

Report to the Legislature: Ford Building Preservation and Use



Ford Building Working Group

January 15, 2006



This information will be made available in alternate format,
for example, large print, Braille, or cassette tape, upon request
by contacting

**Department of Administration
Commissioner's Office
Voice 651.201.2555
Fax 651.296.7909
or
Minnesota Relay Service, 1.800.627.3529**

Executive Summary

The Commissioner of Administration convened the Ford Building Working Group on Sept. 15, 2005. The group, chaired by Jim Rhodes of the Department of Administration, met five times over the course of five months to develop recommendations to the Legislature regarding the desirability and potential means of preserving and using the state-owned Ford Building at 117 University Avenue in St. Paul. The following are the consensus findings and recommendations of the Ford Building Working Group:

- 1) The Ford Building has historical significance and should not be sold, moved or demolished.
 - It is one of 18 similar buildings constructed by Ford Motor Company in early 1900s.
 - The Preservation Alliance lists it as one of Minnesota's "Ten Most Endangered Buildings of 2004."
 - The Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office has determined that the Ford Building is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.
 - Minnesota statutes 86A.04, 86A.05 and 116B.02, subd. 4, recognize the importance of preserving and restoring historic buildings and structures.
- 2) The building should be minimally heated (approximately 45 degrees) while it is "moth-balled." The exterior of the building and the surrounding grounds should be maintained at a level that is expected in the Capitol area.
 - Minimal heat will reduce further internal cosmetic damage from the shock of the freeze/thaw cycle.
- 3) The building should be used for interim office space during restoration of the State Capitol.
 - It is anticipated that the 2006 Legislature will consider a State Capitol restoration project. The Ford Building, because of its location and connection to the Capitol tunnel system, could be a practical, cost-effective solution for use as interim space for Capitol offices that will be relocated during the renovation.
 - Because the State Capitol restoration project could begin after the 2007 legislative session, renovation work at the Ford Building, expected to require 18 months, would need to commence as soon as possible.
- 4) The building and building site should be evaluated in the context of state government, neighborhood and regional objectives, including historic preservation and sustainable community goals.
 - Under federal and state laws, the state can lease up to 5 percent of floor space in the building (approximately 2,500 square feet) for "unrelated purposes."
 - The first floor should include a use that would extend the hours of activity in the area beyond the end of the workday. Some examples include a coffee shop, restaurant or similar "social" business. Longer-term, consideration should be given to including a "one-stop shop" for state government citizen services on the first floor.
- 5) Minnesota's cultural and historic resources are important civic assets. While the redevelopment of historic structures can present unique financial challenges, their preservation and rehabilitation can serve to strengthen communities. The State Legislature

should identify and employ financial strategies and tools that encourage stewardship and facilitate reinvestment in the preservation and enhancement of historic buildings. The Legislature should consider, on a case-by-case basis:

- A policy that would exempt the costs of historic renovation from lease rates. Current policies require the recovery of depreciation and bond interest through lease rates. In the case of the Ford Building, these policies can impede historic preservation.
- Direct funding of the depreciation and bond interest for renovation costs of state-owned historic structures that are financed with proceeds from the sale of state general obligation bonds. This would de-couple these costs from lease rates, lowering the cost of rents for state offices that would locate in the building.

Ford Building Working Group Report to the Legislature

Introduction

The Ford Building, 117 University Avenue, St. Paul, is one of 14 state-owned buildings in the Capitol Complex that are under the custodial management of the Department of Administration. The Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office has determined that the Ford Building is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The Department of Administration, within its mission, strives to provide safe, comfortable and efficient facilities for employees, citizens and visitors. In a larger context, the department, representing state government, recognizes the significance of the Capitol Complex in the social and cultural fabric of the community and surrounding neighborhoods. The Ford Building site, situated near the major St. Paul intersection of Rice Street and University Avenue, is viewed by many as a bridge from the Capitol Complex to the adjacent Rice/University neighborhood. Stakeholders are vigorously working toward improving the neighborhood. It is also worth noting that the nearby Capitol Heights neighborhood, further east, is undergoing significant residential revitalization.

