the combined cluster analysis produced several surprising and potentially insightful groupings of cities, many of the resulting clusters were too confusing to be used as a tool for policy analysis. As a result, we decided to stick with the tradition of separating the Twin Cities metropolitan area region from the rest of the state for the cluster groupings.

Second, because of their unique role in the Minnesota economy, we established the "Center City" cluster of Minneapolis and St. Paul a priori. Because we pre-determined the "Center City" cluster, we did not include Minneapolis and St. Paul in our calculations for the Twin Cities metropolitan area.

Third, we initially excluded cities with fewer than 500 people from our analysis. The sheer quantity of such cities in Greater Minnesota in particular threatened to give them outsized

"High Growth" cities. This categorization reflects a judgment on the part of the department that these cities were more similar to the other cities in the "High Growth" cluster than to the cities in the "Urban Fringe" cluster.

influence on the results of the analysis. By focusing on larger cities, we could make sure that the clusters reflected meaningful differences between the state's main population centers. For the Twin Cities metropolitan area analysis, we assigned the 14 cities with populations less than 500 to the most mathematically similar cluster. For Greater Minnesota, which contained 345 cities with populations below 500, these cities were grouped into a separate cluster, "Cities with a population under 500."

Fourth, we initially excluded four outlier cities from our analysis that tended to overwhelm the clustering algorithm. Carver, Elko/New Market, and Mayer grew so quickly in ten years (194.2 percent, 411.2 percent, and 215.7 percent, respectively) that they tended to break off into one and two city clusters without any analytical value. Along with these high growth cities, we excluded the city of Landfall from our initial analysis because it had an exceptionally high proportion (82 percent) of its total property value represented by commercial/industrial property. While we initially excluded these cities from the clustering process, we added them to the most appropriate cluster post hoc.

Hierarchical vs. Nonhierarchical Clustering

Statisticians have devised two main methods for performing cluster analyses: hierarchical and nonhierarchical clustering.

Hierarchical Clustering: To perform a hierarchical cluster analysis, a statistician does not need to specify a preferred number of clusters as an outcome or identify starting points for the "centers" of the clusters. Instead, hierarchical clustering groups objects in a step-by-step process. It begins with a large data set and merges the most similar objects or groups of objects together one after the other.

Advantages:

- Requires fewer preconceptions about number of clusters and initial centers than nonhierarchical clustering.
- Always produces the same result given a particular set of characteristics.
- A "dendrogram" of a hierarchical cluster analysis allows an analyst to see how groups progressively merge with each other during each step of the process, which can be useful in identifying an intuitive or analytically meaningful number of clusters.

Disadvantages:

- Less flexible than nonhierarchical clustering.
- Once an object is classified in a particular group, it cannot move to another group at a later stage in the process.
- Tends to emphasize small differences between large groups rather than large differences between small groups.

Nonhierarchical Clustering: Nonhierarchical clustering typically requires an analyst to specify the number of clusters he or she wishes to create, as well as to describe the starting points or "centers" of each cluster. From there, the clustering algorithm assigns objects to whichever cluster they most closely resemble. This process is typically repeated several times as the centers

of the clusters change and objects shift between groups.

Advantages:

- Extremely flexible—allows a researcher to specify both the number and starting points for cluster centers.
- Iterative process allows cities to shift to whichever clusters they most closely resemble. Initial “errors” in classification are not irreversible.

Disadvantages:

- Decisions about number of clusters may be influenced by an analyst’s preconceptions about how objects should be sorted.
- If no initial cluster centers are specified, cities are usually assigned randomly to particular clusters, which can result in variation in final results depending on initial cluster centers.

Method of Analysis Used

We began our analysis by standardizing variables and proceeding to use an iterative nonhierarchical k-means cluster analysis, starting with 15 clusters and gradually eliminating redundant or analytically meaningless groupings.

Prior to running the analysis, we standardized the variables to avoid placing undue emphasis on a single characteristic. The clustering process was conducted using SPSS, which always uses simple Euclidian distance to classify objects for a k-means cluster analysis. As a result, if we used variables with very different scales (e.g., median income and population growth rate), the clustering algorithm will weigh variables with larger units more heavily. We therefore standardized each variable, and ran the clustering algorithm using the standardized values. Because we ran two separate analyses, we standardized the variables separately for the Greater Minnesota and Twin Cities metropolitan area analyses.

We developed the final clusters using an iterative process that started with a large number of clusters and proceeded to gradually merge and eliminate clusters until a meaningful result was achieved. Because we used the k-means method of cluster analysis, we had to initially specify the number of clusters we wished to generate. We initially conducted two separate 15-cluster analyses for the Twin Cities metropolitan area and Greater Minnesota. Starting with a large number of clusters gave us a better sense of the patterns and structure of the dataset, which made it easier to build.

The initial 15 cluster analyses contained several clusters that were redundant with one another for purposes of interpretation. For example, both analyses contained two or more clusters with very high growth rates. While there is a statistical difference between these clusters, they are similar enough to combine for the purposes of policy analysis. To reduce the number of clusters to only analytically meaningful groupings, we eliminated one of these clusters and ran a new analysis using the final centers from the previous analysis as initial centers for a new analysis. In the next iteration of the analysis, the two high growth clusters would combine.

After eliminating obviously redundant clusters from our initial analysis, we ended up with six distinct and meaningful clusters for the Twin Cities metropolitan area and seven distinct clusters for Greater Minnesota. Together with the “Center Cities” cluster in the Twin Cities metropolitan area and “Cities With a Population Under 500,” the final analysis resulted in 15 clusters for the state as a whole.

Appendix B-1: City Clusters and Cluster Variables

Metropolitan City Cluster: Center Cities (predetermined)

City	2010 Population	Population Growth Rate 2000-2010	Median Household Income	% of Property Classified Comm./Ind.
Minneapolis	382,578	0.0%	\$46,075	21.5%
Saint Paul	285,068	-0.7%	\$45,439	19.2%
Cluster Profile (including all cities)	333,823	-0.4%	\$45,757	20.3%

Metropolitan City Cluster: Established Cities

City	2010 Population	Population Growth Rate 2000-2010	Median Household Income	% of Property Classified Comm./Ind.
Anoka	17,142	-5.2%	\$48,616	24.0%
Arden Hills	9,552	-1.0%	\$78,681	32.0%
Brooklyn Center	30,104	3.2%	\$49,226	22.0%
Fridley	27,208	-0.9%	\$51,656	34.0%
Golden Valley	20,371	0.4%	\$80,487	28.0%
Hilltop	744	-2.9%	\$26,750	41.0%
Hopkins	17,591	2.6%	\$46,828	29.0%
Little Canada	9,773	0.0%	\$47,419	27.0%
Long Lake	1,768	-4.0%	\$74,688	26.0%
Maple Plain	1,768	-15.3%	\$65,625	31.0%
Maplewood	38,018	8.8%	\$57,438	27.0%
Mounds View	12,155	-4.6%	\$60,087	27.0%
New Hope	20,339	-2.6%	\$49,833	23.0%
Newport	3,435	-7.5%	\$49,646	22.0%
Oak Park Heights	4,339	9.7%	\$50,449	27.0%
Oakdale	27,378	2.7%	\$67,061	20.0%
Osseo	2,430	-0.2%	\$41,964	32.0%
Richfield	35,228	2.3%	\$51,549	19.0%
Roseville	33,660	-0.1%	\$55,300	33.0%
Vadnais Heights	12,302	-5.9%	\$69,926	25.0%
Coates*	161	-1.2%	\$58,929	31.0%

* City assigned to the cluster post-analysis due to being an outlier or a city with a population under 500 in the metropolitan area

Note: When cities were assigned to a cluster postanalysis, the cluster profile (unweighted average) is shown for both (1) the cities included in the statistical analysis only, and (2) all cities included in the final cluster.

Metropolitan City Cluster: Established Cities

Landfall*	686	-2.0%	\$32,500	82.0%
Mendota*	198	0.5%	\$38,750	20.0%
Cluster Profile (statistical analysis)	16,265	-1.0%	\$56,161	27.5%
Cluster Profile (including all cities)	14,189	-1.0%	\$54,496	29.7%

Metropolitan City Cluster: Large Cities

City	2010 Population	Population Growth Rate 2000-2010	Median Household Income	% of Property Classified Comm./Ind.
Apple Valley	49,084	7.8%	\$78,571	12.0%
Blaine	57,186	27.2%	\$73,448	20.0%
Bloomington	82,893	-2.7%	\$59,458	33.0%
Brooklyn Park	75,781	12.5%	\$62,077	20.0%
Burnsville	60,306	0.1%	\$64,292	24.0%
Coon Rapids	61,476	-0.2%	\$62,448	19.0%
Eagan	64,206	1.0%	\$77,604	23.0%
Eden Prairie	60,797	10.7%	\$89,493	21.0%
Edina	47,941	1.1%	\$79,535	16.0%
Lakeville	55,954	29.7%	\$91,631	13.0%
Maple Grove	61,567	22.2%	\$92,768	19.0%
Minnetonka	49,734	-3.1%	\$81,324	23.0%
Plymouth	70,576	7.1%	\$85,340	20.0%
Saint Louis Park	45,250	2.5%	\$58,636	22.0%
Woodbury	61,961	33.4%	\$91,383	14.0%
Cluster Profile (statistical analysis)	60,314	10.0%	\$76,534	19.9%

Metropolitan City Cluster: Fast Growing Suburbs

City	2010 Population	Population Growth Rate 2000-2010	Median Household Income	% of Property Classified Comm./Ind.
Belle Plaine	6,661	75.8%	\$69,065	13.0%
Cologne	1,519	50.1%	\$72,452	8.0%
Farmington	21,086	70.5%	\$80,494	7.0%
Hugo	13,332	109.5%	\$78,261	9.0%
Jordan	5,470	42.7%	\$61,689	14.0%
Rogers	8,597	139.6%	\$92,202	38.0%
Rosemount	21,874	49.6%	\$82,395	13.0%

Metropolitan City Cluster: Fast Growing Suburbs

Saint Francis	7,218	47.0%	\$67,480	8.0%
Shakopee	37,076	80.3%	\$77,018	23.0%
Victoria	7,345	82.5%	\$108,210	2.0%
Waconia	10,697	57.0%	\$82,887	16.0%
Carver*	3,724	194.2%	\$98,378	1.0%
Elko/New Market*	4,110	411.2%	\$90,071	3.0%
Hampton*	689	58.8%	\$65,833	6.0%
Mayer*	1,749	215.7%	\$86,250	7.0%
Cluster Profile (Statistical analysis)	12,807	73.1%	\$79,287	13.7%
Cluster Profile (Average for all cities)	10,076	112.3%	\$80,846	11.2%

Metropolitan City Cluster: Growing High Income Cities

City	2010 Population	Population Growth Rate 2000-2010	Median Household Income	% of Property Classified Comm./Ind.
Andover	30,598	15.1%	\$89,586	5.0%
Centerville	3,792	18.4%	\$82,558	8.0%
Champlin	23,089	4.0%	\$80,279	9.0%
Chanhassen	22,952	12.9%	\$100,284	15.0%
Chaska	23,770	35.0%	\$70,707	18.0%
Circle Pines	4,918	5.5%	\$73,400	4.0%
Cottage Grove	34,589	13.1%	\$80,830	9.0%
East Bethel	11,626	6.3%	\$76,447	5.0%
Forest Lake	18,375	27.3%	\$67,293	14.0%
Ham Lake	15,296	20.3%	\$89,472	7.0%
Hastings	22,172	21.8%	\$64,248	13.0%
Inver Grove Heights	33,880	13.9%	\$67,661	13.0%
Lake Elmo	8,069	17.6%	\$101,818	11.0%
Lakeland	1,796	-6.3%	\$83,672	6.0%
Lilydale	623	12.9%	\$77,500	11.0%
Lino Lakes	20,216	20.4%	\$94,728	9.0%
Mahtomedi	7,676	1.5%	\$87,731	6.0%
Mendota Heights	11,071	-3.2%	\$92,727	19.0%
Nowthen	4,443	24.9%	\$90,045	4.0%
Oak Grove	8,031	16.3%	\$74,415	3.0%
Prior Lake	22,796	43.2%	\$90,360	5.0%
Ramsey	23,668	27.9%	\$81,598	14.0%
Saint Bonifacius	2,283	21.9%	\$74,271	13.0%
Savage	26,911	27.4%	\$89,183	15.0%
Scandia	3,936	6.6%	\$80,556	2.0%
Shoreview	25,043	-3.4%	\$80,762	13.0%

