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Is it Time for a Portolá Trail Designation in San Mateo County?

Paul O. Reimer

Background for Portolá’s Presence in New Spain

Historic Spanish influence in California needs little substantiation beyond the wealth of Spanish place names that decorate any map of the Golden State. However, the absence of this Spanish heritage north of the Russian River and Fort Ross is also indicative of the international power contest evident during the reign of King Carlos III of Spain (1759-1788) as the presence of Russian fur traders, from New Archangel, and English explorers, by way of Canada, threatened the Spanish claim to Alta California. In response, King Carlos ordered his visitor general of New Spain, José de Gálvez, to organize overland expeditions, with support by sea, that would establish garrisons and permanent missions in Alta California with particular emphasis on San Diego, Monterey and, ultimately, San Francisco. The first two were destinations already visited by Spanish sea captains and heralded for their safe and protective harbors. Permanent occupation and population of these key locations would insure the territorial claims of Spain that had existed from the time of Juan Cabrillo’s 1542 sea expedition.

Don Gaspar de Portolá, a Catalan, had been appointed governor of Baja California in 1767 as a reward for his military service in Spain and Italy. Upon his arrival in New Spain, which consisted of the Spanish holdings in Mexico and America’s Southwest, he was given the sensitive task of replacing the Jesuit priests with Franciscans at 17 established missions in Baja California, the Jesuit order of the Catholic Church having fallen out of favor with the king.

His success in replacing the priests at the missions...
was much to his credit. It was this notoriety that led to Portolá heading the 1769 expedition north from the Presidio of Loreto in Baja California. His goal was further establishing Spanish claim to Alta California by colonization at San Diego and Monterey. After the fateful 78-day march from San Diego Bay, his expedition did not recognize Monterey Bay as the party’s leaders saw no expected supply ship or protective harbor.

Portolá’s extended march north crossed the Santa Cruz coastal plain into what is now San Mateo County. In fact, his expedition first saw San Francisco Bay from what is now called Sweeney Ridge, recording it as big enough to harbor “all the navies of Europe,” and returned to San Diego after an arduous six-month trek with discipline intact and without loss of a man (except for five “Christianized” Indians who deserted to stay in more fertile Alta California). Then, after a brief respite of three months, Portolá led a smaller expedition back to Monterey Bay and the mouth of the Carmel River, establishing both Mission San Carlos and Presidio of Monterey, thus completing his assigned task. There seems to be little mystery to obscure Portolá’s intended purpose of strengthening Spanish claim to Alta California by means of permanent occupation.

Place in West Coast History

Turning north on the shore of Monterey Bay led Portolá to his most northerly campsite (now in Pacifica). The trek to Sweeney Ridge resulted in a significant extension of Alta California’s colonization potential. Since Portolá had the blessing of the king and specific order from the king’s visitor general to occupy and fortify the known harbors at San Diego and Monterey, the king’s representatives in Mexico City hoped for Portolá’s success. Consequently, when the first official journal that included a description of the sighting of San Francisco Bay and the report of Portolá’s second effort to initiate a Spanish presence in Monterey arrived on April 24, 1770, Viceroy Croix ordered all bells in Mexico City to be rung in celebration. The viceroy’s laudatory letter along with the expedition’s report was then dispatched to the King Carlos III of Spain on May 4, 1770.

In 1773, King Carlos III, reacting to the range of information available to him from Portolá’s exploration and influenced by Spanish territorial interests, Russian incursions and English progress across Canada, issued two royal edicts. They set forth actions to be taken by New Spain’s Viceroy Fra Don Antonio de Bucareli who had replaced Viceroy Croix (September 1771). Although Commandante Pedro Fages, who Portolá had left in charge of the newly created Presidio of Monterey, undertook further local exploration in an attempt to reach Point Reyes by land (November 1770), it was not until the royal edicts of 1773 reached New Spain that colonization of San Francisco, in addition to San Diego and Monterey, became a clear objective. With the king’s approval and Viceroy Bucareli’s support, Juan Bautista de Anza, commadante of the Presidio at Tubac, pioneered a trail between New Spain’s Tubac, south of Tucson, Arizona, and Alta California’s Monterey, arriving there on April 19, 1774. This particular linkage was of potential logistic value since it offered a land route between New Spain and Alta California which was not beset by the risks and seasonality of ocean passage. Upon return to Tubac in late May, Anza was ordered to recruit a colonization contingent from New Spain to accompany him on the 1,200-mile march to the San Francisco Peninsula by way of Monterey.

