

National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior
National Register of Historic Places



The Mysterious National Register Review Process.

(What Really Happens Behind the Curtain at the National Park Service?)



What Happens After a Nomination is Sent to the NPS

- Still sent via delivery service – US mail is irradiated.
- Date stamped – this starts the 45-day clock.
- Control Unit Review
 - Initial quality control.
 - Federal Register notice prepared – 15-day commenting period from date of Federal Register publication.
 - Data entry.



What Happens After a Nomination is Received by the NPS

- Control Unit checks for:
 - Basic technical problems – maps, photographs/disks, correct paper, signature of SHPO/THPO/FPO, boxes checked and blanks filled-in, UTM's and locational information.
 - Quick review of narratives – do the Criteria match? Is there a statement of significance? Does the description match the photographs? Are there integrity issues? Is the level of significance logical?

Technical Review Checklist

NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATIONS TECHNICAL REVIEW

General Review

___ Have all the blanks been filled, including "n/a" where applicable?

Section 1. Name of Property

___ Is the name a clear, identifiable name with no abbreviations?

Section 2. Location

___ Are all of the items under Location complete? Are the correct codes used? Is the name of the federal land area noted, if pertinent?

Section 3. Certification

___ Is a Level of Significance checked?

___ Is the form signed by a SHPO, THPO, FPO, or authorized delegate?

___ For concurrent nominations, have both parties signed the form?

Section 5. Classification

___ Are all items completed? Is there a clear identification of the number of contributing and noncontributing resources?

___ Does the resource count agree with the narrative in Section 7?

Sections 6. Function or Use

___ Have the historic and current functions been indicated, using the *How To* Bulletin selection list?

Section 7. Description

___ Have the Architectural Classification and Materials sections been completed, where appropriate?

___ Is there an initial paragraph that identifies what is being nominated and summarizes its appearance?

___ Have all alterations to the building/site over time been described and dated, to the extent possible?

___ For historic districts, is there a complete inventory and evaluation list? Does it concur with the district map?

Section 8. Statement of Significance

___ Has all pertinent information been included? The following is mandatory: Applicable NR Criteria, Areas of Significance, and Period of Significance. The following may be needed: Significant Person (if Criterion B is applicable), Cultural Affiliation (if Criterion D--and in some cases Criterion A—is applicable), Significant Dates and Criteria Considerations, as pertinent, and Architect/Builder (if "work of a master" pertains).

___ Does the Narrative Statement include a summary paragraph indicating the significance of the property, directly related to the pertinent NR criteria?

___ Is each Area of Significance discussed briefly in the summary paragraph?

Section 9. Major Bibliographical References

___ Are bibliographic sources provided, including citations in the text?

Section 10. Geographical Data

___ Does the verbal boundary description delineate the precise area within the boundaries of the property, not just a general location?

___ Is the specific number of acres given? Is it consistent with the size of the area noted within the boundaries?

___ Are UTM references provided? Are the required three points given, if the property is 10 or more acres in area?

Section 11. Form Prepared By

___ Is the preparer identified, with contact information?

Maps

___ Is the original USGS map enclosed and properly labeled?

___ Is a sketch map enclosed for historic districts?

Photos

___ Are the black-and-white photographs on the correct paper and appropriately identified and labeled?

___ Is a photo log included as Additional Documentation?

___ Is the CD in a TIF file and the correct resolution?



What Happens After a Nomination is Received by NPS

- If Control Unit notes problems the nomination is flagged for substantive review.
- Automatic substantive review for nominations from these categories:
 - National level of significance.
 - Criteria consideration “g.”
 - Moved properties.
 - Resubmissions.
 - Disputed nominations.
 - High percentage of noncontributing resources.
 - Submitting authority has little track record or new staff.



Documentation Standards: Common Quality Control Issues

- Section 3 omissions (signature, level of significance, all boxes checked).
- No photo CD accompanying submission.
- No or incorrect UTM's.
- Criteria don't match Areas of Significance.
- Incorrect Periods of Significance.
- Poor or missing Verbal Boundary Descriptions.
- No site/district map or poorly done maps.
- Incomplete photo coverage.
- Incorrect photo labeling.
- Failure to notify federal owners.



Documentation Standards: Common Quality Control Issues – Substantive Reviews

- Any technical problem will result in a substantive review.
- Requested reviews or “automatic” reviews also get close scrutiny.
- Substantive reviews often turn up more technical problems as well.



Documentation Standards: Common Quality Control Issues – Substantive Reviews (Section 7)

- Inadequate descriptions.
 - Site and setting are often ignored.
 - cursory descriptions of primary resource(s) or no description of secondary resource(s).
 - No discussion of non-contributing resources and impact on integrity.
- Descriptions do not match resource count.
- Descriptions do not match maps.
- Classification of resources incorrect.



Documentation Standards: Common Quality Control Issues – Substantive Reviews (Section 8)

- Statement of significance
 - No or unclear statement of significance.
 - Confuse function with significance.
 - Areas of significance not supported in narrative.
 - The “kitchen sink approach.”
 - Criterion B/Significant person confusion.
 - Summary statement of significance omitted or confusing.
- Lack of context
 - Compare/contrast property type.
 - Placement of resource in locational or temporal context.
 - Analysis of significance (“it is what it is” argument).