Legislative charge

The 2005 Legislature placed a moratorium on the demolition of the Ford Building until June 30, 2007 and directed the Commissioner of Administration to report to the Legislature by Jan. 15, 2006, with recommendations regarding the desirability and potential means of preserving and using the Ford Building. The report was to include:

- The availability of potential lessees for the building.
- Constraints on leasing the building, including the requirement to pay off any state general obligation bonds previously used in maintaining or rehabilitating the building.
- The cost of restoring and rehabilitating the building, and the feasibility of various means of paying these costs, including potential use of revenue bonds.

The Commissioner of Administration convened a working group of interested legislators, private sector real estate professionals, historic preservation specialists and representatives of the City of St. Paul, neighboring property owners and St. Paul neighborhood associations. A list of members is included as an appendix of this report. The Commissioner appointed Jim Rhodes, Legislative Director of the Department of Administration, as chair of the working group. The group met initially on Sept. 15, 2005. Subsequent meetings were held Oct. 19, Nov. 22, Dec. 14 and Jan. 10 at the State Administration Building.

Responsibility for preservation of historic structures

The Minnesota Historic Sites Act and the Minnesota Environmental Rights Act, among others, help protect public and private historic structures. Additional details on these statutes, as well as standards for the treatment of historic structures, can be found in Appendix D.

History

Ford ownership – The Ford Motor Company constructed the University Avenue building in 1913-14 as a retail, service and sub-assembly facility, with a production rate of 500 vehicles per year (St. Paul Pioneer Press, Feb. 1, 1914). Ford paid \$10,199 for the building site and \$56,000 for construction of the building (Brian McMahon, “The Ford Building: An Historical Overview”).

The three-story building (plus basement) is constructed of cast-in-place reinforced concrete and masonry. The building has approximately 56,000 net square feet (51,000 square feet rentable [Department of Administration Space Management Inventory]) and a footprint of approximately 100 feet by 150 feet. The overall site is slightly more than 2.25 acres, or 98,400 square feet, and is located on the north side of University Avenue, east of Rice Street, in the State Capitol Planning District.

The University Avenue building is one of 18 plants built by Ford throughout the country that shared the same architect and design motifs. It is worth noting that none of the Ford buildings have been demolished and a number of them have been adapted for other uses. The manufacturing components utilized a “vertical feed” hand-assembly method that became obsolete with Ford’s introduction of the assembly line in the early 1920s.

Assembly operations on University Avenue ceased in 1924 when the Highland Park Ford plant opened, but the company continued operating a sales and service business at the site until the mid-1930s. The building was vacant from 1937 until at least 1941 and quite possibly until 1947, when the Kedney Warehouse Company was listed as the building’s occupant (McMahon).

Public ownership – The Ford Building was converted to office space for the federal government sometime around 1951. The state acquired the Ford Building in the late 1960s as part of a larger redevelopment effort in the Capitol area that was directed by the Capitol Area Architectural and Planning Commission.

The building was remodeled for state office space in the late 1970s. A cement stucco finish was also applied to the building’s exterior walls at about this time. In early 1999, building personnel noticed significant deterioration of the stucco facade. Subsequent tests revealed that the stucco was separating from the underlying concrete block. For safety reasons and to prevent further damage, the most severely deteriorated veneer was removed. Chain-link fencing was installed to anchor the remaining stucco.

The most recent occupants of the Ford Building included Minnesota’s Bookstore, the state printing operations and a variety of Department of Administration offices. These uses ceased or were transferred to other facilities in 2002-03 because of the closure of the state printing operations; the building’s deterioration and the need for major repairs; and high projected lease rates that were a reflection of the costs of maintaining and operating the building, which made it economically challenging to occupy.

As custodial manager of the Ford Building, the Department of Administration has utilized bond appropriations from the Legislature for maintaining, improving and remodeling the building for various uses. State policy is that capital debt is reimbursed through lease rates charged by the Department of Administration to the entities leasing space in the building.

As a part of the capital budget planning process, the Department of Administration in 2001 commissioned a study to assess options for the site. The results of the study provided an objective look at the current building and future needs of the state based on the “1993 Strategic Plan for Locating State Agencies.”