As the result, some 240 men women and children with approximately 1,000 mules, cattle and horses, left the Presidio of Tubac on October 23, 1775, bound for San Francisco Bay. This expedition arrived in Monterey on March 10, 1776, after a difficult trek in cold winter conditions. While the colonizers rested in Monterey, Anza rode ahead to the San Francisco Peninsula and by March 28, 1776, had decided upon locations for both mission and presidio. The actual colonization was left to Anza’s second in command, Lt. José Joaquin Moraga, when Anza was summoned to Mexico City in order to report directly to the viceroy.

At the same time that Anza was recruiting
his expedition members, Viceroy Bucareli was implementing another directive of the royal edicts. Don Bruno de Heceta was given command of a Spanish naval squadron, assembled in San Blas, to sail northward along the coast of Alta California and, north of Point Reyes, search for any sign of Russian presence. Don Juan de Ayala was given command of the packet San Carlos as part of the naval squadron and was ordered to enter San Francisco Bay to observe tides, find safe anchorage and map the Bay itself. Ayala and the San Carlos stayed within the Bay for six weeks (August 5 to September 18, 1775) while his pilot, Don José Canizares, finished the first chart of the great harbor originally seen by Portolá from what is now called Sweeney Ridge.4

Clearly, Portolá and his expedition initiated a flurry of activity to claim Alta California at the direction of King Carlos III. The decade from 1769 to 1779 saw more attention to protection of that claim than did the preceding 200 years. In the process, Spanish colonization of the San Francisco Bay region was begun. The impact to California's native populations would be devastating.

For these reasons a permanent historic acknowledgement seems appropriate for Portolá himself as the original expedition’s commander. There has been no formal christening of a Portolá Trail to date, although segments of his route and some of the expedition’s campsites have received state historic designation. With the approaching 250th anniversary (in 2019) of the expedition’s October and November of 1769 presence within San Mateo County, there is a timely opportunity to recognize Portolá. This opportunity could be captured by means of a permanent, continuous and clearly designated trail from southern-most San Mateo County in the Año Nuevo State Park to the San Francisco Bay Discovery Site atop Sweeney Ridge within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

**Process for Portolá Trail Designation**

Diaries of Portolá as well as those of his companions, Fray Juan Crespi, a Franciscan priest, and Ensign Miguel Costansó, an engineer, provide dates and descriptions of the six campsites that the expedition established on its northbound route between Año Nuevo and Sweeney Ridge. There are, of course, other expedition campsites of note, first beyond the San Francisco Bay Discovery Site to the Journey’s End Camp on San Francisquito Creek at the El Palo Alto Redwood Tree (a landmark on El Camino Real). From Journey’s End Camp, where the expedition leaders finally reached consensus that they were substantially north of Monterey Bay and that the Ohlone report of a supply ship was not to be believed, the expedition essentially retraced its steps to San Diego but utilized only some of the same campsites from the northbound trek.

The designation of any proposed Portolá Trail should begin with a historically-based locational review of the six northbound campsites in respect to the clues offered in translations of the Portolá, Crespi and Costansó diaries. The latter two sources are the more detailed accounts of the expedition’s passage. Portolá, himself, offered scant observations save for his diary entries as to trail conditions and his daily estimate of distances traveled. Beyond the campsite settings, there are few clues as to the actual league by league passage of the 62-64 men and 200 horses and mules that constituted the expedition.5 Therefore, placement of a definitive trail route on current topographic maps is challenging. However, an “educated guess” as to the route between campsites should have as its basis some or all of the following factors:

* Consideration of background terrain in the absence of recent human change.
* Recognition of the travel constraint of pack mules.
* Identification of bridge structures or trail improvements in relation to major terrain features that are credited to the expedition’s “Pioneers” in the Crespi or Costansó translations.
Portolá Camp #4 has changed significantly from Portola’s time. In 1769, the various creeks flowing into the Pacific were open to the sea and required bridging before the expedition could pass. Photo courtesy of Paul Reimer.

