

# Phase II: Evaluation According to National Register Criteria

Introduction.....	39
Determinations of Eligibility under Section 106.....	40
Evaluation under State Historic Preservation Legislation.....	41
Nominating Sites to the National Register.....	44
Conducting a Phase II Evaluation.....	44

## Introduction

The purpose of a Phase II evaluation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act is to determine whether an archeological site is significant. According to the SISGAHP, evaluation is the process of determining whether identified properties meet defined criteria of significance and, therefore, should be included in an inventory of historic properties. The SISGAHP standards are:

***Standard I. Evaluation of the significance of historic properties uses established criteria.***

Because the National Register of Historic Places is a major focus of preservation activities on the federal, state, and local levels, the National Register criteria have been widely adopted not only as required for federal purposes but also for state and local inventories. Under Section 106, significance is evaluated against four basic criteria established by the National Park Service for the National Register of Historic Places. These are

- association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history
- association with the lives of significant persons
- embodiment of distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction
- potential to yield important information in prehistory or history

Archeologists can determine the significance of an archeological site or a district (a concen-

tration of related sites) on any or all of these criteria. Most archeological sites and districts are considered significant under criterion D, their potential to yield important information in history or prehistory. What archeologists consider to be important information has changed through the years. In the past, a site was considered significant only if it was large and deeply stratified, could produce data to solve chronological problems, or had data on features and burials.

Today, the focus of archeological investigations has shifted away from single-site concerns toward regional approaches in which many varieties of sites can produce important information. Recent research concerns focus on topics such as settlement/subsistence systems, seasonal rounds, cultural landscapes, and ideology. In these contexts many kinds of sites are important besides stratified sites or large villages.

Sites such as isolated projectile points, lithic workshops, quarries, short-term camps, fishing stations, extractive locales, symbolic markers such as rock art and mounds, and amorphous lithic scatters can be critically important in understanding patterning in past human behavior. In addition, archeological sites of the Historic period may be significant; information on evaluating these site types can be found in the section titled "Recording and Evaluating Historic Archeological Properties."

***Standard II. Evaluation of the significance applies the criteria within historic contexts. Properties are evaluated using a historic context that***

*identifies the significant patterns that properties represent and defines expected property types against which individual properties may be compared. Within this comparative framework, the criteria for evaluation take on particular meaning with regard to individual properties.*

Archeological properties should be evaluated based on comparative data associated with a historic context, including configurations of artifacts, soil strata, structural remains, or other natural or cultural features, associated with a historic context. The importance of such information is evaluated within a cultural, chronological, or regional framework or by developing a "historic context." Evaluating the information potential of a site requires developing research questions to which the site may contribute answers.

The research questions may be developed from a general body of archeological theory or data (see "Establishing Historic Contexts and a Research Design") or from the existing archeological contexts such as those in "Introduction to Wisconsin Archeology: Background for Cultural Resource Planning" (Green et al., 1986) or *Cultural Resource Management in Wisconsin* (Division of Historic Preservation, SHSW).

**Standard III.** *Evaluation results in a list or inventory of significant properties that is consulted in assigning registration and treatment priorities.*

The evaluation process and subsequent development of an inventory of significant properties is an ongoing activity. Evaluation of significance should be completed before a property is included in the inventory and before preservation treatments are considered. Each property in the inventory should be fully documented, including a statement that clarifies the significance of the property within one or more historic contexts. In theory, such a comprehensive list should be maintained by the Division of Historic Preservation; however,

in practice the Division maintains only a list of registered properties, published semiannually. There is no complete list of archeological sites that have been evaluated in Wisconsin, nor is there a listing of properties by type or within any historic context.

**Standard IV.** *Evaluation results are made available to the public.*

Evaluation is the basis for registration and treatment decisions. Information about evaluation decisions should be organized and available for use by the general public and by those who take part in decisions about registration and treatment. Use of appropriate computer-assisted databases should be part of the information-dissemination effort for land-managing agencies, but sensitive information on site locations should be safeguarded from general public distribution.

Archeologists may also be involved in the evaluation of other types of cultural properties such as "traditional cultural properties" or "rural historic landscapes." In these situations, archeologists are advised to contact the National Park Service to obtain copies of National Register Bulletins 30 and 38, which discuss these types of properties. These properties should also be evaluated against the four criteria noted above.