Metropolitan City Cluster: Growing High Income Cities

Stillwater	18,225	20.4%	\$70,090	15.0%
Watertown	4,205	38.8%	\$61,792	8.0%
Randolph*	436	37.1%	\$68,250	6.0%
Cluster Profile (Statistical analysis)	15,502	16.4%	\$81,215	9.8%
Cluster Profile (Average for all cities)	14,982	17.2%	\$80,768	9.7%

Metropolitan City Cluster: High Income Suburbs

City	2010 Population	Population Growth Rate 2000-2010	Median Household Income	% of Property Classified Comm./Ind.
Afton	2,886	1.7%	\$99,375	5.0%
Birchwood	870	-10.1%	\$86,842	0.0%
Corcoran	5,379	-4.5%	\$90,058	5.0%
Deephaven	3,642	-5.5%	\$124,205	2.0%
Dellwood	1,063	2.9%	\$174,821	4.0%
Grant	4,096	1.7%	\$103,707	2.0%
Greenfield	2,777	9.2%	\$98,333	7.0%
Greenwood	688	-5.6%	\$130,417	2.0%
Independence	3,504	8.3%	\$102,500	3.0%
Marine On Saint Croix	689	14.5%	\$91,250	3.0%
Medina	4,892	22.1%	\$118,608	10.0%
Minnetonka Beach	539	-12.2%	\$133,594	2.0%
Minnetrissa	6,384	46.5%	\$118,353	1.0%
North Oaks	4,469	15.1%	\$138,409	3.0%
Orono	7,437	-1.3%	\$110,972	2.0%
Saint Mary's Point	368	7.0%	\$78,929	0.0%
Shorewood	7,307	-1.3%	\$118,495	3.0%
Sunfish Lake	521	3.4%	\$140,833	0.0%
Tonka Bay	1,475	-4.7%	\$116,328	1.0%
Lakeland Shores*	311	-12.4%	\$83,750	4.0%
Medicine Lake*	371	0.8%	\$83,750	2.0%
Pine Springs*	408	-3.1%	\$101,250	0.0%
Woodland*	437	-9.0%	\$175,625	0.0%
Cluster Profile (Statistical analysis)	3,105	4.6%	\$114,528	2.9%
Cluster Profile (Average for all cities)	2,631	2.8%	\$113,931	2.7%

Metropolitan City Cluster: Smaller Residential Cities

City	2010 Population	Population Growth Rate 2000-2010	Median Household Income	% of Property Classified Comm./Ind.
Bayport	3,471	9.8%	\$56,356	18.0%
Columbia Heights	19,496	5.3%	\$51,565	10.0%
Columbus	3,914	-1.1%	\$82,917	14.0%
Crystal	22,151	-2.4%	\$60,032	11.0%
Dayton	4,671	-0.6%	\$69,583	11.0%
Excelsior	2,188	-8.6%	\$60,135	20.0%
Falcon Heights	5,321	-4.5%	\$54,929	6.0%
Hamburg	513	-4.6%	\$68,000	9.0%
Lake Saint Croix Beach	1,051	-7.8%	\$65,481	2.0%
Lauderdale	2,379	0.6%	\$48,070	11.0%
Lexington	2,049	-7.5%	\$50,357	17.0%
Loretto	650	14.0%	\$69,583	21.0%
Mound	9,052	-4.1%	\$65,942	3.0%
New Brighton	21,456	-3.4%	\$60,396	18.0%
North Saint Paul	11,460	-3.9%	\$52,995	12.0%
Norwood Young America	3,549	14.2%	\$55,660	17.0%
Robbinsdale	13,953	-1.2%	\$55,270	8.0%
Saint Anthony	8,226	2.7%	\$54,310	16.0%
Saint Paul Park	5,279	4.1%	\$64,034	11.0%
South Saint Paul	20,160	0.0%	\$55,060	15.0%
Spring Lake Park	6,412	-5.3%	\$53,623	21.0%
Spring Park	1,669	-2.8%	\$45,125	13.0%
Wayzata	3,688	-10.3%	\$64,369	20.0%
West Saint Paul	19,540	0.7%	\$48,440	19.0%
White Bear Lake	23,797	-2.2%	\$56,953	17.0%
Willernie	507	-7.7%	\$55,833	14.0%
Bethel*	466	5.2%	\$44,375	14.0%
Gem Lake*	393	-6.2%	\$74,375	18.0%
Miesville*	125	-7.4%	\$41,719	9.0%
New Germany*	372	7.5%	\$57,750	8.0%
New Trier*	112	-3.4%	\$73,750	6.0%
Vermillion*	419	-4.1%	\$65,500	5.0%
Cluster Profile (Statistical analysis)	8,331	-1.0%	\$58,655	13.6%
Cluster Profile (Average for all cities)	6,828	-1.1%	\$58,828	12.9%

Nonmetropolitan City Cluster: Major Cities

City	2010 Population	Population Growth Rate 2000-2010	Median Household Income	Comm/Ind. Market Value Per Capita
Duluth	86,265	-0.8%	\$41,092	\$10,732
Rochester	106,769	24.4%	\$60,883	\$18,694
Saint Cloud	65,842	11.4%	\$39,149	\$15,152
Cluster Profile (Average)	86,292	11.7%	\$47,041	\$14,859

Nonmetropolitan City Cluster: Regional Centers

City	2010 Population	Population Growth Rate 2000-2010	Median Household Income	Comm/Ind. Market Value Per Capita
Albert Lea	18,016	-1.9%	\$35,629	\$10,429
Austin	24,718	6.0%	\$40,395	\$6,222
Bemidji	13,431	12.7%	\$31,475	\$17,074
Brainerd	13,590	3.1%	\$29,458	\$14,561
Cloquet	12,124	8.2%	\$47,071	\$11,216
Fairmont	10,666	-2.0%	\$40,007	\$13,746
Faribault	23,352	12.2%	\$48,098	\$11,364
Fergus Falls	13,138	-2.5%	\$37,872	\$13,671
Hibbing	16,361	-4.2%	\$36,585	\$7,340
Hutchinson	14,178	8.4%	\$57,750	\$12,997
Mankato	39,309	21.2%	\$40,190	\$20,862
Marshall	13,680	7.4%	\$42,685	\$18,533
Moorhead	38,065	18.3%	\$44,598	\$9,632
New Ulm	13,522	-0.5%	\$45,603	\$10,435
Northfield	20,007	16.7%	\$63,934	\$11,100
Owatonna	25,599	14.1%	\$53,569	\$11,800
Red Wing	16,459	2.1%	\$49,810	\$14,793
Willmar	19,610	6.9%	\$38,529	\$13,941
Winona	27,592	1.9%	\$36,296	\$12,397
Worthington	12,764	13.1%	\$40,703	\$9,365
Cluster Profile (Average)	19,309	7.1%	\$43,013	\$12,574

Nonmetropolitan City Cluster: Sub-regional Centers

City	2010 Population	Population Growth Rate 2000-2010	Median Household Income	Comm/Ind. Market Value Per Capita
Aitkin	2,165	9.1%	\$31,175	\$17,580
Alexandria	11,070	25.5%	\$32,976	\$32,707
Appleton	1,412	-50.8%	\$34,345	\$17,987
Baudette	1,106	0.2%	\$48,819	\$18,809
Baxter	7,610	37.0%	\$59,916	\$44,716
Cannon Falls	4,083	7.6%	\$52,593	\$18,002
Cook	574	-7.7%	\$31,750	\$16,831
Crosslake	2,141	13.1%	\$50,806	\$24,851
Deerwood	532	-9.8%	\$30,000	\$19,251
Detroit Lakes	8,569	16.6%	\$36,798	\$20,440
Grand Marais	1,351	-0.1%	\$40,772	\$18,605
Grand Rapids	10,869	8.4%	\$41,776	\$20,807
Hinckley	1,800	39.4%	\$36,250	\$29,790
Laprairie	665	-10.1%	\$41,442	\$18,223
Motley	671	14.7%	\$34,423	\$17,479
Mt Iron	2,869	-4.3%	\$42,976	\$15,818
Nisswa	1,971	0.9%	\$54,403	\$24,494
Ottertail	572	26.8%	\$38,490	\$37,032
Park Rapids	3,709	13.2%	\$28,586	\$27,216
Pequot Lakes	2,162	20.0%	\$36,875	\$19,556
Perham	2,985	16.6%	\$38,580	\$21,362
Pine City	3,123	2.6%	\$46,025	\$19,412
Princeton	4,698	19.5%	\$38,022	\$15,577
Roseau	2,633	-4.5%	\$46,339	\$13,088
Spicer	1,167	3.6%	\$38,977	\$15,266
Waite Park	6,715	2.2%	\$38,031	\$54,462
Walker	941	-12.0%	\$34,853	\$32,098
Welcome	686	-4.9%	\$35,781	\$19,173
Winthrop	1,399	2.3%	\$37,900	\$16,291
Cluster Profile (Average)	3,112	6.0%	\$39,989	\$22,997

Nonmetropolitan City Cluster: Urban Fringe

City	2010 Population	Population Growth Rate 2000-2010	Median Household Income	Comm/Ind. Market Value Per Capita
Albertville	7,044	94.5%	\$74,940	\$21,766
Becker	4,538	69.8%	\$70,526	\$16,250
Big Lake	10,060	65.9%	\$64,807	\$10,016
Buffalo	15,453	53.0%	\$62,705	\$11,437
Cambridge	8,111	46.9%	\$46,487	\$17,266
Chisago City	4,967	64.7%	\$59,464	\$6,629
Clear Lake	545	104.9%	\$73,125	\$11,449
Clearwater	1,735	102.2%	\$43,669	\$13,808
Delano	5,464	42.4%	\$69,274	\$14,625
Dundas	1,367	149.9%	\$62,065	\$28,228
Elk River	22,974	39.7%	\$72,944	\$17,686
Goodhue	1,176	51.2%	\$53,304	\$7,455
Green Isle	559	67.4%	\$41,154	\$4,618
Hanover (2,938	116.8%	\$100,764	\$4,762
Isanti	5,251	125.9%	\$55,873	\$7,882
Lindstrom	4,442	47.3%	\$57,888	\$6,295
Lonsdale	3,674	146.4%	\$67,863	\$7,683
Maple Lake	2,059	26.1%	\$48,092	\$15,123
Monticello	12,759	62.2%	\$64,141	\$19,858
Montrose	2,847	149.1%	\$61,593	\$4,608
New Prague	7,321	60.6%	\$53,305	\$9,620
Otsego	13,571	112.4%	\$74,449	\$7,164
Saint Michael	16,399	80.2%	\$86,427	\$7,902
Shafer	1,045	204.7%	\$50,370	\$5,873
Waverly	1,357	85.4%	\$66,786	\$4,990
Zimmerman	5,228	83.4%	\$65,858	\$7,118
Cluster Profile (Average)	6,265	86.7%	\$63,380	\$11,158

Nonmetropolitan City Cluster: High Growth Cities

City	2010 Population	Population Growth Rate 2000-2010	Median Household Income	Comm/Ind. Market Value Per Capita
Albany	2,561	42.6%	\$47,938	\$11,345
Braham	1,793	40.5%	\$41,607	\$4,242
Breezy Point	2,346	139.6%	\$51,964	\$10,884
Carlos	502	52.6%	\$50,000	\$4,296

Nonmetropolitan City Cluster: High Growth Cities

Cold Spring	4,025	35.3%	\$63,448	\$11,989
Dilworth	4,024	34.1%	\$50,833	\$11,380
Dover	735	67.8%	\$65,833	\$3,802
Foreston	533	37.0%	\$44,688	\$5,142
Freeport	632	39.2%	\$60,789	\$17,652
Oronoco	1,300	47.2%	\$83,750	\$3,260
Pine Island	3,263	39.6%	\$53,405	\$7,641
Rice	1,275	79.3%	\$56,940	\$16,343
Rock Creek	1,628	45.5%	\$47,287	\$3,103
Royalton	1,242	52.2%	\$47,292	\$6,868
Rush City	3,079	46.5%	\$43,707	\$8,715
Saint Joseph	6,534	39.6%	\$59,680	\$9,094
Sartell	15,876	64.7%	\$65,513	\$13,315
Walnut Grove	871	45.4%	\$33,917	\$7,664
Cluster Profile (Average)	2,901	52.7%	\$53,811	\$8,708

