

AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES EVALUATION HANDBOOK, MONTEREY COUNTY, CALIFORNIA



Lettuce packers at the O. O. Eaton Ranch, 1766 San Juan Road, Aromas

Prepared By:

P A S T
CONSULTANTS LLC

PAST Consultants, LLC
916 Union St., #304
Alameda, CA 94501

Prepared For:



Monterey County Parks Dept.
855 E. Laurel Drive, Building G
Salinas CA 93905

September 2011

**AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES
EVALUATION HANDBOOK,
MONTEREY COUNTY, CALIFORNIA**

Certified Local Government Grant: 2010 – 2011

Date of Publication: September 2011

Prepared For:

Meg Clovis, Cultural Affairs Manager
Monterey County Parks Department
855 E. Laurel Drive, Building G
Salinas, CA 93905

Prepared By:

PAST Consultants, LLC
916 Union St., #304
Alameda, CA 94501

The activity which is the subject of this Certified Local Government Grant has been financed in part with Federal funds from the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, through the California Office of Historic Preservation. However, the contents and opinions do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of the Interior or the California Office of Historic Preservation, nor does mention of trade names of commercial products constitute endorsement or recommendation by the Department of the Interior or the California Office of Historic Preservation.

Regulations of the U.S. Department of the Interior strictly prohibit unlawful discrimination in departmental federally-assisted programs on the basis of race, color, sex, age, disability, or national origin. Any person who believes he or she has been discriminated against in any program, activity, or facility operated by a recipient of Federal assistance should write to:

Director, Equal Opportunity Program
U.S. Department of the Interior
National Park Service
P.O. Box 37127
Washington, D.C. 20013-7127

This page intentionally left blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY..... 1

- A. Project Team 1
- B. Funding 1
- C. Project Description..... 2
 - 1. Project Summary 2
 - 2. Project Objectives 4
 - 3. Project Methodology 4
 - a. Historical Research 5
 - b. Field Reconnaissance Survey..... 5
 - c. Limitations 6
 - 4. Project Meetings 6
- D. Acknowledgments..... 7

II. INTRODUCTION AND AGRICULTURAL DEFINITIONS..... 9

- A. Introduction..... 9
- B. What is Agriculture? 9
 - 1. Monterey County Code Definitions 9
 - 2. Types of Agriculture 11

III. IDENTIFYING AND EVALUATING AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES 13

- A. Historic Context Statements..... 13
- B. Eligibility Criteria 15
 - 1. National Register of Historic Places (NR)..... 15
 - 2. California Register of Historical Resources (CR)..... 16
 - 3. Monterey County Local Official Register of Historic Resources (MCR) 17
 - 4. Other Local Registers Within Monterey County 18
- C. Historic Integrity 18
- D. Property Type Registration Requirements: Eligibility Criteria and Integrity Thresholds 20
- E. Types of Landscapes 21
 - 1. Natural and Cultural Landscapes 22
 - 2. Rural Historic Landscapes 23
 - 3. Landscape Characteristics 24

IV. MONTEREY COUNTY AGRICULTURAL HISTORY 27

- A. Introduction 27
- B. Monterey County 27
 - 1. Location and Boundaries 27
 - 2. Geology and Geography 28
 - a. Natural Features 28
 - b. Soils..... 30
 - 3. Climate 31

- C. Spanish and Mexican Periods (1769–1848): Missions, Land Grants and Extensive Agriculture..... 32
 - 1. Introduction 32
 - 2. Spanish Period (1769 – 1822) 33
 - a. Spanish Missions, Presidios and Pueblos 34
 - b. Transportation Routes 38
 - c. Spanish Land Grants 40
 - 3. Mexican Period (1822 – 1848)..... 40
 - a. Mexican Land Grants..... 40
 - b. Adobe Construction and the “Monterey Colonial” Style..... 41
 - c. Agricultural Commerce..... 43
- D. Early American Period (ca. 1848–1890): Land Grant Subdivisions, Homesteading and Transitions in Extensive Agriculture..... 46
 - 1. Introduction: Statehood, Settlers and Subdivisions 46
 - 2. Land Grant Subdivisions..... 47
 - 3. Homesteading..... 53
 - 4. Transitions in Extensive Agriculture 55
 - a. Cattle Ranching..... 56
 - b. Sheep and Other Stock..... 60
 - c. Grains 63
 - d. Other Extensive Agriculture 67
 - 5. Water Transportation of Agricultural Products..... 68
- E. Agricultural Expansion (ca. 1870–1940): Intensive Agriculture, Railroad & Community Development, Tenant Farming, Corporate Agriculture and Agricultural Colonies 71
 - 1. Introduction 71
 - 2. Intensive Agriculture..... 71
 - a. Dairying 74
 - b. Sugar Beets 79
 - c. Berries 82
 - d. Orchards: Fruit and Nuts..... 83
 - e. Lettuce..... 90
 - f. Artichokes 92
 - g. Beans 93
 - h. Guayule 93
 - i. Other Intensive Crops 94
 - 3. Railroad & Community Development 95
 - 4. Advocacy and Social Organizations 98
 - 5. Irrigation..... 101
 - 6. Corporate Agriculture 105
 - a. Salinas Land Company and California Orchard Company 105
 - b. California Orchard Company..... 109
 - 7. Agricultural Colonies 116
 - a. Fort Romie 116

b. Clark Colony (Greenfield) 119

c. St. Joseph’s Colony 121

F. Industrial Agriculture (ca. 1925–1960): Technological Advances, Product Expansion, Labor Camps, Adaptive Use 123

1. Introduction 123

2. Technological Advances and Product Expansion 123

3. Agricultural Workers and Labor Camps 128

4. Adaptive Use 135

V. HISTORIC THEMES, ASSOCIATED PROPERTY TYPES, ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND INTEGRITY THRESHOLDS..... 137

A. Introduction and Chapter Format 137

1. Historic Themes for Monterey County Agricultural Resources 137

2. Chapter Format and Limitations 138

a. Chapter Format 138

b. Chapter Limitations..... 138

3. Theme and Property Type Example..... 139

B. Theme 1: Extensive Agriculture (ca. 1840s-1960) 140

1. Introduction 140

2. Associated Property Type: Extensive Farmstead..... 141

a. Property Type Description 141

b. Landscape Characteristics 142

c. Eligibility Criteria and Integrity Thresholds 145

d. Listed and Potentially Significant Historic Resources 147

C. Theme 2: Intensive Agriculture (ca. 1870-1960)..... 153

1. Introduction 153

2. Associated Property Type: Intensive Farmstead..... 154

a. Property Type Description: Crops Sub-type 154

b. Property Type Description: Dairy Sub-type 155

c. Landscape Characteristics 156

d. Eligibility Criteria and Integrity Thresholds 159

e. Listed and Potentially Significant Historic Resources 161

D. Theme 3: Corporate Agriculture (1880-1960) 173

1. Introduction 173

2. Corporations and Extant Resources: 174

a. Spreckels Sugar Company 174

b. Salinas Land Company/California Orchard Company 175

3. Associated Property Type: Corporate Farmstead 177

a. Property Type Description 177

b. Eligibility Criteria and Integrity Thresholds 178

c. Listed and Potentially Significant Historic Resources 180

E. Theme 4: Agricultural Colonies (ca. 1890s-1910s) 181

1. Introduction 181

2. Agricultural Colonies and Extant Resources: 182

- a. Clark Colony/Greenfield..... 182
- b. Fort Romie Colony..... 182
- 3. Associated Property Type: Colony Farmstead 183
 - a. Property Type Description 183
 - b. Eligibility Criteria and Integrity Thresholds 184
 - c. Listed and Potentially Significant Historic Resources..... 186
- F. Theme 5: Processing and Distribution (1860-1960) 187
 - 1. Introduction 187
 - 2. Associated Property Type: Locational Processing Facility 188
 - a. Property Type Description 188
 - b. Eligibility Criteria and Integrity Thresholds 189
 - c. Listed and Potentially Significant Historic Resources..... 191
 - 3. Associated Property Type: Commercial Processing Facility..... 193
 - a. Property Type Description 193
 - b. Eligibility Criteria and Integrity Thresholds 194
 - c. Listed and Potentially Significant Historic Resources..... 196
- G. Theme 6: Community Development (ca. 1850-1960) 199
 - 1. Introduction 199
 - 2. Associated Property Type: Residence..... 201
 - a. Property Type Description 201
 - b. Eligibility Criteria and Integrity Thresholds 202
 - c. Listed and Potentially Significant Historic Resources..... 204
 - 3. Associated Property Type: Worker Housing 207
 - a. Property Type Description 207
 - b. Eligibility Criteria and Integrity Thresholds 208
 - c. Listed and Potentially Significant Historic Resources..... 210
 - 4. Associated Property Type: Labor Camp 211
 - a. Property Type Description 211
 - b. Eligibility Criteria and Integrity Thresholds 212
 - c. Listed and Potentially Significant Historic Resources..... 214
 - 5. Associated Property Type: Grange Hall 216
 - a. Property Type Description 216
 - b. Eligibility Criteria and Integrity Thresholds 217
 - c. Listed and Potentially Significant Historic Resources..... 219
 - 6. Associated Property Type: Cultural Meeting House 223
 - a. Property Type Description 223
 - b. Eligibility Criteria and Integrity Thresholds 224
 - c. Listed and Potentially Significant Historic Resources..... 226
 - 7. Associated Property Type: Rural Electrification Building 227
 - a. Property Type Description 227
 - b. Eligibility Criteria and Integrity Thresholds 228
 - c. Listed and Potentially Significant Historic Resources..... 229

VI. GUIDE TO AGRICULTURAL BUILDINGS, STRUCTURES AND OBJECTS 231

- A. Introduction 231
- B. Buildings, Structures and Objects 232
 - 1. Housing 232
 - 2. Barns 236
 - 3. Outbuildings 239
 - 4. Processing and Storage 243
 - 5. Farmstead Support Structures 245
 - 6. Community Infrastructure 247

VII. PRESERVATION GOALS AND PRIORITIES..... 249

- A. Introduction 249
- B. Preservation Goals and Priorities 250
- C. Suggestions for Further Research 253

BIBLIOGRAPHY 255

This page intentionally left blank.

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. Project Team

County of Monterey

Meg Clovis, Cultural Affairs Manager
Monterey County Parks Department
855 E. Laurel Drive, Building G
Salinas, CA 93905

California Office of Historic Preservation

Marie Nelson, State Historian II
Surveys & Contexts/CLG Coordinator
California Office of Historic Preservation
1725 23rd Street, Suite 100
Sacramento, CA 95816

PAST Consultants, LLC

Seth A. Bergstein, Principal, Project Manager and Historic Context Statement co-author*
Paige J. Swartley, Esq., Principal, Historic Context Statement co-author*
916 Union St., #304
Alameda, CA 94501

** Seth A. Bergstein and Paige J. Swartley both meet the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in Architectural History and History.*

B. Funding

Under the auspices of the Certified Local Government (CLG) program, the federal government and the County of Monterey jointly funded this Agricultural Resources Evaluation Handbook. The 1980 amendments to the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 created a CLG program to encourage local governments' direct participation in identifying, evaluating, registering and preserving historic properties and integrating preservation concerns into local planning and decision-making processes. California's CLG program is a partnership among local governments, the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) and the National Park Service, which administers the National Historic Preservation Program. The total project cost for this Agricultural Resources Evaluation Handbook was \$30,500. OHP awarded Monterey County a \$25,000 CLG grant for the 2010-2011 CLG funding year and Monterey County contributed an additional \$5,500 towards the project. The grant period for this project was October 1, 2010 through September 30, 2011.

C. Project Description

1. Project Summary

The *Agricultural Resources Evaluation Handbook* synthesizes three historic context statements devoted to historic agricultural resources in Monterey County's North County Planning Area, Salinas Valley and South County Planning Area: PAST Consultants, LLC's *Historic Context Statement for Agricultural Resources in the North County Planning Area, Monterey County* (2010); Clark Historic Resource Consultants, Inc.'s *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources Located in the Unincorporated Areas Between Salinas and Soledad, Monterey County, California, Phase I* (2000) and *Phase II* (2001); and Galvin Preservation Associates, Inc.'s *Monterey County Parks Reconnaissance Survey and Context Statement of Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area* (2009).

One of the biggest challenges in saving historic resources is answering the question "What do we preserve and why?" Developing a historic context statement is the first step towards helping citizens and municipalities understand the significance of specific historic resources and to prioritize their preservation. The *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Preservation Planning* defines three primary standards for historic preservation:

1. Standard I. Preservation Planning Establishes Historic Contexts.
2. Standard II. Preservation Planning Uses Historic Contexts to Develop Goals and Priorities for the Identification, Evaluation, Registration and Treatment of Historic Properties.
3. Standard III. The Results of Preservation Planning Are Made Available for Integration Into Broader Planning Processes.

Historic context statements are the finished product of Standard I and provide the foundation for governmental agencies to implement Standards II and III: prioritizing the identification, evaluation, registration and treatment of certain historic properties and making the process an integral component of land use planning.¹

National Register Bulletin Number 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation defines **historic contexts** as "historical patterns that can be identified through consideration of the history of the property and the history of the surrounding area."² *National Register Bulletin 16A: How to Complete the National Register Registration Form* is a little more specific, defining a historic context as:

¹ U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Preservation Planning*, http://www.nps.gov/history/local-law/arch_stnds_1.htm.

² U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, *National Register Bulletin Number 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, 7.

Information about historic trends and properties grouped by an important theme in the prehistory or history of a community, State, or nation during a particular period of time. Because historic contexts are organized by **theme, place and time**, they link historic properties to important historic trends.³

To place a resource within its historic context, evaluators must identify the resource's period of significance and the historic theme it represents. The **period of significance** is the "span of time in which a property attained the significance for which it meets" the relevant local, California Register or National Register criteria.⁴ A **historic theme** "is a means of organizing properties into coherent patterns based on elements such as environment, social/ethnic groups, transportation networks, technology, or political developments that have influenced the development of an area during one or more periods of prehistory or history."⁵ By focusing on place, time and theme, historic context statements explain how, when, where and why the built environment developed in a particular manner. They describe an area's significant land use patterns and development, group the patterns into historic themes, identify the types of historic properties that illustrate those themes, and establish eligibility criteria and integrity thresholds for registering historic properties on national, state or local registers of historic properties.

This historic context statement addresses the following place, time and themes:

Monterey County: Monterey County is a large, geographically and geologically diverse region of California. This diversity strongly influences the type of agricultural pursuits that have occurred there over the past few centuries. Recognizing this diversity, Monterey County commissioned three separate historic context statements to uncover the agricultural history of the North County Planning Area, Salinas Valley and South County Planning Area. The North County encompasses about 72,720 acres of the southern Pajaro Valley and the northern Salinas Valley, including the communities of Castroville, Moss Landing, Prunedale, Pajaro, Las Lomas and part of Aromas. The Salinas Valley survey area focused on unincorporated areas in a limited region between Salinas and Soledad, covering about 271,349 acres and the communities of Salinas, Spreckels, Chualar, Gonzales and Soledad. The South County Planning Area encompasses approximately 819,840 acres, including the communities of San Lucas, San Ardo, Bradley, Jolon, Lockwood, Parkfield, Hames Valley, Priest Valley, Peachtree Valley, Bryson and Hesperia. The previous historic context statements did not cover the communities of Greenfield and King City, but the *Agricultural Resources Evaluation Handbook* includes them.

Pre-History to 1960: The agricultural history chapter reviews the settlement of Monterey County by time period, discussing the Ohlone, Esselen and Salinan people (ca. 5000 B.C.-ca.

³ U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, *National Register Bulletin 16A: How to Complete the National Register Registration Form* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, 1997), 4.

⁴ U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, *National Register Bulletin Number 16A: How to Complete the National Register Registration Form*, Appendix IV, 3. This appendix provides a useful glossary of National Register terms.

⁵ U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, *National Register Bulletin Number 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, 8.

1870), the Spanish Period (1769-1822), the Mexican Period (1822-1848) and American Settlement (1848-1960). Other books and reports discuss the Salinan, Esselen, Ohlone, Spanish and Mexican periods in great detail, so this historic context statement focuses on agricultural developments during those periods that have left an imprint on the cultural landscape. The *Agricultural Resources Evaluation Handbook* focuses primarily on extant properties from the American period, because they constitute most of what remains in today's built environment.

Theme Summary: The themes that tell the story of Monterey County agriculture are: Extensive Agriculture; Intensive Agriculture; Corporate Agriculture; Agricultural Colonies; Processing and Distribution; and Community Development. *Chapter 5: Historic Themes, Associated Property Types, Eligibility Criteria and Integrity Thresholds* discusses these themes in detail, focusing primarily on extant historic properties. Many ethnic and cultural groups have played a significant role in Monterey County's agricultural history, including the Irish, Chinese, Japanese, Italians, French, Danes, Croatians, Swiss, Dust Bowl migrants, Filipinos, Mexicans and many others. Their contributions are discussed throughout the historic context statement.

2. Project Objectives

The objectives of the *Agricultural Resources Evaluation Handbook* are to:

- Establish significant events and locational patterns in the agricultural development of Monterey County up to 1960.
- Organize Monterey County's developmental events and patterns into a group of themes that represent agriculture-related resources developed up to 1960.
- Provide a guide to agricultural buildings, structures and objects in Monterey County.
- Provide examples of associated property types within each theme, focusing on extant historic properties.
- Provide eligibility and integrity thresholds for purposes of surveying and/or nominating historic properties to national, state and local registers of historic resources.
- Identify preservation priorities and suggestions for further research.
- Suggest a methodology for evaluating historic agricultural resources throughout California.

3. Project Methodology

This project relies heavily on information contained in the North County, Salinas Valley and South County agricultural historic context statements that Monterey County commissioned between 2000 and 2010. PAST synthesized historical and property information from those three historic context statements and where information gaps appeared, PAST performed additional research. PAST then developed a list of historic themes that convey the context within which Monterey County's agricultural resources developed. To link the historic themes with extant

properties, PAST categorized the agricultural properties identified in the three previous historic context statements. Where gaps existed, PAST conducted field reconnaissance surveys to identify additional extant properties. PAST developed a comprehensive list of associated property types and their eligibility criteria and integrity thresholds for each property type. After evaluating agricultural properties from throughout Monterey County, PAST developed a guide to agricultural buildings, structures and objects to assist property owners and Monterey County staff in identifying those resources. Based on discussion held during meetings of the Agricultural Study Group, convened by the State Office of Historic Preservation, PAST developed an addendum discussing how to apply agricultural evaluation criteria statewide.

a. Historical Research:

PAST prepared this historic context statement under professional standards established by the U.S. Department of the Interior, California State Office of Historic Preservation and professional historic preservation practice. PAST conducted historical research at the following repositories:

- Agricultural History Project, Watsonville, California
- California Agricultural Workers' History Center, Watsonville Public Library, Watsonville, California
- California History Room, California State Library, Sacramento, California
- North Monterey County Chamber of Commerce, Castroville
- John Steinbeck Library, Salinas, California
- Monterey County Agricultural and Rural Life Museum, King City, California
- Monterey County Historical Society, Salinas, California
- Monterey County Library, Aromas Branch, Aromas, California
- Monterey County Library, Prunedale Branch, Salinas, California
- Pajaro Valley Historical Association, Watsonville, California
- San Antonio Valley Historical Association
- Sonoma County Library, Petaluma, California

b. Field Reconnaissance Survey:

While preparing the North County historic context statement in 2009-2010, PAST conducted a “windshield” or “reconnaissance” survey of the area to (1) locate properties that represent the historic themes illustrating the North County’s agricultural history, (2) determine the physical condition of the properties, and (3) develop a set of eligibility criteria and integrity thresholds for each property type. After studying the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 property survey forms in the Salinas Valley and South County historic context statements, PAST also visited some of these properties. Where information gaps existed, PAST conducted additional reconnaissance surveys. In most cases, PAST surveyed properties visible from public roads only. Few roads traverse Monterey County’s agricultural areas and many large properties are not easily visible from the road.

c. Limitations:

The *Agricultural Resources Evaluation Handbook* does not provide a complete agricultural history of Monterey County, list every crop ever grown, describe every ethnic group that worked in local agriculture, or identify everyone who owned, labored on, designed, constructed or inhabited historic agricultural properties up to 1960. Rather, it provides a global look at agricultural properties by establishing broad historic trends and patterns that influenced the county's agricultural development, organizing the historic context into themes, and illustrating those themes with property types and extant properties.

Monterey County's agricultural history is inseparable from that of the Central Coast; therefore, this historic context statement includes information that is relevant to the whole region. To fully understand the area's agricultural history, public agencies and other organizations in Monterey, Santa Cruz and San Benito counties should recognize and emphasize the interconnectedness of the region. Nonprofit organizations like the Agricultural History Project and the Pajaro Valley Historical Association, both located in Watsonville, already emphasize those connections. When setting future preservation priorities and making land use decisions, municipalities should also explore cooperative historic preservation and educational efforts and recognize that decisions made on local and countywide levels have a regional impact.

4. Project Meetings

During this project, PAST participated in numerous project meetings with Meg Clovis, Cultural Affairs Manager for the Monterey County Parks Department; members of the Monterey County Historic Resources Review Board (HRRB); and Marie Nelson, the Certified Local Government Coordinator for Surveys and Contexts at the California Office of Historic Preservation.

On November 5, 2010, we traveled to Salinas to meet with Meg Clovis and tour historic agricultural resources in the Salinas Valley and South County areas of Monterey County. On November 24, 2010, we participated in a conference call with Meg Clovis and Marie Nelson, the Survey/CLG Coordinator at OHP. We reviewed the purposes and content of the AREH; relevant background materials, including federal and state guidance for preparing historic context statements; work products that will be submitted during the course of the year-long project; deadlines; payment arrangements; and procedures for submitting inquiries and documents.

On December 16, 2010, we met with Meg Clovis and HRRB members Kent Seavey and Judy MacClelland to discuss the draft table of contents, historical research and potentially significant agricultural properties. We also discussed research materials, repositories, and individuals who could provide relevant information about Monterey County's agricultural history. In July 2011, we toured Monterey County agricultural resources with Kent Seavey. In August, we presented a progress report about the project at an HRRB meeting. The final progress report and submittal of the 100% AREH occurred at an HRRB meeting on September 1, 2011.

D. Acknowledgments

PAST is grateful to many people in Monterey County and Santa Cruz County who contributed their expertise, interest, passion and time to this project, including:

- Meg Clovis, Cultural Affairs Manager for the Monterey County Parks Department, County of Monterey, California.
- Marie Nelson, Certified Local Government Coordinator for Surveys and Contexts at the California Office of Historic Preservation.
- Monterey County Historic Resources Review Board members: Judy MacClelland, Kellie Morgantini, Salvador F. Munoz, Sheila Prader, Barbara Rainer, John Scourkes and Kent L. Seavey. PAST is especially grateful to Kent Seavey for his wonderful architectural tours, his seemingly limitless information stream and his passion for this project.
- Sharon Turner, Museum Assistant, Monterey County Agricultural and Rural Life Museum, King City, California.
- Agricultural History Project (AHP): Pat Johns (Codiga Center & Museum Director), Lynne Grossi and the dedicated AHP board, staff and volunteers.
- Pajaro Valley Historical Association (PVHA): Louis Arbanas, Jane Borg, Regan Huerta, Alice Leyland, Josephine Lint, GeriAnne Simmons and the dedicated PVHA board, staff and volunteers.
- Monterey County Historical Society (MCHS): Mona Gudgel and the dedicated MCHS staff.
- North Monterey County Chamber of Commerce, Castroville: Denise Amerison.

This page intentionally left blank.

II. INTRODUCTION AND AGRICULTURAL DEFINITIONS

A. Introduction

Monterey County has been an important agricultural center since the 1800s, supplying food and other agricultural products for local, regional, national and international markets. Many factors have contributed to the local agricultural economy's ongoing success, including a temperate Mediterranean climate; fertile and highly productive soils; relatively open landscape; large Spanish and Mexican land grants, which made big farm parcels possible; reclamation and irrigation projects; the adaptive and plentiful workforce, including many different ethnic groups who arrived in successive stages of immigration; access to major transportation and distribution networks; and a willingness to experiment with new crops and products. The crops, technology, distribution methods and labor force have changed over time, but reaping the bounty of the land remains a proud tradition in Monterey County.

To understand Monterey County's agricultural history, it is important to place its evolution as an agricultural center in context. This historic context statement explores the principal geographical, geological, environmental, economic, cultural, social, political, governmental, technological and other factors that have affected the region's development, shaped land use patterns, and influenced the creation of cultural landscapes and the built environment.⁶ It also identifies important property types associated with particular facets of history, explains why those property types are important, shows how they illustrate the relevant historic context, and describes the characteristics properties must retain to convey their historic significance.⁷

It is also important to understand relevant terminology. This chapter defines agricultural terminology. The next chapter defines historic context statement terminology as well as historic resource identification and evaluation terminology, particularly focusing on rural properties. It also describes the national, state and local registration criteria for historic resources.

B. What is Agriculture?

1. Monterey County Code Definitions

To understand the types of historic agricultural resources located in Monterey County and why they might be worthy of preservation, it is important to define "agriculture" and related terms. Local decision-makers will rely in part on the Monterey County Code (MCC) to protect these resources, so this historic context statement uses the MCC's definitions of "agriculture," "agricultural operation," "agricultural support service" and "agricultural processing plant." The

⁶ Marie Nelson, "Writing Historic Contexts" (Sacramento: California Office of Historic Preservation, undated), 2.

⁷ Nelson, "Writing Historic Contexts," 1-2.

definitions are a useful starting point, yet the full breadth of what is meant by “agriculture” cannot be captured within a simple definition, just as the meaning of “food” is infinitely broad.

Generally, **agriculture** encompasses a wide range of activities related to managing plants and animals for human use. The MCC defines agriculture as “the art or science of cultivating the ground; harvesting of crops; rearing and management of livestock; tillage; husbandry; farming; horticulture; and forestry science and art of the production of plants and animals useful to man; and wildlife management.”⁸ In other words, agriculture is intimately tied to the natural environment: soil, water, nutrients, climate, geography, geology, animals and plants. The built environment is also critical. The business of agriculture requires facilities and infrastructure devoted to planting, cultivating, processing, packing, distributing and consuming agricultural products. Perhaps most importantly, no agricultural product would reach consumers without people playing hundreds of roles in different businesses: farm ownership and operation, cultivation, irrigation, transportation, processing, packing, storage, marketing, machinery manufacture and sales, chemicals, seed production, banking, financing, agricultural extension services, research, governmental oversight, groceries, roadside stands, farmers markets and other support services.⁹

Under the MCC, an **agricultural operation** includes cultivating and tilling soil; dairying; producing, cultivating, growing and harvesting agricultural commodities including horticulture, timber, apiculture, livestock, fish, or poultry; and cultural practices associated with farming operations, such as preparing goods for the market, delivering goods to storage, delivering goods to the market, or delivering goods for transportation to the market.¹⁰

The business of agriculture requires many types of physical facilities. Under the MCC, an **agricultural support service** is typically located on or close to a farm. It is a “necessary and accessory facility principally established to serve on-site farming or ranching activities” and “relies on the on-site agriculture as its major means of support.” Support facilities include without limitation coolers, cold storage, loading docks and shops.¹¹ An **agricultural processing plant** is a broader term that includes any structure, building, facility, open or enclosed area, or other location for “refining, treating, or converting agricultural products where a physical, chemical or similar change of an agricultural product occurs.” Examples include coolers, dehydrators, cold storage houses, hulling operations, wineries and facilities for sorting, cleaning,

⁸ County of Monterey, California, “Monterey County Code,” Title 21, Chapter 21.06, Section 21.06.010 (Tallahassee, FL: Municipal Code Corporation, 2009), http://library.municode.com/HTML/16111/level2/T21_C21.06.html#T21_C21.06_21.06.010 (accessed January 22, 2010).

⁹ Carole Frank Nuckton, Refugio I. Rochin, and Ann Foley Scheuring, “California Agriculture: The Human Story,” in *A Guidebook to California Agriculture* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1983), 18.

¹⁰ County of Monterey, California, “Monterey County Code,” Title 16, Chapter 16.40, Section 16.40.010(B) (Tallahassee, FL: Municipal Code Corporation, 2009), http://library.municode.com/HTML/16111/level2/T16_C16.40.html#T16_C16.40_16.40.010 (accessed January 22, 2010).

¹¹ County of Monterey, California, “Monterey County Code,” Title 21, Chapter 21.06, Section 21.06.030, (Tallahassee, FL: Municipal Code Corporation, 2009), http://library.municode.com/HTML/16111/level2/T21_C21.06.html#T21_C21.06_21.06.030 (accessed January 12, 2010).

packing and storing agricultural products in preparation for sale or shipment.¹² Some facilities can be classified as both an agricultural support service and an agricultural processing plant, such as coolers and cold storage facilities.

2. Types of Agriculture

The MCC's definitions of agriculture and related terms provide a framework for understanding the types of historic resources that convey Monterey County's agricultural history. In addition, the agricultural industry uses specific terms to classify farming methods, reflecting the level of labor, money and technology required to modify land and produce agricultural products.

Agriculture is divided into two primary types: extensive and intensive. Extensive agriculture tends to utilize large parcels of land and limited labor, whereas intensive agriculture generally requires an acute level of effort on smaller parcels. More specifically:

Extensive agriculture or **extensive cultivation** relies on existing technology to cultivate the land and uses a low level of labor and capital relative to the size of the farmed area. Examples of extensive agriculture include cultivating grains (*e.g.*, wheat and barley) and raising livestock. For much of the nineteenth century, Monterey County farmers primarily conducted extensive agriculture operations. They focused on growing "staple" crops that would feed both humans and animals, but they also lacked the technology and labor required to cultivate intensive crops.

Intensive agriculture or **intensive cultivation** produces or increases crop yields by applying a relatively high level of labor, capital and technology. Examples of intensive crops grown in Monterey County include artichokes and strawberries, which require large labor pools and significant irrigation and technical expertise to produce. The phrase **truck crops** is an umbrella term that typically indicates the products of intensive agriculture. Examples include high-value specialty crops like fruit and vegetables that are transported on trucks, the preferred mode of local and regional transportation after the 1920s.

Specialization, specialty crop agriculture, single-crop farming or **monoculture** was a major development in American agriculture. As fruit and vegetable growers discovered which crops grew best in particular locations and as their production and marketing costs increased, farmers moved towards **intensive specialization**, focusing on one crop. To allay risks, growers adopted advancements in breeding, fertilizing and pest management, as well as marketing and politics.¹³

Industrial agriculture means specialization on many levels: crop specialization; labor specialization (laborers trained to perform a single task such as harvesting crops versus a single

¹² County of Monterey, California, "Monterey County Code," Title 21, Chapter 21.06, Section 21.06.020 (Tallahassee, FL: Municipal Code Corporation, 2009), http://library.municode.com/HTML/16111/level2/T21_C21.06.html#T21_C21.06_21.06.020 (accessed January 22, 2010).

¹³ Steven Stoll, *The Fruits of Natural Advantage: Making the Industrial Countryside in California* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), xiii-xiv.

family performing all labor on their family farm); and the complete commercialization of farming. It also requires close connections between growers, labor, scientists, investors, marketing agencies, regional markets, governmental regulators, businesses and consumers.¹⁴

Monterey County agriculture followed the general trend found elsewhere in California: extensive agriculture preceded intensive agriculture. The financial, labor and technological limitations of early settlers restricted agricultural production to raising animals and crops that satisfied the local population's needs. As the population increased and more money was available, workers and technology arrived in Monterey County, farmers transitioned from extensive to intensive agriculture. To read the cultural landscape and understand how it changes over time, we must recognize that farmers use land differently for extensive and intensive agriculture, modifying the natural and built environment to facilitate their specialized agricultural production.

Chapter 5: Historic Themes, Associated Property Types, Eligibility Criteria and Integrity Thresholds integrates these terms into the historic themes that convey the significance of Monterey County's agricultural resources. Two of the historic themes, Extensive Agriculture and Intensive Agriculture, reflect the historical division between the two major types of agriculture.

¹⁴ Stoll, *The Fruits of Natural Advantage*, xiv.

III. IDENTIFYING AND EVALUATING MONTEREY COUNTY RESOURCES

This historic context statement provides the general framework for identifying Monterey County's agricultural resources and evaluating them for historic significance and historic integrity. This chapter describes how the process works and outlines the basic format of the rest of the document. First, it describes how historic context statements are organized. Second, it provides eligibility criteria for listing properties in the federal, state and local registers of historic resources. Third, it defines historic integrity and integrity thresholds. Fourth, it defines different types of cultural landscapes (including rural historic landscapes, like those found in Monterey County) and describes landscape characteristics. Fifth, it describes how Chapter 5, the themes chapter, addresses property types, landscape characteristics and integrity thresholds.

A. Historic Context Statements

One of the biggest challenges in saving historic resources is answering the question "What do we preserve and why?" Historic context statements help provide some answers. They identify the geographical, environmental, social, cultural, political, governmental and technological factors that influenced land use patterns and shaped the cultural landscape. They classify those historical developments into themes and identify associated property types that illustrate each theme. Finally, they provide guidance for determining which resources possess historic significance and historic integrity and are therefore eligible for listing on historic registers. All of this information helps to establish *what* we preserve and *why*, providing the historic context within which individual resources can be evaluated using criteria from the National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historical Resources, Monterey County Local Official Register of Historic Resources and other applicable registers.

From a preservation planning perspective, municipalities and citizens use historic context statements to help them understand the significance of specific historic resources so they can make informed decisions about preserving them. The *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Preservation Planning* defines three primary standards for historic preservation:

1. Standard I. Preservation Planning Establishes Historic Contexts.
2. Standard II. Preservation Planning Uses Historic Contexts to Develop Goals and Priorities for the Identification, Evaluation, Registration and Treatment of Historic Properties.
3. Standard III. The Results of Preservation Planning Are Made Available for Integration Into Broader Planning Processes.

Historic context statements are the finished product of Standard I and provide the foundation for governmental agencies to implement Standards II and III: establishing historic preservation priorities and integrating those priorities into local land use planning.¹⁵

National Register Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation defines **historic contexts** as “historical patterns that can be identified through consideration of the history of the property and the history of the surrounding area.”¹⁶ *National Register Bulletin 16A: How to Complete the National Register Registration Form* is a little more specific, defining a historic context as:

Information about historic trends and properties grouped by an important theme in the prehistory or history of a community, State, or nation during a particular period of time. Because historic contexts are organized by **theme, place and time**, they link historic properties to important historic trends.¹⁷

To place a resource within its historic context, evaluators must identify the resource’s period of significance and the historic theme it represents. The **period of significance** is the “span of time in which a property attained the significance” for which it meets the relevant local, California Register or National Register criteria.¹⁸ A **historic theme** “is a means of organizing properties into coherent patterns based on elements such as environment, social/ethnic groups, transportation networks, technology, or political developments that have influenced the development of an area during one or more periods of prehistory or history.”¹⁹ Lastly, an **associated property type** is defined as “a grouping of individual properties characterized by common physical and/or associative attributes.”²⁰ The associated property type is the physical evidence present on the landscape that illustrates the historic theme, which in turn illustrates the historic context.

By focusing on theme, place and time, historic context statements explain how, where and when the built environment developed in a particular manner. They describe significant land use patterns and development, group the patterns into historic themes, identify the associated property types of historic properties that illustrate those themes, and establish **eligibility criteria**

¹⁵ U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Preservation Planning*, http://www.nps.gov/history/local-law/arch_stnds_1.htm.

¹⁶ U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, *National Register Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, 7.

¹⁷ U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, *National Register Bulletin 16A: How to Complete the National Register Registration Form* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, 1997), 4.

¹⁸ U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, *National Register Bulletin Number 16A: How to Complete the National Register Registration Form*, Appendix IV, 3. This appendix provides a useful glossary of National Register terms.

¹⁹ U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, *National Register Bulletin Number 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, 8.

²⁰ U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, *National Register Bulletin 16B: How to Complete the National Register Multiple Property Documentation Form* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, 1999), 14.

and **integrity thresholds** for listing properties on national, state or local registers of historic resources. Eligibility criteria, historic integrity and integrity thresholds are discussed below.

B. Eligibility Criteria

Historic resources may be designated on the federal, state or local level. Generally, to be eligible for listing, a resource must be historically significant and retain enough historic integrity to convey that significance. The criteria for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historical Resources and the Monterey County Local Official Register of Historic Resources are described below.

1. National Register of Historic Places (NR)

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 authorized the Secretary of the Interior to create the National Register of Historic Places. Districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects significant in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering and culture are eligible for listing if they meet at least one of four criteria.²¹ Eligible resources are those

- 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 values, 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.

Eligible resources must also retain sufficient integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association to convey the relevant historic significance.²² The seven aspects of integrity are described later in this chapter.

In general, cemeteries, birthplaces, or graves of historical figures; properties owned by religious institutions or used for religious purposes; structures that were moved from their original locations; reconstructed historic buildings; properties primarily commemorative in nature; and properties that have achieved significance within the past fifty years are considered ineligible for listing in the National Register. However, such properties will qualify if they are integral parts of districts that do meet the criteria or if they fall within the following categories:

- (a) A religious property deriving primary significance from architectural or artistic distinction or historical importance; or

²¹ 16 U.S.C. 470, *et seq.*, as amended. 36 C.F.R. § 60.1(a).

²² 36 C.F.R. § 60.4.

- (b) A building or structure removed from its original location but which is significant primarily for architectural value, or which is the surviving structure most importantly associated with a historic person or event; or
- (c) A birthplace or grave of a historical figure of outstanding importance if there is no appropriate site or building directly associated with that person's productive life; or
- (d) A cemetery which derives its primary significance from graves of persons of transcendent importance, from age, from distinctive design features, or from association with historic events; or
- (e) A reconstructed building when 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 association has survived; or
- (f) A property primarily commemorative in intent if design, age, tradition, or symbolic value has invested it with its own exceptional significance; or
- (g) A property achieving significance within the past 50 years if it is of exceptional importance.²³

2. California Register of Historical Resources (CR)

A resource is eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources if it:

- 1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage.
- 2. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.
- 3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values.
- 4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.²⁴

The California Code of Regulations notes that integrity is the authenticity of a historical resource's physical identity evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource's period of significance. Resources eligible for listing in the California Register must retain enough of their historic character or appearance to be recognizable as historic resources and convey the reasons for their significance.

The same seven aspects of integrity are considered when evaluating resources for listing in the National Register and California Register: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. Alterations over time or historic changes in use may themselves be significant. However, resources that may not retain enough integrity to meet National Register criteria may still be eligible for listing in the California Register.

²³ 36 C.F.R. § 60.4.

²⁴ California Public Resources Code § 5024.1(c).

A moved building, structure, or object may be listed in the California Register if it were moved to prevent its demolition at its former location and the new location is compatible with the resource's original character and use. The resource should retain its historic features and compatibility in orientation, setting, and general environment. A resource less than fifty years old may be considered for listing in the California Register if it can be demonstrated that sufficient time has passed to understand its historical importance. A reconstructed building less than fifty years old may be eligible for listing if it embodies traditional building methods and techniques that play an important role in a community's historically rooted beliefs, customs, and practices, such as a Native American roundhouse.²⁵

3. Monterey County Local Official Register of Historic Resources (MCR)

Chapter 18.25 of the Monterey County Code addresses the "Preservation of Historic Resources" and establishes criteria for listing properties and districts in the Local Official Register of Historic Resources.²⁶

Section 18.25.070 ("Review Criteria") governs the designation of historical resources and historic districts. Specifically, "[a]n improvement, natural feature, or site may be designated an historical resource and any area within the County may be designated a historic district" if the improvement, natural feature, site, or area meets the criteria for listing on the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historical Resources, or if the County finds that one or more of the following conditions exist:

A. Historical and Cultural Significance.

1. The resource or district proposed for designation is particularly representative of a distinct historical period, type, style, region, or way of life.
2. The resource or district proposed for designation is, or contains, a type of building or buildings which was once common but is now rare.
3. The resource or district proposed for designation was connected with someone renowned.
4. The resource or district proposed for designation is connected with a business or use which was once common but is now rare.
5. The resource or district proposed for designation represents the work of a master builder, engineer, designer, artist, or architect whose talent influenced a particular architectural style or way of life.
6. The resource or district proposed for designation is the site of an important historic event or is associated with events that have made a meaningful contribution to the nation, State, or community.
7. The resource or district proposed for designation has a high potential of yielding information of archaeological interest.

²⁵ California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Sections 4852(c) and (d).

²⁶ Monterey County Municipal Code, Chapter 18.25. Section 18.25.100 defines the Local Official Register of Historic Resources. Section 18.25.070 establishes the review criteria.

- B. Historic, Architectural, and Engineering Significance.
1. The resource or district proposed for designation exemplifies a particular architectural style or way of life important to the County.
 2. The resource or district proposed for designation exemplifies the best remaining architectural type of a community.
 3. The construction materials or engineering methods used in the resource or district proposed for designation embody elements of outstanding attention to architectural or engineering design, detail, material or craftsmanship.
- C. Community and Geographic Setting.
1. The proposed resource materially benefits the historic character of the community.
 2. The unique location or singular physical characteristic of the resource or district proposed for designation represents an established and familiar visual feature of the community, area, or county.
 3. The district is a geographically definable area, urban or rural possessing a significant concentration or continuity of site, buildings, structures, or objects unified by past events, or aesthetically by plan or physical development.
 4. The preservation of a resource or resources is essential to the integrity of the district.

4. Other Local Registers Within Monterey County

Criteria for listing in other local registers maintained by municipalities within Monterey County, whether in existence now or developed in the future, shall also be considered when evaluating agriculture resources within those jurisdictions.

C. Historic Integrity

National Register Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation defines **historic integrity** as “the ability of a property to convey its significance.” Historic properties either retain their integrity or they do not. To retain integrity, a resource will always retain several and usually most of the seven aspects of integrity:

1. **Location:** the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred.
2. **Design:** the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property.
3. **Setting:** the physical environment of a historic property.
4. **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.
5. **Workmanship:** the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory.

6. **Feeling:** a property's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.
7. **Association:** the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.

National Register Bulletin 15 notes that evaluating historic integrity may be a subjective analysis, but is always based on understanding the property's physical features and how they relate to the property's historic significance. The integrity evaluation can begin only after the evaluator establishes the property's significance: *why* it is significant (identifying its area of significance and how it meets the relevant National, State or Local designation criteria), *where* it is important (location), and *when* the resource is significant (its "period of significance").

After establishing the property's historic significance, the evaluator assesses integrity using *National Register Bulletin 15's* four-step approach:

1. Define the **essential physical features** that must be present for a property to represent its significance.
2. Determine whether the **essential physical features are visible** enough to convey their significance.
3. Determine whether the property needs to be **compared with similar properties**. And,
4. Determine, based on the significance and essential physical features, **which aspects of integrity** are particularly vital to the property being nominated and if they are present.

National Register Bulletin 15 emphasizes that "ultimately, the question of integrity is answered by whether or not the property retains the **identity** for which it is significant."²⁷

A resource need not be "frozen in time" to retain its historic integrity. A property may have multiple periods of significance, or a long period of significance that includes important changes to the property. Physical changes from different eras may be historically significant in their own right if they illustrate the property's historic significance and they date to the property's period of significance. For example, properties evolve as changes in land use, ownership, technology and architectural styles occur. Monterey County's agricultural properties evolved to accommodate the transition from extensive to intensive agriculture; the farmer's decision to change crops; technological innovation; and modifications in planting, cultivating, irrigating, processing and distribution methods. These changes must be evaluated for their own historic significance and historic integrity. The property must retain the essential physical attributes that identify it as a historic property, and these attributes must date to the property's period(s) of significance.

²⁷ U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, *National Register Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation* (Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, 1997), 44-49 (bold in original).

D. Property Type Registration Requirements: Eligibility Criteria and Integrity Thresholds

As noted above, a property is eligible for listing as a historic resource if it possesses historic significance under the relevant national, state or local registration criteria and it retains enough historic integrity to convey its significance. To help identify potential historic resources, a historic context statement defines historic themes that illustrate the relevant historic context, defines associated property types for each theme, and establishes **property type registration requirements** that address the interplay between historic significance and historic integrity. *National Register Bulletin 16B: How to Complete the National Register Multiple Property Documentation Form* states that property type registration requirements should include:

the physical characteristics, associative qualities, or information potential that an example of the property type must possess to qualify for the National Register. This section should specify the aspects of integrity (location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association) and an explanation of how each aspect is defined for the specific property type.²⁸

The California Office of Historic Preservation's guidelines are more explicit. *OHP Preferred Format for Historic Context Statements* states that

[t]his section should also provide direction for evaluating integrity based on which aspects of integrity are critical for each property type to be able to convey its significance within the theme or context. This guidance should take into consideration the types of changes that may have been made to a resource through time as a result of its original design, location, materials, workmanship and uses.²⁹

The California Office of Historic Preservation defines this process as identifying the eligibility criteria and integrity thresholds of an associated property type.³⁰

As noted above, *National Register Bulletin 16B* states that for every associated property type described in a historic context statement, the property type registration requirements should discuss various physical and associative qualities in addition to discussing the seven aspects of historic integrity. *Chapter 5: Historic Themes, Associated Property Types, Eligibility Criteria and Integrity Thresholds* follows *National Register Bulletin 16B's* guidance and includes two charts for each associated property type. The first chart discusses the following seven categories of physical information for each associated property type:

²⁸ U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, *National Register Bulletin 16B: How to Complete the National Register Multiple Property Documentation Form* (Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, 1999), 16-17.

²⁹ California Office of Historic Preservation, *OHP Preferred Format for Historic Context Statements* (Sacramento, CA: California Office of Historic Preservation, undated), 2.

³⁰ California Office of Historic Preservation, *OHP Preferred Format for Historic Context Statements*, 2.

1. **Physical characteristics** such as style, period, site or structural type, size, scale, proportions, design, architectural details, method of construction, siting, orientation, spatial arrangement or plan, materials, workmanship, artistry, and environmental relationships.
2. **Associative characteristics** such as the property's relationship to important activities, persons, or events, including information such as dates, functions, role, cultural affiliations, relationship to important research topics, and the presence of natural features or resources that helped determine location.
3. **Geographical information** such as the property's relationship to natural resources, climate, topographical features, and soil conditions that may have been relied upon for industry, transportation, defense, or subsistence, or that helped determine the siting, location, form, design, function, and materials of associated cultural resources.
4. The likely nature of **boundaries** for related properties and any special factors to be considered in selecting boundaries, such as the likelihood of the resource to exist in groups or in combination with other significant property types forming historic districts.
5. **Variations** occurring within the property type due to changing cultural, chronological, or geographical influences.
6. **Locational patterns** of the property type, that is, generalizations about the known or likely location, occurrence, and distribution of examples representing the property type.
7. **Condition** or expected condition of property types.³¹

The second chart discusses the **seven aspects of integrity** for each associated property type: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association.

In this historic context statement, Chapter 5 includes a third chart for two of the historic themes and their associated property types. Theme 1 (Extensive Agriculture) and Theme 2 (Intensive Agriculture) include associated property types that are cultural landscapes: farmsteads. Therefore, Chapter 5 discusses the eleven landscape characteristics that are described further in the next section.

E. Types of Landscapes

Farmsteads generally include many buildings, structures and landscape features that support agricultural production: the individual components comprise a recognizable, cohesive unit. Therefore, this historic context statement evaluates farmsteads as cultural landscapes. This section describes natural landscapes, cultural landscapes, historic rural landscapes and eleven landscape characteristics.

³¹ *National Register Bulletin Number 16B: How to Complete the National Register Multiple Property Documentation Form, 14-15.*

1. Natural and Cultural Landscapes

When the first inhabitants arrived in the Monterey Bay Area, the transformation from a natural landscape to a cultural landscape began. A **natural landscape** is the rare, almost non-existent environment that has not been altered, affected, or occupied by people through habitation, agriculture, landscaping, building, pollution or other activity.³² An example might be a prairie free of non-native plants, roads or other intrusions linked directly or indirectly to humans.

In contrast, a **cultural landscape** reflects humanity's impact on the natural environment. *Preservation Brief 36: Protecting Cultural Landscapes: Planning, Treatment and Management of Historic Landscapes*, defines a cultural landscape as "a geographic area, including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife or domestic animals therein, associated with a historic event, activity, or person or exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic values." Human imprints within a cultural landscape can be obvious, *e.g.*, cities, highways, power plants and resorts. They can also be subtle, *e.g.*, invasive plant species, plowed fields, telephone poles, trails through open space, dry-laid rock fences delineating property boundaries, contour-terrace paths made by cattle grazing on hills, abandoned wharf pilings in a slough, railroad tracks and water tanks.³³ Monterey County's cultural landscapes contain all of these features.

Preservation Brief 36 defines four general types of cultural landscapes. Monterey County contains examples of each type:

Historic Designed Landscape: a landscape that was consciously designed or laid out by a landscape architect, master gardener, architect, or horticulturist according to design principles, or an amateur gardener working in a recognized style or tradition. The landscape may be associated with a significant person(s), trend, or event in landscape architecture; or illustrate an important development in the theory and practice of landscape architecture. Aesthetic values play a significant role in designed landscapes. Examples include parks, campuses, and estates.

Historic Vernacular Landscape: a landscape that evolved through use by the people whose activities or occupancy shaped that landscape. Through social or cultural attitudes of an individual, family or a community, the landscape reflects the physical, biological, and cultural character of those everyday lives. Function plays a significant role in vernacular landscapes. They can be a single property such as a farm or a collection of properties such as a district of historic farms along a river valley. Examples include rural villages, industrial complexes, and agricultural landscapes.

³² Burton L. Gordon, *Monterey Bay Area: Natural History and Cultural Imprints* (Pacific Grove, CA: The Boxwood Press, 1979), 4.

³³ Gordon, *Monterey Bay Area: Natural History and Cultural Imprints*, 4.

Historic Site: a landscape significant for its association with a historic event, activity, or person. Examples include battlefields and presidential homes.

Ethnographic Landscape: a landscape containing a variety of natural and cultural resources that associated people define as heritage resources. Examples are contemporary settlements, religious sacred sites and massive geological structures. Small plant communities, animals, subsistence and ceremonial grounds are often components.³⁴

2. Rural Historic Landscapes

Cultural landscapes can be urban, rural or anything in between. Some of Monterey County's historic agricultural resources qualify as rural historic landscapes. *National Register Bulletin 30: Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Rural Historic Landscapes* defines a **rural historic landscape** as

a geographical area that historically has been used by people, or shaped or modified by human activity, occupancy, or intervention, and that possesses a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of areas of land use, vegetation, buildings and structures, roads and waterways, and natural features.³⁵

National Register Bulletin 30 states that rural historic landscapes may be listed in the National Register (and by association, a state register) as either historic sites or historic districts:

Landscapes small in size and having no buildings or structures, such as an experimental orchard, are classified as *sites*. Most, however, being extensive in acreage and containing a number of buildings, sites and structures – such as a ranch or farming community – are classified as *historic districts*.

For properties to qualify as rural historic landscapes, they must “. . . possess tangible features, called **landscape characteristics**, that have resulted from historic human use.”³⁶ These characteristics are described below.

³⁴ Charles A. Birnbaum, ASLA, *Preservation Brief 36: Protecting Cultural Landscapes: Planning, Treatment and Management of Historic Landscapes* (Washington, D.C.: Technical Preservation Services, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, 1994), 1.

³⁵ McClelland, Linda Flint, J. Timothy Keller, ASLA, Genevieve P. Keller, and Robert Z. Melnick, ASLA. *National Register Bulletin 30: Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Rural Historic Landscapes*. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1999), 2.

³⁶ *National Register Bulletin 30: Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Rural Historic Landscapes*, 2.

3. Landscape Characteristics

Whereas individual buildings retain historic integrity by retaining their significant character-defining features, rural historic landscapes retain historic integrity by possessing a considerable number of **landscape characteristics**. According to *National Register Bulletin 30: Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Rural Historic Landscapes*,

Landscape characteristics are the tangible evidence of the activities and habits of the people who occupied, developed, used, and shaped the land to serve human needs; they may reflect the beliefs, attitudes, traditions, and values of these people.³⁷

The eleven landscape characteristics are:

1. **Land Uses and Activities:** Land uses are the major human forces that shape and organize rural communities.
2. **Patterns of Spatial Organization:** The organization of land on a large scale depends on the relationship among major physical components, predominant landforms, and natural features.
3. **Response to the Natural Environment:** Major natural features, such as mountains, prairies, rivers, lakes, forests, and grasslands, influenced both the location and organization of rural communities.
4. **Cultural Traditions:** Cultural traditions affect the ways that land is used, occupied, and shaped.
5. **Circulation Networks:** Circulation networks are systems for transporting people, goods, and raw materials from one point to another.
6. **Boundary Demarcations:** Boundary demarcations delineate areas of ownership and land use, such as an entire farmstead or open range.
7. **Vegetation Related to Land Use:** Various types of vegetation bear a direct relationship to long-established patterns of land use.
8. **Buildings, Structures, and Objects:** Various types of buildings, structures, and objects serve human needs related to the occupation and use of the land.
9. **Clusters:** Groupings of buildings, fences, and other features, as seen in a farmstead, ranch, or mining complex, result from function, social tradition, climate, or other influences, cultural or natural.
10. **Archaeological Sites:** The sites of prehistoric or historic activities or occupation, may be marked by foundations, ruins, changes in vegetation, and surface remains.
11. **Small-Scale Elements:** Small-scale elements, such as a foot bridge or road sign, add to the historic setting of a rural landscape.³⁸

³⁷ *National Register Bulletin 30: Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Rural Historic Landscapes*, 3.

³⁸ For a complete discussion of the eleven landscape characteristics see *National Register Bulletin 30: Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Rural Historic Landscapes (Revised 1999)*, 4-6, 15-18.

National Register Bulletin 30 divides the eleven landscape characteristics into two categories, **processes** and **physical components**:

The first four characteristics are **processes** that have been instrumental in shaping the land, such as the response of farmers to fertile soils. The remaining seven are **physical components** that are evident on the land, such as barns or orchards. Many, but not all, rural properties contain all eleven characteristics. When historic processes are linked to existing components, the rural landscape can be viewed as a unified whole.³⁹

When evaluating Monterey County farmsteads, the eleven landscape characteristics are a critical component of the analysis of historic significance and historic integrity. As noted in Section D, Chapter 5 describes the eleven landscape characteristics associated with cultural landscapes described in Theme 1 (Extensive Agriculture) and Theme 2 (Intensive Agriculture).

³⁹ *National Register Bulletin 30: Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Rural Historic Landscapes*, 4.

This page intentionally left blank.

IV. MONTEREY COUNTY AGRICULTURAL HISTORY

A. INTRODUCTION

To understand the historic context in which Monterey County agriculture developed, this chapter presents a broad overview of the geographical, environmental, social, cultural, political, governmental and technological factors that individually and cumulatively shaped Monterey County's cultural landscape and land use patterns up to 1960. It incorporates the previous three Monterey County agricultural historic context statements, which focused on specific geographic areas: Clark Historic Resource Consultants, Inc.'s *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources Located in the Unincorporated Areas Between Salinas and Soledad, Monterey County, California, Phase I* (2000) and *Phase II* (2001); Galvin Preservation Associates, Inc.'s *Monterey County Parks Reconnaissance Survey and Context Statement of Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area* (2009); and PAST Consultants, LLC's *Historic Context Statement for Agricultural Resources in the North County Planning Area, Monterey County* (2010).

Historic contexts are organized by **place, time and theme**, linking historic properties to important historic trends. Focusing on **place**, this chapter describes Monterey County's location, boundaries, geology, geography and climate. The area's coastal location, fertile soil, alluvial plains, rolling hills and mild climate make it one of the world's most productive agricultural regions. This chapter also covers settlement by **time** period, discussing the Ohlone, Esselen and Salinan people, the Spanish Period (1769-1822), the Mexican Period (1822-1848), the Early American Period (ca. 1848–1890), Agricultural Expansion (ca. 1870–1940), and Industrial Agriculture (ca. 1925–1960). Most of Monterey County's extant historic agricultural resources date from American statehood. Many ethnic and cultural groups have played a significant role in Monterey County's agricultural history and this chapter reviews their contributions.

The historical developments described in this chapter form a set of coherent patterns or **themes** that tell Monterey County's agriculture history: Extensive Agriculture; Intensive Agriculture; Corporate Agriculture; Agricultural Colonies; Processing and Distribution; and Community Development. Chapter 5 describes these themes in more depth and identifies significant Monterey County properties, events, activities, individuals and groups that illustrate each theme.

B. Monterey County

1. Location and Boundaries

Monterey County is on California's Central Coast, about 100 miles south of San Francisco and 300 miles north of Los Angeles. The county is roughly forty-five miles wide and 124 miles long, covering more than two million acres of scenic and fertile land.⁴⁰ This historic context

⁴⁰ Augusta Fink, *Monterey: The Presence of the Past* (San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1972), 8. Arthur Dunn, *Monterey County, California* (San Francisco: Sunset Magazine Homeseekers' Bureau, 1915), 3 [issued on behalf of

statement covers only a portion of Monterey County, three distinct planning areas called the North County Planning Area, Salinas Valley and South County Planning Area.

The **North County Planning Area (North County)** encompasses about 72,720 acres of the southern Pajaro Valley and the northern Salinas Valley, including the communities of Castroville, Moss Landing, Prunedale, Pajaro, Las Lomas and part of Aromas. The **Salinas Valley** survey area focused on unincorporated areas in a limited region between Salinas and Soledad, covering about 271,349 acres and the communities of Salinas, Spreckels, Chualar, Gonzales and Soledad. The **South County Planning Area (South County)** encompasses approximately 819,840 acres, including the communities of San Lucas, San Ardo, Bradley, Jolon, Lockwood, Parkfield, Hames Valley, Priest Valley, Peachtree Valley, Bryson and Hesperia. The previous historic context statements did not cover the communities of Greenfield and King City, but the *Agricultural Resources Evaluation Handbook* includes them.

The *Agricultural Resources Evaluation Handbook* generally excludes areas of Monterey County that lie outside the North County, Salinas Valley and South County planning areas (*e.g.*, the communities southwest of Castroville down to Fort Hunter Liggett). Areas like the Carmel Valley are unique and will require separate historic context statements.

2. Geology and Geography

In 1865, Monterey County Assessor W. P. McGarvey concluded that “Monterey County is not an agricultural county and by its geological nature is precluded from becoming so.”⁴¹ He was wrong: virtually every land feature has contributed to the region’s agricultural dominance. In the Miocene era (5.3 to 23.8 million years ago), the sea covered most of the county and into the Central Valley.⁴² For the past million years, seismic activity, storms and the receding and advancing sea shaped the land. Erosion deposits, sediment, animal carcasses and skeletons formed a thick, mud-like material, contributing to the fertile soils that make Monterey County a productive agricultural center.⁴³

a. Natural Features:

Natural features contributing to Monterey County’s agricultural history include the Pacific Ocean, Monterey Bay, the Pajaro, Salinas, San Antonio and Arroyo Seco rivers, the Elkhorn and Moro Cojo sloughs, the fertile Pajaro and Salinas valleys and the inland hills.


the Monterey County Board of Supervisors, this “souvenir edition” book was published in conjunction with the 1915 Panama-Pacific Exposition in San Francisco and extolled the county’s merits to potential settlers].

⁴¹ Robert B. Johnston, *Old Monterey County: A Pictorial History* (Monterey, CA: Monterey Savings and Loan Association, 1970), 75.

⁴² University of California Museum of Paleontology, “The Miocene Epoch” (Berkeley: University of California Museum of Paleontology, 2002), <http://www.ucmp.berkeley.edu/tertiary/mio.html> (accessed 5 March 2010).

⁴³ Fink, *Monterey: The Presence of the Past*, 7.

The rivers and sloughs are significant in Monterey County's agricultural history because farmers shipped their agricultural products to distant markets via those waterways in the 1800s. When inland goods reached wharves along the Monterey Bay and Pacific Ocean, waiting vessels transported them to San Francisco and other regional markets. The rivers are also important because they provided irrigation water to the fields as early as the 1700s, when the friars at Mission San Antonio de Padua built a water system in the South County. Irrigation projects also enabled agricultural colonies like the Clark Colony (now Greenfield) to develop in the early twentieth century. Without irrigation water from the Arroyo Seco River, the colonists would have been unable to convert sandy, dusty land to fertile orchards and fields.



Frenchman Leon Trousset's 1877 painting looks south towards Moss Landing, the North County's early hub of agricultural shipping. The grain warehouses, wharf, homesteads, ferry and Elkhorn Slough are in the foreground. Moro Cojo Slough is on the left. The old mouth of the Salinas River runs parallel to the beach, on the right. Monterey Bay is also on the right. The town of Castroville lies to the south.⁴⁴

The fertile, alluvial lowlands along the Pajaro and Salinas rivers are significant because they are among the world's most productive agricultural regions, producing billions of dollars of agricultural goods.⁴⁵ Long before settlers planted crops in the valleys, the natural grasses in the valleys fed enormous herds of cattle during the Spanish, Mexican and early American settlement periods. The small but very fertile Pajaro Valley covers roughly 50,000 acres in northern Monterey County and southern Santa Cruz County.⁴⁶ The Pajaro River forms the county line and divides the Pajaro Valley in two. The Monterey County portion is about fifteen miles long (from the Monterey Bay inland) and six to eight miles wide (from the Pajaro River south to Elkhorn Slough).⁴⁷ The Salinas Valley lies between the coastal Santa Lucia Mountains and the

⁴⁴ Clovis, *Monterey County's North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 38. Trousset was related to Cato Vierra, the construction engineer who owned the ferry and built Moss Landing's warehouses, wharf and other facilities.

⁴⁵ Fink, *Monterey: The Presence of the Past*, 165. Hanson, *Geohydrologic Framework of Recharge and Seawater Intrusion in the Pajaro Valley, Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties, California*, 1.

⁴⁶ Hanson, *Geohydrologic Framework of Recharge and Seawater Intrusion in the Pajaro Valley, Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties, California*, 1. Kazuko Nakane, *Nothing Left in My Hands: An Early Japanese American Community in California's Pajaro Valley* (Seattle: Young Pine Press, 1985), 5.

⁴⁷ Nakane, *Nothing Left in My Hands*, 5. Hanson, *Geohydrologic Framework of Recharge and Seawater Intrusion in the Pajaro Valley, Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties, California*, 1.

inland Gabilan Mountains. It is over 100 miles long and contains more than 640,000 acres or 1,000 square miles. The Salinas River forms part of the North County's southwest boundary.⁴⁸

Monterey County's hillsides and interior valleys have historically been grassland, grass-oak woodland and chaparral forest zones.⁴⁹ Water was abundant when Spanish and Mexican settlers arrived in the 1700s. Lakes, ponds, springs and brooks were common and the water table was a few feet below ground. Settlers lived and farmed near the water, using it for animals, crops and households, but floods regularly damaged property and turned valleys into swampy land.⁵⁰

When early settlers modified the landscape to pursue agricultural interests, no environmental controls existed. Farmers sought to use every inch of productive soil, damaging the environment in the process. In the 1850s and '60s, reclamation projects converted marshy areas into productive agricultural land. When farmers planted down to the water's edge, they polluted adjacent waterways with silt and pesticides. Similarly, when settlers cleared hillsides and planted and later removed fruit and eucalyptus trees, erosion resulted. Agricultural experts advised residents to combat erosion by planting Douglas fir trees, a successful experiment that led some North County residents to operate Christmas tree farms. Extensive land clearing and erosion have continued to affect hills, canyons and valleys east of Elkhorn Slough; those hills have the highest rates of soil erosion west of the Mississippi River.⁵¹ Today, organizations like the Elkhorn Slough Foundation educate farmers about the environmental dangers of farming up to the water's edge and work with them to protect and restore lands bordering waterways.⁵² Public and private entities have acquired more than 7,000 acres around the slough to protect it, stabilize and restore the hills and wetlands, and continue farming the land sustainably.⁵³

b. Soils:

Monterey County's most productive and lucrative farmlands are in the North County, Greater Salinas, and Central Salinas Valley Planning Areas, which grow primarily cool season

⁴⁸ Fink, *Monterey: The Presence of the Past*, 8, 136. Dunn, *Monterey County, California*, 3.

⁴⁹ Paul J. Zinke and Constant C. Delwiche, "Soils and Climate," *A Guidebook to California Agriculture* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1983), 51.

⁵⁰ Margolin, *The Ohlone Way*, 8.

⁵¹ County of Monterey Planning Department, *North County Land Use Plan*, 22. Elkhorn Slough Foundation, "ESF acquires Hambey Ranch: A big piece of land in a small watershed" (Moss Landing, CA: Elkhorn Slough Foundation, Summer 2003), <http://www.elkhornslough.org/newsletter/news0307.htm#Hambey>, accessed 17 June 2010. The erosion rate is thirty-three tons per acre annually. Elkhorn Slough Foundation, "Farmers See Stewardship Working: Azevedo Ranch, before and after ten years of stewardship."

⁵² Elkhorn Slough Foundation, "Farmers See Stewardship Working: Azevedo Ranch, before and after ten years of stewardship" (Moss Landing, CA: Elkhorn Slough Foundation, Spring 2003), <http://www.elkhornslough.org/newsletter/news0304.htm#restoration>, accessed 1 May 2010.

⁵³ As of March 2009, entities controlling these lands included the County of Monterey, Elkhorn Slough Foundation, The Nature Conservancy, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, California Department of Fish and Game, Harbor District, State Department of Parks and Recreation and the Agricultural Land Trust. Elkhorn Slough Foundation, "Elkhorn Slough Protected Lands" (Moss Landing, CA: Elkhorn Slough Foundation, March 2009), <http://www.elkhornslough.org/protected.htm>, accessed 1 May 2010.

vegetables, strawberries, wine grapes and nursery crops.⁵⁴ Of approximately 1.3 million acres of agricultural land in the county, about eighty percent is used for grazing.⁵⁵ The South County contains much of the grazing land. Grasses grow well on hillsides, allowing for ranching operations like livestock grazing and growing cereal crops like wheat, grain and barley.⁵⁶

For planning purposes, Monterey County classifies an area's land use capability partly based on soil fertility. Classes I and II are highly productive "prime soils" good for crops or livestock grazing. The Pajaro Valley and coastal Springfield District north of Moss Landing have prime soils. Even Class III and IV "non-prime soils" may produce yields as high as prime soils if the soil quality, location, growing season, irrigation and technology allow. Specialty crops like berries do well on productive non-prime soils.⁵⁷

Alluvium (heavy, rich, bottom land soil made of loose gravel, sand, silt, or clay deposited in flood plains) borders the rivers and extends inland towards the Gabilan Mountains.⁵⁸ Soil in alluvial fans and river terraces is well-drained and irrigated intensive crops like lettuce, artichokes and strawberries grow well in it.⁵⁹ Field, forage, row and truck crops (primarily artichokes, broccoli and celery) grow in loam on flood plains, in swales and terraces. Poorly drained clay soils on flood plains or in basins are used mostly for intensively irrigated row crops like celery, lettuce, broccoli and cauliflower.⁶⁰

Monterey County's fertile soils are a significant contributor to the region's long, prosperous agricultural history. Without them, the region would not have developed into one of the most productive agricultural regions in the world.

3. Climate

Monterey County's mild climate significantly impacts the region's agricultural history because it makes year-round agricultural production possible. The temperate seasons are typical of coastal Central California, with the bulk of the annual precipitation falling in late autumn, winter and spring. Winter is cool and wet; little rain falls in the mild summers. Precipitation generally

⁵⁴ "Chapter 6.0: Agricultural Element," *Monterey County General Plan* (Salinas, CA: County of Monterey, October 26, 2010), AG1.

⁵⁵ "Chapter 6.0: Agricultural Element," *Monterey County General Plan*, AG1.

⁵⁶ Zinke, "Soils and Climate," *A Guidebook to California Agriculture*, 51.

⁵⁷ County of Monterey Planning Department, *North County Land Use Plan*, 45-46.

⁵⁸ U.S. Geological Survey, "Earthquake Glossary: Alluvium," (Reston, Virginia: United States Geological Survey, November 3, 2009), <http://earthquake.usgs.gov/learn/glossary/?term=alluvium> (accessed 8 December 2009).

⁵⁹ Cook, *Soil Survey of Monterey County, California*, 67.

⁶⁰ Cook, *Soil Survey of Monterey County, California*, 17, 56, 86.

increases from south to north.⁶¹ Annual precipitation ranges from fifteen inches in the inland valleys to more than forty inches in the higher mountain ranges.⁶²

The Pajaro Valley benefits from the winds, fog and rain coming ashore from the Monterey Bay.⁶³ The Salinas Valley is America's "salad bowl," the state's biggest vegetable producer. Its three climactic zones support different crops. The coastal zone has relatively high humidity and a narrow temperature range suitable for year-round vegetable production; artichokes do very well there. The adjacent zone is more suitable for truck crops like lettuce, broccoli, celery and carrots. In the third zone, further inland and down the valley, warmer weather crops like tomatoes, beans and cucumbers thrive.⁶⁴

Monterey County's weather cycles have affected the region's agricultural history and cultural landscape. Devastating droughts and floods in the 1860s decimated Monterey County's cattle industry, forcing ranchers and farmers to pursue new opportunities. Some grew grains, transforming their open grazing land to crop fields. Other ranchers experimented with community development, forever changing the cultural landscape from open agricultural land into thriving agricultural towns. For example, in 1863-1864, Juan Castro subdivided part of his vast rancho and created Castroville in the North County, the first subdivision in Monterey County. These developments are discussed further, below.

C. Spanish and Mexican Periods (1769–1848): Missions, Land Grants and Extensive Agriculture

1. Introduction

The Spanish Period (1769-1822) and Mexican Period (1822-1848) were significant in Monterey County's agricultural history for several reasons. First, Spanish missionaries and soldiers introduced *extensive agriculture* (crops and animals requiring a low level of labor and capital relative to a farm's size, e.g., grains and livestock) to the region. Monterey County ranchers and farmers focused mainly on extensive agriculture until the end of the nineteenth century, when *intensive agriculture* became more prominent (crops and animals requiring a high level of labor and capital, e.g., dairying, fruit and vegetables). Second, the missionaries realized the importance of crop irrigation and built an extensive water system at Mission San Antonio de

⁶¹ Gordon, *Monterey Bay Area: Natural History and Cultural Imprints*, 13. Randall T. Hanson, *Geohydrologic Framework of Recharge and Seawater Intrusion in the Pajaro Valley, Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties, California* (Sacramento, CA: U.S. Geological Survey, 2003), 8, <http://pubs.usgs.gov/wri/wri034096/pdf/wri034096.pdf> (accessed 9 December 2009).

⁶² Zinke, "Soils and Climate," *A Guidebook to California Agriculture*, 51.

⁶³ Hanson, *Geohydrologic Framework of Recharge and Seawater Intrusion in the Pajaro Valley, Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties, California*, 8.

⁶⁴ Fink, *Monterey: The Presence of the Past*, 165. Vegetable Specialists and Farm Advisors of Cooperative Extension, "Vegetable Crops," *A Guidebook to California Agriculture* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1983), 162-163.

Padua (1771, National Register, California Historical Landmark, Monterey County Register) in the South County and an aqueduct at Mission Nuestra Señora de la Soledad (1791, California Historical Landmark, Monterey County Register) near Soledad.⁶⁵ Irrigation continues to be a critical component of modern agriculture. Third, Spanish and Mexican settlers expanded the pathways used by the local Ohlone, Salinan and Esselen populations and created new transportation routes to deliver agricultural products in the region. Fourth, Spanish settlers introduced adobe construction and some of the adobe structures associated with Monterey County's early agricultural history still exist. Fifth, Spain and Mexico awarded vast land grants to private ranchers and farmers. Although the owners eventually subdivided these large parcels, many modern Monterey County farms are still much larger than elsewhere in America, a testament to the size of these original land grants. All of these developments significantly modified the cultural landscape in ways that are recognizable today.

Given the age, rarity and agricultural significance of properties from the Spanish and Mexican Periods, any extant property or archaeological resource dating from those eras is potentially eligible for listing in the National Register, California Register and/or the Monterey County Register if its significance is confirmed and it retains historic integrity.

2. Spanish Period (1769 – 1822)

Monterey County agriculture is a relatively recent phenomenon, starting in earnest during the Spanish settlement period.⁶⁶ Although Spaniards visited the area in 1595 and 1602, they did not establish permanent settlements until after Captain Gaspar de Portolá and Father Junípero Serra led the 1769 Portolá Expedition up the California coast. The party of explorers, soldiers, cowboys and animals left San Diego on July 14, 1769 and by September arrived in present-day Monterey County.⁶⁷ During this trip, they named the Pajaro River and in 1770 founded the Presidio of Monterey and Mission San Carlos Borromeo in Monterey (later moved to Carmel).⁶⁸ In 1771, Father Serra returned to Monterey County, founded additional missions and introduced agriculture to the local Ohlone, Salinan and Esselen populations.

