Part I:

Foundation for the Minnesota Statewide Historic Preservation Plan
Looking Toward the Future

The state of Minnesota's evolving demographics and economics have and will continue to impact historic preservation work and the state's historic and cultural resources.

The Minnesota State Demographic Center projects demographic changes to the state. These changes will take shape during the life of this Plan and inevitably affect preservation work throughout the state.

Based on the State Demographer’s latest estimates, the total population of Minnesota in 2020 was 5,709,754. As of 2019 Minnesota's five largest cities were Minneapolis, St. Paul, Bloomington, Rochester, and Duluth. Three of the top five are located in the Twin Cities metro area.

From now until 2070, Minnesota is expected to experience a slower rate of growth. To date, population losses due to out-migration were countered by the arrival of international residents, and Minnesota gained more people than it lost over the past two decades. However, these gains are showing signs of slowing, as fewer new immigrants are expected to arrive in Minnesota. Additionally, rural Minnesota is experiencing a decline in population as residents relocate to urban areas. This trend is projected to lead to declining population in more than two-thirds of Minnesota’s 87 counties. Six of the state’s 11 Economic Development Regions combined are projected to lose over 160,000 residents by 2053. In the 1960s–70s, declining population resulted in dramatic renewal efforts, such as the Urban Renewal movement, through which a substantial number of irreplaceable buildings and neighborhoods were lost. However, our communities learned from those losses and put into place measures that require a thoughtful process to help avoid future similar losses. Today, preservation tools such as Historic Tax Incentives and the Minnesota Main Street program are celebrated for their ability to positively address commercial vacancies, underutilized
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\(^7\) Minnesota State Demographic Center, "Data by Topic: Our Projections," [https://mn.gov/admin/demography/data-by-topic/population-data/our-projections/]. The 11 Economic Development Regions are: Northwest, Headwaters, Arrowhead, West Central, North Central, Southwest Central and Upper Minnesota Valley, East Central and Central, Southwest, South Central, Southeast, and Seven-County Twin Cities.
properties, population declines, economic distress, and other impacts of shifting populations.

Immigration has always been part of the story of Minnesota. In 1920, about 1 in 5 Minnesotans were foreign-born. By 2017, the ratio was about 1 in 12. The largest groups of foreign-born Minnesotans in 2017 (in descending order) were born in Mexico, Somalia, India, Laos (including Hmong), Vietnam, China, Ethiopia, and Thailand (including Hmong). Languages other than English were spoken in the homes of 11.7% of Minnesotans older than five years. The number of people of color (those who identify as a race other than White alone) and/or those who are Hispanic or Latinx in Minnesota has grown five times as much as non-Hispanic White residents. People of color more commonly live in metro areas; however, people of color live in every part of the state. As the state continues to experience demographic change, it is critical to not only reflect back, but to intentionally look forward and consider how to best celebrate the cultural heritage of today’s population.

Minnesota’s workforce is expected to experience both a changing face demographically and a slowing rate of growth. Two changes that will continue to occur simultaneously are that baby boomers will transition out of the workforce and the labor force will experience slowing growth. For the state of Minnesota only a 0.1% average annual growth is projected during the 2020–2025 period. As preservation tradespeople and professionals retire from the workforce, it is important that the pipeline into the field be expanded. Recruiting and training a more diverse staff will meet the needs of identifying and preserving the state’s historic and cultural resources.

Minnesota’s economy has also experienced change, transitioning from one based on material extraction and processing to one based on finished products and services. However, agriculture is still a major part of the economy even though less than 1% of the population is employed in the farming industry. State agribusiness has changed from production to processing and the manufacturing of food products. Forestry, another early industry, remains strong, with logging, pulpwood processing, forest products manufacturing, and paper production. An expanding biomedical industry is led by the world-famous Mayo Clinic, along with Medtronic, Boston Scientific, Abbott Laboratories, and many more corporations.

According to the Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development, the state’s top economic sectors include medical technology, manufacturing, data and information technology, environmental technologies, and food production. Minnesotans work across a variety of these sectors, with the largest employment area being the service industries, including business and health care services. As economic sectors and the technologies used by those sectors experience change, the natural and built environments that once supported those sectors are often vacated. Retaining a property’s historic use or finding a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and
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environment can become increasingly challenging. Landscapes and single-purpose structures that once supported Minnesota’s economy, such as grain elevators, mills, power plants, mines, agricultural fields, and barns, face specific challenges to maintaining continued use or accommodating new ones.

These demographic changes and economic realities will inevitably have an impact on the state’s current and emerging historic and cultural resources. Changes in demographics could influence an evolution in the preservation workforce, preservation project champions, and historic resource caretakers. New populations bring new approaches, broader stories, and a more diverse field of preservation practitioners in Minnesota. Additionally, the number and type of preservation and rehabilitation projects in urban and rural areas may experience fluctuations based on market forces and population needs. Preparation for these demographic changes is part of the ongoing work of this Plan. Engaging new professionals and advocates, making the case for economic and environmental sustainability, sharing the benefits of preservation in languages other than English, striving to identify historic resources that are important to non-English-speaking populations, amplifying presettlement populations and their perspectives, and identifying other activities are all essential approaches to meeting the state’s preservation needs. Ongoing analyses of the effects of demographic and economic forces upon preservation will ensure that all people can share in the enduring environmental, social, and economic benefits of Minnesota’s historic and cultural heritage.
Public, Partner, and Tribal Participation

The public's participation was key in helping to identify historic preservation issues for this Plan, and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) is grateful for the communities large and small, urban and rural throughout the state who shared their thoughts about the preservation challenges and opportunities facing Minnesota. The Plan relied on input gathered through a variety of engagement tools from the public, preservation professionals, owners of historic properties, the Minnesota State Historic Preservation Review Board, tribal nations, federal and state agencies, local governments, academics, and nonprofit partners to inform a historic preservation vision for the future of the state and to establish planning goals.

The overall planning timeline was three years, with two years dedicated to public engagement efforts led by the SHPO (see Figure 1, p. 5). Team members followed engagement principles of meeting people where they are and providing multiple methods of interaction. The SHPO contracted with the State of Minnesota’s Management Analysis and Development (MAD) consultants to facilitate and analyze the partner/stakeholder conversations and to coordinate and evaluate the online survey (see Appendices 3 and 4).

Engagement Goals and Approach

To encourage authentic conversations and generate meaningful input, the Planning Team created an engagement plan that set goals to guide and focus resources early in the process. Goal setting required thinking critically about engagement approaches that would better connect with varying professions, underserved groups, and underrepresented communities that have not traditionally been part of the conversation.
Engagement Goals

- Accessible Participation: Meet people where they are and use their preferred method of communication
- Inclusivity
- Transparency
- Authenticity
- Broad Participation
- More Diverse Conversations
- Informed Participation
- Analysis of Information

Approach

Keep the public informed, listen to and acknowledge their concerns and aspirations, and provide feedback on how public input influenced the draft and final Plan.

Identifying Issues, Opportunities, and Threats to Historic Resources

The SHPO held two work sessions facilitated by a member of MAD to brainstorm issues, opportunities, and threats to historic preservation in Minnesota. These sessions helped identify where additional research was needed and where public input was critical to fully understand the scope of preservation needs in Minnesota. These efforts led to developing engagement questions and identifying stakeholders. As part of identifying partners, each stakeholder’s level of engagement, interest in preservation, and impacts on historic preservation activities in Minnesota were analyzed.

Figure 6: National Register sites across the state of Minnesota used as a planning tool to determine geographic engagement focus areas
Highlights of the Engagement Efforts

- **Engagement Goal Setting**: The SHPO team set goals to help guide initial stages of engagement. The internal SHPO Planning Team carried out and led the engagement efforts.

- **SHPO Planning Work Session**: Conducted in the summer of 2019, this work identified partners and stakeholders and framed the scope of public engagement questions.

- **State Historic Preservation Review Board Interviews**: Each of the 14 State Review Board members were interviewed to gain a broader perspective on engagement needs, trends, and topics.

- **Online Public Survey**: An online survey was released in September 2019 and remained open until January 2020. There were 1,354 responses, of which 570 were partially completed surveys. Survey respondents indicated they were active in historic preservation in their community. The largest professional groups consisted of historians/architectural historians, government employees not related to education or elected office, preservation professionals, and those who work in a trade related to historic preservation (see Appendix 3).

- **Interactive Exhibitors at Public and Professional Events**: Team members participated in eight public and professional engagement events as exhibitors. During these events, staff had individual conversations with over 310 individuals. The COVID-19 pandemic halted plans to attend additional professional events as exhibitor participants.

