

WORKING TOGETHER:

A Preservation Plan for Minnesota's Historic Properties



2000 - 2005



MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY
STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE

WORKING TOGETHER:

A Preservation Plan for Minnesota's Historic Properties

2 0 0 0 - 2 0 0 5

TABLE OF CONTENTS	Page
Introduction	1
The Planning Process	2
The Preservation Picture in Minnesota	4
A Progress Report	14
Goals and Strategies for 2000-2005	18
Appendix: Preservation Legislation	21
Bibliography	22
Summary of Public Comments	24

State Historic Preservation Office
Minnesota Historical Society
(651) 296-5434
©2000

Cover: (clockwise from upper left) Working together on the Minnesota State Capitol Quadriga, St. Paul (Ramsey County); at Battle Point, Leech Lake Reservation (Cass County); at Norway Lutheran Church (Muskogee), St. Paul (Ramsey County); at a log building restoration workshop, Itasca State Park (Clearwater County); at the Nicollet County Courthouse, St. Peter, following the 1998 tornado; and at one of the many planning sessions that helped shape Minnesota's statewide preservation plan.

INTRODUCTION

From St. Paul's Victorian mansions to prairie-town railroad depots—from archaeological evidence of Minnesota's earliest residents to a 1950s service station—from Lake Superior shipwrecks to agricultural landscapes—Minnesota's historic properties are an immensely varied resource. While numerous, they are not unlimited; once lost, they can never be replaced.

Finding ways to ensure the protection and preservation of these valued historic resources for future generations is what this statewide historic preservation plan is all about. Prepared by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) of the Minnesota Historical Society on behalf of Minnesota's entire preservation community, the plan is designed to build consensus toward a shared vision and establish a framework for future action.

ABOUT THE STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE

In 1849 the Minnesota Territorial Legislature established the Minnesota Historical Society for the purpose of preserving the evidence of the past. And in 1969 the Minnesota Legislature designated the director of the Minnesota Historical Society as the State Historic Preservation Officer (MS 138.081). As a major educational institution providing a variety of historical programs and services, the Society is well suited as the umbrella organization for Minnesota's historic preservation program.



Original Main Street Historic District, Sauk Centre, Stearns County (1958 photo)



Ada Village Hall, Ada, Norman County

The SHPO is located in the Society's Historic Preservation, Field Services and Grants Department. As the primary office in the state with expertise in historic preservation, the SHPO advocates the preservation of the state's irreplaceable historic and archaeological resources and provides statewide leadership in carrying out its mission to identify, evaluate, register and protect historic properties in Minnesota.

A VISION FOR THE FUTURE

The vision for Minnesota's statewide preservation planning can be found in *Preserving Minnesota: Planning for Historic Properties into a New Century* (published in 1991 by the Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office), which describes the programs and planning process of the SHPO:

Minnesota's historic and archaeological properties are among the state's most valuable resources. They reflect and illuminate the values of Minnesota's people. They are the physical evidence of the ways people have chosen to live, of our need for beautiful objects as well as functional structures. The presence of historic properties, which display various styles, different historic periods

and the contributions of diverse groups of people, adds diversity and richness to our urban and rural landscapes.

Embracing that vision, this five-year preservation plan for 2000–2005 updates the plan that was implemented in 1995. As with the earlier plan, the success of this revised plan rests on the many citizens, organizations, government agencies, elected officials and preservation professionals who, by working together, will carry out a shared preservation agenda in the 21st century.

Our aims are high:

- to encourage appreciation of the state's cultural resources and promote their relevance to the vitality of today's communities;
- to mobilize the preservation community and enlist new partners in the process;
- to influence public policy and leverage the human, financial and technological resources needed to promote historic preservation statewide.

Through wise stewardship, we can ensure the preservation of Minnesota's rich cultural heritage for the education, appreciation and enjoyment of Minnesotans today and in generations to come.

This statewide historic preservation plan draws on information gathered from many sources over the past 10 years. Driving the effort has been the SHPO's own annual planning, which since the mid-1980s has integrated public and professional participation.

In 1990 the SHPO formalized that participation through a combination of annual regional meetings for the public and periodic planning sessions with selected groups. Those gatherings were designed to identify strengths and weaknesses of current preservation programs and explore trends and issues affecting Minnesota's cultural resources. The process was followed in developing both the 1995 plan and this revision.

Guiding the planning process from the beginning was the 1991 publication, *Preserving Minnesota: Planning for Historic Properties into a New Century*. It provides a context for this revision.



Ernest C. Oberholzer
Rainy Lake Islands
Historic District, Rainy
Lake, Koochiching
County. Ernest C.
Oberholzer (1940
photo)



Dawson Armory and Community Building, Dawson, Lac qui Parle County

THE SHPO ROLE

The State Historic Preservation Office plays the lead role in developing and implementing Minnesota's preservation plan. At their annual planning retreat, SHPO staff members review broad planning objectives, assess the continued validity of the statewide plan's goals, establish priorities and develop a work plan for the coming year. Within that framework, this statewide preservation plan was prepared.

IDENTIFYING OUR CONSTITUENCIES

In developing the public participation component of the planning process, the SHPO identified a wide variety of groups for input:

- General public.
- Preservation-related professionals and those familiar with the field of historic preservation and the work of the Minnesota SHPO. Participants included the Tribal Historic Preservation Officers, the State Review Board, statewide and local historic preservation organizations, preservation consultants, other Minnesota Historical Society staff members, historians, architectural historians and archaeologists.
- Local and county historical organizations.
- Federal, state and local government officials and others whose decisions affect or have the potential to affect historic and cultural resources.
- Heritage preservation commissions, Certified Local Governments and other local communities.
- American Indians.
- Other special-interest populations including the disabled.

PUBLIC AND PROFESSIONAL INPUT

To communicate with these diverse audiences and solicit input for the statewide plan, the SHPO relied on the following vehicles.

Public Meetings: Since 1990 the SHPO has held a minimum of three regional public meetings each year in varying locations. These meetings have been a particularly effective means of gauging general perceptions about preservation, identifying regional issues and threats to historic properties, obtaining recommendations for National Register and survey priorities, and soliciting suggestions for technical assistance and funding.

Agency Participation: The SHPO also conducted planning sessions with state and federal agency personnel, local preservation commissions, the State Review Board and other individuals. In addition, the preservation office gleaned information on statewide trends and issues affecting historic preservation from the planning documents of other agencies, annual reports of heritage preservation commissions and reports generated from review and compliance activities.

