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INTRODUCTION

As part of the ongoing efforts to identify the City’s historic resources, in 2016 the City of Goleta embarked on a citywide historic resources survey and development of a comprehensive historic context statement. The historic context statement for the city’s built environment was developed by Historic Resources Group, including Christine Lazzaretto, Principal; and Molly Iker-Johnson, Associate Architectural Historian, both of whom meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Standards in history and architectural history.¹ The archaeological study was completed by John M. Foster, RPA of Greenwood and Associates, with input from David Stone, RPA of Wood Group Environment & Infrastructure, Inc. and the Barbareño Band of Chumash Indians. The tree study was completed by Carlberg Associates, including Cy Carlberg, Principal; and Christy Cuba, Senior Arborist, both of whom are certified arborists with the International Society of Arboriculture (#WE-0575A and #WE-1982A, respectively) and registered consulting arborists with the American Society of Consulting Arborists (#405 and #502, respectively). The City’s Planning and Environmental Review Department is responsible for management and coordination of the project.

The City of Goleta was incorporated in 2002 and comprises approximately eight square miles. As of the 2010 United States Federal Census, the City of Goleta had a population of 29,888. Goleta is located in Santa Barbara County, California, approximately ten miles northwest of the City of Santa Barbara, and approximately 100 miles southeast of the City of San Luis Obispo. Access to Goleta is via the US 101 Freeway. Situated on the Pacific Ocean, Goleta is bordered by unincorporated Santa Barbara County on the north, east, and west; and to the south by unincorporated Santa Barbara County, the University of California Santa Barbara, the Santa Barbara Municipal airport, and the Pacific Ocean. The geography and topography in the region created a natural barrier for the City, which influenced the way in which it developed.

The historic context statement is divided into three chapters:

Chapter 1: Built Environment
Chapter 2: Archaeological Study
Chapter 3: Tree Study

The area of study for all three chapters is the current boundary of the City of Goleta.
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Chapter 1
Built Environment

Aerial view of Old Town Goleta, 1952. Source: Goleta Valley Historical Society
HISTORIC CONTEXT STATEMENT

Purpose
In order to understand the significance of the historic and architectural resources in the City of Goleta, it is necessary to examine those resources within a series of contexts. The purpose of a historic context statement is to place built resources in the appropriate historic, social, and architectural context so that the relationship between an area’s physical environment and its broader history can be established.

A historic context statement analyzes the historical development of a community according to guidelines written by the California Office of Historic Preservation and the National Park Service, as specified in National Register Bulletin 16A: How to Complete the National Register Registration Form and National Register Bulletin 24: Guidelines for Local Surveys. Bulletin 16A describes a historic context as follows:

Historic context is information about historic trends and properties grouped by an important theme in pre-history or history of a community, state, or the 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. In this way, they provide a framework for determining the significance of a property.  

A historic context statement is linked with tangible built resources through the concept of “property type,” which is a grouping of individual properties based on shared physical or associative characteristics.

This historic context is not intended to be a comprehensive history of the City of Goleta. Rather, its purpose is to highlight trends and patterns critical to the understanding of the built environment. It identifies the various historical factors that shaped the development of the area, including historic activities or events, important people, building types, architectural styles, and patterns of physical development. The historic context provides a framework for the continuing process of identifying historic, architectural, and cultural resources in the city. It is meant to serve as a guide to enable citizens, planners, and decision-makers to evaluate the relative significance and integrity of potential historic resources and to provide a framework for the development of a comprehensive preservation program.

---

Methodology

The historic context statement uses the National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Submission (MPS) approach, and covers each significant phase of the city’s built environment, from the 19th century through 1969. Existing studies were used in the development of this document; where possible, information provided by secondary sources was corroborated by primary source materials. Information in existing studies was supplemented by additional research using both primary and secondary sources and consultation with local experts to develop the historical narrative and obtain additional information about significant individual properties and neighborhoods. Special thanks to Fermina Murray and Ron Nye, who reviewed a draft of the context statement and provided valuable insights and commentary.

Research efforts to inform both the context and field study included:

- Literature review of published and online sources for property-specific information about potentially architecturally or culturally significant properties in Goleta.
- Review of building permits, tax assessor data, Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps (available for select areas in 1930), and aerial photographs.
- Development of study maps illustrating the growth of Goleta by decade in order to review development and settlement patterns.
- Mapping of residential tracts in Goleta subdivided prior to 1969 using information from tract maps and survey records. Map included in Appendix B for reference.
- Research on ownership of all tracts to confirm individuals, developers, or investor consortia.
- Search of local newspapers for key developments, owners, architects, and other historic personages.
- Search of the archives at the Goleta Valley Historical Society.
- Search of the archives at the Santa Barbara Historical Society.
- Search of the archives at the University of California, Santa Barbara.
- Online and manual search of Goleta city directories up to 1970, as available.
- Online searches of the Avery Index to Architectural Periodicals and review of articles generated.
- ProQuest searches of newspapers and other publications, including period trade publications.
- Review of American Institute of Architects (AIA) membership files.
- Outreach (email/in person): Fermina Murray, Ron Nye, Amanda de Lucia, and Bruce Morden.
- Kickoff meeting with City planning staff.
- Meetings with the Goleta Valley Historical Society, South Coast Railroad Museum, and members of the community.
Organization

There are several overarching forces that influenced the development of Goleta. These include the area’s proximity to the Mission Santa Barbara, which formerly owned the lands which now comprise the City of Goleta; the early and continued development of Goleta as an agricultural area; the development of a strong industrial center anchored by the oil and aerospace industries; and a racially and economically diverse population. These factors influenced all types of development in the city (residential, commercial, institutional, and industrial).

The historic context statement provides a narrative historical overview of the major forces that shaped land use patterns and development of the built environment of the City of Goleta, and provides a framework for the identification and evaluation of potential historic resources in the city. Within each context is an identification of the relevant themes associated with that context. The themes outline the historical development patterns, significant events or activities, and significant individuals and groups in Goleta’s history in order to establish the potential historical significance of properties associated with each context and theme.

The context is organized chronologically, and the relevant themes are organized by type of development (single- and multi-family residential, commercial, industrial, and civic/institutional) within each chronological period. A discussion of each architectural style identified in the city, including an identification of character-defining features, is included in the Architecture Context.

Five broad periods have been identified to provide the framework for evaluating built resources within the City of Goleta prior to 1970; see Chapter 2 for a discussion of Goleta’s early history and potential archaeological resources. For some of the early development periods, there may be limited extant resources. Within each period are themes relative to the development of the built environment in Goleta during that period:

- **Context: Mexican Settlement and the Rancho Period (1821-1865)**
  - Theme: The Rancho Period (1821-1865)

  This context addresses the development of the Goleta Valley after Mexico achieved independence from Spain, the evolution of the Rancho period, and the transition from Mexican to American sovereignty after the Mexican-American War.

- **Context: Late 19th/Early 20th Century Development (1866-1918)**
  - Theme: The Development of Two Towns (1869-1918)

The historic context statement identifies early pioneers whose land-holdings or activities influenced how Goleta developed.
This context explores the development of the Goleta Valley after the close of the Rancho period in 1865, and the founding of the towns of La Patera and La Goleta in 1869.

• Context: Development Between the Wars (1919-1940)
  o Theme: Residential Development (1919-1940)
  o Theme: Commercial Development (1919-1941)
  o Theme: Civic & Institutional Development (1919-1941)
  o Theme: Agriculture (1919-1940)
  o Theme: Industrial Development (1919-1940)

This context explores the transformation of Goleta from two neighboring towns and a scattered grouping of ranches and farms into a booming citrus producer and oil town in the years between the First and Second World Wars.

• Context: Goleta During World War II (1941-1945)

This context explores the development of World War II-related military facilities in and around Goleta, and the commercial, industrial, and institutional development of the town during the War.

• Context: Post-World War II Development (1946-1969)
  o Theme: Post-World War II Residential Development
  o Theme: Post-World War II Commercial Development
  o Theme: Post-World War II Agricultural Development
  o Theme: Aerospace Industry
  o Theme: Post-World War II Industrial Development
  o Theme: Post-World War II Civic & Institutional Development

This context addresses the population and economic changes in the Goleta area after World War II, and the town’s transformation from a small agricultural town in 1945 to a booming industrial zone and single-family residential area in 1969.

• Context: Architecture & Design

This context discusses each construction method and architectural style identified in the city, including an identification of character-defining features. Present-day Goleta is home to a variety
of buildings exhibiting an array of architectural styles, including a collection of simply-designed bungalows; large tracts of Ranch houses; commercial vernacular, Spanish Colonial Revival, and Googie commercial buildings; and Mid-century Modern tract homes and institutional buildings.

Eligibility Standards
In addition to the historical narrative and identification of contexts and themes, the historic context statement is intended to provide guidance on evaluating properties that may be eligible for historic designation. Eligibility standards for evaluating potential resources under each context/theme will be added to the final draft of this document following the development of a local preservation ordinance, which will include community input. The eligibility standards will include a discussion of the relevant criteria, integrity considerations, and registration requirements for determining whether a property may be eligible for designation at the federal, state, or local levels.
The Goleta Valley continued to develop after Mexico achieved independence from Spain, through the evolution of the Rancho period and the transition from Mexican to American sovereignty after the Mexican-American War. Important figures associated with this period include Don Nicolas Den, holder of the first land grant in Goleta; and Daniel Hill, Goleta’s first American settler, Nicolas Den’s father-in-law, and recipient of the Rancho La Goleta land grant. During this period, the Goleta Valley was predominately composed of cattle ranches. Though most resources from this period are no longer extant, Goleta’s development during the Rancho period provided the foundation for future growth and contributed to Goleta’s continued agricultural character.

Theme: The Rancho Period (1821-1865)

In 1821, Mexico won its independence from Spain, assumed control of present-day California, and began to secularize the mission properties. The process, completed in 1833, converted the missions into parish churches and established regional commissions to dispose of associated land and resettle Native Americans previously affiliated with the missions. As part of this process, Mission Santa Barbara was secularized, and its lands granted to private landholders. Approximately 40 land grants were made in Santa Barbara County during the Rancho period, two of which lie within the present boundaries of the City of Goleta: Rancho Los Dos Pueblos and Rancho La Goleta. Thus began the Rancho period, when rancheros controlled California.

Daniel Hill (1797-1865) was the Goleta Valley’s first American settler. Born on a farm in South Billerica, a suburb of Boston, Massachusetts, Hill left home at an early age to begin a seafaring life. In 1823, Hill arrived at Refugio Beach, then the property of Don José Vincente Ortega. There he met Ortega’s daughter Rafaela, and decided to settle in the area. He was offered a position as a vaquero on Don Ortega’s Refugio Ranch, but instead decided to open Santa Barbara’s first American trading post.

Hill’s trading post was so successful that before the end of his first week in business, his shelves were completely empty of stock, which he could not replace until another Boston ship arrived at Santa Barbara. Having “sold himself out of the mercantile business,” Hill turned to carpentry, soap making, and stone masonry for his living. He also built himself the one-story Hill-Carrillo Adobe (11 E. Carrillo Street, Santa Barbara), and worked toward achieving Mexican citizenship.
by learning Spanish and converting to Catholicism. Hill and Rafaela Ortega were married in 1826.

Nicholas Den (1812-1862), another prominent early Goleta citizen, traveled from Ireland to America after financial ruin devastated his family. He briefly took a job with a merchant cousin in Nova Scotia, but later traveled to Boston to book passage back to Ireland. Upon learning that the Mexican government, as an inducement to colonize its California provinces, was giving away 48,000-acre cattle ranchos to qualified Catholic citizens, Den signed on as a forecastle hand with the Kent on its journey to California. He arrived in Santa Barbara in December 1836, where he was befriended by Daniel Hill. Den focused on becoming a Californio, speaking only Spanish and changing the spelling of his name to “Nicolas,” and was embraced by the Californians as a result.

In 1837, the Mexican government granted large swaths of land to prominent families across California. Several large grants were located near Santa Barbara, and Den began to worry that someone would claim Dos Pueblos before he was able to do so. Father Narciso Duran at the Mission Santa Barbara lent Den the money to buy 500 head of cattle. Den knew that the best way to establish priority to a given piece of ex-mission land was to run cattle on it, and Duran knew that if private ownership of the mission lands was inevitable, it would be best for a devout Catholic (such as Den) to become the owner.

In 1841, Den formally became a naturalized Mexican citizen, and applied to the Mexican government for a land grant of 15,534 acres: Rancho Los Dos Pueblos. His request was granted on April 18, 1842, and he formally took possession of the rancho on December 21, 1842. As originally surveyed, Rancho Los Dos Pueblos included the entire Goleta Slough area (now occupied by part of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport).* The deed described the grant as follows:

Los Dos Pueblos [Rancho is] located in the neighborhood of the Mission of Santa Barbara, and is bounded as follows: by the beach of the Channel of the same name; by the high hills in the direction of the sierra; by Cañada del Corral, a boundary of the rancho of Antonio Maria Ortega; and by the place called La Cochera, in the direction of the presidio.*

However, in March 1843, Manuel Micheltorena replaced Juan Bautista Alvarado as Governor, repealed Secularization laws, and restored the missions to Franciscan control. In 1843, at an

---

8 When a U.S. Patent was issued for the property in February 1877, the Slough was excluded for an unknown reason. This became the crux of a 1930s litigation between the federal government and the T.B. Bishop Company over ownership of the potentially oil-rich Goleta Sandspit, with the U.S. Supreme Court finding in favor of the original land grant.

9 Tompkins, Goleta: The Good Land, 34.
official hearing before the governor, a compromise was reached that gave the church the area now known as Ellwood Canyon, while Den retained the rest of the rancho. This effectively reduced Den’s grant by half, including the La Patera tract north of the Slough. The loss was only temporary, however: Micheltorena was soon ousted from power, and the Franciscans permanently lost control of the mission lands.

In March 1845, James K. Polk, a statesman dedicated to the annexation of California by the United States, became President of the United States. Less than a week later, California Governor Micheltorena abdicated his office and sailed for Mexico. His successor, Pio Pico, began to give thousands of acres of real estate to eligible Mexicans, either by grant or sale. He also accepted bids for the sale or rental of various California missions, which were later declared null by American courts. Desperate not to lose mission lands to non-Catholic landowners, Fr. Duran turned to Nicolas Den and Daniel Hill. In November 1845, they struck a deal allowing Den and Hill to lease the mission for nine years at $1,200 annually. Governor Pico approved the lease in December 1845.

By this time, Daniel Hill feared he had postponed his petition for a grant of the remaining acres of the Goleta Valley too long. Knowing that an American takeover of California would bring land-hungry Americans with it, Hill sketched a map of the land he wanted and dispatched it to Governor Pico. He proposed boundaries for Rancho La Goleta as:

…bounded on the south by the seashore; on the north by the foot of the ledge of mountains about one league distant from said shore; on the east by the lands known as the Mission Lands of Santa Barbara; and on the west by the lands of Don Nicolas Den, called Dos Pueblos.

Governor Pico granted Hill the 4,426-acre Rancho La Goleta on June 10, 1846. For the first time in history, all the land in the Goleta Valley was privately owned.

---

10 Tompkins, Goleta: The Good Land, 37.
11 Tompkins, Goleta: The Good Land, 38.
12 Tompkins, Goleta: The Good Land, 40.
Confirmation of the Rancho Los Dos Pueblos by the United States Government, 1867. Source: Santa Barbara County Surveyor’s Office.
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Four days after Hill received confirmation of his land grant, the Bear Flag Revolt occurred at Sonoma, foreshadowing the American annexation of California. By this time, though the news had not yet reached California, the United States and Mexico were already at war over the annexation of Texas.

In 1848, to end the Mexican-American War, the countries signed the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, in which Mexico ceded California to the United States. The annexation of California by the United States “dislocated the dominant Hispanic culture” due to the change in government and subsequent influx of Americans.¹³ The transition between Hispanic and early American settlement began when Santa Barbara County was created as one of the original counties into which the new state of California was divided in 1850.¹⁴

In approximately 1850, Hill built an adobe at 35 S. La Patera Lane (Santa Barbara County Place of Historic Merit).¹⁵ The following September, Den deeded Hill the Cochera tract, on which Hill’s adobe stood, for 50 cents an acre. Also in 1851, the United States passed a land act that required both Mexican and American courts to confirm Spanish land grants. Hill’s claim to Rancho La Goleta and Den’s claim to Rancho Los Dos Pueblos were confirmed in 1854. Not all landowners were so fortunate, however: many ranchos were broken up as owners were unable to produce sufficient documentation to satisfy the courts.¹⁶

In January 1854, Colonel William Welles Hollister of Hanover, Ohio, drove his flock of 6,000 sheep 2,500 miles from central Ohio to the Goleta Valley.¹⁷ Though Hollister’s intended destination was the San Benito Valley, by the time they reached the Goleta Valley, his flock was severely diminished and could be driven no further. Hollister arranged grazing privileges for his sheep in Nicolas Den’s Tecolotito Arroyo (present-day Glen Annie Canyon). Hollister fell in love with the land, promising Den that he would soon return to buy Tecolotito Arroyo at such a high price that there could be no refusal.

After Den’s death in March 1862, Rancho Los Dos Pueblos was subdivided into a number of smaller ranches.¹⁸ Per Den’s will, his personal property and the portion of Dos Pueblos Ranch lying west of Tecolotito Arroyo was left to his widow, Rosa, while the remaining half of the

---

¹³ “4.11.1.1.3 Historic Background,” Final Environmental Impact Report for the Comstock Homes Development and Ellwood Mesa Open Space Plan, 4.11-6.
¹⁵ Tompkins, Goleta: The Good Land 52. Various historians cite differing dates for the adobe’s construction, ranging from 1832 to 1854. However, when he applied for a homestead on the property in 1864, Hill noted that he had been living in the house for 14 years, thereby lending credibility to the assertion that the adobe was built in 1850.
¹⁶ Tompkins, Goleta: The Good Land 52.
¹⁷ Col. Hollister’s title came from a brief tenure with a neighborhood militia.
¹⁸ “4.11.1.1.3 Historic Background,” Final Environmental Impact Report for the Comstock Homes Development and Ellwood Mesa Open Space Plan, 4.11-6.
ranch, extending into the Goleta Valley to Carneros Creek, was to be held in trust for his heirs, each to receive a one-tenth portion of the estate as he or she came of age. Unfortunately for Hollister, who returned to buy it less than a month after Den’s death, Tecolotito Arroyo lay inside the portion of the Den estate which was tied up in a trust agreement until the last minor heir came of age in 1882, when Hollister would be 70 years old.

A major drought, which lasted from 1863 to 1865, resulted in the death of Daniel Hill’s cattle, and ultimately, the end of the rancho way of life. To raise money to buy more cattle in an attempt to save his rancho and continue his livelihood, Hill borrowed $8,000, giving Rancho La Goleta as security to Juan Camarillo. As a term of the loan, Hill had to cancel his homestead rights. To meet his payments, Hill sold 1,000 acres of choice ranchland lying south of Hollister Avenue, including the area now known as More Mesa and the asphalt outcrop on the beach, to his son-in-law, T. Wallace More. Hill sold the oil and gas rights under La Goleta Ranch to Russell Heath, the walnut king of the Carpinteria Valley, for $6,000.19

When Hill died in 1865, his land was subdivided between his widow Rafaela and their thirteen children. To raise money, the family had the rancho surveyed and divided into 38 smaller farmsteads, thirteen chosen by lot by the heirs, and the remainder advertised for sale in San Francisco and Los Angeles newspapers. This sale was the first time that any of the rancho land in the Goleta Valley was opened for sale to those not associated with the Mission or Presidio, and marked a transition in land use from cattle ranching to small crop farming.20

CONTEXT: LATE 19TH/EARLY 20TH CENTURY DEVELOPMENT (1866-1918)

The drought that ended the rancho era played a major role in the development of the Goleta Valley in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Former ranchos were subdivided into individual farms, and farmers focused their efforts on drought-tolerant crops, such as lemons, walnuts, olives, and lima beans. The subdivision of rancho lands into individual farms influenced the establishment of small towns to provide the necessary goods and services for farmers, such as blacksmith shops and general stores. Important figures associated with this period include W.W. Hollister, a rancher and entrepreneur who in 1869 purchased 5,000 acres of land from the estate of Goleta pioneer Nicolas Den and established Glen Annie Ranch; Ellwood Cooper, who purchased 2,000 acres of the former Den estate in 1869 and made groundbreaking environmental discoveries; Joseph Sexton, who operated Sexton’s Nursery and introduced exotic plants to the area; and Sherman P. Stow, one of the first commercial lemon ranchers in California.

Theme: The Development of Two Towns (1869-1918)

During the 1870s, the character of the Goleta area began to shift from sparsely populated cattle ranches to farmsteads and towns. The new farmers required goods and services such as farm machinery, wagons and buggies, blacksmithing, and general supplies. To serve their needs, two towns grew up along the County Road (present-day Hollister Avenue), the main road linking the isolated farms with Santa Barbara, More's Landing, and points north.²¹

La Patera, named for the gathering of ducks in the adjacent marshy slough, was located at the corner of Fairview and Hollister Avenues, and was established in 1869 with the opening of Hiram Hill’s blacksmith shop. Jean Marie Birabent’s Birabent Hotel and saloon followed, as well as a store and saloon run by Jean Baptiste Deu.²² St. Raphael Catholic Church was built in La Patera in 1890.²³

²² According to Walker A. Tompkins in his text Goleta: The Good Land, the wood from the demolished Birabent Hotel was used to build the Ellwood Hotel, (170 Magnolia Avenue, 1915).
La Goleta, located on the north side of Hollister Avenue at Patterson Avenue, was situated on the southwestern portion of the La Goleta land grant. It too was founded in 1869, with the establishment of a general store by Isaac G. Foster. Benjamin Pettit’s blacksmith shop followed in 1872, along with Rafaela School, Methodist and Baptist churches, and a post office. The post office, situated in Foster’s store (which also served as the town dance hall), was the focal point of La Goleta. I.G. Foster served as the town’s first postmaster until his death in 1880. In 1898, after two others served in the position, blacksmith Benjamin Pettis sold his blacksmith shop and became postmaster, moving the post office from the store to a new building on his property, a quarter block east of Patterson Avenue on Hollister Avenue.

Between 1870 and 1890, the population of the Goleta Valley increased from 200 to 700 people. The two towns continued to serve the farming community as separate entities for approximately 60 years. Though the Valley’s population grew steadily, the towns themselves saw little development. In 1887, a brief growth spurt occurred at La Patera when engineer George F. Wright platted the “Town Site of La Goleta” there. The subdivision was located south of Hollister Avenue and included Lemon, Orange, and Magnolia Avenues, and Gaviota, Rutherford, Fremont, and Thompson Streets. However, other than a few new dwellings and shops, the town did not develop further at that time. By 1891, Goleta was still described as “nothing more than a trading post for outlying ranches,” with “a couple of dairy ranches and a flourishing creamery,” a railroad depot, a post office, “one store, a hall, Methodist and Baptist churches.”

New amenities and services were established in the Goleta Valley in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Among these were the telegraph, telephone, and railroad, which paved the way for the two towns to grow from small trading posts and into slightly larger commercial and residential centers. However, a lack of available water prevented significant residential development, a problem that would persist until after World War II.

24 At this time, Patterson Avenue was a county road leading over the Santa Ynez Mountains, on land belonging to J.D. Patterson, a developer from Geneva, New York.
26 Foster’s store and dance hall burned down in 1891.
27 Walker A. Tompkins and Horace A. Sexton, Fourteen at the Table: An Informal History of the Life and Good Times of the Sexton Family of Old Goleta (Goleta, California: Goleta Valley Historical Society and Institute for American Research, 1983), 21-22.
30 “Santa Barbara County,” Los Angeles Times, October 21, 1891; “Sketching the Principal Valleys, Ranchos, and Districts,” Los Angeles Times, September 5, 1891.
The telegraph reached Goleta in September 1870, and the telephone arrived later in the 19th century. The first phone service in the area was provided by the Sunset Telephone Company. However, after Sunset’s complete monopoly on phone service alienated customers, a new company, Home Telephone Company, was formed to force improvements in service. Home Telephone Company, headquartered on Carrillo Street in Santa Barbara, installed Goleta’s first telephone exchange in Edgar Blakeway’s general store on Hollister Avenue, east of Patterson Avenue, in August 1910. During World War I, Home and Sunset merged into Santa Barbara Telephone Company, and were absorbed by the Associated Telephone Company.


---

31 Justin Ruhge, “Looking Back: Telephones First Arrived in the Late 1800s,” *Goleta Sun*, June 13, 1991. All telephone records before 1910 were lost.
32 Ruhge, “Looking Back: Telephones First Arrived in the Late 1800s.”
33 Ruhge, “Looking Back: Telephones First Arrived in the Late 1800s.”
Theme: Early Industrial Development (1866-1918)

A number of industrial endeavors took hold in the Goleta Valley in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. These included a variety of agricultural practices, shore whaling, and asphalt mining.

Shore whaling in California began in Monterey. The enterprise proved so profitable that whaling stations were established at various points along the California coast, beginning in approximately 1855. In December 1871, A. Von Doress established a whaling station at Goleta Sandspit, joining many such establishments along the California coast. Men from Jamaica, the Azores, and New England, who had spent long years at sea on whaling ships, were drawn to shore whaling, which offered them the opportunity to settle on land with their families and still ply their trade. The spring and winter migrations of whales along the California coast provided a steady source of income. Six Jamaican whalers and a Chinese cook were the residents of a two-building establishment on the Sandspit at the foot of the bluffs (near present-day University of California, Santa Barbara).

Shore whaling was conducted from a skiff with sail, manned by six men. The bow of the boat carried a Greener’s Gun (harpoon). When a whale was harpooned, the skiff pulled up to it, and one of the men thrust a bomb lance into the whale, the explosion which would usually kill the whale. After towing the whale to shore, the men cut it up to remove the blubber, which would

35 Information on shore whaling adapted from Justin Ruhge Collection, Department of Special Collections, University of California, Santa Barbara, Davidson Library, Santa Barbara, California.
then be rendered down to whale oil for heating and lamps. Because the rendering process required large quantities of wood, Goleta lost many of its oak trees. Work at the Goleta whaling station was suspended in approximately 1880.36

In the 17th and 18th centuries, ships passing by Goleta were commonly greeted by miles of tar and oil floating on the water. Local Chumash used the tar to caulk their tomals, to attach shells to stone bowls, and to waterproof baskets. These tar flows indicated nearby asphalt deposits, which were mined at the Alcatraz Asphalt Mine near the slough, on the present-day University of California at Santa Barbara campus. Asphalt was shipped by coastal steamer from More's Landing to San Francisco and points south during the late 1800s.37 The asphalt mine operated at full capacity for eight years. Each week, five wagons hauled 420 tons of asphalt to the siding at La Patera to await pickup.38 To increase production, the company built a second installation in present-day Isla Vista.39

Shore whaling and asphalt mining were short-lived industrial endeavors in the Goleta Valley; both eventually gave way to the significantly more profitable oil and natural gas industry. Oil, gas, and agriculture would remain the primary industries in Goleta until the post-World War II period, and all relied on the railroad to transport their goods to the ports.

The railroad history of the Goleta Valley began in the late 1880s, when the Southern Pacific Railroad completed the southern quarter of the Coast Line, from Saugus to Ellwood. The first train from Los Angeles arrived in Santa Barbara on August 19, 1887. Four months later, tracks

39 Ruhge, “Looking Back: When ‘asphalt’ was the town industry.” In 1898, the company decided to close the mine to concentrate its efforts on a more profitable mine, located forty miles away at Break Canyon on the Sisquoc Ranch.
were extended to Goleta, where the “Ventura Division” of the Southern Pacific was opened to Ellwood (11 miles west of Santa Barbara) on December 21, 1887. Between the Goleta and Ellwood depots “lay a scant four miles of track.” In between them, the Southern Pacific built a third station at La Patera. The original 1887 route from Santa Barbara into the Goleta area followed a meandering course, more level and requiring less cuts, fills, and bridges than a shorter, more direct route. 

Construction of the Coast Line from the south was halted at Ellwood in December 1887, while the progress from the north had reached as far south as Templeton, 137 miles from Ellwood. Track building was slowed by an economic recession and daunting geographical challenges. It took another 14 years for the railroad to close the gap between Templeton and Ellwood.

In 1896, after bridging the Santa Ynez River, the Southern Pacific Railroad reached as far south as Surf, 56 miles from Ellwood. Three years later, Southern Pacific planners resumed work in the south, and on April 7, 1900, the first construction train pulled into Naples, approximately four miles west of Ellwood. The 661-foot-long bridge over Dos Pueblos Canyon was completed in May 1900, while track-building continued north. Finally, on December 31, 1900, the gap was closed. However, the Coast Line needed much work before it could handle regular rail traffic.

During the race to close the gap, the Southern Pacific also focused on improving and straightening the original 1887 rail line from the south. After three months of ballasting and surfacing, the track was officially opened for service, causing a stampede for tickets on the first trains. The realigned route through the Goleta Valley was located well north of the original alignment, and most of the bends and curves had been eliminated in favor of a greater dependence on engineered cuts and fills to maintain a relatively level grade. 

---

42 Coombs, *Goleta Depot*.
43 Coombs, *Goleta Depot*.
44 Coombs, *Goleta Depot*. 
Railroad routes and stations in the Goleta Valley. Source: South Coast Railroad Museum.
The initial Goleta Depot, a one-story building with a freight-loading platform, was located near the present-day intersection of Ward Drive and Ekwill Street.\textsuperscript{45} However, after the railroad was realigned in 1900, only the Ellwood depot remained along the railroad right-of-way.\textsuperscript{46} In 1900, Goleta citizens and the Southern Pacific Railroad agreed on a new depot site on the Kellogg estate, with the intention of making the station the centerpiece of the town center (relocated to 300 N. Los Carneros Road in 1981, Santa Barbara County Landmark #22, listed in the National Register of Historic Places). The Goleta Depot served both the railroad and the local community in a variety of functions, such as handling freight, passengers, and communications, all of which were performed by the station agent, who lived in the Depot’s second-story apartment.\textsuperscript{47}

The Southern Pacific coastal route came to have a major impact on patterns of settlement, tourism, agriculture, and other forms of social and economic development in Santa Barbara County throughout much of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century. Scores of depots and ancillary buildings were erected in the county during the final years of the construction of the Coast Line. A number of new roads were established linking commercial areas in La Goleta and La Patera to the station. When the railroad was completed in 1901, Goleta had "a good train, express and telegraph service."\textsuperscript{48} Train service into the Goleta Valley consisted of mixed trains (trains carrying both passengers and freight) operating on Wednesdays and Sundays. At harvest time, rail traffic increased, as special freight trains transported Goleta Valley produce to market.\textsuperscript{49}

\textsuperscript{45} Coombs, \textit{Goleta Depot}. The original depot building was shipped north by rail to become the depot in Sunnyvale, California.
\textsuperscript{46} Coombs, \textit{Goleta Depot}. The Ellwood depot was retired in 1936.
\textsuperscript{48} "Santa Barbara County: Goleta's Depot Site," \textit{Los Angeles Times}, February 21, 1900. Also in 1901, the first automobile passed through the Goleta Valley.
\textsuperscript{49} Coombs, \textit{Goleta Depot}.
Numerous two-story, wood-frame railroad depots based on the Combination Station Plan No. 22, like the Goleta Depot, were built by the Southern Pacific Railroad from approximately 1890 to 1920. Because of the plan’s popularity during the rush to close the Coast Line gap, eight depots were built according to Plan 22 in Santa Barbara County, more than any other county or state.\(^{50}\) Character-defining features of this plan include wood sash divided-light double-hung windows, clapboard exterior wall cladding with shingled gable ends, prominent freight-office bay window, and the Railroad’s standard Colonial Yellow paint.\(^{51}\)

**Theme: Agricultural Development (1866-1918)**

Farmers and homesteaders from the eastern and midwestern United States moved into the former La Goleta rancho between the 1860s and 1880s. They initially grew grains, fruits, and vegetables. Later, the Goleta Valley became a major producer and exporter of walnuts, lemons, and lima beans, transforming the region into a considerable force in the agricultural industry.\(^{52}\)

In 1882, the Goleta area was described as having “some of the richest of California soils,” as well as “pleasant homes” and a “good wharf, where much shipping is done.”\(^{53}\) The Hollister, Cooper, and Stow ranches were lauded as “abounding in fruits of all kinds, in corn, grain, olives, nuts and oil.”\(^{54}\) The following year, the *Los Angeles Times* reported that “Goleta is the only section of Santa Barbara county which reports good crops of all kinds. The grain is good, fruit is good and the Goletans are happy.”\(^{55}\)

By 1891, Goleta comprised “one league of land – 4444 acres,” which did not include Rancho Los Dos Pueblos.\(^{56}\) In one newspaper account, Goleta was noted as “the ‘garden spot’ of Santa Barbara bounty [sic].”\(^{57}\) The writer went on to describe Goleta’s agricultural landscape:

> The great staple of Goleta is the English walnut. Formerly the hard-shell nuts were cultivated, but now the soft-shell variety is exclusively put out...It is the habit at

\(^{50}\) Coombs, *Goleta Depot*.
\(^{51}\) Information about typical Southern Pacific Railroad depots adapted from “History & Architecture,” *South Coast Railroad Museum*, [http://goletadepot.org/depot_history.php](http://goletadepot.org/depot_history.php), accessed May 2017. Because it was constructed approximately five years before the Southern Pacific began to use Colonial Yellow as their standard depot color, the depot would originally have been painted slate grey.
\(^{53}\) “Santa Barbara: The Zenith City by the Shore of the Sunset Sea,” *Los Angeles Times*, September 8, 1882.
\(^{54}\) “Santa Barbara: The Zenith City by the Shore of the Sunset Sea.”
\(^{55}\) “The State and the Coast,” *Los Angeles Times*, July 31, 1883.
\(^{56}\) “Sketching the Principal Valleys, Ranchos, and Districts,” *Los Angeles Times*, September 5, 1891.
\(^{57}\) “Sketching the Principal Valleys, Ranchos, and Districts.”
Goleta to plant summer crops between the walnut rows up to the third year of their growth...Beans are quite a feature of Goleta productions, and formerly the pampas occupied considerable of the land, but is now being rapidly superseded by other and more profitable crops...The hills and mesas are devoted to barley and wheat...Oranges, lemons and limes do well in the canons some distance back from the sea, yielding a fair profit, the lemons being excellent.58

Settlers who would have an enduring impact on the development of the area came to Goleta during this period. Some of the city's most well-known resources are related to this period of settlement. Horticulturist Joseph Sexton established one of California's early plant nurseries at his home in Goleta, introducing exotic plants to the area. Col. W.W. Hollister brought English walnut trees to the area, planting the Goleta Valley's first walnut grove at his Glen Annie Ranch. Ellwood Cooper introduced ladybugs to the area, along with several varieties of eucalyptus trees.

