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ABSTRACT

Two Pines Resource Group, LLC (Two Pines) was contracted by the Minnesota Historical Society to document Minnesota’s nineteenth-century masonry ruins. This work is being funded through the Arts and Cultural Heritage Fund of the Clean Water, Land, and Legacy Amendment. A portion of the funding is dedicated to the Statewide Survey of Historical and Archaeological Sites, of which this project is a part. Dr. Andrea Pizza served as Principal Investigator for this study.

The objectives of the investigation were to create an inventory of nineteenth-century masonry ruins in Minnesota, to develop a framework for evaluating their National Register of Historic Places (National Register) eligibility, and to develop strategies for their stabilization, management, and interpretation. These objectives were fulfilled through 1) a review of National Register, Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and Minnesota Office of the State Archaeologist (OSA) database information and associated property documentation, and the consultation of a variety of sources to identify known or likely masonry ruins and the types that occur in Minnesota, along with the creation of a statewide database of masonry ruins; 2) in-depth research to develop a contextual framework and a typology for masonry ruins, along with the creation of a draft National Register Multiple Property Documentation Form (MPDF); 3) a field survey to refine the typology and to assess the characteristics and current conditions of a representative sample of masonry ruins; and 4) consultation with Robert Mack of McDonald & Mack Ltd., who is a respected expert in historical masonry preservation.

The review of existing agency documentation and consultation of other sources resulted in the completion of a database of 41 confirmed nineteenth-century masonry ruins that are either known to exist or have not been confirmed as razed. The database provides the following information as applicable and as permitted by the source materials reviewed and the survey: county, city or township, history/architecture inventory number and property name, archaeological site number and site name, construction date for the original building or structure, destruction date for the same (if due to a single event), property type, ruin elements present, material, condition, interpretive potential, current owner, National Register status, address, legal locations, UTM coordinates, and UTM source and reliability. The in-depth research and field survey culminated in the development of a draft MPDF for Minnesota’s nineteenth-century masonry ruins, which defines five broad functional categories for the property type: industrial ruins, infrastructural ruins, institutional ruins, residential ruins, and commercial ruins.

The field survey additionally found that Minnesota’s masonry ruins are in varying states of deterioration, usually due to the erosion of mortar and associated failure of the stonework, and nearly all are threatened by a lack of stabilization measures. Two Pines consulted with Robert Mack, who provided guidance on the technical preservation measures used to counter these and other commonly encountered threats to masonry ruins. In addition to these technical preservation measures, raising public awareness and interest through the further identification and interpretation of masonry ruins are important measures for the conservation of this relatively rare resource type.
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INTRODUCTION

Two Pines Resource Group, LLC (Two Pines) was contracted by the Minnesota Historical Society (MHS) to document Minnesota’s nineteenth-century masonry ruins.\(^1\) This work was funded through the Arts and Cultural Heritage Fund of the Clean Water, Land, and Legacy Amendment. A portion of the funding is dedicated to the Statewide Survey of Historical and Archaeological Sites (the Survey), of which this project is a part. The work of the Survey is accomplished through competitive bid contracts focused on the documentation of Minnesota’s sites of historical, archaeological, and cultural significance. These investigations take place under the direction and guidance of the Oversight Board, which comprises appointed representatives of the Minnesota Office of the State Archaeologist (OSA) (Scott Anfinson, State Archaeologist), the MHS (Pat Emerson, Head of Archaeology), and the Minnesota Indian Affairs Council (Jim Jones, Cultural Resource Director).

Project Background

Masonry ruins constitute a relatively rare historic resource type within the state of Minnesota. Challenged by issues of safety, the progress of development, difficulties of upkeep, a general unawareness of their existence, and varying perceptions of the value of an incomplete building or structure, masonry ruins have more often than not been demolished or left to the effects of nature and time throughout the course of Minnesota’s history. Masonry ruins, however, are important manifestations of Minnesota history, often representing important historical events, patterns, and property types. Further, ruins are able to evoke the past in a way that complete buildings or structures cannot because in a moment of viewing, they more fully capture the progression of time. Public recognition of their historical importance and appeal has been demonstrated in the ready audiences drawn to attractions such as the Mill City Museum in Minneapolis and Old Mill Park in Hastings.

The preservation of these important resources is achievable through a combination of appropriate physical maintenance, assisting agencies in locating and evaluating masonry ruins under their jurisdiction, and educating the public about their presence, histories, and historical significance. Guidance on these actions, however, for the owners/managers of, or agencies responsible for, masonry ruins is dispersed in a wide variety of, sometimes obscure, published sources or gray literature, and a given source often addresses only a single task. The purpose of this project is to provide a centralized and readily accessible source of guidance for the evaluation and management of masonry ruins.

With this purpose in mind, two main objectives of the investigation of Minnesota’s nineteenth-century masonry ruins were defined by the Oversight Board: 1) to create a comprehensive inventory of masonry ruins in Minnesota and 2) to use examples from this inventory to develop strategies to evaluate historical significance, stabilization options, management problems, and interpretive opportunities. The first objective was fulfilled

\(^1\) Throughout this report, “masonry ruins” refers only to the nineteenth-century masonry ruins of Minnesota as defined on page 2.
during this project primarily through a review and comparison of multiple source materials and the concurrent creation of a statewide database of nineteenth-century masonry ruins. The second objective was fulfilled through a field survey, the creation of a draft National Register of Historic Places (National Register) Multiple Property Documentation Form (MPDF) for Minnesota’s nineteenth-century masonry ruins, and consultation with Robert Mack, an expert in historical masonry preservation. Both objectives are addressed by this report, though it is noted that the fully detailed evaluation strategies are provided in the draft MPDF (Pizza 2013).

**Definition and Categorization**

This project concerns Minnesota’s nineteenth-century masonry ruins. As indicated, this property type is limited to masonry ruins located in Minnesota that were constructed prior to 1900, though the historical building or structure with which they are associated may have been used beyond that year. A masonry ruin is defined as a former building or structure that meets the following conditions:

1) It can no longer serve its original or similar function due to the loss of a major structural element, such as a roof, exterior wall, or floor, and it has not been restored, reconstructed, or integrated into more recent construction so as to replace the lost element and/or recapture functionality;

2) The superstructure was of brick and/or stone masonry construction, and not of wood, concrete block, cast stone, structural tile, or cinder block, nor was only a minor element (e.g., a façade) made using brick or stone masonry; and

3) A portion of the superstructure is intact and present above the existing ground surface, and this portion provides sufficient visual evidence that it can be identified as part of the historical building or structure through comparison with historical photographs or other visual media, or if such media cannot be located for a specific ruin, the portion could realistically still be identified were such media to surface in the future; foundations alone, even if above ground level, do not constitute ruins. In the case of bridges, abutments and piers are considered to be the foundations for the superstructure; therefore masonry abutments and piers do not constitute ruins for the purposes of this project.

Ruins of historic buildings and structures are classified under National Register guidelines as “sites,” which the National Park Service (2002:5) defines as “the location of a significant event, a prehistoric or historic occupation or activity, or a building or structure, whether standing, ruined, or vanished, where the location itself possesses historic, cultural, or archeological value regardless of the value of any existing structure” [emphasis added]; therefore, Minnesota’s nineteenth-century masonry ruins will, under NPS guidelines, be registered as sites.

Although the NPS definition of sites includes archaeological sites, it is neither limited to nor synonymous with archaeological sites, as it also includes historical or cultural sites that may not have associated material culture. Given that such an association may be
absent from masonry ruins sites, masonry ruins should be assigned history/architecture inventory numbers. While any identified archaeological site might include ruins as a feature within the site, in the same way that the eligibility of a complete building or structure would be evaluated as a history/architecture property whether it overlies or is spatially within an archaeological site, so too ruins of these buildings or structures must be evaluated separate from any present archaeological site.

**Structure of the Report**

The next chapter presents the proposed and actual methods that were used to achieve the project objectives, and describes the quality of the datasets associated with these methods. The subsequent chapter addresses the creation of an inventory of masonry ruins. It includes a table of all properties confirmed to be masonry ruins during the course of the study and a discussion of the extent of previous documentation on this property type. Following is a chapter that outlines the typology and provides an overview of the evaluation strategy for masonry ruins, these being fully detailed under separate cover in the draft MPDF. The next four chapters present the results of the field survey, with one chapter devoted to each of the four subtypes defined in the typology. The report closes with recommendations for the management of masonry ruins. Appendix A consists of the UTM coordinates for all surveyed properties. Appendix B contains detailed photographs documenting each of the ruins surveyed and their condition issues. A draft MPDF for Minnesota’s Nineteenth-Century Masonry Ruins can be found in Appendix C.
[BLANK]
METHODS AND QUALITY OF DATASETS

Two Pines was charged with three tasks to complete the documentation of Minnesota’s nineteenth-century masonry ruins. Task 1 was to construct a database and typology of Minnesota’s masonry ruins by reviewing National Register, Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), and OSA database information and associated property documentation in order to identify recorded masonry ruins, and by contacting organizations and consulting historical sources to identify unrecorded masonry ruins. Task 2 was to assess the range of elements, characteristics, and conditions of masonry ruins in the state through the survey of a representative sample in selected counties. Task 3 was to complete this report, with the inclusion of strategies for the evaluation, preservation, management, and interpretation of masonry ruins.

TASK 1: CONSTRUCT A DATABASE AND TYPOLOGY OF MINNESOTA’S NINETEENTH-CENTURY MASONRY RUINS

The goal of Task 1 was to create an inventory of known and likely masonry ruins, which was used to populate a statewide database of Minnesota’s nineteenth-century masonry ruins, and which provided the basis for determining the types of masonry ruins that will be encountered in Minnesota.

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES DATABASE

The federal National Register online database “resource name” field was queried using the terms “ruin” and “ruins,” which resulted in the identification of only two individually listed masonry ruins, the Oxford Mill Ruin (21GD172, GD-STN-010) and the Joseph Brown House Ruins (21RN15, RN-SHT-002). Although the Jordan Brewery Ruins (SA-JRC-002) were also identified, these have since been completely integrated into an apartment building and are therefore no longer considered to be ruins. At least one known National Register-listed masonry ruin property in the state, the Ramsey Mill ruins (21DK61, DK-HTC-101), does not contain the word “ruin” or “ruins” in its recorded property name, and thus did not appear. Further, although the name of this property resulted from a search on the term “mill,” as did those of the Archibald Mill (RC-DNC-009) and the Washburn A Mill (HE-MPC-178), no information was available online to confirm that these properties were either ruins or of masonry construction, as almost none of Minnesota’s National Register records have yet been digitized. It was determined, therefore, that a search of the online federal National Register database was not a reliable means for identifying recorded, much less listed, masonry ruins.

A search of the MHS online database of National Register properties was only slightly more responsive, in that a search of the term “ruin” identified, in addition to the Oxford Mill Ruin, Joseph R. Brown House Ruins, and Jordan Brewery Ruins, one masonry ruin within a historic district, adding the Wasioja Seminary Ruins (DO-WAS-004), because the individual property names within districts are contained within this online database. It did not, however, return known listed ruins such as the Minnesota Point Lighthouse ruins (SL-DUL-2377), which are simply titled “Minnesota Point Lighthouse” in this database, nor any of the ruins associated with the St. Anthony Falls Historic District, such
as the Washburn A Mill; again, because the word “ruins” was not included in the property name submitted.

Subsequently, the publication *The National Register of Historic Places in Minnesota: A Guide* (Nord 2003) was reviewed for masonry ruins. This book, however, proved equally unreliable as the online databases because ruins were not always noted to be such, and ruins known to be within historic districts were not referenced. Text for the Wasiota Historic District, for example, mentions only “limestone quarry and kiln and numerous stone buildings built by resident stonemasons” (Nord 2003:59), while the St. Anthony Falls Historic District listing makes no reference to the ruins of the Washburn A Mill. No additional recorded masonry ruins were identified through this review.

**Office of the State Archaeologist**

A query of the OSA archaeology database was conducted in December of 2012 based on “SR,” the code for structural ruin. This query identified 2,153 sites incorporating some type of structural ruin, three of which were among the previously discussed National Register-listed masonry ruins. The archaeology database does not contain a field for coding the construction material of structural ruins; therefore, the state site form for each property identified through the query was reviewed at the SHPO (see below) to determine whether it comes under the definition of a masonry ruin and whether it dates to the nineteenth century.

The State Archaeologist, Dr. Scott Anfinson, maintains an informal file of masonry ruins that he has encountered. Following the SHPO forms review, this file was reviewed for any sites that were not otherwise documented and as part of the process of assessing which masonry ruins have been well documented. One new site, the Halloran Stagecoach Stop Ruins (FL-CHC-068), was added to the inventory using this file.

**Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office**

A query of the history/architecture database of the SHPO was requested in December of 2012. The history/architecture database query was based on the keyword “ruin.” A comparison of the results of this query with that of the OSA database demonstrated that over the past several decades, some masonry ruins have been recorded alternately as history/architecture properties or archaeological sites, while others, such as the Ramsey Mill ruins (DK-HTC-101, 21DK61) have been recorded as both.

The SHPO history/architecture database query was found to miss at least one known ruin property, the Archibald Mill ruins (RC-DNC-009), which does not contain the term “ruin” in the property name field, although others, such as the Ramsey Mill, were generated because they have been entered with a parenthetical “ruins” in that field. The history/architecture database does not contain a field for coding ruins by construction material; therefore, the state inventory form for each property identified through the query was reviewed to determine whether it comes under the definition of a masonry ruin and dates to the nineteenth century. From these query results, an additional 11 masonry ruins were identified and added to the database, but it is noted that others may have been
previously recorded and not captured through the query due to the format of the entered property name.

A review at the SHPO of each of the site forms for the 2,150 structural ruin properties identified through the OSA archaeology database and not in the National Register was planned to determine which of those properties come under the definition of a masonry ruin and date to the nineteenth century. In this way, eight masonry ruins were identified that were subsequently added to the database. Site forms, however, for 1,000 of the remaining 2,142 sites, for alpha sites that are located within U.S. Forest Service land, are not contained within the SHPO files and therefore could not be reviewed to determine the presence or absence of masonry ruins. After eliminating these sites, as well as sites that date to the twentieth century, and sites that could be confirmed to not include masonry construction, 64 entries remained. Of the site forms for these 64 sites, 19 were missing, 15 were for site leads based on information in *An Illustrated Historical Atlas of the State of Minnesota*, and the remaining 30 either do not clearly identify construction materials, do not state whether portions of a superstructure are present, or do not contain photographs of the structural ruins to which they refer. Only one of these 64 sites had an associated report that could be reviewed for further information, and this report only reiterated that information contained on the site form. Overall, therefore, numerous sites cannot be classified, based on the data on file, as to whether or not they are masonry ruins and hence were not included in the database. It is noted that it is highly likely that other masonry ruins may have been previously recorded and not captured through the site form review due to the dearth of information provided on some site forms.

Although the SHPO and OSA archaeology databases are fairly similar, because a SHPO database query was needed to identify relevant reports, the databases were compared for any differences in the resulting structural ruin entries. Nine sites coded as structural ruins were found to be in the OSA database but did not appear in the SHPO database query results. A review of the forms for these nine sites at the OSA resulted in the inclusion of one additional masonry ruin to the database.

**COUNTY HISTORICAL SOCIETIES**

Two Pines contacted all of Minnesota’s county historical societies by email or mail to request any information they might have on masonry ruins present in their respective counties. Responses were received from only 14 of 87 county historical societies. Of the historical societies that responded, five provided information that pertained to foundations only, which do not qualify as masonry ruins; two were unaware of any masonry ruins; and two provided information on complete buildings and structures, which do not qualify as ruins. The Sherburne County Historical Society suggested that stone ruins may be present at the Minnesota State Correctional Facility in St. Cloud. The Houston County Historical Society provided information on three potential ruins that are unconfirmed. These are associated with the Root River Brewery, a stone school building, and a lime kiln. The Brown County Historical Society provided information on six properties, only three of which potentially fit the definition of masonry ruins. These are associated with brick kilns and a mill race. The Northeast Minnesota Historical Center, which serves St. Louis County, provided information on the ruins of the Duluth Gas and
Water Company Reservoir Ruins. These ruins were added to the database. The Goodhue County Historical Society provided information on the previously identified Oxford Mill Ruins (GD-STN-010), but also on the previously unrecorded Cordes House Ruins (GD-FEA-020), which were subsequently surveyed and added to the database.

**MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY COLLECTIONS ONLINE**

The MHS Collections Online database was searched using the term “ruin,” which generated photographs dating from 1864 to 1974, many of which depict masonry ruins that date to the nineteenth century. The subjects of these photographs that had not already been identified through the above-reviewed information were researched to determine whether they are extant or are likely to be extant. County histories, other historical accounts, and historical maps were reviewed to obtain available locational information for these ruins, and when sufficient, online aerial imagery on GoogleEarth and Bing maps was viewed to assess the presence or absence of the ruins. In this way, two additional ruins were added to the database.

**MAPS**

Three groups of maps were considered to have some potential for identifying the locations of masonry ruins, United States Geological Survey (USGS) quadrangle maps, Sanborn Map Company fire insurance maps, and Trygg maps.

**United States Geological Survey (USGS) Quadrangles**

Having previously found that the notation “ruins” appears in the location of the Joseph Brown House Ruins on the USGS quadrangle, Two Pines intended to review all 7.5’ quadrangle maps for this notation as a means of identifying additional masonry ruins. All maps for the southwest quadrant of the state were examined, during which this notation did not reoccur. Subsequently, a spot check for other well-known ruins, such as those of the Ramsey Mill and the Oxford Mill, was conducted. When it was found that these ruins were not notated on the relevant quadrangle maps, it was surmised that the notation in the case of the Joseph Brown House Ruins was a nearly isolated if not isolated instance. Further, as the other known, National Register-listed ruins are not notated, it is unlikely that lesser known ruins would be. It was therefore determined that examination of the quadrangle maps was not a reliable method for identifying additional ruins, and no further review was conducted.

**Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps**

Two Pines reviewed the most recent (typically circa 1940-1950) Sanborn Map Company fire insurance maps for notations indicative of the presence of ruins, such as “ruins,” “old ruins,” and “gutted by fire,” as are used in this map set. Fire insurance maps are typically limited to city limits or urban areas and are not inclusive of all incorporated areas in the state. In addition to relocating the Ramsey Mill, this review identified 15 potential ruins, four of which post-dated 1900, as indicated by their absence on earlier maps. Current aerial imagery confirmed that another ten have been razed. The remaining potential ruin included noted vacant facilities of the William Penn Stone Company, on the grounds of the former Kettle River Sandstone Company. This property is listed in the National Register as the Kettle River Sandstone Company Quarry; because it did not contain the
word “ruins” in the title, it was not generated by any previous queries. This property was visited during the field survey to determine whether it contains masonry ruins, which it does not.

*Trygg Maps (Public Land Survey)*

A series of maps summarizing the original public land survey data for Minnesota and augmented by information from other documentary sources were compiled by J. William Trygg (1964) during his employment as an appraiser for several tribal communities. Although the intent was for these maps to be reviewed for references to potential ruin locations, such as kilns and mills, it was determined that they are too general with regard to location, which limits the ability to ground-truth any potential ruins, either through online aerial imagery or field survey. These maps, however, should be used to assist in the identification of ruins that are encountered during field survey or through other activities.

**MINNESOTA ARCHAEOLOGISTS**

Two Pines posted a request for information on masonry ruins on the Council for Minnesota Archaeology e-mail listserv on December 14, 2012. Eight archaeologists responded to this request. Two responses were general and did not identify specific ruins. One response provided information on a resource that did not fit the definition of a masonry ruin, and another on a ruin that Sanborn maps indicate post-dates 1912. One response provided information on a ruin for which the age could not be confirmed. One response provided information on ruins that were captured through other research steps. Ron Schirmer of Mankato State University provided information on the ruins of a masonry dam on Trout Brook in Featherstone Township, Goodhue County. Although it was reported to him that the dam was associated with a creamery, historical accounts note only the presence of a tannery and a sorghum mill on Trout Brook in its vicinity, thus it may have been associated with one of these nineteenth-century operations. These ruins were added to the database. Scott Anfinson, State Archaeologist, provided information on carriage house ruins at 332 Summit Avenue in St. Paul, which were added to the database. David Mather, National Register Archaeologist, provided information on potential ruins at the Quarry Hill Nature Center in Rochester, which was found to contain the subsequently surveyed Rochester State Hospital Quarry Dynamite Shack Ruins, also added to the database.