Workshops: The SHPO hosted workshops for state and federal agencies and for other agencies that receive federal funds to air concerns about projects affecting historic resources. Several state agencies were targeted for cooperative work over the past five years, due to their high potential to affect historic resources and/or the absence of comprehensive planning for their cultural resources.

Facilitated Planning Sessions: Held in the fall of 1999 in eight regional locations—two in the metropolitan area of Minneapolis and St. Paul and six in greater Minnesota—these sessions served to gather feedback on progress toward the goals of the 1995 preservation plan. The sessions also helped identify issues and articulate priorities for the "Goals and Strategies" section of this revised plan. Attendance at the sessions totaled 116 and represented a cross-section of Minnesota's preservation community.

Newsletters: Two SHPO newsletters, *The Minnesota Preservation Planner* and *The Minnesota History Interpreter*, reach a combined readership of some 3,500 individuals and agencies. In addition, each year the SHPO publishes and distributes an annual report on the full range of department activities.

ABOUT THIS REVISION

This revised five-year plan should be considered a work-in-progress. It provides the overall framework for the ongoing work of historic preservation—resource identification, evaluation, registration and protection—by all of Minnesota's preservation partners. Other preservation planning documents have been developed to address the needs of particular categories of resources such as shipwrecks and rural historic landscapes. Minnesota's disaster plan for historic properties is yet another example of a specialized planning document. These work in concert with the statewide preservation plan.

Over the next five years, the SHPO will continue to test, evaluate and fine-tune the assumptions, goals and strategies presented in this document. The revision process for the next plan will begin in the fall of 2003 with an evaluation of this plan, followed by a series of public meetings and planning activities that will reshape it.

A new statewide plan will be issued in 2005. By then, it will be time for a fresh look at our progress and the challenges that remain in protecting and preserving our historic resources.

OUR CULTURAL RESOURCES

Within the borders of Minnesota lies a rich variety of historic properties—houses, public buildings, commercial districts and industrial sites, bridges, mines and even a tugboat. These resources help tell Minnesota's story. They are tangible links to our past.

As part of the ongoing work of historic preservation in Minnesota, approximately 50,000 historic structures and some 15,000 archaeological sites in Minnesota have been identified to date. Of these, more than 2,300 properties have been designated locally. And nearly 1,500—encompassing 6,500 individual properties—are listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Every county in the state is represented on the list.

Surveying the Scene

A systematic inventory of Minnesota's historic resources began in 1977 with a statewide, county-by-county survey by the SHPO of standing structures. Over the next 11 years the SHPO identified and evaluated an estimated 32,000 historic properties. The massive body of inventory



Decrow Auditorium, Decrow, Crow Wing County



Kalevala Finnish Evangelical National Lutheran Church, Kalevala Twp., Carlton County

data generated by those surveys was recently compiled as a computer database, making the information more widely accessible as a research and planning tool.

Since that county inventory, the SHPO and other preservation partners have undertaken more specialized surveys and cultural resource studies. Among the areas of focus:

- Historic shipwrecks in the Minnesota waters of Lake Superior.
- Properties associated with the logging industry.
- Sites associated with American Indian land cession treaties.
- Agricultural historic landscapes.
- WPA-era properties.
- State-owned buildings.
- Historic bridges.
- University of Minnesota properties.
- Properties associated with Black Minnesotans in the Twin Cities and Duluth.

In addition, local heritage preservation commissions, largely through federal Certified Local Government grants administered by the SHPO, have gathered extensive survey data for many Minnesota communities.

The number of cities participating in this effort continues to grow and the high quality of their surveys gives these communities valuable information to help ensure that historic resources are considered in local planning.

Understanding Our Resources

To evaluate Minnesota's historic and archaeological resources, the SHPO developed a framework of historic contexts—defined by time period, theme and geographical area—that help determine the significance of each resource within the larger picture of the region's history. For each context, priorities were established for survey, registration and treatment activities. Minnesota's three-tiered historic context framework:

- I. Broad statewide patterns encompassing three periods: Pre-Contact (9500 B.C.–A.D. 1650), Contact (1650–1837) and Post-Contact (1837–1945).
- II. Specific themes, identified as needed, to evaluate properties best understood in a framework smaller than statewide patterns.
- III. Contexts developed by a particular city or other local area for use in local planning.



Bull-of-the-Wood Logging Scow, Morse Twp., St. Louis County



*Above: Cassile Bullard
(photo courtesy of his daughter,
Arlee Blalock)*

*Right: Cassile Bullard House,
St. Paul, Ramsey County*



Filling Gaps

Much remains to be done, at both the state and local levels, to continue the work of identifying and evaluating Minnesota's historic properties. Among the significant gaps in the body of survey data:

- A statewide archaeological survey, initiated at the same time as the county-by-county standing structures survey, was never completed. It remains a high priority.
- Some of the information in the SHPO's county-by-county standing structures survey is now more than 20 years old, and the quality of the data varies from county to county. There is a growing need to update survey data from the early years of that program.
- Traditional cultural properties—that is, properties associated with the cultural practices and beliefs of a living community—need to be identified, especially those associated with Minnesota's American Indian people.
- The SHPO's recent work to identify agricultural historic landscapes in areas of high development provided a model for evaluating a category of historic resources not previously examined in Minnesota.

But that project also underscored a statewide need for more work in identifying and evaluating historic landscapes both urban and rural.

■ With the passage of time, new categories of properties will become eligible for the National Register (for some examples, see "Transportation Systems," page 13). Additional survey work will also spotlight resources to be added to the Register in coming years.

Preservation and Treatment

Preservation and treatment of our historic resources pose the toughest challenges. A lack of funds, planning, expertise and viable uses for historic properties all constitute major hurdles.

These challenges must be understood within a context larger than the resources themselves. Historic resources in rural areas, for example, are particularly vulnerable as those areas experience population loss, economic hardship and changing agricultural technologies. For more on the challenges facing Minnesota's historic and archaeological properties, see "Statewide Factors Affecting Historic Resources," page 10.



*Nansen Agricultural Historic District, Holden and Warsaw Twp.,
Goodhue County*

THE PRESERVATION COMMUNITY

Since Minnesota's historic preservation program was established more than 30 years ago, interest in historic preservation has mushroomed. The state is now home to a growing number of preservation professionals, skilled craftsmen, and architects and developers with preservation expertise. Today Minnesota's historic preservation community is nearly as varied as the resources it works to preserve. Any plan to guide preservation efforts in the future must take into account these many partners.

Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office

The Minnesota Historical Society's SHPO plays the lead role in implementing the statewide preservation plan. Funding for the SHPO comes from federal and state sources. With demands growing in all areas of the program, the small staff is challenged to keep pace with the requirements of administering the federal program that makes up the majority of the SHPO budget. The office also administers two state-funded grants-in-aid programs to assist historic properties; the first was



Ramsey Mill Ruins and Old Mill Park, Hastings, Dakota County

established in 1969. Grant funds appropriated during the last three bonding sessions at the Minnesota Legislature significantly improved the availability of grant assistance for historic properties in public ownership. The status of future funding remains, as always, uncertain.

Today the SHPO is at an important juncture. Several major goals have been achieved, including the automation of survey databases. To carry its work forward, the Minnesota SHPO will be challenged to build stronger partnerships and leverage increased resources if it is to successfully expand public services and employ new technologies to lead historic preservation into the 21st century.

Minnesota's Tribal Historic Preservation Offices

The Mille Lacs and Leech Lake bands of Ojibwe were among the nation's first 12 Indian tribes to establish Tribal Historic Preservation Offices, with a role parallel to the Minnesota SHPO in administering national preservation programs on their reservations. They will focus on archaeological sites and traditional cultural properties and work with the SHPO in dealing with other types of historic resources.



St. Croix Recreational Demonstration Area, St. Croix State Park, Pine County



Edward, Sr., and Markell Brooks House, St. Paul, Ramsey County

National Trust for Historic Preservation

This nonprofit organization provides national leadership in historic preservation and is an important partner in Minnesota's preservation community. The National Trust's commitment to building a network of statewide nonprofit preservation organizations and strong local preservation programs is critical.

Preservation Alliance of Minnesota

Founded in the early 1980s, the Preservation Alliance of Minnesota is a statewide nonprofit organization with over one thousand members. The Alliance works to preserve Minnesota's cultural resources through preservation advocacy, education, a monthly newsletter and a preservation easement program. With assistance from the National Trust's statewide initiative, the Alliance began a new chapter in its history when it hired its first executive director in 1998. As a result, its membership and capacity for preservation outreach and advocacy have increased significantly.

Local Heritage Preservation Commissions

To date, 43 Minnesota communities have enacted local preservation ordinances and 30 are participating in the Certified Local Government program, administered by the SHPO and the National Park Service. Through this program, local communities conduct surveys, designate historic properties, develop and enforce design guidelines, and undertake a wide range of preservation education activities. These communities, among Minnesota's strongest preservation partners, provide leadership on a statewide level. However, many of these programs are underfunded at the local level, and few have professional staff.

Partners in Archaeology

The State Archaeologist, the Institute for Minnesota Archaeology (IMA), private archaeological contractors and the Minnesota Indian Affairs Council all play important roles in the preservation of Minnesota's largely "invisible" cultural resources. The 18-year-old IMA, in particular, is instrumental in research and advocacy for the



Winona Commercial Historic District, Winona, Winona County

state's archaeological resources. Among its many education initiatives, the Institute helped found Minnesota Archaeology Week, held annually since 1995 to increase public awareness.

Preservation Professionals

One measure of growth in Minnesota's preservation community is the number of firms and individuals now conducting cultural resource work in the state. A growing number of independent historians, architectural historians and archaeologists throughout the state do contract work for federal and state agencies, local governments, private developers and the SHPO.

Architects, Builders, Contractors, Lenders, Real Estate Agents and Related Professionals

Also important players in Minnesota's preservation community are a wide range of professionals and trades people whose fields have a significant impact on historic resources.

County and Local Historical Organizations

Minnesota is home to more than 500 historical organizations, including county historical societies in each of the state's 87 counties.



Universal Laboratories Building, Dulut, Meeker County



Iryan Ceyaba Otowae (Little Rapids Archeological Site), Louisville Twp., Scott County

Increasingly they are directing their attention to preservation projects. Many of these organizations are stewards of historic properties; some properties are administered as house museums, others as general history museums. While some of these organizations are local leaders and articulate advocates for historic preservation, the majority have yet to maximize their potential as preservation partners.

Indian Tribes

Minnesota's American Indian tribes, longtime advocates of preserving cultural resources, have become more active over the past five years in historic preservation programs administered by the SHPO. Many now also incorporate historic preservation in tribal planning. That is undoubtedly because properties of traditional cultural significance, such as sacred sites, are only recently being considered in federal and state preservation planning. Amendments to the National Historic Preservation Act in 1992 provide for expanded participation by Indian tribes in the national preservation program, particularly regarding resources on tribal lands. New regulations of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, adopted in 1999, further define a role for Indian tribes in the Section 106 process.



Nokomis Knoll Residential Historic District, Minneapolis, Hennepin County

Owners and Developers of Historic Properties

The majority of the state's historic resources are in the hands of private property owners and developers. Many appreciate the historic or architectural significance of their properties but others remain unaware of their properties' importance.

Local Governments/Agencies/Organizations

A number of city and county governments own historic properties. Local planning and development agencies are responsible for implementing municipal policies that may affect historic properties. And many neighborhood and business organizations are vocal participants in decisions that affect the nature of their communities. All play a role in preserving the historic structures and landscapes that make their communities unique.

State Agencies

The State of Minnesota, through its many agencies, is one of the primary public owners of historic properties in the state. The Department of Administration and the Department of Natural Resources are the principal stewards of those cultural resources. In addition, the activities

of many agencies, like the Minnesota Department of Transportation and the Minnesota Department of Trade and Economic Development, have potential effects on historic properties.

Federal Agencies

The National Historic Preservation Act mandates federal-state-tribal-local partnerships for historic preservation. In addition to their role as principal partners in carrying out the provisions of the act, federal agencies also own property in Minnesota. Interpretation of historic properties is within the mission of some, particularly the U.S. Forest Service and the National Park Service, which maintain a number of historic sites in Minnesota of national and state significance.

STATEWIDE FACTORS AFFECTING HISTORIC RESOURCES

The challenges and opportunities facing historic preservation in the 21st century are influenced by broad social and economic factors that will have a tremendous impact on our state and our historic resources in the years ahead. This look at some of the statewide trends affecting



Viola Cooperative Creamery, Viola Twp. (Viola), Olustad County



Minneapolis YMCA
Central Building,
Minneapolis,
Hennepin County

Minnesota's historic and archaeological resources is drawn partly from reports on 1990 census data prepared by the State Demographer's office, the 1998 Economic Report to the Governor, the 1997 Minnesota Statewide Transportation Plan and other sources.