As property owners sought viable commercial crops to raise on former cattle grazing lands, walnut growing became the first major commercial agricultural business in Goleta. Joseph Sexton developed a soft-shell walnut using Chilean nuts he had imported from San Francisco, and W.W. Hollister introduced English walnut trees on his Glen Annie Ranch. The Santa Barbara County Walnut Growers Association, a cooperative designed to serve the financial interests of the farmers, was formed in 1896.59 In 1899, Goleta walnut farmers shipped 33 carloads of walnuts via the Southern Pacific Railroad.60

Lima beans, another successful crop, were often planted in new walnut orchards, providing a cash crop until the walnut trees were old enough to produce. In the 1880s, Goleta and La Patera provided most of the lima beans on the market, with growers realizing "gross returns of from $66 and $110 per acre."61

Joseph Sexton moved to California at age ten, when his parents relocated the family from Ohio to join the Gold Rush in 1852.62 In November 1866, Sexton followed his parents, who had moved several years previously, to Santa Barbara, bringing with him enough stock to establish a nursery. He constructed a board and batten structure (demolished) near his parents' house (229

58 “Sketching the Principal Valleys, Ranchos, and Districts.”
59 “All Along the Line,” Los Angeles Times, December 3, 1899.
61 History of Sexton Nursery adapted from Walker A. Tompkins and Horace A. Sexton, Fourteen at the Table: An Informal History of the Life and Good Times of the Sexton Family of Old Goleta (Goleta, California: Goleta Valley Historical Society and Institute for American Research, 1983).
Castillo Street, Santa Barbara, demolished), and set up his first nursery nearby. Soon thereafter, Sexton bought his father’s property in the Goleta Valley for $2,200, and built a two-story house on the property, one of ten houses constructed in the Goleta Valley in 1869. Sexton established a nursery at his Goleta Valley home the same year. It was known for its ornamental plants, such as pampas grass and soft-shelled walnut trees.

Per Sexton’s writings, in the winter of 1868, the area south of present-day Hollister Avenue was alive with blackberry vines, willow thickets, and a few creek bank sycamore trees. North of Hollister, extending as far as the foothills, the land was covered with clusters of oak trees and giant mustard. Eleven years later, Sexton and his family had outgrown their first home; Sexton engaged Santa Barbara architect Peter Barber to design a two-story Italianate home 150 feet southeast of their current house (5490 Hollister Avenue, 1880; Santa Barbara County Landmark #14, listed in the National Register of Historic Places).

In the late 1860s, Charles E. Huse, the executor of Nicolas Den’s estate, arranged for the sale of several tracts of land in the former Den estate. W.W. Hollister offered Huse $10 an acre for 5,000 acres of the former Den estate bisected by Tecolotito Creek, between the east ridge of Ellwood Canyon and Carneros Creek. Hollister took immediate possession of Glen Annie Ranch (present-day Bishop Ranch, Santa Barbara County Place of Historic Merit). However, because the sale went against Den’s will, the Santa Barbara Probate Court did not approve the sale, foreshadowing a future legal battle.
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63 Sexton’s father had purchased the land from the heirs of Nicolas Den for $2,200 several years prior. Sexton sold the north sixty acres of his holdings to J.D. Patterson for $2,200, thereby retaining his 40-acre farmstead free of cost.
65 “Sexton Inn,” Justin Ruhge Collection, Department of Special Collections, University of California, Santa Barbara, Davidson Library, Santa Barbara, California.
Hollister established the first large walnut grove in the Goleta Valley with 3,000 English walnut trees, and also planted an almond grove, planted with 10,000 trees obtained from a nursery in San Jose. A “serpentine avenue bordered by cypress and pines” was laid out to the county road, later re-named Hollister Avenue in the Colonel’s honor. At the entrance to the ranch, a monumental white archway was installed, equipped with trundle gates powered by a counterweight in a 30-foot dry well, allowing drivers to operate the gates without alighting from their vehicles. The landscaping in front of the ranch house featured such exotic plants as weeping acacias, gingko, Moreton Bay figs, Abyssinian bananas, Korean cinnamon, and California redwoods.

Another Goleta settler known for introducing exotic flora to the area, Ellwood Cooper, became convinced that Santa Barbara olive oil could compete commercially with Italian oil. In 1869, he purchased 2,000 acres of the former Den estate, seven-eighths of a mile wide, running along the coast between Winchester and Glen Annie canyons.

Cooper intended for his family to live in Santa Barbara while he traveled to and from his ranch daily. However, after a year of traveling the twelve-mile round trip on horseback, Cooper became frustrated with this arrangement, and built a board and batten shack for overnight use. His wife, Sarah, moved with him, and additions were made as needed. The house became the focus of a

---

64 Tompkins, Goleta: The Good Land, 85.
65 Tompkins, Goleta: The Good Land, 85. Around 1900, Hollister’s avenue of cypress and pines was replaced with palm trees, some of which were later transplanted along the north side of Hollister Avenue with varying success.
66 Tompkins, Goleta: The Good Land, 85. The arch remained in its original location until 1962, when it was moved to the Howard Goldman ranch at 570 Glen Annie Road, beyond the present boundaries of the City of Goleta.
67 Tompkins, Goleta: The Good Land, 86.
68 Tompkins, Goleta: The Good Land, 114.
complex of barns, machine shops, an olive mill, and other outbuildings, most of which were removed by subsequent owners.\textsuperscript{71}

In 1872, Cooper’s orchards contained 7,000 olive trees and 12,500 walnut trees, making Ellwood Ranch the largest olive and walnut ranch in California.\textsuperscript{72} Cooper’s olive mill was the largest in the country, and featured vertically-mounted eight-foot iron cogwheels which drove the millstones.

Cooper’s oil operation was a financial failure due to competition provided by Sicilian oil, which was imported at a fraction of the cost of Cooper’s product.\textsuperscript{73} However, Cooper was successful in other endeavors. The eucalyptus “was transplanted up from the Southern Hemisphere through the promotional efforts, initially, of Santa Barbara rancher and college president Ellwood Cooper.”\textsuperscript{74} Alarmed by the deforestation of the United States and foreseeing a solution in eucalyptus, in 1870, Cooper “commenced large planting operations to test many species.”\textsuperscript{75} Cooper imported 50 varieties of eucalyptus from Australia, planting “some fifty thousand” trees.\textsuperscript{76} His primary eucalyptus nursery was situated south of the Gaviota stage road, on a plot near present-day Ellwood School. “By the 1880s the planting of eucalyptus had become a California crusade, cheered on by Cooper, the Los Angeles-based Forest Grove Association, and Abbot

\textsuperscript{72} Kevin Starr, \textit{Material Dreams: Southern California through the 1920s} (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 246.
\textsuperscript{73} Tompkins, \textit{Goleta: The Good Land}, 118.
\textsuperscript{74} Starr, \textit{Material Dreams}, 184.
\textsuperscript{75} Starr, \textit{Material Dreams}, 184; Jean Broadhurst, “The Eucalyptus Trees of California,” \textit{Torreyana} 10 no. 4 (April 1910), 85.
\textsuperscript{76} Starr, \textit{Material Dreams}, 184.
Kinney, the state forester. By 1907, Cooper had planted 200 acres of eucalyptus trees on his 2,000-acre ranch. With the exception of the Santa Maria Valley, where most of the existing eucalyptus trees were grown from seedlings sold by Joseph Sexton’s nursery, most of Santa Barbara County’s eucalyptus trees originated with Ellwood Cooper.

In the early 1880s, Cooper’s almond trees became infected with cottony cushion scale, and, soon after, his walnut groves were threatened by black scale. Searching for solutions to his problem, Cooper learned of a natural parasite that fed on the scale – the ladybug. He sent to China for a supply of the insects, and turned them loose in Ellwood Canyon. Within weeks, the scale had disappeared. Following Cooper’s example, farmers throughout the state imported ladybugs and eradicated black scale from their orchards. To honor his accomplishment, Cooper was elected president of the California State Board of Horticulture in 1883, and held the post for several successive terms.

In the mid-1870s, Hollister and Cooper’s claims to former Den lands were contested. This resulted in Cooper settling with the Dens, surrendering all of his property west of Goleta, south of Hollister Avenue; and an 1890 California Supreme Court ruling returned the Glen Annie Ranch to the Den family. Thomas Bishop received the Sturgis brothers’ property and most of Hollister’s property as payment for his successful prosecution of the Dens’ case. Now known as Bishop Ranch (96 Glen Annie Road; Santa Barbara County Place of Historic Merit), the property remained in the Bishop family until 1959.

---
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83 The Den Vs. Hollister Case.
In 1877, Frank E. Kellogg purchased 20 acres of property west of Joseph Sexton’s nursery, and “engaged quite extensively in bean culture.” By 1882, he established a dairy (demolished) at the south side of Hollister Avenue at the intersection with present-day Ward Memorial Boulevard as part of his 150-acre property. Twenty-five acres of the tract were dedicated to soft-shell English walnut trees, while other areas were dedicated to Pampas grass for market. The dairy produced a majority of the dairy products sold in the Goleta area in the 1890s. In 1892, Kellogg constructed a steam-power creamery on his property, soon “one of the most important institutions of its kind in Southern California.” It was the first creamery erected in Santa Barbara County, and produced 150 pounds of butter daily, using about 2,000 pounds of milk from 150 local cows.

Stow Ranch, another significant agricultural establishment in 19th century Goleta, was established in 1871 when W.W. Stow purchased 1,043 acres of the La Patera tract from Rafaela Hill and
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87 Storke, *A Memorial and Biographical History*, 500-501. Per Justin Ruhge, there were eight dairies in the Goleta Valley, most of which were operated by Italian families.
her second husband, German Senter. The land lay between Carneros and San Pedro creeks, from the foothills to the north boundary of George Williams‘ ranch (now the railroad).

W.W. Stow constructed the Gothic Revival style ranch house at 304 N. Los Carneros Road (attributed to Frank Walker; Santa Barbara County Landmark #6, listed in the National Register of Historic Places) in 1872. Upon completion of the main house, Walker was engaged to design a single-walled summer cottage (demolished) for W.W. Stow, on a hill overlooking the pond north of the main house. In 1876, W.W. Stow deeded his son, Sherman P. Stow, who ran the farm and lived on the land, a portion of La Patera Ranch. In 1883, W.W. Stow mortgaged the entire ranch to Sherman for $40,000.

One of the first crops planted at Stow Ranch was tobacco, which was unsuccessful due to the Goleta Valley’s mild climate and an influx of grasshoppers. Sherman P. Stow bought enough walnut and almond trees to make a 100-acre orchard, “planting at a ratio of five almonds to four walnuts, with a scattering of pecans.” W.W. Stow later added another 1,500 walnut trees to his son’s orchards. However, Stow Ranch became known for its lemons. W.W. Stow obtained a number of grafting shoots from a Lisbon lemon tree in Alameda, California, which were shipped to Los Angeles for grafting to sweet orange rootstock. Crews of Italian woodchoppers were set to clearing oak trees from Stow Ranch, which were then replaced by 1,000 lemon trees, alongside orange and walnut trees, in 1875. This lemon grove, located just east of present-day Stow Grove Park, was the first commercial lemon grove in the Goleta Valley.

88 This house was later occupied by blacksmith Jim Smith and family. It was demolished in the 1920s.
89 Tompkins, Goleta: The Good Land, 125.
90 Tompkins, Goleta: The Good Land, 126.
Lemons became such a successful crop on Stow Ranch that the packing and marketing of the crop was turned over to Harleigh Johnston of San Ysidro Ranch in Montecito. Ultimately, Johnston's private packing house could not handle the growing volume of lemons, so growers from Goleta to Carpinteria joined together to form the Johnston Fruit Company in 1897. Between 1889 and 1892, Johnston packed lemons on the Stow Ranch under the “Mission Brand” label.  

Consistent with development patterns throughout Southern California in the mid- to late-19th century, residents of the Goleta Valley were increasingly diverse. Immigrants from France, Mexico, Ireland, and Germany had moved into the area by 1870, working as laborers, retail merchants, and farmers. The 1870s witnessed a further influx of immigrants to the area, including farmers, shopkeepers, laborers, cooks, stock raisers, and other workers from Ireland, Mexico, Germany, Prussia, Wales, China, Spain, Italy, France, and England. As local ranchers hired new arrivals to plant trees and pick produce throughout the 1880s and 1890s, still more immigrants from North America, Asia, and Europe arrived in the Goleta Valley. Immigrants from China worked primarily as cooks, laundrymen, and farm laborers, and often lived on their employers’ land, while workers of Mexican descent found work in Goleta in the early 20th century as farm laborers, slaughterhouse employees, produce pickers, and railroad workers, living at or near their places of work. In Goleta: The Good Land, specific information about European immigrant groups coming to the area is included based on oral histories conducted with descendants of those groups, providing greater detail about the arrival and settlement of those families than is typically available. This includes immigrants of Scottish and Italian descent, who arrived in Goleta in the late 19th century.

In 1874, Stephen Rutherford purchased a 100-acre tract located south of Hollister Avenue between San Jose Creek and Fairview Avenue, and built a two-story house on present-day Rutherford Avenue (demolished). Rutherford later purchased five sections of land perpendicular to Dos Pueblos Canyon, and began raising potatoes, corn, and hay. In 1888, he built a large redwood home (extensively altered) on the property. He operated the ranch until 1917, when he sold it to oil tycoon Herbert G. Wylie.
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Between 1866 and 1918, many resources related to the agricultural industry were established in the Goleta Valley. These include walnut-, lima bean-, and lemon-packing warehouses, lemon orchards, and machine shops. Cooperative organizations focused on the packing and distribution of walnuts, lima beans, and lemons were also founded during this period, allowing farmers to more easily sell their produce at higher prices.

Despite the local success of the citrus industry, walnuts continued to dominate the Goleta Valley’s agricultural production throughout the early 20th century. In 1903, Goleta wainwright George “Fritz” Maiers invented a labor-saving mechanical walnut huller, and later established a walnut hulling operation at 5970 Hollister Avenue (1915). In 1913, a new, expanded walnut packing warehouse measuring 110 feet by 40 feet (demolished) was built on Kellogg Avenue east of Depot Road near the Southern Pacific Depot and railroad tracks, to store walnuts for shipping.6

In August 1913, Goleta Valley lima bean growers, led by Edgar Stow (son of Sherman P. Stow), formed a cooperative named Goleta Farmers, Inc. (renamed the Goleta Lima Bean Growers’ Association in 1916). In October of the same year, they built a large warehouse and processing facility (demolished) measuring 120 feet by 150 feet on Kellogg Avenue, adjacent to the walnut

packing warehouse.\textsuperscript{97} During the co-op’s first year of operation, the associated farmers raised, harvested, and sold 2.6 million pounds of lima beans.\textsuperscript{98}

In 1915, Goleta experienced a large increase in agricultural activity, notably in the setting out of lemon orchards, doubling the acreage of citrus fruits in the area. As the United States entered World War I, agricultural growth in the Goleta Valley continued. Walnuts, lima beans, and lemons continued to be the Goleta Valley’s main products, exported via cooperative associations to large markets.

\textbf{Theme: Early Civic and Institutional Development (1866-1918)}

As the Goleta Valley transformed from scattered cattle ranches into farms and town settlements, public services and infrastructure, schools, churches, and other local institutions were established in La Goleta and La Patera to meet the needs of the growing population. Though no civic or institutional resources from this period remain extant, these amenities formed part of the cultural fabric of the early Goleta Valley.

\textit{Churches}

Several religious buildings were constructed during this period to provide a gathering place and a place of worship for Goleta Valley residents. Though the original buildings are no longer extant, most of the institutions remain active in the City of Goleta.

When Goleta Valley pioneer Florentine Kellogg arrived in 1872, he immediately began to campaign for the construction of a Methodist church. On October 11, 1875, a board of five trustees was chosen, and a building committee was appointed; in less than two months services took place in the new church.\textsuperscript{99}
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Goleta Methodist Church, 1875. Source: Goleta Valley Historical Society.
\end{center}


\textsuperscript{98} Ruhge, “Looking Back: Goleta was the home of the soft shell walnut.”

\textsuperscript{99} “Goleta Community Church,” Justin Ruhge Papers, Department of Special Collections, University of California, Santa Barbara, Davidson Library, Santa Barbara, California.
St. Raphael Catholic Church was founded in June 1896 by Fr. Polydore Stockman on land donated by Rafaela Hill, widow of Goleta pioneer Daniel Hill. The church stood at 6015 Hollister Avenue (demolished) until 1929, when it moved to Mandarin Avenue.\footnote{100 “History of Saint Raphael Catholic Church,” St. Raphael Catholic Church, Santa Barbara, CA, \url{http://straphaelsb.org/history-of-saint-raphael-catholic-church/}, accessed February 2017.}

New religious organizations formed in the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century, fracturing the Methodist congregation. These groups attempted to erase the boundaries between Protestant denominations, allowing for greater religious freedom and harmony among Goleta residents.

On August 12, 1912, 85 Goleta Valley Protestants organized into the “United Church.” However, because the Methodist Conference would not allow their church to become independent, nearly 60 of the members reorganized into “The Federated Church” on September 22, 1913. While waiting for their church (5320 Hollister Avenue; demolished) to be constructed, members of the Federated Church met at Sexton Hall.\footnote{101 “Goleta Community Church,” Justin Ruhge Papers, Department of Special Collections, University of California, Santa Barbara, Davidson Library, Santa Barbara, California. See below discussion of Sexton’s Hall. Although the Federated Church (now Goleta Community Church) had invited all Goleta Valley Protestants to join, local Baptists maintained their own church.} After approximately eight months, the congregation moved into their new church on May 10, 1914.

Only a small congregation remained at the original Methodist church when the denomination maintained that the church could not become independent as a “United Church” of the Protestant people of the valley. Subsequently the Methodist Conference sent some of their ablest ministers to the Goleta Methodist Church. Regardless, the church had lost the majority of its congregation. The church building and property was sold in 1921 to the Goleta Farm Center.\footnote{102 “Goleta Community Church.”} The building then became a meeting hall and community center.\footnote{103 “Goleta Community Church.” By 1948 the need for both the Farm Center Organization and its meeting place had run out. At that time the membership of the Farm Center voted collectively and had an attorney draw up a petition to be signed individually by the members and owners of the shares to transfer over and give their vested interest to the Federated Church next door for its growing needs.}

\textit{Schools}

Early Goleta Valley children were schooled at home or in Santa Barbara. However, after the Rancho period, the growing populations of La Goleta and La Patera necessitated the creation of local schools and school districts.
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In 1875, the first school in the area, Rafaela School, was constructed on the southwest corner of Hollister and Patterson Avenues (later moved across the street and one block north on Patterson Avenue; demolished).\textsuperscript{104} Approximately 25 children attended the school, which employed one teacher.\textsuperscript{105} Meanwhile, the farm population continued to grow in the foothills north of Goleta and west toward La Patera. In keeping with the desire for locally run schools, districts were established at Cathedral Oaks and old San Marcos roads in 1877. A third school district was established that same year at La Patera along present-day Fairview.\textsuperscript{106} Two school buildings (demolished) served the district, one of which was moved from Fairview to La Patera Lane at Momouth Avenue and completely remodeled in 1895.\textsuperscript{107}

In 1883, after growing attendance overwhelmed the original school building, the Rafaela School building was replaced by the Two-Story School, located on South Patterson Avenue north of Hollister Avenue (demolished). As a result of a petition, the school’s name was changed in 1909 from Rafaela to Goleta School.\textsuperscript{108} In 1911, the student population again outgrew its building. To remedy the situation, a one-story structure of two wings with a two-story belfry at the left of an arched stone entrance was erected on the same site as the Two-Story School (demolished).

\textit{Civic Development}

The Goleta Valley’s first civic amenities were established during this period, facilitating the area’s transformation from a scattering of cattle ranches to farms and town settlements. These

\textsuperscript{104} Dr. Lou Hale Smitheram, “A Chronology of Goleta Valley, History,” \textit{Goleta Historical Notes}, 3(2), Fall 1988; Tompkins, \textit{Goleta: The Good Land}.
\textsuperscript{106} Ruhge, “Looking Back: Schools went up and down with population.”
\textsuperscript{107} Ruhge, “Looking Back: Schools went up and down with population.”
\textsuperscript{108} Ruhge, “Looking Back: Schools went up and down with population.”
establishments allowed La Patera and La Goleta to function collectively as a modern settlement, as opposed to collections of individual farms, businesses, and residential areas.

In 1875, the first post office opened in the town of La Goleta. Although there was disagreement among residents about the name of the town, with some preferring Oakdale and others advocating for La Goleta, the United States Postal Service assigned the name “Goleta” to the local post office, settling the debate.109

The Goleta Valley volunteer fire department organized after the minister’s residence at the Federated Church burned to the ground in 1914. A campaign was launched to raise funds with which they bought a 50-gallon soda-acid tank, cart, and hose. To celebrate the purchase of firefighting equipment, trash and fuel were piled in the schoolyard, and a bonfire was set. The soda-acid cart was placed for duty at the blacksmith shop at the corner of Patterson and Hollister Avenues.110 No firehouses were established during this period.

Social Institutions

There were no social institutions in La Patera or La Goleta for the majority of the 19th century. To provide a safe place for young people to socialize, Joseph Sexton established Sexton Hall (5410 Hollister Avenue; demolished) in May 1890. The hall, which housed a 38-by-80-foot auditorium, served as the center of Goleta social life for several decades.111 Elections, weddings, funerals, dances, graduations, parties, and lodge meetings were held there. The first movie was shown at Sexton Hall in 1897, and two years later, cartoonist, vaudeville comedian, and actor Leo Carrillo is rumored to have made his theatrical debut in the hall.112

109 Smitheram, “A Chronology of Goleta Valley History.”
110 “Goleta Community Church.”
111 Tompkins, Goleta: The Good Land, 225.
In 1895, the Philomathic Club of Goleta was formed. Renamed the Goleta Woman’s Club in 1904, the club campaigned for the establishment of a library, and championed educational, religious, and other, similar causes. Charter members included Elizabeth Sevoy Warren, Serepta Hardcastle Campbell, Lucy Foster Sexton, and Mollie Miller Baker.\textsuperscript{113}

\textsuperscript{113} Tompkins, \textit{Goleta: The Good Land}, 228.
CONTEXT: DEVELOPMENT BETWEEN THE WARS (1919-1940)

Between the First and Second World Wars, Goleta transformed from two towns and a scattered grouping of ranches and farms into a booming citrus producer and oil town. Agriculture continued to be a major economic engine in the Goleta Valley during this period, with major crops including lemons, walnuts, tomatoes, and lima beans. Both oil and natural gas were extracted in the Goleta Valley during the period between the wars, which impacted the development of the early settlements of La Patera and La Goleta.

Development in the town of La Patera took precedence over La Goleta in the 1920s and 1930s for a number of reasons, including the construction of Goleta Union School in 1927 on a ten-acre parcel at the La Patera end of Hollister Avenue, the oil strike in 1928 at the Ellwood oil field to the west, and the creation of an airfield and hangar near the intersection of Fairview and Hollister Avenues. In 1933, the United States Postal Service moved the post office from Hollister and Patterson Avenues in La Goleta to a new building developed by realtor Robert E. Smith at the corner of Hollister and Orange Street in La Patera, bringing with it the name “Goleta.” Thus, La Patera officially became Goleta.

Theme: Residential Development (1919-1940)

This theme explores the transition from ranch and agricultural properties to the early growth of the city and the development of residential neighborhoods. Many residences from this period are located near the town of La Patera, which became the commercial center of Goleta in 1933, when the United States Postal Service established the Goleta post office there. Residences from this period may be eligible as rare examples of the development of the township, or as remnant residences in areas that were later redeveloped or subdivided. Residential properties associated with this context are typically in the Craftsman or Spanish Colonial Revival style, with many vernacular examples. Residential tract development is discussed in a separate sub-theme, below. Multi-family residential development was limited during this period; most multi-family residential development occurred after World War II.

Residential development was disorganized during this period. Several housing tracts were laid out in the 1920s, but were generally not highly developed due to the area’s lack of available water. Most surviving residences from this period originated as a result of scattered development within these subdivisions. A map of Goleta residential tracts and subdivisions is included in Appendix B.

PRE-WORLD WAR II SUBDIVISIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DEVELOPER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elwood Acres</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>W.A. Potter &amp; Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goleta Center</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Los Angeles First National Trust &amp; Savings Bank; Margaret O’Brien; Katie Kelly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the late 1920s, there was a decided effort to further develop La Patera. In 1927, W.A. Potter and his son, Julius Potter, laid out Elwood Acres No. 1 and No. 2 on a portion of Rancho Los Dos Pueblos. The tract consisted of 154 parcels laid out along a portion of Hollister Avenue, Ellwood Beach Drive, Mathilda Drive, and Strehle Lane.\[^{115}\] Though the subdivision map was filed with the County of Santa Barbara in May 1927, the tract was not developed until the post-World War II period, likely because a pipeline carrying oil from the Ellwood oil field to the Ellwood Railroad Depot was routed through the tract in the late 1920s. Aerial photographs of the tract in 1947 show the northern portion of the subdivision occupied by orchards.\[^{117}\]

Also in 1927, Santa Barbara realtor Robert E. Smith and Goleta landowner Frank Dow laid out a tract north of Hollister Avenue, extending from Fairview Avenue to Nectarine Avenue, with three north/south streets (Orange, Magnolia, and Nectarine, matching the names of those streets laid out south of Hollister in 1887) and one east/west street (Mandarin).\[^{118}\] The same year, the adjacent property to the east was platted, with one north/south street (Tecolote) and three east/west streets (Gato, Aguila, and Armitos).\[^{119}\] The owners were listed as the Los Angeles First National Trust & Savings Bank, Margaret O’Brien, and Katie Kelley. Residences constructed in this subdivision during this period were scattered. Those that remain are characterized by simple, rectangular, one- and two-story massing, wood clapboard or textured cement plaster exterior wall cladding, and gabled roofs.

---

\[^{115}\] This context statement utilizes the spelling “Ellwood” to refer to both Ellwood Cooper and the places named after him, with the exception of Elwood Acres No. 1 and No. 2, which was listed as such on the tract map filed with Santa Barbara County.

\[^{116}\] Elwood Acres No. 1 and No. 2 map, County of Santa Barbara, May 1927.


\[^{119}\] Goleta Center map, County of Santa Barbara, November 1927.
At about the same time, a hog and poultry farm along south Fairview Avenue was subdivided into nine cul-de-sacs (Daley, Matthews, Olney, Cloer, Carson, Avion, Payara, Placencia, and Corta Streets), with 40-foot wide lots laid out in a development called Fairfield. A few houses were constructed; however, due to frequent flooding of the adjacent San Jose Creek, the subdivision was never fully developed.  

**Theme: Commercial Development (1919-1940)**

The period between World War I and World War II witnessed a number of changes in the Goleta Valley’s commercial centers. At the beginning of the 1920s, the towns of La Goleta and La Patera formed Goleta’s original commercial districts, centered on Hollister and Patterson Avenues, and Hollister and Fairview Avenues, respectively. The advent and rise in popularity of the automobile led to many changes, while the budding oil industry necessitated new businesses and provided a growing clientele for established enterprises. Goleta and La Patera’s commercial

---

districts combined to become one commercial center in 1933, when the United States Postal Service established the Goleta post office in La Patera, changing that town’s name and effectively combining the neighboring settlements.

In the 1920s, the automobile was the leading consumer product in the country, and by 1925 there was one automobile for every six Americans (compared to one for every 100 in Great Britain).\footnote{Transportation – General 1923-28: Automobiles and the Highways, Calvin Coolidge papers, Library of Congress, American Memory Collection.} The automobile and the freedom it represented touched the American spirit of individualism and exploration, and the new motor tourist – upper and middle class alike -- was lured by the adventure of the open road, unencumbered by the routes and schedules of the railroads. To cater to this new phenomenon, the first auto garages in Goleta were established in 1921 by Ernie Vogel and Fred and Frank Acres.

Osborne “Bud” and Josephine Coffey bought a building at 5968 Hollister Avenue in 1923 and began a café and soda fountain catering to truckers traveling the state highway to Santa Barbara. After oil was struck in 1928, the Coffeys gradually changed their business to a general store, stocking gloves and clothes for oil workers, and then into a grocery store, becoming the first self-service store in Goleta.\footnote{Science Applications International Corporation, “Evaluation of Historic Buildings within the Goleta Project Area,” Final Historic Resources Study: Goleta Old Town Revitalization Plan, January 1997, 7.}

Looking west on Hollister from Patterson Avenue, 1925. Source: Tompkins, Goleta: The Good Land.
On June 29, 1925, a large earthquake struck the Santa Barbara area, damaging or destroying many properties in Goleta, including: 175 Chapel Street (demolished); the Goleta Walnut Association packing house (demolished), shifted several feet off its foundation; the Goleta School on South Patterson Avenue (demolished), considerably damaged; Simpson’s Garage on Hollister Avenue, partially collapsed during the initial earthquake and fully demolished during an aftershock; and most masonry chimneys and brick veneer walls.123

By 1930, the north side of Hollister Avenue between Fairview Avenue and Pine Street contained eighteen businesses, the majority of which served local needs. These included a carpenter, an auto repair shop, a grocery store, a blacksmith and machine shop, a lumber yard, a barber, a restaurant, a pool hall, a butcher, a baker, a drugstore, and a beauty parlor.124 However, several businesses catered to the new breed of automobile tourists, including the Camel Auto Court and gasoline station (171 Nectarine Avenue; c. 1920) and the Ellwood Hotel (170 Magnolia Avenue; 1915).125 The south side of Hollister Avenue remained predominately the domain of walnut and lemon fields, except for the areas located within the 1888 subdivision of the Town Site of La Goleta.

---

123 Tompkins, Goleta: The Good Land, 269-270.
124 1930 Sanborn Fire Insurance map of Goleta.
125 The Ellwood Hotel has since been converted into a multi-family residential building.
The Great Depression all but halted building development in Goleta. Nevertheless, by 1939, the town had grown to the extent that boosters producing the first Goleta directory called the town “The Most Prosperous Community in the Wealthiest County of the Richest State in the World.”

There was some limited development during this period, including a one-story Spanish Colonial Revival building at 5890 Hollister Avenue (1934) built by Frank Dow and Richard E. Smith. The north side of the building housed the Bank of America, and the newly-relocated post office was located on the south side. As Goleta began to emerge from the Great Depression, Associated Telephone replaced the operator at the telephone exchange in Edgar Blakeway’s store with modern switching equipment at a small building at 195 Patterson Avenue. This became the Goleta Central Office for Associated Telephone.

---

126 Goleta Valley Directory, 1939, Goleta Valley Leader.
127 Justin Ruhge, “Looking Back: Telephones First Arrived in the Late 1800s,” Goleta Sun, June 13, 1991. All telephone records before 1910 were lost.
Theme: Civic & Institutional Development (1919-1940)

As La Patera and La Goleta continued to grow, public services and infrastructure, schools, churches, and other cultural institutions were established to meet the needs of the growing population. These institutions became part of the social and cultural fabric of the city. During this period, the two towns established in 1869 became one when the post office was moved from Patterson to Fairview in 1933, bringing with it the name Goleta. Publicly accessible picnic grounds, like the redwood grove now called Stow Grove Park, were also established in the Goleta Valley.