Five thousand years before the Spanish arrived, the Ohlone, Salinan and Esselen people had already begun converting the natural landscape into a cultural landscape. Foreshadowing the agricultural practices of later settlers, they manipulated the environment to improve their food supply, organized their labor and collected, processed, dried and stored their harvests.⁶⁹ Fortified

⁶⁵ Galvin Preservation Associates, Inc., *Monterey County Parks Reconnaissance Survey of Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area* [hereafter, Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*] (Redondo Beach, CA: Galvin Preservation Associates, Inc., October 2009), 45.

⁶⁶ Gordon, *Monterey Bay Area: Natural History and Cultural Imprints*, 6.

⁶⁷ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 37-38.

⁶⁸ Fink, *Monterey: The Presence of the Past*, 17-24, 30, 37, 40, 43. Gordon, *Monterey Bay Area: Natural History and Cultural Imprints*, 166. In 1769, Father Crespi wrote that soldiers named the river the Rio del Pajaro (Bird River) after a large dead condor hanging from a pole in an Ohlone village on the river bank.

⁶⁹ Margolin, *The Ohlone Way*, 41-43, 45, 52. The Ohlones stored dried acorns in hampers and acorn granaries — large, basket-like containers on stilts. Mugwort and aromatic herbs drove away insects and helped prevent mold.

by acorns, wildlife and plants, the local population did not have the tools or the need to engage in most of what the Monterey County Code (MCC) considers “agriculture” (e.g., cultivating soil, planting crops, horticulture and raising animals). Instead, they practiced MCC’s “wildlife management” form of agriculture: hunting and gathering food and burning the land. Their deliberate fires altered the region’s appearance and ecology and created a cultural landscape. Fire germinated food sources, encouraged grass and flower growth, prevented brush from invading food-rich meadows, provided good game habitat and prevented larger fires.⁷⁰

When the Spanish introduced crop and livestock agriculture to Monterey County’s Ohlone, Salinan and Esselen people, they changed the population’s social, cultural, political and economic practices and altered the cultural landscape in ways that are still evident today.⁷¹

a. Spanish Missions, Presidios and Pueblos

During the Spanish period, Monterey County residents relied on outside trade for most provisions rather than developing their own agriculture or other significant commerce.⁷² Abundant fertile land existed but agriculture was limited by primitive equipment, basic cultivation methods and a dwindling Ohlone, Salinan and Esselen workforce, decimated by disease and the virtual slavery system that held them.

Monterey County agriculture in this era consisted primarily of cattle ranching and grain production, types of *extensive agriculture* (animals and crops that require a low level of labor and capital relative to the size of the farmed area).⁷³ Missionaries and soldiers grew food for subsistence and used cattle hides and tallow in trade. For some time, the missions were the only “farms” producing food in California. The first California wheat harvest occurred around 1770 at the San Diego Mission. In 1771, missionaries planted the first barley (the primary livestock feed) at Mission San Antonio de Padua in the Monterey County settlement of Jolon in the South County. Grains were important cool-season crops, grown with little or no irrigation.⁷⁴ Ranching and farming expanded beyond the missions when Monterey Presidio soldiers used rudimentary

⁷⁰ Gordon, *Monterey Bay Area: Natural History and Cultural Imprints*, 4, 6. Margolin, *The Ohlone Way*, 24, 29, 49. County of Monterey, California, “Monterey County Code,” Title 21, Chapter 21.06, Section 21.06.010 (Tallahassee, FL: Municipal Code Corporation, 2009), http://library.municode.com/HTML/16111/level2/T21_C21.06.html#T21_C21.06_21.06.010 (accessed 22 January 2010).

⁷¹ Malcolm Margolin, Editor, *The Way We Lived: California Indian Stories, Songs & Reminiscences* (Berkeley: Heyday Books, 1993), 1, 6. Malcolm Margolin, *The Ohlone Way: Indian Life in the San Francisco-Monterey Bay Area* (Berkeley: Heyday Books, 1978), 1-3, 59, 62-63.

⁷² Holliday, *Rush for Riches*, 27.

⁷³ Steven Stoll, *The Fruits of Natural Advantage: Making the Industrial Countryside in California* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), xiii-xiv.

⁷⁴ Members of the Department of Agronomy and Range Science, U.C. Davis, “Field Crops,” *A Guidebook to California Agriculture* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1983), 109, 111, 113-114.

plows to cultivate four acres of wheat, beans, barley and rice.⁷⁵ Soldiers also brought Spanish beef cattle from Baja California.⁷⁶

Spanish missionaries forced the local Ohlone, Salinan and Esselen populations to adopt Christianity and work at the missions cultivating crops, raising livestock, preparing hides and tallow, making soap, building adobe structures, forging tools, working leather, spinning and weaving. After Mexico secularized the missions in 1834, some Ohlone, Salinan and Esselen people worked as servants or ranch hands, either voluntarily or as forced laborers after being accused of vagrancy and failing to show sufficient funds. Ranchers bid for them, paid the State and gave the laborers only room and board. Others returned to the hunter-gatherer life, married into the community or formed villages.⁷⁷

Mission San Antonio de Padua (1771, National Register, California Historical Landmark, Monterey County Register) was the South County's first permanent settlement and first agrarian community.⁷⁸ The mission grounds are northwest of Jolon on Fort Hunter Liggett land.⁷⁹ In 1771, Fathers Junípero Serra, Miguel Pieras and Buenaventura Sitjar co-founded the mission near the San Antonio River. After a 1772 drought, they moved the mission to its current location in the Los Robles Valley. It was the third and one of the largest of California's twenty-one missions and had access to water, arable land, trade routes and the Salinan people. The mission's Salinan population peaked around 1,000 people but declined in the early 1800s.⁸⁰ The settlers built a water system and at least three outposts. Archaeological deposits likely exist around the mission, outposts and outlying areas.

The Spanish missionaries taught the Salinans adobe construction in the Spanish tradition. The self-sustaining mission's religious, social and economic functions dictated the complex's layout, which originally included a chapel, a small sacristy, houses, store rooms, outbuildings (*e.g.*, facilities for making soap, candles, weavings and leather goods), vineyards, orchards and priests' property on thirty-three acres. Built on the flat valley floor, the mission's rectangular main compound had a central courtyard with a chapel in the middle and other buildings around it. Cattle grazed on hundreds of surrounding acres. An outbuilding was located on the San Antonio River, southeast of the mission. Reflecting their inferior status, the Salinan residents (called "neophytes") lived apart north of the mission in long, adobe dormitories with tile roofs laid over

⁷⁵ Fink, *Monterey: The Presence of the Past*, 42-43, 45, 47. The San José pueblo, near the Santa Clara Mission, was also an agricultural base for the Bay Area presidios.

⁷⁶ Fink, *Monterey: The Presence of the Past*, 42-43, 45, 47. The San José pueblo, near the Santa Clara Mission, was also an agricultural base for the Bay Area presidios.

⁷⁷ Margolin, *The Ohlone Way*, 162, 164-167.

⁷⁸ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 37-39. "Monterey County Register of Historic Resources as of January 2010" (Salinas, CA: County of Monterey, 2010). California Office of Historic Preservation, "California Historical Landmarks: Monterey County" (Sacramento, CA: California Office of Historic Preservation, 2010), http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=21441 (accessed, 14 December 2010).

⁷⁹ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 42.

⁸⁰ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 38, 40. Don Howard, *Lost Adobes of Monterey County*, (Carmel, CA: Monterey County Archaeological Society, 1973), 82. Father Sitjar worked at the San Antonio Mission for thirty-seven years.

reeds. Unmarried men and women lived in separate dormitories. Married couples and children lived in adobe houses with rows of rooms primarily for sleeping.⁸¹

The Salinans built an elaborate water system at Mission San Antonio to operate a gristmill, irrigate field crops and orchards, and water gardens. Part of it is still extant. The water system included a sixty-five foot long mortar and rock dam; canals; underground aqueducts; diversion weirs; a water wheel; ponds; reservoirs; and stone-lined irrigation ditches for the corn and wheat fields.⁸² The canal carried water from San Miguel Creek to the mission. Water flowed southeast to the mission's living quarters, pooled in an area called "Mill Pond," and the inhabitants likely used this water for a variety of purposes. The aqueduct continued southeast of the mission and split into two channels to surround and irrigate the agricultural fields. The aqueduct's western branch curved back toward San Miguel Creek, south of the mission, near the tannery and gristmill. The water powered the gristmill as it ground wheat into flour. The mission also had a circular threshing ground for wheat.⁸³ Mission San Antonio's water system was the first and most elaborate water system of the California missions and its remains are significant as an individual resource.⁸⁴

The missionaries taught the Salinans to grow crops on small plots.⁸⁵ Crops included fruit, olives, grapes, wheat and corn. Fields and trees were fenced off to keep livestock out. The fenced-in area included the vineyardist's adobe house, which may have doubled as a winemaking room. The Salinans dried and stored the fruit, pressed olives into oil, made wine for the missionaries and fed grain to the livestock. They also sent grapes to Monterey for trade. Trained to be cowboys ("vaqueros"), the Salinans raised and drove the livestock, including large herds of cattle, sheep and horses. They branded cattle, rounded them up in late summer and early fall, and sold them for their hides, tallow and dried meat. Some livestock were corralled in an area east of the mission, but most cattle roamed freely in the valley, hills and mountains.⁸⁶

Mission San Antonio outposts included adobe corrals, houses for *vaqueros* tending cattle, and the so-called "Indian's Adobe." The "**Indian's Adobe**" ruins (circa 1860, Monterey County Register) are along Milpitas Road about one mile north of the mission, on the former Milpitas Rancho.⁸⁷ The adobe may have housed the person responsible for maintaining the mission's water system. At one point, the Salinan family of Eusebio and Perfecta Encinales lived in the Indian's Adobe while Eusebio worked 500 acres at the head of the San Antonio Valley, irrigating

⁸¹ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 39-42.

⁸² Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 39, 45. Meg Welden, "The Key to the Garden: Water Development in Monterey County," *Noticias del Puerto de Monterey* (Monterey, CA: Monterey History and Art Association, Ltd., September 1993), 1.

⁸³ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 40.

⁸⁴ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 45.

⁸⁵ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 39. Susan Raycraft and Ann Kennan Beckett, *Images of America: San Antonio Valley* (San Francisco, CA: Arcadia Publishing, 2006), 21.

⁸⁶ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 39-40.

⁸⁷ "Monterey County Register of Historic Resources as of January 2010." Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 41, 53.

a vineyard and orchard, and raising sheep, hogs and cattle.⁸⁸ It was a modest, rectangular, unfinished adobe building with a gable roof covered in Spanish tiles. It had small window openings, hand-hewn lintels, a rough coursed exterior, a fireplace and tile floor.⁸⁹

Ruins of the *Los Ojitos Adobe*, another mission outpost, are still extant along the San Antonio River. The site housed the mission *vaqueros* and served as a main cattle watering hole during dry months. The adobe was originally 39 by 29 feet and had two rooms, a covered porch, thick adobe walls, and huge redwood beams, lashed together with rawhide to support the roof. The east room had a fireplace with floor tiles and the window had a hand-hewn lintel. The outpost grounds also included a corral and possibly two other adobe buildings. A ranching operation eventually bought the site and it served as the area's first post office.⁹⁰ A third mission outpost was located just north of the present community of San Lucas.⁹¹

On October 9, 1791, Father Fermin Francisco de Lasuen founded *Mission Nuestra Señora de la Soledad* (1791, California Historical Landmark, Monterey County Register).⁹² The reconstructed chapel is at 36641 Fort Romie Road near Soledad. The mission's twenty-acre vineyard occupied a canyon about three-and-a-half miles southwest of the mission; it had 5,000 vines by 1836.⁹³ Other crops included barley, cherries, corn, cotton, figs, flax, garbanzo beans, grapes, hemp, horsebeans, olives, oranges, pears, peas, plums, tobacco and wheat. Salinan laborers built a fifteen-mile aqueduct to irrigate 20,000 acres of crops. The missionaries also raised cattle, chickens, goats, horses, pigs and sheep. Typical of the time, cattle hides and tallow were the mission's main agricultural products.⁹⁴ In 1840, Mexico granted to José de la Torre 16,916 acres of former mission land called Rancho Arroyo Seco.⁹⁵ The mission was in ruins by 1841 and the vineyard and orchards had deteriorated.⁹⁶ In 1841, Feliciano Soberanes became

⁸⁸ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 41, 54. Robert B. Johnston, *A Brief History of Southern Monterey County* (Salinas, CA: The Monterey County Historical Society, May 2002), 6.

⁸⁹ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 41.

⁹⁰ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 41, 53. Susan Raycraft and Ann Kennan Beckett, *Images of America: San Antonio Valley* (San Francisco, CA: Arcadia Publishing, 2006), 34. Don Howard, *Lost Adobes of Monterey County*, (Carmel, CA: Monterey County Archaeological Society, 1973), 85-86.

⁹¹ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 41.

⁹² Maynard Geiger, *Franciscan Missionaries in Hispanic California, 1769-1848* (San Marino, CA: The Huntington Library, 1969), 137. "Timeline: Mission Soledad Vineyard and Olson Farm," Monterey County Historical File: Ft. Romie. California Office of Historic Preservation, "California Historical Landmarks: Monterey County" (Sacramento, CA: California Office of Historic Preservation, 2010), http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=21441 (accessed, 14 December 2010).

⁹³ Edith Buckland Webb, *Indian Life at the Old Missions* (Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press, 1982), 98. Hubert Howe Bancroft, *History of California, Volume 3: 1825-1840* (San Francisco: The History Company, 1885), 353, 690, n.14.

⁹⁴ Meg Welden, "The Key to the Garden: Water Development in Monterey County," *Noticias del Puerto de Monterey* (Monterey, CA: Monterey History and Art Association, Ltd., September 1993), 1. Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Historic Overview, 1.

⁹⁵ "Timeline: Mission Soledad Vineyard and Olson Farm," Monterey County Historical File: Ft. Romie.

⁹⁶ Eugene Dufлот du Mofras, *Dufлот de Mofras' Travels on the Pacific Coast, Volume 1* (Santa Ana, CA: Fine Arts Press, 1937), 205.

administrator of other Soledad Mission lands and later acquired the land by Mexican grant.⁹⁷ In 1859, Joseph Sadoc Alemany, the Roman Catholic Bishop of the Diocese of Monterey, received a patent for the mission's former twenty-acre vineyard.⁹⁸ The chapel fell into ruins after 1874 but the Native Daughters of the Golden West reconstructed and rededicated it in October 1955.⁹⁹

After Mexico secularized the missions in 1833, the innovative and extensive irrigation systems at Mission San Antonio and Mission Soledad were abandoned.¹⁰⁰ Canal-based irrigation did not return to Monterey County until the 1880s.¹⁰¹

b. Transportation Routes

The missions changed Monterey County's cultural landscape beyond the mission complexes themselves, including expanding existing footpaths and building new roads to transport agricultural products and connect the missions, presidios, pueblos and related outposts. The transportation routes generally followed natural low lands and waterways.

El Camino Real began as a footpath closely following the 1769 Portola Expedition route along rivers, valleys and canyons and it eventually connected all of the missions. El Camino Real segments still exist near Jolon.¹⁰² Missionaries and laborers also used foot and horse trails and roads to access mission outbuildings and outposts. The *vaqueros* drove cattle to the outposts and to the Port of Monterey for slaughter. Horses and oxen pulled carts of hides and tallow through the Quinado Canyon to the north of the Jolon Valley and on to Monterey. A *carreta* (a two-wheeled oxcart) trail ran from Mission San Antonio north to over Reliz Canyon to Soledad and up the Salinas Valley to Monterey. Mission Road connected the mission to the San Antonio River and Jolon Valley. It is paved and still exists today. The route originally continued into the Santa Lucia Mountains towards the coast.¹⁰³ Another route southwest of Mission San Antonio traversed the mountains and was likely the path of present-day Nacimiento-Fergusson Road. Later South County maps also show a route from the south that follows the San Antonio River, traversing the Pleito Canyon area near the San Antonio Reservoir.¹⁰⁴

The town of Jolon developed on the site of a former Salinan village. It was part of Mission San Antonio's original holdings, five miles from the mission. Salinans later lived, worked and

⁹⁷ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I, Historic Overview*, 3. Feliciano Soberanes was the father of María Joséfa Soberanes de Richardson, who received the grant for the nearby 8,994-acre Los Coches Rancho 1841.

⁹⁸ "Timeline: Mission Soledad Vineyard and Olson Farm," Monterey County Historical File: Ft. Romie.

⁹⁹ California Office of Historic Preservation, "California Historical Landmarks: Monterey County," http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=21441.

¹⁰⁰ Welden, "The Key to the Garden: Water Development in Monterey County," 1.

¹⁰¹ Welden, "The Key to the Garden: Water Development in Monterey County," 3.

¹⁰² Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 41, 63.

¹⁰³ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 41.

¹⁰⁴ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 41.

attended mass at the mission.¹⁰⁵ Because of its proximity to the mission, Jolon became a major stage stop on El Camino Real, which ran roughly along the route of today’s Jolon Road. Spain and Mexico awarded four land grants near Jolon: Rancho Los Milpitas (Little Gardens), Rancho San Miguelito (Little St. Michael), Rancho El Piojo (The Louse), Rancho Los Ositos (The Little Bears).¹⁰⁶ From 1855 to the late 1880s (shortly after the Southern Pacific Railroad came to the South County), the stagecoach route served as a mail route through Jolon. The town was a major trading post for workers in the Los Burros mines (southwest of Jolon, between present-day Fort Hunter Liggett and the Pacific Ocean) and for settlers on the Big Sur coast.¹⁰⁷

A new road later paralleled the rail line, replacing formerly important transportation routes like El Camino Real. After the railroad bypassed it, Jolon lost its status as a main stagecoach stop.¹⁰⁸ In its heyday, Jolon had the Dutton Hotel, the Tidball Store, three saloons, two blacksmith shops, two stores, a large dance hall, jail, Episcopal



Dutton Hotel and the Jolon Station, Jolon, unknown date. (Courtesy of County of Monterey Agriculture and Rural Life Museum photo archives).

church, livery stable, a Chinatown for Chinese gold panners, a Chinese laundry and two places called China Gulch. The deteriorated remains of the *Dutton Hotel* (1850-1874 period of significance) on Jolon Road are listed in the National Register of Historic Places and the Monterey County Register.¹⁰⁹ Antonio Ramirez of Monterey built the Dutton Hotel around 1860 and mission Salinans made the adobe bricks. Lieutenant George Dutton and Captain Tidball acquired the property and remodeled and enlarged it in 1876. Dutton’s family sold it to William

¹⁰⁵ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 118. Donald Thomas Clark, *Monterey County Place Names*, 275. Mabey E. Plaskett and Marno Dutton Thompson, “Jolon Remembered as Thriving Community on Camino Real,” *The Land*, March 1963.

¹⁰⁶ Plaskett, “Jolon Remembered as Thriving Community on Camino Real.”

¹⁰⁷ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 118.

¹⁰⁸ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 117.

¹⁰⁹ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 118. “Monterey County Register of Historic Resources as of January 2010.”

Randolph Hearst in 1929.¹¹⁰ The *Tidball Store* (1875-1899) on Jolon Road is listed in the National Register and the Monterey County Register.¹¹¹

c. Spanish Land Grants

Around 1775, Spain brought Mexican settlers to California and eventually awarded several large land grants. Land grants were a significant development in Monterey County’s agricultural history because they allowed ranchers to conduct extensive agriculture on a grand scale beyond the limited mission confines. Rancho owners raised cattle and grew crops to supply the local population’s needs. Originally unfenced, the ranchos and later subdivisions established property boundaries that are still evident today.¹¹² Before Spanish rule ended in 1822, California residents acquired twenty-five major land grants ranging from 4,000—300,000 acres.¹¹³ That pattern of land distribution continued in the Mexican Period (1822-1848). A map of the Spanish and Mexican land grants and a chart listing the grantee, grant date and size follows Section 3, below.

3. Mexican Period (1822 – 1848)

Mexico declared its independence from Spain in 1822 and Americans and foreigners moved to California seeking landowning opportunities. Some married into local Mexican families, became Mexican citizens and obtained land grants. The new landowners built adobe buildings and raised longhorn cattle on vast, open acreage.¹¹⁴

a. Mexican Land Grants

In April 1822, mission padres and Presidio of Monterey officers swore allegiance to Mexico and the new government gave Presidio commandants and pueblo *alcades* (municipal magistrates) authority to grant land to individuals. Mexico secularized the missions in 1834 (they became parish churches) and distributed former mission lands to encourage agriculture and industry, reward soldiers and provide land to settlers.¹¹⁵ From 1822-1848, Mexico awarded almost forty Monterey County land grants.¹¹⁶ Mexico awarded no South County land grants between 1822-1831. Instead, the Mission San Antonio padres established a few outposts and ranches to

¹¹⁰ Mabey E. Plaskett and Marno Dutton Thompson, “Jolon Remembered as Thriving Community on Camino Real,” *The Land*, March 1963.

¹¹¹ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 118. “Monterey County Register of Historic Resources as of January 2010.”

¹¹² Fink, *Monterey: The Presence of the Past*, 56, 67 and Appendix.

¹¹³ Nuckton, *et al.*, “California Agriculture: The Human Story,” *A Guidebook to California Agriculture*, 10.

¹¹⁴ Fink, *Monterey: The Presence of the Past*, 53, 69.

¹¹⁵ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 51.

¹¹⁶ Nuckton, *et al.*, “California Agriculture: The Human Story,” *A Guidebook to California Agriculture*, 10. The 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo guaranteed existing Mexican property rights, but enforcement was spotty. Some wealthy Americans managed to buy large parcels that were exempt from the 1841 Pre-Emption Act and the 1862 Homestead Act and could not be sold to settlers in 160-acre parcels.

manage the mission's cattle herds. Between 1838-1846, Mexico awarded eleven South County grants, carving some from former mission pastures and crop fields.¹¹⁷ Many grantees were Mexican or Spanish and the South County retained their values and traditions.¹¹⁸

Land grant applicants chose the most desirable properties, often in valleys and hillsides with good grazing land. As Monterey County developed and owners subdivided their vast parcels, important agricultural communities developed on these former ranchos in the North County, Salinas Valley and South County. These communities are described later in this chapter.

b. Adobe Construction and the “Monterey Colonial” Style

Land grantees had to build a dwelling within one year, erect fences and possibly plant fruit trees on the boundaries.¹¹⁹ Ranchos generally had a simple house and rudimentary outbuildings made of adobe and timber, a small vegetable garden and open grazing fields.¹²⁰ Adobe buildings from this period had three-foot thick walls, thatched roofs, dirt floors and simple plans. Rooms were generally arranged in a row with connecting doorways or doorways leading to a common yard.¹²¹

The Salinas Valley included at least four adobe residences associated with the Soberanes family's ranches and farms.¹²² Mexico granted the family's application for the former Soledad Mission lands and the family built three adobes along Fort Romie Road between Mission Soledad and the Salinas River: the *Dudgeon/Duncan Adobe*; the *Barloggi/Costa Adobe*; and the *Soberanes Adobe* (no longer standing) on the D'Arrigo Brothers' Ranch Eleven.¹²³

The fourth Soberanes adobe is the *Los Coches* or *Richardson Adobe* (1843, California Historical Landmark, National Register, Monterey County Register) at the northwest corner of Highway 101 and Arroyo Seco Road, south of Soledad.¹²⁴ In 1841, Governor Juan Bautista Alvarado granted the 8,994-acre Rancho Los Coches to María Joséfa Soberanes de Richardson. Maria's husband, William Brunner Richardson, built the adobe in 1843, planted locust trees in 1846 and

¹¹⁷ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 53.

¹¹⁸ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 54. The Galvin report contains descriptions of the South County ranchos and original rancho buildings that have been demolished. Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 57-67, 74-79. The former 13,299-acre Pleyto (Pleito) Rancho is submerged beneath the San Antonio Reservoir. In 1868, William Pinkerton bought the former land Pleyto (Pleito) land grant. He and his partner Jackson raised sheep and grew wheat, grain, fruit, vines and timber. The former El Piojo and San Miguelito ranchos are on Fort Hunter Liggett land, beyond the scope of this historic context statement. In the 1800s, the Newhall Land and Farming Company combined the two ranchos into a 35,465-acre ranch, where it raised one of the largest cattle herds in California.

¹¹⁹ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 52.

¹²⁰ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 53-54.

¹²¹ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Historic Overview, 4.

¹²² Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Introduction, 4. The ranches relied on water from the Salinas River and local wells. Floods damaged or destroyed some of the ancillary farming structures closer to the river, but the adobes survived in part because they were located on higher ground.

¹²³ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Introduction, 4; Historic Overview, 3. The Soberanes family was closely related to Governor Juan Bautista Alvarado's wife.

¹²⁴ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Introduction, 4; Historic Overview, 3.

made wooden additions to the adobe in 1848.¹²⁵ It later served as a Wells Fargo Station Agent office and post office. Between 1854-68, it served Bixby Overland Stage passengers as an inn and stop along the San Francisco-Los Angeles route.¹²⁶ The Los Coches Inn lost money and the Richardsons took a high interest rate loan from wealthy landowner David Jacks. Jacks foreclosed on the property in 1865 but it took him three years to get the family to leave.¹²⁷ Jacks raised cattle and sheep there and the adobe continued to serve as an inn.¹²⁸

On December 20, 1872, the Southern Pacific Railroad extended its tracks from Salinas to Soledad, the railroad terminus until 1886. The Coast Line Stage Company operated stage coaches south from Soledad and travelers stayed at the Los Coches/Richardson Adobe while awaiting transportation.¹²⁹ After Jacks died in 1909, the David Jacks Corporation established several dairies on the property, west of Highway 101.¹³⁰ The Jacks family donated the Los Coches/Richardson Adobe and ten adjacent acres to the State of California in 1958.¹³¹ It became a travelers' campground but has been vacant since the State transferred it to the City of Soledad in the 1980s.¹³² When the City of Soledad raises funds to complement a \$300,000 California Cultural and Historic Endowment grant it received in 2008, it plans to rehabilitate the adobe as a museum and visitor's center, interpreting the area's transportation and agricultural history.¹³³

During the heyday of adobe construction, new Monterey County residents brought advanced carpentry skills and introduced new architectural styles. Thomas Larkin's home was the first two-story home in the county (built in 1835 at 464 Calle Principal, Monterey, outside the scope of this historic context statement). Built with a redwood frame and adobe walls, the property is a National Historic Landmark and California Historical Landmark and is part of Monterey State Historic Park. Based on Larkin's house, the "Monterey Colonial" style soon spread beyond the City of Monterey. Governor Alvarado and the Soberanes, Abrego, Amesti and Pacheco families built new homes or remodeled existing homes in the style.¹³⁴ The Soberanes family added a

¹²⁵ "California Historical Landmarks: Monterey County," California Office of Historic Preservation, http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=21441 (accessed 13 December 2011). Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Historic Overview, 3.

¹²⁶ "California Historical Landmarks: Monterey County," California Office of Historic Preservation, http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=21441.

¹²⁷ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Historic Overview, 3. David Jacks had a big impact on Monterey County agriculture. His contributions are explained later in this historic context statement.

¹²⁸ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Historic Overview, 3.

¹²⁹ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Historic Overview, 3.

¹³⁰ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Historic Overview, 3.

¹³¹ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Historic Overview, 3. Jimmy Costello, "Monterey Lost Rich Heritage to Shrewd Scot," *Monterey Peninsula Herald*, 1963.

¹³² "Los Coches Adobe," City of Soledad, <http://www.ci.soledad.ca.us/index.aspx?NID=330> (accessed 20 January 2011).

¹³³ "Los Coches Adobe," City of Soledad, <http://www.ci.soledad.ca.us/index.aspx?NID=330> (accessed 20 January 2011).

¹³⁴ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Historic Overview, 2. California Office of Historic Preservation, "California Historical Landmarks: Monterey County" (Sacramento, CA: California Office of Historic Preservation, 2010), http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=21441 (accessed, 14 December 2010).

second story to the Los Coches/Richardson Adobe and the owner of Rancho Buena Vista also added a second story to at least one adobe.¹³⁵

c. Agricultural Commerce

During the Mexican Period, Monterey County agriculture continued to focus on the hide and tallow trade established during the Spanish Period.¹³⁶ California received only one supply ship per year in the Spanish era, limiting trade to mostly within California. After 1822, the Mexican government built a Custom House in Monterey and opened the Monterey Bay to foreign trade so cattle ranchers could exchange their products for goods produced elsewhere.¹³⁷

Water woes delayed Monterey County's agricultural development and limited the products available for trade. In 1837, *HMS Sulphur* Midshipman Francis Simpkinson noted that "The only inconvenience at Monterey and the only thing that nature has not supplied them with is water . . . nothing is grown about Monterey and the people are dependent on the few ranchos about San Francisco for whatever they may require."¹³⁸ They relied on East Coast merchants like Boston's Bryant & Sturgis firm, which controlled most of California's trade by 1823 and offered "leather dollars" or "California bank notes" to missions and ranchers, exchanging cattle hides for goods. The hide trade peaked from 1822-1846: tons of tallow and more than a million hides became candles, soap and leather products. The meat was not sold, generally.

Monterey County pioneers focused on survival. Like their Ohlone, Esselen and Salinan predecessors, they did not have the tools to develop significant agriculture and land values represented grazing potential rather than soil fertility.¹³⁹ In 1831, California produced only 115,000 bushels of grains and vegetables. In 1832, the missions owned about 151,000 cattle; 14,000 horses; and 140,000 sheep, goats and pigs. When Mexico secularized the missions in 1834, the ranchos produced little or no milk, butter or cheese.¹⁴⁰

By 1846, California's population was still low: 6,900 Californios, 6,200 native residents and 77 foreigners (mostly Americans).¹⁴¹ After the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo ended the two-

James Dillon, "National Register of Historic Places Inventory-Nomination Form: Larkin House" (Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, 1976), <http://pdfhost.focus.nps.gov/docs/NHLS/Text/66000215.pdf> (accessed 14 January 2010). By 1835, twenty-five Monterey residents worked in the building trades.

¹³⁵ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Historic Overview, 2-3. (Draft) Historic Preservation Plan, County of Monterey, January 2000, 9.

¹³⁶ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Historic Overview, 2.

¹³⁷ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Historic Overview, 2.

¹³⁸ Sandy Lydon, "History of Monterey Bay," Cabrillo class materials. Jane Borg Collection.

¹³⁹ Burton Anderson, *The Salinas Valley: A History of America's Salad Bowl* (Salinas, CA: Monterey County Historical Society Publications, 2000), 13.


¹⁴⁰ J. S. Holliday, *Rush for Riches: Gold Fever and the Making of California* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1999), 18-19, 23, 27. "Bryant & Sturgis (Boston, Mass.) records, 1801-1872 (inclusive): A Finding Aid" (Boston: President and Fellows of Harvard College, 2009)

<http://oasis.lib.harvard.edu/oasis/deliver/~bak00113>, accessed 25 June 2010.

¹⁴¹ Holliday, *Rush for Riches*, 27.

year Mexican-American War, the United States acquired California and a new era dawned.¹⁴² Political changes and the Gold Rush brought a flood of new residents and prompted new agricultural developments during the American settlement period.

The Spanish and Mexican Periods were significant in Monterey County’s agricultural development because the Spanish and Mexican land grants became the future ranches and farms of the American period. Commercial agriculture in California began on a grand scale because of large land grants, open land unimpeded by forests, and few settlers who required housing.¹⁴³ Details of the Spanish and Mexican land grants follow.



Map of Monterey County Ranchos. Courtesy Donald Thomas Clark, *Monterey County Place Names* (Carmel Valley, CA: Kestrel Press, 1991)

¹⁴² Fink, *Monterey: The Presence of the Past*, 93.

¹⁴³ Nuckton, et al., “California Agriculture: The Human Story,” *A Guidebook to California Agriculture*, 10.

RANCHO	DATE	ACRES	GRANTEE¹⁴⁴
<i>North County:</i>			
Bolsa de San Cayetano	1824	8,866	Ignacio V. F. Vallejo
Bolsa del Moro Cojo	1825, '36-37, '44	30,901	Simeon Castro
Bolsa Nueva	1829, 1836	-----	Francisco Soto
Cañada de Carpenteria	1845	2,236	Joaquín Soto
Familia Sagrada/Bolsa del Potrero Moro Cojo	1822	6,916	José Joaquín de la Torre
Los Carneros (east of Prunedale)	1842	1,629	María Antonia Linares
Los Carneros (north of Prunedale)	1834	4,482	David Littlejohn
Vega del Rio de Pajaro	1820	4,310	Antonio María Castro
<i>Salinas Valley:</i>			
Arroyo Seco	1840	16,523	Joaquín de la Torre
Buena Vista	1822-23	7,726	Santiago & José Estrada
El Alisal	1823 & '34	5,941	Feliciano Soberanes
Guadalupe y Llanitos de Los Correos	1833	8,859	Juan Malarín
Llano de Buena Vista	1822-23	8,446	Santiago & José Estrada
Los Coches	1841	8,794	Joséfa Soberanes
Nacional	1839	6,633	Vicente Cantua
Paraje de Sanchez	1839	6,584	Francisco Lugo
Rincon de la Punta Del Monte	1836	15,219	Teodoro Gonzales
Salinas	1836	4,414	Gabriel Espinosa
San Vicente	1835	19,979	Francisco E. Munrás
Santa Rosa de Chualar	1839	8,890	Juan Malarín
Soledad Mission Lands	1846	8,900	Feliciano Soberanes
Zanjones	1839	6,714	Gabriel de la Torre
<i>South County:</i>			
El Piojo	1842	13,329	Joaquín Soto
Los Ojitos	1842	8,900	Mariano Soberanes
Milpitas	1838	43,281	Ignacio Pastor
Pleyto	1845	13,299	José Antonio Chavez
Poza de Los Ositos	1839	16,939	Carlos Espinosa
San Benito	1842	6,671	Francisco Garcia
San Bernabe	1841 & '42	13,297	Petronilo Rios
San Bernardo	1841	13,346	José M. Soberanes
San Lorenzo	1841	21,884	Feliciano Soberanes
San Lorenzo/Peachtree	1842	22,264	Francisco Rico
San Lorenzo/Topo	1846	48,286	Rafael Sanchez
San Lucas	1842	8,875	Rafael Estrada
San Miguelito de Trinidad	1841	22,136	Rafael Gonzales

¹⁴⁴ Fink, *Monterey: The Presence of the Past*, Appendix. Land grants were originally designated by leagues rather than acres. Often, the boundaries were vague and the amount of land included in the grant was not known exactly.

D. EARLY AMERICAN PERIOD (ca. 1848–1890): LAND GRANT SUBDIVISIONS, HOMESTEADING AND TRANSITIONS IN EXTENSIVE AGRICULTURE

1. Introduction: Statehood, Settlers and Subdivisions

During the Early American Period (ca. 1848-1890), various geographical, environmental, social, cultural, political, governmental and technological factors shaped Monterey County's agricultural development. This period was significant because after the Gold Rush, rancho owners began subdividing their unfenced, vast holdings into smaller, sometimes fenced farm parcels and town lots, changing the cultural landscape. Similarly, homesteaders established small, 160-acre farmsteads on government lands throughout the county. From the mid- to late-nineteenth century, ranches and farms transitioned among different types of **extensive agriculture** (animals and crops requiring a low level of labor and capital relative to the farm's size). Beef cattle gave way to grain fields, potatoes and beans.

California and Monterey County had low populations before the Gold Rush, but immigrants flooded in after rumors of potential riches traveled the world. In the first two years of statehood (1850-1852), California's population jumped from 92,597 to 265,000 and Monterey County's population rose from 1,872 to 2,700. Monterey County's population doubled between 1852 and 1860, when its 4,739 residents included six Chinese.¹⁴⁵ In the ensuing decades, many ethnic groups converted Monterey County into a highly productive agricultural center.

Initially, newcomers were far more interested in mining gold than tilling soil. In 1850, three-quarters of male Californians were miners. When gold fortunes proved elusive, former miners sought new work and some started farming in Monterey County.¹⁴⁶ As new residents clamored for land, Congress created the United States Land Commission in 1851 to review Spanish and Mexican land grants and open invalid claims for settlement. But by the mid-1860s, still only a few thousand people owned the state's prime agricultural land.¹⁴⁷

In the mid- to late-1800s, Monterey County agriculture made several major shifts. Until the mid-nineteenth century, ranching was big business because it did not rely on water and cattle herds could graze on large expanses of land. When the Gold Rush and American statehood brought

¹⁴⁵ Fink, *Monterey: The Presence of the Past*, 116. J. D. B. DeBow, *The Seventh Census of the United States: 1850* (Washington, D.C.: Robert Armstrong, Public Printer, 1853), 969, 970, 972, 982. Joseph C. G. Kennedy, *Preliminary Report of the Eighth Census, 1860* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1862), 247. The Chinese population was undercounted in the census. By about 1860, several hundred Chinese residents lived in a Monterey County fishing village near the present-day Hopkins Marine Station of Stanford University in Pacific Grove.

¹⁴⁶ DeBow, *The Seventh Census of the United States: 1850*, 976. Fink, *Monterey: The Presence of the Past*, 136. California Department of Transportation, *A Historical Context and Archaeological Research Design for Agricultural Properties in California* (Sacramento, CA: Division of Environmental Analysis, California Department of Transportation, 2007).

¹⁴⁷ Fink, *Monterey: The Presence of the Past*, 136-137. Nuckton, *et al.*, "California Agriculture: The Human Story," *A Guidebook to California Agriculture*, 11. Even into the 1930s, a few people owned a great deal of land: 516 owners possessed a total of 8,685,439 acres and sixteen owners controlled at least 84 *square miles* each.

thousands of new settlers to California, miners and residents of San Francisco and Sacramento needed food, demand for cattle rose, and ranchers sold them as beef on the hoof instead of for hides and tallow. They drove livestock from southern Monterey County through the San Antonio and Salinas Valleys.¹⁴⁸ However, after droughts and floods in the 1860s killed thousands of cattle, sheep and other stock and destroyed profits, land became more valuable for crops than for grazing and the cultural landscape changed to reflect this economic reality.

Agricultural pursuits changed from cattle ranching to dry farming, grain production, dairying and raising smaller animals like hogs and sheep. As less grazing land was needed, the size, pattern and use of parcels changed to accommodate new agricultural practices. Some farmers fenced in open land or fenced in their building clusters. In some cases, fencing separated animals from crops. In other cases, landowners fenced in large properties as a display of wealth.

Settlement incentives also changed Monterey County's cultural landscape. Both the California Land Settlement Act of 1851 and the Homestead Act of 1862 created smaller land parcels and more farmers. Under the Land Act, owners of the large Spanish and Mexican land grants either patented or lost their holdings. As owners subdivided vast tracts into smaller farms and settlers claimed 160-acre tracts of public land, agricultural production increased and diversified.

New buildings and structures dotted the landscape, including rammed-earth adobe farmhouses, livestock barns, wood-transverse crib barns, stables, storage buildings for agricultural machinery, workshops, machine sheds, privies, storage sheds, smoke houses, warehouses, granaries, corrals, fences, windmills, water pumps, elevated water tanks, cisterns, watering troughs and wharves. Vegetation included shade trees around the building cluster, vegetable and flower gardens, and plantings demarcating entries and roadways.¹⁴⁹

2. Land Grant Subdivisions

California Land Settlement Act of 1851. Congress passed the California Land Settlement Act (Land Act) of 1851, spurring conveyances and subdivisions that changed the cultural landscape by dividing vast ranchos into smaller farms. Owners of Spanish and Mexican land grants had two years to prove their titles before the United States Land Commission. If a grantee failed to make a claim, the property became federal land.¹⁵⁰ Some grantees lost their property to foreclosure, attorneys, speculators or squatters because of high legal defense fees and the average seventeen-year wait to adjudicate claims.¹⁵¹ The City of Monterey suffered the most notorious

¹⁴⁸ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 56.

¹⁴⁹ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 91-92, 94.

¹⁵⁰ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Historic Overview, 4. Christine A. Klein, "Treaties of Conquest: Property Rights, Indian Treaties and the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo," 26 *New Mexico Law Review* (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico, Spring 1996), 201, 201-204, 218-229.

¹⁵¹ Fink, *Monterey: The Presence of the Past*, 136-137. Nuckton, *et al.*, "California Agriculture: The Human Story," *A Guidebook to California Agriculture*, 11. Even into the 1930s, a small number of people owned a great deal of land: 516 people owned a total of 8,685,439 acres and sixteen people owned at least 84 *square miles* each.

property loss under the Land Act, losing 30,000 acres to its attorney Delos R. Ashley and local resident David Jacks, who bought the land at auction when the City could not pay Ashley's bill for successfully patenting the land.¹⁵²

David Jacks. Scotland native David Jacks (1822-1909) was one of Monterey County's most controversial and pivotal figures.¹⁵³ Including the 30,000 acres he bought from the City of Monterey, Jacks acquired about 100,000 acres through purchase, foreclosure and auction, taking full advantage of the Land Act's negative repercussions on property owners. His acquisitions and agricultural pursuits significantly impacted the county's cultural landscape, particularly in the Salinas Valley, where he owned many of the Spanish and Mexican adobes that were associated with Monterey County's early agriculture.¹⁵⁴ He was a progressive landowner, signing formal contracts with his farmers and tenants, working with Chinese and Japanese farmers, using modern equipment, adopting new irrigation methods, seeking responsible and profitable land use, and subdividing his property into smaller farms when appropriate.¹⁵⁵ His contributions to Monterey County's agricultural history are discussed later in this chapter.

¹⁵² This land included the future City of Pacific Grove, Pebble Beach, Fort Ord, Seventeen Mile Drive, Hotel Del Monte, the Del Monte Forest, Del Rey Oaks, Seaside, Jacks Peak County Park and many other local landmarks. Kenneth C. Jack, "Land King: The Story of David Jack," *News From The Monterey County Historical Society*, (Salinas, CA: Monterey County Historical Society, October 2001), 4-5. Michael A. Loomis, "Scoundrel or Benefactor of Monterey," *California HISTORIAN* (Stockton, CA: Conference of California Historical Societies, December 1992), 11-12.


¹⁵³ Born David Jack in Scotland, he added an "s" to his last name sometime after immigrating to America around 1841. He moved to San Francisco in 1849 and to Monterey in 1851. A clever businessman, he engaged in multiple ventures simultaneously. While clerking for Monterey dry goods store owner James McKinley in the early 1850s, Jacks started farming. Although his early agricultural ventures with potatoes and hogs failed, Jacks was undeterred and became one of the wealthiest landowners in Monterey County, closely associated with the dairy industry and Monterey Jack cheese, explained later in this chapter. Jack, "Land King: The Story of David Jack," 4, 7. "David Jacks, Pioneer, Is Dead, Was Land King," *Monterey Daily Cypress* (Monterey, CA: January 12, 1909).

¹⁵⁴ Cathleen A. Freeman, "David Jacks (1822-1909)," *Monterey County Historical Society, Local History Pages – David Jacks*, <http://www.mchsmuseum.com/jacks1.html>, accessed 12 April 2005. His ranchos included Punta de Pinos, El Pescadero, Aguajito, Noche Buena, Saucito, El Tucho, El Chamisal, El Toro, Buena Vista, El Alisal, Chualar, Zanjones and Los Coches. Grace R. Larsen, "The Amazing Success Story of the Jacks Family," *Mills Quarterly* (Oakland, CA: Mills College, August 1987), 7. Jack, "Land King: The Story of David Jack," 6. Jacks and his wife Maria Christina Soledad Romie Jacks were very charitable. For one dollar, Jacks sold one hundred ocean-front acres from his Punta de Pinos rancho to the Pacific Grove Retreat Association and donated \$30,000 for improvements for the Methodist community which later became the City of Pacific Grove. (Loomis, "Scoundrel or Benefactor of Monterey," 12.)

¹⁵⁵ Larsen, "The Amazing Success Story of the Jacks Family," *Mills Quarterly*, 8-10. Jimmy Costello, "Monterey Lost Rich Heritage to Shrewd Scot," *Monterey Peninsula Herald*, 1963. In 1907, David Jacks turned all of his property over to his wife, Mary (Maria). On July 3, 1907 the David Jacks Corporation was formed in Nevada and two days later, Mary deeded all of her property to the Corporation. The couple's seven children served as company directors, paying their parents a monthly income until David Jacks died in 1909 and Mary Jacks died in 1917. The six surviving Jacks children dissolved the corporation in 1919 and divided the property equally. The Jacks children continued to manage, sell and donate property until the last child died in 1962; none of the children had offspring. Margaret Jacks donated the Los Coches/Richardson Adobe (National Register; California Historical Landmark; Monterey County Register) to the State of California in 1958.

Juan B. Castro and Castroville. Before the 1860s drought, Juan B. Castro’s cattle grazed on his family’s 36,000-acre land grant, Rancho Bolsa Nueva y Moro Cojo.¹⁵⁶ When the drought killed his animals and lowered cattle prices, Castro unsuccessfully tried to sell his rancho for fifty cents an acre.¹⁵⁷ His back-up plan — founding the North County town of Castroville — forever changed Monterey County’s cultural landscape and land use patterns.

In the winter of 1863-1864, Castro created the county’s second subdivision (the first was called “Little Town,” named for Milton Little in the 1850s) and second town (after Monterey).¹⁵⁹ He founded Castroville on a southwest portion of his rancho, donating land for public use and giving away 100 parcels by lottery. Each block had an alley in the middle; individual lots measured fifty by 130 feet. In 1870, seeking more residents, Castro offered “alternate lots, on any part of the town site we still own . . . to any person who will build as soon as practicable, a good comfortable dwelling-house on his lot.”¹⁶⁰ Castro also subdivided his eastern land.¹⁶¹ In 1871, he wanted the Southern Pacific to build its Salinas Valley terminus in Castroville, but asked too much for the land and would not donate it to the railroad. Instead, the railroad built the region’s first roundhouse in Castroville and the terminus in Salinas.¹⁶²



Juan B. Castro,
founder of Castroville.¹⁵⁸

Juan Castro was significant in Monterey County’s agricultural history because he founded Castroville, the county’s first subdivision and the North County’s largest town. He subdivided his land when extensive agriculture proved unprofitable, starting a Monterey County land use trend. Other rancho owners later subdivided their properties into smaller parcels and intensive agriculture replaced extensive agriculture. Castro’s rancho was originally associated with cattle ranching, but since the 1920s, Castroville has been devoted to growing artichokes, an intensive crop. Castroville has also been home to several ethnic communities that worked in agriculture: Italians (who developed the artichoke industry), Chinese (who lived in Castroville’s one-block

¹⁵⁶ Jackson, “Prunedale?,” *North Monterey County Fortnightly*.

¹⁵⁷ *Progress*, Prunedale, CA: Prunedale Chamber of Commerce, May 1996. Jackson, “Prunedale?,” *North Monterey County Fortnightly*.

¹⁵⁸ Johnston, *Old Monterey County: A Pictorial History*, 80.

¹⁵⁹ Johnston, *Old Monterey County: A Pictorial History*, 80. Margaret Clovis, *Images of America: Monterey County’s North Coast and Coastal Valleys* (Charleston, SC: Arcadia Publishing, 2006), 10. Kent Seavey, personal correspondence to PAST Consultants, June 2011.


¹⁶⁰ Johnston, *Old Monterey County: A Pictorial History*, 80. Clovis, *Monterey County’s North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 7, 9, 18-19. Dunn, *Monterey County, California*, 17. Starting in 1911, the Southern Pacific called the Castroville train station “Del Monte Junction” for a time. Patrons of Monterey’s Hotel Del Monte switched trains at Castroville for the hotel. (Clark, *Monterey County Place Names*, 134.)

¹⁶¹ *History of Monterey County* (Fresno, CA: Valley Publishers, 1979), 111.

¹⁶² Johnston, *Old Monterey County: A Pictorial History*, 80. Clovis, *Monterey County’s North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 7, 9, 18-19. Dunn, *Monterey County, California*, 17. Starting in 1911, the Southern Pacific called the Castroville train station “Del Monte Junction” for a time. Patrons of Monterey’s Hotel Del Monte switched trains at Castroville for the hotel. (Clark, *Monterey County Place Names*, 134.)

Chinatown) and Japanese (who worked with sugar beets and other crops and built Castroville’s Japanese Language School in 1936).

John Porter and Pajaro. In 1864, the same time that Juan Castro founded Castroville, prominent North County citizen John T. Porter acquired 820 acres of the Vallejo family’s San Cayetano Rancho. The property was just south of the Pajaro River and north of Castro’s rancho.¹⁶³ His property is the current location of the North County town of Pajaro. Among other achievements, he co-founded the Bank of Watsonville (1874) and the Pajaro Valley National Bank (1888), which offered favorable loans to farmers.¹⁶⁴ Porter was the area’s largest sugar beet grower in the 1870s and part-owner of Claus Spreckels’s sugar beet factory at Soquel.¹⁶⁵ He was also an early strawberry farmer, planting fifty acres on his Pajaro ranch in 1883.¹⁶⁶



John T. Porter, a prominent farmer and businessman whose land holdings included Chinatowns in both Pajaro and Watsonville.

Porter was one of the first Pajaro Valley farmers to hire Chinese laborers. He also helped them with immigration matters, testified on their behalf in criminal proceedings and attended their social events. Porter owned the land and buildings in Watsonville where a Chinatown developed in 1865 on the corner of Maple and Union.¹⁶⁷ After anti-Chinese sentiment arose in Santa Cruz County in the 1880s, Porter moved Watsonville’s Chinatown — buildings and residents — to his Pajaro property in 1888.

The new settlement was called “Brooklyn,” reportedly because it occupied a similar geographical (and perhaps status) relationship to Watsonville as the New York borough of Brooklyn did to Manhattan. It became one of California’s largest Chinatowns.¹⁶⁸ The Porters provided a fire department, school and other municipal services.¹⁶⁹ Chinatown burned in 1924 and 1933, after which the Porter family subdivided and sold the land. The Chinese Association bought the Chinese School at 18 Brooklyn Street, which had replaced the school destroyed in the 1924 fire, and which survived the 1933 fire.¹⁷⁰ The school is listed in the Monterey County

¹⁶³ Swift, “Unveiling the Porter Family Legacy.” Different sources list the purchase date as 1864 or 1874. In 1928, Mrs. Porter told a newspaper that they paid off the purchase in ten years. In those days, deeds generally were recorded only when the land was paid off, which would be 1874. (“Mrs. J. T. Porter, 90 Today, Taught Our First School,” *Watsonville Register-Pajaronian*, 7 March 1928.)

¹⁶⁴ Mekis, *Blossoms into Gold*, 68. Clovis, *Monterey County’s North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 73. Carolyn Swift, “Unveiling the Porter Family Legacy,” *The Mid-County Post*, 23 March 1993.

¹⁶⁵ Casabianca, Ruth. “John T. and Frances Cummins (sic) Porter: A Story of a Pioneer Family in California,” *Noticias del Puerto de Monterey*. Monterey, CA: Monterey History and Art Association, September 1996.

¹⁶⁶ Betty Lewis, *Watsonville Yesterday* (Watsonville, CA: Litho Watsonville Press, 1978), 116.

¹⁶⁷ Ruth Casabianca, “John T. and Frances Cummins (sic) Porter: A Story of a Pioneer Family in California,” *Noticias del Puerto de Monterey* (Monterey, CA: Monterey History and Art Association, September 1996).

¹⁶⁸ Clovis, *Monterey County’s North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 7, 76.

¹⁶⁹ Casabianca, “John T. and Frances Cummins (sic) Porter: A Story of a Pioneer Family in California.”

¹⁷⁰ Clovis, *Monterey County’s North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 81.


Register, but has suffered extreme integrity loss. Students learned the Chinese language, history and culture for four hours every day, after attending public school. The school operated until World War II.¹⁷¹ It contains apartments that have significantly altered the building's integrity.



Left: Pajaro's Chinatown, known as Brooklyn, flooded in 1911 after twenty-eight inches of rain fell and the Pajaro River overflowed. The community also suffered terrible damage in the 1906 Earthquake and in the 1924 and 1933 fires. Right: Historical photograph of the Chinese School (1924) in Pajaro. (Images courtesy of the Pajaro Valley Historical Association.)¹⁷²

The Pajaro and Watsonville Chinatowns, although no longer extant, were significant to the region's agricultural history. The Chinese, an early important component of the North County's agricultural labor force, experienced widespread discrimination but the Porter family readily offered them a place to live and conduct their businesses. The old Chinese School and the name of Brooklyn Street are some of the only reminders of Pajaro's former Chinatown.

In 1938, the John T. Porter Company also subdivided a portion of its property in the North County's Hall District, now part of



Pajaro's Chinatown in 1908. The main section was along Dupont (left), renamed Brooklyn Street before 1920. The map shows Chinese grocery stores, homes and a church, plus Japanese lodgings and pool rooms. The bridge north to Watsonville, across the Pajaro River, is at the upper left.¹⁷³

¹⁷¹ Clovis, *Monterey County's North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 77.

¹⁷² Clovis, *Monterey County's North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 72, 76, 79, 81.

¹⁷³ Sanborn Fire Insurance map of Pajaro, 1908. County of Monterey Historical File: Pajaro Survey.

Las Lomas.¹⁷⁴ Along Hall Road, the Porter Company created a series of twenty-one one-acre lots so buyers could create small farms to supplement their seasonal agricultural income. This subdivision continued the Porter family's tradition of using its land holdings to provide housing for local agricultural workers. The subdivision implemented Federal Housing Administration (FHA) financing standards and used FHA-approved house plans. The Porter Company provided all building materials and retained title to each parcel until the buyer paid off the house and other improvements.¹⁷⁵ Some of the Las Lomas FHA houses still exist and are described in Chapter 5.

Several other properties associated with the Porter family are still extant. The Porter-Vallejo Mansion at 29 Bishop Street in Pajaro is one of two North County properties listed in the National Register of Historic Places; it is also in the Monterey County Register. The Porter family continued to own their historic Las Lomas Ranch (in the same vicinity as the 1930s Las Lomas subdivision) until recently, when they donated it to the Elkhorn Slough Foundation.¹⁷⁶ The next chapter describes the Porter-Vallejo Mansion, the 1930s Las Lomas subdivision and the Las Lomas Ranch in greater detail.

Juan Castro and John Porter significantly modified Monterey County's cultural landscape, prompting extensive agriculture-related community development. Both men carved planned settlements out of their vast North County land holdings but retained some land for extensive and intensive agriculture pursuits. Their subdivisions are still visible on the landscape today. The towns of Castroville, Pajaro and Las Lomas still retain original street patterns, property boundaries, transportation networks and agriculture-related buildings that developed because of Castro's and Porter's decisions to subdivide and develop their properties. For example, the Southern Pacific Railroad built its tracks and established major stops through Castroville and Pajaro because both communities had become significant agricultural centers. Because of the railroad's presence, many agricultural businesses built processing and distribution facilities along the railroad tracks in Castroville and Pajaro, to ship agricultural goods to market as soon as possible. These and other related developments are discussed further below and in *Chapter 5: Historic Themes, Associated Property Types, Eligibility Criteria and Integrity Thresholds*.

After Castro and Porter started dividing their holdings, other subdivisions followed and by 1890, Monterey County farmers owned smaller parcels and crop diversification followed.¹⁷⁷ The size, layout and buildings on farmsteads varied depending on animal and crop requirements, the property owner's financial means and other factors. Farms developed along primary transportation routes, either railroad or roadway, facilitating distribution of goods to the

¹⁷⁴ In 2001, the Elkhorn Slough Foundation acquired 332 acres of the Porter property along Elkhorn Road and Hall Road. It is called the Porter Preserve and includes the marsh at the northern end of the Elkhorn Slough, the historic Porter house and oak-studded pasture land. Elkhorn Slough Foundation, "Elkhorn Slough Protected Lands," <http://www.elkhornslough.org/protected.htm> (accessed 5 March 2010).

¹⁷⁵ Ed Slusser, "About New Miniature Farm Community," *Register-Pajaronian*, 10 May 1938.

¹⁷⁶ Elkhorn Slough Foundation, "Historic Pioneer Ranch to be Preserved" (Moss Landing CA: Elkhorn Slough Foundation, August 7, 2002), <http://www.elkhornslough.org/newspages/newsposter.htm> (accessed March 5, 2010).

¹⁷⁷ Nakane, *Nothing Left in My Hands*, 10.

marketplace. Remarkably, many of the historic property boundaries from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries are still evident on the landscape.

3. Homesteading

In the first few decades after California statehood, governmental incentives brought new settlers to Monterey County to farm on plots much smaller than the original land grants. These laws changed the cultural landscape by requiring settlers to build residences and farm the land. Under the 1851 Land Act, potential settlers could petition for title to public lands by promising to build and occupy a house and to farm or raise livestock.¹⁷⁸ Similarly, under the Homestead Act of 1862, settlers selected 160 acres of surveyed, unclaimed public land, acquiring title after building a house, living there for five years, farming, and paying fees. Settlers could also gain title after six months by changing from homestead to preemption status and paying \$1.25 an acre.¹⁷⁹

Homesteaders took advantage of these settlement opportunities where public land was available. However, many large Monterey County parcels were in private hands, including the vast Spanish and Mexican land grants that often comprised the best land. Some landowners, like David Jacks, subdivided and leased property to tenant farmers, a trend discussed later in this chapter.¹⁸⁰

A few South County homesteaders made claims in the 1860s, but most came in the 1870s and 1880s. The Civil War, the area's remoteness, drought and lack of transportation limited new settlement in the area until then. Transcontinental migration increased after the Civil War ended in 1865. Some of the earliest South County homesteaders were Salinan Indians who formerly worked at Mission San Antonio, as well as Hispanic settlers. Others came from the town of Monterey, the Midwest, Mexico, England, Ireland, France, Italy and Germany.¹⁸¹ Land grantees had already claimed the best property along the Salinas and San Antonio rivers, so homesteaders were limited to hilly areas, canyons and smaller valleys, including Long Valley, Pine Valley, Priest Valley, Indian Valley, Slack Canyon, Hames Valley, Sapaque Valley and Harris Valley. Some squatted on unsurveyed land. To meet their social, spiritual and daily needs, some South County homesteaders concentrated in tight-knit communities like Lockwood, Jolon, Bryson, Hesperia, Parkfield, Hames Valley, Priest's Valley and Harris Valley. Town centers generally included a post office, school, hotel, church, market and community hall. Some families settled near others from their homeland, like German families from the Isle of Föhr living in the Lockwood area.¹⁸²

¹⁷⁸ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Historic Overview, 4.

¹⁷⁹ Howard R. Lamar, *New Encyclopedia of the American West* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 492.

¹⁸⁰ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Historic Overview, 5.

¹⁸¹ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 91, 92. Jack L. Zahniser and Lois J.

Roberts, "Cultural Resources Reconnaissance and Overview Fort Hunter Liggett" (Sacramento, CA: under direction of the Department of the Army, Sacramento District Corps of Engineers, June 1980), 236-237.

¹⁸² Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 91-92.

Lockwood is typical of early small Monterey County agricultural settlements. Located west of the Salinas River in the lower San Antonio Valley, Lockwood is named after Belva Ann Lockwood, the first woman to run for President of the United States. Lockwood developed when new settlers arrived in the 1870s from the Milpitas Rancho, Jolon, Germany's Isle of Föhr and elsewhere. Earlier homesteaders sold 160-acre parcels to the newcomers, who brought relatives to help expand the farms. The fifth generations of early Lockwood families farm the original parcels today; some have grown to several thousand acres. At one point, Lockwood had a hotel, saloon, general store, livery stable, community hall and the Pleasant View School.¹⁸³



The town of Lockwood, unknown date. (Courtesy of the County of Monterey Agriculture and Rural Life Museum photo archives.)

Many new South County settlers dry farmed barley, wheat, hay and corn and raised cattle, hogs, sheep, poultry and horses. With limited funds, the settlers built simple structures with materials found on the property. Common designs included a saltbox house with a simple, side-gable roof; a one-story, two-room, hall and parlor house; or log cabins. Settlers in the 1880s built homes out of rammed earth adobe constructed in forms. Most had a fireplace and sandstone or hard-packed earth floors. Rectangular adobes had gable roofs, and shed roofs over full-width porches or verandas. Square adobes had a hipped or pyramidal roofs and a veranda. Some of the adobe houses had basements, which the farmers dug to provide earth to build the house and any adobe outbuildings.¹⁸⁴ After the Southern Pacific Railroad expanded into the South County, farmers and ranchers started to build larger, two-story, wood-framed homes.¹⁸⁵


¹⁸³ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 120. "Lockwood," *Monterey Life*, August 1980, 23.

¹⁸⁴ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 91-92, 94.

¹⁸⁵ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 94.

The South County contains a number of extant homesteads that are covered in more detail in *Chapter 5: Historic Themes, Associated Property Types, Eligibility Criteria and Integrity Thresholds*. Most contain an adobe residence and other agricultural buildings. One of the most intact homesteads is the **Patterson Ranch** at 69461 Bradley Lockwood Road in Lockwood. In 1882, Benjamin Franklin Patterson moved from Oregon to the South County. He established a ranch about two miles southeast of the Lockwood area, in San Antonio Valley.

Patterson raised cattle, hogs and chickens and grew wheat and barley. The homestead was originally 160 acres but grew to 3,000 acres. The 160-acre Patterson Ranch contains three homes (a circa 1899 rammed-earth adobe with Italianate detailing, a circa 1920 house, and one of unknown date), a barn serving as a wagon shed and granary (circa 1880), machinery shed (circa 1880s-'90s), chicken coop (circa 1920s), adobe smokehouse (circa 1870s), horse barn (circa 1870s), three circular grain storage bins (circa 1916), and sheds. It also had a blacksmith shop and a cistern.¹⁸⁶



Patterson Ranch, 69461 Bradley Lockwood Road in Lockwood.

4. Transitions in Extensive Agriculture

The extensive agriculture begun during the Spanish and Mexican periods continued to dominate Monterey County farms in the American Period. Newcomers discouraged by California’s dry summers and wet winters persevered and Monterey County grain and vegetable production increased by the early 1850s.¹⁸⁷ During this period, large ranchos, small farms and subsistence family farms engaged in extensive agriculture like ranching and growing grains. Farmers gradually converted open grazing lands to fenced fields of barley, wheat, hay, oats, potatoes and beans to feed the burgeoning population.¹⁸⁸ Fencing the land changed the cultural landscape. Previously, natural features like trees or rock outcroppings marked property boundaries. Fences kept animals out of crop fields, clarified previously vague property boundaries and announced that the property owner was wealthy enough to afford fencing.

Extensive agriculture is significant because it was a principal factor in transforming the relatively open, sparsely populated natural landscape into productive agricultural land. Many Monterey County communities developed in association with the growth of extensive agriculture, including most of the communities along the Southern Pacific Railroad line, discussed later in this chapter.

¹⁸⁶ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 99 and DPR 523, “Patterson Ranch, 69461 Bradley Lockwood Road, Lockwood, CA.”

¹⁸⁷ Nuckton, *et al.*, “California Agriculture: The Human Story,” *A Guidebook to California Agriculture*, 11.

¹⁸⁸ Donna F. Mekis and Kathryn Mekis Miller, *Blossoms into Gold: The Croatians in the Pajaro Valley* (Capitola: Capitola Book Company, 2009), xxii.

a. Cattle Ranching:

Monterey County's large cattle ranches represent the first phase of extensive agriculture, dating to the mission period and the Spanish and Mexican land grants. As non-Hispanics acquired the grants, the cultural landscape changed from a few isolated, unfenced rancho outposts raising cattle to larger clusters of fenced cattle complexes and large corporations, representing the shift from free-range to corralled cattle. The rammed-earth adobes, barns, outbuildings, railroads, fences and other man-made features associated with cattle ranching changed the cultural landscape and marked the expansion of California agriculture. In part because of its remoteness, the South County has retained more cattle operations than other parts of Monterey County.

By 1849, enormous herds of black Spanish cattle roamed freely over the County's large, unfenced Spanish and Mexican land grants.¹⁸⁹ Cattle ranching flourished between 1849 and 1865 but then declined in favor of crop agriculture when supply matched demand in the mid-1850s; rancho owners subdivided or lost their land grants; breeders introduced improved American livestock to the market; and drought and floods killed thousands of cattle.¹⁹⁰ To get to market in the early years of ranching, vaqueros drove herds of about 700 to 1,000 cattle on hoof through California's coastal and interior valleys. Herds ate grass along the route as they moved north at a daily clip of about ten or fifteen miles. To allow their cattle to recover from the trip and regain weight before being slaughtered, owners might lease land near the destination point.¹⁹¹ When Southern Pacific extended its rail lines to southern California in the late 1800s, ranchers shipped their stock via rail and the cultural landscape continued to evolve.¹⁹²

When demand for beef rose in California during the Gold Rush, cattle prices rose and stayed high until about 1855. By 1853, 62,000 head of cattle had arrived from the East and Midwest and fattened up in the San Joaquin and Sacramento Valleys before hitting the market.¹⁹³ The influx of out-of-state cattle plus the growth of California's sheep industry in the early 1850s drove cattle prices down.¹⁹⁴ By 1856, the market was saturated and cattle prices dropped by two-thirds.¹⁹⁵ Ranchers were in debt, unable to pay high interest rates and many lost their land, which was subsequently subdivided into smaller parcels.¹⁹⁶

Problems worsened in the early 1860s when climactic fluctuations dramatically impacted California's agricultural focus and economy. It began pouring in December 1861 and floods

¹⁸⁹ Fink, *Monterey: The Presence of the Past*, 136. Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, 45.

¹⁹⁰ Johnston, *Old Monterey County: A Pictorial History*, 59. Robert B. Johnston, "A Brief History of Southern Monterey County," *News from the Monterey County Historical Society* (Salinas, CA: Monterey County Historical Society, May 2002), 8.

¹⁹¹ MaryEllen Ryan and Gary S. Breschini, Ph.D., "The California Cattle Boom, 1849-1862" (Salinas, CA: Monterey County Historical Society, 2010), <http://www.mchsmuseum.com/cattle.html>, accessed 14 June 2001.

¹⁹² Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 86.

¹⁹³ Ryan and Breschini, "The California Cattle Boom, 1849-1862."

¹⁹⁴ Ryan Breschini, "The California Cattle Boom, 1849-1862."

¹⁹⁵ Jackson, "Prunedale?," *North Monterey County Fortnightly*.

¹⁹⁶ Ryan Breschini, "The California Cattle Boom, 1849-1862."

crippled California. From 1861 to 1865, thirty days of rain and then thirty months of extreme drought killed more than 75,000 Salinas Valley cattle.¹⁹⁷ Monterey County ranchers owned 90,450 cattle in 1862, but only 41,847 by 1875.¹⁹⁸ This disaster forced ranchers to shift their economic focus. Juan Castro subdivided his rancho and founded the town of Castroville in 1863-64 (described above in the section on Land Grant Subdivisions).¹⁹⁹ The southern Salinas Valley shifted from cattle to grain farming and the northern Salinas Valley shifted from cattle to sheep ranching.²⁰⁰

Rainfall from the Sierra Nevada and the coast ranges pooled into a Central Valley inland sea, business and travel halted, and about 200,000 head of cattle drowned statewide (possibly one-quarter of California's taxable wealth). Some cattlemen prospered, however. At the market's height in the early 1850s, cattle brought up to \$75 a head in San Francisco. When prices plummeted to about \$8 a head during the 1860s drought, the wealthy agricultural corporation of Miller and Lux bought cattle cheaply and drove herds to safety in Oregon. Because their cattle empire spread across millions of acres in California, Nevada and Oregon, the firm was able to survive the devastating effects of the floods and drought.²⁰¹

Monterey County's ranching complexes were vast acres of valleys and rolling hills. They utilized natural landscape features, including natural grasses and valley waterways, to feed and water their livestock when possible. Ranches had a building cluster, including a house, barns and other outbuildings. The main residence was typically made of adobe. Some ranch buildings were rectangular with a gable roof, plus a shed roof over the porch. Others were square with a hipped or pyramidal roof and a veranda. Ranch properties generally included multiple horse and livestock barns. Some were adobe, front-gable barns; others were wooden, transverse crib barns. Outbuildings included bunk houses, stables, workshops, machine sheds, storage sheds, wood sheds, pump houses, granaries, privies and later, garages. Other structures, objects and features included windmills, wells, water pumps, watering troughs, cisterns and natural springs. Large graded dirt areas surrounded the building cluster. Roadways and circulation routes included the main road to the house, pathways between buildings, animal pathways and hillside cattle terraces. Besides the natural vegetation, shade trees surrounded the building cluster, vegetable and flower gardens supplied the household, and plantings demarcated entries and roadways. In later years, ranches also had fencing and corrals.²⁰²

When California became a state, it adopted the common law of England to the extent it did not conflict with federal or state law. The common law of grazing recognized that residents had

¹⁹⁷ Jackson, "Prunedale?," *North Monterey County Fortnightly*. During the 1862 floods, the mouth of the Salinas River was a mile wide, likely drowning many cattle. Gordon, *Monterey Bay Area: Natural History and Cultural Imprints*, 236.

¹⁹⁸ Johnston, *Old Monterey County: A Pictorial History*, 75.

¹⁹⁹ Johnston, "A Brief History of Southern Monterey County," 8.

²⁰⁰ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Historic Overview, 4.


²⁰¹ MaryEllen Ryan and Gary S. Breschini, Ph.D., "The California Cattle Boom, 1849-1862" (Salinas, CA: Monterey County Historical Society, 2010), <http://www.mchsmuseum.com/cattle.html>, accessed 14 June 2001.

²⁰² Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 73.

common grazing rights, free access to the open range, so California’s “Trespass Act” of 1850 required farmers to fence out cattle rather than requiring cattle owners to fence them in. If farmers wanted to be compensated for future damage cattle inflicted on their crops, they had to build stone fences 4.5 feet high, lumber or rail fences 5.5 feet high, or hedges 5 feet high. These new fences were a major change on the cultural landscape. When the agriculture industry’s focus shifted from cattle to grains, the 1872 “No Fence Law” shifted the fencing burden from farmers to cattle owners. However, exemptions applied to California counties where stock raising was extensive, likely because of the prohibitive cost of fencing large grazing tracts. The new law spurred yet another change in the cultural landscape when inventors filed many barbed wire patents in the 1870s, making fencing cheaper for cattle owners.²⁰³

In 1852, English rancher Joseph Roadhouse bought 800 acres along the Elkhorn Slough, built a home and raised cattle and race horses.²⁰⁵ In 1867, Azores Islands native Cato Vierra, who built Moss Landing’s wharf and warehouses, also owned a 1,000-acre cattle ranch in the wharf vicinity.²⁰⁶

Chinese workers arrived in Monterey County in the mid-1860s. By 1866, they (and later the Japanese) worked on reclamation projects to drain swampy areas of the North County for agricultural use, including sloughs, lakes and marshes around Castroville and wetlands around the Elkhorn and Moro Cojo sloughs.²⁰⁷ The reclaimed land was first used primarily for livestock grazing.²⁰⁸



The Roadhouse family’s Oak Grove Ranch along the North County’s Elkhorn Slough. Seal Bend is at the upper right.²⁰⁴

Irish immigrants James and Mary Kirby started buying a great deal of North County property in 1870, eventually more than 5,500 acres. They raised cattle, pigs, chickens and bees, and grew hay and other crops. Much of their land was in the Hall District (now Las Lomas), Hidden

²⁰³ MaryEllen Ryan and Gary S. Breschini, Ph.D., “The California Cattle Boom, 1849-1862” (Salinas, CA: Monterey County Historical Society, 2010), <http://www.mchsmuseum.com/cattle.html>, accessed 14 June 2001.

²⁰⁴ Elkhorn Slough Foundation, “History of Elkhorn Slough, 1852.”

²⁰⁵ Clovis, *Monterey County’s North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 38. Elkhorn Slough Foundation, “History of Elkhorn Slough, 1852” (Moss Landing, CA: Elkhorn Slough Foundation, 2010), <http://www.elkhornslough.org/history/1852.htm>, accessed 1 May 2010. The slough was initially named Roadhouse Slough, but Roadhouse allegedly renamed it after the shape of an elk’s horn.

²⁰⁶ Clovis, *Monterey County’s North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 40. Horace W. Fabing and Rick Hamman, *Steinbeck Country Narrow Gauge* (Boulder, CO: Pruett Publishing Company, 1985), 4.

²⁰⁷ Nakane, *Nothing Left in My Hands*, 10. Mekis, *Blossoms into Gold*, xxii. Clovis, *Monterey County’s North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 26. Clovis, *Monterey County’s North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 7, 9, 18, 19.

²⁰⁸ *North County Land Use Plan*, 45-46.

Valley and Strawberry Valley.²⁰⁹ The Nature Conservancy, Elkhorn Slough Foundation and Elkhorn Slough National Estuarine Reserve have permanently preserved much of the Kirby family's former cattle grazing land.²¹⁰ The North County currently has a few cattle operations, mostly in the eastern hills along San Juan Grade Road.