**ONLINE RESOURCES**

General online web and image searches under terms such as but not limited to “Minnesota ruins,” “Minnesota kilns,” “Minnesota mills,” and “Minnesota bridge ruins” identified several masonry ruins, many of which had been captured through the previous steps in the literature search. Three additional ruins, however, were identified in this manner: the Twin City Brick Company Ruins, the Fertile Brick Company Ruins, and the ruins of a stagecoach stop in Le Sueur County, all of which were added to the database.

**TASK 2: FIELD SURVEY**

The goal of Task 2 was to document and assess the range of elements, characteristics, and
current conditions of masonry ruins through field survey of a representative sample of the masonry ruins identified in Task 1 within select counties. The sample was not established to address all known or potential masonry ruins within these counties, but rather to ensure inclusion of a broad spectrum of masonry ruin types.

**FIELD SURVEY**

In consultation between the Oversight Board and Two Pines, masonry ruins located in Fillmore, Olmsted, Goodhue, Scott, Ramsey, Pine, and St. Louis counties were selected for field survey.

Each masonry ruin visited and with landowner permission for access was documented through the creation of a measured plan-view sketch map and high-quality digital photography. The plan-view map included the relationship of the ruin to adjacent features, and when feasible, the heights of walls or other elements were measured or generally captured through a photograph including one of the field staff for scale. The condition and characteristics of each masonry ruin were recorded through detailed field notes and photography. Each ruin location was documented using a Trimble GeoXT GPS Unit with sub-meter accuracy.

**INVENTORY FORMS**

History/architecture inventory forms were completed for all field-surveyed masonry ruins. Whether or not a ruin had been previously recorded, “ruins” was included in the property name on the form to facilitate future searches for this property type.

**TASK 3: DEVELOP STRATEGIES FOR EVALUATION AND PRESERVATION**

The development of strategies for the evaluation of masonry ruins for listing in the National Register began with a review of documentation associated with National Register-listed and other previously evaluated properties of this type in Minnesota. This review was used to identify the National Register criteria, areas of significance, and historic contexts under which masonry ruins typically have been found eligible in Minnesota. The review found that while multiple statewide historic contexts apply to Minnesota’s masonry ruins, with but one exception, masonry ruins in Minnesota have only been listed in the National Register under Criterion A. The exception is the Jordan Brewery Ruins (these had not been integrated into a complete building at the time of the nomination), which according to the MHS online database is also listed under Criterion C; however, the nomination form for this property does not specify significance criteria, and no mention of architectural significance is made in the significance statement, despite the fact that architecture is checked as an area of significance (Bloomberg 1979).

It was noted that while the MHS online database indicates that no ruins have been listed under Criterion B, the nomination form for the Joseph R. Brown House Ruins, which does not specify significance criteria, begins its significance statement by stating, “The ruins of the Joseph R. Brown House, built in 1861, are historically significant as the remains of the home of Joseph R. Brown, one of the most important figures in the early history of the state” (Granger 1985). Otherwise, the remaining previously evaluated ruins
were not listed under Criterion B because they were not directly associated with a historically significant individual; for example, although the Ramsey Mill was owned by Alexander Ramsey, he was not significant for his participation in the milling industry, nor did he achieve his significance through activities at the mill. Based, however, on the example of the Joseph R. Brown House Ruins, Criterion B may be applicable to masonry ruins.

The review additionally revealed the need for an overarching thematic context for the use of masonry construction as might tie it in to the statewide contexts; therefore, a literature search, largely relying on secondary sources on specific masonry properties was conducted to obtain information in this regard. Sources on statewide trends in architecture, such as *A Century of Minnesota Architecture* (Torbert 1958), and geographically broader works on the use of masonry materials, such as *American Building* (Condit 1982), were also consulted. The thematic context “Masonry Construction in Minnesota, 1820-1900” is provided along with the following relevant statewide historic contexts in the draft MPDF (Appendix C):

- Initial United States Presence in Minnesota, 1820\(^2\)-1837
- Indian Communities and Reservations, 1837-1934
- St. Croix Triangle Lumbering, 1830s-1900s
- Early Agriculture and River Settlement in Minnesota, 1840-1870
- Railroads and Agricultural Development in Minnesota, 1862-1940
- Minnesota’s Urban Centers, 1860-1940
- Minnesota’s Iron Ore Industry, 1880s-1945

The review of documentation and the literature search resulted in the identification of the types of masonry ruins that may be encountered and an understanding of the conditions under which they are most likely to be historically significant. During this process, it became clear that although some types are more common than others, numerous possibilities exist for the functions of former buildings and structures associated with masonry ruins throughout the state. For this reason, to create a more broadly applicable evaluation strategy, the typology consists of more inclusive functional categories, such as “industrial ruins,” rather than exclusive ones, such as “mill ruins,” which in turn might be complicated by the need for further division into still narrower categories, such as “flour mill ruins” and “lumber mill ruins.” The evaluation process developed for the draft MPDF, therefore, provided guidelines for each of the inclusive categories, which can be used to address any potential masonry ruins that are encountered.

With regard to preservation, Two Pines consulted Robert Mack of McDonald & Mack Architects, who outlined common natural and human threats to the preservation of masonry ruins and provided technical guidance on the measures used to prevent such threats or remedy their effects. Based on the field survey, Two Pines also identified issues complicating two other key components of the preservation of masonry ruins,

---

\(^2\) In some cases, dates have been adjusted from the standard to accommodate the actual period of construction associated with Minnesota’s nineteenth-century masonry ruins, as discussed in the MPDF.
identification and public interpretation, and developed initial steps for addressing these issues.
IDENTIFICATION OF MASONRY RUINS - RESULTS

The review and comparison of sources completed under Task 1, as described in the previous chapter, identified 41 properties in the state of Minnesota that could be confirmed as nineteenth-century masonry ruins, and are either known to exist or cannot be confirmed as having been razed. These were entered into a database. Summary information regarding these properties is provided in Table 1. To determine whether or not all of these masonry ruins are extant would require additional survey. Properties that were confirmed during the course of the study to be no longer extant are not included in the database or Table 1.

In general, Minnesota’s nineteenth-century masonry ruins are poorly documented. Many of the inventory forms date back to the mid 1970s through early 1980s, when recording standards were less stringent than they are currently. Information provided on inventory forms is frequently limited to legal locations of varying specificity, although in some cases these are not provided at all; a name such as “kiln ruins”; a very brief, if any, narrative description; and a single photograph, though in some cases associated documentation such as a newspaper article or a SHPO memorandum is attached. Present elements, approximate measurements, and specific building materials are frequently not noted. With regard to National Register-listed ruins, existing nomination forms were largely completed during the same decades. While nominations generally contain more detailed property histories and descriptions, most have not been updated in over 20 years.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Inventory No.</th>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Historical Function</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Elements Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Winkelmann Lime Kiln</td>
<td>BW-COW-014</td>
<td></td>
<td>lime kiln</td>
<td>stone</td>
<td>unknown without site visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21C0097</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>low walls and low wall fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakota</td>
<td>Ramsey Mill Ruins</td>
<td>DK-HTC-101</td>
<td></td>
<td>flour mill</td>
<td>Oneota dolomite</td>
<td>high wall fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodge</td>
<td>Wasiota Seminary Ruins</td>
<td>DO-WAS-004</td>
<td></td>
<td>seminary</td>
<td>limestone</td>
<td>high walls and high wall fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodge</td>
<td>Mantorville Brewery Ruins</td>
<td>DO-MTC-024</td>
<td></td>
<td>brewery</td>
<td>limestone</td>
<td>unknown without site visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fillmore</td>
<td>Holleran/Halloran Stagecoach Stop Ruins</td>
<td>FL-CHC-068</td>
<td></td>
<td>stagecoach stop</td>
<td>limestone</td>
<td>high wall fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fillmore</td>
<td>Gribben Mill Ruins</td>
<td>FL-HLT-002</td>
<td></td>
<td>flour mill</td>
<td>limestone</td>
<td>high walls and high wall fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fillmore</td>
<td>stone house ruins</td>
<td>FL-PRT-005</td>
<td></td>
<td>house</td>
<td>limestone</td>
<td>high wall and high wall fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fillmore</td>
<td>McCallum/Wilson/Stevens/House Ruins</td>
<td>FL-PRT-008</td>
<td></td>
<td>house</td>
<td>limestone</td>
<td>high walls and high wall fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fillmore</td>
<td>Carey Lime Kiln Ruins</td>
<td>FL-SVT-004</td>
<td></td>
<td>lime kiln</td>
<td>limestone</td>
<td>lower portion of lime kiln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodhue</td>
<td>Oxford Mill Ruins</td>
<td>GD-STN-010</td>
<td>21GD0172</td>
<td>flour mill</td>
<td>limestone</td>
<td>high walls of mill building, wall and wall fragments of tail race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodhue</td>
<td>mill (ruins)</td>
<td>GD-CFC-062</td>
<td></td>
<td>flour mill</td>
<td>stone</td>
<td>unknown without site visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodhue</td>
<td>mill ruins (Union Mill dam)</td>
<td>GD-FLC-014</td>
<td></td>
<td>mill dam</td>
<td>limestone</td>
<td>dam wall fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodhue</td>
<td>flour mill (ruins)</td>
<td>GD-ZST-014</td>
<td></td>
<td>flour mill</td>
<td>stone</td>
<td>unknown without site visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodhue</td>
<td>Cordes House Ruins</td>
<td>GD-FEA-020</td>
<td></td>
<td>house</td>
<td>limestone</td>
<td>high walls and high wall fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodhue</td>
<td>dam ruins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dam</td>
<td>stone</td>
<td>wall fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennepin</td>
<td>Washburn A Mill Ruins</td>
<td>HE-MPC-178</td>
<td></td>
<td>flour mill</td>
<td>limestone</td>
<td>high walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennepin</td>
<td>Schmid Farmstead</td>
<td>21HE0150</td>
<td></td>
<td>house</td>
<td>stone</td>
<td>unknown without site visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennepin</td>
<td>Minnehaha</td>
<td>21HE0386</td>
<td></td>
<td>mill dam</td>
<td>limestone</td>
<td>dam wall fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenyon</td>
<td>Willmar Brick Yard</td>
<td>KH-WLC-072</td>
<td></td>
<td>kiln and smokestack</td>
<td></td>
<td>unknown without site visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeSueur</td>
<td>Stagecoach stop ruins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>stagecoach stop</td>
<td>stuccoed brick</td>
<td>unknown without site visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison</td>
<td>Old Fort Ripley</td>
<td>21MO0127</td>
<td></td>
<td>powder magazine</td>
<td>stone</td>
<td>unknown without site visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mower</td>
<td>LeRoy Mill Site</td>
<td>21MW0034</td>
<td></td>
<td>mill spillway</td>
<td>limestone</td>
<td>unknown without site visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olmsted</td>
<td>Popple Stagecoach Stop Ruins</td>
<td>OL-HFT-006</td>
<td>21GLW</td>
<td>stagecoach stop</td>
<td>limestone</td>
<td>high wall and high wall fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olmsted</td>
<td>Rochester State Hospital Quarry Dynamite Shack Ruins</td>
<td>OL-ROC-382</td>
<td></td>
<td>dynamite shack</td>
<td>limestone</td>
<td>shack walls and lower portion of protective wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>INVENTORY No.</td>
<td>SITE No.</td>
<td>HISTORICAL FUNCTION</td>
<td>MATERIAL</td>
<td>ELEMENTS PRESENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>Fertile Brick Company ruins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>brick kiln or drying shed</td>
<td>brick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsey</td>
<td>Carriage house ruins at 332 Summit Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>carriage house</td>
<td>limestone</td>
<td>high walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsey</td>
<td>Twin City Brick Company kiln ruins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kiln</td>
<td>stone, brick</td>
<td>unknown without site visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renville</td>
<td>Joseph R. Brown House Ruins</td>
<td>RN-SHT-002</td>
<td></td>
<td>house</td>
<td>granite</td>
<td>low walls and high wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>Archibald Mill Ruins</td>
<td>RC-DNC-009</td>
<td></td>
<td>flour mill</td>
<td>limestone</td>
<td>high walls and low wall fragments of mill building, walls of raceway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Louis</td>
<td>Minnesota Point Lighthouse Ruins</td>
<td>SL-DUL-2377</td>
<td></td>
<td>lighthouse</td>
<td>brick</td>
<td>lower portion of lighthouse tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Strunk-Nyssen Brewery (ruins)</td>
<td>SC-JAC-002</td>
<td></td>
<td>brewery complex</td>
<td>limestone</td>
<td>high walls and high wall fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>masonry ruins (Jab)</td>
<td>SC-LOU-005</td>
<td></td>
<td>farmstead</td>
<td>stone</td>
<td>high walls and high wall fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>ruins (Ehmiller)</td>
<td>SC-LOU-007</td>
<td></td>
<td>farmstead</td>
<td>sandstone</td>
<td>low wall fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Schroeder Brick Yard &amp; Lime Kiln</td>
<td>SC-SPC-050</td>
<td>21SC0034</td>
<td>lime kiln</td>
<td>limestone</td>
<td>lower portion of lime kiln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabasha</td>
<td>Watkins/Appel Mill</td>
<td>21W80050</td>
<td></td>
<td>mill</td>
<td>limestone</td>
<td>unknown without site visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Hersey &amp; Bear Planing Mill</td>
<td>21WA0092</td>
<td></td>
<td>planing mill</td>
<td>limestone</td>
<td>high wall and high wall fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Aiple Brewery Ruins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>brewery</td>
<td>limestone</td>
<td>high wall and high wall fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winona</td>
<td>Lamberton Mill</td>
<td>21WN0062</td>
<td></td>
<td>mill</td>
<td>stone</td>
<td>unknown without site visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winona</td>
<td>Hemingway Creek Lime Kilns</td>
<td>21WN0073</td>
<td></td>
<td>lime kiln</td>
<td>limestone</td>
<td>unknown without site visit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TYPOLOGY, DEFINITION OF ELEMENTS, AND EVALUATION STRATEGY

This chapter presents an outline of the typology, definition of elements, and evaluation strategy for masonry ruins, which are detailed fully within the draft National Register MPDF “Minnesota’s Nineteenth-Century Masonry Ruins” (Pizza 2013).

TYPOLOGY

As noted on page 10, the evaluation strategy considers masonry ruins within inclusive functional categories to facilitate the broad applicability of the evaluation guidelines, given the numerous specific functional associations of masonry ruins that may be encountered throughout the state. These functional categories constitute property sub-types within the main property type, which is a nineteenth-century masonry ruin in Minnesota (see page 2). As defined in the MPDF, the sub-types are as follows:

**Industrial ruins** are defined as the ruins of buildings or structures whose primary historical function was associated with extractive, processing, and/or manufacturing operations. Included in this sub-type are the ruins of mills, kilns, breweries, factories, farmsteads, mining-related facilities, and any other buildings and structures, including infrastructural elements, associated with extractive, processing, or manufacturing operations.

**Infrastructural ruins** are defined as the ruins of buildings or structures that historically functioned as facilities or components of the fundamental systems of civic, county, state, or federal entities, including transportation, communication, power and water supply, waste management, and military. Although privately owned, stagecoach- and railroad-related ruins would also be included in this category, as these historically constituted fundamental transportation systems for civic, county, state, and federal entities. This sub-type excludes the ruins of built infrastructural elements of industrial operations, which are evaluated under the sub-type “industrial ruins.” An exception to this exclusion is an infrastructural element that served both a public entity and an industry, for example, a dam that provided electrical power to a town but was also used to power mills would be considered under both sub-types.

**Institutional ruins** are defined as the ruins of buildings and associated structures whose primary historical function was associated with the activities of “an organization, establishment, foundation, society, or the like, devoted to the promotion of a particular cause or program, especially one of a public, educational, or charitable character” (Random House 1996:988). It includes the ruins of such buildings as churches, schools, missions, prisons, hospitals and asylums, governmental buildings, and fraternal halls.

**Residential ruins** are defined as the ruins of houses. It is noted that while the ruins of farmhouses are included under industrial ruins as parts of farmsteads, they would also be considered on their own merits as residences, particularly if no other evidence of the built environment of the farmstead remains.
Commercial ruins are defined as the ruins of buildings whose primary historical function was the furnishing of goods or services for profit. It includes the ruins of such buildings as stores, office buildings, commercial warehouses, service establishments, and entertainment venues.

**Definition of Elements**
The common elements of masonry ruins in Minnesota are defined with regard to two overarching categories: building ruins and structural ruins. As defined by the NPS (2002:4), buildings are functional constructions “created principally to shelter any form of human activity,” such as a house, mill building, or fort, while structures are “those functional constructions usually for purposes other than creating human shelter,” such as bridges, dams, or kilns. Elements can occur singularly or in various combinations at any given ruins site.

**Building Ruin Elements**
The common elements of building ruins are high walls, high wall fragments, low walls, and low wall fragments. Appurtenances such as chimneys may be attached to these and should be noted in recording ruins, but are not considered ruins in and of themselves.

*High Walls and High Wall Fragments*
A high wall is defined as any exterior or interior wall that is one story (eight feet) or greater in height and reflects its original, full horizontal extent with continuity. Continuity need only occur in a portion of the wall; if the lower courses of the wall are continuous, but spaces exist between vertical portions of the wall in the upper courses, for example, where lintels have failed and the stone or brick above them is therefore absent, the element would still be considered a wall (Figure 1).

A high wall fragment is defined as any portion of an exterior or interior wall that is one story or greater in height and does not reflect its original, full horizontal extent with continuity. Even if the original, full horizontal extent of the wall is visible, if the parts of that wall are fully vertically separated in one or more places, these constitute a series of high wall fragments, and not high walls (see Figure 1).

In those cases where walls or wall fragments are variable in height, if the maximum height extends to eight or more feet, the element should be considered as a high wall (fragment) and not a low wall (fragment).

*Low Walls and Low Wall Fragments*
A low wall is defined as any exterior or interior wall with a maximum height of less than one story (eight feet) and that reflects its original, full horizontal extent with continuity. As with high walls, continuity need only occur in a portion of the wall (see Figure 1).
A low wall fragment is defined as any portion of an exterior or interior wall with a maximum height of less than one story and that does not reflect its original, full horizontal extent with continuity. Even if the original, full horizontal extent of the wall is visible, if the parts of that wall are fully vertically separated in one or more places, these constitute a series of low wall fragments, and not low walls (see Figure 1).

**Structural Ruin Elements**

Common structural ruin elements are dictated by the type of structure with which they are associated. Elements of a lime kiln ruin, for example, would typically include those such as exterior kiln walls, fireplace arches, interior lining walls, or fragments of any of these. At a mill ruin, beyond the building, elements such as sluice-way walls or wall fragments may be present. A water tower (the tower consisting of the portion that supports the tank) ruin would only occur as the lower portion of a tower. In any cases, however, where an element is termed as a wall, it must incorporate continuity as described for building ruin walls above; otherwise, it should be termed a wall fragment.

**Evaluation Strategy**

The evaluation strategy designed for Minnesota’s nineteenth-century masonry ruins recognizes that masonry ruins are a unique property type and therefore must be evaluated as such. As architectural history properties, most masonry ruins would not have sufficient integrity to qualify for listing in the National Register. As historical archaeological properties, they would lack the necessary information potential for the same. In essence, masonry ruins cannot readily be assigned to either architectural history or archaeology, and therefore constitute their own type of “history” property. As noted
previously, although any identified archaeological site might include ruins as a feature within the site, in the same way that the eligibility of a complete building or structure would be evaluated as a history/architecture property whether it overlies or is spatially within an associated archaeological site, so too ruins of these buildings or structures must be evaluated separate from any present archaeological site.

The approach to evaluation additionally recognizes that masonry construction has been prolific in the history of Minnesota and can therefore be associated with a wide variety of historic contexts; however, other materials were seen as preferable for certain genres of construction or for certain localities in the nineteenth century, which places limits on the areas and associated levels of significance applicable to masonry ruins. These are further limited by the fact that due to ongoing development, masonry ruins are unlikely to survive in association with some areas of significance.

Finally, the evaluation strategy acknowledges that because a masonry ruin by definition incorporates a significant loss of historical fabric of and hence some of its ability to convey its historical association, various aspects of integrity take on added importance, as does the strength of the historical association between the property and a historically significant event, pattern, or individual. With these property type-specific considerations in mind, the strategy detailed in the draft MPDF incorporates the following salient points with regard to significance and integrity.

**SIGNIFICANCE**

In most cases, masonry ruins will qualify for listing in the National Register under Criterion A or B. Under Criterion C, Minnesota’s nineteenth-century masonry ruins may qualify for listing in the National Register if the extant construction meets one of the standard conditions for architectural significance, i.e., embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction; represent the work of a master; possess high artistic value; or constitute a district that represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction (NPS 2002:17).