- **Media Coverage**: Statewide television and public radio stations broadcast and Greater Minnesota newspapers published stories that encouraged the public to engage with the planning effort and provide feedback to the survey.
• **Guest Speaker Events:** Team members presented information about the Plan and encouraged engagement at several professional conferences, university lectures, community meetings, and other events. The COVID-19 pandemic halted plans to attend additional public engagements.

• **Meeting in a Box:** A "Meeting in a Box" was released for use by nonprofits, community organizations, Certified Local Governments (CLGs), and other government agencies during existing meetings or as an independent event to facilitate conversations and further inform the Plan. Eleven nonprofits, community organizations, and public government commissions hosted events.

• **Tribal Engagement:** The SHPO initiated engagement efforts with Minnesota’s 11 federally recognized tribal nations,11 federally recognized tribes outside of Minnesota with an interest in the state,12 and Minnesota Indian Affairs Council (MIAC). The SHPO presented at the MIAC’s December 2019 board meeting, initiated consultation with Minnesota’s tribal nations, and contacted tribal nations beyond state borders. The SHPO team met individually with Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPOs) and staff at Red Lake Nation, Upper Sioux Community, Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe, and White Earth Nation. By March 2020 the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic precluded any further in-person visits. Because managing the pandemic, which disproportionately impacted tribal communities, took precedence for the tribes the SHPO provided alternative options for giving feedback for the Plan.

• **Partner/Stakeholder Meetings:** Facilitated meetings were held with nearly 20 state and local preservation partner organizations and their subject matter experts, staff, and officials. The SHPO sought input from 17 partnering agencies and stakeholders in the preservation of Minnesota’s historic resources. The


interviews and workshops were facilitated by MAD.

- **Follow-up Survey:** Additional surveys were conducted during the pandemic and in response to local and national calls to address disparities in how people of color, including members of Black and Indigenous communities, are treated and valued.

- **Public Comment on the Draft Plan:** The Draft Plan based on public input was made available for review and comment in the summer of 2021.

**The Pandemic, Social Reckoning, and Insurgency**

After the start of the engagement efforts regarding the Plan, Minnesota, its communities, and the nation experienced several major events and turbulent times, including a pandemic, social reckoning, and insurgency against the authority of the United States. Given these circumstances, following up on earlier public and partner engagement was deemed essential. Listening, learning, and planning work will occur over the next 10 years, so the additional engagement consisted of two online and social media questions: "Looking back on the past year, how has your view of the role of historic preservation in Minnesota changed?" and "Looking ahead, how should diversity, equity, and inclusion be included in preservation?" While participation numbers for this survey were low, respondents' thoughtful and powerful comments illustrate that additional work is needed to realize the state's vision for preservation. Respondents focused comments on inequities and did not comment on the pandemic or the insurgency. Some of the public/partner comments stated that the May 2020 murder of George Floyd in Minneapolis was a clarion call to action, emphasizing that diversity, equity, and inclusion must be a greater focus in preservation.

**Future Collaboration**

Throughout the engagement process and plan development, the SHPO cultivated existing relationships and planted the seeds for new ones; however, team members did not have the opportunity to speak with all interested parties. Relationship building will continue through the life of this Plan, with a concerted effort to connect with more diverse groups and geographies prior to the five-year Plan update.

"I think diversity, equity, and inclusion should be what leads the field of preservation into the future. It needs to be at the forefront[,] and preservation needs to change to recognize that."

"If our profession lacks diversity, we will continue to fail whole groups of people by undervaluing their spaces and experiences simply because we are less exposed to those spaces and people. We must respond to this call to action."

—Public input from 2021 Plan Survey
While past statewide preservation plans recognized the importance of protecting cultural resources representing millennia of American Indian habitation in Minnesota, the current planning process was more deliberate in seeking out the perspective of tribal cultural resources staff through meaningful, in-person conversations about ongoing needs and opportunities. At the Minnesota Indian Affairs Council’s December 2019 board meeting, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer Amy Spong gave a summary of the Plan and anticipated listening sessions with tribes. As part of this outreach, the SHPO Environmental Review Program (ERP) Team planned to make visits to all 11 federally recognized tribes in the state. In February and early March 2020, the ERP Team met individually with Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPOs) and staff at Red Lake Nation, Upper Sioux Community, Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe, and White Earth Nation. Unfortunately, by mid-March the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic precluded any further in-person visits; managing the pandemic, which disproportionately impacted tribal communities, took precedence for the tribes. Alternative options for giving feedback for the Plan were provided and encouraged.

American Indian tribes are recognized by the US Constitution as sovereign nations, having existed before the founding of the United States. Their inherent right to exercise self-governance, including preserving cultural identities and managing tribal economies, places tribes on par with federal and state governments in their authority to exercise control within established boundaries. Although American Indians make up a little over 1% of Minnesota’s total population, membership in a Dakota or Ojibwe tribe distinguishes them from other underrepresented communities in the state.

Jaime Arsenault, White Earth THPO, explained during a visit: “Tribal sovereignty is tied to cultural resources.” The importance of tribal cultural properties is that they “keep people connected to their community. If you took all of that away, then the tribes wouldn’t be tribes.”

The Upper Sioux Community THPO staff identified the need to educate tribal members about the
significance of cultural landscapes, such as Barn Bluff in Red Wing, as paramount to reinforcing the community's identity. "If we're going to be Dakota, we need to connect to those sites," said Upper Sioux THPO Samantha Odegard. Landscapes can have an intangible meaning, she said, conveyed not just by artifacts found there but also in the stories, traditions, and spiritual experiences related to these places.

A theme the ERP Team heard many times during these visits is that preserving places tied to cultural heritage is not just about safeguarding history; it benefits the mental, spiritual, and physical health of individuals. Displacement and historical trauma experienced by Indigenous people has led to negative outcomes through generations. Reconnecting Native peoples with their traditions and cultural places is critical to restoring wholeness and wellness in their communities. Tribal cultural resource programs need adequate funding for facilities, staffing, and resource management to protect their cultural heritage and educate tribal members about the significance of cultural resources. This process is not a luxury; it is essential to begin healing the wounds that have been inflicted historically. There is a need to increase awareness of this important connection to place, especially for Indigenous people, so that there will be greater respect for and willingness to protect meaningful places in the state. "It should be the state's value to protect sites," asserted Drew Brockman, THPO of the Upper Sioux Community. "Not just for the next seven generations of Native youth, but for all of the state's people."

At Leech Lake, THPO Amy Burnette noted that "people just do better" with an intact sense of identity. Native people especially are tied closely to their traditional lands, cultural sites, and spiritual places. These connections not only are important to individual well-being but give an identity to the tribal community.

There is sometimes a fine line between a natural and a cultural resource—often they are one and the same. Tribes with current or ancestral interest in an area and those with treaty rights should take the lead in identifying significant cultural resources and traditional cultural landscapes. Project proposers need to consult with tribes early in the planning process in order to identify cultural resources that may be affected. Adverse effects can include direct disturbance of a resource as well as visual impacts to a landscape. Kade Ferris, Red Lake THPO, stressed that tribes need to be at the forefront of developing context studies and identifying American Indian cultural resources. And broader conversations need to occur about how—and with whom—to share sensitive data about properties of traditional, sacred, and cultural importance.

Looking toward the future, the action items in this Plan include strengthening tribes' capacity for managing and interpreting cultural resources as well as fostering the strong partnerships and meaningful communication that lead to better outcomes. The SHPO ERP Team was honored by the tribal staffs' candor and willingness to share their thoughts during in-person visits in preparing this Plan. It is hoped that these conversations will continue in the not-too-distant future.

Figure 9: **RIGHT** Wild Rice, Lower Rice Lake in Clearwater County
Participation Summary: Identifying Themes for Goal Setting

Throughout the engagement process, Minnesota residents shared insightful, thoughtful, and powerful ideas—including a desire to make the plan accessible and ensure that it continues to reflect the diverse populations and regions of Minnesota. Public engagement efforts began in 2019 during the annual Preserve Minnesota conference in St. Cloud and ended with an online survey in 2021. Plan outreach reinforced ongoing relationships and facilitated new connections with partners and the public.

During analysis of the comments received, several recurring topics or themes emerged. These themes were used to generate the Plan Goals and priorities for the next 10 years (see Part II: Guidance for the Management of Historic and Cultural Resources for the product of this public feedback). Public input highlighted an overarching value that, "Preservation is important to preserve cultural identity and heritage, to access historic resources, and to learn about Minnesota's history."