Goleta was home to a succession of newspapers, most of which published weekly or bi-weekly, though at least one was published daily. Marshall Selover began the Goleta Valley Leader, the first local paper and the only one founded before World War II, in 1936. The Leader was located in a two-story building at 5876 Hollister Avenue (demolished). Marshall’s wife, Esther, worked at the newspaper, and, later, Mrs. H.C. Hammond served as news and society editor. The Leader operated with this staff until about 1943, when Marshall Selover decided to join the war effort by going to work at the Port Hueneme Naval Base. The paper was then taken over by Stanley Lucas, who operated the paper until about 1945, when it went out of circulation.

Schools

By the early 1920s, Goleta Valley schoolhouses were struggling to accommodate the 200 students in the district. To address the situation, the former Cathedral Oaks, La Patera, and Goleta Districts combined to form the Goleta Union School District in 1925. Construction of the Goleta Union School (5679 Hollister Avenue) at La Patera began the following year, spurring the shift of the center of influence from La Goleta to La Patera.

The new school required an $85,000 bond issue to purchase a 10-acre lot situated near the business district in La Patera, and to construct the Mediterranean Revival style schoolhouse designed by Santa Maria architect Louis N. Crawford. The new schoolhouse had six classrooms, an administration office, teacher and student restrooms, special rooms for cooking and manual arts instruction, a library, kitchen, and 390-seat auditorium. The building was promoted as “earthquake resistant,” with “fireproof walls and roof.”

128 Information about the Goleta Valley Leader adapted from Justin Ruhge Collection, Department of Special Collections, University of California, Santa Barbara, Davidson Library, Santa Barbara, California.
130 “Goleta Union School,” pamphlet.
built in 1884, was moved to the rear of the Goleta Union School in 1928. It was used as an auxiliary classroom for many years, and served as a segregated school room for children of Mexican braceros in the early 1940s.

To address overcrowding further west along Hollister Avenue, the Den School (1878; demolished) and Tecolote School (1891; demolished) formed the Ellwood Union School District in 1929, and a new schoolhouse was dedicated in 1933 (Ellwood School, 7686 Hollister Avenue, demolished). The Ellwood School District would not merge with the Goleta Union School District until the mid-1960s. No new school buildings were required until the post-war period, as development in the Goleta Valley stagnated between 1930 and 1955.

Social Institutions

The Goleta Valley remained limited in its social institutions. Sexton Hall closed and another dance hall opened on Fairview Avenue in the 1920s. The Goleta East 4-H Club, which promoted hands-on experimental learning for youth ages 10 to 20, was established in 1930 by the Agricultural Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture, the State

---

131 Rouse, “Goleta Union School: The Center of Things,” 46. The building was demolished in 1951.
132 Gilardo Garcia, interview by David Russell, January 15, 2001, Old Town Goleta Oral History Collection, c. 2000, Department of Special Collections, University of California, Santa Barbara, Davidson Library, Santa Barbara, California; Albert Jaramillo, interview by David E. Russell, transcribed by Laura Funkhouser, November 4, 2000, Old Town Goleta Oral History Collection, c. 2000, Department of Special Collections, University of California, Santa Barbara, Davidson Library, Santa Barbara, California. According to Dr. Ian Crow, principal of the school in 1946, in the fall, the school rented a room in the church on Chapel Street “for walnut pickers’ children.” Playgrounds were also segregated. Mexican-American schoolchildren were integrated with the other Goleta schoolchildren at Goleta Union School in grades 6 and 7, and attended Santa Barbara High School for grades 9 through 12.
University, and co-operating volunteer local lenders and parents. Most club activities revolved around the interests of the farm and rural communities. Club members learned all-around farm work, ranging from food preservation to machine work.\footnote{133}

**Theme: Agriculture (1919-1940)**

Lemons, walnuts, and lima beans, continued to be profitable crops in the period before World War II, and drew in new settlers, who established farms and built houses in the area.\footnote{134} In 1925, the first carload of lettuce ever sent from the Goleta Valley was dispatched to Los Angeles for shipment east, marking the beginning of vegetable growing on a commercial scale throughout the Goleta Valley.\footnote{135}

By 1925, despite the increase in lemon growing in Santa Barbara County around the turn of the 20th century, only 1,560 acres of land was dedicated to citrus crops. By comparison, walnut orchards “occupied 5,500 acres of land, although significantly, the annual value of the citrus crop exceeded that of walnuts by over $100,000.”\footnote{136} Lima beans were “sown on over 49,000 acres in 1925.”\footnote{137}

During the Great Depression, Goleta Valley’s agricultural landscape was transformed. In the 1930s, a fungus began destroying Goleta’s walnut trees, prompting a surge in the acreage devoted to lemons. The reduction in acreage devoted to walnuts also led to a decline in lima

\footnote{133} “Goleta East 4-H Club, 1930-1972,” Community Development and Conservation Collection, Department of Special Collections, University of California, Santa Barbara, Davidson Library, Santa Barbara, California.
\footnote{134} “Oil Development in Santa Barbara County,” *Los Angeles Times*, January 1, 1921.
\footnote{135} “Farm News of the Great Southwest,” *Los Angeles Times*, February 22, 1925.
\footnote{137} Nye, “The Lemon,” 9.
The rapid expansion of lemon production in the Goleta Valley created a need for a local lemon packing facility. In 1935, 60 growers, who collectively represented 600 acres of lemon groves, formed the Goleta Lemon Association. During its first six months of operation, the Goleta Lemon Association shipped 306 carloads of lemons across the United States. In 1936, the association built a lemon packing plant on La Patera Lane (destroyed by fire, 1950; rebuilt


138 Nye, “The Lemon,” 9-10. Per Justin Ruhge, the Goleta Lemon Association continued to operate until 1976, when it was dissolved and purchased by interests in the Central Valley, who operated it as the Goleta Lemon Company. In 1977, the buildings were sold and became the Santa Barbara Lemon Association, which operated them as a lemon packing house, until 1986, when the organization left, ending the lemon packing business in the Goleta Valley.

1951). The all-wood structure, designed by William W. Ache, spanned 80,000 square feet, and included a 120-foot by 300-foot washing and packing section and a two-story, 120-foot by 154-foot storage area. The storage rooms were insulated with "thick redwood planks, while the exterior of the building was covered in aluminum paint to increase solar reflectivity." The all-wood structure, designed by William W. Ache, spanned 80,000 square feet, and included a 120-foot by 300-foot washing and packing section and a two-story, 120-foot by 154-foot storage area. The storage rooms were insulated with "thick redwood planks, while the exterior of the building was covered in aluminum paint to increase solar reflectivity.”

Tomatoes also transformed the agricultural landscape in the Goleta Valley during the Great Depression. In the late 1930s, Marvin Shrode and his son Earl, both experienced farmers, experimented with various crops that could be dry farmed (not irrigated) along the coast. Tomatoes proved the best crop for Goleta’s mild climate and adobe-type soil. Marvin Shrode presented dry farming as a technique for growing tomatoes to local farmers, who agreed to plant a portion of their land (ordinarily planted with lima beans) with dry-farmed tomatoes. Over 2,000 acres of tomatoes were grown on farmable land between Gaviota and Carpinteria. Contract farmers prepared the soil, and the Shrodes handled planting, pest control, harvesting, and shipping the tomato crop. The tomato business quickly became a major employer between June and September, and provided year-round employment for several hundred farm workers who worked in the fields and in the packing house.

---

143 The Shrode Family, Shrode Produce Company Landmark Proposal, August 1998, 3. Earl and Marvin Shrode came to the Goleta Valley in 1933 to oversee the farming and general operation of the 3,000-acre El Capitan Ranch for the San Diego Fruit and Produce Company.
144 The dry-farming technique was to give each plant one gallon of water at the time of planting, and no further moisture during the growing season. Tomatoes flourished under these conditions along the coast.
145 Shrode Produce Company Landmark Proposal, 3-4.
146 Shrode Produce Company Landmark Proposal, 4.
The dairy industry continued in Goleta during this period as well. The Doty family ran Ellwood Dairy from 1937 to 1958. The dairy, housed on the former Ellwood Ranch, boasted 300 cows and a bottling facility. Other area dairies included the Golden State Dairy (400 W. Carrillo Street, Santa Barbara), the Mission Dairy, the Riviera Dairy, and the San Marcos and Montecito Dairy, all of which operated outside of the present-day City of Goleta, but proved ample competition for the Ellwood Dairy. Ultimately, however, the dairy industry in the Goleta Valley disappeared as a result of a 1950s California state law requiring dairies to lower the butterfat content in their milk products. This lowered the usable product of each milking, which meant that smaller dairies such as those in the Goleta Valley could no longer compete with the larger dairies of the Central Valley. Additionally, the cost of hauling feed into the Goleta Valley was costly, and ultimately proved too steep for small dairies in the area.

**Theme: Industrial Development (1919-1940)**

**Sub-Theme: Goleta Oil Fields**

Oil played a significant part in Goleta’s development between the wars. The Goleta area had long seemed likely for oil extraction: a natural offshore seep had allowed for the harvesting of tar from surface strata since the mid-1800s, asphalt was mined in the late 1800s, and a petroleum strike in Summerland in 1894 triggered a dramatic boom in population and land speculation. However, early explorations west of Santa Barbara had failed.

In 1920, Kate Den Bell, daughter of Nicolas Den, noted at a family gathering on Ellwood Terrace (present-day Sandpiper Golf Course) that, if an oil well was sunk there, oil would be struck. However, she would not allow drilling to commence during her lifetime, because an oil strike would only mean escalated property values, and therefore astronomically higher inheritance taxes for her children.

Meanwhile, others continued to search for oil in Goleta. In 1927, E.J. Miley sunk test wells in Tecolote Canyon. The effort yielded both oil and gas for a brief time, but then salt water was encountered, and the effort was abandoned. At about the same time, Frank A. Morgan, a

---

148 “Goleta’s Forgotten Past.”
150 Coombs and Olsen, _Sentinel at Ellwood_, 3.
151 Coombs and Olsen, _Sentinel at Ellwood_, 3.
geologist, became convinced that Kate Bell (who died in 1927) had been correct in her assessment of Ellwood Terrace. He convinced his employer, Rio Grande Oil Company, to obtain exploration rights from Bell’s heirs. Rio Grande formed a partnership with Barnsdall Oil Company, which had just abandoned testing on the neighboring Edwards Ranch. The pact called for Barnsdall to sink a well to 3,000 feet, with Rio Grande paying half of the drilling costs and relinquishing a one-half interest in its oil rights.

The first well sunk on the property, Luton-Bell No. 1, was named in honor of the property owners. The well was begun on June 1, 1928. In three weeks, Barnsdall had gone 160 feet beyond the agreed-upon limit, with no signs of oil or gas. Barnsdall notified Rio Grande that they would remove the rig, or Rio Grande could rent Barnsdall’s machinery for $100 a day to continue drilling. Before Rio Grande responded to the offer, Frank Morgan visited Ellwood for a final inspection, where he detected faint signs of petroleum in the last coring from the well. He

---
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reported his findings to Rio Grande, which attempted to contact Barnsdall to formally dissolve the partnership. However, Barnsdall’s geologist ordered a final coring before abandoning work. The coring broke into an oil-rich deposit less than ten feet below the bottom of the well. The partnership continued.154

Luton-Bell No. 1 produced crude oil at 180 barrels per hour during its first hours of production. “It was unusually high gravity oil, coming in under extremely high pressure, with no water present, and only a trace of sulfur.”155 The companies, which did not have enough equipment to handle the volume of flow from the well, worked quickly to secure all of the apparatus of the Santa Barbara Oil Company, which had been drilling unsuccessfully on Hollister Ranch. Production was reduced to 100 barrels per hour, and additional storage facilities were built. A 1,000-barrel tank was quickly completed, and several others of 500-barrel capacity or more were constructed soon thereafter.156 After a month, the Barnsdall-Rio Grande well was under control.

Plans called for oil to be shipped by rail to Rio Grande’s Vinvale refinery, located near Los Angeles. A trenching crew began laying an 8,000-foot-long oil pipeline west from the Barnsdall-Rio Grande well, through Ellwood Acres No. 1, to the Ellwood railroad station, where carpenters assembled a special loading platform.157 While these facilities were under construction, Barnsdall and Rio Grande arranged for the Seaside Oil Company to take the surplus flow. On July 27, 1928, “a fleet of six Seaside trucks drove through town […] , hauling the Goleta Valley’s first captured oil to the company’s Ventura refinery.”158 Two days later, workers finished the pipeline and loading dock, and the Southern Pacific Company had side-tracked a string of Rio Grande tank cars at the Ellwood depot. That day, “a train pulling eight of the cars carried the first rail shipment of petroleum to the Rio Grande processing plant.”159

154 Coombs and Olsen, Sentinel at Ellwood, 4-5.
155 Coombs and Olsen, Sentinel at Ellwood, 6.
156 Coombs and Olsen, Sentinel at Ellwood, 6-7.
158 Coombs and Olsen, Sentinel at Ellwood, 7.
159 Coombs and Olsen, Sentinel at Ellwood, 7.
Map of oil fields and pier placements, 1930. Source: Scott-McIntosh Petroleum, Incorporated Collection, circa 1928-1930, Department of Special Collections, University of California, Santa Barbara, Davidson Library, Santa Barbara, California.
Barnsdall and Rio Grande quickly announced their plans to sink a series of companion wells near Luton-Bell No. 1. In early August, they began Luton-Bell No. 2, 3,000 feet east of the discovery well. However, the companies were no longer alone in their efforts, as news of their success had spread. Geologists and negotiators from oil companies large and small scoured the area in search of likely drilling sites. Soon, dozens of oil leases throughout much of the Goleta Valley were signed, including one giving the Reservoir Hill Gasoline Company exploration rights on 60 acres of Ellwood Ranch and 300 acres of Bishop Ranch. By April 1930, the Ellwood oil field was home to 28 oil wells, netting about 42,000 barrels of oil per week, or 1,500 barrels per well.

Goleta’s burgeoning oil industry needed buildings to support their operations. Ellwood leaseholders built administrative offices, field workers’ housing, and maintenance sheds and equipment storage warehouses. Many of these buildings were located on the state highway near the Southern Pacific Railroad crossing. The “strategic spot along the western approach into the Goleta Valley” was also an ideal location for a filling station.

Located beside the vast oil field, the Barnsdall-Rio Grande Gasoline Station (1929, Morgan Walls & Clements; Santa Barbara County Landmark #29) was the product of the oil strike, which quickly made the Barnsdall-Rio Grande oil company a major player on the New York Stock Exchange. Almost overnight, they were Goleta’s biggest taxpayer. When Barnsdall and Rio Grande decided to build a filling station at the entrance to their oil field, they wanted it to be a showpiece. Taking direction from the architectural aesthetic promoted in Santa Barbara by Pearl Chase, which emphasized Spanish Colonial and Mediterranean Revival styles, the companies

---

160 “Luton Bell Well Controlled,” Los Angeles Times, August 6, 1928.
161 Coombs and Olsen, Sentinel at Ellwood, 7.
162 Scott-McIntosh Petroleum, Incorporated Collection, circa 1928-1930, Department of Special Collections, University of California, Santa Barbara, Davidson Library, Santa Barbara, California.
163 Coombs and Olsen, Sentinel at Ellwood, 9.
hired Los Angeles-based master architects Morgan, Walls & Clements, who had designed service stations in Santa Barbara, to design their service station in the Spanish Colonial Revival style. The station building, once finished, was flanked by two flag poles (one each for the American and Californian flags), and sheltered by a curved, five-foot-high masonry wall with octagonal piers to hold spotlights and hoses for water and compressed air. Landscaping included two japonica hedges and flower beds, one of which also featured a sign designed in the form of an oil derrick, emblazoned with the words “Barnsdall & Rio Grande” in paint and neon lettering.\footnote{164 Coombs and Olsen, \textit{Sentinel at Ellwood}, 12-13.}

The Barnsdall-Rio Grande service station, situated at the entrance to the companies’ oil field, served as a corporate showpiece. Before long, the companies added a restaurant next to the filling station. The Spanish Colonial Revival-style restaurant (demolished) housed the Spud Inn, a play on the term for beginning an oil well. By 1931, the diner had become El Bar Rio Café. Shortly thereafter, Goleta restauranteurs Laurence and Hilda Wheeler took over the operation, and changed the name to Wheeler Inn. They expanded the facility, adding a family apartment and, following the repeal of Prohibition, a liquor store.\footnote{165 Coombs and Olsen, \textit{Sentinel at Ellwood}, 15.}

Ellwood was at one time the most productive oil field in the world, yielding more than 100 million barrels of oil in over 3 decades. Goleta’s oil fields remained among largest in the United States from the 1920s to 1937, when oil production in Goleta began to decline.\footnote{166 1930 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map of Goleta.}
Sub-Theme: Development of the Airport (1928-1940)

Though the airport is not situated within the boundary of the City of Goleta, it influenced the development of the city, as businesses were established to serve the airport and its clientele. A brief overview of its historical development is therefore included here.

In 1928, Gordon Sackett and Royce Stetson established a flight school in a cow pasture near the corner of Hollister and Fairview Avenues. The 3,000-foot dirt airstrip marked the beginning of Santa Barbara Municipal Airport. In the 1920s, Earle Ovington, who became the first pilot to carry US mail by air in 1911, constructed a private hangar for his biplane on the present-day Santa Barbara Community Golf Course.

As airplane manufacturing grew in the late 1930s, the airstrip developed into an airfield. In 1930, Frederick Stearns II established Santa Barbara Airways, built the first paved runways, and installed the first radio equipment at the airfield. General Western Aircraft Corporation manufactured the Meteor, an open cockpit monoplane, at the airport. Air travel was expanded when the General Western Aero Corp. Ltd. built two hangars adjacent to the existing airfield at Fairview Avenue in 1931, and initiated service to San Francisco, Los Angeles, Tucson, and San Diego. In 1932, Century Pacific Airlines began the first commercial airline passenger service at the airport, followed in 1936 by United Airlines.

---

167 In 1961, the City of Santa Barbara annexed the airport property by a 37,000-foot by 300-foot ocean strip from the Santa Barbara harbor to the south end of the airfield. Source: Santa Barbara Airport, Santa Barbara – A Rich Aviation History, 2004, 2.

168 Justin Ruhge Collection, Department of Special Collections, University of California, Santa Barbara, Davidson Library, Santa Barbara, California. In 1938, after Ovington’s death, the hangar was dismantled and sold to Robert O. Giffin. Giffin reconstructed it the following year at 5757 Hollister Avenue (now Santa Cruz Market), where it served as the Goleta Caterpillar tractor showroom until 1953, when it was converted to a market.

169 Tompkins, Goleta: The Good Land, 289.
CONTEXT: GOLETA DURING WORLD WAR II (1941-1945)

During World War II, industrial and commercial activity in Southern California all but halted as all resources were directed toward the war effort. In Goleta, war-related activities ranged from the establishment of a Marine base at the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport to the establishment of a prisoner-of-war camp west of the present City limits. The population of the Marine base brought new business to Goleta’s commercial core, while the prisoners of war housed at the nearby camp picked and packed lemons and walnuts, helping the local agricultural industry remain afloat while local landowners and laborers were fighting overseas. The Japanese bombing of the Ellwood oil field generated a burst of publicity for the area, briefly transforming Goleta into a tourist destination. However, despite its wartime population increase and momentary surge in tourism, Goleta remained relatively small in population, with an agriculture-based economy throughout the 1940s.

In 1941, Santa Barbara citizens passed a bond measure to develop a commercial airport. The City of Santa Barbara purchased land in the Goleta Valley, and invested $1 million in the airport under an agreement with the Civil Aeronautics Administration. They began a building program, constructing hangars and runways, and filling in the marshland on which the airport sat with land from Mescalitan Island, a former Chumash village site in the Goleta Slough.

On December 7, 1941, the Empire of Japan launched a surprise attack on the United States Navy at Pearl Harbor, setting in motion a wave of anti-Japanese sentiment in America that would ultimately disrespect, incarcerate, and economically devastate Japanese American families and communities. Fear and prejudice against the Japanese community surged in the aftermath of the attack. Hundreds of Japanese American workers were fired from their jobs throughout Southern California, including those who worked for the Union Pacific Railroad.

In 1942, the United States Navy leased the airport property from Santa Barbara for a Marine pilot training base. At the time, the airport consisted of two hangars, a new United Airlines terminal, and four 4,000-foot runways on 580 acres. In June 1942, the first contingent of contractors arrived in Goleta to begin construction of the new Marine Corps Air Station. A railroad spur was constructed to handle the influx of materials needed to lengthen the runways to 4500 feet each, and to construct 103 temporary wooden buildings. The base, which was activated in August 1942, contained mess halls, chapels, post exchanges, theaters, a laundry, administration buildings, a control tower, maintenance shops, hangars, an Olympic-sized swimming pool, libraries, a sewer system and disposal plant, telephone and electrical systems,
and approximately 40 barracks. The Marine base was intended to be used for training Marine pilots, who would then be deployed overseas.

On February 18, 1942, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066 that authorized the Secretary of War and any military commander designated by him “to prescribe military areas…from which any or all persons may be excluded.” Although the order did not specify the exclusion of Japanese Americans, the intention was clear. On March 18, 1942, the War Relocation Authority (WRA) was established by Executive Order 9102 to administer the incarceration camps and Executive Order 9066.

“Civil control stations,” the first step in the incarceration process, were established around Southern California. Japanese residents first registered at one of the control stations and then reported on their designated day of travel. For the Goleta Valley area, the Veterans Memorial

Building (112 W. Cabrillo Boulevard, Santa Barbara) served as the civil control station. Before they were incarcerated, the twelve Japanese Americans noted on the 1940 United States census in Goleta worked primarily as farm laborers or domestic servants, and lived on their employers' land. Other Japanese Americans worked in Goleta, but lived in nearby Santa Barbara.

As an interim step on the way to their final destinations, most Japanese Americans were taken to temporary detention centers (historically called assembly centers). Those from Santa Barbara County (approximately 450 in total) were taken first to the Tulare Assembly Center in the San Joaquin Valley, where "a county fairground had been converted to a prison, with high barbed wire fencing, tall towers with guards, and floodlights." The majority of Santa Barbara County Japanese American residents were then bused to Manzanar Camp near Lone Pine, California, or Gila River, Arizona.

Between 1942 and 1945, approximately 120,000 Japanese Americans were incarcerated in ten remote concentration camps. To comply with the incarceration mandate, many Japanese Americans were forced to sell their businesses or property for pennies on the dollar. Others turned to trusted non-Japanese friends or religious organizations to store their possessions and look after their property. On December 17, 1944, President Roosevelt issued Public Proclamation Number 21, which rescinded the exclusion order.

At sundown on February 23, 1942, a large Japanese submarine surfaced off Ellwood Mesa and fired its deck cannon at the oil production facilities clustered along the shore. Goleta residents reported between 16 and 29 shells fired. At least three shells struck near the Bankline Company's oil refinery. Rigging and pumping equipment at an oil well approximately 1,000 yards inland were destroyed, but no other damage was incurred. One shell overshot its target by three miles and landed on the Tecolote Ranch, where it exploded. Another landed on the nearby Staniff Ranch, failing to explode but creating a five-foot deep crater. Numerous shells dropped into the sea, landed on the beach, or hit nearby cliffs.

---

173 United States census data, 1940. One man is listed in the census as a produce salesman, but it is not clear whether he owned his business.
177 “‘Avenge Ellwood!’ The Japanese Attack on CA.”
Immediately after the attack on Ellwood, the Goleta Valley experienced an increase in tourism, and businesses thrived. However, soon thereafter, a steady decline in sales, brought on by fear of another attack, local blackouts, and gasoline rationing, halted economic growth in the Ellwood area. This “boom-and-bust” was devastating for Wheeler Inn, which was closed shortly after the shelling. The Barnsdall-Rio Grande gasoline station also suffered from a decline in business but continued to operate until the early 1950s.

During World War II, the U.S. Army captured hundreds of thousands of prisoners in North Africa and Europe. Rather than house prisoners in local camps where resources were limited, the Army moved German and Italian detainees to the United States in empty Liberty ships. Large prisoner-of-war camps were scattered all over the country, but were primarily located in the Southern states and California. Approximately 9,000 prisoners were shipped to Camp Cooke (Vandenberg Air Force Base) near Santa Maria, and from there, distributed to sixteen branch camps up to 300 miles away.

One such branch camp was located in the Goleta Valley in 1944. The camp, specifically for German soldiers, was situated at the edge of Gatos Canyon, approximately 9 miles west of Fairview Avenue along Highway 101. The camp operated from October 1944 to December

---

181 Though the prisoner-of-war camp was not located within the present boundaries of the City of Goleta, the presence of the camp nearby affected the town of Goleta during the war.
1945, consisted of about 20 Quonset huts and canvas buildings, and was managed and guarded by two officers and 30 enlisted men. It housed approximately 250 prisoners. Placing the prisoners in local towns gave them a glimpse into American life. Because prisoners could not engage in war-related work by terms of the Geneva Convention, they were used as laborers in nearby farms, harvesting lemons, walnuts, and other crops, or processing walnuts at the packing house on Kellogg Avenue. Some were assigned road work. Prisoners earned an income while temporarily replacing American laborers who were fighting in the war.  

Apart from the lemon and walnut harvesting and packing duties performed by inmates at the nearby prisoner-of-war camp, few agricultural activities continued in Goleta during the war. Among these was the Shrode family’s continued practice of dry-farming tomatoes. In 1944, the Shrodes formed the Shrode-Nelson Produce Company to pack and ship their tomatoes, and began to process their produce at a space in the Goleta Depot building. Because tomatoes are fragile and perishable, a properly-equipped, centrally-located packing house was imperative. After investigating several locations, they decided in 1944 to relocate on the Southern Pacific Railroad property at 26 S. La Patera Lane, the site of the Goleta Lemon Association packing house. Shrode-Nelson added onto an existing 2,000-square-foot utilitarian packing house on the property, formerly used by the Goleta Lemon Association. They ultimately created a 12,000-square-foot wood frame packing house clad in corrugated metal siding (Santa Barbara County Landmark #40). The Southern Pacific Railroad installed a spur line leading to the packing house, and a separate spur for the Goleta Lemon Association facility next door. At peak production, approximately 150 railroad cars of tomatoes were shipped each season under the “Barbara Coast” and “S-N Tomatoes” labels. 

On August 4, 1942, the United States instituted the Mexican Farm Labor Program, a temporary intergovernmental agreement for the use of Mexican agricultural labor on United States farms. From 1942 to 1964, the program, also referred to as the Bracero Program, brought millions of migrant Mexican farm laborers to the United States.  

Under the program, the federal government assumed the transportation costs to and from Mexico, as well as medical and other expenses, and employers agreed to pay workers a minimum wage, and provide housing and transportation to the fields. The workers in turn agreed to fulfill a term of employment not to exceed ten months, and then return to their native country...In 1951 it was estimated

---

182 Ruhge, “Looking Back: POW camp begins historic sightseeing
183 Shrode Produce Company Landmark Proposal 4.
that there were 2,500 workers, including an unknown number of braceros, employed in [Santa Barbara County’s] four lemon packing plants and 588 groves, 2,000 of whom were employed year-round.\textsuperscript{185}

Groups of braceros moved through Goleta, living on or near the land where they worked. Other workers of Mexican descent were employed by farmers, the local slaughterhouse, the railroad, or produce cooperatives, and lived in enclaves near their places of employment.\textsuperscript{186} Children of braceros and local Mexican workers attended school in a building behind the Goleta Union School.

During the 1940s and 1950s, the agricultural industry employed about half of the population in the coastal area. The tomato business accounted for over 25\% of the total agricultural employment. Goleta’s tomato industry slowly faded away in the late 1950s due to rising labor and leased land costs, increasing scarcity of land due to competition for housing developments, and new automated harvesting machines capable of picking tons of tomatoes per acre on the flatlands of the San Joaquin Valley.\textsuperscript{187}

World War II also spurred institutional development in the Goleta area, while civic spending remained stagnant. In 1942, local women organized to set up a completely equipped Disaster Center in the Farm Center Hall on Chapel Street. There they conducted classes in first aid, created a casualty station with a stand-by staff of registered nurses on 24-hour call, and established a surgery room with professional operating table, autoclave, and anesthesia equipment. This effort led to the establishment of the Junior Women’s Club of Goleta in April 1943 by a group of women interested in helping the war effort.\textsuperscript{188} The club, the only known institution formed in Goleta during World War II, took on numerous projects. These included collecting for the Red Cross, providing refreshments at the USO Center at the Goleta Union School, sponsoring Community Chest campaigns, decorating the mess hall at the Marine base (present-day Santa Barbara Municipal Airport), organizing dances for servicemen, and sewing slippers for veteran patients at Hoff Hospital in Santa Barbara. The club later became a Junior-Senior club, changing its name to “the Woman’s Service Club of Goleta,” and joining the General Federation of Women’s Clubs in 1948.\textsuperscript{189} The club was instrumental in the establishment of the Goleta Valley Library, initially housed in a store near the corner of Hollister and Patterson

\textsuperscript{185} Nye, “The Lemon,” 16.
\textsuperscript{186} United States census data, 1940.
\textsuperscript{187} Shrode Produce Company Landmark Proposal, 5.
\textsuperscript{188} Stories of Goleta Valley Pioneers (Goleta, CA: Golden Coast Publishing, 1971).
\textsuperscript{189} Goleta Historical Notes, Goleta Valley Historical Society 8 (Fall 1993).
The club also helped to establish the Girls Club of Goleta Valley in 1955, and provided trees for each new school site in the Goleta Valley.\footnote{Goleta Historical Notes, Goleta Valley Historical Society 8 (Fall 1993).}

\footnote{Goleta Historical Notes, Goleta Valley Historical Society 8 (Fall 1993).} The library was moved to Goleta Union School by 1950, then to a shopping center off South Fairview Avenue in 1960, and, ultimately, to its present location at 500 N. Fairview Avenue.
CONTEXT: POST-WORLD WAR II DEVELOPMENT (1946-1969)

Introduction

The Goleta area underwent dramatic changes during and after World War II. The creation of a Marine base at the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport temporarily increased the local population and created new business for local commercial enterprises. The Goleta Valley also housed a prisoner-of-war camp during World War II, and the inmates were used to pack and pick produce while local farmers and laborers were overseas fighting in the war. This practice served to buoy Goleta’s agriculturally-based economy during the war, and helped the area to remain relatively prosperous during wartime rationing. The nearby Ellwood oil field also proved pivotal in the war effort, providing some of the oil and gasoline necessary for military ships, planes, and vehicles.

The Southern California phenomenon of a postwar population boom and concurrent housing shortage experienced by returning Gls and their families largely bypassed Goleta, which remained a small farming community into the mid-1950s. Many factors contributed to the area’s slow development after the war, including a lack of sufficient water to support population growth in the area. Additionally, the Highway 101 bypass, constructed in 1947, drew traffic to the freeway instead of the city’s surface streets, isolating downtown Goleta during this period, and hampering commercial development immediately after the war.

Agriculture continued to be the driving economic force in Goleta during the 1940s and early 1950s. However, the farming industry was threatened by a lack of water in 1948. It was not until the Cachuma Dam was completed in 1953 that Goleta experienced significant post-World War II growth. Its subsequent development was so rapid that only a few commercial buildings constructed prior to 1946 remain on Hollister Avenue, the town’s original commercial corridor. New industries flooded Goleta, including aerospace and manufacturing corporations, which would play a significant role in the city’s growth in the decades after the war.

In the mid-1950s, the completion of the Cachuma Dam project and the arrival of aerospace companies radically changed Goleta’s economic structure and built landscape. The newly-completed dam and reservoir provided a new and reliable water source for Goleta, allowing for rapid development in the area. Companies such as Raytheon, Aerophysic, and Delco moved to Goleta after the completion of the dam, as Fortune-500 companies headquartered on the east coast realized the prudence of developing high-tech divisions or subsidiaries on the west coast. Tracts of single-family residences were frantically subdivided to cater to the rapid population increase caused by the arrival of the aerospace companies, each of which brought several hundred employees to the area. The establishment of the University of California at Santa Barbara campus in 1954 on the former Marine base also increased local demand for housing and amenities in Goleta. As the only available land in Goleta was dedicated to agriculture, the creation of residential subdivisions necessarily caused a decrease in the area’s agricultural activity.
By 1969, Goleta had transformed from a small agricultural town to a booming industrial zone and accompanying residential suburb.

