I was asked to summarize U.S. and Canadian rural trends focusing on rural-urban interdependence. Takes my research of scores of multiple regressions and tries to contextualize the regression results into what it means for the rural-urban divide and then policy. I will also provide context for the uninitiated.

This should complement the following presentation by JunJie Wu and because U.S./Canada is further along the integration of rural to urban—some lessons apply to other countries.

This summarizes our paper by the same title. The paper can be found at my web site at Ohio State. Google Swank Rural-Urban Policy Much of this includes background for those who have not thought about place-based policy.

We thank many comments of readers without any attribution including Jill Clark, David Freshwater, Christine Gosselin, Robert Greenwood, Maureen Kilkenny, and Darrel Pack. We also thank Infrastructure Canada for their support in funding part of this research under a grant entitled: “Mapping the Rural-Urban Interface: Partnerships for Sustainable Infrastructure Development.” We also thank the Canada Rural Revitalization Foundation and the Federation of Canadian Municipalities for their support in this project, in particular Robert Greenwood.

I appreciate the help of Mike St. Louis and Erin Sawyer in their help preparing the commuting slides.

KEY DEFINITION: “GROWTH CLUSTER” IS A GROUP OF TOWNS/COMMUNITIES TRYING TO GAIN CRITICAL MASS; VS “INPUT-OUTPUT” CLUSTER IS TRYING TO PUT TOGETHER A GROUP OF BUSINESSES WITH INPUT-OUTPUT LINKAGES.

Thank you for the privilege to talk to you today about a very important topic—the future of Rural Canada and America.
Outline

1. My presentation is aimed to inform a better policy in the context of a North American rural-urban divide.
   - Need to understand why places prosper if we want to help them prosper—New Rural Economy
   - Hundreds of North American rural-urban regions centered on one or more urban areas-self formed.
     - These regions compete globally. If a region is not profitable for business and/or offers a low quality of life, it loses!
Introduction—cont.

• **What’s causes this rural-divide?**
• **It is not distinguishing the landscape from what the people actually do!**
  • The bucolic landscape may look agricultural or forested, etc, but the people are usually working on other things.
  • But, we get (bad) policy that treats rural areas based on their appearance, not on what the people do.
    – Farm subsidies, ethanol, wind power, logging roads that favor special interests or sectors, but not broader rural development
    – But, politicians and opinion leaders (NYT) only hear these well organized groups and repeat their talking points.
    – Governance reflects 19th Century borders, not 21st Century realities
I will emphasize the U.S. to avoid repetition in a limited time for presentation. Our paper covers more details for Canada.

---

**Intro--cont**

To Illustrate my points, my outline is:

1. Is rural policy ≡ natural resource sector policy?
2. What are trends in the North American agri-food and farm economy?
   - Great agri-productivity growth and success.
3. Yet by 1970, Rural America has transformed into a New Rural Economy
   - Growing Rural-Urban interdependence
4. Policy reforms to end the rural-urban divide
   - Emphasize U.S.— I discuss Canada when it differs.
   - Our paper covers both countries in detail.
The main component of U.S. RD policy is in the five year farm bill for USDA. USDA RD spending is only 3% of its budget

Rural America is very diverse
6.5% work in primary-sector farming, compared to 1/3 in 1950
About 1/4 of earnings are from manufacturing

Is Farm Policy Rural Policy?—cont.

• Equating natural-resource policy as ‘rural’ policy is akin to equating Security & Exchange Comm. policy or FED banking policy as ‘urban’ policy.
  
  – *A natural-resource based ‘rural’ policy directly affects the same share of the rural economy as a policy aimed at financial services in urban economies.*

• My point is **not** that ‘sector policies’ are ‘bad.’ We need a food policy! It is sector policies are **NOT** ‘place policies.’

• This also has implications regarding claims that ‘green’ policies are analogous to being a ‘rural’ policy.
  