Minnesota’s nineteenth-century masonry ruins may qualify for listing in the National Register under Criterion D if they meet two conditions. The first condition is that the extant construction retains features that can provide important information either on activities that occurred historically within the building or structure, or on historical construction techniques or design specific to the individual building or structure, or the building or structure type, and the ruins are the only source for this information. The second condition is that the ruins qualify under at least one of the other three National Register significance criteria; if an association with historically significant patterns/events, persons, or design/construction is not present, then information on the activities or construction techniques associated with the ruins would not be important to history.

In cases where the significance of masonry ruins under Criteria A and B is tied to the construction and use of the former building or structure with which they are associated, such significance may be associated with any of the statewide contexts “Initial United
States Presence in Minnesota, 1820-1837,” “Indian Communities and Reservations, 1837-1934,” “St. Croix Triangle Lumbering, 1830s-1900s,” “Early Agriculture and River Settlement in Minnesota, 1840-1870,” “Railroads and Agricultural Development in Minnesota, 1862-1940,” Minnesota’s Urban Centers, 1860-1940,” and “Minnesota’s Iron Ore Industry, 1880s-1945.” In evaluating, therefore, the National Register-eligibility of a ruin, property-specific research will be required to determine relevant contextual associations. Property-specific research will also be necessary to determining the applicable areas and levels of significance for a given ruin; however, the possibilities for these are limited under each sub-type (Table 2).

In limited cases, the significance of masonry ruins under Criterion A will be based on their ruination state. In these cases, ruins would be considered significant either for their association with a historically significant event that led to their existence (e.g., the Joseph R. Brown House Ruins) or of preservation that occurred as the result of a targeted campaign or movement that occurred more than 50 years ago (e.g., the Ramsey Mill ruins).

**INTEGRITY**

Under the seven National Register aspects of integrity, the requirements outlined in the draft MPDF are such that masonry ruins that are eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion A or B must retain excellent integrity of materials and location, and good to excellent integrity of setting and association to qualify for listing in the National Register. By extension of these four aspects, masonry ruins that qualify for listing in the National Register will automatically have good to excellent integrity of feeling.

Masonry ruins that are eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion C must retain excellent integrity of materials, workmanship, and design. Those that are eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion D must retain excellent integrity of materials and design. Excellent integrity of workmanship is necessary for those ruins whose significance under Criterion D lies in their ability to provide information on historical construction, including both its technological and aesthetic aspects.

Additional integrity requirements specific to sub-type are presented in the draft MPDF in reference to ruins that represent a component or components of former complexes of buildings and structures.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Local</strong></th>
<th><strong>State</strong></th>
<th><strong>National</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industrial</strong></td>
<td>Criterion A: Agriculture Industry&lt;br&gt;Ethnic Heritage Exploration/Settlement</td>
<td>Criterion B: Agriculture Industry</td>
<td>Criterion A: Agriculture Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>Criterion A: Community Planning and Development Exploration/Settlement</td>
<td>Criterion A: Exploration/Settlement Military Transportation</td>
<td>Criterion B: Military Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional</strong></td>
<td>Criterion A: Education&lt;br&gt;Ethnic Heritage&lt;br&gt;Health/Medicine&lt;br&gt;Politics/Government&lt;br&gt;Religion&lt;br&gt;Social History</td>
<td>Criterion B: Education&lt;br&gt;Ethnic Heritage&lt;br&gt;Health/Medicine&lt;br&gt;Politics/Government&lt;br&gt;Religion&lt;br&gt;Social History</td>
<td>Criterion B: Education&lt;br&gt;Ethnic Heritage&lt;br&gt;Health/Medicine&lt;br&gt;Politics/Government&lt;br&gt;Religion&lt;br&gt;Social History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial</strong></td>
<td>Criterion A: Commerce&lt;br&gt;Entertainment/Recreation&lt;br&gt;Ethnic Heritage Exploration/Settlement</td>
<td>Criterion B: Commerce</td>
<td>Criterion B: Commerce</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIELD SURVEY RESULTS—INDUSTRIAL RUINS

Industrial ruins constitute the majority of confirmed masonry ruins in Minnesota, with 27 of 41 total confirmed ruins falling into this functional category, some of which cross functional categories. Of these, nine are associated with mills, four with lime kilns, three with breweries, three with brick factories, three with dams, two with farmsteads, one with a dynamite shack, one with a mill spillway, and one with a planing mill. Eleven industrial ruins were visited during the field survey for the project, including two associated with flour mills, one associated with a mill dam, three associated with lime kilns, two associated with farmsteads, one associated with a brewery complex, one associated with a water bottling facility, and one associated with a dynamite shack (Figure 1). Attempts were made to survey the ruins of the Jab Farmstead (SC-LOU-006) and the Twin Cities Brick Company kiln, but in both cases, flooding and washout conditions prevented access to the properties. An attempt was also made to survey the ruins of a flour mill in Zumbrota Township (GD-ZBT-014), but the property owner denied access, stating that the ruins have not been present since she moved there in 1964. The inventory form, however, for this property, with a photo, dates to 1978.

FIGURE 2. LOCATIONS OF SURVEYED INDUSTRIAL RUINS
FILLMORE COUNTY: GRIBBEN MILL RUINS (FL-HLT-002)

Location: Holt Township, T103N, R9W, Section 21, SW-NE-SE
Construction Date: Circa 1868  Survey Date: June 17, 2013
Ownership: Private

Historical Background: The Gribben Mill was constructed circa 1868 by brothers Patrick and Peter Gribben (Gribbin) after they purchased the land in that year. The following year, Patrick turned his stake in the partnership over to his son James. James was bought out by Peter in 1880, when Peter chose to move the machinery and operations west, where wheat production had skyrocketed (Turner et al. 1882:383, 385).

Description and Current Condition: The Gribben Mill Ruins comprise a combination of high walls and high wall fragments associated with a former two-and-a-half-story limestone flour mill. Since an inventory form was prepared for this ruin in 1976, the east wall has deteriorated noticeably. The gable is no longer continuous, due to the loss of the upper-story lintels and the stones that were overlying them. The remaining uppermost stones of the peak appear to be loose. The segmental-arch lintels over the doorway and windows on the lower story of the east wall remain intact, but cracking and separation of the stone is evident underneath the first-story windows, and a large hole is present to the upper right of the south window.

The north wall exhibits a loss of mortar in the upper portion, and although the window openings are intact, pronounced cracking and separation of the stone is evident below them. Further, it appears that this wall is bowing near the east end.

The west wall has undergone a substantial loss of its upper portion, being approximately half the height of the east wall, such that only the bases of the first-story windows are evident. Substantial cracking and separation are evident in this wall.

The entire center section of the south wall is absent, leaving two wall fragments on this side of the former building. The upper courses of the fragments are also absent, and deterioration of the mortar increases with height.
Threats: The only known threat to the Gribben Mill Ruins is a lack of stabilization.

Interpretation: The Gribben Mill Ruins are not currently being interpreted.
FILLMORE COUNTY: CAREY LIME KILN RUINS (FL-SVT-004)

**Location:** Spring Valley Township, T103N, R13W, Section 9, NE-SE  
**Construction Date:** circa 1868  
**Survey Date:** June 17, 2013  
**Ownership:** Private

**Historical Background:** The Carey Lime Kiln was constructed circa 1868 by L. G. Odell, after he purchased the land in that year. Although an 1882 source states that Odell was still operating the lime kiln “in connection with his farm” (Turner et al. 1882:561), the 1878 plat shows the property under the ownership of E. C. Clary (Warner & Foote 1878). By 1896, the property was owned by James McKee, and sometime between that year and 1915, it was transferred to W. H. Carey (Geo A. Ogle & Co. 1896; Webb Publishing Co. 1915). Between 1915 and 1928, the property came under the ownership of the Winona Savings Bank, which held the property until sometime between 1956 and 1963, when it was purchased by J. and E. Mlinar (Webb Publishing Co. 1928; Thomas O. Nelson Co. 1956; Rockford Map Publishers 1963).

**Description and Current Condition:** The Carey Lime Kiln Ruins consist of the lower portion of a former lime kiln, the upper portion having been lost over time. The lower portion includes four exterior walls and three visible fireplace arches. The kiln ruin has been infilled with earth, masking any potential interior masonry elements. A substantial amount of collapse has occurred on the southeast side of the ruin, and loose stones are evident on the northeast side. The mortar has heavily deteriorated throughout the ruin.

**Threats:** The only known threat to the Carey Lime Kiln Ruins is a lack of stabilization.

**Interpretation:** The Carey Lime Kiln Ruins are not currently being interpreted.
GOODHUE COUNTY: UNION MILL DAM RUINS (GD-FLC-014)

Location: Florence Township, T112N, R13W, Section 20, NE-NE-NE
Construction Date: Circa 1864    Survey Date: June 19, 2013
Ownership: Private

LOOKING NORTHEAST
**Historical Background:** Based on information provided by the current property owner, the mill rights for this property, located on Wells Creek, were purchased in 1864. He stated that an 1860s map on display at the Sawyer Inn in Goodhue identifies the mill as the Union Mill. This name is corroborated by Andreas’ (1874) *An Illustrated Historical Atlas of the State of Minnesota*.

Referring to Florence Township, an 1893 history of Goodhue County notes, “The flouring mills have been for a time doing business on Wells’ creek, within this town, but at the present time are not in active operation” (Hancock 1893:272). An 1894 plat map does not depict the mill (C. M. Foote & Co. 1894).

**Description and Current Condition:** The Union Mill Dam Ruins consist of two wall fragments of a former limestone dam with banked earth on the back sides. One is a large...
fragment of the main dam wall, which runs north-south, and the other is a small wing wall fragment, which runs east from the north end of the large fragment. The mortar has heavily eroded out of both wall fragments and is therefore only visible if one looks deep into the joints. Several large stones have fallen out of the large wall fragment and are lying on the ground in front of it. Further, an entire vertical section of the stonework has eroded out near the north end of the large wall fragment, and stonework in the top and bottom of this fragment has eroded out in several places.

**Threats:** The only known threat to the Union Mill Dam Ruins is a lack of stabilization.

**Interpretation:** The Union Mill Dam Ruins are not currently being interpreted.

**GOODHUE COUNTY: OXFORD MILL RUINS (GD-STN-010, 21GD0172)**

*Location:* Stanton Township, T112N, R18W, Section 25, N-SE-SW

*Construction Date:* 1878

*Survey Date:* June 19, 2013

*Ownership:* Private

*Historical Background:* The Oxford Mill was constructed in 1878 by C. N. Wilcox to accompany a circa-1867 mill also known as the Oxford Mill, which Wilcox built in partnership with J. S. and E. T. Archibald. Between 1867 and 1878, Wilcox bought out the Archibalds and began construction of the four-story limestone flour mill in May of the latter year. The mill was completed in the fall, immediately prior to the peak year for wheat production in the Cannon River Valley, after which growth of the crop in the region quickly declined. In 1905, fire gutted the large mill building, but left the exterior mostly intact (Wood, Alley, & Co. 1878:418; Zuckerman 1978).

*Description and Current Condition:* The Oxford Mill Ruins comprise the high walls of a former four-story mill building, a wall and wall fragments of a sluice-way, and other wall fragments, all of which are limestone. Fenestration for the mill building incorporates large and heavy limestone lintels, most of which remain in place. The mill is built on a slope, thus the west wall is three stories high with a sub-level, while the east wall is four stories high. The former sluice-way is located on and parallels the north side of the building and extends from there west and underneath Oxford Mill Road.
includes a north wall and a south wall fragment, the latter cutting off on the east. From the east end of the north wall, a wing wall fragment extends north. Other wall fragments are similarly placed on the south side of the building, and still another limestone wall fragment is located approximately 10 feet to the south of these, although the latter may just be associated with a retaining wall.

With little exception, no major cracking or separation is present in the walls of the mill building. In the west wall, a fair amount of mortar has been lost from below the first-story windows and from the courses between stories. The east wall, similarly, exhibits more mortar deterioration in the courses immediately below the windows, and a lintel is absent from the south opening, which was likely a doorway. Deterioration of mortar in
the south wall is primarily in the upper-story courses and in limited sections. The two western lintels in this wall are cracked. The east half of the north wall has lost a substantial upper portion of stonework, and it has suffered pronounced mortar loss in the sub-level, near which the sluice-way ran. Courses of stone below the second window from the west on the north wall have fallen out. Overall, the north wall appears generally more unstable than the rest. Beyond these identified issues, the mortar and the stonework of the Oxford Mill building appear to be highly intact.

A substantial amount of collapsed stone is visible on the ground in the sluice-way. The north wall of the sluice-way appears to be at its original extent, extending much farther east than does the south wall fragment, thus the south wall was probably the source of the collapsed stone. The south wall fragment is also leaning and likely to fall soon.

**Threats:** The only known threat to the Oxford Mill Ruins is a lack of stabilization.

**Interpretation:** The Oxford Mill Ruins are not currently being interpreted.

**Olmsted County: Rochester State Hospital Quarry Dynamite Shack Ruins (OL-ROC-382)**

*Location:* Rochester, T107N, R13W, Section 31, SE-SW-NW  
*Construction Date:* circa 1885?  
*Survey Date:* June 18, 2013  
*Ownership:* City of Rochester

This property comes under the functional categories of industrial ruins and institutional ruins. Descriptive information is provided in the report section on institutional ruins.

**Pine County: Sandstone Water Bottling Company/Sandstone Spring Water Company Ruins (PN-SSC-015)**

*Location:* Sandstone, T42N, R20W, Section 16, NW-NW-SE  
*Construction Date:* circa 1905  
*Survey Date:* June 24, 2013  
*Ownership:* Private
Information obtained from the inventory form prior to the survey indicated that the building associated with the ruins was constructed soon after a fire destroyed Sandstone in 1894. A secondary source consulted after the survey, however, indicates that the building was constructed circa 1905. Even so, because this ruin was surveyed, the information is presented here.

**Historical Background:** The building associated with this ruin was constructed circa 1905 by the English Spring Water Company of Minneapolis, which later changed its name to the Sandstone Spring Water Company. The spring water was popular in the Twin Cities and was shipped there by rail car. Unfortunately, the taste of the water was occasionally tainted by a “large creosote plant located less than a mile away” (Langseth 1989:99) and then completely contaminated after a sewer pipe from the plant burst. The Sandstone Spring Water Company shut down its facility, moving its operation to Chippewa Falls in Wisconsin.

**Description and Current Condition:** The Sandstone Spring Water Company Ruins are made up of a high wall with brick chimney on the north side, high wall fragments on the remaining sides, and low wall fragments and bulkhead walls on the east, all associated with a former one-and-a-half-story, sandstone, water bottling facility building.

Based on a comparison with photographs of the ruins taken for the original inventory form in 1974, they are largely unchanged since that time. The stonework and mortar currently appear to be highly intact, although slight differentiation in the color of the mortar suggests the possibility that repointing has occurred. Visible condition issues
include a wide horizontal separation under the threshold in the north wall, likely where stairs used to be present, a loose keystone in the lintel of the west window of the north wall, and missing lintel stones above the east window of the north wall.

**Threats:** The only known threat to the Sandstone Spring Water Company Ruins is a lack of stabilization.

**Interpretation:** The Sandstone Spring Water Company Ruins are not currently being interpreted.

**Scott County: Strunk-Nyssen (Shakopee) Brewery Complex Ruins (SC-JAC-002)**

**Location:** Jackson Township, T115N, R23W, Section 11, NE-NW-NW

**Construction Date:** circa 1854  
**Survey Date:** June 21, 2013

**Ownership:** Private

**Historical Background:** The brewery associated with these ruins was built by Herman Strunk circa 1854 and commenced operations in either late 1856 or early 1857. For a few months in 1859, it was rented to Joseph Nichof and Company, after which Strunk ran it with Philip Dorre (Hoverson 2007:298-299). Signage at the ruin indicates that Andrew Winker purchased the brewery from Strunk and Dorre in 1863. Upon Winker’s death in
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1870, the brewery was held by Andrew’s wife Mary, who may or may not have continued to operate it. In 1873, Hubert Nyssen took over operations, subsequently marrying Mary in 1875, although she retained ownership rights. Nyssen ran the brewery until Prohibition closed it down in 1920. After Prohibition ended, the “Nyssen brewery was used as a distillery, a winery, and a puppy mill” (Hoverson 2007:299).

The stone barn/granary associated with these ruins was likely constructed at the same time as the Strunk-Nyssen brewery, circa 1854. When the brewery became a distillery (Northwestern Distilleries, Inc.), the building was used as a cooper shop (Sanborn 1935). The barn/granary ruin is located approximately 160 feet west of the brewery ruin.

**Description and Current Condition:** It is noted here that many portions of these ruins could only be assessed at a distance due to fencing and safety issues. The Strunk-Nyssen Brewery Complex ruins are extensive. Of the brewery as it was configured in 1890, based on a fire insurance map of that year (Sanborn-Perris Map Company 1890), the ruins comprise high walls and high wall fragments of the northern and western ice houses; malt cellar/malt and barley storage section; the kiln; the section housing the pump, water tank, malt mill, mash tub, and beer kettle (malt mill section); and the section housing the men’s rooms.

The barn/granary ruin exhibits portions of the original building and a later addition on the east. With regard to the original building, it includes high walls on the east and south, and a high wall fragment on the north. With regard to the addition, it consists of high walls on the north, south, west, and east, the former two meeting up with the east wall of the original building. Bulkhead walls extend from the west wall of the addition. A single associated feature consists of a low foundation measuring 10 by 12 feet in area, located approximately 23 feet west of the barn/granary.

The brewery appears to be suffering from fairly serious condition issues. The west wall of the northern ice house is vertically split and is leaning to the west, and only a small earthen embankment is present on its west side. The north wall is leaning north with no support, and it exhibits a major vertical crack and separation on the upper portion of its exterior. Another large vertical crack and separation are apparent on the interior of the east wall. Although the interior exhibits some whitewash or plaster, the exterior is suffering from major mortar deterioration, as is the interior of the west wall. The north wall fragment for the malt mill, men’s rooms, and eastern ice house shows substantial deterioration of mortar, cracking, and separation. Its upper courses have been lost, although enough remain that the upper-story window openings are complete, as has the west end of the wall. The malt cellar/malt and barley storage section is currently being cleaned out and is undergoing some form of stabilization under the current property owners, who intend to use this section for brewing beer. It is not known how or whether the current measures will impact the historical fabric of the ruin.

The kiln appears to be the most-well preserved portion of the brewery. Although the lower portion of the north wall has undergone some mortar loss, it appears to otherwise be fairly intact.
The original portion of the barn/granary ruin exhibits fairly intact mortar on the exterior of the east wall and north wall fragment, the latter also retaining some whitewash or plaster. With regard to both, the majority of the interior exhibits the whitewash/plaster, thus the underlying mortar has likely been protected as well. The exterior of the south wall appears to have once been faced in mortar, but this facing is now only present on the lower half of the wall. Brick insets flank either side of what appears to be an upper-level doorway. It is not clear why brick was used here; given that the mortar facing extends up onto the brick, it was not for stylistic purposes. The threshold of this doorway has been lost, as have several courses of stone above the upper-story windows. The current uppermost courses of stone appear loose. While the interior of the south wall retains much whitewash/plaster and looks to be in the same condition as the east wall and north wall fragment above the level of the cellar, at cellar level, it displays substantial deterioration of the stonework and mortar.

**Threats:** The only known threat to the Strunk-Nyssen (Shakopee) Brewery Complex Ruins is a lack of stabilization; however, the need for stabilization of these ruins appears to be more pressing than many others encountered during the survey. It is not known how or whether stabilization measures currently being undertaken by the property owners for a beer brewing operation will impact the historical fabric of the ruin.

**Interpretation:** The Strunk-Nyssen (Shakopee) Brewery Complex Ruins are currently interpreted through signage located on the Minnesota Valley Trail.

**Scott County: Farm Ruins (SC-LOU-005)**

*Location:* Louisville Township, T115N, R23W, Section 29, NE-NW  
*Construction Date:* pre-1898, likely circa 1860  
*Survey Date:* June 21, 2013  
*Ownership:* U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

This property comes under the functional categories of industrial ruins and residential ruins. Descriptive information is provided in the report section on residential ruins.