The study determined that the building was in need of major structural, mechanical, electrical, interior and exterior repairs in order to return it to a viable use for office space. The study presented seven scenarios along with estimated costs, which are in 2001 dollars and do not consider inflation or further deterioration that can occur in a vacant building.

The seven scenarios from the report, along with resulting square footage and 2001 cost estimates, are:

- Renovate existing building (51,218 rentable square feet), \$9.3 million.
- Renovate existing building and expand the second and third floors (resulting in 68,500 rsf), \$12.7 million.
- Demolish existing building and construct a new building of comparable footprint (89,500 rsf), \$18.8 million.
- Renovate and expand building to maximize the site (106,000 rsf), \$20 million.
- Demolish existing building and construct a new building to maximize the site (128,500 rsf), \$25.9 million.
- Renovate and expand existing building (106,000 rsf) and build a 218-stall parking ramp, \$24.2 million.
- Demolish existing building and construct a new building (128,500 rsf) and a 324-stall parking ramp, \$32.5 million.

CPMI, an author of the 2001 assessment, recently estimated that these costs would be about 35 percent higher in current dollars. Further analysis would be required to determine accurate cost estimates.

One member of the working group, a private developer, expressed reservations regarding the cost figures and noted his firm’s work on a similar-sized office building that was renovated for residential and commercial use, which was completed for less than \$6 million.

In 2004, the Department of Administration sought about \$1.2 million in bonding money from the Legislature for demolishing the building, replacing it with 50 parking stalls and constructing a roundhouse-style building (similar to the building at University Avenue and Capitol Boulevard) for tunnel access. The Legislature did not act on a Bonding Bill in 2004. The Department of Administration re-submitted its request the following year, but it was rejected by a House committee. Language was then added to the Omnibus State Government Finance Bill placing a moratorium on demolition and directing the Commissioner of Administration, in consultation with interested parties, to report to the Legislature on potential preservation and use of the building.

Historical significance – A Historic Sites survey completed in 1982 by the Ramsey County Historical Society and the St. Paul Heritage Preservation Commission listed the Ford Building as historically significant and potentially eligible for designation on the National Register of Historic Places and for listing as a St. Paul city landmark. The Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office

subsequently determined that that the Ford Building is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

The Preservation Alliance named the Ford Building one of its “Ten Most Endangered Historic Properties of 2004.” Architecture Minnesota magazine in its July-August 2004 issue listed the Ford Building as “endangered.” The National Trust for Historic Preservation is on record supporting preservation of the Ford Building.

Based on discussions of the Ford Building Working Group, staff members from the Capitol Area Architectural and Planning Board, the St. Paul Heritage Preservation Commission and the Minnesota Historical Society/State Historic Preservation Office will continue discussions and recommend appropriate statutory changes to clarify ambiguities among federal, state and local laws that regulate how required reviews of historic structures are considered by these various governmental entities.

Current status

The Ford Building is in “mothball” status and does not have an occupancy permit. The Department of Administration currently pays an average of \$25,000 a year for minimal maintenance of the building. The Department of Administration spent about \$79,000 in 2005 for additional exterior repairs when further deterioration was observed during an annual review. Since then, some of the brickwork on the front of the building has fallen or loosened. Bricks removed during the repair work are stored in the building. The exterior stucco covering the masonry is retained with chain-link fencing. The mechanical system is not repairable; salvageable parts have been used for systems elsewhere in the Capitol Complex.

The only current use is as a critical access point to the Capitol Complex tunnel system for employees using Parking Lot C.

Discussion

The working group members, representing a broad cross-section of interests, presented their views and ideas during wide-ranging discussions, mostly focused on potential uses for the building. Suggestions included residential condominiums, a “one-stop shop” for government services, retail businesses such as a health club and coffee shop and interim state-office space during the Capitol renovation project. Neighborhood representatives especially expressed a strong interest in uses that are not limited to the 8-5 workday/week.