Emerging Themes

- Historic preservation is directly tied to economic vitality and sustainability.
- Stakeholders want more education and technical assistance, money, and partnership opportunities.
- Changing and improving the regulatory framework would make preservation easier.
- Cultivating and coordinating partnerships among stakeholders should be encouraged.
- Information needs to be shared and made more accessible.
- Historic preservation needs to broaden its perspective, and evaluation criteria must be more inclusive of diverse communities and historic resources.
- More archaeological sites need to be inventoried and designated.
- Minnesotans have insufficient knowledge about historic and cultural resources.
- The public survey ranked the top threats to preservation as low lawmaker interest; the public not valuing preservation; a lack of understanding of resources; and a perception that new is better than old.

Figure 10: Open Streets West Broadway North Minneapolis. Photo by Catherine Sandlund
• Higher costs and limited funds are barriers to preservation.

• Historic preservation should be more fully integrated into local planning.

• Pro-development housing policies are perceived to be in conflict with preservation.

• A shortage of skilled tradespeople and professionals is a barrier for preservation.

• The impact of climate change on preservation is significant and needs to be addressed.

Goals for the Management of Historic and Cultural Resources

After analysis of the themes and review of public, partner, and stakeholder comments, an outline was created as the starting point for statewide Goals and Objectives.

The themes, along with all the engagement feedback, became the five Goals listed below. Added to the Goals are related Objectives and Actions that will provide direction for the management of historic and cultural resources. The Goals are as follows:

GOAL 1: Facilitate Connections and Cultivate Partnerships

GOAL 2: Expand and Share Information, Skills, and Access

GOAL 3: Develop Proactive Strategies That Advance Equity, Expand Access, Increase Diversity, and Foster Inclusion

GOAL 4: Promote Economic Benefits and Inspire Innovative Financial Opportunities

GOAL 5: Strengthen Links Between Preservation, Sustainability, and Resiliency

Implementing the 2022–2032 Plan

The preceding preservation plan, A New Season: Preservation Plan for Minnesota’s Historic Properties 2012–2017, was initially set to expire in 2017. Several circumstances required extensions for this Plan to expire in December 2021. Leadership changes at the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) in 2016 necessitated the first extension. Another extension was needed in 2018, when the SHPO was transferred from the Minnesota Historical Society (MNHS) to the Minnesota Department of Administration. While it was not feasible to initiate an engagement and public participation process during this transition period, it also was not prudent to begin a planning process when both the SHPO and MNHS had not fully explored how the two organizations would partner moving forward. In 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic impacted staff capacity and halted in-person engagement plans, requiring a third and final extension.

Time Frame for Plan / Planning Cycle 2022–2032

Review in 2026

A five-year, midpoint review of the Plan will be completed as necessary. Prior to the scheduled midpoint review in 2026, the SHPO will work toward supporting and promoting the Plan in the following ways:

preservation in collaboration with the Minnesota SHPO and other preservation partners.

\[13\] The MNHS remains an important partner for the SHPO. MNHS has committed to continue to define its role in
• Continue building existing relationships and initiate new relationships, particularly with those organizations identified as priority groups.
• Build awareness of the Plan and how it can be used to help guide the management of historic and cultural resources throughout the state.
• Remind partners and others to utilize and revisit the Plan during their own policy, planning, and work plan effort.
• Identify and work with partners to recognize who will lead the work and who may support the efforts needed to realize Plan Objectives.
• Monitor and assess progress across the state and allow for partners and communities to share their accomplishments that achieve Plan Goals.
• Recalibrate portions of the Plan if the midpoint assessment shows there is strong need for amendments.

New Plan Update for 2032

Work on the next Plan will begin in 2029 for completion and adoption effective in 2032.

Action Items for the State of Minnesota and Preservation Organizations

Organizations throughout the state are encouraged to incorporate the Statewide Historic Preservation Plan into their ongoing work plan development and scheduled activities.

Action Items for the SHPO: Establish Yearly Targets

In conjunction with annual reporting requirements, the SHPO will prioritize the Goals and Objectives that relate to its Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) responsibilities. This process will begin in late fall for completion by early in the next calendar year. This effort will allow for assessment of past successes and analysis of potential shortfalls. The SHPO will invite partners to participate in this level of work plan development, especially those who are working directly with the office to realize Plan Goals. The Plan will be used as a framework to identify the HPF activities for the coming year. Activities that are specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and time-based will be prioritized. Each activity will identify internal leaders and necessary external partners and set targets for completion. To support planning continuity, the SHPO will continue to utilize the internal planning team model that will guide the 2022–2032 Plan through its tenure and initiate ongoing planning efforts on behalf of the office.

During the planning process, the public and partners identified several potential tasks and plan updates. Potential priorities may include improving the SHPO website, convening a statewide tribal engagement meeting, creating preservation funding incentives, focusing on process improvements (i.e., digital management systems), and clarifying the SHPO’s partnership with the MNHS and MNHS Heritage Preservation Department. Certain planning documents, such as the Disaster and Recovery Plan for Historic and Cultural Resources, require updates, and new planning documents, such as the Climate Action Plan, are needed.

Next Steps for Engagement

The 2022–2032 Plan engagement resources and timelines did not allow the SHPO to connect with all interested parties in this planning cycle; however, it is the SHPO’s intention to continue the important work of listening, meeting, and relationship building throughout the duration of this Plan. Ongoing engagement efforts will capitalize on opportunities to explore new connections through existing organizations and programs and by stepping out of the standard preservation networks. Engagement of
these groups will continue through the planning period, especially in the first five years.

Because Minnesota's land mass is a large area (86,936 square miles total) with a dispersed population, building meaningful relationships and creating an authentic presence around the state can be difficult. The SHPO will continue to explore a full spectrum of engagement methods, from in-person to virtual.

The SHPO will continue to cultivate relationships with MNHS, Tribal Historic Preservation Offices (THPOs), tribal cultural resources staff, professional organizations, other state agencies, post-secondary education institutions, advocacy organizations, local and county historical societies, Heritage Preservation Commissions, local governments, and others.

---


15 MNHS and SHPO should continue to collaborate on fostering an appreciation for Minnesota history among all Minnesotans.
Minnesota has approximately 13,000 years of human history within its current borders and is fortunate to have a wide variety of historic and cultural properties to illustrate that history. These range from cultural landscapes to built environments, rural townships to urban cities, and everything in between. The properties include archaeological sites that represent the remnants of past activities, whether from the ancient or relatively recent past.

When considering historic properties as part of preservation planning, it is useful to identify the categories of historic and cultural resources recognized in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Buildings and structures are the most visible historic property types because they are extant constructions. A building is a property mainly used for sheltering people and their activities. Examples include houses, churches, commercial and industrial buildings, courthouses, and libraries. Structures, on the other hand, are largely those properties built for other purposes.

Bridges, tunnels, dams, turbines, windmills, grain elevators, and fire towers are examples. Finally, an object is something such as a piece of statuary, a monument, or a fountain. In contrast, a site may not be readily recognizable. Some sites are archaeological sites. For example, a building or structure that has decomposed into ruins and artifacts has become a site. Such sites can be recent or ancient, ranging from places of habitation or resource gathering to ceremony and much more. Funerary mounds, rock shelters, and petroglyphs are further examples, as are shipwrecks and battlefields. Other sites are places identified in written records, such as a treaty signing or fur trade rendezvous location, or through oral history, such as an important gathering place for medicinal plants.

Historic Districts are a compilation of resources, such as a grouping of commercial, industrial, or residential buildings; archaeological sites; or a combination of different resource types. A district reflects cohesion and continuity. While the
individual building or resource helps define the
district, the collection as a whole is the focus.

Traditional Cultural Properties and Cultural
Landscapes are rooted in culture, and are most
often represented in the NRHP as sites or districts.
The former are places expressing the core
traditions, beliefs, practices, and social institutions
of communities, such as a place central to the
history or cosmology of an American Indian tribe.
Such places act as lodestones (natural magnets)
bounding people to cultural identity. Other examples
include urban settings, such as a Polish, Jewish, or
African American neighborhood, or natural
locations, like a valley, field, or bluff with cultural
significance. Cultural Landscapes are substantially
cohesive landforms and can be designed,
vernacular, or comprised entirely of natural
features. There are many types of landscapes, such
as an area of rocky outcrops or rolling hills, river
systems, or lakeshores. Formal gardens, cemeteries,
and campus malls are additional examples. Even
streetscapes and farmsteads can be landscapes.