## Determinations of Eligibility under Section 106

If an archeologist working under Section 106 concludes that a site is significant, the federal agency should reach a formal Determination of Eligibility (DOE). The documentation to be completed by the archeologist is NPS Form 10-900, the National Register of Historic Places nomination form. Copies of this form, including a "short form," are available from the Historic Preservation Division, SHSW. Step-by-step instructions are available in National Register Bulletin 16A, *How to Complete the National Register Registration Form*; copies can be obtained from the National Park Service.

If the SHPO and the federal agency agree that it is significant, the site is then officially de-

terminated eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. If the archeological property cannot be either avoided through project redesign or incorporated into the project design without being impacted by construction, a mitigation plan should be developed by the archeologist and reviewed by appropriate agencies (see “Phase III: Data Recovery & Mitigation”). It is important to provide as much information as possible in the DOE, which establishes the important research questions. Further, if the site is avoided through project redesign, such as a shift in the highway alignment, the Office of the State Archaeologist can use the DOE to formally nominate the site to the National Register of Historic Places. Formally listing the site on the NRHP can help future preservation efforts under state historic preservation laws, should the site be threatened by activities regulated by state agencies or local units of government.

## Evaluations under State Historic Preservation Legislation

*Information provided by Chip Brown, State Compliance Coordinator (State Historical Society)*

It is important to recognize that Wisconsin state historic preservation laws, while parallel and similar in intent to federal historic preservation laws, are quite different from them in execution, party responsibility, and investiture.

State laws, found at *Wis. Stat.* §§ 44.40, 44.42 and 66.037 (the first dealing with state agencies, and the latter two dealing with local units of government and school boards), require that the agency or other unit of government determine whether a particular undertaking<sup>1</sup> will affect an historic property. Historic properties are defined at § 44.30(3) *Stat.* as:

Any building, structure, object, district, area or site, whether on or beneath the surface of land or water, that is significant in the history, prehistory, architecture, archeology or culture of this state, its rural and urban communities or the nation.

Further, only certain categories of historic properties may be evaluated for effects under each of the above state laws. According to §

44.40 *Stat.*, an evaluation may be conducted when an undertaking will affect an historic property that is (1) a listed property on the National Register or State Register either individually (single properties or districts) or as contributing elements in a district; (2) on the Wisconsin inventory of historic places; or (3) on the list of locally designated historic places under § 44.45 *Stat.*<sup>2</sup>

Under § 44.42 *Stat.*, which is defined for local units of government and school boards by § 66.037 *Stat.*, the categories are further restricted to listed properties (as above), or properties recorded on the list of locally designated historic places under § 44.45 *Stat.*

In no case does state historic preservation law require an archeological survey to locate historic properties. In every case, known historic properties (as described above) must be present *and within* the area to be affected by the undertaking before any review, and possible archeological survey, is required.

Under state law, the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), through the State Compliance Coordinator (SCC), must determine whether the undertaking will adversely affect the historic property. Based upon information found in the Archeological Site Inventory (ASI), the Architecture History Inventory (AHI), past Compliance records, published and unpublished reports, and other information, the SCC determines that an adverse effect may, or may not, result. The SCC then may require negotiation with the agency or unit of government to “reduce such [adverse] effects,” (§ 44.40[3] and § 44.42[2]).

When an archeological historic property may be adversely affected, negotiation may lead to archeological field work of some kind. The scope of any archeological survey may be narrow or broad as each case requires and as each negotiated agreement dictates.

Frequently, a survey is conducted to identify the boundaries of a known site to establish the basis for redesigning specifics of an undertaking.<sup>3</sup> Guidelines for retrieving this information from the archeological record may be necessary and helpful to ensure appropriate (to

the particular case) data-collection methods, information collection, and report format:

A pedestrian survey and/or shovel testing, if justifiable, at the site location shall be conducted to determine site boundaries. The resulting report from such survey shall include information known about this site, lists and general descriptions of artifacts and/or artifact classes if no diagnostic artifacts are obtained, lists and general descriptions of associated materials (e.g. faunal remains), a map showing the site in its specific environs—particularly in relation to the area of the undertaking, and a USGS topographic map showing the site location as accurately as possible.