Over the course of meeting, the members received briefings regarding the history of the building; Constitutional, regulatory and financial issues that impact the site; and previously proposed use scenarios. The following points represent a consensus of the members of the working group:

1. The building and land are intertwined. Both were purposefully acquired for state government use. The Ford Building is of historical significance and offers an opportunity for neighborhood revitalization. The building should not be destroyed, sold or moved. The land is of significant value to the state because of its location on the Capitol Complex and its proximity to the State Capitol and State Office Building, including direct access to the tunnel system.

2. No substantive changes are currently proposed for the building or land. The building should be maintained in “mothball” status pending further decisions regarding its future. In order to reduce further building deterioration from the shock of freeze-and-thaw cycles, minimal heating (45 degrees) could be provided during colder months through the use of space heaters. However, the potentially expensive costs of operating space heaters would be borne by the entire Capitol Complex. The restoration of central heating would require reconstruction of the building’s HVAC system at significant expense.
3. Utilizing the building as interim state office space during the proposed Capitol renovation project may be convenient and cost-effective for those offices that will need to be temporarily relocated. The Capitol Area Architectural and Planning Board is developing a proposal in which Capitol restoration would begin following the end of the 2007 legislative session. At least 35,000 square feet of interim office space, and possibly more, will be required over the following six years. The complete renovation is expected to occur over eight to 10 years. Using the Ford Building for interim office space during Capitol restoration could be advantageous because of the building’s location and connection to the Capitol Complex tunnel system. Preparing the Ford Building for interim use would require the approval of funding during the 2006 legislative session. Preparations would need to be completed by the summer of 2007.
4. Leasing up to 5 percent of the building (the maximum allowable under federal tax code regarding tax-exempt bonds) for unrelated purposes, such as a coffee shop, restaurant or similar business. Longer term, consideration should be given to the concept of a “one-stop shop” for state government citizen services at the Ford Building. These uses would be located on the first floor, along University Avenue, and might serve to expand the building’s use beyond the end of the work day. Another option would be office space for lobbyists.
5. Re-opening the building for any use would require substantial renovation work. These costs, if bonded, would be recovered through the lease rates that would be paid by occupants. The Department of Administration estimated in FY2001 that this rate would be approximately \$36 per square foot, per year (based on estimated renovation costs of \$10.8 million), which is significantly above current market rates in downtown St. Paul and in state-owned facilities in the Capitol Complex. The rental rate would decrease after 20 years when the debt is retired. A possible solution would be a “historic preservation” allocation by the Legislature that would “buy down” the lease rate and make the space more competitive with what is available in the market.

Leasing vs. ownership analysis

The facility needs of the state can be addressed in leased space or state-owned space financed by the proceeds from the sale of general obligations bonds or revenue bonds. The evaluation of alternatives includes, among other things, a comparison of rent costs for alternative locations to determine the impact on the state agency’s operating budget (cash flow). However, in comparing lease vs. ownership costs, several additional factors are considered, including an evaluation of life-cycle costs on a net present value basis. In many cases, building ownership will save the state money in the long term, however, each project is considered on a case-by-case basis.

The lease rates for state-owned buildings managed by Admin include depreciation and bond interest on past improvements and all building operating costs. The projected lease rate for the Ford Building includes bond interest and depreciation on past improvements. This accounts for approximately \$1.84 of the projected square-foot lease rate. The depreciation and bond interest on the renovation of the building would account for \$15.46 of the projected rent (based on estimated cost of \$10.8 million).

The useful life of the Ford Building upon completion of the renovation would likely be extended 30 years or more. The benefits of ownership include creating equity or residual value in buildings. This benefit is realized to the greatest extent during the period after debt retirement and before the building is fully depreciated.

2005 legislation responses

The following points are in direct response to the charge by the Legislature to the Commissioner of Administration contained in 2005 session law.