Because of its remoteness and its hilly, mountainous terrain, the South County has retained more ranching operations than either the North County or the Salinas Valley. Large South County cattle operations operated on rancho land in the best valley and hill areas. Some expanded to include dry farming. Representative ranching operations from this period included San Bernardo Ranch, San Lucas Ranch, Peach Tree Ranch, Pleyto Ranch, Milpitas Ranch, Ranchos El Piojo and San Miguelito, and the Salsipuedes Ranch.²¹¹ The *San Bernardo Ranch* at 63113 Railroad Street in San Ardo is 233 acres and contains numerous buildings associated with both cattle ranching and dairying, including horse, dairy and main barns.

Large cattle herds also grazed on the former Milpitas Rancho near Jolon. In 1838, Mexico granted the 43,280-acre rancho, former Mission San Antonio land, to Ignacio Pastor. By 1872, Faxon D. Atherton owned the land, farmed on 10,000 acres, dammed Mission Creek to irrigate alfalfa fields, grazed large cattle herds on the rolling hills and conducted a small dairy operation. Olive and fruit trees grew without irrigation on the former mission lands.²¹²

Large-scale farming and ranching supplied the beef needs of grocery stores and restaurants in large cities like San Francisco and Los Angeles. The firm of Miller and Lux, which owned land in Monterey County, was one of the most important agricultural and land companies meeting those needs.²¹³ Miller and Lux's cattle empire controlled about three million acres in California, Nevada and Oregon, including all of Peachtree Valley (slightly northeast of King City) in Monterey County.²¹⁴ The company established surveying offices to get accurate land measurements, determining property boundaries, elevations and dimensions.²¹⁵

²⁰⁹ Church, *Historical Notes of North Monterey County With a History of Hidden Valley*, 4-8, 56.

²¹⁰ Elkhorn Slough Foundation, "Elkhorn Slough Protected Lands," <http://www.elkhornslough.org/protected.htm>. Elkhorn Slough Foundation, "Farmers See Stewardship Working: Azevedo Ranch, before and after ten years of stewardship," <http://www.elkhornslough.org/newsletter/news0304.htm#restoration>.

²¹¹ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 72, 86.

²¹² Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 55, 79. The Milpitas Ranch House is also associated with the property. It is listed in the National Register and Monterey County Register for its association with William Randolph Hearst and its period of significance is 1925-1949. It is located on Fort Hunter Liggett property. "Monterey County Register of Historic Resources as of January 2010." National Register of Historic Places, (Washington, DC: Department of the Interior) <http://nationalregisterofhistoricplaces.com/ca/Monterey/state.html> (accessed 14 December 2010).

²¹³ Kern County Superintendent of Schools, "Miller and Lux Survey Office," Kern County Museum (Bakersfield, CA: Kern County Superintendent of Schools, 2011), [http://www.kcmuseum.org/stories/storyReader\\$109](http://www.kcmuseum.org/stories/storyReader$109), accessed 14 June 2001.

²¹⁴ MaryEllen Ryan and Gary S. Breschini, Ph.D., "The California Cattle Boom, 1849-1862" (Salinas, CA: Monterey County Historical Society, 2010), <http://www.mchsmuseum.com/cattle.html>, accessed 14 June 2001.

²¹⁵ Kern County Superintendent of Schools, "Miller and Lux Survey Office," Kern County Museum (Bakersfield, CA: Kern County Superintendent of Schools, 2011), [http://www.kcmuseum.org/stories/storyReader\\$109](http://www.kcmuseum.org/stories/storyReader$109), accessed 14 June 2001.

German butcher Heinrich Kreiser moved to New York in 1846 and to California in 1850 as Henry Miller, the name on the non-transferable steamer ticket he bought from a New York friend.²¹⁶ He opened a successful San Francisco butcher shop on Jackson Street.²¹⁷ He bought cattle from stockyards in San Francisco, Santa Clara Valley, San Joaquin Valley and the San Francisco peninsula.²¹⁸ In 1857, he expanded his cattle empire by buying options on all available cattle north of the Tehachapi range in Southern California, stunning his colleagues and allowing Miller to set terms.²¹⁹ In 1858, he founded Miller and Lux with former competitor Charles Lux, who managed the San Francisco office while Miller traveled California buying land and cattle. Like dairyman David Jacks did in Monterey County, Miller and Lux acquired land in many different ways. They bought ranchos outright or bought out one rancho heir, raised cattle on the land as a tenant in common with other heirs, then bought them out. They loaned ranchers money on future cattle profits and foreclosed on the loan when sales disappointed. They paid the firm's employees to file 160-acre Homestead Act claims and then bought them out.²²⁰

Their large landholdings throughout the state heavily influenced California's water law and irrigation development. Miller and Lux and the Kern County Land Company of Haggin and Tevis were the biggest landholders in Kern County and built almost all of the southern San Joaquin Valley's big drainage projects and canal systems.²²¹ In the case of *Miller & Lux v. Enterprise Canal & Land Co.* (1915) the court held that a landowner's riparian rights (owners of land bordering a body of water have the right to reasonable use of it) last only from when the water reaches the user's land until it flows past the land. After Miller and Lux's litigation, irrigation districts soon developed to distribute water in California (described in the section on Irrigation, below).²²²

b. Sheep and Other Stock:

Starting in the Spanish and Mexican eras and continuing into the American period, Monterey County ranchers raised sheep. After floods and drought devastated Monterey County from 1861 to 1865, northern Salinas Valley ranching shifted from cattle to sheep.²²³ By 1870, Monterey County raised more sheep than any other California county.²²⁴

In 1859, Englishman Eugene Sherwood started raising sheep on Rancho San Lorenzo (north of San Lucas in the South County) but quit the business after the drought.²²⁵ However, he and other

²¹⁶ Ryan and Breschini, "The California Cattle Boom, 1849-1862."

²¹⁷ Eugene T. Sawyer, *History of Santa Clara County, California* (Los Angeles: Historic Record Co., 1922), 351.

²¹⁸ Ryan and Breschini, "The California Cattle Boom, 1849-1862."

²¹⁹ Sawyer, *History of Santa Clara County, California*, 351.

²²⁰ Ryan and Breschini, "The California Cattle Boom, 1849-1862."

²²¹ Ryan and Breschini, "The California Cattle Boom, 1849-1862."

²²² Ryan and Breschini, "The California Cattle Boom, 1849-1862."

²²³ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Historic Overview, 4.

²²⁴ Kent Seavey, "National Register of Historic Places Registration Form: Rancho San Lucas (Trescony Ranch)," (Pacific Grove, CA: Kent Seavey, 1990).

²²⁵ Kent Seavey, "National Register of Historic Places Registration Form: Rancho San Lucas (Trescony Ranch)."

established the Monterey County Fairgrounds to exhibit the area's high quality stock and produce.²²⁶

In the South County area of San Lucas, Italian Alberto Trescony persevered through the climate changes and operated **Rancho San Lucas**, one of the most prominent and successful Monterey County sheep, cattle and barley ranches in the nineteenth century. Rancho San Lucas is the County's best example of an extensive agriculture farmstead. The Trescony family has owned and operated it since 1862.²²⁷ As a teenager, Alberto Trescony (ca. 1812-1892) left his native Italy for Paris and then for America in the late 1830s, working in tinsmithing, construction, restaurants and other enterprises until he arrived in Texas. From there, he took advantage of Mexico's bonus for sheep driven to the capital, selling 2,000 animals there and moving to Monterey, California with the profits. There, he worked in metal, operated a cantina, owned cattle and horses, and acquired a cattle brand that is the oldest working cattle brand in the state today. In addition to owning Monterey's Washington Hotel (where delegates to California's Constitutional Convention stayed) and San Juan Bautista's St. John's Hotel (used by people on the way to the southern mines), Trescony bought Elias Howe's Half Way House tavern along the Monterey-San Juan Bautista stage route. Combining all of his previous trades into one enterprise, Trescony added a hotel, store and blacksmith shop to the tavern and the property became a centerpiece of the city of Salinas.²²⁸

Trescony paid Monterey merchant James McKinley \$3,000 for the 8,875-acre rancho in 1862, in the midst of the floods and drought that destroyed the stock herds and wealth of many rancho owners. In 1867, he bought about 3,000 acres of the nearby Rancho San Bernardo. Trescony raised cattle and horses, but sheep were his focus. By 1870, Trescony's herd of 22,000 sheep ranged on Rancho San Lucas and neighboring properties. His Basque shepherds drove the herd as far as San José to graze on open land. Trescony sold the sheep for their meat, hides and wool. Trescony drove the sheep to rail stations at Soledad, Gilroy or San José and shipped hides and wool from Moss Landing to San Francisco commission merchants.²²⁹

In 1880, Trescony bought the 22,000-acre Rancho Tularcitos in Carmel Valley, which was a dairy farm.²³⁰ He kept it going but also leased or sold portions of the rancho to tenant farmers. In 1885, he added 6,700 acres to Rancho San Lucas after buying the adjacent San Benito Rancho. He grew a high-quality malting barley which he sold on the international market, including in Liverpool, England.²³¹ Monterey County has always traded internationally, starting with the Mexican Republic in the 1800s, and Trescony's endeavors are a good example of early international trade from the County.²³²

²²⁶ Kent Seavey, personal communication to PAST Consultants, LLC, June 2011.

²²⁷ Monterey County Historical Society, "Alberto Trescony (?-1892)," (Salinas, CA: Monterey County Historical Society, 2010), http://www.mchsmuseum.com/trescony_alberto.html, accessed 14 June 2011.

²²⁸ Seavey, "National Register of Historic Places Registration Form: Rancho San Lucas (Trescony Ranch)."

²²⁹ Monterey County Historical Society, "Alberto Trescony (?-1892)."

²³⁰ Seavey, "National Register of Historic Places Registration Form: Rancho San Lucas (Trescony Ranch)."


²³¹ Monterey County Historical Society, "Alberto Trescony (?-1892)."

²³² Meg Clovis, personal communication to PAST Consultants, LLC, June 2011.

Trescony was one of a series of Monterey County landowners to offer land to the Southern Pacific Railroad so the rail line could link Northern and Southern California. The railroad had already reached Chualar, Gonzales and Soledad by 1873, thanks to David Jacks, (through his Chualar Rancho) the Gonzalez brothers (through their Rincon de la Puente del Monte Rancho) and Catalina Munras (through her Rancho San Vicente). In 1883, Trescony deeded a twelve-mile right-of-way through Rancho San Lucas to the railroad. In 1886, the railroad laid track through the lands of Charles King (King City station and town), Trescony (San Lucas station and town), Brandenstein and Godchaux (San Ardo station and town) and Bradley Sargent (Bradley station and town).²³³

After the town of San Lucas became established on his property in 1886-87, Trescony equipped and leased fifteen farms to tenant farmers. Some tenants later bought their own farms, just like tenant farmers did after working for other Monterey County agricultural operations like the Spreckels Sugar Company, Salinas Land Company, California Orchard Company, and David Jacks. The tenant farming system was a critical component of transitioning immigrants from field workers to land owners. Trescony tenant M. Righetti of Cayucos leased 3,000 acres for a dairy farm and Trescony supplied the materials for a barn, two dairy houses, water pumps, corrals and barbed wire. Trescony also graded a road from San Lucas to the west, opening 8,000 acres for wheat farming. By the time he died in 1892, Trescony owned more than 40,000 acres of farmland and San Lucas was the most important shipping point in the South County.²³⁴

Listed as a historic district in the National Register of Historic Places, Rancho San Lucas's period of significance is from 1862-1892. The rancho is significant because of Alberto Trescony's substantial contributions to Monterey County agriculture, including cross-breeding livestock, introducing improved cereal varieties, and developing San Lucas as the most important market center in the South County.²³⁵ The 3,400-acre ranch includes ten historic buildings and structures, corral fencing and historic landscape features. The buildings include an adobe ranch house, adobe blacksmith shop and transverse adobe stock barn (all 1865), a bunkhouse and granary (both 1888), a three-bay stock barn, transverse stock barn, bull barn, wooden granary (all 1880s) and a cattle chute (circa 1911). Trescony's wife Catherine created the Ranch House's design and plan.²³⁶



²³³ Seavey, "National Register of Historic Places Registration Form: Rancho San Lucas (Trescony Ranch)."

²³⁴ Seavey, "National Register of Historic Places Registration Form: Rancho San Lucas (Trescony Ranch)."

²³⁵ Seavey, "National Register of Historic Places Registration Form: Rancho San Lucas (Trescony Ranch)."

²³⁶ Seavey, "National Register of Historic Places Registration Form: Rancho San Lucas (Trescony Ranch)."

Besides sheep and cattle, Monterey County ranchers raised horses in the 1850s and 1860s. For example, English rancher Joseph Roadhouse, raised race horses (and cattle) on 800 acres along the Elkhorn Slough starting in 1852.²³⁷ In addition to his cattle, Meyer Brandenstein also operated a large pig farm near San Ardo in the 1870s.²³⁸ Hiram Corey and others also raised and bred prize horses in Monterey County.²³⁹ In 1872, Corey also leased the Bueno Vista Rancho (7,725 acres) and bought it in 1883, operating it as a stock and dairy ranch. The Corey House is listed on the National Register.²⁴⁰

c. Grains:

As the United States Land Commission adjudicated claims and rancho owners divided their land into smaller parcels, crop production surpassed cattle grazing as the primary land use.²⁴² Wheat demand rose during and after the Gold Rush, expanding as the Civil War opened markets, and farmers planted wheat, barley and other grains in Monterey County for decades.²⁴³ Partly because of the lack of summer rains or significant irrigation, farmers focused on winter grains.²⁴⁴

J. Bryant Hill was one of the first Monterey County farmers to grow grain commercially, planting ninety-five barley acres in the Salinas Valley in 1852.²⁴⁵ Monterey and San Benito counties had 570 acres of wheat and 1,880 acres of barley in 1857; 5,350 acres of wheat and 18,486 acres of barley by 1862.²⁴⁶ The grain fields were vast, treeless and unfenced.²⁴⁷



Ten-horse teams plowed the land.²⁴¹

²³⁷ Clovis, *Monterey County's North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 38. Elkhorn Slough Foundation, "History of Elkhorn Slough, 1852" (Moss Landing, CA: Elkhorn Slough Foundation, 2010), <http://www.elkhornslough.org/history/1852.htm>, accessed 1 May 2010. The slough was initially named Roadhouse Slough, but Roadhouse allegedly renamed it after the shape of an elk's horn.

²³⁸ Kent Seavey, personal communication to PAST Consultants, LLC, June 2011.

²³⁹ Kent Seavey, personal communication to PAST Consultants, LLC, June 2011.

²⁴⁰ Luther A. Ingersoll, "Monterey-Marin-Inyo County CA Archives Biographies: Corey, Hiram 1831 – ," (1893) <http://files.usgwarchives.net/ca/monterey/bios/corey1084nbs.txt>, accessed 14 June 2011.

²⁴¹ Johnston, *Old Monterey County: A Pictorial History*, 77.

²⁴² Fink, *Monterey: The Presence of the Past*, 138.

²⁴³ Dunn, *Monterey County, California*, 5. Nakane, *Nothing Left in My Hands*, 6. Johnston, *Old Monterey County: A Pictorial History*, 75.

²⁴⁴ Nuckton, *et al.*, "California Agriculture: The Human Story," *A Guidebook to California Agriculture*, 11.

²⁴⁵ Rutillus Harrison Allen, *Economic History of Agriculture in Monterey County, California During the American Period* (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1932), 26.

²⁴⁶ Allen, *Economic History of Agriculture in Monterey County*, 42. Johnston, *Old Monterey County: A Pictorial History*, 75.

²⁴⁷ Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, 47.

After the droughts and floods of the early 1860s killed so many head of cattle, southern Salinas Valley farming shifted heavily to grain production.²⁴⁸ By 1867, California farmers grew oats. By 1869, wheat, barley and oats were the Pajaro Valley’s primary crops.²⁴⁹ Hill-grown wheat was “clear and free from rust” and considered superior to valley wheat.²⁵⁰ In 1873, local farmers produced 4.5 million tons of wheat, barley, oats, beans and potatoes, shipping daily loads to Moss Landing.²⁵¹ Two years later, Monterey County farmers cultivated more than 130,000 acres, including almost 100,000 acres in wheat.²⁵² The 1875 *Watsonville Pajaronian* noted that the Pajaro Depot had “tier upon tier of valuable grain piled nearly to the roof twenty feet high,” showing “the great productiveness of the valley.”²⁵³ However, grain crops suffered through more drought and floods in the 1870s and 1880s.²⁵⁴

As new, faster, better agricultural machines came on the market, Monterey County farmers were able to produce more goods with less effort and fewer workers. In the early settlement period, clearing agricultural land in the North County hills was arduous. Men felled oak trees with cross-cut saws, removed stumps with hand shovels or a horse and pulley system, and cut roots with axes.²⁵⁶ The hard work of tilling soil, cultivating, harvesting and processing crops followed.

In 1848, a Santa Cruz foundry made California’s first iron plows, a vast improvement over the rudimentary plows first used by Monterey Presidio soldiers in the late 1700s. In 1859, horse-drawn mechanical harvesters replaced men who reaped grain by hand.²⁵⁷ Using gang plows, farmers could prepare the field and sow eighty to one



North County workers take a break in front of a steam boiler near Blackie Road. (Courtesy of Nancy Ausonio.)²⁵⁵

²⁴⁸ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I, Historic Overview*, 4.

²⁴⁹ Members of the Department of Agronomy and Range Science, U.C. Davis, “Field Crops,” *A Guidebook to California Agriculture* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1983), 115. Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, 49.

²⁵⁰ Martin, *Directory of the Town of Watsonville for 1873*, 44.

²⁵¹ Mekis, *Blossoms into Gold*, 66.

²⁵² Johnston, *Old Monterey County: A Pictorial History*, 75.

²⁵³ Clovis, *Monterey County’s North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 69.

²⁵⁴ Johnston, *Old Monterey County: A Pictorial History*, 91.

²⁵⁵ Clovis, *Monterey County’s North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 21. “First Crops Brought Name ‘Spud Valley,’” *Watsonville Register-Pajaronian*.

²⁵⁶ Warren Church, *Historical Notes of North Monterey County With a History of Hidden Valley* (Unpublished manuscript: 2004), v, 2, 3, 5.

²⁵⁷ Agricultural History Project, “Technology,” Agricultural Timelines display (Watsonville, CA: Agricultural History Project).

hundred acres a day.²⁵⁸ Six horses or mules pulling a twelve-foot “header” could harvest fifteen to twenty-five acres of grain a day.²⁵⁹ In the 1870s, threshing crews had needed fourteen laborers, two feeders, an engineer and a sack sewer (sewing shut an average of 1,000 sacks of threshed grain a day).²⁶⁰ However, crew sizes fell by one third when a flatbed wagon called a low Derrick Table was invented to move stacked grain to the thresher.²⁶¹ By 1880, California farmers used steam-powered threshers; the steam-powered tractor arrived a decade later.²⁶² The 1870s and 1880s were the era of “bonanza wheat” farms, and grain acreage soared to a new high in 1889.²⁶³ Around 1900, gasoline-powered harvesters replaced thirty-horse combined harvesters.²⁶⁴

An 1873 publication observed that the “rich little [Pajaro] valley has long been noted for the immense crops of grain and other products which it annually yields. . . . This is really garden land, and the adjoining hills and canyons are good grain land.” In the North County, grain fields covered the Pajaro Valley, including along San Juan Road and in the town of Aromas. In 1873, Daniel Tuttle had some of the best land in the valley, including wheat and sugar beet fields, and George Pardee had about 160 acres of good grain land near the beach.²⁶⁵ The area between Castroville and Salinas also contained extensive grain fields.²⁶⁶

Several mills were located in and around Monterey County. Castroville had a flour and grain mill by 1868.²⁶⁷ The Farmers Flouring Mill in Watsonville processed local grains.²⁶⁸ Charles Thomas’s Pajaro Street mill could produce 100 barrels of flour in twenty-four hours.²⁶⁹ William Brumwell built the Salinas Flour Mill in 1870-71, north of the future Southern Pacific Railroad depot and west of Natividad Street.²⁷⁰

Chinese workers labored in the grain fields, replacing the Ohlones.²⁷¹ The *Directory of the Town of Watsonville for 1873* noted that “[b]inding in the harvest fields seems by common consent to have been turned over to the Chinese, white laborers not caring particularly for this kind of work.” Paying the Chinese about \$1.50 per acre, farmers employed many of them during the

²⁵⁸ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Historic Overview, 5. James T. Stockdale, *Monterey County Illustrated: Resources, History, Biography* (Salinas, CA: E. S. Harrison, 1889), 29.

²⁵⁹ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Historic Overview, 5.

²⁶⁰ Clovis, *Monterey County’s North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 21. “First Crops Brought Name ‘Spud Valley,’” *Watsonville Register-Pajaronian*.

²⁶¹ Clovis, *Monterey County’s North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 70.

²⁶² Agricultural History Project, “Technology.”

²⁶³ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Historic Overview, 5.

²⁶⁴ Dunn, *Monterey County, California*, 6. “Field Crops,” *A Guidebook to California Agriculture*, 111-112.

Agricultural History Project, “Technology.”

²⁶⁵ Martin, *Directory of the Town of Watsonville for 1873*, 44.

²⁶⁶ “First Crops Brought Name ‘Spud Valley,’” *Watsonville Register-Pajaronian*.

²⁶⁷ Johnston, *Old Monterey County: A Pictorial History*, 80.

²⁶⁸ Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, 70.

²⁶⁹ Martin, *Directory of the Town of Watsonville for 1873*, 21-22.

²⁷⁰ Johnston, *Old Monterey County: A Pictorial History*, 79.

²⁷¹ Mekis, *Blossoms into Gold*, xxii.

harvest season and throughout the year. Still, they said they “prefer white labor but are compelled to accept Chinese labor,” reflecting the same type of racial discrimination that forced the Chinese to move from the Watsonville Chinatown to a new Pajaro Chinatown in 1888.²⁷²

By 1888, California was the nation’s second-biggest wheat producer.²⁷³ But wheat production declined after 1890 when soils became depleted, disease harmed crops, farmers started growing intensive irrigated crops, foreign markets declined, and Argentina, Russia and India became competitive wheat producers.²⁷⁴ Faced with these challenges, Pajaro and Salinas Valley rancho owners subdivided their land into smaller parcels, often twenty acres or fewer, for sale or lease.²⁷⁵ Even so, Monterey County was one of California’s principal grain producers in 1915. At that point, Salinas Valley farmers grew mostly barley, wheat and oats. Eastern breweries bought most of the local barley and King City in the South County shipped most of the grain.²⁷⁶ In the early 1900s, Salinas Valley farmers produced about 95,000 acres of wheat, 59,000 acres of barley 58,000 acres of small grains, 2,374 acres of potatoes and 1,587 acres of alfalfa.²⁷⁷

The *San Lucas Grain Elevator* (circa 1900), located near the Southern Pacific Railroad tracks south of Main and Mary streets in San Lucas, is representative of this theme. The building cluster included the grain elevator and five metal cylindrical grain storage bins (circa 1950).²⁷⁸

The *Patterson Ranch* at 69461 Bradley Lockwood Road in Lockwood is one of the most intact nineteenth century homesteads and was used in part for growing wheat and barley, as well as raising cattle, hogs and chickens. Benjamin Franklin Patterson’s ranch (originally 160 acres but grew to 3,000 acres, now 160 acres again) contains three homes (a circa 1899 rammed-earth adobe with Italianate detailing, circa 1920, and unknown date), a barn serving as a wagon shed and granary (circa 1880), three circular grain storage bins (circa 1916), machinery shed (circa 1880s-’90s), chicken coop (circa 1920s), adobe smokehouse (circa 1870s), horse barn (circa 1870s), and sheds. It also had a blacksmith shop and a cistern. A portion of the property is used for livestock grazing.²⁷⁹

One of the most unusual remnants of the North County’s extensive agriculture is the *Ellingwood Hay Company’s barn* (1000 Highway 101, Aromas). In 1945, the Ellingwood Hay Company built the 20,000 square foot steel-framed hay barn.²⁸⁰ Leon’s Machine Works, Inc. of Watsonville used more than 22,000 pounds of aluminum and 100 tons of steel; Kaiser

²⁷² Martin, *Directory of the Town of Watsonville for 1873*, 55-56, 58.

²⁷³ “Field Crops,” *A Guidebook to California Agriculture*, 111-112.

²⁷⁴ “Field Crops,” *A Guidebook to California Agriculture*, 113. Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, 71.

²⁷⁵ Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, 71.

²⁷⁶ Dunn, *Monterey County, California*, 5.

²⁷⁷ “Salinas Valley’s History is Long and Distinguished,” *The Packer*, 26 June 1976.

²⁷⁸ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, DPR 523, “San Lucas Grain Elevator, (No Address Available), San Lucas, CA.”

²⁷⁹ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 99 and DPR 523, “Patterson Ranch, 69461 Bradley Lockwood Road, Lockwood, CA.”

²⁸⁰ Kent Seavey, “DPR Form 523A: Ellingwood Hay Company Barn” (Pacific Grove, CA: Kent Seavey, 2009), 1.

Permanente supplied some of each. More than 200 feet long, 100 feet wide and fifty-three feet high, the barn held about 5,000 tons of hay.²⁸¹ It is still a major landmark along the highway. In contrast, the *Fanoe Road Farmstead* (circa 1930) on the 27300 block of Fanoe Road in Gonzales has a more traditional hay barn with twelve-inch wide vertical boards as siding.²⁸²

d. Other Extensive Agriculture:

When the Gold Rush began, farmers sought a fast profit from miners and hotels. Seen as a scurvy cure or preventative, potatoes were a prized crop and Monterey County farmers grew it extensively.²⁸³ In 1851, J. Bryant Hill planted the first Pajaro Valley potatoes on 1,000 Santa Cruz County acres. Disillusioned miners moved to the Pajaro Valley to replicate his success, but the 1853 crop overwhelmed the market and many farmers were financially ruined. Some recovered and planted wheat and other crops.²⁸⁴ The Irish were the first important immigrant group in Monterey County, farming potatoes and other crops.²⁸⁵ Other Monterey County farmers continued to grow potatoes over the years. Farmers also grew potatoes and beans in the Elkhorn area around 1914 and around Castroville.²⁸⁶ In 1915, Monterey County promotional materials claimed that the Salinas Valley “excels the world in potato raising,” particularly the Salinas Burbank potato.²⁸⁷ In that year, the “Salinas Burbank” potato grew on 5,000 acres in the northern Salinas Valley. Farmers also planted white, pink and red beans.²⁸⁸

Monterey County residents also raised bees and other animals.²⁸⁹ In the nineteenth century, local bees produced a fine sage honey from the black or California sage covering the North County hills. After 1900, manzanita began displacing the sage and honey production declined.²⁹⁰ During World War II, Robert Blohm sold North County manzanita bulbs for smoking pipes.²⁹¹

From the 1860s to the 1890s, Californians planted many eucalyptus trees, thinking the hardwood would make good furniture. However, curing and marketing the wood was problematic and the trees became an important fuel source instead. In the early 1870s, some doctors incorrectly believed that eucalyptus could eradicate malaria and so the U.S. Department of Forestry and California Board of Forestry began distributing the so-called “Fever Destroying Tree” for that

²⁸¹ “Big as a Barn Or Cozy as a Cottage.” *The Permanente News*. Oakland, CA: The Permanente Metals Corporation, December 1947.

²⁸² Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, DPR 523, “Fanoe Road Farmstead, Fanoe Road, 27300 Block, Gonzales, CA.”

²⁸³ Holliday, *Rush for Riches*, 133.

²⁸⁴ “First Crops Brought Name ‘Spud Valley’,” *Watsonville Register-Pajaronian*, 2 July 1952. Nakane, *Nothing Left in My Hands*, 6.

²⁸⁵ Nakane, *Nothing Left in My Hands*, 6. Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, xxii, 193.

²⁸⁶ “Prunedale,” *North County News*, February 27, 1980. Clovis, *Images of America: Monterey County’s North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 30.

²⁸⁷ Dunn, *Monterey County, California*, 5.

²⁸⁸ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Historic Overview, 11.

²⁸⁹ Church, *Historical Notes of North Monterey County With a History of Hidden Valley*, 5, 8.

²⁹⁰ Church, *Historical Notes of North Monterey County With a History of Hidden Valley*, 1.

²⁹¹ Church, *Historical Notes of North Monterey County With a History of Hidden Valley*, 2.

purpose. By 1874, about 1,000,000 eucalyptus trees grew in California.²⁹² Between 1900 and 1930, North County farmers again planted eucalyptus trees as a crop.²⁹³ Planted from 1911-1920 for furniture use, the eucalyptus grove along Highway 101 east of Aromas is the largest in North America. Because eucalyptus trees do not spread far from where they are planted, the grove retains the sharp rectangular outline it had originally. Trees harvested from there have been used for firewood and cardboard.²⁹⁴ After Prunedale farmers stopped growing apples, they planted eucalyptus trees but found that the hard and dense wood cracked, making it a poor wood for making furniture. Instead, growers cut it for firewood, causing erosion problems. In 1929, the agricultural commissioner convinced them to replace the eucalyptus trees with fir trees.²⁹⁵ As part of a Depression-era project, the Civilian Conservation Corps also planted fir trees around the North County.²⁹⁶ Christmas tree farms later became big business in the North County.

5. Water Transportation of Agricultural Products

Before the Southern Pacific Railroad arrived in Monterey County in 1871, farmers had two shipping alternatives: wagons or boats. Neither was ideal. Limited roads, blocked routes and long distances made wagon distribution inefficient. Subsistence farming was the primary agricultural pursuit before 1860, but Monterey County farmers shipped some crops, like durable grains, to San Francisco and other markets via the Pacific Ocean.²⁹⁷ Farmers shipped goods from three main sites in the North County: Pajaro Landing, Brennan's Landing (later called Watsonville Landing and Hudson's Landing) and Moss Landing.

In 1855, James Brennan — ship owner, commission produce broker and owner of several coastal landings — bought Pajaro Landing at the mouth of the Pajaro River, near the end of present day Beach Road. At first, Ohlones hand-carried 100-pound sacks of grain to rowboats, then rowed the cargo out to larger ships. In 1856, Captain Edward Barry installed a mechanism that used an

²⁹² Gordon, *Monterey Bay Area: Natural History and Cultural Imprints*, 78-79.

²⁹³ "Prunedale," *North County News*, 27 February 1980. Ornamental eucalyptus is still a Monterey County nursery crop. Donald L. Dahlsten, *et al.*, "Biological control of the blue gum psyllid proves economically beneficial," *California Agriculture* 52(1):35-40, January-February 1998, <http://californiaagriculture.ucanr.org/landingpage.cfm?article=ca.v052n01p35&fulltext=yes> (accessed July 6, 2010).

²⁹⁴ Gordon, *Monterey Bay Area: Natural History and Cultural Imprints*, 81-82. In Alfred Hitchcock's 1958 movie *Vertigo*, Jimmy Stewart and Kim Novak's characters drive through the eucalyptus grove on Highway 101.

²⁹⁵ Jackson, "Prunedale?," *North Monterey County Fortnighter*. Cynthia Hibbard, "Alice Crouch: California's First Real Christmas Tree Farmer," *North County News*, 21 December 1977.

²⁹⁶ Cynthia Hibbard, "Alice Crouch: California's First Real Christmas Tree Farmer," *North County News*. Cynthia Hibbard, "Christmas Tree Farms Dot North County Land," *North County News*, date unknown. Dugdale, "North County develops: They grow houses instead of Prunes," *Salinas Californian. Progress*, Prunedale, CA: Prunedale Chamber of Commerce, May 1996. Today, growers in Prunedale focus on Christmas trees, strawberries and mushrooms. Jackson, "Prunedale?," *North Monterey County Fortnighter*.

²⁹⁷ Molho, "Crossing the Bar: A Brief History of Agriculture and Transportation on the Central Coast."

offshore buoy, pulley system, and a mule-driven windlass to tow crops efficiently and safely on covered, protected surf boats out to anchored schooners.²⁹⁸

Brennan sought a location where ships could be more easily loaded, so he tried bringing ships into the Salinas River mouth. Starting in 1860, he built Brennan's Landing, warehouses and loading facilities at Elkhorn Slough's northern end. He had the *Salinas* steamer built, which delivered grain and produce from the landing to San Francisco twice weekly and brought goods back from the city. In 1867, Brennan sold his interests in the *Salinas*, Brennan's Landing and his other interests to his partner and employee Captain Robert Sudden. Captain Sudden needed a new agent and brought in Goodall, Nelson and Perkins, a shipping line that eventually became the Pacific Coast Steamship Company. Brennan's Landing's name changed to Watsonville Landing and then to Hudson's Landing, after Mark A. Hudson who operated it for 40 years, starting in 1868.²⁹⁹ In 1914, E. C. Vierra dismantled the landing's warehouse buildings and salvaged over 200,000 board-feet of valuable redwood, some boards up to two feet wide.³⁰⁰



Remnants of a toll bridge across the Elkhorn Slough. (PAST photograph, 2010.)

Impressed by James Brennan's success, Captain Charles Moss built Moss Landing at the mouth of the Elkhorn Slough in 1866 and it became the main shipping point for Salinas and Pajaro Valley crops until the railroad arrived in 1871.³⁰¹ Captain Moss's farm was about one mile from the Moss Landing harbor. Moss Landing sat at the entrance to the Elkhorn and Moro Cojo sloughs and received Pajaro and Salinas Valley shipments of grain, potatoes, beans, produce, lumber and other products, which were loaded directly to the schooners. Moss and his partner

²⁹⁸ Allan Molho, personal correspondence to Meg Clovis, 26 February 2011. Allan Molho, "Crossing the Bar: A Brief History of Agriculture and Transportation on the Central Coast," Exhibit at the Agricultural History Project of the Central Coast, Watsonville, CA.

²⁹⁹ Molho, personal correspondence to Meg Clovis, 26 February 2011. Molho, "Crossing the Bar: A Brief History of Agriculture and Transportation on the Central Coast." Clovis, *Monterey County's North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 44.

³⁰⁰ "Queen of Elkhorn Slough Waterways Survived Grave; Became Schoolhouse," *Register Pajaronian*, 15 September 1937. Vierra was the son of Cato Vierra, who built Moss Landing's wharf and warehouses in 1866.

³⁰¹ Clovis, *Monterey County's North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 7.

Donald Beadle hired Cato Vierra, an emigrant from the Azores Islands, to build a wharf, bridges, warehouses and other infrastructure.³⁰² Vierra built the first bridge over the Salinas River so horse-drawn wagons could unload cargo directly at the warehouses, which stored up to 15,000 tons of grain. Vierra also operated a ferry across the Elkhorn Slough's mouth and built a toll bridge in the early 1870s. He sold the bridge to Monterey County in 1889.³⁰³

Moss sold his interests to the Pacific Coast Steamship Company in 1876 and most of the region's agricultural products then shipped by rail.³⁰⁵ The 1906 earthquake destroyed Moss Landing warehouses, bridges and the pier, and damaged the railroad tracks.³⁰⁶ Moss Landing retains few physical remnants of its heyday in agricultural shipping.

In Monterey County's agricultural history, Moss Landing, Pajaro Landing, and Brennan's/Hudson's Landing were significant because they

were associated with farmers' early efforts to distribute agricultural goods outside the region and they facilitated the expansion of the county's grain industry. This creative, water-based distribution network was a precursor to the more efficient railroad network that eventually allowed Monterey County farmers to ship their crops to markets in the Midwest, East Coast and abroad. Wood pilings rotting in the water are the main physical evidence of these former shipping hubs.



Moss Landing warehouses and shipping facilities, 1891.³⁰⁴

³⁰² Molho, personal correspondence to Meg Clovis, 26 February 2011. Horace W. Fabing and Rick Hamman, *Steinbeck Country Narrow Gauge* (Boulder, CO: Pruett Publishing Company, 1985), 4. Clovis, *Monterey County's North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 37.

³⁰³ Clovis, *Monterey County's North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 42-44. Vierra bought his property from Paul Lazere, a Frenchman who envisioned building the town of St. Paul where Moss Landing now stands. In 1916, Vierra's relatives David and Ed Vierra established a 5,000-acre saltworks plant where Lazere intended St. Paul to be. The Vierra saltworks, Vierra oyster beds in the Elkhorn Slough, and the Moss Landing fishing industry are beyond the scope of this historic context statement. Clovis, *Monterey County's North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 53, 60.

³⁰⁴ Clovis, *Monterey County's North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 43.

³⁰⁵ Fabing and Hamman, *Steinbeck Country Narrow Gauge*, 10.

³⁰⁶ Clovis, *Monterey County's North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 50, 51.

E. AGRICULTURAL EXPANSION (ca. 1870–1940): INTENSIVE AGRICULTURE, RAILROAD & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, TENANT FARMING, CORPORATE AGRICULTURE AND AGRICULTURAL COLONIES

1. Introduction

Starting in the 1870s, intensive agriculture began replacing extensive agriculture in Monterey County and the cultural landscape evolved as ranchers and farmers made the transition. Intensive agriculture applies a high level of labor, capital and technology, such as advanced equipment, irrigation, horticultural research and technical expertise. New communities developed along the rail lines in the North County, Salinas Valley and South County. Property owners converted open grazing and grain fields to dairy farms, orchards and row crop production. They built milking parlors, greenhouses, equipment and storage barns, windmills, irrigation ditches, produce drying sheds, and other agricultural buildings and structures. As gasoline engines replaced horse-drawn equipment, farmers built structures in which to house and repair automobiles and gas-powered machinery like tractors and harvesters. As production increased and family farms could not handle all farming tasks on-site, entrepreneurs built packing sheds, creameries, cold storage facilities, shipping facilities and other large buildings to distribute agricultural products to distant markets. Property owners built worker housing to accommodate the expanding labor force. New roads connected new communities and expanded truck transportation of agricultural products, eventually overtaking railroad transit.

2. Intensive Agriculture (ca. 1870-1960)

Monterey County’s important intensive agriculture businesses have included dairies, orchards and row crop farms.³⁰⁷ As the twentieth century progressed, large commercial operations increasingly took over and replaced family farms.³⁰⁸ The new business model was significant because it changed the cultural landscape. Companies built large production and storage facilities on farms and near the railroad lines. Corporations that bought family farms converted the main farmhouse to either offices or housing for employees. Some smaller outbuildings fell into disuse or disrepair, no longer suitable for large farming operations.

Several factors spurred Monterey County’s transition from extensive to intensive agriculture, including climate, agricultural financing, the railroad’s arrival, the shift to demand-based agriculture, a large immigrant labor pool and technological advances.

The change from a production-based to a demand-based agricultural model fueled Monterey County’s transition from extensive to intensive agriculture. Traditionally, family farmers had followed the subsistence agricultural model: they grew crops in “kitchen gardens” or small plots, feeding their families first and selling or bartering excess crops. As farmers began planting larger plots, they still planted the crop and amount they wanted, simply seeking a

³⁰⁷ Steven Stoll, *The Fruits of Natural Advantage*, xiii-xiv.

³⁰⁸ Stoll, *The Fruits of Natural Advantage*, xii.

market after the harvest. This production-based method exposed the farmer to financial risks of a poor harvest, excess supply and low demand. In the 1870s and 1880s, Claus Spreckels's sugar beet factory and Croatian apple brokers devised a new demand-based model, offering contracts to farmers before they planted or harvested the crop, buying the produce outright and shifting more financial risk to themselves. These were called "blossom contracts" in the apple industry because brokers would base their contract offers on how good the apple blossoms looked. Growing a single specialty crop was deemed risky for farmers because of potential supply and demand problems, labor issues, weather and insect problems and changing freight costs. But Croatian brokers thought of crops in terms of markets and trade. Treating crops as a commodity and as a speculative large-scale investment was a revolutionary concept in the nineteenth century. Contract-based plantings became more common and farmers began limiting their crops to those for which they had contracts: intensive crops.³⁰⁹

Also, farmers realized that the area's mild climate and long growing season allowed fruit to flourish.³¹⁰ As Pajaro Valley farmers started planting fruit instead of grains in the 1880s, San José bankers loaned them up to \$400 per acre of orchard versus \$50 per acre of wheat. Small-scale agricultural banking institutions financed new ventures, but without track records, new farmers had difficulty qualifying for bank loans. To overcome this problem, the Pajaro Valley's Croatian apple brokers creatively funded farmers with whom they had "blossom contracts" by paying part of the purchase price at the outset and paying the balance from escrow at harvest time. Local farmers, shippers and others served on bank boards in the late 1800s and early 1900s and were sympathetic to agricultural interests. In particular, the Croatian brokers were instrumental in developing the local agricultural financial industry.³¹¹

When the Southern Pacific Railroad extended its line into Monterey County, new towns developed and existing towns expanded. Such railroad-impacted communities include Aromas, Pajaro, Las Lomas, Castroville, Salinas, Spreckels, Gonzales, Soledad, Greenfield, King City, San Lucas, San Ardo and Bradley. Growers and shippers built packing houses along the rails to facilitate distribution to distant markets. The Southern Pacific Milling Company owned and operated twenty-five warehouses from Salinas south to Santa Paula for shipping and storing grains and other products.³¹²

New workers from different ethnic groups arrived by rail to fill the increasing demand for agricultural labor.³¹³ Many immigrant agricultural workers came without families and moved around the area as different crops ripened and needed harvesting. As they married or brought families from home, they settled permanently and new migrant workers replaced them. Because

³⁰⁹ Mekis, *Blossoms into Gold*, 61-62, 69.

³¹⁰ Members of the Pomology and Viticulture Departments, U.C. Davis, and Fruit and Nut Specialists and Farm Advisors, Cooperative Extension, "Fruit and Nut Crops," *A Guidebook to California Agriculture* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1983), 135.

³¹¹ Mekis, *Blossoms into Gold*, 69.

³¹² Margaret E. Clovis and Monterey County Agricultural and Rural Life Museum, *Salinas Valley (Images of America Series)* (Charleston, SC: Arcadia Publishing, 2005), 84.

³¹³ Johnston, "A Brief History of Southern Monterey County."

of language and cultural differences, a new middleman found work in agriculture: labor contractors serving as interpreters and mediators between employers and workers.³¹⁴ When they came to the area in the 1860s, the Chinese created the “boss” labor contracting system, centrally organizing a cheap labor pool for employers. The bosses thoroughly understood farming. The July 26, 1894 *Watsonville Pajaronian* noted that “The Chinese bosses are good judges of the coming beet crop, and they all say that the coming crop will be mammoth, and that 20 tons to the acre will be frequently reported.” They were right.³¹⁵

After the Japanese arrived in North County around 1892, they modified the Chinese boss system, using it to rise in rank from seasonal laborers to sharecroppers, renters, managers and owners. Japanese labor clubs were common by 1910 and open to anyone who could pay the annual fee. Members only participated as long as they wanted the services. Bosses negotiated with employers, determined wages (generally charging five percent as a fee), found jobs for workers, provided job information to migrant workers, traded information with other regional bosses, and expanded to neighboring counties. The clubs also negotiated land and home leases.³¹⁶ The labor contracting system encouraged workers to band together. In a June 1901 disturbance at a Spreckels sugar beet ranch in King City, Monterey County, a foreman fired eight Japanese workers. About sixty others quit immediately, expressing a preference for the Pajaro Valley, where the work was lighter, the sun cooler and the Japanese were better respected.³¹⁷

Other Monterey County ethnic groups also organized their labor. In 1934, Luis Aguido and Damian Marcuelo established the Filipino Farm Labor Union.³¹⁸ In 1934 and 1936, Filipino unions waged strikes in the Salinas lettuce fields. From 1965-1982, the United Farm Workers (UFW) movement organized labor in the area, leading to the rise of Cesar Chavez.³¹⁹

With new labor available, farmers quickly cultivated more acres.³²⁰ Entrepreneurs introduced new crops and pesticides, as well as creative growing, packing, distribution and marketing methods. Irrigation increased, eliminating reliance on unpredictable rainfall. As growers learned that crops were suited to specific soils and climactic zones, specialization and diversification followed.³²¹ These changes all modified the cultural landscape.

Into the twentieth century, large farms still outnumbered small family farms. In 1915, a local author noted that this “resulted in many tracts being rented, and has had a tendency to hold back the more rapid development of the county” But times were changing and “. . . owners of large tracts are yielding to the inevitable, and many of them are cutting up their unwieldy tracts

³¹⁴ Nakane, *Nothing Left in My Hands*, 9.

³¹⁵ Nakane, *Nothing Left in My Hands*, 24-26, 31.

³¹⁶ Nakane, *Nothing Left in My Hands*, 5, 24-25, 31-32.

³¹⁷ Nakane, *Nothing Left in My Hands*, 24-27, 32-33.

³¹⁸ Clovis, *Monterey County’s North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 86-87.

³¹⁹ Mekis, *Blossoms into Gold*, 196. Labor conflicts of this era fall outside of the time period covered here.

³²⁰ Lawrence J. Jelinek, *Harvest Empire: A History of California Agriculture* (San Francisco: Boyd and Fraser Publishing Company, 1979), 52.

³²¹ Johnston, *Old Monterey County: A Pictorial History*, 77.

and selling them to settlers who show a disposition to add to the wealth of the county by adhering to the rules of intensive farming.”³²² However, a lot of prime land never became small parcels, especially as industrial agriculture took over in the twentieth century.

Intensive agriculture is significant in Monterey County’s agricultural history because it prompted the booming expansion of the local agricultural economy. Businesses involved in intensive agriculture modified the cultural landscape by constructing new processing and distribution facilities, as well as worker housing to accommodate the large labor force. Intensive agricultural operations also neglected, demolished, or adaptively used buildings that previously supported extensive agricultural operations. Case-by-case analysis of individual buildings is necessary to determine how and when the buildings changed to accommodate different agricultural practices.

a. Dairying:

Dairying is considered intensive agriculture because it requires high levels of capital and technology, especially after testing requirements for tuberculosis and butterfat hit the industry. It is also associated with irrigation, an expensive undertaking.


Little milking occurred during the Spanish and Mexican periods and Monterey County had only 248 milking cows in 1850.³²³ Dairy herds became more common in the 1860s. C. S. Abbott was one of the first and most important local dairymen. In 1865, he bought 4,000 acres, including the present site of the Salinas Valley town of Spreckels and drove 500 cows down from Marin County. By 1870, Abbott had 1,500 cows and sold most of their output as butter.³²⁴

³²² Dunn, *Monterey County, California*, 7.

³²³ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Historic Overview, 8. Allen, *Economic History of Agriculture in Monterey County, California During the American Period*, 51.

³²⁴ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Historic Overview, 8-9. Allen, *Economic History of Agriculture in Monterey County, California During the American Period*, 51.

California’s temperate climate allowed farmers to raise cows for about sixty percent of East Coast costs because food and shelter are cheaper. Here, crops grow year-round and cow feed is therefore more abundant and less costly than in cold climates. When sugar beets were a major Monterey County crop, local cows ate 100,000 tons of their pulp annually. Dairying increased as farmers devoted more acres to alfalfa, another popular cow feed. Mild Monterey County winters allow cows to live mostly outside rather than in barns, further reducing costs.³²⁶ Thus, the climate also impacted the cultural landscape: Monterey County farmers simply did not need to build the large dairy barns typically found in colder climates.



Castroville farmers delivering milk.³²⁵ (Courtesy of the Monterey County Historical Society.)

Each dairy made butter and milk on-site until creameries opened. Founded in 1897, the Castroville Cooperative Creamery was Monterey County’s first creamery. The Royal Creamery bought it before World War II and moved it to Salinas.³²⁷ By 1902, the Watsonville Creamery operated on San Juan Road in Pajaro.³²⁸ In 1907, the Alpine Evaporated Cream Company opened.³²⁹ Castroville’s Del Monte Junction Creamery made award-winning butter by 1915.³³⁰ In 1933, dairymen formed the Salinas Valley Milk Producers’ Cooperative.³³¹

From 1900 to 1911, Monterey County produced almost 7.4 million pounds of butter and 10.7 million pounds of cheese. In 1915, the county had about 20,000 dairy cows, forty-five creameries, and one evaporated milk plant. The county produced fifteen percent of California’s cheese. Both the Salinas and Pajaro valleys were dairy centers, with the latter “especially . . . adapted for dairying, the climate being absolutely ideal in every respect.” Dairymen fed milk by-products such as whey and buttermilk to their calves and pigs.³³²

Dairies thrived in the Salinas Valley, from Salinas to San Lucas; in north county dairies near Castroville and the Elkhorn Slough and in the Springfield District (north of Moss Landing). By 1881, San Francisco banker and “gentleman farmer” J. Henry Mayers (or Meyer) had a mansion

³²⁵ Clovis, *Monterey County’s North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 20.

³²⁶ Dunn, *Monterey County, California*, 7-8, 10, 21-22.

³²⁷ Clovis, *Monterey County’s North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 20. Subsequent owners included the Golden State Milk Company and the Foremost Company.

³²⁸ Sanborn Fire Insurance map of Pajaro, 1902. County of Monterey Historical File: Pajaro Survey.

³²⁹ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Historic Overview, 9.

³³⁰ Dunn, *Monterey County, California*, 23.

³³¹ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Historic Overview, 9.

³³² Dunn, *Monterey County, California*, 2, 21, 23. Clovis, *Monterey County’s North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 20.

near Castroville where he grew grain and prospered with his Elkhorn Dairy, which supplied all of Stanford University's milk.³³³

Danish immigrants arrived by the 1860s and became prominent Monterey County ranchers and dairymen. Important Danish dairying families in the North County included the Springfield District's Struve family and the Pajaro Valley's Storm family, who intermarried.³³⁴ The Struve family was one of the first to settle in the Pajaro Valley and pioneered the local use of tractors.³³⁵ Struve Road and Struve Slough are named after them.³³⁶ The Arts and Crafts-style **Struve House** (1770 Highway 1, north of Moss Landing) is a significant North County property.

Swiss and Portuguese families eventually dominated the California and Monterey County dairy industries. In 1889, Portuguese dairymen rented 100-acre and larger parcels from Salinas Valley landowners who had been farming grain or leasing property to grain farmers.³³⁷ Swiss families settled along the Salinas River in the late 1880s and many rented dairy land. Dairying expanded as young dairy hands saved money to buy land and bring their families to the farm.

For example, Swiss dairyman Candido Francioni arrived in the Salinas Valley in 1888, worked as a farm hand for fifteen years, operated a dairy for eight years on a rented part of David Jacks's ranch near Soledad and finally bought sixty acres in Greenfield. He milked forty of his sixty cows, made 26,000 pounds of cheese annually, raised milk-fed hogs and sold calves.³³⁸ In the late 1800s and early 1900s, a Swiss family operated a dairy on the I. Scaroni Ranch in the Mission District (named after the former Mission Soledad). One of the daughters worked on the dairy and said dairymen "had no milk barns in those days . . . [w]e milked right out in the corral, rain or shine, hot or cold. It was hard, hard work."³³⁹

³³³ Clovis, *Monterey County's North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 53. *History of Monterey County*, 112 and illustration after page 24.

³³⁴ "Peter Storm Killed by Falling Tree: A Horrible Death for Prominent Resident," *Watsonville Evening Pajaronian*, 10 January 1916. Storm may actually have worked on a McCusker or McClusky ranch. Family names were often misspelled in different sources. Built before 1881, the McCusker House was between Moss Landing and the Pajaro River, near the Monterey Bay and the McClusky Slough.³³⁴

³³⁵ David Pacani, "Exhibit of Struve family planned," *Watsonville Register-Pajaronian*, 1 December 1999.

³³⁶ "Hans Struve," obituary, June 1977. In 1936, noted architect William W. Wurster designed a Pajaro Valley home at 483 Trafton Road for Edith and Nels H. Struve (1886-1974). (Pajaro Valley Historical Association, "Pajaro Valley Historical Association Heritage Homes Tour." Circa 1989.) The property is bounded by Highway 1 and Trafton Road but is difficult to see. Nels was the son of Danish native Nels N. Struve, who owned a 320-acre Pajaro Valley ranch. The younger Struve ranched with his father and then bought property near Harkins Slough and farmed in the Trafton District. He raised beef and dairy cattle and grew sugar beets and other vegetables. ("Nelse H. Struve," *Watsonville Register-Pajaronian*, 18 April 1974. His name is spelled variously as Nelse or Nels.)

³³⁷ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Historic Overview, 9. *Salinas Valley Rustler*, 1915 Homeseekers Edition, 36. Mekis, *Blossoms into Gold*, 193.

³³⁸ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Historic Overview, 9. *Salinas Valley Rustler*, 1915 Homeseekers Edition, 36.

³³⁹ "We Worked Hard but Had Visiting Time" Recalls Maming" in "Looking Back: Greenfield News 60th Year Jubilee Edition," *Greenfield News* (Greenfield, CA: 21 April 1965), 25.

In 1915, Gonzales was the largest dairying town in Monterey County. In the 1920s, many dairies operated in the southern portion of the Salinas Valley, from Chualar to San Lucas.³⁴⁰ At the peak of the Salinas Valley dairy industry, three milk plants operated in the area, two in Soledad alone.³⁴¹ In 1938, Salinas Valley Milk Producers' Cooperative members started buying feed from the Co-op. Between 1955 and 1960, the farmers had saved on feed costs, leading to larger herds and an oversupply of milk. Surplus milk coupled with pesticide contamination problems in the 1960s forced many Monterey County dairies to close in the mid- to late-1960s. By 1970, only three dairies remained in the Salinas Valley Milk Producers' Cooperative.³⁴² Many Monterey County dairies have sold their land to row crop farms and vineyards.³⁴³

David Jacks and the "Jacks Houses." After David Jacks's initial agricultural failures with potatoes and hogs, he became well-known for producing Monterey Jack cheese. In the Spanish and Mexican periods, Franciscan missionaries made the soft, creamy, light cheese, then called *queso del pais* (country cheese) or *queso blanco* (white cheese). It became a local dietary staple.³⁴⁴ In the 1880s, Dona Juana Cota de Boronda made small quantities of *queso del pais* at the family's Rancho de Los Laureles in Carmel Valley and sold it locally.³⁴⁵

David Jacks was the first person to make the cheese successfully on a large commercial scale. He owned a dairy on the Salinas River, leased land to dairy farmers, and formed partnerships in fourteen dairies with Portuguese and Swiss dairymen. In the 1880s or 1890s, he started making *queso del pais* and marketed it as "Jacks Cheese" or "Jacks Monterey Cheese." Very popular on the West Coast, it became known as Monterey Jack cheese. Some dispute exists about whether the "Jack" memorializes David Jacks or the "house jack" implement used to pressurize the milk into cheese. Carmel Valley resident Domingo Pedrazzi made "Pedrazzi's Jack Cheese" before David Jacks produced his cheese, lending credence to the latter explanation.³⁴⁶

The Salinas Valley is home to a number of so-called "Jacks Houses," named for David Jacks and associated with his dairy operations. They are iconic vestiges of the Salinas Valley's dairy history. The David Jacks Corporation built many identical one-and-a-half story houses plus ancillary farm buildings on Jacks's land from Chualar to Soledad. The designer is unknown. The buildings appear to reflect late nineteenth century architectural design although they were

³⁴⁰ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I, Historic Overview*, 9. Orser, *It Happened In Soledad*, 26.

³⁴¹ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I, Historic Overview*, 10.

³⁴² Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I, Historic Overview*, 10.

³⁴³ Vicky Peterson, "Albertoni dairy one of the few in the Valley," *The Land*, January 1980.

³⁴⁴ Jack, "Land King: The Story of David Jack," 6-7.

³⁴⁵ Loomis, "Scoundrel or Benefactor of Monterey," *California HISTORIAN*, 12. Dona Boronda's granddaughter Teresa Russell states that Dona Boronda sold her cheese to David Jacks, who marketed and exported it in crates marked "Jack Cheese." The "jack" was a vice. As the milk in the jack turned to cheese, the maker squeezed it between wooden paddles in the jack, using leather straps to bind the paddle handles together. (Wendy Moss, "The 'True' Story of Monterey Jack Cheese," *Monterey County Historical Society*, 1996 letter from Teresa Russell, <http://www.mchsmuseum.com/cheese.html>, accessed 12 June 2009).

³⁴⁶ Jack, "Land King: The Story of David Jack," 6-7. Loomis, "Scoundrel or Benefactor of Monterey," *California HISTORIAN*, 12.

built between 1908 and 1915.³⁴⁷ David Jacks subdivided and leased out parcels of his large Salinas Valley landholdings to dairymen and ranchers. Reportedly, when tenants signed a lease with the David Jacks Corporation, they had the option to pay \$800 to have the company build a Jacks House on the property. A Monterey area mill pre-cut the house materials and the pieces were delivered to the dairy or ranch.³⁴⁸ Each Jacks house is twenty-six feet by thirty-two feet, with a six-foot deep front porch and a six-foot deep rear shed addition, making the full footprint twenty-six feet by forty-four feet. One distinctive design feature makes them easy to recognize: the roof eaves cut off the tops of the side upper-story windows.³⁴⁹

Many of the extant Jacks houses are located near the Highway 101 corridor between Chualar and southern Soledad. The highest concentration is at the southern edge of Soledad between Highway 101 and Arroyo Seco Road. *Chapter 5: Historic Themes, Associated Property Types, Eligibility Criteria and Integrity Thresholds* identifies the known extant and demolished Jacks houses and their addresses. In the future, Monterey County might designate the extant Jacks houses as a non-contiguous historic district. The **Foletta Road Jacks House Dairy** (1908) at 24645 Foletta Road in Chualar is one of the best examples.³⁵⁰

The Salinas Valley's **Albertoni Dairy** (37221 Arroyo Seco Road, Soledad) has a long dairy history and also includes a Jacks house. It operated as a dairy until the 1980s but now features row crops.³⁵¹ Swiss immigrant Osvaldo Albertoni arrived in the Salinas Valley in 1921 and started operating dairies with Charlie Gianolini and Gene Sciaroni of Greenfield. Albertoni founded the Albertoni Dairy in 1943 and his sons Oliver and Clem later took over the operation.³⁵² The property includes a Jacks house, horse barn, dairy house, milking barn, dairy barn, water tower, granary, chicken coops, shop, garage and modern buildings.³⁵³

The **Binsacca Foothill Ranch** (37393 Foothill Road, Soledad) is another representative Salinas Valley dairy ranch. Like many in the region, it specialized in Monterey Jack cheese.³⁵⁴ The extant agricultural buildings and structures reveal its long and diverse agricultural history,

³⁴⁷ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Introduction, 5.

³⁴⁸ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Historic Overview, 6. Clark Historic Resource Consultants, Inc., *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources Located in the Unincorporated Areas Between Salinas and Soledad, Monterey County, California, Phase II* [hereafter, Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase II*] (Santa Rosa, CA: Clark Historic Resource Consultants, Inc., September 2001), Survey Results, 3. Monterey County Historical File: "Jacks Houses."

³⁴⁹ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Historic Overview, 6. Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase II*, Survey Results, 3.

³⁵⁰ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Introduction, 5.

³⁵¹ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase II*, DPR Form 523, "Albertoni Dairy, 37221 Arroyo Seco Road, Soledad."

³⁵² Vicky Peterson, "Albertoni dairy one of the few in the Valley," *The Land*, January 1980.

³⁵³ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase II*, DPR Form 523, "Albertoni Dairy, 37221 Arroyo Seco Road, Soledad."

³⁵⁴ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Historic Overview, 9.

including a residence (1902), dairy barn, two dairy houses, horse barn, water storage tank, granary, pigeon shed, chicken coops, brooder shed, apple house, wash house and a brick oven.³⁵⁵

b. Sugar Beets:

By the 1870s, local farmers planted sugar beets, the first intensive crop grown on a large scale in Monterey County. For more than a century, many ethnicities worked in the sugar beet fields. Japanese immigrants were among the first to do so, arriving in the Pajaro Valley around 1892 and working in the beet fields until the end of the 1800s or longer.³⁵⁶ For example, Toshi Murata's family lived in the Castroville area in the early 1920s, working 250 sugar beet acres.³⁵⁷ The Spreckels Sugar Company ran labor camps for its workers throughout Monterey County, and many camps were divided by ethnicity (described later in the section on Labor Camps).

The Spreckels Sugar Company dominated Monterey County's sugar beet industry for about a century. Claus Spreckels's choice to invest in the region was a main factor easing the transition from extensive wheat farming to intensive specialty crop production. By 1887, Claus Spreckels was the Pacific Coast's leading sugar refiner with successful ventures in San Francisco, Hawaii and Philadelphia. After years of using Hawaiian sugar cane, Spreckels switched to sugar beets. On November 5, 1887, he offered seeds and technology to Pajaro Valley farmers if they agreed to cultivate sugar beets.³⁵⁸ In December 1887, Watsonville (Santa Cruz County) citizens contributed \$13,140 and a site for America's largest sugar beet factory. Built in 1888, the Western Beet Sugar Company's plant was a boon to local farmers. The first harvest (called a "campaign") was in 1889, with the Pajaro Valley's rich alluvial soil producing sugar percentages higher than any beets in the world.³⁵⁹ Spreckels offered annual planting contracts to farmers to guarantee enough beets, paying them by the ton based on sugar content and paying rail freight to the factory.³⁶⁰ He also leased sugar beet land to farmers. The Watsonville plant processed 350 tons of beets daily (the daily capacity later expanded to 1,000 tons) and made about three million pounds of raw sugar annually. Spreckels's San Francisco factory refined the raw sugar.³⁶¹

Between Spreckels and his competitors, California's sugar beet production skyrocketed from 5.2 million pounds in 1889 to about 44 million pounds in 1894.³⁶² On August 1, 1896, Claus Spreckels spoke at Salinas's Agricultural Hall, asking 2,000 farmers and ranchers to grow enough sugar beets to meet the demand of a new factory he planned to build locally.³⁶³ They

³⁵⁵ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, DPR Form 523, "Binsacca Foothill Ranch, 37393 Foothill Road, Soledad, CA."

³⁵⁶ Nakane, *Nothing Left in My Hands*, 27.

³⁵⁷ Nakane, *Nothing Left in My Hands*, 6, 10, 16, 24, 27. Mekis, *Blossoms into Gold*, xxii.

³⁵⁸ Gary S. Breschini, Mona Gudgel and Trudy Haversat, *Spreckels* (Charleston, SC: Arcadia Publishing, 2006), 7.

³⁵⁹ Horace W. Fabing and Rick Hamman, *Steinbeck Country Narrow Gauge*, 26-27.

³⁶⁰ Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, 66. Dunn, *Monterey County, California*, 24. Betty Lewis, *W. H. Weeks: Architect* (Fresno, CA: Pioneer Publishing Company, 1989, Second Edition).

³⁶¹ Gary S. Breschini, Mona Gudgel and Trudy Haversat, *Spreckels* (Charleston, SC: Arcadia Publishing, 2006), 7.

³⁶² Nakane, *Nothing Left in My Hands*, 24.

³⁶³ Breschini, *et al.*, *Spreckels*, 7.

agreed, he moved ahead with his new factory, and farmers, tenants and colonists in the Salinas Valley converted thousands of acres of grain fields to sugar beet fields. This economic boost drew the Salinas Valley out of a depression that had also impacted the rest of the country.³⁶⁴ The sheer magnitude of the Spreckels Sugar Company dramatically impacted Monterey County agriculture and altered the cultural landscape. The company's biggest contributions included introducing irrigation to the Salinas Valley on a large scale, establishing beet ranches down the length of the Salinas Valley, building the company town of Spreckels, establishing segregated labor camps, and helping spur the development of Salinas Valley agricultural colonies.

Citing Spreckels's announcement that "What we need in California is men who will go to work on the farms of the State and develop its resources," land promoters founded agricultural colonies and enticed would-be farmers to move to Monterey County and start a new life. Two Salinas Valley colonies were founded in 1897, Fort Romie and St. Joseph's Colony, and both supplied sugar beets to Spreckels (described below in the section on Agricultural Colonies).³⁶⁵ Spreckels also bought and developed the King Ranch near King City, across the Salinas River from the Dunphy Ranch.³⁶⁶

To expand his sugar beet empire, Spreckels bought former dairy land about five miles south of Salinas and eighteen miles east of Monterey. Dairyman Carlisle S. Abbott had leased it by 1865, owned it by 1875, built a home and outbuildings, milked 1,500 cows and made 200,000 pounds of butter annually.³⁶⁷ Abbott Street parallels Highway 101 south of Salinas near Abbott's dairy property. The landscape changed considerably after the Spreckels Sugar Company bought the land and founded the town of Spreckels, California, one of the few company towns remaining in California today. It is located along Spreckels Boulevard and is also accessible from Harkins Road and Harris Road, both of which intersect Abbott Street.

Because only horse-drawn vehicles could travel between Salinas and Spreckels, in 1897 the company extended its narrow-gauge railroad from the Watsonville factory to the new factory site in Spreckels, calling it the Pajaro Valley Consolidated Railroad. The rails allowed Spreckels to transport raw materials to the plant and move the refined sugar to Moss Landing for shipping.³⁶⁸

Between 1898 and the 1930s, architect William H. Weeks designed most of the buildings in the company town, including the factory, offices, houses for workers and their families, and

³⁶⁴ "St. Joseph Colonists Came to Salinas In Dry 1897-98," *Salinas Californian*, 20 March 1948. "Forgotten Edens: Agricultural Colonies in the Salinas Valley." Unpublished, undated manuscript in the files of the County of Monterey.

³⁶⁵ "St. Joseph Colonists Came to Salinas In Dry 1897-98," *Salinas Californian*, 20 March 1948. "Forgotten Edens: Agricultural Colonies in the Salinas Valley." Unpublished, undated manuscript in the files of the County of Monterey.

³⁶⁶ Tom Thwaits, Draft of Speech (Salinas Land Company Office, Greenfield, CA: circa 1968), 3. As described later in this section, the Salinas Land Company bought the Dunphy Ranch in 1917 and irrigated it for orchards and vegetables.

³⁶⁷ Breschini, *et al.*, *Spreckels*, 8, 13.

³⁶⁸ Breschini, *et al.*, *Spreckels*, 8.

commercial structures.³⁶⁹ The five-story Spreckels factory was 582 feet long, 102 feet wide and required four million bricks imported from Germany and 3,500 tons of steel.³⁷⁰ It opened in 1899, processing 3,000 tons of beets daily, requiring 30,000 acres of beets to meet this demand.³⁷¹ Irrigation was critical and the factory used 13 million gallons of water daily, the same amount the city of San Francisco used.³⁷² Spreckels closed his Watsonville factory shortly after the new factory opened.³⁷³ The devastating 1906 earthquake damaged the factory in Spreckels but it was repaired. By 1952, the factory processed almost 7,000 tons daily. The company ceased operations at the factory before the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake damaged it; it was demolished in 1993.³⁷⁴

The town's original buildings included a sixty-one room hotel and forty worker residences in twelve different designs. *The Owl* of October 14, 1897 reported that the four-room houses would also have an outhouse and barn.³⁷⁵ The houses were built in a grid bounded by Spreckels Boulevard, Llano Avenue, Fifth Street and Railroad Avenue (adjacent to the railroad tracks that serviced the factory), with cross streets of Hatton Avenue and First, Second, Third and Fourth streets. The town had a United Presbyterian church and a Catholic church.³⁷⁶ Black walnut trees planted along Spreckels Boulevard became an important feature of the cultural landscape.

The former sugar factory site and the town of Spreckels comprise the Spreckels Historic District, listed in the Monterey County Register of Historic Resources. The town still has the original street grid, a small commercial district, original worker housing and public buildings. Commercial structures include the two-story, brick with cast-iron storefront Emporium building and a wood building that formerly housed the library and the *Spreckels Courier* office. The town also has an elementary school, a Veterans Memorial building and a Catholic church. The town has about 180 single-family homes. Most are modest three-to-five room wood-framed homes but a few Spreckels employees lived in more prominent homes. For example, the company's district manager, Charles Pioda, lived in a large bungalow (1911) at Third and Llano Streets. The large bungalow on Third Street was the former company Clubhouse but is now a home.³⁷⁷

The Spreckels Sugar Company exemplifies the late nineteenth century industrial boom in America. Before the 1890s, Americans imported most of their sugar. The town of Spreckels is also significant as one of the few company towns in California. Only a few remain, including

³⁶⁹ Breschini, *et al.*, *Spreckels*, 8. Glenn David Mathews, AIA, *Spreckels, California: Design Guidelines* (Salinas, CA: Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection Department, 1999), 10-11.

³⁷⁰ Breschini, *et al.*, *Spreckels*, 8.

³⁷¹ Breschini, *et al.*, *Spreckels*, 8, 14.

³⁷² Breschini, *et al.*, *Spreckels*, 8.

³⁷³ Breschini, *et al.*, *Spreckels*, 14. By 1901, Spreckels's monopoly diminished with competition from the American Sugar Refining Company. Spreckels balked at the price demanded by Pajaro Valley growers, who then stopped growing sugar beets in the area. (Nakane, *Nothing Left in My Hands*, 26.)

³⁷⁴ Breschini, *et al.*, *Spreckels*, 8, 14.

³⁷⁵ Breschini, *et al.*, *Spreckels*, 8, 15.

³⁷⁶ Breschini, *et al.*, *Spreckels*, 15.

³⁷⁷ Mathews, *Spreckels, California: Design Guidelines*, 10-11.

McCloud, formed by the McCloud River Railroad and Lumber Company; and Crockett, built by the C&H Sugar Company. The architectural styles of the structures in Spreckels are noteworthy. The community also has a prominent historical connection with the U.S. sugar beet industry. Distinguished people associated with Spreckels include sugar magnate Claus Spreckels, founder of the Spreckels Sugar Company and the town; and well-known California architect, William H. Weeks, who took Spreckels's vision and made it a reality.³⁷⁸

By 1915, the company grew beets on about 17,500 acres and processed 200,000 tons annually.³⁷⁹ Spreckels grew beets at Andrew Molera's Mulligan Hill Ranch on Molera Road near Castroville. When sugar beet prices dropped around 1920, Spreckels let his lease end and Molera found a new crop: artichokes.³⁸⁰

c. Berries:

Strawberries were an early and important intensive crop in Monterey County. Even the Ohlones harvested a local wild strawberry.³⁸¹ The beneficial climate, long growing season and adaptability of many strawberry varieties to local conditions give California a leading role in strawberry production.³⁸² Strawberries are labor intensive: growers plant them annually to maximize yield, the long fruiting season can last ten months, and hand harvesting is required because berries ripen at different times and sizes.³⁸³

Planted in 1865, the Gilkey farm in the North County's Vega District was the first Pajaro Valley strawberry farm and the first crops were sold to the local market with some struggle.³⁸⁴ But when the railroad arrived in Monterey County in 1871, the region transitioned from growing grain to fruit and strawberries became more popular.³⁸⁵ Farmers planted strawberries as solo crops and between rows of apple trees.³⁸⁶ A "strawberry-shipping boom" to San Francisco began in the late 1870s and strawberry cultivation grew steadily: 42 acres in 1881, 118 acres in 1883, 185 acres in 1884, 268 acres in 1885, 522 acres in 1895, 700 acres in 1901, and 840 acres in 1902.³⁸⁷ In August 1902, the *San Francisco Chronicle* noted that

Although apples lead, and although there has been a great planting in this fruit during the past ten years, berries have, all things considered, hold a prominent place as a profitable

³⁷⁸ Mathews, *Spreckels, California: Design Guidelines*, 11.

³⁷⁹ Dunn, *Monterey County, California*, 24. Betty Lewis, *W.H. Weeks: Architect*.

³⁸⁰ Clovis, *Monterey County's North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 22.

³⁸¹ Crops Brought Name 'Spud Valley', *Watsonville Register-Pajaronian*.

³⁸² "Fruit and Nut Crops," *A Guidebook to California Agriculture*, 157, 159.

³⁸³ "Fruit and Nut Crops," *A Guidebook to California Agriculture*, 157.

³⁸⁴ Nakane, *Nothing Left in My Hands*, 7.

³⁸⁵ Nakane, *Nothing Left in My Hands*, 6.

³⁸⁶ Dunn, *Monterey County, California*, 13, 18.

³⁸⁷ Nakane, *Nothing Left in My Hands*, 9, 24, 28.

crop. The yield of strawberries is enormous. It will startle the Eastern farmer to hear that the growers pick these berries nearly ten months of the year.³⁸⁸

Backed by strawberry research and a big labor pool, farmers planted larger orchards and ranchers converted land from wheat to fruit for higher profits.³⁸⁹ Prominent North County resident John T. Porter was an early strawberry farmer. He planted fifty acres on his Pajaro ranch in 1883.³⁹⁰

Although industrial-scale strawberry farms dominate Monterey County today, early strawberry farms were small. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, one farmer and a few workers could survive on income from a two-acre strawberry farm. Most Japanese farmers working under contract or on shares worked on farms of five or six acres.³⁹¹ Japanese strawberry farmers generally farmed one parcel for four to six years then moved to another farm for fresh soil.³⁹² Both women and men worked in the fields, including female Pajaro resident Fuji Murakami, whose family grew strawberries until World War II.³⁹³

In 1915, landowners sold unimproved strawberry land for \$100-\$200 per acre or rented it out for \$20-\$30 per acre per year. First-year land preparation costs were \$20-\$25 per acre. Each acre supported about 15,000-20,000 plants, costing \$3 for every 1,000 plants.³⁹⁴ By 1915, Monterey County farmers annually produced over one million pounds of strawberries, plus Loganberries (200,000 pounds), blackberries (50,000 pounds) and raspberries (50,000 pounds).³⁹⁵ Strawberry acreage in California doubled from the late 1940s to the early 1980s as industrial agriculture took over.³⁹⁶ Today, most strawberry workers are Mexican. In 2009, strawberries surpassed lettuce as Monterey County's top crop for the first time.

d. Orchards: Fruit and Nuts

Monterey County farmers have successfully grown a wide variety of orchard crops including apples, apricots, pears, peaches, plums, prunes, cherries, almonds and walnuts.³⁹⁷ Some of the most prominent orchard areas have been in the Pajaro Valley and the Salinas Valley. While few extant historic resources illustrate the Pajaro Valley's orchard industry, the Salinas Valley stretch from Greenfield to King City retains buildings and irrigation infrastructure that tell the story of

³⁸⁸ Nakane, *Nothing Left in My Hands*, 11.