Specifics of many undertakings dictate from the outset that additional archeological information be obtained, including on significance of the archeological site. Guidelines for these activities also will assist archeologists in their survey work:

Extensive shovel testing, and some test excavation of defined units, may be necessary to establish this information. The resulting report shall provide extensive information on and analysis of the recovered archeological and associated materials. This analysis shall be provided within the appropriate local/regional/global context for such sites at such locales. A determination of eligibility for listing in the State Register and National Register of Historic Places may be included in this report. If this survey type is conducted as the initial survey, all of the information described above to be included in the site boundary survey shall be included in this survey report. If this survey is conducted after a site boundary survey has been conducted, data replication is not necessary for its own sake—it is sufficient to reference the previous report.

Infrequently, an archeological mitigation must be performed if a significant archeological site will be destroyed as a result of the undertaking. Guidelines for this work should be the same as those used to direct mitigation work under federal law. Nevertheless, standards for work may be negotiated under state law so that the archeological scope of work is either more or less extensive than a comparable scope of work executed under federal law.

Finally, some archeological surveys are tailored to the negotiated settlement pertinent to the undertaking. One common example of a specialized survey type is monitoring of a project area during ground-disturbing activities to identify archeological remains, including artifacts, associated materials, and features. General guidelines for such archeological activity may be useful:

An archeologist shall monitor ground disturbing activities for the unearthing of archeological material. If such material is identified, the ground disturbing activities may be halted to allow for immediate mitigational data recovery. The SCC shall be notified of such finds as soon as possible after discovery. The excavation shall include recovery of material within the area of ground disturbance. If possible, reconnaissance should be undertaken to determine whether any, and if so what portion, of the archeological site remains undisturbed. Upon completion of data recovery, the archeologist shall prepare a report detailing, with brief analysis (if possible), the materials excavated. A statement of site significance shall be included, if significance may be reasonably ascertained. The report shall note that the material was recovered pursuant to a negotiated agreement to allow monitoring and salvage mitigation.

Each case under state law jurisdiction involving archeological sites may be negotiated to suit the particulars of the specific undertaking and the principle players involved. Necessarily, constructing guidelines for archeological work may be general at most, and unknown until negotiated at least. It is important to coordinate all work with the SCC and the relevant agency or other unit of government before carrying it out because, under state historic preservation laws, as is clear from the foregoing, the actuality of a survey type with its associated guidelines, and any additional or progressive survey work, is never absolute.

<sup>1</sup> Under state law, the word “undertaking” is not often used. Undertaking is used in this context so as to provide some analogy to federal law. We refer to undertakings as *projects* or *cases*. According to § 44.40 *Stat.*, undertakings actually are

actions of the state agency that may cause or permit an adverse effect on historic property in-

cluding, but not limited to, any state agency action that involves the exercise of state agency authority in the issuance of a permit, license, authorization, variance or exception or in any grant of financial assistance and any state agency action related to property owned by the state agency or related to its long-range planning and facilities development.

Under § 66.037, which provides some defining information for 44.42 *Stat.*, undertakings are

1. Long-range planning for facilities development.
2. Any action under sub. (3) [See below.].
3. Razing any historic property which it owns.

### (3) OWNERSHIP, USE AND DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY.

(a) A political subdivision may preserve or rehabilitate any historic property which it owns, construct buildings on that property, own and maintain that property for public purposes or lease or convey that property.

(b) If a political subdivision leases to another person a historic property, the political subdivision shall include provisions in the lease which protect the historic character and qualities of that property. If the political subdivision conveys a historic property, the political subdivision shall obtain a conservation easement under s. 700.40 to protect the historic character and qualities of the property.

<sup>2</sup> The list of locally designated historic places is very short; it includes historic properties from a small number of communities. The office of the Local Preservation Coordinator (LPC) in the Division of Historic Preservation maintains the list of locally designated places. For more information, contact the LPC directly.

<sup>3</sup> A project may be redesigned to avoid the site, or further archeological work may be conducted.

## Nominating Sites to the National Register

To nominate an archeological site to the National Register of Historic Places, the NPS 10-900 form should be completed and submitted to the Office of the State Archaeologist, Historic Preservation Division (SHSW). For those who have never completed the NPS 10-900 form, a copy of National Register Bulletin

16A, *How to Complete the National Register Registration Form*, is recommended. Nominations are presented at the quarterly meetings of the State Historic Preservation Review Board. If the state board approves the nomination, it is forwarded to the National Park Service in Washington DC. If the National Park Service concurs that the site is significant, it formally lists the site and sends a notice to the Historic Preservation Division. The property owner of a site on the NRHP can obtain a tax credit for the land included in the nomination, under *Wis.Stats.70.11(13m)*.