Availability of potential lessees:

The Department of Administration continually reviews the availability of state-owned space for leasing to state entities, as well as space needs for those entities. The Ford Building was vacated because the cost of maintaining it as viable office space at low lease rates paid by the state printing operation became prohibitive. In addition, the condition of the building made it undesirable to prospective tenants. The costs of renovating or renovating and expanding the building would result in a high lease rate under current policies. Future potential leasing considerations include:

- A number of state boards, councils and/or agencies could possibly utilize the space in a renovated Ford Building. However, rent costs would likely be significantly higher than those at their current locations.
- The building could be utilized for temporary office relocation space during the Capitol restoration project, but this would depend on scheduling for both projects. The Department of Administration estimates that preparing the Ford Building for use would take about 18 months under normal circumstances.
- The Department of Administration in its 2004 Capital Budget Request projected the annual rental rate at \$36.21 per square foot, including the cost of renovation. The rental rate would decrease after 20 years, when the bond funds used to finance the renovation would be paid off.
- The state can contract for building-related services, such as a cafeteria or food service, at the Ford Building. The Department of Administration currently contracts with a private firm for food service in several Capitol Complex Buildings. Further, Minnesota Statute 248.07 provides Services for the Blind the ability to provide food service at this location.

Constraints on leasing:

Past improvements to the Ford Building have been financed with proceeds from the sale of state general obligation bonds. Therefore, the Ford Building is considered bond-financed property and is subject to certain federal and state requirements (constitutional and statutory) related to the use, management and/or sale of the property. Bond-financed property must be used for the express purpose of carrying out a government program established or authorized by law. Under federal and state laws, the state can lease up to 5 percent of a state-owned building for “unrelated purposes.”

Private leases over the 5 percent limit would have to be for a government program established or authorized by law. In these instances, the state is required to retain control of the program and would act similar to a board of directors.

Cost of restoration/rehabilitation:

The 2001 assessment estimated costs ranging from \$9.3 million for renovation (substantially for new mechanical systems) to \$32.5 million for the construction of a new 120,800 square foot building with a 324-stall parking ramp. A summary of these scenarios is included earlier in this report. The costs are in 2001 dollars and do not consider inflation or further deterioration that can occur in a vacant building. CPMI, one of the authors of the 2001 assessment, recently estimated that these costs would be about 35 percent higher in current dollars. Further analysis would be required to determine accurate cost estimates.

Appendix A: Ford Building Working Group members

Appendix B: The Ford Building: An Historical Overview

Appendix C: Sustainability and Historic Preservation Guidelines

Appendix D: Ford Building Predesign Assessment & Renovation/Reuse Scenarios

Appendix A
Ford Building Working Group members

John Arlandson

Rep. Greg Blaine

Kathleen Blair

Britta Bloomberg

Gerrie Boice

Carol Carey

Sen. Satveer Chaudhary

Rep. Matt Dean

Rep. Dan Dorman

John Errigo

Rep. Pat Garofalo

Karl Haddeland

Sen. Linda Higgins

Jerry Hoffman

Rep. Carl Jacobson

Rep. Sheldon Johnson

Jared Jordal

Rep. Phyllis Kahn

David Kelliher

Christine Kiel

Sen. Sheila Kiscaden

Rory Koch

Charles Liddy

Sven Lindquist

Rep. Diane Loeffler

Kevin Lundeen

Paul Mandell

Brian McMahon

Debbie Montgomery

Scott Neske

Krysta Niedernhofer

Troy Olsen

Mary Olson

Rep. Mark Olson

Sandy Pappas

Pastor Patrick Patterson

Dick Pellow

LaRissa Peltola

Rep. Neil Peterson

Helen Roberts

Marge Romero

Patricia Rooney

Rep. Marty Seifert

Rep. Loren Solberg

Amy Spong

Rep. Kathy Tingelstad

Pastor Sue Tjornehoj

Renee Tyler

Department of Administration Staff

Jim Rhodes, Convener

Wayne Waslaski

Jim Schwartz

Benjamin Brandenburg

Georgie Peterson, Facilitator

Appendix B: **The Ford Building: An Historical Overview**

In 1913, only 10 years after Henry Ford founded The Ford Motor Company in Detroit, plans were announced for building assembly plants in Minneapolis and St. Paul. The architectural firm Kees and Colburn of Minneapolis designed both buildings under the direction of Ford architect John Graham. The structures were built during 1913 and 1914, and share stylistic motifs. At ten stories in height, the Minneapolis plant, still standing at 419 N. 5th Street, was likely the tallest structure ever built for the purpose of manufacturing automobiles. The smaller sub-assembly plant in St. Paul, at 117 University Avenue, was more ornate than the utilitarian Minneapolis plant, in deference to its prominent location adjoining the new state capitol and its more sales-oriented purpose.