Prior to World War II, Goleta’s residential development consisted of isolated farmhouses and a neighborhood of small single- and multi-family homes. The neighborhood, situated to the north of Goleta’s commercial center, was laid out on a grid pattern, with narrow lots and few sidewalks. Property owners purchased parcels and subsequently constructed their own homes. During the postwar era, Goleta’s residential subdivisions were developed on land formerly dedicated to walnut and lemon orchards. Developers offered three to four Ranch- or Mid-century Modern-style models, which were constructed prior to sale. These subdivisions typically reflect postwar planning patterns, including curvilinear streets, cul-de-sacs, concrete curbs and sidewalks, and integrated two-car garages. By 1969, former agricultural land in the northeastern and western sections of Goleta was developed with the single-family subdivisions, industrial and commercial expansion, and institutional buildings necessitated by the rapid surge in population caused by the arrival of aerospace companies and the University of California at Santa Barbara in the mid-1950s.

In the two decades after the war, Goleta was transformed with new commercial and institutional buildings and several large housing tracts. Between 1956 and 1958, nearly $30,000,000 in construction occurred in the Goleta Valley, including nearly 1,000 new homes in seven subdivisions, as well as stores, industrial buildings, and schools. The dollar figure excluded the millions of dollars being spent on building improvements at the nearby University of California at Santa Barbara.192 By 1959, the Goleta Valley was described as the “greenland of the lemon and bustling home of electronics establishments.”193 At that time, work on the El Sueno to Ellwood freeway extension had begun, and several tracts of homes, a new elementary school, and new commercial buildings were under construction.194

194 Sullivan, “Goleta Valley Booming with Developments.”
Theme: Post-World War II Residential Development

The aerospace companies flooding into the Goleta Valley in the mid-1950s each brought with them several hundred employees and their families, quickly exceeding the limited housing stock available in the area. A projected 166 people per month were expected to move to the Goleta Valley from the late 1950s to the mid-1970s, “an increase of 34,000 people” from the estimated population of 28,000 in the mid-1950s. The new residents of the Goleta Valley created intense demand for housing, prompting the subdivision of almost 100 tracts between 1955 and 1969. The University of California at Santa Barbara (UCSB) also spurred residential development in Goleta when it was established on the former Marine base in the Goleta Valley in 1954. Between 1955 and 1959, at least 12 new residential subdivisions were platted. A map of residential subdivisions/tracts is included in Appendix B; a list of the postwar subdivisions is included in Appendix C.

The promise of profit in Goleta drew many developers to the area, including Paul and Elias Miller, R.A. Watt, William Koart, and perhaps the most well-known, Harry Cecil “H.C.” Elliott (1913-2009). Heralded as “one of California’s true pioneer builders,” and the “largest homebuilder in the [Santa Barbara] area,” Elliott was credited with building over 20,000 homes in California and Arizona over the course of his 40-year career. Between 1960 and 1965, Elliott was responsible for the development of five tracts in the northeastern portion of Goleta.

Goleta’s postwar housing tracts were developed on land formerly dedicated to walnut and lemon orchards. As the demand for housing in Goleta increased, agricultural land rapidly gained value, until it had escalated to the point that many ranch owners felt they would make more money selling their property to developers than they “could hope to make in twenty years of hard work.” Examples include Corona del Mar Ranch (also known as Bishop Ranch, County of Santa Barbara Place of Historic Merit), which was sold to Chicago financier Henry Crown in 1957. Two years later, Crown’s Exchange Building Corporation hired William L. Pereira & Associates to prepare a master plan for the future development of the ranch. The plan included industrial parks near Hollister Avenue and golf courses in the foothills. Stow Ranch sold

---

196 This narrative discussion is intended to provide an overview of residential development during this period, including the tracts that appear eligible as potential historic districts. A list of known post-World War II residential tracts and subdivisions is included in Appendix C. The information included in the table is intended to provide additional data about residential development in Goleta and inform future researchers about this facet of Goleta history; a complete history of each tract is outside the scope of this project.
198 Elliott developed tracts 10,111 (1960); 10,124 (1960); 10,141 (1960-1961); 10,225 (1962); and 10,402 (1965), all of which were located north of Calle Real between La Patera Lane and Patterson Avenue.
199 Tompkins, Goleta: The Good Land, 341.
acres from La Patera Lane to Carneros Creek, between the freeway and Cathedral Oaks Road, where a new subdivision was established above Los Carneros Lake (the former Stow Pond).

Most postwar subdivisions in Goleta featured three to four Ranch-style models, with consistent set-backs. Developers employed postwar planning techniques, including curvilinear streets, cul-de-sacs, concrete curbs and sidewalks, and integrated two-car garages accessed by concrete driveways. Models were generally characterized by their one-to-two-story height; asymmetrical massing in L-shaped plans; low-pitched hipped or gabled roofs with wide overhanging eaves; a variety of materials for exterior cladding, including plaster and board-and-batten; and divided light wood sash windows, sometimes with diamond-shaped panes. Decorative details include scalloped bargeboards and shutters. Goleta subdivisions of this type include El Encanto Heights No. 1 and No. 2 (1957-1959), Holiday Park (1957-1958), Lake Los Carneros North (1964), and Fairview Gardens No. 1 and No. 2 (1957).

Kellogg Park, subdivided by the Goleta Development Corporation (owned by Garfield Sorensen and Ralph Beckman) in 1955, was the first post-World War II subdivision in Goleta, and the only one with Mid-century Modern style residences. Construction of the 118-home tract, roughly bounded by the railroad on the north, Mallard Avenue on the west, Hollister Avenue on the south, and Kinman Avenue on the east, began in November 1956, and was completed

200 Tompkins, Goleta: The Good Land, 336. Pereira & Associates was also hired to do a master plan of Stow Ranch,
201 “Work Will Begin on Kellogg Tract,” Santa Barbara News-Press; November 4, 1956; Santa Barbara County tract maps.
in August 1957.\textsuperscript{202} The models, designed by Los Angeles-based master architects Jones & Emmons, each featured three bedrooms and one-and-one-half bathrooms.\textsuperscript{203} Built-in ranges, ovens, and fireplaces were optional. The homes were situated on approximately 6,500 square foot lots, and ranged in price from $13,300 to $16,200.\textsuperscript{204} Neighborhood shopping facilities were provided at the intersection of the tract’s main street, Kinman Avenue, at Hollister Avenue.\textsuperscript{205} Most buyers for the homes were employees of Aerophysics Development Corporation or Raytheon Manufacturing company, or faculty members at University of California at Santa Barbara.\textsuperscript{206}

Goleta reported a 122\% increase in population between April 1960 and October 1965. By 1966, the town boasted fifteen physicians and surgeons, twelve dentists, two optometrists, four chiropractors, three attorneys, two mortuaries, “five banks, one savings and loan institution, two finance companies, a weekly newspaper, a branch library, three movie theaters,” eight parks and playgrounds, two discount department stores, and several shopping centers.\textsuperscript{207} Tract development continued at a rapid pace through 1969. Most of Goleta’s building stock today consists of one- and two-story, single-family tract homes, many of which were constructed between 1955 and 1969 in response to the increased demand for housing brought about by the arrival of aerospace companies in Goleta and the establishment of UCSB campus nearby.

\textsuperscript{204} “Kellogg Park Goleta Subdivision Due Soon.”
\textsuperscript{205} “Work Will Begin on Kellogg Tract.”
\textsuperscript{206} “118-Home Project Nearing Completion.”
\textsuperscript{207} Tompkins, \textit{Goleta: The Good Land}, 337.
Sub-theme: Multi-Family Residential Development

During the postwar period, multi-family residences were constructed as infill in older tracts. Many multi-family residences were constructed in the prewar neighborhood north of Goleta’s commercial center. Additional multi-family residences were constructed as infill in the industrial area south of Goleta’s commercial center, and mobile home parks were also established, likely first serving as temporary housing for newly-arrived employees in the aerospace industry. Small subdivisions of Ranch style multi-family residences can be found at the outskirts of Goleta, primarily near Mills Road and Whittier Drive. However, Goleta primarily catered to single-family residential developments during the postwar period.

An example of multi-family housing constructed in the post-World War II era in the prewar neighborhood north of Goleta’s commercial center is Casablanca Apartments, c. 1965, 5362 Hollister Avenue. Source: Historic Resources Group.
Theme: Post-World War II Commercial Development

There was limited commercial growth in Goleta in the years immediately following World War II, as the city remained primarily an industrial town during that period. In addition, the construction of the Highway 101 bypass in 1947 drew commercial traffic away from downtown Goleta. The commercial district established in the prewar period along Hollister Avenue between Patterson and Fairview Avenues continued to be the main commercial thoroughfare after the war, and commercial activity along Hollister and Fairview Avenues grew starting in the 1950s. Many existing businesses along Hollister constructed new buildings or remodeled their existing storefronts after the war. New commercial corridors were also established in the 1950s and 1960s, including along Calle Real.

Several new businesses were established in Goleta between 1950 and 1951. The area boasted three cafes and a bakery, along with barber and beauty shops, three auto repair shops, a department store, five grocers, four service stations, a mortuary, a pharmacy, several clothing stores, and numerous agricultural and petroleum supply stores.²⁰⁸ By 1967, the Goleta Valley had 30 restaurants and three bakeries, seven barber and eight beauty shops, four department stores, eight grocery stores, 21 service stations, a mortuary, four pharmacies, numerous clothing stores, and dozens of construction-related businesses. The area was also home to a travel agency, two golf courses, three motels, and a surfboard shop.²⁰⁹

Theme: Post-World War II Agricultural Development

Walnuts, lima beans, and lemons remained profitable for Goleta ranchers in the postwar years. However, several factors contributed to the ultimate demise of agriculture in the region. Among these were the oak root fungus that killed many of the region’s walnut trees and thereby removed the ability of farmers to raise lima beans while waiting for their trees to mature; the growing population necessitating the construction of new housing stock on formerly agricultural land; and fires destroying packing houses of each of the area’s three farming cooperatives. Walnut growers left the Goleta Valley for the Santa Ynez Valley, and lima bean production halted as well.

On January 26, 1950, there was a fire at the Goleta Lemon Association Packing House, which destroyed the packing house and the lemons stored within. The building was replaced in November 1950 by a new, larger facility able to “process 12 carloads of lemons per eight hour day,” increasing its output from 300 to 1200 carloads of lemons per year. “Advances in automation” allowed the Goleta Lemon Association to reduce its packing force from 300 to 125.

---

210 During the postwar period, Goleta ranchers employed Mexican braceros, farm workers guaranteed food, shelter, sanitation, and a minimum wage under the Mexican Farm Labor Act (1942-1964), to pick and pack their produce. However, because braceros lived in one place only so long as they had work, they did not remain in Goleta. Their housing consisted of temporary camps along the railroad or in the fields, which are no longer extant.

211 Ruhge, “Looking Back: Goleta was the home of the soft shell walnut.”


214 Ruhge, “Looking Back: Goleta was the home of the soft shell walnut.”
During the 1960s, the Goleta Lima Bean Growers’ Association’s packing house, no longer used by the organization, was leased to Valley Merchandise Mart, one of the first discount stores in the region. However, Valley Merchandise Mart’s tenure in the building was short-lived, because, on March 22, 1966, both the lima bean and walnut packing houses were destroyed in a fire. Neither was replaced.

At about the same time, the last local train along the Coast Route passed through Goleta. On May 20, 1965, passenger rail service in Goleta came to an end. Electronic signaling and the eventual computerization of the Southern Pacific system eliminated the need for order-issuing stations along the line. Beginning in the late 1950s, Southern Pacific began to close many of its Santa Barbara County depots. With the closures of the Naples, Concepcion, and Gaviota depots, Goleta Depot inherited much of the business of the depots lying to the west along the coast. By 1973, however, though train orders were still issued from Goleta and the depot continued to handle freight, business had dropped substantially, and the Southern Pacific decided it had no further need of the Goleta Depot. After defending the building against vandalism and threats of demolition, Goleta Beautiful’s Depot Committee successfully found a new location for the structure in 1981, at 300 North Los Carneros Road, near the Stow House. The depot was moved on November 18, 1981, and was subsequently rehabilitated and adaptively reused as the South Coast Railroad Museum. It was named Santa Barbara County Landmark #22 in October of 1982.

During the postwar period, the Goleta Valley’s predominately agriculture-based economy faced ruin due to a prolonged drought. The local water table dropped from twenty-four feet to forty-eight feet in 1948. Nearby Santa Barbara made washing cars and watering lawns misdemeanors, and the federal government proposed a reclamation dam be built on the Santa Ynez River. Planning for the Cachuma Dam project had begun in the early 1940s, when the Board of Supervisors of Santa Barbara County requested that the Bureau of Reclamation investigate a county-wide plan to utilize local water resources for maximum benefit. The Goleta Water District formed in 1944 to establish a legal entity representing the Goleta Valley area that could enter into contracts for a water supply from the Cachuma Water Project. On November 22, 1949, county voters overwhelmingly approved the contract for the Cachuma Dam, along with the

215 Ruhge, “Looking Back: Goleta was the home of the soft shell walnut,” The walnut packing house had ceased operations in 1960.
216 Combs, Goleta Depot: The History of a Rural Railroad Station, 77.
217 Combs, Goleta Depot: The History of a Rural Railroad Station.
218 Tompkins, Goleta: The Good Land, 318.
219 “Goleta Water District, 1944,” Goleta Magazine, 1988-1990. Organizations – Smaller Holdings: Community Development and Conservation Collection, Department of Special Collections, University of California, Santa Barbara, Davidson Library, Santa Barbara, California.
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connecting Tecolote Tunnel and South Coast Conduit. The dam, an earth and rock filled structure standing 206 feet tall by 2975 feet wide, was located on the Santa Ynez River approximately twenty-five miles northwest of the City of Santa Barbara. The dam was built by Mittry Constructors, Inc.; construction began in August 1950, and was completed in 1953. The reservoir formed by the dam had a normal capacity of 205,000 acre-feet, and covered an area of 3250 acres when full. The dam provided a steady water supply for Goleta and the surrounding area, which paved the way for future progress.

---

220 Bureau of Reclamation, *Cachuma Project, Santa Barbara County, California*, United States Department of the Interior, 1956. Goleta was served by the South Coast Conduit of the Tecolote Tunnel. The area was also served by the Glen Annie reservoir, an earth dam, 102 feet tall by 240 feet wide, which could hold 500 acre-feet of water.
Cachuma Project concept drawing, 1956. Source: Bureau of Reclamation, *Cachuma Project, Santa Barbara County, California*, United States Department of the Interior, 1956. Local History Files, Department of Special Collections, University of California, Santa Barbara, Davidson Library, Santa Barbara, California.
Theme: Aerospace Industry

Agriculture continued to be the driving economic force in Goleta during the immediate postwar period, and the oil industry continued through the mid-1950s. However, the aerospace industry became a significant factor in Goleta starting in the mid-1950s, with Aerophysics, Raytheon, Applied Magnetics, Hughes, and Clenet each establishing a presence in the city. The space needed to house both the industries and their employees radically transformed Goleta’s landscape. No longer was Goleta a small agricultural town, but a booming industrial center. Former walnut and lemon orchards gave way to industrial development and dozens of new, single-family residential subdivisions.

In 1950, the Goleta Valley had a population of 7,000 people, 1,800 of which resided in the town of Goleta. By 1960, the Goleta Valley’s population had grown to 19,000, and by 1966, had increased to 47,000. Twenty-nine manufacturing and research corporations were listed in the 1967 Goleta Valley business directory. Many of these corporations manufactured plastic containers, while others specialized in electronics or aerospace. Several aircraft manufacturing plants and automobile repair businesses had been established at the nearby airport.

During the early 1950s, Fortune-500 companies headquartered on the east coast realized the prudence of developing high-tech divisions or subsidiaries on the west coast. As a result, in 1956, the aerospace industry began to move into the Goleta Valley. While a few small aerospace companies were already in operation at the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport, the mass influx of aerospace companies marked the first major planned development in the Goleta Valley by east coast corporations.

By September 1956, Aerophysics, Raytheon, Ratel, and Josten were located in the Goleta Valley. Aerophysics, a division of the Studebaker-Packard Corporation, was the first in the area. Aerophysics was the outgrowth of the Aerophysics Development Corporation, founded by Dr. W. Bollay in 1951 in the basement of his Pacific Palisades home. Bollay ultimately moved the company to Santa Monica and was doing work on the Dart missile when he sold the business to Studebaker-Packard in 1955. Bollay and his employees moved with the business to Goleta in 1956, where ground was broken for their new facility (6745 Los Carneros Road, 1957; Howell, 1967 Goleta Valley Business Directory (Goleta, CA: Goleta Valley Chamber of Commerce, 1967).
Arendt, Mosher & Grant) on March 30. Studebaker-Packard purchased a 104-acre site, formerly part of Rancho Los Dos Pueblos, in February 1956. In September 1956, Curtiss-Wright acquired Aerophysics, its 300 employees, and its 103,000-square-foot facility from Studebaker-Packard. Curtiss-Wright completed the four building Aerophysics campus in April 1958.

With the Aerophysics facility as a nucleus, companies such as Hughes’ Santa Barbara Research Center (SBRC); Raytheon; Burroughs; Applied Magnetics; Tracor; Edgerton, Germeshausen & Grier, Inc. (EG&G); and more built facilities of their own along Hollister Avenue, forming a high-tech aerospace center in the Goleta Valley. By 1956, Raytheon employed 150 people in a 36,000-square-foot plant on 15 acres, Ratel employed 300 people in a 18,000-square-foot facility on 6 acres, and Josten employed 285 people in a 37,000-square-foot facility on 18 acres.

In October 1960, General Motors (GM) purchased the former Aerophysics facility for its Defense Systems Division. Two years later, GM created the GM Research Laboratories to conduct research and development activities on defense systems. GM Research Laboratories later merged with Delco Electronics, and was renamed Delco Systems Operations. The company was involved in developing early missile guidance systems during the Cold War, guidance systems for NASA’s Apollo lunar program, and systems engineering for the Apollo Lunar Roving Vehicle. To test the maneuverability of the rovers, a moonscape was built behind the engineering building.

Ruhge, “Looking Back: Since the 1950s, high-tech industries have dominated Goleta’s economy.”
Ruhge, “Industrial Zoning in the Master Plan for Goleta Valley.”
Ruhge, “Looking Back: Since the 1950s, high-tech industries have dominated Goleta’s economy.”
Per Justin M. Ruhge, three lunar rovers built in Goleta remained on the moon as of 1990, and two others were in museums.
Ruhge, “Looking Back: Since the 1950s, high-tech industries have dominated Goleta’s economy.”
By the mid-1960s, such firms as GM, Raytheon, EG&G, Hughes Aircraft, Joslyn Electronic Systems, Defense Research Corporation, Ratel, Inc., and Bausch & Lomb had established think tanks in the Goleta Valley. The employees the companies brought with them to the area, who in turn brought their families, significantly increased the local population. Between the massive facilities constructed to house aerospace companies and the sprawling subdivisions constructed to accommodate their employees, aerospace dramatically transformed Goleta’s built landscape from bucolic farmland to a busy industrial town.

Raytheon (75 Coromar Drive, 1957; Howell, Arendt, Mosher and Grant), 1958. Source: Local History Collection, Department of Special Collections, University of California at Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA.

**Theme: Post-World War II Industrial Development**

Aerospace was not Goleta’s only new industry during the postwar period. Goleta’s postwar economy “showed a marked shift from primarily agricultural to residential-industrial.” By the end of the 1960s, these included Applied Magnetics Corporation (75 Robin Hill Road), Honeywell Information Systems, Inc. (26 Coromar Drive), and Santa Barbara Research Center (75 Coromar Drive). These companies also brought employees and their families to the Goleta Valley, significantly increasing the local population and prompting further residential development in and around Goleta.

In addition, due to Goleta’s beach-front location, a local surfing and surfboard industry developed. Surfing in the Goleta area began on Goleta Beach in the late 1930s and early 1940s.

---

Early Goleta Valley surfers used 9- to 11-foot balsa wood boards. However, after World War II, surfboard manufacturers had access to new materials, such as fiberglass, plastic, and polyurethane foam, radically changing surfboard construction and manufacturing, though the surfboards remained between 9 and 11 feet in length. In the late 1960s, the “shortboard revolution” occurred, and the average length of a surfboard went from ten to six feet. At the same time, local surfboard shapers began to move into the Goleta area. Among these were Reynolds Yater (Yater Surfboards, 10 State Street, Santa Barbara), John Bradbury (Creative Freedom Surfboards), Jeff White (White Owl Surfboards), Al Merrick (Channel Islands Surfboards, 36 Anacapa Street, Santa Barbara), Marc Andreini (Andreini Surfboards), and Dave Johnson (Progressive Surfboards, 286 S. Fairview Avenue).\textsuperscript{236}

[L: Surfers on Goleta Beach, c. 1930. Source: Local History Collection, Department of Special Collections, University of California at Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA. Center: Marc Andreini, 1971. R: Dave Johnson, 1978. Source for both: goletasurfing.com.]

**Theme: Post-World War II Civic & Institutional Development**

In the years after World War II, Coast Highway (U.S. 101) underwent a major improvement. In October 1945, construction began on a new two-lane highway between Hollister Wye and Tecolote Creek.\textsuperscript{237} The new right-of-way opened in January 1947, and had an immediate effect on the Goleta Valley. It “siphon[ed] a tremendous flow of cars away from Hollister Avenue” from State Street in Santa Barbara to its western terminus in Ellwood, drawing the “steady flow of post-war traffic” away from Goleta businesses.\textsuperscript{238} Concerned that Goleta’s economy would

---

\textsuperscript{236} Progressive Surfboards was founded in 1975 at the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport, after the close of the period of significance for this study. However, Progressive is the only custom surfboard manufacturer remaining in present-day Goleta.

\textsuperscript{237} This is referred to as Hollister Wye in Tompkins, *Goleta: The Good Land*, 312. Hollister Wye is also referenced in a City of Goleta Staff Report regarding a revised Caltrans freeway agreement dated April 1, 2008.

\textsuperscript{238} Tompkins, *Goleta: The Good Land*, 312-313.
suffer due to the new freeway, local businessmen formed the area’s first cohesive booster organization to meet the need for an “organized promotional and advertising program.”\textsuperscript{239} The Goleta Valley Chamber of Commerce formed in 1947, when the highway was moved from Hollister to north of the railroad. The Chamber offices were in downtown Goleta.\textsuperscript{240}

Other local institutions were established in the postwar period to cater to the local population. One such institution was the \textit{Goleta Valley Review}, begun in 1949 by R. Barker to fill the void left by the \textit{Goleta Valley Leader} after it closed in approximately 1945. The \textit{Review} was headquartered at 5840 Hollister Avenue. Another Goleta Valley newspaper, the \textit{Goleta Gazette}, was run by Richard R. Buffum from 1960 to 1968. Thomas Maurice began the \textit{Goleta Coast News}, a tri-county business paper, in 1968, followed by the \textit{Goleta Valley Sun} in 1969. Alvin Remmenga took over the \textit{Goleta Advisor} (founded in 1967 by Frank Morales and J. Paul Jewkes) in 1969.\textsuperscript{241}

The Marine air base at the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport went on a caretaker status in March 1946. Two months later, the Navy declared the facility surplus, and turned it over to the War Assets Administration (WAA).\textsuperscript{242} In June 1948, the WAA awarded the deactivated Marine base, excepting the airport (which had been returned to the City of Santa Barbara), to the Regents of the University of California for use as a college campus. The library and geology buildings were the first buildings constructed to supplant the barracks.\textsuperscript{243} After implementing an aggressive building program, the school, then called the University of California, Santa Barbara College, opened its doors for the 1954 autumn semester. Its initial student population was 1,725, and there were 152 faculty members. The Regents’ original maximum enrollment number of 3,500 students was met in 1960. By the fall of 1965, enrollment had grown to 9,750, and plans were in progress for an eventual enrollment of 15,000 students.\textsuperscript{244} The exponential growth of UCSB’s student body necessitated growth in faculty as well. The rapid influx of UCSB faculty and staff, along with their families, strained the already limited housing stock of the Goleta Valley, and prompted the development of still more single-family residential subdivisions in the area.

\textsuperscript{239} Tompkins, \textit{Goleta: The Good Land}, 313.
\textsuperscript{240} “Goleta Valley Chamber of Commerce,” \textit{Goleta Magazine}, 1988-1990. Organizations – Smaller Holdings: Community Development and Conservation Collection, Department of Special Collections, University of California, Santa Barbara, Davidson Library, Santa Barbara, California.
\textsuperscript{241} Information about postwar Goleta newspapers adapted from Justin Rhuge Collection, Department of Special Collections, University of California, Santa Barbara, Davidson Library, Santa Barbara, California.
\textsuperscript{242} Tompkins, \textit{Goleta: The Good Land}, 312.
\textsuperscript{243} Smitheram, “A Chronology of Goleta Valley History.”
\textsuperscript{244} Tompkins, \textit{Goleta: The Good Land}, 332.
In the 1950s and early 1960s, many religious institutions in Goleta constructed new sanctuaries. The Goleta Federated Church moved to a new sanctuary in 1950. Goleta area Baptists built a new sanctuary in 1963 (550 Cambridge Drive), as did the local Lutheran congregation (Good Shepherd Lutheran Church, 380 Fairview Avenue, c. 1960). In 1959, St. Raphael Catholic Church moved from its first building on Mandarin Avenue to a new church building on the northeast corner of Hollister Avenue and St. Josephs Street.\(^{245}\) The new property, purchased by the Archdiocese in March 1958, was also home to a rectory, and St. Raphael School, which opened its doors with three classrooms in September 1963. Four classrooms were added to the school in August 1965.\(^{246}\)

In the mid-1950s, the Goleta Valley’s population growth necessitated the establishment of several new schools. In February 1962, the Fairview School opened (401 N. Fairview Avenue), joining Goleta Union School in the Goleta Union School District.\(^{247}\) Quickly thereafter, Kellogg School (1963) was constructed at 475 Cambridge Drive, and La Patera School (1964) was built.

\(^{245}\) The original sanctuary, constructed in 1896, had been moved to Mandarin Avenue from the southwest corner of Hollister and Fairview Avenues (present-day Jiffy Lube) when the property was sold to Seaside Oil in 1929.


\(^{247}\) Cathedral Oaks and Isla Vista Schools were also constructed in the late 1950s or early 1960s.
at 555 N. La Patera Lane. In 1969, Elwood School joined Goleta Union School District. In 1963, after “soaring enrollment” forced nearby La Colina Junior High School to operate year-round, Goleta Valley Junior High (6100 Stow Canyon Road, 1964) was built on the former Fairview (Walora) Ranch north of Stow Canyon Road and west of Fairview Avenue. Six years later, Dos Pueblos High School (7266 Alameda Avenue, 1966; Cook, Frost, Greer, and Schmandt) opened, which was the Goleta Valley’s first four-year high school.

Goleta’s postwar population growth also created a need for reliable medical care. As a result, several doctors moved to the area in the mid-1950s. In 1959, five doctors purchased 1.25 acres of land on Storke Road for a medical center, medical laboratory, and pharmacy. This served the Goleta area for several years, but could not fully meet the demands of the growing town. By 1966, the town boasted 15 physicians and surgeons, 12 dentists, two optometrists, and four chiropractors. The same year, several area doctors joined together to found the 118-bed Goleta Valley Hospital at the corner of Hollister and Patterson Avenues. The hospital, built in two phases, consisted of five buildings on an eleven-acre site. The first phase, which consisted of the hospital and a 26-suite medical center “of Spanish modern architecture,” was scheduled to be completed in February 1964. The second phase comprised two medical buildings and nurses’ quarters. This state-of-the-art hospital met the needs of the Goleta Valley’s expanded postwar population, further transforming Goleta’s formerly agricultural landscape.
CONCLUSION

Goleta’s economy and built landscape both changed dramatically after World War II. The Cachuma Dam, completed in 1953, provided Goleta with a new reliable water source, which allowed for rapid suburban and industrial development. Former walnut and lemon orchards were transformed into residential and industrial subdivisions to cater to the rapid population increase caused by the arrival of aerospace companies with several hundred employees apiece, as well as the establishment of the University of California at Santa Barbara campus on the former Marine base. By 1969, Goleta was no longer the small, agricultural town it had been prior to World War II, but rather, a booming industrial city.
CONTEXT: ARCHITECTURE AND DESIGN

Present-day Goleta is home to a variety of buildings exhibiting an array of construction methods and architectural styles, including a collection of simply-designed bungalows; large tracts of Ranch houses; commercial vernacular, Spanish Colonial Revival, and Googie-style commercial buildings; and Mid-century Modern tract homes and institutional buildings.

