DUDEK

725 FRONT STREET, SUITE 400
SANTA CRUZ, CALIFORNIA 95060
T 831.600.3500 F 831.600.3501

October 23, 2018

Niko Letunic, Principal
Eisen Letunic
1936 University Avenue, Suite 250
Berkeley, CA 94704

Subject: ***Cultural Resource Assessment for the Pacific Grove Shoreline Management Plan***

Dear Mr. Letunic:

The City of Pacific Grove is studying options to develop a continuous recreation trail along the City's Pacific Ocean shoreline. The Pacific Grove Shoreline Management Plan (Project) is a response to shoreline erosion that is impacting an existing 4,695 foot seawall, and is also an advance response to future sea level elevation rise, which is expected to continue to erode and impact the existing shoreline. The present study is accomplished to identify possible constraints that cultural resource may have on the proposed Project. The Project will comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and the Local Coastal Program (Chapter 23.90.200) and Chapter 7 of the City's General Plan.

The (Project) study area is situated on the southern end of the Monterey Bay along the Pacific Grove coastline. The study area is bound by the Monterey Bay Aquarium on the east, the northern terminus of Asilomar Beach State Park on the west, Ocean View Boulevard to the south, and the Pacific Ocean to the north (Figure 1).

Dudek requested a records search for the proposed Project from the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) at Sonoma State University on May 16, 2018. Due to the high number of sites and studies in the vicinity of the Project Area, the records search area included a 1/8–mile buffer for previously recorded sites and a 50–meter (m) buffer for previously conducted studies. NWIC responded on June 25, 2018 and identified 17 resources within the Project Area and 17 resources within the 1/8-mile radius. In addition, there are 41 studies (57 reports) within the Project Area and 90 studies (141 reports) within the 50-m radius (some studies contain multiple reports) (Attachment 1). A Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File (SLF) search identified the presence of Native American cultural resources and recommended contacting the Ohlone Costanoan Esselen Nation (OCEN) (Attachment 2).

In 2016, Holman & Associates conducted an archaeological study of the western portion of the Project Area for The Point Pinos Trail Project, from the boundary of Asilomar Beach State Park to the Pacific Grove Gardens Marine Park (Schlagheck 2016). To avoid redundancy, Dudek did not re-survey the portion of the Project Area covered by Holman & Associates but integrates the findings here within.

On July 26, 2018, Dudek archaeologists surveyed the study area not investigated by Holman & Associates (Schlagheck 2016). The focus of the survey was to characterize existing conditions for previously recorded archaeological sites and to identify whether any additional archaeological resources are located within the Project Area (Attachment 3). The combined effort of Holman & Associates and Dudek confirmed 17 previously recorded archaeological sites within the Project Area (Attachment 4). Although Dudek did not identify any additional archaeological sites, some site boundaries were found to extend beyond the recorded limits (Figure 2). Ryan Brady, MA, RPA supervised the project; Sarah Brewer, BA, and Kolin Taylor, BA, performed the survey; Sarah Brewer and Julie Royer, MA, prepared the report findings. All archaeologists involved in this project meet the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards.

The entire Project Area is highly sensitive for archaeological resources.

PROJECT LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

The Project is situated on the southern end of the Monterey Bay along the Pacific Grove coastline. The Project is bound by the Monterey Bay Aquarium on the east, the northern terminus of Asilomar Beach State Park on the west, Ocean View Boulevard to the south, and the Pacific Ocean to the north.

The City of Pacific Grove is studying options to develop a continuous recreation trail along the City's Pacific Ocean shoreline. The Pacific Grove Shoreline Management Plan (Project) is a response to shoreline erosion that is impacting an existing 4,695 foot seawall, and is also an advance response to future sea level elevation rise, which is expected to continue to erode and impact the existing shoreline. One consideration of the proposed Project is to protect cultural resources potentially impacted by the Project. The Project complies with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and the Local Coastal Program.