Historic properties need to be understood within
their own frame of reference. A historic context is
used as an organizational framework to provide
information necessary for recognizing and
potentially comparing historic properties. Historic
contexts can be developed around any subject;
however, they are often specific to a period of time,
resource type, or geographic area. The
development of these documents allows us to
recognize the significance of historic resources
beyond what is readily visible. Historic contexts are
inherently flexible in their subject matter, ranging in
focus from nationwide architectural trends to local
social movements. The development of robust
historic contexts allows us to understand the impact
of people’s activities on the land and offers a
framework through which to understand the
significance of that impact with regard to
preservation planning.

Assessment of Survey and Inventory
Efforts

Historic properties are tangible links to our past and
allow us to better understand and learn from our
shared history. At the core of that effort is the
ongoing work of Minnesota’s State Historic
Preservation Office (SHPO), which manages and
leads preservation initiatives throughout the state.
One of the largest ongoing projects, required by the
National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as
amended, is the organization of the Statewide
Inventory. The Inventory is a collection of
information related to properties identified through
cultural resource surveys. It is not intended to be
exhaustive, and indeed it cannot be. It will always
be a work in progress as surveys proceed and the
scope of historic preservation evolves. Within the
Inventory, only a small percentage of identified
properties are currently eligible for listing or are
listed in the NRHP. Most have not been evaluated.
A well-managed inventory of properties in the state
allows all preservation professionals, advocates,
and municipal planners to focus their work more
efficiently. Cumulative survey efforts have, to date,
identified approximately 86,000 standing properties
and 21,000 archaeological sites (see Figure 15:
Inventoried Properties by County and Table 1: Total
Inventoried Properties by County, p. 32–33).

Historic Inventory
Resource Types

- Historic (82%)
- Archaeological (18%)
- Both (.2%)

total inventoried resources= 111,980

Figure 12: Historic Inventory Resources Types
Of the 111,980 inventoried resources, most are buildings and structures, with archaeological sites representing only about 20% of the current inventory listings, despite covering the vast majority of Minnesota’s history. Historic designation efforts have been disproportionate across the state and across time periods.

It is important to keep in mind that designation happens at many different levels. Several hundred more individual properties as well as historic districts encompassing thousands of additional properties have been designated locally by municipalities around the state. While these designations use criteria based on but different from that of the NRHP, the SHPO strives to maintain an accurate recording of these findings to facilitate project review and research.

In the past, the SHPO had sufficient funding to routinely conduct survey and inventory projects as well as prepare historic contexts as part of the department’s annual work plan. This effort was to fulfill the SHPO’s charge under the National Historic Preservation Act. However, since the early 1990s, funds for comprehensive survey efforts have only sporadically been available to the SHPO. For example, in 2013, under the stipulations of a Memorandum of Agreement, the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) undertook a survey of Chaska brick resources in the vicinity of Carver County, which resulted in the preparation of an NRHP Multiple Property Documentation Form.

In order to assist in the recognition of the state’s historic resources, approximately 60 statewide historic contexts were developed. These documents range in focus from the Paleo Indian Tradition to
State's Veterans Facilities to Railroads and Agricultural Development (1870–1940). Like the comprehensive survey discussed earlier, funds for developing statewide historic contexts were difficult to secure after the early 1990s. As a result, many of the documents provide only a brief overview of an otherwise rich subject matter. Conversely, many municipalities are creating robust historic contexts that will provide a better understanding of the significance of related historic properties.

In addition to survey projects initiated by specific federal and state funding, the SHPO continues to gain many new inventory records from survey projects undertaken by Minnesota's 46 Certified Local Governments (CLGs). These projects are assisted by federal funds and administered by the SHPO to aid local governments in implementing historic preservation planning projects. Eligible CLG grant activities include development of local historic resource inventories. Many CLGs have adopted goals to conduct comprehensive citywide surveys over successive years in multiple phases. For example, the cities of Duluth and Fergus Falls have taken advantage of numerous CLG grants to identify historic resources in specific geographic areas or neighborhoods. In other cases, municipalities have chosen to use CLG funds to concentrate on a particular type or era of resources. For instance, the City of Minneapolis conducted a survey of streetcar-related commercial buildings and the City of Newport identified all mid-twentieth-century resources within its borders. Four different CLG grants allowed the City of Elk River to investigate the potential of archaeological resources along the Mississippi River, while the City of Edina's CLG grant paid for a reconnaissance-level survey to determine if archaeological sites are present within the city limits. Data from these surveys are incorporated into local planning and permitting databases, as well as the Statewide Inventory.

**Historic and Cultural Resources Requiring Additional Research, Documentation, and Understanding**

1. Archaeological heritage in general
2. Wild rice stands
3. Natural resources that are linked to cultural resources and practices
4. Cultural landscapes
5. Historic parks and recreation facilities at the municipal/city levels
6. Recreation and vacation resources
7. Agricultural land
8. Rural agricultural buildings (barns, granaries, slaughterhouses, etc.)
9. Resources related to missing historic contexts
10. Auto-oriented buildings of the Modern and other eras (drive-ins, outdoor theaters)
11. Purpose-built buildings such as movie theaters
12. Resources and downtown cores that are now in floodplains
13. Small-scale commercial buildings in urban cores
14. Dams
15. Water towers
16. Rural bridges
17. Industrial buildings
18. Churches
19. Decommissioned public buildings and municipal buildings (fire stations, libraries, schools, etc.)
20. Higher education buildings
21. Brutalist buildings
22. Post-modernist resources
23. Modernist resources
24. Properties located in areas that are impacted by climate change

*Survey of MN SHPO staff. Not intended to be comprehensive or a list of priorities*
Plan survey respondents pointed to the largest perceived threats to historic preservation in Minnesota: an indifference to and a lack of understanding about historic and cultural resources. More than half of stakeholders surveyed for this Plan are concerned that lawmakers and the general public are uninterested in historic preservation and do not recognize the benefits to themselves or their community. A primary way to combat this apathy is to make information and data related to historic resources more accessible, ideally within a system that is data driven but also inspiring. Accurate information about historic and cultural resources can be folded into ongoing storytelling at the local and state levels to highlight the accessibility and relevance of the historic environment within Minnesota. The opportunity exists to create more accurate data so that users can better understand the wide range of resources and communities represented within the Inventory.

To that end, the SHPO is working toward a comprehensive and integrated data system that will allow for electronic access to data, mapping of all inventoried historic resources, and a file management system for conducting project reviews and tracking for the SHPO’s many programs. Since the 2018 relocation to the Department of Administration, the SHPO has enjoyed broad support for digitization and technology improvements and has partnered with MnDOT and the Minnesota Geospatial Information Office (MnGeo) in a multiyear effort to scan paper records and build an application that will make inventory data available to researchers and the general public in a geospatial context. In 2021, the SHPO began working with MnGeo to provide for electronic project and application submissions for the State Environmental Review and Tax Incentive Programs. This two-year effort will replace the SHPO’s outdated and separate databases with an integrated, cloud-based file management system. To facilitate these efforts and provide more help to researchers, the SHPO hired a cultural resource information manager in 2018.

Identification and Recordation of Inventoried Resources

The Statewide Historic Inventory is an archive of information related to surveyed properties in the state. The program has recorded approximately 91,428 historic resources and about 20,552 archaeological sites representing every county in Minnesota. This information, housed and managed at the SHPO offices, is generated by the SHPO, other government agencies, county and local historical societies, educational institutions, research organizations, and private property owners. The Inventory contains information on Minnesota's known archaeological sites and historic standing structures. The majority of archaeological sites and many historic standing structures have not yet been inventoried; as that work is undertaken, additional properties will be added to SHPO files. The Inventory currently includes information on close to 112,000 resources, 14,614 of which have been determined eligible for or are listed in the NRHP. Each resource is recorded on a Statewide Inventory or Site Form.

Inventory information, including historic and architectural inventory forms, archaeology site forms, National Register nomination, and all other related reports and supporting documentation, are available to staff and researchers at the State Historic Preservation Office. In addition to these documents, the SHPO maintains copies of preservation planning reports related to all levels and types of documentation produced in conjunction with our various programs. However, counties in the southeast and central parts of the state are disproportionately represented in the Inventory. Although the Inventory has grown substantially during the 2012–2021 planning cycle, only a small percentage of Minnesota has been
surveyed. Furthermore, although many of the state’s urbanized areas have been surveyed to some degree, much of this survey data is approaching 30 or more years in age. While the SHPO manages these records, the data is often outdated, which must be taken into consideration when using resource data for research and analysis.