³⁸⁹ Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, 64.

³⁹⁰ Betty Lewis, *Watsonville Yesterday* (Watsonville, CA: Litho Watsonville Press, 1978), 116.

³⁹¹ Nakane, *Nothing Left in My Hands*, 42.

³⁹² Nakane, *Nothing Left in My Hands*, 43.

³⁹³ Nakane, *Nothing Left in My Hands*, 40.

³⁹⁴ Dunn, *Monterey County, California*, 18.

³⁹⁵ Dunn, *Monterey County, California*, 13, 18. Aromas Friends of the Library and Pajaro Valley Historical Association, "Aromas History Walking Tour," October 24, 1982. Pajaro Valley resident John H. Logan created the loganberry by crossing raspberry and blackberry plants.

³⁹⁶ "Fruit and Nut Crops," *A Guidebook to California Agriculture*, 157.

³⁹⁷ California Orchard Company, *Developing 1,905 Acres*, 13.

the Clark Colony (now Greenfield), Salinas Land Company and California Orchard Company, which grew thousands of acres of fruit and nut trees after 1905, 1917 and 1919, respectively.

By the 1850s, Pajaro Valley residents had planted backyard apple trees but by 1860, the Pajaro Valley still had fewer than fifty acres of fruit trees in production.³⁹⁹ In the 1870s, however, the area expanded into an internationally known apple center. By 1873, the Blackburn & Waters nursery (founded by James Waters and J. A. Blackburn) had forty acres of orchards in the North County.⁴⁰⁰ While orchard growers waited for newly planted trees to mature, they interplanted other crops between the trees. In the Pajaro Valley in the 1870s, orchard owners interplanted strawberries at first but later substituted peas, corn, sugar beets and other vegetables to avoid harming apple tree root growth with excessive irrigation.⁴⁰¹ In the Salinas Valley and South County in the early 1920s, the California Orchard Company interplanted beans, peas and other annual crops.⁴⁰²

The Pajaro Valley apple industry expanded after 1873 when high demand, high prices, railroad transportation, sufficient labor, apple experimentation and clever Croatian fruit brokers gave the valley new agricultural prominence. In 1873-1874, Red Scale devastated the Santa Clara Valley's apple crop, allowing Pajaro Valley growers to step in and meet San Francisco's demand for fruit.⁴⁰³ When the Southern Pacific Railroad arrived in Monterey County in 1871, more workers came to the orchards and fields of the Pajaro and Salinas Valleys.⁴⁰⁴ However, high freight prices still kept many growers from shipping via rail and they continued to use wagons to transport their



Workers spray apples in the early 1900s. Pajaro Valley entomologists William H. Volck and E. E. Luther formulated safe, effective pesticides, protecting local apples from the codling moth. (Courtesy of Pajaro Valley Historical Association.)³⁹⁸

³⁹⁸ Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, 85.

³⁹⁹ Nakane, *Nothing Left in My Hands*, 7. Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, 49.

⁴⁰⁰ Martin, *Directory of the Town of Watsonville for 1873*, 44. S. Martinelli & Company is perhaps the best-known Pajaro Valley apple company today. In 1868, Italian-Swiss immigrant Stephen Martinelli founded it as the Champagne Cider Company, in Watsonville. Nakane, *Nothing Left in My Hands*, 7. Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, 48. Sylvia Brown and Susan Collins, "Martinelli's Cider Celebrates 140th Anniversary With New Sparkling Apple Fruit and Berry Juice Blends" (San Francisco: Brown & Collins, 19 May 2008), 1.

⁴⁰¹ Nakane, *Nothing Left in My Hands*, 10-11. Mekis, *Blossoms into Gold*, 69.

⁴⁰² California Orchard Company, *Developing 1,905 Acres*, 14.

⁴⁰³ Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, 70.

⁴⁰⁴ Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, 65.

goods.⁴⁰⁵ But with the increased apple demand and higher sale prices after the Red Scale devastation, growers shipped their fruit via train.⁴⁰⁶ By 1915, the Pajaro Valley shipped 4,000 carloads of fruit.⁴⁰⁷

Croatian fruit brokers Marco Rabasa and L. G. Sresovich created the Pajaro Valley's first apple buying, packing and shipping system.⁴⁰⁸ Under the old production-based agricultural model, farmers planted what they wanted and sought buyers after the harvest. Croatian fruit brokers helped the agricultural industry expand by implementing the demand-based agricultural model in which customer preferences influenced crop plantings. They also offered "blossom contracts" to growers, buying the crop before it matured and encouraging farmers to plant more orchards. Claus Spreckels offered similar sugar beet contracts in the 1870s. But fruit contracts were riskier than beet contracts because apples are perishable, so brokers started "reading" apple blossoms to determine tree health and crop value. The broker assumed losses formerly borne by the grower: crop failure, pests, supply and demand fluctuations, and labor and transportation problems.⁴⁰⁹ Croatian apple distributors also developed standards for cleanliness, inspecting, grading, packing, packaging and storing apples.⁴¹⁰ Railroads charged by the ton, so pooling crops saved money.⁴¹¹ In 1884, Watsonville's first apple-packing business was founded, consolidating the harvests of multiple growers.⁴¹²

Standardization funneled undersized and damaged apples into dried fruit, juice or vinegar. This development was significant because it changed the cultural landscape: new buildings and structures were needed to process crops in new ways. For example, apple dryers were built throughout the Pajaro Valley. Apple drying was the most labor-intensive aspect of the industry and flourished during the 1898 Spanish-American War, when military demand was high.

Chinese laborers, seeking new work after Spreckels moved his plant from Watsonville to Spreckels in 1898, opened apple drying operations in Prunedale, Aromas and around Pajaro.⁴¹³ Apple growers and distributors allowed the Chinese to invest in apple dryers because the business was deemed "marginal and unstable." They acted as middlemen and contracted with the migrant laborers but when drying technology improved and made the industry more efficient and profitable, the Chinese were unable to compete.⁴¹⁴ Croatian apple distributors built an apple

⁴⁰⁵ Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, 64-65.

⁴⁰⁶ Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, 65.

⁴⁰⁷ Dunn, *Monterey County, California*, 13.

⁴⁰⁸ Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, 70.

⁴⁰⁹ Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, 66-68, 81.

⁴¹⁰ Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, 96-97.

⁴¹¹ Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, 72-74.

⁴¹² Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, 68, 70-71.

⁴¹³ Nakane, *Nothing Left in My Hands*, 29. Mekis, *Blossoms into Gold*, 192. Jackson, "Prunedale?," *North Monterey County Fortnightly*. Everett Messick, "Where Are the Prunes in Prunedale?," *Monterey Herald*, undated. Cynthia Hibbard, "Origin of Name is Plain — Prunes for Prunedale," *North County News*, 3 December 1975. Clovis, *Monterey County's North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 78. Aromas Friends of the Library and Pajaro Valley Historical Association, "Aromas History Walking Tour," October 24, 1982. Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, 111.

⁴¹⁴ Mekis, *Blossoms into Gold*, 192.

dryer in 1900 and J. F. Unglish later built a large kiln in Pajaro.⁴¹⁵ By 1904, Croatian shippers built Unglish-style dryers and leased them to Chinese businessmen using Chinese workers. Chinese-operated apple dryers dominated the industry for the next two decades, although apple drying facilities have virtually disappeared from the North County landscape.⁴¹⁶ Japanese laborers also worked in the packing and drying industries.⁴¹⁷

By 1915, Pajaro Valley land prices were the highest in Monterey County because the “most highly improved orchards” were located there as well as a good water supply.⁴¹⁹ At the time, the Pajaro Valley was the world’s most productive apple area and the Monterey County section of the Pajaro Valley annually produced more than \$1 million worth of apples.⁴²⁰ As of 1915, “many of the hundred [Pajaro Valley] packing-houses, sixteen evaporated and a score or more of cider, vinegar and canning establishments” were located in Monterey County.⁴²¹

Innovations and efficiencies in

contracting, packing, marketing, shipping, railroad scheduling, and railroad routes led to cost-effective production and wide distribution to the American Midwest, East Coast and abroad.⁴²²

Building on this success, Pajaro Valley apple growers and distributors expanded their interests to businesses related to agriculture, including finance, insurance, cold storage, lumber, steel, printing companies, steamship lines and railroads.⁴²³

The expanding apple business and subsequent labor specialization created new employment opportunities for women. They worked as apple sorters and packers, especially after the Croatian packers and shippers declined to offer blossom contracts in 1891, forcing some growers to start packing and shipping their own crops.⁴²⁴



The flooded, Chinese-owned Pacific Operating Company apple dryer on San Juan Road, near the Main Street Bridge from Pajaro to Watsonville (demolished).⁴¹⁸
(Courtesy of Pajaro Valley Historical Association.)

⁴¹⁵ Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, 111.

⁴¹⁶ Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, 112.

⁴¹⁷ Nakane, *Nothing Left in My Hands*, 6. Mekis, *Blossoms into Gold*, 193.

⁴¹⁸ Clovis, *Monterey County’s North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 78.

⁴¹⁹ Dunn, *Monterey County, California*, 11.

⁴²⁰ Dunn, *Monterey County, California*, 12, 15.

⁴²¹ Dunn, *Monterey County, California*, 15.

⁴²² Mekis, *Blossoms into Gold*, 74.

⁴²³ Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, 112-113.

⁴²⁴ Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, 109, 159.


Monterey County Horticultural Commissioner J. B. Hickman noted in 1915 that “The warm, well-drained slopes of the hills in the northern end of Monterey County offer almost ideal locations for apricots Cool northern slopes everywhere and the heavy lands of Pajaro and Carmel valleys offer perfect conditions for apples and pears.”⁴²⁵ Prunedale, a community of about twenty-five square miles in northeast North County, is named for prune trees planted there in the nineteenth century. Farmers settled in the hilly area in the 1860s.⁴²⁶ Residents cleared hills of oak trees, shipped the valuable wood to San José via the Southern Pacific Railroad, and planted orchards on the bare hills. Before then, the area supported mostly subsistence farming, bee hives and dairies.⁴²⁷

Prunedale farmers thought the area’s light, sandy soil and ample water supply would help orchards succeed.⁴²⁹ The San Miguel Canyon Road area of Prunedale was called the Lake District in the 1880s, attesting to the available water.⁴³⁰ Reportedly, real estate developers suggested that farmers plant prunes and named the area Prunedale.⁴³¹

Prunes are a variety of plums with very high sugar content.⁴³²

Some early prune, apple and apricot crops did not fare well

because the farmers did not irrigate well enough or use fertilizers. Prunes perform best in warm climates and the trees fared poorly in the chilly valleys around Prunedale. The cold, moist air split them open and the prunes failed to dry properly.⁴³³



Female apple packers in Watsonville, 1904.
(Courtesy of Pajaro Valley Historical Association.)⁴²⁸

Prune orchards grew in the Prunedale area along San Miguel Canyon Road and into Echo and Paradise Valleys. The Hambey family planted the first prune orchards on 640 acres in San Miguel Canyon and Echo Valley. James Crouch, who married Mary Hambey in 1886, helped

⁴²⁵ Dunn, *Monterey County, California*, 13.

⁴²⁶ “Prunedale,” *North County News*, February 27, 1980. Don Dugdale, “North County develops: They grow houses instead of Prunes,” *Salinas Californian*, 5 July 1976.

⁴²⁷ *History of Monterey County*, 111.

⁴²⁸ Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, 109.

⁴²⁹ “Prunedale,” *North County News*, 27 February 1980. Don Dugdale, “North County develops: They grow houses instead of Prunes,” *Salinas Californian*, 5 July 1976.

⁴³⁰ Everett Messick, “Where Are the Prunes in Prunedale?,” *Monterey Herald*, undated.

⁴³¹ *Progress*, Prunedale, CA: Prunedale Chamber of Commerce, May 1996. Cynthia Hibbard, “Origin of Name is Plain — Prunes for Prunedale,” *North County News*, 3 December 1975.


⁴³² Everett Messick, “Where Are the Prunes in Prunedale?,” *Monterey Herald*, undated.

⁴³³ Cynthia Hibbard, “Origin of Name is Plain — Prunes for Prunedale,” *North County News*, 3 December 1975. “Prunedale,” *North County News*, 27 February 1980.

graft and plant the first Prunedale trees. By the time James’s son Nathaniel and Alice Crouch married in 1925, prunes were gone from the area, likely by 1910.⁴³⁴ The Crouch family home at 1833 San Miguel Canyon Road was built in 1886.⁴³⁵ The “farmers’ telephone system” (a single line strung along redwood posts about twenty feet high) served farmers along San Miguel Canyon Road, through Long Canyon and west to Elkhorn until after 1949.⁴³⁶

After prune trees, they planted apples, apricots and plums.⁴³⁸ Apple orchards still covered most of Prunedale into the 1940s, but became unprofitable. One of the last producing orchards, along Maher Road north of Royal Oaks Park, was removed around 1970.⁴³⁹ Over time, the Prunedale hills also have been used as cattle grazing land, dairies, orchards and chicken farms.⁴⁴⁰

Farmers in the Salinas Valley and South County also cultivated thousands of acres of orchards, successfully competing with farmers in the Pajaro Valley. Significantly, many of the orchard growers in the Salinas Valley and South County were associated with the Clark Colony (now Greenfield), the Salinas Land Company, and the California Orchard Company, described in more detail in the sections on Corporate Agriculture and Agricultural Colonies. By irrigating thousands of acres of arid land, planting symmetrical rows of fruit and nut orchards and row crops, establishing eucalyptus windbreaks to protect crops, building permanent worker housing, constructing outbuildings and building irrigation infrastructure, the Clark Colony, Salinas Land Company and California Orchard Company significantly accelerated the Salinas Valley’s agricultural development and changed the cultural landscape.



⁴³⁴ Ken Schultz, “Rural Prunedale Adding,” *Monterey Peninsula Herald*.

⁴³⁵ *Progress*, Prunedale, CA: Prunedale Chamber of Commerce, May 1996.

⁴³⁶ Church, *Historical Notes of North Monterey County With a History of Hidden Valley*, 6.

⁴³⁷ County of Monterey Historical Files: Aromas History.

⁴³⁸ “Prunedale,” *North County News*, February 27, 1980.

⁴³⁹ Dugdale, “North County develops: They grow houses instead of Prunes,” *Salinas Californian*.

⁴⁴⁰ Dugdale, “North County develops: They grow houses instead of Prunes,” *Salinas Californian*.

⁴⁴¹ “Progress in California’s Development: Unique Colony Founded in the Salinas Valley.” “Clark Colony’s Substantial Growth,” *The Western Empire*. “Humble Start of Thriving Greenfield Told: Farmers Laughed at Pioneer Effort.” Clovis and Monterey County Agricultural and Rural Life Museum, *Salinas Valley*, 79. “Grange brochure lauded Greenfield,” unknown paper, September 1980. “What a transformation has come over this area!”, unknown paper, September 1980. Helen E. Lorentzen McDonald, “Greenfield, 1930s,” 19 September 1991.

⁴⁴² “Greenfield gent recalls 1905’s ‘Clark City’ days.”

the Clark Colony Water Company developed the largest irrigation and domestic water system in the Salinas Valley and the crops thrived because of it.⁴⁴³ Row crops eventually replaced the orchards.

In the early twentieth century, American fruit consumption rose but the number of fruit trees dropped, consolidating production and profit on fewer farms. From 1910 to 1920, peach trees declined from 137 million to 87 million; pear trees declined from 24 million to 20.5 million; and plum and prune trees

declined from 23.4 million to 20 million. But from 1916 to 1921, residents of New York City, Chicago, Philadelphia and St. Louis increased their peach and apple consumption by 13,150 railroad cars.⁴⁴⁴ In the early 1920s, imports of walnuts and almonds were necessary to meet the United States consumption demand; therefore, growing these nuts in California was a good investment.⁴⁴⁵ With fewer trees available to satisfy consumers' needs in the 1910s, the time was ripe for big agricultural corporations like the Salinas Land Company



The Salinas Land Company and California Orchard Company installed a state-of-the-art irrigation system to water the fruit, nuts and vegetables they planted on thousands of acres between Greenfield and King City.

(founded in 1917) and its subsidiary, the California Orchard Company (founded in 1919), to step in and fill the void. The companies bought thousands of acres between Greenfield and King City and decided to plant orchards in part because of the success of the Clark Colony.

In 1919, fruit and nut grower Carlyle Thorpe proposed to the Salinas Land Company that he and colleagues form a new corporation, buy Salinas Land Company land and plant fruit orchards.⁴⁴⁶ The group founded the California Orchard Company; its offices are in Greenfield on Teague

⁴⁴³ "Progress in California's Development: Unique Colony Founded in the Salinas Valley," *San Francisco Chronicle* (San Francisco, CA: San Francisco Chronicle), 15 July 1905. "Clark Colony's Substantial Growth," *The Western Empire*. Monterey County Historical Society, "Colony Settlements."

⁴⁴⁴ California Orchard Company, *Stockholders Report*, 10-11.

⁴⁴⁵ California Orchard Company, *Stockholders Report*, 11.

⁴⁴⁶ Teague, *Fifty Years a Rancher*, 62. California Orchard Company, *Developing 1,905 Acres*, 6, 8.

Avenue where it abuts Highway 101. The large parcel is about four miles north of King City, which at that time had 1,500 residents and was a stop on the Southern Pacific's rail line connecting San Francisco and Los Angeles.⁴⁴⁷ The company invested hundreds of thousands of dollars on its irrigation system and turned the previously arid land into thriving orchards.⁴⁴⁸

By 1924, the company had planted pears (300 acres), apricots (290 acres), almonds (265 acres), apples (250 acres), prunes (160 acres), peaches (150 acres), walnuts (90 acres), grapes (75 acres) and plums (50 acres).⁴⁴⁹ After the orchard trees matured, only the walnuts, apricots and almonds were profitable because although the other trees gave good fruit, they were over-produced nationally. Additional walnut trees and row crops replaced the other unprofitable crops.⁴⁵⁰ Walnuts and apricots were the main fruit and nut trees grown on Salinas Land Company and California Orchard Company land until 1971, when they were removed and vegetables and vineyards became the major crops.

e. Lettuce:

Lettuce debuted as a Monterey County crop in 1915 and by 1955, the Salinas Valley produced about forty-five to fifty percent of the nation's lettuce.⁴⁵¹ It was the County's top crop for many years until 2009, when strawberries eclipsed it for the first time. Many Salinas Valley labor camps were associated with lettuce workers. By 1955, most of the field workers were Mexican, many of whom came to the Salinas Valley under the federal government's Bracero Program.⁴⁵²

With the ideal soil and climate for growing lettuce, plus 20,000 acres of irrigated and irrigable land, the Salinas Valley became America's premier lettuce supplier when Southern California became unable to meet the high consumer demand. Los Angeles County was a major lettuce producer but population expansion turned the lettuce fields into new communities, removing the main source of California spring, summer and fall lettuce. The Imperial Valley continued to produce a winter lettuce crop, but it was simply too hot there to produce lettuce the other nine months of the year. The lettuce supply was diminishing and East Coast demands for western lettuce were rising at the same time that Salinas Valley growers were seeking a new, profitable crop to replace sugar beets. Sugar beets had been the major Salinas Valley crop for a few decades, but yields and value were declining. Sugar beet and lettuce production require large labor pools, so the switch between crops was relatively smooth.⁴⁵³

Pajaro Valley resident Moses (Mose) S. Hutchings was the first farmer to raise and ship lettuce in Monterey County and on the Central Coast. In 1915, he planted three acres of lettuce on the

⁴⁴⁷ California Orchard Company, *Developing 1,905 Acres*, 6, 8.

⁴⁴⁸

⁴⁴⁹ Ralph Newman, "Where a Big Thing is Being Done in a Big Way," *Pacific Rural Press* (22 March 1924).

⁴⁵⁰ Teague, *Fifty Years a Rancher*, 63. Norm Nuck, *Antique Advocate, Part 3*.

⁴⁵¹ Paul F. Griffin and C. Langdon White, "Lettuce Industry of the Salinas Valley," *The Scientific Monthly* (American Association for the Advancement of Science, August 1955), 77.


⁴⁵² Griffin and White, "Lettuce Industry of the Salinas Valley," 80.

⁴⁵³ Griffin and White, "Lettuce Industry of the Salinas Valley," 77.

ranch of his in-laws, James and Ida Rowe, at 1767 San Juan Road in the North County. In the spring of 1916, by lantern light at 2:00 a.m., he and local high school students cut and ice-packed lettuce in the field. He drove the crop by wagon team to Pajaro Junction where Wells Fargo shipped it to the H.P. Garin Co. in San Francisco. Hutchings hired Japanese employees and planted ten acres in 1917 and sixteen acres in 1918.⁴⁵⁴

In 1920, farmers planted lettuce in the Salinas Valley.⁴⁵⁶ In 1925, the Salinas Land Company and California Orchard Company planted lettuce on their land between King City and Greenfield in the South County.⁴⁵⁷ Large lettuce farms became the norm after initial plantings on farms smaller than ten acres were too small to be profitable and failed to meet the national lettuce demand. Lettuce fields are flat and have raised beds in rows of uniform height, allowing farmers to irrigate the crops evenly, facilitate drainage and accommodate field operations. From planting to harvest, lettuce requires sixty-five days in the warmest season and 120 days or more in the coldest season.⁴⁵⁸

Harvesting and packing methods have shifted over time, with new machines and buildings appearing on the cultural landscape to accommodate the changes. Initially, field workers hand-harvested lettuce by moving down the rows, cutting mature lettuce heads and tossing them into trucks or trailers. Larger farms used mechanical loaders. Workers delivered the lettuce to packing sheds, where packers arranged it in wooden crates, placed ice on top and loaded the crates into refrigerated railcars. This “top-icing” kept the lettuce fresh but often bruised it, froze it or made it slimy with the combination of ice and excessive moisture.



Lettuce fields covered the fertile Salinas Valley after 1920. This map shows the extent of the lettuce-growing region in 1955.⁴⁵⁵

Packing and cooling practices changed dramatically in 1946. Field “dry-packing” (placing about two dozen lettuce heads in a cardboard carton) made packing sheds obsolete. At the same time,

⁴⁵⁴ Clovis, *Monterey County’s North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 84.

⁴⁵⁵ Griffin and White, “Lettuce Industry of the Salinas Valley,” 78.

⁴⁵⁶ Griffin and White, “Lettuce Industry of the Salinas Valley,” 79.

⁴⁵⁷ Thwaites, *Draft of Speech* (Salinas Land Company Office, Greenfield, CA: circa 1968), 4.

⁴⁵⁸ Griffin and White, “Lettuce Industry of the Salinas Valley,” 79.

vacuum pre-cooling eliminated the problems with top-icing. The cultural landscape changed as a result, with carton-making machines and packing trucks appearing in the fields and vacuum cooling buildings replacing packing sheds. Field workers used either the “ground-pack,” machine-pack” or “trailer-pack” method. In the ground-pack method, workers delivered a truck with a carton-making machine to the harvesting area where “cutter-trimmer” workers cut the mature lettuce, trimmed defective leaves and returned the heads to the planting bed. Packers picked up the lettuce heads and placed them in cardboard cartons, which they stapled and placed on a truck. In the machine-pack method, workers cut, trimmed and replaced the lettuce heads on the planting beds; a machine passed over the trimmed heads; carton makers made cartons; packers packed lettuce on the machine’s packing tables; and the closed, stapled cardboard cartons were conveyed to a truck. The trailer-pack method used a smaller crew than the machine-pack method and reduced packing and shipping costs. Cutter-trimmers prepared the lettuce; pickup men transferred the trimmed lettuce heads to packing tables extending from the sides of a trailer; packers placed the lettuce in cartons, which were gravity-conveyed to a truck. The packers, carton makers and carton closers all rode and worked on the trailer.⁴⁵⁹

Workers then transferred the packed cartons to a vacuum cooling plant, where large vacuum tubes extracted air and evaporated moisture from the cartons, reducing the lettuce’s temperature. By 1955, vacuum cooling only took twenty-five minutes compared to the 24- to 36-hour top-icing process used before 1946. Vacuum-packed crops are much fresher when they reach the market. As of 1955, nine steam and ammonia vacuum cooling plants operated in the Salinas Valley.⁴⁶⁰

Lettuce is unusual among vegetables, because it is only consumed fresh.⁴⁶¹ Therefore, the cultural landscape associated with lettuce production does not include facilities like canning, drying or freezing plants. Any original lettuce packing sheds that remain in Monterey County have been adaptively used or may be vacant.

f. Artichokes:

Monterey County’s moist, foggy coastal region offers the perfect conditions for growing artichokes.⁴⁶² In 1921-1922, Andrew Molera planted Monterey County’s first artichoke crop along Molera Road near the North County community of Castroville. Molera had leased his Mulligan Hill Ranch to Claus Spreckels for years for sugar beet production, but when Spreckels was unable to renew his lease, Molera sought new tenants and crops.

Molera acquired artichoke shoots from Italian farmers in Half Moon Bay and planted an acre of artichokes.⁴⁶³ On a trip through the county, Italians Angelo Del Chiaro and Egidio Maracci saw

⁴⁵⁹ Griffin and White, “Lettuce Industry of the Salinas Valley,” 80.
⁴⁶⁰ Griffin and White, “Lettuce Industry of the Salinas Valley,” 82.
⁴⁶¹ Griffin and White, “Lettuce Industry of the Salinas Valley,” 84.
⁴⁶² Clovis, *Monterey County’s North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 24.
⁴⁶³ Clovis, *Monterey County’s North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 22.

the crop and promptly leased 150 acres from Molera, planting the artichokes with Daniel Pieri and Angelo Del Chiaro's cousin Amerigo Del Chiaro.⁴⁶⁴ They were so successful that the Del Chiaro, Pieri, Tottino and Bellone families formed the California Artichoke and Vegetable Growers Corporation by 1924.⁴⁶⁵ It is now called Ocean Mist.⁴⁶⁶

Nine local growers had planted artichokes by 1923. By 1927, fifty growers had planted 12,000 acres of artichokes.⁴⁶⁸ Castroville still claims the title of "Artichoke Capital of the World," with the name proudly emblazoned over Merritt Street since 1931.⁴⁶⁹


g. Beans:

Monterey County farmers have been growing beans since the nineteenth century. They became a huge crop when the Salinas Land Company and its California Orchard Company subsidiary interplanted beans between their maturing orchard trees, starting in 1917. The

companies and their tenants grew the King City Pink Bean (heavily used in soup and barbeque recipes), Fordhook lima beans (started in 1948 for freezing), large and baby lima beans, small white beans, Kentucky wonder beans, seed beans and many other crops.⁴⁷⁰

h. Guayule:

Guayule looks like sagebrush and grows about three or four feet tall. In 1925, the federal government planted 8,000 experimental acres of guayule in the Salinas Valley. It planned to process the plant into rubber in case of national emergency. In 1931, an extraction mill located south of Salinas at Spence Siding produced an average of 700 pounds of rubber per acre. The government's forethought paid off when a national emergency struck in the form of World War II. The government began the Emergency Rubber Project and farmers cultivated 40,000 acres of



Packing artichokes at the Ocean Mist packing shed in Castroville.⁴⁶⁷

⁴⁶⁴ Clovis, *Monterey County's North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 22-23.

⁴⁶⁵ Clovis, *Monterey County's North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 23.

⁴⁶⁶ Clovis, *Monterey County's North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 23.

⁴⁶⁷ Clovis, *Monterey County's North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 23.

⁴⁶⁸ Clovis, *Monterey County's North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 23.

⁴⁶⁹ Clovis, *Monterey County's North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 7.

⁴⁷⁰ California Orchard Company, *Developing 1,905 Acres*, 12. "Bean Harvest Is Setting Record," *The Land*, October 1956. Tom Thwaites, Draft of Speech (Salinas Land Company Office, Greenfield, CA: circa 1968), 5. Thwaites was the Salinas Land Company's superintendent from 1945-1977. Teague, *Fifty Years a Rancher*, 64. Norm Nuck, *Antique Advocate*, Part 3.

guayule near the South County communities of San Ardo, King City and San Lucas. The experiment ended in 1946, however, and 21 million pounds worth of rubber in the form of guayule plants were destroyed.⁴⁷¹ The United States Department of Agriculture Research Station located near the Salinas airport is the former site of the United States Natural Rubber Research Station, a guayule (used to make rubber) research station from World War II.⁴⁷² Camp McCallum was a guayule labor camp that housed German and Italian prisoners of war during World War II. It later housed Mexican braceros and is now a labor co-operative.⁴⁷³ It is located off Old Stage Road southeast of Salinas (northeast of the intersection of Alisal Road and Old Stage Road).

i. Other Intensive Crops:

Since the 1800s, landowners throughout Monterey County raised chickens, both for home use and for commercial sale. Many properties still have chicken coops and other poultry outbuildings, including pigeon and brooder sheds, although their fragility and dilapidated condition makes them endangered in Monterey County's cultural landscape. In the North County, at least one mushroom farm now grows part of its crop in former chicken coops.

Even the smallest agricultural products played a role in Monterey County's agricultural history. Nurseries and home gardeners, especially begonia and fern growers, used leaf mold harvested by hand from decayed leaves of coastal live oaks. From the late-1930s to the mid-1960s, about 25,000 cubic yards of leaf mold were harvested in the North County's Long Canyon or Long Valley.⁴⁷⁴ Long Canyon was the southernmost property of the James Kirby Company and it lies between Elkhorn Slough Foundation land on the east end and residential properties on the west end.⁴⁷⁵ Demand for leaf mold was high before World War II but increased significantly as post-war development accelerated. By 1963, treated sawdust largely replaced leaf mold as a soil amendment. The Kirby family sold leaf mold from their land in the Strawberry Valley area.⁴⁷⁶

Monterey County farmers have grown many other intensive crops including Brussels sprouts, broccoli,⁴⁷⁷ peas, grapes, spinach, paprika peppers, canning and fresh tomatoes, onions, garlic, chili peppers, corn,⁴⁷⁸ cut flowers (opening in the 1950s and '60s, Pajaro Valley nurseries

⁴⁷¹ Clovis and Monterey County Agricultural and Rural Life Museum, *Salinas Valley*, 114.

⁴⁷² Meg Clovis, personal communication to PAST Consultants, LLC, June 2011.

⁴⁷³ Meg Clovis, personal communication to PAST Consultants, LLC.

⁴⁷⁴ Church, *Historical Notes of North Monterey County With a History of Hidden Valley*, 6.

⁴⁷⁵ Church, *Historical Notes of North Monterey County With a History of Hidden Valley*, 6.

⁴⁷⁶ Church, *Historical Notes of North Monterey County With a History of Hidden Valley*, 2, 4.

⁴⁷⁷ Clovis, *Monterey County's North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 62.

⁴⁷⁸ California Orchard Company, *Developing 1,905 Acres*, 12. "Bean Harvest Is Setting Record," *The Land*, October 1956. Tom Thwaites, Draft of Speech (Salinas Land Company Office, Greenfield, CA: circa 1968), 5. Thwaites was the Salinas Land Company's superintendent from 1945-1977. Teague, *Fifty Years a Rancher*, 64. Norm Nuck, *Antique Advocate, Part 3*.

produced a majority of the carnations, chrysanthemums and roses in the United States),⁴⁷⁹ orchids⁴⁸⁰ and asparagus.

3. Railroads & Community Development

Trains had a significant impact on nineteenth century American life and on Monterey County's agricultural history and cultural landscape. Railroads fueled economic booms, enabled businesses to ship goods and passengers long distances, facilitated natural resource exploitation, and encouraged western settlement and pleasure travel. From the 1850s-1870s, the United States granted more than 170 million acres of western land to railroad companies and the railroads promoted California's climate, soils and other advantages to settlers. Railroads offered ship and rail packages to Europeans, encouraging entire groups to settle new towns. These "group settlements," "colonizations" or "migration chains" boosted railroad revenues and established instant communities for new immigrants.⁴⁸¹

When the Southern Pacific Railroad came to Monterey County in 1871, it helped expand or create agriculture-based communities like Aromas, Pajaro, Las Lomas, Castroville, Salinas, Spreckels, Chualar, Gonzales, Soledad, Greenfield, King City, San Lucas, San Ardo and Bradley. As residents built new homes and businesses along the rails, property values and rail profits rose. On July 17, 1871, Southern Pacific began extending its rail line from Gilroy to Salinas. When Watsonville citizens failed to contribute funds to build a station in Santa Cruz County, Southern Pacific built its main depot in Monterey County's Pajaro Junction (later named Watsonville Junction and now known as Pajaro). Service between Pajaro Junction and San Francisco began in November 1871; service between Salinas and San Francisco began in November 1872.⁴⁸² In December 1872, the railroad reached Soledad, which was the southern terminus until 1886. After 1886, the line extended south through King City, San Lucas, San Ardo and Bradley.⁴⁸³ Salinas Valley rancho owners donated rights-of-way, including David Jacks through his 15,000-acre Chualar Rancho; Mariano and Alfredo Gonzalez through their

⁴⁷⁹ Dala Bruemmer, "Where Have all the flower growers gone?" *Register Pajaronian*, 19 March 2004.

⁴⁸⁰ "Prunedale," *North County News*, 27 February 1980. McLellan Botanicals has a large facility on 2352 San Juan Road in Aromas but current employees do not know when the company moved there. (Ibis Diaz, Sales Account Manager, McLellan Botanicals, personal communication to Paige J. Swartley, 23 July 2010.) Edgar McLellan was a dairyman who started a Burlingame (San Mateo County) nursery in 1884 and became San Francisco's "Flower King." In 1930, his son Rod moved the nursery to Colma and then to Aromas at an unknown date, where they grow orchids and ornamental eucalyptus. The Taiwan Sugar Company (Taisuco America) now owns the company. "Answers: Who Am I?," *Heritage Newsletter*, (Colma: Cypress Lawn Heritage Foundation, Spring 2008), 6. Algis Ratnikas, "Timeline of the San Francisco Bay Area: c. 1930-1975" (Timelines of History, undated), http://timelines.ws/cities/sfba_c.html, accessed April 26, 2010.

⁴⁸¹ Hillstrom, *The Dream of America: Immigration 1870-1920*, 68-72.

⁴⁸² Fabing and Hamman, *Steinbeck Country Narrow Gauge*, 7. Nakane, *Nothing Left in My Hands*, 8.


⁴⁸³ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Historic Overview, 5. Clovis and Monterey County Agricultural and Rural Life Museum, *Salinas Valley*, 48.

11,500-acre Rincon de la Puente del Monte Rancho; and Catalina Munras through her 14,000-acre San Vicente Rancho. The towns of Chualar, Gonzales and Soledad developed on these ranchos and became railroad stops.⁴⁸⁵ Highway 101 parallels the railroad line through these towns.

When Southern Pacific arrived in Monterey County in 1871, it monopolized agricultural shipping and charged wheat growers excessive freight rates.

Competition arrived in 1874 when David Jacks and local businessmen invested in the Monterey and Salinas Valley Railroad, a nineteen-mile narrow gauge line from Salinas to Monterey.⁴⁸⁶ In response,

Southern Pacific expanded local service and lowered its rates.⁴⁸⁷ The Monterey and Salinas Valley Railroad could no longer compete, went bankrupt in 1880, and Southern Pacific's subsidiary Pacific Improvement Company bought it and demolished the narrow gauge line.⁴⁸⁸ Also in 1880, Southern Pacific completed its branch line between Castroville and Monterey.⁴⁸⁹ In 1887, Southern Pacific opened a depot on Walker Street in Watsonville. New packing plants opened nearby and fruit hauling to the old Pajaro Depot declined.⁴⁹⁰



Interior of the Southern Pacific Railroad's roundhouse in Pajaro (demolished). (Courtesy of Pajaro Valley Historical Association.)⁴⁸⁴

⁴⁸⁴ Clovis, *Monterey County's North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 83.

⁴⁸⁵ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I, Historic Overview*, 5. Stockdale, *Monterey County Illustrated: Resources, History, Biography*, 31.

⁴⁸⁶ Anderson, *The Salinas Valley: A History of America's Salad Bowl*, 45-46. Fink, *Monterey: The Presence of the Past*, 127.


⁴⁸⁷ Jack, "Land King: The Story of David Jack," 8. Larsen, "The Amazing Success Story of the Jacks Family," *Mills Quarterly*, 8.

⁴⁸⁸ Fink, *Monterey: The Presence of the Past*, 127. Anderson, *The Salinas Valley: A History of America's Salad Bowl*, 45-46.

⁴⁸⁹ Fink, *Monterey: The Presence of the Past*, 130. As of 1983, Southern Pacific owned more than 20 million acres in California, more than any other entity. For every mile of track laid, the federal government granted 12,800 acres to the railroad. The land alternated on either side of the tracks in a checkerboard pattern, every mile. (Nuckton, *et al.*, "California Agriculture: The Human Story," *A Guidebook to California Agriculture*, 11.)

⁴⁹⁰ Mekis, *Blossoms into Gold*, 52.

More rail competition arrived when Claus Spreckels built his Western Beet Sugar Company factory in Watsonville and founded his own railroad in January of 1890. Chinese laborers built the 14-mile line from Watsonville, across large North County farms, terminating at Moss Landing's wharf.⁴⁹² In 1891, a 23.6-mile narrow gauge line from Moro Cojo to Salinas opened. In 1897, Spreckels built the Pajaro Valley Extension Railroad to access the Gabilan Mountains' limestone quarries that provided construction and sugar beet processing materials. On December 9, 1897, Spreckels's railroad and its spur lines became the Pajaro Valley Consolidated Railroad, nicknamed the "Dinky Line" because the locomotives were small.⁴⁹³ As more farmers began shipping by truck, profits fell and rail operations ended in 1927. Southern Pacific bought the "Dinky Line" or "Dead Beet Line" in 1930 and removed the narrow gauge tracks.⁴⁹⁴



Mules pull loaded sugar beet cars along a portable track in the field, transporting crops to the Pajaro Valley Consolidated Railroad line. (Courtesy of Pajaro Valley Historical Association.)⁴⁹¹

Monterey County farmers knew that the railroad would link them to large, distant markets and boost agricultural production.⁴⁹⁵ Before rail refrigeration became reliable, local farmers mostly grew crops near large cities and sold them to local markets.⁴⁹⁶ This began to change in 1915, when Moses (Mose) S. Hutchings became the first farmer to grow and ship lettuce in the Pajaro Valley and Central Coast. He planted three acres of lettuce on the Rowe Ranch, his in-laws' property at 1767 San Juan Road, Aromas (designed in 1900 by William Weeks). To keep the lettuce cool, he harvested and field-packed it at 2 a.m., driving it to the Pajaro Depot in a wagon for shipment to the H. P. Garin Co. in San Francisco.⁴⁹⁷ Reliable refrigerated rail cars became commonplace for shipping produce in the Monterey County area by 1923, and this technology dramatically expanded Monterey County's agricultural production and distribution.⁴⁹⁸

⁴⁹¹ Clovis, *Monterey County's North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 22.

⁴⁹² "Spreckels & Pajaro Valley Consolidated Railroad, 1880s-1930," (Monterey County Historical Society Archives, File # 90.53.144), 4.

⁴⁹³ Fabing, *Steinbeck Country Narrow Gauge*, 67, 94.

⁴⁹⁴ Fabing, *Steinbeck Country Narrow Gauge*, 94. Anderson, *The Salinas Valley: A History of America's Salad Bowl*, 47.

⁴⁹⁵ Nakane, *Nothing Left in My Hands*, 9.

⁴⁹⁶ Vegetable Specialists and Farm Advisors of Cooperative Extension, "Vegetable Crops," *A Guidebook to California Agriculture* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1983), 164.

⁴⁹⁷ Clovis, *Monterey County's North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 84.

⁴⁹⁸ Anderson, 124.

In Monterey County, the railroad sped up agricultural shipping times; expanded trade areas to the East Coast and abroad; fostered land speculation; led to Moss Landing's decline as a shipping center; transported agricultural laborers throughout the region, including thousands of Mexican workers who came to California through the federal government's Bracero Program (1942-1964); and helped spur community development.

Agricultural facilities built along the rails included packing houses, warehouses, ice factories, cold storage facilities, shipping facilities, and housing for tenant farmers and laborers. Businesses like O. P. Silliman's warehouses and the Southern Pacific Milling Company (founded by Southern Pacific's agent in Paso Robles, R. M. "Dick" Shackelford) benefitted from the building boom and their facilities were located in many Salinas Valley communities. An 1889 book about Monterey County described grain warehouses as "conspicuous features of the county" with a warehouse near every railroad station. Salinas's 1,100-foot grain warehouse was the longest warehouse in interior California.⁴⁹⁹ Consolidating the buildings close to the railroad improved efficiency and lowered costs. Monterey County's depots and roundhouses are gone, but agricultural buildings along the tracks remain.

4. Advocacy and Social Organizations

Agriculture is a complex, large industry with a wide influence in the professional and personal lives of local residents. Since early in Monterey County's agricultural history, advocacy and social organizations have promoted agriculture, protected the interests of local farmers and workers, encouraged children to become involved in farming, and served as community activity centers. Many organizations had overlapping functions.


⁴⁹⁹ Stockdale, *Monterey County Illustrated: Resources, History, Biography*, 29. Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Historic Overview, 5.

In 1872, cattle ranchers, farmers and others founded the Monterey County Agricultural Society. In 1876, the Monterey Agricultural Fair Association was incorporated to “promote agriculture . . . stock raising . . . mechanics and manufactures.”⁵⁰¹ Later, organizations associated with specific crops, like the Pajaro Valley Orchardists Association and the Watsonville Apple Growers Association, addressed issues specific to their line of business.⁵⁰²

Nationwide, the grange system is one of the best-known agricultural advocacy and social organizations and it is well-represented in Monterey County. Founded in 1867, the Order of Patrons of Husbandry (now the National Grange)

was America’s first agricultural fraternity, although it was open to men, women and youth equally. It emphasizes service to agriculture, the community and the country and encourages members to use the democratic process to shape local, state and national policies that impact agriculture.⁵⁰³ At the California State Grange’s first convention in 1873, members proposed legislation to reduce railroad fares, freights and port charges and to develop irrigation. The members also sought to establish a cooperative trade system and to organize banks that would offer farmers reasonable loans. In 1929, the California State Grange became the first statewide organization to advocate for building the Shasta Dam, to conserve water for irrigating the Sacramento and San Joaquin valleys.⁵⁰⁴

The Aromas Grange (founded 1913), Prunedale Grange (founded 1920) and Springfield Grange (founded 1933) are discussed in *Chapter 5: Historic Themes, Associated Property Types, Eligibility Criteria and Integrity Thresholds*.⁵⁰⁵ The San Bernardo Grange is on Main Street in San Ardo and the Buena Vista Grange is at 518 River Road in Salinas, between the towns of Spreckels and Chualar. The Corral De Tierra Grange meets in the Elk’s Hall at 614 Airport



The Aromas Pig Club, which became a 4-H Club. The man standing behind the word “Aromas” may be Pajaro Valley farmer James Rowe, who founded it in 1918. His intensive farmstead at 1767 San Juan Road (house designed by William Weeks, 1900) is listed in the Monterey County Register. (Courtesy of Monterey County Agricultural and Rural Life Museum.)⁵⁰⁰

⁵⁰⁰ Clovis, *Monterey County’s North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 122.

⁵⁰¹ Johnston, *Old Monterey County: A Pictorial History*, 77, 89.

⁵⁰² Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, 106-107, 144.

⁵⁰³ California State Grange, “What is the Grange?,” (Sacramento, CA: California State Grange, 2010), http://www.californiagrangenet/what_grange.html, accessed 13 June 2010.

⁵⁰⁴ California State Grange, “History: National Grange,” (Sacramento, CA: California State Grange, 2010), <http://www.californiagrangenet/history.html>, accessed 13 June 2010. California State Grange, “What is the Grange?”

⁵⁰⁵ Church, *Historical Notes of North Monterey County With a History of Hidden Valley*, 5.

Boulevard in Salinas.⁵⁰⁶ Other Monterey County granges have operated in Lockwood and Hesperia.⁵⁰⁷


Other organizations are associated with particular ethnic groups who worked in the local agricultural industry. For example, Japanese labor clubs founded in the early 1900s located agricultural jobs for members, negotiated labor contracts, determined wages, aided members with financial and personal transactions, offered lodging and served as meeting places. The Japanese Language School in Castroville (11199 Geil Street; listed in the National Register and the Monterey County Register) and the Chinese School in Pajaro (18 Brooklyn Street; listed in the Monterey County Register) taught the children of immigrant agricultural workers the language and culture of their homelands and served as community meeting places. Chapter 5 describes the Japanese Language School further.

Monterey County advocacy and social organizations welcomed children as members, many of whom likely worked in agriculture as adults. Local 4-H Clubs and the Pajaro Poultry Club (a branch of 4-H) encouraged children to take responsibility for raising farm animals. The grange halls also offer youth memberships.

Other Monterey County social organizations likely had many members who were engaged in agriculture. Examples of social groups in Castroville alone include the Native Sons of

Castroville, Masons, Modern Woodmen of America, Odd Fellows, Young Men's Institute and Legionnaires.⁵⁰⁹ Future research should examine whether buildings associated with these groups may be significant for their association with the region's agricultural history.

These advocacy and social organizations are significant to Monterey County's agricultural history because they are associated with the transition of local agriculture from small family farms to farming on an industrial scale. This transition required additional workers, who banded together to further their labor interests, promote agriculture, or maintain cultural ties. As they were financially able, they built grange halls, schools and community meeting houses in Monterey County. Chapter 5 discusses buildings associated with local advocacy and social organizations.



Pajaro Poultry Club member Irene Davis with her flock, ca. 1932. She earned more than \$23 profit from her purchase of 50 day-old chicks. (Courtesy of Monterey County Agricultural and Rural Life Museum.)⁵⁰⁸

⁵⁰⁶ California State Grange, "Find A Grange," http://www.californiagrango.org/find_grange.cfm, accessed 14 June 2011.

⁵⁰⁷ Meg Clovis, personal communication to PAST Consultants, LLC.

⁵⁰⁸ Clovis, *Monterey County's North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 86.

⁵⁰⁹ Clovis, *Monterey County's North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 14, 29, 34.

5. Irrigation

Irrigation was significant to Monterey County agriculture because it accelerated the region's transition from extensive to intensive agriculture. Intensive crops like sugar beets, berries, lettuce and artichokes require a dependable water supply in an area with unpredictable rainfall.

Local soil drains well and little water goes to waste, so irrigation is cost effective and efficient.

Agricultural corporations like the Spreckels Sugar Company, Salinas Land Company and California Orchard Company required significant irrigation and were among

the first Monterey County property owners to install large, complex irrigation systems. Several of the agricultural colonies established in Monterey County also had good irrigation infrastructure, including the second phase of Fort Romie and the Clark Colony (now Greenfield).

“Most of California is a semiarid country. Here, the dry farmer is so tremendously handicapped in both quantity and quality [of] production that he cannot long survive the competition of thoroughly irrigated farms.”

California Orchard Company, circa 1924⁵¹⁰

From the outset, farmers irrigating in the dry season were very successful.⁵¹¹ They increased yields, offered better crops to the market, attracted more customers, increased profits, expanded operations and left new imprints on the cultural landscape. They constructed more buildings to accommodate their growing businesses, especially processing and distribution facilities, and built worker housing to accommodate the large labor pool necessary in intensive agriculture. The irrigation canals, ditches, flumes, dams, pumping plants, pipelines and electric stations also modified the cultural landscape by introducing a network of waterways and infrastructure that traversed farm parcels, delineated property boundaries and followed the paths of local roads.

Spanish missionaries introduced irrigation to Monterey County and gravity systems irrigated fields on both the Soledad Mission and San Antonio Mission.⁵¹² Ranch owners generally relied on surface water for their stock animals until both an overabundance and dearth of water – in the floods and drought of 1862 to 1865 – killed thousands of cattle and spelled the end of Monterey County's dominant cattle industry. When rancho owners subdivided their grazing and grain lands into smaller farm parcels, the new owners irrigated them to maximize crop production and profits.⁵¹³ With irrigation, the shift from extensive agriculture (*e.g.*, cattle and cereal crops) to intensive agriculture (*e.g.*, fruit and vegetables) gained serious momentum.

⁵¹⁰ California Orchard Company, *Stockholders Report*, 15.


⁵¹¹ Dunn, *Monterey County, California*, 8.

⁵¹² MaryEllen Ryan and Gary S. Breschini, Ph.D., “An Overview of Monterey County Agriculture,” (Salinas, CA: Monterey County Historical Society, 2010), <http://www.mchsmuseum.com/agoverview.html>, accessed 14 June 2011.

⁵¹³ Dunn, *Monterey County, California*, 7.

Monterey County landowners built diversion ditches in the late 1870s and early 1880s. Meyer Brandenstein, founder of the South County town of San Ardo, made the first large water claim in 1882. He and partner Lazard Godchaux had bought two-thirds (8,901 acres) of Rancho San Bernardo in 1871 (Alberto Trescony owned the other third as well as the adjacent Rancho San Lucas), organized the San Bernardo and Salinas Valley Canal and Irrigation Company, and built a six-mile long canal in 1884 to irrigate alfalfa.⁵¹⁴ Alfalfa was one of Monterey County’s first irrigated crops and alfalfa plantings increased as grain plantings decreased.⁵¹⁵ When farmers introduced alfalfa as cow feed, the County’s dairy industry expanded. Irrigated alfalfa survived rainfall fluctuations, achieved a higher yield, and irrigation was deemed an “absolute necessity” to the crop.⁵¹⁶

By 1875, Pajaro Valley strawberry growers used windmills to pump water to their crops. In 1879, the Watsonville Water Works used flumes to release excess water from the Corralitos reservoir for strawberry irrigation. Wells also supplied irrigation water.⁵¹⁸ Early irrigation projects were often done property-by-property. When the Japanese-run Y. Kōsansha Company leased Pajaro Valley strawberry fields in 1908, it bought a pumping machine, dug a well and built elevated flumes to transport water.⁵¹⁹



Irrigating artichokes near Castroville.
(Courtesy of Castroville Historical Society.)⁵¹⁷

Into the early decades of the twentieth century, flumes of long wooden boxes were nestled into the ground and water flowed to the strawberries from holes cut in the side. Pressing a board on top of the water made it flow faster.⁵²⁰

By 1901, farmers had filed seventy water claims for the Salinas River and its tributaries; they also claimed water from the Arroyo Seco, San Lorenzo and San Antonio rivers. However, the claims often exceeded the headgate and ditch capacity, flood control was difficult, and

⁵¹⁴ Ryan and Breschini, “An Overview of Monterey County Agriculture.”

⁵¹⁵ Dunn, *Monterey County, California*, 5, 7.

⁵¹⁶ Dunn, *Monterey County, California*, 5, 7.

⁵¹⁷ Clovis, *Monterey County’s North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 24.

⁵¹⁸ Nakane, *Nothing Left in My Hands*, 8. Agricultural History Project, “Technology.”

⁵¹⁹ Nakane, *Nothing Left in My Hands*, 39. Borg, *Nihon Bunka/Japanese Culture*, no page number.

⁵²⁰ Nakane, *Nothing Left in My Hands*, 41.

preserving diversion dams and ditches was challenging so few claims were actually used.⁵²¹ In 1907, the Salinas Valley Irrigation Association was founded. After Miller and Lux's water rights litigation of 1915 (described above in the Cattle Ranching section), irrigation districts became an important mechanism for distributing water to California agricultural operations.⁵²²

Gravity irrigation using canals and flumes was inadequate so farmers experimented with storage ponds and pumping stations. The Spreckels Sugar Company used steam-powered pumps for its sugar beet factory in the Salinas Valley town of Spreckels (established in 1897) and pumped irrigation waste water to its local beet fields. After Spreckels improved the technology, other local farmers added pumping plants. The Soledad Land and Water Company used a pumping plant near the old Soledad Mission to irrigate 800 acres. Pumping plants also supplied the Salvation Army Colony at Fort Romie with 8,000 gallons of water per minute. Domingo Breschini used a pump plant to irrigate alfalfa on 500 acres of the Las Salinas Rancho; a similar pumping plant operated at Buena Vista Rancho. However, when local rivers ran low in the summer, pumping directly from the river did not provide adequate water.⁵²³

Next, farmers experimented with underground water supplies. In 1898, one of the first wells was drilled south of Gonzales. The Spreckels Sugar Company also developed deep-well technology and used seventy-foot wells by 1904 to replace pumping and storage ponds. Farmers still used gravity irrigation and pumping plants by 1910, but deep well pumping became more popular.⁵²⁴ Starting in 1917, the Salinas Land Company and its subsidiary California Orchard Company developed extensive wells along the Salinas River between Greenfield and King City (described further in the section on Corporate Agriculture). By 1929, row crop irrigation depended entirely upon deep wells.⁵²⁵

Some Monterey County agricultural firms have been in business long enough to experience most or all of the major developments in California irrigation. For example, the Salinas Land Company and California Orchard Company used furrow irrigation between 1920 and 1960; transitioned to sprinkler irrigation with underground pressure lines, reservoirs and booster pumps in the 1960s; and introduced drip irrigation in the mid-1990s.⁵²⁶

Monterey County farmers have used many canals and dams to deliver water to their crops. The nine-mile Salinas Canal drew water from the Salinas River, the largest submerged stream in America. Dams held water impounded from smaller streams, and ditches carried the water to the fields.⁵²⁷ The Salinas Dam was built in 1941 in the upper Salinas Valley.⁵²⁸ More dams followed in the 1950s and 1960s.

⁵²¹ Ryan and Breschini, "An Overview of Monterey County Agriculture."

⁵²² Ryan and Breschini, "The California Cattle Boom, 1849-1862."

⁵²³ Ryan and Breschini, "An Overview of Monterey County Agriculture."

⁵²⁴ Ryan and Breschini, "An Overview of Monterey County Agriculture."

⁵²⁵ Ryan and Breschini, "An Overview of Monterey County Agriculture."

⁵²⁶ "Salinas Land Company – California Orchard Company."

⁵²⁷ Dunn, *Monterey County, California*, 7-9.

⁵²⁸ Gordon, *Monterey Bay Area: Natural History and Cultural Imprints*, 237.



Clough Farm, 1478 San Juan Road, showing berry workers and an elevated redwood flume irrigating the crop. (Courtesy of the Pajaro Valley Historical Association.)

Electricity was a key component of Monterey County irrigation. In 1879, George Roe founded the California Electric Light Company and operated America's first central generating station serving electric customers. In 1898, the Pacific Gas and Electric Company's (PG&E) predecessors first pumped California irrigation water in California, allowing the agricultural industry to flourish.⁵²⁹ By the 1910s, electricity was available for operating irrigation pumping plants and irrigation became more reliable. From 1912 to 1927, the Coast Valleys Gas and Electric Company provided services to agricultural operations in Monterey County.⁵³⁰ During this period, the company built many Spanish Eclectic-style electric power buildings in the County. PG&E later acquired the company. By 1952, PG&E represented 520 merged companies, including the Coast Valleys Gas and Electric Company that had served Monterey County agricultural operations in the early twentieth century.⁵³¹ In the 1930s, PG&E made another major consolidation, integrating service across Northern California and expanding rural service. By 1950, 98 percent of farms in PG&E's service area had electricity.⁵³²

⁵²⁹ Pacific Gas and Electric Corporation, "Energizing California for 150 Years." PG&E began in 1852 as the San Francisco Gas Company, founded by Peter and James Donahue. After merging with many competitors for a half-century, the company merged with the California Gas and Electric Corporation in 1905 to form PG&E.

⁵³⁰ It included the Monterey County Gas and Electric Company, Monterey County Gas and Electric Company Water Properties, Monterey Gas and Electric Company and Salinas City Gas and Electric Company. ("The Amalgamation of Predecessor Gas Companies Consolidated into Pacific Gas and Electric Company," Pacific Gas and Electric Company, <http://www.pge.com/about/company/profile/history>, accessed 14 May 2011.)

⁵³¹ Pacific Gas and Electric Corporation, "Energizing California for 150 Years," <http://www.pge.com/about/company/profile/history>, accessed 14 May 2011.

⁵³² Pacific Gas and Electric Corporation, "Energizing California for 150 Years."

6. Corporate Agriculture

In Monterey County, large corporations accelerated the pace of agricultural development, bringing tenant farming, irrigation, railroads, infrastructure, corporate headquarters, worker housing and other agriculture buildings to the area. The large firms of Miller and Lux (described in the Extensive Agriculture section on cattle), David Jacks Corporation, Spreckels Sugar Company, Salinas Land Company, California Orchard Company and Driscoll's (all described in the Intensive Agriculture section) have been among the most important and influential agricultural companies to shape Monterey County's cultural landscape.

a. Salinas Land Company and California Orchard Company

Three successful Ventura County businessmen and farmers, Abe Hobson (1861–1929), John Lagomarsino (1864-1923) and Charles Teague (1873-1950), founded the Salinas Land Company in 1917 and the California Orchard Company in 1919.⁵³³ In 1917, the Salinas Land Company bought 13,000 acres just north of King City in Monterey County, including the southern half (8,388 acres) of the original 16,939-acre Rancho Posa de Los Ositos.⁵³⁴ The company's property was four miles wide and nine miles long, located south of Greenfield (the northern boundary was about one-half mile north of Lagomarsino Avenue), west of the Salinas River, east of the Los Padres National Forest foothills, and north of Pine Canyon, near where the present King City bridge crosses the Salinas River.⁵³⁵ The main roads within the property are named for the

⁵³³ Abe Hobson and his brother William operated Hobson Brothers Packing Co., a Ventura meat-packing firm with the largest livestock herd in Southern California. He was also president of the Santa Barbara Packing Co. and Palo Verde Land & Water Co. and a bank director. Italian immigrant John Lagomarsino was president and manager of the Ventura Realty Co. and Del Norte Land Co., vice president of the California Lima Bean Growers Association, and a bank director. Teague was a walnut and citrus expert, president and general manager of the Limoneira Ranch Co. (growing lemons, walnuts and oranges), president and manager of Teague-McKeveitt Co. (growing lemons in Santa Paula), president of the California Fruit Growers Exchange and the California Walnut Growers Associates, and President Herbert Hoover appointed him to the Federal Farm Board in 1929. (California Orchard Company, *California Orchard Company: Developing Nineteen Hundred & Five Acres of Fruit and Farm Land in Monterey County, California* [hereafter *Developing 1,905 Acres*] (Los Angeles: California Orchard Company, 1922), 5, 6, 8.)

⁵³⁴ Sources cite conflicting information about the number of acres that the Salinas Land Company bought from the rancho. Most sources state that the company bought the southern half of Rancho Posa de Los Ositos (variously translated as the well or resting place of the little bears), which would be a little more than 8,000 acres. Other sources state that the company bought 8,000 acres of farmland and 5,000 acres of range land, the total of which almost equals the 16,939 acres that comprised the original rancho. The Salinas Valley Rustler of November 9, 1917 stated that Hobson and Lagomarsino bought 13,000 acres. (*Salinas Valley Rustler*, 9 November 1917 and that S. L. Shaw was working on buildings on the property. Charles Collins Teague, *Fifty Years a Rancher* (Los Angeles: The Ward Ritchie Press, 1944), 62. "Salinas Land Company – California Orchard Company," undated document from the Salinas Land Company files, Greenfield, California, 1, listing highlights for tour guides. Norm Nuck, *Antique Advocate – Part 3*, series of four articles about the Salinas Land Company and California Orchard Company (unknown date).)

⁵³⁵ Historical Survey of the Monterey Peninsula, "Land Grants" File 55. "Salinas Land Company – California Orchard Company," 1.

corporate founders: Teague Avenue, Hobson Avenue and Lagomarsino Avenue, which run parallel to each other and perpendicular to Highway 101.

During the Spanish, Mexican and American eras, the property changed hands the same way other large Monterey County parcels did. In 1839, Spain granted to Carlos Espinosa the 16,939-acre Rancho Posa de Los Ositos, covering the areas around Greenfield and King City. Espinosa Road on the southern side of Greenfield honors the family. The Espinosas had been in Monterey County a long time. Patriarch Salvador Espinosa moved from Spain to Soledad in 1798 and became the Soledad Mission administrator. To prove the family's rancho ownership to the U.S. Lands Commission, the Espinosas hired William Dunphy to survey the land. Dunphy, an Ireland native, owned Monterey County ranches; South San Francisco slaughter houses and other property; a San Francisco mansion on Sacramento Street; and about 200,000 acres in Nevada with more than 30,000 head of cattle and many horses. The U.S. confirmed the rancho's title in 1858. As payment for Dunphy's surveying services, the Espinosas gave him part of the rancho.⁵³⁶ It was that portion that the Salinas Land Company bought in 1917.

In the 1800s, the Salinas Valley was green in the winter but dry, windy and dusty in the summer, covered in oak trees, California bunch grass, sage brush and willow thickets. Maps of the Salinas Valley labeled the area south of Soledad as the "Salinas Desert" as late as the 1860s.⁵³⁷ Deemed worthless for farming, the unfenced Rancho Posa de Los Ositos was used for grazing black Mexican cattle, horses and sheep. The soil was mostly chalk rock shale formation and the land was arid; only three places had water, reportedly. As elsewhere in Monterey County, the droughts and floods between 1861 and 1865 killed off about ninety percent of the cattle. However, the floods improved the land for farming, washing rich topsoil from the foothills to the valley floor and pushing rich silt over the Salinas River banks to the adjacent valley.⁵³⁸ Starting in the late 1910s, the Salinas Land Company and California Orchard Company took advantage of these soil changes, irrigating the fertile land, planting thousands of acres of orchards and vegetables, and building barns, offices, worker housing and other outbuildings and infrastructure to conduct agriculture as big business.

When the Salinas Land Company bought the Dunphy estate in 1917, farmer Paul Talbott (the "Wheat and Barley King of the Salinas Valley") had grown wheat and barley there since 1900.⁵³⁹ He worked the land with horses and mules. After the annual grain harvest, Dunphy's cattle ate the wheat stubble. Because the stubble was not plowed under, the soil's fertility declined

⁵³⁶ Teague, *Fifty Years a Rancher*, 62. James Kelly, "Story of the pink bean," *Gonzales Tribune*, 24 January 2001. Norm Nuck, *Antique Advocate, Part 1*.

⁵³⁷ Tom Thwaits, Draft of Speech (Salinas Land Company Office, Greenfield, CA: circa 1968), 1.

⁵³⁸ Kelly, "Story of the pink bean." Norm Nuck, *Antique Advocate, Part 1*.

⁵³⁹ Teague, *Fifty Years a Rancher*, 63. Norm Nuck, *Antique Advocate, Part 2*. Talbott arrived in Monterey County in 1875, bought 2,600 acres in Chualar Canyon and raised cattle. In 1876, he moved to the Jacks ranch near Chualar, where he cultivated 1,500 acres. In 1904, he moved to King City. His business and community interests were closely related to agriculture: he was president of the Salinas Valley Electric and Power Company, vice president of the Salinas Valley Warehouse and Storage Company, and a long-time Monterey County Supervisor.

without the added nutrients.⁵⁴⁰ Talbott continued to farm the property after the Salinas Land Company purchased it.⁵⁴¹ The Dunphy estate’s original headquarters were located in the Salinas River bottom across from the intersection of present-day Highway 101 and Hobson Avenue.⁵⁴²

In 1917, the King City area had almost no commercial bean, walnut, almond or apricot plantings. However, the residents of Clark Colony (now Greenfield) had shown that the Salinas Valley was suited for growing fruit and nuts.⁵⁴³ Planning to irrigate the land, the Salinas Land Company’s founders believed they could grow fruit and nut trees (using Teague’s expertise) and beans (Lagomarsino and Teague both grew beans in Southern California), in addition to continuing Paul Talbott’s wheat and barley farming. Talbott was skeptical, doubting the property could yield more than three sacks of beans per acre. In time, he produced twenty bean sacks per acre as a Salinas Land Company tenant farmer.⁵⁴⁴

Although the Salinas Land Company eventually sold 4,125 acres, it took the remaining land off the market when its bean crops became extremely successful.⁵⁴⁶ In 1928, it started a tenant farming system, leasing land

on a share basis of about 300 acres each. Tenants paid a share of the crop to the company and paid cash to cover interest and depreciation on the irrigation system, but the Salinas Land Company paid the electric bills. Many tenants came from the Ventura and Oxnard areas, where company founders Teague, Lagomarsino and Hobson lived. Some tenants eventually bought their leased land, including Paul Talbott. Tenant Arnold Frew later became superintendent of the California Orchard Company.⁵⁴⁷ In the 1920s and ’30s, few lessees had exclusive use of one irrigation well so the superintendent and pump supervisor made irrigation schedules, allowing the tenants to share the water.⁵⁴⁸

“Despite much criticism in the past of tenant farming, there have been a great many successful demonstrations of that method of utilizing the land. One of these is the Salinas Land Company. All of our tenants have done well. Before we took the land off the market some of them had accumulated enough capital to purchase the lands they farmed, while some made enough money to buy ranches in other places in the valley.”

**Charles Collins Teague,
Salinas Land Company & California Orchard Company
co-founder⁵⁴⁵**

⁵⁴⁰ Teague, *Fifty Years a Rancher*, 62.

⁵⁴¹ Norm Nuck, *Antique Advocate*, Part 2.

⁵⁴² Thwaites, Draft of Speech, 4. “Salinas Land Company – California Orchard Company.”

⁵⁴³ Teague, *Fifty Years a Rancher*, 62.

⁵⁴⁴ Teague, *Fifty Years a Rancher*, 62-63. Norm Nuck, *Antique Advocate*, Part 2. Norm Nuck, *Antique Advocate*, Part 3.

⁵⁴⁵ Charles Collins Teague, *Fifty Years a Rancher* (Los Angeles: The Ward Ritchie Press, 1944), 64.

⁵⁴⁶ Teague, *Fifty Years a Rancher*, 63. “Salinas Land Company – California Orchard Company,” undated document from the Salinas Land Company files, Greenfield, California, 1, listing highlights for tour guides.

⁵⁴⁷ Norm Nuck, *Antique Advocate*, Part 3.

⁵⁴⁸ Tom Thwaites, Draft of Speech, 5.

Tenants grew many crops on Salinas Land Company and California Orchard Company land, including barley, wheat, orchards (covered in more detail under the California Orchard Company, below), the King City Pink Bean (heavily used in soup and barbeque recipes), Fordhook lima beans (started in 1948 for freezing), large and baby lima beans, small white beans, Kentucky wonder beans, seed beans, peas, grapes, lettuce (introduced in 1925), sugar beets (introduced in 1941), spinach, broccoli, paprika peppers, canning and fresh tomatoes, onions (for dehydration), garlic (for dehydration), potatoes for potato chips and processing, chili peppers, and corn for snacks. By the 1960s, the Salinas Land Company and COCO property had produced almost every Monterey County crop except strawberries, artichokes, asparagus and Brussel sprouts.⁵⁴⁹ Walnuts and apricots were the main fruit and nut trees until 1971, when they were removed and the land was irrigated for vegetables to become the major crops. Today's crops include broccoli, lettuce, peppers, tomatoes, cauliflowers, peas, onions, cabbage, seed beans, carrots and parsley. They are primarily sprinkler-irrigated with some furrow irrigation and drip irrigation, which started in the mid-1990s.⁵⁵⁰

The Salinas Land Company and California Orchard Company have grown wine grapes since the companies were founded. However, before 1964, Monterey County's annual agricultural report did not list wine grape acreage separately because they were not a big component of the county's agricultural production. From 1965 to 1971, vineyards and other insignificant crops were grouped in the "miscellaneous" column. In 1972, Monterey County vineyards became more important, with 2,620 acres and a \$22.7 million value. By 1980, the 30,061 vineyard acres under cultivation (but not yet all mature) had a \$37 million value. Although the vineyard acreage dropped by 5,000 by 1990 (replaced by row crops), its value increased to \$63.7 million in 1990. By 1999, Monterey County farmers grew 34,187 acres of grapes, worth \$157.9 million. By 2000, vineyards occupied 45,030 acres worth \$216.4 million, the fifth highest crop value in Monterey County after head lettuce, leaf lettuce, broccoli and strawberries.⁵⁵¹

Today, vineyards occupy much of the Salinas Land Company and California Orchard Company properties, although their tenants still grow row crops, too. In the early 2000s, tenants grew 2,100 acres of row crops, 1,738 acres of premium varietal wine grapes on Salinas Land Company property, and 1,635 acres of vineyards on COCO land. The motives of soil conservation, water conservation, power conservation, labor reduction, air quality and higher profits spurred the conversion from row crops to vineyards. Over the years, furrow and sprinkler irrigation had washed away valuable topsoil. Using drip irrigation for the vineyards reduced both washout and storm runoff. Grapes also require less water than row crops, reducing pumping expenses and power needs. Vineyards require less tractor work than row crops and are mostly harvested by machine, reducing labor costs, diesel emissions and dust. Vineyard profits are also higher than

⁵⁴⁹ California Orchard Company, *Developing 1,905 Acres*, 12. "Bean Harvest Is Setting Record," *The Land*, October 1956. Tom Thwaites, Draft of Speech (Salinas Land Company Office, Greenfield, CA: circa 1968), 5. Thwaites was the Salinas Land Company's superintendent from 1945-1977. Teague, *Fifty Years a Rancher*, 64. Norm Nuck, *Antique Advocate*, Part 3.

⁵⁵⁰ "Changing Times '95: Salinas Land Co. has long, strong roots in South County," *Gonzales Tribune*, Soledad Bee, *Greenfield News*, 27 September 1995. "Salinas Land Company – California Orchard Company."

⁵⁵¹ Norm Nuck, *Antique Advocate*, Part 4.

row crop profits, partly due to reduced power, water and labor costs.⁵⁵² One of the Salinas Land Company’s current tenants, Scheid Vineyards, has its tasting room at 1972 Hobson Avenue in Greenfield in a barn that is more than 100 years old.⁵⁵³

In 1966, the Salinas Land Company traded its 5,000 acres of range land for the Selva Ranch near Gonzales, which had 100 acres of river bottom land, 220 acres of sprinkler irrigated bench land and 600 acres of range land.⁵⁵⁵ In 1968, a newspaper proclaimed that “Today the Salinas Land Co. property, farmed by enterprising tenants utilizing modern techniques, is one of the most productive row crop areas in the nation. It’s a model success for operations of its type.”⁵⁵⁶

The Salinas Land Company and California Orchard Company “are splendid examples of what the business enterprise system, actuated by individual initiative and the profit motive, has meant to America. Had it not been possible, under our form of government, to create the capital necessary to finance such enterprises, those lands undoubtedly would have remained much longer in a nonproductive or very low productive state. Even as it was, the Monterey County property lay undeveloped until 1917, long after most of the other fine valleys of California had been brought to a high state of cultivation.”

**Charles Collins Teague,
Salinas Land Company & California Orchard
Company co-founder⁵⁵⁴**

In 1969, the Salinas Land Company and California Orchard Company (COCO, described further below) management merged, with the Teague, Lagomarsino and Hobson families still in charge.⁵⁵⁷ Smith-Hobson, LLC, a Ventura-based, family-owned land company established in 1865 by William Dewey Hobson, owns and manages the Salinas Land Company and properties in five California counties. It focuses on cattle ranching, lemons, avocados, row crops leases, oil and gas, and industrial and commercial properties.⁵⁵⁸

b. California Orchard Company

In 1919, fruit and nut grower Carlyle Thorpe proposed to the Salinas Land Company that he and colleagues form a new corporation, buy Salinas Land Company land and plant fruit orchards.⁵⁵⁹ Thus, the California Orchard Company (COCO) was founded with Charles Teague as president,

⁵⁵² Norm Nuck, *Antique Advocate, Part 4*.

⁵⁵³ Scheid Vineyards, “Take a Tour,” <http://www.scheidvineyards.com/tastingroom/takeframeset.html>, accessed 14 June 2011.

⁵⁵⁴ Charles Collins Teague, *Fifty Years a Rancher* (Los Angeles: The Ward Ritchie Press, 1944), 64.

⁵⁵⁵ “Changing Times ’95: Salinas Land Co. has long, strong roots in South County,” *Gonzales Tribune, Soledad Bee, Greenfield News*, (27 September 1995), 20A. Tom Thwaites,

⁵⁵⁶ “50th Anniversary Recalls Salinas Land Co. History,” *The Land* (March 1968), 3

⁵⁵⁷ “Explanation of the relationship between Salinas Land Company and California Orchard Company” (16 May 1995). Meg Clovis’s notes from Salinas Land Company files, Greenfield.

