

DCD (SP02)

From: Rosetta Virgilio
To: Internet:barbara_little@nps.gov
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 1999 5:36 PM
Subject: Guidelines for Evaluating and Registering Archeological Properties

Barbara,

This is in response to Carol Shull's November 3, 1999, correspondence. We thank you for the opportunity to review the subject draft document; however we do not have any substantive comments to provide at this time.

Rosetta
301-415-2307

CC: Kerr, Kathleen, Lohaus, Paul, Usilton, Brenda

89
NRC FILE CENTER COPY

PDR S TPRG

SP-A-2



United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

1849 C Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20240

IN REPLY REFER TO:

H32(2280)

NOV 3 1999

Dear Colleague:

Enclosed is a draft of a National Register bulletin, *Guidelines for Evaluating and Registering Archeological Properties*. This draft is an update of the National Register Bulletin, *Guidelines for Evaluating and Registering Historical Archeological Sites and Districts*, published in 1993. We would appreciate receiving your comments and suggestions on this draft by **January 15, 2000**. You may share this draft with any persons or organizations that may have an interest in this subject and the National Register of Historic Places program. Please forward any comments to Barbara Little, Archeology and Ethnography, National Park Service, 1849 C Street, NW, NC210, Washington, DC 20240. If you have any questions, she can be reached at 202/343-1058 or by e-mail at barbara_little@nps.gov.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Carol D. Shull, Keeper
National Register of Historic Places
National Register, History and Education

Fn: nrb99-2

Guidelines for Evaluating and Registering Archeological Properties

Table of Contents

Preface

Acknowledgments [when comments are received]

I. Introduction

What is Archeology?

Archeology is the study of past ways of life through material remains and, often, other evidence such as oral history, ethnography, and the documentary record. The perspective of archeology is comparable to that of history but archeology is more often considered a social science than one of the humanities. In the United States it is considered one of the four fields of anthropology along with cultural, biological and linguistic anthropology.

Archeologists have at least three over-arching goals. The first is to reconstruct sequences of societies and events in chronological order in local and regional contexts. The second is to reconstruct past lifeways, including the ways that people made a living (such as how they obtained and raised food as well as how they produced, distributed and consumed tools and other goods); the ways they used the landscape (such as the size and distribution of camps, villages, towns, and special places); and their interactions with other societies and within their own (such as household structure, social organization, political organizations and relationships). The third is to achieve some understanding of how and why human societies have changed through time.

To pursue these goals, archeologists must assemble information from many individual sites. The synthesis of archeological research requires a great deal of time but it is the accumulation and comparison of answers to many questions of seemingly local or short-term interest that allow questions of major anthropological significance to be addressed. For example, archeologists seek to understand the effects of environmental change and population pressure and the impact of human actions on the landscape. Such questions often require pieces of information from numerous small and large sites. Like most sciences, archeology is less involved with spectacular discoveries than with testing modest hypotheses about rather humble phenomena. The accumulated results of such tests provide the basis for large scale research. Thus, no one should be surprised at the fact that archeologists often are more interested in small, simple, ordinary, and seemingly redundant properties than in big, impressive monuments.

Archeology in USA and the National Historic Preservation Act

Most archeology in the United States is done as a result of statute and regulation, particularly that of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires that Federal agencies take into account the effect their projects have on properties listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. As part of the process, the State Historic Preservation Officer and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation must be afforded an opportunity to comment on the proposed project. It is the responsibility of the Federal Agency to comply with the Advisory Council's regulations, 36 CFR Part 800, to ensure that these cultural resources are considered in the Federal planning process.

Listing of a property in the National Register of Historic Places does not give the Federal government any control over a property, nor does it impose any financial obligations on the owners, or obligations to make the property accessible to the public, or interfere with an owner's right to alter, manage, or dispose of their property. Listing in the National Register provides recognition that a property is significant to the Nation, the State, or the community and assures that federal agencies consider the historic values in the planning for Federal or federally assisted projects.

During the first decade of that Act, properties were afforded consideration only if they were actually listed. Amendments to the act expanded that protection to properties that were eligible as well, spawning a whole industry of Cultural Resource Management tied to all kinds of projects with federal involvement. Reference to "Section 106" in U.S. archaeological parlance refer to this provision of the Act. The National Register criteria, then, have become enormously important in U.S. archaeology. They are applied far beyond the actual listing of sites in the Register; they are applied to nearly every potentially threatened site on federal and much state land. It is clear that State offices, where many of the day to day recommendations about significance are made, use what is actually listed on the Register as a guide to determining what is eligible for the Register.

The evaluation criteria for the National Register of Historic Places are used for the daily work of Cultural Resource Management. Defining the research potential and, increasingly, other values of archaeological sites and districts according to these criteria has affected the way the public as well as the profession regards the significance of archaeology. There has been a great deal of discussion in the professional literature about the significance concept and its application to archaeological properties. For an annotated bibliography see Briuer and Mathers (1997). See also Briuer (1996) and Lees and Noble (1990).

What is an Archeological Property?

As humans interact with their environment and with each other, they leave behind evidence of their actions. Derived from the common phrase "archeological site," the National Register defines an archeological property as the place or places where the remnants of a past culture survive in a physical context that allows for the interpretation of these remains. It is this physical evidence of

the past and its patterning that is the archeologist's data base. The physical evidence, or archeological remains, usually takes the form of artifacts (e.g., fragments of tools or ceramic vessels), features (e.g., remnants of walls, cooking hearths, or trash middens), and ecological evidence (e.g., pollens remaining from plants that were in the area when the activities occurred). Ecological remains of interest to archeologists are often referred to as "ecofacts." Things that are of archeological importance may be very subtle, hard to see and record. It is not only artifacts themselves that are important but the locations of artifacts relative to one another, which is referred to as archeological context (not to be confused with historic contexts, discussed below). Archeologists frequently rely upon ethnographic information, either directly or through analogy, to analyze the archeological record. Oral history and traditional knowledge is often essential for interpretation.

In accordance with National Register terminology, an archeological property can be a district, site, building, structure, or object. However, archeological properties are most often sites and districts.

An archeological property may be "prehistoric," historic, or contain components from both periods. What is often termed "*Prehistoric archeology*" studies the archeological remains of indigenous American societies as they existed before substantial contact with Europeans. The National Historic Preservation Act treats prehistory as a part of history for purposes of national policy. Because many Native American groups consider the term "prehistory" to pejoratively suggest that there was no history prior to European contact, we use the term "pre-contact" instead of "prehistoric" in this bulletin unless we are quoting legislation or regulations.

The date of contact varied across the country. Therefore there is no single year that marks the transition from pre-contact to contact and post-contact. It is important to use the periods of significance for a property to understand its chronological place in the history of what is now the United States.

For example, between 1492 and 1495, Christopher Columbus landed on the island of Puerto Rico; Juan Ponce de Leon named and explored the Florida peninsula in 1513; the English labeled a portion of the Atlantic coastline (no North Carolina) as "Virginia" in 1584, and Jean Nicolet arrived in Wisconsin in 1634. In the western United States, Juan de Anza contacted the Native Americans of what is now inland Southern California in 1749, the year that Alexandria, Virginia, already a thriving port, was officially chartered; and Meriwether Lewis and William Clark first contacted the Native Americans of the northwest plains in 1805, several centuries after Columbus arrived in the New World. Thus, the boundary between the pre-contact and historic periods is individually defined from region to region. What constitutes contact between Native American and Europeans also varies. In most regions of the country, Native American groups experienced European contact through long-range trade and the diffusion of European diseases long before they had any direct, face-to-face interaction with the Europeans.

Historical archeology is the archeology of sites and structures dating from time periods since significant contact between American Indians and Europeans. It may be thought of as the archeology of the modern world. Documentary or oral records can be used to better understand these properties and their inhabitants. An integrated historical and archeological investigation will generally produce more information about a particular historic property (or activities associated with that property) than would have been gleaned through the separate study of either the archeological remains or the historical record alone.

While pre-contact sites may have standing architecture or ruins, they would rarely be evaluated without consideration of their archeological value. Historical archeological properties also may include standing or intact buildings or structures that have a direct historical association with below-ground archeological remains. Historic places such as Mount Vernon, the home of George Washington, that are well-recognized for their historical and architectural importance often contain hidden archeological components.

Archeological remains can be terrestrial or underwater. Although it is common to think of underwater archeology as dealing exclusively with shipwrecks, there are many types of sites that are submerged. Some sites, for example, are submerged under the water of reservoirs.

Archeologists strive to better understand humankind and its history through the study of the physical remains that are left behind and the patterning of these remains. Even modern trash cans and landfills may be worthy of investigation (e.g., Rathje 1977, 1979). For the purposes of the National Register of Historic Places, however, historical archeological properties are at least 50 years old. A historical archeological property less than 50 years old may be listed in the National Register if the exceptional importance of the archeological remains can be demonstrated.

What is the Purpose of this Bulletin?

Across the United States, archeological properties are a finite and increasingly threatened cultural resource. Although archeological sites contain a unique source of information about the past, their study can often require a considerable investment of personnel and funding in background **research**, excavation, and curate. As the only official national listing of important archeological **properties**, the National Register is a valuable tool in the management and preservation of our increasingly rare archeological resources. Thus, National Register nominations should be prepared for properties where the management or preservation of the property is anticipated or desirable. All archeologists should be well versed in the kinds and level of information needed to complete a National Register nomination form prior to conducting fieldwork.

In many ways, a National Register nomination often is similar to a synopsis of an archeological research report. Research summaries describe the physical environment of the site,

sketch the cultural background for the project area, outline the history of previous investigations, detail the nature of the archeological record at the site, and elucidate the important scientific questions that were addressed by the study. National Register nominations contain components comparable to this ideal research report, with specific emphasis on the description of the site and its significance in understanding our past.

This bulletin provides specific guidance on how to prepare National Register of Historic Places nomination forms for archeological properties. This guidance applies also to the preparation of the individual nominations that accompany multiple property National Register nominations. It also applies to Determination of Eligibility (DOE) documents although they need not be prepared on the standard nomination forms.

Who can prepare nominations for archeological properties?

Anyone may prepare an archeological property nomination and submit it to the National Register through the appropriate State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), a Federal agency's Historic Preservation Officer (FPO), or a Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO). At a minimum, the preparer(s) should have a first-hand knowledge of the relevant archeological and historical literature and of archeological resources similar to the property being nominated or have the assistance of persons who do.

In general, archeologists who meet the minimum qualifications for a professional in archeology have the knowledge or expertise needed to adequately describe and evaluate the significance of an archeological property. These qualifications include a graduate degree in archeology, anthropology, or a related field; field and analytical experience in North American archeology; at least one year of full-time supervisory experience in the study of historical archaeological properties; and a demonstrated ability to carry research to completion. With guidance from a SHPO office or federal agency or with training through paraprofessional certification programs or academic course work, avocational archeologists and others can acquire the knowledge needed to prepare archeological nominations. (The minimum qualifications for an archeologist, as well as other cultural resource specialists, are outlined in "Appendix A - Professional Qualification Standards," Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 61.)

Who can determine the eligibility of archeological properties?

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) requires Federal agencies to consider the impacts of their undertakings on properties included in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. Regulations provide two ways to make eligibility determinations. Formal determinations are made by the Keeper of the National Register at the request of the Federal agency official (36 CFR 63.2). More commonly, Federal agencies use the

Consensus Determination of Eligibility (Consensus DOE) process provided by Section 800.4 of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation's regulations. This allows Federal decision makers, in consultation with SHPOs or THPOs, to assess a property and, should they both agree that it meets the criteria for listing on the National Register of Historical Places, treat the property as eligible for purposes of compliance with the Council's regulations. In either case, a specific property is found eligible or ineligible for the National Register, thereby establishing its status in the Section 106 process.

The use of the Consensus process does not allow for a lower threshold for significance than the formal DOE or NRHP listing procedures. DOE is a legally recognized finding that a property meets the criteria for listing in the National Register. Under Section 106, properties that are eligible are given the same legal status as properties formally listed in the National Register, requiring that the Federal agency official "take into account" the effects of an undertaking upon them and afford the Council a "reasonable opportunity to comment" on those effects. To qualify, a property must be found to meet one or more of the National Register criteria either by the formal determination of the Keeper (36 CFR 63) or by the consensus process. It is essential to note that the same criteria, including concepts of significance and integrity, apply to properties determined eligible and those accepted by the Keeper for formal listing in the National Register. This means that a property determined eligible could be nominated to the National Register because it meets the same criteria, although nomination is not legally required.

When should information be restricted from public access?

Although the information in the National Register is part of the public record, Section 304 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), as amended in 1992 and Section 9(a) of the Archeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) provide the legal authority for restricting information about archeological properties. The National Register Bulletin, *Guidelines for Restricting Information About Historic and Prehistoric Resources* specifies the legislative authority for restricting information in the National Register as well as in other inventories.

Section 304 (a) Authority to Withhold from Disclosure, reads as follows:

The head of a Federal agency or other public official receiving grant assistance pursuant to this Act, after consultation with the Secretary, shall withhold from disclosure to the public, information about the location, character, or ownership of a historic resource if the Secretary and the agency determine that disclosure may - (1) cause a significant invasion of privacy; (2) risk harm to the historic resource; or (3) impede the use of a traditional religious site by practitioners.

In this context privacy refers to the privacy of individuals.

ARPA protects archaeological resources on public lands and Indian lands. Section 9(a) permits the withholding from the public of information concerning the nature and location of any archaeological resource unless such information does “not create a risk of harm to such resources or to the site at which such resources are located” (9(a)(2)).

The full text of the relevant sections of these laws should be consulted.

Vandalism, artifact collecting (also called pot hunting, relic hunting, bottle collecting, etc.) and removal of historic features or structures are all activities that diminish the integrity of an archeological site. In order to minimize the possibility that these activities will occur as a result of nominating the site to the National Register, the preparer or the Preservation Officer may ask that the specific location of the property be restricted. There is no need to prove that a particular site is at risk if other similar types of sites are endangered. Other kinds of information (e.g., the presence of human remains or marketable artifacts) may also be restricted. Restricted information other than location should be on a separate continuation sheet and not in the body of the text. Locational information is provided in specific sections of the nomination and is deleted easily. For this reason, the preparer should ensure that locational information is indeed restricted to easily deleted parts of the text and not scattered throughout the description of the property.

If the property and its location are generally known, then locational information should not be restricted. Also, if all of the site information should be made available to those conducting research or, for example developing heritage tourism or education projects, then the information should not be restricted.

Using the National Register

The National Register helps us understand and appreciate our heritage and what specific places mean in American history. National Register documentation is used by researchers, planners, teachers, tourism professionals, and community advocates. National Register documentation is an important source of archeological information directly available to the general public. The National Register Information System (NRIS) is a data base that is available to anyone via the Internet. It does not contain specific locational information for properties where this information is restricted. The NRIS facilitates research that is regional and comparative. Multiple Property documentation in particular can provide excellent source material for both professional research and popular interpretation.

The Teaching with Historic Places program develops lesson plans based on National Register documentation. These lesson plans are available to teachers and others via the Internet. Several National Register travel itineraries are available on the Internet as well.

Listing of resources promotes their preservation rather than destruction, thereby fostering stewardship of significant places. Planning is more efficiently done when information about properties that are recognized as significant is readily available in nominations. Unless properties are actually listed in the National Register, it is difficult for archeological historic places -- particularly those not readily apparent to the casual observer -- to be fully appreciated by the public .

What If an Archeological Property Is Nationally Significant?

Archeological properties are nominated at the local, state, or national level of significance. The State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO) or the Federal Preservation Officer (FPO) make the recommendation as to level of significance based upon the documentation presented in the nomination. Most archeological sites are listed as significant at a statewide or local level. Note that "statewide" is checked for "regionally" significant properties. The Historic Preservation Officer may check "nationally" significant if the significance of the property transcends regional significance.

The Secretary of Interior, however, determines if a property is *officially* of national significance. In order to make this determination, the Secretary applies the criteria and follows the procedures in 36 CFR, Part 65-National Historic Landmarks Program. Archeological sites are evaluated generally under criterion 6, which reads:

(6) that have yielded information of major scientific importance by revealing new cultures, or by shedding light upon periods of occupation over large areas of the United States. Such sites are those which have yielded, or which may reasonably be expected to yield, data affecting theories, concepts and ideas to a major degree.

If a property appears to be nationally significant and qualify for designation as a National Historic Landmark, then Appendix V of *How to Complete the National Register Registration Form* should be consulted for additional guidelines on completing the National Register form and providing supplemental information. (Also see *Archeology in the National Historic Landmarks Program* by Robert S. Grumet 1988; 1990.) In-depth guidance is provided in the NHL Bulletin, *How to Prepare National Historic Landmark Nominations*.

What other National Register Bulletins may be helpful?

Appendix A, "National Register Bulletins," lists the current National Register bulletins that provide guidance on nominating properties to the National Register. The primary bulletin for all individual and district nominations *How to Complete the National Register Registration Form*.

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

How to Complete the National Register Multiple Property Documentation outlines how to prepare a multiple property documentation form.

It is important to consult *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, especially when evaluating archeological properties that may also be important for their association with historical events or broad patterns, significant persons, or significant architecture. *How to Establish Boundaries for National Register Properties* will be especially helpful. See in particular its appendix, *Definition of National Register Boundaries for Archeological Properties*. Those working with places of value to Native Americans will want to consult *Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties*. Depending on the individual circumstances of your property, other bulletins may be useful.

In addition to the requirements described in this and other National Register bulletins, individual SHPOs, THPOs and FPOs may request additional information not required as part of a complete National Register form. Prior to budgeting for, or embarking upon, a nomination project, consult the appropriate Preservation Officer about additional requirements and the nomination review process.

What other National Park Service guidance may be helpful?

National Park Service *Thematic Framework* (NPS 1996)
www.cr.nps.gov/history/thematic.html

National Historic Landmarks Bulletin:
How to Prepare National Historic Landmark Nominations.

Archeological Assistance Program Technical Briefs:
#3: Archeology in the National Historic Landmarks Program. 1988, 1990. Robert S. Grumet.
#10: The National Historic Landmarks Program Theme Study and Preservation Planning. 1992.
Robert S. Grumet.