  – Building wind turbines is not rural policy, it is energy policy.
Canada- U.S. Farm Economy

• The overriding theme is recent success
  – Fewer farmers growing amazing amounts of food.
    • Feeding the world at a much lower price.
  – Fewer farms due to consolidation
  – Fewer farm workers and fewer related agri-business workers (related to productivity growth)
  – This has contributed in transforming the old rural economy into the New Rural Economy.
  – Less goods production means less direct exposure to the global economy.
According to BLS household data, only just over 1% of Americans are primarily employed in Agriculture when using a primary job definition.
I will follow the long-held convention that nonmetropolitan defines rural. In the U.S., metro implies a city core of at least 50,000 residents.
To illustrate the change in rural America, note that roughly all of Rural America outside of the Northeast and the West Coast was farm dependent in 1950. That “rural” economy was very influenced by global events such as the boom in commodity prices surrounding WW II and the Korean War.

Sources for this analysis are U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, 2007 Farm Bill Theme Papers, Rural Development July 2006.
• In terms of rural development, it is the green counties that would mostly benefit from expanded farming employment. Other rural counties are much more tied to nearby urban areas in an interdependent relationship.

• By 2000, farm dependent counties were mostly limited to the Great Plains. Other remote rural counties that have often struggled include natural resource dependent counties—usually in mining or forestry.

• The rapid increases in productivity in farming and natural resources have put these regions at a disadvantage in terms of employment opportunities (e.g., we need fewer farmers to produce the same amount of food as we did in the 1940s). Farm productivity is good for feeding the world, but has put many rural communities under stress.

• Another problem is the tremendous changes in rural America have gone mostly unrecognized in key circles. Policies are often designed with the 1950 vision of rural America, not the current much more diverse version.

• Sources for this analysis are U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, 2007 Farm Bill Theme Papers, Rural Development July 2006.
Non farm Rural Population

• Has the shrinking *farm* footprint spread to the *non-farm rural population*?
• No—The share of the U.S. population that is *nonfarm* rural has remained roughly constant for 150 years (Kilkenny and Johnson, 2007).
• The same applies to Canada.
• The point is the 1950s Myth of Rural North America does not apply. It is clearly very different than the stereotype.

• Thanks to Maureen Kilkenny for the idea about the landscape still agriculture but the people are doing many things.
Canada has the same pattern of a declining farm population, rising urban population, BUT relatively stable Nonfarm rural population.

Sources, see Partridge and Olfert, (2008)

How does the New York Times view of ‘rural’ policy work?

• What about alternative energy?
  – May be good energy policy, but wouldn’t (say) wind turbines have the same effect as building cell towers has had on rural North America?
  – Take ethanol subsidies in the U.S. Heartland? Have they transformed rural America even in the construction boom? Ans: No.
  – Sectoral policies indirectly exacerbate rural angst that nothing is being done that affects most rural Americans.
Opportunity costs of subsidies, $46 million for a 100 million gallon plant per year?

“Direct employment in the plants is not large, typically averaging about 35 jobs per plant. The 88 nonmetro plants employ about 3,100 workers. Seventy percent of the nonmetro ethanol plants in operation are located in counties that declined in population from 2000 to 2006, whereas just half of all nonmetro counties lost population. Of new ethanol plants under construction, nearly four-fifths (67) are in nonmetro counties and 75 percent of these are in counties with declining population. (In economic development, weigh the opportunity cost of the subsidy vs. other things that could be done in rural America. Is this a net gain?)” From Rural America at a Glance.

Of 26 million jobs, 3,100 nonmetro jobs represents 0.01% of total rural employment.

For work of Caution on Ethanol, see....

For more details of how ethanol affects the Iowa economy, see David Swensen, The Economic Impact of Ethanol Production in Iowa is available at: http://ideas.repec.org/p/isu/genres/12865.html

Here is the associated press release: from SSTI, 5015 Pine Creek Drive, Westerville, Ohio 43081
Phone: (614) 901-1690 http://www.ssti.org

Iowa Researcher Finds Limits to the Economic Impact of Ethanol

In recent years, Iowa, like many midwestern states, has experienced a boom in ethanol production. Iowa’s natural competitive advantage in growing and processing corn has helped it to move to the forefront of the emerging biofuels industry. The state provides numerous incentives and assistance programs through its Department of Natural Resources to help spur the creation of ethanol-related companies and jobs. A new report by Iowa State University economist David Swenson, however, argues that even if these programs are successful at building a strong ethanol industry, the overall economic impact of this success would be smaller than predicted.