⁵⁵⁸ Smith-Hobson, LLC, <http://www.smithhobson.com>, accessed 14 June 2011.

⁵⁵⁹ Teague, *Fifty Years a Rancher*, 62. California Orchard Company, *Developing 1,905 Acres*, 6, 8.

Abe Hobson (and later John Lagomarsino) as vice president and Carlyle Thorpe as general manager.⁵⁶⁰ The California Orchard Company's offices are on Teague Avenue in Greenfield, where it abuts Highway 101.

Like the Salinas Land Company, COCO saw the economic benefits of farming on a big scale. The company told potential investors that “[f]arming is at present the biggest business in America,” with more capital in farming than in railroads, manufacturing or mining. However, it noted that “[m]ost big business is handled with greatest efficiency and to the greatest profit through large corporations. As yet the business of farming is not widely handled in this way.”⁵⁶¹

But COCO went on to do just that, growing crops on several thousand acres; building its own nurseries; manufacturing its own cement irrigation pipelines from on-site gravel; laying miles of steel and cement irrigation pipelines; building more than eleven miles of roads in its first two years of operation; buying large, expensive equipment to cultivate crops; building permanent housing for employees; and using the tenant farming system.⁵⁶² Farming on such a large scale with a wide variety of crops helped to offset negative climactic or market conditions, allowing certain crops to make up for others that drew less profit or failed because of the climate.⁵⁶³

In October of 1919, COCO bought 1,905 acres from the Salinas Land Company in a stock trade worth \$240,900.⁵⁶⁴ The large parcel sloped up towards the Santa Lucia Mountains from Highway 101, which parallels the Salinas River.⁵⁶⁵ It was about four miles north of King City, which at that time had 1,500 residents and was a stop on the Southern Pacific's rail line between San Francisco and Los Angeles.⁵⁶⁶ COCO took over the property on January 1, 1920 and made it into “a model orchard property,” as it told stockholders.⁵⁶⁷ In 1924, it leased with an option to buy another 2,167 acres from the Salinas Land Company, north and east of the property COCO already owned. The combined parcels created a ranch about two-and-a-half miles long and two-and-a-half miles wide, increasing COCO's Highway 101 frontage by about two miles.⁵⁶⁸

⁵⁶⁰ Teague, *Fifty Years a Rancher*, 63. California Orchard Company, *Annual Report* (Los Angeles, CA: California Orchard Company, 26 March 1924), 1, 5. The company's principal employees were very experienced in agriculture. Director and General Manager Carlyle Thorpe was formerly an officer or manager with La Dera Citrus Co., California Ranch Co. (grew walnuts, apricots, beans, grain and other crops), Mountain View Citrus Co., and California Walnut Growers Association. Resident Manager and Superintendent W. E. Goodspeed was an instructor at Utah Agricultural College and the University of California, Agricultural Department and was a manager of the California Walnut Growers Association. Other key employees were Foreman of Cultural Operations Arnold Frew; Superintendent of Pruning Operations and Pest Control R. G. Selph; and Superintendent of Mechanical Operations F. R. Berryessa. (California Orchard Company, *Developing 1,905 Acres*, 5.)

⁵⁶¹ California Orchard Company, *Developing 1,905 Acres*, 1.

⁵⁶² California Orchard Company, *Developing 1,905 Acres*, 12-13.

⁵⁶³ California Orchard Company, *Developing 1,905 Acres*, 16.

⁵⁶⁴ California Orchard Company, *Developing 1,905 Acres*, 6, 8.

⁵⁶⁵ Ralph Newman, “Where a Big Thing is Being Done in a Big Way,” *Pacific Rural Press* (22 March 1924).

⁵⁶⁶ California Orchard Company, *Developing 1,905 Acres*, 6, 8.

⁵⁶⁷ California Orchard Company, *Annual Report*, 1, 3.

⁵⁶⁸ California Orchard Company, *Stockholders Report*, 11-13.

COCO told stockholders that it chose the parcel it bought in 1919 for five main reasons: (1) the land was suitable for growing fruit and nuts; (2) it had excellent, easily cultivated soil, a deep silt loam perfect for fruit and nut trees; (3) it was adaptable to irrigation, located only 500 yards from the Salinas River, “one of the best watersheds in California, where an abundance of water is available for irrigation by pumping only fifty feet to the surface”; (4) the adjacent foothills and sloping land protected the parcel from the wind; and (5) the area’s temperature and rainfall allowed trees to escape spring frosts, assuring “more uniform and bounteous crops.”⁵⁶⁹

Crops. In spring of 1920, COCO planted 416 acres of fruit and nut orchards with 26,728 trees.⁵⁷⁰ The following spring, COCO planted 502 more acres with 36,560 trees. By January of 1922, COCO had planted 56 acres with 27,300 grape vines and 1,602 acres with 102,000 fruit and nut trees, including almonds, apples, apricots, pears, peaches, plums, prunes and walnuts.⁵⁷¹ In 1922, COCO could cultivate forty-eight acres a day with tractors pulling sixteen feet of heavily weighted double discs.⁵⁷² By 1924, COCO had planted pears (300 acres), apricots (290 acres), almonds (265 acres), apples (250 acres), prunes (160 acres), peaches (150 acres), walnuts (90 acres), grapes (75 acres) and plums (50 acres).⁵⁷³ After the orchard trees matured, only the walnuts, apricots and almonds were profitable because although the other trees (and grapevines) gave good fruit, they were over-produced nationally. COCO removed the unprofitable trees and replaced them with additional walnut trees and row crops.⁵⁷⁴

“. . . it must be apparent that a large, advantageously located ranch operated by experts, and managed with scientific accuracy and proven business ability, can produce better products, and more to the acre, at lower cost – than the same acreage of land, cut up into small holdings, and operated by various individuals, each working for his own hand and often at cross purposes with his neighbors.”

California Orchard Company, 1922

From the start, the company interplanted beans, peas and other annual crops between the orchard rows until the trees bore marketable fruit.⁵⁷⁵ In 1923, COCO interplanted 1,000 gross (600 net) acres of pink and lima beans, producing more than 2,100 pounds of pink beans and 1,500 pounds of lima beans per net acre and making a \$22,000 profit on a \$37,500 expense. The crop was so successful that COCO planted thirty percent more beans in 1924. The bean profits reduced the orchard’s operating costs and beans became an increasingly important crop.⁵⁷⁶ COCO reported that after 1924, some of the orchard trees would be too large to continue interplanting beans.⁵⁷⁷

⁵⁶⁹ California Orchard Company, *Developing 1,905 Acres*, 6-7.

⁵⁷⁰ California Orchard Company, *Developing 1,905 Acres*, 13.

⁵⁷¹ California Orchard Company, *Developing 1,905 Acres*, 13.

⁵⁷² California Orchard Company, *Developing 1,905 Acres*, 8.

⁵⁷³ Ralph Newman, “Where a Big Thing is Being Done in a Big Way,” *Pacific Rural Press* (22 March 1924).

⁵⁷⁴ Teague, *Fifty Years a Rancher*, 63. Norm Nuck, *Antique Advocate, Part 3*.

⁵⁷⁵ California Orchard Company, *Developing 1,905 Acres*, 14.

⁵⁷⁶ California Orchard Company, *Annual Report*, 1.

⁵⁷⁷ California Orchard Company, *Stockholders Report*, 8.

Other crops included bush fruit, strawberries, barley and alfalfa.⁵⁷⁸ COCO grew enough barley hay to feed its work animals, with over 400 tons of surplus hay by 1922.⁵⁷⁹ Foretelling the future importance of Salinas Valley viticulture, the company reported that the “grape vineyard is a picture of vigor and has made a truly wonderful growth this year.” The vines of Alicante Bonschet (then California’s highest priced grapes) were still immature but the product was already under a sales contract.⁵⁸⁰

Irrigation. The Salinas Land Company started irrigating its property in 1918 before COCO was founded. The first two wells were drilled near the west end of the King City bridge crossing the Salinas River. By 1919, twelve wells were drilled along the present Highway 101.⁵⁸² Eventually, the wells pumped more than 50 million gallons of water daily.⁵⁸³ In COCO’s first few years of business, it spent almost \$209,000 on the irrigation system including wells, concrete and steel pipelines, reinforced concrete pump houses, a switch shed, transformer, derricks, force lines, pumps, motors, reservoirs, wells, and a telephone system.⁵⁸⁴ Electricity to run the irrigation system was a big expense.⁵⁸⁵ COCO reported “an abundant and unfailing supply” of water even during dry years, with four wells producing 12 million gallons per day.⁵⁸⁶ The first four wells operated along the Salinas River at the west end of the Salinas River bridge.⁵⁸⁷ Each had a deep-well pump that lifted more than 3 million gallons of irrigation water daily into a steel force line to a booster plant. From there, electric motors drove three centrifugal pumps, which propelled the irrigation water through a concrete pipeline to the ranch’s higher elevations.⁵⁸⁸

“In the COCO pumping plants will be found nothing but the finest and most up-to-date equipment . . . the electric motors . . . will shove a veritable river of water over the Company’s property.”

**California Orchard Company,
circa 1924⁵⁸¹**

Led by Slovenian workers Charlie Ragus, Bill Ragus and Mike Kristich, a fifty-man crew made COCO’s concrete irrigation pipes on-site at the Salinas River using sand and gravel from the property.⁵⁸⁹ Pipe was hauled by wagon and engineer Charles Petit laid out the pipe lines. The

⁵⁷⁸ California Orchard Company, *Annual Report*, December 31, 1923 Balance Sheet.

⁵⁷⁹ California Orchard Company, *Developing 1,905 Acres*, 14.

⁵⁸⁰ California Orchard Company, *Stockholders Report* (Los Angeles: California Orchard Company, circa 1924), 1-2.

⁵⁸¹ California Orchard Company, *Stockholders Report*, 2.

⁵⁸² Tom Thwaits, Draft of Speech (Salinas Land Company Office, Greenfield, CA: circa 1968). “Salinas Land Company – California Orchard Company.”

⁵⁸³ “50th Anniversary Recalls Salinas Land Co. History,” *The Land* (March 1968), 3.

⁵⁸⁴ California Orchard Company, *Stockholders Report*, 3. California Orchard Company, *Annual Report*, December 31, 1923 Balance Sheet. California Orchard Company, *Developing 1,905 Acres*, 11.

⁵⁸⁵ California Orchard Company, *Annual Report*, 3.

⁵⁸⁶ California Orchard Company, *Annual Report*, 3.

⁵⁸⁷ Norm Nuck, *Antique Advocate*, Part 3.

⁵⁸⁸ Ralph Newman, “Where a Big Thing is Being Done in a Big Way.” California Orchard Company, *Stockholders Report*, 1-2. California Orchard Company, *Developing 1,905 Acres*, 9.

⁵⁸⁹ Norm Nuck, *Antique Advocate*, Part 3.

first lines were to the foothills.⁵⁹⁰ Gravity lines ran off the main line and valves distributed water to blocks of trees with limited waste and labor. Meters and “measuring boxes” tracked how much water the system pumped, how much water was used per block of trees and the cost.⁵⁹¹

COCO reduced irrigation costs by manufacturing its own pipes, buying cement cheaply and digging trenches with a trencher machine instead of by hand.⁵⁹³ By 1922, COCO had installed about thirty miles of buried concrete distributing pipes to irrigate the property and almost four miles of steel pipeline. Placed every twenty-five feet along the pipeline, outlet pots regulated the water flow using valves and shutter-regulated outlet gates.⁵⁹⁴ Eventually, sixteen wells and one hundred miles of steel and concrete pipelines irrigated 8,000 acres of COCO and Salinas Land Company land.⁵⁹⁵ At the time, only a large agricultural corporation could afford to install an irrigation system of this extent, make its own irrigation supplies, and buy such expensive equipment. Irrigation was unsuitable on only sixty or seventy of COCO’s acres, upon which it grew grains instead of irrigated fruit and nut trees.⁵⁹⁶ In the mid-1920s, *Pacific Service* magazine called COCO’s irrigation system of pumps and booster stations “an excellent example of efficient agricultural engineering.”⁵⁹⁷ When COCO leased an additional 2, 167 acres from the Salinas Land Company in 1924, a “modern irrigation system” covered 2,103 acres of it with five wells, turbine pumps, motors, twenty-one miles of concrete pipeline and three-and-a-half miles of steel pipeline. The leased property had “eight sets” of farm buildings, including houses, barns, garages and other structures. COCO planted beans on the leased property.⁵⁹⁸

“Irrigation water is more valuable in California than the land itself. There is usually no rain from April to November. The property of the California Orchard Company is one of the most adequately irrigated in the state.”

California Orchard Company, 1922⁵⁹²

Furrow irrigation was used between 1920 and 1960. Sprinkler irrigation using underground pressure lines, reservoirs and booster pumps started in the 1960s. Drip irrigation started in the mid-1990s.⁵⁹⁹

⁵⁹⁰ “Changing Times ’95: Salinas Land Co. has long, strong roots in South County,” *Gonzales Tribune, Soledad Bee, Greenfield News*, 27 September 1995.

⁵⁹¹ Ralph Newman, “Where a Big Thing is Being Done in a Big Way.”

⁵⁹² California Orchard Company, *Developing 1,905 Acres*, 15.

⁵⁹³ California Orchard Company, *Developing 1,905 Acres*, 6-7, 12.

⁵⁹⁴ California Orchard Company, *Developing 1,905 Acres*, 7, 11.

⁵⁹⁵ Teague, *Fifty Years a Rancher*, 63. Norm Nuck, *Antique Advocate, Part 2*. Norm Nuck, *Antique Advocate, Part 3*.

⁵⁹⁶ California Orchard Company, *Developing 1,905 Acres*, 8.

⁵⁹⁷ Norm Nuck, *Antique Advocate, Part 3*.

⁵⁹⁸ California Orchard Company, *Stockholders Report*, 11-13.

⁵⁹⁹ “Salinas Land Company – California Orchard Company.”

Buildings and Equipment. By 1924, COCO had built tool and tractor sheds, at least four barns and other outbuildings.⁶⁰⁰ By 1922, COCO had built a boarding house for single male workers with twenty-two rooms, a dining room, kitchen, club room, lavatories, showers, baths and other facilities.⁶⁰¹ Located next to the boarding house was the superintendent's large bungalow, which also housed the ranch office and second-floor rooms furnished for officers, directors and stockholders.⁶⁰² Three five-room bungalows housed the assistant superintendent, pruning foreman, mechanical foreman and their three five-room bungalows for the assistant superintendent, pruning foreman, mechanical foreman and their families. They were "neat, comfortable, and economical of construction" and meant to "insure permanency of [the] employees." For less than \$3,000, COCO also built and furnished a separate guest house for visiting stockholders, "a unique little bungalow" with three bedrooms, large combination living and dining room, kitchen with an electric range, bathroom and a double garage. It was built near the boarding house for unmarried male workers.⁶⁰³

By 1922, COCO owned four tractors, three cars, three trucks, twenty-two horses and mules, "a complete set of all farming tools and implements" and built appropriate buildings to house all of these assets.⁶⁰⁴ Although COCO used tractors to pull chisel plows, harrow plows and pea drills in 1924, it also relied heavily on mules to do much of the orchard work because it was cheaper.⁶⁰⁵ By 1924, it replaced most of its old trucks, tractors and automobiles and bought "fine young animals" to replace "unsatisfactory stock."⁶⁰⁶ The company also invested in "frost-fighting" equipment, including smudge-pots, smudge oil, oil storage tanks and other equipment. It protected the almond trees, which usually blossom in mid-February.⁶⁰⁷ The company also installed a "modern and complete" fruit drying system and bought a "modern almond huller."⁶⁰⁸

In 1923, COCO estimated that it would produce an average of fifteen million pounds of fruits and nuts annually at full capacity.⁶⁰⁹ Most of its fruit was "suitable for drying, canning, or shipping green" but the "greatest profits accrue where the fruit can be conveniently canned."⁶¹⁰ In 1923, "one of the largest fruit packing concerns in California" purchased a King City cannery site but COCO was unsure whether that cannery would pay well for its fruit or could even handle COCO's entire crop. Therefore, COCO bought its own ten-acre King City canning site, fronting

⁶⁰⁰ California Orchard Company, *Annual Report*, 1; California Orchard Company, *Stockholders Report*, 2. Assets on the December 31, 1923 balance sheet included the company's offices in King City and Los Angeles, land worth \$242,286, buildings and appurtenances worth \$47,396, orchard development costing \$313,260, as well as animal teams, equipment, tractors, trucks, cars, a trenching machine, repair shop, farm implements and commissary equipment. California Orchard Company, *Developing 1,905 Acres*, 14.

⁶⁰¹ California Orchard Company, *Developing 1,905 Acres*, 6, 14.

⁶⁰² California Orchard Company, *Developing 1,905 Acres*, 6.

⁶⁰³ California Orchard Company, *Stockholders Report*, 2, 4-6.

⁶⁰⁴ California Orchard Company, *Developing 1,905 Acres*, 15.

⁶⁰⁵ Ralph Newman, "Where a Big Thing is Being Done in a Big Way."

⁶⁰⁶ California Orchard Company, *Annual Report*, 1.

⁶⁰⁷ California Orchard Company, *Stockholders Report*, 4.

⁶⁰⁸ California Orchard Company, *Stockholders Report*, 7.

⁶⁰⁹ California Orchard Company, *Annual Report*, 5.

⁶¹⁰ California Orchard Company, *Annual Report*, 3.

on the Southern Pacific spur tract only two blocks from the town's business center, to process its fruit in-house. The company estimated that it could subdivide and sell five of the ten acres yet recover the purchase price of the entire property. It planned to build the first part of the cannery when fruit production was heavy enough to make the cannery profitable, in approximately 1925 or 1926.⁶¹¹

Windbreaks. COCO spent \$6,197 on windbreaks, planting eucalyptus trees in rows spaced about 800 feet apart to help counteract the Salinas Valley "zephyr" winds.⁶¹² In a "lath house" on the property (an open structure with posts and beams, roofed in lath with space between each board to allow sun and rain to enter), COCO grew 170,000 eucalyptus trees, 84,000 of which were planted on the property by 1922.⁶¹³ Eucalyptus windbreaks have been a hallmark of Monterey County's cultural landscape for many decades, ever since they were grown as a crop. However, some property owners are cutting them down and leaving only the stumps behind, and eucalyptus windbreaks may be a disappearing component of historic agricultural properties.

"Our big job is behind us. Where a barren grain field stood but four years ago, there has since sprung up like magic one of the most complete and beautiful orchard properties to be found in the entire State of California. In response to the garden-like tillage, the thorough irrigation, the scientific fertilization and pruning, our orchards have thrived beyond our early expectation."

**California Orchard Company,
March 26, 1924⁶¹⁴**

⁶¹¹ California Orchard Company, *Annual Report*, 4.

⁶¹² California Orchard Company, *Annual Report*, December 31, 1923 Balance Sheet. California Orchard Company, *Stockholders Report*, 10.

⁶¹³ California Orchard Company, *Developing 1,905 Acres*, 11.

⁶¹⁴ California Orchard Company, *Annual Report*, 1.

7. Agricultural Colonies

Monterey County had three main agricultural colonies: Fort Romie Colony, Clark Colony (now Greenfield, the fifth most populated Monterey County town as of 2006) and St. Joseph's Colony.⁶¹⁵ These colonies formed an important component of Monterey County's settlement history in the late 1890s and early 1900s. The Salinas Valley and South County were still relatively unpopulated at that time and the colonies attracted new residents with little wealth but a willingness to work hard. The promised payoff was a chance to own productive agricultural land. In 1898, a *Salinas Daily Index* reporter interviewing Fort Romie colonists noted that "One and all said: 'We worked in the city from daylight until dark, earning a mere pittance, and when the year was at an end, we had nothing. Now we have a future and will improve.'"⁶¹⁶

Irrigation allowed these colonies to develop. Without water from the Salinas River and Arroyo Seco River, the colonists would have been unable to convert the sandy, dusty land to fertile orchards and fields.⁶¹⁷ Corporate agriculture also factored in the success of agricultural colonies because both Fort Romie and St. Joseph's Colony supplied sugar beets for the Spreckels Sugar Company's factory outside of Salinas. Fort Romie and Greenfield still retain structures dating from the agricultural colony days but St. Joseph's has not fared as well.

a. Fort Romie

The Salvation Army founded three agricultural colonies to help the working poor leave congested cities and become self-supporting through agricultural work: Fort Romie in Monterey County, Fort Amity in Colorado and Fort Herrick in Ohio. In 1897, Monterey County Supervisor Charles T. Romie (brother-in-law of prominent agricultural landowner David Jacks) sold the Salvation Army 520 acres in the Salinas Valley, which became the Fort Romie Colony. It is located four miles southwest of Soledad, west of the Salinas River, and was formerly part of the Soledad Mission's lands.⁶¹⁸ The former colony's main roads are Fort Romie Road (formerly Mission Road), Colony Road (formerly Washington Road), Foothill Road (formerly Mesa Road), Lucerne Street and Mile End Road.

A sign at the intersection of Fort Romie Road and Mile End Road proudly marked the entrance to the "Fort Romie Salvation Army Colony."⁶¹⁹ The colony's slogan, "The Landless Man to the Man-less Land" illustrated the hope that families without property would move to this

⁶¹⁵ Plans for other colonies were announced in local papers, including a colony fifteen miles west of Bradley in the South County intended for "about 100 colonists from Kentucky." The parcel covered 8,000 acres of the Pleyto Rancho. ("Another Colony," unknown newspaper, August 1897.)

⁶¹⁶ Patricia Binsacca Terry, "Fort Romie: The Salvation Army's First Colony" (Salinas, CA: Monterey County Historical Society, 2010), <http://www.mchsmuseum.com/fortromie.html>, accessed 14 June 2011.


⁶¹⁷ Monterey County Historical Society, "Colony Settlements" (Salinas, CA: Monterey County Historical Society, 2010), <http://www.mchsmuseum.com/colonysettlements.html>, accessed 14 June 2011.

⁶¹⁸ Terry, "Fort Romie: The Salvation Army's First Colony."

⁶¹⁹ Clovis and Monterey County Agricultural and Rural Life Museum, *Salinas Valley*, 56.

unpopulated spot, cultivate the land and prosper.⁶²⁰ The Salvation Army solicited funds for the colony from across the country. Donors ranged from New York City residents to Monterey County’s sugar king, Claus Spreckels, who donated \$1,000.⁶²¹ Fort Romie and St. Joseph’s colonists supplied sugar beets to the Spreckels factory near Salinas.⁶²²

In 1898, the Salvation Army built a reservoir fifty feet square and thirty feet deep and a tunnel to connect it to the river. Pumping plants were designed to supply the colony with 8,000-9,000 gallons of water per minute, enough to irrigate 1,500 to 2,000 acres. The Salvation Army also built an 850-foot long flume to the San Jurjo Ranch, whose owners wanted to purchase extra water that the colonists did not need. Charles Romie donated 2,000 eucalyptus, cypress and



The Salvation Army Central Hall served many functions, including housing the Rochdale Company’s mercantile store and serving as the meeting space for the Fort Romie Grange, founded in 1911.⁶²³

other trees for windbreaks for the colonists to plant once the irrigation system began.⁶²⁴ Unfortunately, a three-year drought dealt a severe blow to the colony. Rainfall was insufficient to water the crops and irrigation was insufficient. All but one family left, the Frank Oscar Lindstrand family. Like the other colonists, Mr. Lindstrand was not trained as a farmer. Originally from Finland, he had been a railway car conductor before moving to Fort Romie. Nevertheless, his perseverance paid off and he was a Fort Romie resident and local leader in both phases of Fort Romie’s development.

In 1903, the Salvation Army revived Fort Romie with a second wave of settlement and irrigation. It resurveyed the colony, laid it out as a townsite with roads and waterways, resettled it with

⁶²⁰ Clovis and Monterey County Agricultural and Rural Life Museum, *Salinas Valley*, 54.

⁶²¹ Terry, “Fort Romie: The Salvation Army’s First Colony.”

⁶²² “St. Joseph Colonists Came to Salinas In Dry 1897-98,” *Salinas Californian*, 20 March 1948. “Forgotten Edens: Agricultural Colonies in the Salinas Valley.” Unpublished, undated manuscript in the files of the County of Monterey.

⁶²³ Terry, “Fort Romie: The Salvation Army’s First Colony.”

⁶²⁴ Ryan and Breschini, “An Overview of Monterey County Agriculture.” Terry, “Fort Romie: The Salvation Army’s First Colony.”

colonists experienced with farming, and irrigated it with water from the Arroyo Seco River, used a steam pump for Salinas River water, and used Spreckels's canals for irrigation. A new pumping plant started operating on February 29, 1912 with a 5,000 gallons per minute capacity, irrigating an average of ten acres every twelve hours. The *Salinas Daily Index* noted that "There are six twelve-inch wells which are apparently inexhaustible." The Fort Romie Water Company, at the corner of Private #2 Road and Fort Romie Road, still operates.

By 1903, seventy colonists raised sugar beets under contract to Spreckels. Colonists also grew alfalfa, potatoes, beans and onions; raised cows, pigs and chickens; and made cheese, butter and honey.⁶²⁵ Residents later sold some of the small farm parcels to Spreckels, Swiss dairy farmers and other residents.⁶²⁶ The colonists had a wide range of cultural backgrounds. In 1903, thirteen families were from America, two were Scandinavian, and one family each of Finnish, German, Swiss, Dutch and Italian descent.⁶²⁷

Each Fort Romie farmstead was ten or twenty acres and the residents lived in very modest, single-story, wooden homes. Families with two children lived in a two-room house; families with three or more children lived in a four-room house with a kitchen, dining room and two bedrooms. They farmed their tracts with plows, seeds, sheds, tools, windmills and equipment from the Salvation Army.⁶²⁹

Buildings and stores in Fort Romie included the D.W. Wiley Cheese Factory, R.H. Gilkey's Blacksmith and Wagon Maker Shop, shoe repair



The Pura farmstead in Fort Romie. Jerry Pura's family arrived in Fort Romie by 1906 and J. M. Pura was elected as a director of the Fort Romie Water Company in 1915. Mrs. Pura kept the Water Company's books and Margaret Pura Olson delivered water bills to customers when she was a child.⁶²⁸

⁶²⁵ Ryan and Breschini, "An Overview of Monterey County Agriculture." Terry, "Fort Romie: The Salvation Army's First Colony."

⁶²⁶ Monterey County Historical Society, "Colony Settlements."

⁶²⁷ Terry, "Fort Romie: The Salvation Army's First Colony."

⁶²⁸ Terry, "Fort Romie: The Salvation Army's First Colony."

⁶²⁹ Terry, "Fort Romie: The Salvation Army's First Colony." Clovis and Monterey County Agricultural and Rural Life Museum, *Salinas Valley*, 57.

shop, tobacco and candy store, ice cream parlor, clubhouse, library, school, social hall, creamery and the Salvation Army Central Hall. The second story of the Central Hall was a meeting space and the first floor housed the Rochdale Company, a consumer cooperative which the colonists operated as shareholders. The store was named for a cooperative movement begun in Rochdale, England. The Fort Romie Rochdale Company dissolved in January 1913. The Salvation Army founded the Mission School, which taught Fort Romie students and other pupils in the Mission District. The Fort Romie Telephone Company operated a farm line from Soledad to the colony; residents installed their own wires and poles.⁶³⁰

By 1910, all of the colonists had paid off their mortgages and loans and the Salvation Army withdrew from the colony. When the Salvation Army left, the residents founded the Fort Romie Grange, which served a social function as well as being an agricultural organization. The Grange bought the Salvation Army Central Hall in November 1912 which was rededicated as the Grange Hall on July 11, 1913.⁶³¹

b. Clark Colony (Greenfield)

In 1904, the Arroyo Seco Improvement Company bought 7,000 acres of the Arroyo Seco Rancho, acquired water rights and built canals on the property nine miles south of Soledad. A year later, they sold their interests to the California Home Extension Association which laid out Clark Colony on the property. It was named after Association founder John S. Clark. The town was renamed Clark City and then Greenfield (honoring a Clark Colony man), after the Post Office notified the community that too many cities were called Clark City. Colonists bought parcels of five, ten, twenty and forty acres with water rights attached.⁶³²

The new settlement was a barley field when residents arrived and they all used one well (on what is now Eighth Street) to meet their immediate needs.⁶³³ The colonists lived in a tent city in the “Three Mile Flat” area while they built homes.⁶³⁴ For years, the Spreckels Sugar Company grew acres of sugar beets in the Three-Mile Flat area, tended by immigrant workers from India. Dairy farms eventually replaced the sugar beet fields.⁶³⁵

⁶³⁰ Terry, “Fort Romie: The Salvation Army's First Colony.” Clovis and Monterey County Agricultural and Rural Life Museum, *Salinas Valley*, 57.

⁶³¹ Terry, “Fort Romie: The Salvation Army's First Colony.”


⁶³² “Clark Colony’s Substantial Growth,” *The Western Empire*, August 1905. Clovis and Monterey County Agricultural and Rural Life Museum, *Salinas Valley*, 73. Monterey County Historical Society, “Colony Settlements.”

⁶³³ Helen E. Lorentzen McDonald, “Ethel Page,” 5 September 1991.

⁶³⁴ Monterey County Historical Society, “Colony Settlements.”

⁶³⁵ “Humble Start of Thriving Greenfield Told: Farmers Laughed at Pioneer Effort,” *Salinas Daily Post*, (Salinas, CA: *Salinas Daily Post*), 8 March 1936.

By July 1905, three hundred people lived in the colony and had built sixty-two houses in ten weeks. Another eight hundred residents were scheduled to arrive after the grain harvest.⁶³⁶ The William Page family dug the first house well in the community and later installed the first electric pump around 1912.⁶³⁷ Early commercial and community buildings housed a grocery store, hardware store, post office and community meetings.⁶³⁸ A one-room schoolhouse south of town accommodated the colony’s children as well as those of local Swiss farmers.⁶³⁹



The California Home Extension Association circulated this map as part of the “Official Announcement” of land for sale at the proposed Clark Colony, now the town of Greenfield.

Founded in 1905, the Clark Colony Water Company used water from the Arroyo Seco River to operate a system of canals, ditches and laterals, which was the largest irrigation and domestic water system in the Salinas Valley at the time.⁶⁴⁰ Colony crops included potatoes, beans, alfalfa, grains, gooseberries, almonds, walnuts, apricots, pears, apples, peaches, prunes, plums, cherries, blue gum trees (on a parcel where Dust Bowl migrants set up a camp in the 1930s), peas, lettuce and other vegetables. Colonists also raised chickens.⁶⁴¹ The Clark Colony’s apples were

⁶³⁶ “Progress in California’s Development: Unique Colony Founded in the Salinas Valley,” *San Francisco Chronicle* (San Francisco, CA: San Francisco Chronicle), 15 July 1905. “Clark Colony’s Substantial Growth,” *The Western Empire*.

⁶³⁷ Helen E. Lorentzen McDonald, “Ethel Page,” 5 September 1991. In 1916, the Page family opened the Page Hotel in town (renamed the Hotel Greenfield after 1944). J. G. Yeomans built the structure around 1906 and used it as a hardware store and lumber yard; it was also a grocery store before the Pages bought it.

⁶³⁸ Helen E. Lorentzen McDonald, “Ethel Page,” 5 September 1991.

⁶³⁹ “Greenfield gent recalls 1905’s ‘Clark City’ days,” unknown newspaper, 6 September 1980.

⁶⁴⁰ “Progress in California’s Development: Unique Colony Founded in the Salinas Valley,” *San Francisco Chronicle* (San Francisco, CA: San Francisco Chronicle), 15 July 1905. “Clark Colony’s Substantial Growth,” *The Western Empire*. Monterey County Historical Society, “Colony Settlements.”

⁶⁴¹ “Progress in California’s Development: Unique Colony Founded in the Salinas Valley.” “Clark Colony’s Substantial Growth,” *The Western Empire*. “Humble Start of Thriving Greenfield Told: Farmers Laughed at Pioneer Effort.” Clovis and Monterey County Agricultural and Rural Life Museum, *Salinas Valley*, 79. “Grange

excellent, winning more blue ribbons and selling for higher prices than the esteemed apples produced in Watsonville and the Pajaro Valley.⁶⁴² To protect crops from the Salinas Valley wind, residents planted eucalyptus windbreaks after about 1907.⁶⁴³ They shipped crops to and received freight from Metz (formerly Chalone), which had become a stop on the Southern Pacific Railroad in 1886.⁶⁴⁴ Row crops eventually replaced the orchards.⁶⁴⁵ The area now has an increasing number of vineyards, a rapidly expanding industry in the Salinas Valley.

In 1915, the *King City Rustler* noted that Greenfield farmers grew “hundreds of acres of alfalfa with dairies and cheese factories, orchards loaded with delicious fruits, groves and alignments of stately gums, fragrant acacias and flower gardens on every hand; wind-mills in all directions spreading their white sails to the wind.”⁶⁴⁶ Many Swiss dairymen lived in the area before the Clark Colony developed, with some estimates of more than a dozen Swiss dairies, such as the Vanoli and Rava dairy.⁶⁴⁷ After Spreckels bought the Espinosa Ranch, many Swiss families farming there moved to the Clark Colony.⁶⁴⁸ Greenfield farmers were successful and the Greenfield Grange was very active. It was originally located in an old shed, then in a granary and finally in its own building.⁶⁴⁹

Based in part on the orchard success of Clark Colony residents, the founders of the Salinas Land Company and California Orchard Company planted vast orchards between Greenfield and King City starting in 1917.⁶⁵⁰ The city of Greenfield is still thriving and is one of Monterey County’s main population centers.

c. St. Joseph’s Colony

From 1897 to 1907, St. Joseph’s Colony operated on part of the former Rancho Cienega del Gabilan, about fourteen miles southeast of Salinas at the junction of Alisal Road and Old Stage Road. Led by N. H. Lang and Superior Judge N. A. Dorn, the San Francisco-based German Colonization Association of California, Inc. distributed promotional materials to German Catholic families across America, enticing them to move to the Salinas Valley to farm sugar beets for the Spreckels plant.⁶⁵¹ The Association’s stationery featured sugar beets wrapped in a banner proclaiming “Sugar Beet Land.”⁶⁵²

brochure lauded Greenfield,” unknown paper, September 1980. “What a transformation has come over this area!”, unknown paper, September 1980. Helen E. Lorentzen McDonald, “Greenfield, 1930s,” 19 September 1991.

⁶⁴² “Greenfield gent recalls 1905’s ‘Clark City’ days.”

⁶⁴³ “Greenfield gent recalls 1905’s ‘Clark City’ days.”

⁶⁴⁴ “Humble Start of Thriving Greenfield Told: Farmers Laughed at Pioneer Effort.”

⁶⁴⁵ “Louis Tommasini was resident here before Greenfield was,” unknown newspaper, September 1980.

⁶⁴⁶ Clovis and Monterey County Agricultural and Rural Life Museum, *Salinas Valley*, 80.

⁶⁴⁷ Clovis and Monterey County Agricultural and Rural Life Museum, *Salinas Valley*, 79. “Greenfield gent recalls 1905’s ‘Clark City’ days.”

⁶⁴⁸ “Greenfield gent recalls 1905’s ‘Clark City’ days.”

⁶⁴⁹ “Greenfield gent recalls 1905’s ‘Clark City’ days.” McDonald, “Greenfield, 1930s.”

⁶⁵⁰ Teague, *Fifty Years a Rancher*, 62.

⁶⁵¹ “St. Joseph Colonists Came to Salinas In Dry 1897-98,” *Salinas Californian*, 20 March 1948. “Forgotten Edens: Agricultural Colonies in the Salinas Valley.” Unpublished, undated manuscript in the files of the County of

The colony was about 10,000 acres and the town settlement covered about 250 acres, with colonists buying ten-acre parcels.⁶⁵³ It included a post office, store and homes on the east end and a combination church and school and additional homes on the west end. The homes generally consisted of three adjacent rooms: one for the family, the middle for hay storage, and the third for animals. At least some of the colonists bought lots based on misleading information and photographs, arriving in Salinas to find their property almost worthless.⁶⁵⁴ Most of the colonists were former merchants and tradesmen, not farmers, and their inexperience, the 1897-98 drought, fluctuating beet prices, small farming parcels, and the unsuitability of the colony's land for farming spelled disaster. The Association originally sought about 150 families, but peak residence only reached about 90 residents in 1900. The population later declined and the last colonists sold their land in 1907.⁶⁵⁵ Although the colony started out as a respectable enterprise, it devolved into a real estate sham.⁶⁵⁶

F. H. Lang repurchased the colonists' land and sold it to brothers Charles and Henry Bardin, who established a ranch. The Bardins sold St. Joseph's Catholic Church for \$600 to Catholic residents of the town of Spreckels. The new congregants moved the church in two pieces to the corner of Llano Avenue and Second Street in Spreckels, where Bishop T. J. Conaty of Los Angeles dedicated it.⁶⁵⁷ Some of the colony buildings still standing in 1978 included Lang's two-story redwood-framed house, a horse stable, tack shed, two barns, corrals, fences and the original St. Joseph's School.⁶⁵⁸

Monterey. "Der Unterzeichnete: Deutsche Katholische Colonisations - Verein Von Californien," 1897. Files of the County of Monterey.

⁶⁵² "Memorandum" from Surveyor Jackson, German Colonization Association of California, undated. Files of the County of Monterey.

⁶⁵³ "Memorandum" from Surveyor Jackson, German Colonization Association of California. "Forgotten Edens: Agricultural Colonies in the Salinas Valley." Monterey County Historical Society, "Colony Settlements."

⁶⁵⁴ "St. Joseph Colonists Came to Salinas In Dry 1897-98," *Salinas Californian*, 20 March 1948. "Forgotten Edens: Agricultural Colonies in the Salinas Valley."

⁶⁵⁵ "St. Joseph Colonists Came to Salinas In Dry 1897-98," *Salinas Californian*. "Forgotten Edens: Agricultural Colonies in the Salinas Valley." Monterey County Historical Society, "Colony Settlements."

⁶⁵⁶ Monterey County Historical Society, "Colony Settlements."

⁶⁵⁷ "St. Joseph Colonists Came to Salinas In Dry 1897-98," *Salinas Californian*. W. Harold Peck, "St. Joseph's Church," 1950.

⁶⁵⁸ "Colony structures still stand," Unknown newspaper, 27 May 1978.

F. INDUSTRIAL AGRICULTURE (ca. 1925–1960): TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCES, PRODUCT EXPANSION, LABOR CAMPS, ADAPTIVE USE

1. Introduction


Industrial agriculture features specialization on many levels: crop specialization; labor specialization (laborers trained to perform a single task such as harvesting crops versus a single family performing all labor on their family farm); and the complete commercialization of farming. It also requires close connections between growers, labor, scientists, investors, marketing agencies, regional markets, governmental regulators, businesses and consumers.⁶⁵⁹ In Monterey County today, most agricultural production is on the industrial scale.

Many of the technological advances of the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth century allowed Monterey County's intensive agriculture to transform into industrial agriculture. A large, specialized labor pool was equally critical to the transformation and immigrant groups like Filipinos and Mexicans filled labor needs throughout the twentieth century. Employers built labor camps throughout the county to accommodate the workers.

2. Technological Advances and Product Expansion

Pesticides: From the 1880s to 1907, pests and pesticides caused major damage locally.⁶⁶⁰ By 1900, pests like the codling moth infested more than a third of Pajaro Valley's apples. The Federal Bureau of Chemistry found that seventy-one percent of pesticides were too dangerous, potentially killing more crops than pests did. In 1901, California passed the country's first pesticide law and Pajaro Valley apple growers successfully sued manufacturers who had sold inconsistently formulated pesticides.⁶⁶¹

U.C. Berkeley entomologists William H. Volck and E. E. Luther came to the area in 1902 and 1905, respectively, and found that the Pajaro Valley's coastal fog turned pesticides volatile, burning tree leaves. They experimented and formulated gentle, effective pesticides.⁶⁶² Volck and Luther pioneered a new type of public-private partnership with the U.C. experiment station that other pesticide companies later followed. Local apple growers helped pay for Volck and Luther's experiments at first. The two men later founded the California Spray Chemical Company in Watsonville and



Pioneering entomologist William H. Volck experiments with pesticides in the laboratory. (Courtesy of Pajaro Valley Historical Association.)

⁶⁵⁹ Stoll, *The Fruits of Natural Advantage*, xiv.

⁶⁶⁰ Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, 85.


⁶⁶¹ Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, 84.

⁶⁶² Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, 85.

distributed their product internationally under the name “Ortho.” They allowed the U.C. experiment station to review their pesticide formulations, achieving extra credibility and selling a new product that the university was financially unable to develop and sell.⁶⁶³ By 1907, the worst codling moth and pesticide problems ended and the North County’s apple industry continued to expand.⁶⁶⁴ In Monterey County’s agricultural history, Volck and Luther were significant because their experiments and pesticide formulas enabled agricultural operations to survive and to continue producing superior crops. Although some local farmers grow organic fruit and vegetables, pesticides are still critical to Monterey County’s agricultural industry.

Packing and Packaging: Improvements in agricultural packing and packaging took Monterey County agriculture to a new level of efficiency and sophistication. These changes were significant because they allowed growers to concentrate on cultivation rather than processing. Labor specialization increased, processing tasks were consolidated or outsourced, and new buildings like packing houses and packaging plants were constructed to accommodate these changes.

In 1894, local Croatian apple distributors learned the importance of marketing at the California Midwinter International Exposition in San Francisco, including standardizing fruit grading by size, shape, color, damage and texture; separating fruit into categories like fancy, choice, standard, pie and juice apples; and designing creative, attractive packaging.⁶⁶⁶ They also used colorful, creative produce labels for marketing impact.⁶⁶⁷ Local companies still use these techniques today, using creative packaging to introduce new product lines.



M. N. Lettunich, the Croatian packer and shipper known as the “Dean of the Watsonville apple industry,” operated the Del Monte Fruit Farm in Aromas and other packing houses in the Pajaro Valley.⁶⁶⁵

⁶⁶³ Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, 85-86.

⁶⁶⁴ Dunn, *Monterey County, California*, 16. Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, 85. The William H. Volck house is located at 261 East Beach Street in Watsonville, Santa Cruz County. In the 1950s, Helen Volck Tucker donated it to the Pajaro Valley Historical Association (PVHA) as a museum to honor her late husband. PVHA later sold it but maintains the Volck Museum in a carriage house on its current property, the Bockius-Orr House at 332 East Beach Street in Watsonville. (Pajaro Valley Historical Association, “The Volck Museum – Carriage House” (Watsonville, CA: Pajaro Valley Historical Association).) <http://www.pajarovalleyhistory.org/index.php?page=about-vm>, accessed 3 May 2010.)

⁶⁶⁵ “M. N. Lettunich Pioneered [rest of title missing],” *Watsonville Morning Sun*, circa 1939. Agricultural History Project Historical Files.

⁶⁶⁶ Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, 98, 102-104.

⁶⁶⁷ Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, 105.

Agricultural packaging developments were not limited to the apple industry. In 1923, Charles Sambrailo, founder of the Sambrailo Packaging Company, sought to improve packaging. To start, he introduced paper liners to protect produce as workers packed it into wooden boxes. In 1957, Sambrailo developed strawberry packing trays with glued and folded-over windows, which reduced fruit damage by making the packaging stronger. They replaced the old strawberry cartons. Since then, the family-owned business has continued to create innovative packaging for the agricultural industry.⁶⁶⁸ The Sambrailo Packaging Company has a large plant at 1750 San Juan Road near Aromas, next to the Southern Pacific Railroad crossing. The Salinas Valley Wax Paper Company occupies an Art Deco-style building at 1111 Abbott Street in Salinas.

Innovations in agricultural packing and packaging were significant because they increased efficiency, led to increased labor specialization, and expanded the agricultural industry. Many of the new packing and packaging facilities were built near major transportation networks, such as railroad depots and principal roadways, so the products could ship to market faster.


Refrigeration: Distributing fresh Monterey County fruit to distant markets was problematic until the 1920s. Developments that improved the process included the new East Coast produce auction and distribution system (1896), railroad schedule and route standardization (after 1900), the Panama Canal (1914), and reliable refrigerated rail cars (1920s).⁶⁶⁹

⁶⁶⁸ “Sambrailo Packaging continues to revolutionize the industry,” *Register-Pajaronian*, 24 September 2003. Sambrailo Packaging, “Sambrailo Packaging Company History” (Watsonville, CA: Sambrailo Packaging), <http://www.sambrailo.com/history.html> (accessed 3 May 2010). The company’s corporate headquarters and two other properties are in Watsonville; it has eleven facilities in California and Mexico.

⁶⁶⁹ Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, 87-88.

In 1867, J. B. Sutherland invented the first refrigerated rail “bunker” car, with bunkers (insulated containers filled with ice) in each end of the car, cooling produce in between. Several decades of technological development improved car reliability and specialization for meat or fruit.⁶⁷¹ The cars became commonplace for shipping produce in the Monterey County area by 1923, coinciding with the rise of industrial agriculture.⁶⁷²

A few years earlier, in 1916, North County farmer Moses (Mose) S. Hutchings shipped the first refrigerated produce out of Monterey County. From his mother-in-law Eva Rowe’s ranch at 1767 San Juan Road in the Pajaro Valley, Hutchings packed a wagon of wooden crates laden with lettuce, using ice as the refrigerant. Spoilage was common in this era, with ice melting and contaminating the produce. Refrigerated rail cars and vacuum coolers were a vast improvement. In 1946, Rex L. Brunsing invented the vacuum cooler, a major technological advancement in lettuce refrigeration. The cooler consisted of an enormous vacuum tube, eight feet long and five feet in diameter, that could hold up to sixteen crates of lettuce. In 1946, Monterey County farmers successfully shipped the first lettuce using this system. At first, farmers shipped their produce on refrigerated bunker cars, but in the 1950s, chlorofluorocarbon (CFC) refrigeration rendered the first bunker cars obsolete.⁶⁷³



In 1916, Mose S. Hutchings drove the first Pajaro Valley lettuce harvest to the Pajaro Depot for shipment. He grew it at the ranch of his in-laws James and Ida Rowe, at 1767 San Juan Road. (Courtesy of Pajaro Valley Historical Association.)⁶⁷⁰

Developments in cold storage also occurred in the early twentieth century. In 1912, the first cold storage facility was built in Watsonville.⁶⁷⁴ In the early twentieth century, Croatian apple distributors founded the Monterey County Ice and Development Company in Salinas, because no pre-cooling plants existed for storing apples and other produce. They also founded the Pajaro Valley Cold Storage Co., still in business in Watsonville.⁶⁷⁵

Frozen food was the next innovation to expand Monterey County’s agricultural industry and alter the cultural landscape. Around 1941, the Pajaro Valley frozen food industry developed to meet

⁶⁷⁰ Clovis, *Monterey County’s North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 84.

⁶⁷¹ Anderson, *The Salinas Valley: A History of America’s Salad Bowl*, 121. Barbara Krasner-Khait, “The Impact of Refrigeration,” <http://www.history-magazine.com/refrig.html> (accessed 26 May 2010).

⁶⁷² Anderson, 124.

⁶⁷³ Anderson, *The Salinas Valley: A History of America’s Salad Bowl*, 121, 124. Barbara Krasner-Khait, “The Impact of Refrigeration.”

⁶⁷⁴ Agricultural History Project, “Technology.”

⁶⁷⁵ Mekis, *Blossoms Into Gold*, 135, 144.

military food demands. In 1944, the military consumed twenty million pounds of vegetables and one million pounds of fruit, including 274 refrigerated cars from Watsonville. In the late 1940s, freezers in home refrigerators became popular. In 1950, Pajaro Valley frozen food packers produced 17.5 percent of the statewide total and 3.2 per cent of the national total. By the early 1950s, the Pajaro Valley was the “frozen food center of the West,” with thirteen plants processing fruits and vegetables. Five plants operated year-round and the other plants operated seasonally, processing apples, berries and artichokes. The frozen food industry first concentrated on bulk production for the military, hotels, restaurants, and hospitals, but by the mid-1950s it also produced frozen food for sale at grocery stores.⁶⁷⁶

All of these refrigeration-related developments were significant in Monterey County’s agricultural history because they allowed local growers to ship their products to distant markets. Businesses built new processing and distribution facilities along major Monterey County transportation routes, adjacent to railroad tracks and main roads.

Research: Research, especially in the strawberry industry, improved agricultural output in the twentieth century. Additional research by the University of California cooperative extensions, other educational institutions and independent scientists also improved production. Among other things, the Pajaro Valley strawberry industry supports a University of California fruit breeding program. The research has developed high-yield strawberry varieties for fresh market sales and for processing.⁶⁷⁷ Researchers improved cultural systems, including soil fumigation, annual planting, drip irrigation, fertilizers and bed size and configuration.⁶⁷⁸ These developments changed the type of equipment used on farms, altered the appearance of fields and required laborers to learn new skills.

The United States Department of Agriculture Research Station located near the Salinas airport is the former site of the United States Natural Rubber Research Station, a guayule (used to make rubber) research station from World War II.⁶⁷⁹

All of these technological advances pushed Monterey County’s intensive agriculture into the new realm of industrial agriculture. Property owners and growers subsequently hired more workers to keep up with the high production demands.

⁶⁷⁶ Agricultural History Project, “Technology.” Anderson, *The Salinas Valley: A History of America’s Salad Bowl*, 121, 124. Barbara Krasner-Khait, “The Impact of Refrigeration.” The plants included Artichokes, Inc., Baker Food Products, California Berry Freezers, Inc., California Freezing & Cold Storage Co., Fresh Frozen Foods Corp., George F. Martin & Co., Monterey Bay Berry Growers cooperative, Frank S. Oliver & Son, N.S. Papac & Son, A.L. Ruso, Inc., Joe Valentine and Sons and Watsonville Canning Co.

⁶⁷⁷ “Fruit and Nut Crops,” *A Guidebook to California Agriculture*, 157.

⁶⁷⁸ “Fruit and Nut Crops,” *A Guidebook to California Agriculture*, 157, 159.

⁶⁷⁹ Meg Clovis, personal communication to PAST Consultants, LLC, June 2011.

3. Agricultural Workers and Labor Camps

For industrial agriculture to be successful, it requires large labor pools, historically comprised mostly of immigrants. Seasonal crops like grapes, apricots, peaches, prunes, sugar beets and berries have peak labor needs around harvest time, requiring more migratory labor than do year-round crops. With seasonal crops maturing mostly in the summer when warm temperatures and rainless days prevail, permanent housing for laborers was unusual. Charles Teague, co-founder of the Salinas Land Company and the California Orchard Company, noted that “The cost of permanent housing to a producer of seasonal crops would often equal the value of his farm or orchard” and was simply unaffordable.⁶⁸⁰ In contrast, year-round crops require a permanent workforce with permanent housing.⁶⁸¹

To accommodate the new workers and to establish some standard living conditions when the government forced that on employers, hundreds of labor camps were established in Monterey County. Many were segregated by ethnicity. During the industrial agriculture era, many farm workers have been Filipino, Dust Bowl migrants, and Mexicans.

Filipinos: Filipino immigrants arrived in Monterey County in the 1920s.⁶⁸² They labored in the local fields before World War II, following the Japanese immigrants as a major source of farm labor.⁶⁸³ As anti-Filipino racial tensions mounted, a race riot occurred in 1930 and Filipino agricultural worker Fermin Tobera was shot and killed in a bunkhouse on the Murphy ranch on San Juan Road.⁶⁸⁴ The federal government restricted Filipino immigration by 1934.⁶⁸⁵



Filipino workers in T. J. Horgan's lettuce field on Lewis Road in the 1920s.
(Courtesy of Pajaro Valley Historical Association.)⁶⁸⁶

⁶⁸⁰ Teague, *Fifty Years a Rancher*, 66.

⁶⁸¹ Teague, *Fifty Years a Rancher*, 66.

⁶⁸² Mekis, *Blossoms into Gold*, xxiii.

⁶⁸³ Nakane, *Nothing Left in My Hands*, 5.

⁶⁸⁴ Mekis, *Blossoms into Gold*, 194-195. Richard B. Meynell: “Remembering the Watsonville Riots,” Excerpted from “Little Brown Brothers, Little White Girls: The Anti-Filipino Hysteria of 1930 and the Watsonville Riots,” *Passports*, Vol. 22 (1998), http://www.modelminority.com/joomla/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=271:remembering-the-watsonville-riots-&catid=40:history&Itemid=56, accessed 2 April 2010.

⁶⁸⁵ Mekis, *Blossoms into Gold*, 195.

Italians have been synonymous with Castroville since the early 1920s, when they started growing artichokes on Andrew Molera’s Mulligan Hill Ranch on Molera Road. Traveling through Monterey County, Angelo Del Chiaro and Egidio Maracci saw Molera’s first artichoke crop on his property and leased 150 acres from him immediately. They planted artichokes with Daniel Pieri and Del Chiaro’s cousin Amerigo. The Del Chiaro, Pieri, Tottino and Bellone families founded the California Artichoke and Vegetable Growers Corporation by 1924, now called Ocean Mist.⁶⁸⁷

During World War II, Italian prisoners of war were held at Ford Ord in Monterey. Local Italian-American families were allowed to visit them there and host them in Castroville. Prisoners like Giuseppe Sbarra married local girls and became artichoke growers. During the war, the federal government imposed a curfew and painted a white line down Castroville’s Merritt Street. About seventy Italian families lived in Castroville but Italy natives could not cross the line. Dino Lazzarini, who farmed artichokes for forty-six years, managed his ranch from across the white line in the road, yelling instructions to his workers. Despite the conflict, Lazzarini’s artichoke-packing shed hosted many festivities for the Ford Ord Italian prisoners. In 1942-1943, some Castroville residents who had served in the Italian military were sent to internment camps.⁶⁸⁸ After the war ended, the Italians resumed farming artichokes in Castroville.

Dust Bowl Migrants: In the 1930s, a terrible drought, severe dust storms and the Great Depression forced many residents of Texas, Arkansas, Oklahoma and surrounding states to flee their homes. Some Dust Bowl refugees moved to the Pajaro and Salinas Valleys, seeking work.⁶⁹⁰ Alisal, now within the City of Salinas, was once called “Little Oklahoma” because many Dust Bowl migrants settled there and worked in the Salinas Valley lettuce fields and packing sheds.⁶⁹¹ They also settled in Prunedale, raising cows, chickens and vegetables. Some sold milk in Salinas.⁶⁹² Local farmers offered them forty-five cents an hour to work in packing sheds,



Dust Bowl migrants camp beneath eucalyptus trees. (Photographer, location and date unknown.)⁶⁸⁹

⁶⁸⁶ Clovis, *Monterey County’s North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 86-87.

⁶⁸⁷ Clovis, *Monterey County’s North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 22-23.

⁶⁸⁸ Elizabeth Schilling, “Love and war: A story from Castroville’s past,” *Register-Pajaronian*, 30 March 1987.

⁶⁸⁹ John Steinbeck, *The Harvest Gypsies: On the Road to the Grapes of Wrath* (Berkeley: Heyday Books, 1988; reprint of 1936 edition by *The San Francisco News*), sixth page of photographs between pages 32-33.

⁶⁹⁰ Mekis, *Blossoms into Gold*, xxiii.

⁶⁹¹ Church, *Historical Notes of North Monterey County With a History of Hidden Valley*, 3.

⁶⁹² “Prunedale: no longer ‘out in the sticks’,” *Monterey County Herald*, 21 June 1987.

which they considered “great pay” and “easy money,” versus working in the fields. Many migrants lived in “cardboard communities” and Alisal had hundreds of such shelters. The long harvesting season allowed Dust Bowl migrants to live in the area for most of the year, but they moved to areas like Yuma and Phoenix for the winter. In 1959, former Dust Bowl refugees still living in the area created the annual “Oldtimers Shed Workers Potluck Picnic” to reminisce about their lettuce packing days. The annual picnic occurred at least until 1982.⁶⁹³

Mexicans: Mexican farmers continued to live in Monterey County after California became an American state.⁶⁹⁴ Mexican immigration to the United States was slow in the last half of the nineteenth century because of discrimination and lack of opportunities, but increased in the 1920s when Mexicans came to work in farming, ranching and mining to replace dwindling Asian labor.⁶⁹⁵ The thriving American economy and Mexican political unrest also drew them. From 1910 to 1930, the Mexican population in America rose from 200,000 to 600,000. The actual population was likely higher but fluctuated as immigrants re-crossed the border.⁶⁹⁶

As World War II dawned, many growers sought workers to fill low-paying agricultural jobs vacated by new military personnel or to replace Japanese workers whom the government had forcibly removed to internment camps. On August 4, 1942, the United States and Mexico created the Mexican Farm Labor Program for the temporary use of Mexican agricultural labor on American farms. From 1942 to 1964, the government signed 4.6 million worker contracts; many workers returned several times. In 1951, Congress formalized the Bracero Program as Public Law 78, concerned about agricultural production as the country entered the Korean conflict. The controversial Bracero Program worried farm workers already living here, who feared job competition and lower wages. The government established rules and standards for employment and living and working conditions, but many violations occurred and employers reaped big profits while the workers struggled with the arduous, low-paid work. Between the 1940s and mid-1950s, farm wages dropped sharply as growers took advantage of the Braceros and other laborers.⁶⁹⁷ Many Mexicans moved to the Pajaro and Salinas Valleys during the federal government’s Bracero Program.⁶⁹⁸ In August of 1942, trains brought 600 Mexicans to the Salinas Valley to work in the Spreckels factory.⁶⁹⁹ Thousands more followed.⁷⁰⁰ The program peaked in 1956-58. Public Law 78 expired in December 1964.⁷⁰¹

⁶⁹³ Joe Livernois, “Old shed workers meet as history reviews itself,” *North County News*.

⁶⁹⁴ Gordon, *Monterey Bay Area: Natural History and Cultural Imprints*, 62-63.

⁶⁹⁵ Hillstrom, *The Dream of America: Immigration 1870-1920*, 28, 93-94.

⁶⁹⁶ Hillstrom, *The Dream of America: Immigration 1870-1920*, 28-29.

⁶⁹⁷ Bracero History Archive, “About” (Center for History and New Media, 2010), <http://braceroarchive.org/about>, accessed 3 February 2010.

⁶⁹⁸ Mekis, *Blossoms into Gold*, xxiii.

⁶⁹⁹ Mekis, *Blossoms into Gold*, 196.

⁷⁰⁰ Anderson, *The Bracero Program in California*, Introduction, 1, 9.

⁷⁰¹ Anderson, *The Bracero Program in California*, Introduction, 1, 9. Anderson, who undertook an exhaustive study of California’s Bracero Program, particularly as it affected health matters, believed that the program had nothing to do with wartime labor shortage for most of the program’s life. Based on his research, he argued that it was “simply a device for American agribusiness to take selfish advantage of the poverty of Mexican peons (which comes from



Salinas Valley Bracero labor camp, 1956. (Photograph by Leonard Nadel.)⁷⁰²

Monterey County labor camps once dotted the landscape, with Salinas Valley towns and farms containing most of them. Between 1920 and 1934, Salinas had at least ninety-eight labor camps. Other valley towns, including Chualar, Soledad and King City each had more than a dozen camps during that time. Camp McCallum was a guayule labor camp that housed German and Italian prisoners of war during World War II. It later housed Mexican braceros and is now a labor co-operative.⁷⁰³

Major operations like Spreckels, the California Orchard Company, the Salinas Land Company, and the H. P. Garin Company had many camps, some divided by ethnicity. Camps ranged in quality, from uniform, relatively solid construction to mere shacks made of found materials. Because these camps were not valued highly or were made poorly, many have been demolished. The company town of Spreckels, designed by renowned architect William Weeks, is perhaps the best example of agricultural worker housing in Monterey County (described above in the discussion of the Spreckels Sugar Company). The company provided housing based on the worker hierarchy at the factory, building larger homes for bosses, smaller homes for other workers and their families, and a dormitory for single men. The Salinas Land Company provided housing similar to the Spreckels model, although not as a large company town. The superintendent's bungalow also functioned as the ranch office, foremen had smaller bungalows, and single men lived in a dormitory (described further in the discussion of the Salinas Land Company and California Orchard Company, above).⁷⁰⁴

the same root as 'pawns'), to the devastation of U.S. farm workers, Mexican-Americans whether farm workers or not, small farmers, family life in rural Mexico, and every reasonable standard of social decency and honor."

⁷⁰² Leonard Nadel, "Living quarters in a bracero camp in the Salinas Valley, California," in Bracero History Archive, Item #2338, <http://braceroarchive.org/items/show/2338> (accessed 3 February, 2010).

⁷⁰³ Meg Clovis, personal communication to PAST Consultants, LLC.

⁷⁰⁴ Meg Clovis, personal communication to PAST Consultants, LLC, June 2011.

Labor camps existed throughout Monterey County and records from the California Department of Industrial Relations identify their general locations from about 1920-1934. To aid future researchers in finding extant potentially significant labor camps, this section presents historical information about where Monterey County labor camps were known to be located, and the types of buildings that labor camps may contain.

A labor camp of about thirty-three homes is located at 56490 Cattlemen Road in San Lucas (South County). The Toro Labor Camp at 266 Hitchcock Road in Salinas and the Martin Work Camp at 36571 Foothill Road in Salinas are also examples of agricultural labor camps. These three labor camps are presented in *Chapter V: Historic Themes, Associated Property Types, Eligibility Criteria and Integrity Thresholds* under *Theme 6: Community Development*.

The Salinas area had at least ninety-eight labor camps for ranch, potato, dairy, lettuce, beet and berry workers, including Japanese and Filipino lettuce camps. Camp operators included names like Abirmido, American Fruit Growers, Avilla, Bergschicker, Blanco, Burns, Canete, Catalla and Bordges, Catiel, Chin, Christensen, Crown Fruit Extract Co., Daugherty, Earl Fruit Co., Eckels, Emery, Farley Fruit Co., Farm Produce Sales Co. of Hayward, Foster Wrinkler Bros., Fugimoto, George Rianda, Guidotti, Hart, Holdridge, Holme, H. P. Garin, Hudson of Monterey, J. Clemente, Joshicka, Kahn Co., Chong Hing Lee, Machado, Madson, Moreno, Morse & Co. of San Francisco, Nagasaki, Nakata, Nishi, Nissen, Ohashi Estate, Olivete, Oni, Oune, Patrick and Reichmut (or Reicmuth), Patrick Farm, Porter, Repri, Ritchie, Russell (Tracy Waldron Fruit Co.), Sales, Salinas Vegetable Farm, Sampayan, Speigl, Storm, Ward Fruit Co., Yamaguchi, Yamani, and Yonemura Berry Farm.⁷⁰⁵ In Cooper (Salinas area), at least six labor camps existed for potato and lettuce workers. Operators included Bordges, Eckels, Mills Packing House, Garwin, Lee Hung Hing, Speigl and Strobel.⁷⁰⁶

The Spreckels plant operated more than thirty labor camps in Monterey County, including two Japanese camps, two Filipino camps and three Mexican camps. Operators Banta, Kilot and Kondo operated other Spreckels-area labor camps for lettuce workers.⁷⁰⁷ Spreckels also had a labor camp in Soledad.⁷⁰⁸

Chualar had at least seventeen labor camps operated for lettuce, sugar beet and dairy farmworkers, including Japanese and Filipino employees. Labor camp operators included Spreckels, the California Vegetable Exchange, Chualar Farm Co., Arca, Patrick Farm, and individual names like Chung, Iwakiri, Okamura, Silva, Sargentti, Oune and Cune.⁷⁰⁹

Gonzales also had at least seventeen labor camps that housed dairy and lettuce workers, including Japanese and Filipino camps. Camp operators included names like Arena, Bardino

⁷⁰⁵ "Monterey County Labor Camps."

⁷⁰⁶ "Monterey County Labor Camps."

⁷⁰⁷ "Monterey County Labor Camps."

⁷⁰⁸ Kent Seavey, personal communication to PAST Consultants, LLC, June 2011.

⁷⁰⁹ "Monterey County Labor Camps."

Bedolla, Claussen, Cochran, Filipino Farmers Inc., Fuki, Gezzi and Vosti, Healion Bros., Jacopetti, Martella and Moretti, Migotti Bros., Morisoli and Reanhold, Pedrazzi and Torroni, Porra and Selachi, and the Vezzlo Bros.⁷¹⁰

At least thirteen labor camps operated in King City for dairy, fruit, orchard and ranch laborers. The camp operators included the Salinas Land Company, California Orchard Company, Folleta, Possi and Adams.⁷¹¹

Blanco had at least nine labor camps for ranch, lettuce, beet and vegetable workers. Operators included Anadon, Balister, Bergshicker, Breschini, Olivete, Schwein, Smith, Salinas, Spiegl, and Takashi.⁷¹² Soledad had at least six labor camps for hay ranch, cattle ranch, dairy, beet and pea workers. Operators included David Jacks, Romie Jacks, Garcia, Pura, and Somera.⁷¹³ At least three labor camps existed in the Castroville vicinity: Lee Hing operated a labor camp for laborers working in potato fields; Breschini operated a similar camp; and the Molera artichoke ranch operated a labor camp.⁷¹⁴

At least six labor camps existed in Pajaro, including four lettuce worker camps operated by the Pajaro Valley Lettuce Company, J. Ojeda, R. Mapa and Sing Wo Kee. Kee also operated a ranching labor camp near Pajaro. Thomas Porter's berry farm labor camp was located about four miles southeast of Pajaro.⁷¹⁵ At least six labor camps were located south of the Pajaro River, likely along San Juan Road. Pajaro farmer Frank Eaton employed Japanese workers by 1907.⁷¹⁶ Three miles east of town, Eaton operated a labor camp for berry and lettuce workers and ran another ranching labor camp in the area. The Porter berry farm operated a labor camp five miles southeast of Watsonville. Trafton's ranch labor camp was three-and-a-half miles west of Watsonville. James Waters operated a labor camp for lettuce workers three miles east of Watsonville and a labor camp for berry workers five miles east of Watsonville.⁷¹⁷

A former forty-six unit camp was built in the 1920s on Kent's Court in Pajaro. Originally occupied by railroad workers, it later housed agricultural workers. In the 1990s, manufactured housing replaced the dilapidated homes and only one historic building (with significant integrity loss) remains at this location. Because the building is not a labor camp itself, it would not be eligible for listing as such, but it may be historically significant as one of the last remaining labor camp buildings in the North County.

⁷¹⁰ "Monterey County Labor Camps."

⁷¹¹ "Monterey County Labor Camps."

⁷¹² "Monterey County Labor Camps."

⁷¹³ "Monterey County Labor Camps."

⁷¹⁴ "Monterey County Labor Camps."

⁷¹⁵ "Monterey County Labor Camps," California Department of Industrial Relations, Commission on Immigration and Housing. (Bancroft Library, U.C. Berkeley).

⁷¹⁶ Nakane, *Nothing Left in My Hands*, 38-39.

⁷¹⁷ "Monterey County Labor Camps."

The number of California agricultural labor camps rose more than fifty percent during the Bracero Program.⁷¹⁸ In 1957, Monterey County had 247 such camps. The United States and Mexico drafted a standard work contract for Bracero workers, which required employers to provide free “hygienic lodgings” that were “not inferior to those of the average type which are generally furnished to domestic agricultural workers” in the area, including beds or cots and blankets or mattresses, “when necessary.” Overcrowding was forbidden and sanitary facilities were required. Because most agricultural housing was already poor, the requirement that Bracero facilities not be “inferior” was a very low standard. During the first five years of the program, the United States and Mexico did not create more specific standards, beyond that the buildings be in good condition with adequate toilets, clean cooking and eating facilities. In 1956, the U.S. Department of Labor defined what “adequate” and “sanitary” meant, but employers and the California and Texas legislatures complained, forcing the Labor Department to reissue the standards in 1957. California also had its own labor camp code, which the State Division of Housing enforced; county health officers could also inspect the camps and enforce regulations.⁷¹⁹ The quality of Bracero housing ranged from shockingly substandard to military-style barracks or slightly better. Four general types of camps existed: (1) association camps, (2) corporation or large-scale grower camps, (3) fringe or marginal camps and (4) family camps.⁷²⁰

Groups of employers maintained association camps, housing as many as 1,000 or more men. Some camps had new sleeping, dining and sanitary facilities; others were remodeled domestic farm labor camps. Some had army barracks or public housing units moved to the site; concrete and steel structures became more common because they were easily maintained. These camps had a fluctuating population throughout the year because the growing seasons of as many as 200 association members overlapped. The facilities were generally in good shape because farmers paid membership fees and for the labor they used (per man-hour); most the group’s income went towards maintaining the labor pool’s central housing.⁷²¹ Future research may discover if any employers built association camps in the North County.

Corporations or large-scale growers also ran big camps but the facilities were generally inferior to association camps. The for-profit corporations housed workers for only part of the year and did not maintain the facilities as well as the associations did. The Braceros lived in the same housing that the corporations had offered for years, previously occupied by Dust Bowl migrants and Filipinos. They rarely built new housing for Braceros and infrequently repainted them or repaired problems in the older housing, yet the facilities were “reasonably close to standard.”⁷²² It is likely that Monterey County farmers offered this type of housing; future research may locate specific sites with extant buildings.

⁷¹⁸ Henry P. Anderson, *The Bracero Program in California* (New York: Arno Press, 1976), 59.

⁷¹⁹ Anderson, *The Bracero Program in California*, 61-64.

⁷²⁰ Anderson, *The Bracero Program in California*, 66-69.

⁷²¹ Anderson, *The Bracero Program in California*, 66-67.

⁷²² Anderson, *The Bracero Program in California*, 67.

The “fringe camps” were small, isolated, hidden by vegetation and built with flimsy materials, perhaps no better than chicken coops. Short-term, speculative farmers who leased land for a season were most likely to ignore housing standards and operate fringe camps.⁷²³ Family camps were mostly under the radar, since the California Labor Camp Act exempted employers with five or fewer Braceros. Workers generally lived in good conditions because the employer often worked with them personally.⁷²⁴ It is highly likely that both of these types of camps existed in Monterey County. Because they were either so poorly made or offered very small quarters, it may be difficult to locate many extant structures.

4. Adaptive Use

In an industry as dynamic as agriculture, adaptive use is common and maintaining a building’s historic integrity can be challenging. In Monterey County, some of the large architect-designed single-family farmstead residences are now corporate offices or worker housing. For example, the office of Reiter Berry Farms is located in the William Weeks-designed Rowe Ranch on 1767 San Juan Road in Aromas (1900). Barns find new uses and instead of storing hay from the days of extensive agriculture, they store machinery for cultivating intensive crops. In the North County, former chicken coops are now used to grow mushrooms.

Profit margins can be slim in agriculture and companies may want to invest more money in crops and land than in historic buildings. When routine maintenance is deferred, historic agricultural buildings can deteriorate quickly. The problem can be magnified on large parcels with many small, obsolete outbuildings. Structures like chicken coops and greenhouses may have been cheaply built, be difficult to reuse, and are likely to be in poor condition. Property owners are more likely to maintain large, well-constructed buildings like cold storage facilities and distribution centers, which are also easier to adaptively reuse.

Property owners and governmental entities trying to encourage preservation of historic agricultural buildings, structures and objects face many challenges. Providing education and incentives are keys to preserving these somewhat ephemeral agricultural buildings. The best solution is to keep the buildings in active use, so helping property owners brainstorm alternative purposes for their buildings can help save them.

⁷²³ Anderson, *The Bracero Program in California*, 67-68.

⁷²⁴ Anderson, *The Bracero Program in California*, 68.

This page intentionally left blank.

V. HISTORIC THEMES, ASSOCIATED PROPERTY TYPES, ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND INTEGRITY THRESHOLDS

A. Introduction and Chapter Format

1. Historic Themes for Monterey County Agricultural Resources

Building upon the historical patterns and broad influences discussed in *Chapter 4: Monterey County Agricultural History*, this chapter provides a systematic approach to evaluating potentially significant properties by describing the historic themes, with their associated property types, which reflect Monterey County's agricultural development up to 1960. Within each theme, this chapter also identifies specific Monterey County properties that illustrate how significant individuals, groups, events and activities shaped the landscape. Property types and specific examples illustrate the historic theme, which in turn supports the historic context.⁷²⁵

Monterey County agricultural resources built during this context statement's period of pre-history to 1960 illustrate these historic themes:

1. Extensive Agriculture (ca. 1840s-1960)
2. Intensive Agriculture (ca. 1870-1960)
3. Corporate Agriculture (ca. 1880-1960)
4. Agricultural Colonies (ca. 1870-1960)
5. Processing and Distribution (ca. 1860-1960)
6. Community Development (ca. 1850-1960)

Monterey County is an ever-changing agricultural and cultural landscape. Agriculture has shaped the region since its first inhabitants arrived and it continues to make an imprint on the land through widespread industrial crop cultivation and livestock raising. By its very nature, agriculture changes depending on factors like geology, geography, climate, economics, technology, labor and the shifting popularity and profitability of crops. Historic properties in the County reflect these changes and some properties can therefore be classified under more than one theme. Thus, the date ranges presented after each theme must be broad.