Population

Contrasting trends of unprecedented growth in urban and suburban areas and depopulation of smaller, rural communities will continue to challenge the planning capabilities of community leaders, public policy makers and service providers.

The state's central corridor, stretching from St. Cloud through Minneapolis/St. Paul to Rochester, is a major

growth center in the northern United States. That growth has come at the expense of Minnesota's rural areas; some counties lost as much as 20 percent of their population during the 1980s. It is expected that by the year 2020 a full 68 percent of the state's population will reside in the Twin Cities, Rochester and St. Cloud.

Planners will also have to accommodate an increasingly diverse population that, at the same time, is aging. The state's minority population is expected to nearly triple between 1990 and 2020. And in some rural areas, the population is aging faster than statewide averages.

Challenges and Opportunities:

- The population loss in rural areas has been accompanied by a decline in the number of family farms and a loss of rural resources. Small towns are experiencing a similar decline as they struggle for survival.
- In major growth centers, population surges and urban sprawl pose a threat to many of our historic resources where the landscape is changing at a rapid rate. For example, development projects and new construction may replace historic structures or alter their surroundings.
- As the population ages and baby boomers become empty-nesters,

growing numbers of Minnesota residents are exhibiting a renewed interest in homes and neighborhoods with a distinct sense of place. In Minneapolis's riverfront and center-city communities, for example, this has presented opportunities for redeveloping older industrial areas and revitalizing residential neighborhoods. In some smaller communities around the state, the appeal of small-town life is beginning to draw retirees back.

■ The state's growing minority populations are untapped audiences for historic preservation. In some areas new immigrants are embracing historic neighborhoods built by other immigrant groups a century ago. These newer Minnesotans are putting their own stamp on the Minnesota landscape; the places important to them today will be among the properties preserved by the next generation of historic preservationists.

Economics

Like much of the rest of the country, Minnesota benefited from a period of strong economic growth during the 1990s. The strong economy generated financial resources for many historic preservation projects. It also resulted in a pattern of widening income disparity between urban/suburban population centers and declining rural areas. That disparity will affect local and statewide public policy decisions as well as public and private investment in cultural resources.



Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception
(Catholic), Crookston, Polk County



Sallwater Bridge, Sallwater, Washington County

In areas both prosperous and struggling, historic preservation can be a successful economic development tool—part of the solution to building the healthy, livable communities envisioned by state leaders for the future.

Challenges and Opportunities:

- The economic decline of many rural communities threatens historic properties because there is a lack of funds to maintain them. In more prosperous areas, it is the rush to undertake development and redevelopment projects that threatens historic properties. The economics of rehabilitating a historic property cannot always compete with the economics of large-scale development.
- The lack of viable uses for historic properties also constitutes a major threat. Buildings and structures stand the best chance of preservation when they are in use. In recent years the SHPO has seen good results in working with communities and private citizens to conduct reuse studies of vacant, threatened or underused buildings.

- In smaller, rural communities, historic preservation projects can revitalize a historic main street and, in the process, create jobs and stimulate the local economy.
- In urban areas, too, historic preservation projects can return unused historic structures to productive service, bring people to underused parts of the city or provide infrastructure for affordable housing.
- Throughout Minnesota, the preservation of historic properties can serve to develop and promote heritage tourism. In short, historic preservation contributes to a quality of life that attracts investment to communities.

Transportation Systems

Changes in the state's transportation networks will also have a significant impact on Minnesota's historic resources. Whether the effects will be negative—by destroying resources—or positive—by increasing economic development and tourism—will depend on the commitment to historic preservation by local citizens and elected officials.

Challenges and Opportunities:

- Minnesota's statewide transportation plan recognizes the need to preserve and enhance the environment, including our cultural resources, and the need for innovation to reduce negative impacts. At the same time, the plan notes that our current highway system cannot accommodate projected demand. Planning for light rail and mass transit is already underway. Such new systems and expansion of the existing highway system will greatly affect historic resources along the routes and in nearby communities.
- The Federal Highway Administration's new context-sensitive highway design initiative, intended to integrate roads into adjacent natural and built environments, should help encourage innovation in addressing complex resource-protection issues.
- Proposed expansion of the Twin Cities International Airport and regional airports likewise threatens nearby historic resources.
- Railroad line abandonment will continue to have a direct impact on



Lakeside Pavilion, Glenwood, Pope County

Minnesota's historic resources as communities struggle to find new uses for related properties. Abandoned depots have excellent potential for adaptive reuse but financial resources are needed to realize that potential.

■ Several types of transportation-related properties will become increasingly important as historic resources. Early aviation facilities are beginning to be evaluated for eligibility to the National Register. Sections of the interstate highway system are now nearly 50 years old; as remnants of a significant transportation system, these properties and their alteration will be among emerging preservation issues in the years ahead.

Government

Federal, state and local governments have become principal players in historic preservation by establishing the legal basis and regulatory framework for protecting cultural resources. However, federal funding cuts and tax reform continue to reduce the amount of local government monies for preservation programs. In this climate of increased competition for limited public funds, preservation efforts by those in the private, nonprofit and commercial sectors are increasingly important.

Challenges and Opportunities:

■ Some local governments are turning to historic preservation as an economic development strategy. A number of Minnesota communities

have qualified for federal matching grants by enacting local preservation ordinances, achieving Certified Local Government status and participating in the National Register of Historic Places process. These communities are successfully planning for the protection of their historic resources. Yet, too many elected officials at the county, municipal and township levels still fail to consider cultural resource management in their planning.

■ Changes in public policy—regarding accessibility, building codes or disposal of surplus property, for example—also can place historic resources at risk. But progress is being made in creating a public policy environment more favorable for the protection of historic resources. In Minnesota's last three legislative sessions, there has been growing support for legislation to establish incentives that will encourage historic building rehabilitation.



Minneapolis St. Paul and Sault Ste. Marie Depot, Thief River Falls, Pennington County

A PROGRESS REPORT

The 1995 preservation plan outlined a statewide agenda of goals and strategies that addressed identified needs and set priorities for the next five years. Each year since then, the SHPO has monitored progress toward those goals. The 1995 goals are listed below, along with just some of the accomplishments of Minnesota's many preservation partners around the state.