The Inventory is growing at an average rate of 1,700 newly identified resources per year. The largest contributor to the Inventory is the environmental review process, which generates an average of 790 new and updated inventory forms and 160 reports annually. These resources are predominantly standing structures, with the vast majority being surveyed at just the reconnaissance, or windshield survey, level, resulting in limited historical research being completed for individual properties. This type of survey is biased toward architectural significance and often only considers the most well-known historic context available.

Of the more than 1,800 National Register–listed properties in Minnesota (see Figure 15: Inventoried Properties by County, p. 32), 64% are listed for their association with broad patterns of history (Criterion A), 16% for their association with persons significant in history (Criterion B), 62% for their significant design or construction (Criterion C), and 6% for their information potential (Criterion D). Increasing the number of nominations that recognize archaeological sites beyond their information potential, properties related to traditional cultural practices, gender diversity, difficult history, and communities typically underrepresented in the federal program is essential in the next decade and will allow Minnesota’s historic and cultural resources to better represent the current and past breadth of our shared history. Not only should new contexts, surveys, and designations be pursued, but listed properties should be reexamined to incorporate information that provides a more comprehensive understanding of their significance.

Figure 14: Dairy Queen, Rochester. Built in 1947, this is the first DQ in Minnesota. Photo by Michael Koop
Figure 15: Inventoried Properties by County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Total Inventoried</th>
<th>NRHP&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aitkin</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anoka</td>
<td>1061</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becker</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beltrami</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Stone</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Earth</td>
<td>1307</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlton</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carver</td>
<td>1573</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass</td>
<td>2253</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chippewa</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chisago</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearwater</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>1133</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottonwood</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crow Wing</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakota</td>
<td>1399</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodge</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faribault</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fillmore</td>
<td>1496</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeborn</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodhue</td>
<td>2911</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennepin</td>
<td>20358</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubbard</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isanti</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itasanti</td>
<td>2381</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanabec</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kandiyohi</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kittson</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koochiching</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>16</sup> National Register districts are counted as only one listing even though they may contain dozens or hundreds of individual properties.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Total Inventoried</th>
<th>NRHP¹⁶</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lac qui Parle</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake of the Woods</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Sueur</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahnomen</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLeod</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeker</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mille Lacs</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison</td>
<td>1726</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mower</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Counties</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicollet</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nobles</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olmsted</td>
<td>1075</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otter Tail</td>
<td>1153</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennington</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipestone</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pope</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsey</td>
<td>11495</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Lake</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>107233</strong></td>
<td><strong>1868</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Total Inventoried Properties by County
Measuring Accomplishments Toward Achieving the Prior 2012–2021 Plan

Minnesota’s first statewide historic preservation plan, issued in 1995, outlined an agenda of broad goals for the state’s preservation community. In subsequent plans, priorities and strategies for implementation changed as the field of historic preservation evolved and new challenges and opportunities arose.

For each plan, the Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) monitors ongoing progress toward the state’s preservation goals, aided by feedback from individuals and organizations with a stake in preservation as well as from the interested public. The following is a sampling of the accomplishments of Minnesota’s many preservation partners from around the state since 2012, when the most recent statewide preservation plan was finalized. While the highlighted programs are select examples, they also represent a snapshot of successful endeavors that make up the current environment for historic preservation in the state. Intended to be representative, not exhaustive, this summary is organized around the five broad goals put forth in the 2012 statewide historic preservation plan.

It is important to note that for the majority of time this assessment covers (and since the late 1960s) the SHPO was located at the Minnesota Historical Society (MNHS), the quasi-state nonprofit history organization. In 2017, a law change, passed by the legislature and approved by the governor, directed the 2018 move of the SHPO to the Minnesota Department of Administration. Most of the SHPO-related activities referenced in this section represent initiatives that occurred when the SHPO was housed within a larger Heritage Preservation Department in MNHS, which included Local History Services and Grant Programs.

2012–2021 Plan Goal: Preserve the places that matter: Increase the identification, designation, and protection of Minnesota’s historic and archaeological resources.

Digitization of the Statewide Historic Inventory, Analysis, and Digital Mapping

Development of Minnesota’s Statewide Historic Inventory began in the 1970s, and since then it has been available only in hard copy by visiting the SHPO and the Office of the State Archaeologist (OSA). In order to make the Inventory more accessible, the SHPO partnered with the Minnesota Department of Transportation’s Cultural Resources Unit (MnDOT CRU) in 2017 to complete a needs assessment and requirements gathering study. The SHPO moved to the Department of Administration in 2018 and in 2019 began scanning the Inventory documentation in preparation for integration into an online platform. SHPO conducted a business analysis to identify needs and started geolocating historic properties in 2019. Also, that year the Minnesota Geospatial Information Office (MnGeo) began scoping for a new geospatial web application, which will ultimately facilitate the creation, review, and maintenance of Inventory information currently held in multiple Microsoft Access databases.

Peavey Plaza: Preserving a Cultural Landscape

Peavey Plaza is a two-acre sunken park adjacent to Nicollet Mall highlighted by a recessed reflecting pool and a dramatic fountain. Designed by Modernist landscape architect M. Paul Friedberg, FASLA, and dedicated in 1975, it is regarded as one of the most important works of landscape architecture in the twentieth century. The downtown Minneapolis park was recently rehabilitated and reopened amid much celebration.
Saving Peavey Plaza and securing its long-term future occurred only after a lengthy grassroots effort and legal battle. The plaza served its intended purpose admirably for decades but did not age well, especially given Minnesota's challenging winters. Pressure to update the plaza had been building on the City of Minneapolis, which proposed raising it to street grade, thereby obliterating the original design. The City also applied to the Minneapolis Heritage Preservation Commission (HPC) for a permit to demolish Peavey Plaza. In 2012, the HPC voted 8–1 to deny the demolition application. Alarmed by the City's controversial proposal to demolish the Modernist icon, the Cultural Landscape Foundation and the Preservation Alliance of Minnesota (now Rethos Places Reimagined) filed a lawsuit under the Minnesota Environmental Rights Act, and they prevailed in saving the plaza from demolition, thus enabling rehabilitation.

Peavey Plaza was listed in the National Register in 2013 as the finest surviving example of Friedberg’s work from the period. A new design approved by the HPC and the SHPO retained character-defining features according to the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes. The $10 million rehabilitation, completed in July 2019, preserved the majority of the original design and features of the plaza. The project improved its accessibility and brought new light to the southern end of Nicollet Mall.

Figure 16: The rehabilitated Peavey Plaza, Minneapolis. Photo © Elizabeth Felicella
Historic Trunk Highway Studies

The Minnesota Department of Transportation’s Cultural Resources Unit (MnDOT CRU) initiated a study of pre-1971 trunk highways as part of the agency’s ongoing efforts to identify and evaluate historic resources for consideration during environmental review processes, particularly Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. In 2013 and 2016 MnDOT CRU completed two statewide historic contexts related to the development of Minnesota’s trunk highway system: *Minnesota Trunk Highways (1921–1954): Historic Context and National Register Evaluation and Integrity Considerations* (August 2016) and *Evaluation Report and Historic Context: Minnesota Bridges, 1955–1970* (July 2013), which included trunk highway evaluations. MnDOT CRU worked closely with the SHPO in developing both of these studies. These two historic contexts, along with the associated National Register criteria created to facilitate evaluation of individual properties, have become the basis for the state’s work in systematically identifying and evaluating the entirety of the trunk highway system. This collaboration with MnDOT offered an opportunity for the state agencies to work together toward a common goal, much of which was accomplished outside of the formal project review process.

Survey and Designation

During the previous planning period from 2012–2020, the SHPO and its partners achieved the following:

- 15,222 standing structures identified
- 2,297 archaeological sites identified
- 92 local landmark designations reviewed and commented on
- 146 individual properties listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)
- 9 historic districts encompassing 1,354 properties listed in the NRHP
- 84 archaeological sites listed in the NRHP

Among the archaeological sites listed in the National Register is Indian Mounds Park in St. Paul, which uniquely preserves the only remaining burial mounds within the Minneapolis–St. Paul urban core, which roughly overlies the traditional cultural hub of the Dakota. The site is significant for providing evidence of the northernmost examples of Hopewell-style earthworks along the Mississippi River. The 18 mounds originally constructed at the site were prominent features within a much larger cultural landscape highly visible along the margins of the Mississippi River Valley. This sacred cemetery site provided a nucleus for burial rituals over thousands of years throughout the Middle Woodland Tradition and likely into the early historic period.
New SHPO Staff

Due to the increased number of National Register evaluations and nominations generated from the Minnesota Historical and Cultural Heritage (Legacy) Grant program and the state historic tax credits program, a new National Register architectural historian was added to the SHPO in 2015. In addition, a cultural resources information manager was hired in 2018 to lead efforts in completing a web portal and digitizing paper documents as well as to manage the survey and inventory documentation and data. A new staff position, communications and grants manager, was created in 2019 to develop internal website content, oversee social media outlets, and manage the federal grants program.