Key considerations include:

- Is the trail in sufficient proximity to the “educated guess” route so as to insure that those who will utilize the trail can appreciate the terrain, vistas and surroundings of the original Portolá expedition while, wherever possible, avoiding high speed traffic on Highway 1? In this regard, it is important to note that the diarists reported extensive burned areas along the route of travel from fires intentionally started by local tribes as part of their subsistence practices. Such a fire-related visual heritage no longer exists.

- Can the intended purposes of the Portolá Trail be accomplished in combination with other approved projects (such as the Coastal Trail), existing public rights of way (such as Old San Pedro Mountain Road and Old Stage Road), and/or accessible trail increments through protected open space or recreational use properties?

- Are there sufficient points of access and potential for parking that appear compatible with trail use and also with existing urban neighborhood land use?

- Is there evidence of established public jurisdictions dealing with land protection and outdoor recreation to insure future improvements, to control and support usage, and to provide maintenance over the route?

Confirmation of Portolá’s Campsites

As outlined above, a process leading to a Portolá Trail starts with a reasonable and historically justifiable location of the expedition’s six northbound campsites. The Portolá Trail, always subject to historical interpretation, is the strand along which the campsites are strung. Thus, campsite locations provide historic justification for the Portolá Trail route within San Mateo County. Of the six expedition campsites between Año Nuevo Point and the San Francisco Bay Discovery Site, there are two with definite locations on the beach at stream entries unless substantial differences in watercourse discharge points on the Pacific shore can be documented. In both instances, at Purisima Creek (Portolá Camp #3) and Pilarcitos Creek (Portolá Camp #4), alignment of the “educated guess” Portolá Trail is synonymous with the Coastal Trail even if stream discharge points are open to question. Clearly, this part of Portolá’s route should be located along the beach, as is the Coastal Trail, with joint signage added to the already improved Coastal Trail.

There are three historic site marker locations that have been situated with ease of access rather than historic accuracy as their rationale for placement. The first of these (Portolá Camp #2), in the San Gregorio
State Beach access and parking area west of Highway 1, describes the expedition campsite as inland by .5 league, nominally 1.3 miles. Crespi’s diary is the source of the .5 league reference, and his diary translation speaks to a pleasant valley surrounded by high hills and, within that valley, a campsite from which the ocean can be seen. An “educated guess” solution places this campsite just south of San Gregorio Creek and adjacent to or bifurcated by Old Stage Road. It the only place from which the ocean is seen at a distance of 1.3 miles because of the intervening hills.

Location of the expedition campsite on what is now called Martini Creek (Portolá Camp #5), north of Montara, is made easier with references from Costansó’s diary. The expedition members were wet and cold since tents were not part of Baja California travel gear. Portolá searched for a protected campsite out of the ocean weather behind the Devil’s Slide cliffs, and Costansó placed the site at “the extreme end of this [hollow]” created by three tributaries to Martini Creek.

The third wayward camp marker (Portolá Camp #6) can be found at the site of the larger-than-life statue of Portolá which was given to the State of California by the People of Catalonia (see front cover). As placed in Pacífica on Highway 1 at the intersection of Crespi Drive, the site itself warrants “educated guess” location along any Portolá Trail in respect to the expedition’s route on the afternoon of November 4, 1769. This march took Portolá and his company to the San Francisco Bay Discovery Site, the Bay having been seen by the expedition’s hunters and scouts from what is now called Sweeney Ridge during the preceding three days. The historic plaque in Pacífica generally places the expedition’s camp on the south side of San Pedro Valley but offers no specific details as to location. References from the diaries of Portolá, Crespi and Costansó throw doubt on a beach campsite and, since the expedition spent several days at its Pacífica campsite while Portolá recuperated from dysentery, attention to its location seems in order.