**Scott County: Ehmiller Farm Ruins (SC-LOU-007)**

*Location:* Louisville Township, T115N, R23W, Section 28, SE-SW  
*Construction Date:* pre-1898, likely circa 1860  
*Survey Date:* June 21, 2013  
*Ownership:* U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

This property comes under the functional categories of industrial ruins and residential ruins. Descriptive information is provided in the report section on residential ruins.
Scott County: Schroeder Lime Kiln Ruins (SC-SPC-050, 21SC0034)

Location: Shakopee, T115N, R22W, Section 6, NW-NW
Construction Date: circa 1876  Survey Date: June 21, 2013
Ownership: State of Minnesota – Department of Natural Resources

Historical Background: According to the interpretive sign at this ruin, Herman Schroeder founded a brickyard in this location in 1876, presumably at which time the lime kiln associated with the ruin was constructed. A biographical sketch of Herman Schroeder indicates that he started the brickyard in partnership with his brother Henry, then bought him out in 1896 (R. L. Polk & Co. 1907). After Herman’s death in 1922, his son Adolph assumed control of the brick and lime manufacturing operations, which he ran until his death in 1949 (Shakopee Argus 1922; The Shakopee Valley News 1949).

Description and Current Condition: The Schroeder Lime Kiln Ruins consist of the lower portion of a lime kiln, the upper portion having heavily deteriorated over time. The lower portion includes four exterior walls and two visible fireplace arches, one each in the north and west walls. Any other potentially present arches have been infilled and covered over with earth, which has been substantially banked up and largely blocks the south wall of the kiln, from where it slopes down to the north on the east and west sides of the kiln. Mortar has eroded off of the north wall, but can be seen deep in the joints. Based on the variable depths at which the stones are set on the west wall, it appears as though an exterior layer of stonework may once have been present that is now only visible on the north end. This exterior layer appears intact on the lower two-thirds of the east wall, but is gone from the upper one-third. Both the east and west walls are suffering from a major loss of mortar and exhibit wide separations in the stonework.

Threats: The only known threat to the Schroeder Lime Kiln Ruins is a lack of stabilization.

Interpretation: The Schroeder Lime Kiln Ruins are currently interpreted through signage located on the Minnesota Valley Trail.
SCOTT COUNTY: LIME KILN RUINS (SC-SPC-067)

Location: Shakopee, T115N, R23W, Section 2, SE-SW
Construction Date: circa 1863  Survey Date: June 21, 2013
Ownership: State of Minnesota – Department of Natural Resources

Historical Background: These ruins were recorded as being associated with a lime kiln. Neither the former kiln nor any other structure is recorded in its location in An Illustrated Historical Atlas of the State of Minnesota (Andreas 1874), but an 1898 plat shows the property under the ownership of Barbara Conter (Northwest Publishing Co. 1898). An 1882 historical account indicates that John Conter, a French immigrant, married a
Barbara Wagner in 1858 and began a lime burning operation in 1863 (Warner & Foote 1882:305). The 1898 plat map, however, labels a building in its location as a brewery, so it may be that the kiln was repurposed for use in a brewing operation. The property is not labeled in any fashion on subsequent available plat maps, which begin with the year 1913.

**Description and Current Condition:** These previously recorded ruins have been razed.
FIELD SURVEY RESULTS– INFRASTRUCTURAL RUINS

Infrastructural ruins constitute a relatively low percentage of confirmed masonry ruins in Minnesota, with six of 41 total confirmed ruins falling into this functional category. Of these, four are associated with stagecoach stops, one with a powder magazine, one with a lighthouse, and one with a reservoir. Three infrastructural ruins were visited during the field survey for the project, two of which are associated with stagecoach stops and one of which is associated with a likely stagecoach stop. Two locations with the potential to contain masonry ruins associated with bridges were visited, at which point it was determined that only abutments, which do not constitute masonry ruins, were present. Access was denied at a third bridge location.

**Figure 3. Locations of Surveyed Infrastructural Ruins**
**Fillmore County: Holleran/Halloran Stagecoach Stop Ruins (FL-CHC-068)**

*Location:* Chatfield, T105N, R11W, Section 4, NE-NE-NW  
*Construction Date:* circa 1860  
*Survey Date:* June 17, 2013  
*Ownership:* Private

**Historical Background:** An 1878 plat map showing the location of this ruin indicates that the property was under the ownership of Edward Holleran in that year (Warner & Foote 1878). By 1896, the property had gone into estate (Geo. A. Ogle & Co. 1896), and it was still indicated as such on the 1915 plat map of the area (Webb Publishing Co. 1915). In 1928, Florence (Halloran), Edward’s daughter, was indicated as the property owner.

**Description and Current Condition:** Based on its similarities to the Popple Ruins (see below) in form and particularly in the presence of a vertically truncated second floor, as well as its location along an early road (Andreas 1874) now called Old Territorial Road, these ruins likely represent a former stagecoach stop building. The Halloran Stagecoach Stop Ruins consist of high wall fragments associated with the former two-and-a-half-story, limestone building. Although the full extent of the former building is represented by the fragments, no continuity is present on any given side, due to voids created by the collapse of stone from above original openings. Substantial cracks in the stonework run up through the lower story of the south and east wall fragments, and the lower portion of the northern wall fragment on the west side. Erosion of the mortar is variable throughout the ruin, and some areas contain thick and differently colored mortar which suggests limited repointing has occurred. Oxidation on the interior of the ruin indicates the building was destroyed by fire, as do burned joist ends still present in the walls and burned wood elements lying on the ground.

**Threats:** The only known threat to the Halloran Stagecoach Stop Ruins is a lack of stabilization.

**Interpretation:** These ruins are not currently being interpreted.
FILLMORE COUNTY: STONE STAGE STOP RUINS (FL-SVT-005)

Location: Spring Valley Township, T103N, R13W, Section 10, NE-NE
Construction Date: Circa 1860   Survey Date: June 17, 2013
Ownership: Private

Historical Background: According to the inventory form for these ruins, the construction of the former building with which they are associated occurred in the 1850s or 1860s. The ruins depicted appear to be of limestone and roughly two stories in height.

Description and Current Condition: These previously recorded ruins have been razed.
OLMSTED COUNTY: STAGE STOP BUILDING (POPPLE STAGECOACH STOP) RUINS (21OLW) (OL-HFT-006)

Location: High Forest Township, T105N, R14W, Section 6, SE-NE-NW
Construction Date: Circa 1860    Survey Date: June 18, 2013
Ownership: Private

LOOKING SOUTHWEST

COURTESY OF JIM BARTELS

POPPLE STAGECOACH STOP, DATE UNKNOWN

Historical Background: According to the current landowner, Jim Bartels, the former stagecoach stop building with which this ruin is associated was constructed by Henry Popel (spelling provided by landowner). An 1878 plat map shows the entire NW ¼ under the ownership of a T. Popple, and the NE ¼ as owned by M. J. Popple (Warner & Foote 1878). By 1896, the NW ¼ had been divided such that the E ½ of the NW ¼ was part of a large, approximately 241-acre parcel that also included the NE ¼ of Section 6, all of which was owned by an E. A. Popple (Geo A. Ogle & Co. 1896). In 1914, the
property was under the ownership of Fred Schwanke, and it remained in the Schwanke family until at least 1950 (Webb Publishing Co. 1914; Anderson Publishing Co. 1928; Farm Plat Book Publishing Co. 1950). Based on information provided by Mr. Bartels, sometime prior to 1930, a lean-to was added to the east side of the stagecoach stop building, and then circa 1930, a second lean-to was added to the east of the first.

**Description and Current Condition:** The Popple Stagecoach Stop Ruins consist of a high wall on the east and high wall fragments on the north and south of a former two-and-a-half-story, limestone, stagecoach stop building, and the east and north low walls of the earlier lean-to. Associated with these masonry ruins is the concrete foundation of the circa-1930 lean-to. The majority of the former west wall and the entire south wall have collapsed, particularly as erosion occurs downhill to the west. Mr. Bartels has filled in earth behind the ruin on the north and west side in an attempt to stave off further collapse.

The east wall of the ruin retains two window openings and a doorway, all with heavy stone lintels. The lintel for the doorway has split in half, and is likely to collapse soon. The east wall is suffering from erosion of mortar, particularly at the top and beneath the first-story window, and the lower north portion of this wall shows cracking and separation of the stonework. Plaster is evident on the interior of the east wall, as is the wood framing for the doors and window, and the joist ends. The north wall fragment has severely deteriorated. Major separation of the stonework at the west end indicates that a large section is likely to fall soon as erosion downhill to the west continues. Stonework below and above a doorway in the center has been lost, and the stones above and to the east of the lintel are loose. The east window opening and its interior wood framing are
intact. Overall, loss of mortar characterizes this wall fragment, as well as the walls of the lean-to.

**Threats:** Despite the landowner’s interest and efforts, the Popple Stagecoach Stop Ruins are severely threatened by a lack of stabilization. Otherwise, no known threats to the ruins exist.

**Interpretation:** These ruins are not currently being interpreted.
FIELD SURVEY RESULTS– INSTITUTIONAL RUINS

Institutional ruins constitute the fewest number of confirmed masonry ruins in Minnesota, with two of 41 total confirmed ruins falling into this functional category. Of these, one is related to a seminary, and one to a dynamite shack for the quarrying operations of the Rochester State Hospital, the latter one of which also falls under the functional category of industrial ruins. This dynamite shack ruin was visited during the field survey for the project. An attempt was made to survey the ruins of a former schoolhouse (OL-ELM-004), in part to determine whether it constituted a masonry ruin because the material was not indicated on the inventory form, but this ruin is no longer extant.

FIGURE 4. LOCATION OF SURVEYED INSTITUTIONAL RUIN
**Olmsted County: Rochester State Hospital Quarry Dynamite Shack Ruins (OL-ROC-382)**

**Location:** Rochester, T107N, R13W, Section 31, SE-SW-NW  
**Construction Date:** circa 1885?  
**Survey Date:** June 18, 2013  
**Ownership:** City of Rochester

**Historical Background:** The Rochester State Hospital Dynamite Shack was constructed to support the hospital’s quarrying operations, likely circa 1885, when the operations began. The quarry provided stone for use in building hospital facilities and for sale to the public, which provided funds to the hospital.

**Description and Current Condition:** The Rochester State Hospital Quarry Dynamite Shack Ruins comprise the limestone walls of the main structure and the lower portion of the once six-foot-high limestone wall that stood in front of it for protective purposes. The uppermost courses of stonework have been lost from the main structure, although the arch above the doorway is evident, and areas where the mortar is crumbling and stonework is separating are present on both the exterior and interior of the shack. At least some of the mortar also appears to be newer. The interior has been vandalized with graffiti.

The former protective wall, which includes a main wall running parallel to the face of the shack and wing walls, is mostly lost, with perhaps 18 inches of height remaining.

**Threats:** The Rochester State Hospital Quarry Dynamite Shack Ruins are maintained as part of Quarry Hill Park. Vandalism is the only known threat associated with these ruins.

**Interpretation:** These ruins are currently interpreted through a brochure available to Quarry Hill Park guests through the park visitor center and signage locate at the entrance to the quarry.
FIELD SURVEY RESULTS—RESIDENTIAL RUINS

Residential ruins constitute the second highest number of confirmed masonry ruins in Minnesota, with nine of 41 total confirmed ruins falling into this functional category, two of which cross functional categories. Five of these are associated with houses, two with farmsteads, and one with a carriage house. Five residential ruins were visited during the field survey for the project. Three of these are associated with houses, and the other two with farmsteads.

FIGURE 5. LOCATIONS OF SURVEYED RESIDENTIAL RUINS
FILLMORE COUNTY: STONE HOUSE RUINS (FL-PRT-005)

Location: Preston Township, T102N, R10W, Section 15, SW-SE
Construction Date: Circa 1853    Survey Date: June 17, 2013
Ownership: Private

LOOKING NORTHEAST

Historical Background: According to the current landowner, Lowell Tollefson, the house associated with this ruin was built by members of his family, who homesteaded the property circa 1853. The building does not appear on the original General Land Office survey map of the area, which dates to 1854, nor in An Illustrated Historical Atlas of the State of Minnesota, which dates to 1874. An 1896 plat shows the building under the ownership of Mons Larson (Geo A. Ogle & Co. 1896), but the property was transferred to Engebret Johnson, an immigrant from Norway, sometime between 1896 and 1915 (Webb Publishing Co. 1915). The property remained in the Johnson family for several decades, Engebret’s son Carl owning the property by 1928, and an Everett Orvis Johnson assuming ownership sometime between that year and 1956 and retaining it through at least 1977 (Webb Publishing Co. 1928; Thomas O. Nelson Co. 1956; Rockford Map Publishers 1977).

Description and Current Condition: This ruin is limited to a limestone high wall and two high wall fragments. The west wall contains a window opening, the interior wood framing of which remains. Mortar is not evident in the stones above the window opening, and the stonework at the north end of this fragment has deteriorated. What remains appears loose. A footing that was located during the survey to the north of the wall fragments suggests that the west wall, which appears finished on the north end, used to extend out farther to the north, pointing to the former presence of an addition. Evidence of plaster coating and preservation of the mortar on the exterior of the north wall fragment supports the idea that this wall was located in the interior of the house at some point.

Threats: Mr. Tollefson informed Two Pines that this ruin has been subject to unauthorized salvage of stone. Otherwise, the only known threat to these ruins is a lack of stabilization.

Interpretation: These ruins are not currently being interpreted.
FILLMORE COUNTY: McCallum/Wilson/Stevens House Ruins (FL-PRT-018)

Location: Preston Township, T102N, R10W, Section 22, SW-SE-NE
Construction Date: Circa 1861       Survey Date: June 17, 2013
Ownership: Private

Historical Background: According to the property owner, Joe Stevens, his aunt related that the construction of the house associated with this ruin dates to the Civil War. A house, however, does appear in its location on the original General Land Office survey map of the township, which dates to 1854. While the house is not depicted on the 1874 map contained in Andreas’ *An Illustrated Historical Atlas of the State of Minnesota*, this atlas is not always precise with regard to houses. A house does appear in the same location as on the 1854 map on the 1896 plat, under the ownership of J. McCallum et al., and then under the Janet McCallum Estate on the 1915 plat (Geo A. Ogle & Co. 1896; Webb Publishing Co. 1915). Sometime between 1915 and 1928, ownership of the property transferred to Terris Wilson, who was listed on plat maps through 1956, and then in 1963, the landowner was noted as Wilson and Stevens (Webb Publishing Co. 1928; Forde Printing 1940; Thomas O. Nelson Co. 1956; Rockford Map Publishers 1963). Mr. Stevens noted that his mother, who was recently deceased at 93 years of age, lived in the house her entire life, thus based on census records, she would have been Naomi Wilson, who married Fowler Stevens. Fowler Stevens is listed as the sole property owner on the 1972 plat, while Naomi Stevens is listed for 1977 (Directory Service Company 1972; Rockford Map Publishers 1977).

Description and Current Condition: The McCallum/Wilson/Stevens House Ruins consist of the high walls and a high wall fragment of the two-and-a-half-story limestone house. The high walls are located on the north, south, and west side, and the fragment is on the south end of what was once the east face, where the interior is now exposed. A brick chimney that was added circa 1945 is located on the north wall. Where the house is
not covered by vines, the stonework and mortar are highly intact, with the exception of the east end of the south wall, which is crumbling, and the west end of the south wall, where some deterioration of the stonework and mortar has occurred.

**Threats:** Mr. Stevens is planning to have this ruin demolished in the summer of 2013 as a safety measure for his grandchildren. Its destruction is therefore imminent.

**Interpretation:** These ruins are not currently being interpreted.
**Goodhue County: Cordes House Ruins (GD-FEA-020)**

*Location:* Featherstone Township, T112N, R15W, Section 23, NE-NE-NE  
*Construction Date:* 1875  
*Survey Date:* June 19, 2013  
*Ownership:* State of Minnesota – Department of Natural Resources

**Historical Background:** An interpretive sign located at the ruin states that the house associated with this ruin was built in 1875 by German immigrants Frank and Metta Cordes, who lived there with their three daughters. It also notes that one of the daughters, Catherine, took ownership of the farm with her husband August H. Dicke after her parents died. The property was eventually sold in 1897. An individual by the name of J. (Joachim) H. Ehlen, who may have been the purchaser, owned the property in 1914 through at least 1933 (Webb Publishing Co. 1914; Rhame 1933). Between 1933 and 1954, ownership transferred to an Irene Biourn(e), and she appears to have retained the property until the Department of Natural Resources acquired it in 1965 (Ray Johnson Printing Co. 1954, Rockford Map Publishers 1962).

**Description and Current Condition:** The Cordes House Ruins comprise high walls and high wall fragments associated with the former two-story house and associated one-story kitchen wing, constructed of limestone. The basement level of the house has not been filled in. Much of the exterior retains scored plaster facing that once covered the entire house, while plaster without scoring is fairly ubiquitous on the interior. Several of the window openings are intact and include lintels of alternating stacked rowlock and soldier brick, although the lower south window on the east wall shows that the brick was faced with scored plaster along with the rest of the house. Interior wood framing is also present in the window openings, and some floor joist ends can be observed on the interior of the house. Brick chimney remnants are located on the interior of the south wall of the kitchen wing and the interior of the east and west walls.

Although some deterioration of mortar has occurred, the mortar is generally more intact than the majority of the ruins surveyed for the current study. The most problematic areas
in this regard appear to be the central portion of the south wall of the kitchen wing and the lower portions of all walls and wall fragments. Pronounced cracking and separation of the stonework is located on the east wall above the basement window openings, and one major crack is present down the west wall. An east-west running wall in the basement has lost its upper courses of stone.

**Threats:** The only known threat to the Cordes House Ruins is a lack of stabilization.

**Interpretation:** These ruins are currently interpreted through signage located on the Stone House Trail within the Hay Creek Management Unit of the Richard J. Dorer State Forest.
SCOTT COUNTY: FARM RUINS (SC-LOU-005)

Location: Louisville Township, T115N, R23W, Section 29, NE-NW
Construction Date: Circa 1860    Survey Date: June 21, 2013
Ownership: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Historical Background: The building associated with this ruin is not depicted on either the original General Land Office survey map of the area, nor in An Illustrated Historical Atlas of the State of Minnesota (Andreas 1874), although the latter is not always precise with regard to houses. An 1898 plat map depicts a building, indicating that the former building associated with the ruin predates that year (Northwest Publishing Co. 1898). The map identifies the landowner at the time as Joseph Monnie. By 1913, ownership had transferred to Josephine Monnie, then sometime between that year and 1940 to A. C. Oxenrider, who retained the property until at least 1944 (Webb Publishing Co. 1913; Scott County Farm Bureau 1940; Dahlgren 1944). By the time the 1963 plat map was created, the owners were Richard E. Mertz & Robert Sweeney, but no owner was indicated on the 1970 plat map (Title Atlas Co. 1963; Directory Service Company 1970).

Description and Current Condition: These previously recorded ruins have been razed.

SCOTT COUNTY: EHMILLER FARM RUINS (SC-LOU-007)

Location: Louisville Township, T115N, R23W, Section 28, SE-SW
Construction Date: Circa 1860    Survey Date: June 21, 2013
Ownership: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Historical Background: No buildings associated with this ruin are depicted on either the original General Land Office survey map of the area, nor in An Illustrated Historical Atlas of the State of Minnesota (Andreas 1874), although the latter is not always precise with regard to houses. An 1898 plat map depicts a building, indicating that the former buildings associated with the ruin predate that year, and it identifies the landowner as S. Ehmiller (Northwest Publishing Co. 1898). The property remained under the ownership of the Ehmiller family through at least 1967, with Joseph Ehmiller holding ownership of the property by 1913, and Gabriel and Catherine Ehmiller owning the property by 1940 through at least 1967 (Webb Publishing Co. 1913; Rockford Map Publishers 1967). On
the 1970 plat map, Robert Smith is listed as the property owner (Directory Service Company 1970).

**Description and Current Condition:** The Ehmiller Farm Ruins consist of minimal low wall fragments associated with a former sandstone residence and barn. This ruin has undergone severe deterioration since it was recorded in 1980. At that time, the residence was essentially whole, though one wall was showing signs of stress, and high wall fragments of the barn were present. The limited remaining fragments of this ruin include the northeast, southeast, and southwest corners of the residence, and west and north wall fragments of the barn. All have substantial loss of mortar, although some plaster facing remains on the interior of the east window opening and the west wall fragment.

**Threats:** The Ehmiller Farm Ruins are severely threatened by a lack of stabilization and have already suffered substantial material loss.