In anticipation of the new plants, Ford had already been assembling cars in leased space in Minneapolis, in a loft building at 616 S. Third Street. In the final three months of 1912, one hundred workers assembled 750 Model T's at this location. The movable assembly line had not yet been introduced, so the manufacture of cars was a fairly laborious manual process. Workers who started at the original facility recalled that the car parts were shipped in, seven to a boxcar, and were put together on wooden benches with just a few hand tools.

Ford had an even earlier sales presence in Minnesota. The second Ford dealership ever established by the company, Tenvoorde Motor Company in St. Cloud, received its franchise in March, 1903, three months *before* the company's incorporation. In Minneapolis, six weeks after the company was founded in Detroit, a distributorship known as the Northwestern Automobile Company received the 13th Ford car produced, and handled sales for the next nine years. Minnesota has the distinction of having more Ford dealers in continuous service for 50 years or longer than any other state.

A 1913 Ford Company newsletter stated:

From the very first the Northwest was a very good market for Ford cars. There is something about the hardy life of the farmers, most of them descendants of the Vikings, that led them to appreciate peculiarly the clean-cut strength of the Ford. In a way, the Ford is like one of these farmers. . . . As the years passed, the Ford cars rolled out of Minneapolis in numbers increasingly large. Year by year the business of the Ford dealers in that territory grew. Year by year the demand for cars became greater. This increasing demand made it absolutely necessary to establish a Ford branch in Minneapolis this year, with a sub-branch in St. Paul.

The Minutes of the Ford Motor Company Board of Directors, April 15, 1913, report the company spent \$10,199 purchasing the St. Paul site on University Avenue and was projecting a construction cost of \$56,000 for the new building. The Minneapolis site cost \$66,803, and the building was projected to cost \$300,000.

The Minneapolis project ran into early difficulty. In January, 1913, a dispute over an alleyway issue was raised at a City Council meeting and threatened to stall the project. St. Paul officials immediately took advantage of that opening and lobbied hard to have the larger assembly plant located in St. Paul, as reported in an article in the St. Paul Dispatch, January 30, 1913:

Factory Architect Graham of the Ford Motor Company came to St. Paul to look over the site recently purchased by the Ford people on University avenue. The land is just south of the North Central Commercial Club. It was originally planned to build a large retail store on the site and to erect a big assembling plant in Minneapolis. A difference over the running of an alley through the Minneapolis site has come up and the Ford people are now thinking of building the factory in St. Paul. Officials of the Ford company said today that all matters would be held in abeyance until it was a settled fact in which city the factory would be located.

Needless to say, the threat of pulling out of Minneapolis led the City Council to quickly resolve the alley issue and allow for construction to proceed.

A lengthy article in the St. Paul Pioneer Press on February 1, 1914, described the St. Paul Ford building just prior to its opening:

It is of reinforced concrete construction, 100 by 150 feet, with three stories and basement, and contains a total of 60,000 square feet of floor space, being the largest of its kind in the city. A unique feature of this newest of automobile branches is a tile roof constructed in such a way that cars can be tested, and worked out on top of the building, the walls extending nine feet above the tiling. . . The output of this company in St. Paul alone for 1914, is estimated at 500 cars. The local plant is but one of many. The Ford plant at Detroit alone would support a city of from 75,000 to 100,000 people. Branch assembling plants are located at Buffalo, Cambridge, Chicago, Columbus, Dallas, Denver, Houston, Kansas City, Long Island City, Los Angeles, Memphis, Minneapolis, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Portland, Ore.; San Francisco, Seattle and St. Louis in this country. Besides those there is the Ford Motor Company, Ltd. of Canada with a factory at Ford, Ont., across the Detroit river from Detroit, and Canadian service stations at Montreal, Toronto, Vancouver, London, Ont.; Calgary, Montreal, Hamilton, Saskatoon, and Winnipeg. Then there is the Manchester, England, factory, and service stations at Hamburg, Germany, and Paris France. The whole purpose of this gigantic system of branch plants is to facilitate manufacturing and shipping and to assure Ford owners in every part of the world the highest type of service after they have purchased their cars.