REGULATORY CONTEXT

State of California

The California Register of Historical Resources

In California, the term "historical resource" includes "any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which is historically or archaeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California" (Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5020.1(j)). In 1992, the California legislature established the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) "to be used by state and local agencies, private groups, and citizens to identify the state's historical resources and to indicate what properties are to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from substantial adverse change" (PRC Section 5024.1(a)). The criteria for listing resources on the CRHR, enumerated in the following text, were developed to be in accordance with previously established criteria developed for listing in the NRHP. According to PRC Section 5024.1(c)(1–4), a resource is considered historically significant if it (i) retains "substantial integrity," and (ii) meets at least one 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

(4) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history

To understand the historic importance of a resource, sufficient time must have passed to obtain a scholarly perspective on the events or individuals associated with the resource. A resource less than 50 years old may be considered for listing in the CRHR if it can be demonstrated that sufficient time has passed to understand its historical importance (see 14 CCR 4852(d)(2)).

The CRHR protects cultural resources by requiring evaluations of the significance of prehistoric and historic resources. The criteria for the CRHR are nearly identical to those for the NRHP, and properties listed or formally designated as eligible for listing in the NRHP are automatically listed in the CRHR, as are state landmarks and points of interest. The CRHR also includes properties designated under local ordinances or identified through local historical resource surveys.

California Environmental Quality Act

As described further in the following text, the following CEQA statutes and CEQA Guidelines are of relevance to the analysis of archaeological, historic, and tribal cultural resources:

PRC Section 21083.2(g) defines "unique archaeological resource."

PRC Section 21084.1 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a) define "historical resources." In addition, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b) defines the phrase "substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource." It also defines the circumstances when a project would materially impair the significance of a historical resource.

PRC Section 21074(a) defines "tribal cultural resources."

PRC Section 5097.98 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e) set forth standards and steps to be employed following the accidental discovery of human remains in any location other than a dedicated ceremony.

PRC Sections 21083.2(b)–(c) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4 provide information regarding the mitigation framework for archaeological and historic resources, including examples of preservation-in-place mitigation measures; preservation-in-place is the preferred manner of mitigating impacts to significant archaeological sites because it maintains the relationship between artifacts and the archaeological context, and may also help avoid conflict with religious or cultural values of groups associated with the archaeological site(s).

Under CEQA, a project may have a significant effect on the environment if it may cause "a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource" (PRC Section 21084.1; CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b)). If a site is either listed or eligible for listing in the CRHR, or if it is included in a local register of historic resources, or identified as significant in a historical resources survey (meeting the requirements of PRC Section 5024.1(q)), it is a "historical resource" and is presumed to be historically or culturally significant for purposes of CEQA (PRC Section 21084.1; CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a)). The lead agency is not precluded from determining that a resource is a historical resource, even if it does not fall within this presumption (PRC Section 21084.1; CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a)).

A "substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource" reflecting a significant effect under CEQA means "physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired" (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b)(1); PRC Section 5020.1(q)). In

turn, the significance of a historical resource is materially impaired when a project does any of the following:

(1) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register; or

(2) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to Section 5020.1(k) of the PRC or its identification in an historical resources survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the PRC, unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or

(3) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA [CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b)(2)].

Pursuant to these sections, the CEQA inquiry begins with evaluating whether a project site contains any "historical resources," then evaluates whether that project will cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource such that the resource's historical significance is materially impaired.

If it can be demonstrated that a project will cause damage to a unique archaeological resource, the lead agency may require reasonable efforts be made to permit any or all of these resources to be preserved in place or left in an undisturbed state. To the extent that they cannot be left undisturbed, mitigation measures are required (Section 21083.2(a), (b), and (c)).

Section 21083.2(g) defines a unique archaeological resource as an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria:

(1) Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information

(2) Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type

(3) Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person

Impacts to non-unique archaeological resources are generally not considered a significant environmental impact (PRC Section 21083.2(a); CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(c)(4)). However, if a non-unique archaeological resource qualifies as tribal cultural resource (PRC 21074(c); 21083.2(h)), further consideration of significant impacts is required.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 assigns special importance to human remains and specifies procedures to be used when Native American remains are discovered. As described in the following text, these procedures are detailed in PRC Section 5097.98.