Swenson argues in The Economic Impact of Ethanol Production in Iowa that many projections of the economic impact of corn ethanol suffer from improper input-output modeling and frequently overestimate the number of jobs that could be created by the industry. He found that the ethanol boom that occurred between 2000 and 2005 did not lead to the creation of many construction jobs. Instead, much of that construction work was undertaken by out-of-state firms that brought specialized workers with them.

Once an ethanol plant is finished, it rarely requires many workers. A 50 million-gallons-per-year (MGY) ethanol plant requires only 35 direct workers, while the more intensive 100 MGY plants still only require 46 employees. In addition, the number of full-time employees required for these plants is expected to decline as the technology becomes more advanced.

Some of the other most frequent errors made in modeling the impact of ethanol pointed out by Swenson include:
• Corn Production – Models often include the corn grown for ethanol as a new activity. In most cases, this corn is already being produced. In cases in which new corn would have to be grown, that land would have previously been used to produce other crops.
• Transportation – Many models include new jobs in transportation and trucking, under the assumption that ethanol plants will need new supply lines. Farmers, however, already use trucking companies to move their corn. In fact, by building local ethanol plants, the state may even see a reduction in the demand for transport services.
• Regional Offsets – Other industries that compete for many of the same input resources, such as hog and poultry producers, will have to pay more for resources and services. Also, the cost of corn-based feeds will increase for these industries.

Since corn production in Iowa – and any other state – is naturally limited by the availability of land and other resources, the number of ethanol plants a state can accommodate is finite. According to Swenson, even if Iowans were able to produce two billion bushels of corn, the state would still only require 55 plants averaging 90 MGY in size. In 2005, the state grew only 400 million bushels. In 2009, 42 ethanol plants will already be operational, and the state appears to be approaching its ceiling for ethanol production and employment.

Swenson does not propose ending state support for the biofuels industry, but he does suggest that some of the state’s justifications for its ethanol programs are based on misleading employment indicators. The overall impact may be smaller than expected in the state, even though Iowa has long been a national leader in biofuels production. For other states, with even less land dedicated to corn production and with less focus on ethanol, the employment impact may be even more limited.
Voting with their feet: Are more people moving in than moving out as economists best signal of whether a place is prospering in terms of economic and quality of life. I picked a year period where bio-fuels rage was going quite strong. Note in the red ‘circle’ of the greatest intensity of ethanol plants that there is still broader out-migration in rural America—even during the construction phases. Also, this reaffirms that ethanol may be an excellent farm/energy/environmental policy, but it does not substitute for a rural policy.

Note the yellow patterns in the Great Plains and the red/blue growth near urban areas and high amenity areas. Those trends overwhelm other demand shocks.
Policy basis should be real trends
What are the broader rural trends?
• The reality is there are 3 rural Americas:
  1) Amenity/recreation rich near mountains, lakes, oceans
     • Incredible growth in parts of the amenity-rich U.S.
     • Less in Canada than US, though growing this decade
  2) Metro adjacent with commuting & wrestling with sprawl, growth
  3) Remote rural that depends on resource sectors
     • Considerably lags the first 2 in population growth

Amenity driven growth is very powerful. For perspective, I picked places that we have heard of though not rural. Also to avoid the small base problem of a county of 100 people that added 100 people doubled in population—who cares.

Between 2001-06, metropolitan Calgary grew 13.4%; but metro Las Vegas grew 22% to almost 1.8million; metro Phoenix grew 19.3% during the period to over 4 million people. But LV and Phoenix have been doing this for decades.

Regarding metro adjacent settings, metropolitan Wood Buffalo (Ft McMurray) 2001-06 grew 23.6%/ exurban Delaware County outside of Columbus, in slow growing Ohio grew 31.4% during the period to nearly 157,000 people

Population Change Reflects Success

• Voting with their feet and diversity
  – Rural U.S. experienced net in-migration from metro America during the 1990s and the first-half of this decade.
    • 1970s was also good for rural America, but the 1980s was a very weak decade for rural America
    • Rural America is growing less than metro America (6% vs. 2% pop growth 2000 to 2005)—due to immigration
    • Rural Canada has not fared as well—more remote rural
  – Yet, about ½ of non-metro counties lost pop. from 2000 to 2005—shows rural diversity.