An article in the St. Paul Pioneer Press, February 13, 1921 described an auto mechanics school that later operated at the Ford Building:

A course of instruction for mechanics in charge of Ford cars and trucks for commercial houses has been started by the W. H. Schmelzel company, and the first session of school was held Friday at 7:30 P.M. at the Ford building, 117 University avenue. The subjects to be dealt with include front system, motor, transmission, rear axle, starting and lighting and general care and operation. The course may be taken free of charge by any mechanics handling Ford cars and sessions will be held at the Ford building, February 18, 25 and March 4. The Schmelzel Company has made 1800 hundred feet of animated film showing the operation of motor, cooling system, etc., to illustrate the points that will be made by the experts in charge of the course. The first session was attended by about 75 mechanics.

During the time that the Ford buildings were being constructed, Henry Ford was experimenting in Detroit with the assembly line, which essentially made the multi-story gravity feed “factory” obsolete. A sprawling one-story assembly plant, incorporating the new assembly line “process,” opened in 1924 in the Highland neighborhood of St. Paul, and is still in operation today. Assembly operations at the 117 University Avenue plant ceased, but Ford Company continued to hold the building as a sales and service center for a number of years. City directories and photographs show the Ford Building was vacant from 1937 through at least 1941. In 1947, the Kedney Warehouse Co was listed as occupying the building. By 1951 the structure was converted to federal offices and housed the US Division of Conciliation, and the Division of Social Welfare. The State of Minnesota occupied the building in 1952 with offices for the Department of Labor, Taxation, and Barbers Examination, among others, and has owned it to the present day.

In a Historic Sites Survey done by the Ramsey County Historical Society and the Saint Paul Heritage Preservation Commission in 1982, the Ford Building at 117 University Avenue was listed as historically significant and potentially eligible for designation on the National Register of Historic Places, and for listing as a St. Paul city landmark. Formal designation applications are currently being prepared and have received the support of the Preservation Alliance of Minnesota and other groups.

Brian McMahon
St. Paul

Appendix C

Sustainability and Historic Preservation Statutes and Guidelines

1. Sustainability Guidelines

The U.S. Green Building Council, a national organization of building industry leaders, works to promote buildings that are environmentally responsible, profitable and healthy places to live and work. The council has developed a 100-point rating system, first published in 1999, that are designed to improve the quality of buildings while reducing their impact on the environment before, during and after construction. The LEED-NC (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design-New Construction) rating system is applicable to new commercial construction and major renovation projects. The six subject areas of the rating system are:

- Sustainable sites
- Water efficiency
- Energy and atmosphere
- Materials and resources
- Indoor environmental quality
- Innovation and design process

Information about the U.S. Green Building Council and LEED-NC are available online at www.usgbc.org.

2. Minnesota Statutes and Historic Resources

Several state statutes offer protection for historic structures. These include:

- The Minnesota Environmental Rights Act, specifically Chapter 116B.02, subd. 4.
- The Outdoor Recreation Act of 1975, specifically M.S. 86A.04 and M.S. 86.05, subd. 11.
- Minnesota Statutes 2005, Chapter 138,665, Duties of state in regard to historic properties.
- Minnesota Statutes Chapter 16B.24 sub. 6 states a preference for the use of historic structures when needs cannot be accommodated in state-owned structures.

3. Historic Preservation Guidelines (U.S. Department of the Interior)

According to the National Park Service, “*The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* are the Secretary's best advice to everyone on how to protect a wide range of historic properties. *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring and Reconstructing Historic Buildings* are intended to provide guidance to historic building owners and building managers, preservation consultants, architects, contractors and project reviewers prior to treatment. These standards are accompanied by more detailed guidelines that provide additional direction for those undertaking preservation of historic structures.”

Additional Information is available online at: <http://www.cr.nps.gov/hps/tps/standguide/index.htm>.

Standards for Rehabilitation of Historic Structures

1. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces and spatial relationships.
2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.
4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.
5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.
8. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.