To help gauge our accomplishments against what we set out to achieve, the SHPO held a series of eight facilitated meetings in the fall of 1999. The feedback gathered from individuals with a stake in historic preservation as well as from the interested public is also summarized here.

1. Increase community awareness of the value and importance of the state's cultural resources.

Consensus: Historic preservation has benefited from heightened visibility over the past five years. Examples: increased media coverage for historic preservation issues; greater presence on the Internet for a number of preservation partners; better understanding of the economic benefits of historic preservation, most notably those derived from heritage tourism; increased visibility and effectiveness of local heritage preservation commissions; and heightened awareness of the negative impacts of urban sprawl.

- In 1996 the SHPO created a new position to develop and implement statewide preservation education and outreach programs. This work has focused on strengthening existing partnerships and forging new ones to further the goal of increasing preservation education.

- Each year since the 1995 plan was adopted, National Historic Preservation Week has been successfully promoted on both a statewide level and in local communities. The number of sponsoring partners has increased steadily. In addition, Minnesota Archaeology Week, held back to back with Preservation Week, has created greater recognition for Minnesota's archaeological resources.



Ann Biddle House, Glenwood, Pope County

- Aided largely by federal Certified Local Government grants, several communities—Faribault, Eden Prairie, Newport and Cottage Grove—have developed curriculum materials for use in the public schools.

2. Encourage integration of historic preservation at all levels of planning to promote consideration of cultural resources in decision-making processes.

Consensus: Preservation and cultural resource planning issues continue to be too often overlooked at the county, municipal and township levels. But progress has been made in other planning arenas:

- A number of state and federal agencies, including the University of Minnesota, the Federal Highways Administration (FHWA), the Minnesota Department of Transportation and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), have worked in partnership with the SHPO to undertake cultural resource management planning.

- The 1997 floods in the Red River and Minnesota River valleys and 1998 tornado disasters across southern Minnesota provided dramatic opportunities to integrate cultural resource planning with disaster



*Glen Lake Children's Camp,
Eden Prairie, Hennepin
County*

preparedness, response and recovery. Agency and community partnerships paved the way.

- The leadership of Certified Local Governments in preservation planning efforts has ensured that historic preservation has an annual presence at the Upper Midwest Regional Planning Association Conference and the Minnesota State Planning Conference.

- The SHPO has encouraged creative mitigation measures as a means to help leverage cultural resource planning initiatives. A recent example: an action plan for the Minneapolis Warehouse District that resulted from the Section 106 review of the new Federal Reserve Bank facility.

3. Expand and strengthen the network of organizations and individuals engaged in historic preservation throughout the state.

Consensus: There has been progress toward this goal on four fronts: a stronger and more visible Preservation Alliance of Minnesota; expanded grassroots leadership and participation, evidenced largely by the high visibility of local heritage preservation commissions; a growing commitment to cultural resource preservation on the part of Minnesota's American Indian population; and evidence of a diverse mix of players in Minnesota's preservation community.

- Two Minnesota Indian tribes—Leech Lake and Mille Lacs—were among the first 12 in the nation to be certified to assume certain SHPO responsibilities within their reservations. They have

demonstrated a growing commitment to the preservation of their local cultural resources.

- Four more cities enacted preservation ordinances, bringing the number of communities with local ordinances to 43. Six cities joined the ranks of Minnesota's Certified Local Governments, bringing the total to 30.

- An increased Web presence for the SHPO and the Institute for Minnesota Archaeology, along with growing use of the Web by other preservation partners, holds promise for improved communication in the preservation community.

- After three years of concentrated effort by the SHPO, the Main Street program failed to find a new state agency home. However, interest at the local level and on the part of the Preservation Alliance of Minnesota continues and other models are being explored.



Germania Hall, Germania Twp., Todd County



*Hennepin Theatre, Minneapolis,
Hennepin County*

4. Provide incentives to encourage historic preservation.

Consensus: Financial incentives, in the form of grants, tax incentives and low-interest loans, are the most effective incentives to encourage historic preservation.

■ State bonding sessions in 1996 and 1998 increased amounts authorized for historic preservation projects. And some of the 1998 tornado disaster recovery funds from the state disaster recovery appropriation were earmarked for historic preservation assistance. More than \$2.3 million has been awarded to some 60 historic properties as a result of these programs.

■ Federal Transportation Enhancement funds have assisted a small but varied group of preservation projects statewide. However, greater effort is needed to encourage both applicants and Minnesota Department of Transportation district offices to make the process more accessible for historic preservation.

■ Proposed state tax incentive and Tax Increment Financing (TIF) bills to assist historic preservation have received positive hearings in the Minnesota Legislature. The Preservation Alliance of Minnesota and the Minnesota Historical Society have worked together with other partners in advocating for historic preservation and building grass-roots support.

■ A revolving fund for endangered properties remains a statewide need.

5. Maximize efforts to identify and designate significant historic resources.

The SHPO is the official repository for Minnesota's inventory data as well as the office with registration responsibilities at the federal, state and local levels.

■ Historical and archaeological survey accomplishments since 1995 have been notable. Cooperative interagency projects have identified and evaluated the state's historic bridges, Minnesota logging camps and historic properties on the University of Minnesota campuses. Recently a study of historic farmsteads was begun. This initial work in identifying and evaluating Minnesota's agricultural historic landscapes was made possible through a state-funded project recommended by the Legislative Commission on Minnesota Resources.

■ Since 1995 a total of 76 properties, including 14 historic districts, have been added to the National Register of Historic Places. The combined new listings comprise 880 contributing properties. The photographs in this publication feature many of those new listings.



John Harris Harding Grammar and High School and John A. Johnson Grammar School, Aurora, St. Louis County



*Church of the Most Holy Trinity,
Wheatland Twp. (Veseli), Rice
County*

■ Grant funds available to Certified Local Governments (CLG) for surveys and designation of eligible properties to local registers have helped those communities take responsibility for their cultural resources. A total of 17 CLG surveys have been conducted since 1995 and more than 90 historic properties have been designated to local registers in cities ranging from Duluth to Winona to New Ulm.

6. Encourage appropriate treatment of historic resources.

Consensus: Successful historic preservation projects teach by example and often serve as catalysts for increasing preservation awareness in a community. Technical assistance and accessible "how-to" information are especially important in ensuring that preservation is done correctly.