Heritage Preservation Services:
Protecting Archeological Sites on Public Lands. 1993. Susan L. Henry

II. Historic Contexts for Archeological Evaluation

Historic contexts provide the basis for judging a property's significance and, ultimately, its eligibility under the Criteria. Historic contexts are those patterns, themes, or trends in history by which a specific occurrence, property, or site is understood and its historic meaning (and ultimately its significance) is made clear. Context discussion is similar to what is often called a

“culture history” or “historical and archeological background” section in archeological site reports. This bulletin addresses evaluation, but survey and identification goals also should be based on historic contexts.

A historic context is a body of thematically, geographically, and temporally linked information. For an archeological property, the historic context is the analytical framework within which the property's importance can be understood and to which an archeological study is likely to contribute important information.

A historic context is multi-dimensional; numerous contexts may be appropriate for an individual archeological property. For example, an architectural context would be applicable if one were nominating a property with a standing structure that is directly associated with the archeological deposits and is also an excellent example of an important architectural style that has been rarely documented.

Many factors influence the determination of which contexts are most important vis-a-vis a given archeological property. These factors include the type of property; the data sets and archeological patterning represented at the site; the region in which the property is located; the time period that the property was occupied or used; the history of the region where the site is located; the role that the property played in the historical development of the jurisdiction, state, and region in which it is located; the property's role in America's history; the information identified in the state historic preservation plan based upon work and research that has already been done; and the research interests and theoretical orientation of the archeologist.

Archeological properties can be associated with a variety of historic contexts, and these contexts will contain varying levels of refinement and sophistication. Only those contexts important to understanding and justifying the significance of the property must be discussed.

EXAMPLE: Through research one has learned that the well preserved ruins of an eighteenth-century sugar factory are directly linked to the chartering and early economic development of a town in which they are located. The ruins also are the only surviving sugar factory ruins that illustrate the region's early maritime and international trade activities. In addition, research indicates that 100 years after its abandonment the sugar factory housed a state militia unit for a few weeks, this was the only other use of the property.

- To illustrate the sugar factory's significance, one must discuss the establishment and early economic development of the town and the maritime and international trade activities of the region at the time the factory was in operation. The association of the sugar factory with these activities, as well as the technology of sugar production, must be addressed.

- Assuming no historical importance associated with the militia's stay, however, it is unlikely that an archeological study of the property would contribute information important to understanding the state's military history. As a result, this aspect of the property's history need not be discussed as a context.

- If the use of the factory by the militia unit has a bearing on the integrity of the property, this should be noted in the descriptive text.

The discussion of historic contexts should be organized in a manner that best presents the context information for the given property. Document the supporting evidence for the significance criteria checked and for the information categories (Areas of Significance, Historic Function, Period of Significance, and Cultural Affiliation). If applicable, document Architectural Classification, Criteria Considerations, Significant Dates, Significant Person, and Architect/Builder. Each information category does not need to be discussed separately. Nevertheless, the reader should be able to see the link between the information presented in the "Historic Contexts" discussion and that provided in the information categories. For example, if "Education" is entered under "Areas of Significance," the "Historic Context" discussion must include sufficient information to justify entering that category.

In addition, the information presented in the historic contexts and in other sections of the significance section must be interrelated. For example, a nomination that include hypotheses on economic development among its important research questions should have a discussion of the property's, district's, or region's economic development in the historic context.

Major decisions about identifying, evaluating, registering, and treating historic properties are most reliably made in the context of other related properties. A historic context is an organizational format that groups information about related historic properties, based on a theme, geographic limits and chronological period. Evaluation uses the historic context as the framework within which to apply the criteria for evaluation to specific properties or property types.

Historic contexts are linked to actual historic properties through the concept of the property type. Generally historic contexts should not be constructed so broadly as to include all property types under a **single** historic context or so narrowly as to contain only one property type per historic context. The following procedures should be followed in creating a historic context.

1. Identify the concept, time period and geographic limits for the historic context.
2. Assemble existing information about the historic context.
3. Synthesize the information.
4. Define property types.
5. Identify further information needs.

All archeological sites have some potential to convey information about the past, however, not all of that information may be important to our understanding of prehistory or history. The nature of important information is linked to the theories or paradigms that drive the scientific study of past societies. It is important to realize that historic contexts, and therefore site significance, should be updated and changed to keep pace with current work in the discipline. As Nicholas Honerkamp (1988:5) writes:

We ignore theory at our peril It is very easy to become scientifically and/or humanistically superfluous if we do not continually redefine what is important and why it is important. If as archeologists we can identify questions that matter and then explain why they matter, a number of things then begin to fall into place. For instance, field methodologies and analysis routines become driven by solid research designs instead of existing in a theoretical vacuum and being applied in a mechanistic fashion; in the cultural resource management context, the "significance" concept becomes better defined and less slippery in its application ...

To assist in the preparation of National Register nominations, all state historic preservation offices have gathered information, such as county and state histories, cartographic sources, archeological and architectural site files, and management documents that foster the identification, evaluation, and preservation of cultural resources. These materials may include previously identified local, regional, or statewide historic contexts. The state, tribal or federal historic preservation office may be able to provide relevant contexts or historic contexts. In many cases, the "Areas of Significance" or the historic "Functions and Uses" listed in *National Register Bulletin How to Complete the National Register Registration Form* suggest appropriate historic contexts. Helpful information regarding historic contexts also may be found in multiple property National Register submissions for similar historic properties (see Appendix B).

The National Park Service's Thematic Framework (1996) provides guidance on the development of historic contexts. Consideration of the main themes and associated topics will promote a framework that is inclusive of many levels of community and regional history. The framework is designed to assist in the development of historic contexts by guiding researchers to ask thorough questions about a property or region. The text of the Thematic Framework is available at www.cr.nps.gov/history/thematic.html.

III. Identifying archeological properties

How Are Archeological Properties Identified?

Proper identification of a historic property serves as the foundation for a sound National Register nomination and for subsequent planning protection, and management of the resource. When considering a property for listing in the National Register, the nomination preparer needs to

be able to answer questions about the history of the property and its physical setting the characteristics of the site's archeological record, and the boundaries of the property.

The identification of archeological properties generally involves background research, field survey, archeological testing and analysis and evaluation of the results. Archeologists use a variety of information sources to reconstruct the history of a property including written documents, oral testimony; the presence and condition of surviving buildings, structures, landscapes, and objects; and the archeological record. Where the archeological is well-known, the locations and types of sites may serve as the basis for predictive models for further site identification. Written documentary resources may provide information about the people and activities that occurred at a site; oral history and traditional knowledge can enumerate aspects of the archeological property's use, abandonment, and subsequent alteration; and extant buildings, structures, landscape features, and objects can provide important temporal and functional information upon which to base additional research.

Generally background research should be completed prior to the field studies. This research involves examining primary sources of historical information (e.g., deeds and wills), secondary sources (e.g., local histories and genealogies), and historic cartographic sources; reviewing previous archeological research in similar areas, models that predict site distribution, and archeological, architectural, and historical site inventory files; and conducting informant interviews.

Information that can only be obtained through archeological survey or test excavations may be needed for many archeological properties before a nomination can be prepared. The identification of archeological properties is discussed more thoroughly in National Register Bulletin: *Guidelines for Local Surveys: A Basis for Preservation Planning*, especially Chapter 11, "Conducting the Survey," and Appendix 1, "Archeological Surveys." Also see The Secretary of Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Identification. Individual states or localities may have specific guidelines or permit requirements for archeological investigations. Contact your State Historic Preservation Officer, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, or the Federal Preservation officer prior to beginning any archeological research project (Camett 1991).

In order to identify the presence and location of a site, an archeologist generally begins by inspecting the ground surface or probing below the surface using soil cores or shovel tests. Artifacts (such as nails, ceramic sherds, and fragments of bottle glass) and features (such as mounds, circular depressions, concentrations of bricks, or defined soil discolorations) are the most common indicators of archeological properties. Artifacts in the plow-disturbed soils of active and former agricultural fields can also demonstrate the location of archeological properties. Non-native plant species or spatial patterning of plants (such as clusters of daffodils or groupings of cedar trees) may signal the presence of a historical archeological property.

Archeologists usually identify the presence and extent of a site through excavation of randomly, systematically, or judgmentally placed test units. Test units are used to show the presence or absence of artifacts and features below the present ground surface. If the primary goal of the fieldwork is to determine the National Register eligibility of an archeological property, then disturbance to the property through excavation, including test excavation, should be kept to the minimum needed to demonstrate the information potential and boundaries of the archeological deposits.

After the field studies are complete, the archeologist identifies and documents the artifacts, features, and ecofacts that make up the property. For the purpose of comparison with other properties, these data are quantified. Special attention is given to describing and analyzing temporally, functionally, and culturally diagnostic artifacts, features, or ecofacts. Generally, one must complete the laboratory analysis phase of a project before determining the potential significance of an archeological property.

Among American archeologists, specific test strategies -- that is, the number, shape, placement, and method of test excavations -- are as diverse as the characteristics of the archeological record. Because of the impact on the quality of information recovered, the archeological field methods used at historic properties are an important part of the description of any archeological research project.

What different kinds of surveys are commonly used?

(For more information consult the National Register Bulletin *Guidelines for Local Surveys: A Basis for Preservation Planning*)

Both the *Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Identification* and common practice distinguish between two general levels of survey: *reconnaissance*, and *intensive* survey. Both kinds of survey involve background research as well as field work, but they are different in terms of the level of effort involved.

Reconnaissance is an inspection of an area, useful for generally characterizing its resources and for developing a basis for deciding how to organize and orient more detailed survey efforts. An *intensive survey* is a close and careful look at the area being surveyed. It is designed to identify precisely and completely resources in the area. It generally involves detailed background research, and a thorough inspection and documentation of properties in the field.

Reconnaissance and intensive survey are often conducted in sequence, with reconnaissance being used in planning intensive survey. They are also sometimes combined, with intensive survey directed at locations where background research indicates a likely high concentration of historic resources and reconnaissance directed at areas where fewer resources can be expected. They can also be combined with reference to different resource types: for example, in a given area it may be

appropriate to conduct an intensive survey of buildings and structures but only a reconnaissance with reference to archeological sites, while in another area archeological sites may require intensive survey while buildings need only a "once over lightly" examination.

The *Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Identification* specify the kinds of information that should be collected as a result of field survey:

A **reconnaissance survey** should document:

1. The kinds of properties looked for;
2. The boundaries of the area surveyed;
3. The method of survey, including the extent of survey coverage;
4. The kinds of historic properties present in the survey area;
5. Specific properties that were identified, and the categories of information collected; and
6. Places examined that did not contain historic properties.

An **intensive survey** should document:

1. The kinds of properties looked for;
2. The boundaries of the area surveyed;
3. The method of survey, including an estimate of the extent of survey coverage;
4. A record of the precise location of all properties identified; and
5. Information on the appearance, significance, integrity, and boundaries of each property sufficient to permit an evaluation of its significance.

It is important to take historic contexts into account. Failure to do so can lead to the application of survey methods that are not cost-effective, that fail to identify significant resources, or that contain uncontrolled biases.

Historic contexts are almost always refined, modified, added to, and elaborated on as the survey itself proceeds. At the point of planning the survey, it may be feasible to define them only in broad, general terms; sufficient flexibility should always be maintained to allow changes to take place as the survey progresses. An initial statement of historic contexts should be developed during the earliest stages of planning to guide development of the actual survey design.

Oral history and ethnography can contribute to identification efforts. Much of a community's or neighborhood's history may not be on record anywhere, but may be richly represented in the memories of its people, and its cultural and aesthetic values may be best represented in their thoughts, expressions, and ways of life. For this reason, it is often important to include an oral historical or ethnographic component in the survey. Both fields of study are based substantially on interviews with knowledgeable citizens: oral history focusses on straightforward recordation of their recollections, while ethnography is more concerned with contemporary cultural values, perceptions, and ways of life.

Oral historical and ethnographic research must be planned and carried out with the full knowledge and cooperation of community and neighborhood leaders and with sensitivity to their cultural backgrounds, values, and modes of expression. For more information consult the National Register Bulletins, *Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties* and *Guidelines for Local Surveys: A Basis for Preservation Planning*.

IV. Evaluating Significance of archeological properties

National Register Criteria

The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting materials, workmanship, feeling association, and:

- A. that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
- B. that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
- C. that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic value, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- D. that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Criteria Considerations

Unless certain special requirements (known as the criteria considerations) are met, moved properties; birthplaces; cemeteries; reconstructed buildings, structures, or objects; commemorative properties; and properties that have achieved significance within the past 50 years are not generally eligible for the National Register. The criteria considerations, or exceptions to these rules, are found in National Register Bulletin *How to Complete the National Register Registration Form* and National Register Bulletin, *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*.

Note: if a property is an integral part of a district or site that meets the criteria, then do not apply the criteria considerations to the individual property. For example, a nomination for an archeological district consisting of archeological sites, some above-ground ruins, several standing structures, and two historically associated cemeteries need not address the criterion consideration for cemeteries because the two cemeteries are an integral part of the district. For more information on cemeteries and burial places, see National Register Bulletin: *Guidelines for*

Evaluating and Registering Cemeteries and Burial Places. A cemetery that is nominated under Criterion D for information potential does not need to meet criteria consideration D.

The National Register criteria considerations are:

- A. A religious property may be eligible if it derives its primary significance from architectural or artistic distinction or historical importance.
- B. A property removed from its original or historically significant location can be eligible if it is significant primarily for its architectural value or it is the surviving property most importantly associated with a historic person or event.
- C. A birthplace or grave of a historical figure may be eligible if the person is of outstanding importance and if there is no other appropriate site or building directly associated with his or her productive life.
- D. A cemetery may be eligible if it derives its primary significance from graves of persons of transcendent importance, from age, from distinctive design features, or from association with historic events.
- E. A reconstructed property may be eligible when it is accurately executed in a suitable environment and presented in a dignified manner as part of a restoration master plan and when no other building or structure with the same associations has survived.
- F. A property primarily commemorative in intent can be eligible if design, age, tradition, or symbolic value has invested it with its own historic significance.
- G. A property achieving significance within the last 50 years may be eligible if it is of exceptional importance.

A National Register property must meet at least one of the above National Register criteria; it may meet more than one. Each criterion that is checked on the nomination form must be fully justified. For example, if a Civil War battlefield qualifies under Criteria A and D, then both the battle and its importance and the important information that archeological investigations would likely yield need to be addressed.

Properties nominated to the National Register under Criteria A, B, or C often contain archeological deposits. For example, a nineteenth-century farmstead (including the main houses and outbuildings) that qualifies for listing under Criteria A, B, or C may have intact archeological deposits. In many cases, however, these deposits are undocumented. In such cases, the preparer should clearly note the potential for archeological deposits in the text of the nomination. Unless the significance of the property is justified under Criterion D, Criterion D should not be checked

on the nomination form. Once additional studies are done to document the archeological information retained in the site, then the nomination form should be amended to add Criterion D.

In the above case, the archeological deposits need not relate to the significance of the documented standing structures. For example, the Henderson Hill Historic District in West Virginia is a large nineteenth-century farm complex eligible under A, B, C, and D. The archeological component of the farm itself has not been evaluated but three Woodland period mounds on the property are likely to yield important information.

Evaluating Sites in Context

The National Register Bulletin, *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, recommends the following sequence for evaluation:

1. Categorize the Property.
2. Determine which historic context(s) the property represents.
3. Determine whether the property is significant under the National Register Criteria.
4. Determine if the property represents a type usually excluded from the National Register.
5. Determine whether the property retains integrity.

There are a few things to keep in mind when following this sequence. Historic contexts usually have been developed in some form for the identification of properties. It is possible, though, that the contexts will need to be further developed for evaluation. The assessment of integrity is the final step in the sequence and should not be used as an initial step with which to screen properties.

Since decisions regarding the evaluation of properties involves placing properties in historic contexts, the more that is known about a given context, the better will be the evaluation decisions made about particular properties.

Evaluation decisions can be made on the basis of incomplete data, but it is wise not to make them without some information on historic contexts and their component property types. A decision that a given property is not significant should never be made without access to a reasonable body of data on relevant historic contexts, since such an uninformed decision may result in the property's destruction without attention to its historic values.

When an evaluation must be made without a firm understanding of the relevant historic contexts, however, it should be made on the basis of as much relevant data as it is possible to accumulate, and with full recognition of the fact that it may result in the destruction of a property that might later on the basis of complete survey results be found to be very significant, or in the investment of money and other resources in a property later found to lack historic value.

A statement of significance, whether designed to show that a property is or is not significant, should be developed as a reasoned argument, first identifying the historic context or contexts to which the property could relate, next discussing the property types within the context and their relevant characteristics, and then showing how the property in question does or does not have the characteristics required to qualify it as part of the context.

In order to decide whether a property is significant within its historic context, determine:

- the facet of history of the local area, State, or the nation that the property represents;
- whether that facet of prehistory or history is significant
- whether it is a type of property that has relevance and importance in illustrating the historic context
- how the property illustrates that history and
- whether the property possesses the physical features necessary to convey the aspect of prehistory or history with which it is associated.

Local context

The level of context of archeological sites significant for their information potential depends on the scope of the applicable research design. For example, a late Mississippian village site may yield information in a research design concerning one settlement system on a regional scale, while in another research design it may reveal information of local importance concerning a single group's stone tool manufacturing techniques or house forms. It is a question of how the available information potential is likely to be used.

State context

Pre-contact and many early colonial sites are not often considered to have "State" significance, per se, largely because States are relatively recent political entities and usually do not correspond closely either to Native American political territories or cultural areas or to U.S. lands prior to statehood. Numerous sites, however, may be of significance to a large region that might geographically encompass parts of one, or usually several, States. Pre-contact resources that might be of State significance include regional sites that provide a diagnostic assemblage of artifacts for a particular cultural group or time period or that provide chronological control (specific dates or relative order in time) for a series of cultural groups.

National context

A property with national significance helps us to understand the history of the nation by illustrating the nationwide impact of events or persons associated with the property, its architectural type or style, or information potential. It must be of exceptional value in representing or illustrating an important theme in the history of the nation. A pre-contact settlement that might be of national significance is a settlement that functioned as a long-term inter-regional trade center. See the section above, What if an archeological property is nationally significant?