Native American Historic Cultural Sites

State law (PRC Section 5097 et seq.) addresses the disposition of Native American burials in archaeological sites and protects such remains from disturbance, vandalism, or inadvertent destruction; establishes procedures to be implemented if Native American skeletal remains are discovered during construction of a project; and established the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to resolve disputes regarding the disposition of such remains. In addition, the Native American Historic Resource Protection Act makes it a misdemeanor punishable by up to 1 year in jail to deface or destroy an Indian historic or cultural site that is listed or may be eligible for listing in the CRHR.

California Health and Safety Code section 7050.5

In the event that Native American human remains or related cultural material are encountered, Section 15064.5(e) of the CEQA Guidelines (as incorporated from PRC Section 5097.98) and California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 define the subsequent protocol. If human remains are encountered, excavation or other disturbances shall be suspended of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains or related material. Protocol requires that a county-approved coroner be contacted in order to determine if the remains are of Native American origin. Should the coroner determine the remains to be Native American, the coroner must contact the NAHC within 24 hours. The most likely descendent may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in PRC Section 5097.98 (14 CCR 15064.5(e)).

NATURAL AND CULTURAL CONTEXT

Environmental Context

Pacific Grove is located approximately 100 miles south of San Francisco at the southernmost point of the Monterey Bay, on the northeastern portion of the Monterey Peninsula, adjacent to the City of Monterey. The Project follows the Pacific Coast shoreline north of Ocean View Boulevard from the Monterey Bay Aquarium on the east to the northern terminus of Asilomar Beach State Park on the west. Geology within the Project Area is characterized as Early to Late Cretaceous Period Mesozoic granitic rocks of the Salinan Block, and includes Mesozoic granite, quartz monzonite, granodiorite and quartz diorite (USGS 2018). Soils closest to the Pacific shoreline are considered Coastal Beaches, while soil along the bluffs are characterized as Baywood sand, with 2 to 15 percent slopes (USDA NRCS 2018). Neither soil type typically contains buried A-horizons. The vegetation community is categorized as Coastal Prairie-scrub mosaic (*Baccharis*, *Danthonia*, *Festuca*) (Küchler 1977), although most of the area has been developed and landscaped. The climate is characterized as Mediterranean with mild summers and cooler wet winters. Mean annual temperature ranges between 48°F and 65°F, with 19.7 inches (in.) of annual rainfall (Western Regional Climate Center 2018). The proximity of the Pacific Ocean mediates dramatic temperature fluctuations throughout the year.

Cultural Setting

Prehistoric

The Project Area lies within the territory prehistorically occupied by the Costanoan or Ohlone people. Costanoan refers to eight separate Penutian-stock language groups situated roughly from modern-day Richmond in the north to Big Sur in the south. The Rumsen tribelet occupied the Monterey area (Levy 1978). Of the Rumsen-speaking groups, Milliken and Johnson (2010) identify four local groups in the area, of which, the *Calenda Ruc* inhabited the project vicinity.

Glimpses into the ways of life for prehistoric Californians continue to be pieced together through studies of ethnography and archaeology. Early European explorers from the 16th and 18th centuries provided the first written descriptions about the native Californians they encountered, although details are sparse. Attempts at systematic ethnographies did not occur until the early 20th century, generations after the effects of missionization and integration had altered Costanoan/Ohlone lifestyles drastically. Much of these studies focused on recording Native languages before they fell into disuse. Information from the archaeological record continues to fill in the gaps of prehistoric lifeways. Archaeologists extrapolate trends in tool use, trade, diet and migration from studies on archaeological sites. Costanoan/Ohlone descendants are often invited to participate in decisions about their ancestral sites as well as educate others about their traditional lifeways.

Information from the archaeological record continues to fill in the gaps of our understanding of prehistoric lifeways. Prehistoric research in the Monterey Bay dates back to the early 1900s, although the bulk of archaeological excavations date to the 1960s and later. Early research was conducted by Beardsley (1946). More recent excavations and surveys include the work of Cartier (1993), Dietz and Jackson (1981), Dietz et al. (1988), Hildebrandt and Mikkelsen (1993), Hylkema (1991), Jones (1993), Jones and Ferneau (2002a), Jones et al. (1996) and Milliken et al. (1999) among others referenced below. Jones et al. (2007) presents a synthetic overview of prehistoric adaptive change in the Central Coast. This temporal framework, for the prehistoric era of greater Central California coast, spans a period of approximately 10,000–12,000 years, and divides into six different periods. Researchers distinguish these periods by perceived changes in prehistoric settlement patterns, subsistence practices, and technological advances. These adaptive shifts identify differences in temporally discrete artifact assemblages, site locations, and site types. Table 1 summarizes the cultural chronology presented by Jones et al. (2007).