Nonmetropolitan City Cluster: Residential Communities

City	2010 Population	Population Growth Rate 2000-2010	Median Household Income	Comm/Ind. Market Value Per Capita
Annandale	3,228	20.3%	\$45,395	\$11,102
Arlington	2,233	9.0%	\$50,417	\$3,051
Atwater	1,133	5.0%	\$51,125	\$6,206
Avon	1,396	12.4%	\$55,847	\$13,621
Barnesville	2,563	17.9%	\$53,295	\$2,913
Bird Island	1,042	-12.8%	\$50,069	\$5,140
Brownsdale	676	-5.8%	\$52,679	\$3,032
Brownton	762	-5.6%	\$54,583	\$1,798
Byron	4,914	40.4%	\$66,406	\$6,935
Center City	628	7.9%	\$65,179	\$6,669
Chatfield	2,779	16.1%	\$55,000	\$6,201
Claremont	548	-11.6%	\$68,571	\$11,404
Clarks Grove	706	-3.8%	\$48,214	\$5,420
Cleveland	719	6.8%	\$57,083	\$2,504
Cohasset	2,698	8.7%	\$64,500	\$6,755
Cokato	2,694	-1.2%	\$45,833	\$12,783
Cottonwood	1,212	5.6%	\$57,829	\$7,918
Courtland	611	13.6%	\$63,000	\$8,488
Danube	505	-4.5%	\$48,611	\$2,552
Dodge Center	2,670	19.9%	\$49,464	\$10,074

Nonmetropolitan City Cluster: Residential Communities

City	2010 Population	Population Growth Rate 2000-2010	Median Household Income	Comm/Ind. Market Value Per Capita
Eagle Lake	2,422	35.5%	\$61,635	\$2,061
East Grand Forks	8,601	14.7%	\$50,090	\$8,787
East Gull Lake	1,004	2.7%	\$59,637	\$4,427
Elgin	1,089	31.8%	\$51,429	\$3,829
Ellendale	691	17.1%	\$70,119	\$3,991
Elysian	652	34.2%	\$67,688	\$6,350
Eyota	1,977	20.3%	\$62,466	\$3,329
Foley	2,603	20.8%	\$47,955	\$7,445
Geneva	555	23.6%	\$48,947	\$2,571
Glencoe	5,631	3.3%	\$49,574	\$7,315
Glyndon	1,394	32.9%	\$57,981	\$2,869
Good Thunder	583	-1.5%	\$50,208	\$2,986
Goodview	4,036	19.7%	\$50,382	\$12,335
Grand Meadow	1,139	20.5%	\$55,000	\$3,805
Hallock	981	-18.0%	\$54,926	\$4,905
Harris	1,132	1.0%	\$57,663	\$9,805
Hayfield	1,340	1.1%	\$49,063	\$7,475
Henderson	886	-2.6%	\$54,219	\$3,477
Hermantown	9,414	26.4%	\$64,330	\$15,713
Hokah	580	-5.5%	\$52,857	\$3,549
Kasson	5,931	34.9%	\$62,406	\$4,193
Kimball	762	20.0%	\$52,500	\$11,421
Lacrescent	4,830	-1.9%	\$51,500	\$5,179
Lake City	5,063	2.3%	\$46,705	\$10,618
Lake Crystal	2,549	5.3%	\$56,279	\$4,470
Lake Shore	1,004	3.9%	\$62,500	\$4,036
Lester Prairie	1,730	25.6%	\$58,571	\$4,207
Lesueur	4,058	3.5%	\$53,097	\$10,743
Lewiston	1,620	9.2%	\$62,794	\$6,306
Litchfield	6,726	2.5%	\$46,591	\$10,463
Madison Lake	1,017	21.5%	\$56,683	\$4,762
Mantorville	1,197	13.6%	\$66,173	\$1,964
Mapleton	1,756	4.6%	\$50,820	\$4,592
Mazeppa	842	8.2%	\$52,273	\$3,229
Medford	1,239	25.9%	\$62,404	\$13,985
Melrose	3,598	16.4%	\$46,077	\$11,450
Nicollet	1,093	22.9%	\$48,281	\$5,471
North Branch	10,125	26.2%	\$62,627	\$12,612
North Mankato	13,394	14.9%	\$60,194	\$10,439
Proctor	3,057	7.2%	\$52,665	\$9,082

Nonmetropolitan City Cluster: Residential Communities

City	2010 Population	Population Growth Rate 2000-2010	Median Household Income	Comm/Ind. Market Value Per Capita
Randall	650	21.5%	\$45,972	\$6,936
Raymond	764	-4.9%	\$55,114	\$2,908
Richmond	1,422	17.2%	\$46,295	\$8,063
Rockford (Jt)	4,316	23.9%	\$49,597	\$7,733
Rockville	2,448	-2.4%	\$58,125	\$6,897
Rollingstone	664	-4.7%	\$62,500	\$3,042
Rushford Village	807	13.0%	\$61,250	\$9,554
Sabin	522	24.0%	\$62,292	\$1,342
Saint Augusta	3,317	8.2%	\$67,978	\$7,130
Saint Charles	3,735	13.4%	\$56,830	\$5,526
Saint Clair	868	5.0%	\$57,083	\$1,744
Saint Peter	11,196	13.5%	\$45,667	\$4,122
Saint Stephen	851	-1.0%	\$65,000	\$3,149
Sauk Centre	4,317	9.8%	\$47,601	\$13,397
Sauk Rapids	12,773	25.1%	\$56,479	\$8,347
Stacy	1,456	10.1%	\$56,042	\$15,675
Stephen	658	-7.1%	\$49,438	\$2,267
Stewart	571	1.2%	\$48,646	\$4,330
Stewartville	5,916	9.3%	\$51,173	\$6,631
Stockton	697	2.2%	\$49,934	\$2,650
Wanamingo	1,086	7.8%	\$50,345	\$11,298
Waseca	9,410	10.8%	\$45,583	\$8,430
Waterville	1,868	1.9%	\$48,427	\$5,252
West Concord	782	-6.5%	\$56,250	\$3,591
Winsted	2,355	12.5%	\$48,191	\$8,150
Wyoming	7,791	11.5%	\$73,714	\$13,051
Zumbrota	3,252	16.6%	\$58,227	\$13,233
Cluster Profile (Average)	2,719	10.5%	\$55,220	\$6,727

Nonmetropolitan City Cluster: Rural Cities

City	2010 Population	Population Growth Rate 2000-2010	Median Household Income	Comm/Ind. Market Value Per Capita
Ada	1,707	3.0%	\$40,987	\$3,456
Adams	787	-1.6%	\$40,833	\$3,911
Adrian	1,209	-2.0%	\$41,389	\$3,739
Alden	661	1.4%	\$45,104	\$2,803

Nonmetropolitan City Cluster: Rural Cities

City	2010 Population	Population Growth Rate 2000-2010	Median Household Income	Comm/Ind. Market Value Per Capita
Amboy	534	-7.1%	\$42,417	\$5,173
Argyle	639	-2.6%	\$37,375	\$3,675
Audubon	519	16.6%	\$42,750	\$8,772
Aurora	1,682	-9.1%	\$45,285	\$3,654
Babbitt	1,475	-11.7%	\$37,500	\$4,510
Bagley	1,392	12.7%	\$30,385	\$8,507
Balaton	643	0.9%	\$39,716	\$2,245
Barnum	613	16.8%	\$36,513	\$6,210
Battle Lake	875	27.6%	\$36,023	\$9,264
Belgrade	740	-1.3%	\$31,466	\$8,060
Benson	3,240	-4.0%	\$34,449	\$13,872
Biwabik	969	1.6%	\$32,656	\$5,650
Blackduck	785	12.8%	\$27,778	\$8,441
Blooming Prairie	1,996	3.3%	\$38,750	\$4,860
Blue Earth	3,353	-7.4%	\$34,773	\$7,655
Bovey	804	21.5%	\$33,375	\$2,207
Breckenridge	3,386	-4.9%	\$43,894	\$5,860
Brooten	743	14.5%	\$36,250	\$10,883
Browerville	790	7.5%	\$36,250	\$5,921
Browns Valley	589	-14.6%	\$23,250	\$2,351
Buffalo Lake	733	-4.6%	\$41,500	\$9,646
Buhl	1,000	1.7%	\$34,650	\$1,433
Butterfield	586	3.9%	\$43,750	\$2,825
Caledonia	2,868	-3.3%	\$34,478	\$10,215
Canby	1,795	-5.7%	\$45,391	\$3,801
Carlton	862	6.4%	\$40,000	\$6,386
Cass Lake	770	-10.5%	\$24,063	\$8,381
Chisholm	4,976	0.3%	\$37,963	\$2,618
Clara City	1,360	-2.4%	\$37,240	\$8,701
Clarissa	681	11.8%	\$29,803	\$3,857
Clarkfield	863	-8.6%	\$32,708	\$6,610
Clearbrook	518	-6.0%	\$31,597	\$4,578
Coleraine	1,970	-5.7%	\$45,781	\$4,416
Crookston	7,891	-3.7%	\$40,858	\$5,722
Crosby	2,386	3.8%	\$27,586	\$7,728
Dassel	1,469	19.1%	\$39,141	\$9,941
Dawson	1,540	0.1%	\$39,132	\$6,251
Deer River	930	3.0%	\$23,906	\$9,074
Eagle Bend	535	-10.1%	\$24,946	\$4,731
Eden Valley	1,042	20.3%	\$32,411	\$7,056

Nonmetropolitan City Cluster: Rural Cities

City	2010 Population	Population Growth Rate 2000-2010	Median Household Income	Comm/Ind. Market Value Per Capita
Edgerton	1,189	15.1%	\$38,750	\$7,065
Elbow Lake	1,176	-7.8%	\$37,042	\$5,463
Elmore	663	-9.8%	\$28,636	\$3,696
Ely	3,460	-7.1%	\$31,905	\$11,515
Emily	813	-4.0%	\$37,750	\$8,934
Erskine	503	15.1%	\$32,708	\$4,920
Evansville	612	8.1%	\$26,500	\$4,845
Eveleth	3,718	-3.8%	\$36,755	\$3,120
Fairfax	1,235	-4.6%	\$38,571	\$3,927
Fertile	842	-5.7%	\$40,104	\$4,717
Floodwood	528	5.0%	\$21,708	\$5,246
Fosston	1,527	-3.0%	\$29,597	\$8,410
Franklin	510	2.4%	\$30,521	\$1,179
Frazee	1,350	-2.0%	\$32,969	\$4,307
Fulda	1,318	2.7%	\$39,348	\$2,012
Gaylord	2,305	1.1%	\$36,172	\$6,187
Gibbon	772	-4.5%	\$39,643	\$3,299
Gilbert	1,799	-2.6%	\$40,925	\$2,700
Glenville	643	-10.7%	\$38,203	\$3,234
Glenwood	2,564	-1.2%	\$35,396	\$10,884
Graceville	577	-4.6%	\$35,833	\$3,135
Granite Falls	2,897	-5.6%	\$43,056	\$6,996
Greenbush	719	-8.3%	\$40,461	\$3,838
Grove City	635	4.4%	\$43,021	\$3,956
Halstad	597	-4.0%	\$35,000	\$3,168
Hancock	765	6.7%	\$40,547	\$2,966
Harmony	1,020	-5.6%	\$32,455	\$10,120
Hawley	2,067	9.8%	\$41,550	\$5,693
Hector	1,151	-1.3%	\$42,422	\$6,710
Hendricks	713	-1.7%	\$39,271	\$3,153
Henning	802	11.5%	\$29,712	\$6,437
Heron Lake	698	-9.1%	\$38,750	\$6,091
Hill City	633	32.2%	\$18,889	\$5,329
Hills	686	21.4%	\$40,764	\$2,247
Hoffman	681	1.3%	\$24,091	\$5,711
Holdingford	708	-3.8%	\$47,500	\$3,588
Houston	979	-4.0%	\$40,774	\$6,189
Howard Lake	1,962	5.9%	\$31,856	\$11,201
Hoyt Lakes	2,017	-3.1%	\$45,338	\$8,473
Intl Falls	6,424	-4.2%	\$30,214	\$10,555