■ Since 1995 growing numbers of communities and organizations have conducted reuse studies of vacant, threatened or underused historic properties. This strategy, employed for some 25 properties, has enabled communities to make informed decisions about their resources. Among the properties benefiting from reuse studies: Kasota Village Hall, St. James Opera House in St. James, Dania Hall in Minneapolis, Red Wing High School, Winsted City Hall, St. Louis County Jail in Duluth, and Johnson and Harding schools in Aurora.

■ Preservation easements for a number of historic properties were executed through the Section 106 review process. This will ensure their appropriate treatment in the future. Recent examples: the Dawson Armory in Lac qui Parle County and the Frank Farmhouse in Carver County.

■ "Tech Talk," a bimonthly column in *The Minnesota History Interpreter*, provides technical information about appropriate treatments. And the Contractors Database maintained by the SHPO is used frequently by a varied clientele.



Franklin Branch Library, Minneapolis, Hennepin County



Kettle River Bridge, Sandstone, Pine County

GOALS AND STRATEGIES FOR 2000-2005

Education. Partnerships. Relevance. Those words characterize the priorities embodied in this statewide preservation plan:

- **education**, because greater public awareness and understanding are key to addressing the critical needs of preservation in Minnesota today;
- **partnerships**, because historic preservation is everyone's responsibility and its success depends on working together to advance a shared agenda;
- **relevance**, because historic preservation speaks to broad issues facing the state in the years ahead—building healthy, livable communities; promoting smart growth; protecting the environment and our cultural resources.

The general goals set in the 1995 plan remain valid. With some modification, they will continue to guide our work over the next five years.

Those goals, and some strategies for achieving them, are outlined below. Strategies from the earlier plan that have proven effective will continue to be pursued; other strategies have been updated to reflect new priorities. These strategies are intended not as an exhaustive list but as suggestions to clarify direction and identify possible roles for Minnesota's many preservation partners.

It is up to each of us with a stake in preserving our historic resources to share in advancing this preservation agenda for Minnesota. For some of us, that may mean shaping our work plans to include additional strategies, specific objectives and measurable outcomes. For others, it may mean simply participating in programs initiated by other preservation partners.

In any case, accomplishing the crucial work of historic preservation will call for a redirection of human and financial resources and continued diligence by every preservation partner in addressing Minnesota's preservation needs.

1. Increase community awareness of the value of Minnesota's historic resources.

- Increase the visibility of historic preservation by such means as National Historic Preservation Week and Minnesota Archaeology Week, an annual statewide conference, recognition of successful preservation efforts and cultivation of relationships with the media.
- Develop and promote programs that encourage preservation education and reach new audiences—particularly elected officials at the county, municipal and township levels; people in the building trades; property owners and students of all ages.
- Promote use of the National Register of Historic Places by educators, communities and history professionals as a means to educate the public about the built environment.
- Strengthen the historic preservation ethic already present in many communities through interpretive programs. For example, heritage tourism initiatives that tell the stories behind our cultural resources can help build support for their preservation.
- Use the Internet and other new technologies to share information about the state's historic resources and historic preservation activities and accomplishments.

2. Encourage integration of historic preservation at all levels of planning.

- Assist federal, state and local agencies in becoming responsible stewards of the historic resources in their care or those affected by their activities. Example: foster the development of comprehensive cultural resource plans that promote the consideration of historic properties.

- Establish or strengthen state statutes and local ordinances to require a role for historic preservation in project planning.
- Urge planners and planning agencies to address historic preservation concerns throughout the course of their work, using consultations, participation in workshops and conferences, and committee representation at the state and local levels.
- Implement the management plans developed for special categories of historic resources, such as Minnesota's underwater resources, agricultural historic landscapes and University of Minnesota properties.

3. Expand the statewide network of organizations and individuals engaged in historic preservation.

- Strengthen the preservation advocacy role of statewide and local nonprofit organizations, from the Preservation Alliance of Minnesota to county and local historical societies to the growing number of grass-roots organizations tackling preservation issues.
- Encourage the creation of local heritage preservation commissions and expand participation in the Certified Local Government program.
- Use new technologies to improve communication among organizations and individuals interested in historic preservation.
- Strengthen consultation with American Indian people. Encourage tribes to establish historic preservation programs and develop preservation expertise.
- Develop information and programs for owners of historic properties to increase their participation in the preservation community.

4. Promote historic preservation as an economic development tool and provide economic incentives that encourage it.

- Gather and disseminate information to target audiences (e.g., state and local government officials, property owners, developers) about the cultural and economic benefits of historic preservation, featuring preservation success stories.
- Foster a "preservation-friendly" environment for development projects involving historic properties, through public policy and education initiatives at the state and local level. Example: Work to amend the state's uniform building code to include provisions for historic building conservation.
- Promote use of existing incentive programs such as federal investment tax credits and facade easements.
- Initiate and support efforts to establish tax incentives at local, state and national levels by educating lawmakers and identifying leaders to carry forward a coordinated agenda.
- Expand and diversify historic preservation funding sources, including nongovernmental sources, that will supplement increasingly limited public funds. Use education and outreach as a means to this end.
- Identify potential funding sources and a future home for a state revolving fund for historic preservation. Properties particularly at risk or those in private hands where other assistance may not be available would benefit from such a program.

5. Identify, evaluate and designate significant historic and archaeological resources.

- Conduct surveys at the state and local levels to address emerging issues and gaps in existing surveys. For example, the SHPO will

concentrate its efforts on traditional cultural properties and historic landscapes both urban and rural.

- Designate historic properties, including historic districts, to national, state and local registers to increase recognition and protection for the resources. Use Certified Local Government grant funds to conduct surveys and designate eligible properties at the local level.

6. Encourage appropriate management and treatment of historic resources.

- Promote use of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties, particularly among property owners and those in the building industries.
- Identify new uses for vacant or underused resources. The reuse study model employed by the SHPO explores the preservation potential for threatened resources within a realistic community and economic context.
- Use new technologies as well as traditional training methods to increase access to technical information and assistance in caring for structural and archaeological properties, targeting owners of historic properties both public and private.
- Encourage protection of historic resources through tools such as preservation easements, cultural resource management plans, historic structures reports and design guidelines for local historic districts.
- Advocate archaeological data recovery, historical documentation and/or architectural and engineering recordation as a means of preserving important information in cases when destruction of a historic property cannot be avoided.