Best Way to Please a NR Reviewer

- Context
- Context
- Context



Documentation Standards: Common Quality Control Issues – Substantive Reviews (Section 8)

- Too much information!
 - Genealogy is not generally needed.
 - Complete history of property/town/county not needed
 - Focus on context sufficient to evaluate significance.
- Multiple Property Submissions that don't refer to cover document.
- Period of significance not explained.
 - Historic name/period of significance.
 - P.O.S. not logically tied to area(s) of significance.



Documentation Standards: Common Quality Control Issues – Substantive Reviews (Section 10)

- Verbal Boundary Descriptions
- Maps used in lieu of VBD are of the wrong scale
- Boundary justifications for districts
- UTM's

Photographs

- NCSHPO Photo Policy Working Group
- Number of photos
 - No need to photograph every resource
 - Suggested limits in number of Photographs
- Images NR receives is what gets digitized



Embedded Images

- No color images should be embedded.
- Discourage embedding black-and-white images
 - pages with text and images need to be digitized differently
 - clarity/copying is a problem
- Put images at end of form on continuation sheets
 - Make sure images print properly

IMPROPERLY EMBEDDED

NPS Form 10-900a
(Rev. 8/98)

NPS/William C. Page, Public Historian, Word Processor Format
(Approved 10/02/97)

DMP No. 1074-0013

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

**NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES
CONTINUATION SHEET**

Section number 7 Page 13 CPN 209-1116

Sigma Sigma-Delta Chi Fraternity House, Story County, Iowa.

FORMER SIGMA CHI FRATERNITY HOUSE
125 North Hyland Avenue



The former Sigma Chi Fraternity House (now Triangle Fraternity House) stands as a representative example of the outstanding Tudor Revival-influenced designs employed by Greek letter organizations in Ames for their residences. Completed circa 1922, this design contrasts with that of the Sigma Sigma-Delta Chi Fraternity House and provides a foil to the latter's eclectic design.

Source: <www.stuorg.iastate.edu/triangle/houseinfo.htm>, 2006.

Sensitive Information

7 DESCRIPTION

CONDITION		CHECK ONE	CHECK ONE
<input type="checkbox"/> EXCELLENT	<input type="checkbox"/> DETERIORATED	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UNALTERED	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL SITE
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GOOD	<input type="checkbox"/> RUINS	<input type="checkbox"/> ALTERED	<input type="checkbox"/> MOVED DATE _____
<input type="checkbox"/> FAIR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UNEXPOSED		

DESCRIBE THE PRESENT AND ORIGINAL (IF KNOWN) PHYSICAL APPEARANCE

KOD 171 was located as a result of a U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service inventory of a portion of its holdings on Kodiak Island, conducted as part of the Service's program to comply with the mandates of E.O. 11593 and the Historic Preservation Act of 1966. This work was begun in 1977 and continued during the 1978 field season. The survey included aerial inspection of the coastal and riverine portions of the refuge, as well as on-the-ground and boat surveys

The majority of the sites located were tested in order to determine their extent, depth, and cultural-historical placement within the Kodiak Island sequence. Four hundred and sixty-two km. of coastline were surveyed. 75 sites were located during the field season. In addition to KOD 171, one other site and one archeological district will be nominated to the National Register of Historic Places as a result of the 1977 field season.

At least 22 house depressions, the majority of which are clustered along the shore of a small protected bay, are present on the ridge. A second locality of the site is located on a small rise, approximately 100 meters north of the bay shore, separated from the main body of the site by a low, marshy area.

KOD 171 was originally located and reported by Ales Hrdlicka of the Smithsonian Institute in 1932. He noted little concerning the site except that it was large--over eight acres--and apparently occupied up through the Russian period (Hrdlicka 1944: 98,99).

Diagnostic artifacts recovered from the site and the general outline of the housepits suggest a Koniag phase cultural placement for the deposits at 171. None of the Russian material reported by Hrdlicka was found in either the tests or surface collections.

Extensive clam beds presently exist in the tidal flats of the island directly across the channel from the site. Several Cetacian and Pinniped species were sighted in the channel fronting the site during testing. As these are well represented in the faunal sample, it is probably safe to assume that they were also locally available in the past. In addition to various bottom fish present in the channel, sal-

- Information is thoroughly checked
- Nominations will be digitized but not web accessible
- Place all sensitive information in one or two obvious places
- Examples
 - First paragraph of section 7 and 8
 - All on one Continuation sheet in the back



Listing of the Property

- Prior to the end of the 45 day window the nomination will be:
 - Accepted
 - Listed in the National Register as submitted.
 - Listed with SLR.
 - Formally Determined Eligible for Listing (owner objections).
 - Returned
 - Opportunity to correct mistakes.
 - Rejected



Final Processing

- Nomination Returned to Control Unit
 - Property Listed
 - Notice Posted to “Weekly List of Actions”
 - Corrections made to NRIS database
 - Documentation transmitted to Archival Storage
 - Property Returned/Rejected
 - Copy of Documentation prepared
 - Original documentation returned to SHPO/FPO/TPO with written comments

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES



National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior

EXPERIENCE YOUR AMERICA