Nonmetropolitan City Cluster: Rural Cities

City	2010 Population	Population Growth Rate 2000-2010	Median Household Income	Comm/Ind. Market Value Per Capita
Ironton	572	14.9%	\$28,889	\$6,856
Isle	751	6.2%	\$31,176	\$11,868
Ivanhoe	559	-17.7%	\$35,952	\$2,644
Jackson	3,299	-5.8%	\$39,035	\$10,194
Janesville	2,256	7.0%	\$46,103	\$2,110
Jasper	633	6.0%	\$25,781	\$6,074
Karlstad	760	-4.3%	\$37,059	\$3,035
Kasota	675	-0.7%	\$46,818	\$3,600
Keewatin	1,068	-8.2%	\$25,417	\$1,791
Kenyon	1,815	9.3%	\$43,664	\$5,655
Kerkhoven	759	0.0%	\$26,750	\$3,409
Kiester	501	-7.2%	\$34,750	\$3,012
Lafayette	504	-4.7%	\$46,250	\$5,794
Lake Benton	683	-2.8%	\$34,375	\$3,153
Lake Park	783	0.1%	\$40,600	\$6,883
Lakefield	1,694	-1.6%	\$41,300	\$4,398
Lamberton	824	-4.1%	\$33,688	\$7,835
Lanesboro	754	-4.3%	\$31,923	\$9,745
Lecenter	2,499	11.6%	\$41,481	\$7,391
Leroy	929	0.4%	\$42,500	\$7,491
Little Falls	8,343	8.1%	\$33,447	\$11,979
Littlefork	647	-4.9%	\$43,409	\$1,151
Long Prairie	3,458	13.7%	\$37,781	\$7,624
Luverne	4,745	2.8%	\$41,179	\$8,287
Lyle	551	-2.7%	\$42,426	\$1,614
Mabel	780	1.8%	\$38,000	\$2,559
Madelia	2,308	-1.4%	\$41,528	\$4,871
Madison	1,551	-12.3%	\$40,156	\$3,354
Mahnomen	1,214	1.0%	\$31,528	\$9,003
Marble	701	0.9%	\$34,444	\$2,178
Mcintosh	625	-2.0%	\$26,500	\$3,178
Menahga	1,306	7.0%	\$31,275	\$4,836
Milaca	2,946	14.2%	\$33,843	\$7,766
Minneota	1,392	-3.9%	\$37,188	\$3,293
Minnesota Lake	687	0.9%	\$42,212	\$2,831
Montevideo	5,383	0.7%	\$37,835	\$9,499
Montgomery	2,956	5.8%	\$43,441	\$8,093
Moose Lake	2,751	22.9%	\$40,027	\$7,209
Mora	3,571	11.8%	\$41,081	\$11,023
Morgan	896	-0.8%	\$41,420	\$4,195

Nonmetropolitan City Cluster: Rural Cities

City	2010 Population	Population Growth Rate 2000-2010	Median Household Income	Comm/Ind. Market Value Per Capita
Morris	5,286	4.3%	\$38,511	\$6,855
Morristown	987	0.6%	\$44,000	\$2,730
Mt Lake	2,104	1.1%	\$39,712	\$3,763
Nashwauk	983	5.1%	\$33,207	\$8,203
New London	1,251	17.4%	\$40,950	\$9,731
New Richland	1,203	0.5%	\$42,875	\$2,886
New York Mills	1,199	3.5%	\$26,985	\$11,383
Olivia	2,484	-3.3%	\$37,198	\$9,817
Onamia	878	3.7%	\$21,734	\$12,307
Ortonville	1,916	-11.2%	\$38,287	\$4,957
Osakis	1,740	11.0%	\$39,091	\$5,550
Parkers Prairie	1,011	2.0%	\$32,045	\$7,264
Paynesville	2,432	7.3%	\$44,911	\$10,962
Pelican Rapids	2,464	3.8%	\$32,014	\$9,125
Pennock	508	0.8%	\$40,583	\$2,360
Pierz	1,393	9.1%	\$35,833	\$9,078
Pine River	944	1.7%	\$29,125	\$12,676
Pipestone	4,317	0.9%	\$37,902	\$7,013
Plainview	3,340	4.7%	\$45,099	\$7,704
Preston	1,325	-7.1%	\$40,052	\$9,695
Red Lake Falls	1,427	-10.3%	\$39,833	\$2,628
Redwood Falls	5,254	-3.8%	\$39,049	\$7,457
Renville	1,287	-2.7%	\$41,065	\$5,730
Rushford	1,731	2.1%	\$41,058	\$7,106
Sacred Heart	548	-0.2%	\$32,778	\$4,071
Saintjames	4,605	-1.9%	\$38,689	\$5,539
Sandstone	2,849	83.9%	\$35,556	\$4,633
Scanlon	991	18.3%	\$43,828	\$6,949
Sebeka	711	0.1%	\$35,000	\$5,855
Sherburn	1,137	5.1%	\$41,016	\$1,863
Silver Bay	1,887	-8.8%	\$42,857	\$4,442
Silver Lake	837	10.0%	\$44,423	\$3,902
Slayton	2,153	3.9%	\$39,732	\$5,709
Sleepy Eye	3,599	2.4%	\$43,375	\$4,607
Spring Grove	1,330	2.0%	\$36,250	\$5,245
Spring Valley	2,479	-1.5%	\$42,416	\$6,341
Springfield	2,152	-2.8%	\$42,500	\$4,071
Staples	2,981	-4.0%	\$27,333	\$5,215
Starbuck	1,302	-0.9%	\$36,127	\$5,997
Taylors Falls	976	2.6%	\$40,917	\$6,674

Nonmetropolitan City Cluster: Rural Cities

City	2010 Population	Population Growth Rate 2000-2010	Median Household Income	Comm/Ind. Market Value Per Capita
Thief River Falls	8,573	1.9%	\$36,218	\$7,402
Tower	500	4.4%	\$31,607	\$8,095
Tracy	2,163	-4.6%	\$40,893	\$3,647
Trimont	747	-0.9%	\$33,750	\$4,697
Truman	1,115	-11.4%	\$47,321	\$7,784
Twin Valley	821	-5.1%	\$25,104	\$1,946
Two Harbors	3,745	3.7%	\$39,520	\$10,164
Tyler	1,143	-6.2%	\$39,167	\$3,528
Ulen	547	2.8%	\$34,583	\$13,487
Verndale	602	4.7%	\$30,395	\$4,474
Virginia	8,712	-4.9%	\$32,664	\$9,486
Wabasha	2,521	-3.0%	\$41,846	\$11,973
Wabasso	696	8.2%	\$44,545	\$8,083
Wadena	4,088	-4.8%	\$28,924	\$8,732
Warren	1,563	-6.9%	\$44,113	\$4,673
Warroad	1,781	3.4%	\$44,063	\$14,025
Watkins	962	9.3%	\$30,417	\$7,260
Wells	2,343	-6.1%	\$38,314	\$5,501
Westbrook	739	-2.1%	\$30,556	\$3,062
Wheaton	1,424	-12.0%	\$40,806	\$7,036
Windom	4,646	3.5%	\$35,757	\$7,495
Winnebago	1,437	-3.4%	\$36,976	\$7,485
Cluster Profile (Average)	1,705	1.5%	\$36,852	\$6,089

Nonmetropolitan City Cluster: Cities under 500 Population (predetermined)

City	2010 Population	Population Growth Rate 2000-2010	Median Household Income	Comm/Ind. Market Value Per Capita
Akeley	432	4.9%	\$30,625	\$4,131
Alberta	103	-27.5%	\$37,750	\$14,486
Aldrich	48	-9.4%	\$9,911	\$8,148
Alpha	116	-7.9%	\$41,518	\$3,528
Altura	493	18.2%	\$45,313	\$3,865
Alvarado	363	-2.2%	\$51,705	\$1,279
Arco	75	-25.0%	\$32,500	\$1,791
Ashby	446	-5.5%	\$46,719	\$6,499
Askov	364	-1.1%	\$31,302	\$7,203

Nonmetropolitan City Cluster: Cities under 500 Population (predetermined)

City	2010 Population	Population Growth Rate 2000-2010	Median Household Income	Comm/Ind. Market Value Per Capita
Avoca	147	0.7%	\$40,625	\$6,597
Backus	250	-19.6%	\$29,250	\$7,597
Badger	375	-20.2%	\$32,656	\$3,282
Barrett	415	16.9%	\$32,125	\$2,735
Barry	16	-36.0%		\$6,773
Beardsley	233	-11.1%	\$44,583	\$2,796
Beaver Bay	181	3.4%	\$41,458	\$24,147
Beaver Creek	297	18.8%	\$33,571	\$5,385
Bejou	89	-5.3%	\$29,750	\$4,182
Bellechester	175	1.7%	\$29,583	\$3,710
Bellingham	168	-18.0%	\$32,656	\$12,493
Beltrami	107	5.9%	\$40,833	\$10,602
Belview	384	-6.8%	\$29,375	\$1,314
Bena	116	5.5%	\$10,536	\$1,126
Bertha	497	5.7%	\$31,029	\$3,523
Big Falls	236	-10.6%	\$30,833	\$1,107
Bigelow	235	1.7%	\$64,375	\$3,725
Bigfork	446	-4.9%	\$29,688	\$7,887
Bingham Lake	126	-24.6%	\$56,875	\$23,631
Biscay	113	-0.9%	\$56,000	\$192
Blomkest	157	-15.6%	\$54,167	\$4,014
Bluffton	207	-1.4%	\$40,208	\$4,358
Bock	106	0.0%	\$27,083	\$9,329
Borup	110	20.9%	\$56,250	\$1,315
Bowlus	290	11.5%	\$45,333	\$2,849
Boy River	47	23.7%	\$25,625	\$1,740
Boyd	175	-16.7%	\$35,208	\$2,180
Brandon	489	8.7%	\$46,250	\$13,958
Brewster	473	-5.8%	\$44,417	\$16,214
Bricelyn	365	-3.7%	\$33,409	\$4,051
Brook Park	139	-10.9%	\$37,344	\$7,159
Brooks	141	0.0%	\$32,386	\$6,758
Brookston	141	43.9%	\$33,929	\$2,787
Brownsville	466	-9.9%	\$40,268	\$1,254
Bruno	102	0.0%	\$30,417	\$11,203
Buckman	270	29.8%	\$69,375	\$6,331
Burtrum	144	-1.4%	\$26,250	\$1,623
Callaway	234	17.0%	\$44,583	\$3,775
Calumet	367	-4.2%	\$38,125	\$3,592
Campbell	158	-34.4%	\$48,438	\$7,363

Nonmetropolitan City Cluster: Cities under 500 Population (predetermined)

City	2010 Population	Population Growth Rate 2000-2010	Median Household Income	Comm/Ind. Market Value Per Capita
Canton	346	0.9%	\$28,750	\$2,954
Cedar Mills	45	-15.1%	\$51,042	\$10,901
Ceylon	369	-10.7%	\$35,417	\$1,120
Chandler	270	-2.2%	\$41,875	\$14,350
Chickamaw Beach	114	-23.0%	\$41,875	\$755
Chokio	400	-9.7%	\$41,563	\$2,599
Clements	153	-19.9%	\$43,917	\$5,059
Climax	267	9.9%	\$45,938	\$2,167
Clinton	449	-0.9%	\$40,000	\$2,393
Clitherall	112	-5.1%	\$18,000	\$2,396
Clontarf	164	-5.2%	\$44,583	\$6,317
Cobden	36	-41.0%	\$21,667	\$15,036
Comfrey	382	4.1%	\$41,625	\$4,949
Comstock	93	-24.4%	\$57,500	\$5,014
Conger	146	9.8%	\$46,875	\$4,702
Correll	34	-27.7%	\$61,250	\$3,996
Cosmos	473	-18.7%	\$42,734	\$4,584
Cromwell	234	63.6%	\$21,000	\$6,128
Currie	233	3.6%	\$30,625	\$2,549
Cuyuna	332	43.7%	\$45,000	\$764
Cyrus	288	-5.0%	\$35,179	\$2,756
Dakota	323	-1.8%	\$51,000	\$1,572
Dalton	253	-1.9%	\$34,722	\$4,805
Danvers	97	-10.2%	\$44,375	\$13,393
Darfur	108	-21.2%	\$40,357	\$4,546
Darwin	350	26.8%	\$70,333	\$5,365
Deer Creek	322	-1.8%	\$25,000	\$4,515
Degraff	115	-13.5%	\$17,143	\$3,582
Delavan	179	-19.7%	\$31,818	\$5,527
Delhi	70	1.4%	\$35,000	\$20,115
Denham	35	-12.5%	\$38,750	\$6,246
Dennison	212	26.2%	\$46,250	\$10,725
Dent	192	0.0%	\$43,958	\$6,013
Dexter	341	2.4%	\$46,071	\$17,734
Donaldson	42	2.4%	\$38,889	\$14,780
Donnelly	241	-5.1%	\$35,625	\$2,533
Doran	55	-6.8%	\$14,375	\$1,877
Dovray	57	-14.9%	\$43,333	\$25,722
Dumont	100	-18.0%	\$56,250	\$10,578
Dundee	68	-33.3%	\$23,125	\$2,811