However, these date ranges should not be confused with a property's period of significance. When evaluating a property for the National Register of Historic Places (NR), the California Register of Historical Resources (CR) and the Monterey County Register (MCR), the period of significance must be determined on a case-by-case basis. Through an analysis that divides the historic context into individual themes and their associated property types, the historical significance of properties associated with each theme can be determined.

⁷²⁵ California Office of Historic Preservation, *OHP Preferred Format for Historic Context Statements*, 1.

2. Chapter Format and Limitations

a. Chapter Format

This chapter systematically describes each historic theme in the following manner:

- *Introduction*: This section defines the theme, relates it to applicable Monterey County Code (MCC) or agricultural industry definitions, and lists associated property types.
- *Associated Property Types*: This section defines the associated property types using:
 - *Property Type Description*. The description follows the seven-part National Register format outlined in *Chapter 3: Identifying and Evaluating Agricultural Resources* and describes: physical characteristics, associative characteristics, geographical information, boundaries, variations, locational patterns and condition.
 - *Landscape Characteristics*. For Theme 1: Extensive Agriculture and Theme 2: Intensive Agriculture, a chart describes eleven landscape characteristics and applies them to Rural Historic Landscapes. The landscape characteristics are: land uses and activities; patterns of spatial organization; response to the natural environment; cultural traditions; circulation networks; boundary demarcations; vegetation related to land use; buildings, structures and objects; clusters; archaeological sites; and small-scale elements.
 - *Eligibility Criteria and Integrity Thresholds*. This section includes guidance on applying the National Register (NR), California Register (CR) and Monterey County Register (MCR) eligibility criteria and evaluating whether a property retains historic integrity. This section includes charts analyzing the seven aspects of historic integrity: location, setting, design, materials, workmanship, feeling and association.
 - *Listed and Potentially Significant Historic Resources*. This section lists extant (unless noted otherwise) properties that illustrate the significant historical patterns, events, social, political, technological and cultural influences, and/or significant individuals relevant to each theme. A given property's national, state, or local registration status (if any) is stated.

b. Chapter Limitations

This chapter provides the analytical framework for evaluating potentially significant properties. Using the property types as a guide in the field, a planner, researcher, or layperson can associate a property with a historic theme that supports the historic context. The historic theme and associated property type descriptions provide the critical background information for completing intensive survey forms and/or nominations to national, state and local historic registers. This chapter also provides a framework for evaluating whether properties possess enough historic integrity to convey their significance.

The discussion presents extant resources that are potentially historically significant, based on initial research and reconnaissance-level property surveys. The historical information and

analysis presented here is meant to be preliminary, for the purposes of establishing potential historic significance. Using this chapter as a guide, individual properties should be researched and field-evaluated on a case-by-case basis to establish historic significance and integrity.

3. Theme and Property Type Example

The Williamson property at 951-953 Trafton Road illustrates two historic themes, Extensive Agriculture and Intensive Agriculture. In the 1870s, William Williamson built the house at 951 Trafton Road on the farmstead where he grew wheat and raised livestock, examples of extensive agriculture. The Williamson family later cultivated sugar beets, lettuce and cauliflower (intensive agriculture) and constructed the bungalow at 953 Trafton Road in the 1920s. The Williamson family farmed intensive crops until leasing the property in 1958 for artichoke cultivation. Starting in 1888 and for many decades afterwards, the property is also associated with William Williamson's daughter-in-law, widow Mollie Williamson, one of the most successful female farmers in the area.

The Williamson property provides a good example of how this chapter is intended to be used as a guide to registration. The *historic context* for the Williamson property is the development of agriculture under the *themes* of extensive and intensive agriculture. The *period of significance* for the property's extensive agriculture would be 1874-1888, when the site was engaged in extensive agriculture. The *period of significance* for the property's development of intensive agriculture would be 1888-1958, when the family cultivated intensive crops and built the second residence at 953 Trafton Road. This example also illustrates the coordination of theme and historic research, which revealed when the type of agriculture changed.

The Williamson property illustrates how change in agricultural method (from extensive to intensive agriculture) can be considered historically significant. In this case, the property could be registered for its association with the Williamson family under the themes of extensive agriculture and intensive agriculture. If both themes are used, then the period of significance would be 1874–1958, when the property was in continuous farming use by the family.

The *associated property type* in this example would be an Extensive Farmstead (1874-1888), Intensive Farmstead (1888-1958) or both, if the Williamson family's continuous use is considered historically important. Using this chapter and the representative example of the associated property type (Extensive Farmstead or Intensive Farmstead) as a guide, field survey of the property would determine if it possesses the physical and associative characteristics, the rural historic landscape characteristics, and the historic integrity that would qualify it for listing in a national, state or local historic register.

B. Theme 1: Extensive Agriculture (ca. 1850 – 1960)

1. Introduction

The theme of *Extensive Agriculture* focuses on agricultural operations that require a low level of labor and capital relative to the size of the farmed area.⁷²⁶ In Monterey County, extensive agriculture is associated with low mechanical technology; minimal or no irrigation; transportation of agricultural goods to market via local waterways (*e.g.*, the Elkhorn Slough and other local sloughs, the Pajaro and Salinas rivers, Monterey Bay and the Pacific Ocean); and a labor pool consisting of ethnic groups from North America and Western Europe (*e.g.*, the Ohlone, Salinan and Esselen people; early Spanish and Mexican settlers, and later immigrants from China, Canada, Ireland, Scotland, Switzerland, Denmark and the Azores Islands).

The property type associated with the Extensive Agriculture theme is *Extensive Farmsteads*, which the Monterey County Code (MCC) classifies as an *agricultural operation*. Extensive farmsteads are also classified as Rural Historic Landscapes.

Cattle ranching and grain production (*e.g.*, wheat and barley) are examples of extensive agriculture. Expanding these operations may require more land, but only a negligible addition of new technology and manpower. Monterey County farmers practiced extensive agriculture mostly in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, although some farmers still conduct extensive agricultural operations today. Many of the surviving Monterey County extensive farmsteads date from 1800-1880. Many active extensive farmsteads are livestock operations. The Olson Ranch in Soledad is the best example of both Extensive and Intensive Agriculture in Monterey County and is designated as a historic district.

The next sections include a comprehensive description of the Extensive Farmstead property type and a discussion of specific properties that may be potentially significant historic resources illustrating the Extensive Agriculture theme.

⁷²⁶ Stoll, *The Fruits of Natural Advantage: Making the Industrial Countryside in California*, xiii-xiv.

2. Associated Property Type: Extensive Farmstead

a. Property Type Description



Eade/Cooper Ranch: 57440 Highway 198

Physical Characteristics: A cluster of buildings generally containing a primary residence, typically of a simple, vernacular style; barns for livestock and equipment; outbuildings reflecting the property’s use; and housing for workers. The cluster is usually in a valley and/or among trees to protect it from the elements. Often, corrals for horses or other animals are located within the cluster or adjacent to the livestock barns. The remaining landscape is kept natural to allow livestock to roam and graze.

Associative Characteristics: Extensive farmsteads are associated with their particular use, such as cattle ranches, grain fields or early homesteads.

Geographical Information: Extensive farmsteads tend to be located in hilly areas, where soil was not conducive to raising intensive crops and water sources were distant. This type of property requires large tracts of land for animals to roam freely and graze on the abundant grasses found in the region’s hillier areas. However, some extensive properties are located in the flat terrain.

Boundaries: Boundary demarcations include roads, driveways, fences, gates, posts and trees along the property lines. Rugged and hilly landscapes also provide natural boundaries. When the region was first settled, property lines were often vague and demarcated by rock outcroppings, trees or other landscape features.

Variations: Variations include buildings specific to an extensive farmstead’s use. For example, early homesteaders grew wheat, barley, hay and oats, so hay barns and storage sheds would likely be found, along with an early farm residence. For cattle ranches, barns, corrals and outbuildings specific to raising cattle would be a property variation. Depending on the property owner’s wealth, an extensive farmstead may include an architect-designed house.

Locational Patterns: Ranchers grazed cattle all over Monterey County, including the Pajaro and Salinas Valleys, on coastal land south of the Pajaro River down to the Castroville vicinity, and on interior hills. Grain fields covered the Pajaro Valley, including along San Juan Road and in Aromas. The area between Castroville and Salinas also contained extensive grain fields. Presently, extensive farmsteads occur in the rolling lands and rugged areas of Monterey County. The most noteworthy extant examples are located in South County, along Highway 198 east of San Lucas, Jolon Road, and the interior valleys along Pine Canyon Road and Vineyard Canyon Road.

Condition: Although active, extensive farmsteads are more common in the South County than in the Salinas Valley or North County, the condition of these properties is generally good, particularly if the ranch or dairy is still used for its original purpose.

b. Landscape Characteristics

 <p>Cattle Ranch: 1784 San Juan Grade Rd.</p>	<p>Land Uses and Activities: Owners of extensive farmsteads shaped the landscape by building housing, barns and outbuildings on a protected, rural site. Livestock also shaped the landscape by roaming and grazing, creating trails and contour terraces and modifying vegetation. Planting, cultivating and harvesting cereals and grains also modified the landscape.</p>
 <p>Cattle Ranch: 1784 San Juan Grade Rd.</p>	<p>Patterns of Spatial Organization: The extensive farmstead organized domestic and functional operations around a cluster set within a protected valley or among trees. Dirt, gravel or paved driveways lead from the cluster to the main road, livestock barns, support buildings and surrounding hillsides. Dirt roads or flattened areas along fences are common, providing repair access.</p>
 <p>Cattle terraces on the ranch at 1784 San Juan Grade Rd.</p>	<p>Response to the Natural Environment: Extensive farmsteads require large tracts of land for grazing and roaming livestock. The cluster is generally located in a valley to be near a natural water source for livestock and for protection from the elements. The site of the primary residence may be near large trees for additional shade and protection. Cattle terraces (generally, paths following the contour of the land) appear on the landscape in hilly areas, denoting where cattle walk along the grade.</p>
 <p>View of barns at Smith/Copley Ranch, 58153 Highway 198, San Lucas</p>	<p>Cultural Traditions: Various cultural groups adopted specific extensive agricultural practices, continuing traditions from their native land. An example would be the Smith family, who applied their English cultural traditions to dry farming and stock raising in the South County.</p>

 <p>Access road leading to the cluster at Smith/Copley Ranch, 58153 Highway 198, San Lucas</p>	<p>Circulation Networks: Circulation networks include dirt, gravel or paved driveways or roads leading to the primary road, connecting the cluster to surrounding corrals, and surrounding fields and hillsides. Properties tend to be primarily undeveloped, so roads are limited and focus around the cluster.</p>
 <p>Access road and fencing demarcating boundary at 53060 Pine Canyon Road, King City (Galvin Photo).</p>	<p>Boundary Demarcations: Boundaries include the primary road, fences, gates, posts and natural features like hills and trees. A fencing system was critical for keeping livestock from roaming off the property. Flat plowed areas or small dirt roads adjacent to fences provide access for efficient fence repair. Fences can be a variety of types; however, board and barbed-wire fences are the most common.</p>
 <p>Ornamental and shade trees planted around the primary residence at the Patterson Ranch, 69461 Bradley Lockwood Road, Lockwood (Galvin photo).</p>	<p>Vegetation Related to Land Use: Vegetation includes grasses, extensive cereal crops planted for early homesteads and ornamental vegetation, such as decorative, paired palm trees to highlight the property's entrance from the road. Windbreaks in the form of planted deciduous trees are also common.</p>

 <p>Primary residence and tank house (left) at Eade/ Cooper Ranch, 57440 Highway 198, San Lucas.</p>	<p>Buildings, Structures, and Objects:</p> <p>Domestic buildings include the primary residence and possibly a tank house. Barns for housing and feeding livestock or storing equipment generally dominate the cluster in size and scale. Outbuildings particular to the extensive farmstead’s use will also be extant. Worker housing near the cluster is also common.</p>
 <p>Cluster at 1784 San Juan Grade Road. The house is hidden behind the large oak trees to the extreme left.</p>	<p>Clusters:</p> <p>Extensive farmsteads usually contain a cluster of buildings set within a protected valley or surrounded by large native trees. The cluster may be near a natural water source for efficient livestock feeding. Buildings in the cluster may include the primary residence and tank house, livestock barns, outbuildings for repairing farm equipment and machinery, and worker housing.</p>
 <p>Early homestead with original farmhouse (center, with white shutters) at 14468 Blackie Road.</p>	<p>Archaeological Sites:</p> <p>Early extensive farmsteads may have the potential to yield archaeological information if the surrounding soil was not heavily disturbed by agricultural or household operations. Each site should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.</p>
 <p>Windmill at 47905 San Lucas Road, King City (Galvin photo).</p>	<p>Small-Scale Elements:</p> <p>Small-scale elements may include decorative arches or signs announcing the ranch’s name, water and feeding troughs scattered along the grazing lands, corrals, windmills and cattle guards.</p>

c. Eligibility Criteria and Integrity Thresholds

Extensive farmsteads may be historically significant for their association with a particular extensive crop or a particular method of livestock raising (criteria NR-A, CR-1, MCR-A1, A2, A4, A6, C1 & C2).

Extensive farmsteads may also be historically significant for their association with an individual significant in the history of Monterey County (criteria NR-B, CR-2, MCR-A3).

This property type also may be historically significant as an example of a distinctive architectural type, period or method of construction, or its association with an important architect or designer (criteria NR-C, CR-3, MCR-A5, B1, B2 & B3).


To qualify for the above criteria, the extensive farmstead must possess historic integrity. Extensive farmsteads are examples of rural historic landscapes and must possess a substantial number of landscape characteristics to qualify for registration. For extensive farmsteads, the resource’s physical characteristics are represented by landscape characteristics as well as the character-defining features of the extant buildings on the landscape. The following chart provides guidelines for evaluating integrity.

Location	<i>Location is the place where the significant activities that shaped a property took place, often determined by geographical factors.</i> Extensive farmsteads are generally located on large tracts of open land suitable for grazing animals or growing grains, a nearby water source for livestock, and a sheltered place for the farmstead’s building cluster. Extensive farmsteads whose characteristics retain their historic location have integrity of location.
Setting	<i>Setting is the physical environment within and surrounding a property, including large-scale features (e.g., woodlands or rock formations) and small-scale features (e.g., fences, gateposts, springs or individual trees).</i> Extensive farmsteads with integrity of setting retain the building cluster within the sheltered location, open land for livestock grazing, roads or paths leading from the cluster to outlying grazing lands, and property-specific large- and small-scale features that contribute to the historic setting. The building cluster, fencing and other features should be as intact as possible.
Design	<i>Design is the composition of natural and cultural elements comprising the form, plan, and spatial organization of a property. Elements include buildings, structures, boundary demarcations, circulation networks, windbreaks, vegetation and topography.</i> The cluster’s spatial organization should be intact and communicate the property’s historic use. At a minimum, the cluster should contain the primary residence, barns and outbuildings for animals and equipment, corrals and fencing that contribute to its overall design. Circulation networks and boundary demarcations should reflect the site’s land use patterns. Changes may be historic if they date to the property’s period of significance.

Materials	<i>Materials include construction materials of buildings, outbuildings, roadways, fences, and other structures. For rural historic landscapes, vegetation similar to historic species in scale, type and visual effect will generally convey historic integrity. Timber construction and wood siding are the most common construction materials for the cluster’s buildings, corrals and fencing and reflect integrity of materials. Repairs to buildings over time with materials that communicate the farmstead’s historic use, such as corrugated roofing or replaced barbed-wire fencing, will retain integrity of materials if they are constructed within the period of significance and reflect the evolving nature of the historic farmstead.</i>
Workmanship	<i>Workmanship is exhibited in the ways people have fashioned their environment for functional and decorative purposes, including how they constructed buildings, fences and small-scale elements. For rural historic landscapes, workmanship in raising crops contributes to integrity if it reflects traditional or historic practices. Historic construction techniques may illustrate the workmanship of particular ethnic groups, vernacular traditions, or architects and builders such as William H. Weeks, Alex Chalmers and William W. Wurster, who designed several local farmhouses. Extensive farmsteads with integrity of workmanship exhibit the traditional or historic practices in use during the property’s period of significance.</i>
Feeling	<i>Feeling is intangible but is evoked by the presence of physical characteristics that reflect the historic scene. The cumulative effect of setting, design, materials and workmanship creates the sense of past time and place. The property’s rural setting, design, materials and workmanship should reflect the site’s historic use as an extensive farmstead. Alterations to buildings or to small-scale elements should date to the farmstead’s period of significance.</i>
Association	<i>Association is the direct link between a property and the important events or persons that shaped it. Continued use and occupation help maintain integrity of association if traditional practices are carried on. Using traditional methods in new construction reinforces a property’s integrity by linking past and present. An extensive farmstead with integrity of association should reflect the historic persons (e.g., owners, architects or workers), historic land use, and historic events that shaped the property as an extensive farmstead. An intact building cluster, circulation network, fencing and small-scale elements contribute to the property’s integrity of association.</i>

d. Listed and Potentially Significant Historic Resources

Alberto Trescony’s *Rancho San Lucas (1862), located at Paris Valley Road and Rancho San Lucas entry road, San Lucas* is listed as a historic district in the National Register of Historic Places. The rancho is significant because of Alberto Trescony’s substantial contributions to Monterey County agriculture, including cross-breeding livestock, introducing improved cereal varieties, and developing San Lucas as the most important market center in the South County.⁷²⁷ The 3,400-acre ranch includes ten historic buildings and structures, corral fencing and historic landscape features. The buildings include an adobe ranch house, adobe blacksmith shop and transverse adobe stock barn (all 1865), a bunkhouse and granary (both 1888), a three-bay stock barn, transverse stock barn, bull barn, wood granary (all 1880s) and a cattle chute (circa 1911). Trescony’s wife Catherine created the Ranch House’s design and plan.⁷²⁸



The State Highway 198 corridor from San Lucas into Long Valley contains a handful of extensive farmsteads spread along the roadway in their original configurations. Highlights of this corridor include the *Eade/Cooper Ranch (1886), 57440 Highway 198*. Spread along both sides of the roadway, the site contains a Victorian residence, intact livestock barns, cattle scales, ramps and squeezes, corrals and fencing.



English couple Samuel and Elizabeth Thomas Smith settled in the South County in 1875. They homesteaded 160 acres on Long Valley Road near San Lucas. The Smiths raised cattle and grew wheat, barley, oats and hay. Two ranches on Highway 198 are apparently associated with the Smiths. *Smith (Taylor) Ranch, Highway 198, San Lucas* is 266 acres and includes an abandoned residence (circa 1900), wood outbuilding and collapsed barn. It is currently used as grazing land.⁷²⁹

⁷²⁷ Seavey, “National Register of Historic Places Registration Form: Rancho San Lucas (Trescony Ranch).”

⁷²⁸ Seavey, “National Register of Historic Places Registration Form: Rancho San Lucas (Trescony Ranch).”

⁷²⁹ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 98 and DPR 523, “Smith Ranch, Taylor Ranch, San Lucas, CA.”



Entrance to Smith Copley Taylor Ranch (PAST photo).

The **Smith Copley Taylor Ranch, 58153 Highway 198, San Lucas**, west of the Smith (Taylor) Ranch, is now about 371 acres. It includes eleven buildings: a residence, blacksmith shop, garage, horse barn, machinery barn, another barn, grain storage bins (all circa 1930s), greenhouse, two sheds, and a modern trailer.⁷³⁰

Patterson Ranch, 69461 Bradley Lockwood Road, Lockwood. In 1882, Benjamin Franklin Patterson moved from Oregon to the South County. He established a ranch about two miles southeast of the Lockwood area, in San Antonio Valley. The original home burned in 1899 and he built a new adobe by 1900, which is the main residence on the property today. Patterson raised cattle, hogs and chickens and grew wheat and barley. The homestead was originally 160 acres but grew to 3,000 acres. The 160-acre Patterson Ranch contains three homes, including a circa 1899 rammed-earth adobe with Italianate, a barn serving as a wagon shed and granary (circa 1880), machinery shed (circa 1880s-'90s), chicken coop (circa 1920s), board-and-batten shed (circa 2004), adobe smokehouse (circa 1870s), horse barn (circa 1870s), three circular grain storage bins (circa 1916), and two sheds. It also had a blacksmith shop and a cistern. The property spans both sides of Jolon Road and a portion of it is used for livestock grazing.⁷³¹



Patterson Ranch, 69461 Bradley Lockwood Road, Lockwood (Galvin photo).

Wollensen Ranch, 68780 Jolon Road, Lockwood. In 1886, Hans and Laura Wollensen moved from the German Isle of Föhr to the South County, where they joined an enclave of other Isle of Föhr families. They built their home two miles south of Lockwood, just west of the Jolon-Bradley Road. The Wollensen Ranch is about 316 acres and includes two residences (circa 1880s with a 1920 rammed-earth annex; and circa 1952), horse barn (circa 1900), boathouse (circa 1900), chicken coop (circa 1900), water tower (circa 1900), outhouse (circa 1920), grain

⁷³⁰ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 98 and DPR 523, “Smith Copley Taylor Ranch, 58153 Highway 198, San Lucas, CA.”

⁷³¹ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 99 and DPR 523, “Patterson Ranch, 69461 Bradley Lockwood Road, Lockwood, CA.”

elevator and storage bins (circa 1950s), garage/barn (circa 1952), and five sheds. The property has a deep well with a windmill and piped water.⁷³²

A number of adobe buildings related to extensive agriculture are located in South County. They include:

José Mario Gil Adobe (ca. 1850-1874) is listed in the National Register and the Monterey County Register.⁷³³ It is located on Jolon Road on Fort Hunter Liggett land.⁷³⁴

Dunn Adobe, 56200-56023 Jolon Road, King City: The Dunn Adobe (circa 1864) in the South County is listed in the Monterey County Register.⁷³⁵ Carmen Dunn lived in a one-story adobe at 56200-56023 Jolon Road, in a sparsely wooded area within Quinado Canyon, west of San Lucas. The long, rectangular adobe building has a side gable roof and originally had small wooden windows. It is deteriorating and abandoned. A Craftsman-style house (ca. 1920s), a wooden barn, shed and the circa 1960s Salinan Cultural Center are also on the property. Previous owners likely raised livestock on the property.⁷³⁶

Los Lobos Ranch, 65700 Los Lobos Road, San Ardo: In 1871, Frenchman Justin Gautx bought 629 acres and built the Los Lobos Ranch or “43 Ranch” in the South County’s Hames Valley, south of San Ardo. Gautx was a well-known horse breeder, raised pigs and sheep, and grew barley. The ranch is now about thirty-five acres and has eleven buildings, arranged in a rectangular cluster. The adobe house is long and rectangular, with a gable roof, full-width porch supported by wood posts, and pointed lintels over the wooden windows and doors. In addition to the adobe, the ranch has three other residences, a large barn, air conditioned pig pens, sheep corrals, a boathouse, shed, garage, airplane hangar and warehouse. The current owners have fruit orchards and raise chickens and livestock.⁷³⁷

Gillett Ranch, 68004 Jolon Road, Bradley/Lockwood area. In 1879, Edward Gillett moved to the South County from Ohio. He settled in the Lockwood area on 160 acres, grew hay and raised hogs, horses and cattle. The Gillett Ranch is now about seventy-eight acres and includes eight buildings and structures: a residence (originally built in Greenfield but moved to the Gillett property in 1888), horse barn (circa 1880), four sheds, water tower and two grain storage bins. The house is a rammed-earth adobe partially clad in wood siding. The rectangular-shaped

⁷³² Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 100 and DPR 523, “Wollensen Ranch, 68780 Jolon Road, Lockwood, CA.”

⁷³³ “José Mario Gil Adobe,” National Register of Historic Places, Department of the Interior, <http://nrhp.focus.nps.gov/natregsearchresult.do?fullresult=true&recordid=0> (accessed 21 January 2001). “Monterey County Register of Historic Resources as of January 2010.”

⁷³⁴ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 65.

⁷³⁵ “Monterey County Register of Historic Resources as of January 2010.”


⁷³⁶ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 95.

⁷³⁷ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 97 and DPR 523 Form, “Los Lobos Ranch, 65700 Los Lobos Road, San Ardo, CA.”

building cluster is south of Jolon Road. A wooden entrance gate with a wrought-iron sign reading “Gillett” marks the property.⁷³⁸

Antonio Boronda Adobe, Reliz Canyon. The Antonio Boronda Adobe site (circa 1870) in the Reliz Canyon area of the South County is listed in the Monterey County Register.⁷³⁹ The adobe was thirty-two by sixteen feet, with sixteen-inch walls. The adobe included large pieces of Monterey shale used as tempering and bita mulch used as a binding agent. The residence was built along one of the direct routes to Mission San Antonio.⁷⁴⁰

Beasley Place, Main Street, San Lucas. The Beasley Place (circa 1885) in the South County community of San Lucas is listed in the Monterey County Register.⁷⁴¹ Englishman Thomas Beasley moved to the South County in the 1860s. He built a two-story adobe house on the former Milpitas land grant. The walls were three feet thick, it had an adobe fireplace, and an outdoor staircase led to a large attic. He planted two pear trees near the house, customary at many early adobes.⁷⁴²



San Lucas grain elevator (PAST photo).

Extant outbuildings from South County’s era of grain production include the **San Lucas Grain Elevator** (circa 1900), located near the Southern Pacific Railroad tracks south of Main and Mary streets in San Lucas. The building cluster included the grain elevator and five metal cylindrical grain storage bins (circa 1950).⁷⁴³

Salinas Valley properties associated with grain farming include the **Fanoe Road Farmstead** (circa 1930) on the 27300 block of Fanoe Road in Gonzales, which contains a granary, with the typical framing on the exterior and six-inch wide horizontal siding boards facing the building’s interior, which allowed the grain to be removed

more easily. The property also has a very large hay barn with twelve-inch wide vertical boards as siding.⁷⁴⁴

⁷³⁸ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 92, 98, and DPR 523 Form, “Gillett Ranch, 68004 Jolon Road, Bradley, CA.”

⁷³⁹ “Monterey County Register of Historic Resources as of January 2010.”


⁷⁴⁰ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 95.

⁷⁴¹ “Monterey County Register of Historic Resources as of January 2010.”

⁷⁴² Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, 96.

⁷⁴³ Galvin, *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*, DPR 523, “San Lucas Grain Elevator, (No Address Available), San Lucas, CA.”

⁷⁴⁴ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, DPR 523, “Fanoe Road Farmstead, Fanoe Road, 27300 Block, Gonzales, CA.”



Entrance to Smith Copley Taylor Ranch (PAST photo).

The **Olson Ranch (1882), 35422 Paraiso Springs Road, Soledad** is the best example of both Extensive and Intensive Agriculture in Monterey County and is a designated historic district in the Monterey County Register. Otto and Ann Olson moved to the Olson Ranch around 1882 and by 1929, the Ranch comprised about 2600 acres. The Olsons bought grain sacks from Southern Pacific Milling Co. in 1906. The Olsons later purchased tractors and machinery for the farm operation and built a complete equipment repair shop on the ranch. The Olsons raised hay, wheat, oats and barley, grew vineyards and orchards, and raised cattle, hogs, chickens

and horses. Grain farming continued into the 1970s but Gallo now owns the property and operates vineyards there.⁷⁴⁵

Extant property examples of extensive agriculture are not as prevalent in North County. However, several farms operated first as extensive farmsteads; later farming crops as intensive farmsteads. An example is the **Williamson Farm, 951 and 953 Trafton Road, near Pajaro**: Like many Monterey County properties, these parcels transitioned from extensive agriculture to intensive agriculture at the end of the nineteenth century. Irishman and former miner William J. Williamson formed the Watsonville firm of Brown and Williamson Lumber Company, later known as the Charles Ford Lumber Company. He sold it in 1874 and became a farmer on 175 acres on Trafton Road, twenty of which were reclaimed slough land. At that time, he built the house at 951 Trafton Road. He built a “bunk house” behind a wood shed on the property, where the workers slept. The men ate their meals with the family. At wheat threshing time, twenty-five men would stay there, bringing a Chinese cook to help. On the western side of the property, a building that originally had doors on both sides served as a blacksmith shop on one side and a wagon-repair shop on the other. Williamson grew wheat, oats, hay, potatoes, apples, pears,




Williamson Farm at 951-953 Trafton Road (PAST photo).

⁷⁴⁵ Monterey County Planning Commission staff report for June 25, 2003 meeting, Combined Development Permit (Gallo [Olson Ranch]; PLN010188), 35422 Paraiso Springs Road, Soledad, <http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/planning/cca/cca2003/PC/06-25-03/PLN010188PC1.pdf> (accessed March 24, 2011).

cows, pigs, chickens and a vegetable garden and was one of the Pajaro Valley’s “best known farmers and contributed materially to the fame of this section as an agricultural success.”

His son Robert inherited the land in 1883 and started raising sugar beets in 1888. After Robert’s first wife died in 1882, Mollie Aston and her sister Sally moved to the ranch to work for Williamson and care for his children. Robert and Mollie married in 1884 and had a son Orman in 1894; Robert died in 1900. Mollie and her step-son Jim managed the ranch, buying out his three sisters’ interests. In 1913, Mollie bought out Jim and farmed with her son Orman. She became one of the most successful female farmers in the area and added a turkey farm and the Taylor Ranch on Riverside Road to her holdings. In 1921, Orman married Etheleen Trafton and built the second Williamson house at 953 Trafton Road. Irrigation allowed the family to switch from dry farming to the main crop of lettuce; they also grew cauliflower and continued to grow sugar beets as a minor crop until about 1945.⁷⁴⁶ In 1958, the property was leased to the Louie Delfino family for growing artichokes. The Pajaro Valley Consolidated Railroad had a station stop on the Williamson properties.

14468 Blackie Road, Castroville: This very early farmstead was likely associated with grain production in the mid-1800s. Vast wheat fields grew between Castroville and Salinas and this property on Blackie Road is within that area.⁷⁴⁷



⁷⁴⁶ “Another Pioneer Gone: Dies at Age of 81, After Half Century in Pajaro,” Pajaro Valley Historical Association files: William Williamson. Fred H. Jenkins, “This ‘n That!,” unknown date, Pajaro Valley Historical Association files: Williamson and William Williamson. Agricultural History Project, “Life in Early Days of Mud Flats, Recalled by Mollie Williamson.” Pajaro Valley Historical Association, “Pajaro Valley Historical Association Heritage Homes Tour.”

⁷⁴⁷ “First Crops Brought Name ‘Spud Valley’,” *Watsonville Register-Pajaronian*.

C. Theme 2: Intensive Agriculture (ca. 1870-1960)

1. Introduction

The theme of *Intensive Agriculture* focuses on agricultural operations that require a relatively high level of labor, capital and technology for crop production.⁷⁴⁸ Intensive agriculture is associated with advanced technology, including horticultural science; advancements in farm equipment and machinery; irrigation; transportation via railroads and trucks; high volumes of labor; and immigrants from Asia, Western and Central Europe and Mexico. Ethnic groups working in Monterey County's intensive agriculture labor pool included Chinese, Japanese, Croatians, Italians, Filipinos and Mexicans, as well as American Dust Bowl migrants.

The property type associated with the Intensive Agriculture theme is *Intensive Farmsteads*, which the Monterey County Code (MCC) classifies as an *agricultural operation*. Two sub-types have been identified: Crop Farmsteads and Dairies. Intensive farmsteads are classified as Rural Historic Landscapes.

Intensive agricultural operations include dairying and row crop farms. Dairying was one of the most significant agricultural operations that shaped the Salinas Valley landscape, from Salinas south to San Lucas. A unique example of a dairy are those constructed by the David Jacks Corporation for tenant farmers who wished to develop dairying operations. When the property was leased, the tenant had the option of having a "Jacks House" constructed. This one and one-half story, vernacular Greek Revival house is extant in the Salinas Valley from Chualar to Soledad and is classified as an intensive farmstead, sub-type dairy.

Intensive farmsteads developed for crop raising concentrate in North County. Some of Monterey County's most important intensive crops have included sugar beets, apples, lettuce, artichokes and berries, which require large labor pools and significant irrigation and technical expertise to produce. Expanding these intensive agricultural operations would require not only additional land but also a substantially larger workforce and possibly new technology to plant, cultivate, harvest, process and distribute the agricultural products.

Intensive farmsteads are generally oriented near a major road or railroad and typically contain a primary residence, sometimes a tank house, and various outbuildings, including barns, storage facilities and worker housing. Today, these sites often contain non-contributing buildings (*e.g.*, mobile homes for workers or new sheds and storage facilities supporting the site's current use).

The next sections include a comprehensive description of the Intensive Farmstead property sub-types and a discussion of specific Monterey County properties that may be potentially significant historic resources illustrating the Intensive Agriculture theme.

⁷⁴⁸ Steven Stoll, *The Fruits of Natural Advantage*, xiii-xiv.

2. Associated Property Type: Intensive Farmstead

a. Property Type Description: Crops Sub-type



Storm Farmstead at 170 Hayes Road.

Physical Characteristics: A primary residence in a variety of styles, including Greek Revival, Victorian, Bungalow and Spanish Revival styles, oriented towards a primary transportation route. Outbuildings include barns for equipment and sometimes animals; buildings for crop storage or preparation; worker housing; and non-contributing storage and crop preparation buildings reflecting the site’s current use.

Associative Characteristics: Intensive farmsteads are associated with particular intensive agriculture crops, such as sugar beets or artichokes, or with a significant person who introduced a particular crop or other agricultural innovation, or who impacted the agricultural industry by dominating certain crop markets. These sites may also be associated with a particular ethnic group that dominated an industry, such as the Croatians in the apple market.

Geographical Information: Intensive farmsteads are typically located in the Pajaro and Salinas Valleys on rich alluvial soils. Intensive Farmsteads needed to be near a primary transportation link, either railroads or roadways.

Boundaries: During a site’s historic period of significance, boundaries included the primary road, driveways and trees and may have included fencing demarcating crop fields. Today, industrial agriculture has removed most of the fences, where they previously existed. In these cases, fencing remnants may be visible near the primary residence and outbuildings. Trees planted for windbreaks or ornamentation may also remain.

Variations: Variations include the main house’s architectural style, depending on the construction date, and the form of outbuildings reflecting their use for specific crops.

Locational Patterns: The North County’s intensive farmsteads are located in the Pajaro and Salinas Valleys near main roads and near railroad tracks. Extant concentrations remain along San Juan Road (from Pajaro to Murphy’s Crossing Road); on lower San Miguel Canyon Road south of the intersection with San Juan Road; and on Lewis, Hayes and Vega roads south of Pajaro. Intensive farmsteads also extend along Hall Road east and west of Las Lomas and on Trafton Road, east and west of State Highway 1.

Condition: Industrial agriculture has encroached on and often removed boundary demarcations. Barns and outbuildings are typically in poor condition, especially if they are no longer used for their original purpose. Many have become storage buildings for modern industrial farming equipment. The main residence is in fair to good condition. Non-contributing industrial agricultural buildings and equipment are now placed on these sites.

b. Property Type Description: Dairy Sub-type



Vezzolo Dairy at 125 Hunter Lane, Salinas.

Physical Characteristics: A primary residence in a variety of styles, including Victorian, Bungalow and Spanish Revival styles, oriented towards a primary transportation route. Outbuildings include dairy barns, milk houses, cheese processing houses, tank houses, equipment barns and worker’s housing.

Associative Characteristics: Dairies are associated with the production of milk and milk products, such as butter and cheese, or with a significant person who introduced dairying to the region. Jacks dairies are associated with the David Jacks Corporation and the specific house type constructed on the dairy farmstead. These sites may also be associated with a particular ethnic group that dominated an industry, such as the Swiss in the dairy market.

Geographical Information: Dairy farmsteads are typically located in the valleys, near a river water source, with close access to a transportation corridor, either railroads or roadways.

Boundaries: During a site’s historic period of significance, boundaries included the primary road, driveways and trees and may have included fencing demarcating crop fields. Today, industrial agriculture has removed most of the fences, where they previously existed. In these cases, fencing remnants may be visible near the primary residence and outbuildings. Trees planted for windbreaks or ornamentation may also remain.

Variations: Variations include the main house’s architectural style, depending on the construction date, the type of dairy and animal barns and the form of outbuildings reflecting the particular dairy operation. Following sanitary requirements of the 20th century, dairy barns and outbuildings were constructed with concrete floors; animal and milk preparation locations became separated. Often dairies contain examples of both Class A and Class B buildings.

Locational Patterns: Dairies concentrated in the Salinas Valley along and within easy distance to the railroad/101 corridor, stretching from Salinas south to San Lucas. Dairies are also concentrated along River Road from Salinas to Soledad. Jacks dairies remain extant along the 101 corridor between Chualar and Soledad. Several dairies are located in North County; however, few are extant.

Condition: Extant dairies remain in good to poor condition. Industrial agriculture has encroached on and often removed boundary demarcations. Barns and outbuildings are typically in fair to poor condition, especially if they are no longer used for their original purpose. Many have become storage buildings for modern industrial farming equipment. The main residence is in fair to good condition. Non-contributing industrial agricultural buildings and equipment are now placed on these sites.

c. Landscape Characteristics

 <p>300 Hayes Rd.</p>	<p>Land Uses and Activities: Owners of intensive farmsteads shaped the landscape by creating a site for the dairy or farm complex and working the rich local soil for a particular crop. In many cases, a farmstead focused on a single crop, such as strawberries; or on the production of milk products. In the case of orchards, farmers planted other crops between rows of maturing apple trees, to take advantage of the fertile land until the trees matured.</p>
 <p>Jacks House and outbuildings at 37221 Arroyo Seco Rd., Soledad.</p>	<p>Patterns of Spatial Organization: The intensive farmstead generally contains various buildings in a cluster with the primary house facing the road. Dirt, gravel or paved driveways lead from the cluster to the main road and to the surrounding fields. Driveways also connect various outbuildings to provide efficient movement throughout the site. Intensive farmstead building clusters were spaced at irregular intervals along a primary road, based on the size and dimension of each property. Evidence of this spacing remains along San Juan Road east of Pajaro and along River Road from Salinas to Soledad.</p>
 <p>Apple orchard at 300 Hayes Rd.</p>	<p>Response to the Natural Environment: Intensive farmsteads rely on fertile soil and a steady water source to cultivate crops. Therefore, many of Monterey County’s intensive farmsteads are located in the fertile alluvial valleys along the Pajaro and Salinas rivers. Technological advancements in irrigation and the availability of electricity after the turn of the twentieth century enabled farmers to cultivate crops farther away from river and canal water sources. Climate often determined the crop type. For example, North County artichoke farmsteads are generally located near the ocean because artichokes grow best in cool, moist growing conditions. Dairies were located in the river valleys for access to water and transportation routes.</p>
 <p>Hutchings Ranch, 350 San Miguel Canyon Rd.</p>	<p>Cultural Traditions: Cultivating a specific crop requires specialized technical and horticultural expertise. Some cultural groups became associated with specific Monterey County crops, such as the Italians with artichokes, because of their familiarity with growing the same crop in their native lands. Others, like the Croatians, dominated the Pajaro Valley apple industry because they had a background in agriculture and shipping in their native country, and focused their Pajaro Valley efforts on improving apple processing, marketing and distribution. The Swiss dominated the dairy industry for decades in the early 20th century.</p>

 <p>Circulation network at Williamson Farm, 951-953 Trafton Road</p>	<p>Circulation Networks: Circulation networks include dirt, gravel or paved roads connecting the building cluster to the primary road. On-site roads also link outbuildings to the primary residence and connect the cluster of buildings to the outlying crop fields and processing and distribution points.</p>
 <p>Roadways, fencing and dirt road serve as boundaries at the Vezzolo Dairy, 125 Hunter Lane, Salinas.</p>	<p>Boundary Demarcations: Boundaries include the primary road, driveways, fences, and natural features such as hills and trees. A fencing system sometimes surrounded the cluster of buildings to demarcate it from the crop fields. Modern industrial agriculture has removed or altered most of the original boundary demarcations, except for roads. Extant fencing consists of vertical wood or woven sticks surrounding the cluster, as well as board and barbed-wire fences demarcating property boundaries.</p>
 <p>Palm trees at 951 Trafton Rd.</p>	<p>Vegetation Related to Land Use: Vegetation includes various row crops (e.g., strawberries or lettuce) and orchards (e.g., apple trees). Often, orchards contained a combination of fruit trees and row crops to maximize land production while the trees matured. Ornamental trees, such as paired palm trees, sometimes delineated the property's entrance and communicated the fertility of the farmer's land. Trees planted as windbreaks also exist along roads and original property lines.</p>
 <p>Jacks house, barn and worker housing at 1600 Chualar River Rd., in Chualar</p>	<p>Buildings, Structures, and Objects: Domestic buildings associated with intensive farmsteads include the primary residence and possibly a tank house. On larger sites, worker housing is sometimes found. Intensive farmsteads that were previously extensive farmsteads may contain a barn formerly used for animals and feed, potentially converted to barns for equipment. Outbuildings for storing and processing particular crops or for dairying operations are also possible on the site.</p>

 <p>Cluster at 1660 San Juan Rd. Note early housing between the main house and tank house.</p>	<p>Clusters: Intensive farmsteads usually contain a cluster of buildings set around and behind the primary residence. A tank house usually provided water for domestic purposes. A vertical board fence often surrounds this cluster to separate it from the surrounding fields.</p>
 <p>Encroachment of industrial agriculture at the Clough Farm, 1478 San Juan Rd.</p>	<p>Archaeological Sites: Intensive farmsteads have undergone significant changes since industrial agriculture came to Monterey County. In most cases, current row crops stretch from the cluster's fencing to the primary road. Often, outbuildings such as tank houses and storage sheds have been removed to create more crop fields. Although tilling the land for crops has likely removed the upper layers of soil containing archaeological remains, each property should be evaluated for its archaeological potential on a case-by-case basis.</p>
 <p>Timber gate at 745 Trafton Rd.</p>	<p>Small-Scale Elements: Small-scale elements may include decorative signs bearing the ranch or farmer's name or timber gates over dirt roads to increase the site's visual impact. Industrial agriculture has removed many small-scale elements on Monterey County farmsteads.</p>

d. Eligibility Criteria and Integrity Thresholds

Intensive farmsteads may be historically significant for their association with the development of the technical expertise, intellectual capital and/or mobilization of an ethnic labor pool required to produce a particular intensive crop or dairying operation (criteria NR-A, CR-1, MCR-A1, A2, A4, A6, C1 & C2).

Intensive farmsteads may also be historically significant for their association with an individual significant in the history of Monterey County, such as David Jacks and his Jacks Dairies (criteria NR-B, CR-2, MCR-A3).

Intensive farmsteads may be historically significant as an example of a distinctive architectural type, period or method of construction (criteria NR-C, CR-3, MCR-A5, B1, B2 & B3). An example would be the “Jacks House.”

To qualify for the above criteria, the intensive farmstead must possess historic integrity. Intensive farmsteads are examples of rural historic landscapes and must possess a substantial number of landscape characteristics to qualify for registration. For intensive farmsteads, the physical characteristics of the resource are represented by landscape characteristics as well as the character-defining features of the extant buildings on the landscape. The following chart provides guidelines for evaluating integrity.

Location	<i>Location is the place where the significant activities that shaped a property took place, often determined by geographical factors.</i> Intensive farmsteads are generally located on moderate tracts of open land in the Pajaro and Salinas Valleys where the most fertile soil exists, and near a road or rail transportation link. Intensive farmsteads whose characteristics retain their historic location have integrity of location.
Setting	<i>Setting is the physical environment within and surrounding a property, including large-scale features (e.g., woodlands or rock formations) and small-scale features (e.g., fences, gateposts, springs or individual trees).</i> Intensive farmsteads with integrity of setting retain the main house and building cluster surrounded by planted fields or dairy outbuildings. Roads or paths lead from the cluster to various outbuildings and to the crop fields. The building cluster, fencing and other small-scale features should be as intact as possible.
Design	<i>Design is the composition of natural and cultural elements comprising the form, plan, and spatial organization of a property. Elements include buildings, structures, boundary demarcations, circulation networks, windbreaks, vegetation and topography.</i> The cluster’s spatial organization should be intact and communicate the property’s historic use. At a minimum, the cluster should contain the primary residence, barn(s) and outbuildings for crops and equipment, worker housing and small-scale elements that contribute to its overall design. Retention of the main house’s architectural style is primary to communicating

	<p>historic significance. Each house should be examined to determine the presence of historic character-defining features. Changes to the house may be historic if they date to the property’s period of significance and do not remove the character-defining features. Circulation networks and boundary demarcations should reflect the site’s land use patterns.</p>
Materials	<p><i>Materials include construction materials of buildings, outbuildings, roadways, fences, and other structures. For rural historic landscapes, vegetation similar to historic species in scale, type and visual effect will generally convey historic integrity.</i> Construction materials of the main house will relate to its architectural style and date of construction and can be timber, wood or stucco. Board wood fences and barbed-wire fences are the most common boundary materials. Outbuildings for the cluster are typically of wood with replacement materials such as corrugated metal siding or roofing. Repairs to buildings over time with materials that communicate the farmstead’s historic use, such as corrugated roofing or replaced barbed-wire fencing, will retain integrity of materials if they are constructed within the period of significance and reflect the evolving nature of the historic farmstead.</p>
Workmanship	<p><i>Workmanship is exhibited in the ways people have fashioned their environment for functional and decorative purposes, including how they constructed buildings, fences and small-scale elements. For rural historic landscapes, workmanship in raising crops contributes to integrity if it reflects traditional or historic practices.</i> Historic construction techniques may illustrate the workmanship of particular ethnic groups, vernacular traditions, architects, or builders (such as David Jacks), who built or designed several local farmhouses. Intensive farmsteads with integrity of workmanship exhibit the traditional or historic practices in use during the property’s period of significance.</p>
Feeling	<p><i>Feeling is intangible but is evoked by the presence of physical characteristics that reflect the historic scene. The cumulative effect of setting, design, materials and workmanship creates the sense of past time and place.</i> The property’s rural setting, design, materials and workmanship should reflect the site’s historic use as an intensive farmstead. Alterations to buildings or to small-scale elements should date to the farmstead’s period of significance.</p>
Association	<p><i>Association is the direct link between a property and the important events or persons that shaped it. Continued use and occupation help maintain integrity of association if traditional practices are carried on. Using traditional methods in new construction reinforces a property’s integrity by linking past and present.</i> An intensive farmstead with integrity of association should reflect the historic persons (e.g., owners, architects or workers), historic land use, and historic events that shaped the property as an intensive farmstead. An intact building cluster, circulation network, fencing and small-scale elements contribute to the property’s integrity of association.</p>

e. Listed and Potentially Significant Historic Resources

Jacks Houses. Built from Chualar to just south of Soledad, these uniform, prefabricated, single-family houses are vernacular Greek Revival with one-and-a-half stories, a wood frame and gable roof, with the roof ridge perpendicular to the street. Each Jacks house is twenty-six feet by thirty-two feet, with a six-foot deep front porch and a six-foot deep rear shed addition, making the full footprint twenty-six feet by forty-four feet. Front porch variations include a full-width enclosed porch, a smaller enclosed porch, an open porch with posts, or a small open portico. The interior has a four-room over four-room configuration. The shed addition provides extra space for a kitchen and bathroom. Some Jacks houses have stucco applied over the original clapboards; some had basements. One distinctive design feature makes them easy to recognize: the roof eaves cut off the tops of the side upper-story windows. The window pattern in the gable ends and side elevations distinguish the Jacks houses. In both gable ends, two vertical double-hung, wood sash windows are placed so the center stile is even with the bottom of the roof eaves. Many Jacks properties also included a horse barn that is uncommon elsewhere in California. The forty-two foot by forty-two foot barn is asymmetrical with a tall section and a shed addition on only one side elevation, making it look like a salt-box roof.⁷⁴⁹

Many of the extant Jacks houses are located near the Highway 101 corridor between Chualar and southern Soledad. The highest concentration is at the southern edge of Soledad between Highway 101 and Arroyo Seco Road. In the future, Monterey County might designate the extant Jacks houses as a non-contiguous historic district. Previous surveys have located the following extant or demolished Jacks houses in Monterey County⁷⁵⁰:

ADDRESS	NOTES
36501 Arroyo Seco Road, Soledad ⁷⁵¹	Demolished 1973; foundation and basement remain.
36841 Arroyo Seco Road, Soledad ⁷⁵²	
37221 Arroyo Seco Road, Soledad ⁷⁵³	Albertoni Dairy
1600 Chualar River Road, Chualar ⁷⁵⁴	
36196 Doud Road, Soledad ⁷⁵⁵	
26771 El Camino Real North, Gonzales ⁷⁵⁶	
Fanoe Road, Gonzales ⁷⁵⁷	

⁷⁴⁹ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Historic Overview, 6. Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase II*, Survey Results, 3.

⁷⁵⁰ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase II*, Survey Results, 4.

⁷⁵¹ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase II*, Survey Results, 4.

⁷⁵² Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase II*, DPR 523, “Pedevilla Jacks House, 36841 Arroyo Seco Road, Soledad, CA.”

⁷⁵³ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase II*, Survey Results, 4.

⁷⁵⁴ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Historic Overview, 7. Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase II*, Survey Results, 4.

⁷⁵⁵ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase II*, Survey Results, 4.

⁷⁵⁶ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase II*, Survey Results, 4.

24645 Foletta Road, Chualar ⁷⁵⁸	Finest example.
Highway 101, Soledad ⁷⁵⁹	Apparently unaltered.
37722 Highway 101, Soledad ⁷⁶⁰	
37805 Los Coches Road, Soledad ⁷⁶¹	
Los Coches Road, Soledad ⁷⁶²	Site of Jacks House demolished in 2000.
37507 Paraiso Road, Soledad	
37061 Vida Road, Soledad	

A number of Jacks Houses are or were located along the Arroyo Seco River, Arroyo Seco Road, Los Coches Road, Paraiso Springs Road, and Highway 101 outside of Soledad. Those properties include the old Guidotti Brothers Ranch, E. Panziera and Sons Ranch, O. Albertoni & Son Ranch, C. Z. Gunderson Ranch, A. Clark Ventana Meador Vineyard, Doud Ranch, Merrill Farms, and Bruno Breschini Ranch. Other Jacks houses are or were located at 240 Ninth Street in Greenfield; on Encinal Road near Salinas; on Arroyo Seco Road on Albertoni Dairy property; and the Pershall Home on Doud Road south of Soledad.⁷⁶³



⁷⁵⁷ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I, Historic Overview*, 7.

⁷⁵⁸ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I, Historic Overview*, 7.

⁷⁵⁹ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase II, Survey Results*, 4.

⁷⁶⁰ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase II, Survey Results*, 4.

⁷⁶¹ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase II, Survey Results*, 4.


⁷⁶² Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase II, Survey Results*, 4.

⁷⁶³ *Soledad Bee*, May 1975.

The Salinas Valley’s *Albertoni Dairy* (37221 Arroyo Seco Road, Soledad) has a long dairy history. It operated as a dairy until the 1980s but now is planted with row crops.⁷⁶⁴ Swiss immigrant Osvaldo Albertoni arrived in the Salinas Valley in 1921 and started operating dairies with Charlie Gianolini and Gene Sciaroni of Greenfield. Albertoni founded the Albertoni Dairy in 1943 and his sons Oliver and Clem later took over the operation.⁷⁶⁵ The property includes a Jacks House, horse barn, dairy house, milking barn, dairy barn, water tower, granary, chicken coops, shop, garage and modern buildings.⁷⁶⁶



The Albertoni Dairy at 37221 Arroyo Seco Rd., Soledad (PAST photo).



The Binsacca Foothill Ranch at 37393 Foothill Rd., Soledad (PAST photo).

The *Binsacca Foothill Ranch* (37393 Foothill Road, Soledad) is a rare, but representative South County dairy ranch. Like many in the region, it specialized in Monterey Jack cheese.⁷⁶⁷ The property has many extant agricultural buildings and structures that reveal its long and diverse agricultural history, including a residence (1902), dairy barn, two dairy houses, horse barn, water storage tank, granary, pigeon loft, chicken coops, brooder shed, apple house, wash house and a brick oven.⁷⁶⁸

⁷⁶⁴ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase II*, DPR Form 523, “Albertoni Dairy, 37221 Arroyo Seco Road, Soledad.”

⁷⁶⁵ Vicky Peterson, “Albertoni dairy one of the few in the Valley,” *The Land*, January 1980.

⁷⁶⁶ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase II*, DPR Form 523, “Albertoni Dairy, 37221 Arroyo Seco Road, Soledad.”

⁷⁶⁷ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, Historic Overview, 9.

⁷⁶⁸ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I*, DPR Form 523, “Binsacca Foothill Ranch, 37393 Foothill Road, Soledad, CA.”

Bernardino Breshini, Jr., Dairy, 28275 Alta Road, Gonzales: An outstanding extant example of an early 20th Century dairy, this example contains all the primary buildings and outbuildings to communicate the property’s historic integrity. Resources include the bungalow residence, a dairy barn, milk house, horse barn, garage, equipment sheds, worker’s housing and a chicken coop.



View of the Breschini Dairy from State Route 101 (PAST photo).

Struve Dairy, 1770 Highway 1, Moss Landing: The Struve family was one of the first to settle in the Pajaro Valley and they pioneered the local use of tractors.⁷⁶⁹ The Struve dairy was located in the Springfield District along Highway 1 north of Moss Landing. The Arts and Crafts-style Struve House is a prominent fixture along Highway 1. Struve Road and Struve Slough are named after the family. Hans C. Struve (1892-1977), a grain farmer, lived at the Struve House at 1770 Highway 1. He was a life member of the Springfield Grange. Photos appear below.⁷⁷⁰

⁷⁶⁹ David Pacani, “Exhibit of Struve family planned,” *Watsonville Register-Pajaronian*, 1 December 1999.

⁷⁷⁰ “Hans Struve,” obituary, June 1977. In 1936, noted architect William W. Wurster designed a Pajaro Valley home at 483 Trafton Road for Edith and Nels H. Struve (1886-1974). (Pajaro Valley Historical Association, “Pajaro Valley Historical Association Heritage Homes Tour.” Circa 1989.) The property is bounded by Highway 1 and Trafton Road but is difficult to see. Nels was the son of Danish native Nels N. Struve, who owned a 320-acre Pajaro Valley ranch. The younger Struve ranched with his father and then bought property near Harkins Slough and farmed in the Trafton District. He raised beef and dairy cattle and grew sugar beets and other vegetables. (“Nelse H. Struve,” *Watsonville Register-Pajaronian*, 18 April 1974. His name is spelled variously as Nelse or Nels.)



Moon Glow Dairy, 357 Dolan Road, Moss Landing: Today, the Moon Glow Dairy at 357 Dolan Road is the only active North County dairy. Monterey County Supervisor Louis R. Calcagno founded it in 1957.⁷⁷¹ The 110-acre operation adjoins the Elkhorn Slough and the Moss Landing power plant.⁷⁷² As of March 2009, the dairy had about 1,000 cows and shipped about 650 gallons of milk daily.⁷⁷³




⁷⁷¹ “About Lou” (Moss Landing, CA: Lou Calcagno, 2009), http://www.re-electlou.com/Lou_Calcagno/Bio.html (accessed 21 June 2010).

⁷⁷² Scott Winokur and Christian Berthelsen, “Cutting a Deal on the Environment: Activists accused of favoring cash over mission at Moss Landing” (San Francisco: *San Francisco Chronicle*, 3 June 2001).

O. O. Eaton House, 1766 San Juan Road, Aromas (1930, Robert H. Orr):

O. O. Eaton (1874-1948) was one of the North County’s most successful strawberry and lettuce farmers. Los Angeles-based architect Robert H. Orr designed Eaton’s Tudor Revival-style home in 1930, hidden in the trees on the hill above San Juan Road.⁷⁷⁴ Eaton owned seventy-five irrigated acres of berries.⁷⁷⁵ Eaton installed his irrigation system for \$6,000, with annual irrigation costs of \$25 per acre in 1915. The system used two pumps: a twenty-five horsepower unit pumping 800 gallons of water per minute and a fifteen horsepower unit pumping 300 gallons per minute. Non-irrigated strawberry farms produced an average of 125 chests per acre, at seventy-five pounds per chest.⁷⁷⁶ In contrast, Eaton’s irrigation system increased the yield to an average of 200 (maximum of 400-450) chests per acre.⁷⁷⁷ Eaton’s crop sold for between \$3.50 and \$10 a chest. Strawberry picking has always required intensive labor. At one point, a six-acre section of Eaton’s farm kept thirty-two pickers at work full-time for two weeks.⁷⁷⁸



Lettuce packers at the Eaton Ranch, 1766 San Juan Road, in the 1920s. (Courtesy of Pajaro Valley Historical Association).

⁷⁷³ “Economic Woes Send Cows To Slaughterhouses” (Salinas, CA: KCBA, 2 March 2009), <http://www.kcba.com/Global/story.asp?S=9871650> (accessed 21 June 2010).

⁷⁷⁴ Betty Lewis, “Robert Orr: Watsonville architect’s work still lives on,” *Register-Pajaronian*, May 19, 2005. Robert Orr moved with his family from Canada to the Hollister vicinity in 1881, when he was eight. Around 1896, his father hired William Weeks to design a house. Robert drove Weeks to and from Gilroy in a horse and buggy and told him he wanted to study architecture. Weeks opened a Salinas office and hired Robert to supervise construction of some structures for Spreckels’s new plant south of Salinas. He worked in Salinas for two years and then Weeks transferred him to Watsonville in 1898. He married Hilda Eaton, Robert W. Eaton’s niece and O. O. Eaton’s cousin. Orr later founded the architectural firm of Orr, Strange, Inslee and Senefeld in Los Angeles.


⁷⁷⁵ Dunn, *Monterey County, California*, 19.

⁷⁷⁶ Dunn, *Monterey County, California*, 18, 19.

⁷⁷⁷ Dunn, *Monterey County, California*, 19.

⁷⁷⁸ Dunn, *Monterey County, California*, 19.

Rowe Ranch, 1767 San Juan Road, Aromas (1900, William Weeks): Architect William H. Weeks designed this house for Aromas natives James and Ida Rowe in 1900. It is listed in the Monterey County Register. A grain farmer, apple grower and butcher, James Rowe once “hired” thirty Aromas schoolchildren (for one dollar per child) to pick mustard from his field. In 1918, Rowe founded the Aromas Pig Club for children, giving them pigs to raise. Sponsored by the Aromas Grange, the Pig Club became the Aromas 4-H Club in 1922. Rowe led it for twenty years and was also involved with the Aromas Grange.⁷⁷⁹ The Rowe Ranch is most famous for being the location of the first lettuce grown in the Pajaro Valley. In 1915, Rowe’s son-in-law, Moses (Mose) S. Hutchings, planted three acres of lettuce on the property. To keep it cool, he harvested and field-packed it at 2 a.m., driving it to the Pajaro Depot in a wagon for shipment to San Francisco.⁷⁸⁰



Rowe House at 1767 San Juan Road, Aromas, listed in the Monterey County Register (PAST photo).

Reiter Berry Farms, Inc., founded in 1983, now owns the property.⁷⁸¹ In 1904, Joseph “Ed” Reiter and Richard Driscoll started growing berries together in the Pajaro Valley. In 1944, Ned and Donald Driscoll, Joe Reiter, T. B. Porter, Kenneth Sheehy and M. W.

Johnson founded the Strawberry Institute to research and breed strawberries. In the late 1940s, Driscoll’s contracted with its first independent farmers and in 1953, the strawberry growing cooperative of Driscoll Strawberry Associates, Inc. was founded. In 1966, it merged with the Strawberry Institute under the Driscoll Strawberry Associates name and focuses on berry research, breeding, production, sales and distribution. In 1971, Driscoll’s “grower owners” started shipping berries under the common Driscoll’s label. Ed Reiter’s grandson Miles Reiter is now the Chairman and CEO of Driscoll’s. Reiter Berry Farms supplies berries to Driscoll’s and their office is in the Rowe House at 1767 San Juan Road.⁷⁸²


⁷⁷⁹ County of Monterey Historical Files: “1767 San Juan Rd.” Pajaro Valley Historical Association, “Pajaro Valley Historical Association Heritage Homes Tour.” Pajaro Valley Historical Association Files: “1767 San Juan Road, Rowe, James.” The Monterey County Register of Historic Resources indicates that the Rowe House dates from 1880, but Weeks was only sixteen then and not yet living in California. County of Monterey, “Monterey County Register of Historic Resources as of June, 2009,” (Salinas, CA: Monterey County, 2009) http://publicagendas.co.monterey.ca.us/MG75670/AS75689/AS75695/AI83873/DO83876/DO_83876.PDF, accessed 10 June 2010.

⁷⁸⁰ Clovis, *Monterey County’s North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 84.

⁷⁸¹ County of Monterey Historical Files: “1767 San Juan Rd.” Pajaro Valley Historical Association, “Pajaro Valley Historical Association Heritage Homes Tour.” Pajaro Valley Historical Association Files: “1767 San Juan Road, Rowe, James.” The Monterey County Register of Historic Resources indicates that the Rowe House dates from 1880, but Weeks was only sixteen then and not yet living in California. County of Monterey, “Monterey County Register of Historic Resources as of June, 2009,” (Salinas, CA: Monterey County, 2009) http://publicagendas.co.monterey.ca.us/MG75670/AS75689/AS75695/AI83873/DO83876/DO_83876.PDF, accessed 10 June 2010.

⁷⁸² Driscoll Strawberry Associates, Inc., “Our Story” (Watsonville, CA: 2010), <http://www.driscolls.com/about/our-story.php>, accessed 10 June 2010.

Storm Ranch, 170 Hayes Road: In 1867, Danish native Peter Storm (1854-1916) came to the Pajaro Valley with his father J. P. Storm.⁷⁸³ In 1891, Peter bought his 210-acre ranch at 170 Hayes Road. The valley portion was 110 acres, plus 100 acres in the hills, which he used for cattle grazing and farming. In 1899, he planted thirty acres of apples. When he died in 1916, he was “one of Pajaro Valley’s most successful ranchers.” As a teenager, Peter worked on his father’s ranch and then rented land from him, starting his own farming and cattle raising business and working a threshing machine. Peter rented a Salinas Valley property for three years, but lost almost everything because of a long drought. For the next fifteen years, he rented the 500-acre McCoskey Ranch and became very successful. Two of Storm’s sisters married Struve brothers, another important Danish agricultural family in the North County.⁷⁸⁴



Views of the Storm Ranch, 170 Hayes Road (PAST photos).


Hutchings Ranch, 350 San Miguel Canyon Road: In 1869, Lyman S. Hutchings (1829-1889) and his wife Mary Rigby (1836-1917) acquired the ranch at 350 San Miguel Canyon Road from homesteader John Maxwell. President U.S. Grant signed Maxwell’s deed. Lyman’s grandson, Foster Hutchings, said “he traded for a Squatter’s Right: a team of mules, a wagon and a barrel of whiskey.” Hutchings built the two-story redwood house that still stands today, as well as a large horse barn. He planted a fruit orchard east of the house. He later bought a ranch on Lewis Road, built a second house there and built a second barn as a fruit dryer, one of the first in the

⁷⁸³ J. M. Guinn, *History of the State of California and Biographical Record of Santa Cruz, San Benito, Monterey and San Luis Obispo Counties* (Chicago: The Chapman Publishing Co., 1903), 475-476. J. P. Storm rented a Pajaro Valley farm for a year and then bought and converted 300 acres “from the wild” into a farm. He also bought a 200-acre farm and a 100-acre farm.

⁷⁸⁴ “Peter Storm Killed by Falling Tree: A Horrible Death for Prominent Resident,” *Watsonville Evening Pajaronian*, 10 January 1916. Storm may actually have worked on a McCusker or McClusky ranch. Family names were often misspelled in different sources. Built before 1881, the McCusker House was between Moss Landing and the Pajaro River, near the Monterey Bay and the McClusky Slough.⁷⁸⁴

area. He raised cows and grew plums, cherries, apricots, peaches, nectarines, pears, soft-shelled almonds, quinces and three acres of strawberries. An 1879 book by Wallace W. Elliott and Company of San Francisco described Hutchings as “one of the most noted strawberry producers in this section.” He sold dried fruit and produce to Castroville, Salinas, Santa Rita, Hollister and San Juan Bautista via horse and wagon. By 1879, his ranch was 195 acres and it eventually extended from Prasso Ranch in San Miguel Canyon to the top of Lewis Road.

Lyman and Mary’s son Moses (Mose) S. Hutchings (1877-1952) married Rhoda Rowe, daughter of James and Ida Rowe (see 1767 San Juan Road property description). He was the first farmer to grow and ship lettuce in the Pajaro Valley and Central Coast. In 1915, he planted three acres of lettuce on the Rowe ranch at 1767 San Juan Road. In the spring of 1916, by lantern at 2:00 a.m., he and local high school students cut and ice-packed the lettuce in the field. He drove it by wagon team to Pajaro Junction where Wells Fargo shipped the lettuce to the H. P. Garin Co. in San Francisco. In 1917, Mose planted ten acres of lettuce. In 1918, he planted sixteen acres and had Japanese employees. He also sold hay, potatoes, milk and eggs. In 1924, he expanded the house at 350 San Miguel Canyon Road, planted twenty acres of pears, and moved in with Rhoda and their children. Mose Hutchings worked with Matt McGowan and Monterey County Farm Advisor A. A. Tavernetti to bring the Farm Bureau to the Pajaro Valley. He also helped establish the Monterey County Fair.⁷⁸⁵




⁷⁸⁵ Doris Hutchings Means, “Hutchings, Lyman Smith,” courtesy of the Agricultural History Project Collection. Doris Hutchings Means, “Hutchings were Mormon clan who settled in Pajaro,” *Register-Pajaronian*, 29 August 1998. Foster Hutchings, “Foster’s Remembrances,” provided to Agricultural History Project by Ellen Hutchings, 2003, courtesy of the Agricultural History Project Collection. Elinor Baldwin, “Pioneer Hutchings family will celebrate 100th anniversary of founding the ranch,” possibly September 1969. Dorothy H. Vera, “Hutchings Ranch Is a Century Old,” *Salinas Californian*, October 4, 1969. Clovis, *Monterey County’s North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 84. The original 1869 ranch purchase was either fifty or seventy acres; sources disagree.

McGowan House, 745 Trafton Road (original house ca. 1864): Wheat and barley farmer John McGowan built this house shortly after 1864. He originally built it higher on the hillside but the 1906 earthquake and the heavy rains of 1907 loosened the soil. The house slid down the hill to its present location, after which the McGowans built a new foundation and additional rooms.⁷⁸⁶

By 1915, descendent W. J. McGowan owned a ninety-three acre orchard three miles southwest of Pajaro and leased it to tenants on a long-term basis for \$5,000 per year. At that time, McGowan’s sixty acres of Bellefleur (Bellflower) apples were about thirteen to twenty years old. Each acre had forty-eight trees and yielded up to 15,000 loose or 11,250 packed apple boxes. Some of McGowan’s oldest trees annually yielded up to twelve loose boxes of apples each.⁷⁸⁷ The Pajaro Valley Consolidated Railroad had two station stops (McGowan No. 1 and McGowan No. 2) on two McGowan properties along Trafton Road.

This property is another example of a farm that evolved from extensive to intensive agriculture. It illustrates both themes, but appears to have achieved its greatest significance for its association with apple growing and has been classified under the Intensive Agriculture theme. The farmstead shaped the landscape through its apple orchards and its station stops along the Pajaro Valley Consolidated Railroad.



⁷⁸⁶ Pajaro Valley Historical Association, “Pajaro Valley Historical Association Heritage Homes Tour.” Circa 1989.

⁷⁸⁷ Dunn, *Monterey County, California*, 16.

Thompson Farms in Aromas: 1615 San Juan Road (1880); 1666 San Juan Road (1920); intersection of San Juan Road and Murphy Hill Road; and intersection of San Juan and Aromas Roads:

John Thompson was one of the Pajaro Valley’s principal farmers and landowners since at least 1873.⁷⁸⁸ By 1908, he owned at least four large tracts along San Juan Road. Three were at the intersection of San Juan and Murphy roads near Murphy’s Crossing: two were north of San Juan Road bordering John Murphy’s land (at 1615 San Juan Road and at the intersection of San Juan and Murphy Hill roads); the third was across the street at 1666 San Juan Road, between the Rowe and Eaton parcels. The fourth was a large parcel at the northeast corner of the San Juan and Aromas roads intersection. A 1915 book about Monterey County noted that Thompson owned seventy-five acres near Pajaro, but did not identify the exact parcel(s). The book likely referred to Thompson’s three nearly contiguous parcels at the intersection of San Juan and Murphy roads.

Thompson grew Bellefleur and Newtown apples and his trees were already ten to eighteen years old by 1915. He planted fifty-five to an acre, twenty-eight feet apart, yielding about 32,000 loose boxes of apples annually. At one time, he sold his apples to the Croatian packers and shippers on “blossom contracts” in April or May. He grossed \$6,800 in 1909, \$7,200 in 1910, and \$7,600 for the mature trees in 1911. His expenses were between \$1,800 and \$2,000 annually: plowing at \$2.50 per acre, cultivation at \$3.50 per acre, pruning at \$600 for the orchard, and three \$100 summer sprays for \$300 total, with winter spraying not needed every year. By 1915, Thompson had leased his land to tenants on a five-year lease. He earned \$7,000 for each of the first three years and \$7,500 for each of the last two years, for which he performed no work in the orchard.⁷⁸⁹



The Thompson property at 1666 San Juan Road is listed in the Monterey County Register (PAST photo).

- ***1615 San Juan Road (1880), Aromas:*** This property is listed in the Monterey County Register. The house and outbuildings are set back from the road. This parcel includes a one-and-a-half story rectangular wood frame house with a hipped roof, gabled pediment breaking the roof line, open porch with a hipped roof and central pediment; monitor barn, tank house and several outbuildings.⁷⁹⁰
- ***1666 San Juan Road (1920), Aromas:*** Listed in the Monterey County Register, this property includes a Spanish Colonial Revival home that John Thompson built in 1920 and occupied until the 1940s. An older home is located behind it, as is a water tank and a

⁷⁸⁸ Martin, *Directory of the Town of Watsonville for 1873*, 43.

⁷⁸⁹ Dunn, *Monterey County, California*, 16.

⁷⁹⁰ County of Monterey Historical Files: “1615 San Juan Rd.”

few smaller outbuildings. Thompson leased the land to lettuce growers from the 1920s until right after World War II.⁷⁹¹

The Thompson properties at 1615 San Juan Road and 1666 San Juan Road are already listed in the Monterey County Register and may also be eligible for listing in the National Register or California Register.

⁷⁹¹ County of Monterey Historical Files: “1660 San Juan Rd.” (actual street address is 1666 San Juan Road).

D. Theme 3: Corporate Agriculture (ca. 1880-1960)

1. Introduction

Extant resources from two of the three agricultural corporations, Spreckels Sugar Company and the Salinas Land Company/California Orchard Company are covered under this theme. Land leased to tenant farmers by the David Jacks Corporation is covered under *Theme 2: Intensive Agriculture*.

Corporations transformed the landscape by taking arid dry land, used primarily for growing grains, into a fertile crop- or orchard-producing region with the investment of large quantities of capital and the available irrigation technology that emerged in the late 19th and 20th centuries. These two corporations developed a tenant farming system to offset investment costs and create the capital to justify such a huge financial investment. The corporations sought a transportation corridor for transporting goods to the marketplace, a road network linking farmsteads to the transportation corridor and a layout of farmsteads, barns and support buildings within the corporation's boundaries that allowed sufficient room for the development of crops.

Today, extant resources from these two corporate developments are concentrated in two areas: the town of Spreckels and the original land purchased by the Salinas Land Company. The resources are summarized for each company below. Corporate farmsteads from these two companies suffer from an extreme loss of integrity. Development pressure and industrial agriculture has removed much of the outbuildings and other landscape characteristics that would qualify individual farmsteads as corporate farmsteads in the Spreckels area. However, several parcels with a William Weeks-designed Spreckels residence and one or two outbuildings have been given the *Associated Property Type: Corporate Farmstead*. Individual houses constructed by the Spreckels Sugar Company, but with no integrity as a farmstead are classified under *Theme 6: Community Development, Associated Property Type: Residence, Sub-type: Town Residence*.

On the Salinas Land Company/California Orchard Company land, extant farmsteads are rare. However, the Arts & Crafts bungalows built for company leadership and one dormitory remain. The individual bungalows would be classified under *Theme 6: Community Development, Associated Property Type: Residence, Sub-type: Farmstead Residence*. In addition, vestiges of irrigation ditches, wells and pump stations; as well as the windbreaks remain on the land. The following discusses the extant properties found in Spreckels and the Salinas Land Company lands, with an example of the associated property type.

2. Corporations and Extant Resources

a. Spreckels Sugar Company

The extant historic resources located in the town of Spreckels include associated buildings on the site of the sugar plant (demolished in 1992), several commercial buildings, housing and other community development buildings, all of which are considered contributing structures to the Monterey County historic district. Individual houses, as shown to the right, would be classified as *Town Residences* under *Theme 6: Community Development*.