**Interpretation:** These ruins are not currently being interpreted, although they are noted in the trail map brochure for the Louisville Swamp Unit of the Minnesota Valley National Wildlife Refuge, in which the ruins are located.
FIELD SURVEY RESULTS-- PROPERTIES NOT QUALIFYING AS MASONRY RUINS

Based on the definition of masonry ruins as a property type, provided in the draft MPDF (see p. 2-3 of this document), three of the properties surveyed were determined not to qualify as masonry ruins. Even so, a brief review of these previously identified properties is instructive for future assessments of potential ruin properties and is therefore included here.

PINE COUNTY: KETTLE RIVER SANDSTONE COMPANY QUARRY (PN-SSC-008)

Location: Sandstone, T42N, R20W, Section 10, NE-SW
Construction Date: circa 1897  Survey Date: June 24, 2013

The Kettle River Sandstone Company Quarry includes nineteenth-century buildings and what the National Register nomination for this property terms as “quarry site ruins,” including the quarry walls, “the walls of two stone crushers; a circular sandstone artesian well; rail beds identifying locations of tracks used to move the sandstone block around the quarry; several foundations of quarry buildings; the remains of the dam; and piles of sandstone blocks” (Koop 1990:7-1). While these elements are the remains of the quarry operations, they do not qualify as masonry ruins. Some, like the rail beds or the quarry walls, were not of masonry construction, and therefore it is immediately evident that they are not masonry ruins. A closer look, however, is necessary for the foundations, particularly of the crushers. It should first be noted that in the nomination description, “stone crushers” does not refer to crushers made of stone, but rather crushers used for stone. The individual foundation walls stand anywhere from approximately 12 to 15 feet in height and are clearly made of mortared sandstone; however, the historical photograph of the crusher at the quarry site clearly shows that it had a frame superstructure, as did all buildings and structures at the quarry. As such, it does not qualify as a masonry ruin. The remains of the dam are no longer extant.
ST. LOUIS COUNTY: COMPRESSOR BUILDING FOUNDATION RUINS AND SMOKESTACK (SL-BRE-009)

Location: Breitung Township, T62N, R15W, Section 27, SW-NE-NW
Construction Date: 1884    Survey Date: June 5, 2013

The Soudan Iron Mine Compressor Building Foundation Ruins and Smokestack were listed in the National Register in 2007 as a contributing property to the Stuntz Bay Boathouse Historic District. The property consists of machinery bases from the interior of a former compressor building, partial foundations of the building, and the smokestack associated with the building. While substantial, the machinery bases do not constitute either interior or exterior superstructural elements of the original building, all of which
are lost, nor do the remnant foundations, thus they do not constitute masonry ruins. The smokestack was ancillary to and not incorporated into the compressor building, thus it is not a ruin of the building. As a standalone structure, it is intact and therefore not a ruin.

**Scott County: Jordan Brewery (SC-JAC-002)**

*Location:* Jordan, T114N, R23W, Section 19, SE-SE  
*Construction Date:* circa 1861, addition circa 1900  
*Survey Date:* June 21, 2013
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![Jordan Brewery Ruins, 1979](image3)

*Minnesota Historical Society 02905-17A*
The Jordan Brewery Ruins were listed in the National Register in 1980, at which time they consisted of the high walls of the Jordan Brewery, which was gutted by fire in 1954. Since the time that the nomination was completed, however, the ruins were integrated into an apartment building, and previously open spaces in the ruins have been enclosed with new walls for living spaces and to create associated courtyards. The apartment complex constitutes an extant building; therefore, the Jordan Brewery no longer qualifies as a ruin.
MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

Minnesota’s nineteenth-century masonry ruins are both limited and threatened cultural resources; therefore, their management, particularly with regard to those that may be eligible for listing in the National Register, should be considered with some sense of urgency. The key components of this management are identification, preservation, and interpretation.

IDENTIFICATION

Before Minnesota’s masonry ruins can be preserved or interpreted, they must be identified. The identification of previously unrecorded masonry ruins, by necessity, will be an ongoing process as cultural resources surveys are conducted in new locations or as local informants bring information to the SHPO, county historical societies, or other institutions with an interest in historic preservation. It is noted that in at least two cases, when Two Pines spoke to a property owner regarding a known masonry ruin, they were directed to another, previously unidentified one.

Any number of masonry ruins, however, may have been previously recorded but cannot be identified due to a lack of standardization in recordation and existing databases and/or to an absence of information. The SHPO history/architecture database does not contain a code for ruins, and this study has confirmed that such properties, in the past, frequently were submitted by the surveyor without the word “ruins” in the name, and therefore they were not returned by a query of the database using that term. To find previously recorded masonry ruins that would not be returned by a database query therefore would require a review of all paper history/architecture inventory forms. With regard to ruins previously recorded only as archaeological sites, the 1,000 site forms held by the National Forest Service for sites coded as containing structural ruins should be reviewed to identify which, if any, are for nineteenth-century masonry ruins. Insufficient information to determine whether the ruins are of masonry construction and/or date to the nineteenth century was present in the SHPO files on 64 sites coded as containing structural ruins; therefore unless additional information surfaces or these sites are revisited, any of these that actually are masonry ruins will likely remain unidentified.

As outlined in the draft MPDF for Minnesota’s nineteenth-century masonry ruins, all such properties should be recorded as history/architecture properties. It is recommended that the existing SHPO history/architecture database be updated to include a field for coding ruins as such, and further, one for major construction material type (e.g., brick, stone) (which, incidentally, would be useful to future studies seeking information on a specific construction type). For known inventoried masonry ruins and for any inventoried masonry ruins identified in reviewing the paper forms, entries should have these fields appropriately coded and the word “ruins” should be entered into the property name for good measure. For consistency and to facilitate searches, any ruins previously recorded only as archaeological sites should be assigned history-architecture inventory numbers and be entered into the database as such. Going forward, all masonry ruins should be recorded with the word “ruins” in the property name, and the elements present and the construction material should be noted on the inventory form, with the latter entered into the appropriate field in the SHPO database.
**Preservation**

For the vast majority of masonry ruins surveyed during the current study, a lack of stabilization measures is the primary threat to survival. By and large, masonry ruins were found to be in remote or semi-remote areas where they are free from targeting by vandals or the risks posed by urban development. They were also, however, largely found to be suffering from substantial loss or deterioration of mortar accompanied by cracked stone, collapse/loss of stone or brick, or similar forms of failure in the masonry construction.

The physical upkeep, however, of masonry ruins is challenged by the fact that the majority are privately owned. In one case from the current survey, the property owner was demolishing the ruins on his property due to safety concerns. While many property owners are content to have the ruins present and do not want to demolish them, they also do not expend any time or money in proactively preserving them. Other property owners have an interest in preservation but not the technical know-how or the financial resources needed to take on stabilization.

Even in the case of publicly owned ruins, such as those which occur on Minnesota Department of Natural Resources or U.S. Fish and Wildlife land, preservation measures may not always be in place. Online photographs, for example, show that at the Jab Farmstead Ruins (SC-LOU-006) within the Louisville Swamp Unit of the Minnesota Valley National Wildlife Refuge, at least two of the ruins have been provided with a roof, and some repointing has possibly occurred. Within the same unit, however, the Ehmiller Farm Ruins (SC-LOU-007) have been allowed to severely deteriorate so that they do not remotely approximate their condition when they were recorded in 1980.

Given the relative rarity of this resource type, and the speed with which some masonry ruins have degraded in just the last three decades, it would be worth consideration by the MHS to try to obtain some of the more intact and historically significant masonry ruins to be designated as Historic Sites. If this is not feasible, it is recommended that the MHS or the SHPO work cooperatively with individual county historical societies, who might then in turn coordinate with property owners to develop procedures for monitoring and maintaining historically significant masonry ruins. These procedures will require identification of the specific threats to any given ruins and responses tailored to their specific situation.

Challenges to the preservation of masonry ruins and basic guidelines for their treatment are presented in a generalized fashion below. Preservation of historic structures should always be performed in accordance with the Secretary of Interior’s Standards (http://www.nps.gov/tps/standards.htm). Detailed information on the cleaning, coating, and repointing of historic masonry buildings, as well as the removal of graffiti, are provided in *Preservation Briefs* Nos. 1, 2, and 38 (http://www.nps.gov/tps/how-to-preserve/briefs.htm). Other methods for the non-destructive evaluation of masonry construction and the preservation and treatment of specific types of masonry materials, such as serpentine stone and limestone, are addressed in a *Preservation Tech Notes* series devoted to masonry (http://www.nps.gov/tps/how-to-preserve/tech-notes.htm).
COMMON PRESERVATION CHALLENGES AND TREATMENT GUIDELINES
Contributed by Robert C. Mack, FAIA

Several challenges to the preservation of masonry ruins are common to Minnesota. These consist of freeze-thaw damage, rising damp/capillary ground water, settling/soil subsidence, erosion, intrusion of biological growth, impact damage, and graffiti and other forms of vandalism. The proper means for addressing these challenges will depend on the specific conditions of each ruin and its surroundings, i.e., the problems present and their causes, the location of the ruins, and the resources available for their treatment. In all cases, the first concern must, of course, be public safety. If hazardous conditions exist they must be addressed promptly, even if the treatment is a simple as placing a fence around the ruins to exclude “visitors.” While there might be a tendency to simply remove failing material, it is better to wait and to develop an appropriate plan, if feasible. In the interim, deteriorated areas should be stabilized to prevent further damage: New supports, such as new bricks or stone, should be installed below foundation areas that are unstable. Shoring, such as treated lumber, should be installed below failed areas such as cracked lintels.

Freeze-Thaw Damage and Rising Damp/Capillary Ground Water
Freeze-thaw damage is the most common cause of masonry deterioration and was the most commonly encountered problem during the survey for this study. Although the water can enter the units in either liquid or vapor form, it is through the liquid form that the damage can occur. Water expands as it freezes and forms crystals, and this expansion can be of sufficient force to cause crushing of the units, spalling of the face of the units, or disintegration of the mortar. Freeze-thaw damage can occur on a larger level, as well as the individual masonry unit level, as water in a crack can expand, widening the crack and shifting the units out of place. Cracking and shifting, in turn, can lead to failed arches, leaning walls, and similar problems. Minnesota is subject to frequent freeze-thaw cycles even in the coldest weather, as the sun can warm the masonry to an above-freezing temperature even while the surrounding air is below freezing.

Rising damp can penetrate masonry construction from the ground up, with moisture being drawn into absorbent materials, existing flaws, and crevices in the construction, which can contribute to freeze-thaw damage. In addition, however, as this action occurs, soluble salts may be transported into the material where the crystals then can expand upon evaporation of the moisture, creating the same type of effect.

Treatments
General principles for preventing the entry of water into masonry ruins are as follows:

1) Start at the top; the top surfaces of the ruins present a horizontal surface that is far more prone to water absorption than a vertical surface:

   • Place a water-resistant tarp or other cover over the tops of the walls. Make certain that it is anchored against the wind.
• Install a mortar wash on the top surfaces. Provide an adequate slope for drainage.

• Place flashing with a drip edge on the top and then place compatible new masonry on top to provide an appropriate appearance while holding the flashing in place.

2) Repoint the walls:

• Remove loose mortar in a gentle manner. Since the concern is the replacement of deteriorated mortar, most of it probably can be removed with simple hand tools.

• Replace missing mortar with soft mortar such as ASTM Type O. The mortar should intentionally be quite weak, especially for deteriorated masonry.

• Be certain to fill deep voids, not just the surface of the joints.

• See “Preservation Brief #2: Repointing Mortar Joints in Historic Masonry Buildings” from the National Park Service for further information on repointing.

3) Remove incompatible materials:

• Remove any high strength mortar that has been used in repointing and replace it with soft mortar. High strength mortar can actually hasten deterioration since it hinders natural thermal movement and can prevent the exiting of any water that enters the wall.

• Remove any concrete wash, which can also hold water in the wall, leading to deterioration. Plaster can remain in place, as this material is soft and allows the ready movement of water.

Water-repellent coatings should not be installed. While they sound like an appropriate measure, they frequently accelerate damage. See “Preservation Brief #1: Assessing Cleaning and Water-Repellent Treatments for Historic Masonry Buildings” from the National Park Service for further information on water repellents.

Settling/Soil Subsidence and Erosion

Settling can be caused by inadequate foundations or by subsidence, such as development of a sink hole. It usually occurs relatively early in the life of the building. Erosion can be the result of the flow of water or of “sandblasting” by windborne particles. The most common erosion, however, is the result of abrasive cleaning.

Treatments

The general principles for countering settling, soil subsidence, and erosion are as follows:

1) Keep out water, following the guidelines presented above.

2) Avoid the use of abrasive cleaners.
Intrusion of Biological Growth

Biological growth, such as trees, shrubs, and vines, is detrimental to masonry. Overhanging branches can break, causing damage, and shading ruins from the drying action of the sun, while roots can lead to heaving and displacement of the walls.

Treatments

The general principle for reducing damage to ruins caused by such growth is to remove all biological growth with the potential for causing such damage from the vicinity of the ruins. Trees, in particular, should not be allowed close to ruins.

Impact Damage

Impact damage can result from falling trees, vehicular impact, and similar forces, but it rarely occurs.

Treatments

Regular inspection of the conditions surrounding masonry ruins may assist in reducing the potential for impact damage; for example, a tree that appears unstable may be removed before it can fall. Generally, however, impact damage will be unpredictable and therefore unavoidable.

Graffiti/Vandalism

Graffiti can be in the form of paint and markers, or in the form of inscriptions in the surface of the masonry unit. Another form of vandalism is the removal of stone for other purposes.

Treatments

The most effective treatment in the prevention of vandalism is to monitor the activity in the vicinity of ruins as closely as possible. Anti-graffiti coatings should not be installed and would be ineffective on the rough surfaces of masonry ruins.

Paint and markers can be cleaned with chemicals, though if the surface is rough or absorbent, the removal may be incomplete. Further, the use of inappropriate chemicals may result in permanent damage to the masonry. Inscribed graffiti and removed stone cannot be repaired. See “Preservation Brief #38: Removing Graffiti from Historic Masonry” from the National Park Service for further information on graffiti removal methods and materials.

INTERPRETATION

One means by which to assist in the preservation of masonry ruins is by increasing public awareness of and interest in these properties and the reasons for their historical significance through public interpretation. Based on the survey sample, the majority of the masonry ruins in Minnesota are neither known to, nor interpreted for, the general public. Members of Two Pines staff, for example, were asked by an individual during the survey what the Oxford Mill Ruins are, and she lived just down the road. Due largely to the fact that most of the ruins are private property, their locations are not well publicized,
and many cannot be accessed by the general public. Interpretation, consisting of signage, was observed at four masonry ruins surveyed during the current study: the Cordes House Ruins, the Rochester State Hospital Quarry Dynamite Shack Ruins, the Strunk-Nyssen Brewery Complex Ruins, and the Schroeder Lime Kiln Ruins. The former is on public land, while the latter two are on private land but visible from the Minnesota Valley Trail, the signage being located on Minnesota Department of Natural Resources property. Although the signage explains, to varying extents, the functional aspects of the former properties, no real attention is given to historic contextualization.

The Mill City Museum, housed in the stabilized ruins of the Washburn A Mill in Minneapolis, is easily the most in-depth and elaborate interpretive effort for masonry ruins in Minnesota. The scope, however, of this effort was possible due to its size and prominent location, not to mention its national historical significance, conditions which do not apply to the majority of Minnesota’s masonry ruins. Interpretation other than signage, therefore, must be based on the particular historical and current conditions surrounding a given ruins property.

Universally, signage constitutes the most straightforward and inexpensive means of interpreting masonry ruins for the public. At a minimum, signage for individual masonry ruins properties should identify the former building(s) or structure(s) with which the ruins are associated; provide information that situates and emphasizes their importance within their historic context at the local, regional, or national level; and depict in some fashion the manner in which the visible ruins correspond to the building(s) or structure(s) that were present historically. As with preservation efforts, because most masonry ruins are located on private property, coordination with property owners would need to occur prior to any interpretive efforts, particularly for ruins that are not visible from public standpoints. For those that are visible from public standpoints, interpretive signage could be placed at those standpoints with the notation that the ruins are on private property and may not be approached.

In addition to the interpretation of individual properties, interpretation of specific property types could occur on a regional scale. In the southeast quadrant of Minnesota, the potential exists for a tour of stone stagecoach stop ruins, in an area that is known as the Minnesota Triangle (Larsen 1930). At least three such ruins were identified as extant during the course of this study (two others have been razed), and given the extensiveness of the stagecoach trail network in the Minnesota Triangle (Larsen 1930:391), it is likely that others are present and as yet undiscovered. Similarly, southeastern Minnesota holds several visually impressive stone flour mill ruins, including those of the Ramsey Mill (Dakota County), the Oxford Mill (Goodhue County), the Archibald Mill (Rice County), and the Gribben Mill (Fillmore County). Thematic signage could be placed at the individual properties, and interpretive brochures containing an overview of the importance of flour milling locally and statewide, along with maps to direct people to the individual ruins could be provided at visitor centers in the area or at relevant county historical societies.
The need to implement conservation measures for Minnesota’s historically significant nineteenth-century masonry ruins is pressing. Given the rate at which masonry ruins have deteriorated or been lost to either the elements or intentional demolition in just the last thirty years, continued inaction is likely to result in the accelerated loss of nearly all examples of this resource type, and at the very least their integrity to convey historical identity and significance. Consultation between the MHS, SHPO, OSA, county historical societies, private landowners, federal and state land managers, and other potentially interested parties, or other initial steps toward the implementation of conservation measures for masonry ruins should be taken at the earliest opportunity possible. In this way, the state may be able to safeguard this finite and threatened cultural resource type.
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APPENDIX A: UTM COORDINATES OF SURVEYED PROPERTIES
(EXTANT RUINS)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Property Number</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holleran/Halloran Stagecoach Stop Ruins</td>
<td>FL-CHC-068</td>
<td>567479</td>
<td>4855210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gribben Mill Ruins</td>
<td>FL-HLT-002</td>
<td>587439</td>
<td>4839816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone house ruins</td>
<td>FL-PRT-005</td>
<td>579284</td>
<td>4831338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCallum/Wilson/Stevens/House Ruins</td>
<td>FL-PRT-008</td>
<td>579556</td>
<td>4830707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carey Lime Kiln Ruins</td>
<td>FL-SVT-004</td>
<td>549184</td>
<td>4842785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordes House Ruins</td>
<td>GD-FEA-020</td>
<td>534041</td>
<td>4927323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Mill Dam Ruins</td>
<td>GD-FLC-014</td>
<td>548267</td>
<td>4927413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Mill Ruins</td>
<td>GD-STN-010</td>
<td>505454</td>
<td>4924551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popple Stagecoach Stop Ruins</td>
<td>OL-HFT-006</td>
<td>536188</td>
<td>4864388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester State Hospital Quarry Dynamite Shack Ruins</td>
<td>OL-ROC-382</td>
<td>545371</td>
<td>4875276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandstone Water Bottling Company/Sandstone Spring Water Company Ruins</td>
<td>PN-SSC-015</td>
<td>509733</td>
<td>5107434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strunk-Nyssen Brewery Ruins</td>
<td>SC-JAC-002</td>
<td>455960</td>
<td>4959746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehmiller Ruins</td>
<td>SC-LOU-007</td>
<td>452751</td>
<td>4953507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schroeder Lime Kiln Ruins</td>
<td>SC-SPC-050</td>
<td>459129</td>
<td>4961005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: SUPPLEMENTAL PHOTOGRAPHS
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Looking northwest, granary detail showing addition
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Looking northeast, granary interior detail
Ehmiller Farm Ruins (SC-LOU-007)
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Ehmiller Farm Ruins (SC-LOU-007)
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Schroeder Lime Kiln Ruins (SC-SPC-050)

Looking south, detail
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Schroeder Lime Kiln Ruins (SC-SPC-050)
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STATEMENT OF HISTORIC CONTEXTS

MASONRY CONSTRUCTION IN MINNESOTA, 1820-1900

Stone is as old as the hills. Masonry is the material which mankind instinctively thinks of when he considers historical works of art in architecture. Psychologically, masonry in a building conveys a sense of permanence, of its having been ‘alive’ when our forebears were living and of its survival, through the vicissitudes of generations to come.

That these impressions, spoken by architect S. Robert Anshen (1957:129) at a national conference on modern masonry in 1956, are well founded is reflected in recurring references to the endurance of masonry construction in various discourses pertaining to the topic, both historical and current. An 1868 U.S. Government report, for example, laments, “One feature unfavorable to the permanence and safety of the [Union Pacific line] is, the almost entire want of stone masonry in bridges and culverts” (Williams 1869:22), while a modern contractor extols the “image of a masonry building [as] one of excellence and permanence,” noting that “no other material leaves as lasting an impression of strength, quality and substance as that conveyed by brick, block and stone” (VanWell Masonry Inc. 2013).