The accompanying table identifies the architectural styles found in Goleta and includes a brief discussion of the origins of the style and a list of character-defining features intrinsic to each. A property that is eligible for designation as an excellent example of its architectural style retains most - though not necessarily all - of the character-defining features of the style and continues to exhibit its historic appearance. A property that has lost some historic materials or details can be eligible if it retains the majority of the features that illustrate its style in terms of the massing, spatial relationships, proportion, pattern of windows and doors, texture of materials, and ornamentation. The property is not eligible, however, if it retains some basic features conveying massing but has lost the majority of the features that once characterized its style.\textsuperscript{254} A property important for illustrating a particular architectural style or construction technique must retain most of the physical features that constitute that style or technique.\textsuperscript{255}


\textsuperscript{255} \textit{National Register Bulletin 15}. 
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<thead>
<tr>
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<th>DESCRIPTION/SIGNIFICANCE</th>
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</table>
| Adobe Construction | Early adobe buildings were typically small, single-story structures, with thick adobe walls, flat roofs framed with vigas, and usually a long, covered porch supported on wood posts, called a corredor, along one or more sides. Adobe construction consists of thick walls composed of large sun-dried bricks, usually made from mud and straw and covered with earth plaster to protect the unfired bricks. The unreinforced adobe walls typically vary from one and one-half to six feet thick, resting on a dirt or rock foundation. Door and window openings are usually framed with heavy timber lintels, often left exposed. Adobe construction demonstrates a continuation of indigenous building traditions that were passed down from generation to generation of craftsmen. Adobe construction used locally available resources, and was appropriate for the climate in the Southwest, staying cool in the summer and warm in the winter. Following California’s cession to the United States in 1850 there was a migration of settlers from the east. During this period, many adobe structures were destroyed to make way for new development. Others were altered with the addition of steep gable or hipped roofs, usually clad in wood shakes but occasionally in clay tiles, and wood framed wings. Some adobes were clad in clapboard siding with Federal or Greek Revival decorative details and double hung windows to create a more Angloized appearance. In some cases, adobes were covered with a cement plaster finish. | • Rectangular or L-shaped plan with simply arranged interior spaces  
• Thick masonry walls of adobe brick  
• Simple, unadorned exteriors (often with cement plaster veneer)  
• Few, small window and door openings with wood lintels  
• Double hung, wood sash windows  
• Corredores along one or more sides | Daniel Hill Adobe, 35 S. La Patera Lane (c. 1850; Santa Barbara County Place of Historic Merit). Source: GoletaHistory.com |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STYLE/TYPE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION/SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES</th>
<th>LOCAL EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Residential Vernacular | The term “Residential Vernacular” is be used to describe residential buildings with little or no distinguishing decorative features, including modest wood-frame houses or cottages and workers’ housing. They were widely constructed in the late 19th and early 20th centuries by builders without design input from professional architects. Many were built from ‘plan books’ or kits. These buildings are characterized by their simplicity and lack of any characteristics of recognizable styles, but frequently feature pre-fabricated wood trim such as brackets, porch posts, and spindles. The “Shotgun” building type consists of a linear organization of rooms, front to back, opening one to the other without intervening corridors. | • One- or two-story height  
• Rectangular or L-shaped plan and simple massing  
• Wood frame construction  
• Gabled or hipped roof with boxed or open eaves  
• Horizontal wood siding  
• Full- or partial-width porch, sometimes with decorative brackets, posts, or spindles  
• Double-hung, wood sash windows  
• Simple window and door surrounds | Beck House, 5399 Overpass Road (1887) |

Beck House, 5399 Overpass Road (1887)
## STYLE/TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STYLE/TYPE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION/SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES</th>
<th>LOCAL EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Commercial Vernacular | Although not an officially recognized style, “commercial vernacular” describes simple commercial structures with little decorative ornamentation, common in American cities and towns of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. They are typically brick in construction, with minimal decorative detailing. | • Simple square or rectangular form  
• Flat roof with a flat or stepped parapet  
• Brick exterior wall surfaces, with face brick on the primary facade  
• First-story storefronts, typically with a continuous transom window above  
• Wood double-hung sash upper-story windows, often in pairs  
• Segmental arch window and door openings on side and rear elevations  
• Decorative detailing, if any, may include cornices, friezes, quoins, or stringcourses | ![Comfort Zone Furniture, 5968 Hollister Avenue, c. 1925](Comfort Zone Furniture, 5968 Hollister Avenue, c. 1925) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STYLE/TYPE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION/SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES</th>
<th>LOCAL EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Industrial Vernacular | The term “Industrial Vernacular” is used to describe simple industrial buildings with little or no distinguishing decorative features. These buildings are characterized by their utilitarian design, prosaic materials, and lack of any characteristics of recognizable styles. This term encompasses buildings constructed as airport structures (i.e. hangars), factories, and packing houses. Prior to the widespread use of electric lighting, controlling and capitalizing on daylight was a necessary component of the design of manufacturing buildings. Daylight was brought into the building using a variety of methods, including expansive industrial sash windows, orientation of intensive hand work next to the exterior walls of the building, skylights, and specialized roof forms to bring light into the interior. With the development of better illumination from fluorescent bulbs, manufacturers changed their focus in design from capitalizing on available light to controlling lighting and ventilation through closed systems. Controlled conditions factories are distinguished by their minimal use of windows for light and ventilation. While some windows may be located on the front-facing façade or on an attached office, the building relies on internal systems for circulation and climate control. | - Square or rectangular plan and simple massing  
- One- or two-story height  
- Flat, truss, or sawtooth roof, usually with parapet  
- Roof monitors, skylights, or clerestory windows  
- Brick masonry construction, expressed or veneered in cement plaster  
- Divided-light, steel-sash awning, hopper, or double-hung windows  
- Oversized bays of continuous industrial steel sash on two or more façades (daylight factory)  
- Lack of fenestration or sky-lighting (controlled conditions factory)  
- Architecturally notable entrance or overall design (controlled conditions factory)  
- Loading docks and doors                                                                 | Santa Cruz Market, 5757 Hollister Avenue (former Earle Ovington plane hangar, dismantled and moved to site in 1939)                                                                                                                   |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STYLE/TYPE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION/SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES</th>
<th>LOCAL EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Agricultural Vernacular | The term “Agricultural Vernacular” is used to describe simple agricultural support structures (i.e. barns, corncribs). They are typically of wood construction with little or no distinguishing decorative features. These buildings are characterized by their utilitarian design, prosaic materials, and lack of any characteristics of recognizable styles. | • Square or rectangular plan and simple massing  
• One- or two-story height  
• Wood frame construction  
• Gabled or hipped roof with boxed or open eaves  
• Wood exterior wall cladding  
• Little or no fenestration  
• Simple window and door surrounds | Barn at Norman Beard Nursery, 200 Ellwood Ridge Road (1955). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STYLE/TYPE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION/SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES</th>
<th>LOCAL EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Quonset Hut  | A Quonset hut is a semi-cylindrical structure constructed of corrugated steel sheeting placed atop arched wood or metal rib framing. Typical features include oversized door and steel-frame industrial windows. Due to the portability and versatility of this building type, these structures can be found throughout the city and adapted to a variety of uses, though they are most commonly found in industrial areas. A Quonset hut is significant as an important World War II-era building type and method of construction, notable for its simple construction, distinctive shape, use of prefabricated materials, and flexible interior plan. Intact examples represent the design and development of a low-cost and highly-versatile structure by the U.S. Navy for military use during World War II, and its adaptive reuse for housing and other uses during the postwar years. | - Half-cylinder shape, with wood or metal rib framing  
- Rectangular plan  
- Clad in corrugated metal sheeting  
- Oversized doors  
- Steel-frame industrial windows, typically with divided-lights |  
903 S. Kellogg Avenue (c. 1945)  
Quonset hut (demolished), Goleta prisoner of war camp, no date. Source: goletahistory.com |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STYLE/TYPE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION/SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES</th>
<th>LOCAL EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italianate</td>
<td>The Italianate style was first developed in Britain. In 1802, architect John Nash designed Cronkhill, a small country house in Shropshire that resembled an Italian villa. This house became the model for what was known as the Italianate Villa style during the early Victorian era. The first Italianate style buildings in the United States were constructed in the late 1830s, and most surviving examples in Southern California date from the 1870s through the 1890s. The Italianate style in the United States grew out of the Picturesque movement, which was a reaction to the classical revival styles popular in the 18th and early 19th centuries. The style was promoted by the architectural pattern books of Andrew Jackson Downing. It was Downing’s friend and follower, Henry W. Cleveland, who brought the Italianate style to the West Coast. Cleveland designed the Bidwell Mansion for John and Annie Bidwell in 1868. Located in Chico, it became the social and cultural center of the Sacramento Valley. While most Italianate style houses on the East Coast were constructed of masonry, those on the West Coast were constructed of wood. The people of Southern California may have embraced the Italianate style because of the similarities between the area’s topography and climate and that of southern Europe. The style became popular for domestic architecture in Southern California, but was applied equally to commercial architecture.</td>
<td>Vertical emphasis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two stories in height</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wood, masonry, or concrete construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brick or shiplap exterior wall cladding, occasionally with quoined corners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low-pitched roofs, sometimes with towers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Projecting eaves supported by elaborate brackets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frequent use of angular bays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Narrow front porches and second-story balconies with thin columns and spindled balustrades</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heavy articulation of headers over windows and doors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sexton House, 5490 Hollister Avenue (Peter Barber, 1880; Santa Barbara County Landmark #14, listed in the National Register of Historic Places). Source: National Register nomination, Sexton House, 1992.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STYLE/TYPE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION/SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES</th>
<th>LOCAL EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Gothic Revival | Like the Italianate style, the Gothic Revival style grew out of the Picturesque movement, which was a reaction to the severe classical revival styles of the late 18th and early 19th centuries. The style gained popularity in Britain in the late 18th century and remained the preferred style of ecclesiastical, educational, and other institutional architecture through the 19th century. The style spread across the United States in the 19th century, initially as a style for ecclesiastical buildings. Its visual references to old world roots also made it a popular style for educational and institutional buildings that needed to convey continuity with tradition. The style's popularity continued into the 20th century, until the 1930s when Gothic forms were abstracted into the geometric style of Art Deco. In Southern California, the Gothic Style tended to be simpler in massing and ornament than earlier interpretations across the United States. Silhouettes were more compact, with abstracted references to buttresses hugging close to façades. Gothic Revival style domestic buildings were typically constructed of wood; ecclesiastical and institutional examples were typically of wood or masonry, and later of concrete, sometimes scored to resemble stone. | • Vertical emphasis  
• Wood, masonry, or concrete construction  
• Steeply-pitched front or cross gable roof, often with corbeled or crenellated gable ends and overhanging eaves  
• Towers, spires, pinnacles, and finials  
• Buttresses, usually engaged  
• Windows and doors set in pointed arched openings  
• Leaded and stained glass windows, sometimes with tracery | [Stow House, 304 N. Los Carneros Road (Frank Walker, 1872; Santa Barbara County Landmark #6, listed in the National Register of Historic Places). Source: Goleta Valley Historical Society](http://www.gvhistorical.org) |

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STYLE/TYPE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION/SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES</th>
<th>LOCAL EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Neoclassical Cottage | One-story, hipped roof or Neoclassical cottages are a common subtype of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. These are modest one-story houses or cottages with simplified forms and hipped roofs with minimal decorative features. Neoclassical cottages usually have hipped roofs with prominent central dormers. The portico featured on grander Neoclassical buildings is here reduced to a simple porch that may be either full- or partial-width. The porch may be included under the main roof or have a separate flat or shed roof supported on classical columns. | - One-story height  
- Square or rectangular plan and simple massing  
- Frequently symmetrical composition  
- Hipped roof with prominent central dormer and boxed eaves with cornice; sometimes front gable roof with open eaves  
- Horizontal wood siding  
- Full- or partial-width front porch with classical columns  
- Double-hung wood-sash windows  
- Simple window and door surrounds | 175 Chapel Street (c. 1915) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STYLE/TYPE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION/SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES</th>
<th>LOCAL EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Craftsman  | Craftsman architecture grew out of the late-19th century English Arts and Crafts movement. A reaction against industrialization and the excesses of the Victorian era, the movement stressed simplicity of design, hand-craftsmanship, and the relationship of the building to the climate and landscape. Craftsman architecture developed in the first decade of the 20th century as an indigenous California version of the American Arts and Crafts movement, incorporating Southern California's unique qualities. Constructed primarily of stained wood, with wide overhanging eaves, balconies, and terraces extending the living space outdoors, the style embodied the goals of the Arts and Crafts movement. The Craftsman bungalow dates from the early 1900s through the 1920s. The bungalow’s simplicity of form, informal character, direct response to site, and extensive use of natural materials, particularly wood and stone, was a regional interpretation of the reforms espoused by the Arts and Crafts movement’s founder, William Morris. Craftsman bungalows generally have rectangular or irregular plans, and are one to one-and-a-half stories tall. They have wood clapboard or shingle exteriors and a pronounced horizontal emphasis, with broad front porches, often composed with stone, clinker brick, or plastered porch piers. Other character-defining features include low-pitched front-facing gable roofs, and overhanging eaves with exposed rafter tails. As opposed to smaller developer-built or prefabricated bungalows, two-story Craftsman houses were often commissioned for wealthy residents and designed specifically with the homeowner’s needs and the physical site in mind. They generally feature a low-pitched gable roof, wide overhanging eaves with exposed rafter tails, and windows grouped in horizontal bands. A high-style Craftsman house is distinguished by the quality of the materials and complexity of design and may feature elaborate, custom-designed woodwork, stained glass, and other fixtures. By World War I, the Craftsman style declined in popularity and was largely replaced by Period Revival styles. The Craftsman bungalow continued to be built into the 1920s, but was often painted in lighter colors, stripped of its dark wood interiors, or blended with characteristics of various revival styles. | • Horizontal massing  
• Low-pitched gable roof with rolled or composition shingle roofing  
• Wide overhanging eaves with exposed rafter tails, outriggers, or knee braces  
• Exterior walls clad in wood shingle, shake, or clapboard siding  
• Projecting partial- or full-width, or wrap-around front porch  
• Heavy porch piers, often of river stone or masonry  
• Wood sash casement or double-hung windows, often grouped in multiples  
• Wide front doors, often with a beveled light  
• Wide, plain window and door surrounds, often with extended lintels  
• Extensive use of natural materials (wood, brick or river stone) | Kellogg House, 110 S. Kellogg Avenue (1914) |
The Spanish Colonial Revival style attained widespread popularity throughout Southern California following the 1915 Panama-California Exposition in San Diego, which housed a series of buildings designed by chief architect Bertram Grosvenor Goodhue in the late Baroque *Churrigueresque* style of Spain and Mexico. The *Churrigueresque* style, with areas of intricate ornamentation juxtaposed against plain stucco wall surfaces and accented with towers and domes, lent itself to monumental public edifices, churches, and exuberant commercial buildings and theaters, but was less suited to residential or smaller scale commercial architecture. For that, architects drew inspiration from provincial Spain, particularly the arid southern region of Andalusia, where many young American architects were diverted while World War I prevented their traditional post-graduate “grand tour” of Great Britain, France, Italy, and Germany. The resulting style was based on infinitely creative combinations of plaster, tile, wood, and iron, featuring plaster-clad volumes arranged around patios, low-pitched tile roofs, and a spreading, horizontal orientation. It was a deliberate attempt to develop a “native” California architectural style and romanticize the area’s colonial past, though it drew directly from Spanish and other Mediterranean precedents and bore little resemblance to the missions and rustic adobe ranch houses that comprised the state’s actual colonial-era buildings.

The popularity of the Spanish Colonial Revival style extended across nearly all property types, including a range of residential, commercial, and institutional buildings, and coincided with Southern California’s population boom of the 1920s, with the result that large expanses of Santa Monica, Los Angeles, and surrounding cities were developed in the style. Some towns, such as Santa Barbara, even passed ordinances requiring its use in new construction. It shaped the region’s expansion for nearly two decades, reaching a high point in 1929 and tapering off through the 1930s as the Great Depression gradually took hold. Like other revival styles, the Spanish Colonial Revival style was often simplified, reduced to its signature elements, or creatively combined with design features of other Mediterranean regions such as Italy, southern France, and North Africa, resulting in a pan-Mediterranean mélange of eclectic variations (see Mediterranean Revival Style). It was also sometimes combined, much less frequently, with the emerging Art Deco and Moderne styles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STYLE/TYPE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION/SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES</th>
<th>LOCAL EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Spanish Colonial Revival | The Spanish Colonial Revival style attained widespread popularity throughout Southern California following the 1915 Panama-California Exposition in San Diego, which was housed in a series of buildings designed by chief architect Bertram Grosvenor Goodhue in the late Baroque *Churrigueresque* style of Spain and Mexico. The *Churrigueresque* style, with areas of intricate ornamentation juxtaposed against plain stucco wall surfaces and accented with towers and domes, lent itself to monumental public edifices, churches, and exuberant commercial buildings and theaters, but was less suited to residential or smaller scale commercial architecture. For that, architects drew inspiration from provincial Spain, particularly the arid southern region of Andalusia, where many young American architects were diverted while World War I prevented their traditional post-graduate “grand tour” of Great Britain, France, Italy, and Germany. The resulting style was based on infinitely creative combinations of plaster, tile, wood, and iron, featuring plaster-clad volumes arranged around patios, low-pitched tile roofs, and a spreading, horizontal orientation. It was a deliberate attempt to develop a “native” California architectural style and romanticize the area’s colonial past, though it drew directly from Spanish and other Mediterranean precedents and bore little resemblance to the missions and rustic adobe ranch houses that comprised the state’s actual colonial-era buildings. | - Asymmetrical façade  
- Irregular plan and horizontal massing  
- Varied gable or hipped roofs with clay barrel tiles  
- Plaster veneered exterior walls forming wide, uninterrupted expanses  
- Wood-sash casement or double-hung windows, typically with divided lights  
- Round, pointed, or parabolic arched openings  
- Arcades or colonnades  
- Decorative grilles of wood, wrought iron, or plaster  
- Balconies, patios or towers  
- Decorative terra cotta or glazed ceramic tile work | 74 Tecolote Avenue (1929)  
5811 Mandarin Drive (c. 1925)  
7811 Mandarin Drive (c. 1925)  
74 Tecolote Avenue (1929)  
5811 Mandarin Drive (c. 1925)  
7811 Mandarin Drive (c. 1925) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STYLE/TYPE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION/SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES</th>
<th>LOCAL EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mediterranean Revival | The Mediterranean Revival style is distinguished by its eclectic mix of architectural elements from several regions around the Mediterranean Sea, including Spain, Italy, southern France, and North Africa. Much of the American architecture of the late 19th and early 20th centuries can be broadly classified as ultimately Mediterranean in origin, including the Beaux Arts, Mission Revival, Spanish Colonial Revival, and Italian Renaissance Revival styles. But by the 1920s, the lines between these individual styles were frequently blurred and their distinguishing characteristics blended by architects who drew inspiration from throughout the Mediterranean region. These imaginative combinations of details from varied architectural traditions resulted in the emergence of a distinct Mediterranean Revival style. In contrast to the more academic and more literal interpretations such as the Andalusian-influenced Spanish Colonial Revival style or the restrained, dignified Italian Renaissance Revival style, the broader Mediterranean Revival frequently incorporated elements of Italian and Spanish Renaissance, Provencal, Venetian Gothic, and Moorish architecture into otherwise Spanish Colonial Revival designs. The Mediterranean Revival style is sometimes more formal and usually more elaborately composed and ornamented than the simpler, more rustic Spanish Colonial Revival style, and often more flamboyant than the sober Italian Renaissance Revival style. Typical features of the Mediterranean Revival style include arched entrance doorways with richly detailed surrounds; arcades and loggias; stairways and terraces with cast stone balustrades; and Classical decorative elements in cast stone or plaster, including architraves, stringcourses, cornices, pilasters, columns, and quoins. | • Frequently symmetrical façade  
• Rectangular plan and two-story height  
• Hipped roof with clay barrel tiles and wide boxed or bracketed eaves, or eave cornice  
• Exterior walls veneered in smooth plaster  
• Wood-sash casement windows, typically with divided lights; sometimes double-hung windows  
• Palladian windows or other accent windows  
• Arched door or window openings  
• Elaborate door surrounds  
• Arcades, colonnades, or loggias  
• Terraces and stairs with cast stone balustrades  
• Cast stone or plaster decorative elements including architraves, stringcourses, cornices, pilasters, columns, and quoins  
• Decorative grilles of wood, wrought iron, or plaster  
• Balconies, patios or towers  
• Decorative terra cotta or glazed ceramic tile work | Goleta Valley Community Center, 5681 Hollister Avenue (Louis N. Crawford, 1926)  
5890 Hollister Avenue (c. 1930) |
### Mid-century Modern

**DESCRIPTION/SIGNIFICANCE**

Mid-century Modern is a term used to describe the post-World War II iteration of the International Style in both residential and commercial design. The International Style was characterized by geometric forms, smooth wall surfaces, and an absence of exterior decoration. Mid-century Modern represents the adaptation of these elements to the local climate and topography, as well as to the postwar need for efficiently-built, moderately-priced homes. In Southern California, this often meant the use of wood post-and-beam construction. Mid-century Modernism is often characterized by a clear expression of structure and materials, large expanses of glass, and open interior plans.

The roots of the style can be traced to early Modernists like Richard Neutra and Rudolph Schindler, whose local work inspired “second generation” Modern architects like Gregory Ain, Craig Ellwood, Harwell Hamilton Harris, Pierre Koenig, Raphael Soriano, and many more. These post-war architects developed an indigenous Modernism that was born from the International Style but matured into a fundamentally regional style, fostered in part by *Art and Architecture* magazine’s pivotal Case Study Program (1945-1966). The style gained popularity because its use of standardized, prefabricated materials permitted quick and economical construction. It became the predominant architectural style in the postwar years and is represented in almost every property type, from single-family residences to commercial buildings to gas stations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STYLE/TYPE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION/SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES</th>
<th>LOCAL EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mid-century Modern | Mid-century Modern is a term used to describe the post-World War II iteration of the International Style in both residential and commercial design. The International Style was characterized by geometric forms, smooth wall surfaces, and an absence of exterior decoration. Mid-century Modern represents the adaptation of these elements to the local climate and topography, as well as to the postwar need for efficiently-built, moderately-priced homes. In Southern California, this often meant the use of wood post-and-beam construction. Mid-century Modernism is often characterized by a clear expression of structure and materials, large expanses of glass, and open interior plans. The roots of the style can be traced to early Modernists like Richard Neutra and Rudolph Schindler, whose local work inspired “second generation” Modern architects like Gregory Ain, Craig Ellwood, Harwell Hamilton Harris, Pierre Koenig, Raphael Soriano, and many more. These post-war architects developed an indigenous Modernism that was born from the International Style but matured into a fundamentally regional style, fostered in part by *Art and Architecture* magazine’s pivotal Case Study Program (1945-1966). The style gained popularity because its use of standardized, prefabricated materials permitted quick and economical construction. It became the predominant architectural style in the postwar years and is represented in almost every property type, from single-family residences to commercial buildings to gas stations. | • One or two-story configuration  
• Horizontal massing (for small-scale buildings)  
• Simple geometric forms  
• Expressed post-and-beam construction, in wood or steel  
• Flat roof or low-pitched gable roof with wide overhanging eaves and cantilevered canopies  
• Unadorned wall surfaces  
• Wood, plaster, brick or stone used as exterior wall panels or accent materials  
• Flush-mounted metal frame fixed windows and sliding doors, and clerestory windows  
• Exterior staircases, decks, patios and balconies  
• Little or no exterior decorative detailing | 87 Mallard Avenue (Jones & Emmons, 1957) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STYLE/TYPE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION/SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES</th>
<th>LOCAL EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ranch</td>
<td>The Ranch style emerged from the 1930s designs of Southern California architect Cliff May, who merged modernist ideas with traditional notions of the working ranches of the American West and in particular, the rustic adobe houses of California’s Spanish- and Mexican-era ranchos. The resulting architectural style – characterized by its low horizontal massing, sprawling interior plan, and wood exterior detailing - embodied the mid-century ideal of “California living.” The Ranch style enjoyed enormous popularity throughout the United States from the 1940s to 1970s. It epitomized unpretentious architecture and dominated the suburbs of the post-World War II period. It was more conservative than other modern residential architecture of the period, often using decorative elements based on historical forms and capitalizing on the national fascination with the “Old West.” The underlying philosophy of the Ranch house was informality, outdoor living, gracious entertaining, and natural materials. The most common style of Ranch house is the California Ranch. It is characterized by its one-story height; asymmetrical massing in L- or U-shaped plans; low-pitched hipped or gabled roofs with wide overhanging eaves; a variety of materials for exterior cladding, including plaster and board-and-batten; divided light wood sash windows, sometimes with diamond-shaped panes; and large picture windows. Decorative details commonly seen in California Ranch houses include scalloped bargeboards, false cupolas and dovecotes, shutters, and iron or wood porch supports. The California Ranch house accommodated America’s adoption of the automobile as the primary means of transportation with a two-car garage that was a prominent architectural feature on the front of the house, and a sprawling layout on a large lot. Floor plans for the tracts of Ranch houses were usually designed to meet the FHA standards, so that the developer could receive guaranteed loans. Another variation on the Ranch house was the Modern Ranch, which was influenced by Mid-century Modernism. Modern Ranches emphasized horizontal planes more than the California Ranch, and included modern instead of traditional stylistic details. Character-defining features included low-pitched hipped or flat roofs, prominent rectangular chimneys, recessed entryways, and wood or concrete block privacy screens. Other stylistic elements resulted in Asian variations.</td>
<td>• One-story height</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="7102 Del Norte Drive (1959)" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sprawling L- or U-shaped plan, often with radiating wings</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="6586 Camino Ventura (1967)" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Low, horizontal massing with wide street façade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Low-pitched hipped or gable roof with open overhanging eaves and wood shakes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Plaster, wood lap, or board-and-batten siding, often with brick or stone accents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Divided light wood sash windows (picture, double-hung sash, diamond-pane)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Wide, covered front porch with wood posts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Attached garage, sometimes linked with open-sided breezeway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Details such as wood shutters, attic vents in gable ends, dovecotes, extended gables, or scalloped barge boards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Modern Ranch sub-type may feature flat or low-pitched hipped roof with composition shingle or gravel roofing; metal framed windows; wood or concrete block privacy screens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STYLE/TYPE</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION/SIGNIFICANCE</td>
<td>CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES</td>
<td>LOCAL EXAMPLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Googie     | Googie has been described as Modernism for the masses. With its swooping lines and organic shapes, the style attempted to capture the playful exuberance of postwar America. Named for the John Lautner-designed Googie’s Restaurant in Los Angeles, the style was widely employed in roadside commercial architecture of the 1950s, including coffee shops, bowling alleys, and car washes. It exaggerated the vocabulary of Mid-century Modern design to catch the eye of passing motorists with dramatic sculptural rooflines, shimmering walls of glass, abstract shapes, and prominent integral signage. | • Expressive rooflines, including butterfly, folded-plate, and cantilevers  
• Organic, abstract, and parabolic shapes  
• Clear expression of materials, including concrete, steel, asbestos, cement, glass block, plastic, and plywood  
• Large expanses of plate glass  
• Thematic ornamentation, including tiki and space age motifs  
• Primacy of signage, including the pervasive use of neon | Butler Event Center, 5555 Hollister Avenue (Louis Mazetti, 1967) |
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INTRODUCTION

Purpose
The City of Goleta has significant archaeological resources within its borders and intends to manage those resources in a responsible and sensitive manner. As part of that effort an archaeological context statement was mandated to become one aspect of the City’s historic preservation program. Preparation of the context statement was undertaken in order provide an updated context for the results of archaeological research associated with preservation planning efforts that have been completed before and since the founding of the City. The results will be used by the City of Goleta for such project planning purposes as developing a mitigation program to minimize impacts to significant cultural resources, and in recommending project and land use alternatives.

This document presents the results of cultural resources investigations completed in Goleta from prehistory to the middle of the American Period to demonstrate the regional understanding of archaeological properties throughout the city, as well as to inform future planning decisions. The document identifies important periods, events, themes, and patterns of development, and provides a framework for evaluating individual cultural resources relative to National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historical Resources, and Goleta Historic Resources Inventory eligibility criteria. Historic property types associated with these periods and themes are also identified and described in the archaeological resources context statement, and significance and integrity considerations are included for each.

It is important to note that while the context statement identifies key archaeological and historical themes in Goleta’s development, it is not a comprehensive history of the city, nor is it a definitive listing of all the city’s significant resources. Instead, it provides a general discussion of cultural factors that influenced the location and settlement of Goleta’s archaeological sites, why sites associated with that settlement pattern are important, and what characteristics are necessary to be identified to qualify them as significant, “historic” resources.

Concepts and Time Periods
Cultural resources include prehistoric and historical archaeological sites, historical structures and buildings, and sites of ethnic significance. Prehistoric archaeological sites may consist of surface and subsurface deposits containing human related artifacts, burial interments, food refuse and/or food preparation features such as hearths, and bedrock associated features containing milling elements, rock art, or living shelters. Historical archaeological sites may consist of surface or subsurface refuse deposits containing artifacts or food refuse and surface-exposed features such as building foundations, wall footings, and other features associated with former historic dwellings and related structures, as well as commercial, agricultural, or other facilities. Historical archaeological sites are distinguished from historic buildings and structures, which consist of
standing homes or other buildings related to commercial or agricultural activities. Ethnic resources may consist of locations that hold a particular significance to groups such as Native American, Spanish, Mexican, or early Anglo residents who have prehistoric or historic ties to the local area. In some instances, these ethnic resources are also archaeological or built architectural sites.

**Project Location and Description**

The “Goleta Valley” is a coastal plain between the Santa Ynez Mountains and the ocean, approximately three miles across (Figure 1). It consists of Holocene and Pleistocene alluvium, colluvium, estuarine deposits, as well as marine terraces created during interglacial high sea level episodes (Minor et al. 2009).

The area has been subject to rapid geologic uplift, as evidenced by its coastal bluffs and narrow beaches. Between the flattest part of the Goleta Valley and the ocean is an area of uplift paralleling the shore which includes, from west to east, Isla Vista, Mescalitan Island, More Mesa, and the Hope Ranch Hills. The elevation of this block of land relative to Goleta Valley increases from 40 to 300 feet along this length. The uplift was caused by motion along the More Ranch Fault, one of the most geologically active faults in the area. This fault roughly follows a line along El Colegio Road, through the southern part of the airport, along Atascadero Creek, and then continues east into Santa Barbara as the Mission Ridge Fault Zone. Soils in Goleta are mostly well drained fine brown sandy loam of the Milpitas series (Minor et al. 2009).

Some of the underlying sedimentary units contain economically recoverable quantities of oil and gas. The Ellwood Oil Field was worked beginning in the 1920s, with its onshore portions only being dismantled in the 1970s (Santa Barbara County Planning & Development Department 2013).

The Santa Ynez Mountains form a scenic backdrop to Goleta. They consist of multiple layers of sandstone and conglomerate units dating from the Jurassic Age to the present, uplifted rapidly since the Pliocene. Rapid uplift has given them their craggy, scenic character, and numerous landslides and debris flows, which form some of the urban and suburban lowland area, are testament to their geologically active nature (Minor et al. 2009).

**Organization of the Document**

One of the goals of this document is to provide a comprehensive treatment of the archaeological resources in the City of Goleta. In order to make this an inclusive document, the Barbareño Band of Chumash Indians, local archaeologists, and members of the public have provided pertinent and important contributions to these discussions. The following materials provide a synthesis of this information.
This 1995/6 USGS map is the last of the paper updates, which is the standard that is used at the Central Coastal Information Center.
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HISTORIC RESOURCES GROUP
We are the Barbareño Band of Chumash Indians, the Band of the Land, and the area which today you call 'Goleta' and 'Santa Barbara' is our ancestral homeland! How can we convey to you what our homeland means to us?

This we know: Our family members who came before us, the *hul-mol-moloq-i’ waš hul-kuh-ku’,* the ‘ancient ones’, have passed on to us the knowledge of the cultural, historical and spiritual value of our homeland. On this land, over the span of hundreds and thousands of years, our family members were born, lived out their lives, and died. The spirits of those family members are still with us, forever connected to this land they love. We honor them even as we honor the land as sacred. For us, the sacredness of the land will never be derived from the financial value of the land nor what we can built upon it for our financial gain.

We remember the stories that have been passed down to us, because they connect us to our *nohnonočwaš,* our ancestors, and to the land they lived on. These stories are important to us, because though we may live in this modern world, we derive much of our meaning from the people’s wisdom and experiences of the past contained in the stories. In this way it can be said, we are the past, which ties us to the present and to the future.

These stories from our ancestors are not typically stories that you will read in any history book; those books have not been written by our people. Though we continually strive for healing, these are stories we keep locked in hearts scarred from the memory of a thousand and more injustices visited upon our people by the invaders. But still, the stories long to be told.

Our stories are the spirit of the land, speaking through the ancestors and touching our hearts. They begin in the time from before memory, from the mists of time from whence our people came. And even if your ancestors are not from this land, if you truly love this land and feel a deep connection to it, perhaps you too may know the deep and true wisdom of these stories.

As you read the following stories and thoughts, remember that the great number of cultural resource sites in the Goleta Valley are intimately connected to the present day Barbareño Chumash descendants. These cultural resource sites were the places our ancestors, or to be more precise - our family members, lived out their lives on, and when they died, these sites are where they were buried. Through the unfeeling and objective scientific jargon with which these sites are associated today, it is easy to forget that they are the final resting places of our family members. But never forget that these sites, and human remains and cultural items found at these sites, deserve to be treated with the utmost respect and dignity.
How did this land become our ancestral homeland? It is said that our people originated from the islands and came later to this mainland. The following was a story told by a family member many years ago.

_Saxipak’a…_

Once upon a time long, long ago, the ancient Chumash people were living on Limuw - Santa Cruz Island, and Hutash – the earth goddess, lived there too.

Every year the island became noisier and more crowded because of all the babies being born there. Hutash could not sleep because of all the noise, so she decided some of the Chumash would have to move from the island to the mainland. No people were living on the mainland in those days. But how was Hutash going to get the people from the island to the mainland?

Hutash thought and thought and finally had an idea: she would make a bridge made from a wištoyo – a rainbow- and the people would be able to cross safely from the island to the mainland. So Hutash made the Rainbow Bridge, and she made it tall and long until it stretched to the heavens and out to the horizon.

Hutash told the people to gather all their belongings and their animals and cross the Rainbow Bridge to the mainland.

The Rainbow Bridge stretched high into the sky and far above the water. The people started out and began to cross over the Rainbow Bridge to the mainland. Many of the people were able to safely cross over to the mainland.

But some of the people felt dizzy from being so high above the water. Some of these people lost their balance and fell far down to the water below.

Hutash was watching the people cross the Rainbow Bridge. She saw people fall from the rainbow bridge into the water, and she became sad. After all, she had told them to cross the Rainbow Bridge.

In her sadness and compassion for her people, and because she didn’t want them to drown, Hutash turned those people who had fallen off the bridge into ‘alolk’oy, porpoises. This is why, these many years later, the Chumash still say the porpoises are their people.

That is the story of the Rainbow Bridge and how our people came to this land.

There is another story of how our people came to this land. This story was also passed down over and over, throughout many years and across countless fires, during the time after dinner
and prayers in the villages when the stories would be told, *ma' li siy' alaśalwaš i ka siysaquti' nan*, when the old ones would teach the young ones the history of our people. The telling of this takes place at the Santa Barbara Mission, but remember it is much older than anything the Spanish brought. This is the story:

*When the Chumash people from the islands would come to Santa Barbara Mission, the mainland Indians here would make fun of them, probably they considered them unsophisticated country bumpkins. But the island Chumash would merely answer that all the Indians are Chumash even the people from the Tulare country and all. Then the island Chumash would remind the Indians at the Santa Barbara Mission that all the peoples of the mainland started at the islands, and like fog creeping across the water, came to their respective villages on the mainland here, though many have already forgotten this and do not remember.*

These are the origins of our people on this land. Remember that our history did not begin with the arrival of the Spanish, the Mexicans and the Americans. Our people lived here for many, many years before the invaders came.

The families of the Barbareño Band of Chumash Indians are the people who have traditionally inhabited coastal Santa Barbara County and parts of the backcountry. Our family members were those whose cultural and linguistic knowledge preserved a record of Barbareño heritage resources by working with anthropologists John P. Harrington, Alfred Kroeber, and others. Our family members and relatives are the well-known sources of Barbareño traditional knowledge as they are the individuals who provided the information cited in all of the articles and books published on Barbareño language and culture.

Ancient cultural and linguistic knowledge of our Chumash ancestors have been preserved, written and published by non-native historians, linguists and archaeologists. However, during this same time, the Chumash ancestors and family members continued to carry-on our cultural knowledge, safeguarding our language, oral traditions and cultural practices for future generations. These cultural gifts carried across many generations are received with an open heart. Oral traditions and stories are one of the strongest threads we have in our native tapestry.

Our ancestors' stories contain elements of surprise, challenge, conflict, suspense, resolution, and consequences. All these elements serve a purpose within our Chumash world, tying us to the land and to each other, securing our cultural future.

Our ancestors suffered from colonization, resulting in forced suppression of identity, and to survive - compliance. The fallout has resulted in transgenerational trauma and cultural deprivation. Cultural deprivation occurred in our family, when our children were taken to be educated and raised in a boarding school setting by those who thought that residential
institutionalization was better than being raised in a family. This wound of a fractured past for many families is revisited when recounting stories of our ancestors for non-natives that think this past defines an indigenous person.