Shows rural America is faring well and attracting more net domestic migrants from urban areas. Urban American only grows faster due to immigration.

Nonmetro population change from net domestic migration: Illustrating the diversity of rural America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2001-02 Number</th>
<th>2001-02 %</th>
<th>2005-06 Number</th>
<th>2005-06 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All nonmetro counties</td>
<td>39,378</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>145,626</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counties depend on:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>-22,581</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-12,150</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>-374</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,039</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>-11,917</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>29,571</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>53,389</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>59,269</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Calculated by ERS using Census Bureau county population estimates.

Farming counties still had negative net migration even after good year in 2005-06. Productivity growth in farming is a powerful force. Diverse service oriented economies fared best.
Human capital and the knowledge economy trumps alternative forms of growth.

“One job function that is increasingly important in the knowledge economy is creative thinking—combining knowledge and ideas in novel ways to solve problems or create new opportunities. Occupations that typically require high levels of creativity include engineers, scientists, designers, artists, and business managers. Highly creative occupations are found predominantly in metropolitan areas, but some nonmetro counties also contain a relatively high proportion of these occupations.” Source: Rural America at a Glance.

The pattern of sprawl & urban led economic development through rural commuting are the primary reasons for the need for more regionalization in governance.
Engines of Growth are defined as MAs > 500,000 population, 2003 definition.


100km and 200km rings. 100kms is one hour commuting distance.

Great Plains really show the 3 Americas due to its dispersed population settlements. Also the catalyst for much of Congressional discussion on rural policy.

Growth is heavily concentrated in these rings around engines of growth. Growth also occurs in mountains, Black Hills, Ozarks—High Amenity growth!

Some “small” engines of growth are Fargo-Moorhead, Bismarck, Sioux Falls/Sioux City, and the I80 corridor across Nebraska.
2001, Place of Work/Place of Residence data provided by special tabulation.

**Notes:** A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) is defined in the text. The geographic areas delineated within the commuting shed are Consolidated Census Subdivisions (CCS). Statistics Canada defines a CCS as a group of adjacent census subdivisions. Census subdivision (CSD) is generally a municipality. Generally small urban census subdivisions (towns, villages, etc.) are combined with the surrounding more rural census subdivision (du Plessis et al. 2002). See footnote 7 for more details.
Policy in Canada and U.S.

- A) Fractured! B) Underfunded, C) Led in both countries’ Ag ministries (AAFC & USDA)
  - 88 U.S. programs in 16 agencies (Kilkenny and Johnson, 2007)
  - 3% of USDA expenditures is RD—or 1/7\textsuperscript{th} of commodity programs (Hill and Blountford, 2008)
  - AAFC rural is led by the Rural Secretariat (RS). RS accounts for 0.4% of AAFC expenditures.
  - Canada’s Community Futures is a small program, but has interesting stakeholder involvement
  - Especially Canada has regional organizations
    - ACOA, Western Diversification, and U.S. ARC
Policy for a New Rural Economy

• 1. Fund broad-based rural RD policy at a reasonable level. RD is not sectoral policy.

• 2a. Increase the local match in expenditures. Local communities know their fate—limit adverse selection. (Kilkenny and Johnson, 2007)

• 2b. Infrastructure funding should be prioritized to highest valued uses (Renkow)
  – Support network effects and high returns in amenity rich areas and near urban areas
  – General theme is ‘target’ and ‘triage.’
Other countries are finding their version of improvements.


- Other examples of regionalization:
How can we regionalize?

- This can be a formal consolidation of gov’ts or it could be collaboration to make regions competitive.
  - Why rely on borders drawn for the needs of the 19th century
  - Further regional needs for “neighbors”:
    - Economic development
    - Transport people/access to services and amenities
    - Environment/Land use
    - Education/health
    - Quality of life initiatives
    - Increased political clout for common interests.

• At least if we are worried about long-term sustainability of communities, cooperation seems better than going it alone and seeing the community die (or unnecessarily struggle).

• But, regional cooperation needs to be properly planned and needs to be proactive enough to be successful.