Legacy Grant Review

SHPO staff serve as subject matter experts for the Minnesota Historical and Cultural Heritage (Legacy) Grant program, funded through the state's Arts and Cultural Heritage Fund and administered by the Minnesota Historical Society. Staff provide technical assistance, review, and process grant applications for projects that preserve and enhance access to Minnesota's cultural and historical resources. To date, staff have reviewed and commented on hundreds of proposals for projects from across the state in multiple program areas, including historic context studies, property evaluations, surveys, National Register nominations, reuse studies, and historic structure reports.

2012–2021 Plan Goal: Promote preservation’s economic benefits: Strengthen the connections between historic preservation, community economic vitality, and sustainability.

Historic Preservation Tax Incentives Program

The use of state and federal preservation tax credits for the rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of historic buildings has had a significant impact throughout Minnesota and with projects of all sizes. Although most projects are in the Twin Cities, about one-quarter have been in Greater Minnesota, including Cannon Falls, Duluth, Ely, Faribault, Fergus Falls, New Ulm, Owatonna, and St. Cloud. Completed projects range in size from $12,000 to over $200 million in qualified rehabilitation expenses. Dayton's
Department Store project in Minneapolis, at an estimated $213.8 million in historic tax credits, is the largest tax incentives project to date.

Rehabilitation of the McCloud-Edgerton House, by contrast, illustrates how the credit can be utilized for even small-scale residential properties. Historic Saint Paul acquired the McCloud-Edgerton House when the condemned property was flagged by the City of St. Paul as a Category 2 Registered Vacant Building. Despite its location within the Irvine Park Historic District, the value of the parcel was considered higher as a vacant lot, which posed an imminent threat. Within one month of purchasing the abandoned circa 1870 duplex, Historic Saint Paul found a buyer to ensure the property's long-term preservation. The ensuing rehabilitation is one of the smallest state tax credit projects completed to date: the $238,723 project received $33,901 in tax credits in 2014.

State Historic Tax Credit Reports

A decade worth of research has revealed the success and importance of the state historic tax credit program administered by the SHPO in partnership with the Minnesota Department of Revenue. The Minnesota Historic Structure Rehabilitation Tax Credit was signed into law in April 2010 as an incentive to stimulate job growth, increase local tax bases, and revitalize communities across the state by encouraging private investment in historic properties. In the first year, 24 projects applied for the new state tax credit, a sizable increase from the previous year, when only two Minnesota projects sought the federal tax credit. The SHPO is required by law to "annually determine the economic impact to the state from the rehabilitation of property for which credits or grants are provided." Starting in 2011, the University of Minnesota Extension has worked with the SHPO to analyze and report annually on the economic impact of the state historic tax credit. Collectively, the reports from 2011–2020 demonstrate the remarkable success of the state historic tax credit program and the positive impact it has had on Minnesota's economy as well as its historic resources. As of the end of 2020, the Minnesota historic tax credit has resulted in:

- 144 new tax credit projects
- $3.5 billion of economic activity generated
- $1.9 billion in labor income generated
- 18,650 jobs supported
- $9.52 of economic activity generated for every $1 of historic tax credit (FY 2020)

Finally, the industries experiencing the largest impacts from the rehabilitation work include wholesale trade, owner-occupied dwellings...
(including mortgage-owned houses), and real estate (rental properties and realtor revenues).

Legacy Grants Support Preservation

The Minnesota Historical and Cultural Heritage Grants program—popularly known as Legacy grants—is a competitive process created to provide financial support for projects focused on preserving Minnesota's history and culture. This state-funded program is made possible by the Arts and Cultural Heritage Fund using sales tax revenue resulting from the Clean Water, Land and Legacy Amendment created through the vote of Minnesotans in 2008. While the Legacy grants program is administered by the Minnesota Historical Society, SHPO staff provide technical support to review and monitor grants for preservation projects; this work was used as a matching share for the federal Historic Preservation Fund for eligible grant projects when SHPO was at MNHS. Hundreds of historic resources statewide have benefited from Legacy funds, with over $2 million in grants being used for projects spanning a range of SHPO program areas.

Legacy Grants for Preservation, 2012–2020:

- 10 grants = $212,200 for Historic Context Studies
- 48 grants = $844,947 for Surveys of Buildings and Archaeological Sites
- 28 grants = $226,639 for Evaluations of Historic Resources
- 61 grants = $754,394 for National Register/Local Designation Forms
- 123 grants = $15,469,273 for "Bricks and Mortar" Rehab Projects
- 249 grants = $6,507,771 for Planning Documents

Highlighted below are four examples of Legacy-funded preservation projects.

1. St. Cloud State University

St. Cloud State University received a Legacy grant to conduct an archaeological survey to locate the remains of Fort Holes—a civilian fortification constructed in 1862 in response to a perceived American Indian threat. The project to find the archaeological remains of Fort Holes resulted in educational opportunities for the local community of Fair Haven and for students at St. Cloud State University. Working in partnership with the Stearns History Museum, 22 community volunteers assisted with the fieldwork portion of the project. Fieldwork was open to public viewing and allowed for discussion with site visitors, which provided great opportunities to demonstrate how the archaeological process works.

Figure 19: Fair Haven. Photo by Rob Mann
2. Grant County Courthouse

Grant County's 1905 Beaux Arts/Renaissance Revival–style courthouse was designed with ornate interior murals by Odin J. Oyen. Legacy funds conserved and preserved four murals, decorative panels, and an 18x25-foot ceiling mural entitled *Justice and Power of the Law*. The project included paint analysis, matching historic mortar/plaster, and replication of plaster. The project demonstrated how the interior—with its conserved, preserved, and reproduced murals, scrolling, stained glass, woodwork, and built-in furniture—provides a link to the past, not just with the decorative features themselves but also with the memory of the craftsmen, such as Oyen, who produced them.

3. Andrew Peterson Farmstead

The Andrew Peterson Farmstead in Carver County is distinctive because Swedish immigrant Peterson—an agricultural and horticultural innovator who established the farm—kept a daily diary for 43 years, from 1855 to 1898. Six Legacy grants totaling $236,640 have been secured by the Carver County Historical Society (the site owner) to preserve the buildings and landscape on the property. Funds have been used to prepare an interpretive master plan for the farmstead; write a historic structures report; investigate structural issues, prepare construction drawings, and restore a barn's stone foundation; and repair the framing and exterior walls of another barn. These projects will allow the currently unoccupied site to be converted for use as a multifunctional visitor center dedicated to interpreting the property through the lens of Minnesota's rich immigrant and agricultural history.

4. Old Highland Neighborhood, Minneapolis

Old Highland in Minneapolis's Near North neighborhood partnered with Preserve Minneapolis to bring national old house expert Bob Yapp to teach nine hands-on workshops over three days on exterior wood repair, window restoration, and passive wood flooring repair and restoration. The

![Figure 20: Grant County Courthouse courtroom ceiling mural before and after restoration. Photos by Scott Gilbertson](image)

![Figure 21: Participants in Bob Yapp's Old House Restoration workshop sponsored by Preserve Minneapolis and the Old Highland neighborhood scrape paint from wood siding. Photo by Linda Pate](image)
workshops taught neighborhood residents that instead of disposing of old-growth material in a landfill, rehabilitating windows, siding, spindles, and columns is an environmentally friendly practice that helps reduce their carbon footprint. Homeowners also learned that home restoration is an economically sustainable practice.

**2012–2021 Plan Goal: Educate, educate, educate: Build a foundation for effective preservation education and activism.**

As part of the SHPO’s outreach efforts, staff presented numerous specialized educational sessions, including to the Minnesota Municipal Clerks Institute, the Association of Minnesota Counties, and the Department of Iron Range Resources and Rehabilitation. Staff also served as guest lecturers for classes at Minnesota State University, Mankato; St. Cloud State University; the University of Minnesota Duluth; and the University of Minnesota Twin Cities. The National Register architectural historian co-teaches a class on historic research and documentation, and the National Register archaeologist teaches a class on applied heritage management, both at the University of Minnesota Twin Cities. Finally, the National Register historian traveled throughout the state and gave approximately 75 presentations about the National Register program, historic bridges, and the Minnesota State Capitol.