Bungalows on Third Street, Spreckels (PAST photo).

Evidence of Spreckels houses, designed by William Weeks and bearing the decorative sugar beet in the street-facing gable end, exist near the town of Spreckels and the Salinas area. These properties are classified under this theme, *Corporate Agriculture*, as *Corporate Farmsteads* if they contain at least a barn or several outbuildings and some small-scale elements.



Spreckels house at 93 Abbott Road, near Spreckels (PAST photo).

b. Salinas Land Company and California Orchard Company (COCO)



Salinas Land Company/COCO house on Hobson Avenue (PAST photo).

The Salinas Land Company/California Orchard Company land is a triangular wedge roughly bounded by Lagomarsino Avenue to the north, the intersection of Central Avenue with Highway 101 to the south, Highway 101 to the east, and Central Avenue to the west. Scattered within the property are a few extant farmhouses and bungalows bearing the Company's trademark board-and-batten exterior cladding. Examples of *Corporate Farmsteads* appear to be no longer extant. Individual houses (left) would be classified as *Farmstead Residences* under *Theme 6: Community Development*.

Company and guest residences include several higher style Arts & Crafts bungalows. It appears that the 1922 boarding house and superintendent's large bungalow remain extant at the intersection of Central Avenue and Thompson Canyon Road.



Left: Corporate dormitory at south end of Central Avenue; Right: Arts & Crafts house on Thompson Canyon Road at Central Avenue (PAST photos).

The two most significant extant features left by the company include the great windbreaks planted in the area and the remnants of historic irrigation pump houses, wells and ditches. Examples appear below. It should be noted that industrial agriculture, in the form of vineyards have stripped the area of its historic integrity.



Views on Hobson Ave. Left: Windbreaks with encroachment of vineyards; Right: historic pump house.
(PAST photos)

2. Associated Property Type: Corporate Farmstead

a. Property Type Description



Corporate Farmstead: 14 Spreckels Road, Spreckels

Physical Characteristics: Primary feature is a farmstead residence, done in the Corporation’s architectural style. For example, the Spreckels Sugar Company utilized the vernacular Queen Anne style in small homes designed by architect William Weeks. A decorative sugar beet in the upper story of the street-facing gable end is a character-defining feature of the Weeks house type. To qualify as a *Corporate Farmstead* at least one or more outbuildings reflecting the property’s use (e.g., animal or equipment barns) and other small-scale elements should be extant on the property.

Associative Characteristics: Corporate farmsteads are associated with the corporation responsible for their construction. They also may be associated with a particular use, such as the farmsteads leased by the Spreckels Sugar Company to tenant farmers for the purpose of growing sugar beets.

Geographical Information: Spreckels corporate farmsteads are concentrated near the town of Spreckels, but may be located as far south as King City, where land was leased for sugar beet growing. Corporate farmsteads for the Salinas Land Company/California Orchard Company (COCO) would be located within the corporation’s land holdings.

Boundaries: Boundary demarcations include roads, driveways, fences, gates, posts and trees along the property lines. Rugged and hilly landscapes also provide natural boundaries.

Variations: Variations include buildings specific to the architectural style used by a given corporation. For the Spreckels Sugar Company, this style ranged from vernacular Queen Anne to Arts & Crafts and Modernist ranch styles of the 1930s – 1950s. For the Salinas Land Company/California Orchard Company, the style employed was an Arts & Crafts style: utilizing simple bungalows for tenant farmers, and more high-style Craftsman styles for the larger Superintendent’s and guest houses.

Locational Patterns: Corporate farmsteads for the Spreckels Sugar Company can be located anywhere within the Salinas Valley. Presently, extant examples concentrate around Salinas and Spreckels. Corporate farmsteads for the Salinas Land Company/California Orchard Company have not been located at this time. However, reconnaissance survey within the Company’s boundaries should be undertaken to verify the existence of corporate farmsteads.

Condition: Corporate farmsteads are rapidly disappearing due to the encroachment of industrial agriculture. The extant examples found around Spreckels are in fair to poor condition. To date, corporate farmsteads for the Salinas Land Company/COCO have not been found with sufficient historic integrity.

b. Eligibility Criteria and Integrity Thresholds

Corporate farmsteads may be historically significant for their association with a particular corporation (e.g., Spreckels) that developed the landscape for a particular agricultural operation. (criteria NR-A, CR-1, MCR-A1, A2, A4, A6, C1 & C2).

Corporate farmsteads may also be historically significant for their association with an individual significant in the history of Monterey County (criteria NR-B, CR-2, MCR-A3).

Corporate farmsteads may be historically significant as an example of a distinctive architectural type, period or method of construction (criteria NR-C, CR-3, MCR-A5, B1, B2 & B3).

To qualify for the above criteria, the corporate farmstead must possess historic integrity, in the form of the primary residence, barns, outbuildings, fencing and small-scale elements, as well as the character-defining features of the extant buildings on the landscape. The following chart provides guidelines for evaluating integrity.

Location	<i>Location is the place where the significant activities that shaped a property took place, often determined by geographical factors.</i> Corporate farmsteads are generally located in the fertile areas of the Salinas Valley, around Salinas and Spreckels, and on the lands of the Salinas Land Company/COCO. Corporate farmsteads whose characteristics retain their historic location have integrity of location.
Setting	<i>Setting is the physical environment within and surrounding a property, including large-scale features (e.g., woodlands or rock formations) and small-scale features (e.g., fences, gateposts, springs or individual trees).</i> Corporate farmsteads with integrity of setting retain the main house and building cluster surrounded by planted fields. Roads or paths lead from the main transportation route to the various outbuildings and to the crop fields. The building cluster, fencing and other small-scale features should be as intact as possible.
Design	<i>Design is the composition of natural and cultural elements comprising the form, plan, and spatial organization of a property. Elements include buildings, structures, boundary demarcations, circulation networks, windbreaks, vegetation and topography.</i> The cluster’s spatial organization should be intact and communicate the property’s historic use. At a minimum, the cluster should contain the primary residence, barn(s), one or more outbuildings for crops and equipment, and small-scale elements that contribute to its overall design. Retention of the main house’s corporate architectural style is primary to communicating historic significance. Each house should be examined to determine the presence of historic character-defining features. Changes to the house may be historic if they date to the property’s period of significance and do not remove the character-defining features.

Materials	<i>Materials include construction materials of buildings, outbuildings, roadways, fences, and other structures. For rural historic landscapes, vegetation similar to historic species in scale, type and visual effect will generally convey historic integrity. Construction materials of the main house will relate to its corporate architectural style and date of construction. For example, houses for the Salinas Land Company/COCO bear a board-and-batten exterior wall finish or shingles. Board wood fences and barbed-wire fences are the most common boundary materials. Outbuildings for the cluster are typically of wood with replacement materials such as corrugated metal siding or roofing. Repairs to buildings over time with materials that communicate the farmstead’s historic use, such as corrugated roofing or replaced barbed-wire fencing, will retain integrity of materials if they are constructed within the period of significance and reflect the evolving nature of the historic farmstead.</i>
Workmanship	<i>Workmanship is exhibited in the ways people have fashioned their environment for functional and decorative purposes, including how they constructed buildings, fences and small-scale elements. For rural historic landscapes, workmanship in raising crops contributes to integrity if it reflects traditional or historic practices. Historic construction techniques may illustrate the workmanship of particular architect or designer contracted by the corporation, such as William H. Weeks, for the Spreckels Sugar Company. Corporate farmsteads with integrity of workmanship exhibit the traditional or historic practices in use during the property’s period of significance.</i>
Feeling	<i>Feeling is intangible but is evoked by the presence of physical characteristics that reflect the historic scene. The cumulative effect of setting, design, materials and workmanship creates the sense of past time and place. The property’s rural setting, corporate design, materials and workmanship should reflect the site’s historic use as a corporate farmstead. Alterations to buildings or to small-scale elements should date to the farmstead’s period of significance.</i>
Association	<i>Association is the direct link between a property and the important events or persons that shaped it. Continued use and occupation help maintain integrity of association if traditional practices are carried on. Using traditional methods in new construction reinforces a property’s integrity by linking past and present. A corporate farmstead with integrity of association should reflect the historic persons (e.g., owners, architects or workers), historic land use, and historic events that shaped the property as a corporate farmstead. An intact building cluster, circulation network, fencing and small-scale elements contribute to the property’s integrity of association.</i>

c. Listed and Potentially Significant Historic Resources

Corporate farmsteads with sufficient historic integrity are rare. Several Spreckels Corporate Farmsteads have been identified near the Salinas/Spreckels area and scattered up and down the Salinas Valley (see below). Since the company leased land up and down the Salinas Valley for purposes of growing sugar beets, examples may be located during future surveys.



Spreckels farmstead at 93 Abbott Road (PAST photo).

To date, Corporate Farmsteads with sufficient historic integrity have not been located on the Salinas Land Company/COCO land. Detailed surveys, coordinated with historic research specific to this company should be undertaken to locate potential sites.

E. Theme 4: Agricultural Colonies (ca. 1890s-1910s)

1. Introduction

Extant resources from two of the two agricultural colonies, Clark Colony and Fort Romie, are covered under this theme.

Agricultural colonies transformed the landscape by taking arid dry land, used primarily for growing grains, into a fertile crop-producing region with the investment of large quantities of capital and the available irrigation technology that emerged in the late 19th and 20th centuries. The intention of the colony founders, the Salvation Army in Fort Romie's case, was to provide the opportunity for impoverished workers to leave the cities and create a new life as farmers. Often the colony residents grew crops for the major corporations, particularly sugar beets for the Spreckels Sugar Company. The colonies located near a transportation corridor for transporting goods to the marketplace, developed a road network linking farmsteads to the transportation corridor and created a logical layout of farmsteads, barns and support buildings within the colony's boundaries.

Today, extant resources from the two colonies, Clark Colony and Fort Romie, are concentrated in two areas. The town of Greenfield became what was Clark Colony, which clustered small vernacular bungalows into groups. Each family had access to their own land behind their homes, on which the required outbuildings were placed. To date, no sites containing the original layout of these clusters and associated outbuildings have been located in Greenfield to qualify them as *Associated Property Type: Colony Farmstead*. While individual examples of the simple bungalows exist, development appears to have removed the historic buildings needed to communicate integrity as a colony farmstead in the Greenfield area. Individual houses constructed for Clark Colony are classified under *Theme 6: Community Development, Associated Property Type: Residence, Sub-type: Town Residence*.

On the Fort Romie land, scattered examples of farmsteads with the colony house and one or more outbuildings remain. These sites can be categorized as the *Associated Property Type: Colony Farmstead*. The individual bungalows that were once the primary residence for a colony farmstead, but have had their outbuildings and small-scale elements removed, would be classified under *Theme 6: Community Development, Associated Property Type: Residence, Sub-type: Farmstead Residence*.

2. Agricultural Colonies and Extant Resources


a. Clark Colony/Greenfield

The extant historic resources located in the town of Greenfield include the commercial buildings, the Greenfield Grange (covered under *Theme 6: Community Development*), and numerous simple bungalows with minimal Arts & Crafts detailing. Farmsteads communicating sufficient historic integrity have not been located to date. Individual houses, as shown to the right, would be classified as *Town Residences* under *Theme 6: Community Development*.



b. Fort Romie Colony

The Fort Romie Colony land is a triangular wedge roughly bounded by the intersection of Fort Romie and Foothill roads to the north, Paraiso Springs Road to the south, Fort Romie Road to the east, and Foothill Road to the west. Original farmsteads constructed for the colony remain within this area. These farmsteads contain a small, hipped-roof bungalow, animal barns, several outbuildings and small-scale elements reflecting the farmer's use of the property. An example appears below and would be classified under this theme as property type *Colony Farmstead*.



3. Associated Property Type: Colony Farmstead

a. Property Type Description



Colony Farmstead: Mile End Road, Fort Romie

Physical Characteristics: Primary feature is a farmstead residence, typically a hipped-roof vernacular bungalow with minimal architectural detail. A cluster of a barn(s), several outbuildings, fencing and small-scale elements appear behind the main residence. To qualify as a *Colony Farmstead* at least one or more outbuildings reflecting the property’s use (e.g., animal or equipment barns) and other small-scale elements should be extant on the property.

Associative Characteristics: Colony farmsteads are associated with the agricultural colony responsible for their construction. They also may be associated with a particular use, such as the farmsteads that grew sugar beets for the Spreckels Sugar Company. However, Fort Romie farmers relied on a variety of agricultural operations for subsistence, including raising animals (e.g., pigs and chickens) as well as crops.

Geographical Information: Colony farmsteads are located within the boundaries of the agricultural colony lands. In Monterey County this would be the Greenfield area and Fort Romie lands. To date, Colony Farmsteads have not been located with sufficient historic integrity around Greenfield.

Boundaries: Boundary demarcations include roads, driveways, fences, gates, posts and trees along the property lines. Rugged and hilly landscapes also provide natural boundaries.

Variations: Variations include outbuildings for various agricultural uses, such as horse barns, chicken coops, equipment barns, and worker’s housing. Houses may have more Arts & Crafts architectural details that vary from the more common hipped-roof variety.

Locational Patterns: Presently, extant examples of Colony Farmsteads have been located only within the Fort Romie boundaries. However, reconnaissance survey of the Greenfield area should be undertaken to verify the existence of farmsteads related to Clark Colony.

Condition: Colony farmsteads are rapidly disappearing due to the encroachment of industrial agriculture. The extant examples found around Fort Romie are in poor condition. To date, colony farmsteads for the Clark Colony have not been found with sufficient historic integrity.

b. Eligibility Criteria and Integrity Thresholds

Colony farmsteads may be historically significant for their association with a particular agricultural colony (e.g., Fort Romie) that developed the landscape. (criteria NR-A, CR-1, MCR-A1, A2, A4, A6, C1 & C2).

Colony farmsteads may also be historically significant for their association with an individual significant in the history of Monterey County (criteria NR-B, CR-2, MCR-A3).

Colony farmsteads may be historically significant as an example of a distinctive architectural type, period or method of construction (criteria NR-C, CR-3, MCR-A5, B1, B2 & B3).

To qualify for the above criteria, the colony farmstead must possess historic integrity, in the form of the primary residence, barns, outbuildings, fencing and small-scale elements, as well as the character-defining features of the extant buildings on the landscape. The following chart provides guidelines for evaluating integrity.

Location	<i>Location is the place where the significant activities that shaped a property took place, often determined by geographical factors.</i> Colony farmsteads are located in the Salinas Valley, because of the proximity to the Salinas River for irrigation. Colony farmsteads whose characteristics retain their historic location have integrity of location.
Setting	<i>Setting is the physical environment within and surrounding a property, including large-scale features (e.g., woodlands or rock formations) and small-scale features (e.g., fences, gateposts, springs or individual trees).</i> Colony farmsteads with integrity of setting retain the main house and building cluster surrounded by planted fields. Roads or paths lead from the main transportation route to the various outbuildings and to the crop fields. The building cluster, fencing and other small-scale features should be as intact as possible.
Design	<i>Design is the composition of natural and cultural elements comprising the form, plan, and spatial organization of a property. Elements include buildings, structures, boundary demarcations, circulation networks, windbreaks, vegetation and topography.</i> The cluster’s spatial organization should be intact and communicate the property’s historic use. At a minimum, the cluster should contain the primary residence, barn(s), one or more outbuildings for crops and equipment, and small-scale elements that contribute to its overall design. Retention of the main house’s architectural style is primary to communicating historic significance. Each house should be examined to determine the presence of historic character-defining features. Changes to the house may be historic if they date to the property’s period of significance and do not remove the character-defining features.

Materials	<i>Materials include construction materials of buildings, outbuildings, roadways, fences, and other structures. For rural historic landscapes, vegetation similar to historic species in scale, type and visual effect will generally convey historic integrity. Construction materials of the main house will relate to its vernacular style and will likely be of wood with minimal detailing. Outbuildings for the cluster are typically of wood with replacement materials such as corrugated metal siding or roofing. Repairs to buildings over time with materials that communicate the farmstead’s historic use, such as corrugated roofing or replaced barbed-wire fencing, will retain integrity of materials if they are constructed within the period of significance and reflect the evolving nature of the historic farmstead.</i>
Workmanship	<i>Workmanship is exhibited in the ways people have fashioned their environment for functional and decorative purposes, including how they constructed buildings, fences and small-scale elements. For rural historic landscapes, workmanship in raising crops contributes to integrity if it reflects traditional or historic practices. Historic construction techniques may illustrate the workmanship of particular farmer who created the various outbuildings with little or no prior knowledge. Workmanship of colony farmsteads leans toward the vernacular. Colony farmsteads with integrity of workmanship exhibit the traditional or historic practices in use during the property’s period of significance.</i>
Feeling	<i>Feeling is intangible but is evoked by the presence of physical characteristics that reflect the historic scene. The cumulative effect of setting, design, materials and workmanship creates the sense of past time and place. The property’s rural setting, vernacular design, materials and workmanship should reflect the site’s historic use as a corporate farmstead. Alterations to buildings or to small-scale elements should date to the farmstead’s period of significance.</i>
Association	<i>Association is the direct link between a property and the important events or persons that shaped it. Continued use and occupation help maintain integrity of association if traditional practices are carried on. Using traditional methods in new construction reinforces a property’s integrity by linking past and present. A colony farmstead with integrity of association should reflect the historic persons (e.g., owners or workers), historic land use, and historic events that shaped the property as a corporate farmstead. An intact building cluster, circulation network, fencing and small-scale elements contribute to the property’s integrity of association.</i>

c. Listed and Potentially Significant Historic Resources

Colony farmsteads with sufficient historic integrity are rare and are scattered within the original boundaries of the Fort Romie land.



Fort Romie Road farmstead with integrity of setting (PAST photo).

To date, Colony Farmsteads with sufficient historic integrity have not been located on the Clark Colony land. Detailed surveys, coordinated with historic research specific to this company should be undertaken to locate potential sites.

F. Theme 5: Processing and Distribution (ca. 1860-1960)

1. Introduction

In Monterey County, the theme of *Processing and Distribution* is associated with a wide variety of technology, from low-technology hand-harvesting to higher technology cold storage facilities and advanced strawberry breeding techniques; transportation via water, railroads and trucks; and agricultural workers from many countries and cultures, including the Chinese, Japanese, Croatians, Filipinos and Mexicans.

Property types include *Locational Processing Facilities*, which the Monterey County Code (MCC) classifies as *agricultural support services*, and *Commercial Processing Facilities*, which the MCC classifies as *agricultural processing facilities*.

Locational processing facilities include a single building or grouping of buildings built to process an agricultural product where it was farmed. These facilities may include packing sheds, apple dryers and berry processing centers. Facilities date to the primary period during which the farm product was produced.

Commercial processing facilities include a single building or grouping of buildings constructed for processing a farm product off-site from where it was grown. In most cases, these facilities are owned by a different entity than the farm that produced the crop. These buildings include apple packing, berry processing and cold storage facilities. Dates of extant commercial processing facilities generally fall within the 1900s.

The next sections include comprehensive descriptions of the Locational Processing Facility and Commercial Processing Facility property types and discussions of specific Monterey County properties that may be potentially significant historic resources illustrating the Processing and Distribution theme.

2. Associated Property Type: Locational Processing Facility

a. Property Type Description



Strawberry Hills Forever: 231 Jensen Road, Springfield District.

Physical Characteristics: A single building or group of long buildings, at times attached, with gable roofs oriented perpendicular to the road or site. The buildings are simple in design with little or no ornamentation. Large, double doors appear in the gable ends. For larger sites, as shown above, the buildings orient around a central courtyard for truck loading. In early examples, the gable ends aligned along rail lines for easy loading onto railroad freight cars. The buildings tend to be wood-framed with vertical board (generally dating before 1900), corrugated iron or metal siding (generally dating after 1900). Concrete-framed buildings are more common after World War I.

Associative Characteristics: Locational processing facilities are associated with processing a particular crop, such as apples or strawberries, and may be located on an intensive farmstead.

Geographical Information: The facility is located near transportation lines, either rail or roadway, with appropriate loading docks facing the railroad or road. They are found on flat level sites that accommodate the great length of the building.

Boundaries: These facilities are located within the property boundary, as close to the transportation link as possible.

Variations: Variations include buildings for processing a specific product. Construction materials may also vary, depending on the construction date. Packing facilities from the apple-production era are generally timber-framed structures with exterior wood siding and shake or corrugated roofs. After the 1900s, buildings tended to be more standardized, with balloon frames, wood trusses supporting the roofs, and exterior cladding of corrugated iron or steel. Examples dating later in the period of significance may have concrete frames and/or concrete block walls.

Locational Patterns: Apple dryers and packing facilities were quite numerous in the Pajaro Valley in the 1870s - 1900s. Residential development and industrial agriculture have removed most of these buildings. Several examples of post-1900 packing facilities are found in Pajaro and in the Springfield District. No extant apple dryers have been located definitively for this report. Locational processing facilities in the form of cheese production buildings are common on dairies in the Salinas Valley, along River Road, Foletta Road and the dairies around Salinas.

Condition: Many of these facilities appear to be closed and abandoned. The structures generally suffer from lack of use, neglect and vandalism.

b. Eligibility Criteria and Integrity Thresholds

Locational processing facilities may be historically significant for their association with processing a particular intensive crop (criteria NR-A, CR-1, MCR-A1, A2, A4, C1 & C2) and should retain the length, massing, roof design and siding that convey their historic significance. If buildings are attached or oriented in groups around a central loading area, the overall spacing and design of the site should be intact.

Locational processing facilities may be historically significant for their association with an individual significant in the history of Monterey County (criteria NR-B, CR-2, MCR-A3) and should retain the physical characteristics described in the above paragraph.

Locational processing facilities may be historically significant as an example of a distinctive architectural type, period or method of construction (criteria NR-C, CR-3, MCR-B1, B2 & B3).

To qualify for the above criteria, the locational processing facility must possess historic integrity. For locational processing facilities, the physical characteristics of the resource are represented by the character-defining features of the extant buildings on the landscape. The following chart provides guidelines for evaluating integrity.


Location	<i>Location is the place where the significant activities that shaped a property took place, often determined by geographical factors.</i> Locational processing facilities are located on intensive farmsteads near transportation lines, either rail or roadway, with appropriate loading docks facing the railroad or road. They are found on flat level sites that accommodate the great length of the building. Locational processing facilities whose characteristics retain their historic location have integrity of location.
Setting	<i>Setting is the physical environment within and surrounding a property, including large-scale features (e.g., woodlands, rock formations) and small-scale features (e.g., fences, gateposts, springs, individual trees).</i> Since these buildings are located on intensive farmsteads, the farmstead’s setting is the primary setting for this property type. The facility generally occupies a flat, level site to accommodate the great length of the building(s) and is located as close to the transportation link as possible.
Design	<i>Design is the composition of natural and cultural elements comprising the form, plan, and spatial organization of a property. Elements include buildings, structures, boundary demarcations, circulation networks, windbreaks, vegetation and topography.</i> Design tends to be simple or industrial in nature, with little ornamentation. Evidence of loading docks or courtyards for trucks also communicates overall design. Changes may be historic if they date to the property’s period of significance.

Materials	<i>Materials include construction materials of buildings, outbuildings, roadways, fences, and other structures. Vegetation similar to historic species in scale, type and visual effect will generally convey integrity of setting. Facilities built before 1900 are generally timber-framed structures with exterior wood siding and shake or corrugated roofs. After the 1900s, buildings tended to be more standardized, with balloon frames, wood trusses supporting the roofs, and exterior cladding of corrugated iron or steel. Examples dating later in the period of significance may have concrete frames and/or concrete block walls.</i>
Workmanship	<i>Workmanship is exhibited in the ways people have fashioned their environment for functional and decorative purposes, including how they constructed buildings, fences and small-scale elements. For rural historic landscapes, workmanship in raising crops contributes to integrity if it reflects traditional or historic practices. Integrity of workmanship is less critical for this property type, as the building form and materials became standardized in the twentieth century. Earlier timber-framed buildings may reflect cultural construction practices and should be examined for unique methods of construction.</i>
Feeling	<i>Feeling is intangible but is evoked by the presence of physical characteristics that reflect the historic scene. The cumulative effect of setting, design, materials and workmanship creates the sense of past time and place. The property’s rural setting, industrial design, and industrial construction materials should reflect the site’s historic use. Alterations to buildings should date to the facility’s period of significance and not remove the historic industrial character-defining features.</i>
Association	<i>Association is the direct link between a property and the important events or persons that shaped it. Continued use and occupation help maintain integrity of association if traditional practices are carried on. Using traditional methods in new construction reinforces a property’s integrity by linking past and present. A locational processing facility with integrity of association should reflect the historic persons (e.g., owners, architects, workers), historic land use, and historic events that shaped the property.</i>

c. Listed and Potentially Significant Historic Resources

Snyder Ranch, 1875 San Juan Road, Aromas: John W. Snyder bought forty-three acres at 1875 San Juan Road in 1871 and cultivated apricots. Architect William H. Weeks designed a house for John and his wife Harriet at the foot of Hunter’s Hill. They built a smaller house nearby for parents Adam and Louisa Snyder in 1883. A 2007 aerial view shows a house and large packing shed, hidden from San Juan Road by trees (visible in center of right image) . In 1890, John and his sons Elmer and John E., bought 254.9 acres on Carpenteria Road in Aromas (in the San Benito County part of town) in the Bardue Tract, the first land division of Rancho Las Aromitas y Las Aguas Calientes. Chinese laborers cleared the Carpenteria Road parcel, shipped the oak firewood from the Southern Pacific Railroad’s Aromas station (formerly known as “Sandcut”) to San Francisco, and planted the first apricot orchard in Aromas. Farmers provided campgrounds, wood and water for the San Joaquin Valley laborers who worked in Aromas apricot orchards during the summer.⁷⁹² The packing shed shown below is an example of a locational processing facility.

Although the Snyder Ranch is potentially significant as an intensive farmstead in support of the theme of intensive agriculture (criteria NR-A, CR-1, MCR-A1, A2, A4, A6, C1 & C2) and/or its association with the Snyder family (criteria NR-B, CR-2, MCR-A3), the locational processing facility at the site may be eligible as a stand-alone building for its association with processing and distribution of agricultural products (criteria NR-A, CR-1, MCR-A1, A2, A4, C1 & C2). The building is also potentially significant because it may embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction (criteria NR-C, CR-3, MCR-B1, B2 & B3).



⁷⁹² Alzora Snyder, “Snyder Family in Aromas,” April 15, 1984. Pajaro Valley Historical Association files: Snyder. Clovis, *Monterey County’s North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 95, 101.

Strawberry Hills Forever, 231 Jensen Road, Springfield District: This locational processing facility is potentially eligible as a stand-alone building for its association with processing and distribution of agricultural products (criteria NR-A, CR-1, MCR-A1, A2, A4, C1 & C2). The building is also potentially significant because it may embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction (criteria NR-C, CR-3, MCR-B1, B2 & B3).



Views of 231 Jensen Road (PAST photos).

Locational processing facilities include buildings utilized for butter and cheese production. These structures can be found within the cluster of the extant dairies in the Salinas Valley and along the Highway 101 corridor. An example appears below.



Locational cheese processing facility on River Road near the intersection of Chualar River Road (PAST photo).

3. Associated Property Type: Commercial Processing Facility

a. Property Type Description



Former Smucker's Processing Facility: 423 Salinas Road, Pajaro.

Physical Characteristics: A large single building or grouping of buildings industrial in design. Buildings of this type typically date from the 1900s and may display architectural detailing in vogue at the time of construction, like the Streamline Moderne building, above. The buildings typically are concrete framed, with wood sash or steel industrial sash windows, flat-roofed, or circular-roofed supported by wood or steel trusses.

Associative Characteristics: Commercial processing facilities may be associated with processing a particular farm product, such as berries, or may process a variety of farm products, as in a cold storage facility. They are associated with the development and processing of intensive crops in Monterey County.

Geographical Information: Commercial processing facilities are located near rail lines and major roads for easy loading and distribution of the processed crop to the marketplace. They require long, flat sites on large parcels.

Boundaries: These facilities are located on land owned or leased by the processing company. Boundaries are the parcel's property line.

Variations: Variations include the method of construction, potentially reinforced concrete, steel frame or concrete block; an architectural style popular during the facility's time of construction (*e.g.*, Art Deco or Streamline Moderne); fenestration patterns related to the facility's use; and wood-frame or steel industrial-sash windows.

Locational Patterns: Commercial processing facilities are generally located in an agricultural region's primary distribution centers. For the North County, this includes Pajaro, Pajaro Junction and Castroville. Presently, few commercial processing facilities exist in the North County, with the exception of several in Castroville and Pajaro. Commercial processing facilities are located along transportation corridors throughout the Salinas Valley, particularly along the Southern Pacific Railroad.

Condition: These facilities are in fair to good condition when they continue to be operated as processing facilities today.

b. Eligibility Criteria and Integrity Thresholds

Commercial processing facilities may be historically significant for their association with processing a particular intensive crop (criteria NR-A, CR-1, MCR-A1, A2, A4, C1 & C2) and should retain the length, massing, roof design and siding that convey their historic significance. If buildings are attached or oriented in groups around a central loading area, the overall spacing and design of the site should be intact.

Commercial processing facilities may be historically significant for their association with an individual or commercial entity significant in the history of Monterey County (criteria NR-B, CR-2, MCR-A3) and should retain the physical characteristics described in the above paragraph.

Commercial processing facilities may be historically significant as an example of a distinctive architectural type, period or method of construction (criteria NR-C, CR-3, MCR-B1, B2 & B3).

To qualify for the above criteria, the commercial processing facility must possess historic integrity. For commercial processing facilities, the physical characteristics of the resource are represented by the character-defining features of the extant buildings on the landscape. The following chart provides guidelines for evaluating integrity.


Location	<i>Location is the place where the significant activities that shaped a property took place, often determined by geographical factors.</i> Commercial processing facilities are located on land owned or leased by the processing company in small towns near truck or railroad transportation links.
Setting	<i>Setting is the physical environment within and surrounding a property, including large-scale features (e.g., woodlands, rock formations) and small-scale features (e.g., fences, gateposts, springs, individual trees).</i> Commercial processing facilities occupy a flat, level site to accommodate the great length of the building(s) and are as close to the transportation link as possible, typically in the industrial area of a town.
Design	<i>Design is the composition of natural and cultural elements comprising the form, plan, and spatial organization of a property. Elements include buildings, structures, boundary demarcations, circulation networks, windbreaks, vegetation and topography.</i> Design is industrial in nature, with minimal stylistic ornamentation, such as Art Deco or Streamline Moderne. Evidence of loading docks communicates overall design and the building’s historic use. Changes may be historic if they date to the property’s period of significance and do not mar the building’s historic design.

Materials	<i>Materials include construction materials of buildings, outbuildings, roadways, fences, and other structures. Vegetation similar to historic species in scale, type and visual effect will generally convey integrity of setting. As most extant examples date to after 1900, materials are concrete or concrete block, with standardized wood trusses and wood or steel industrial sash windows. Alterations to building materials should not remove historic character-defining features and should date within the period of significance.</i>
Workmanship	<i>Workmanship is exhibited in the ways people have fashioned their environment for functional and decorative purposes, including how they constructed buildings, fences and small-scale elements. For rural historic landscapes, workmanship in raising crops contributes to integrity if it reflects traditional or historic practices. Integrity of workmanship is less critical for this property type, as the building form and materials became standardized in the twentieth century.</i>
Feeling	<i>Feeling is intangible but is evoked by the presence of physical characteristics that reflect the historic scene. The cumulative effect of setting, design, materials and workmanship creates the sense of past time and place. The property’s town setting, industrial design, and industrial construction materials should reflect the site’s historic use. Alterations to buildings should date to the facility’s period of significance and not remove the historic industrial character-defining features.</i>
Association	<i>Association is the direct link between a property and the important events or persons that shaped it. Continued use and occupation help maintain integrity of association if traditional practices are carried on. Using traditional methods in new construction reinforces a property’s integrity by linking past and present. A commercial processing facility with integrity of association should reflect the historic persons (e.g., owners, architects, workers), historic land use, and historic events that shaped the property.</i>

c. Listed and Potentially Significant Historic Resources

Commercial Processing Facility at 13503 Blackie Rd., Castroville. This commercial processing facility is located adjacent to the railroad tracks in Castroville’s industrial area. Immediate access to the railroad facilitated fast, efficient shipping to distant markets as soon as the product was ready for distribution.


This commercial processing facility is potentially significant for its association with processing and distribution of intensive agricultural products (criteria NR-A, CR-1, MCR-A1, A2, A4, C1 & C2). In addition, the building is potentially significant because it may embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction (criteria NR-C, CR-3, MCR-B1, B2 & B3).



SunRidge Farms, 423 Salinas Road, Pajaro (former Smucker’s plant): This former Smucker’s plant is located in the commercial and industrial center of Pajaro, near the railroad tracks. This commercial processing facility is potentially significant for its association with processing and distribution of intensive agricultural products criteria NR-A, CR-1, MCR-A1, A2, A4, C1 & C2). It may also embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction (criteria NR-C, CR-3, MCR-B1, B2 & B3).



Central Cold Storage, 13526 Blackie Road, Castroville: The frozen food industry started around World War II and employed many Monterey County agricultural workers. By the early 1950s, the Pajaro Valley was the “frozen food center of the West,” with thirteen plants processing fruits and vegetables. Five plants operated year-round and the other plants operated seasonally, processing apples, berries and artichokes.⁷⁹³



Central Cold Storage, 13526 Blackie Road, Castroville.
(PAST photo)

These commercial processing facilities may be eligible for their association with processing and distribution of agricultural products (criteria NR-A, CR-1, MCR-A1, A2, A4, C1 & C2). In addition, the building is potentially significant because it may embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction (criteria NR-C, CR-3, MCR-B1, B2 & B3).

Giant Artichoke Restaurant, 11261 Merritt Street, Castroville: Commercial processing facilities include retail operations, such as the Giant Artichoke Restaurant, located in Castroville. This commercial processing facility may be eligible for its association with processing and distribution of agricultural products (criteria NR-A, CR-1, MCR-A1, A2, A4, C1 & C2). It is also potentially significant because it may embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction (criteria NR-C, CR-3, MCR-B1, B2 & B3).



Giant Artichoke Restaurant and Produce Stand, 11261 Merritt Street, Castroville (PAST photos).

⁷⁹³ The plants included Artichokes, Inc., Baker Food Products, California Berry Freezers, Inc., California Freezing & Cold Storage Co., Fresh Frozen Foods Corp., George F. Martin & Co., Monterey Bay Berry Growers cooperative, Frank S. Oliver & Son, N.S. Papac & Son, A. L. Ruso, Inc., Joe Valentine and Sons and Watsonville Canning Co.

Commercial processing facilities occur along the Southern Pacific Corridor in the Salinas Valley. In this region, the railroad developed stops in towns roughly ten miles apart: Chualar, Gonzales, Soledad, Greenfield, King City and San Lucas. Farmsteads developed in a five- to ten-mile radius around the towns and the towns became the hub of commercial activity, centered around the primary transportation route: the railroad.

Various corporations developed systems of grain and crop storage that utilized the same commercial processing facility type (*e.g.*, a warehouse building) set along the railroad at strategic stops, typically within the towns. These storage facilities became the hub by which farmers within the town's radius delivered their produce and farm products. An example would be the O.P. Silliman Warehouse Company, which developed warehouses for the storage of grain set in the town hubs along the Southern Pacific Railroad line in Salinas Valley. Examples of these warehouses appear below.



O.P. Silliman warehouses. Left: Chualar; Right: King City (PAST photos).

G. Theme 6: Community Development (ca. 1850 – 1960)

1. Introduction

In Monterey County, the theme of *Community Development* is associated with the neighborhoods, towns and cities that developed or expanded because of the agricultural industry; with the agricultural community's involvement in agriculture-related political, civic and cultural matters; and with workers from many countries and cultures. Housing units comprise many of the historic resources associated with this theme. The company town of Spreckels is a prime example. Agricultural laborers, farmers and business owners occupied a range of housing including flimsy, substandard structures with dirt floors; bunkhouses; vernacular residences; and architect-designed mansions featured in newspapers and listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Labor camps, boardinghouses and neighborhood enclaves like the Chinatowns and Japantowns in Pajaro and Castroville provided housing for ethnic groups that worked in local agriculture. Housing experiments, like the subdivision of Federal Housing Administration homes built on John Porter's Las Lomas ranch in the late 1930s, integrated agriculture into a housing development. Prominent California architect William H. Weeks designed several notable Pajaro Valley homes, including those of John T. Porter and James and Ida Rowe. This theme also includes community infrastructure buildings that brought utilities like power and water to agricultural operations. Buildings that hosted community gatherings, like grange halls and community meeting houses, are also included in the Community Development theme.

Associated property types are *Residences (Sub-types Farmstead and Town Residence, Worker Housing, Labor Camps, Grange Halls, Community Meeting Houses, and Rural Electrification Buildings)*.

The *Residence* property type includes grand homes built for leading families who shaped Monterey County agriculture, such as the Porter-Vallejo Mansion in Pajaro. It also includes houses built on intensive, corporate and colony farmsteads in cases where new construction or industrial agriculture has removed most of the historic cluster, farm outbuildings and boundaries, except the house. In this case, the residence is identified as *Sub-type: Farmstead Residence*. Residences located in towns, including the towns of Spreckels and Greenfield are identified as *Sub-type: Town Residence*.

The *Worker Housing* property type includes homes for agricultural laborers that are not located on a farmstead or are located on a farmstead that has lost its integrity as a rural historic landscape. The Community Development theme differentiates *Farmstead Residences* from *Worker Housing* because the latter were constructed for laborers who had no ownership rights within the agricultural operation and were hired to work the land.

The *Labor Camp* property type includes small vernacular homes grouped together to house farm laborers efficiently. They were located throughout Monterey County, but historic examples are

rare because many were constructed of cheap, impermanent materials. The labor camp at 56490 Cattlemen Road in San Lucas is one of the best remaining labor camps in the county.

The *Grange Hall* property type is geographically-based and associated with a particular town or community. They tend to be vernacular in design with a minimal degree of architectural detailing reflecting popular styles in the building's era of construction.

The *Cultural Meeting House* property type is associated with a particular ethnic community that influenced Monterey County agriculture. They tend to be vernacular in design with a minimal degree of architectural detailing reflecting either a popular architectural style from the building's era of construction, or a style or construction method common to the ethnic group's homeland.

The *Rural Electrification Building* property type includes the structures constructed by the Coast Valleys Gas & Electric Company (later Pacific Gas and Electric Company), placed in each town along the primary transportation corridor for purposes of providing electricity for irrigation and town development. These buildings were constructed in one of two prototypes; examples are presented in this section.

The next sections include comprehensive descriptions of the Residence, Worker Housing, Labor Camp, Grange Hall, Cultural Meeting House and Rural Electrification Building property types and discussions of specific properties that may be potentially significant historic resources illustrating the Community Development theme.

2. Associated Property Type: Residence

a. Property Type Description



Farm Residences: Left: Sub-type *Farmstead Residence*, 1372 San Juan Road.
Right: Sub-type *Town Residence*, Spreckels Avenue, Spreckels.

Physical Characteristics: An individual house on a town parcel (Sub-type: Town Residence), or a house on a farmstead parcel that once included an extensive, intensive, corporate, or colony farmstead (Sub-type: Farmstead Residence). Residences appear in almost every architectural style popular from 1850 to 1960, including Greek Revival (above-left) and Mid-century (above-right).

Associative Characteristics: Residences are associated with their particular use. In some cases, they were the primary residences of farmers of extensive or intensive agriculture crops. They may be associated with key individuals or companies who shaped Monterey County’s landscape, such as the Spreckels Sugar Company, or they may represent evidence of a planned agricultural colonies, as in Greenfield and Fort Romie.

Geographical Information: This property type may be found anywhere. It concentrates in the County’s towns and communities, in flat lands and valleys where extensive or intensive farmsteads dominate, as well in the small agricultural colonies that housed agricultural families.

Boundaries: Boundaries historically included the parcel on which the house is located. Roadways or railroad transportation links also form boundaries, as does natural topography.

Variations: Variations include the architectural style and construction materials of the house, which include vernacular Greek Revival, Italianate and Queen Anne Victorian styles; Craftsman, Spanish- and Pueblo-revival styles; and simple vernacular, hipped-roof bungalows found in the agricultural colonies. FHA houses, early tract ranch, and post-and-beam styles are examples of styles dating to the 1930s–1950s.

Locational Patterns: Residences may be found anywhere in Monterey County, but concentrate in areas of extensive or intensive agriculture and the development of small agricultural communities. They are common in and around the major towns and communities, and along other primary roadways.

Condition: Condition of these residences varies from poor to good, depending on the occupancy of the residence. Abandoned examples have also been located, particularly on the hillside roads north of the Los Lomas community and at abandoned farmsteads along the County’s primary roads. Many of these houses now house industrial agricultural laborers.

b. Eligibility Criteria and Integrity Thresholds

Residences may be historically significant for their association with a particular method of agricultural development, such as extensive, intensive, corporate, or colony agriculture (criteria NR-A, CR-1, MCR-A1, A2, A4, C1 & C2) and should retain the building’s size, massing, design, materials and architectural detail to convey its historic significance.

Residences may be historically significant for their association with an individual significant in the history of Monterey County (criteria NR-B, CR-2, MCR-A3) and should retain the physical characteristics described in the above paragraph.

Residences may be historically significant as an example of an architect-designed residence or of a distinctive architectural type, period or method of construction (criteria NR-C, CR-3, MCR-B1, B2 & B3).

To qualify for the above criteria, the residence must possess historic integrity, as reflected in the physical character-defining features of the building. The following chart provides guidelines for evaluating integrity.


Location	<i>Location is the place where the significant activities that shaped a property took place, often determined by geographical factors. Ideally, residences should retain their historic location. However, this property type includes main houses of extensive, intensive, corporate, or colony farmsteads whose cluster, outbuildings, property boundary demarcations (e.g., fencing), and small-scale elements have been removed leaving only the main house.</i>
Setting	<i>Setting is the physical environment within and surrounding a property, including large-scale features (e.g., woodlands, rock formations) and small-scale features (e.g., fences, gateposts, springs, individual trees). Integrity of setting is a difficult issue for farmstead residences that fall into this property type because their original farmstead cluster has been lost. Generally, besides the residence’s location on the original farmstead, much of the historic setting has been compromised. Town residences that retain their original town setting have integrity of setting.</i>
Design	<i>Design is the composition of natural and cultural elements comprising the form, plan, and spatial organization of a property. Elements include buildings, structures, boundary demarcations, circulation networks, windbreaks, vegetation and topography. Design is of primary importance for this property type. Residences exist in every major architectural style dating from 1850 to 1960, ranging from Greek Revival and Victorian styles, Craftsman and revivalist styles of the early 20th century and mid-century styles dating into the 1950s. The historic character-defining features of the residence’s style should be determined. Additions, alterations or other changes to the building that remove the identifiable style would also strip the residence of integrity.</i>

Materials	<i>Materials include construction materials of buildings, outbuildings, roadways, fences, and other structures. Vegetation similar to historic species in scale, type and visual effect will generally convey integrity of setting. Integrity of materials is also of primary importance, as materials are a primary character-defining feature contributing to a residence’s architectural style. A residence having most of its historic materials; or materials added within the period of significance (that do not remove historic features) would have integrity of materials.</i>
Workmanship	<i>Workmanship is exhibited in the ways people have fashioned their environment for functional and decorative purposes, including how they constructed buildings, fences and small-scale elements. Historic construction techniques may illustrate the workmanship of particular corporations, ethnic groups or vernacular traditions, particularly for corporate and colony residences. Residences with integrity of workmanship exhibit the traditional or historic practices in use during the property’s period of significance.</i>
Feeling	<i>Feeling is intangible but is evoked by the presence of physical characteristics that reflect the historic scene. The cumulative effect of setting, design, materials and workmanship creates the sense of past time and place. The property’s rural or small town setting, design, materials and workmanship should reflect the site’s historic use.</i>
Association	<i>Association is the direct link between a property and the important events or persons that shaped it. Continued use and occupation help maintain integrity of association if traditional practices are carried on. Using traditional methods in new construction reinforces a property’s integrity by linking past and present. A residence with integrity of association should reflect the historic persons (e.g., owners, architects, workers), historic land use, and historic events that shaped the property.</i>

c. Listed and Potentially Significant Historic Resources

Porter-Vallejo Mansion, 29 Bishop Street, Pajaro: This property is one of two North County resources listed in the National Register. In 1864, the Vallejo family sold to John T. Porter 820 acres of the San Cayetano Rancho, just south of the Pajaro River.⁷⁹⁴ The property included a six-room house that Juan Antonio Vallejo had built for his fiancée, but he was killed in a bull-lassoing accident before the couple married. In 1871, the Porters moved the house away from the flood-prone Pajaro River to its present location at 29 Bishop Street in Pajaro.⁷⁹⁵ In 1874, the Porters finally paid off the property and remodeled the house in the Gothic Revival style.⁷⁹⁶ Between 1895-1899, prominent architect William H. Weeks made significant additions, converting the modest house into a Queen Anne-style mansion, the first local home with electricity. Its twenty-three rooms included a library, billiards room, china room and dining room. The grounds included gardens, a tennis court and a dancing pavilion.⁷⁹⁷ The integrity of the property's historic setting has been lost and so the property falls into the Housing theme as a Stand-Alone Farm Residence.

This building is historically significant for its association with the Porter family, farmers and business owners who influenced North County agriculture and housed the former Watsonville and Pajaro Chinatowns on Porter property (criteria NR-B, CR-2, MCR-A3).⁷⁹⁸ In addition, this William Weeks-designed residence is historically significant as an example of a distinctive architectural type, period or method of construction (criteria NR-C, CR-3, MCR-B1, B2 & B3).



Left: 1880s lithograph of the Porter-Vallejo Mansion at 29 Bishop Street, Pajaro. (Courtesy of the Pajaro Valley Historical Association.) Right: a current photograph of the mansion (PAST photo).

⁷⁹⁴ Swift, "Unveiling the Porter Family Legacy."

⁷⁹⁵ Clovis, *Monterey County's North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 72.

⁷⁹⁶ Clovis, *Monterey County's North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 72-73.

⁷⁹⁷ Clovis, *Monterey County's North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 74.

⁷⁹⁸ "Porter-Vallejo Mansion," Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, 2010, <http://nrhp.focus.nps.gov/natregsearchresult.do?fullresult=true&recordid=43> (accessed 13 April 2010.) "National Register of Historic Places:

1372 San Juan Road, Pajaro: The Greek Revival house at 1372 San Juan Road is listed in the Monterey County Register. Industrial agriculture has altered or completely removed the landscape characteristics that would qualify this property as an intensive farmstead or rural historic landscape. Encroachment by new buildings, materials and equipment has removed virtually all of the farmstead’s historic features, leaving only the original house and one outbuilding. Therefore, this site is classified as a *Farmstead Residence*.



At 1372 San Juan Road, the Greek Revival house and tank house are the only historic buildings on the property (PAST photo).

John T. Porter Company’s FHA “Miniature Farm” Subdivision, Hall Road, Las Lomas:

In 1938, the John T. Porter Company subdivided a portion of its property in the Hall District, now part of Las Lomas, just east of Hudson’s Landing. It fronted Elkhorn Road and straddled both sides of Hall Road.⁷⁹⁹ The Porter Company subdivided 21.5 acres into one-acre lots so buyers could create small farms to supplement their seasonal agricultural income. The unusual experimental subdivision was reportedly the first regional attempt to create a rural, self-supporting community of one-acre tracts. Watsonville real estate promoter Sidney Jehl patterned the subdivision after Henry Ford’s Greenwich Village near Dearborn, Michigan, where Ford’s employees supplemented their salaries with small-scale farming. A 1938 *Register-Pajaronian* article noted that the concept “is an answer to the needs of the ‘forgotten man,’ whose income is too small to permit him to support his family decently, or whose employment, as is often the case in agricultural pursuits in the Pajaro Valley is seasonal.” The Porter Company provided all

California – Monterey County,” <http://www.nationalregisterofhistoricplaces.com/ca/Monterey/state.html>, (accessed 13 April 2010).

⁷⁹⁹ In 2001, the Elkhorn Slough Foundation acquired 332 acres of the Porter property along Elkhorn Road and Hall Road. It is called the Porter Preserve and includes the marsh at the northern end of the Elkhorn Slough, the historic Porter house and oak-studded pasture land. Elkhorn Slough Foundation, “Elkhorn Slough Protected Lands,” <http://www.elkhornslough.org/protected.htm> (accessed 5 March 2010).

building materials and retained title to each parcel until the buyer paid off the house and other improvements. The company required a small cash down payment and considered building the house as an additional “down payment” towards owning each parcel.⁸⁰⁰ John Porter’s descendant Diane Porter Cooley stated that her family patterned the subdivision idea after the Homestead Act. The Porter Company marketed the parcels to Dust Bowl migrants, some of whom tried to build sod houses on their land, a building tradition from their homeland.⁸⁰¹

The National Housing Act of 1934 stimulated the collapsed housing industry by creating the Federal Housing Administration (FHA). The FHA developed minimal housing standards, from design to financing, distributing them from 1936-40 in publications such as *Subdivision Development, Planning Profitable Neighborhoods* and *Planning Neighborhoods for Small Houses*.⁸⁰² These standards established the “FHA Minimum House” with a single-story, rectangular plan, a simple gabled or hipped roofline with close (shallow) eaves, and sparse traditional detail, including multiple-pane windows, shutters, clapboard siding, and a small front porch supported on plain columns.

With low-cost construction, low taxes and long-term FHA loans, the Las Lomas “miniature farm owner” could pay only \$15-\$18 a month. The Porter Company’s offer was a vast improvement on their previous housing. By May 1938, eighteen of the twenty-one one-acre tracts along Hall Road were sold, free plans were ready for eight homes, and “although no earth has been turned on his property for a home, [one buyer] already moved his cow onto his miniature farm.”⁸⁰³



⁸⁰⁰ Ed Slusser, “About New Miniature Farm Community,” *Register-Pajaronian*, 10 May 1938.

⁸⁰¹ Diane Porter Cooley, email communication from Meg Clovis to Paige J. Swartley, 16 August 2010.

⁸⁰² Ames, *Historical Residential Suburbs: Guidelines for Evaluation and Documentation for the National Register of Historic Places*, 48.

⁸⁰³ Slusser, “About New Miniature Farm Community,” *Register-Pajaronian*, 10 May 1938.

3. Associated Property Type: Worker Housing

a. Property Type Description



Stand-Alone Worker Housing: 6 Springfield Road (left); 315 San Juan Road, Pajaro (right).

Physical Characteristics: Single buildings or paired buildings of simple vernacular design and simple construction methods. These buildings typically are wood framed, clad in wood or corrugated iron siding and have simple gable roofs.

Associative Characteristics: This property type is associated with intensive agricultural development, which requires large numbers of workers to cultivate a particular intensive crop.

Geographical Information: Worker housing is located on extensive, intensive, corporate and colony farmsteads throughout the Monterey County, where soil conditions are ideal for growing intensive crops.

Boundaries: Boundaries are difficult to determine for some worker houses, as they can be found in the midst of farmsteads stripped of their clusters, or within a large industrial agricultural operation that has removed evidence of the original farmstead.

Variations: Variations include the construction materials employed and the type of minimalist architectural detail chosen for the building. Vernacular Queen Anne and bungalow styles are common variations.

Locational Patterns: Worker housing concentrates in the flatlands near main roads, where farmsteads are placed, and along primary roads leading to and from towns.

Condition: Because these houses were constructed cheaply and quickly, condition tends to be poor.

b. Eligibility Criteria and Integrity Thresholds

Worker housing may be historically significant for its association with the growth of intensive agriculture and the industry’s critical dependence on a large labor pool, mostly low-paid immigrants (criteria NR-A, CR-1, MCR-A1, A2, A4, C1 & C2). Worker housing should retain the building’s size, massing, materials and minimal architectural detail to convey its historic significance.

Worker housing may be historically significant for its association with an individual, corporation, or colony significant in the history of Monterey County (criteria NR-B, CR-2, MCR-A3) and should retain the physical characteristics described in the above paragraph.

Worker housing is not likely to be historically significant as an example of a distinctive architectural type, period or method of construction (criteria NR-C, CR-3, MCR-B1, B2 & B3).

To qualify for the above criteria, worker housing must possess historic integrity, as reflected in the physical character-defining features of the building that communicate its purpose as housing for laborers. The following chart provides guidelines for evaluating integrity.

Location	<i>Location is the place where the significant activities that shaped a property took place, often determined by geographical factors. Ideally, worker housing should retain its historic location. However, this property type also includes worker housing that may be the only structure remaining on an intensive farmstead, and the worker housing may also have been moved.</i>
Setting	<i>Setting is the physical environment within and surrounding a property, including large-scale features (e.g., woodlands, rock formations) and small-scale features (e.g., fences, gateposts, springs, individual trees). Worker housing with integrity of setting retains its original rural or town setting.</i>
Design	<i>Design is the composition of natural and cultural elements comprising the form, plan, and spatial organization of a property. Elements include buildings, structures, boundary demarcations, circulation networks, windbreaks, vegetation and topography. Worker housing tends to be utilitarian or vernacular in design with little or no ornamentation. If these buildings retain their historic utilitarian design, then they possess integrity of design.</i>
Materials	<i>Materials include construction materials of buildings, outbuildings, roadways, fences, and other structures. Vegetation similar to historic species in scale, type and visual effect will generally convey integrity of setting. Worker housing with most of its historic materials; or materials added within the period of significance (that do not remove historic features) would have integrity of materials.</i>

Workmanship	<i>Workmanship is exhibited in the ways people have fashioned their environment for functional and decorative purposes, including how they constructed buildings, fences and small-scale elements. For rural historic landscapes, workmanship in raising crops contributes to integrity if it reflects traditional or historic practices. Historic construction techniques may illustrate the workmanship of particular ethnic groups or vernacular traditions. Worker housing with integrity of workmanship exhibits the traditional or historic practices in use during the property’s period of significance.</i>
Feeling	<i>Feeling is intangible but is evoked by the presence of physical characteristics that reflect the historic scene. The cumulative effect of setting, design, materials and workmanship creates the sense of past time and place. The property’s rural or small town setting, design, materials and workmanship should reflect the site’s historic use.</i>
Association	<i>Association is the direct link between a property and the important events or persons that shaped it. Continued use and occupation help maintain integrity of association if traditional practices are carried on. Using traditional methods in new construction reinforces a property’s integrity by linking past and present. Worker housing with integrity of association should reflect the historic people (e.g., workers), historic land use, and historic events that shaped the property.</i>

c. Listed and Potentially Significant Historic Resources

This type of housing occurs on farmsteads and near population centers and includes small, vernacular, but more permanent buildings standing alone or in small clusters. They may be potentially significant for their association with the growth of intensive agriculture and the industry’s critical dependence on a large labor pool, mostly low-paid immigrants.



Stand-alone worker housing along Lewis Road in Pajaro (left) and on a farmstead at 6 Springfield Road in the Springfield District (right). (PAST photos).

Worker housing may cluster in towns and be constructed of a vernacular style (above-left) or in simplified Queen Anne style, as in the example below.



Two views of worker housing at 230 Blanco Road, Salinas (PAST photos).

4. Associated Property Type: Labor Camp

a. Property Type Description



Labor Camp: 56490 Cattlemen Road in San Lucas (Galvin Photos).

Physical Characteristics: A cluster of buildings of similar simplified, vernacular architectural styles, constructed by the farmstead or corporation owner. Alternatively, labor camps used found materials to construct simplified, almost ramshackle buildings built by the laborers themselves.

Associative Characteristics: This property type is associated with intensive, extensive, and corporate agricultural development, which requires large numbers of workers to cultivate a particular intensive crop.

Geographical Information: Labor camps are generally located on or near farmsteads throughout the flat regions of Monterey County. However, some substandard labor camps were deliberately hidden in remote, hilly areas.

Boundaries: Boundaries are difficult to determine for labor camps, as their poor construction and substandard living conditions forced the closure or demolition of numerous camps. The migrant nature of laborers also obviates permanent locations for this property type.

Variations: Variations include the materials used for the individual buildings and any simplified architectural detailing.

Locational Patterns: By their very nature, temporary labor camps would locate anywhere in Monterey County where sufficient temporary farm employment existed. To date, only the remnants of a handful of labor camps have been located.

Condition: Poor due to typically temporary or inexpensive construction materials and substandard living conditions.

b. Eligibility Criteria and Integrity Thresholds

Labor camps may be historically significant for their association with intensive agricultural laborers (criteria NR-A, CR-1, MCR-A1, A2, A4, C1 & C2) and should retain the camp’s location, overall grouped design of buildings and at least several examples of historic construction materials or construction methods, reflecting a particular ethnic group.

To qualify for the above criteria, a labor camp must possess historic integrity, as reflected in the physical character-defining features of the building that communicate its purpose. By the labor camp’s very nature, this would be difficult to achieve. For example, the labor camp in Pajaro was nearly entirely demolished due to its substandard living conditions. However, replacement dwellings have been erected on the same site, enabling the site itself to retain integrity of location and setting. The following chart provides guidelines for evaluating integrity.

Location	<i>Location is the place where the significant activities that shaped a property took place, often determined by geographical factors. A labor camp found in its historic location would have integrity of location.</i>
Setting	<i>Setting is the physical environment within and surrounding a property, including large-scale features (e.g., woodlands, rock formations) and small-scale features (e.g., fences, gateposts, springs, individual trees). Although few extant examples have been found, labor camps could have a rural or small town setting.</i>
Design	<i>Design is the composition of natural and cultural elements comprising the form, plan, and spatial organization of a property. Elements include buildings, structures, boundary demarcations, circulation networks, windbreaks, vegetation and topography. Labor camps do not represent high stylistic design. They tend to contain utilitarian buildings with no ornamentation grouped around a cooking or water source.</i>
Materials	<i>Materials include construction materials of buildings, outbuildings, roadways, fences, and other structures. Vegetation similar to historic species in scale, type and visual effect will generally convey integrity of setting. Labor camps may be constructed of almost any useable materials, from small wood-framed residences to ramshackle enclosures made from found materials. Given the disposable nature of these materials, replacement materials found in labor camps may still contribute to integrity if the camp retains its historic use.</i>
Workmanship	<i>Workmanship is exhibited in the ways people have fashioned their environment for functional and decorative purposes, including how they constructed buildings, fences and small-scale elements. For rural historic landscapes, workmanship in raising crops contributes to integrity if it reflects traditional or historic practices. Historic construction or assembly techniques may illustrate the workmanship of particular ethnic groups or vernacular traditions and contribute to the significance of a labor camp for a particular ethnic group.</i>

Feeling	<i>Feeling is intangible but is evoked by the presence of physical characteristics that reflect the historic scene. The cumulative effect of setting, design, materials and workmanship creates the sense of past time and place. The property's design, materials and simplified workmanship should reflect the site's historic use as a labor camp. Complete replacement of non-historic buildings within the camp, though common, would remove integrity of feeling.</i>
Association	<i>Association is the direct link between a property and the important events or persons that shaped it. Continued use and occupation help maintain integrity of association if traditional practices are carried on. Using traditional methods in new construction reinforces a property's integrity by linking past and present. A labor camp with integrity of association should reflect the historic people (e.g., workers), historic land use, and historic events that shaped the property as a labor camp.</i>

c. Listed and Potentially Significant Historic Resources

56490 Cattleman Road, San Lucas: This camp contains thirty-three homes set within a uniform grid pattern. Images appear below:



Views of labor camp housing at 56490 Cattlemen Road, San Lucas (Galvin Photos).

Toro Labor Camp: 266 Hitchcock Road, Salinas:


The Toro Labor Camp resembles a military compound with six board-and-batten bunkhouses, kitchen and bathroom facilities and a water tower, as shown below:



Views of Toro Labor Camp at 266 Hitchcock Road, Salinas (PAST photos).

Martin Labor Camp: 36571 Foothill Road, near Soledad:

The Martin Labor Camp consists of six bunkhouses, sheds, latrines and a dining room, constructed to William H. Weeks designs for Spreckels Sugar Company's Ranch No. 2 (drawing 95).⁸⁰⁴ The buildings are simple board-and-batten structures, with later stucco finishes. The complex resembles a military compound with six board-and-batten bunkhouses, kitchen and bathroom facilities and a water tower, as shown below:



⁸⁰⁴ Clark, *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I, DPR 523A: Martin Work Camp.*

5. Associated Property Type: Grange Hall

a. Property Type Description



Aromas Grange: Corner of Bardue and Rose streets, Aromas.

Physical Characteristics: A single building of simple design, with minimal architectural detail. Grange halls were generally wood-framed with wood siding or shingle wall materials, gabled roofs with exposed rafter tails, and wood sash windows.

Associative Characteristics: Grange halls are associated with the social and advocacy issues of specific agricultural communities.

Geographical Information: As grange halls were regional gathering places, they are sparsely distributed in Monterey County.

Boundaries: Boundaries are the parcel on which the building is located.

Variations: Variations include wall cladding type, either boards or shingles, type of window (double-hung sash or casement) and architectural detail.

Locational Patterns: North County granges include the Springfield Grange, Aromas Grange and Prunedale Grange. The Aromas Grange is associated with two separate buildings. In the Salinas Valley, granges have been found in Greenfield and along the River Road corridor. The Buena Vista Grange on the northern section of River Road is listed on the Monterey County Register. South County granges include Hesperia Hall near Bradley and the San Bernardo Grange in San Ardo.

Condition: Condition is good if the buildings are still in current use. The Aromas Grange continues to fulfill its advocacy and social roles as one of the oldest active granges in California.

b. Eligibility Criteria and Integrity Thresholds

Grange halls may be historically significant for their association with social and advocacy efforts in Monterey County (criteria NR-A, CR-1, MCR-A1, A2, A4, C1 & C2) and must possess a substantial number of historic character-defining features that date to the period of significance. These features include the building’s overall design, construction materials and architectural detailing.

Because of their vernacular nature, grange halls are not likely to be historically significant as an example of a distinctive architectural type, period or method of construction (criteria NR-C, CR-3, MCR-B1, B2 & B3).

To qualify for the above criteria, the grange hall must possess historic integrity, as reflected in the building’s physical character-defining features. The following chart provides guidelines for evaluating integrity.

Location	<i>Location is the place where the significant activities that shaped a property took place, often determined by geographical factors. Grange halls with characteristics that retain their historic location have integrity of location.</i>
Setting	<i>Setting is the physical environment within and surrounding a property, including large-scale features (e.g., woodlands, rock formations) and small-scale features (e.g., fences, gateposts, springs, individual trees). Grange halls with integrity of setting retain their original location, either in a rural or town setting, usually near a primary road or crossroads for easy access by community members.</i>
Design	<i>Design is the composition of natural and cultural elements comprising the form, plan, and spatial organization of a property. Elements include buildings, structures, boundary demarcations, circulation networks, windbreaks, vegetation and topography. Grange halls are typically vernacular in design, but the building may bear minimal Craftsman, Art Deco or revivalist styles popular during the time of construction. Each building should be examined to determine its historic character-defining features. Changes may be historic if they do not remove these features and they date to the property’s period of significance.</i>
Materials	<i>Materials include construction materials of buildings, outbuildings, roadways, fences, and other structures. Vegetation similar to historic species in scale, type and visual effect will generally convey integrity of setting. Materials are wood frame and siding with shake or shingle roofs. Replacement materials should not remove character-defining features that communicate the building’s historic use.</i>

Workmanship	<i>Workmanship is exhibited in the ways people have fashioned their environment for functional and decorative purposes, including how they constructed buildings, fences and small-scale elements. For rural historic landscapes, workmanship in raising crops contributes to integrity if it reflects traditional or historic practices. Historic construction techniques may illustrate the workmanship of particular ethnic groups or vernacular traditions. Grange halls with integrity of workmanship exhibit the traditional or historic practices in use during the property’s period of significance.</i>
Feeling	<i>Feeling is intangible but is evoked by the presence of physical characteristics that reflect the historic scene. The cumulative effect of setting, design, materials and workmanship creates the sense of past time and place. The property’s rural or small town setting, design, materials and workmanship should reflect the site’s historic use.</i>
Association	<i>Association is the direct link between a property and the important events or persons that shaped it. Continued use and occupation help maintain integrity of association if traditional practices are carried on. Using traditional methods in new construction reinforces a property’s integrity by linking past and present. A grange hall with integrity of association should reflect the historic persons (e.g., grange members), historic land use, and historic events that shaped the property.</i>

c. Listed and Potentially Significant Historic Resources

Aromas Community Grange 361, Bardue Street and Rose Avenue, Aromas: In 1913, twenty-five charter members formed Community Grange 361 in the small community of Vega, renamed Aromas in 1918. The Aromas Grange membership oath includes the promise “[t]o encourage the sustainable availability of wholesome, nutritious food.” The Aromas Grange is the sixth-oldest existing grange in California. The Aromas Grange has been very involved in developing the local community, including bringing a railroad depot to town and sponsoring the first 4-H Club. Grain and apple farmer James Rowe (see description of 1767 San Juan Road in the Intensive Agriculture theme section) founded the Aromas Pig Club for children, giving them pigs to raise. The Pig Club became the 4-H Club in 1922. Rowe led it for twenty years and was also involved with the Aromas Grange.⁸⁰⁵

The Aromas Community Grange hall is potentially significant for its association with social and advocacy efforts in the North County (criteria NR-A, CR-1, MCR-A1, A2, A4, C1 & C2).



Views of Aromas Community Grange, in Aromas (PAST photos).

Former Prunedale Community Grange 388, 8300A Prunedale North Road, Prunedale: On August 13, 1920, F. A. Wells organized Prunedale Community Grange 388. Dormant from 1924 to May 3, 1927, the Grange is very active today. The building at 8300A Prunedale North Road, reportedly the oldest public structure in Prunedale (ca. 1900), was the former Prunedale Grange. It currently serves as the Prunedale Senior Center and American Legion Post #593, and was formerly a church, as well. While the Grange remodeled that building in the mid-1930s, it

⁸⁰⁵ Aromas Community Grange, “History of the Teressie White Memorial Scholarship Foundation” (Aromas, CA: Aromas Community Grange), http://www.aromasgrange.org/html_pages/The%20Aromas%20Grange%20History.pdf (accessed 14 January 2010). Aromas Community Grange, “Membership Application” (Aromas, CA: Aromas Community Grange), http://www.aromasgrange.org/html_pages/GrangeNewMemberForm.pdf (accessed 14 January 2010). County of Monterey Historical Files: “1767 San Juan Rd.” Pajaro Valley Historical Association, “Pajaro Valley Historical Association Heritage Homes Tour.” Pajaro Valley Historical Association Files: “1767 San Juan Road, Rowe, James.”

temporarily met in Charles Langley’s 1860s barn (now demolished) on his Prunedale horse ranch, above the intersection of San Miguel Canyon Road and Highway 101. The Prunedale Grange assisted with many communication and transportation improvements that helped local farmers, including installing phone lines from Watsonville to Elkhorn on the Hall and Long Valley roads (1921) and working with state and local officials to open the “Dunbarton cutoff” into Salinas (now Highway 101).⁸⁰⁶ The former grange hall at 8300A Prunedale North Road is potentially significant for its association with social and advocacy efforts in the North County (criteria NR-A, CR-1, MCR-A1, A2, A4, C1 & C2).

Springfield Community Grange 523, Elkhorn and Werner Roads, near Las Lomas: North County resident Frank H. Wells organized the Springfield Grange in 1933.⁸⁰⁷ Additional research is needed to discover the construction history of this grange hall; however, it is potentially significant for its association with social and advocacy efforts in the North County (criteria NR-A, CR-1, MCR-A1, A2, A4, C1 & C2).



Left: Former Prunedale Grange, 8300A Prunedale North Road, Prunedale (Google Earth).
 Right: Springfield Grange, corner of Elkhorn and Werner roads (PAST photo).

⁸⁰⁶ Cynthia Hibbard, “Origin of Name is Plain — Prunes for Prunedale,” *North County News*, 3 December 1975. “Grange Will Celebrate Its 50th Anniversary,” *North County News*, 11 May 1977. Everett Messick, “\$6 Million Expansion Beginning,” *The Herald*, 15 February 1988. Jackson, “Prunedale?,” *North Monterey County Fortnightly*. Everett Messick, “Historic Barn Will Rise Again,” *Monterey County Herald*, 25 November 1988. “The History of the Barn at The Prunedale Shopping Center,” undated. The Grange used Langley’s barn for social events and a state-sponsored Depression-era training program to teach quilting and sewing. In 1956, the Grange built a new Grange Hall on San Miguel Canyon Road. To accommodate the 1988 Prunedale Shopping Center expansion, a developer swapped a four-acre site on Moro Road with the Grange’s San Miguel Canyon Road parcel and the Grange moved to its current location. The developer demolished Langley’s dilapidated barn but reused some elements in a replica incorporated into the Prunedale Shopping Center.

⁸⁰⁷ J. D. Hartz, Public Relations Director, California State Grange, email to Paige J. Swartley, 21 July 2010.

Buena Vista Grange, 518 River Road, near Salinas: Housed in a Gothic Revival Church since 1934, the Buena Vista Grange is unusual because of its high-style decorative elements. It is listed on the Monterey County Register.⁸⁰⁸



Buena Vista Grange, 518 River Road (PAST photo).

Greenfield Grange, Greenfield: Located in downtown Greenfield and active through the 1930s, the building now houses a church (below).



Greenfield Grange, Greenfield (PAST photo).

⁸⁰⁸ Clark, Agriculturally Related Historic Resources in Salinas Valley, Phase I, DPR 523A: Buena Vista Grange, No. 564..

The *Hames Valley Grange*, 72203 Jolon Road, Bradley, is an extant example of a grange located in South County (below).⁸⁰⁹ The *San Bernardo Grange #506*, San Ardo (below), is another extant South County grange. Dedicated on January 11, 1935 it represents an example of a Depression-era grange and is potentially significant for listing as a local historic resource because of its association with agricultural community development and the agricultural advancement in Monterey County.⁸¹⁰



Left: Hames Valley Grange (Galvin photo). Right: San Bernardo Grange. (Photo courtesy Kent Seavey).

⁸⁰⁹ Galvin, Monterey County Parks Reconnaissance Survey of Agricultural Resources in the South County Planning Area, 2008-2009, DPR 523A: 72203 Jolon Road.

⁸¹⁰ Seavey, Kent. *San Bernardo Grange #506*, DPR 523A and B, 7/22/07.

6. Associated Property Type: Cultural Meeting House

a. Property Type Description



Japanese Language School: 11199 Geil Street, Castroville, listed in the National Register and Monterey County Register.

Physical Characteristics: A single building of simple design, sometimes with architectural details reflecting the construction or design practices of an associated ethnic group’s homeland. Cultural meeting houses were wood-framed with wood siding or shingle wall materials, gabled roofs with exposed rafter tails and wood sash windows.

Associative Characteristics: Cultural meeting houses are associated with a particular ethnic community that influenced Monterey County agriculture.

Geographical Information: Cultural meeting houses were generally built in population centers to serve the local ethnic community, so they are sparsely distributed in Monterey County.

Boundaries: The boundary is the parcel on which the building is located.

Variations: Variations include wall cladding type, either boards or shingles, type of window (double-hung sash or casement) and architectural detail.

Locational Patterns: Cultural meeting houses are rare in Monterey County. The Japanese Language School in Castroville is the best example located for this study. A former Chinese School is located in Pajaro.

Condition: The Japanese Language School’s condition is good because it has been meticulously restored, is still in use, and is listed in the National Register and the Monterey County Register. The Chinese School in Pajaro is listed in the Monterey County Register, but has suffered serious integrity loss.

b. Eligibility Criteria and Integrity Thresholds

Cultural meeting houses may be historically significant for their association with a particular ethnic community that influenced Monterey County agriculture (criteria NR-A, CR-1, MCR-A1, A2, A4, A6, A7, C1 & C2) and should retain the building’s size, massing, design, materials and architectural or cultural detail to convey its historic significance.

Cultural meeting houses may be historically significant for their association with an individual significant in the history of Monterey County (criteria NR-B, CR-2, MCR-A3) and should retain the physical characteristics described in the above paragraph.

Cultural meeting houses may be historically significant as an example of a distinctive architectural type, period or method of construction (criteria NR-C, CR-3, MCR-B1, B2 & B3).

To qualify for the above criteria, the cultural meeting house must possess historic integrity, as reflected in the physical character-defining features of the building. The following chart provides guidelines for evaluating integrity.