Consideration should be given to a possible district nomination in those situations where extensive identification studies have been accomplished. For example, for long linear projects such a proposed highway corridor, it may be possible to identify numerous sites within a particular valley. These sites may be more appropriately evaluated as a district, with significance not solely determined by individual characteristics of each site. Other sites may be more appropriately evaluated as part of a thematic nomination, such as logging camps in northern Wisconsin.

## Conducting a Phase II Evaluation

Phase II evaluations may be conducted in conjunction with a variety of preservation planning activities. Often they are performed to comply with Section 106, if the site is likely to be impacted by a federally sponsored or licensed activity or project. Sites may also be evaluated in conjunction with Section 110 compliance if a federal agency is evaluating sites on lands that it owns. In these situations, the site may not be threatened with imminent destruction, and often multiple sites are evaluated at one time. Sites may also be evaluated in conjunction with the Office of the State Archaeologist Survey and Planning Grant program. Survey and planning evaluations in Wisconsin often focus on thematic or multiple property nominations to the NRHP. In Wisconsin, sites on state and municipal lands may also be evaluated under state historic preservation statutes.

All Phase II evaluations should be conducted by placing the site within a historic context. As discussed, historic contexts are patterns or trends in prehistory or history through which sites can be understood, categorized, and assessed under the NRHP criteria. The criteria address the kinds of data considered important in this context, as well as requirements for site integrity.

Examples of historic contexts developed for Wisconsin include cultural study units such as *The Early and Middle Archaic Periods of Southeastern Wisconsin* and *The Late Woodland Study Unit in Region 6, Western Wisconsin*, as well as National Register Multiple Property Documentation Forms such as *The Paleoindian Tradition of Wisconsin*, and *The Historic Logging Industry in State Region 2 and the Nicolet National Forest*. Typically, these documents provide summaries of pertinent site data, note gaps in the data base, and define research questions. Some also provide definitions of property types (site types representing that particular historic context) and requirements for National Register eligibility.

If an appropriate historic context is not available, the archeologist evaluating a site should provide sufficient information to place the site into an interpretive framework and provide specific data to support the conclusion that the site is significant. Archeologists working on Phase II evaluations are encouraged to consult with the state regional archeologists and the Office of the State Archaeologist to obtain the most up-to-date information on cultural study units, Multiple Property Documentation Forms, pertinent National Register nominations, and formal determinations of eligibility.

In addition to meeting NRHP criteria, an archeological site should also possess integrity. Integrity means that the site has not been severely impacted, and that it still maintains some degree of contextual association with the landform on which it lies. In Wisconsin, a site is usually considered to have integrity if it has not been deeply plowed or eroded, or if *in situ*, sub-plow zone features or artifacts have been identified. It has been argued, however, that even disturbed or plowed sites may possess enough spatial integrity to qualify for the NRHP, particularly in regions or landscape

settings where the majority of archeological sites have been severely impacted.

One corollary of the increasing importance of diverse site types is that small surface sites are being viewed as having potential for yielding significant information. It is now recognized that surface and subsurface distributions of artifacts may reveal patterning even when a site has been plowed or eroded. The kinds of artifacts recovered from a site can yield important temporal or functional information even if the context of the artifacts is somewhat disturbed. Site size information alone can be important in explicating regional settlement patterns.

The scale of Phase II field investigations may vary according to the type, size, and complexity of the archeological deposits. At a minimum, Phase II evaluations should be designed to generate data on site size, date, structure, and condition. Examination of the site should consist at a minimum of controlled surface collection or shovel testing to establish site size and identify variability in debris densities across the site, along with subsurface testing to determine whether features or activity areas are present. If the site is significant, the recommendation to the agency should be to redesign the project to avoid the site. Further measures of protection, such as placement of a preservation covenant on the land or development of a management plan, should be considered to ensure future protection of the site.