Table 1
California Central Coast Chronology

Temporal Period	Date Range*
Paleo-Indian	pre-8000 cal BC
Millingstone (or Early Archaic)	8000 to 3500 cal BC
Early	3500 to 600 cal BC
Middle	600 cal BC to cal AD 1000
Middle-Late Transition	cal AD 1000-1250
Late	cal AD to 1250-1769

Source: Jones et al. (2007).

Paleo-Indian

The Paleo-Indian era represents people's initial occupation of the region and is quite sparse across the Monterey Bay region. Evidence of this era is generally expressed through isolated artifacts or sparse lithic scatters (Bertrando 2004). Further south, in the San Luis Obispo area, fluted points characterizing this era are documented near the town of Nipomo (Mills et al. 2005) and Santa Margarita (Gibson 1996). No points of this type have been found yet in the Monterey Bay. Possible occupation dating to the Paleo-Indian period is reported at CA-SCR-38/123, at Wilder Ranch (Bryne 2002), and in CA-SCR-177 in Scotts Valley (Cartier 1993). The traditional interpretation is that people living during this time were highly mobile hunters who focused subsistence efforts on large mammals. In contrast, Erlandson et al. (2007) proposes a "kelp highway" hypothesis for the peopling of the Americas. Proponents of this model argue that the earliest inhabitants of the region focused their economic pursuits on coastal resources. Archaeological sites that support this hypothesis are mainly from the Santa Barbara Channel Islands. Some scholars hypothesize that

Paleo-Indian sites in the Bay Area may exist but are inundated due to rising ocean levels throughout the Holocene (Jones 1992).

Millingstone

Settlement in the Monterey Bay appears with more frequency in the Millingstone Period. Sites of this era have been discovered in Big Sur (Jones 2003; Fitzgerald and Jones 1999) and Moss Landing (Jones and Jones 1992; Milliken et al. 1999). Assemblages are characterized by abundant millingstones and handstones, core and core-cobble tools, thick rectangular (L-series) *Olivella* beads, and a low incidence of projectile points, generally lanceolate or large side-notched varieties (Jones et al. 2007). Eccentric crescents are also found in Millingstone components. Sites are often associated with shellfish remains and small mammal bone, which suggest a collecting-focused economy. Newsome et al. (2004) report that stable isotope studies on human bone, from a Millingstone component, indicate a diet composed of 70%–84% marine resources. Contrary to these findings, deer remains are abundant at some Millingstone sites (cf. Jones et al. 2008), which suggests a flexible subsistence focus. People living during the Millingstone era are thought to have been highly mobile.

Early

The Early Period corresponds with the earliest era of what Rogers (1929) called the "Hunting Culture." According to Rogers, the "Hunting Culture" continues through to the Middle-Late Transition in the present framework. The Early Period is marked by a greater emphasis on formalized flaked stone tools, such as projectile points and bifaces, and the initial use of mortar and pestle technology. Early Period sites are located in more varied environmental contexts than millingstone sites, suggesting more intensive use of the landscape than previously (Jones and Waugh 1997).

Early Period artifact assemblages are characterized by Large Side-notched points, Rossi Square-stemmed points, Spire-lopped (A), End-ground (B2b and B2c), Cap (B4), and Rectangular (L-series) *Olivella* beads. Other artifacts include less temporally diagnostic Contracting-stemmed and Año Nuevo long-stemmed points, and bone gorges.

Early Period sites are common and often found in estuary settings along the coast or along river terraces inland and are present in both Monterey and Santa Cruz Counties. Coastal sites dating to this period include CA-MNT-108 (Breschini and Haversat 1992a), CA-SCR-7 (Jones and Hildebrandt 1990), and CA-SCR-38/123 (Jones and Hildebrandt 1994).