Yet, within our family, we have tangible items as well. The sacred abalone shell passed from Chumash Grandmother to granddaughter. This represents our ties to the past while continuing as a living contemporary representation of our cultural continuity. It also epitomizes our physical ties to nature and respect to the earth which has always nourished us from the past to the future. Our family also has the representation of social injustice and inequality, and what some locals have called ‘the farming out of Chumash children as soon as they were able to work.’ An old oil lantern, used by a child of only 4 years old at the Santa Ynez Ranch, is another tie to the past. It was her job every morning at 4 AM, to walk to each of the workers shacks, light their lanterns and wake them to start the day. Saved for so many years and passed from elderly mother to son. The story is sad, but only one of many.

Our oral traditions are the memories of the past and connect us to the present. Our stories become the narrative of our people, and our old ways will never be a forgotten period in our history.

Tangible items passed down by family members are treasures. But we have lost so much over the years, including the sacred and precious land, so more often we have only the stories, the *timolοqinaš*, the tales of the old timers, the memories of the ancestors.

You already know part of our story well. When the Spanish invaders came, they took most everyone into the Mission. The diseases and the heartbreak from being separated from the land did the rest.

Did we have warning that these times of tribulations, which continue to the present, would come upon us?

There is at least one story of a warning, told years ago by a family member. At some time before the Spanish came, at a certain trail between the villages, a mysterious man in silver clothes would appear. When the curious villagers would approach, the man would always disappear behind a rock, never to be found. Did this foretell the coming of the Spanish conquistadores and their armor? Perhaps, but the appearances did not help to save the villages.

You have your stories, from the culture and experiences of your forefathers. You have ‘Goldilocks and the Three Bears,’ ‘Little Red Riding Hood’ and ‘Hansel and Gretel.’ You have your songs such as “Ring Around the Rosy,” which your children sing and which tells of a time of hardship for your forefathers.
We have our stories too, like the following story that comes from the time when animals were people. It takes place at our village of S'axpi'lil, near the heart of present day Goleta. It was told by a family member who as a young girl in the 1840s lived at the place known as ‘Alwat’alam, said to mean ‘choked with weeds.’ You know the area today as Lake Los Carneros. She told this story more than one hundred years ago but of course the story is much older than that. It is called ‘Coyote Goes to War.’

‘There were three fishermen at the site which in the future would be called More’s Landing (half a mile down the coast from Goleta Beach), and Coyote was there too. He was singing that he was cold, and the fishermen heard his song. One of them said to him, “Well, if you’re cold and hungry, why don’t you put on an otter-skin blanket like the Indians do?” Another fisherman threw some fish guts to Coyote and asked him why he didn’t eat them. Coyote got very angry and said that he would get the fisherman’s guts pretty soon.

‘Coyote was living at S’axpi’lil, a large town situated where Goleta is now, and Slo’w (Eagle), Xelex (Prairie Falcon), and Qaq’ (Raven) were there also. The three fishermen lived there too. Coyote was very quick to anger, and he got mad because they made fun of him. The next day he prepared to go to war. He went away to the Tulare country to get carrizo for his arrows, and he made many arrows. And all night he spent his time making arrows and bows and other weapons. By dawn the next morning he had everything ready. Now usually when they are going to have a war they make a big fire as a signal, but the fishermen didn’t know there was going to be a war. Coyote began to shoot at the village. The captain, Eagle, said, “What is wrong with Coyote – has he gone crazy?” He told some men to go and tell Coyote to stop, because he might injure someone in the village. But Coyote paid no attention and kept on shooting, and he killed the men Eagle had sent out to talk with him. The captain was afraid, so he sent the bravest men he had, Qaq’ and Xelex, who were also captains. But still Coyote paid no attention to them, and the war went on until everyone in the village was fighting. Coyote formed companies of men from Ventura, La Purisima, and the Tulare. At last all were killed, including Qaq’ and Xelex, and only Slo’w was left, and Coyote. And Slo’w made a motion like he was shooting and said, “I am a captain too, and I can die as well as any.” So he escaped.

This is what our homeland means to us: Stand upon the estuary land now covered by asphalt and concrete that you know as the Santa Barbara Airport. Long ago our people knew it as Tiptip, the estuary that was once one of the most densely populated areas in California before the Spanish came to stay. Around the estuary were our villages of ‘Alka’ aš and Helo’ and Heliyik and other settlements whose names have passed now from memory. In the distance are the remnants of our ancestral island, Quwa’. The Spanish renamed it as Mescalitan Island and it
was destroyed in the 1940s to construct the airport. Those who destroyed the island also disturbed and destroyed the resting places of our ancestors on the island. In the morning, stand looking to the east, and you will see ališaw, the sun, illuminating the tallest mountain behind Santa Barbara, Tiptipšup. You know it as La Cumbre Peak. In the evening, look to the west and you will see nipolomol, the mountains, including Senek, Santa Ynez Peak, turning purple in the setting sun. And if the land means anything to you as sacred, your heart will ache with its beauty!

The eastern outskirts of the Goleta city limits run along a stream called Maria Ygnacio Creek. Maria Ygnacia was a family member who lived during bitter times in our people’s history when first the Spanish, then the Mexicans, and finally the Americans came to stay. Yet through it all she endured and passed down her knowledge and wisdom to us, her descendants.

Maria Ygnacia was Chumash. She spent most of her life in the area we call today Goleta/Santa Barbara. What we know about her has been passed down to her descendants in stories told by her son’s wife and recorded by a linguist studying the native language who came to this area in the early 20th century. The written records of the Santa Barbara Mission also tell part of her story because the Mission played an important part in her and her family’s lives.

Her story begins in 1769, the year her mother was born. The same year the Portolà expedition made its way overland from Baja California, passing through the present day Goleta/Santa Barbara area and eventually reaching the San Francisco Bay area. Her mother married the man who was to become Maria’s father, and they lived over the mountains in the village of Shniwax along the Santa Ynez River.

Some years later, Maria Ygnacia’s father assumed the inheritance of his mother’s lineage, and he and his wife moved to the coastal town of Syuxtun so he could take up his position as a wot, a chief. The large town of Syuxtun, a political capital, was located west of the mouth of Mission Creek in what today is within the city of Santa Barbara. The chief of this town also had authority over several other villages in the surrounding area.

Maria Ygnacia was born at Syuxtun on April 17, 1803. When Maria was young, she became sick from a respiratory infection. Many young people died from this infection said by some to be caused by witchcraft from their enemies. The padre at the mission said to her parents that, if their baby were baptized, God would heal her. By this time, half of the people living at Syuxtun had been baptized. So at the padre’s urging, Maria was baptized. And in fact she was healed.

Eventually, her family moved back over the mountains to Shniwax. Because Maria had been baptized, her parents would come once a year to visit the padre at the mission. There they would receive their annual allotment of a blanket and a dress.
A number of dry years forced the remaining people into the missions for survival, including Maria’s family. At this time, many Indians along the coast were being brought into the mission in order to build it. A family member related the story: “Malínsya ’í nohnówasha hi ’al eneq i waswaš… When Maria was a very old woman, she used to talk about the time when she was very little. She was old enough to have seen when they dug ground at the place where there was going to be the mission here in Santa Barbara. She remembered running along the edge of where they were digging and she was very happy. There had been another mission. And then afterwards they built the mission that’s there now.”

The people at the mission lived in crowded compounds in rows of adobe apartments. White man’s diseases took many lives, for the Chumash had no natural resistance to them. The measles epidemic in the winter of 1806 especially, took many Indian lives all over California. The soldiers and guards were cruel, oftentimes mistreating the Chumash and taking advantage of the young women.

Her brother was born at the mission and baptized in 1808. His name was Pedro. When Maria was 14, a terrible earthquake struck the Santa Barbara area and aftershocks continued for 3 days. From cracks made in the mountainsides people could see a bright luminescence. Everybody slept in the open. Chumash elders said the quakes were caused by giant serpents moving beneath the ground. They said the serpents were unhappy because the Chumash had given up their old religious beliefs.

In 1824 there was a revolt at the mission against mistreatment by the soldiers and the unhealthy living conditions. The Indians fought the Spanish soldiers in Mission Canyon. At night Maria Ygnacia and her people escaped over the Santa Ynez Mountains back to Shniwax, along the Santa Ynez River. From there they made their way through the mountains to the Tulare swamps in the Central Valley, where the Yokuts people welcomed them. The Chumash from Santa Barbara finally agreed to return to the mission if they would not be punished.

Maria Ygnacia obtained a grant of land in a canyon next to the mission vineyard which was then on San Jose Creek. The land grant was at the place named the Alikon. The creek which flowed down from the mountains and through the property was later renamed Maria Ygnacio Creek. Today if you drive up Old San Marcos Pass Road, you can see the site of the Alikon ranch where she used to live. Drive past the new housing tracts and as the road curves to the left and the view opens up, down below on the right you can see where the Alikon ranch used to be. Later, that place became known as the Indian Orchard.

At the Alikon, Maria lived with her mother, close relatives, and her 2 young children. Without this land grant, her family would have lost their language, they would have been split apart. But at the Alikon they had their own foods, they spoke their own language. And for that reason, the
language came down to her descendants and the present-day Chumash of Goleta/Santa Barbara and still exists, although we have no fluent speakers left.

On Sundays, Maria Ygnacia and her family traveled by wagon to the small chapel built by the Indians on the reservation at Kaswa', La Cieneguita, near the present-day Modoc Road/Hope Ranch area. Yes, there was once a reservation for the Chumash in that area. But like so much else that has disappeared, that has, too.

As the daughter of the wot, the chief, Maria Ygnacia would gather her people at the beach near La Goleta for ceremonies under the full moon. There they would sing their ancient songs and make offerings to the sea. Even now, if you walk along these beaches under the light of the full moon, listen to the sound of the waves. And if you listen closely enough, maybe you can hear the voices of the old Chumash, mourning all that has been lost.

Maria Ygnacia died in June 1865. Out of the thousands of Chumash born at Syuxtun over the many years it was occupied, she outlived all those born at that village on the Santa Barbara waterfront.

The Alikon was sold some years later and so passed out of the family. But Maria Ygnacia’s most important legacies continue in the language and the stories that she passed down to her descendants. And the Catholic faith for which our ancestors paid such a heavy price to receive, and which many of her descendants still hold to tightly. This is the story of Maria Ygnacia.

Every hill and contour of the land, every tree and every insect on every leaf and blade of grass, every mountain peak and rock upon the shore is sacred in the estimation of our people. Every place in the Goleta Valley and beyond in our ancestral homeland has been the scene of events, happy and sad, eventful and mundane in the lives of our people and how could it be otherwise since we have lived here for hundreds and thousands of years!

When I walk through the fields, the dried grass brushes my legs as I pass, and as I listen closely, the spirit of the land whispers to me. The spirit of the land tells me that the resting places of our ancestors are in danger as their resting places are dug into, built upon, and exploited for gain.

As I walk along the beach at La Goleta, I can hear the melody of the waves and I know that too, is the spirit of the land. It tells me that in the beautiful sea our grandmothers once made offerings to and danced the Seaweed Dance for, the creatures in it are dying and being reduced to extinction. In my dreams and in my waking moments, the spirit of the land tells me things I once knew and things I have forgotten, that we were a proud people with our songs, dances, and stories, which told the wisdom of the ancestors.
And the spirit of the land reminds me that we had our language! Our beautiful and simple, flowing and elegant language that contained in it all the feelings and thoughts and emotions that we wanted to express when words were called for.

We danced around our fires during ceremony, and our songs expressed our prayers in the language, and we taught the language to our young people. They in turn became of age and they taught the language to their young ones, and like our beautiful and famous Chumash baskets, the language held the things we esteemed most highly in our culture, such as wisdom and our history and the hopes and dreams of the people; all of it was contained in the basket of our language. Through the hundreds and thousands of years of our people’s existence, our language basket remained a constant for us, a basket with the most beautiful designs, elegant in its simplicity. The weaves curving into lines, carrying balance and perfection.

Then the invaders came and at first we welcomed them, but they overstayed their welcome and they snatched the basket of our language from our hands and threw it upon the ground hoping to smash it. Then they stomped all over it with their boots, hoping to stamp it out of existence because they knew that the language tied us together and gave us an identity as a proud and strong people.

The language lay smashed on the ground but there were those families such as Maria Ygnacia’s that nurtured it through those lean years, when our language held on by a heartbeat and a thread while bitter winds howled at the door and threatened to extinguish even the memory of it.

For long lonely years the land cried out to hear our language expressed in song and speech again. The animals that walked upon the ground and the birds that flew in the sky longed to hear the sweet sounds of our precious language. But there the basket lay for many years all smashed to pieces and in ruins almost.

Just when all seemed lost and when the occupiers had all but forgotten us, we knelt in the dirt and gathered up all the pieces of this beautiful basket, and we carefully and lovingly stitched the pieces back together again.

Now the basket is becoming whole again, it will become strong in the hearts of the people and bring pride and comfort to them. Once more it is taking its rightful place as the center around which the people gather.

The language is bringing healing and joy to this land which strains under the weight of the occupiers. The animals on the ground and the birds in the sky are hearing the sweet sounds of the language again as they had before for hundreds and thousands of years. This is the story of our language. The spirit of the land speaking through our stories and the ancestors.
Do you still not understand what this land means to us? Then open your heart and let the following lines from the ancient language of the land and the people guide you towards an understanding of why the land is sacred:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Napašnipit hihe'it'i he'lšup}, \\
\text{‘ipwakapi hiptayašnipit}, \\
\text{k‘ayke swil 'it'i hisiywe'}, \\
\text{hikiynohnotšwaš.}
\end{align*}
\]

Walk softly over the land, beneath it the ancestors sleep.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Napeša 'aqšmul hipitaq}, \\
\text{'ikapsa'alaqwa'y hipitaqus hisiyašiw} \\
\text{hihel'a'aha'š,} \\
\text{hisiyto'ni hima'm hihe'it'i he'lšup.}
\end{align*}
\]

Be still. Listen to the quiet; the spirit of the land speaks.

This then is what our homeland means to us. But remember, this is not the whole story. For how can you tell the complete story of a people who existed on the land for hundreds and thousands of years?

Remember that this is not the end of the story. It is only the beginning of the next chapter. For the people are coming together again to form the circle, the language is being revitalized, the culture is being renewed and remembered. And the ancestors are being honored once again.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{A fire brought close to the brink,} \\
\text{Now rising from the ashes.} \\
\text{The hopes and dreams of the people burning bright again.}
\end{align*}
\]

This is the story at this moment, the story that the land and the ancestors wish to tell at this time. The story of a proud people connected to the land and their ancestors forever.
We are the Barbareño Band of Chumash Indians!

*Kiy ko ʔi ka šiš-kuhk’ ú’ hi ʔitil šup o kiya nu na!*

We are the people of this land!
ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

Prehistory

The majority of the background information was derived from Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan FEIR prepared by Theodore Cooley and Stacie Wilson (2006) and acknowledgment is hereby made.

Evidence exists for the presence of humans in the Santa Barbara coastal area for thousands of years. The period in California prehistory prior to 10,000 years ago has been labeled the Paleoindian Horizon (Erlandson 1994). Even though evidence for the earliest unquestioned evidence of human occupation in southern Santa Barbara County is dated to between 10,000 to 8,000 B.P. (Erlandson and Colten 1991), human prehistory along the Santa Barbara channel area coast may extend back at least some 12,000 years (Erlandson et al. 1987, 1996). Paleoindian groups during this time focused on hunting Pleistocene megafauna, including mammoth and bison. Plants and smaller animals were undoubtedly part of the Paleoindian diet as well, and when the availability of large game was reduced by climatic shifts near the end of the Pleistocene, the subsistence strategy changed to a greater reliance on these resources.

Subsequent to the Early Man or Paleoindian Horizon, beginning circa 9,000 to 8,000 years ago, a distinctive artifact assemblage, labeled the Milling Stone Horizon by Wallace (1955), became ubiquitous in California. In the Santa Barbara area, this assemblage was first designated as the Oak Grove by Rogers (1929) and is now termed the Early Period (King 1990). Beginning approximately 7,500 years ago, prehistoric human settlement in the local area apparently increased rapidly with a number of sites dating to approximately this time, and many more dating subsequent to it (Colten 1987; Erlandson 1988, 1997; Glassow 1997). Analysis of pollen from this period of time indicates that a relatively dry climate prevailed. The people who produced this assemblage predominated for nearly 4,000 years, or until approximately 5,000 years ago, in most areas of the state. They practiced a mostly gathering subsistence economy, focusing mainly on natural vegetal resources, small animals, and marine resources such as shellfish. One of the major tool types evident in their assemblage was the milling stone and muller (also referred to as mano and metate). These tools were used primarily to process (grind) various kinds of seeds, and vegetal foodstuffs. The large quantities of these tools found by archaeologists in such sites resulted in the designation of the period as the Milling Stone Horizon. Shellfish gathering has been determined to represent an important component of the Early Period diet (Erlandson 1994). Hunting appears to have emphasized the exploitation of larger terrestrial game using large projectile points tied to spears. Toward the end of the Early Period, sea mammal hunting appears to have supplemented subsistence strategies (Glassow et al. 1990).

The earliest Early Period sites in the Santa Barbara area date to circa 8,000 years ago (Erlandson 1994). In Santa Barbara coastal areas, Milling Stone sites tend to occur on upper elevation
landforms such as bluffs, terraces, or knolls, often at some distance from the current shoreline. The sea level at this point in time, however, was approximately 65 feet lower than present (Masters and Gallegos 1997). Subsequent sea level rise throughout the Holocene Period resulted in erosion of the landforms adjacent to the Pacific Ocean. It is reasonable to assume that numerous Early Period settlements that were located adjacent to the coastline have been lost to these natural forces. Early Period coastal sites are often large with extensive midden deposits, cemeteries, and possible subterranean house pits. The Early Period inhabitants may represent the first inhabitants of the Goleta area.

Beginning with sites dating to approximately 5,000 years ago, archaeologists began to notice differences between some site assemblages. These differences involved changes in the tool inventory with new tool types indicative of new subsistence technologies. Identified as the Hunting Period by Rogers (1929), this is called the Middle Period of Santa Barbara Channel prehistory (King 1990). Pollen samples dated to this time period indicate that the climate was substantially wetter than before. This wetter climate supported the spread of oak woodland and riparian habitats. Populations adapted to this wetter climate and increased variety of vegetable resources by adopting the mortar and pestle to process readily available coast live oak acorns. Large projectile points indicate the hunting of large and medium-sized land animals. Increased fishing activity exploiting a greater range of habitats and hunting of marine mammals occurred. Toward the end of this period, the plank canoe was developed, making ocean fishing and trade with the Channel Islands safer and more efficient (Arnold 1987). Based on the number of sites that have been dated, prehistoric habitation increased considerably in the Goleta area during the Middle Period, considered to have been a function of a favorable cooler climate and abundance of plant and animal resources.

Between approximately 800 years to 1350 AD, a period of dryer and warmer climate called the Medieval Climatic Anomaly (Stine 1994) resulted in important changes prehistoric lifestyles. Numerous researchers beginning with Moratto et al (1978) have associated increased prehistoric population violence, reduced trade, and a possible upheaval of political authority during this time (Schwitalla and Jones 2012). Reduced rainfall resulting in decreased access to animal foods has been particularly noted between 1210 and 1390 AD, resulting in greater competition for these resources (Schwitalla and Jones 2012:110).

Rogers identified this as the Canalino Period, but it is now called the Late Period (King 1990). Included in these new technologies were the bow and arrow that appears to have been introduced by populations spreading east from the Great Basin. The bow and arrow, using small projectile points, were necessary to hunt the preponderance of smaller terrestrial animals as the drier climate and changes in leafy vegetation resulted reduction in the numbers of larger game to hunt. The period is characterized as a time of cultural elaboration and increased sophistication including artistic, technological, and sociological changes (Erlandson and Rick 2002). An
increased number of permanent and semi-permanent villages clustered along the Santa Barbara Channel and on the Channel Islands, and the diversity of environmental site settings in which sites have been identified, indicates a substantial increase in prehistoric population. Intensification of terrestrial as well as marine resources occurred. Acorns continued to be processed, and land mammals were hunted with the bow and arrow, rather than exclusively by spear. Trade networks, controlled by village chiefs (evident locally in the villages of Saxpilil and Helo around the Goleta Slough) expanded and played an important part in local Chumash culture, reinforcing status differences and encouraging craft specialization. Shell beads, found throughout the Early and Middle Periods, increased in number and variety, and were used in monetary exchange as well as distinguishing status and social value. Rogers identified the culture of the period as Canalino, which is now called the Late Period (King 1990). The protohistoric culture of the Chumash was terminated by the arrival of a Spanish expedition led by Gaspar de Portolà in 1769. Chumash culture changed dramatically with the establishment of Mission Santa Barbara in 1782.

**Ethnography**

The period between the first documented European interaction with the Chumash in 1542 and the Portolà overland expedition in 1769 is known as the protohistoric period (Gamble 2008). At the time of first European contact in 1542, the Goleta area was occupied by a Native American group speaking a distinct dialect of the Chumash language. Historically, this group became known as the Barbareño Chumash (Landberg 1965), the name deriving from the Mission Santa Barbara whose jurisdiction incorporated many local Chumash after its founding in 1776. The Chumash were hunters and gatherers who lived in an area with many potentially useful natural resources. They had developed a number of technologies and subsistence strategies that allowed them to maximize the exploitation of these natural resources.

Consequently, prior to a drastic change caused by disease and other forms of cultural disruption introduced by the Spaniards, Chumash settlements were numerous, with some containing large residential areas, semi-subterranean houses, and large cemeteries. At the time of Spanish contact, the Goleta area and immediate vicinity was densely populated with at least 10 Chumash villages (Johnson et al. 1982). A number of these settlements were situated around the Goleta Slough, the estuary that extended beyond Hollister Avenue to the north, beyond Los Carneros Road to the west, beyond Ward Memorial Boulevard to the east, and as far south as Goleta Beach. At high tide, the slough was as deep as 12 deep and was navigated by boat (Stone 1982), and contained an abundance of marine resources including shellfish, fish, birds, and marine mammals. Early Spanish explorers, missionaries, and administrators characterized the ethnohistoric Chumash as having a strong propensity for trade, commerce, and craft specialization, as well as for intervillage warfare (Erlandson 1994).
History

The first European contact to the Santa Barbara coastal region was in 1542 by the Portuguese explorer Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo, whose voyage up the California coast under the flag of Spain was the first expedition to explore what is now the west coast of the United States. It was, however, Spanish explorer Sebastian Vizcaino, sailing though the region in December 1602, retracing Cabrillo’s voyage, who christened the channel Santa Barbara in honor of Saint Santa Barbara, whose day in the Catholic calendar is December 4. After 1602, there is no verified documentation of European contact in the region until Portolá’s expedition along the coast of California in route to Monterey Bay in 1769. The goal of his voyage was to relocate the port of Monterey for the establishment of a Presidio to complement the newly founded Presidio of San Diego and to explore the coastline in between. Accompanying Portolá was Sergeant José Francisco Ortega, who would become the first comandante of the Santa Barbara Presidio, constructed in 1781–1782.

Although the Santa Barbara region was not initially identified as a recommended site for the establishment of a mission, it was situated along the main route leading from the newly founded missions in the north to the mission in San Diego, and Spanish colonial officials were worried that a Chumash uprising could jeopardize this route. Therefore, it was decided that the establishment of a Presidio and several missions among the Chumash was needed to secure a safe passage (Johnson et al. 1982). Mission Santa Barbara was founded on December 4, 1786, and in the first year of commission, 186 Chumash people were baptized, 83 of whom were from the Goleta region (Johnson et al. 1982:20). In 1803, a proportionally large number of baptisms occurred throughout the five missions located within the Chumash territory, putting such a strain on the missions that the newly baptized were allowed to remain in certain native villages which were renamed after saints. In the Goleta area, there were at least two of such communities, San Miguel and San Francisco, the native villages of Mescalitan (S’axpíliil) and Cieniguitas (Kaswa’s), respectively (Johnson et al. 1982:21).

In the time between the establishment of the Santa Barbara Mission and Presidio (1786) and the end of Spanish rule in California in 1822, the Goleta area was primarily used by the Franciscan fathers for grazing cattle and sheep. In 1806, a measles epidemic took many lives and marked the beginning of the decline of both Mission Santa Barbara and the native population (Johnson et al. 1982). In 1822 and 1823, the most severe drought in mission history occurred, resulting in two very poor harvest years. A Chumash revolt occurred in 1824, possibly influenced by the lack in food supply (Johnson et al. 1982:25). Many of the Chumash population dispersed into the mountains and to the southern San Joaquin Valley. After two Mexican expeditions into the interior, many of them were persuaded to return to Santa Barbara.

Although Mexico had gained independence from Spain in 1822, it was not until 1835 that secularization of the missions occurred, the mission became a parish church, and the Chumash
were made free citizens (Johnson et al. 1982). The 1824 Secularization Proclamation of Governor José Figueroa decreed that half of the mission lands were to be divided between the Native Americans and the colonists; however, much of the land became available to private persons, as no provisions were made in how the mission properties were to be disposed (King 1990). The policy of the Mexican government was to grant the mission lands and other unclaimed property to prominent citizens who were required to develop the properties and to build homes on them. The City of Goleta encompasses parts of two of these land grants: Los Dos Pueblos Rancho, granted to Nicholas Den in 1842, and La Goleta, granted to Daniel Hill in 1846 (King 1990; Tompkins 1960). Nicholas Den, a native of Ireland, and Daniel Hill, a native of Massachusetts, had migrated to the Santa Barbara area in the 1820s and 1830s, respectively, and had become citizens of Mexico and converts to Catholicism. The ranchos were used by Den and Hill primarily to raise cattle for hide and tallow production (King 1990; Tompkins 1960).

The American period began in 1848, when Mexico signed a treaty ceding California to the United States. Santa Barbara County was one of the original counties of California, formed in 1850 at the time of statehood. In 1851, a land act was passed that required the confirmation of ownership of Spanish land grants, although the process took many years to complete. Daniel Hill received a patent for La Goleta on March 10, 1865, and Los Dos Pueblos was patented to N. A. Den on February 23, 1877, fifteen years after his death.

The 1850s were prosperous for the owners of the ranchos, as the price of beef was inflated greatly due to the gold rush. However, droughts in the early 1860s proved devastating to the cattle ranchers, and the ranchos saw change in ownership for the first time (King 1990; Tompkins 1960). Daniel Hill first sold 400 acres of La Goleta to his son-in-law, T. Wallace More, in 1856 and an additional 1,000 acres in 1864, a year before his death. William Hollister acquired more than 5,000 acres of Los Dos Pueblos in 1869 and 1870. The 1870s saw the characterization of the Goleta area began to shift from sparsely populated cattle ranches to farmsteads and towns. The area of La Goleta north of Hollister Avenue was subdivided into 38 parcels, ranging from 31 to 258 acres each (King 1990:51), and a town taking on the name of Goleta was established in the southwestern portion of the old La Goleta land grant. Early pioneers during this time include J. D. Patterson, Richard Sexton, B. A. Hicks, Ira A. Martin, John Edwards, and Isaac Foster (King 1990). By 1890, the population of Goleta had grown from 200 in 1870 to 700 people (King 1990:51). In a legal battle that began in 1877 and lasted until 1885, the sale of Los Dos Pueblos was deemed illegal based on Nicholas Den’s will, and the land was transferred back to Den’s children and the lawyer, Thomas B. Bishop, who had represented them. During Hollister’s ownership, however, Los Dos Pueblos had changed dramatically. Hollister established Glen Annie Ranch, and, along with Ellwood Cooper, turned the area into the productive agriculture enterprise that is still seen today (Tompkins 1960).

City of Goleta
Citywide Historic Context Statement
HISTORIC RESOURCES GROUP
In 1887, the Southern Pacific Railroad connected Santa Barbara County to Los Angeles and in 1901 to San Francisco, bringing with it the expansion and growth of ranching and agriculture in the Goleta Valley. Goleta in the early 1900s was described by J. M. Guinn as “a small village eight miles to the northwest of Santa Barbara. The country around to a considerable extent is devoted to walnut-growing and olive culture” (1907:422). Joseph Sexton, who had developed the softshell walnut, inspired many additional local farmers to plant their land with walnuts and a grower’s association was formed (King 1990). In the early 1870s, Sherman Stow planted lemon, walnut, and almond orchards; the lemon orchards were the first commercial lemon planting in California (Tompkins 1960). The lemon industry continued to develop, and in the 1930s, a lemon packing plant was constructed. Today agriculture in the Goleta foothills consists mainly of lemons and avocados (King 1990).

Oil production along the Goleta coast began in the 1920s and boomed in 1928 with the discovery of the Ellwood oil fields. After 1937, oil production began to decline; however, natural gas was also discovered along the coast and is still being tapped today. Suggestions that the Goleta Slough be turned into a harbor first originated in the early 1920s and persisted into the 1960s, although this plan eventually disintegrated with the infilling of marshlands in 1930s and 1940s in order to accommodate an airport. In 1941, the City of Santa Barbara bought Mescalitan Island and the surrounding tide flats (King 1990). The 1950s and 1960s brought tremendous change to the Goleta area, as the construction of Cachuma Dam provided a relief to the area’s problem of a reliable water source and fueled rapid growth with commercial and residential development.
SITE INFORMATION

Previously Identified Resources

A record and literature search was undertaken at the Central Coast Information Center at the University of California, Santa Barbara by staff archaeologist Dana N. Slawson, M.A. The summary of archaeological site characteristics in Table 1 is limited to information provided in site records accessed at the Central Coastal Information Center (CCIC). Nonetheless all of the available site records were obtained and the information is summarized below in Tables 1 and 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE CA-SBA-</th>
<th>GENERAL TIME PERIOD</th>
<th>SITE TYPE</th>
<th>ARTIFACTS</th>
<th>FEATURES</th>
<th>BURIALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Prehistoric/Ethnohistoric</td>
<td>Ethnohistoric Village (Helo)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>House floors</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Habitation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Hearths</td>
<td>Two cemeteries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Habitation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Rock clusters</td>
<td>~17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Habitation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Oval pit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Habitation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None observed</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Habitation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>Human remains observed during monitoring of brushing Single intact burial. Other isolated remains were identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Habitation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>House pits</td>
<td>27, two components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Habitation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Substantially disturbed; unknown</td>
<td>Two cemeteries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Habitation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Substantially disturbed; unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Prehistoric\Historical</td>
<td>Ethnohistoric Village (S'axpilin)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Rock features and cache</td>
<td>&gt;100 flexed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Habitation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE CA-SBA-</td>
<td>GENERAL TIME PERIOD</td>
<td>SITE TYPE</td>
<td>ARTIFACTS</td>
<td>FEATURES</td>
<td>BURIALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Habitation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Habitation</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Midden</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Midden?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Habitation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>House pits</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Habitation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dance platform</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Habitation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dance floor/temescal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Habitation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dance floor/temescal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Habitation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Midden</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Midden</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Midden</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Midden</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>Burials reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Habitation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>Burials reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Cave</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Basket</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1093</td>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Refuse deposits</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1194</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Midden</td>
<td>None observed</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1195</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Midden</td>
<td>None observed</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1203</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Habitation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Rock clusters</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1207</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Midden</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1321</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Processing site</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1326</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Lithic scatter</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 1. ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE CA-SBA-</th>
<th>GENERAL TIME PERIOD</th>
<th>SITE TYPE</th>
<th>ARTIFACTS</th>
<th>FEATURES</th>
<th>BURIALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1568</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Midden</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1574</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Midden</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1575</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Midden</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1576</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Midden</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1577</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Midden</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1663</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Midden</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Midden</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Midden</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Midden</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Midden</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1673</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Lithic scatter</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1674</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Shell and lithic scatter</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1688</td>
<td>Prehistoric?</td>
<td>Faunal remains</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Shell and lithic scatter</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1703</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Midden</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Rock features</td>
<td>Single tooth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1717</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Shell scatter</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1735</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Shell and lithic scatter</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Lithic scatter</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Possible quarry</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Midden</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>Refuse deposit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2153</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Midden</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 1. ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE CATALOG</th>
<th>GENERAL TIME PERIOD</th>
<th>SITE TYPE</th>
<th>ARTIFACTS</th>
<th>FEATURES</th>
<th>BURIALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2204/H</td>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27 features</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2433</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Midden</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2499</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Lithic scatter</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2586</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Lithic scatter</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2588</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Midden</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2674</td>
<td>Historical?</td>
<td>Shell scatter</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2768</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Midden</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3380</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Shell scatter</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3384</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Shell scatter</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3493</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Habitation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Fire altered rock</td>
<td>Burials reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3495</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Shell and lithic scatter</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3496</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Shell and lithic scatter</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3634H</td>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>Paving stones</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3636</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Midden</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3715</td>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>Channelized creek</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Additional water ways</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>SPECIFIC REMAINS</td>
<td>SITE TYPE</td>
<td>ARTIFACTS</td>
<td>FEATURES</td>
<td>BURIALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>038282</td>
<td>Prehistoric isolate Flake</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>038283</td>
<td>Two shell fragments, Prehistoric? isolate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>038623</td>
<td>One shell fragment isolate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>038624</td>
<td>Shell fragment isolate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>038627</td>
<td>Shell fragment isolate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>038628</td>
<td>Shell fragment isolate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>038629</td>
<td>Shell fragment isolate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>038630</td>
<td>Shell fragment isolate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>038631</td>
<td>Shell fragment isolate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>038632</td>
<td>Shell fragments isolate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>038644</td>
<td>Prehistoric Point isolate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>038646</td>
<td>Prehistoric Core</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>None recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>040911</td>
<td>Historical – NRHP Stow House</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>040913</td>
<td>Historical – NRHP Goleta Depot</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>040959</td>
<td>Historical Southern Pacific Railroad line/Bridge</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>040960</td>
<td>Historical Southern Pacific Railroad line/Bridge</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02033</td>
<td>Historical Sexton House</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Summary

There are 67 recorded archaeological sites, 12 isolates, and two National Register sites within the city boundaries of Goleta. Of the 67 recorded sites, 60 are classified as prehistoric, 6 historical, and one noted as both prehistoric and historical. A total of 17 sites have been recorded as presenting one or more burials with one containing as many as 100 individuals. Features noted were highly variable and included house floors, rock clusters, hearths, oval pits, house pits, rock features, dance floors/platforms (3), a basket, and a lithic quarry.