Archeological properties which obviously stand out within the landscape, such as the ruins of southwestern pueblos and the mounds and earthworks of the mid-continent, may clearly convey their significance simply because they are visible. It is no surprise that archeologists have spent a lot of energy on researching and writing about these salient sites (e.g. Tainter and Tainter 1996:7). However, it is clear from many studies that small sites also yield important information. Many of the arguments made by Talmage and others (1977) in "The Importance of Small, Surface, and Disturbed Sites as Sources of Significant Archeological Data" still hold. For example, demonstrating the significance of small sites on the Colorado Plateau, Alan Sullivan (1996) has looked at the evidence of wild-resource production from two non-architectural sites along eastern south rim of the Grand Canyon. The most obvious features at these sites are piles of fire-cracked rocks. Several things suggest these are production locations: the form of the rock piles, paleobotanical contents, patterned artifacts, including manos and metates and Tusayan Gray-ware. There are no fragments of trough metates, a form associated with maize processing. In the Upper Basin trough metates are found exclusively at architectural sites. Sullivan (1996:154) surmises that "These patterned differences in metate form support the hypothesis that the role of wild resources in Western Anasazi subsistence economies has been underestimated" because our economic models are based on data skewed toward consumption rather than production locales and assemblages.

Sullivan states that archaeologists have been remiss for not fully evaluating the contexts of subsistence remains. Because we have focused all our attention on sites of food consumption (the large Pueblo sites with architecture) rather than production (including these small sites), we have misinterpreted the role of wild resources among the Western Anasazi. The editors (Tainter and Tainter 1996:17) of a recent volume summarize his point this way:

Sullivan makes the important suggestion that we have misunderstood Puebloan subsistence because we have focused our research on locations where food was consumed (pueblos) rather than locations where it was produced. The latter may be small, ephemeral artifact scatters. Many archaeologists overlook the importance of these small sites.

Overlooking the significance of small sites, however, may skew our understanding of past lifeways as those sites not only receive less research attention but also are destroyed without thorough recordation because they are "written off" as ineligible for listing in the National Register. Such losses point up the need for continuously reexamining historic contexts and allowing new discoveries to challenge our ideas about the past.

Evaluators of archeological properties using the National Register Criteria should be aware of new discoveries and developments that effect historic contexts and take them into account during site evaluation.

It is also important to consider significance before considering integrity. At Fort Leonard Wood in Missouri, Smith (1994:96) developed a regional context through a combined cultural, historical and landscape approach. The context assists in identifying sites that best represent the

range and variety of culture history. The most difficult part Smith found in devising such a context was the integration of the historic context with the archaeological remains. Smith used site types as the key in an approach that could be used as a model for approaching the evaluation and management of common site types. In developing the context for the Fort Leonard Wood settler community, Smith identified different types of settlers with purposes ranging from subsistence to cash cropping and characterized associated sites according to their archaeological visibility, signature, and sensitivity. Some sites, such as twentieth-century tenant sites, have high visibility, easily identified signatures, and low sensitivity. It would be important to examine some but by no means all of this common type of site. (See also Peacock 1997 for a discussion of common site types and information potential). Other sites, such as those of early squatters, have very low visibility, low signatures (that is, they are difficult to identify), and very high sensitivity because they are extremely rare and would provide important information. Even a damaged site could be worthwhile for addressing research questions if it represents a less common type. In a region that is very poorly known, for example, the investigation even of deflated sites may yield information potential for 1) basic archeological questions about use of the region and 2) baseline data on site condition with which to evaluate other similar sites in the region.

Evaluating archeological properties under the criteria

The use of criteria A, B, and C for archeological sites is appropriate in limited circumstances and has never been supported as a universal application of the criteria. However, it is important to consider the applicability of criteria other than D when evaluating archeological properties. The preparer should consider as well whether, in addition to research significance, a site or district has traditional, social or religious significance to a particular group or community. It is important to note that under criteria A, B, and C the archeological property must have demonstrated its ability to convey its significance, as opposed to sites eligible under criterion D, where only the potential to yield information is required.

Criterion A: Event(s) and broad patterns of events

Mere association with historic events or trends is not enough, in and of itself, to qualify under Criterion A: the property's specific association must be considered important as well.

1. Identify the event(s) with which the property is associated. Generally for archeological properties this is demonstrated primarily through contexts that specify culture history. Archeological evidence supports the linkage. Event or events include:

- A specific event marking an important moment in American (including local) history (e.g., a battle, treaty signing, court decision) or

- A series of linked events or a historical trend (e.g., a military campaign, relocation of Native Americans to missions, establishment of a town, growth of a city's fishing industry, a major migration, establishment of a new cultural or political system, emergence of agriculture).

2. Document the importance of the event(s) within the broad pattern(s) of history. For example, the nomination of a Revolutionary War battle site, at a minimum, should include a discussion of the importance of the battle and its relevance to the Revolutionary War. Note that broad patterns of our history (including local history) are the same as what the National Register calls historic contexts, which are defined as relevant historic themes set within a time period and geographic region.

3. Demonstrate the strength of association of the property to the event or patterns of events. In order to do this, the property must have existed at the time of and be directly associated with the event or pattern of events. A mission built 50 years after the Pueblo Revolt would probably have no direct association with the Pueblo Revolt. A mission that was abandoned as a result of the Pueblo Revolt, on the other hand, would have a direct association.

4. Assess the integrity of the property. Under Criterion A, a property must convey its historic significance. In other words, archeological properties must have well preserved features, artifacts, and intra-site patterning in order to illustrate a specific event or pattern of events in history. Refer to the preceding section 'Aspects, or Qualities, of Integrity' for further guidance.

Archeological sites that are recognized 'type' sites for specific archeological complexes or time periods are often eligible under Criterion A. Because they define archeological complexes or cultures or time periods, type sites are directly associated with the events and broad patterns of history. In addition, archeological sites that define the chronology of a region are directly associated with events that have made significant contributions to the broad patterns of our history.

Properties that have yielded important information in the past and that no longer retain additional research potential, such as completely excavated archeological sites, must be assessed essentially as historic sites under Criterion A. Such sites must be significant for associative values related to: 1) the importance of the data gained or 2) the impact of the property's role in the history of the development of anthropology/archeology or other relevant disciplines. Like other historic properties, the site must retain the ability to convey its association as the former repository of important information, the location or historic events, or the representation of important trends.

Some sites may be listed for their significance in the history of archeology. In Colorado, the first Basketmaker II rockshelter excavated is listed under criterion A at the state level for archeology. House types and domestic features were identified archeologically here for the first time. The rockshelter, excavated by Earle Morris in 1938, is also listed for criterion D because at

least half of the midden remains and there is likely to be information there on the transition from the Archaic to Basketmaker adaptations.

The Yamasee Indian towns in the South Carolina Low Country are eligible under criterion A as well as D as part of the first Indian land reservation in South Carolina. The Yamasee played a key role in the defense of south Carolina against the Spanish from 1684 to 1715.

A cultural landscape which includes both traditional cultural places and archeological sites may be eligible under criteria A and D for its significance in the areas of Ethnic Heritage and Archeology. In an example from California, a landscape containing a village site and additional cultural features, as well as natural features of oak groves and grasslands, demonstrates the management of hunted and gathered resources through burning to promote particular environments. One of several research questions identified concerned the relationship between inland and coastal sites in the region.

The Kukaniloko Birth Site in Hawaii is listed under A, B, and D for Archeology - prehistoric; Ethnic Heritage - Native Hawaiian; Social History; Politics-government; and Religion. Kukaniloko is a celebrated place set aside for the birth of high ranking chiefs and chiefesses. It is marked by a concentration of 180 large basalt stones. Once part of a larger religious complex, Kukaniloko continues to be visited by Hawaiians who occasionally leave offerings. It is associated with a number of prominent chiefs born there. Important information may be gathered from the analysis of the boulders and petroglyphs, which are thought to have astronomical significance.

The Multiple Property Submission "Precontact American Indian Earthworks, 500 BC - AD 1650" for Minnesota creates registration requirements for earthworks under criteria A, B, C, and D. The following two examples demonstrate the requirements.

Site X was first mapped in 1885 and contains more than 60 mounds and earthworks. A village site appears to be immediately associated with the site. Several of the mounds have looter's holes in them but the site has never been plowed. The site is still wooded and there is no recent development on or near the site and it is essentially in pristine condition. This site has excellent integrity of design, setting, materials, feeling, and association, and could therefore be nominated to the National Register under Criteria A, C, and D.

Site Y consisted of at least 225 earthworks and mounds and associated village site. It is the type site for a Late Prehistoric context. However, the site has been extensively plowed, several factories have been built on it, and it is within an industrial park. Although the location of the mounds have been relocated using aerial photography and remote sensing, most have been destroyed. There is some evidence, however, that there are still some intact materials at the site. In this case, the site is not eligible under criteria A or C because integrity of design, setting, and feeling are very poor and integrity of materials and association are merely acceptable. However it

is eligible under criterion D if the mound group and village are considered one site because together they still hold significant research potential.

A site determined eligible under Criteria A and D under this MPS cover document is eligible under Criterion A because it typifies a distinctive type of site that is part of the broader pattern associated with the emergence of agriculture along the margin of the eastern Plains and increasing population nucleation after circa 1100 A.D.

Criterion B: Important Persons

The persons associated with the property must be individually significant within a historic context. A property is not eligible if its only justification for significance is that it was owned or used by a person who is a member of an identifiable profession, class, or social or ethnic group. The known major villages of individual Native Americans who were important during the contact period or later can qualify under Criterion B. As with all Criterion B properties, the individual associated with the property must have made some specific important contribution to history. Examples include sites significantly associated with Chief Joseph and Geronimo.

1. Identify the important person or persons associated with the property. (For in-depth guidance on nominating a property under Criterion B, refer to National Register Bulletin, *Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Properties Associated with Significant Persons*) "Persons significant in our past" refers to individuals whose activities are demonstrably important within a local, state, or national historic context. Under Criterion B, a property must be illustrative rather than commemorative of a person's life. An illustrative property is directly linked to the person and to the reason why that person is considered to be important. In most cases, a monument built to commemorate the accomplishments of a judge important in this nation's history would not be eligible for listing in the National Register. (For exceptions to this general rule refer to the "Criteria Consideration F: Commemorative Properties" discussion in National Register Bulletin, *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*) The courthouse where the judge worked and wrote his opinions, on the other hand, would be eligible under Criterion B.

2. Discuss the importance of the individual within the relevant historic context(s). The person associated with the property must be individually significant and not just a member of a profession, class, or social or ethnic group. For example, a doctor who is known to have been important in the settlement and early development of a community would be important under Criterion B. A person who is known to have been a doctor but with no special professional or community standing would not be important under Criterion B.

3. Demonstrate the strength of association between the person and the property. Generally, properties should be associated with the activities, events, etc. for which the person is important. For example, the lab where a renowned scientist developed his inventions would be more strongly

associated with the scientist than the apartment house where he lived. The importance or relevance of the property in comparison to other properties associated with the person should be addressed. Properties that pre- or post-date an individual's significant accomplishments usually are not eligible under Criterion B.

4. Address the property's integrity. Sufficient integrity implies that the essential physical features during its association with the person's life are intact. If the property is a site that had no material cultural remains, then the setting must be intact. Under Criterion B, archeological properties need to be in good condition with excellent preservation of features, artifacts, and spatial relationships. Again, an effective test is to ask if the person would recognize the property. If "no," then integrity may be insufficient to qualify under Criterion B. Refer to the preceding section 'Aspects, or Qualities, of Integrity' for further guidance.

The Puckshunubbee-Haley Site in Madison county, Mississippi is listed under both criteria B and D as the residence site (without standing structures) of two significant individuals: Puckshunubbee, an important Choctaw chief from about 1801 to 1824, and pioneer Major David W. Haley, who purchased the chief's house after his death and was central to land negotiations with the Choctaw. This three-acre property also contains a Late Mississippian mound.

The Modoc Lava Beds Archaeological District in California is eligible under criteria A, B, and D. Under A, this 46,780-acre district is associated with the Modoc War of 1872-73 and contains places of traditional cultural significance to the Modoc people. Eligibility under B is for association with Captain Jack, the principal Modoc leader during the war, for the areas of significance Ethnic Heritage/Native American and Military. Important information under criterion D is associated with chronology; settlement and subsistence; exchange relationships; military architecture; art and religion. The Modoc Lava beds was a major geographic crossroads for the far western United States. The role of the district's inhabitants in controlling the distribution of obsidian from the Medicine Lake Highland volcanic field is one of the specific research topics.

Criterion C: Design, Construction, and Work of a Master

To be eligible under Criterion C, a property must meet at least one of the following requirements:

- Embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction.
- Represent the work of a master.
- Possess high artistic value.

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

- Represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.

The above requirements should be viewed within the context of the intent of Criterion C; that is, to distinguish those properties that are significant as representatives of the human expression of culture or technology (especially architecture, landscape architecture, and engineering).

1. Identify the distinctive characteristics of the type, period, or method of construction, master or craftsman, or the high artistic value of the property. Distinctive characteristics of type, period, or method of construction are illustrated in one or more ways, including:

- The pattern of features common to a particular class of resources, such as a sugar mill with associated archeological remains that is representative of eighteenth-century Caribbean sugar mills.
- The individuality or variation of features that occurs within the class, such as the well preserved ruins of an 1860s brewery that was designed and built to produce one type of ale.
- The evolution of that class, or the transition between the classes of resources, such as the well preserved sites of four adjacent shipyards, each representing a different time period in clipper ship building.

A master is a figure of generally recognized greatness in a field, a known craftsman of consummate skill, or an anonymous craftsman whose work is distinguishable from others by its characteristic style and quality. If a well preserved, eighteenth-century pottery kiln site, such as the Mt. Sheppard, North Carolina pottery, illustrates how a particular type of exceptional pottery was produced by a renowned pottery manufacturer, then it would qualify under Criterion C.

High artistic value may take a variety of forms including community design, landscaping, or planning; engineering; and works of art. A property with high artistic value must (when compared to similar resources) fully express an aesthetic ideal of a particular concept of design. The well preserved ruins of a building that was used as a hospital and still has intact walls covered with pictures and graffiti drawn by Civil War soldiers who stayed there would be eligible under Criterion C.

2. Discuss the importance of the property given the historic contexts that are relevant to the property and the applicability of Criterion C. Note that the work of an unidentified craftsman or builder is eligible if the work (usually a building or structure) Uses above the level of workmanship of other similar or thematically-related properties. As a result, comparison with other properties is usually required to make the case of eligibility under Criterion C. For example, a colonial plantation site may have standing buildings that are excellent examples of a rare form of colonial construction. To illustrate this, Colonial-period construction methods need to be

discussed to a level of detail sufficient to demonstrate that the construction methods seen at the example plantation are rare.

3. Evaluate how strongly the property illustrates the distinctive characteristics of the type, period, or method of construction, master or craftsman, or the high artistic value of the property. For example, an archeological property with a standing structure that was used as a stage stop for the Butterfield Overland Mail service may qualify under Criterion A but not be eligible under Criterion C because the structure is not representative of the stage stops that were actually built to service the stages and mail carriers.

4. Address the integrity of the property. To meet the integrity requirement of Criterion C, an archeological property must have remains that are well preserved and clearly illustrate the design and construction of the building or structure. One exception to the above-ground rule is structures that were intentionally built below the ground. For example, many industrial complexes, such as brick manufacturing or mining sites, contain potentially significant architectural or engineering remains below ground. Another exception might be found at archeological sites that contained relatively intact architectural remains buried through either cultural or natural processes. Thus, well-preserved architectural remains that were uncovered by archeological excavation might be considered eligible under Criterion C. Refer to the preceding section "Aspects, or Qualities, of Integrity" for further guidance

A late Mississippian village that illustrates the important concepts in prehistoric community design and planning will qualify. A Hopewellian mound, if it is an important example of mound building construction techniques, would qualify as a method or type of construction. A Native American irrigation system modified for use by Europeans could be eligible if it illustrates the technology of either or both periods of construction. Properties that are important representatives of the aesthetic values of a cultural group, such as petroglyphs and ground drawings by Native Americans, are eligible.

The Beattie Mound Group in downtown Rockford, Illinois, is eligible under criteria C and D for architecture and archeology. The mound group embodies distinctive characteristics of the earthwork type of construction in three forms: conical, linear, and turtle effigy. This group is unusual in representing a variety of forms in a small area. These mounds are part of the "Effigy Mound" tradition of the Upper Mississippi Valley, which dates from about A.D. 300-1100.

An archeological district in Colorado is listed at the state level of significance under criteria C and D for architecture and archeology. The district contains at least 24 sites dating from A.D. 975-1150. These sites include: rock shelters with coursed masonry features; rock shelters with wall alignments; rock shelters without architectural features; open masonry which incorporate boulders/rocks outcrops into room features; and mesa top sites with alignments. Research questions focus on the relationship of the district to related sites in the Four Corners region. As a frontier community established during a time of dynamic cultural change, this district may

establish the extreme northern extension of an important culture area. The boundary contains a complete environmental profile from the mesa top downslope to the creek.

In Alaska, a cedar dugout canoe more than 29 feet long is listed as a structure and a site. Its historic function is Transportation/water-related; it is not currently in use. In fact, it was never finished by the Tlingit Indian(s) who began construction sometime before around 1920. Because it is unfinished, it shows part of the construction process that would not be apparent in a finished canoe. It is an example of an early Northern type of Indian canoe with a distinctive profile. When it was listed in 1989, it was the only partially finished Native canoe of this type found *in situ* in southeast Alaska, although some "blanks" have been found in Canada. The canoe is eligible under Criterion C as it embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type: the Northern canoe; and method of construction: the unfinished canoe retains construction elements usually lost in a completed canoe. The construction site itself is preserved as the tree stump from which the log was cut is intact and exhibits saw marks that help date the construction to no earlier than the late 19th century. The site has the potential to yield important information about the use of the forest by Tlingit peoples and about the construction of canoes during the last decades when they were being made. Archeological investigations at the site are likely to yield artifacts or features associated with manufacture.