• These are several reasons that argue for a regional approach and they should be considered when forming regions of common interests.
• 5. Rural development deserves its own agency—not locked into ministries dedicated to sectoral policy.
  – Front-line bureaucrats are dedicated but Parliament and Congress focus on their well-organized sectoral constituencies.
  – The agency should not have an energy or environmental emphasis—*à la* EU
    • Need energy & environmental policy, but rural would again be lost in those policies.
      – Wind turbines, bio economy….NOT real rural policy
Conclusion

• The American farm economy is strong and farmers are quite prosperous

• Rural Canada/US is much more than farming
  • Sector policies are ineffective for place prosperity
  • The latest fads are also ineffective place policy

• New Rural Economy took hold by 1970
  • Rural North America growth relates to:
    (1) urban proximity
    (2) amenities
Conclusions-cont.

- Reform RD policy away from sectoral policy or the latest fads and towards a New Rural Economy. In order of increasing importance:
  1. Increase real RD funding
  2. Formalize local matches for funding
  3. Target infrastructure funding to high valued uses
  4. Regionalize policy to incorporate urban and rural
  5. Give rural policy its own agency
Conclusions--cont

- Missing is the need to increase knowledge and human capital—but real governance constraints in North America for local schools.

- **We believe the rural-urban divide is really growing pains of a New Rural Economy.**
  - Based on the new rural-urban interdependence (sprawl, urban led growth) and weak governance that reflects 19th Century realities.
  - Exacerbated by backward looking policy when rural North America was solely natural resource driven.
Thank you

Presentation will be posted at The Ohio State University, AED Economics, Swank Program website:

aede.osu.edu/programs/Swank/  
(under presentations)

- For commuting maps for all urban areas of Canada:
Appendix Slides

The Statistics Canada slides at the end are directly from Ray Bollman of Statistics Canada on MIZ and RST population growth.
Darker shades of red is population growth. Darker Shades of blue is population loss. Note that the patterns extend across borders in the West, Great Plains, and Atlantic Canada/New England.
Canada’s 9 largest CMAs and selected U.S. “twins”.

See the Partridge and Olfert paper for further details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Area</th>
<th>2006 CMA Pop.</th>
<th>Density Rank</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Density Rank</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Density Rank</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Toronto</td>
<td>5,113,149</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.540.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>866.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Montreal, QC</td>
<td>5,635,571</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.831.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>853.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Vancouver, BC</td>
<td>2,116,581</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,700.90</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>735.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Ottawa</td>
<td>1,130,761</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,554.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>197.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Calgary, AB</td>
<td>1,079,310</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,374.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>211.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Edmonton, AB</td>
<td>1,034,945</td>
<td></td>
<td>953.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>109.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Quebec, QC</td>
<td>715,515</td>
<td></td>
<td>978.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>218.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Winnipeg, MB</td>
<td>694,668</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,425.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Hamilton, ON</td>
<td>692,911</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,741.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>505.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Panel b: U.S. Metropolitan Areas, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Area</th>
<th>2000 MA Pop.</th>
<th>Density Rank</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Density Rank</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Density Rank</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Chicago</td>
<td>9,157,540</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,279.90</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>821.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Boston</td>
<td>5,819,100</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,296.70</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>101.8</td>
<td>642.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Portland</td>
<td>2,265,223</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,941.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>202.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Columbus, OH</td>
<td>1,540,157</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,622.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>304.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Oklahoma City</td>
<td>1,083,346</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,428.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>158.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Tulsa</td>
<td>803,235</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,214.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Albany</td>
<td>875,583</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,180.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>168.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Omaha</td>
<td>716,998</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,691.90</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Toledo, OH</td>
<td>648,203</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,623.90</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>284.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This table is by way of summarizing some of the relationships. As researchers in rural development, we seem to spend quite a lot of our time convincing rural and urban audiences, and especially the latter that the interdependence is mutual, that a regional approach makes sense. This table can be used to illustrate the interdependence. The shading on here was initially designed to signify demand and supply though I am not sure that is entirely applicable. But I think of the white as the demand side of both product and factor markets and the shaded as supply. So the rural population, at least within commuting distance depends on urban for employment, for private and public services, and for urban amenities. Extending out some distance form the urban centre, the rural population is on the demand side for these goods and services. From the perspective of the urban centre, they depend on the rural labour force for some of their workforce, the rural population forms part of the market for the private and public goods and services provided in the city, as well as the urban amenities.