APPENDIX: PRESERVATION LEGISLATION

The most comprehensive federal law pertaining to the protection of cultural resources is the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, which created State Historic Preservation Offices in each state, established the National Register of Historic Places and created a federal-state-tribal-local partnership:

Section 106 requires federal agencies to consider the effect of their activities on historic properties and to afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation the opportunity to comment on those activities. In practice, this provision is administered under the regulations in 36 CFR 800, which require that federal agencies consult with the State Historic Preservation Office regarding all undertakings. Certain projects with effects on historic properties also are referred to the Advisory Council.

Section 110 defines the broad requirements for preservation programs in federal agencies.

Revisions enacted in 1992 provide expanded participation for Indian tribes in the national preservation program, including a provision for the creation of Tribal Historic Preservation Offices that are able to assume State Historic Preservation Office responsibilities within reservation boundaries.

Other federal laws relating to protection of cultural resources include the **Abandoned Shipwrecks Act of 1987**, the **Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974**, the **American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978**, the **Archeological Resources Protection Act of 1979**, the **Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990** and the **National Environmental Policy Act of 1969**.

Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 138 designates the director of the Minnesota Historical Society as the State Historic Preservation Officer (MS 138.081) and places responsibility for Minnesota's historic preservation program firmly with the Minnesota Historical Society. Chapter

138 contains several additional sections pertaining to historic and archaeological resources:

The **Minnesota Field Archaeology Act** (MS 138.31–138.42) establishes the office of the State Archaeologist; requires licenses to engage in archaeology on public land; establishes ownership, custody and use of objects and data recovered during survey; and requires state agencies to submit development plans to the State Archaeologist, the Minnesota Historical Society and the Minnesota Indian Affairs Council for review when there are known or suspected sites in the area.

The **Minnesota Historic Sites Act** (MS 138.661–138.669) establishes the State Historic Sites Network and the State Register of Historic Places, and requires that state agencies consult with the Minnesota Historical Society before undertaking or licensing projects that may affect properties on the Network or on the State or National Registers of Historic Places.

The **Minnesota Historic Districts Act** (MS 138.71–138.75) designates certain historic districts and enables local governing bodies to create commissions to provide architectural control in these areas.

A portion of the **Minnesota Private Cemeteries Act** (MS 307.08) protects all human burials or skeletal remains on public or private land. Other state laws and rules that pertain to protection of cultural resources are the Minnesota Environmental Rights Act (MS 116B.02), the rules of the Minnesota Environmental Quality Board in regard to state Environmental Assessment Worksheets and Environmental Impact Statements, and the Wetland Conservation Act Rules. **Minnesota Statutes 471.193**, the legislation that enables local units of government to establish heritage preservation commissions and promote historic resources, provides perhaps the most comprehensive protection of historic properties because it is at the local government level where most decisions about land and buildings are made.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- City of Cottage Grove, Department of Community Development. *Historic Preservation Element of the Cottage Grove Comprehensive Plan 2020*. Cottage Grove, Minn.: Planning Department, 1999.
- Claybaugh Preservation Architecture. "Thinking about the Unthinkable: A Disaster Plan for Historic Properties in Minnesota." State Historic Preservation Office, Minnesota Historical Society, 1999. Typescript.
- Dobbs, Clark A. *Historic Context Outlines: The Contact Period Contexts (ca. 1630 A.D.-1820 A.D.)*. Minneapolis: Institute for Minnesota Archaeology, 1989.
- Dobbs, Clark A. *Outline of Historic Contexts for the Prehistoric Period (ca. 12,000 B.P.-A.D. 1700)*. Minneapolis: Institute for Minnesota Archaeology, 1989.
- Economic Resource Group. *1998 Economic Report to the Governor*. St. Paul: State of Minnesota, 1998.
- Kaester, John L. "Summary of Eight Regional Planning Sessions Held to Assist the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) to Evaluate the Current Statewide Historic Preservation Plan." State Historic Preservation Office, Minnesota Historical Society, 2000. Typescript.
- Landscape Research. *The St. Cloud Heritage Preservation Plan: Conserving the City's Historic Resources*. St. Cloud, Minn.: Planning Department, 1998.
- Landscape Research. *The University of Minnesota Preservation Plan*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1998.
- Marken, Mitchell W., et al. "Beneath Minnesota Waters: Minnesota's Submerged Cultural Resources Preservation Plan." State Historic Preservation Office, Minnesota Historical Society, 1997. Typescript.
- McMurry, Martha. *Turn of the Century: Minnesota's Population in 1900 and Today*. St. Paul: Minnesota Planning, 1999.
- McMurry, Martha, et al. *Minnesota's Changing Counties: The Next 30 Years*. St. Paul: Minnesota Planning, 1993.
- McMurry, Martha, and R. Thomas Gillaspie. *A Changing Population: The Next 30 Years*. St. Paul: Minnesota Planning, 1993.
- Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, Office of Planning. *State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan, 1995-1999*. St. Paul: Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, 1994.
- Minnesota Department of Transportation. *Minnesota Statewide Transportation Plan Executive Summary*. St. Paul: Minnesota Department of Transportation, 1997.
- Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office. *Preserving Minnesota: A Plan for Historic Properties in the New Century*. St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society, 1995.
- Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office. *Preserving Minnesota: Planning for Historic Properties into a New Century*. St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society, 1991.
- Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office. "Tier 1: Pre-Contact Period Contexts"; "Tier 1: Contact Period Contexts"; "Tier 1: Post-Contact Period Contexts"; "Tier 2: Thematic Contexts"; "Tier 2: Thematic Contexts/State-Owned Buildings." State