It is, therefore, not surprising that in the 1820s, masonry was selected as the primary means of construction for Fort Snelling, the first permanent United States presence within the future state of Minnesota. A stronghold meant to impart to observers a sense of both strength and durability, Fort Snelling incorporated a diamond-shaped stone enclosure punctuated at each of its four corners with a stone tower. Within this enclosure were located buildings primarily of the same stone, a limestone that conveniently could be quarried from the bluff upon which the fort was constructed (Torbert 1958; Minnesota Historical Society 2013a).

Locally available stone was also chosen by prominent fur traders Henry Hastings Sibley and John Baptiste Faribault as the material for their houses near Fort Snelling (Friends of the Sibley Historic Site 2000-2010a). Both residences were of ashlar masonry, Sibley’s a basic but solid building of limestone obtained from a nearby quarry, and Faribault’s a somewhat larger and slightly more elaborate affair of sandstone “quarried near the site or taken from nearby Pike Island” (Torbert 1958; Friends of the Sibley Historic Site 2000-2010b). These houses, along with others built in the 1830s, heralded permanent EuroAmerican occupation in Minnesota, which occurred over the next decade slowly but steadily, concentrated initially in the vicinity of the future Twin Cities and the St. Croix River valley, and then spreading rapidly within the southern half of the state, in response to land cession treaties between the United States and the Dakota and Ojibwe in 1837, 1847, and 1851.

By the time Minnesota became a state in 1858, its institutional identity was manifested by masonry buildings in its three primary population centers: the University of Minnesota in St. Anthony/Minneapolis, the territorial prison in Stillwater, and the Capitol in St. Paul. Though it sat unoccupied on the University grounds for ten years after its 1857 construction, the University’s Old
Main building was a three-story, neoclassical stone symbol of the regents’ “dream of grandeur” (Gray 1958:27) for the future of higher learning in the state. The prison, which received its first inmates in 1853, was constructed of stone following a vote for the material by the Minnesota Board of Commissioners of Public Buildings (Dunn 1960:138). Locally quarried limestone formed a three-story prison house, a workshop, an office, and the 12-foot wall demarcating the grounds of the original prison. Stone was later used in the construction of additional buildings within the prison complex. The two-story Territorial/State Capitol was a relative rarity in Minnesota masonry buildings at the time it was completed in 1853, because it was built of brick. As of the early 1850s, the technological advancements that would allow for mechanized mass production of bricks had not come fully to fruition, production of brick on a large scale was not yet prevalent in Minnesota, and the railroad, by which mass-produced bricks were largely transported, had not reached the territory; thus stone continued to dominate as the material for masonry construction in Minnesota through the territorial period and into its early statehood.

In a nascent state largely unfamiliar to its newest residents and thus fraught with unpredictability, masonry construction instilled a sense of civic stability in grand hotels such as the four-story, limestone Winslow House in St. Anthony (1857); it represented the solidity of religious beliefs in churches such as the limestone Church of St. Peter in Mendota (1853); it illustrated the presence of the new government in American Indian agency buildings such as the brick Winnebago Agency in St. Clair (1855); it fostered feelings of security and separation from less-understood segments of the growing population through facilities such as the expansive, Kasota-stone State Hospital in St. Peter (1867); and it signaled the ability to achieve financial success through homes such as the imposing, grey limestone house built in St. Paul for James Burbank (1863).

Masonry construction, however, was not limited to statement architecture, nor were the reasons for its use entirely symbolic or psychological. For many of the buildings mentioned above, the expressed motives for using masonry construction were practical, such as the cost-efficiency and availability of local stone, or the ability of masonry construction relative to wood to withstand various natural and cultural forces (see, e.g., Minnesota Hospital for Insane - Board of Trustees and Officers 1868; Minnesota Historical Society 2013b). Due to this ability, particularly with reference to fire resistance, masonry construction “had replaced wood as the favored building material for commercial, industrial, and institutional buildings” (Millett 1992:41) in the Twin Cities by the 1860s.

Practicality certainly played a primary role in the choice of masonry for industrial buildings and structures in Minnesota’s early history; for example, one of Minnesota’s earliest industries, the production of quicklime through the reduction of limestone, required the construction of kilns using stone lined with brick to withstand the fire and intensive heat generated during the conversion process, as is exemplified by the lime kiln at Grey Cloud Island (ca. 1846). Another of Minnesota’s earliest industries, and eventually its most important, flour and grist milling, turned to stone to ensure structural soundness in the high buildings needed to house the technological components and processes of grain milling, and to protect grain stores (Torbert 1958; Condit 1982:64). By the time Minnesota reached statehood, stone, multi-story mill buildings dotted waterways within central, east-
central, and particularly southeastern Minnesota, such as the two-and-a-half-story Brown and Thompson mill in Riceford, Houston County; the four-story Pickwick Mill in Pickwick, Winona County; and the four-story Ramsey Mill in Hastings, Dakota County (Neill 1882:471; Rogers 1905:38; Pickwick Mill Association 2012). Other early Minnesota industrial concerns making use of stone construction included breweries, such as the Aiple Brewery, in Stillwater (ca. 1850); foundries, such as the one built by A. R. Morell in Hastings (1859); and, on occasion, lumber mills, such as the Hersey and Bean planing mill, also in Stillwater (ca. 1854).

The practicality of stone, of course, extended to the selection of the material for modest domestic buildings during Minnesota’s early years, in regions where stone was locally available and therefore inexpensive and easy to transport. In Scott County, for example, stone houses were somewhat common in locations within the Minnesota River Valley, but relatively rare elsewhere (Gombach Group 1997-2013). Similarly, stone houses appear to have been more common in the Driftless Area of southeastern Minnesota than in other areas of the state. These comparisons suggest that personal preference was tempered by accessibility. Where accessibility to resources, however, was more or less equal, the use of stone reflected personal tastes. In many cases, the preference for stone architecture was tied to ethnic background, whereby immigrant populations transferred familiar building techniques and styles from their homelands. England, France, the Netherlands, and Germany, for example, all have strong traditions of construction in stone (McAlester and McAlester 1993:38; Tishler 1986:142).

Although stone was a frequently preferred and more accessible material for masonry construction during Minnesota’s formative years, this is not to say that brick construction was absent. The Winnebago Agency in St. Clair and the first Territorial/State Capitol, as noted above, were constructed of brick, as was Minnesota’s first lighthouse at Minnesota Point. At the time the latter was built, from 1856 to 1858, brick construction was fairly standard for lighthouses; those for the lighthouse at Minnesota Point in Duluth were brought by ship from Cleveland, Ohio (Lighthousefriends.com 2001-2013). Imported brick, in this case from Milwaukee, also was used for the house of fur trader Hypolite Dupuis, built in 1854 (Friends of the Sibley Historic Site 2000-2010c). As these cases illustrate, early brick construction in Minnesota frequently required a funding source or above-average means to cover the cost of procuring bricks. Alternately, the combination of proximity to a clay source and either knowledge of brick production or the presence of a local brick manufacturer could render brick construction affordable and accessible. Missionary Gideon Pond, for example, built his house (1856) in Bloomington using bricks manufactured from clay extracted from the Minnesota River bottom below the bluff upon which the house was located (City of Bloomington 2013). As with stone, brick was a matter of personal preference when cost and material accessibility allowed.

The accessibility and popularity of brick would rise tremendously in the decades following the acceptance of Minnesota as a state, thanks to the overlapping of two ongoing developments: mechanization and other technological advances in brick production, which began in the decades prior to statehood, and the construction of railroads, which began in the decade after (Davis 1895:19-20; McKee 1973:44; Plumridge and Meulenkamp 1993:46). As brick manufacturing became easier and
faster and the method for transporting mass-produced brick became more efficient, the cost-effectiveness of brick increased. This increase, combined with the needs of the state’s quickly growing population, resulted in an increase in brick masonry construction during the latter part of the nineteenth century. With new technologies and transportation at their disposal, and bolstered by rising demand, Minnesotans began manufacturing brick in earnest, and regional production centers arose or expanded in places like Chaska, Red Wing, St. Cloud, and Springfield. Although stone remained a popular and common choice for masonry construction in buildings of all functional types, whether industrial, institutional, commercial, or residential, brick construction thus became more prevalent throughout the state. Minneapolis, for example, which historically had typically seen stone used in its industrial construction, witnessed brick buildings such as the Crown Roller Mill (1878-1880) and the Standard Mill (1879) come to occupy the milling district beside their stone counterparts. The city of Wabasha witnessed a spike in the construction of high-style Italianate brick homes after the railroad arrived in 1871, facilitating the transportation not just of materials but also of eastern-U.S. ideas about architectural style (Larson 1987). Lanesboro’s commercial district continues to exhibit several brick commercial buildings that were constructed alongside stone and frame construction in the decade or so after the Southern Minnesota Railroad reached it in 1868.

While the expansion of railroads into new locations resulted in the greater dispersal of brick construction throughout the state, one of its other nineteenth-century masonry construction byproducts was the sprinkling of the landscape with stone arch bridges. Having the necessary financial backing and being the transportation for the construction material, railroads were responsible for the majority of the stone arch bridges constructed in Minnesota (Gardner 2008:27), with the pièce de résistance being the Stone Arch Bridge constructed by James J. Hill’s Minneapolis Union Railway Company in 1883. Although stone arch bridges of the railroad variety were the most common during the nineteenth century, other bridges constructed entirely of stone were built outside of the railroads’ purview, including the Point Douglas-St. Louis River Road Bridge, a stone arch bridge constructed in 1863 along the military road near Stillwater; the stone-arch Lyndale Avenue Bridge over Minnehaha Creek completed in 1892 (razed); and several, more discreet structures in urban, rural, and park settings. As with most stone construction, the latter tended to be located in areas where the raw material was locally obtainable (Gardner 2008:36-37).

Stone bridges were but one infrastructural use of masonry construction by railroad companies in nineteenth-century Minnesota. Depots, engine houses, freighthouses, pumphouses, and other railroad facilities were built of brick or stone. At the federal, state, and civic levels, a variety of masonry infrastructural property types were constructed during the latter part of the nineteenth century, including the stone arch dam on the Root River in Lanesboro (1868), the limestone water tower in Kasson (1895), the brick municipal power plant in Springfield (1894), and the brick light station in Two Harbors (1891). Masonry construction was additionally used in the infrastructure of various industrial concerns. Stone dams and other infrastructural elements of mill complexes were built to withstand the relentless force of moving water. For any number of industries, ancillary buildings that benefited from fire resistance, such as boiler houses, engine houses, and foundries, were often constructed of brick or stone.
Despite the overwhelming use of stone and brick in all types of masonry construction in Minnesota during the nineteenth century, the search for alternative and innovative building materials, whether for masonry or another type of construction, had been underway in the United States for some time by the turn of the century. The use of cast iron, for example, began to progress in the country during the mid nineteenth century, as did structural steel and reinforced concrete in the decades to follow (Condit 1982:79-86, 123-130). In 1900, the first patent was issued for a concrete-block-making machine, invented by Harmon Palmer, which allowed for the block to be more easily produced, initializing the success of a viable and soon-to-be popular alternative to brick and stone in masonry construction (Simpson 1999:11). All material innovations were not immediately, uniformly, or pervasively adopted in Minnesota, and brick and stone masonry construction remained common in the state into the twentieth century. The year 1900, however, is useful as a transitional marker because it signals, in Minnesota, the increased adoption of other types of construction which resulted in the diminished use of brick and stone masonry.

The statewide historic contexts presented in summary fashion below were developed for the Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office (MnSHPO) in 1993 (Dobbs 1993; MnSHPO 1993). As developed by the MnSHPO, these include “Initial United States Presence, 1803-1837,” “Indian Communities and Reservations, 1837-1934,” “St. Croix Triangle Lumbering, 1830s-1900s,” “Early Agriculture and River Settlement, 1840-1870,” “Railroads and Agricultural Development, 1870-1940,” “Urban Centers, 1870-1940,” and “Minnesota’s Iron Ore Industry, 1880s-1945.” With regard to masonry ruins, the date ranges associated with these contexts have been modified slightly. Most notably, while the existing context for the “Initial United States Presence” begins in 1803, because the earliest masonry construction in the state occurred with the erection of Fort Snelling, the beginning date for this context is revised to 1820. Evaluation of a masonry ruin, should consider the relevant regional history when determining which of the following contexts provides an appropriate framework for determining its historical significance.

**INITIAL UNITED STATES PRESENCE IN MINNESOTA, 1820-1837**

“Initial United States Presence in Minnesota, 1820-1837” begins with the construction of Fort Snelling at the confluence of the Minnesota and Mississippi Rivers in 1820, a benchmark in United States expansionism which constituted the first permanent United States Government occupation in the future state of Minnesota. The fort was established primarily to safeguard United States interests in the fur trade, which were focused in the Great Lakes region after the depletion of desired animal species elsewhere. The relative abundance of furs to be had, of course, meant that private fur traders were also putting down roots in the area. Competition between the Government and the private sector for the patronage of American Indian fur trappers, combined with increasing contact between Dakota and Ojibwe groups and between American Indians and members of various other ethnic groups as they all participated in the fur trade made for a period of complex interactions and conflict, which fort personnel, including Indian Agent Lawrence Taliaferro, attempted to mediate. Despite the functioning, albeit occasionally violent, co-existence of all of these groups early in the fort’s history, overhunting and a loss of demand resulted in the collapse of the fur trade. As the Government and powerful private traders looked to other natural resources Minnesota had to offer, a series of treaties...
were initiated beginning in 1837 that would both codify U.S. ownership of lands and eventually remove American Indians from those lands to reservations. Although the treaties marked the onset of legal settlement for non-Native peoples, some individuals, including missionaries and their families, government farmers, traders, and the like were permitted to take up residence in the future state prior to their enactment. This period, then, witnessed the beginning of alterations to the landscape through the depletion of wildlife; clearing of land for Fort Snelling, new residences in the vicinity of the fort, and early farming; and associated changes to the built environment.

**INDIAN COMMUNITIES AND RESERVATIONS, 1837-1934**

“Indian Communities and Reservations 1837-1934” begins with the cession of lands by the Dakota and Ojibwe through two treaties that put the United States in possession of lands between the Mississippi and St. Croix rivers from approximately Hastings north to a line running roughly due east from the confluence of the Mississippi and Crow rivers. From this point forward during the nineteenth-century, American Indian lifeways underwent extensive changes as the United States successively appropriated lands, disrupted traditional practices, and along with various religious interests, intensified its efforts to acculturate American Indians. Agencies were established to administer the terms of the treaties and federal policies and to “oversee” Indian populations, thereby embodying their newly found loss of independence, and to teach and promote European-based agricultural practices. White missionaries took it upon themselves to try to Christianize, with varying success, American Indians, while the United States Government eventually banned traditional religious practices, with the same intent. The Government also established Indian boarding schools, with the purpose of separating children both spatially and through “educational” measures from their Indian identities. The tensions engendered by the severe imbalance of power were widespread in both American Indian and EuroAmerican communities during the nineteenth century, but most strongly were manifested in the U.S.-Dakota War of 1862. With this war perceived by the United States as an added justification, practices to remove the cultures of American Indians were carried on well into the twentieth century, continuing patterns of accumulating cultural change.

**ST. CROIX TRIANGLE LUMBERING, 1830s-1900s**

“St. Croix Triangle Lumbering, 1830s-1900s” is focused on the period after the treaties of 1837 were ratified, giving the United States an area rife with white pine forests advantageously situated in proximity to the Mississippi, St. Croix, and Rum rivers, which could be used to transport logs to and provide power for the lumber mills that were built along them. Once the door was opened to new settlement in this area, people of European descent flooded in from overseas and the eastern United States in pursuit of fortunes to be made not only through lumberjacking and milling, but also in support of these industries. In August of 1839, the first commercial lumber mill in Minnesota was completed in the future city of Marine-on-St. Croix, and less than five years after that, the first lumber mill was operating in Stillwater. As these and other mills were built, towns and their attendant industries, commercial outfits, and public and private institutions developed around them, constituting the future state’s earliest EuroAmerican settlements and its economic core. Stillwater, the largest of these towns, was the uncontested center of Minnesota lumber milling for the next approximately two decades. Although this honor shifted to Minneapolis by 1870, the St. Croix Triangle’s lumber industry
was by no means diminished and in fact saw substantial growth, along with its other economic bases and its population, following the entrée of railroads in the early 1870s. Railroads gave birth to a multitude of lumber-related manufacturing enterprises because they provided efficient transportation of finished goods from the St. Croix Triangle to their final destination, whereby previously, sawn lumber had to be “raft[ed] downriver to other markets for processing” (Landscape Research 2011:13). The result was that the St. Croix Triangle reached its economic peak with regard to the lumber industry during the last decade of the nineteenth century, after which it began a downward trajectory due to the depletion of white pine.

**EARLY AGRICULTURE AND RIVER SETTLEMENT IN MINNESOTA, 1840-1870**

“Early Agriculture and River Settlement in Minnesota, 1840-1870” concerns the period prior to intensive railroad construction in the state, when rivers constituted the major transportation conduits, and agriculture found its beginnings as an economic base for Minnesota. Early in this period, farming was limited to the area that had been opened by the 1837 treaties, occurring largely in the cutover. With additional land cession treaties, however, agriculture-based settlements by immigrants in the newly opened lands skyrocketed in the central, south, and southeast parts of the state during the 1850s, concentrating near rivers. In rural areas, family farms were built and operated, as were supporting institutions, such as churches and schools, with members of a given ethnic group often spatially concentrating to form communities. The farms provided grain for local milling interests, which began to multiply rapidly along rivers and tributaries, and other raw products for shipment to non-local markets. Rural residents, making their start in relatively undeveloped areas, created a market for building materials and finished goods. The need for some of these materials and goods, such as quicklime, gave rise to local industries, but many others needed to be shipped in. Locations with natural river landings, therefore, became commercial hubs for the exchange of unprocessed materials and finished goods, providing a foundation for the population centers, and the accompanying institutions and industrial concerns, which grew up around them. These river-based population centers were among Minnesota’s most densely occupied areas until the railroad allowed for the efficient transportation of people, materials, and goods to and from more inland areas of the state.

**RAILROADS AND AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT IN MINNESOTA, 1862-1940**

“Railroads and Agricultural Development in Minnesota, 1862-1940” is concerned with the advent and interaction of railroads with communities outside of urban centers whose economic survival, directly or indirectly, was tied to agriculture; those associated with the advent and interaction of railroads with regard to Minnesota’s other major industries, lumber milling and iron mining, are covered under other contexts. When railroads multiplied in tendril-like fashion across Minnesota over the mid to late nineteenth century, they opened up to new settlements all but the north-central-most region of the state, which railroads reached after 1900. In most of these regions, agriculture was the economic foundation. In opening up the state, railroads created local patterns of settlement and economic symbiosis as occurred between rural and more developed areas under “Early Agriculture and River Settlement, 1840-1870,” but also parallel patterns on a much larger scale. Wheat from bonanza farms in the Red River Valley, for example, supplied the immense flour milling operations in Minneapolis and provided a market for their flour and the finished goods of other Minneapolis-based industries.
Minnesota, similarly, became a supplier of agricultural goods and products, and served as a market for, other states and countries. Considering the state as a whole, this context frames the most widespread and intensive development of Minnesota during the nineteenth century. Entire regions witnessed new population influxes and settlements, which created residences, institutions, businesses, industrial operations, infrastructural elements, and other accompanying elements of the built environment, as railroads made transportation to and from a multitude of locations efficient.

**MINNESOTA’S URBAN CENTERS, 1860-1940**

“Minnesota’s Urban Centers, 1860-1940,” as its title implies, centers on the history of Minnesota’s primary combined population and industrial centers. In 1860, the state’s capital city of St. Paul reached a population of 10,000, and two years later, the state’s first railroad connected it to St. Anthony, another quickly growing community established near the St. Anthony Falls. This community was ultimately subsumed into Minneapolis in 1872, after that city’s population had surpassed 13,000 residents. By 1900, St. Paul and Minneapolis were urban centers in every sense, with a combined population of over 365,000. Minneapolis was the capital of flour milling in the United States, while St. Paul, situated at the head of navigation for steamboats on the Mississippi River and a major terminal for multiple railroads, was an immense transportation and distribution center. Transportation and distribution also played primary roles in the development of the port cities of Duluth and Winona, and of other secondary urban centers that fulfilled regional needs within the state: Mankato in the south, Moorhead in the northwest, Rochester in the southeast, and St. Cloud in the center. Though they did not all operate at the same scale, Minnesota’s nineteenth-century urban centers were cores of settlement for large populations with diverse social and economic backgrounds, who lived and interacted in a multitude of residential, industrial, and institutional settings, creating significant impacts to the physical and cultural landscape of the state.