Archaeologists have long debated whether the shift in site locations and artifact assemblages during this time represent either population intrusion as a result of mid-Holocene warming trends,

or an in-situ adaptive shift (cf. Mikkelsen et al. 2000). The initial use of mortars and pestles during this time appears to reflect a more labor intensive economy associated with the adoption of acorn processing (cf. Basgall 1987)

Middle

The trend toward greater labor investment is apparent in the Middle Period. During this time, there is increased use of plant resources, more long-term occupation at habitation sites, and a greater variety of smaller "use-specific" localities. Artifacts common to this era include Contracting-stemmed projectile points, a greater variety of *Olivella* shell beads and *Haliotis* ornaments that include discs and rings (Jones 2003). Bone tools and ornaments are also common, especially in the richer coastal contexts (Jones and Ferneau 2002a; Jones and Waugh 1995), and circular shell fishhooks are present for the first time. Grooved stone net sinkers are also found in coastal sites. Mortars and pestles become more common than millingstones and handstones at some sites (Jones et al. 2007). Important Middle Period sites include CA-MNT-282 at Willow Creek (Jones 2003; Pohorecky 1976), and CA-MNT-229 at Elkhorn Slough (Dietz et al. 1988). Middle Period sites north of the Monterey Bay include CA-SCR-9 and CA-SMA 218 at Año Nuevo (Hylkema 1991).

Jones et al. (2007) discuss the Middle Period in the context of Rogers' "Hunting Culture" because it is seen as a continuation of the pattern that begins in the Early Period. The pattern reflects a greater emphasis on labor-intensive technologies that include projectile and plant processing. Additionally, faunal evidence highlight a shift toward prey species that are more labor intensive to capture, either by search and processing time or technological needs. These labor-intensive species include small schooling fishes, sea otters, rabbits, and plants such as acorn. Jones and Haney (2005) offer that Early and Middle Period sites are difficult to distinguish without shell beads due to the similarity of artifact assemblages.

Middle-Late Transition

The Middle-Late Transition also marks the end of Rogers' "Hunting Culture," which seems to occur sometime during this era. Artifacts associated with the Middle-Late Transition include contracting-stemmed, double side-notched, and small leaf-shaped projectile points. The latter are thought to represent the introduction of bow and arrow technology to the region. A variety of *Olivella* shell bead types are found in these deposits and include B2, B3, G1, G2, G6, and K1 varieties (Jones 1995), notched line sinkers, hopper mortars, and circular shell fishhooks (Jones et al. 2007). Sites in Monterey County that correspond with this time are CA-MNT-1233 and -281 at Willow Creek (Pohorecky 1976), CA-MNT-1754, and CA-MNT-745 in Priest Valley (Hildebrandt 2006).

The Middle-Late Transition is a time that appears to correspond with social reorganization across the region. This era is also a period of rapid climatic change known as the Medieval Climatic Anomaly (cf. Stine 1994). The Medieval Climatic Anomaly is proposed as an impetus for the cultural change that was a response to fluctuations between cool-wet and warm-dry conditions that characterize the event (Jones et al. 1999). Archaeological sites are rarer during this period, which may reflect a decline in regional population (Jones and Ferneau 2002b).

Late

Late Period sites are found in a variety of environmental conditions and include newly occupied task sites and encampments, as well as previously occupied localities. Artifacts associated with this era include Cottonwood and Desert Side-notched arrow points, flaked stone drills, steatite and clamshell disc beads, *Haliotis* disc beads, *Olivella* bead types E1 and E2, and earlier used B2, B3, G1, G6, and K1 types. Millingstones, handstones, mortars, pestles, and circular shell fishhooks also continue to be used (Jones et al. 2007). Sites dating to this era are found in coastal and interior contexts. In the Monterey Bay area, Late Period sites include CA-MNT-143 at Asilomar State Beach (Brady et al. 2009), CA-MNT-1765 at Moro Cojo Slough (Fitzgerald et al. 1995), CA-MNT-1485/H and -1486/H at Rancho San Carlos (Breschini and Haversat 1992b), and CA-SCR-177 at Davenport Landing (Fitzgerald and Ruby 1997). Coastal sites dating to the Late Period tend to be more resource acquisition or processing sites, while residential occupation is more common inland (Jones et al. 2007).