On the other hand, Urban residents have a demand for recreation in rural areas, for food safety and security, for a maintained environment, and for land for residential, industrial and commercial development beyond their current boundaries if they are to expand in an orderly way. From the rural perspective each of these can be seen as the basis for supplying recreation activities, food, environmental stewardship, and some arrangement for realizing tax revenues or proceeds from the sale of land.

A full understanding of these relationships is necessary in order to elicit the kind of cooperation or joint effort that is required to realize the mutual benefits of this interdependence. Mutual benefits as well as conflicts—both call for cooperation. Ultimately governance of urban and rural areas is involved.
Unlike 1950, ag and other primary is a small share of even rural and small town Ontario which is defined after taking out CAs/CMAs or towns/cities>10,000 and their tight commuting zones.
Figure P8
In Saskatchewan, population growth only in the CMA of
Regina and Saskatoon in the 1986 to 2001 period

Percent change in total population

1986 to 1991
1991 to 1996
1996 to 2001
2001 to 2006

All LUCs
CMAs
CA
All RST areas
Strong MIZ
Moderate MIZ
Weak MIZ
No MIZ

Larger urban centres (LUCs)
Rural and small town (RST) areas


Each Metropolitan Area (CMA) has had its population adjusted using the Consumer Price Index, and the population is
then distributed to the LUCs and RSTs. This method of distributing the population allows for a more accurate
evaluation of population growth within the CMA.

Larger urban centres (LUCs) include all cities and towns with populations of 10,000 or more. Rural
and small town (RST) areas include all areas outside of the LUCs.
In Manitoba, consistent strong population growth in strong MIZ (metropolitan influenced zones)


Comment on Metropolitan Zone (MIZ): over 100,000 people in the urban core and its suburbs and municipalities within 50 kilometers in radius of the core or communities in the urban core.

Comment on Agglomerations (CA): over 10,000 to 100,000 people in the urban core and its suburbs and municipalities within 25 kilometers in radius of the core or communities in the urban core.

MIZ is defined as the urban core or adjacent areas with the highest concentration of population and economic activity.
Figure F6
In Ontario, 2001 to 2006 strong population growth in the larger cities (CMAs) and in No MIZ (metropolitan influenced zones)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent change in total population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All LUCs</th>
<th>CMAs</th>
<th>CAs</th>
<th>All RST areas</th>
<th>Strong MIZ</th>
<th>Moderate MIZ</th>
<th>Weak MIZ</th>
<th>No MIZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Larger urban centres (LUCs)  Rural and small town (RST) areas


Legend:
- CMAs: Census Metropolitan Areas
- CAs: Census Agglomerations
- All RST areas: Rural and small town areas
- Strong MIZ: Metropolitan influenced zones with a high degree of influence
- Moderate MIZ: Metropolitan influenced zones with a moderate degree of influence
- Weak MIZ: Metropolitan influenced zones with a weak degree of influence
- No MIZ: Metropolitan areas with no influence


The Large Urban Centres (LUCs) are defined as areas with a population of over 100,000 people. The Rural and Small Town (RST) areas are defined as areas with a population of less than 10,000 people.
Figure 10

In each period, strong MIZ grew faster than moderate MIZ which, in turn, grew faster Weak MIZ, Canada

Percent change in total population


All LUCs CMAs CAs All RST areas Strong MIZ Moderate MIZ Weak MIZ No MIZ Territories

Larger urban centres (LUCs) Rural and small town (RST) areas

Source: Statistics Canada, Census of Population 1996-2006. Data are tabulated according to land use types.

Census Large Urban Centres (LUCs) (over 50,000) in a city or an urban area and includes amalgamated town and municipalities where 50% or more of the workforce are employed in the service sector.

Census Agglomeration (CA) (over 10,000 to 50,000) in an urban core and includes all neighbouring towns and municipalities where 50% or more of the workforce are employed in the service sector.

Rural Small Towns (RST) are settlements that are not part of an urban core or a census agglomeration and have a population of less than 10,000.

Metropolitan Influence (MI) is assigned to the land use type(s) that contains the largest share of the workforce that commutes to any LUC or CA. Strong MIZ has 45% or more of the workers from an LUC or CA. Weak MIZ has 1 to 5 percent of the workforce from an LUC or CA.