Nonmetropolitan City Cluster: Cities under 500 Population (predetermined)

City	2010 Population	Population Growth Rate 2000-2010	Median Household Income	Comm/Ind. Market Value Per Capita
Dunnell	167	-15.2%	\$43,036	\$4,975
Easton	199	-7.0%	\$36,250	\$6,681
Echo	278	0.0%	\$27,321	\$4,750
Effie	123	35.2%	\$12,656	\$2,557
Eitzen	243	6.1%	\$34,625	\$6,601
Elba	152	-29.0%	\$39,861	\$3,355
Elizabeth	173	0.6%	\$41,103	\$3,000
Elkton	141	-5.4%	\$50,250	\$3,186
Ellsworth	463	-14.3%	\$30,764	\$2,527
Elmdale	116	8.4%	\$54,063	\$3,373
Elrosa	211	27.1%	\$44,583	\$10,052
Emmons	391	-9.5%	\$40,000	\$2,453
Erhard	148	-1.3%	\$33,409	\$5,712
Evan	86	-5.5%	\$38,472	\$1,514
Farwell	51	-10.5%	\$24,688	\$1,530
Federal Dam	110	8.9%	\$30,875	\$2,117
Felton	177	-18.1%	\$24,444	\$4,275
Fifty Lakes	387	-1.3%	\$42,206	\$3,310
Finlayson	315	0.3%	\$35,833	\$10,982
Fisher	435	0.0%	\$42,292	\$1,427
Flensburg	225	-7.8%	\$58,750	\$820
Florence	39	-36.1%	\$44,583	\$2,348
Forada	185	-6.1%	\$51,250	\$6,863
Fort Ripley	69	-6.8%	\$32,188	\$11,086
Fountain	410	19.5%	\$43,125	\$8,943
Foxhome	116	-18.9%	\$49,167	\$1,635
Freeborn	297	-2.6%	\$39,375	\$2,487
Frost	198	-21.1%	\$36,750	\$1,692
Funkley	5	-66.7%	n/a	\$9,407
Garfield	354	26.0%	\$40,375	\$12,144
Garrison	210	-1.4%	\$28,750	\$47,732
Garvin	135	-15.1%	\$40,536	\$1,964
Gary	214	-0.5%	\$40,625	\$2,636
Genola	75	5.6%	\$33,125	\$43,991
Georgetown	129	3.2%	\$78,333	\$4,370
Ghent	370	17.5%	\$61,667	\$3,402
Gilman	224	4.2%	\$51,563	\$4,803
Gonvick	282	-4.1%	\$31,389	\$3,496
Goodridge	132	34.7%	\$21,635	\$1,332
Granada	303	-4.4%	\$36,250	\$809

Nonmetropolitan City Cluster: Cities under 500 Population (predetermined)

City	2010 Population	Population Growth Rate 2000-2010	Median Household Income	Comm/Ind. Market Value Per Capita
Grasston	158	50.5%	\$48,250	\$2,834
Greenwald	222	10.4%	\$49,375	\$5,123
Grey Eagle	348	3.9%	\$29,375	\$5,445
Grygla	221	-3.1%	\$31,528	\$5,075
Gully	66	-37.7%	\$23,125	\$7,350
Hackensack	313	9.8%	\$22,500	\$32,695
Hadley	61	-24.7%	\$48,542	\$16,416
Halma	61	-21.8%	\$40,000	\$2,154
Hammond	132	-33.3%	\$48,333	\$1,165
Hanley Falls	304	-5.9%	\$27,917	\$1,153
Hanska	402	-9.3%	\$44,875	\$3,809
Harding	125	19.0%	\$25,000	\$7,529
Hardwick	198	-10.8%	\$24,773	\$2,590
Hartland	315	9.4%	\$35,139	\$3,940
Hatfield	54	14.9%	\$51,250	\$8,302
Hayward	250	0.4%	\$62,500	\$5,652
Hazel Run	63	-1.6%	\$41,250	\$1,975
Heidelberg	122	69.4%	\$73,750	\$3,609
Hendrum	307	-2.5%	\$40,179	\$1,882
Henriette	71	-29.7%	\$24,000	\$5,940
Herman	437	-3.3%	\$29,688	\$11,109
Hewitt	266	-0.4%	\$39,722	\$1,538
Hillman	38	31.0%	\$29,125	\$1,881
Hitterdal	201	0.0%	\$43,750	\$2,640
Holland	187	-13.0%	\$29,417	\$3,636
Hollandale	303	3.8%	\$48,125	\$3,035
Holloway	92	-17.9%	\$22,708	\$92,531
Holt	88	-1.1%	\$48,125	\$1,291
Humboldt	45	-26.2%	\$73,125	\$1,861
Ihlen	63	-41.1%	\$21,250	\$3,356
Iona	137	-20.8%	\$56,250	\$1,979
Iron Junction	86	-7.5%	\$50,375	\$9,480
Jeffers	369	-6.8%	\$39,028	\$6,214
Jenkins	430	49.8%	\$44,554	\$26,789
Johnson	29	-9.4%	\$19,583	\$3,397
Kandiyohi	491	-11.5%	\$41,750	\$2,601
Kelliher	262	-10.9%	\$22,875	\$3,668
Kellogg	456	3.9%	\$47,143	\$3,976
Kennedy	193	-24.3%	\$41,250	\$2,709
Kenneth	68	11.5%	\$43,542	\$448

Nonmetropolitan City Cluster: Cities under 500 Population (predetermined)

City	2010 Population	Population Growth Rate 2000-2010	Median Household Income	Comm/Ind. Market Value Per Capita
Kensington	292	2.1%	\$48,021	\$8,150
Kent	81	-32.5%	\$50,250	\$2,307
Kerrick	65	-8.5%	\$68,750	\$4,987
Kettle River	180	7.1%	\$45,625	\$3,992
Kilkenny	134	-9.5%	\$64,375	\$1,950
Kinbrae	12	-42.9%	\$66,667	\$10,650
Kingston	161	34.2%	\$37,279	\$1,099
Kinney	169	-15.1%	\$63,000	\$3,741
Lake Bronson	229	-6.9%	\$32,083	\$1,585
Lake Henry	103	14.4%	\$22,500	\$14,517
Lake Lillian	238	-7.4%	\$41,094	\$5,264
Lake Wilson	251	-7.0%	\$43,000	\$2,355
Lancaster	340	-6.3%	\$30,208	\$1,479
Laporte	111	-23.4%	\$51,364	\$9,833
Lasalle	87	-3.3%	\$48,000	\$10,394
Lastrup	104	5.1%	\$43,750	\$3,779
Lengby	86	8.9%	\$29,821	\$3,573
Leonard	41	41.4%	\$41,000	\$4,660
Leonidas	52	-13.3%	\$22,321	\$5,652
Lewisville	250	-8.8%	\$28,750	\$2,568
Lismore	227	-4.6%	\$32,292	\$4,716
Long Beach	335	23.6%	\$74,500	\$3,654
Longville	156	-13.3%	\$24,167	\$51,129
Louisburg	47	80.8%	\$51,750	\$2,579
Lowry	299	10.3%	\$48,000	\$6,008
Lucan	191	-15.5%	\$40,795	\$2,783
Lynd	448	29.5%	\$60,682	\$1,220
Magnolia	222	0.5%	\$46,250	\$5,818
Manchester	57	-29.6%	\$23,750	\$10,311
Manhattan Beach	57	14.0%	\$48,438	\$37,471
Mapleview	176	-6.9%	\$26,023	\$3,317
Marietta	162	-6.9%	\$33,105	\$1,841
Maynard	366	-5.7%	\$40,625	\$10,818
Mcgrath	80	23.1%	\$26,250	\$548
Mcgregor	391	-3.2%	\$30,000	\$26,958
Mckinley	128	60.0%	\$27,750	\$868
Meadowlands	134	20.7%	\$19,500	\$2,905
Meire Grove	179	20.1%	\$25,357	\$3,556
Mentor	153	2.0%	\$20,625	\$6,661
Middle River	303	-5.0%	\$32,778	\$3,434

Nonmetropolitan City Cluster: Cities under 500 Population (predetermined)

City	2010 Population	Population Growth Rate 2000-2010	Median Household Income	Comm/Ind. Market Value Per Capita
Milan	369	13.2%	\$39,722	\$3,702
Millerville	106	-7.8%	\$59,375	\$8,498
Millville	182	-2.2%	\$45,833	\$6,682
Milroy	252	-7.0%	\$36,964	\$5,376
Miltona	424	52.0%	\$30,200	\$6,460
Minneiska	111	-4.3%	\$73,889	\$5,144
Minnesota City	204	-13.2%	\$51,458	\$6,656
Mizpah	56	-28.2%	\$25,750	\$1,870
Morton	411	-7.0%	\$44,167	\$5,459
Murdock	278	-8.3%	\$44,063	\$18,415
Myrtle	48	-23.8%	\$23,750	\$13,361
Nashua	68	-1.4%	\$46,875	\$11,651
Nassau	72	-13.3%	\$43,281	\$9,376
Nelson	187	8.7%	\$50,227	\$7,938
Nerstrand	295	26.6%	\$47,244	\$7,986
Nevis	390	7.1%	\$35,000	\$7,702
New Auburn	456	-6.6%	\$40,729	\$1,492
New Munich	320	-9.1%	\$43,125	\$5,458
Newfolden	368	1.7%	\$40,625	\$2,113
Nielsville	90	-1.1%	\$24,773	\$840
Nimrod	69	-8.0%	\$33,281	\$2,785
Norcross	70	18.6%	\$36,875	\$4,850
Northome	200	-13.0%	\$38,036	\$4,864
Northrop	227	-13.4%	\$39,063	\$1,882
Odessa	135	19.5%	\$18,500	\$2,686
Odin	106	-15.2%	\$26,875	\$3,705
Ogema	184	28.7%	\$30,769	\$5,186
Ogilvie	369	-22.2%	\$24,250	\$8,848
Okabena	188	1.6%	\$40,417	\$1,898
Oklee	435	9.8%	\$40,455	\$2,221
Ormsby	131	-14.9%	\$38,125	\$6,001
Orr	267	7.2%	\$37,566	\$13,763
Oslo	330	-4.9%	\$45,288	\$6,899
Ostrander	254	19.8%	\$43,889	\$8,322
Palisade	167	41.5%	\$34,500	\$4,147
Pease	242	48.5%	\$56,429	\$6,512
Pemberton	247	0.4%	\$60,833	\$5,131
Perley	92	-24.0%	\$37,679	\$4,817
Peterson	199	-26.0%	\$38,056	\$2,398
Pillager	469	11.7%	\$29,323	\$12,641

Nonmetropolitan City Cluster: Cities under 500 Population (predetermined)

City	2010 Population	Population Growth Rate 2000-2010	Median Household Income	Comm/Ind. Market Value Per Capita
Plato	320	-4.8%	\$51,250	\$9,938
Plummer	292	8.1%	\$51,667	\$2,004
Porter	183	-3.7%	\$36,875	\$7,931
Prinsburg	497	8.5%	\$53,036	\$7,673
Quamba	123	25.5%	\$45,417	\$932
Racine	442	24.5%	\$52,361	\$8,737
Ranier	145	-22.9%	\$41,250	\$7,102
Regal	34	-15.0%	\$47,500	\$9,167
Remer	370	-0.5%	\$14,514	\$13,183
Revere	95	-5.0%	\$26,250	\$3,244
Richville	96	-22.6%	\$25,750	\$4,425
Riverton	117	1.7%	\$44,219	\$497
Roosevelt	151	-9.0%	\$45,000	\$3,202
Roscoe	102	-12.1%	\$25,000	\$4,214
Rose Creek	394	11.3%	\$48,125	\$2,663
Rothsay	493	-0.8%	\$36,923	\$3,600
Round Lake	376	-11.3%	\$31,181	\$5,632
Rushmore	342	-9.0%	\$33,125	\$3,800
Russell	338	-8.9%	\$42,083	\$2,567
Ruthton	241	-15.1%	\$42,500	\$10,351
Rutledge	229	16.8%	\$38,250	\$1,926
Saint Anthony	86	-4.4%	\$43,750	\$1,006
Saint Hilaire	279	2.6%	\$48,542	\$8,762
Saint Leo	100	-5.7%	\$33,333	\$1,304
Saint Martin	308	10.8%	\$61,908	\$14,737
Saint Rosa	68	54.5%	\$34,688	\$17,289
Saint Vincent	64	-45.3%	\$46,875	\$472
Sanborn	339	-21.9%	\$42,500	\$7,649
Sargeant	61	-19.7%	\$73,750	\$12,143
Seaforth	86	11.7%	\$27,500	\$442
Sedan	45	-30.8%	\$48,214	\$6,936
Shelly	191	-28.2%	\$31,429	\$3,230
Shevlin	176	10.0%	\$40,000	\$5,688
Skyline	289	-12.4%	\$77,750	\$0
Sobieski	195	-0.5%	\$40,893	\$3,189
Solway	96	39.1%	\$70,208	\$4,864
South Haven	187	-8.3%	\$45,000	\$6,098
Spring Hill	85	54.5%	\$36,500	\$1,942
Squaw Lake	107	8.1%	\$21,250	\$5,530
Steen	180	-1.1%	\$43,750	\$752