Criterion D: Information Potential

Criterion D requires that a property "has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history." Most properties listed under Criterion D are archeological sites and districts, although extant structures and buildings may be significant for their information potential under this criterion. To qualify under Criterion D, a property must meet two basic requirements:

- The property must have, or have had, information that can contribute to our understanding of human history of any time period.
- The information must be considered important

Nominations should outline the type of important information that a property is likely to yield as shaped by the applicable research topics. To do this, the property must have the necessary kinds and configuration of data sets and integrity to address important research questions.

There are five primary steps in a Criterion D evaluation.

1. Identify the property's data set(s) or categories of archeological, historical, or ecological information.

2. Identify the historic context(s), that is, the appropriate historical and archeological framework in which to evaluate the property.
3. Identify the important research question(s) that the property's data sets can be expected to address.
4. Taking archeological integrity into consideration, evaluate the data sets in terms of their potential and known ability to answer research questions.
5. Identify the important information that an archeological study of the property has yielded or is likely to yield.

Application of Criterion D requires that the important information which an archeological property may yield must be anticipated at the time of evaluation. Archeological techniques and methods have improved greatly even in the few decades since the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act. The questions that archeologists ask have changed and become, in many cases, more detailed and more sophisticated. The history of archaeology is full of examples of important information being gleaned from sites previously thought unimportant. Because important information and methods for acquiring it change through time, it may be necessary to reassess historic contexts and site evaluations periodically.

Changing perceptions of significance are simply a matter of the normal course of all social sciences and humanities as they evolve and develop new areas of study. What constitutes "information important in prehistory or history" changes with archeological and historical theory, method, and technique.

Specific questions may change but there are a number of categories of questions that are used routinely to frame research designs in terms of anthropological observations of societies. Such general topics include 1) economics of subsistence, technology, and trade; 2) land use and settlement; 3) social and political organization; 4) ideology, religion, and cosmology and 5) paleoenvironmental reconstruction.

Though the disciplined study of the archeological record and supporting information, archeologists can provide answers to certain important questions about the past that are unobtainable from other sources. Archeological inquiry generally contributes to our understanding of the past in three ways. It:

- Reinforces, alters, or challenges current assumptions about the past.;
- Tests new hypotheses about past activities; and
- Describes, records, and reconstructs past lifeways across time and space.

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

If archeological studies were conducted previously at a site, additional test excavation may not be required before preparing a National Register nomination. For example, the Shenks Ferry site in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania (a contact period village dating from the sixteenth century) was excavated in the early 1930s and in the 1970s and was listed in the National Register in 1982 without additional field investigations.

The patterning of artifacts and features on the ground surface of some properties may be sufficient to warrant nominating them to the National Register. If this is the case, then demonstrating the presence of intact subsurface artifact or feature patterning through test excavations may not be required. That is, there is no mandatory testing of sites to determine their significance. For example, Camp Carondelet in Prince William County, Virginia, the 1861-1862 winter camp of a Louisiana brigade, was listed in the National Register without excavations. This Civil War camp, which is evidenced by above-ground patterning of hut outlines, chimney falls, trash pits, roads, and rifle pits has sufficient surface information to justify a statement of significance. Field work included mapping the above camp features and noting the location of artifacts visible on the surface of the ground and in and around holes dug by relic hunters. Similarly, mounds or earthworks such as those of the Effigy Mound tradition of the Upper Mississippi Valley would not require intrusive testing for a convincing statement of significance to be argued based on analogy with similar excavated properties.

Increasingly, archeologists are using scientific instruments to identify subsurface archeological features. Remote sensing techniques, which include ground-penetrating radar (GPR), soil resistivity, and soil chemistry surveys, are often applied in conjunction with test excavations that confirm the presence of subsurface cultural remains (Thomas 1987). Such prospecting techniques are non-destructive and can provide rapid three-dimensional reconnaissance of a site, but the results are often ambiguous unless they are checked in the field. For further information see Heimmer (1992) and Bevan (1993).

At the John Dickinson house, a National Historic Landmark located near Dover, Delaware, ground-penetrating radar was used to locate subsurface evidence of outbuildings, bams, and other features prior to the reconstruction of this eighteenth-century plantation's architecture (Bevan 1981). At Fort Benning, Georgia, electromagnetic, magnetic, and GPR investigations at the Creek town of Upatoi revealed highly patterned subsurface features interpreted as probably graves. The use of non-destructive techniques provided evidence of subsurface remains and raised the priority of site protection as a land management concern (Briuer et al. 1997).

Data Sets

Data sets, or data categories, are groups of information. Data sets are defined by the archeologist, taking into consideration the type of artifacts and features at the property, the research questions posed, and the analytical approach that is used. Whatever their theoretical

foundation -- particularistic, nomothetic, structural, processual, or post-modern -- all archeologists look at patterns in the archeological record. It is the evaluation or analysis of data sets and their patterning within the framework of research questions that yields information. Data sets can be types of artifacts (such as ceramics, glass, or tools), archeological features (such as privies, trash middens, or tailings piles), or patterned relationships between artifacts, features, soil stratigraphy, or above-ground remains. A graveyard, for example, might contain at least three data sets: the human remains, items buried with the deceased, and the arrangement of the graves within the cemetery.

Data sets that are known or expected to be represented at the property should be described. If the property is a district and there are multiple data sets (which is likely), then each of the kinds of data sets should be described. The data sets represented at each site may be presented in tabular form or in a matrix. The data sets described in this section must be consistent with the artifact and feature information included in the "Narrative Description" of the site. For example, if a chronology data set is described, then the property must have data (such as time-diagnostic artifacts) that can be used to address chronology. If there is a data set, or data sets, linked to a research topic of non-local exchange systems, for example, then there must be evidence of such activities represented in the archeological deposits.

Important Information and Research Questions

What are important questions in archeology? Even if a current list of important research questions existed (that archeologists could agree upon), the questions would still change as the discipline evolves and certain questions are answered and others are asked. Moreover, research questions of the future cannot be anticipated and the kinds of data necessary to answer future research questions cannot be determined with certainty. Thus, the research potential of a historic property must be evaluated in light of current issues in archeology, anthropology, history, and other disciplines of study (Ferguson 1977). The list of important research questions need not be lengthy or exhaustive. Examples of the kinds of research questions anticipated may be provided. A single important question is sufficient.

Theoretical positions on and pragmatic debates about important research questions are expressed at professional archeological conferences and in the professional literature and journals. For example, the Society for Historical Archeology sponsored a plenary session titled "Questions that Count in Archeology" at its annual meeting in 1987. This session addressed the issue of which theoretical framework or general research topics will generate the most important historical archeology questions (e.g. Deagan 1988). From a theoretical viewpoint, Kathleen Deagan (1988:9), for example, makes the case that the questions that "count cannot be answered by either historical or archeological data alone, or through simple comparisons of two data categories." Rather than simply reinforcing other documentary sources, the interpretation of archeological evidence provides a supplementary and

complementary record of the past. Other questions that count are those that apply archeological techniques to answering history-based questions about which there is inadequate documentation. In fact, to date, this has been historical archeology's most successful scholarly contribution (Deagan 1988:9). According to Deagan (1988:9), "other questions appropriate to the unique capabilities of historical archeology focus on understanding general cultural phenomena that transcend specific time and space," such as the study of acculturation.

A nomination should provide a clear link between the contexts, the research questions, and the data found at the property. Whatever the theoretical orientation of the archeologist, the connection between the archeological data and the important questions should be explicit in the National Register nomination.

One way to link archeological remains with research questions is through middle-range theories that connect the empirical world with generalized hypotheses (Leone 1988; Merton 1967; Binford 1977, 1981a, 1981b; Thomas 1983a, 1983b; South 1977, 1988). The middle-range and general theories should follow from and be consistent with the information presented in the discussion of historic contexts.

As noted above, there is no set outline that must be followed in describing research questions within the narrative statement of significance. General theories and the more specific hypotheses that shape the research questions, for example, may be presented in the historic context discussion and simply referenced during the description of important research questions. The National Register nomination should include a clear and concise presentation of the required information. The specific format for doing this will be determined in large part by the nature of the archeological property and its information potential.

Archeologists have recognized the importance of comparative information from a regional data base in making effective eligibility decisions. This is especially true when dealing with large numbers of a common resource type that have not been evaluated, such as nineteenth century farmsteads or stone circles. A regional perspective provides a logical framework in which to evaluate both the "mundane" or 'redundant' historic properties (e.g., Hardesty 1990; McManamon 1990; Peacock 1997; Smith 1990; Wilson 1990).

A good **example** of a regional study proposed in National Register documentation is the **Multiple Property Submission**, "Native American Archaeological Sites of the Oregon Coast." In the cover document, several sets of research topics and questions are presented at local, regional, and national scales of research. Topics used to evaluate the eligibility of individual sites include: 1) How have Oregon Coast environments occupied and/or used by Native Americans varied through space and time? 2) When and how did coastal adaptations develop along the Oregon Coast? 3) How did Oregon Coast settlement and subsistence change through time? 4) When did ethnographic patterns first develop on the Oregon Coast? 5) How did

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

Euroamerican colonization affect Oregon Coast Native Americans and how did Native Americans affect the course of colonization? And 6) Questions related to general archaeological method and theory.

Under each of these topics are more detailed questions. The MPS cover document recognizes that the study of individual sites creates the building blocks for regional models and ultimately for more general and broadly applicable archeological and anthropological method and theory. Regional research topics that can be addressed through the comparative study of individual sites include the following. 1) Changes in Oregon coast environments through time. 2) Antiquity of coastal adaptations. 3) Regional developments in settlement and subsistence. 4) Origins and development of ethnographic cultural patterns. 5) Effects of European contact and colonization on Native Americans and their resources.

General topics of broad importance are addressed in a comparative framework. Four such topics are extensions of the regional questions. These are: 1) Environmental Change and Human Adaptations; 2) Coastal Adaptations and Maritime Cultural Ecology; 3) Cultural Complexity and its origins; and 4) "European radiation" and indigenous societies.

When evaluating sites within a regional perspective, the following kinds of information should be presented:

- Definition of the region or community under consideration,
- Relative estimate of how many other similar properties were once located within the region,
- Identification, where applicable, of surviving standing structures or sites,
- Evaluation of level of archeological investigation of similar properties, and the
- Outline of the documentary, ethnographic, or other supporting evidence related to the property

To systematically evaluate properties, National Register nomination preparers often use an evaluation matrix, especially for precontact archeology properties. This approach to evaluation can also be particularly useful for evaluating the scientific or information potential of a historical archeological property. Donald L. Hardesty describes the development of a significance evaluation matrix in his 1988 publication, *The Mining and Miners: A View From the Silver State*. Although Hardesty's focus is on mining properties, the process that Hardesty calls 'a logical questioning framework' is applicable to all kinds of archeology properties (1990:48).

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

In Hardesty's evaluation matrix the vertical axis comprises key areas of research (such as demography, technology, economics, social organization, and ideology) while the horizontal axis describes three research levels (world system, region, and locality) where questions about the past may be addressed. The specific features of an evaluation matrix are determined taking into consideration the theoretical framework, middle range theories linking the data sets to the relevant research questions, the research questions or topics, and the data sets represented at the property. In this example, a historical archeological property would be eligible for the National Register if its archeological record contains information with sufficient integrity that can be used to address one of the topics within the evaluation matrix. If the information at the site cannot be used to address these research themes, then the property may not be eligible for the National Register.

AN EVALUATION MATRIX FOR MINES

Research Domain	World System	Region	Locality
Demography	Comparative data on patterns of mining frontier demography	Patterns of occupation /abandonment in district	Reconstruction of household population
Technology	Adaptive variety and change in industrial and appropriate technologies on the mining frontier	Adaptive change in industrial technologies imported into district	Reconstruction of mining/milling technologies
Economics	Adaptive patterns of economic production and distributions on the mining frontier	Patterns of economic distribution and production within the district	Reconstruction of household consumption and production
Social Organization	Patterns of mining frontier social structure and change	Patterns of "colony" social structure and ethnic relations	Reconstruction of household status and ethnicity
Ideology	Emergence of "syncretic" mining frontier ideology	Interaction of Victorian and ethnic folk cultures	Reconstruction of household ideology

Archeological properties that fall in the median between the clearly eligible and the clearly ineligible are the most difficult to evaluate for inclusion in the National Register. Moreover, it is important to realize that professional archeologists, history, and architectural historians may disagree with decisions regarding the eligibility of a particular historic property. In theory, given

high quality archeological research designs and comprehensive historic contexts, questions of eligibility should be minimal. In a very real sense, the problem with evaluating marginal or redundant properties is not with the resource, but in the questions we ask of the past. As with all scientific endeavors, it is the quality of the questions we ask that determines the nature of the answers we recover from the past.

The Mt. Jasper Lithic Source in Coos County, New Hampshire is significant in the areas of prehistoric archeology and industry primarily for its contribution to the understanding of lithic technology and, secondarily, for its contribution to understanding settlement and exchange patterns. The lithic source area contains places where a rare and high quality raw material was found, mined, and made into tools essential for survival by hunter-gatherer from ca. 7000 BC to A.D. 1500. Evidence for its widespread use comes from the recovery of tools made from Mt. Jasper rhyolite at sites distant from the source.

In the southern Idaho uplands, a large district significant at the state level encompasses the drainages of two creeks and represents 6000 years of occupation. Site types in this high desert sagebrush-grass-juniper environment include rockshelters and caves, rock art sites, campsites, lithic scatters, workshops, and rock alignments. Important research questions under criterion D concern the arrival of the Shoshoni in southern Idaho, the relationship of the area people to the Fremont residents in Utah, and the function of various types of rock alignments.

The Big Sioux Prehistoric Prairie Procurement System Archeological District contains a representative sample of the best preserved elements of a hunting and gathering system in the northwest Iowa plains from 10,000 to 200 years ago. It includes large and small sites, plowed and unplowed, and material on all types of landforms in the river valley. This discontinuous district's 30 sites are stretched along 15 miles of river terraces and bluffs. They include all pre-contact time periods: late base camps, deeply-buried early Archaic camps and procurement sites from all time periods. The nomination argues that there is a common bias toward emphasizing individual sites, especially large and spectacular sites. Small, temporarily occupied sites seem to be the first to fall out of research designs. Small sites may appear to produce little information because broad cultural patterns cannot be reconstructed from one small site. However, small sites, especially single-component sites may contain detailed information which is unobtainable from larger, multi-component sites. Without the context of a larger subsistence and settlement system, small sites may appear meaningless but in a well-developed context, their significance can be assessed realistically. Base camps must be connected with temporary sites in order to reconstruct the whole settlement system.

Other Significance Considerations

The following-Areas of Significance, Period of Significance, Significant Dates, Significant Person(s), Cultural Affiliation, Architect or Builder-are important for all nominations, whether Criteria A, B, C, or D are being applied. Criteria considerations are listed and discussed above under "National Register Criteria."

Areas of Significance

For historical archeological properties enter "ARCHEOLOGY: Historic-Aboriginal" or "ARCHEOLOGY: Historic-Non-Aboriginal" or both. For pre-contact properties enter "ARCHEOLOGY: Prehistoric." In addition, enter any categories and subcategories about which the property is likely to yield important information and list them in relative importance to the property. For example, an Indian industrial school may have the following areas of significance: "Historic: Aboriginal," "Education," and "Ethnic Heritage: Native American." If the school was of a special architectural design, then "Architecture" may also be added to the list. A pre-contact lithic source may have areas of significance "Archeology: Prehistoric" and "Industry." A paleo-Indian kill site may have the areas of significance "Archeology: Prehistoric" and "Agriculture" or "Economics" because there are no areas of significance specific to non-agricultural societies.

The ARCHEOLOGY Area of Significance has the subcategories noted above. Many archeological sites can be associated with a specific ethnic group, which also has subcategories. If this is the case, then enter "ETHNIC HERITAGE: Asian," "ETHNIC HERITAGE: Black," "ETHNIC HERITAGE: European," "ETHNIC HERITAGE: Hispanic," "ETHNIC HERITAGE: Native American," "ETHNIC HERITAGE: Pacific Islander," or "ETHNIC HERITAGE: Other."

Other Areas of Significance include: AGRICULTURE, ART, COMMERCE, COMMUNICATIONS, COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT, CONSERVATION, ECONOMICS, EDUCATION, ENGINEERING, ENTERTAINMENT/RECREATION, EXPLORATION/SETTLEMENT, HEALTH/MEDICINE, INDUSTRY, INVENTION, LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE, LAW, LITERATURE, MARITIME HISTORY, MILITARY, PERFORMING ARTS, PHILOSOPHY, POLITICS/GOVERNMENT, RELIGION, SCIENCE, SOCIAL HISTORY, TRANSPORTATION, AND OTHER. Each of these Areas of Significance, none of which have subcategories, are defined in National Register Bulletin *How to Complete the National Register Registration Form*.

Every effort should be made to use the listed "Areas of Significance." If none is applicable (except, of course, "Archeology..."), then "Other" may be entered and the appropriate area(s) of significance described in the text. The use of the "Other" category, however, precludes analysis of the property in terms of the other properties listed in the National Register. Each of the areas of significance must be described in the narrative significance section, and, if the property is eligible under Criterion D, linked to the information potential of the property.

Period of Significance

The period of significance for an archeological property is the time range (which is usually estimated) during which the property was occupied or used and for which the property is likely to yield important information if evaluated under Criterion D. There may be more than one period of significance. If the periods of significance overlap, then they should be combined into one longer period of significance. Periods of significance should be listed in order of importance relative to the property's history, the areas of significance, and the criteria under which the property is being nominated. The periods of significance must follow from the data presented in the narrative description and significance statements in the nomination.

For example, an antebellum plantation that was built in 1820 and burned in 1864 and has well preserved archeological deposits that date from 1820 to 1864 has a 1820-1864 period of significance. If the same property were reoccupied from 1870 through 1900 and this period is represented by intact archeological deposits, then the periods of significance are 1820-1864 and 1870-1900. If the same site were then occupied sporadically from 1910 to 1920 by transients and there are no archeological remains associated with this period of use, then the periods of significance are still 1820-1864 and 1870-1900.