If redesign is not a feasible or prudent alternative, additional field investigation may be warranted to generate additional data on site structure and feature density and distribution prior to the development of an appropriate Data Recovery Plan (see Phase III: Data Recovery and Mitigation). The need for additional field investigations and archival work after completion of the Phase II evaluation, but prior to the development of a Data Recovery Plan, often results when agencies place a restriction on the amount of field work that can be undertaken during the Phase II evaluation. Such restrictions preclude an understanding of the entire site, making it difficult to formulate recommendations on appropriate mitigation treatment and to develop the research questions and Data Recovery Plan.

## *Sample Size*

There is no way to determine a universal minimum sample size appropriate for Phase II evaluations. The sample size used for field investigations should be justified given the type of site, size of the site, environmental setting, and historic context. Minimally, the sample size selected should be sufficient to generate the data needed to determine site size, type, cultural/temporal affiliation, integrity, and significance. Subsurface investigations should be conducted to insure that significant remains have not been missed by sampling.

In some cases, limited subsurface investigations may make it possible to conclude that a site has no information potential. For example, when minimal material remains are recovered after several collections, and the site is on a highly eroded or deflated landform, it could be concluded that the loss of site integrity, hence the minimal potential for intact remains, justifies the determination that the site is not eligible for the NRHP. Such decisions should be based on an understanding of site formation processes and natural processes or modern land use practices affecting site destruction.

If sufficient data are not generated to demonstrate the lack of site integrity, a general guideline would be a minimum 10% sample of non-plowed sites and 25% sample of plowed sites before the investigator concludes that the site is not significant and therefore not eligible for the NRHP. Further, archeologists should consider how the field and analytical methods used affect the data generated and the conclusions reached. For example, using shovel probes or 1 x 1 meter excavation units to evaluate a site may produce information on the distribution of artifacts in the plow zone or A horizon, but the probability of intersecting a spatially discrete feature, activity area, or post mold is minuscule. Further, excavation units placed in areas of high debris density may intersect only secondary middens while missing residential zones, cemeteries, or activity areas. Large-scale machine stripping of the plow zone in several different landscape positions across a site is the most effective way to determine whether significant spatial information is preserved. Deep excavations by hand or machine may be necessary to determine whether

any buried occupations are present (see “Geomorphological and Geoarcheological Investigations in Support of Archeological Investigations”).

Evaluation of historic sites is often difficult for archeologists, as many agencies do not understand the role of historic archeology in interpreting recent history. The specific requirements for the evaluation of historic sites have not been clearly defined. Further, determining when something should be considered an historic archeological site, such as a property with standing structures, is not always clear. For more specific information on documenting and evaluating historic sites, see “Recording and Evaluating Historic Archeological Properties.”

## *Field Methods and Techniques*

The following steps should be considered a necessary part of Phase II field work:

**1. Mapping.** Detailed topographic mapping of a site and its immediate environs is necessary to provide a base for plotting investigation units, site limits, artifact distributions, and modern features. Topographic mapping may also reveal important microrelief features related to human use of the locale. Including topographic data regarding a site’s landform setting is especially important for documenting mounds and mound groups.

**2. Controlled surface collection/close interval shovel probing.** Collecting surface cultural materials with horizontal spatial controls is used to define apparent site limits and to reveal clustering or patterning in artifact distributions. Controlled surface collections are most effectively conducted on sites that have been recently plowed and washed by rain. Multiple surface collections may be needed to obtain a representative sample of the quantity, variety, and distribution of various artifact classes. There are many ways of performing a controlled surface collection, including piece plotting all debris and tools or collecting within equal-sized grid units. The sampling approach selected should be justified through the research design.

Subsurface investigation should be used on sites where the surface is obscured by vegeta-

tion, fill, or other factors. An explicit sampling design should be used, and shovel probing, post-hole coring, and/or other subsurface techniques should be employed. Shovel probing alone is never sufficient for evaluating an archeological site.

**3. Excavations.** Excavation of units by natural or arbitrary levels should be conducted following the controlled surface collection, to sample the site for potential subsurface or sub-plow zone remains and to assess the site's integrity and information potential. Questions such as site size and depth, site date(s) and cultural affiliation, site function, degree of preservation of organic remains, presence of cultural features or activity areas, and extent of previous disturbance should be considered.