Nonmetropolitan City Cluster: Cities under 500 Population (predetermined)

City	2010 Population	Population Growth Rate 2000-2010	Median Household Income	Comm/Ind. Market Value Per Capita
Storden	219	-20.1%	\$33,750	\$4,167
Strandquist	69	-21.6%	\$33,958	\$1,820
Strathcona	44	51.7%	\$52,500	\$2,115
Sturgeon Lake	439	26.5%	\$36,250	\$5,644
Sunburg	100	-9.1%	\$50,556	\$5,649
Swanville	350	-0.3%	\$45,313	\$12,118
Taconite	360	14.3%	\$34,750	\$8,636
Tamarack	94	59.3%	\$31,250	\$9,599
Taopi	58	-37.6%	\$30,417	\$48
Taunton	139	-32.9%	\$24,643	\$5,158
Tenstrike	201	3.1%	\$45,208	\$2,692
Thomson	159	3.9%	\$55,625	\$426
Tintah	63	-20.3%	\$30,000	\$3,546
Trail	46	-25.8%	\$11,875	\$6,676
Trommald	98	-21.6%	\$56,250	\$0
Trosky	86	-25.9%	\$55,000	\$1,651
Turtle River	77	2.7%	\$43,750	\$8,094
Twin Lakes	151	-10.1%	\$29,167	\$1,700
Underwood	341	6.9%	\$46,648	\$5,741
Upsala	427	0.7%	\$42,596	\$5,741
Urbank	54	-8.5%	\$24,375	\$7,421
Utica	291	26.5%	\$50,875	\$5,346
Vergas	331	6.4%	\$40,938	\$6,196
Vernon Center	332	-7.5%	\$33,333	\$12,474
Vesta	319	-5.9%	\$35,250	\$5,395
Viking	104	13.0%	\$31,500	\$766
Villard	254	4.1%	\$41,250	\$6,994
Vining	78	14.7%	\$26,875	\$9,230
Wahkon	206	-34.4%	\$38,125	\$12,298
Waldorf	229	-5.4%	\$51,250	\$4,732
Walters	73	-17.0%	\$24,167	\$772
Waltham	151	-23.0%	\$48,375	\$1,108
Wanda	84	-18.4%	\$46,250	\$4,190
Warba	181	-1.1%	\$25,625	\$2,806
Watson	205	-1.9%	\$36,250	\$1,554
Waubun	400	-0.7%	\$32,596	\$2,588
Wendell	167	-5.6%	\$35,313	\$4,659
West Union	111	27.6%	\$49,107	\$1,804
Westport	57	-20.8%	\$43,125	\$3,000
Whalan	63	-1.6%	\$63,125	\$3,000

Nonmetropolitan City Cluster: Cities under 500 Population (predetermined)

City	2010 Population	Population Growth Rate 2000-2010	Median Household Income	Comm/Ind. Market Value Per Capita
Wilder	60	-13.0%	\$42,813	\$9,687
Williams	191	-9.0%	\$36,731	\$6,577
Willow River	415	34.3%	\$32,679	\$6,698
Wilmont	339	2.1%	\$33,500	\$2,892
Wilton	204	9.7%	\$50,893	\$5,476
Winger	220	7.3%	\$31,719	\$4,996
Winton	172	-7.0%	\$26,827	\$2,291
Wolf Lake	57	83.9%	\$11,607	\$5,000
Wolverton	142	16.4%	\$44,896	\$2,319
Wood Lake	439	0.7%	\$41,500	\$5,148
Woodstock	124	-6.1%	\$27,361	\$4,580
Wrenshall	399	29.5%	\$55,000	\$8,053
Wright	127	36.6%	\$36,875	\$7,991
Wykoff	444	-3.5%	\$44,327	\$4,396
Zemple	93	24.0%	\$23,250	\$485
Zumbro Falls	207	16.9%	\$36,875	\$6,297
Cluster Profile (Average)	207	-0.7%	\$39,610	\$6,217

Appendix B-2: City Clusters Listed by County

County/City	Cluster
Aitkin	
Aitkin	Sub-Regional Centers
Hill City	Rural
McGrath	Cities under 500 Pop.
McGregor	Cities under 500 Pop.
Palisade	Cities under 500 Pop.
Tamarack	Cities under 500 Pop.
Anoka	
Andover	Growing High Income Suburbs
Anoka	Established Cities
Bethel	Smaller Residential Cities
Blaine	Large Cities
Centerville	Growing High Income Suburbs
Circle Pines	Growing High Income Suburbs
Columbia Heights	Smaller Residential Cities
Columbus	Smaller Residential Cities
Coon Rapids	Large Cities
East Bethel	Growing High Income Suburbs
Fridley	Established Cities
Ham Lake	Growing High Income Suburbs
Hilltop	Established Cities
Lexington	Smaller Residential Cities
Lino Lakes	Growing High Income Suburbs
Nowthen	Growing High Income Suburbs
Oak Grove	Growing High Income Suburbs
Ramsey	Growing High Income Suburbs
Spring Lake Park	Smaller Residential Cities
St. Francis	Fast Growing Suburbs
Becker	
Audubon	Rural
Callaway	Cities under 500 Pop.
Detroit Lakes	Sub-Regional Centers
Frazee	Rural
Lake Park	Rural
Ogema	Cities under 500 Pop.
Wolf Lake	Cities under 500 Pop.
Beltrami	
Bemidji	Regional Centers
Blackduck	Rural
Funkley	Cities under 500 Pop.
Kelliher	Cities under 500 Pop.
Solway	Cities under 500 Pop.
Tenstrike	Cities under 500 Pop.
Turtle River	Cities under 500 Pop.
Wilton	Cities under 500 Pop.
Benton	
Foley	Residential Communities

County/City	Cluster
Gilman	Cities under 500 Pop.
Rice	High Growth
Sauk Rapids	Residential Communities
Big Stone	
Barry	Cities under 500 Pop.
Beardsley	Cities under 500 Pop.
Clinton	Cities under 500 Pop.
Correll	Cities under 500 Pop.
Graceville	Rural
Johnson	Cities under 500 Pop.
Odessa	Cities under 500 Pop.
Ortonville	Rural
Blue Earth	
Amboy	Rural
Eagle Lake	Residential Communities
Good Thunder	Residential Communities
Lake Crystal	Residential Communities
Madison Lake	Residential Communities
Mankato	Regional Centers
Mapleton	Residential Communities
Pemberton	Cities under 500 Pop.
Skyline	Cities under 500 Pop.
St. Clair	Residential Communities
Vernon Center	Cities under 500 Pop.
Brown	
Cobden	Cities under 500 Pop.
Comfrey	Cities under 500 Pop.
Evan	Cities under 500 Pop.
Hanska	Cities under 500 Pop.
New Ulm	Regional Centers
Sleepy Eye	Rural
Springfield	Rural
Carlton	
Barnum	Rural
Carlton	Rural
Cloquet	Regional Centers
Cromwell	Cities under 500 Pop.
Kettle River	Cities under 500 Pop.
Moose Lake	Rural
Scanlon	Rural
Thomson	Cities under 500 Pop.
Wrenshall	Cities under 500 Pop.
Wright	Cities under 500 Pop.
Carver	
Carver	Fast Growing Suburbs
Chanhassen	Growing High Income Suburbs
Chaska	Growing High Income Suburbs
Cologne	Fast Growing Suburbs
Hamburg	Smaller Residential Cities
Mayer	Fast Growing Suburbs
New Germany	Smaller Residential Cities
Norwood Young America	Smaller Residential Cities
Victoria	Fast Growing Suburbs

County/City	Cluster
Waconia	Fast Growing Suburbs
Watertown	Growing High Income Suburbs
Cass	
Backus	Cities under 500 Pop.
Bena	Cities under 500 Pop.
Boy River	Cities under 500 Pop.
Cass Lake	Rural
Chickamaw Beach	Cities under 500 Pop.
East Gull Lake	Residential Communities
Federal Dam	Cities under 500 Pop.
Hackensack	Cities under 500 Pop.
Lake Shore	Residential Communities
Longville	Cities under 500 Pop.
Pillager	Cities under 500 Pop.
Pine River	Rural
Remer	Cities under 500 Pop.
Walker	Sub-Regional Centers
Chippewa	
Clara City	Rural
Maynard	Cities under 500 Pop.
Milan	Cities under 500 Pop.
Montevideo	Rural
Watson	Cities under 500 Pop.
Chisago	
Center City	Residential Communities
Chisago City	Urban Fringe
Harris	Residential Communities
Lindstrom	Urban Fringe
North Branch	Residential Communities
Rush City	High Growth
Shafer	Urban Fringe
Stacy	Residential Communities
Taylor Falls	Rural
Wyoming	Residential Communities
Clay	
Barnesville	Residential Communities
Comstock	Cities under 500 Pop.
Dilworth	High Growth
Felton	Cities under 500 Pop.
Georgetown	Cities under 500 Pop.
Glyndon	Residential Communities
Hawley	Rural
Hitterdal	Cities under 500 Pop.
Moorhead	Regional Centers
Sabin	Residential Communities
Ulen	Rural
Clearwater	
Bagley	Rural
Clearbrook	Rural
Gonvick	Cities under 500 Pop.
Leonard	Cities under 500 Pop.
Shevlin	Cities under 500 Pop.
Cook	
Grand Marais	Sub-Regional Centers
Cottonwood	
Bingham Lake	Cities under 500 Pop.
Jeffers	Cities under 500 Pop.
Mountain Lake	Rural
Storden	Cities under 500 Pop.
Westbrook	Rural

County/City	Cluster
Windom	Rural
Crow Wing	
Baxter	Sub-Regional Centers
Brainerd	Regional Centers
Breezy Point	High Growth
Crosby	Rural
Crosslake	Sub-Regional Centers
Cuyuna	Cities under 500 Pop.
Deerwood	Sub-Regional Centers
Emily	Rural
Fifty Lakes	Cities under 500 Pop.
Fort Ripley	Cities under 500 Pop.
Garrison	Cities under 500 Pop.
Ironton	Rural
Jenkins	Cities under 500 Pop.
Manhattan Beach	Cities under 500 Pop.
Nisswa	Sub-Regional Centers
Pequot Lakes	Sub-Regional Centers
Riverton	Cities under 500 Pop.
Trommald	Cities under 500 Pop.
Dakota	
Apple Valley	Large Cities
Burnsville	Large Cities
Coates	Established Cities
Eagan	Large Cities
Farmington	Fast Growing Suburbs
Hampton	Fast Growing Suburbs
Hastings	Growing High Income Suburbs
Inver Grove Hgts	Growing High Income Suburbs
Lakeville	Large Cities
Lilydale	Growing High Income Suburbs
Mendota	Established Cities
Mendota Heights	Growing High Income Suburbs
Miesville	Smaller Residential Cities
New Trier	Smaller Residential Cities
Randolph	Growing High Income Suburbs
Rosemount	Fast Growing Suburbs
South St. Paul	Smaller Residential Cities
Sunfish Lake	High Income Suburbs
Vermillion	Smaller Residential Cities
West St. Paul	Smaller Residential Cities
Dodge	
Claremont	Residential Communities
Dodge Center	Residential Communities
Hayfield	Residential Communities
Kasson	Residential Communities
Mantorville	Residential Communities
West Concord	Residential Communities
Douglas	
Alexandria	Sub-Regional Centers
Brandon	Cities under 500 Pop.
Carlos	High Growth
Evansville	Rural
Forada	Cities under 500 Pop.
Garfield	Cities under 500 Pop.
Kensington	Cities under 500 Pop.