If a portion of the same property was mined for gold from 1875 through 1880 and the remains of this mining activity are intact and well preserved, then the periods of significance will still be 1820-1864 and 1870-1900. If the mining activity extended from 1865 to 1875, then the property's period of significance would be 1820-1900. The subperiods of significance (i.e., 1820-1864, 1865-1875, and 1870-1900) may be listed below the overall period of significance but, since subperiods are not coded into the National Register database, this is not required. The subperiods of significance, however, should be described in the narrative significance statement.

Significant Dates

Significant dates are single years in which a special event or activity associated with the significance of the property occurred. A significant date is by definition included within the period of significance time range. The property must have historical integrity for all the significant dates entered. The beginning and closing dates of a period of significance are "significant dates" only if they mark specific events or activities related to the significance of the property. The dates should be listed in order of importance given the property's history and why it is significant. Martin's Hundred in Virginia has two significant dates: 1619, the year when it was established, and 1622, the year when it was almost completely destroyed in a Native American uprising (Nöel Hume 1982).

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

For archeological districts enter dates that relate to the significance of the district as a whole and not for individual resources unless the dates are also significant relative to the district. For many archeological properties, specific significant dates cannot be identified. If this is the case, enter "N /A." Radiocarbon, tree ring or other scientifically-determined absolute dates can be entered in this section. Note, however, that radiocarbon dates will be listed in the NRIS without their standard deviations.

Significant Person(s)

If an archeological property is being listed in the National Register under Criterion B (i.e., association with a significant person or persons), then this category should be completed. Enter the full name of the significant person, placing the last name first. If there is more than one significant person, list them in order of importance relative to the property's history. Do not enter the name of a family, fraternal or organization. Enter the names group of several individuals in one family or organization, only if each person made contributions for which the property meets Criterion B. Enter the name of a property's architect or builder only if the property meets Criterion B for association with that individual.

Cultural Affiliation

Cultural affiliation must be filled out when nominating a property under Criterion D. Cultural affiliation has been defined by the National Register to be "the archeological or ethnographic culture to which a collection of artifacts or resources (or property) belongs." For pre-contact archeological resources, "cultural affiliation" generally refers to a cultural group that is, in part, defined by a certain archeological assemblage and time period - For example, "Paleoindian," "Hopewell," "Hohokam," "Adena," and "Shoshonean" are commonly used cultural affiliation terms. Archeologists also commonly enter the archeological time period in this category; for example, "Early Archaic," "Ute Woodland," and "Prehistoric," and "Proto historic."

Historical archeologists usually are able to enter the ethnic identity of the group that occupied or used the property because the information is generally available through documents, oral histories, or comparative studies. For example, "Hawaiian," "Chemehuevi," "Creek," "Irish-American," "Chinese-American," "African-American," "British," "Spanish," and "Dutch" are common cultural affiliation entries. Entries such as "Shaker" and "Mormon" are also used. When a historical property, such as a mining camp, cannot be linked to a specific cultural group, then the appropriate entry simply may be "Anglo-American" or "Euro-American" or even "American." Every effort should be made to complete the cultural affiliation section; however, if the cultural affiliation is unknown, enter "unknown."

Architect or Builder

The name of the person(s) responsible for the design or construction of the property, if known, is entered in this category. The full name should be used. If the property's design derived from the stock plans of a company or government agency and are not credited to a specific individual, enter the name of the company or agency; for example, Southern Pacific Railroad, Sears, or U.S. Army. Enter the name of property owners or contractors only if they were actually responsible for the property's design or construction. If the architect or builder is unknown, enter "unknown."

Aspects, or Qualities of Integrity

The National Register criteria stipulate that a property must possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. National Register Bulletin , *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation* directs that "integrity is the ability of a property to convey its significance" and "to retain historic integrity a property will always possess several, and usually most, of the aspects."

The importance of each of these aspects of integrity depends upon the nature of the property and the criterion or criteria under which it is being nominated. Integrity of location, design, materials, and association are of primary importance, for example, when nominating archeological sites under Criteria A and B. Design, materials, and workmanship are especially important under Criterion C. Location, design, materials, and association are generally the most relevant aspects of integrity under Criterion D. Integrity of setting within the site is important under Criteria A and B. Under Criteria C and D, integrity of setting adds to the overall integrity of an individual site and is especially important when assessing the integrity of a district. Integrity of feeling also adds to the integrity of archeological sites or districts as well as to other types of properties. Integrity of setting and feeling usually increase the "recognizability," of the site or district and enhances one's ability to interpret an archeological site's or district's historical significance.

ASPECTS, OR QUALITIES, OF INTEGRITY	
<u>Aspect/Quality</u>	<u>Definition</u>
Location	The place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred.
Design	The combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property.

Setting	The physical environment of a historic property. Setting includes elements such as topographic features, open space, viewshed, landscape, vegetation, and artificial features.
Materials	The physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property.
Workmanship	The physical evidence of the labor and skill of a particular culture or people during any given period in history.
Feeling	A property's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.
Association	The direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property. Under D it is measured in the strength of association between data and important research questions.

Assessment of integrity must come after an assessment of significance:

Significance + integrity = eligibility.

To assess integrity, first define the essential physical qualities that must be present for the property to represent its significance.

Second, determine if those qualities are visible or discernible enough to convey their significance. Remember to consider the question of "to whom significance might be conveyed." For example, the significance of particular historic buildings may be apparent primarily to architectural historians but not to many individuals in the general public. Similarly, the significance of some properties may be apparent primarily to specialists, including individuals whose expertise is in the traditional cultural knowledge of a tribe. A property does not have to readily convey its significance visually to the general public; however, National Register documentation of the significance of a property should be written such that members of the general public can understand the property's significance and the physical qualities which convey that significance.

Third, determine if the property needs to be compared to other similar properties. This decision is made in light of the historic context(s) in which the property's significance is defined.

Finally, based on the significance and essential physical qualities, determine which aspects of integrity are vital to the property being nominated and whether they are present.

Archeologists use the word integrity to describe the level of preservation or quality of information contained within a district, site, or excavated assemblage. A property with good archeological integrity has archeological deposits that are relatively intact and complete. The archeological record at a site with integrity has not been severely impacted by later cultural activities or natural processes. Properties without archeological integrity may contain elements that are inconsistent with a particular time period or culture. For example, the contents of a thirteenth-century Native American trash pit should not contain artifacts indicative of a nineteenth-century American farmstead. Because of the complexity of the archeological record, however, integrity is a relative measure and its definition depends upon the historic context of the archeological property.

Few archeological properties have wholly undisturbed cultural deposits. Often, the constant occupation or periodic reuse of site locations can create complex stratigraphic situations. Above-ground organization of features and artifacts may be used as evidence that below-ground patterning is intact. Because of the complexity of the archeological record and the myriad of cultural and natural formation processes that may impact a site, the definition of archeological integrity varies from property to property. For properties eligible under Criterion D, integrity requirements relate directly to the types of research questions defined within the archeologist's research design. In general, archeological integrity may be demonstrated by the presence of:

- Spatial patterning of surface artifacts or features that represent differential uses or activities,
- Spatial patterning of subsurface artifacts or features, or
- Lack of serious disturbance to the property's archeological deposits.

In addressing the presence of nineteenth-century farmsteads, archeologist John Wilson, for example, posed three sets of questions that are helpful in determining the potential archeological integrity of a given site or district (Wilson 1990):

- Are the archeological features and other deposits temporally diagnostic, spatially discrete, and functionally defined? Can you interpret what activities took place at the property and when they occurred?
- How did the historic property become aspects of integrity are discussed in the an archeological site? Were the cultural and natural site formation processes catastrophic, deliberate, or gradual? How did these changes impact the property's archeological deposits?
- What is the quality of the documentary record associated with the occupation and subsequent uses of the property? Are the archeological deposits assignable to a particular individual's, family's, or group's activities?

Generally, integrity cannot be thought of as a finite quality of a property. Integrity is relative to the specific significance which the property conveys. Although it is possible to correlate the seven aspects of integrity with standard archaeological site characteristics, those aspects are often

unclear for evaluating the ability of an archeological property to convey significance under Criterion D. The integrity of archeological properties under criterion D is judged according to important information potential. Archeological sites may contain a great deal of important information and yet have had some disturbance or extensive excavation (and, thereby, destruction). For example, sites that have been plowed may be eligible if it is demonstrated that the disturbance caused by plowing does not destroy the important information that the site holds.

All properties must be able to convey their significance. Under Criterion D, properties do this through the information that they contain. Under Criteria A, B, and C, the National Register places a heavy emphasis on a property looking like it did during its period of significance. One of the tests is to ask if a person from the time or the important person who lived there, would recognize it. If the answer is 'yes,' then the property probably has integrity of design. If the answer is "no," then the property probably does not. Keep in mind that the reason why the property is significant is a very important factor when determining what is it that the person should recognize. For example, if a plantation was best known for its formal and informal gardens and agricultural activities, then recognizable landscapes may be more important than recognizable buildings.

One of the most common questions asked about archeology sites and integrity is: Can a plowed site be eligible for listing in the National Register? The answer, which relates to integrity of location and design, is: If plowing has displaced artifacts to some extent, but the activity areas or the important information at the site are still discernable, then the site still has integrity of location or design. If not, then the site has no integrity of location or design.

A 17-acre multi component **camp** site in the southeastern United States has been plowed continuously since 1965 to depths greater than the thickness of topsoil. Portions of some features remain intact and the property has horizontal integrity, with Archaic, Troyville and Plaquemine components somewhat co-mingled yet concentrated in different sections. The nomination states that "The nature and dispersion patterns of the artifacts from the various components indicate that the hill was primarily a scene of small scale and/or temporary activities. It was never a large village occupied by numerous people. Therein lies a compelling reason for the site's importance." The site is significant in the lower Mississippi valley partly because of the small scale occupation there. Small sites are not always evaluated because attention is paid primarily to large mound and village sites in the region. Important research questions would involve the relationship of this small hamlet/work camp to the larger mound sites and villages. The nomination points out specific research goals from the State archaeological plan as well.

Sites that have lost contributing elements may retain sufficient integrity to convey their significance under criterion D. For example, at a 25-acre mound site in the southeastern United States, of four mounds described in 1883, there is now one left associated with an extensive artifact scatter. Repeated surface collections were carried out to better understand the internal organization of the settlement. The nomination states that "On the basis of knowledge of similar

sites, subsurface features such as cooking facilities, storage pits, and domestic habitations are likely to exist.” One of the research domains likely to be addressed at this A.D. 600-1000 property, which was listed in 1995, concerns the study of the technology and social organization of craft production. The researchers expect to find evidence of rudimentary craft specialization in connection with the emergence of social inequality. At this major mound group, such crafts could have been used by the elite who could control access to or the production of craft items in support of their status.

Location

The location of a property often helps explain its importance. Archeological sites and districts almost always have integrity of location. Integrity of location is closely linked to integrity of association, which is discussed below. Integrity of location would not necessarily preclude the eligibility of secondary or redeposited deposits in an archeological property. Integrity depends upon the significance argued for the property. Shipwreck sites best illustrate the subtleties of integrity of location.

EXAMPLES: The shipwreck comprises a ship that fought in a very important battle of the Civil War. Its significance is tied to only this battle.

- If the ship sank during the battle or in a place away from the battle site but the sinking was related to the battle, then the shipwreck still retains integrity of location under any of the criteria.
- If, for reasons unrelated to the battle, the ship sank in another location, then the shipwreck, no matter how intact it is, does not have integrity of location under Criterion A.

EXAMPLE: The above mentioned ship is also important because of its unique construction.

- If the ship's sinking is unrelated to its role in the Civil War, then the shipwreck is still eligible for listing under Criterion C, because the location of the ship's sinking is unrelated to the importance of the ship's construction.

EXAMPLE: The shipwreck is a ship that was commanded by one naval officer from 1850 to 1870. It engaged in blockades, battles, and general transport. The naval officer is now recognized as one of the most important naval officers in the Civil War and an innovator of naval engagement techniques.

- No matter where the ship sank, it is still eligible under Criterion B.

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

Note that, as under Criterion A, integrity of location is usually a prerequisite under Criterion B. In this example, however, the property's significance is tied to an important naval officer and by nature, ships change location.

EXAMPLE: The shipwreck is a sailing ship that patrolled Maine's coast from 1840 to 1890. Its significance is tied to that function. It has state-wide significance.

- If the ship later sank off Maine's coast or in an adjoining river or bay, then the ship has integrity of location under Criterion A.
- If the ship sailed to Florida in 1890 to serve as a private yacht and along the way sank off Cape Hatteras, then the ship does not have integrity of location under Criterion A.

EXAMPLE: Each of the above shipwreck examples have intact archeological deposits.

- If each of the shipwreck sites can yield important information through archeological investigations, then each, as a historical archeological site, has integrity of location under Criterion D.

EXAMPLE: The shipwreck is a ship that sank during a War of 1812 naval battle, subsequent natural erosion and turbulence has since scattered the ship's structure and contents over at least a two square-mile area. Occasionally, divers find artifacts that are believed to be from the ship, but there is no discernable patterning of remains.

- If no discernable patterning is present, then the shipwreck has no integrity of location under any of the criteria, including Criterion D.

Design

Elements of design include Organization of space, proportion, scale, technology, ornamentation, and materials. The word 'design' brings to mind architectural plans and images of buildings or structures. Design, however, also applies to the layout of towns, villages, plantations, etc. For an archeological site, integrity of design generally refers to the patterning of structures, buildings, or discrete activity areas relative to one another. It is of paramount importance under Criterion C and is extremely important under Criteria A and B. Recognizability of a property, or the ability of a property to convey its significance, depends largely upon the degree to which the design of the property is intact. The nature of the property and its historical importance are also a factor.

Under Criterion D, integrity of design for archeological sites most closely approximates intra-site artifact and feature patterning. For districts, inter-site patterning can be used to illustrate integrity of design.

Setting

Setting includes elements such as topographic features, open-space, views, landscapes, vegetation, manmade features (e.g., paths, fences), and relationships between buildings and other features.

Archeological sites may be nominated under Criterion D without integrity of setting if they have important information potential. For example, if a site has rich and well-stratified archeological deposits dating from the 1690s to the 1790s but is located under a modern parking lot and between two modern commercial buildings, it will still qualify under Criterion D. In this case, the setting does not detract from the information potential of the site.

If a site's or district's historical setting (or the physical environment as it appeared during its period of significance) is intact, then the ability of the site or district to convey its significance is enhanced. If the setting conveys an archeological site's significance, then the site has integrity of setting under Criteria A and B. In order to convey significance, the setting must

- Appear as it did during the site's or district's period of significance, and
- Be integral to the importance of the site or district.

Materials

According to National Register Bulletin *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, "the choice and combination of materials reveals the preferences of those who created the property and indicate the availability of particular types of materials and technologies." Integrity of materials is of paramount importance under Criterion C. Under Criteria A and B, integrity of materials should be considered within the framework of the property's significance.

Under Criterion D, integrity of materials is usually described in terms of the presence of intrusive artifacts/ features, the completeness of the artifact/feature assemblage, or the quality of artifact or feature preservation.

Workmanship

Workmanship "is the evidence of an artisan's labor and skill in constructing or altering a building, structure, object, or site." It can apply to the property as a whole or to its individual components. Most often, integrity of workmanship is an issue under Criterion C. Under Criteria A and B, integrity of workmanship is important if workmanship is tied to the significance of the property.

Under Criterion D, workmanship usually is addressed indirectly in terms of the quality of the artifacts or architectural features. The skill needed to produce the artifact or construct the architectural feature is also an indication of workmanship. The importance of workmanship is dependent on the nature of the site and its research importance.

Feeling

A property has integrity of feeling if its features in combination with its setting convey a historic sense of the property during its period of significance. Integrity of feeling enhances a property's ability to convey its significance under all of the criteria.

- If the site itself is still intact, but it is now surrounded by housing subdivisions and commercial buildings, then the site does not have integrity of feeling under Criterion A.

Association

According to National Register Bulletin *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, "a property retains association if it is the place where the event or activity occurred and is sufficiently intact to convey that relationship to an observer." Integrity of association is very important under Criteria A and B. The association between a property and its stated significance must be direct under these two criteria.

Under Criterion D, integrity of association is measured in terms of the strength of the relationship between the site's data or information and the important research questions. For example, a site with well-stratified archeological deposits containing butchered animal remains has information on subsistence practices over time. There is a strong association between the site's information and questions on subsistence practices.

National Register Bulletin *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, should be consulted for additional guidance on evaluating integrity.

V. Preparing Documentation for National Register eligibility and listing

When completing the National Register form with name and locational information, please consult the section above "When should information about historic properties be restricted from public access?" In some cases, the common name of a site may give its location. In such cases, a Smithsonian trinomial or similar designation may be more appropriate as the preferred name.

Classification

Most archeological properties are classified either as a site or as a district. A site is the location of a significant event or of historical human occupation or activity. The location must possess historical, cultural, or archeological value regardless of the value of any existing building or structure. Comprising the remains of a sixteenth- through nineteenth-century Spanish mission, Mission Socorro in El Paso County, Texas is an example of an archeological site. Established after the Pueblo Revolt of 1680, this property functioned as a refugee mission for the Piro Indians. This site contains a material record of Piro acculturation into the Spanish and subsequent Anglo-American cultures. Study of the property could reveal information about lifeways at eighteenth-century Spanish missions and changes in Spanish and Native American technology, society, and ideology in a colonial frontier setting.

A district is a grouping of sites, buildings, structures, or objects that are linked historically by function, theme, or physical development or aesthetically by plan. The properties within a district are usually contiguous. For example, the Wakulla Springs Archeological and Historical District in Florida contains 55 archeological properties and six buildings that contribute to this diverse National Register district with a period of significance beginning in 15,000 B.C. Because archeological investigations are labor intensive and time consuming, survey and evaluation of 100 percent of the resources within a proposed archeological district may be impractical, if not unattainable. If it can be demonstrated that the area between the individual properties, although not completely surveyed, is likely to contain significant resources related to the documented properties, then classification as a district may still be appropriate despite the lack of a 100 percent survey.