**Preservation Training**

The SHPO produces the annual Preserve Minnesota (PreserveMN) conference, which brings together volunteer and professional practitioners from across the state. The conference is held in a different city each year, hosted by a Certified Local Government (CLG) that uses a CLG grant to cover some of the expenses. The event provides an unparalleled opportunity for sharing, learning, networking, and strengthening preservation efforts in our state. Participation has grown gradually in the past decade, with over 200 attendees at the 2019 conference.

![Figure 22: Our Minnesota State Capitol by National Register Historian Denis Gardner includes stories of the capitol's construction, its renovation in 2015–2017, laborers and craftspeople, and the design by noted architect Cass Gilbert.](image)
In addition, the SHPO worked with and provided CLG grants to the cities of Red Wing (2013), Faribault (2014), Winona (2016), and Little Falls and St. Cloud (2021) to host the Commission Assistance and Mentoring Program (CAMP®) offered by the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions (NAPC). CAMP® training includes hands-on activities, informative group discussions, and high-quality presentations by prominent professionals for preservation-focused boards and commissions, their partners, and others who are interested in or impacted by this work.

Figure 23: Archaeologist Doug Birk (1943–2017) leads a tour of the Little Elk Heritage Preserve in Lindbergh State Park during the 2015 Preserve Minnesota conference. Photo by David Mather

Figure 24: Participants in the Commission Assistance and Mentoring Program (CAMP®) held in Faribault perform a skit during the training. Photo by Michael Koop
Education for All

The SHPO’s history partners often use federal Certified Local Government grants, Minnesota Historical and Cultural Heritage Grants, and funds from the state-funded Heritage Partnership Program to educate at the local and regional level. Many are taking this opportunity to prepare walking tours, podcasts, heritage tourism apps, and educational programs on history and preservation. For instance, the City of Stillwater received a Commission Excellence Award from the NAPC in 2014 for their education and website projects. The SHPO also partnered with Rethos Places Reimagined (formally Preservation Alliance of Minnesota) to develop a new place-based learning program originally known as Cornerstone Academy. Many of the training sessions, including a tax credit program featuring SHPO staff members, were sold out. In 2014 the SHPO combined its annual statewide preservation conference with the annual meeting of the American Association for State and Local History, which was held in St. Paul. "Greater than the Sum of Our Parts" featured multiple sessions and tours related to preservation and provided a terrific opportunity for attendees to network with local history and preservation peers from across the country.

Heritage Preservation Commission Training Program

Heritage Preservation Commissions (HPCs) across Minnesota struggle with a host of issues, including waning support for historic preservation, insufficient staff capacity, recruitment and retention of qualified commission members, and, perhaps most importantly, inadequate, infrequent, and inconsistent training activities. Minnesota’s 57 HPCs vary greatly in terms of their size, demographics, financial capacity, and regulatory framework and the resources of the built environment they work to protect. Some HPCs are going strong, while others are languishing or have become inactive due to waning interest and membership. Many commission members lack the knowledge and experience to navigate the complex and difficult decisions they are charged with making. In 2015–2016, a training resource was developed to satisfy the needs of communities with HPCs across the entire state. A training manual introduces participants to key concepts, common terminology, and core principles of preservation practices. Topics include local preservation, the legal basis for preservation, designation and treatment of historic properties, project review, and design issues. The manual is designed to be introductory even as it covers a wide range of material. It serves as a companion piece to an online tutorial for heritage preservation commissioners that provides a more abbreviated introduction to the same topics. Both the manual and the online tutorial follow the same
organizational structure, with training materials organized in a format that is user-friendly and highly visual. Their modular formats can be built upon over time as further topics are introduced.

Improving Understanding of and Compliance with Preservation Laws

One example of interagency cooperation and partnership is the work that the SHPO has done with other agencies at St. Croix State Park. On July 1, 2011, straight-line winds of over 100 miles per hour tore through the St. Croix Recreational Demonstration Area (RDA), a state park and National Historic Landmark, damaging or destroying 84 of the park’s 163 historic buildings. The St. Croix RDA’s historic structures, roads, and trails comprise the most extensive collection of individual New Deal projects in Minnesota and are located within one of the largest and best examples of RDA planning and design in the country. The event was declared a major disaster, making federal funding available to the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR), which is responsible for maintaining the park. After weeks of steady effort to clear debris, the park was opened to visitors, but damaged buildings—simple Adirondack-type shelters, masonry and log cabins, bicycle and picnic shelters, and administrative buildings—were cordoned off. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) was on the ground soon after the disaster declaration to provide support as the DNR continued its work and assessed the damage to historic structures. As the extent of the damage became clear, FEMA’s regional environmental officer reached out to the National Park Service Midwest Office, the SHPO, the Minnesota Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management, and the DNR to review the projects and discuss ways to appropriately repair the historic structures. The consulting parties gathered regularly to review and discuss treatment measures to ensure that the historic character of the RDA would not be compromised. This level of engagement, driven by the DNR’s plans for repairs and managed by FEMA’s environmental review staff, resulted in the timely review of nearly 60 separate grant projects affecting almost half of the structures in the RDA. The consultation process successfully addressed damage to the park’s historic resources, preserving an important part of our nation’s history. That success allows the park to continue providing opportunities for outdoor recreation as originally envisioned almost 90 years ago. The consulting parties, guided by the requirements of Section 106, preserved St. Croix’s place as the best example of RDA design and planning and maintained its collection of architecturally significant Rustic style buildings for the enjoyment of future generations.

Stillwater Lift Bridge and St. Croix River Project

Another example of government partnership occurred in Stillwater, home to the historic Stillwater Lift Bridge, and the proposal for the St. Croix River Crossing project. A proposed new
highway bridge to the south of Stillwater, which was the subject of a federal Section 106 review, took the better part of three decades to complete. The project was a complex undertaking that involved two states, seven federal agencies, six state agencies, the Minnesota SHPO, the Wisconsin SHPO, various local, state, and national advocacy groups, as well as the citizens of several communities in the area that would be affected by the construction of a new vehicular river crossing to replace the historic bridge crossing. It is also the largest bridge construction project in Minnesota's history.

Those in favor of a new bridge argued that it was needed to address traffic congestion in downtown Stillwater, most of which is a National Register–listed historic district, and to accommodate growth in western Wisconsin. Environmentalists countered that a new freeway-style bridge would harm the St. Croix River, a federally protected National Wild and Scenic Riverway, and encourage urban sprawl. Preservationists fought to protect the iconic historic Stillwater Lift Bridge, which is listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Constructed in 1931, the bridge has a functional and symbolic connection with downtown Stillwater and is significant as a rare surviving example of vertical-lift highway bridge construction of the Waddell and Harrington type.

After years of project planning, alternatives analysis, stakeholder meetings, a lawsuit, and extensive Section 106 consultation, the new St. Croix Crossing Bridge opened on August 2, 2017. Interstate highway vehicular traffic has been rerouted onto the new bridge, and the historic Stillwater Lift Bridge has been rehabilitated and converted into a bicycle and pedestrian facility. A 4.7-mile bicycle and pedestrian loop trail crosses the St. Croix River at the Stillwater Lift Bridge and the new St. Croix Crossing bridge. The Stillwater Lift Bridge rehabilitation/conversion and the loop trail construction were two of several mitigation measures agreed upon by all signatories to resolve the adverse effects caused by the new bridge construction. The opening of the new bridge in August 2017 was a tremendous success given the history and complexities of the project review.

Environmental Review Program

Following the SHPO’s transfer from the Minnesota Historical Society to the Minnesota Department of Administration, the Government Programs and

Figure 26: The St. John's Landing Group Camp Cabin in St. Croix State Park, one of many buildings that was damaged and repaired after straight-line winds on July 1, 2011. Photos by MN DNR
Compliance unit was renamed the Environmental Review Program (ERP). The ERP Team partnered with the state agency's Continuous Improvement (CI) staff to develop and complete a CI project focused on process improvements and efficiencies, including website updates and communications with stakeholders. From 2012 to 2020, SHPO completed approximately 27,168 reviews: 2,390 were non-federal reviews for state and local projects, and 14 were for properties that have preservation covenants or easements. To help facilitate this work, SHPO maintains 43 Programmatic Agreements and/or Memorandums of Understanding with an array of federal and state agencies.