Location	<i>Location is the place where the significant activities that shaped a property took place, often determined by geographical factors. Cultural meeting houses with characteristics that retain their historic location have integrity of location.</i>
Setting	<i>Setting is the physical environment within and surrounding a property, including large-scale features (e.g., woodlands, rock formations) and small-scale features (e.g., fences, gateposts, springs, individual trees). Cultural meeting houses with their rural or town setting retain integrity of setting.</i>
Design	<i>Design is the composition of natural and cultural elements comprising the form, plan, and spatial organization of a property. Elements include buildings, structures, boundary demarcations, circulation networks, windbreaks, vegetation and topography. Cultural meeting houses are typically vernacular in design, but may exhibit construction practices or details associated with a particular ethnic group. Changes may be historic if they do not remove these features and they date to the property’s period of significance.</i>
Materials	<i>Materials include construction materials of buildings, outbuildings, roadways, fences, and other structures. Vegetation similar to historic species in scale, type and visual effect will generally convey integrity of setting. Materials are wood frame and siding with shake or shingle roofs. Replacement materials should not remove character-defining features that communicate the building’s historic design or use.</i>

Workmanship	<i>Workmanship is exhibited in the ways people have fashioned their environment for functional and decorative purposes, including how they constructed buildings, fences and small-scale elements. For rural historic landscapes, workmanship in raising crops contributes to integrity if it reflects traditional or historic practices. Historic construction techniques may illustrate the workmanship of particular ethnic groups or vernacular traditions. Cultural meeting houses with integrity of workmanship exhibit the traditional or historic practices in use during the property’s period of significance.</i>
Feeling	<i>Feeling is intangible but is evoked by the presence of physical characteristics that reflect the historic scene. The cumulative effect of setting, design, materials and workmanship creates the sense of past time and place. The property’s rural or small town setting, design, materials and workmanship should reflect the site’s historic use.</i>
Association	<i>Association is the direct link between a property and the important events or persons that shaped it. Continued use and occupation help maintain integrity of association if traditional practices are carried on. Using traditional methods in new construction reinforces a property’s integrity by linking past and present. A cultural meeting house with integrity of association should reflect the historic persons (e.g., owners, workers and members), historic land use, and historic events that shaped the property.</i>

c. Listed and Potentially Significant Historic Resources

Castroville Japanese Language School, 11199 Geil Street, Castroville: When the Japanese community dedicated this building on August 31, 1936, Castroville was home to about twenty Japanese families, many of whom worked in local agriculture.⁸¹¹ Facing racial discrimination, the Japanese wanted a meeting place where the community could maintain strong cultural ties.⁸¹² This building served as a school for Japanese children to learn about their culture, traditions and language; as a social meeting hall; and as a Buddhist temple.⁸¹³ The Japanese military bombed Pearl Harbor in December 1941 and President Roosevelt issued Executive Order 9066 on February 19, 1942, forcing Japanese-Americans into internment camps.⁸¹⁴ The school closed but later housed Japanese-Americans returning from the internment camps and military service.⁸¹⁵ The Castroville school district bought the building in the late 1940s for storage, wood shop classes and school offices. It became vacant in the late 1980s.⁸¹⁶ The Monterey County Redevelopment Agency bought it in 1999 and rehabilitated it for use as a community and youth center. It is listed in the National Register under Criterion A in the areas of education, social history and Asian ethnic heritage. It is also listed in the Monterey County Register.⁸¹⁷ In addition, it is potentially historically significant as an example of a distinctive architectural type, period or method of construction (criteria NR-C, CR-3, MCR-B1, B2 & B3).



Japanese Language School, 11199 Geil Street, in Castroville (PAST photo).

⁸¹¹ Clovis, *Monterey County's North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 32.

⁸¹² U.S. Department of the Interior, "National Asian-Pacific Heritage Month" (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior), <http://www.nps.gov/history/nr/feature/asia/2000/feature00.htm> (accessed 9 February 2010).

⁸¹³ "Castroville Japanese Language School," Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, 2010, <http://nrhp.focus.nps.gov/natregsearchresult.do?fullresult=true&recordid=11> (accessed 13 April 2010). "National Register of Historic Places: California—Monterey County," <http://www.nationalregisterofhistoricplaces.com/ca/Monterey/state.html>, (accessed 13 April 2010). Clovis, *Monterey County's North Coast and Coastal Valleys*, 32-33.

⁸¹⁴ Franklin D. Roosevelt, "Executive Order No. 9066 Authorizing the Secretary of War to Prescribe Military Areas" (Washington, D.C.: The White House, 19 February 1942).

⁸¹⁵ U.S. Department of the Interior, "National Asian-Pacific Heritage Month" (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior), <http://www.nps.gov/history/nr/feature/asia/2000/feature00.htm> (accessed 9 February 2010).

⁸¹⁶ County of Monterey, Grant Application to the Monterey Peninsula Foundation for the Japanese Language School in Castroville, 2007.

⁸¹⁷ "Castroville Japanese Language School," Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, 2010, <http://nrhp.focus.nps.gov/natregsearchresult.do?fullresult=true&recordid=11> (accessed 13 April 2010). "National Register of Historic Places: California – Monterey County," <http://www.nationalregisterofhistoricplaces.com/ca/Monterey/state.html>, (accessed 13 April 2010).

7. Associated Property Type: Rural Electrification Building

a. Property Type Description



Rural Electrification Buildings: Left: Greenfield; Right: Chualar.

Physical Characteristics: A single building appearing in two forms: either a corrugated metal building with hipped metal roof and single ventilator, with minimal architectural detail; or a larger, concrete structure with arched entrance and windows and details in the Spanish Revival Style.

Associative Characteristics: These buildings are associated with Coast Valleys Gas & Electric Company (later Pacific Gas and Electric Company) that provided a series of small substations for means of conveying electricity along the transportation corridor linking the Salinas Valley towns.

Geographical Information: Along the Highway 101 corridor from Chualar to San Lucas.

Boundaries: Boundaries are the parcel on which the building is located.

Variations: Variations include the two different building prototypes, the hipped-roof corrugated version, and the Spanish Revival version.

Locational Patterns: Along the Highway 101 corridor in the Salinas Valley from Chualar to San Lucas.

Condition: Condition ranges from fair to good.

b. Eligibility Criteria and Integrity Thresholds

Rural electrification buildings may be historically significant for their association with community development and the spread of irrigation pumping stations in the Salinas Valley (criteria NR-A, CR-1, MCR-A1, A2, A4, C1 & C2) and must possess a substantial number of historic character-defining features that date to the period of significance. These features include the building’s overall design, construction materials and architectural detailing.

Because of their prototypical design, both building designs may be historically significant as an example of a distinctive architectural type, period or method of construction (criteria NR-C, CR-3, MCR-B1, B2 & B3).

To qualify for the above criteria, the building must possess historic integrity, as reflected in the building’s physical character-defining features. The following chart provides guidelines for evaluating integrity.

Location	<i>Location is the place where the significant activities that shaped a property took place, often determined by geographical factors. Rural Electrification Buildings with characteristics that retain their historic location have integrity of location.</i>
Setting	<i>Setting is the physical environment within and surrounding a property, including large-scale features (e.g., woodlands, rock formations) and small-scale features (e.g., fences, gateposts, springs, individual trees). Rural Electrification Buildings with integrity of setting retain their original location, either in a rural or town setting, along a primary transportation route.</i>
Design	<i>Design is the composition of natural and cultural elements comprising the form, plan, and spatial organization of a property. Elements include buildings, structures, boundary demarcations, circulation networks, windbreaks, vegetation and topography. Rural Electrification Buildings are of the two designs described above. Changes may be historic if they do not remove the character-defining features of either prototype.</i>
Materials	<i>Materials include construction materials of buildings, outbuildings, roadways, fences, and other structures. Vegetation similar to historic species in scale, type and visual effect will generally convey integrity of setting. The corrugated wall and roof materials of the first prototype and the Spanish Revival details and use of stucco cladding of the second prototype should be present and not compromised by additions or alterations.</i>

Workmanship	<i>Workmanship is exhibited in the ways people have fashioned their environment for functional and decorative purposes, including how they constructed buildings, fences and small-scale elements. For rural historic landscapes, workmanship in raising crops contributes to integrity if it reflects traditional or historic practices. Rural Electrification Buildings with integrity of workmanship exhibit the construction materials and methods common to both prototypes.</i>
Feeling	<i>Feeling is intangible but is evoked by the presence of physical characteristics that reflect the historic scene. The cumulative effect of setting, design, materials and workmanship creates the sense of past time and place. The property’s rural or small town setting, design, materials and workmanship should reflect the site’s historic use.</i>
Association	<i>Association is the direct link between a property and the important events or persons that shaped it. Continued use and occupation help maintain integrity of association if traditional practices are carried on. Using traditional methods in new construction reinforces a property’s integrity by linking past and present. A Rural Electrification Building with integrity of association should reflect the historic patterns of community development that gave rise to this property type.</i>

c. Listed and Potentially Significant Historic Resources

The Highway 101 corridor, from Salinas to San Lucas contains these buildings. Examples of the two prototypes appear below.



This page intentionally left blank.

VI. GUIDE TO AGRICULTURAL BUILDINGS, STRUCTURES AND OBJECTS

A. Introduction

This chapter provides a broad framework for classifying the types and functions of Monterey County's agricultural buildings, structures and objects associated with the property types outlined in *Chapter V: Historic Themes, Associated Property Types, Eligibility Criteria and Integrity Thresholds*.

In 2007, the California Department of Transportation published *A Historical Context and Archaeological Research Design for Agricultural Properties in California*, providing a framework and methodology for evaluating properties within the historic context of California agriculture.⁸¹⁸ This well-researched document establishes the broad historical and developmental patterns that shaped California's agricultural landscape and represents one of the few published attempts at classifying California's agricultural property types and their representative buildings, structures and objects.

This chapter uses the Caltrans report as a basis for categorizing Monterey County's agricultural buildings, structures and objects into six categories:

1. Housing
2. Barns
3. Outbuildings
4. Processing and Storage
5. Farmstead Support Structures
6. Community Infrastructure

For each category, a photograph of the building, structure or object appears on the left, accompanied by a general description of its function, massing, roof and wall materials, interior spaces and window/door configuration. These descriptions are deliberately general to help field surveyors and planners broadly define the type and use of particular agricultural structures.

Note: An asterisk after the photograph title indicates the image was taken from: Galvin Preservation Associates: *Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area 2008 – 2009*.

⁸¹⁸ California Department of Transportation, *A Historical Context and Archaeological Research Design for Agricultural Properties in California*, Division of Environmental Analysis, California Department of Transportation, Sacramento, CA., 2007. Hereafter, *Caltrans 2007*.

B. Buildings, Structures and Objects

1. Housing

The “Housing” category includes primary residences for farmstead or ranch owners, as well as shelter for workers either on the farmstead or in worker camps.

Monterey County housing materials varied depending on the availability of building materials, the development of saw milling technology, and the needs and wealth of the farm owner.

Primary residences and worker housing were constructed of adobe (1830s to 1850s), native stone (primarily in the foothills, 1850s to 1870s), logs (1850s to 1870s) and milled boards (1850s to 1960).⁸¹⁹ Given the proliferation of lumber mills following the Gold Rush, milled boards constructed in platform or balloon-framed structural systems are the most common structural material for Monterey County’s agricultural residences. Few examples of adobe construction remain; most date before 1870.

Monterey County’s vernacular farmstead residences generally consist of simple one- or two-room dwellings with shed or gable roofs, small front porches on simple wood posts, and local materials used for structural support and wall/roof finishes. These houses bear little or no ornamentation. From the 1870s to 1960, Monterey County farmstead owners built their homes in virtually all of the popular, contemporaneous architectural styles including Greek Revival; Italianate, Gothic and Queen-Anne Victorian styles; Arts & Crafts and Spanish Revival bungalow styles; foursquare houses; and Federal Housing Administration (FHA) or mid-century styles dating between the 1930s and 1960.

Vernacular hybrid Victorian styles unique to Monterey County include the corporate house designs provided by architect William Weeks for the agricultural community of Spreckels and the Jacks Houses provided to dairy workers in the South County and Salinas Valley.

Worker housing may consist of simple gable or shed-roofed structures constructed by the farmstead owner depending on the needs of the operation or pre-fabricated structures grouped into labor camps designed to house workers for large agricultural operations. In some labor camps, vernacular worker house construction is evident in the use of “found” materials, including cardboard boxes, fabrics, corrugated metal or similar materials. Given the temporary nature of these dwellings, few examples of this type of worker housing are extant today.

Examples of Monterey County agricultural housing include:

⁸¹⁹ *Caltrans 2007, 147.*

Vernacular adobe farmstead residence (ca. 1850-1880)*



- One-story single family residence
- Simple gable or shed-roof covered in wood shingles or clay tile
- Walls constructed of adobe block
- Simple, vernacular interior spaces, commonly hall and parlor type
- Wood doors and windows
- Small front porch supported by uncarved wood posts
- Small shed additions to side and/or rear

Vernacular wood farmstead residence (ca. 1850-1880)



- Wood framed, one-story single family residence, no foundation
- Side or front gabled roof covered in wood shingle or metal
- Wood siding: horizontal or vertical boards; board-and-batten
- Salt box or hall and parlor type
- Tall, narrow wood doors and windows
- Covered porch supported by wood posts
- Small shed additions to side and/or rear
- Shaded by trees, set within small cluster of buildings at the end of a dirt driveway

Designed adobe farmstead residence (ca. 1870-1900)*



- Rammed earth construction with thick walls covered in plaster
- Complex roof massing with hipped or cross-gable roofs.
- Continuous veranda surrounding residence
- Decorative woodwork potentially in various Victorian styles, including Italianate and Queen Anne
- Wood structural system to support roof
- Wood windows and doors

Designed High Style farmstead residence (1870-1960)



- Single or multiple-story, wood-framed residence
- Complex roof massing, with multiple roof planes and possibly towers or bay windows
- Architect or pattern book designs in Greek Revival, Italianate, Queen Anne, Craftsman, Colonial Revival, Spanish Revival and Modernist architectural styles
- Front or side porches with high style architectural details
- Carved ornamentation, decorated cresting, verge board, porch supports, etc., depending upon the house's style
- House surrounded by picket fencing and large shade trees to separate it from the working areas of the farmstead

Corporate Residence: Spreckels House



- Typically single-story, wood-framed residence
- Constructed in a variety of architectural styles, the earliest being a vernacular Queen Anne-style with a decorative sugar beet in gable end.
- Other styles include Craftsman and mid-Century
- Architectural details consistent with a given style

Jacks House



- One and one-half story, wood-framed residence
- Constructed in the same vernacular Greek Revival Style with roof gable perpendicular to the street or farmstead front
- Wall finishes typically wood siding but may have later stucco
- Four-room over four-room interior configuration
- Full-width porch on front gable end
- Paired windows in gable end whose center stile aligns with bottom of roof eaves
- Center upper-story window in side elevation placed at top of wall

Corporate Residence: California Orchard Company House



- Single- or two-story, wood-framed residence
- Constructed in a Craftsman style
- Most extant examples have vertical board-and-batten wall finishes
- Architectural details consistent with the Craftsman style, such as wide overhanging eaves, exposed rafter tails, expansive front porches and clinker brick chimneys

Worker's Housing



- Simple, rectangular buildings of a common design used to house workers
- Gable roof massing covered in wood or asphalt shingles
- Wood structural system covered with wood or corrugated siding
- Multiple wood-framed windows on building sides
- Single door entrance in gable-end wall
- Modestly ornamented, but may contain minimal Colonial Revival, Craftsman, or Modernist architectural detail
- Located within the cluster but separated from the main residence

Labor Camp*



- Small, rectangular buildings of a simple, inexpensive design placed in rows on the farm site
 - Simple gable or shed roof massing covered in wood or asphalt shingles
 - Wood structural system covered with wood or corrugated metal siding
 - Small open plan
 - Single entry door; few windows
 - May be constructed of “found” materials
-

2. Barns

Monterey County ranchers and farmers have used their barns to house and feed animals (*e.g.*, horse, cattle and sheep) and to store crops, farm equipment and vehicles. Dairy barns tend to be more specialized than other animal barns to accommodate milking.

Although pre-1870 log-framed barns may appear in Monterey County, particularly in the South County, milled boards constructed in balloon or platform frames are the primary barn construction material. Barns were fastened with cut nails before 1900 and wire nails after 1900. Mortise-and-tenon barns may be extant; virtually all were constructed before 1900.⁸²⁰

Published descriptions of California barns are broad and not very informative. Although regional variations brought to the West by various Northeast and Midwest ethnic groups exist in small numbers, Monterey County barns tend to be simple, vernacular, gable-roofed structures with one or more shed-roofed additions. After 1900, the “monitor barn” style predominated, with a central, gable-roofed section rising above flanking shed roofs; the resulting clerestory provides ventilation.

Examples of Monterey County barns include:

Three-bay Horse Barn



- Central bay with flanking shed-roofed side aisles
- Entrance in central gable end, with doors in each shed end
- Wood-framed construction
- Barn entrance in gable end
- Vertical board wood siding
- Wood shake or corrugated roofing material
- May contain hay loft in gable end

Central Bay, Side Aisle Dairy Barn



- Large central bay with continuous roofline over side aisle
- Large doors in central bay, smaller door in side aisle
- Small windows on side elevation
- Vertical board wood siding
- Wood shake or corrugated roofing material

⁸²⁰ Caltrans 2007. 155.

Transverse Cross-aisle Dairy Barn



- Central aisle with gable roof bisected by transverse cross aisle
- Entrance in transverse aisle with large doors in gable end
- Small windows on side elevation
- Wood-framed construction, wood siding
- Roof composed of wood shingles or corrugated metal
- May contain roof ventilators
- May contain hay loft in upper gable end

Monitor Barn



- Central, gable-roofed bay flanked by symmetrical shed-roofed bays.
- Open, monitor space above shed roofs for ventilation
- Roof typically of corrugated metal or wood shingles
- Vertical board siding
- Wide side aisles covered by drop shed roofs
- Large wood sliding doors on gable ends

Gable-roofed Dairy Barn



- Long, low building with gable roof.
- Large entrance doors in gable end
- Wood-framed construction, wood siding
- Roof typically of corrugated metal or wood shingles
- Small windows along side elevations

Gambrel Three-bay Barn



- Central bay with flanking side aisles
- Gambrel roof design
- Wood-framed construction
- Large entrance doors in gable end. May have doors in side aisles
- Vertical board wood siding
- Wood shake or corrugated roofing material

Single Bay, Side Aisle Equipment Barn



- Central bay with flanking side aisle
- Continuous roofline from central bay to side aisle
- Entrance in central gable end, with doors in each shed end
- Wood-framed construction
- Vertical board wood siding
- Wood shake or corrugated roofing material

Class A Dairy House



- Central bay with gable roof
- Entrance in central gable end
- Constructed of sanitary materials, concrete floors and steel wall cladding
- Concrete wall materials or metal siding
- Corrugated roofing materials

3. Outbuildings

The purposes and needs of each Monterey County agricultural property determined the types of outbuildings built on that property. Outbuildings generally consist of all ancillary farm buildings or structures that are not residences (primary or worker) or barns. These structures include tool, blacksmith and machine shops; milking houses; tankhouses; garages and carriage houses; and animal and storage sheds. The styles of these structures directly reflect their function, the finances of the farmstead owner and any ethnic or cultural building practices that the owner or builder brought from his or her native land. Many outbuildings, such as storage sheds and tool shops, are simplified vernacular structures built of local materials and serving the specific needs of the farmstead owner. Building materials include adobe (rarely), stone, milled lumber, concrete and steel (the latter two occurring predominantly after 1900).

Examples of Monterey County agricultural outbuildings include:

<i>Blacksmith Shop*</i>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Used to manufacture and repair farm machinery and equipment • Simple gable or shed roof massing finished in wood shingles or corrugated metal • Wood structural system with wood siding • Large sliding entry door for tractors, threshers, etc. • Few small windows • Open interior spaces containing a forge, work benches and related equipment
<i>Machine and tool shop*</i>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Used for storing and repairing farm machinery and equipment • Simple gable or shed roof massing finished in wood shingles or corrugated metal • Wood structural system with wood siding • May contain open sides for easy access • Interior spaces may contain work benches and related equipment

Large Equipment Shed*



- Large, multiple-bay structures for storing larger farm equipment, such as tractors, harvesters and associated motorized devices
- Gable or shed roof massing covered in wood shingles or corrugated metal
- Open side with bays for storing or repairing large farm equipment
- Wide interior spaces for storing and repairing large equipment
- May contain shed additions serving as a tool or machine shop
- Wood structural system with wood siding or corrugated metal siding

Storage Shed*



- Small outbuildings within the farmstead cluster used for storing smaller equipment
- Simple gable or shed roof massing covered in wood shingles or corrugated metal
- Wood structural system with wood or corrugated metal siding
- Few or no windows; single door entry
- Contains small interior space for equipment storage

Milk House



- Small gable roofed structure
- Gable roof with paired gable-roofed ventilators
- Class B: Wood structural system finished with wood or metal siding
- Class A: Concrete structural system with concrete floors
- Primary entrance in side; may contain doors in gable end
- Wood shingle or corrugated metal roofing

Cattle Scale and Squeeze*



- Simple structure with a ramp used to load cattle onto trucks
- Gable roof massing covered in wood or asphalt shingles
- Primary structure is an open but covered structure containing a scale for weighing livestock
- Wood structural system with wood siding
- Surrounded by wood board fencing and animal corrals
- Located near roads or large circulation areas within ranching complex

Animal Shed*



- Simple vernacular structure used for housing and feeding smaller livestock
- Shed or gable roof massing finished with wood or asphalt shingles, or corrugated metal
- Open on one side; supported by wood posts
- Wood structural system with wood siding
- Dirt floor
- Associated with corrals and pens

Breeding Shed*



- Simple single-story building for breeding calves and other small livestock
- Gable roof massing finished in wood shingles or corrugated metal
- Wood structural system with wood siding
- Single door with few or no windows
- Open interior space designed for livestock breeding
- Used for housing calves or small animals
- Located within the corral areas, and/or surrounded by well-maintained animal fencing

Granary*



- Small and simple building used for storing grain
- Simple gable or shed roof massing covered with wood shingles or corrugated metal roofing
- May contain shed-roofed addition
- Exposed structural system visible on the exterior of the building with horizontal wood siding on the interior
- Structure is elevated above ground level for ventilation
- Single door; no windows

Outhouse*



- Small, simple vernacular building
- Simple gable or shed roof covered in wood shingles or boards
- Wood structural system with vertical board wood siding
- Open, small box plan containing privy or pit
- Vertical board or board-and-batten siding
- Single wood front door; no windows

Garage or Carriage House*



- Rectangular structure used to store and maintain carriages or cars
- Gable roof massing covered in wood or asphalt shingles
- Wood structural system with wood or corrugated metal siding
- Often contains matching high-style Victorian, Craftsman, or Revivalist architectural detail to match the primary residence
- Located within the cluster near the main house
- Contains one or more bays for cars or carriages
- May contain garage doors to protect equipment

Tank House*



- Multiple-story building housing water tank for primary farmstead residence
- Gable roof massing covered in wood or asphalt shingles
- Box-like plan large enough to house water tower and associated equipment
- May contain high-style Victorian, Craftsman or Revivalist architectural detail to match the primary residence
- Wood structural system clad in wood siding
- Single door; multiple windows in upper story

Chicken Coop*



- Small, simple building used for housing and caring for chickens
- Shed or gable roof massing covered in wood shingles or corrugated metal
- Wood structural system with wood or corrugated metal siding
- Contains open entrance or ramp for chickens to enter the building
- Surrounded by fencing and/or wire mesh enclosures for animal roaming
- Few or no windows

Greenhouse*



- Simple rectangular structure used to store and grow plants
- Gable roof massing consisting of an open framework with glass or plastic panels
- Open wood structural system finished with glass or plastic panels
- Open interior space containing tables for plants
- Single entry door in gable-end wall

4. Processing and Storage

Processing and storage buildings are structures designed specifically for preparing and storing farm products. They include on-site buildings, such as packing houses and drying sheds, and large industrial structures constructed in towns near railroad and roadway transportation links. The former structures tend to be simple, gable or shed-roofed structures designed for processing and storing a specific crop. These structures are typically wood-framed and finished buildings (particularly before 1900) or concrete-framed with a wood or truss-supported roofing system (generally after 1900). The latter structures, constructed primarily in the 20th century, are typically concrete or steel framed with a concrete, steel, or wood-framed roof support system.

Cheese Processing Facility



- Small gable roofed structure attached or adjacent to milkhouse
- Gable roof with paired gable-roofed ventilators
- Class B: Wood structural system finished with wood or metal siding
- Class A: Concrete structural system with concrete floors
- Primary entrance in side; may contain doors in gable end
- Wood shingle or corrugated metal roofing

Food Processing Plant



- Long, rectangular building of industrial size and scale
- Gable, gambrel or arched roof massing supported by timber or concrete trusses
- Concrete or steel wall framing system finished in concrete or concrete block
- Large cargo doors opening onto a loading dock for distribution along transportation routes
- Few or no windows

Food Storage Warehouse



- Long, rectangular building, sometimes attached as a series of identical buildings
- Moderately-pitched gable roof finished in wood or asphalt shingles or rolled roofing (after 1900)
- Wood or concrete (after 1900) wall structural system finished with vertical boards or concrete/concrete block (after 1900)
- Large cargo doors at gable end facing a loading dock for distribution along transportation routes
- Few or no windows

Cold Storage Facility



- Long, rectangular building
- Gable, gambrel or arched roof massing supported by timber or concrete trusses
- Concrete or steel wall framing system finished in concrete or concrete block
- Large cargo doors opening onto a loading dock for distribution along transportation routes
- Few or no windows

5. Farmstead Support Structures

Farmstead support structures are site features that are not classified as buildings. They include corrals; water tanks; watering and feeding troughs; irrigation ditches; access roads; wells and windmills; and abandoned farming equipment.

*Corrals and Animal Pens**



- Wood post and board fencing
- Square and rectangular pens separate and direct animals to feeding, sheering, milking or branding areas
- Corrals also contain feeding troughs and watering troughs
- Many corrals have cattle squeezes for loading animals onto trucks or wagons for transport
- Corrals used for roping and branding have unpaved dirt floors

*Feeding and Watering Areas**



- Open field areas with natural grasses
- Contain feeding troughs: long, narrow basins constructed of metal, wood, or concrete
- Minimal buildings
- Located within the rolling fields, near roads
- Water pumps associated with watering troughs to pump water from natural springs

*Elevated Water Tanks**



- Wood framed construction
- Elevated round cylindrical tank constructed out of vertical wood planks tied together with metal cable or straps
- Supported on typical 4" x 4" post and beam construction platform
- Ladder leading up to the water tank
- Located near main residence
- Some water tanks are housed within a tank house (building)

Wells, pumps, and windmills*



- Metal trellised pyramid shaped tower
- Complete windmill includes metal blades, turbine and fan
- Attached pump to bilge water from well below
- Horizontal pipe (sucker rod) attached to pump to release water into collection basin
- Concrete lined collection basin, or cistern
- Some collection basins are covered with wood planking
- Below ground well

Grain Silos and Grain Elevators*



- Round, cylindrical metal silos
- Conical metal roofs with small opening in top
- Some are elevated on wood platforms
- Small door or chase along the bottom of the silo to release the grains
- Adjacent elevator or structure to hold boom to load silo with loose grain

Abandoned Farming Equipment*



- Old harvesters, balers, side hill combines, tractors, etc. are left abandoned in place once retired from use. Some are stored in garages or sheds; many are left in situ within or near the farm complex

Irrigation Ditches and Tree Rows*



- Irrigation ditches divert and channel water to collection ponds in wet months
- Ditches typically border roadways
- Tree rows provide demarcation of properties as well as wind breaks near building clusters
- Trees are planted in rows of the same variety

6. Community Infrastructure

This category comprises buildings and structures that enabled the development of new communities. Examples include buildings constructed to service the community, such as railroad and electrical buildings; and buildings that support the social aspects of a town, such as granges and schools. Since this category includes a number of function types, building materials and architectural styles vary considerably.

School



- Simple, vernacular structure with architectural detail that may reflect local ethnic traditions
- Moderately-pitched gable roof finished in wood or asphalt shingles
- Wood wall framing finished with wood siding
- Sash or casement windows with minimal architectural detail

Grange or Community Hall



- Simple, vernacular structure with minimal architectural detail
- Moderately-pitched gable roof finished in wood or asphalt shingles
- Wood wall framing finished with wood siding
- Sash or casement windows with minimal architectural detail

Electrical Utility Building



- Single structure, first prototype is small, hipped roof building
- Second prototype: larger building with Spanish Revival detailing
- Hipped corrugated roof with ventilator (Type 1)
- Clay-tiled roof with gable ventilator (Type 2)
- Type 1: Corrugated wall siding with no windows
- Type 2: Concrete wall siding with arched entrance in gable end, with flanking windows. Contains side windows.

Irrigation Structure



- Small corrugated pump house
- Gable roof in corrugated metal
- Corrugated metal wall finish
- Single entrance door
- Attached to pipes, wells or other irrigation infrastructure

VII. PRESERVATION GOALS AND PRIORITIES

A. Introduction

Monterey County's agricultural landscape is in constant flux and the buildings, structures and sites that reflect the area's agricultural history evolve to meet new needs. Historically, the region transitioned from extensive agriculture (*e.g.*, cattle grazing, grain production and dry vegetable farming) to intensive industrial agriculture (*e.g.*, irrigated berries, apples, lettuce and artichokes). Over the past few centuries, workers from around the globe have made Monterey County into one of the most productive agricultural regions in the world, and its fertile soils continue to yield specialty crops of unprecedented quality and quantity.

While change is a necessary, even vital, part of agricultural development, current industrial agricultural practices threaten Monterey County's diverse historic agricultural resources. Demanding vast tracts of land and a large labor pool, industrial agriculture has substantially removed many of the landscape characteristics, buildings, structures and other features that would qualify some properties as rural historic landscapes. This historic context statement includes several illustrative examples.


An aerial view of the Clough Farmstead, shown to the right, provides a striking illustration of the magnitude of encroachment caused by industrial agriculture. Open fields, non-contributing structures and equipment used in the industrial strawberry fields surround the site's original building cluster.

Within the cluster, the few remaining historic buildings suffer from deferred maintenance as they now serve as haphazard storage facilities.⁸²¹

Because industrial agriculture is quickly removing the integrity of some of Monterey County's best rural historic landscapes, it is critical for the County to continue the preservation planning process outlined in the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Preservation Planning*:

- Standard I. Preservation Planning Establishes Historic Contexts.

⁸²¹ PAST Consultants, LLC, *Historic Context Statement for Agricultural Resources in the North County Planning Area, Monterey County*, 179.



Industrial agriculture surrounding the Clough Farmstead at 1478 San Juan Rd. (Courtesy Google Earth, 2010.)

- Standard II. Preservation Planning Uses Historic Contexts to Develop Goals and Priorities for the Identification, Evaluation, Registration and Treatment of Historic Properties.
- Standard III. The Results of Preservation Planning Are Made Available for Integration Into Broader Planning Processes.

This historic context statement fulfills Standard I's broad goal by establishing Monterey County's historic agricultural context, historic themes, associated property types, eligibility criteria and integrity thresholds. The County should now implement Standards II and III. Preservation priorities to fulfill those standards are listed below.

B. Preservation Goals and Priorities

Standards II and III of the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Preservation Planning* emphasize that information in historic context statements should help communities develop goals and priorities for identifying, evaluating, registering and treating historic properties, and that communities should integrate preservation planning into broader planning processes.

It is particularly important to identify potentially significant agricultural properties because demolition applications or other proposed projects may adversely impact them. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines define a "historical resource" as:

- (1) A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources;
- (2) A resource included in a local register of historical resources (defined in Public Resources Code § 5020.1(k)) or identified as significant in an historical resource survey (defined in Public Resources Code § 5024.1(g)), shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.
- (3) Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be "historically significant" if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (Public Resources Code, § 5024.1, Title 14 California Code of Regulations, Section 4852) including the following:

- (1) It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
 - (2) It is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
 - (3) It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
 - (4) It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.
- (4) The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historical resources (defined in Public Resources Code § 5020.1(k)), or identified in an historical resources survey (defined in Public Resources Code § 5024.1(g)) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be an historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code sections 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.⁸²²

When evaluating a potential project, lead agencies must determine whether a project may cause a substantial change in the significance of a historical resource. If so, that project may have a significant effect on the environment. A “substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource means physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired.”⁸²³

To help protect historic resources from significant adverse impacts, Monterey County should implement the following steps:

- Allocate funds to conduct additional reconnaissance-level and intensive-level surveys of potentially historic agricultural resources. Educating property owners about the survey process and purposes, as well as getting permission to enter properties, will ensure the survey’s success. Conduct outreach to the local agricultural community with letters and workshops that explain the purpose, procedures and value of the survey process. Provide a letter on Monterey County letterhead explaining the survey process. This letter is critical to the understanding of the property owners who are sensitive to newcomers on their property.
- Continue collecting oral histories about the region’s agricultural past, as various local educational and nonprofit organizations have done.

⁸²² California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3 [California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines], § 15064.5(a)(2).

⁸²³ California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines, § 15064.5(4)(b)(1).

- Synthesize results of the intensive-level survey to determine the potential for properties or rural historic landscapes to be nominated to national, state, and local registers; to become historic districts; or to execute Williamson Act or Mills Act contracts.
- Enter information into the County’s Geographic Information System (GIS) about properties that have been recorded in historic surveys or listed in historic registers. Identify them with information about whether the properties are listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register, California Register, Monterey County Register or another local register.
- “Red flag” any County records that are identified, located or maintained by Assessor’s Parcel Number (APN) if the parcel is listed in a historic register or identified in a historic survey, noting the property’s verified or potential historic significance. Red flagging puts realtors and other people interested in a property on notice that the property may be historic. Early notification can prevent future problems when parcels change hands if new property owners already know that future projects will have to take the property’s historic status or potentially historic status into account.
- Train planning and building department personnel regarding the meaning and importance of GIS listings and the “red flagged” APNs.
- Send congratulatory letters to owners of properties identified in historic surveys. The letter should praise the owners for owning a potentially significant agriculturally-related property (perhaps including an attractive certificate), explain the responsibilities associated with such status, and explain the benefits of historic status (*e.g.*, Mills Act property tax reductions, availability of the State Historical Building Code). The letter should be positive.
- When Monterey County mails annual property tax bills to owners of properties listed in a historic register or identified in a historic survey, the bill should indicate that the property is historic or potentially historic.

Because Monterey County’s agricultural history is inseparable from that of the Central Coast, this *Agricultural Resources Evaluation Handbook* includes information that is relevant to the whole region. To fully understand the area’s agricultural history and to protect important agricultural resources, public agencies and other organizations in Monterey, Santa Cruz and San Benito counties should recognize and emphasize the interconnectedness of the region. Nonprofit organizations like the Monterey County Historical Society, Agricultural History Project and the Pajaro Valley Historical Association already emphasize those connections. When setting future preservation priorities and making land use decisions, municipalities should also explore cooperative historic preservation and educational efforts and recognize that decisions made on local and countywide levels have a regional impact.

C. Suggestions for Further Research

Cultural Landscapes and Potential Districts

The land, in its entirety, developed by the Salinas Land Company and California Orchard Company may potentially be considered a cultural landscape if the region contains enough landscape characteristics and character-defining features that communicate the method in which the land was transformed. A primary future research task should be the consultation of local and regional repositories (such as the Hagan Agricultural Library at the University of California, Davis) to determine the existence of historic maps of the area. The company's extant headquarters could also be contacted for this information.

Fort Romie presents a similar opportunity for the designation of a cultural landscape as some of the original spacing of the colony farmsteads can be discerned. Further research is again recommended, coordinated with historic aerial maps and a reconnaissance survey to determine if the area possesses enough historic integrity.

Research and reconnaissance of the properties on the Highway 198 corridor from San Lucas to the Monterey County line should be undertaken to determine if this highway could be designated a Heritage Corridor as was River Road in the Salinas Valley.

It is also suggested that the extant Jacks Dairies in the corridor between Chualar and Soledad be designated as a non-contiguous historic district.

Archaeology

Archaeological investigations could help determine historic ethnic customs, locate footprints of removed rural historic landscape characteristics and determine crop evolution at a particular site. It is generally assumed that industrial agriculture has removed the primary layers of soil that would contain this information, but this may not be the case on every site. For example, the extensive farmstead on Blackie Road (right) may contain a wealth of archaeological evidence. Experienced archaeologists should evaluate sites on a case-by-case basis to determine their archaeological information potential.



Does the agricultural property at 14468 Blackie Road have archaeological information potential?
(PAST photo).

This page intentionally left blank.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Anderson, Burton. *The Salinas Valley: A History of America's Salad Bowl*. Monterey, CA: The Monterey County Historical Society, Inc., 2000.

Anderson, Henry P. *The Bracero Program in California*. New York: Arno Press, 1976.

Baer, Morley. *Adobes in the Sun*. San Francisco, CA: Chronicle Books, 1972.

Bancroft, Hubert Howe. *History of California, Volume 3: 1825-1840*. San Francisco, CA: The History Company, 1885.

Borg, Jane W. and Kathy McKenzie Nichols. *Nihon Bunka/Japanese Culture: One Hundred Years in the Pajaro Valley*. Watsonville, CA: Pajaro Valley Arts Council, 1992.

Breschini, Gary S., Mona Gudgel and Trudy Haversat, *Spreckels*. Charleston, SC: Arcadia Publishing, 2006.

California Orchard Company. *Annual Report*. Los Angeles, CA: California Orchard Company, March 26, 1924.

California Orchard Company. *California Orchard Company: Developing Nineteen Hundred & Five Acres of Fruit and Farm Land in Monterey County, California*. Los Angeles, CA: Orchard Company, 1922.

Chan, Sucheng. *This Bittersweet Soil: The Chinese in California Agriculture, 1860-1910*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.

Church, Warren. *Historical Notes of North Monterey County With a History of Hidden Valley*. Unpublished manuscript: 2004.

Clark, Donald Thomas. *Monterey County Place Names*. Carmel Valley, CA: Kestrel Press, 1991.

Clovis, Margaret. *Monterey County's North Coast and Coastal Valleys (Images of America Series)*. Charleston, SC: Arcadia Publishing, 2006.

Clovis, Margaret E. and Monterey County Agricultural and Rural Life Museum. *Salinas Valley (Images of America Series)*. Charleston, SC: Arcadia Publishing, 2005.

- Craig, Richard B. *The Bracero Program: Interest Groups and Foreign Policy*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1971.
- DeBow, J. D. B. *The Seventh Census of the United States: 1850*. Washington, D.C.: Robert Armstrong, Public Printer, 1853.
- Duflot du Mofras, Eugene. *Duflot de Mofras' Travels on the Pacific Coast, Volume 1*. Santa Ana, CA: Fine Arts Press, 1937.
- Dunn, Arthur. *Monterey County, California*. San Francisco: Sunset Magazine Homeseekers' Bureau, 1915.
- Fabing, Horace W. and Rick Hamman. *Steinbeck Country Narrow Gauge*. Boulder, CO: Pruett Publishing Company, 1985.
- Fink, Augusta. *Monterey: The Presence of the Past*. San Francisco, CA: Chronicle Books, 1972.
- Geiger, Maynard. *Franciscan Missionaries in Hispanic California, 1769-1848* (San Marino, CA: The Huntington Library, 1969).
- Gordon, Burton L. *Monterey Bay Area: Natural History and Cultural Imprints*. Pacific Grove, CA: The Boxwood Press, 1979.
- Guilbault, Rose Castillo. *Farmworker's Daughter: Growing Up Mexican in America*. Berkeley, CA: Heyday Books, 2005.
- Guinn, J. M. *History of the State of California and Biographical Record of Santa Cruz, San Benito, Monterey and San Luis Obispo Counties*. Chicago: The Chapman Publishing Co., 1903.
- Hillstrom, Kevin. *The Dream of America: Immigration 1870-1920*. Detroit: Omnigraphics, Inc., 2009.
- History of Monterey County, California, with Illustrations Descriptive of Its Scenery, Farms, Residences, Public Buildings, Factories, Hotels, Schools, Churches, and Mines*. San Francisco, CA: Elliott & Moore, Publishers, 1881 (Facsimile Reproduction published by Valley Publishers, Fresno, California, 1979).
- Holliday, J. S. *Rush for Riches: Gold Fever and the Making of California*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1999.

Jelinek, Lawrence J. *Harvest Empire: A History of California Agriculture*. San Francisco: Boyd and Fraser Publishing Company, 1979.

Johnston, Robert B. *Old Monterey County: A Pictorial History*. Monterey, CA: Monterey Savings and Loan Association, 1970.

Kennedy, Joseph C. G. *Preliminary Report of the Eighth Census, 1860*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1862.

Leffingwell, Randy. *Barns*. Minneapolis, MN: MBI Publishing Company, 2001.

Lewis, Betty. *W. H. Weeks: Architect*. Fresno, CA: Pioneer Publishing Company, 1989, (Second Edition).

London, Jack. *Valley of the Moon*. Berkeley, CA: Macmillan Company, 1913.

Lydon, Sandy. *Chinese Gold: The Chinese in the Monterey Bay Region*. Capitola, CA: Capitola Book Company, 1985.

Lydon, Sandy. *The Japanese in the Monterey Bay Region*. Capitola, CA: Capitola Book Company, 1997.

Margolin, Malcolm. *The Ohlone Way: Indian Life in the San Francisco-Monterey Bay Area*. Berkeley: Heyday Books, 1978.

Margolin, Malcolm, Ed. *The Way We Lived: California Indian Stories, Songs & Reminiscences*. Berkeley: Heyday Books, 1993.

Martin, Edward. *Directory of the Town of Watsonville for 1873, embracing a General Directory of Residents, together with a Description of the Pajaro Valley, its Climate, Soil, Resources, and a Variety of Useful Information*. Watsonville, CA: C. O. Cummings, 1873.

Mekis, Donna F. and Kathryn Mekis Miller. *Blossoms into Gold: The Croatians in the Pajaro Valley*. Capitola: Capitola Book Company, 2009.

Mohr, Nancy L. *The Barn: Classic Barns of North America*. Philadelphia, PA: Running Press, 2001.

Nakane, Kazuko. *Nothing Left in My Hands: An Early Japanese American Community in California's Pajaro Valley*. Seattle, WA: Young Pine Press, 1985.

- Noble, Allen G. and Richard K. Cleek. *The Old Barn Book: A Field Guide to North American Barns & Other Farm Structures*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1995.
- Pfingst, Edward Porter. *Memories of the Pajaro Valley: An Interview With Edward Porter Pfingst*. Watsonville, CA: Pajaro Valley Historical Association, 1974.
- Raycraft, Susan and Ann Keenan Beckett. *San Antonio Valley (Images of America Series)*. Charleston, SC: Arcadia Publishing, 2006.
- Eugene T. Sawyer, *History of Santa Clara County, California* (Los Angeles: Historic Record Co., 1922.
- Scheuring, Ann Foley (Editor) and Faculty and Staff of the University of California. *A Guidebook to California Agriculture*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1983.
- Secrest, William B. *California Feuds: Vengeance, Vendettas & Violence on the Old West Coast*. Sanger, CA: Quill Driver Books/Word Dancer Press, 2005.
- Souvenir Edition Monterey County Illustrated: Resources, History, Biography*. Salinas, CA: E.A. Harrison, Publisher (undated, pencil inscription on frontispiece states publication date of 1888 or 1889).
- Starr, Kevin. *California: A History*. New York, NY: Modern Library, 2005.
- Steinbeck, John. *The Harvest Gypsies: On the Road to the Grapes of Wrath*. Berkeley: Heyday Books, 1988; reprint of 1936 edition by *The San Francisco News*.
- Stoll, Steven. *The Fruits of Natural Advantage: Making the Industrial Countryside in California*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
- Street, Richard Steven. *Beasts of the Field: A Narrative History of California Farmworkers, 1769-1913*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2004.
- Teague, Charles Collins. *Fifty Years a Rancher*. Los Angeles, CA: The Ward Ritchie Press, 1944.
- Thollander, Earl. *Barns of California*. San Francisco, CA: California Historical Society, 1974.
- Vaught, David. *Cultivating California: Growers, Specialty Crops, and Labor, 1875-1920*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.

Vegetable Specialists and Farm Advisors of Cooperative Extension, "Vegetable Crops," A *Guidebook to California Agriculture*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1983.

Walker, Richard A. *The Conquest of Bread: 150 Years of Agribusiness in California*. New York: The New Press, 2004.

Wall, Rosalind Sharpe. *When the Coast Was Wild and Lonely*. Pacific Grove, CA: The Boxwood Press, 1987.

Webb, Edith Buckland. *Indian Life at the Old Missions*. Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press, 1982.

Webster's II: New Riverside University Dictionary. Boston: Riverside Publishing Company, 1984.

Welden, Meg. "The Key to the Garden: Water Development in Monterey County," *Noticias del Puerto de Monterey* (Monterey, CA: Monterey History and Art Association, Ltd., September 1993).

Wickson, Edward J. *The California Fruits and How to Grow Them*. San Francisco, CA: Pacific Rural Press, 1921.

Withington, Jack. *Historical Buildings of Sonoma County*. Penngrove, CA: 3rd Wing Press, 2000.

Zinke, Paul J. and Constant C. Delwiche, "Soils and Climate," *A Guidebook to California Agriculture*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1983.

Newspaper and Magazine Articles

"\$15 Million Cold Cash In a Year." *Watsonville Register-Pajaronian*, 2 July 1952.

"50th Anniversary Recalls Salinas Land Co. History." *The Land*, March 1968.

Agricultural History Project. "Life in Early Days of Mud Flats, Recalled by Mollie Williamson." *Agricultural History Project Newsletter*. Watsonville, CA: Agricultural History Project, April 1989.

"Andy Storm Dies in SF." *Watsonville Pajaronian*, 31 May 1941.

“Another Pioneer Gone: Dies at Age of 81, After Half Century in Pajaro,” Pajaro Valley Historical Society files: William Williamson.

“Answers: Who Am I?” *Heritage Newsletter*. Colma: Cypress Lawn Heritage Foundation, Spring 2008.

“Area’s last hop field is torn out,” *Watsonville Register-Pajaronian*, 2 July 1952.

Aromas Friends of the Library and Pajaro Valley Historical Association. “Aromas History Walking Tour,” 24 October 1982.

Baron, Ethan. “Alliance for Food and Farming relocates from LA to Pajaro Valley.” *Register-Pajaronian*, 19 March 2004.

“Bean Harvest Is Setting Record.” *The Land*, October 1956.

“Big as a Barn Or Cozy as a Cottage.” *The Permanente News*. Oakland, CA: The Permanente Metals Corporation, December 1947.

Bruemmer, Dala. “Where have all the flower growers gone?” *Register-Pajaronian*, 19 March 2004.

Casabianca, Ruth. “John T. and Frances Cummins (sic) Porter: A Story of a Pioneer Family in California,” *Noticias del Puerto de Monterey*. Monterey, CA: Monterey History and Art Association, September 1996.

“Changing Times ’95: Salinas Land Co. has long, strong roots in South County.” *Gonzales Tribune, Soledad Bee, Greenfield News*, September 27, 1995.

“Clark Colony’s Substantial Growth,” *The Western Empire*, August 1995. Monterey County Historical Society, “Colony Settlements.”

Costello, Jimmy. “Monterey Lost Rich Heritage to Shrewd Scot,” *Monterey Peninsula Herald*, 1963.

“David Jacks, Pioneer, Is Dead, Was Land King.” *Monterey Daily Cypress* (Monterey, CA: January 12, 1909.

Dugdale, Don. “North County develops: They grow houses instead of Prunes.” *Salinas Californian*, 5 July 1976.

“Farming in the Pajaro Valley — the basis of our economy.” *Register-Pajaronian*, 19 March 1977.

“First Crops Brought Name ‘Spud Valley’,” *Watsonville Register-Pajaronian*, 2 July 1952.

“Forgotten Edens: Agricultural Colonies in the Salinas Valley.” Unpublished, undated manuscript in the files of the County of Monterey.

“Grange Will Celebrate Its 50th Anniversary.” *North County News*, 11 May 1977.

“Greenfield gent recalls 1905’s ‘Clark City’ days.” Unknown newspaper, September 6, 1980.

Griffin, Paul F. and C. Langdon White, “Lettuce Industry of the Salinas Valley.” *The Scientific Monthly* (American Association for the Advancement of Science, August 1955).

“Hans Struve,” obituary, June 1977.

Hibbard, Cynthia. “Alice Crouch: California’s First Real Christmas Tree Farmer.” *North County News*, 21 December 1977.

Hibbard, Cynthia. “Origin of Name is Plain — Prunes for Prunedale.” *North County News*, 3 December 1975.

“Humble Start of Thriving Greenfield Told: Farmers Laughed at Pioneer Effort.” *Salinas Daily Post*, March 8, 1936.

Jack, Kenneth C. “Land King: The Story of David Jack,” *News From The Monterey County Historical Society*. Salinas, CA: Monterey County Historical Society, October 2001.

Jackson, Jim. “Prunedale?” *North Monterey County Fortnighter*, 22 September 1989.

Johnston, Robert B. “A Brief History of Southern Monterey County.” *News from The Monterey County Historical Society*. Salinas, CA: Monterey County Historical Society, May 2002.

Kieffer, Brad. “Aromas’ cots now gone but not forgotten.” *Hollister Free Lance*, 7 September 1986.

Klein, Christine A. “Treaties of Conquest: Property Rights, Indian Treaties and the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo,” 26 *New Mexico Law Review*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico, Spring 1996.

Lewis, Betty. “Robert Orr: Watsonville architect’s work still lives on.” *Register-Pajaronian*, 19 May 2005.

Lewis, Betty. *Watsonville Yesterday*. Watsonville, CA: Litho Watsonville Press, 1978.

Livernois, Joe. "Old shed workers meet as history reviews itself." *North County News*, 18 August 1982.

Loomis, Michael A. "Scoundrel or Benefactor of Monterey," *California HISTORIAN*. Stockton, CA: Conference of California Historical Societies, December 1992.

Lorenson, Edward H. "The Days Gone By," *Watsonville Evening Pajaronian*, 14 October 1916.

Luther, Floyd, editor. "The Blohm family story — The road to Aromas." *Register-Pajaronian*, 23 August 2000.

"M. N. Lettunich Pioneered [rest of title missing]." *Watsonville Morning Sun*, circa 1939. Agricultural History Project Historical Files.

Messick, Everett. "\$6 Million Expansion Beginning." *The Herald*, 15 February 1988.

Messick, Everett. "Historic Barn Will Rise Again." *Monterey County Herald*, 25 November 1988.

Messick, Everett. "Where Are the Prunes in Prunedale?" *Monterey County Herald*, undated.

"Mrs. J. T. Porter, 90 Today, Taught Our First School," *Watsonville Register-Pajaronian*, 7 March 1928.

"Nelse H. Struve," *Watsonville Register-Pajaronian*, 18 April 1974.

Newman, Ralph. "Where a Big Thing is Being Done in a Big Way." *Pacific Rural Press*, March 22, 1924.

"North County home—over a century old." *North County News*, 13 December 1978.

Nuck, Norm. *Antique Advocate – Part 3* (a series of four articles about the Salinas Land Company and California Orchard Company – unknown date).

Pacani, David. "Exhibit of Struve family planned," *Watsonville Register-Pajaronian*, 1 December 1999.

Peck, W. Harold. "St. Joseph's Church," 1950.

"Peter Storm Killed by Falling Tree: A Horrible Death for Prominent Resident." *Watsonville Evening Pajaronian*, January 10, 1916.

Peterson, Vicky “Albertoni dairy one of the few in the Valley,” *The Land*, January 1980.

Progress, Prunedale, CA: Prunedale Chamber of Commerce, May 1996.

“Progress in California’s Development: Unique Colony Founded in the Salinas Valley.” *San Francisco Chronicle* , July 15, 1905.

“Prunedale.” *North County News*, 27 February 1980.

“Prunedale: no longer ‘out in the sticks’.” *Monterey County Herald*, 21 June 1987.

“Prunedale The Last Frontier” *The Quail*. Prunedale, CA: September 1990.

“Queen of Elkhorn Slough Waterways Survived Grave; Became Schoolhouse.” *Register-Pajaronian*, 15 September 1937.

Raider, Faith. “Consistent, creative Doblars earn Farm Family of the Year.” *Register-Pajaronian*, 22 September 1995.

“Roosevelt Bars the Hyphenated.” *New York Times*, 13 October 1915.

Ryan, Mary Ellen and Gary S. Breschini, Ph.D., “The California Cattle Boom, 1849-1862.” Salinas, CA: Monterey County Historical Society, 2010.

“St. Joseph Colonists Came to Salinas In Dry 1897-98,” *Salinas Californian*, 20 March 1948.

“Sambrailo Packaging continues to revolutionize the industry,” *Register-Pajaronian*, 24 September 2003.

Schilling, Elizabeth, “Love and war: A story from Castroville’s past,” *Register-Pajaronian*, 30 March 1987.

Schultz, Ken. “Rural Prunedale Adding.” *Monterey Peninsula Herald*, 29 March 1979.

Slusser, Ed. “About New Miniature Farm Community.” *Register-Pajaronian*, 10 May 1938.

Swift, Carolyn. “Unveiling the Porter Family Legacy,” *The Mid-County Post*, March 23, 1993.

“The Amazing Success Story of the Jacks Family,” *Mills Quarterly*. Oakland, CA: Mills College, August 1987.

“The History of the Barn at The Prunedale Shopping Center.” Undated.

“We Worked Hard but Had Visiting Time” Recalls Maming” in “Looking Back: Greenfield News 60th Year Jubilee Edition.” *Greenfield News*. April 21, 1965.

Winokur, Scott and Christian Berthelsen. “Cutting a Deal on the Environment: Activists accused of favoring cash over mission at Moss Landing.” San Francisco: *San Francisco Chronicle*, 3 June 2001.

Government Documents

County of Monterey, California. Grant Application to the Monterey Peninsula Foundation for the Japanese Language School in Castroville, 2007.

County of Monterey, California. Monterey County Code, Title 21, Chapter 21.06, Section 21.06.010. Tallahassee, FL: Municipal Code Corporation, 2009, http://library.municode.com/HTML/16111/level2/T21_C21.06.html#T21_C21.06_21.06.010 (accessed 22 January 2010).

County of Monterey, California. Monterey County Code, Title 21, Chapter 21.06, Section 21.06.020. Tallahassee, FL: Municipal Code Corporation, 2009, http://library.municode.com/HTML/16111/level2/T21_C21.06.html#T21_C21.06_21.06.020 (accessed 22 January 2010).

County of Monterey, California. Monterey County Code, Title 21, Chapter 21.06, Section 21.06.030. Tallahassee, FL: Municipal Code Corporation, 2009, http://library.municode.com/HTML/16111/level2/T21_C21.06.html#T21_C21.06_21.06.030 (accessed 12 January 2010).

County of Monterey, California. Monterey County Code, Title 16, Chapter 16.40, Section 16.40.010(B). Tallahassee, FL: Municipal Code Corporation, 2009, http://library.municode.com/HTML/16111/level2/T16_C16.40.html#T16_C16.40_16.40.010 (accessed 22 January 2010).

County of Monterey Planning Department, California. *Monterey County, California, North County Land Use Plan, Local Coastal Program*. Monterey County, CA: County of Monterey, 1982, as amended.

County of Monterey Historical Files:

18 Brooklyn Street
21 Fremont Street
170 Hayes Road
300 Hayes Road
1330 San Juan Road

1372 San Juan Road
1478 – 1480 San Juan Road
1615 San Juan Road
1660 San Juan Road
1766 San Juan Road
1767 San Juan Road
Aromas (Area History File)
Aromas History
Castroville Sign II
Crops: Potatoes
Elkhorn Slough
History File: Castroville
Moss Landing (Area History File)
Pajaro History File
Pajaro Survey (Area History File)
Prunedale (Area History File)

Consultant Reports

California Department of Transportation, *A Historical Context and Archaeological Research Design for Agricultural Properties in California*. Sacramento, CA: Division of Environmental Analysis, California Department of Transportation, 2007.

Clark Historic Resource Consultants, Inc. *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources Located in the Unincorporated Areas Between Salinas and Soledad, Monterey County, California, Phase I*. Santa Rosa, CA: Clark Historic Resource Consultants, Inc., September 2000.

Clark Historic Resource Consultants, Inc. *Agriculturally Related Historic Resources Located in the Unincorporated Areas Between Salinas and Soledad, Monterey County, California, Phase II*. Santa Rosa, CA: Clark Historic Resource Consultants, Inc., September 2001.

Galvin Preservation Associates, Inc. *Monterey County Parks Reconnaissance Survey of Agricultural Resources In The South County Planning Area*. Redondo Beach, CA: Galvin Preservation Associates, Inc., October 2009.

Mathews, Glenn David. *Spreckels, California: Design Guidelines*, 1999.

PAST Consultants, LLC. *Historic Context Statement for Agricultural Resources in the North County Planning Area, Monterey County*. Petaluma, CA: PAST Consultants, LLC, September 2010.

Maps

1903-1906 Pajaro Valley map, Pajaro Valley Historical Association.

“General Map of Lines of the Pajaro Valley Consold. R.R.,” Fabing, Horace W. and Rick Hamman. *Steinbeck Country Narrow Gauge*. Boulder, CO: Pruett Publishing Company, 1985, frontispiece.

“Map of the Pajaro Valley, Santa Cruz County California,” C.B. Lewis, Deputy County Surveyor, 1908.

Monterey County Ranch Atlas, Monterey County Agriculture On-Line
http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/ag/ranch_maps.htm (accessed 18 July 2010).

“North County Planning Area,” Monterey County Planning Department (undated).

Sanborn Fire Insurance map of Pajaro, 1902. County of Monterey Historical File: Pajaro Survey.

Sanborn Fire Insurance map of Pajaro, 1908. County of Monterey Historical File: Pajaro Survey.

Websites

Aromas Community Grange. “History of the Teressie White Memorial Scholarship Foundation.” Aromas, CA: Aromas Community Grange, http://www.aromasgrange.org/html_pages/The%20Aromas%20Grange%20History.pdf (accessed January 14, 2010).

Aromas Community Grange. “Membership Application.” Aromas, CA: Aromas Community Grange, http://www.aromasgrange.org/html_pages/GrangeNewMemberForm.pdf (accessed January 14, 2010).

“About Lou.” Moss Landing, CA: Lou Calcagno, 2009, http://www.re-electlou.com/Lou_Calcagno/Bio.html (accessed June 21, 2010).

Terry, Patricia Binsacca. “Fort Romie: The Salvation Army's First Colony” (Salinas, CA: Monterey County Historical Society, 2010), <http://www.mchsmuseum.com/fortromie.html> (accessed June 14, 2011).

Bracero History Archive. “About.” Center for History and New Media, 2010, <http://braceroarchive.org/about> (accessed February 3, 2010).

“Bryant & Sturgis (Boston, Mass.) records, 1801-1872 (inclusive): A Finding Aid.” Boston: President and Fellows of Harvard College, 2009, <http://oasis.lib.harvard.edu/oasis/deliver/~bak00113> (accessed June 25, 2010).

“California Historical Landmarks: Monterey County.” California Office of Historic Preservation, http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=21441 (accessed December 13, 2011).

California State Grange. “History: National Grange.” Sacramento, CA: California State Grange, 2010, <http://www.californiagranger.net/history.html> (accessed June 13, 2010).

California State Grange. “What is the Grange?” Sacramento, CA: California State Grange, 2010, http://www.californiagranger.net/what_grange.html (accessed June 13, 2010).

“Castroville Japanese Language School.” Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, 2010, <http://nrhp.focus.nps.gov/natregsearchresult.do?fullresult=true&recordid=11> (accessed April 13, 2010).

County of Monterey. “Monterey County Register of Historic Resources as of June, 2009,” (Salinas, CA: Monterey County, 2009) http://publicagendas.co.monterey.ca.us/MG75670/AS75689/AS75695/AI83873/DO83876/DO_83876.PDF (accessed June 10, 2010).

Driscoll Strawberry Associates, Inc. “Our Story.” Watsonville, CA: 2010, <http://www.driscolls.com/about/our-story.php> (accessed June 10, 2010).

“Economic Woes Send Cows To Slaughterhouses.” Salinas, CA: KCBA, March 2, 2009, <http://www.kcba.com/Global/story.asp?S=9871650> (accessed June 21, 2010).

Elkhorn Native Plant Nursery. “About Elkhorn Nursery.” Moss Landing, CA: Elkhorn Native Plant Nursery, 2010, <http://www.elkhornnursery.com/default.aspx?pid=1d8c89c2-248c-4fe5-b653-4b891b175745> (accessed May 5, 2010).

Elkhorn Native Plant Nursery. “Plant and Seed Availability.” Moss Landing, CA: Elkhorn Native Plant Nursery, April 20, 2010, <http://www.elkhornnursery.com/default.aspx?pid=1c16f64c-4291-4c62-81be-8e533b384445> (accessed May 5, 2010).

Elkhorn Slough Foundation. “Elkhorn Slough Protected Lands.” Moss Landing, CA: Elkhorn Slough Foundation, March 2009, <http://www.elkhornslough.org/protected.htm> (accessed May 1, 2010).

Elkhorn Slough Foundation. "ESF acquires Hambey Ranch: A big piece of land in a small watershed." Moss Landing, CA: Elkhorn Slough Foundation, Summer 2003, <http://www.elkhornslough.org/newsletter/news0307.htm#Hambey> (accessed June 17, 2010).

Elkhorn Slough Foundation, "ESF Adds 550 Acres to Protected Lands," (Moss Landing, CA: Elkhorn Slough Foundation, 2003), <http://www.elkhornslough.org/newsletter/news0301.htm> (accessed June 1, 2010).

Elkhorn Slough Foundation. "Farmers See Stewardship Working: Azevedo Ranch, before and after ten years of stewardship." Moss Landing, CA: Elkhorn Slough Foundation, Spring 2003, <http://www.elkhornslough.org/newsletter/news0304.htm#restoration>, (accessed May 1, 2010).

Elkhorn Slough Foundation. "Foundation Dedicates Porter Preserve." Moss Landing CA: Elkhorn Slough Foundation, 2002, <http://www.elkhornslough.org/newsletter/news0210.htm#porter> (accessed March 5, 2010).

Elkhorn Slough Foundation. "Historic Pioneer Ranch to be Preserved." Moss Landing CA: Elkhorn Slough Foundation, August 7, 2002, <http://www.elkhornslough.org/newspages/newspporter.htm> (accessed March 5, 2010).

Elkhorn Slough Foundation. "History of Elkhorn Slough, 1852." Moss Landing, CA: Elkhorn Slough Foundation, 2010, <http://www.elkhornslough.org/history/1852.htm>, (accessed May 1, 2010).

Forstall, Richard L., Editor. "California: Population of Counties by Decennial Census: 1900 to 1990." U.S. Bureau of the Census, Population Division: March 27, 1995, <http://www.census.gov/population/cencounts/ca190090.txt> (accessed January 7, 2010).

Hanson, Randall T. *Geohydrologic Framework of Recharge and Seawater Intrusion in the Pajaro Valley, Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties, California*. Sacramento, CA: U.S. Geological Survey, 2003, <http://pubs.usgs.gov/wri/wri034096/pdf/wri034096.pdf> (accessed December 9, 2009).

http://www.mchsmuseum.com/trescony_alberto.html (accessed June 14, 2011).

Kern County Superintendent of Schools, "Miller and Lux Survey Office," Kern County Museum (Bakersfield, CA: Kern County Superintendent of Schools, 2011), [http://www.kcmuseum.org/stories/storyReader \\$109](http://www.kcmuseum.org/stories/storyReader $109) (accessed June 14, 2011).

Krasner-Khait, Barbara. "The Impact of Refrigeration," <http://www.history-magazine.com/refrig.html> (accessed May 26, 2010).

"Los Coches Adobe," City of Soledad, <http://www.ci.soledad.ca.us/index.aspx?NID=330> (accessed January 20, 2011).

Monterey County Planning Commission. Staff report for June 25, 2003 meeting, Combined Development Permit (Gallo [Olson Ranch]; PLN010188), 35422 Paraiso Springs Road, Soledad, <http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/planning/cca/cca2003/PC/06-25-03/PLN010188PC1.pdf> (accessed March 24, 2011).

Monterey County Historical Society, "Colony Settlements." (Salinas, CA: Monterey County Historical Society, 2010), <http://www.mchsmuseum.com/colonysettlements.html>, (accessed June 14, 2011).

Nadel, Leonard. "Living quarters in a bracero camp in the Salinas Valley, California." Bracero History Archive, Item #2338, <http://braceroarchive.org/items/show/2338> (accessed February 3, 2010).

"National Register of Historic Places: California – Monterey County." <http://www.nationalregisterofhistoricplaces.com/ca/Monterey/state.html> (accessed April 13, 2010).

Pacific Gas and Electric Corporation, "Energizing California for 150 Years," <http://www.pge.com/about/company/profile/history> (accessed May 14, 2011).

Pajaro Valley Historical Association. "The Volck Museum – Carriage House." Watsonville, CA: Pajaro Valley Historical Association, <http://www.pajarovalleyhistory.org/index.php?page=about-vm> (accessed May 3, 2010).

"Porter-Vallejo Mansion." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, 2010, <http://nrhp.focus.nps.gov/natregsearchresult.do?fullresult=true&recordid=43> (accessed April 13, 2010.)

Ratnikas, Algis. "Timeline of the San Francisco Bay Area: c. 1930-1975." Timelines of History, undated, http://timelines.ws/cities/sfba_c.html (accessed April 26, 2010).

Ryan Mary Ellen and Gary S. Breschini, Ph.D., "An Overview of Monterey County Agriculture," (Salinas, CA: Monterey County Historical Society, 2010), <http://www.mchsmuseum.com/agoverview.html> (accessed June 14, 2011).

Sambrailo Packaging. "Sambrailo Packaging Company History." Watsonville, CA: Sambrailo Packaging, <http://www.sambrailo.com/history.html> (accessed May 3, 2010).

Smith-Hobson, LLC, <http://www.smithhobson.com> (accessed 14 June 14, 2011).

University of California Museum of Paleontology. "The Miocene Epoch." Berkeley: University of California Museum of Paleontology, 2002, <http://www.ucmp.berkeley.edu/tertiary/mio.html> (accessed March 5, 2010).

U.S. Geological Survey. "Earthquake Glossary: Alluvium." Reston, VA: U.S. Geological Survey, November 3, 2009, <http://earthquake.usgs.gov/learn/glossary/?term=alluvium> (accessed December 8, 2009).

U.S. Department of the Interior. "National Asian-Pacific Heritage Month." Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, <http://www.nps.gov/history/nr/feature/asia/2000/feature00.htm> (accessed February 9, 2010).

Warren Church Christmas Tree Farm. "Our Farm." Royal Oaks, CA: Warren Church Christmas Tree Farm, <http://warrenchurchtrees.com> (accessed May 1, 2010).

Other Media

Agricultural History Project. "Technology," Agricultural Timelines display. Watsonville, CA: Agricultural History Project.

Agricultural History Project. "Transportation," Agricultural Timelines display. Watsonville, CA: Agricultural History Project.

Allen, Rutillus Harrison. *Economic History of Agriculture in Monterey County, California During the American Period* (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1932).

Birnbaum, Charles A. ASLA. *Preservation Brief 36: Protecting Cultural Landscapes: Planning, Treatment and Management of Historic Landscapes*. Washington, D.C.: Technical Preservation Services, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, 1994.

Brown, Sylvia and Susan Collins. "Martinelli's Cider Celebrates 140th Anniversary With New Sparkling Apple Fruit and Berry Juice Blends." San Francisco: Brown & Collins, 19 May 2008.

California Department of Transportation. *A Historical Context and Archaeological Research Design for Agricultural Properties in California*. Sacramento, CA: Division of Environmental Analysis, California Department of Transportation, 2007.

California Office of Historic Preservation. *OHP Preferred Format for Historic Context Statements*. Sacramento, CA: California Office of Historic Preservation, undated.

Copeland, Dennis and Lee Gularte. *Union Catalog of Historic Documents*. Salinas, CA: Monterey County Historical Advisory, 2005.

Derry, Anne, H. Ward Jandl, Carol D. Shull, and Jan Thorman. *National Register Bulletin 24: Guidelines for Local Surveys: A Basis for Preservation Planning*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1977 (Revised by Patricia L. Parker, 1985).

Diaz, Ibis, Sales Account Manager, McLellan Botanicals, personal communication to Paige J. Swartley, 23 July 2010.

“Explanation of the relationship between Salinas Land Company and California Orchard Company.” Meg Clovis’s notes from Salinas Land Company files, Greenfield, May 16, 1995.

“Forgotten Edens: Agricultural Colonies in the Salinas Valley.” Unpublished, undated manuscript in the files of the County of Monterey.

Fox, Jason and R. Brooks Jeffery. *Carport Integrity Policy, Arizona State Historic Preservation Office*. Phoenix, AZ: University of Arizona, 2005.

Fulton, Janet. “The Prunedale Hills: A Study in Landscape Change.” Unpublished manuscript, April 1986.

Hartz, J. D., Public Relations Director, California State Grange, personal communication to Paige J. Swartley, 21 July 2010.

Historical Survey of the Monterey Peninsula. “Land Grants,” File 55: “Salinas Land Company – California Orchard Company.”

Jenkins, Fred H. “This ’n That!,” unknown date. Pajaro Valley Historical Association files: Williamson.

Johnston, Robert. *Revolution in Agriculture*. Robert B. Johnston Papers, Monterey County Historical Society.

Johnston, Warren E. and Alex F. McCalla. *Special Report 04-1: Whither California Agriculture: Up, Down, or Out? Some Thoughts About the Future*. Davis, CA: University of California, Giannini Foundation of Agricultural Economics, 2009.

- Jones, Allen. *Agriculture: Salinas Valley Seed Program* (untitled and undated thesis). Monterey County Historical Society.
- Lydon, Sandy. "History of Monterey Bay," Cabrillo class materials, Jane Borg Collection.
- Lydon, Sandy, *et al.* *An Outline History of Agriculture in the Pajaro Valley*. Watsonville, CA: Agricultural History Project, (printed by PVUSD Adult Education Community Print Shop), 1989.
- McClelland, Linda Flint, J. Timothy Keller, ASLA, Genevieve P. Keller, and Robert Z. Melnick, ASLA. *National Register Bulletin 30: Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Rural Historic Landscapes*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1999.
- Molho, Allan. "Crossing the Bar: A Brief History of Agriculture and Transportation on the Central Coast," Exhibit at the Agricultural History Project of the Central Coast, Watsonville, CA.
- Molho, Allan. Personal correspondence to Meg Clovis, 26 February 2011.
- Monterey County Historical Society, "Alberto Trescony (?-1892)." Salinas, CA: Monterey County Historical Society, 2010.
- "Monterey County Labor Camps." California Department of Industrial Relations, Commission on Immigration and Housing. Berkeley, CA: University of California, Bancroft Library.
- National Register Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1998.
- National Register Bulletin 16A: How to Complete the National Register Registration Form*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1997.
- Nelson, Marie. "Writing Historic Contexts." Sacramento, CA: California Office of Historic Preservation, undated.
- Olmstead, Alan L. and Paul W. Rhode. "The Evolution of California Agriculture, 1850-2000," in Jerome B. Siebert (Editor), *California Agriculture: Dimensions and Issues*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 2004.
- Pajaro Valley Historical Association, "Pajaro Valley Historical Association Heritage Homes Tour." Circa 1989.
- Pajaro Valley Historical Association Files: "William Williamson."

Pajaro Valley Historical Association Files: “Williamson.”

Pajaro Valley Historical Association Files: “1767 San Juan Road, Rowe, James.”

Roosevelt, Franklin D. “Executive Order No. 9066 Authorizing the Secretary of War to Prescribe Military Areas.” Washington, DC: The White House, 19 February 1942.

“Salinas Land Company – California Orchard Company,” undated document from the Salinas Land Company files, Greenfield, California.

Seavey, Kent. “DPR Form 523A: Ellingwood Hay Company Barn.” Pacific Grove, CA: Kent Seavey, 2009.

Seavey, Kent. “National Register of Historic Places, Registration Form, Rancho San Lucas (Trescony Ranch).” San Lucas, CA: Kent Seavey, 1990.

Seavey, Kent. “DPR Form 523A and B: San Bernardo Grange.” San Ardo, CA: Kent Seavey, 2007.

Shikuma, Hiroshi. *Strawberry Growing in the Pajaro Valley*. Santa Cruz, CA: University of California, (printed interview with Hiroshi Shikuma, taken from Monterey County Historical Archives, courtesy Meg Clovis), 1986.

Smithsonian National Museum of American History. *Bittersweet Harvest: The Bracero Program 1942 – 1964*. Exhibit at Mexican Heritage Plaza, San José, CA, February 20-May 2, 2010.

Snyder, Alzora. “Snyder Family in Aromas,” 15 April 1984. Pajaro Valley Historical Association files: Snyder.

“Spreckels & Pajaro Valley Consolidated Railroad, 1880s-1930,” Monterey County Historical Society Archives, File # 90.53.144.

Tom Thwaits, Tom. *Draft of Speech* (Salinas Land Company Office, Greenfield, CA: circa 1968).

“Timeline: Mission Soledad Vineyard and Olson Farm,” Monterey County Historical File: Ft. Romie (undated).