**MINNESOTA’S IRON ORE INDUSTRY, 1880s-1945**

“Minnesota’s Iron Ore Industry, 1880s-1945” frames the period of iron mining and associated development in northern Minnesota. The beginning of this period coincides with the construction of railroads into the iron range, because these were necessary to carry the amount of ore generated from commercial mining. When the first Duluth and Iron Range Railroad line was built into the Vermilion Range in 1884, connecting the Soudan Mine to a port that would eventually become Two Harbors, iron mining in Minnesota had begun. A connection to Duluth was established within two years, followed by a multitude of branch lines to serve the continual opening of new mines. In 1890, iron ore was discovered on the Mesabi Range, prompting the construction of the first trackage of the Duluth Missabe and Northern Railway Company from the Mountain Iron Mine in 1892. Iron mining effected unprecedented change in the landscape of northern Minnesota, not only through the removal of material, but also through the built environment. Although the lumber industry had previously encouraged new settlers to Minnesota’s iron range, it was not until the mining industry took hold that substantial settlements were established. These settlements included the relatively ephemeral mining locations, typically employing frame construction, which were residential enclaves situated near mines on company-owned land, and more permanent town sites. European immigrants populated the majority of these settlements, having come to northern Minnesota to gain work in the mines. Mining
activity itself also affected the built environment, as necessary support building, structures, and equipment were erected in the vicinity of mines. At the end of the nineteenth century, mining’s place in the state’s industrial history was solidified as Minnesota overtook Michigan to become the leading producer of iron ore in the United States.
ASSOCIATED PROPERTY TYPES

MINNESOTA’S NINETEENTH-CENTURY MASONRY RUINS

As its name indicates, this property type is limited to masonry ruins located in Minnesota that were constructed prior to 1900, though the historical building or structure with which they were associated may have been used beyond that year. A masonry ruin is defined as a former building or structure that no longer possesses original design or structural integrity (NPS 2002:4) and meets the following conditions:

1) It can no longer serve its original or similar function due to the loss of a major structural element, such as a roof, exterior wall, or floor, and it has not been restored, reconstructed, or integrated into more recent construction so as to replace the lost element and/or recapture functionality;

2) The superstructure was of brick and/or stone masonry construction, and not of wood, concrete block, cast stone, structural tile, or cinder block, nor was only a minor element (e.g., a façade) made using brick or stone masonry; and

3) A portion of the superstructure is intact and present above the existing ground surface, and this portion provides sufficient visual evidence that it can be identified as a recognizable part of the historical building or structure through comparison with historical photographs or other visual media, or if such media cannot be located for a specific ruin, the portion could realistically still be identified were such media to surface in the future; foundations alone, even if above ground level, do not constitute ruins. In the case of bridges, piers and abutments are considered to be the foundations for the superstructure; therefore masonry piers and abutments do not constitute ruins.

Ruins of historic buildings and structures are classified under National Register guidelines as “sites,” which the National Park Service (NPS) (2002:5) defines as “the location of a significant event, a prehistoric or historic occupation or activity, or a building or structure, whether standing, ruined, or vanished, where the location itself possesses historic, cultural, or archeological value regardless of the value of any existing structure” [emphasis added]; therefore, Minnesota’s nineteenth-century masonry ruins will, under NPS guidelines, be registered as sites.

Although the NPS definition of sites includes archaeological sites, it is neither limited to nor synonymous with archaeological sites, as it also includes historical or cultural sites that may not have associated material culture. Given that such an association may be absent from masonry ruins sites, masonry ruins should be assigned history/architecture inventory numbers. While any identified archaeological site might include ruins as a feature within the site, in the same way that the eligibility of a complete building or structure would be evaluated as a history/architecture property whether it overlies or is spatially within an archaeological site, so too ruins of these buildings or structures must be evaluated separate from any present archaeological site.
**Common Elements of Masonry Ruins**

The common elements of masonry ruins in Minnesota are defined with regard to two overarching categories: building ruins and structural ruins. As defined by the NPS (2002:4), buildings are functional constructions “created principally to shelter any form of human activity,” such as a house, mill building, or fort, while structures are “those functional constructions usually for purposes other than creating human shelter,” such as bridges, dams, or kilns. Elements of masonry ruins can occur singularly or in various combinations at any given ruins site.

**Building Ruin Elements**

The common elements of building ruins are high walls, high wall fragments, low walls, and low wall fragments. Appurtenances such as chimneys may be attached to these and should be noted in recording ruins, but are not considered ruins in and of themselves.

**High Walls and High Wall Fragments**

A high wall is defined as any exterior or interior wall that is one story (eight feet) or greater in height and reflects its original, full horizontal extent with continuity. Continuity need only occur in a portion of the wall; if the lower courses of the wall are continuous, but spaces exist between vertical portions of the wall in the upper courses, for example, where lintels have failed and the stone or brick above them is therefore absent, the element would still be considered a wall (Figure 1). In their current state, for example, the ruins of the main Oxford Mill building consist entirely of high walls.

A high wall fragment is defined as any portion of an exterior or interior wall that is one story or greater in height, but which does not reflect its original, full horizontal extent with continuity. Even if the original, full horizontal extent of the wall is visible, if the parts of that wall are fully vertically separated in one or more places, these constitute a series of high wall fragments, and not high walls (see Figure 1). In their current state, for example, the ruins of the Ramsey Mill building consist entirely of high wall fragments.

In those cases where walls or wall fragments are variable in height, if the maximum height extends to eight or more feet, the element should be considered as a high wall (fragment) and not a low wall (fragment).

**Low Walls and Low Wall Fragments**

A low wall is defined as any exterior or interior wall with a maximum height of less than one story (eight feet) and that reflects its original, full horizontal extent with continuity. As with high walls, continuity need only occur in a portion of the wall (see Figure 1). In their current state, for example, the ruins of the Joseph R. Brown house include low walls along with a high wall.

A low wall fragment is defined as any portion of an exterior or interior wall with a maximum height of less than one story, but which does not reflect its original, full horizontal extent with continuity. Even if the original, full horizontal extent of the wall is visible, if the parts of that wall are fully vertically...
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Figure 1. Examples of walls and wall fragments

separated in one or more places, these constitute a series of low wall fragments, and not low walls (see Figure 1). In their current state, for example, the ruins of the Ehmiller farmstead (SC-LOU-007) consist entirely of low wall fragments.

Structural Ruin Elements
Common structural ruin elements are dictated by the type of structure with which they are associated. Elements of a lime kiln ruin, for example, would typically include exterior kiln walls, fireplace arches, interior lining walls, or fragments of any of these. When they all occur together, as at the Carey Lime Kiln Ruins (FL-SVT-004) in their current state, where only the top portion of the kiln is missing, the element present would be the lower portion of the lime kiln. At a mill ruin, beyond the building, elements such as sluice-way walls are likely to be present. A water tower (the tower consisting of the portion that supports the tank) ruin would only occur as either a tower fragment or the lower portion of the tower. In many cases, however, where an element is termed as a wall, it must incorporate continuity as described for building ruin walls above; otherwise, it should be termed a wall fragment.

Significance
This Multiple Property Documentation Form (MPDF) is intended for the evaluation of masonry ruins associated with buildings or structures that were constructed during the nineteenth century. The specific conditions for the significance of masonry ruins under each of the National Register criteria are
presented within the registration requirements, below. Although the achievement of significance typically began at or near the time of construction, based on continued significant use of the former building or structure, the period of significance may extend into the twentieth century.

Two notable exceptions to the significance of masonry ruins being tied to the construction and use of the former building or structure, and therefore to the discussion of significance presented below are the Ramsey Mill (DK-HTC-101, 21DK0061) and the Joseph R. Brown House Ruins (RN-SHT-002, 21RN0015). Although significant in association with its construction and operation as a flour mill, the Ramsey Mill is also significant under Criterion A as a ruin in the area of entertainment/recreation. After the mill was destroyed by fire in 1894, it became a high-profile tourist attraction touted for its picturesque setting, and “rapidly became the subject of commercial postcards, souvenir publications, and newspaper accounts,” (Henning 1997:8-8-9) leading to a successful local campaign to preserve the ruin within a park in 1925. Other ruins may be locally significant under Criterion A in cases where it is determined that the preservation of a ruin is the result of a targeted campaign or movement that occurred more than 50 years ago and not happenstance. In such cases, while the associated Area of Significance might be Entertainment/Recreation, depending on the reasons for the campaign, it is more likely to be conservation.

The Joseph R. Brown House Ruins are significant for a number of reasons pertaining to the construction and use of the house, but also for their association with “events which precipitated and marked the beginning of the Dakota War of 1862” (Granger 1985). Other ruins may be significant at the local, state, or national level under Criterion A in cases where it is determined that the ruins are a direct result of and strongly represent a historically significant event, under the area(s) of significance associated with the event.

Because brick masonry and stone masonry have been used in Minnesota buildings and structures since 1820, the historic associations for masonry ruins that are significant in association with the construction and use of the former buildings and structures that they represent are many and varied; so, therefore, are the potential applicable Areas of Significance. The significance of masonry ruins may be linked to any of the historic contexts presented in Section E, and may occur at either the local, state, or national level, as outlined in the registration requirements.

The period of the context “Initial United States Presence in Minnesota, 1820-1837” marks the onset of the transition from primarily American Indian settlements to primarily EuroAmerican settlements throughout the future state of Minnesota. During this era, masonry construction was used in buildings and structures associated with military installations, missions, American Indian agencies, and United States-based fur trading; in houses and hotels built by the first EuroAmericans; and in industrial buildings and structures in support of these occupations, such as the stone government flour mill at Fort Snelling. The most likely Areas of Significance for masonry ruins associated with this context, therefore, are Ethnic Heritage (e.g., houses), Exploration/Settlement (e.g., houses, industrial structures, missions), Industry (e.g., industrial buildings/structures), and Military (e.g., military installations). No masonry ruins associated with this context have been identified to date.
“Indian Communities and Reservations, 1837-1934” finds overlap with the context of the initial United States presence in Minnesota because it addresses the history of American Indian communities in the wake of EuroAmerican intrusion. Masonry construction associated with this context was generally within the purview of the EuroAmerican government, in buildings and structures tied to American Indian agencies, missions, and boarding schools. The most likely Areas of Significance for masonry ruins associated with this context, therefore, are Education (e.g., boarding schools), Ethnic Heritage (e.g., residences), Military (e.g., military installations), Politics/Government (e.g., agency buildings), and Religion (churches). Ethnic Heritage and Politics/Government are likely to be widely applicable to ruins with this contextual association. Previously listed or eligible masonry ruins associated with this context are:

- Powder Magazine Ruins (listed as contributing property to Old Fort Ripley site [21MO0127])
- Joseph R. Brown House Ruins (RN-SHT-002, 21RN0015; listed)

“St Croix Triangle Lumbering, 1830s-1900s” is limited to the east-central area of Minnesota, where lumbering dominated the economy from the late 1830s through the early twentieth century. During this period, masonry construction was used in the St. Croix Triangle in residences; institutional and commercial buildings that affirmed the permanency of new settlements and provided for the educational, social, spiritual, physical, and consumer needs of the booming population associated with the success of the lumber industry; lumber mills and associated buildings and structures; industrial buildings or structures used in the manufacture of items not related to lumbering but necessary to the survival and comfort of residents; and possibly in elements of the newly established communities' infrastructure. In association with this context, the most likely Areas of Significance for masonry ruins are Education (e.g., schoolhouses), Ethnic Heritage (e.g., houses, industrial buildings/structures, churches), Health/Medicine (e.g., hospitals), Industry (lumbering-related and other industrial buildings/structures), Politics/Government (e.g., town halls), Religion (churches), Social History (e.g., fraternal halls), and Transportation (e.g., railroad facilities, railroad bridges). The only previously listed or eligible masonry ruin associated with this context is:

- Hersey and Bean Planing Mill Ruins (21WA0092; eligible as contributing to the Stillwater South Main Street Archaeological District)

“Early Agriculture and River Settlement in Minnesota, 1840-1870” frames the early history of population centers that were initiated and flourished due to an advantageous situation along a river, hinterland agricultural operations, and agriculture-related industries, all of which used rivers for major transportation needs, prior to the arrival of railroads into their regions. In the built environment of this era, masonry construction was used in farmhouses and associated outbuildings; institutional and commercial buildings that affirmed the permanency of new settlements and accommodated the educational, social, spiritual, physical, and consumer needs of their residents; flour mills, grist mills, and other industrial facilities that processed and/or used agricultural products; industrial buildings or structures used in the manufacture of items not related to agriculture but necessary to the survival and
comfort of residents; and possibly in elements of the newly established communities’ infrastructure. In association with this context, the most likely Areas of Significance for masonry ruins are Agriculture (e.g., farmstead buildings/structures, agriculture-related industrial buildings/structures), Education (e.g., schoolhouses), Ethnic Heritage (e.g., houses, farmstead buildings/structures, industrial buildings/structures, churches), Industry (industrial buildings/structures), Politics/Government (e.g., town halls), and Religion (churches). Previously listed or eligible masonry ruins associated with this context are:

- Ramsey Mill Ruins (DK-HTC-101, 21DK0061; listed)
- Wasiogja Seminary Ruins (DO-WAS-004; listed as contributing to the Wasiogja Historic District)
- Mantorville Brewery Ruins (DO-MTC-024; listed as contributing to the Mantorville Historic District)
- LeRoy Mill spillway ruins (eligible as part of LeRoy Mill Site [21MW0034])
- Strunk-Nyssen Brewery ruins (SC-JAC-002; eligible)

“Railroads and Agricultural Development in Minnesota, 1862-1940” encompasses the first decades of Minnesota’s railroad age, which occurred in the midst of the American Industrial Revolution and witnessed unprecedented population growth in the state. Affecting and affected by this growth and technological development were agriculture and related industries, which became the primary economic basis of the state and are therefore given particular attention under this context. Masonry construction was widespread from 1870 to 1900, extending to nearly all functional categories of the built environment. In association with this context, the most likely Areas of Significance for masonry ruins are Agriculture (e.g., farmstead buildings/structures, agriculture-related industrial buildings/structures), Community Planning and Development (e.g., city dams, water towers), Education (e.g., schoolhouses), Ethnic Heritage (e.g., houses, farmstead buildings/structures, industrial buildings/structures, churches), Health/Medicine (e.g., asylums, hospitals), Industry (industrial buildings/structures), Politics/Government (e.g., town halls), Religion (churches), Social History (e.g., asylums, fraternal halls), and Transportation (e.g., railroad facilities, railroad bridges). Previously listed or eligible masonry ruins associated with this context are:

- Oxford Mill Ruins (GD-STN-010, 21GD0172; listed)
- Archibald Mill Ruins (RC-DNC-009; listed)

Covering the same period as the previous context, “Urban Centers in Minnesota, 1860-1940” is focused specifically on the development of the primary urban centers of Minneapolis and St. Paul, and the secondary urban centers of Duluth, Mankato, Moorhead, Rochester, St. Cloud, and Winona. By and large, therefore, the Areas of Significance for masonry ruins are the same as those for “Railroads and Agricultural Development in Minnesota, 1862-1940.” The only previously listed or eligible masonry ruin associated with this context is:

- Washburn A Mill Ruins (HE-MPC-178; listed as contributing to the St. Anthony Falls Historic District)
The context “Minnesota’s Iron Ore Industry, 1880s-1945” is geographically limited to Minnesota’s iron ranges and locations that directly supported the iron mining industry, such as Duluth, which served as the major shipping point. With regard to the iron ranges, nineteenth-century masonry ruins would occur only in association with the Vermilion and Mesabi ranges, as the development of the mining industry on the Cuyuna Range post-dates 1900. Within this contextual framework, masonry construction was used in buildings and structures at mining facilities, but also in the full complement of built-environment functional categories in the cities and towns that developed hand in hand with the mining industry, and in the buildings and facilities of the railroads that served it. The most likely Areas of Significance for masonry ruins under this context are Community Planning and Development (e.g., water works), Education (e.g., schoolhouses), Ethnic Heritage (e.g., houses), Health/Medicine (e.g., hospitals), Industry (e.g., mining-related buildings and structures, other industrial buildings/structures), Politics/Government (e.g., town halls), Religion (e.g., churches), Social History (e.g., fraternal halls), and Transportation (e.g. railroad facilities). No masonry ruins associated with this context have been identified to date.

**Integrity**

In the paragraphs that follow, the seven aspects of integrity as defined by the NPS are discussed as they pertain to all of Minnesota’s nineteenth-century masonry ruins. Additional integrity requirements specific to sub-type are presented in their respective sections.

**Materials**

The materials of masonry ruins consist of brick or stone structural elements, usually bound by mortar, of a former building or structure’s superstructure. In the case of masonry ruins, the materials define the property type. To qualify, therefore, for listing in the National Register, a masonry ruin must retain excellent integrity of materials, as evidenced by the retention of a portion of the laid stone and/or brick which constituted the superstructure during its period of significance.

**Location**

The locations of masonry ruins are the places where the former buildings or structures were constructed. For masonry ruins that are historically significant under Criterion A, location is intrinsic to the historical importance of construction or the activities that followed as part of a broader pattern, or to the occurrence of an important event. For masonry ruins that are significant under Criterion B, location is a key component of the circumstances or conditions under which historically significant individuals lived or participated in the acts/activities that made them important. A masonry ruin must therefore retain excellent integrity of location to qualify for listing in the National Register under Criterion A or B. If a masonry ruin is significant under Criterion C or D, integrity of location is not necessary except in those cases where its significance is tied to its situation within a particular landscape or environmental setting.
Setting
Evaluation of the integrity of setting for a masonry ruin should consider the parcel upon which it is located and properties within its immediate viewshed. Because masonry ruins, by definition, have had some portion of their historical fabric removed, setting takes on added importance in the ability of ruins to convey their historical significance under Criterion A or B. To retain integrity of setting, land uses within the parcel and the immediate viewshed must generally reflect those present during the period of significance. If, for example, historical land usage was primarily undeveloped, current land usage must be largely natural or at least rural. If the surrounding built environment was tied to a specific industry, such as mining, during the period of significance, either period elements of that environment, whether or not they are currently used for the historically present industry, or more recent industrial elements, preferably associated with the historical industry, must be present. Additionally, if a natural feature was essential to the functioning of the former building or structure, that feature or vestiges of that feature must be present. If a mill, for example, was located on a creek that provided it with power, and that creek has since been undergrounded or re-routed, and vestiges of the original channel are no longer visible, the ruin would have reduced integrity of setting. A masonry ruin must retain good to excellent integrity of setting to qualify for listing in the National Register under Criterion A or B. If a masonry ruin is significant under Criterion C or D, integrity of setting is not necessary except in those cases where its significance is tied to its situation within a particular landscape or environmental setting.

Association
Association is the direct link between an important historical event, activity, or person and a historic property. As with setting, this aspect of integrity is of heightened importance in the ability of masonry ruins to convey their historical significance under Criterion A or B. The National Park Service (2002:45) states that a property “retains association if it is the place where the event or activity occurred and it is sufficiently intact to convey that relationship to an observer.” With regard to the first condition, retention of integrity of association is dependent on integrity of location. Assessing the second condition is more subjective but will be directly related to the type of former building or structure represented by the masonry ruins and the reasons for its historical significance. If the former building was a four-story flour mill, built at that height to accommodate new technologies during the rise of Minnesota’s flour-milling industry, a one-foot-high low wall is not likely to convey the relationship of the property to the historic activity. Similarly, an isolated high wall of one of the first houses built in a burgeoning settlement from which house size or plan cannot be visually extrapolated cannot convey the manner in which the early settlers lived in that house. A masonry ruin must retain good to excellent integrity of association to qualify for listing in the National Register under Criterion A or B. If a masonry ruin is significant under Criterion C or D, integrity of association is not necessary except in those cases where its significance is tied to its situation within a particular landscape or environmental setting.

Feeling
Feeling is the ability of a masonry ruin to evoke the historical sense of its period of significance. In some respects, ruins benefit from their incompleteness with regard to feeling because they readily call
forth the past by their instant evining of the progress of time; yet evocation of the past is not necessarily evocation of the period of significance. Achievement of the latter is largely dependent on the appearance and situation of the ruin and the character of its surroundings, and therefore directly relies on integrity of materials, location, setting, and association. A ruin that qualifies for listing in the National Register under Criterion A or B must have integrity in all four of these aspects, thus it will automatically have integrity of feeling. If a masonry ruin is significant under Criterion C or D, integrity of feeling is not necessary except in those cases where its significance is tied to its situation within a particular landscape or environmental setting.