**2012–2021 Plan Goal: Increase diversity in Minnesota’s historic preservation community: Include participants who reflect the breadth of the state’s racial/ethnic groups, geography, income levels, and ages.**

**Updated Fort Snelling Historic District**

Using an Underrepresented Community Grant from the National Park Service, the Fort Snelling Historic District National Register nomination form (originally listed in 1966) is in the final stages of being updated. Preparation of the new nomination, a multiyear effort, has been led by the SHPO’s National Register Archaeologist. The new nomination fully recognizes the importance of all people central to the property's history, with particular attention paid to the underrepresented communities of African Americans, American Indians, Japanese Americans, and women.

**The Lee House: A Right to Establish a Home**

During 2014 the SHPO had the unique and rewarding opportunity to recognize a property significant for its association with civil rights in Minnesota. Arthur and Edith Lee purchased a small home in south Minneapolis in 1931. The young couple was African American, and their new home was in an area that homeowners considered a "white neighborhood." Although the neighborhood did not have restrictive covenants, 400 residents had signed a "gentleman's agreement" with the Eugene Field Neighborhood Association promising not to sell or lease their property to non-Caucasians. Soon after the Lees moved in, many community members tried to force them out of the house, and race riots enveloped the house and neighborhood after the story was printed in local newspapers. The attacks continued for months. Thankfully, the Lees had the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and Lena Olive Smith, Minnesota’s first female African American lawyer, on their side. Smith worked on their behalf to ensure a peaceful resolution, preserving the Lees' civil and property rights. However, the police maintained a presence near the property and escorted the Lees' six-year-old daughter to kindergarten the entire year. The Lees moved out of the house in 1933.

In the early 2000s, Professor Greg Donofrio and his students at the University of Minnesota picked up the effort to honor the Lees. The class researched the history of the house and historic contexts related to school integration, home ownership, civil rights, and media relations. The University of Minnesota’s Goldstein Museum of Design also featured an exhibition curated by Donofrio and a consultant as a result of the research: "A Right to Establish a Home." In addition, two Minnesota high school students won a State History Day competition for their exhibit on the Lees: "Racism in Our Hometown: The Arthur Lee Family, Minneapolis (1931)."
Donofrio's class worked in partnership with the Field Regina Northrop Neighborhood Group to secure a Legacy grant to write a National Register nomination. There wasn't a dry eye during the presentation of the nomination before the State Review Board in May 2014. Arthur and Edith Lee's descendants attended the meeting, along with the most recent owner of the property, 92-year-old Pearl Lindstrom, who spoke about how much it meant to her to be able to honor the Lees by listing the property. The Arthur and Edith Lee House was listed in the National Register on July 11, 2014. Lindstrom passed away in November, just as the SHPO learned the nomination was being featured on the National Park Service’s (NPS) National Register website.

Public Archaeology at Kathio National Historic Landmark

In east-central Minnesota, Kathio National Historic Landmark (designated in 1964) commemorates the ancestral homeland of the Mdewakanton Dakota nation and their meeting with French explorers Daniel Greysolon Sieur du Lhut and Father Louis Hennepin in 1679 and 1680, respectively. The landmark encompasses the entirety of Mille Lacs Kathio State Park and a significant portion of the Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe community. The landmark's rich archaeological and cultural heritage, beautiful natural resources, and public accessibility make it an ideal location for interpretive programs.

Figure 27: Arthur and Edith Lee House, Minneapolis. Photo by Michael Koop
For many years, the SHPO has collaborated with Minnesota State Parks on public archaeology programs. Recently, the reach of those programs has expanded through collaboration with the Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe and the Mille Lacs Tribal Historic Preservation Office (THPO), particularly through new programs at the Mille Lacs Indian Museum. Annual or ongoing programs that the SHPO regularly assists with include:

- Public Archaeology research excavations or tours
- Kathio Archaeology Day programs (with the Minnesota Archaeological Society)
- "Snowshoeing into the Past"
- "Canoeing into the Past"

The canoeing programs use two 10-person "voyageur" canoes owned by Mille Lacs Kathio State Park. These programs allow members of the public to experience being on the water without needing to know how to canoe on their own. Guides steer the canoes, leaving room for 18 participants on each trip. The tours are guided by the Mille Lacs Kathio State Park naturalist and the SHPO National Register archaeologist. Tours were held for a Minnesota teacher training workshop and for regular state park and Minnesota Historical Society programs. The canoe programs allow participants to experience the state park in a meaningful way, by getting a sense of the landscape and traditional travel routes. Multiple archaeological sites can be seen from the water and discussed on the tours.

Visitors can also witness the return of wild rice to the National Historic Landmark for the first time in at least 40 years. Changes to dams at the outlets of Mille Lacs and Ogechie Lake have allowed the rice to grow again. These were cooperative projects between the Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe and Minnesota State Parks, and the SHPO assisted with project reviews, along with the Mille Lacs THPO and the US Army Corps of Engineers. Historically, dense stands of wild rice in the outlet lakes provided the staple food source that supported Dakota and, later, Ojibwe villages in the area. Restoration of the wild rice beds is a significant enhancement of the historical integrity of the National Historic Landmark as a whole.
2012–2021 Plan Goal: **Lead the way: Develop leaders at all levels to strengthen Minnesota’s preservation network.**

**Partnering for Preservation**

Three partnerships that occurred when the SHPO was located at the Minnesota Historical Society (MNHS) and continue today under the stewardship of MNHS demonstrate the benefits of collaborating with stakeholders to advance preservation. These partnerships are described below.

**Rethos Places Reimagined Education**

In 2014, through an MNHS Legacy Partnership Grant, the SHPO worked with Rethos Places Reimagined (formally Preservation Alliance of Minnesota) to launch Cornerstone (now PAM Education), a preservation education initiative. The statewide program developed a training series for homeowners, realtors, community members, and professionals in fields that frequently interact with historic buildings and districts. Dozens of classes led

by expert instructors including SHPO staff have been held for over 4,500 students on topics including window, plaster, and porch repair; Arts and Crafts stenciling; and understanding historic tax credits.

**Northern Bedrock Historic Preservation Corps**

The second partnership involved working to establish the Northern Bedrock Historic Preservation Corps, a Duluth-based nonprofit whose mission is to develop an enduring workforce and life skills through service learning in historic preservation and community stewardship. Corps members receive basic training followed by significant hands-on experience and mentoring from specialists in the field. Northern Bedrock trains young adults while addressing the preservation needs of historic structures and landscapes across the state, ranging from historic barns and log Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) buildings to cemeteries. Each Northern Bedrock field season has seen an increase in capacity, with three crews working hitches on sites from Grand Portage to

![Figure 29: Northern Bedrock Historic Preservation Corps, with assistance from Ray Stenglein of Environmental Associates Inc., repaired the masonry stairs at Riverside Park, St. Cloud. Photo by Ann Marie Johnson](image)
Thief River Falls to Hastings. In 2018 alone corps members completed over 14,000 service hours of historic preservation for 21 organizations throughout the state, working on 23 historic structures, making repairs in eight cemeteries, and surveying five archaeological sites.

**Main Street Program Returns to Minnesota**

The Main Street program was relaunched in 2010 in a partnership with Rethos Places Reimagined (formally Preservation Alliance of Minnesota). Using Legacy grants and other funds, the program has grown steadily so that today it has 20 Designated Main Street and Network Communities. Minnesota Main Street promotes downtown vitality by leveraging communities' existing assets: people, businesses, places, and unique stories. Since 2010 the program has helped build stronger communities through preservation-based economic development. For every $1 spent running a local Main Street program, $26 are reinvested in the community's district. Reinvestment in Minnesota's Main Street districts has resulted in the following:

- 889 new jobs created
- $99,781,477 in private downtown investment
- $38,320,605 in public downtown investment
- 627 building rehabilitation projects
- 159 new small businesses and expansions
- 48,055 volunteer hours contributed

**Communication with Elected Officials**

SHPO staff and others participate each year in National Historic Preservation Advocacy Week by meeting in Washington, DC, with members of the Minnesota congressional delegation. Senators and representatives are educated about preservation success stories in their districts, the benefits of preservation to their communities, economic impacts of preservation including the historic tax credit program, and the importance of the work of the State Historic Preservation Office. The SHPO also notifies local elected officials when a property is listed in the National Register to ensure they are aware of the significant historic properties located in their communities.

In addition, various preservation partners, including Rethos, MNHS, the Minnesota History Coalition, and other history organizations have advocated on the state level for policy and funding for historic preservation and history activities.