History

Spanish Period (1542–1822)

The earliest known European visitor to the Monterey Peninsula was Juan Rodríquez Cabrillo, a Portuguese explorer who was sent by the Viceroy of New Spain to explore the Pacific coast north of Mexico. Cabrillo landed on Point Pinos in November of 1542 and named it for the generous amount of pine trees. He also called the Monterey Bay the "Bahia de los Pinos," or "Bay of the Pines" (Espinosa and Tello 1802). The expedition of Sebastián Vizcaíno, who was sent by Spain to survey the California coastline to locate feasible ports, also landed on Point Pinos in December of 1602 (Espinosa and Tello 1802). Vizcaíno renamed the Bay "Monterey" after the Conde de Monterey, the Spanish Viceroy of New Spain, who sent him on the expedition (Chapman 1920). Despite being mapped as an advantageous berth for Spanish shipping efforts, Spanish settlement in Alta California did not make its way to the Monterey Bay until the second half of the eighteenth century. In an effort to prevent the establishment of English and Russian colonies in northern Alta California, Don Gaspar de Portolá, the Governor of Baja, embarked on a voyage in 1769 to establish military and religious control over the area (Bolton 1927). After mistakenly circumventing the Monterey Bay and reaching the San Francisco Bay, the expedition backtracked

to San Diego, but reached Point Pinos on the way back down and erected a wooden cross near the Carmel River (Bolton 1927). The following year, in 1770, Portolá set out on a second expedition and successfully located the Monterey Bay. At that time, the Mission San Carlos de Borromeo and the Presidio of Monterey were established. The Spanish missions drastically altered the lifeways of the Native Americans. Spanish missionaries conscripted members of local Native American communities to move to the Mission, where they were indoctrinated as Catholic neophytes.

Mexican Period (1822–1848)

After more than a decade of intermittent rebellion and warfare, New Spain (Mexico and the California territory) won independence from Spain in 1821. In 1822, the Mexican legislative body in California ended isolationist policies designed to protect the Spanish monopoly on trade, and decreed California ports open to foreign merchants. In 1834, the Mexican government secularized the mission lands releasing the Native Americans from control of the mission-system. (Cleland 2005; Dallas 1955). Extensive land grants were established in the interior during the Mexican Period, in part to increase the population inland from the more settled coastal areas where the Spanish had first concentrated its colonization efforts. The rancho that once occupied the Project Area was called Rancho Punta de Pinos (Rollins 1876).

American Period (1848–Present)

The Mexican–American War ended with the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848, ushering California into its American Period. Monterey was one of the 27 original counties of California, designated on February 18, 1850. California officially became a state with the Compromise of 1850 that also designated Utah and New Mexico (with present-day Arizona) as U.S. territories. The new state of California recognized the ownership of lands in the state distributed under the Mexican Land Grants of the previous decades (Waugh 2003).

As the Gold Rush was picking up steam in 1849, a massive influx of people seeking gold steadily flooded the rural counties of California. Sea resources were a draw to the Monterey Peninsula and Chinese entrepreneurs were the first to launch a successful commercial fishing industry. They established several villages along the coast to take advantage of fish and seafood, the first at Point Lobos in 1851, with villages at Point Alones and Stillwater Cove following shortly behind (Kemp 1995; Mikkelsen and Jones 2010). The Chinese houses were built right on the rocks of the shore and the community worked together to process abalone, squid, sardines, oysters, mussels, cod, halibut etc. Their success, however, was met with resistance by other European fisherman, and a suspicious fire burned down the entire Point Alones village in 1906, a disaster that it never fully recovered from (Kemp 1995).

Pacific Grove

The City of Pacific Grove started out as a Methodist retreat center in 1874, with tents erected on a yearly basis between First Street and Pacific Avenue in the southeastern portion of Pacific Grove (Weiland 2018). The town was incorporated as a city in 1889 with 1300 permanent residents, with three separate additions made by 1910 (Weiland 2018).