When the sites within a district are not contiguous and the space between the sites is not significant and the sites have a direct relationship through cultural affiliation or a related elements of a pattern of land use or historical development, then the property is best described as a discontiguous district.

A discontiguous district is most appropriate where:

- Elements, such as sites, are spatially discrete.
- Space between the elements, or sites, has not been demonstrated to be significant as it relates to the district.
- Visual continuity is not a factor in the significance.

The Brogan Mound and Village Site in Clay county, Mississippi is an example of a Discontiguous District. This property consists of a Middle Woodland burial mound and an associated multi component habitation area approximately 200 meters away. A highway right-of-way and a house occupy the area between these portions of the district.

Multiple property submissions comprise a group of individual properties that share a common theme or historic context. Multiple property nominations facilitate the evaluation and registration of individual properties by grouping them with other properties with similar characteristics. A multiple property submission calls for the development of historic contexts, selection of related property types, and the identification and documentation of related significant properties. It may be based on the results of a comprehensive interdisciplinary survey for a specific area, county, or region of a state, or it may be based on an intensive study of the resources illustrative of a specific type of site, a single cultural affiliation, or a single or closely related group of historic events or activities.

Multiple property submissions are made up of a cover document (NPS 10-900-b) and individual nominations. The cover document includes the following sections: Statement of Historic Contexts, Associated Property Types, Geographical Data, Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods, and Major Bibliographic References. The individual nominations, which can be districts, sites, structures, buildings and/or objects, include brief description and significance sections and boundary and bibliographic information. Multiple property submissions are designed to facilitate nominating additional properties at a later date.

Previously prepared multiple property submissions can be useful guides to appropriate historic contexts and registration requirements for archeological properties. Multiple property submission are discussed in *National Register Bulletin: How to Complete the National Register Multiple Property Documentation Form*. The National Register maintains a list of approved multiple property submissions; the list and copies of the documentation are available upon request.

A list of current Multiple Property Submissions under which archeological properties have been nominated is included as Appendix B.

NATIONAL REGISTER PROPERTY AND
RESOURCE TYPES

District

A district possesses a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, or objects united historically or aesthetically by plan or physical development.

Examples: college campuses; central business districts; residential areas; commercial areas; large forts; industrial complexes; civic centers; rural villages; canal systems; collections of habitation and limited activity sites; irrigation systems; large farms, ranches, estates, or plantations; transportation networks; and large landscaped parks.

Site

A site is the location of a significant event, a prehistoric or historic occupation or activity, or a building or structure, whether standing, ruined, or vanished, where the location itself possesses historic, cultural, or archeological value regardless of the value of any existing structure. **Examples:** habitation sites, funerary sites; rock shelters; village sites; hunting and fishing sites; ceremonial sites; petroglyphs; rock carvings; gardens; battlefields; ruins of historic buildings and structures; campsites; sites of treaty signing; trails; areas of land; shipwrecks; cemeteries; designed landscapes; and natural features, such as springs, rock formations, and land areas having cultural significance.

Building

A building, such as a house, bam, church, hotel, or similar construction, is created principally to shelter any form of human activity. "Building" may also be used to refer to a historically and functionally related unit, such as a courthouse and a jail or a house and a bam. **Examples:** Houses; bams; stables; sheds; garages; courthouses; city halls; social halls; commercial buildings; libraries; factories; mills, train depots; stationary mobile homes, hotels, theaters; schools; stores; and churches.

Structure

The term "structure" is used to distinguish from buildings those functional constructions made usually for purposes other than creating human shelter. **Examples:** bridges; tunnels; gold dredges; fire towers; canals; turbines; dams; power plants; corncribs; silos; roadways; shot tower; windmills; grain elevators; kilns; mounds; cairns; palisade fortifications; earthworks; railroad grades; systems of roadways and paths; boats and ships; railroad locomotives and cars; telescopes; carousels; handstands; gazebos; and aircraft.

Object

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

The term "object" is used to distinguish from buildings and structures those constructions that are primarily artistic in nature or are relatively small in scale and simply constructed. Although it may be, by nature or design, movable, an object is associated with a specific setting or environment. **Examples:** sculpture; monuments; boundary markers; statuary; and foundations.

**Archeological Districts:
Contributing and Noncontributing Resources**

A contributing site, building, structure, or object adds to the historical associations, historic architectural qualities, or archeological values for which a property is significant; a noncontributing site, building, structure, or object does not. A contributing resource has the following characteristics:

- It was present during the period of time that the property achieved its significance.
- It relates to the documented significance of the property.
- It possesses historical integrity or is capable of yielding important information relevant to the significance of the property.

Contributing and noncontributing resources need to be differentiated and tallied. Identify all sites, buildings, structures, and objects located within the property's boundaries that are substantial in size and scale and determine which are contributing and which are noncontributing. As a general rule:

- Count a geographically continuous site as a single unit regardless of its size or complexity.
- Count separate areas of a discontinuous district as separate entities (e.g., sites, structures, etc.)
- Do not count minor resources (such as small sheds, grave markers, or machinery) unless they are important to the property's significance.
- Do not count architectural ruins separately from the site of which they are a part.
- Do not count landscape features (such as fences and paths) separately from the site of which they are a part unless they are particularly important or intrusive. For example, a narrow gravel pathway built 10 years ago to guide tourists from one mission building to another should not be counted.
- Do not count individual archeological components of stratified archeological sites separately.

A landscape feature, such as a formal garden or complex of formal gardens, may be classified and counted either as a site or as a district. Landscape features associated with archeological properties, however, will generally be counted as sites. National Register Bulletin: *Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Rural Historic Landscape* and National Register Bulletin: *How to Evaluate and Nominate Designed Historic Landscapes* provide guidance on defining, describing, and evaluating rural and designed landscapes. Refer to National Register

Bulletin *How to Complete the National Register Registration Form* for further guidance on counting resources.

CLASSIFICATION EXAMPLES

<u>Situation</u>	<u>Classification</u>
1870s homestead archeological site with no standing structures or above-ground ruins.	Site
1870s homestead archeological site with a standing barn and house dating to the 1870s.	Site
1870s homestead archeological site situated atop and adjacent to important precontact archeological deposits.	Site
Four 1870s homestead sites adjacent to one another.	District
A pre-contact irrigation system fragmented by modern developments.	Discontiguous District
Three Historically-related shipwrecks that are located approximately one-quarter mile apart.	Discontiguous District
Twenty shell midden sites located within a particular-county.	Multiple Property Submission

Historic and Current Functions or Uses

Historic function or use relates to the function of the property during the time period associated with the property's significance. Current function refers to the present-day function/use of the property. Historic function and current function for archeological properties usually differ. For example, a Colonial-period site with a buried foundation of a county courthouse that is currently under cultivation has a historic function of GOVERNMENT/ county courthouse and a current function of AGRICULTURE / SUBSISTENCE/ agricultural field. If none of the listed

functions and uses is appropriate, then the "Other" category may be checked and a description filled in.

Note that completion of the 'Functions/Uses' category is especially important. There is no site-type category, in the sense that archeologists use the term, on the nomination form. Since most archeological properties are classified by function or use, the Function/Use designation approximates a site-type designation.

FUNCTIONS AND USES PERTAINING TO ARCHEOLOGICAL PROPERTIES	
<u>Category</u>	<u>Subcategory</u>
Domestic	Single dwelling, multiple dwelling, secondary structure, hotel, institutional housing, camp, village site
Agriculture/ Subsistence	Processing, storage, agricultural field, animal facility, fishing facility or site, horticultural facility, agricultural outbuilding, irrigation facility
Industry/ Processing/ Extraction	Manufacturing facility, extractive facility, waterworks, energy facility, communications facility, processing site, industrial storage
Commerce/Trade	Business, professional, organizational, financial institution, specialty store, department store, restaurant, warehouse, trade (archeology)
Transportation	Rail-related, air-related, water-related, road-related (vehicular), pedestrian-related
Government	Capitol, city hall, correctional facility, fire station, government office, diplomatic building, custom house, post office, public works, courthouse
Defense	Arms storage, fortification, military facility, battle site, Coast Guard facility, naval facility, air facility
Recreation and Culture	Theater, auditorium, museum, music facility, sports facility, outdoor recreation, fair, monument/marker, work of art

Landscape	Parking lot, park, plaza, garden, forest, unoccupied land, underwater, natural feature, street furniture/ object, conservation area
Education	School, college, library, research facility, education related
Religion	Religious facility, ceremonial site, church school, church-related residence
Funerary	Cemetery, graves/burial, mortuary
Health Care	Hospital, clinic, sanitarium, medical business/office, resort
Social	Meeting hall, clubhouse, civic
Vacant/Not in Use	(Use this category when the property is not being used)
Work in Progress	
Unknown	
Other	

Architectural Classification Materials

The descriptive categories, Architectural Classification and Material, are applicable only for archeological sites that have standing buildings or structures. If the property has a standing, contributing structure or building then these descriptive categories must be completed.

Data categories for "Architectural Classification" and architectural style references are listed in National Register Bulletin *How to Complete the National Register Registration Form*. These categories represent American architectural styles. An archeologist may need to consult with an architectural historian to identify the correct architectural classification. If the building or structure does not fit into the classification scheme and an appropriate classification is known, then "Other" should be checked and the name written in. For example, "Other: Mesa Verde Pueblo. If a building or structure style is not listed in the "Architectural Classification" list and "Other" is inappropriate, then "No Style" should be entered.

Architectural classification "categories," "subcategories," and "other stylistic terminology" have not been established for "ruins." **Ruins** are defined by the National Register as buildings or structures that no longer possess original design or structural integrity. When there is considerable structural integrity still remaining which is the case at many pueblos, the property should be classified as buildings rather than ruins. The principal existing and visible exterior materials, whether historic or non-historic, of standing buildings or structures or of above ground ruins must be described. A listing of materials from which to choose is provided in National Register Bulletin *How to Complete the National Register Registration Form*. If there are no aboveground buildings, structures, or ruins, enter N/A. For example, if there is a subsurface stone foundation but no above-ground evidence, N/A should be entered.

Narrative Description

The narrative description is the text that describes the archeological property as it was in the past (i.e., during its "period of significance") and as it is in the present. It also describes the property's environmental or physical condition, including the property's past environmental setting and its current setting. The property's physical integrity should also be discussed. There is no outline that must be followed when describing archeological properties. Many preparers, however, have found the following outline useful.

1. SUMMARY

Summarize the highlights of the information presented in the description narrative. At a minimum, the summary paragraph(s) should identify the general location of the property, its type, period of significance, the cultural group(s) associated with the property, the range of contributing resources, and the integrity of the property and its setting. Note that the period of significance and the cultural group associated with the property will be discussed more fully in the following "Evaluating Significance" section. For the purposes of this summary, these subjects should be discussed to the level needed to provide the reader with a basic orientation regarding the property.

2. ENVIRONMENT

Describe the present and, if different, the past environment and physical setting that prevailed during the property's period(s) of occupation or use, or period of significance. This description should focus on the environmental features or factors that are or were relevant to the location, use, formation, or preservation of the archeological property.

3. TIME PERIOD OF OCCUPATION OR USE

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

Identify the time period when the property is known or projected to have been occupied or used. Explain how the period of time was determined, especially the beginning and end dates. Include comparisons with similar properties if data from them were used to establish the time period. The period of occupation often corresponds to the period of significance. Note that the individual period(s) of occupation or use is discussed in detail under the physical description of the property. This section is intended to be more general and inclusive of the periods of occupation.

4. PERSONS, ETHNIC GROUPS, OR ARCHEOLOGICAL CULTURES

Identify those who, through their activities, created the archeological property or, in the case of a district, occupied or used the area and created the sites within it. Discuss the supporting evidence for making such a determination.

5. PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS

Describe the physical makeup of the nominated property or properties. Where appropriate, the description of a site or a district should include the following:

Site:

- Site type, such as village, quarry, tavern, rural homestead, military fortification, or shoe factory.
- Important (or contributing) standing structures, buildings, or ruins.
- Kinds and approximate number or density of features (e.g., middens, hearths, roads, or garden terraces), artifacts (e.g., manos and metates, lithic debitage, medicine bottles), and ecofacts (e.g., insects, macrobotanical remains).
- Known or projected depth and extent of the archeological deposits and the supporting evidence for archeological integrity.
- Known or projected dates for the period(s) in which the site was occupied or used and the supporting evidence.
- Vertical and horizontal distribution of features, artifacts, and ecofacts.
- Natural and cultural processes, such as flooding and refuse disposal, that have influenced the formation of the site.
- Noncontributing buildings, structures, and objects within the site.

District:

- Type of district, such as an eighteenth-century New England village or a middle Woodland mound group.

- Cultural, historical, or other relationships among the sites that make the district a cohesive unit.
 - Kinds and number of contributing sites, buildings, structures, and objects that make up the district.
 - Information on individual or representative sites and other resources within the district. Refer to the "Physical Characteristics" of a 'Site' presented above. For districts with few significant archeological resources (usually sites), describe the individual sites. For archeological districts with a number of resources (usually sites), describe the most representative resources or types of resources and present the data on the individual resources in a table.
 - Noncontributing sites, buildings, structures, and objects within the district.
6. **LIKELY APPEARANCE OF THE PROPERTY DURING ITS PERIOD(S) OF OCCUPATION OR USE**

Because of limited data, this description is often general and speculative, especially if above-ground elements no longer exist. Nevertheless, the description should be consistent with the description of the archeological remains. Knowledge of similar properties that have been comprehensively investigated may be used to support the description. A description of the property as it likely appeared in the past is particularly useful in evaluating integrity.

7. **CURRENT AND PAST IMPACTS**

Identify the impacts, natural and cultural, past and current, on or immediately around the property, such as modern development, vandalism, neglect, road construction, agriculture, soil erosion, or flooding. For a district, describe the integrity of the district as a whole and the integrity of individual sites. The emphasis in this section should be on identifying the kinds of impacts and assessing the extent or degree of impact. If qualitative categories, such as "high," "low," etc., are used, then these should be defined.

8. **INTEGRITY**

As defined by the National Register, properties that are eligible for inclusion have integrity. Integrity has seven aspects: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. As with much of the National Register nomination process, assessment of the archeological integrity at a particular historic property or district depends upon the identified historic contexts, questions, and research design. A comprehensive, accurate, and explicit evaluation of archeological integrity is an essential part of any nomination. For further discussion of integrity, see the section titled "Aspects, or Qualities, of Integrity."

9. PREVIOUS INVESTIGATIONS

Previous investigations are discussed for the purposes of (1) documenting disturbances from archeological investigations, (2) identifying the information that the property has already yielded, and (3) determining, in part, the information potential if additional studies are conducted at the property. The following topics should be addressed: archival, literature, and oral history research; the extent and purpose of any excavation, testing, mapping, or surface collection; dates of relevant research and field work and pertinent biases; the identity of the researchers and, if relevant, their institutional or organizational affiliation; and directly relevant bibliographic references. Focus on those studies that retain to the specific property being nominated. Other relevant studies and research should become evident through reading the "Contexts" section in the narrative significance discussion. Of particular importance are the archeological studies conducted to identify the property and determine its horizontal and vertical extent and its integrity. If known, identify the location of repositories where collections and site records are curated.

10. CONTRIBUTING AND NONCONTRIBUTING RESOURCES

List the contributing and noncontributing resources if they have not already been described as such in previous subsections. Often in the case of archeological properties, all categories of resources except "site" are noncontributing. When this occurs, the preparer simply needs to state, for example, that "all nine buildings on the property postdate the period of significance and are noncontributing resources" and that "there is only one contributing resource--the archeological site." Note that the totals of the contributing and noncontributing counts in the text must match with those found on the National Register form under the heading "Number of Resources within Property" and match those identified on the site map.

Narrative Statement of Significance

The "Statement of Significance" is an analytical statement. In this section the significance of the property is justified by addressing applicable National Register criteria, areas of significance, period of significance, cultural affiliation, and, if applicable, criteria considerations, significant dates, significant persons, and the architect or builder.

The statement of significance is the most important section of any archeological nomination. It documents and justifies the significance of the property.

With the exception of the "Summary of Significance" at the beginning of the section, there is no established outline for presenting the significance information. At a minimum, all statements of significance should describe the historic contexts used to evaluate the significance of the historic

property. See the Section on Evaluating the Significance of Archeological Properties for assistance with this section.

The "Summary of Significance" is a concise statement, accompanied by the supporting rationale, of why the property is significant. The criterion or criteria under which the property is being nominated and the areas of significance should be cited. In addition, the important information that the property is likely to yield should be summarized.

Summary of Significance

The significance of Fort Davis, 41SE289, lies in the fact that it was a major force in providing protection for Euro-American settlers who remained in the Rolling Plains southwest of Fort Worth during the Civil War. In the absence of adequate military protection, families realized they would have to "fort up" together, or retreat east to larger settlements. Their decision to stay was an important determinant in the subsequent settlement and history of the western frontier of Texas following the Civil War, qualifying the site for listing on the National Register under Criterion A. Moreover, the site is significant as the only fancily fort that has been investigated archaeologically, and contains an archaeological assemblage of a very short time span (1864-1867) from families living at some distance from supplies during the Civil War. Such a collection will be of value to other researchers working on properties dating to this period. The cemetery is considered significant for the genealogical and historical data that it can provide concerning the fort residents and their descendants. Therefore, Fort Davis also meets Criterion D for inclusion in the National Register (Kenmotsu 1992).

Summary of Significance

Cannonball Ruins is eligible under criterion D in the areas of Community Planning/Development and Ethnic Heritage. The site has the potential to provide information regarding the organization of prehistoric communities as well as information regarding Mesa Verde cultural tradition and how it contributes to historic Pueblo Indian culture. The site is also significant in the area of Agriculture for its ability to provide information regarding the role of intensified horticulture. Habitation sites with public architecture are extremely important to our understanding of Southwestern U.S. prehistoric political and social development, population aggregation and regional abandonment.

Cannonball Ruins is eligible under criterion A for association with the movement of Mesa Verde Anasazi settlements to canyon and canyon-head settings in the 13th century A. D., an event that made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of Southwestern prehistory. The site represents a well-preserved example of a 13th-century village and is one of the largest and last villages from this period.