County/City	Cluster
Millerville	Cities under 500 Pop.
Miltona	Cities under 500 Pop.
Nelson	Cities under 500 Pop.
Osakis	Rural
Faribault	
Blue Earth	Rural
Bricelyn	Cities under 500 Pop.
Delavan	Cities under 500 Pop.
Easton	Cities under 500 Pop.
Elmore	Rural
Frost	Cities under 500 Pop.
Kiester	Rural
Minnesota Lake	Rural
Walters	Cities under 500 Pop.
Wells	Rural
Winnebago	Rural
Fillmore	
Canton	Cities under 500 Pop.
Chatfield	Residential Communities
Fountain	Cities under 500 Pop.
Harmony	Rural
Lanesboro	Rural
Mabel	Rural
Ostrander	Cities under 500 Pop.
Peterson	Cities under 500 Pop.
Preston	Rural
Rushford City	Rural
Rushford Village	Residential Communities
Spring Valley	Rural
Whalan	Cities under 500 Pop.
Wykoff	Cities under 500 Pop.
Freeborn	
Albert Lea	Regional Centers
Alden	Rural
Clarks Grove	Residential Communities
Conger	Cities under 500 Pop.
Emmons	Cities under 500 Pop.
Freeborn	Cities under 500 Pop.
Geneva	Residential Communities
Glenville	Rural
Hartland	Cities under 500 Pop.
Hayward	Cities under 500 Pop.
Hollandale	Cities under 500 Pop.
Manchester	Cities under 500 Pop.
Myrtle	Cities under 500 Pop.
Twin Lakes	Cities under 500 Pop.
Goodhue	
Bellechester	Cities under 500 Pop.
Cannon Falls	Sub-Regional Centers
Dennison	Cities under 500 Pop.
Goodhue	Urban Fringe
Kenyon	Rural
Pine Island	High Growth
Red Wing	Regional Centers
Wanamingo	Residential Communities
Zumbrota	Residential Communities
Grant	
Ashby	Cities under 500 Pop.
Barrett	Cities under 500 Pop.
Elbow Lake	Rural
Herman	Cities under 500 Pop.

County/City	Cluster
Hoffman	Rural
Norcross	Cities under 500 Pop.
Wendell	Cities under 500 Pop.
Hennepin	
Bloomington	Large Cities
Brooklyn Center	Established Cities
Brooklyn Park	Large Cities
Champlin	Growing High Income Suburbs
Corcoran	High Income Suburbs
Crystal	Smaller Residential Cities
Dayton	Smaller Residential Cities
Deephaven	High Income Suburbs
Eden Prairie	Large Cities
Edina	Large Cities
Excelsior	Smaller Residential Cities
Golden Valley	Established Cities
Greenfield	High Income Suburbs
Greenwood	High Income Suburbs
Hopkins	Established Cities
Independence	High Income Suburbs
Long Lake	Established Cities
Loretto	Smaller Residential Cities
Maple Grove	Large Cities
Maple Plain	Established Cities
Medicine Lake	High Income Suburbs
Medina	High Income Suburbs
Minneapolis	Center Cities
Minnetonka	Large Cities
Minnetonka Beach	High Income Suburbs
Minnetrista	High Income Suburbs
Mound	Smaller Residential Cities
New Hope	Established Cities
Orono	High Income Suburbs
Osseo	Established Cities
Plymouth	Large Cities
Richfield	Established Cities
Robbinsdale	Smaller Residential Cities
Rogers	Fast Growing Suburbs
Shorewood	High Income Suburbs
Spring Park	Smaller Residential Cities
St. Anthony	Smaller Residential Cities
St. Bonifacius	Growing High Income Suburbs
St. Louis Park	Large Cities
Tonka Bay	High Income Suburbs
Wayzata	Smaller Residential Cities
Woodland	High Income Suburbs
Houston	
Brownsville	Cities under 500 Pop.
Caledonia	Rural
Eitzen	Cities under 500 Pop.
Hokah	Residential Communities
Houston	Rural
La Crescent	Residential Communities
Spring Grove	Rural
Hubbard	
Akeley	Cities under 500 Pop.
Laporte	Cities under 500 Pop.
Nevis	Cities under 500 Pop.
Park Rapids	Sub-Regional Centers

County/City	Cluster
Isanti	
Braham	High Growth
Cambridge	Urban Fringe
Isanti	Urban Fringe
Itasca	
Bigfork	Cities under 500 Pop.
Bovey	Rural
Calumet	Cities under 500 Pop.
Cohasset	Residential Communities
Coleraine	Rural
Deer River	Rural
Effie	Cities under 500 Pop.
Grand Rapids	Sub-Regional Centers
Keewatin	Rural
La Prairie	Sub-Regional Centers
Marble	Rural
Nashwauk	Rural
Squaw Lake	Cities under 500 Pop.
Taconite	Cities under 500 Pop.
Warba	Cities under 500 Pop.
Zemple	Cities under 500 Pop.
Jackson	
Alpha	Cities under 500 Pop.
Heron Lake	Rural
Jackson	Rural
Lakefield	Rural
Okabena	Cities under 500 Pop.
Wilder	Cities under 500 Pop.
Kanabec	
Grasston	Cities under 500 Pop.
Mora	Rural
Ogilvie	Cities under 500 Pop.
Quamba	Cities under 500 Pop.
Kandiyohi	
Atwater City	Residential Communities
Blomkest	Cities under 500 Pop.
Kandiyohi	Cities under 500 Pop.
Lake Lillian	Cities under 500 Pop.
New London	Rural
Pennock	Rural
Prinsburg	Cities under 500 Pop.
Raymond	Residential Communities
Regal	Cities under 500 Pop.
Spicer	Sub-Regional Centers
Sunburg	Cities under 500 Pop.
Willmar	Regional Centers
Kittson	
Donaldson	Cities under 500 Pop.
Hallock	Residential Communities
Halma	Cities under 500 Pop.
Humboldt	Cities under 500 Pop.
Karlstad	Rural
Kennedy	Cities under 500 Pop.
Lake Bronson	Cities under 500 Pop.
Lancaster	Cities under 500 Pop.
St. Vincent	Cities under 500 Pop.
Koochiching	
Big Falls	Cities under 500 Pop.
Intl Falls	Rural
Littlefork	Rural
Mizpah	Cities under 500 Pop.

County/City	Cluster
Northome	Cities under 500 Pop.
Ranier	Cities under 500 Pop.
Lac Qui Parle	
Bellingham	Cities under 500 Pop.
Boyd	Cities under 500 Pop.
Dawson	Rural
Louisburg	Cities under 500 Pop.
Madison	Rural
Marietta	Cities under 500 Pop.
Nassau	Cities under 500 Pop.
Lake	
Beaver Bay	Cities under 500 Pop.
Silver Bay	Rural
Two Harbors	Rural
Lake of the Woods	
Baudette	Sub-Regional Centers
Williams	Cities under 500 Pop.
Le Sueur	
Cleveland	Residential Communities
Elysian	Residential Communities
Heidelberg	Cities under 500 Pop.
Kasota	Rural
Kilkenny	Cities under 500 Pop.
Le Sueur	Residential Communities
Le Center	Rural
Montgomery	Rural
New Prague	Urban Fringe
Waterville	Residential Communities
Lincoln	
Arco	Cities under 500 Pop.
Hendricks	Rural
Ivanhoe	Rural
Lake Benton	Rural
Tyler	Rural
Lyon	
Balaton	Rural
Cottonwood	Residential Communities
Florence	Cities under 500 Pop.
Garvin	Cities under 500 Pop.
Ghent	Cities under 500 Pop.
Lynd	Cities under 500 Pop.
Marshall	Regional Centers
Minneota	Rural
Russell	Cities under 500 Pop.
Taunton	Cities under 500 Pop.
Tracy	Rural
McCleod	
Biscay	Cities under 500 Pop.
Brownton	Residential Communities
Glencoe	Residential Communities
Hutchinson	Regional Centers
Lester Prairie	Residential Communities
Plato	Cities under 500 Pop.
Silver Lake	Rural
Stewart	Residential Communities
Winsted	Residential Communities
Mahnomen	
Bejou	Cities under 500 Pop.
Mahnomen	Rural
Waubun	Cities under 500 Pop.

County/City	Cluster
Marshall	
Alvarado	Cities under 500 Pop.
Argyle	Rural
Grygla	Cities under 500 Pop.
Holt	Cities under 500 Pop.
Middle River	Cities under 500 Pop.
Newfolden	Cities under 500 Pop.
Oslo	Cities under 500 Pop.
Stephen	Residential Communities
Strandquist	Cities under 500 Pop.
Viking	Cities under 500 Pop.
Warren	Rural
Martin	
Ceylon	Cities under 500 Pop.
Dunnell	Cities under 500 Pop.
Fairmont	Regional Centers
Granada	Cities under 500 Pop.
Northrop	Cities under 500 Pop.
Sherburn	Rural
Trimont	Rural
Truman	Rural
Welcome	Sub-Regional Centers
Meeker	
Cedar Mills	Cities under 500 Pop.
Cosmos	Cities under 500 Pop.
Darwin	Cities under 500 Pop.
Dassel	Rural
Eden Valley	Rural
Grove City	Rural
Kingston	Cities under 500 Pop.
Litchfield	Residential Communities
Watkins	Rural
Mille Lacs	
Bock	Cities under 500 Pop.
Foreston	High Growth
Isle	Rural
Milaca	Rural
Onamia	Rural
Pease	Cities under 500 Pop.
Princeton	Sub-Regional Centers
Wahkon	Cities under 500 Pop.
Morrison	
Bowlus	Cities under 500 Pop.
Buckman	Cities under 500 Pop.
Elmdale	Cities under 500 Pop.
Flensburg	Cities under 500 Pop.
Genola	Cities under 500 Pop.
Harding	Cities under 500 Pop.
Hillman	Cities under 500 Pop.
Lastrup	Cities under 500 Pop.
Little Falls	Rural
Motley	Sub-Regional Centers
Pierz	Rural
Randall	Residential Communities
Royalton	High Growth
Sobieski	Cities under 500 Pop.
Swanville	Cities under 500 Pop.
Upsala	Cities under 500 Pop.
Mower	
Adams	Rural
Austin	Regional Centers

County/City	Cluster
Brownsdale	Residential Communities
Dexter	Cities under 500 Pop.
Elkton	Cities under 500 Pop.
Grand Meadow	Residential Communities
Leroy	Rural
Lyle	Rural
Mapleview	Cities under 500 Pop.
Racine	Cities under 500 Pop.
Rose Creek	Cities under 500 Pop.
Sargeant	Cities under 500 Pop.
Taopi	Cities under 500 Pop.
Waltham	Cities under 500 Pop.
Murray	
Avoca	Cities under 500 Pop.
Chandler	Cities under 500 Pop.
Currie	Cities under 500 Pop.
Dovray	Cities under 500 Pop.
Fulda	Rural
Hadley	Cities under 500 Pop.
Iona	Cities under 500 Pop.
Lake Wilson	Cities under 500 Pop.
Slayton	Rural
Nicollet	
Courtland	Residential Communities
Lafayette	Rural
Nicollet	Residential Communities
North Mankato	Residential Communities
St. Peter	Residential Communities
Nobles	
Adrian	Rural
Bigelow	Cities under 500 Pop.
Brewster	Cities under 500 Pop.
Dundee	Cities under 500 Pop.
Ellsworth	Cities under 500 Pop.
Kinbrae	Cities under 500 Pop.
Lismore	Cities under 500 Pop.
Round Lake	Cities under 500 Pop.
Rushmore	Cities under 500 Pop.
Wilmont	Cities under 500 Pop.
Worthington	Regional Centers
Norman	
Ada	Rural
Borup	Cities under 500 Pop.
Gary	Cities under 500 Pop.
Halstad	Rural
Hendrum	Cities under 500 Pop.
Perley	Cities under 500 Pop.
Shelly	Cities under 500 Pop.
Twin Valley	Rural
Olmsted	
Byron	Residential Communities
Dover	High Growth
Eyota	Residential Communities
Oronoco	High Growth
Rochester	Major Cities
Stewartville	Residential Communities
Ottertail	
Battle Lake	Rural
Bluffton	Cities under 500 Pop.
Clitherall	Cities under 500 Pop.
Dalton	Cities under 500 Pop.