Workmanship
With regard to masonry ruins, workmanship is the evidence of the technological practices and aesthetic principles of historical-period stone or brick masonry construction. Masonry ruins that are eligible under Criterion C or that are eligible under Criterion D for their ability to provide information on historical construction, including both its technological and aesthetic aspects, must have excellent integrity of workmanship. Integrity of workmanship need not be considered in evaluating the eligibility of masonry ruins under Criterion A or B, or in evaluating the eligibility under Criterion D of masonry ruins whose significance lies in their ability to provide important information on activities not related to construction.

Design
The design of masonry ruins consists of the physical and spatial elements of the former building or structure, in many cases in tandem with those of the surrounding natural and built environments, which resulted from “conscious decisions made during the original conception and planning of a property” (NPS 2002:44). Masonry ruins that are eligible under Criterion C or D must have excellent integrity of design. Integrity of design need not be considered in evaluating the eligibility of masonry ruins under Criterion A or B.

Registration Requirements
Minnesota’s nineteenth-century masonry ruins are most likely to qualify for listing in the National Register under Criterion A or B in relation to the functions they served historically as buildings or structures, which can be extrapolated to five property subtypes presented below: industrial ruins, institutional ruins, infrastructural ruins, residential ruins, and commercial ruins.

Under Criterion C, Minnesota’s nineteenth-century masonry ruins may qualify for listing in the National Register if the extant construction meets one of the standard conditions for architectural significance, i.e., embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction; represent the work of a master; possess high artistic value; or constitute a district that represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction (NPS 2002:17). A masonry ruin, for example, that has sufficient remaining construction to embody the construction methods of stone stagecoach stop buildings in mid nineteenth-century rural southeastern Minnesota, would meet the first condition, while several of these identified over the region could meet the last.
In another example, assuming sufficient remaining construction, ruins that clearly demonstrate the design and workmanship employed by a master stonemason would meet the condition of representing the work of a master, either if the stonemason can be identified and is recognized as such, or if the stonemason cannot be identified but “the work rises above the level of workmanship of other similar or thematically-related properties” (NPS 2002:26).

Masonry ruins in Minnesota are least likely to possess high artistic value, which the NPS (2000:26) notes, “must fully express an aesthetic ideal of a particular concept of design,” not only in and of a property itself, but also in comparison with similar properties; therefore, although ruins may be picturesque within a landscape, unless they were intentionally incorporated into that landscape as part of a specific design, they would not meet the condition of high artistic value. The NPS cites the “well-preserved ruins of a building that was used as a hospital and still has intact walls covered with pictures and graffiti drawn by Civil War soldiers who stayed there” as an example of ruins that would meet this condition, presumably because the building was conceptualized as a hospital and the art has a direct relationship to its use as such.

Minnesota’s nineteenth-century masonry ruins may qualify for listing in the National Register under Criterion D if they meet two conditions. The first condition is that the extant construction retains features that can provide information either on activities that occurred historically within the building or structure, or on historical construction techniques or design specific to the individual building or structure, or the building or structure type, and the ruins are the only source for this information. The second condition is that the ruins qualify under at least one of the other three National Register significance criteria; if an association with historically significant patterns/events, persons, or design/construction is not present, then information on the activities or construction techniques associated with the ruins would not be important to history. The ruins of an 1860s Cannon River valley flour mill that was designed to operate using a technology unique to flour milling or to that time period or region (Criterion A), and with sufficient remaining construction for its elements to show how some or all of that operation occurred, constitutes one example of masonry ruins that may qualify for listing in the National Register under Criterion D.

**Sub-Type: Industrial Ruins**

The sub-type “industrial ruins” is defined as the ruins of buildings or structures whose primary historical function was associated with extractive, processing, and/or manufacturing operations. Included in this sub-type are the ruins of mills, kilns, breweries, factories, farmsteads, mining-related facilities, and any other buildings and structures, including infrastructural elements, associated with extractive, processing, or manufacturing operations.

Previously listed or eligible industrial masonry ruins in Minnesota are:

- Ramsey Mill Ruins (DK-HTC-101, 21DK0061; listed)
- Mantorville Brewery Ruins (DO-MTC-024; listed as contributing to the Mantorville Historic District)
Although the Jordan Brewery Ruins (SA-JRC-002) and the V-shaped Dam Wall Ruins (HE-MPC-296) were also identified, the former have since been completely integrated into an apartment building, and the latter have been integrated into existing lock and dam construction. Both are therefore no longer considered to be ruins.

**Criterion A**

Industrial ruins are eligible under Criterion A in the area of Agriculture or Industry if the operations that occurred at the former buildings or structures played an important role in an industry at the state or national level, or served as an important economic foundation for a community or region, either alone or in conjunction with other operations of the same type (e.g., brick manufactories in Chaska). Additionally, industrial ruins would be eligible in the area of Agriculture or Industry if an event important to the history of that industry occurred at the former building or structure.

Industrial ruins are eligible under Criterion A in the area of Ethnic Heritage at the local level if they represent a pattern of a specific industry being carried out by members of an ethnic group which defined or strongly contributed to the success of an ethnic settlement or established an important economic niche for ethnic group members as a subset of a larger community.

Industrial ruins are eligible under Criterion A in the area of Exploration/Settlement at the local level if the operations that occurred at the former building or structure were of outstanding importance to the establishment or survival of a new community.

**Criterion B**

Industrial ruins will only be eligible under Criterion B in the area of Agriculture or Industry. For industrial ruins to be eligible under Criterion B, historical operations at the associated building or structure must have been established and at least initially carried out by an individual of historical significance to an industry that is important at the local, state, or national level, and participation in the operations must have formed or solidified his or her significance in that industry. Further, another property must not exist that better represents his or her historical significance, either because it is more closely associated with his or her significant activities or because it is a more intact example.
Additional Integrity Requirements
To qualify for listing in the National Register, industrial ruins that are eligible under Criterion A or B must include the ruins of the primary functioning element of the property present historically. In some instances, as with a factory, the primary functioning element will have been the only functioning element. If, however, the property comprised a complex of masonry buildings and structures and the ruins of the primary building/structure are not present, the ancillary ruins cannot stand alone as eligible. By way of example, if a brewery operation incorporated the main brewery building, an ice house, and a warehouse, but only the ruins of the ice house and warehouse remain, the ruins do not qualify for listing in the National Register. Likewise, if the ruins of either the house or barn are not present on a farmstead, the ruins of the remaining outbuildings and structures do not qualify for listing in the National Register.

If an industrial operation historically comprised a complex of masonry buildings and structures that worked relatively equally in the operation, then the complex as a whole is considered to be the primary functioning element, and hence the ruins of a majority of the historical buildings and structures must be present. For a granite quarrying operation, for example, that incorporated a building for cutting, one for polishing, one for carving monuments, a crusher plant, and a blacksmith shop to retain integrity, the ruins of at least three of the buildings (or a combination of ruins and extant buildings) would need to be present.

Sub-Type: Infrastructural Ruins
The sub-type “infrastructural ruins” is defined as the ruins of buildings or structures that historically functioned as facilities or components of the fundamental systems of civic, county, state, or federal entities, including transportation, communication, power and water supply, waste management, and military. Although privately owned, stagecoach- and railroad-related ruins would also be included in this category, as these historically constituted fundamental transportation systems for civic, county, state, and federal entities. This sub-type excludes the ruins of built infrastructural elements of industrial operations, which are evaluated under the sub-type “industrial ruins.” An exception to this exclusion is an infrastructural element that served both a public entity and an industry, for example, a dam that provided electrical power to a town but was also used to power mills should be evaluated under both sub-types.

Previously listed or eligible infrastructural masonry ruins in Minnesota are:

- Minnesota Point Lighthouse Ruin (SL-DUL-2377; listed)
- Powder magazine ruins (listed as contributing to Old Fort Ripley Site [21MO0127]).

Criterion A
Infrastructural ruins will be eligible under Criterion A in the area of Community Planning and Development at the local level if the former building or structure was integral to the establishment of a fundamental system within a community, such as a water tower within a community’s first water works, or a city dam that made it possible for residents to have electrical power.
Infrastructural ruins will be eligible under Criterion A in the area of Exploration/Settlement at the local level if the purpose served by the former building or structure was of outstanding importance to the establishment or survival of a new community, or at the local or state level if the purpose served was of outstanding importance to opening a region for new settlements.

Infrastructural ruins will be eligible under Criterion A in the area of Military at the state or national level if the former building or structure was constructed under the purview of or used by the U.S. military and given one of the following conditions are met:

- An important event in U.S. military history occurred in direct relationship to the former building(s) or structure(s)
- The ruins represent an installation that was constructed or occupied as part of a significant pattern of historical events at the state or national level

Infrastructural ruins will be eligible under Criterion A in the area of Transportation if the former building or structure meets at least one of the following conditions:

- It was a bridge that provided a connection of outstanding importance to commerce, industry, or passengers at the local, state, or national level; it is noted, however, that eligible masonry bridge ruins will be rare, as a bridge making a connection of outstanding importance will typically be extant or have been replaced in the same location
- It was a stagecoach stop building on a line that provided an important mode of transportation at the local or state level prior to the arrival of railroads
- It is associated with a railroad station that meets the Criterion A registration requirements for railroad station historic districts in the National Register MPDF “Railroads in Minnesota, 1862-1956,” i.e., it was a significant contributor to the economic growth of surrounding commercial or industrial operations; it served as a significant regional distribution center for commercial or industrial products; or it served as a significant regional transportation center for passengers (Schmidt et al. 2007:207)
- It is associated with a railroad yard that meets the Criterion A registration requirements for railroad yard historic districts in the National Register MPDF “Railroads in Minnesota, 1862-1956,” i.e., it provided freight car classification services on a historically significant railroad corridor or it provided facilities for the construction, maintenance, service, or storage of railroad motive power or rolling stock on a historically significant railroad corridor (Schmidt et al. 2007:214)

**Criterion B**
The only infrastructural ruins that would qualify for listing in the National Register under Criterion B are those occurring at military-related properties, which would be significant under the Military *Area of Significance* at the state or national level if both of the following conditions are met:

- A battle or other event occurred at the installation, during which an individual historically significant in U.S. military history gained their historical importance; and
The individual’s activities during the event occurred in direct relation to the former building(s) or structure(s) represented by the ruin(s)

The day-to-day presence of an individual at a military installation is not sufficient for eligibility under Criterion B, given that likely that all military installations have been home to at least one historically important individual, and the significance of such individuals is typically achieved through their actions in combat, thus battle sites would better represent their military significance.

Infrastructural ruins otherwise will not qualify for listing in the National Register under Criterion B. By definition, non-military infrastructural buildings and structures are constructed for use by the masses, and therefore do not have a meaningful association with a specific individual beyond the architect or builder. Significance with regard to an architect or builder would fall under Criterion C, and is not applicable to masonry ruins.

Additional Integrity Requirements
With regard to the ruins of railroad stations and railroad yards, ruins that qualify for listing in the National Register under Criterion A or B must retain the ruins of the primary functioning element. In the case of railroad stations, this element consists of the depot, and in the case of railroad yards, it consists of the engine house.

Sub-Type: Institutional Ruins
The sub-type “institutional ruins” is defined as the ruins of buildings and associated structures whose primary historical function was associated with the activities of “an organization, establishment, foundation, society, or the like, devoted to the promotion of a particular cause or program, especially one of a public, educational, or charitable character” (Random House 1996:988). It includes the ruins of such buildings as churches, schools, missions, prisons, hospitals and asylums, governmental buildings, and fraternal halls.

The only previously listed or eligible institutional masonry ruin in Minnesota is:

- Wasioja Seminary Ruin (DO-WAS-004; listed as contributing to the Wasioja Historic District)

Criterion A
Institutional ruins will be eligible under Criterion A in any of the Areas of Significance discussed within this section, if the former building or complex was the site of a historically important event relevant to that Area of Significance.

Institutional ruins will be eligible under Criterion A at the local, state, or national level in the area of Education, Health/Medicine, or various aspects of Social History if the former building or complex is directly associated with the development of an important movement or practice in the relevant field/aspect.
Institutional ruins will be eligible under Criterion A in the area of Ethnic Heritage if the former building or complex housed the activities of an institution important in the history of an ethnic community and was developed by that community for their use (local level), such as an ethnically associated fraternal hall that was the primary social center for the ethnic community; or if it was an institution important in the history of an ethnic group as part of a broader pattern of their institutional history (local, state, or national level), such as an Ojibwe boarding school.

Institutional ruins will be eligible under Criterion A in the area of Politics/Government at the local level if the former building served as the main political center, e.g., a town hall, for a community. No ruins exist for the first two state capitol buildings, and it is unlikely that the ruins of any other buildings of state-level political or governmental significance exist.

Institutional ruins will be eligible under Criterion A at the local, state, or national level in the area of Religion if the former building or complex is associated with an important pattern or event in the history of religion that is recognized from a secular scholarly perspective or with the importance of a particular religious group in the social, cultural, economic, or political history of an area. Such ruins must meet the requirements of National Register Criteria Consideration A (see below).

For all Areas of Significance presented above, the historical association must not be better represented by another property at the applicable level of significance, either due to a closer association with the movement/practice/activities/pattern or because it is intact.

**Criterion B**

Institutional ruins will be eligible under Criterion B in the areas of Education, Health/Medicine, Politics/Government, Religion, or Social History if an individual with historical significance in an associated discipline, field, or organization formed or solidified their historical importance through activities or events at the former building and if another property does not exist that better represents his or her historical significance, either because it is more closely associated with his or her significant activities or because it is a more intact example. The level of significance will correspond to the level at which the individual was significant. Per Criteria Consideration A (see below), if the Area of Significance is Religion, the individual’s significance in religious history must transcend religious recognition or extend to other historic contexts.

**Additional Integrity Requirements**

Similar to industrial ruins, institutional ruins that are eligible under Criterion A or B must include the ruins of the primary institutional building present historically. If the institution comprised a complex of masonry buildings and structures, and the ruins of the primary building are not present, the ancillary ruins cannot stand alone as eligible.

If an institution historically comprised a complex of masonry buildings and structures that worked fairly equally in the operation, then the complex as a whole is considered to be the primary functioning element, and hence the ruins of a majority of the historical buildings and structures must be present.
Sub-Type: Residential Ruins
The sub-type “residential ruins” is defined as the ruins of houses. It is noted that while the ruins of farmhouses are included under industrial ruins as parts of farmsteads, they may also be considered on their own merits as residences, particularly if no other evidence of the built environment of the farmstead remains. It is noted, however, that the ruins of farmhouses without any associated outbuildings or outbuilding ruins will not qualify for listing in the National Register in the area of agriculture under Criterion A because they would not be able to convey their significant association. While an individual responsible for important agricultural developments may have contemplated or designed these in the home, such an association with the Agriculture Area of Significance would come under Criterion B. Similarly, residences serving dual or multiple functions, such as mission houses, should be evaluated under all applicable sub-types.

The only previously listed or eligible residential ruin in Minnesota is:

- Joseph R. Brown House Ruins (RN-SHT-002, 21RN0015; listed).

**Criterion A**
Residential ruins will be eligible under Criterion A in the area of Ethnic Heritage at the local level if the former house is associated with a demonstrable community-specific pattern of ethnic settlement incorporating masonry construction.

Residential ruins will be eligible under Criterion A in the area of Exploration/Settlement at the state or local level if the former house is one of the first established in the development of a community or particular region of the state.

**Criterion B**
Residential ruins will be eligible under Criterion B in any number of potential Areas of Significance at either the local, state, or national level, given that an individual of demonstrated historical significance occupied the former house and provided the following conditions are met:

- The former house was occupied by the significant individual during the period in which (s)he achieved historic significance
- Another property does not exist that better represents his or her historical significance, either because it is more closely associated with his or her significant activities or because it is a more intact example

**Additional Integrity Requirements**
No additional integrity requirements apply to residential ruins.

Sub-Type: Commercial Ruins
The sub-type “commercial ruins” is defined as the ruins of buildings whose primary historical function was the furnishing of goods or services for profit. It includes the ruins of such buildings as stores, office buildings, commercial warehouses, service establishments, and entertainment venues. No commercial ruins have been identified in Minnesota to date.

**Criterion A**

Commercial ruins will be eligible at the local level under Criterion A in the area of Commerce if the enterprise housed in the former building initiated or anchored important commercial development within a community. Similarly, if the enterprise housed in a building initiated the commercial development within a community, the associated ruins will be eligible at the local level under Criterion A in the area of Exploration/Settlement.

Commercial ruins will be eligible under Criterion A at the local level in the area of Entertainment/Recreation if the venue with which the ruins are associated served as the primary entertainment/recreation facility for a community and fostered a sense of that community. If that community was defined by their ethnic heritage, then the area of Ethnic Heritage would also apply.

Although the individual eligibility of masonry ruins under Criterion A as outlined above is possible, masonry ruins fitting these conditions are likely to be rare. Commercial ruins will most likely be eligible under Criterion A as contributing properties to historic commercial districts.

**Criterion B**

Commercial ruins will only be eligible under Criterion B in the area of Commerce. For commercial ruins to be eligible under Criterion B, the historical enterprise at the associated building or structure must have been established and at least initially carried out by an individual historically significant in commerce at the local, state, or national level, and participation in the enterprise must have formed or solidified his or her significance in the world of commerce. Further, another property must not exist that better represents his or her historical significance, either because it is more closely associated with his or her significant activities or because it is a more intact example. The level of significance will correspond to the level at which the individual was significant.

**Additional Integrity Requirements**

No additional integrity requirements apply to commercial ruins.

**Criteria Considerations**

The National Register Criteria Considerations B-G will not apply to Minnesota’s nineteenth-century masonry ruins. Criterion Consideration A applies to a masonry ruin if the former building or structure was constructed by a religious institution, is owned now or was owned during the period of significance by a religious institution, is used now or was used during the period of significance for religious purposes, or if Religion is the Area of Significance (National Park Service 2002:26). In order to meet the requirements of Criteria Consideration A, a masonry ruin must be associated with a specific important event or pattern in the history of religion or under another historic context; illustrate the
importance of a particular religious group in the social, cultural, economic, or political history of an area; or be associated with a person whose significance in religious history transcends religious recognition or extends to other historic contexts.

**Periods of Significance**

The periods of significance for masonry ruins will vary, as the period of significance for any given masonry ruin will consist of the year(s) in which the historically significant activities, events, or associations occurred. It is noted that although this MPDF is intended for properties whose achievement of significance began during the nineteenth century, the end of the period of significance should extend past 1900 if the reason for a ruin’s historical significance continued beyond that year.
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SUMMARY OF IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION METHODS

IDENTIFICATION
Identification of Minnesota’s National Register-listed nineteenth-century masonry ruins occurred through queries of the National Register online database and the Minnesota Historical Society’s online search for National Register properties, as well as a review of *The National Register of Historic Places in Minnesota: A Guide* (Nord 2003). The identification of non-listed masonry ruins was conducted through queries of the Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office and the Office of the State Archaeologist databases; requests for information from county historical societies and the state’s professional cultural resource community; an online search for relevant properties; and personal communications during a representative survey of such ruins. In most cases, follow-up research consisting of reviews of state architectural history inventory forms and archaeology site forms, historical maps, online visual media, and secondary historical sources was necessary to confirm whether ruins were of masonry or constructed during the nineteenth century.

EVALUATION
National Register evaluations were not conducted during the creation of the MPDF. A field survey, however, of a representative sample of identified masonry ruins was conducted to document and assess the range of elements, characteristics, and current conditions of masonry ruins in Minnesota. Information obtained during this survey would contribute to National Register evaluations of the properties surveyed.

The evaluation process developed in this MPDF provides guidelines that address the significance of masonry ruins in two ways. The first is based on the construction and use of the former buildings and structures with which masonry ruins are associated, under which ruins are considered under four inclusive functional categories. Because brick masonry and stone masonry have been used in a wide variety of Minnesota buildings and structures since 1820, the historic associations for masonry ruins that are significant in this way are many and varied; so, therefore, are the potential applicable *Areas of Significance*, historic contexts and levels of significance. The second is based on ruins in their ruination state, under which they are considered significant either for their representation of the historically significant event that led to their existence or of preservation that occurred as the result of a targeted campaign or movement that occurred more than 50 years ago.
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