The site is also eligible under criterion B because of its association with the life and career of Sylvanus G. Morley, a person significant in the history of American archeology. Cannonball Ruins was the only excavation Morley undertook in the continental United States and the one in which he obtained his first fieldwork experience.

Cannonball Ruins is eligible under criterion C for its architectural significance. The standing structures at the site embody the distinctive characteristics of "Hovenweep-type" architecture and construction.

VI. Bibliographic References

In the bibliography, or reference section, include all primary and secondary sources that were used in documenting and evaluating the property and in preparing the National Register nomination. All references cited in the text must be listed in the bibliography established historic context reports or multiple property nominations that were used to evaluate the property also should be cited.

There is no mandatory bibliographic style. The National Register does require, however, that a standard style be used and only one style be used for any given nomination. Standard bibliographic styles are found in *A Manual of Style* and *A Manual for Writers*, both published by the University of Chicago Press. Archeologists may choose to use the bibliographic styles endorsed by the primary professional journals - *Historical Archaeology* and *American Antiquity*.

If an archeological property is in a national park and has standing structures or buildings, then the "List of Classified Structures" (LCS) should be consulted and cited. Each park maintains a list of properties within its boundaries, and each National Park Service Regional Office has a LCS Coordinator who maintains the files for the park units within the region.

Previous National Park Service Documentation

Although the nominating official (i.e., the State Historic Preservation Officer, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, or Federal Preservation Officer) is responsible for completing this section of the nomination, the preparer of the nomination should know whether or not the property has been:

- Listed in the National Register, Determined eligible by the National Register for listing in the National Register (DOE),
- Designated as a National Historic Landmark (NHL),
- Recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS)

- ☐ Recorded by Historic American Engineering Record (HAER), or
- ☐ Preliminarily determined to be eligible as an individual listing under 36 CFR 67, which are rules and regulations regarding the certification of historic properties for rehabilitation tax benefits.

Files are maintained by the National Park Service for all of the above kinds of evaluated historic properties. The National Register, History and Education program of the National Park Service, which is located in Washington D.C., maintains the National Register and official DOE files and the National Historic Landmark files. Records of many other properties determined eligible are found in files maintained by state historic preservation offices and federal preservation offices. Historic American Buildings Survey and Historic American Engineering Record files are prepared by the National Park Service's HABS/HAER division, which also maintains a comprehensive listing of all HABS/HAER documented properties. Most HABS/HAER files and accompanying photographs are available through the Library of Congress. These files, some dating back to the 1930s, typically include detailed architectural drawings and excellent black -and-white photographs. State historic preservation offices maintain files on the properties listed or determined to be eligible for listing in the National Register and on the properties certified for tax purposes under 36 CFR 67.

VII. Establishing Boundaries and Geographic Information

Boundaries define the horizontal extent of a historic property. Defining the perimeter of an archeological site is often a difficult task because of the unique environmental setting and archeological characteristics at individual properties. There is no standard method for defining the extent of a archeological site's boundaries.

The methods for defining and documenting the boundaries of an archeological property should be explicitly described. Although final boundaries may have to be determined after data analysis is complete, the archeologist should make every effort to define preliminary boundaries of the property while in the field.

The intent of the "Geographical Data" section of the National Register nomination is to define the location and extent of the property being nominated. The parameters that physically define and describe the property's boundaries and the rationale for establishing those parameters is of paramount importance this section.

Absolute boundary definition is often not achievable, especially for archeology properties. Nevertheless, for public administration purposes, defensible boundaries are required. This means

that the boundaries chosen have to be justified and that justification must be consistent with the information presented in the description and significance sections.

When selecting boundaries, keep in mind the following general guidelines:

- The boundaries should encompass, but not exceed, the full extent of the significant resources and land area making up the property.
- Buffer zones or acreage not directly contributing to the significance of the property should be excluded.
- Include landscape features that are important in understanding the property.
- A setting that directly contributes to the significance of the property may be included.
- Leave out peripheral areas of the property that no longer retain integrity.
- As a general rule, because it is inconsistent with the concept of a site or district representing a discrete entity, specific areas within the boundaries of the property cannot be excluded from the nomination of the property. If the district does contain individual resources or areas that are linked by historic association or function but are separated geographically, then it may be appropriate to describe and evaluate the property as a discontinuous district.

GUIDELINES FOR SELECTING BOUNDARIES

The selection of boundaries for archeological sites and districts depends primarily on the scale and horizontal **extent** of the significant features. A regional pattern or assemblage of remains, a location of repeated **habitation**, a location or a single habitation, or some other distribution of archeological evidence, all imply different spatial scales. Although it is not always possible to determine the boundaries of a site conclusively, a knowledge of local cultural history and related features such as site type can help predict the extent of a site. Consider the property's setting and physical characteristics along with the results of archeological survey to determine the most suitable approach.

Obtain evidence through one or several of the following techniques:

Subsurface testing , including test excavations, core and auger borings, and observation of cut banks.

Surface observation of site features and materials that have been uncovered by plowing or other disturbance or that have remained on the surface since deposition.

Observation of topographic or other natural features that may or may not have been present during the period of significance.

Observation of land alterations subsequent to site formation that may have affected the integrity of the site.

Study of historical or ethnographic documents, such as maps and journals.

If the techniques listed above cannot be applied, set the boundaries by conservatively estimating the extent and location of the significant features. Thoroughly explain the basis for selecting the boundaries in the boundary justification.

If a portion of a known site cannot be tested because access to the property has been denied by the owner, the boundaries may be drawn along the legal property lines of the portion that is accessible, provided that portion by itself has sufficient significance to meet the National Register criteria and the full extent of the site is unknown.

Archeological districts may contain **discontiguous elements** under the following circumstances:

1. When one or several outlying sites has a direct relationship to the significance of the main portion of the district, through common cultural affiliation or as related elements of a pattern of land use, and
2. When the intervening space does not have known significant resources.

(Geographically separate sites not forming a discontiguous district may be nominated together as individual properties within a multiple property submission.)

National Register bulletins provide guidance on defining boundaries, including

- National Register Bulletin: *How to Complete the National Register Registration Form* and
- National Register Bulletin: *Defining Boundaries for National Register Properties* and its appendix: *Definition of National Register Boundaries for Archeological Properties*.

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

Note that for **discontiguous districts**, each separate area of land must be described in terms of acreage, Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM) references, a Boundary description, and a boundary justification.

Acreage

Enter the total acreage for the property. Acreage should be accurate to the nearest whole acre; or, if known, to the nearest tenth of an acre. If the property is less than one acre, enter "less than one acre." On the other hand, if the property acreage is known to be, for example 0.7 acres, then 0.7 may be entered instead. For properties that are more than 100 acres, a United States Geological Survey (USGS) acreage estimator may be used to calculate the acreage. If the property is a discontiguous district, then the acreage for each area must be listed as well as the total acreage (e.g., A = 0.3; B = 1.2; and C = 5.7 acres. Total = 7.2 acres)

UTM References

Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM) grid references are used to identify the exact location of the property. A USGS quadrangle map and a UTM coordinate are necessary tools for determining UTM reference points. Many state historic preservation offices will assist applicants in completing this item. Appendix VIII of National Register Bulletin: *How to Complete the National Register Registration Form* and National Register Bulletin: *Using the UTM Grid System to Record Historic Sites* provides instructions on how to determine UTMS. The following are general guidelines that apply to all kinds of properties:

- For properties that are less than 10 acres, enter the UTM reference for the point corresponding to the center of the property.
- For properties of 10 or more acres enter three or more UTM references. The references should correspond to the vertices of a polygon drawn on the USGS map accompanying the nomination.
- For **linear properties** of 10 or more acres, such as canals or trails, enter three or more UTM references, all of which should correspond to points along the line drawn on the accompanying USGS map.
- if UTM references define the boundaries of the property, as well as indicate the location, the polygon or line delineated by the references must correspond exactly to the property's boundaries.

- If the property is a discontinuous district, then a UTM reference is needed for each area. Three or more UTM references will be needed for those areas that are greater than ten acres.

Verbal Boundary Description

The verbal boundary description is a textual description of the boundary of the property as shown on the maps accompanying the nomination. It usually takes one of the following forms:

- A legal parcel number (e.g., Henderson County tax map 40, parcel 0024).
- A block and lot number (e.g., Block or Square 52, Lot 006).
- A subsection of a section within the Township and Range system (e.g., NW 1/4, NW 1/4, SE 1/4 of Section 11, Township 10S, Range 7E).
- Metes and bounds (e.g., From the north side of the intersection of Walnut Creek and County Highway 36, the boundary proceeds in a northwest direction for 600 feet, the boundary line then turns and heads east for 200 feet, at which point the boundary turns and proceeds in a south-southeast direction to the original starting point.) This type of description should always begin at a readily identifiable feature located on the ground as well as on the map.
- The dimensions of a parcel of land fixed upon a given point such as the intersection of two streets, a benchmark, the tip of a spit of land jutting into a bay. (e.g., The property boundary forms a rectangle which is 2000' in a north-south direction and 1000' in an east-west direction. The property's southeast corner corresponds to the northwest corner of the intersection of U.S. Highway 40 and Main Ave.)

A map drawn to a scale of at least 1" = 200' may be used in place of a verbal description. When using a map for this purpose, note under the heading "Verbal Boundary Description" that the boundaries are indicated on the accompanying base map. For example, "The boundary of the property is shown as the dashed line on the accompanying Willow Creek County parcel map #14." The map must have a scale and a north arrow and clearly show the relationship between the archeological property, its boundaries, and the surrounding natural and cultural features. The primary disadvantage of simply referring to a map for the property boundary is a pragmatic one -- if the map is misplaced, then the location cannot be accurately determined.

If the boundaries of a large property are exactly the same as the UTM polygon, then the boundaries marked on the USGS map may be used in place of a verbal boundary description. For example, "The boundary of the Borrego Industrial Archeological District is delineated by the polygon whose vertices correspond to the following points: A 18 313500 413 6270; B 18 312770 4135940; and C 18 313040 4136490." If the UTM polygon is the same as the property's boundaries, then the boundaries of the property may be established even if the map is misplaced.

Boundary Justification

The boundary justification explains the reasons for selecting the boundaries of the property. The reasons should follow from the description and significance discussions. For archeological properties more than one reason may apply. All the reasons should be given and linked to the boundaries as they are drawn on the map. For example, "The property's western and southern boundaries correspond to the historic boundary of the property; the northern boundary follows the shoreline of the bay, which has not changed since the time period of the property's significance; and the eastern boundary corresponds to the eastern extent of intact archeological deposits. These boundaries encompass all of the archeological deposits and above-ground features and structures associated with the property."

For discontinuous districts, explain how the property meets the condition for a discontinuous district and how the boundaries were selected for each area. If the boundary justification is the same for all the areas of the district, simply present the justification and explain that this applies to each of the areas and list them.

VIII. Maps and Photographs

At a minimum, a USGS map showing the location of the property (and, if more than 10 acres, its boundaries) and black-and-white photographs documenting the appearance and condition of the property must be included with every National Register nomination. Additionally, because of the complex nature of archeological properties, a site map (sketch or to scale) is usually required. National Register Bulletin: *How to Complete the National Register Registration Form* outlines the requirements for maps and photographs. See also the National Register Bulletin: *How to Improve the Quality of Photos for National Register Nominations*. Some basic information is presented below.

Maps

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

For most properties, the National Register requires a sketch map to document a district or a complex site. Site maps drawn to scale are preferable. All maps need to conform to the following requirements:

- Maps should be drawn, printed, or photocopied on archival paper. Maps should be folded to be no larger than 8 ½ by 11 inches. When submitting a large map that is not on archival paper, fold the map and submit it in an archival folder no larger than 8 ½ by 11 inches.
- Display the following fourteen items on the map:
 1. Boundaries of the property, including points of UTM readings, carefully delineated.
 2. Names of major streets near the district and all named streets bordering the property.
 3. Names of places, especially those mentioned in the text sections of the nomination.
 4. Highway numbers.
 5. A north arrow (magnetic or true).
 6. Approximate scale for a sketch map and exact scale for a map drawn to scale.
 7. Contributing sites, buildings, structures, and objects. (These should correspond to the description or list of contributing resources in the narrative sections and to the totals of contributing resources.)
 8. Noncontributing sites, buildings, structures, and objects. (These should correspond to the description or list of noncontributing resources in the narrative sections and to the totals of noncontributing resources.)
 9. Land uses and natural features covering substantial acreage or having historic significance, such as forests, fields, orchards, quarries, rivers, lakes, and harbors.
 10. The general location and extent of disturbance, especially that described in the narrative sections.
 11. The location of previous archeological excavations, especially those that were extensive enough to cause some disturbance to the archeological deposits.

12. The location of features and artifact loci described in the narrative section.
13. The distribution of sites in a district. If more practical, this information may also be shown on the USGS map.
14. For districts, the number of the accompanying photographs intended to show views of the property.

If the property is more than 10 acres, then a USGS map may be used in place of a sketch map as long as it can legibly show the required information. Maps drawn to a larger scale may be used to show the concentration of resources or types of representative sites. These maps should be keyed to a larger map covering the entire property. Archeological site numbers are usually sufficient for keying.

Photographs

Clear black-and-white photographs need to be submitted with each nomination form. The photographs should accurately represent the property as described and its integrity. One-photograph may be adequate to document a very small historical archeological site; more, however, are generally needed to adequately document the property. Documenting each property in an archeological district is unnecessary. Photographs of the properties most representative of the district, however, should be submitted. The photographs should be keyed to those representative properties described in the narratives. Prints of historic photographs, artifacts, features, etc. may supplement documentation. All, or a representative sample, of the contributing standing structures must be photographed.

Guidelines include the following:

- The number of photographic views depends on the size and complexity of the property. Submit as many photographs as needed to depict the current condition and significant aspects of the property. Include representative views of both contributing and, if instructive, noncontributing resources. Photographs of representative artifacts and features may be included as well.

For archeological sites submit one or more photographs that depict:

- The condition of the site and above-ground or surface features,
- Significant disturbances, and

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

- The site in relation to its environmental setting.

For archeological districts submit one or more photographs that show:

- The principal sites,
- The representative site types,
- The overall integrity of the district, and
- Areas of significant disturbance.

The National Register requests recent photographs to document the present condition of the property. If photographs already exist and they accurately depict the condition of the property, then the older photographs may be used. A note to this effect, however, should be included in the nomination.

One copy of each photograph is submitted to the National Register. The SHPO or FPO may require additional sets of photographs. In addition, they may also require a set of slides. It is important to know this information prior to conducting field work or even budgeting on a National Register nomination project.

Photographs must be:

- Unmounted.
- Of high quality.
- At least 3 ½ by 5 inches; preferably 8 by 10 inches for the most important views.
- Printed on double or medium weight paper having a standard finish (matte, glossy, satin).
- Labeled in pencil or with a photographic marker.

The preferred way to label photographs is to print in pencil (soft lead pencils work best) on the back of the photograph. (Photographs with adhesive labels will not be accepted.) Include the following information:

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

1. Name of the property or, if a district, the name of the resources (e.g., site number), and then the name of the district.
2. **County** and **state** where the property is located.
3. **Name** of the photographer.
4. **Date** of the photograph.
5. Location of the original **negative**.
6. **Description of the view** indicating direction of the camera.
7. **Photograph number**. For districts use this number to identify the vantage point on the accompanying sketch map.

Alternatively, continuation sheets may be used instead of completely labeling each photograph. To do this, label the photographs by name of property, county, and state, and photograph number (Items 1, 2, and 7 above). For each photograph, list the remaining information (Items 3-6) and Items 1, 2, and 7 on a continuation sheet. Information common to all photographs, such as the photographer's name or the location of the negatives, may be listed once with a statement that it applies to all photographs.

If the photographic paper will not accept pencil marks, print Items 1, 2, and 7 using a permanent marking pen in the front border near the lower right corner of the photograph (do not mark on the image area) and use the continuation sheets alternative.

In submitting a photograph to the NPS with a National Register form, **photographers grant permission to the NPS** to use the photograph for publication and other purposes, including duplication, display, distribution, study, publicity, and audio-visual presentations. The photographer will be credited.

IX. Ownership

All state historic preservation offices need the names and addresses of all fee-simple property owners. This information is used to notify owners of the intended nomination of their property to the National Register and its listing. The SHPO, THPO, or FPO may ask applicants to enter this information on the nomination form, on continuation sheets, or on another form.

The SHPO, THPO, or FPO will also submit the following items with the completed National Register form:

- Notarized letters of objection from property owners and
- Comments received from public officials, owners, and the general public.

X. Bibliography

Bevan, Bruce

1983 Electromagnetics for Mapping Buried Earth Features. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 10(1):47-54.

1981 *A Ground-Penetrating Radar Survey at Dickinson Mansion*. Prepared for Delaware Division of Historical and Cultural Affairs, Bureau of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, Dover, Delaware.

Binford, Lewis R.

1977 General Introduction. In *For Theory Building in Archaeology. Essays on Faunal Remains, Aquatic Resources, Spatial Analysis, and Systemic Modeling*, edited by L. R. Binford, pp. 1-10. Academic Press, New York.

1981a Middle-range Research and the Role of Actualistic-Studies. In *Bones: Ancient Men and Modern Myths*, edited by L. R. Binford, pp. 21-30. Academic Press, New York.

1981b Introduction to Part 11: Middle-range Research-In Search of Methodology. In *Bones Ancient Men and Modern Myths*, edited by L. R. Binford, pp. 31-34. Academic Press, New York.

1989 *Debating Archaeology*. Academic Press, Inc, San Diego.

Briuer, Frederick L., Editor

1996 Cultural Resource Significance Evaluation: Proceedings of a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Workshop 3-4 October 1994, Vicksburg, Mississippi.

Briuer, Frederick L. and Clay Mathers

1997 Trends and Patterns in Cultural Resources Significance: A Historical Perspective and Annotated Bibliography. Technical Report EL-97-5, April 1997. U. S. Army Corps of Engineers Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Mississippi.
[Www.wes.army.mil/e./ccspt/publications.html](http://www.wes.army.mil/e./ccspt/publications.html).