County/City	Cluster
Deer Creek	Cities under 500 Pop.
Dent	Cities under 500 Pop.
Elizabeth	Cities under 500 Pop.
Erhard	Cities under 500 Pop.
Fergus Falls	Regional Centers
Henning	Rural
New York Mills	Rural
Ottertail	Sub-Regional Centers
Parkers Prairie	Rural
Pelican Rapids	Rural
Perham	Sub-Regional Centers
Richville	Cities under 500 Pop.
Underwood	Cities under 500 Pop.
Urbank	Cities under 500 Pop.
Vergas	Cities under 500 Pop.
Vining	Cities under 500 Pop.
Pennington	
Goodridge	Cities under 500 Pop.
St. Hilaire	Cities under 500 Pop.
Thief River Falls	Rural
Pine	
Askov	Cities under 500 Pop.
Brook Park	Cities under 500 Pop.
Bruno	Cities under 500 Pop.
Denham	Cities under 500 Pop.
Finlayson	Cities under 500 Pop.
Henriette	Cities under 500 Pop.
Hinckley	Sub-Regional Centers
Kerrick	Cities under 500 Pop.
Pine City	Sub-Regional Centers
Rock Creek	High Growth
Rutledge	Cities under 500 Pop.
Sandstone	Rural
Sturgeon Lake	Cities under 500 Pop.
Willow River	Cities under 500 Pop.
Pipestone	
Edgerton	Rural
Hatfield	Cities under 500 Pop.
Holland	Cities under 500 Pop.
Ihlen	Cities under 500 Pop.
Jasper	Rural
Pipestone	Rural
Ruthton	Cities under 500 Pop.
Trosky	Cities under 500 Pop.
Woodstock	Cities under 500 Pop.
Polk	
Beltrami	Cities under 500 Pop.
Climax	Cities under 500 Pop.
Crookston	Rural
East Grand Forks	Residential Communities
Erskine	Rural
Fertile	Rural
Fisher	Cities under 500 Pop.
Fosston	Rural
Gully	Cities under 500 Pop.
Lengby	Cities under 500 Pop.
Mcintosh	Rural
Mentor	Cities under 500 Pop.
Nielsville	Cities under 500 Pop.
Trail	Cities under 500 Pop.
Winger	Cities under 500 Pop.

County/City	Cluster
Pope	
Cyrus	Cities under 500 Pop.
Farwell	Cities under 500 Pop.
Glenwood	Rural
Long Beach	Cities under 500 Pop.
Lowry	Cities under 500 Pop.
Sedan	Cities under 500 Pop.
Starbuck	Rural
Villard	Cities under 500 Pop.
Westport	Cities under 500 Pop.
Ramsey	
Arden Hills	Established Cities
Falcon Heights	Smaller Residential Cities
Gem Lake	Smaller Residential Cities
Lauderdale	Smaller Residential Cities
Little Canada	Established Cities
Maplewood	Established Cities
Mounds View	Established Cities
New Brighton	Smaller Residential Cities
North Oaks	High Income Suburbs
North St. Paul	Smaller Residential Cities
Roseville	Established Cities
Shoreview	Growing High Income Suburbs
St. Paul	Center Cities
Vadnais Heights	Established Cities
White Bear Lake	Smaller Residential Cities
Red Lake	
Brooks	Cities under 500 Pop.
Oklee	Cities under 500 Pop.
Plummer	Cities under 500 Pop.
Red Lake Falls	Rural
Redwood	
Belview	Cities under 500 Pop.
Clements	Cities under 500 Pop.
Delhi	Cities under 500 Pop.
Lamberton	Rural
Lucan	Cities under 500 Pop.
Milroy	Cities under 500 Pop.
Morgan	Rural
Redwood Falls	Rural
Revere	Cities under 500 Pop.
Sanborn	Cities under 500 Pop.
Seaforth	Cities under 500 Pop.
Vesta	Cities under 500 Pop.
Wabasso	Rural
Walnut Grove	High Growth
Wanda	Cities under 500 Pop.
Renville	
Bird Island	Residential Communities
Buffalo Lake	Rural
Danube	Residential Communities
Fairfax	Rural
Franklin	Rural
Hector	Rural
Morton	Cities under 500 Pop.
Olivia	Rural
Renville	Rural
Sacred Heart	Rural
Rice	
Dundas	Urban Fringe

County/City	Cluster
Faribault	Regional Centers
Lonsdale	Urban Fringe
Morristown	Rural
Nerstrand	Cities under 500 Pop.
Northfield	Regional Centers
Rock	
Beaver Creek	Cities under 500 Pop.
Hardwick	Cities under 500 Pop.
Hills	Rural
Kenneth	Cities under 500 Pop.
Luverne	Rural
Magnolia	Cities under 500 Pop.
Steen	Cities under 500 Pop.
Roseall	
Badger	Cities under 500 Pop.
Greenbush	Rural
Roosevelt	Cities under 500 Pop.
Roseau	Sub-Regional Centers
Strathcona	Cities under 500 Pop.
Warroad	Rural
St. Louis	
Aurora	Rural
Babbitt	Rural
Biwabik	Rural
Brookston	Cities under 500 Pop.
Buhl	Rural
Chisholm	Rural
Cook	Sub-Regional Centers
Duluth	Major Cities
Ely	Rural
Eveleth	Rural
Floodwood	Rural
Gilbert	Rural
Hermantown	Residential Communities
Hibbing	Regional Centers
Hoyt Lakes	Rural
Iron Junction	Cities under 500 Pop.
Kinney	Cities under 500 Pop.
Leonidas	Cities under 500 Pop.
Mckinley	Cities under 500 Pop.
Meadowlands	Cities under 500 Pop.
Mt Iron	Sub-Regional Centers
Orr	Cities under 500 Pop.
Proctor	Residential Communities
Tower	Rural
Virginia	Rural
Winton	Cities under 500 Pop.
Scott	
Belle Plaine	Fast Growing Suburbs
Elko/New Market	Fast Growing Suburbs
Jordan	Fast Growing Suburbs
Prior Lake	Growing High Income Suburbs
Savage	Growing High Income Suburbs
Shakopee	Fast Growing Suburbs
Sherburne	
Becker	Urban Fringe
Big Lake	Urban Fringe
Clear Lake	Urban Fringe
Elk River	Urban Fringe

County/City	Cluster
Zimmerman	Urban Fringe
Sibley	
Arlington	Residential Communities
Gaylord	Rural
Gibbon	Rural
Green Isle	Urban Fringe
Henderson	Residential Communities
New Auburn	Cities under 500 Pop.
Winthrop	Sub-Regional Centers
Stearns	
Albany	High Growth
Avon	Residential Communities
Belgrade	Rural
Brooten	Rural
Cold Spring	High Growth
Elrosa	Cities under 500 Pop.
Freeport	High Growth
Greenwald	Cities under 500 Pop.
Holdingford	Rural
Kimball	Residential Communities
Lake Henry	Cities under 500 Pop.
Meire Grove	Cities under 500 Pop.
Melrose	Residential Communities
New Munich	Cities under 500 Pop.
Paynesville	Rural
Richmond	Residential Communities
Rockville	Residential Communities
Roscoe	Cities under 500 Pop.
Sartell	High Growth
Sauk Centre	Residential Communities
Spring Hill	Cities under 500 Pop.
St. Anthony	Cities under 500 Pop.
St. Augusta	Residential Communities
St. Cloud	Major Cities
St. Joseph	High Growth
St. Martin	Cities under 500 Pop.
St. Rosa	Cities under 500 Pop.
St. Stephen	Residential Communities
Waite Park	Sub-Regional Centers
Steele	
Blooming Prairie	Rural
Ellendale	Residential Communities
Medford	Residential Communities
Owatonna	Regional Centers
Stevens	
Alberta	Cities under 500 Pop.
Chokio	Cities under 500 Pop.
Donnelly	Cities under 500 Pop.
Hancock	Rural
Morris	Rural
Swift	
Appleton	Sub-Regional Centers
Benson	Rural
Clontarf	Cities under 500 Pop.
Danvers	Cities under 500 Pop.
De Graff	Cities under 500 Pop.
Holloway	Cities under 500 Pop.
Kerkhoven	Rural
Murdock	Cities under 500 Pop.
Todd	
Bertha	Cities under 500 Pop.

County/City	Cluster
Browerville	Rural
Burtrum	Cities under 500 Pop.
Clarissa	Rural
Eagle Bend	Rural
Grey Eagle	Cities under 500 Pop.
Hewitt	Cities under 500 Pop.
Long Prairie	Rural
Staples	Rural
West Union	Cities under 500 Pop.
Traverse	
Browns Valley	Rural
Dumont	Cities under 500 Pop.
Tintah	Cities under 500 Pop.
Wheaton	Rural
Wabasha	
Elgin	Residential Communities
Hammond	Cities under 500 Pop.
Kellogg	Cities under 500 Pop.
Lake City	Residential Communities
Mazeppa	Residential Communities
Millville	Cities under 500 Pop.
Minneiska	Cities under 500 Pop.
Plainview	Rural
Wabasha	Rural
Zumbro Falls	Cities under 500 Pop.
Wadena	
Aldrich	Cities under 500 Pop.
Menahga	Rural
Nimrod Village	Cities under 500 Pop.
Sebeka	Rural
Verndale	Rural
Wadena	Rural
Waseca	
Janesville	Rural
New Richland	Rural
Waldorf	Cities under 500 Pop.
Waseca	Residential Communities
Washington	
Afton	High Income Suburbs
Bayport	Smaller Residential Cities
Birchwood	High Income Suburbs
Cottage Grove	Growing High Income Suburbs
Dellwood	High Income Suburbs
Forest Lake	Growing High Income Suburbs
Grant	High Income Suburbs
Hugo	Fast Growing Suburbs
Lake Elmo	Growing High Income Suburbs
Lake St. Croix Beach	Smaller Residential Cities
Lakeland	Growing High Income Suburbs
Lakeland Shore	High Income Suburbs
Landfall	Established Cities
Mahtomedi	Growing High Income Suburbs
Marine-on-St. Croix	High Income Suburbs
Newport	Established Cities
Oak Park Heights	Established Cities
Oakdale	Established Cities

County/City	Cluster
Pine Springs	High Income Suburbs
Scandia	Growing High Income Suburbs
St. Marys Point	High Income Suburbs
St. Paul Park	Smaller Residential Cities
Stillwater	Growing High Income Suburbs
Willernie	Smaller Residential Cities
Woodbury	Large Cities
Watonwan	
Butterfield	Rural
Darfur	Cities under 500 Pop.
La Salle	Cities under 500 Pop.
Lewisville	Cities under 500 Pop.
Madelia	Rural
Odin	Cities under 500 Pop.
Ormsby	Cities under 500 Pop.
St James	Rural
Wilkin	
Breckenridge	Rural
Campbell	Cities under 500 Pop.
Doran	Cities under 500 Pop.
Foxhome	Cities under 500 Pop.
Kent	Cities under 500 Pop.
Nashua	Cities under 500 Pop.
Rothsay	Cities under 500 Pop.
Wolverton	Cities under 500 Pop.
Winona	
Altura	Cities under 500 Pop.
Dakota	Cities under 500 Pop.
Elba	Cities under 500 Pop.
Goodview	Residential Communities
Lewiston	Residential Communities
Minnesota	Cities under 500 Pop.
Rollingstone	Residential Communities
St Charles	Residential Communities
Stockton	Residential Communities
Utica	Cities under 500 Pop.
Winona	Regional Centers
Wright	
Albertville	Urban Fringe
Annandale	Residential Communities
Buffalo	Urban Fringe
Clearwater	Urban Fringe
Cokato	Residential Communities
Delano	Urban Fringe
Hanover	Urban Fringe
Howard Lake	Rural
Maple Lake	Urban Fringe
Monticello	Urban Fringe
Montrose	Urban Fringe
Otsego	Urban Fringe
Rockford	Residential Communities
South Haven	Cities under 500 Pop.
St. Michael	Urban Fringe
Waverly	Urban Fringe
Yellow Medicine	
Canby	Rural
Clarkfield	Rural
Echo	Cities under 500 Pop.
Granite Falls	Rural

County/City	Cluster
Hanley Falls	Cities under 500 Pop.
Hazel Run	Cities under 500 Pop.
Porter	Cities under 500 Pop.
St. Leo	Cities under 500 Pop.
Wood Lake	Cities under 500 Pop.