- Historic Preservation Office, Minnesota Historical Society, 1989. Typescript.
- Murphy, Patricia. *The Public Buildings of the State of Minnesota: An Architectural Heritage*. St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society, 1986.
- Office of the Governor. "Minnesota: Strategic Directions of the Ventura Administration." St. Paul, 1999. Videocassette. Internet version called "The Big Vision."
- Parker, Patricia L., and Thomas E. King. *National Register Bulletin No. 38: Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties*. National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior.
- Reinhardt, Hazel. *A Portrait of Rural Minnesota*. Grand Rapids, Minn.: Blandin Foundation, 1994.
- Rosie, Charlene K. "Non-Government Organizations Survey." State Historic Preservation Office, Minnesota Historical Society, 1994. Typescript.
- Slus, Jackie, et al. "Managing a Working Landscape: A Protection Strategy for the Nansen Agricultural Historic District, Goodhue County, Minnesota." State Historic Preservation Office, Minnesota Historical Society, 1999. Typescript.
- Slus, Jackie, et al. "Preserving Minnesota: Inventorying, Managing and Preserving Agricultural Historic Landscapes in Minnesota." State Historic Preservation Office, Minnesota Historical Society, 1999. Typescript.
- Swordt, Carolyn E. *Local History and Archaeology Curriculum for the City of Eden Prairie*. Eden Prairie, Minn.: Planning Department, 1996.
- Tschofen, Carmen. *Local History Curriculum Phase II Program*. Faribault, Minn.: Planning Department, 1996.
- Zahn, Thomas R., and Associates. *Faribault Heritage Preservation Commission Planning Report*. Faribault, Minn.: Planning Department, 1988.
- Zahn, Thomas R., and Associates. *Preservation Plan for the City of Minneapolis*. Minneapolis: Planning Department, 1991.
- Zellie, Carole. *The Northfield Heritage Preservation Plan: Planning for an Historic City in the Cannon River Valley of Minnesota*. Northfield, Minn.: Planning Department, 1992.
- Zellie, Carole. "A Study of Conservation Districts." State Historic Preservation Office, Minnesota Historical Society, 1991. Typescript.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

During the development of this statewide plan, we invited comments from the constituents identified on page 3. Many participated in regional meetings where they shared their perceptions of the state of historic preservation in Minnesota. Others reviewed a draft of the plan circulated by mail and via the Internet.

Among those responding to our call for comments on the plan were representatives from all levels of historic preservation activity—federal, state, regional and local. We heard from the National Park Service, county historical societies and heritage preservation commissions. We received mail from preservation consultants, educators and interested citizens. Each made valuable, thought-provoking suggestions.

Many of those suggestions have been incorporated in this document. A brief summary of the written comments follows.

Strengths of the Plan

Overall, respondents found the plan a valuable tool for guiding Minnesota's preservation activities. They applauded the formulation of a shared vision for all with a stake in preserving Minnesota's cultural resources.

The planning process was deemed sound and the constituencies clearly defined. Of particular value to some readers was the summary in "The Preservation Picture" of the challenges facing historic preservation in the years ahead. And a number of preservation partners, particularly the Institute for Minnesota Archaeology, proudly added their own accomplishments to those highlighted in "The Progress Report."

The goals and strategies proposed for 2000–2005 won universal support. Among those most strongly endorsed were the education of local officials, planners and developers about the economic benefits of historic preservation and the need for more financial resources for preservation projects. Several readers did, however, express frustration at the lack of specifics and offered a number of suggestions for expanding and strengthening this section of the plan.

Suggestions

"The Preservation Picture"

- Add other players to "The Preservation Community": city and county governments, local planning agencies, developers, lenders and neighborhood business associations.
- Strengthen the "Statewide Factors" section: clarify how shifting demographics and economic conditions in both urban and rural areas pose threats to historic properties, and articulate the benefits of historic preservation as a quality-of-life issue and economic development tool.

"A Progress Report"

- Give more specific examples, particularly those that would demonstrate the economic benefits of preservation projects.

"Goals and Strategies for 2000–2005"

- Focus preservation education and promotion efforts on state lawmakers, city officials and county commissioners as well as planners and developers. The flip side: Help preservation specialists better understand the forces affecting preservation (the economics of real estate development, market realities, etc.).
- Individualize strategies to address the needs of both bigger cities and smaller towns.
- Recruit county and local historical societies as advocates of historic preservation in their communities.
- Remove barriers to historic preservation by streamlining the review/approval process.
- Encourage development of a building code for building conservation.
- Establish a network to monitor the protection of local historic sites.
- Define measurable outcomes by which to evaluate successes and failures and outline a clear implementation plan—that is, who needs to do what to make things happen.

Our thanks to all who took the time to attend the meetings, review the draft plan and share your comments and concerns. By pooling our ideas and our energies, we can better carry out the vital work of preserving Minnesota's irreplaceable cultural resources.

Minnesota Historical Society
State Historic Preservation Office

Nina M. Archabal
State Historic Preservation Officer;
Director, Minnesota Historical Society

Jan R. Stewart
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer;
Deputy Director, Minnesota Historical Society

Brian L. Bloomberg
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

Scott Antfinson
National Register Archaeologist

Thomas Graeber
Survey & Information Management Coordinator

Michele Decker
Administrative Secretary

Dennis A. Gimmesdal
Government Programs & Compliance Officer

Kelly Gracie-Johnson
Programs Secretary

Sarah Jordan Reiners
Review & Compliance Assistant

Michael Koop
Historic Preservation Program Specialist

John Lauber
Education & Preservation Outreach Coordinator

Charles W. Nelson
Historical Architect

Susan Roth
National Register Historian

Mandy Skypala
Grants Specialist



MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY
STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE

345 KELLOGG BOULEVARD WEST
ST. PAUL, MN 55107-1906
PHONE: (651) 296-3434, TTY: (800)-627-3529
FAX: (651) 292-2374
E-MAIL: mnshpo@mhs.org
WEB SITE: www.mnhs.org

The Minnesota Historical Society is a non-profit educational and cultural institution established in 1849 to preserve and share Minnesota history. The Society collects, preserves and tells the story of Minnesota's past through museum exhibits, extensive libraries and collections, historic sites, educational programs and book publishing.

The Society has statutory responsibility for the state's historic preservation program. The State Historic Preservation Officer advocates for the preservation of the state's irreplaceable historic and archaeological resources and provides statewide leadership in carrying out its mission to identify, evaluate, register and protect historic properties in Minnesota.

Upon request, this publication can be made available in alternative formats—audiocassette, large print, or computer disk.

This publication has been financed in part with Federal funds from the National Park Service, U. S. Department of the Interior. However, the contents and opinions do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of the Interior.

This program receives Federal funds from the National Park Service. Regulations of the U. S. Department of the Interior strictly prohibit unlawful discrimination in departmental Federally assisted programs on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, or disability. Any person who believes he or she has been discriminated against in any program, activity, or facility operated by a recipient of Federal assistance should write to: Director, Equal Opportunity Program, U. S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, P. O. Box 37127, Washington, D.C. 20013-7127.



MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY
STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE

345 KILLECKI BOULEVARD WEST
ST. PAUL, MN 55102-1906
PHONE: (612) 296-5434
FAX: (612) 281-2374
E-MAIL: mnhs@mnhs.org
WEB SITE: www.mnhs.org