The size and number of excavation units should be sufficient to make reliable statements about these characteristics and the condition of the site. Investigations should focus on confirming site limits, understanding the complexity and extent of the archeological deposits, and examining the potential for deeply buried occupations or ground surfaces. Proper care should be given to recording all cultural and stratigraphic data through field notes, plan and profile mapping, and photography. Screening of cultural sediments and flotation sampling should be implemented.

**4. Removal of the plow zone.** Machine removal of the plow zone can be an effective method for examining a larger percentage of the total site area than could be accomplished through the use of hand excavation units alone. The plow zone should be stripped by machine (scraper, pan, backhoe) only to just above the base of the plow zone. The junction of the plow zone with the subsoil should be shovel skimmed by hand, so that potentially intact cultural deposits will not be damaged. Stripping the plow zone should be instituted only after topographic mapping, controlled surface collection, and sampling the plow zone to establish the depth of the plow zone across the site.

**5. Remote Sensing.** Aerial photo interpretation, including infrared work, can be useful in defining site setting, site limits, and the internal

structure of the site. Other forms of remote sensing, such as ground-penetrating radar or resistivity and conductivity techniques, may also be appropriate.

**6. Buried archeological deposits.** Archeological sites should be examined to identify the potential for deeply buried archeological deposits (see "Geomorphological and Geoarcheological Investigations in Support of Archeological Investigations").

**7. Safety concerns.** Before conducting any field investigations using heavy machinery, including for trenching, it is important to call Digger's Hotline: 1-800-242-8511. Digger's Hotline should also be notified prior to conducting archeological excavation, particularly along a highway right-of-way, where utilities, including fiber optic cables and gas pipelines, are often present. Note that some local utilities do not subscribe to Digger's Hotline and must be contacted directly.

### *Analysis and Interpretation*

Documentation for a Phase II evaluation is not completed with field work; analysis is an integral part of the documentation process. Analytical techniques should be selected that are relevant to interpreting the site within the historic context and appropriate to the type of data generated by the field work. Types of analysis that may be appropriate include but are not limited to studying artifact types and distribution; radiometric and other means of age determination; studies of soil stratigraphy; studies of organic matter, pollen, animal bones, shells, and seeds; studies of soil composition; and studies of the site's natural environment.

Analysis of the materials recovered and data generated during Phase II field work should include, minimally,

- a description of all artifacts classes/types, with a summary table noting quantity and weight (if appropriate) by horizontal and vertical provenience and/or feature context
- a description of the means of chronological determination for the assemblage

- a description of the attributes of diagnostic artifacts, including type name and date, and illustrations of all diagnostic artifacts, or a representative sample of artifact types, by line drawings or photographs
- a sampling approach for the analysis of paleoecological data (pollen, floral, faunal, sediment, phytolith, etc.)
- a description of all features, including content, plan view, and profile information
- a description and interpretation of the soil matrix, including horizons, disturbances, and site formation processes
- a description and interpretation of the spatial relationships of features and artifacts concentrations within the site

If the site is significant, the data generated from it should be interpreted within the historic context or compared to other similar sites in the region. If the historic context has been developed, the site should be compared to defined property types, or a new property type should be defined. The features or characteristics of the site should be compared with those expected. In the absence of a well-defined historic context, the site should be compared to other similar sites in the region. This should include describing the site's information potential or research value and placing the property within a cultural, temporal, and/or thematic context.

### ***Recommendations and Documentation***

If the archeologist believes the site has the potential to produce important information and should be determined eligible, or formally nominated to, the National Register, then the archeologist should recommend avoiding the site through project redesign. Recommending fencing the site, or even monitoring construction in the immediate site area, may be appropriate and ensure that the site is not inadvertently destroyed during construction.

Language can be recommended for construction contracts to ensure that the contractor is aware of the specific areas to avoid and of penalties for disturbing the site area. Monitoring, however, is never a substitute for data recovery. If the site does not qualify for listing

on the NRHP, then no additional archeological investigation should be recommended.

No matter whether a site is determined eligible or not eligible for the NRHP, a technical report should be prepared describing the results of the evaluation (see "Technical Report Guidelines"). If the site is determined eligible for, or will be formally nominated to, the National Register, the archeologist should complete NPS Form 10-900.

Additional information can be found in *National Register of Historic Places in Wisconsin: Guidelines for Completing National Register of Historic Places Forms, Supplementary Manual*, a publication of the Division of Historic Preservation, SHSW (revised 1988).