Briuer, Frederick, Janet E. Simms, and Lawson M. Smith

1997 Site Mapping, Geophysical Investigation, and Geomorphic Reconnaissance at Site 9ME395 Uptoi Town, Fort Benning, Georgia. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Miscellaneous Paper EL-97-3. [Www.wes.army.mil/e./ccspt/publications.html](http://www.wes.army.mil/e./ccspt/publications.html).

Camett, Carol

1991 *Legal Background of Archeological Resources Protection*. Technical Brief No. 11, Archeological Assistance Division, National Park Service, Washington, D.C.

Deagan, Kathleen A.

1988 Neither History Nor Prehistory: the Questions that Count in Historical Archaeology. *Historical Archaeology* 22:7-12.

Ferguson, Leland (editor)

1977 Historical Archaeology and the Importance of Material Things. *Special Publication Series*, Number 2. Society for Historical Archaeology.

Grumet, Robert S.

1988 *Archeology in the National Historic Landmarks Program*. Technical Brief No. 3, Archeological Assistance Program, National Park Service, Washington, D.C.

1990 *The National Historic Landmarks Program Theme Study and Preservation Planning*. Technical Brief No. 10. (revised 1992) Archeological Assistance Division, National Park Service, Washington, D.C.

Hardesty, Donald

1990 Evaluating Site Significance in Historical Mining Districts, *Historical Archaeology* 24:42-51.

1988 *The Archeology of Mining and Miners: A View From the Silver State*. Society for Historical Archaeology Special Publication Series 6. Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Heimmer, D. H.

1992 Near Surface, High Resolution Geophysical Methods for Cultural Resource Management and Archeological Investigations. USDI, NPS, Rocky Mountain Regional Office, Interagency Archeological Services, Denver.

Honerkamp, Nicholas

1988 Questions that Count in Archaeology: Plenary Session, 1987 Meeting of the Society for Historical Archaeology Conference on Historical and Underwater Archaeology Savannah, Georgia. *Historical Archaeology* 22:5-6.

Kenmotsu, Nancy

1992 Fort Davis Family Fort, Stephens County, Texas. National Register of Historic Places Nomination, National Register of Historic Places, Washington, D.C.

Lees, William B, and Vergil E. Noble

1990 Methodological Approaches to Assessing the Archaeological Significance of Historic Sites, *Historical Archaeology* 24:9.

1990 Other Questions that Count: Introductory Comments on Assessing Significance in Historical Archaeology, *Historical Archaeology* 24:10-13.

Leone, Mark P.

1988 The Relationship Between Archaeological Data and the Documentary Record: 18th Century Gardens in Annapolis, Maryland. *Historical Archaeology* 22:29-35.

McManamon, Francis P.

1990 A Regional Perspective on Assessing the Significance of Historic Period Sites, *Historical Archaeology* 24:14-22.

Merton, Robert K.

1967 *On Theoretical Sociology. Five Essays, Old and New.* The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois.

National Park Service

1996 *Thematic Framework.* www.cr.nps.gov/history/thematic.html

Nöel Hume, Ivor

1982 *Martin's Hundred.* Victor Gollancz Ltd., London.

Peacock, Evan and Alanna J. Patrick

1997 Site Survey and Land-Records Research: A Comparison of Two Methods for Locating and Characterizing Historic Period Sites on the Tombigbee National Forest, Mississippi. *Mississippi Archaeology* 32(1):1-26.

Rathje, William L.

1977 In Praise of Archaeology: Le Project du Garbage. In *Historical Archaeology and the Importance of Material Things*, edited by Leland

Ferguson. *Special Publication Series*, No. 2:36-42. Society for Historical Archaeology.

1979 Modern Material Culture Studies. In *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory*. Vol. 2. edited by Michael B. Schiffer. Academic Press, Inc., New York.

Smith, Samuel D.

1990 Site Survey as a Method for Determining Historic Site Significance, *Historical Archaeology* 24:34-41.

Smith, Steven D.

1994 Context and Archaeology of Settler Communities: An Example from Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri. Pp 95-105 in *Settler Communities in the West*, Historic Contexts for Cultural Resource Managers of Department of Defense Lands, edited by Robert Lyon. National Park Service, Rocky Mountain Region.

South, Stanley

1977 *Method and Theory in Historical Archeology*. Academic Press, New York.

1988 Whither Pattern? *American Antiquity* 22:25-28.

Sullivan, Alan P. III

1996 Risk, Anthropogenic Environments, and Western Anasazi Subsistence. In *Evolving Complexity and Environmental Risk in the Prehistoric Southwest*, edited by J. A. Tainter and B. B. Tainter, pp. 145-165. Proceedings of the Workshop "Resource Stress, Economic Uncertainty, and Human Response in the Prehistoric Southwest," held February 25-29, 1992 in Santa Fe, New Mexico. Santa Fe Institute for Studies in the Sciences of Complexity, Proceedings Volume XXIV, Addison-Wesley.

Tainter, Joseph A. And Bonnie Bagley Tainter, Editors

1996 *Evolving Complexity and Environmental Risk in the Prehistoric Southwest*. Proceedings of the Workshop "Resource Stress, Economic Uncertainty, and Human Response in the Prehistoric Southwest," held February 25-29, 1992 in Santa Fe, New Mexico. Santa Fe Institute for Studies in the Sciences of Complexity, Proceedings Volume XXIV, Addison-Wesley.

Talmage, Valerie, Olga Chesler and Staff of Interagency Archeological Services.

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

1977 The Importance of Small, Surface, and Disturbed Sites as Sources of Significant Archeological Data. USDI, National Park Service, Washington, D.C.

Thomas, David Hurst

1983a *The Archaeology of Monitor Valley. 1. Epistemology.* Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History, Vol. 58: Part 1. New York.

1983b *The Archaeology of Monitor Valley. 2. Gatecliff Shelter.* Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History, Vol. 59: Part 1. New York.

1987 *The Archaeology of Mission Santa Catalina de Guale 1. Search and Discovery.* Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History, Vol. 63: Part 2. New York.

Wilson, John S.

1990 We've Got Thousands of These! What Makes an Historic Farmstead Significant? *Historical Archaeology* 24:23-33.

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

Appendix A -- National Register Bulletins

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

Appendix B -- Multiple Property Submission cover documents under which archeological properties have been nominated.

Multiple submission cover documents under which archeological properties have been nominated

- | | |
|------------|--|
| Alabama | Plantation Houses of the Alabama Canebrake and Their Associated Outbuildings
MPS |
| Arizona | Bandelier's, Adolph F. A., Archeological survey of Tonto Basin, Tonto NF MPS

Casa Grande MRA

Fort Lowell MRA

Hohokam Platform Mound Communities of the Lower Santa Cruz River Basin c.
A.D. 1050-1450 MPS

Hohokam and Euroamerican Land Use and Settlement along the Northern Queen
Creek Delta MPS

Logging Railroad Resources of the Conconino and Kaibab National Forests MPS

Prehistoric Walled Hilltop sites of Prescott National Forest and Adjacent Regions
MPS

Snake Gulch Rock Art MPS |
| Arkansas | Rock Art Sites in Arkansas TR |
| California | Earth Figures of California - Arizona Colorado River Basin TR |
| Colorado | Archaic Period Architectural sites in Colorado MPS

Dinosaur National Monument MRA

Great Pueblo Period of the McElmo Drainage Unit MPS |

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

Historic Resources of Aspen MPS

Prehistoric Paleo-Indian Cultures of the Colorado Plains MPS

Connecticut Lower Connecticut River Valley Woodland Peiord Archaeological TR

Delaware Nanticoke Indian Community TR

St. Jones Neck MRA

Florida Archaeological Resources in the Upper St. Johns River Valley MPS

Archaeological Resources of the Caloosahatchee Region

Archaeological Resources of the Everglades National Park MPS

Archaeological Resources of the Naval Live Oaks Reservation MPS

Rural Resources of Leon County

Georgia Baconton MRA

Columbus MRA

Cumberland Island National Seashore MRA

Old Federal Road in Georgia's Banks and Franklin Counties MPS

Idaho Chinese sites in the Warren Mining District MPS

Iowa Mines of Spain Archeological MPS

Municipal, County, and State Corrections Properties MPS

Prehistoric Hunters and Gatherers on the Northwest Iowa Plains, C. 10,000-200
B.P. MPS

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

Prehistoric Mounds of the Quad-State Region of the upper Mississippi River Valley
MPS

Kansas Kansas Rock Art TR

Santa Fe Trail MPS

Kentucky Ashland MRA

Clark County MRA

Early Stone Buildings of Kentucky TR

Green River Shell Middens of Kentucky TR

Hickman, Kentucky MPS

Mammoth Cave National Park MPS

Pisgah Area of Woodford County MPS

Prehistoric Rock Art Sites in Kentucky MPS

Louisiana Louisiana's French Creole Architecture MPS

Maine Native American Petroglyphs and Pictographs in Maine MPS

Androscoggin River Drainage Prehistoric Sites MPS

Boothbay Region Prehistoric Sites TR

Cobscook Area Coastal Prehistoric Sites MPS

Maine Fluted Point Paleoindian Sites MPS

Penebscot Headwater Lakes Prehistoric Sites MPS

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

- Prehistoric Sites in North Haven TR
- Maryland
 - Delaware Chalcedony Complex TR
 - Prehistoric human adaptation to the Coastal Plain Environment of Anne Arundel County MPS
- Mass.
 - Barnstable MRA
 - Blue Hills and Neponset River Reservations MRA
 - First Period Buildings of Eastern Massachusetts TR
 - Stoneham MRA
- Michigan
 - Shipwrecks of Isle Royale National Park TR
- Minnesota
 - American Indian Rock Art in Minnesota MPS
 - Minnesota's Lake Superior Shipwrecks MPS
 - Minnesotat State Park CCC/WPS/Rustic Style MPS
 - Pipestone County MRA
 - Portage Trails in Minnesota MPS
 - Precontact American Indian Earthworks MPS
 - Washington County MRA
- Missouri
 - Prehistoric Rock Shelter and Cave Sites in Southwestern Missouri MPS
 - Santa Fe Trail MPS
- Montana
 - Archeological Resources of the Upper Missouri River Corridor MPS

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

Whoop-Up Trail of Northcentral Montana MPS

New Hampshire

Harrisville MRA

New Mexico

Anasazi Sites within the Chacoan interaction sphere TR

Animas Phase sites in Hidalgo county MPS

Anton Chico Land Grant MRA

Archaic sites of the northwest Jemez Mountains MPS

Chaco Mesa Pueblo III TR

Corona Phase Sites in the Jicarilla Mountains, New Mexico, MPS

Cultural Developments on the Pajarito Plateau MPS

Gallina Culture Developments in North Central New Mexico MPS

Jimenez Cultural Developments in North-Central New Mexico

Jemez Springs Pueblo sites TR

Late Prehistoric Cultural Developments along the Rio Chama and Tributaries MPS

Lincoln Phase sites in the Sierra Blanca Region MPS

Mining sites in the Nogal mining district of the Lincoln National Forest MPS

Navajo-Refugee Pueblo TR

Prehistoric adaptations along the Rio Grande Drainage, Sierra County, New Mexico
TR

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

Prehistoric and Historic Agricultural sites in the Lower Rio Bonito Valley TR

Pueblo IV sites of the Chupadera Arroyo MPS

Railroad Logging Era Resources MPS

Rayado Ranch MPS

Ring Midden sites of the Guadalupe Mountains MPS

Santa Fe Trail MPS

New York

Colonie Town MRA

Rhinebeck Town MRA

North Carolina

Dan River Navigation System in North Carolina TR

Durham MRA

Iredell County MRA

Oregon

Early French-Canadian Settlement MPS

Native American Archeological sites of the Oregon Coast MPS

Pennsylvania

Bituminous Coal and Coke resources of PA MPS

Gristmills in Berks County MPS

Industrial Resources of Huntingdon county MPS

Iron and Steel Resources in Pennsylvania MPS

Rhode Island

Foster MPS

Indian use of Block Island, 500 BC-AD 1676 MPS

Indian use of Salt Pond Region between ca. 4000 BP and ca 1750 AD MPS

North Kingstown MRA

South Carolina

Congaree Swamp National Monument MPS

Early Ironworks of Northwestern South Carolina TR

Edisto island MRA

Historic Resources of St. Helena Island c. 1740-c. 1935 MPS

Late Archaic-Early Woodland period shell rings of South Carolina

McCormick MRA

Pacolet Soapstone Quarries TR

Yamasee Indian Towns in the South Carolina Low county MPS

South Dakota

19th century South Dakota Trading Posts MPS

Big Bend Area MRA

James River Basin Woodland sites TR

Petroforms of South Dakota TR

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

Prehistoric Rock Art of South Dakota MPS

Rock Art in the Southern Black Hills TR

South Dakota portion of the Bismark to Deadwood trail MPS

Tennessee Historic and historic archaeological resources of the American Civil War MPS

Iron Industry on the Western Highland Rim 1790s-1920s MPS

Mississippian Cultural Resources of the Central Basin (AD 900-AD 1450) MPS

Mocassin Bend MRA

Texas 19th century pottery kilns of Denton county TR

Bastrop MPS

Indian Hot Springs MPS

New Mexican Pastor Sites in Texas Panhandle TR

Salado MRA

Utah Great Basin Style Rock Art TR

Tintic Mining District MRA

Vermont Bellows Falls Island MRA

Virgin islands Virgin Islands National Park MRA

Virginia Civil War Properties in Prince William County MPS

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

Montgomery county MPS

Oakland Farm Industrial Park MRA

West Virginia

Berkeley county MRA

Bulltown MRA

Rockshelters on the Gauley Ranger District, Monongahela National Forest MPS

Wisconsin

Cooksville MRA

Great Lakes Shipwrecks MPS

Late woodland stage in Archeological Region 8 (AD 650-1300) MPS

Paleo-indian tradition in Wisconsin MPS

Prehistoric Archaeological resources of the Milwaukee VA Medical Center MPS

Trempealeau MRA

Wisconsin Indian Rock Art Sites MPS

Wyoming

Aboriginal Lithic Source Areas in Wyoming TR

Domestic Stone Circle Sites in Wyoming MPS

Early and Middle Archaic Housepit sites in Wyoming MPS

Appendix C -- Checklist for Archeological Nominations

The following list of questions may be used as a checklist in the final review of a nomination prior to submission to the National Register of Historic Places. **Bold-printed** segments indicate major categories of information in the National Register nomination.

2.0 Has the “not for publication” box been considered?

7.0 DESCRIPTION

Is the environmental setting described and related to the property or district? Cross check with topographic and sketch maps and photographs.

Are the probable occupation or construction dates identified for all components or the property or district? If the property can not be dated, the text should so state. Cross check with sketch maps and photographs.

Are all major or significant features identified and described? Cross check with topographic and sketch maps and photographs. Check areas and periods of significance.

Are the major types of alterations and disturbances identified and evaluated for their impact upon the property's or district's integrity? Cross check with sketch maps and photographs.

Are all contributing and non-contributing properties in the district identified and counted? Cross check with topographic and sketch maps and photographs.

Does the description convey the significant qualities of the property? Do the significant aspects retain integrity?

Is the character of the district identified?

Does this character provide a basis for grouping properties into a district?

8.0 SIGNIFICANCE

Does the narrative clearly represent and convey the Period(s) and Area(s) of Significance checked? Have they been justified in a specific discussion within the Statement of Significance?

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

Have the applicable criteria been identified and documented within the Statement of Significance?

Does the context in which a property has been evaluated as significant justify the local, state, or national level of significance chosen for the property?

Is Cultural Affiliation (necessary under D) indicated in the Statement of Significance?

Have the criteria considerations been indicated and justified where applicable?

FOR PROPERTIES MEETING CRITERION A:

Does the significance statement identify the applicable major event(s) associated with the property or district?

Does the significance statement justify the importance of the event(s) with respect to its impact on the broad patterns of prehistory or history?

Does the significance statement demonstrate that the property or district has stronger associations to the event(s) than other comparable properties or districts?

FOR PROPERTIES MEETING CRITERION B:

Does the significance statement identify the specific person(s) who was significant in the past?

Does the significance statement justify the importance of the person(s)?

Does the significance statement demonstrate that the property or district has stronger associations to the person(s) than other comparable properties or districts? Comparison should be made on the basis of length of association and degree of integrity.

FOR PROPERTIES MEETING CRITERION C

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

Does the significance statement identify and justify the importance of applicable design concept(s), construction technique(s), or usage of building material(s)?

Does the significance statement demonstrate that the property or district provides a better illustration of a design concept(s), construction technique(s), or usage of building materials than other properties or districts?

Comparison should be made on the basis of those:

- Characteristics that were typically common to a:
Design concept(s), construction technique(s), or usage of building material(s)
- Characteristics that express individuality or variation within a:
Design concept(s), construction technique(s), or usage of building materials
- Characteristics that documents the evolution of a:
Design concept(s), construction technique(s), or usage of building material(s)
- Characteristics that documents the transition of one:
Design concept(s), construction technique(s), or usage of building material(s)

FOR PROPERTIES MEETING CRITERION D:

Does the significance statement describe the potential research topics that the property can address?

Does the significance statement justify the importance of these research topics within a applicable historic context? Does the significance statement identify the data that can address these research topics?

Does the significance statement affirm that the property contains or is likely to contain these data?

9.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Are all citations used in the text referenced in the bibliography?

10.0 GEOGRAPHICAL DATA

Are boundary lines fixed at permanent features or UTM references appearing on USGS topographic maps?

Does the sketch map indicate the boundary of the nominated property?

Does the verbal boundary description describe the boundaries on all sides of the property or district?

Does the boundary justification discuss the:

- Method(s) used to define the boundary
- Relationship between the property's or district's significance and the boundary?

Are all major or significant features included within the boundary?

Does the boundary exclude unjustified acreage or buffer zones?

Does the boundary include entire buildings, structures, or objects as opposed to only portions of buildings, structures, or objects?

ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENTATION

Are the sketch maps labeled?

- Title
- Legend
- North arrow

☐ Scale

Does the sketch map show the entire boundary of the property or district?

Does the sketch map show features, disturbances, and contributing and non-contributing elements discussed in the nomination?

Do the photographs illustrate the:

- Environmental setting
- Major or significant features
- Major alterations or disturbance?