Of the prehistoric sites 19 have been characterized as habitation/villages, 26 as midden, 5 as lithic and shell scatters, 5 as lithic scatters, 4 as shell scatters, one processing site, and one faunal scatter. Of the recorded historical archaeological sites, one is described as consisting of paving stones, a channelized creek, shell scatter, refuse deposit, house, and various structures.

Of the sites characterized as midden, three are reported to include burials while no features were recorded for the others.

Results of the records search confirm that Goleta has an extensive record of human occupation from the prehistoric era to modern times. While early archaeologists such as D.B. Rogers began recording archaeological sites during the 1920s, the intensity of his efforts did not always include careful mapping of site boundaries; his attention was directed to the most extensive village sites that offered the greatest opportunity for artifact characterization and exploration of cemeteries. Systematic excavation and recording of archaeological sites has occurred only over a period of approximately the last 50 years, when several resources were threatened by development of US 101 and major overpasses such as Storke Road/Glen Annie Road, Los Carneros Road, and Fairview Road. Archaeologists associated with the University of California, Santa Barbara and Los Angeles conducted "salvage" excavations to characterize cultural deposits before their construction. The passage of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in 1970 regulated that systematic significance assessments and mitigation programs be undertaken when project impacts were unavoidable, increasing substantially opportunities for archaeological exploration and the number of archaeological sites that have been recorded.

These investigations are focused exclusively within individual project development footprints, and therefore have not been comprehensive nor necessarily coordinated with previous efforts in a cohesive manner. Continued urbanization of the Goleta Valley has resulted in some level of disturbance to nearly all archaeological sites and loss of information about the past. When an archaeological site is impacted, it is the required that the archaeologist update an existing site record with the current condition of the resource and include additional data gathered during the mitigation excavation. While the status of a given site record can be revised, these updates do not occur in any systematic or regular way. Consequently, site records may not contain any updates from when they were originally mapped and described, even if they may have been
substantially disturbed or destroyed. The records search results indicated 67 prehistoric and/or historic archaeological sites have been previously recorded within, or partially within, the current City limits. Research also revealed that four sites are listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Three are historic buildings: the Stow House, the Sexton House, and the Goleta Depot; and one is a prehistoric site, CA-SBA-52. No State Historic Landmarks are recorded in Goleta.

Most of the prehistoric sites present in the city represent either major villages, places of less substantial habitation such as temporary or seasonal campsites, or resource procurement and/or processing locations. A substantial number of the village or larger habitation sites in the Goleta included one or more cemeteries. Historic archaeological sites consist mostly of historic trash deposits, some likely associated with a former dwelling, commercial structure, or other specific activity location.

The records search also revealed that approximately 50 percent of the area within the City limits has been previously surveyed for cultural resources. Most of these surveys have been conducted since the inception of CEQA in 1970. However, these previous surveys were not necessarily of the same intensity, as standards for completing the investigations were not standardized. Depending on the intended purpose of the survey, different levels of intensity or professionalism were sometimes employed. Cultural Resource Guidelines were developed in 1986 by the County of Santa Barbara that governed the completion of studies throughout the Goleta Valley. These continue to be used by the City of Goleta. The intensity and efforts to evaluate for the presence of buried archaeological deposits, however, has been less consistent. In general, if existing archaeological survey reports are older than ten years, the results may not reflect current standards for the accurate identification of subsurface archaeological deposits in areas where prehistoric living surfaces could be buried by alluvial erosion processes (i.e., adjacent slope wash, flooding, etc.).

**Field Inspection**

The primary purpose of the field investigation was to assess the archaeological potential of the documented cultural resources within the study area. In conjunction with additional research, a summary of the known attributes of each site was prepared (Table 1). The tabulation provides the site number, general time period, the type of site, features present or recorded, and whether burials were observed. During this investigation, 22 of the sites were inspected.

**Property Types and Eligibility Standards**

A property type is a grouping of individual properties based on shared physical or associative characteristics. Property types link the ideas incorporated in the theoretical historic context with actual historic properties that illustrate those ideas.
Prehistoric Sites

*Habitation (Complex Sites).* These sites are characterized by multiple categories of artifact types, food remains, burials, and cultural features. They may be called villages, base camps, and habitation sites.

*Processing Sites.* The primary aspects of such sites include food remains, limited artifact types, and absence of burials and features suggesting occupation. These resources are identified as middens, lithic and shell scatters, or special purpose sites.

Site Locational Patterns

Plotting of the two site types within the City limits revealed a surprisingly clear spatial distribution. The primary locational attribute was the presence of water, particularly around the sloughs and main water courses (creeks and streams). The habitation sites are located in close proximity to the Goleta or Devereux sloughs, where substantial shellfish and fishing opportunities were available. The processing sites were in close proximity of the habitation site zones but were clustered in well-defined areas and tended to be inland. The processing sites are associated with hunting and gathering resources that were not readily available within the immediate vicinity of the estuary environments, such as seeds from coastal sage scrub habitat, acorns from oak woodlands, and terrestrial animals that would use riparian habitats and streams as movement corridors. Archaeologists studying the Barbareño Chumash consider that prehistoric populations along the Santa Barbara Channel, including occupying sites now with the City limits, congregated in the communal villages during the summer and fall when food resources were most abundant (including off-shore fishing in tule balsas and later in plank canoes), and then split off into smaller extended family groups during the winter in smaller camps dispersed inland when resources were less abundant. Therefore, the spatial patterning of larger settlements capable of supporting populations in the several hundreds, as were described by Spanish explorers associated with the spread of Franciscan missionization was dependent upon available resources surrounding the Goleta and Devereux sloughs. Smaller temporary camps and processing areas were strategically located to exploit vegetable and animal resources needed to supplement the villages surrounding the sloughs and the coastline, and to accommodate the seasonal migration from the larger sites during periods when coastal resources were not sufficiently plentiful to support the community village. It is important to note that limiting the focus of this prehistoric settlement pattern to only those resources within the City limits artificially constrains the extent to which populations living in these sites gathered and hunting in a settlement pattern extending throughout the Santa Ynez Mountain foothills and ridgeline, and included a complex social interaction with their Chumash *Samala* neighbors in the Santa Ynez Valley (Johnson 1982, Johnson et al. 1982).
Historic Sites

Recorded historical archaeological resources are limited to several farm structures, canals, paving stones, and refuse deposits. There is insufficient information to suggest any patterning. It is probable that the primary reason that there are not more historical archaeological sites is that historical development in Goleta was primarily agricultural until the mid-20th century, unlike the 19th and early 20th century urbanization in Santa Barbara. Agricultural parcels in these rural areas are generally large so that evidence of refuse deposits is associated with the few farm houses that have survived modern development. The illicit exploration and collection of historical deposits such as bottle collecting could influence the extent to which these resources still survive as well. It is reasonable to assume however, that locations of 19th and early 20th century agricultural ranches are likely to contain refuse deposits in close proximity to the activity’s main ranch house, as municipal waste pick up and disposal would not have been available until after 1930.

Expected Integrity/Condition

Historical processes that contribute to the degradation of archaeological sites in the Goleta area include railroad and freeways transportation corridors, agricultural activities including citrus, row crops, other associated tasks including plowing, tree replacement, excavation for irrigation lines, and diversion of waterways. By far the greatest impact to cultural resources is residential, commercial, and industrial development. Other activities that have degraded the integrity of archaeological resources directly or indirectly include: channelization of streams; utility infrastructure such as fiber optic cable excavation; recreational facilities including parks and trails; erosion resulting from landform alterations, and illicit artifact collection.

EVALUATION

Basis for Site Evaluation

Although the City of Goleta is ultimately responsible for determining which cultural resources properties are significant, this study was requested to provide a professional opinion about the integrity and scientific importance of the known sites. Not all of the cultural resources can be assessed because some still require subsurface testing to confirm their locations and boundaries, evaluate their integrity, and ascertain their cultural context and complexity. Some are buried, and little to no surface evidence can be presently observed.

California Public Resources Code Section 5024.1.

The California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) is an authoritative guide in California to be used by state and local agencies, private groups, and citizens to identify the state's significant historical resources and to indicate what properties are to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from substantial adverse change.
To the extent possible, therefore, the sites have been evaluated according to the criteria for eligibility to the CRHR. The criteria for listing a resource on the CRHR are important because impacts to such a site are considered significant under CEQA whenever such properties are impacted directly or indirectly by an undertaking.

The CRHR shall include historical resources (these include both prehistoric and historic-period cultural resources) determined by the commission, according to procedures adopted by the commission, to be significant and to meet the criteria in subdivision (c).

A resource may be listed as an historical resource in the CRHR if it meets any of the following criteria:

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; or
4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The scientific significance of individual cultural resources is best judged with reference to a broad regional context. This is because individual sites, or even collections of sites from a single inter-related locality, do not possibly reflect the full range of cultural patterning present in a particular region. The role a particular site may have played in the prehistoric hunter and gatherer settlement system and specific research value are relevant aspects of a site’s significance. A knowledge of site structure, content, and integrity (the extent to which the site has been previously disturbed by modern development) is required to appropriately evaluate its research potential relative to local research questions considered to be “important in prehistory and history.”

Assessing scientific significance thus involves the examination of a large array of possible articulations between data gathered from a site and these local research issues—issues which might include studies of chronology (changes in lifestyles through time), technology, subsistence, settlement patterns, exchange systems, demography, and other research domains in the prehistoric and historical periods.

An important consideration when evaluating a site’s potential to yield significant information is the integrity of its deposits and features. During this study and previous investigations, prior impacts to site deposits were noted. However, a site’s research potential still exists even when it
has been substantially disturbed; for example, portions of an impacted site may still provide valuable data on chronology, technology and settlement pattern; thus all sites regardless of evidence of previous disturbance require careful assessment.

In addition to scientific significance, historical cultural resources may possess public and ethnic heritage values. For instance, persons associated with a particular site (or their descendants) may retain strong connections with that place through memories or folklore. The importance of this aspect of significance lies not only in the strength of these associations as they contribute to broad patterns of history, but also in the valuable yet very ephemeral source of information such memories represent. As well, cultural resources may have broader public significance insofar as they can serve to educate the general populace about important aspects of national, state, and local history.

The scientific or research significance is approached at two levels:

1. Does the site contain the data needed, in a condition of integrity, to address important research questions? Or

2. If the site does not meet the criteria by itself, does it contain data which, when considered together with information from other sites, may contribute to scientific research?

Research Domains

Data that archaeological sites must contain to satisfy the criteria for significance fall within broad themes or domains which may related to human behavior, factors which influence human behavior, or to topics concerned with improving the archaeologist’s ability to generate information about human behavior. Within each of the domains discussed, a number of questions were advanced which merit investigation. These were purposefully formulated to address a wide range of cultural resources with varying condition and degrees of disturbance, of different age and complexity, diverse functions and ethnic/national associations. Research questions posed include chronology, settlement patterns, subsistence patterns, technology, regional exchange, and mortuary treatments and human osteology.

These research questions are linked to the archaeological sites through a set of questions followed by a specific listing of archaeological evidence that is needed to address each question, and thus provides a guide for assessing the historic significance of archeological deposits that may be exposed within the project area (Price and Lichtenstein 2008). The existing Archaeological Element of the City’s Cultural Resource Guidelines, as adopted from the County of Santa Barbara, provides a list of conceptual research topics that researchers who have focused their attention on the prehistory of Goleta regularly address. There are a number of research questions that already exist that are used to focus Santa Barbara Channel prehistory
investigations. The general categories of research are defined herein, but are not at all exclusive to the range of questions that can be addressed.

For example, questions of trade representing economic and social exchange between Chumash populations occupying sites within the City’s jurisdiction and outlying Chumash areas to the west, north, east and south (among Channel Island settlements and throughout the state) are a critical area of research.

Shifting strategies of subsistence in villages surrounding the Goleta Slough have been addressed, considering multiple factors including:

- changes in sea level- increasing in the past 12,000 years and affecting access to coastal shellfish species;
- climate change- (periods of drier and wetter weather determined by studies of pollen in Santa Barbara Channel cores samples. These changes substantially affected the types of plant and animal resources within the villagers’ vicinity;
- population pressure (the number and size of villages increased throughout the Early to Late Periods, leading to increased competition for food resources and warfare); and
- sociopolitical complexity (the manufacturing and exchange of shell beads between Chumash living on Santa Cruz Island and villages on the mainland, as well as intermarriage between villagers on the islands, the Santa Barbara Channel, and villages within the Santa Ynez and Cuyama Valley).

These potential research questions can be addressed by archaeological site data as identified below.

1. Chronology

Data Requirements:

a. Temporally discrete components;

b. Materials suitable for radiocarbon dating and obsidian hydration;

c. Stratigraphically discrete strata; and

d. Discrete archaeological features or sufficient quantities of artifacts to allow for analysis and interpretation.

2. Settlement Patterns
Data Requirements:

a. Sufficient testing to determine site boundaries; and

b. Discrete archaeological features or sufficient quantities of artifacts to allow for analysis and interpretation.

3. Subsistence Patterns

Data Requirements:

a. Floral and faunal data;

b. Artifact analysis with specific emphasis on procurement and processing tools; and

c. Evidence of seasonality.

The presence of these tools can indicate the types of plants being utilized and processed at particular sites. Some plants, which were important prehistorically, were stored after processing. Presumably, some types of vessels or storage pits were used to store these foods.

4. Technology

Data Requirements:

a. Temporal control; and

b. Discrete archaeological features or sufficient quantities of artifacts to allow for analysis and interpretation.

5. Mortuary Treatment and Human Osteology

Data Requirements:

a. Temporal control;

b. Human remains; and

c. DNA analysis

Site Assessments

While most of the sites will require additional effort to define boundaries, confirm the presence of subsurface deposits, correlate physical remains with documentary information, determine the nature of the deposit, and evaluate integrity, tentative assessments are offered to provide the
City of Goleta with data needed for management decisions, and to suggest avenues of continuing research.

Sites which were deemed ineligible for nomination to the CRHR were so assessed for three basic reasons. Category A sites were said to be no longer intact and the remaining content not associated with significant events or persons of the past; lacking in significant architectural remains; and not likely to yield important historical information. Category B consisted of sites believed to have “little or no physical remains.” The third category of ineligible sites included those “known to have been destroyed by extensive land modifications associated with construction or agricultural activity.”

The data potential of the individual sites is here evaluated based on the context developed earlier in this document, whether each has yielded, or may be likely to yield, the specific classes of information required to address the explicit research questions. For historic-period sites, the data requirements may be acquired through archival research, archaeological excavation and analysis, technical studies such as palynology that can inform on climate change and adaptations to over time, or any combination of these approaches.

The potential CRHR eligibility of the 67 cultural resources documented during this study is evaluated in relation to the various considerations discussed above. Table 2 provides data regarding the research domains defined above that might be addressed by information present at each site, other forms of significance that are represented, and a preliminary evaluation of the site’s CRHR eligibility. Since the significance of many archaeological sites cannot be evaluated adequately from surface observations alone, several sites will require additional assessment should planned developments result in potential direct or indirect impacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No. SBA-</th>
<th>Tested/Data Recovery</th>
<th>Research Domains</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Site Integrity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5</td>
<td>NRHP</td>
<td>Estimated that 85% was still intact as of 1991 (P. Snethkamp 1991).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>90% estimated to have been disturbed (Harrison 1956). Recent data recovery identified limited portions of intact deposits that provided significant research potential (Stone and Victorino 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Destroyed (Schwartz 1957); Possible intact midden (Erlandson and Wilcoxon 1981a); Possible intact portions of site (Foster 1991a); Potential intact portions of site (Fulton 2001a); Extended Phase 1 excavations identified intact deposits on the periphery of the cultural deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site No. SBA-</td>
<td>Tested/Data Recovery</td>
<td>Research Domains</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Site Integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>that were not destroyed by grading in the 1960s (Wilcoxon 1998; Victorino 2018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Destroyed (Chartkoff, Chartkoff, and Kona 1967a). This site was explored in support of Los Carneros Road improvements. Sparse cultural materials were recovered during data recovery excavations (D. Stone, personal communication 2018).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td>Yes (Chartkoff, Chartkoff, and Kona 1967b)</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Site record suggests “bulldozing top part of site” Chartkoff, Chartkoff, and Kona 1967b) but also indicates “lower part of site may be still salvageable” (ibid). Extensively pot-hunted and agriculturally related disturbance (Erlandson and Wilcoxon 1981b). Illicit excavation confined to the upper levels of site (Wilcoxon 1981a). Portions of intact midden were found (Fulton 2001b). Data recovery was conducted for the Willow Springs I and II projects. Significant intact cultural resources were identified during both data recovery phases (Gerstle and Serena 1982; Stone and Victorino 2014).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Appears to have been destroyed (Erlandson and Wilcoxon 1981c).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>“The rest of the site is, to our knowledge at this time being completely destroyed (D.S. Miller 1961). &quot;Much of the site has been graded and compacted. Some areas are intact and have not been badly damaged (Craig 1979). Substantial intact significant deposits were identified during Marriott Residence Inn project Extended Phase 1 and Phase 3 investigations (Stone, Victorino, and McDaniel 2017).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Substantial damage from development since 1960s, but intact, significant deposits identified at the edge of the Goleta Slough (Hess et al 1998; Lebow et al. 2003; Stone, Victorino, and McDaniel 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>“All of site surface is developed” (Chartkoff, Chartkoff, and Kona 1967c). “Few undisturbed sections of site remain; Canal widening by USA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2. SITE SIGNIFICANCE AND INTEGRITY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No. SBA-</th>
<th>Tested/Data Recovery</th>
<th>Research Domains</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Site Integrity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Yes (?)</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>“60-65% destroyed by land development” (Anonymous n.d.); Housing tract covers site; will be affected by channel – as far as undamaged portions of site (below surface) are concerned (Chartkoff, Chartkoff, and Kona 1967d). Disturbance is extensive by housing and flood channel work (Erlandson and Wilcoxon 1981e).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>“Housing tract covers most of site. Will be affected by channel improvements” (Chartkoff, Chartkoff, and Kona 1967e). Extensive by housing and stream channelization (Erlandson and Wilcoxon 1981f).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>“Housing tract covers most of site. Will be affected by channel improvements” (Chartkoff, Chartkoff, and Kona 1967f). Associated with agriculture and housing (Erlandson and Wilcoxon 1981g).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>90% destroyed; knoll has been leveled for orchard; Whether intact deposits still exist is unknown (Wilcoxon 1981b). May be largely destroyed (Spanne 1982).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Cattle pasture on top (Miller and Klug 1961).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Sparse, yet intact, subsurface deposits were found in both loci and that the data extracted has exhausted its research potential. It should be noted that while the majority of the site has been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site No. SBA-</td>
<td>Tested/Data Recovery</td>
<td>Research Domains</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Site Integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>destroyed, it is unknown if additional intact remains are present north of US 101 (Kaijankoski 2013).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Not mentioned in site records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Not mentioned in site records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Relatively good because it’s a large site. Numerous alterations including pipelines and roads (Swenson, Oslan, and Peterson 1984). Good to fair though formal testing is needed (De Barros 1986).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>50 to 100 feet of site removed for widening of Highway 101 and Frontage Road (Miller 1961a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Cultivation, Frontage Road (Miller 1961b).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Now largely destroyed (Heizer 1948). Could not be relocated in 1999 (Ruby 1999).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Road cuts and cultivation (WMH 1956). Development planned (Macko 1979a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>An estimated two-thirds of the site has already been cut out by housing and roads. Most of the remainder has approximately 1” graded off the top (Lyon and Pierce 1959). Extensive mechanical disturbance while some areas may retain integrity (Foster 1991b).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Probably half the site has been leveled (P. Lyons 1959). Agricultural usage (Wilcoxon 1981c). Extensively disturbed but still contains large amounts of important data (Colten 1985).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1, 2, 3?, 4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>“Cleaned out” (Orr 1954).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1093H</td>
<td>No?</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Standing structures removed (Craig 1980). Area of former structure has been damaged by housing tract construction (Craig 1980).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1194</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Site is disturbed from erosion and off-road traffic (Moore 1980a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site No. SBA-</td>
<td>Tested/Data Recovery</td>
<td>Research Domains</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Site Integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1195</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Site is disturbed from erosion and off-road traffic (Moore 1980b).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1203</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Erosion, stream realignment, ca. 1974 (Serena 1981).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1207</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Erosion, pothunting, school, and roads (Horne 1972). Top of knoll graded off, apron remains intact (Erlandson and Wilcoxon 1981h).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1321</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Dirt road around and through site (Spanne 1974).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1326</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2, 3, 4</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Disturbed by railroad cut, buried pipeline, and access roads (Ehmann, Perez, and Poussan 1975). Has been heavily impacted by paved road and the Southern Pacific Railroad as well as a gas pipeline and earth moving equipment (De Barros 1986b).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1568</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Considerable (Erlandson and Heinzen 1978a). May consist of secondary fill deposit (Erlandson and Wilcoxon 1981i).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1574</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Planned development for this area should have little effect or no effect on the sites (Heinzen 1978).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1575</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Nothing noted (Erlandson and Heinzen 1978b).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1576</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Nothing noted (Erlandson and Heinzen 1978c).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1577</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Nothing noted (Erlandson and Heinzen 1978d).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Rodents, diskng, spiking, orchards, grazing, terrace construction, and archaeological testing (Macko 1979b).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Reservoir construction on approximately 6 acres of site and archaeological testing (Macko 1979c).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Construction, cultivation, grazing, rodents, and planned development (Macko et al. 1979a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Grazing, rodents, berm construction, proposed construction (Macko et al. 1979b).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2. SITE SIGNIFICANCE AND INTEGRITY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Tested/Data Recovery</th>
<th>Research Domains</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Site Integrity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1672</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Extensive with road construction and recontouring. Site may be secondary deposition (Erlandson and Garnica 1979).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1673</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Erosion along coastal bluff and some historic structures. Mentions imported fill but no explanation (Erlandson 1980a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1674</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Erosion and some historic disturbance, possibly extensive (Erlandson 1980b).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1688H</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Road construction and erosion (Serena 1980a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Site bisected by old oil facility road (Serena 1980b).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1703</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Damaged by stream rechannelization (Erlandson and Wilcoxon 1981j). Site area substantially impacted by previous residential development, flood control channelization (Victorino 2009). Intact cultural resources were tested and mitigated associated with Las Vegas/San Pedro Creek capacity improvements within the Caltrans ROW (Ruby and Mikkelsen 2016).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1717</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Discing, portion of site to N. destroyed in mobile home park construction (Pence 1981).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1735</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Cultivated, eroded, and disturbed by tree roots (Spanne 1972).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1, 2, 4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Some disturbance from trails through the site and Santa Lucia Canyon Road; may cut across the northern edge (O’Halloran and English 1982).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Portions of the site removed for fill; low intensity agriculture. Proposed development would remove remainder (Erlandson 1982a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750H</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1, 2, 4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Extensive associated with road building and utilities (Erlandson 1982b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2153</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Site appears to have been impacted by continuous agricultural activity and filling and recontouring of small tributary drainage adjacent. Unclear whether site is primary or secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site No.</td>
<td>Tested/Data Recovery</td>
<td>Research Domains</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Site Integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBA-2204/ H</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Some early features (1880s) disturbed by later installation of leach field. Some features to be impacted by future rehabilitation of house, redevelopment of grounds (Brock 1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2433</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>The site area has been modified in the recent past by construction activities. The only potential area that may be undisturbed is near the western end, where the site abuts the Glen Annie Road and there are patches of natural vegetation. Considering the nature of the surrounding area, highway, roads, and channel, it is possible that the site represents redeposited midden, possibly from CA-SBA-54 or CA-SBA-142 (Foster 1991c).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2499</td>
<td>Phase 2 testing</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Entire parcel has been graded/disked for agricultural operation. Revisit to site February 1993, reported most of Concentration A disked. When site was mapped 3/24/93, area had been disked again (Mann 1993). Agricultural disturbance in area (Pfeiffer 1998).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2586</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Site may be a redeposit from elsewhere (Peak 1991).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2588</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Badly eroded by erosions of tracks (Peak, Gerry, and Oglesby 1991). Potentially intact cultural deposits (Fulton and Strudwick 2001). It is possible that subsurface materials might still be present (Ruby 1999).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2674H</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Recently deposited marine shell (Sheets 1994).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2768</td>
<td>Yes, Phase 2 test</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Testing in the area indicates fill over a disturbed deposit containing culturally derived shell. Most of the site appears to lie within an orchard with impacts from roads, water line, and fiber optic line. Site area to the north may be more intact (Toren 1995).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2. SITE SIGNIFICANCE AND INTEGRITY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No. SBA-</th>
<th>Tested/Data Recovery</th>
<th>Research Domains</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Site Integrity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3380</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Disced, plowed, bladed. Cathedral Oaks Road may have impacted portions of the site (Dugger 1992a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3384</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Construction of housing, roads, sewer, etc. Site consists of relatively intact deposits as well as redeposited loci (Dugger 1992b).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3493</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Paved road and possible fill may have covered deposits along eastern boundary (Esteban, Fleming, and Rockey 1998a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3495</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Dirt road runs through site and landscaping for golf course and Hollister Avenue has taken place. Site is highly disturbed (Pfeiffer and Eerkens 1998).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3496</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Grading and landscaping activities during golf course construction may have impacted site in the past. Sea cliff erosion continues to affect seaward edge of site (Pfeiffer and Munns 1998).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3634H</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Displaced pavers (Strudwick and Knight 2001).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3636</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Site has been heavily disturbed by previous UPRR and US 101 construction. Possible impact by construction of modern industrial complex just south of the site. Testing indicates a highly disturbed area. Subsequent to testing the site area was completely graded away during UPRR maintenance (Haslouer and Kay 2001).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3715H</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Not determined</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Channel largely retains its structural integrity although there is some deterioration evident (Munns 2003).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Significance Key: NRHP = National Register of Historic Places site; PE = Potentially eligible; NE = Not eligible (probably); ? = Unknown.
Summary

The opinions expressed about CRHR eligibility in Table 2 are, in most cases, tentative and subjective. At least 22 sites are regarded as potentially eligible based on observed remains with the potential to address questions of importance to the region. Three are probably not eligible. One prehistoric site is on the National Register of Historic Places.

The remaining sites (41) were not evaluated because of inadequate data. Many are currently buried under sediment or under water; for others, structures, some of considerable age, were demolished or relocated when various buildings were constructed. Although it is certainly possible that obscured, submerged, or cleared sites may lack integrity and significant remains, the test excavations conducted to date suggest that it would be premature to assume that they are necessarily destroyed or lack scientific research potential.
GOALS AND PRIORITIES

BBCI Goals and Priorities
Our views regarding the cultural resources landscape in the City of Goleta:

1. All Prehistoric archaeological sites are significant to our band.

   Regarding Significance:
   
   • Local Chumash consider all prehistoric and historical archaeological sites mapped and unmapped to be sensitive and significant.
   
   • Our heritage is linked spiritually and culturally to Prehistoric and Historical and former and current resources on sites found within the City of Goleta and its jurisdiction.

   • Procedures for identifying and protecting tribal resources should always address degrees of sensitivity of the sites implementing CEQA guidelines and SB 18 and AB 52 compliance procedures, including identification, evaluation (analysis) and mitigation as part of the environmental review.

2. Preservation/Disturbance:

   • Preservation and conservation of open-space land and natural resources, are immediate concerns of the local Chumash.

   • Local Chumash continue today to carry on the stewardship of preserving cultural sites, features, and landscapes as our Chumash ancestors had for thousands of years. If our ancestral sites are disturbed and destroyed our lasting legacy of having occupied these homelands will be lost. Therefore, consultation with the BBCI can be an important tool to understand the impact of development on cultural resources in the City of Goleta.

   • Long term preservation/proper scientific investigation

   • Ensure City, State and Federal laws and regulatory guidelines are followed.

3. Local Chumash monitors shall be present for all ground disturbing activities on projects that we deem important to our band.

4. Burial excavation policy

   • If human remains are exposed, no further excavation or site disturbance in the area.
• Follow Native American Grave Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) and associated/applicable California State regulations

• Ensure Native American burial sites and remains are protected pending the identification of Most Likely Descendent (MLD) if burial located.

5. Artifact Policy

• All archaeological materials removed from a project site shall be curated at a local qualified institution that would grant our band access to local collections.

6. Sacred Lands File

• Contact and consult with the Native American Heritage Commission on documentation

7. Reburial

• Allow a cultural ceremony to be performed revering our ancestors.

• Make sure all burial items are held with the utmost respect.

Archaeological Goals and Priorities

One of the most obvious factors regarding archaeological resources in Goleta is the extremely high density of sites within city boundaries. It can be said, with little exaggeration, that the entire city is archaeologically sensitive. Another pertinent factor is the extremely high number of discreet “villages” or “habitation” sites within the city. This is due to the presence of the numerous environmentally favorable habitats and topography. Many of the “village” sites also contain numerous burial components (12) which highlights the need for sensitive treatment. Appropriate recommendations will be developed with the input of the public, archaeologists, and Native Americans as the ordinance process continues.
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Chapter 3
Tree Study

This chapter prepared by:

CARLBERG ASSOCIATES
828 5th Street, Suite 3
Santa Monica, CA 90403
Telephone 310-451-4804
www.cycarlberg.com
BACKGROUND/INTRODUCTION

This component of the Historic Context Statement comprises sites (trees in City rights-of-way, parks, schools, and open spaces) that were either developed prior to 1969 or otherwise held historic value. As part of this study, Carlberg Associates drove the entire City and where access was available, walked these sites and photographed the trees. Historic Resources Group provided a map of the City of Goleta showing properties and neighborhoods coded by decade of development through 1969, and potential landscape features or sites of interest in the City. This study concentrated on these sites as well as those found during our travels through the City.

The purpose of this study is to document the presence of historic and heritage-quality tree species throughout the City and encourage the preservation of those trees that have thus far resisted development around them. The objective of this report is to enhance the City’s urban forest management efforts and provide awareness to this rich diversity of specimen trees.

CLIMATE OVERVIEW

Goleta’s climate and weather patterns are unsurpassed for an almost year-round growing season. The mild climate comprises high temperatures normally within ten degrees of 70° year-round; low temperatures rarely fall below 40°, with an average precipitation of 19.4 inches. 259

Sudden hot winds, locally referred to as “sundowners,” can result in temperatures well over 100°, and are caused by high-pressure systems drawing dry air from the inland side of the Santa Ynez Mountains. Such winds can suddenly desiccate (dehydrate) plant material, especially plants that are unprotected from the strong winds and not recharged soon after by some form of application of water (rainfall or irrigation).

Historic drought conditions have beset the community’s trees, most notably the planted and naturalized eucalyptus trees in the Ellwood Grove. A number of native California coast redwood trees, literal sentries in the Kellogg Park Residential District, are also not at peak performance. California native oaks and sycamores are prominent in Goleta’s parks and historic spaces; the obvious success of these trees and those from similar climates (Mediterranean and Australian trees – jacaranda, lacebark, paperbark) attests to the sophistication of Goleta’s preservation strategies and plant palette. The latter exhibit excellent health and appear to have withstood the many years of severe drought.

STREET TREE PLANTINGS

Public rights-of-way trees are typically planted in “parkways,” the strip of land located between the sidewalk and curb. Parkways in Goleta can vary in width between 2 to about 10 feet, with the wider parkways supporting larger trees (e.g., American sweetgum). Goleta’s street tree plantings were presumably launched as subdivisions were completed. Found throughout the world, street tree plantings are particularly appealing to homebuyers and those who gravitate toward an aesthetic only trees can provide. They provide way-finding, sense of place, shade, and habitat. Street layouts, particularly in the northeast section of town, are more rural in character and do not have a curb/gutter and sidewalk system; therefore there are no parkways. In these situations, public easements and parkways are rare – hence no regular form of street tree plantings.

Parkway plantings in Goleta give us a glimpse into the history of the City’s urban forest and trees popular at the time of subdivision development. Among the tree species in vogue at that time were American sweetgum (*Liquidambar styraciflua*), Indian laurel fig (*Ficus microcarpa*), Brazilian pepper (*Schinus terebinthifolius*), shamel ash (*Fraxinus uhdei*), Modesto ash (*Fraxinus velutina*), and paperbark (*Melaleuca quinquenervia*). Different neighborhoods have their own unique patterns and associations of different species. The northeast residential neighborhoods east of Fairview are characterized by American sweetgum and shamel ash, while many of the north/south streets in the southwest residential area are planted primarily with queen palms and a collection of blooming evergreen pears, and the El Encanto Heights Residential District contains a majority of shamel ash. Many of the streets in these neighborhoods have suffered attrition and the presence of a uniform planting is lacking.

Two notable street tree plantings are:

**Lake Los Carneros North Residential District**

Some of the most striking street tree plantings are in the Lake Los Carneros North Residential District, with a predominance of one species (paperbark) and few vacant planting sites, with the trees exhibiting excellent health and high-quality maintenance. Camino Talavera had some of the oldest and noteworthy specimens. These two species – paperbark and bottlebrush – are undoubtedly well suited to Goleta’s environment. These Australian species, along with lacebark (*Brachychiton discolor*), are abundant in the City’s parks.

**Orange Street**

This planting – creating an allée – of queen palms (*Syagrus romanzoffianum*) is southern California at its most recognizable. Note the consistency and lack of empty planting sites. This is likely one of the oldest intact street tree plantings in the City.
Neighborhood Characteristics and Themes

Some of the original species (e.g., American sweetgum and shamel ash) have outgrown their planting sites and aggressive root systems have damaged hardscape and other infrastructure. Recognizing this, Goleta’s urban foresters have interplanted with newly introduced, sometimes smaller species, such as Australian willow (*Geijera parviflora*). This is only effective when most or all of the vacant planting sites contain trees, there are no more than two species per block, and homeowners are dissuaded from planting other species in the parkways in front of their homes. Public education and outreach is clearly essential to maintaining consistency and uniformity.

The preponderance of one species throughout an entire neighborhood is referred to as a monoculture. The disadvantages of monocultural plantings are many-fold, the primary drawback being that a disease or pest epidemic could destroy an entire neighborhood.

In the last 25 years, designing streetscapes with an eye toward species, size, class, and age diversity has become standard. Urban Forestry best management practices encourage, for example, limiting any genus to 10% of the total tree population (recommendations vary) to reduce the risk of damage from an epidemic of pests or disease. Although retaining uniformity in species per block or number of blocks is still an appropriate approach – and definitely more aesthetically pleasing – some cities are interplanting with different species. This is most effective in downtown areas, where large trees provide shade and presence, and smaller trees offer a more intimate scale and pleasant walking and shopping experience.

Goleta’s Urban Forest Management Plan discourages this type of monoculture planting. Besides monocultural planting, streets can comprise a mature mixed plantings, various ages/mixed plantings, or various ages/monoculture.

INDIVIDUAL TREES

Goleta has two (of 207) officially designated “California Big Trees” (a database maintained by the Urban Forest Ecosystems Institute at Cal Poly San Luis Obispo): a California sycamore and an Australian willow located at the Goleta Valley Community Center.260

By virtue of its status as a California native tree, the sycamore is also one of 769 national champions as set forth by American Forests.261

---


CONCLUSION

The City of Goleta has an unparalleled collection of historic trees. Carlberg Associates applauds the community for developing an Urban Forest Management Plan (UFMP) that sets forth current industry standards for the management of public trees. With such valuable resources in parks and open spaces, the opportunities for conservation and preservation are limitless. Goleta’s UFMP sets forth a five-year policy framework for how trees within public areas will be managed. As with all public-owned trees, the City’s Arborist recommends care of the urban forest and the City conducts all maintenance activities. Partnerships with non-profits regarding the care and watering of historic trees, such as with the Goleta Valley Historical Society, demonstrates the value the community places on significant trees.

The UFMP and existing City Municipal Code provisions provide legal guidance to City staff in managing public trees. The UFMP established a list of trees permitted in City rights-of-way, established guidelines for how they are to be planted and maintained. The UFMP establishes the framework for policies for ordinances and regulations and provides direction regarding administering the UFMP.

Individual trees may be considered important community resources because of unique or noteworthy characteristics or values. The UFMP contains provisions regarding nominating such a tree as a “Heritage Tree”. (However, the City Council directed that Heritage Trees nomination process not be used until the Historic Preservation ordinance is adopted.) A tree may qualify as a Heritage Tree if it has a documented history that reflects Goleta’s cultural heritage. Cultural heritage would include an association with or contribution to a historic structure, site, or street, or a connection to a person of historical note or historic event. If designated as a Heritage tree, such as tree would not be removed unless it is dead, dying or in a dangerous/hazardous condition as determined by the City.

Special status could also be recognized for tree size (trunk diameter, height, maximum canopy spread), tree species (such as the drooping melaleuca at the Goleta Valley Community Center, which is an unusual species in California), age, ecological value, or location. In addition to the continuing implementation of the UFMP, the City may want to consider establishing a process for conservation of trees in open spaces, such as along creeks, as these areas may not be located in rights of way areas covered by the UFMP.

TREE STUDY

---


The accompanying table is not a comprehensive inventory of the trees within the City of Goleta, but is rather intended to inform the City’s decision-making process when drafting the Historic Preservation Ordinance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PHOTOGRAPHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winchester Open Space I</td>
<td>This space is characterized by a grove of red gum (eucalyptus) and pine trees.</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Red river gum" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester Open Space II</td>
<td>Characterized by mature paperbark, lacebark, and different species of eucalyptus.</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Eucalyptus, paperbark" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 Warwick Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen Park and Open Space</td>
<td>This well-maintained park contains a Frisbee-golf course, baseball and soccer fields. There are large multi-stemmed red gum (eucalyptus), stone pine, and coast live oak.</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Coast live oak" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1995) 7524 Padova Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>PHOTOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen Park and Open Space (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Coast live oaks, eucalyptus" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bella Vista Park</td>
<td>This park contains many exotic species; the groves of Canary Island pines and olive trees are notable.</td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Canary Island pines" /> <img src="image3.jpg" alt="Olive trees" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>PHOTOGRAPHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Bishop Ranch  
96 Glen Annie Road (no access) | Although we were not granted access to Bishop Ranch, the large, skyline, heritage-quality trees are visible from Glen Annie Road. We feature a photograph of an English walnut tree, a remnant of the walnut groves that all succumbed to root rot and were replaced by citrus and avocado groves. | ![English walnut](image1.png) |
| Lake Los Carneros North Residential District | Some of the most striking street tree plantings are in the Lake Los Carneros North Residential District. We attribute this to a predominance of one species (paperbark) and few vacant planting sites, with the trees exhibiting excellent health and high-quality maintenance. Camino Talavera had some of the oldest and noteworthy specimens we saw. These two species – paperbark and bottlebrush – are undoubtedly well suited to Goleta’s environment. These Australian species, along with lacebark (*Brachychiton discolor*), are abundant in the City’s parks. There are lovely examples of paperbark (*Melaleuca quinquenervia*) and Brazilian pepper (*Schinus terebinthifolius*) as street trees in this district. Both of these species perform well in Goleta. | ![paperbark](image2.png) ![paperbark](image3.png) ![paperbark](image4.png)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PHOTOGRAPHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lake Los Carneros North Residential District (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Paperbark" /> <img src="image2.png" alt="Brazilian pepper" /> <img src="image3.png" alt="Paperbark" /> <img src="image4.png" alt="Paperbark" /> <img src="image5.png" alt="Paperbark" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>PHOTOGRAPHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Los Carneros Park</td>
<td>This public park, adjacent to the entrance to the Stow House, contains a windrow of red gum (eucalyptus) star pine, coral trees, lacebark (<em>Brachychiton</em>), sycamores, and coast live oak.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goleta Depot

The founder of Rancho La Patera, William Whitney Stow, was legal counsel for the Southern Pacific Railroad and an influential political figure at the state level. Among his most notable achievements was the creation of Golden Gate Park in San Francisco.

This approximate 1,100-acre property comprises rich soils, and in the late 1890s supported lemon, almond, and walnut groves. Sherman Stow, William’s son, a founding member of the Johnston Fruit Company, and his wife Ida had six children and began their life on one of California’s most lovely historic ranches.

Later, during the tenure of Sherman’s son, Edgar Stow (1915-1949) the ranch was expanded. Edgar played a leading role in helping to expand the area’s citrus industry, as well as developing a disease resistant variety of lemon that subsequently was cultivated statewide.

The ranch stayed in the Stow (and later Van Horne) family until the 1960s. A portion of the property, La Patera Ranch, still operates as one of Goleta Valley’s most productive ranches.

The collection of specimen, heritage-quality trees include titoki, *Lagunaria patersonii*, star pine, eucalyptus, bunya-bunya, Moreton Bay chestnut, Victorian box, and an extraordinarily large eugenia (brush cherry).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PHOTOGRAPHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
- Cow Itch or Primrose Tree (*Lagunaria pattersonii*) – likely planted 1913-1920.
- Star Pine (*Araucaria heterophylla*) – Circa 1880.
- Titoki (*Alectryon excelsus*) – Australian tree. Very rare in the United States.                                                                 |             |

[Images of Stow House and surrounding trees and paths]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PHOTOGRAPHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stow House</td>
<td>• Chilean wine palm <em>(Jubea chilensis)</em> – late 19th or early 20th century.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bunya-Bunya tree <em>(Araucaria bidwillii)</em> – 19th century.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Monterey cypress <em>(Cupressus macrocarpa)</em> – Likely depicted in a circa 1890-1910 photograph.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Red gum <em>(Eucalyptus camaldulensis)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Queen palm <em>(Syagrus romanzoffianum)</em> – early 20th century.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Coast redwood <em>(Sequoia sempervirens)</em> – Circa 1913-1920.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>PHOTOGRAPHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stow Grove Park</td>
<td>Of particular note are the hedgerow of Victorian box in the parking lot, lacebark (Brachychiton), coast live oak, eucalyptus, coral tree, and California sycamore. Most of the coast redwoods are declining.</td>
<td><img src="" alt="Photographs" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>PHOTOGRAPHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stow Grove Park (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="coast redwoods" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="coast live oak" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="coast redwoods, coast live oak" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>PHOTOGRAPHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stow Grove Park (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Coral trees" /> <img src="image2.png" alt="Coral trees" /> <img src="image3.png" alt="Coral trees" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stow Canyon Open Space</td>
<td>Coast live oaks, California sycamores, lacebark.</td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Coral tree, lacebark" /> <img src="image5.png" alt="Coral tree, lacebark" /> <img src="image6.png" alt="Coral tree, lacebark" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murfield Drive and Valez Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6230 Stow Canyon Road</td>
<td>Lovely examples of avocado, deodar cedar, California sycamore – all likely dating to 1920s.</td>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="deodar cedar" /> <img src="image8.png" alt="deodar cedar" /> <img src="image9.png" alt="deodar cedar" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~1-acre farm/ranch (1925)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>PHOTOGRAPHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6230 Stow Canyon Road (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley Park and Kellogg Elementary School</td>
<td>Good examples of native California sycamore and coast live oak at the park, and a wonderful London plane tree specimen at the school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Sexton House in Goleta, California is a two-story Italianate style house that was built in 1880. It was designed by architect Peter J. Barber. The original owner, Joseph Sexton, was a horticulturist who planted trees and shrubs on the property that, in 1991, partially screened the house from Hollister Avenue. Pacifica Suites Hotel was developed on the property as a hotel with 87 suites ("Joseph and Lucy Foster Sexton House," Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Joseph_and_Lucy_Foster_Sexton_House, accessed August 30, 2017).

There is an exceptional collection of mature trees, including Queensland kauri, star pine, flame tree, Mexican blue palm, dragon tree, Canary Island date palm, Guadalupe palm, and Chilean wine palm.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PHOTOGRAPHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexton House (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Orange tree" /> <img src="image2.jpg" alt="Norfolk island pine" /> <img src="image3.jpg" alt="Queen palm" /> <img src="image4.jpg" alt="Angel's trumpet" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image5.jpg" alt="Orange tree" /> <img src="image6.jpg" alt="Norfolk island pine" /> <img src="image7.jpg" alt="Queen palm" /> <img src="image8.jpg" alt="Angel's trumpet" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sycamore tree</td>
<td>On the northeastern edge of Old Town Goleta is the largest California sycamore tree (<em>Platanus racemosa</em>) ever measured anywhere on the planet. It is referred to locally as the Sister Witness Tree, although there is no DNA evidence to support the connection. Located behind fencing on city-owned but not-yet-public property that’s being planned for a new Old Town park, the tree is officially recognized as a National Champion Tree through American Forests. The tree is 94 feet tall with a trunk circumference of 52.2 feet and a canopy of 95.5 feet (Matt Kettmann, &quot;Sister Witness Tree, Queen of Sycamores,&quot; <em>Santa Barbara Independent</em>, October 2, 2012).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 S. Kellogg Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>PHOTOGRAPHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kellogg Ranch</td>
<td>There are many examples of heritage-quality coast live oak and coast redwood in this residential complex.</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Coast redwood" /> <img src="image2.png" alt="Coast redwood" /> <img src="image3.png" alt="Coast live oak tree" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 S. Kellogg Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>PHOTOGRAPHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler Event Center</td>
<td>“The Witness Tree, a 250-year old California sycamore located in the patio of the Butler Event Center on Hollister Avenue, was designated as a Historical Landmark prior to the City incorporating. The Witness Tree is actually a substitute: the original Witness Tree was cut down in the 1800s to build Hollister Avenue” (<a href="http://example.com">State of the Goleta Urban Forest Report</a>, November 17, 2009).</td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5555 Hollister Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Goleta Valley Community Center | This facility is rich with mature plantings of jacaranda, melaleuca, deodar cedar, and the ‘California Big Tree’ Australian willow:  
  - National Champion: This tree, in Goleta, was nominated by Randy Baldwin in 2012. It measures 49 feet high, with a trunk circumference of 82 inches and a crown spread of 64 feet for a total of 147 points. ([Australian Willow](http://example.com), Urban Forest Ecosystems Institute, accessed April 1, 2017). | ![Image](image3.jpg) |
<p>| 5681 Hollister Avenue         |                                                                                                                                                                                                         | <img src="image4.jpg" alt="Image" /> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PHOTOGRAPHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goleta Valley Community Center (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellwood Main Monarch Aggregation Site (Goleta Butterfly Grove)</td>
<td>This area is named after Ellwood Cooper, who settled in Goleta with his family in 1870. Cooper grew olives, walnuts, grapes, almonds, oranges, lemons and Japanese persimmons on his large ranch. This created a very favorable setting for the yearly visitation of monarch butterflies to the region (&quot;City of Goleta Monarch Butterfly website,&quot; <a href="http://www.goletabutterflygrove.com/">http://www.goletabutterflygrove.com/</a>, accessed April 1, 2017). Blue gums (Eucalyptus globulus) are considered the preferred trees for overwintering monarch butterflies. The past few years have seen the decline of many of the trees as a result of drought stress and associated pest infestation.</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="drooping melaleuca" /> <img src="image2.png" alt="jacaranda" /> <img src="image3.png" alt="drooping melaleuca" /> <img src="image4.png" alt="jacaranda" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>PHOTOGRAPHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellwood Main Monarch</td>
<td>There are lovely examples of old specimens of narrow-leaved paperbark (Melaleuca linariifolia) at this property.</td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregation Site (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsdall-Rio Grande Gasoline Station</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PHOTOGRAPHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnsdall-Rio Grande Gasoline Station (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Creek Open Space</td>
<td>Lovely examples of mature coast live oak and California sycamore.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

San Jose Creek Open Space:
- Lovely examples of mature coast live oak and California sycamore.
- Beautiful examples of California sycamore on the east edge of San Jose Creek.
- Heritage-quality California sycamore east edge of Berkeley Road.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PHOTOGRAPHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Creek Open Space (continued)</td>
<td>Many mature exotic trees thrive in this space located between Kellogg Way and Pine Avenue, south of the Goleta Boys and Girls Club.</td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="San Jose Creek" /> <img src="image2.jpg" alt="San Jose Creek" /> <img src="image3.jpg" alt="San Jose Creek" /> <img src="image4.jpg" alt="San Jose Creek" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>PHOTOGRAPHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608 Torrey Place</td>
<td>Cooks Pine (Araucaria columnaris)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5939 Mandarin Street</td>
<td>Coast redwood (Sequoia sempervirens)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>PHOTOGRAPHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5853 Mandarin Street</td>
<td>Coast redwood (<em>Sequoia sempervirens</em>)</td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast corner Mandarin Drive and Orange Avenue</td>
<td>Coast redwood (<em>Sequoia sempervirens</em>)</td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>PHOTOGRAPHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Orange Avenue</td>
<td>Coast redwood (<em>Sequoia sempervirens</em>)</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast corner Mandarin Drive and Orange Avenue</td>
<td>Camphor (<em>Cinnamomum camphora</em>)</td>
<td>![Image] ![Image] ![Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>PHOTOGRAPHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Avenue north of Mandarin Drive</td>
<td>This planting – creating an allée – of queen palms (<em>Syagrus romanzoffianum</em>) is southern California at its most recognizable. Note the consistency and lack of empty planting sites. This is likely one of the oldest intact street tree plantings in the City.</td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona Court north of Armstrong Road</td>
<td>Queen palm street tree planting (<em>Syagrus romanzoffianum</em>)</td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>PHOTOGRAPHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepperdine Court north of Armstrong Road</td>
<td>Queen palm street tree planting (<em>Syagrus romanzoffianum</em>)</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Queen palm tree" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral Oaks Road north of Bishop Ranch</td>
<td>Coast redwood (<em>Sequoia sempervirens</em>), about 50 years old</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Coast redwood" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>PHOTOGRAPHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekwill Street east of Patterson Avenue</td>
<td>Jacaranda (Jacaranda mimosifolia)</td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Place</td>
<td>American sweetgum (Liquidambar styraciflua)</td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Street</td>
<td>Weeping bottlebrush (Callistemon viminalis)</td>
<td><img src="image3.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>PHOTOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong Road west of Pacific Oaks Road</td>
<td>Evergreen pear (<em>Pyrus kawakami</em>)</td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="PHOTO1" /> <img src="image2.jpg" alt="PHOTO2" /> <img src="image3.jpg" alt="PHOTO3" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Encanto Heights neighborhood</td>
<td>Shamel ash (<em>Fraxinus uhdei</em>)</td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="PHOTO1" /> <img src="image2.jpg" alt="PHOTO2" /> <img src="image3.jpg" alt="PHOTO3" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Plantings</td>
<td>The region is historically rich in agriculture and once supported English walnut, lemon, olive, and avocado trees. The walnuts succumbed to root rot and only individual remnants can be found. Citrus and avocados are widely planted</td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="PHOTO1" /> <img src="image2.jpg" alt="PHOTO2" /> <img src="image3.jpg" alt="PHOTO3" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A property may be designated as historic by National, State, and local authorities. In order for a building to qualify for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historical Resources, it must meet one or more identified criteria of significance. The property must also retain sufficient historic integrity to evoke the sense of place and time with which it is historically associated. This historic context statement will provide guidance for listing at the federal, state, and local levels, according to the established criteria and integrity thresholds.

National Register of Historic Places

The National Register of Historic Places is an authoritative guide to be used by Federal, State, and local governments, private groups, and citizens to identify the Nation’s cultural resources and to indicate what properties should be considered for protection from destruction or impairment. The National Park Service administers the National Register program. Listing in the National Register assists in preservation of historic properties in several ways, including: recognition that a property is of significance to the nation, the state, or the community; consideration in the planning for federal or federally assisted projects; eligibility for federal tax benefits; and qualification for Federal assistance for historic preservation, when funds are available.

To be eligible for listing and/or listed in the National Register, a resource must possess significance in American history and culture, architecture, or archaeology. Listing in the National Register is primarily honorary and does not in and of itself provide protection of a historic resource. The primary effect of listing in the National Register on private owners of historic buildings is the availability of financial and tax incentives. In addition, for projects that receive Federal funding, a clearance process must be completed in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. State and local regulations may also apply to properties listed in the National Register.

The criteria for listing in the National Register follow established guidelines for determining the significance of properties. The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects:

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

264 36CFR60, Section 60.2.
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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.\[^{265}\]

Standard preservation practice evaluates geographically contiguous collections of buildings from similar time periods and historic contexts as historic districts. The National Park Service defines a historic district as “a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, or objects united historically or aesthetically by plan or physical development.”\[^{266}\]

**Integrity**

In addition to meeting any or all of the designation criteria listed above, the National Park Service requires properties to possess historic integrity. Historic integrity is the ability of a property to convey its significance and is defined as “the authenticity of a property’s historic identity, evidenced by the survival of physical characteristics that existed during the property’s historic period.”\[^{267}\]

The National Register recognizes seven aspects or qualities that comprise integrity, which are also referenced in the City’s local ordinance: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. These qualities are defined as follows:

- *Location* is the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event took place.

- *Design* is the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property.

- *Setting* is the physical environment of a historic property.

- *Materials* are 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.

---

\[^{265}\] 36CFR60, Section 60.3. Criterion D typically applies to archaeological resources.

\[^{266}\] National Register Bulletin 15.

\[^{267}\] National Register Bulletin 16A.
• **Workmanship** is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory.

• **Feeling** is a property's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.

• **Association** is the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.268

In assessing a property's integrity, the National Park Service recognizes that properties change over time. *National Register Bulletin 15* provides:

To retain historic integrity a property will always possess several, and usually most, of the aspects. It is not necessary for a property to retain all its historic physical features or characteristics. The property must retain, however, the essential physical features that enable it to convey its historic identity.

A property that has lost some historic materials or details can be eligible if it retains the majority of the features that illustrate its style in terms of the massing, spatial relationships, proportion, pattern of windows and doors, texture of materials, and ornamentation. The property is not eligible, however, if it retains some basic features conveying massing but has lost the majority of the features that once characterized its style.269

A property that has sufficient integrity for listing at the national, state, or local level will typically retain a majority of the identified character-defining features, and will retain sufficient integrity to convey its significance. The required aspects of integrity are dependent on the reason for a property's significance. Increased age and rarity of the property type are also considerations when assessing integrity thresholds. For properties that are significant for their architectural merit (Criterion C), a higher priority is placed on integrity of design, materials, and workmanship. For properties that are significant for their association with important events or people, integrity of feeling and/or association may be more important.

For properties which are considered significant under National Register Criteria A and B, *National Register Bulletin 15* states:

---

268 National Register Bulletin 15.
269 National Register Bulletin 15.
A property that is significant for its historic association is eligible if it retains the essential physical features that made up its character or appearance during the period of its association with the important event, historical pattern, or person(s).

A property important for illustrating a particular architectural style or construction technique must retain most of the physical features that constitute that style or technique.\textsuperscript{270}

Criteria Considerations

Certain kinds of properties are not usually considered for listing in the National Register. These include religious properties, moved properties, birthplaces or graves, cemeteries, reconstructed properties, commemorative properties, and properties achieving significance within the past 50 years.\textsuperscript{271} These properties can be eligible for listing, however, if they meet special requirements, called Criteria Considerations, in addition to being eligible under one or more of the four criteria and possessing integrity. The National Park Service has defined seven Criteria Considerations; those that are the most relevant to this study include:

Criteria Consideration A: Religious Properties

A religious property is eligible if it derives its primary significance from architectural or artistic distinction or historical importance.

A religious property requires justification on architectural, artistic, or historic grounds to avoid any appearance of judgment by government about the validity of any religion or belief. Historic significance for a religious property cannot be established on the merits of a religious doctrine, but rather, for architectural or artistic values or for important historic or cultural forces that the property represents. A religious property’s significance under Criterion A, B, C, or D must be judged in purely secular terms. A religious group may, in some cases, be considered a cultural group whose activities are significant in areas broader than religious history.\textsuperscript{272}

Criteria Consideration B: Moved Properties

A property removed from its original or historically significant location can be eligible if it is significant primarily for architectural value or it is the surviving property most importantly associated with a historic person or event.\textsuperscript{273}

\textsuperscript{270} National Register Bulletin 15.
\textsuperscript{271} National Register Bulletin 15.
\textsuperscript{272} National Register Bulletin 15.
\textsuperscript{273} National Register Bulletin 15.
The National Register Criteria for Evaluation limit the consideration of moved properties because significance is embodied in locations and settings as well as in the properties themselves. Moving a property destroys the relationships between the property and its surroundings and destroys associations with historic events and persons. A move may also cause the loss of historic features such as landscaping, foundations, and chimneys, as well as loss of the potential for associated archeological deposits. Properties that were moved before their period of significance do not need to meet the special requirements of Criteria Consideration B.

Criteria Consideration G: Properties that have Achieved Significance within the Past 50 Years

A property achieving significance within the past fifty years is eligible if it is of exceptional importance.

The National Register Criteria for Evaluation exclude properties that achieved significance within the past 50 years unless they are of exceptional importance. 50 years is a general estimate of the time needed to develop historical perspective and to evaluate significance. This consideration guards against the listing of properties of passing contemporary interest and ensures that the National Register is a list of truly historic places. The phrase "exceptional importance" does not require that the property be of national significance. It is a measure of a property's importance within the appropriate historic context, whether the scale of that context is local, State, or national.

California Register of Historical Resources

The California Register of Historical Resources is an authoritative guide in California used by State and local agencies, private groups, and citizens to identify the State's historical resources. The California Register was established in 1998, with eligibility criteria based upon National Register criteria. The criteria for listing in the California Register are:

1. Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the United States.
2. Associated with the lives of persons important to local, California or national history.
3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction or represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values.
4. Has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California or the nation.

274 National Register Bulletin 15.
275 Criterion 4 typically applies to archaeological resources, which is outside the scope of this project.
The California Register consists of resources that are listed automatically and those that must be nominated through an application and public hearing process. The California Register includes the following:

- California properties formally determined eligible for (Category 2 in the State Inventory of Historical Resources), or listed in (Category 1 in the State Inventory), the National Register of Historic Places.

- State Historical Landmarks No. 770 and all consecutively numbered state historical landmarks following No. 770. For state historical landmarks preceding No. 770, the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) shall review their eligibility for the California Register in accordance with procedures to be adopted by the State Historical Resources Commission.

- Points of historical interest which have been reviewed by the OHP and recommended for listing by the commission for inclusion in the California Register in accordance with criteria adopted by the commission.\(^{276}\)

Other resources which may be nominated for listing in the California Register include:

- Individual historical resources.

- Historical resources contributing to the significance of an historic district.

- Historical resources identified as significant in historical resources surveys, if the survey meets the criteria listed in subdivision (g) of Section 5023.1 of the Public Resources Code.

- Historical resources and historic districts designated or listed as city or county landmarks or historic properties or districts pursuant to any city or county ordinance, if the criteria for designation or listing under the ordinance have been determined by the office to be consistent with California Register criteria.

- Local landmarks or historic properties designated under any municipal or county ordinance.\(^{277}\)

**California Points of Historical Interest**

The California Point of Historical Interest Program was established in 1965 to accommodate an increased interest in recognizing local historic properties not able to meet the restrictive criteria of the State Historical Landmarks program. The criteria for the Points are the same as those that govern the Landmark program, but are directed to local (city or county) areas. California Points

\(^{276}\) California PRC, Section 5023.1(d).

\(^{277}\) California PRC, Section 5023.1(e).
of Historical Interest do not have direct regulatory protection, but are eligible for official landmark plaques and highway directional signs.

**Local Designation**

The City of Goleta is currently developing a comprehensive Historic Preservation Program building upon the City’s General Plan and the work previously done by the County of Santa Barbara prior to the City’s incorporation. While the City presently does not have any specific historic preservation regulations, there are policies and action items relating to Historic Preservation within the Visual and Historic Resources Element of the General Plan. The Historic Preservation Program is being developed in accordance with the goals identified in the General Plan:

- To identify, protect, and encourage preservation of significant architectural, historic, and prehistoric sites, structures, and properties that comprise Goleta’s heritage
- To identify, preserve, protect, and enhance significant historic landscaping, gardens, and open spaces, including agricultural areas and heritage trees, which contribute to the setting or context of Goleta.\(^{278}\)

**Goleta Historic Resources Surveys**

Prior to the incorporation of the City of Goleta in 2002, several surveys were conducted of potential historic resources that are now within the boundaries of the City. These were added to a list of potential historic resources within Santa Barbara County. Additional historic resources were identified and added to a list of potential historic properties within the City during the development of the City of Goleta General Plan (published September 2006). Additionally, individual properties have been evaluated as part of project-based environmental review.

The current survey effort is the first citywide survey for the City of Goleta. This survey project will review all properties on the County’s list within the City of Goleta, as well as identify additional properties, neighborhoods, and other features that have potential historic significance.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DEVELOPER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kellogg Park</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Garfield &amp; Florence P. Sorensen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Encanto Heights No. 1</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Sunwood Construction Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Gardens No. 1</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Hollyridge Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Gardens No. 2</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Marlin Land Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday Park</td>
<td>1957-58</td>
<td>Holiday Homes Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10051 No. 1</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>William James &amp; Florence L. Hamilton; Effingham Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara Industrial Center</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>John J. Pollon; Pann Mallas; Don Mallas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Encanto Heights No 2</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>El Encanto Inc. (Paul M. &amp; Joyce Gainor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10051 No. 2</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Newsome Homes (Elias Miller)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10051 No. 3</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Bilson Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10061</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Holiday Development Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10051 No. 4</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Dewey Homes (Elias &amp; Paul Miller)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10051 No. 5</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Ladds Homes, Inc. (Paul &amp; Elias Miller)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10051 No. 6</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>DeWitt Homes (Elias &amp; Paul Miller)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10051 No. 7</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Personality Homes (Alice &amp; Elias Miller)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10051 No. 8</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Orange Manor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10051 No. 9</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Acme Homes (Paul &amp; Barbara Miller)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10051 No. 10</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Tamar Manor, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10111</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>H.C. Elliott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10116</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>R.E. &amp; Edith F. Glikbarg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10124</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Montclair Enterprises (H.C. Elliott)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10141</td>
<td>1960-61</td>
<td>H.C. Elliott, Inc. (H.C. Elliott)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10123</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Fred G. &amp; Margaret Eichert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10149</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Far West Financial Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10212</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>City Title &amp; Insurance Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10203</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Dike Land Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10218</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Roseglen Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10223</td>
<td>1962-63</td>
<td>Audubon Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10224</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Robin Hill Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10225</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Montclair Enterprises (H.C. Elliott)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10235</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Winchester Homes (Ralph &amp; Shirley Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10158</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Commonwealth Savings &amp; Loan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10218</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Roseglen Construction; Far West Financial Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>DEVELOPER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10267</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Ranch Development Company; Osborne &amp; Josephine Coffey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10268</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Mound Investment Company; P.W. Brand, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10294</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Santa Barbara Industrial Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10306</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Roseglen Construction; Far West Financial Corp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10338</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Tom &amp; Eve Edwards; E.L. &amp; Lela Kenworthy; Francis &amp; Barbara McGowan; Karl &amp; Marjorie Brendlin; Santa Barbara Humane Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10341</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>William Koart; Russell E. Doty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10347 (Lake Los Carneros North)</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Carodale, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10358</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Audubon Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10365</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Ralph &amp; Shirley Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10362</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Joseph &amp; W.H. Airey; Tom Gaggs; Louis &amp; Evelyn Frank; J.R. Lathim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10379</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Edward McCarty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10385</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Santa Barbara Industrial Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10387 (University Village)</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Transamerica Title Insurance Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10402</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Montclair Enterprises (H.C. Elliott); Eli &amp; Leatrice Loria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10379</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Cardinal Homes, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10384</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Cardinal Homes, Inc.; Department of Veterans’ Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10482</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Title Insurance &amp; Trust Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10530</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Ralph &amp; Shirley Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10497</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Audubon Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10599</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Title Insurance &amp; Trust Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10623</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Title Insurance &amp; Trust Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10660</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Ko-Art Homes, Inc. (William Koart)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10670</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Title Insurance &amp; Trust Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10722</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>R.A. Watt Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10754 (Lake Los Carneros East)</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>R.A. Watt Co. (Lessee); BoWatt Properties (Fee Owner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10699</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Goleta Development Co.; Live Oak Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10780</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>University Exchange Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10792</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>County of Santa Barbara and University Exchange Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>DEVELOPER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10818</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Ko-Art Homes (William Koart)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10822</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>University Exchange Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10915</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Ko-Art Homes (William Koart)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10846</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>University Village Plaza; TI Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10953</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Ko-Art Homes (William Koart)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 10955</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Ko-Art Homes (William Koart)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 11001</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>George A. Cavaletto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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