Clearly, the expedition travelled an inland route over San Pedro Mountain to avoid the ocean-front cliffs. In his diary, Portolá characterizes the route as “bad road” followed by “Indian trail” even after his soldiers attempted to improve the passage. All of the diarists cite a moderate rate of ascent from the Martini Creek campsite and then a difficult and steep descent north from the saddleback pass of San Pedro Mountain to the valley below. The view afforded at the ridgeline proved to be a revelation for the expedition. From this elevation (approximately 1,200 feet) the Farallon Islands and the white cliffs associated with Point Reyes could be seen across the great bight outside the Golden Gate that was then called San Francisco Bay by the Spanish ship captains (today named Gulf of the Farallons). It was from this vantage point that Portolá and his expedition leaders first found visual evidence that they were substantially north of Monterey Bay. This northwest view would greet anyone on the Old San Pedro Mountain Road portion of a proposed Portolá Trail if there is no fog at sea.

A band of Ohlones was encountered at the crest and the explorers had guidance from these natives to San Pedro Valley below. In her book, Montara Mountain, Barbara VanderWerf discusses the Indian Trail as most likely following the ridge lines behind the Willow Brook...
Estates neighborhood in San Pedro Valley. Contact with the Pacifica Department of Public Works identified Perez Drive as the primary, terrain-respecting street in Willow Creek Estates. This correlation of modern street location with the Indian Trail, leads to the conjecture that Portolá descended from San Pedro Mountain via the steep ridge at the south end of today’s Perez Drive still searching for the supply ship that was never found.

From diary entries concerning the Pacifica campsite, it is not clear that Portolá and his men proceeded beyond the side tributary canyon (Willow Creek Estates) to the more open San Pedro Valley and westerly toward Pruristac, an Aramai Ohlone village. That village site, for which historical evidence abounds, was on the north bank of San Pedro Creek at the current Sanchez Adobe County Historical Park. From scouting reports and/or his own view, Portolá knew that San Pedro Creek, flowing through the mid-valley from the east, disappeared into the sand short of the ocean leaving an inland marsh of “considerable extent.” The intervening marsh before the ocean front, the Ohlone village location, the fact that Portolá and his men were increasingly dependent on the Ohlones for food and, finally, the previous day’s search for shelter from the ocean-front wind and rain all suggest that the expedition did not camp on the beach at Linda Mar (Pacifica State Beach). The translation by Eldredge in 1902 cites a San Pedro Valley campsite, and Crespi’s diary entry adds a side canyon description of a “Hollow 100 varas wide and 600 varas deep.”

A vara being 33+ inches, almost 1 yard in length, we are looking for a side hollow to San Pedro Valley in which six football fields can be placed side by side on relatively flat terrain. Sure enough, such a 12-acre hollow can be located, but Crespi’s description, in Bolton’s translation, has the hollow’s mouth opening to the northwest. The candidate hollow, protected from ocean weather, opens to the northeast. Fortunately, the most recent translation of the Crespi journals by Alan K. Brown, published in 2001, reads differently. Brown makes the case that the noroeste (northwest) referred to in Crespi’s directional call is actually the bearing from the tributary hollow opening to the bight formed by the Pedro Point Headlands at the south end of the body of water then called San Francisco Bay by the Spanish ship captains. Thus, the hollow between Peralta and Adobe Streets extending to the south of Rosita Road (now the site of Pacifica School District’s Educational Center) appears to meet the diarist’s description of the Portolá campsite in Pacifica. The hollow becomes more of a canyon at its upper end and is now crossed by the signature bridge for Highway 1 that provides access to the Devil’s Slide Bypass Tunnel.

The expedition route from the Pacifica campsite on November 4, 1769, initially “following the beach to the North,” then turns sharply to the right into the mountains following the hollow between ascending ridges, west to east. This is new information found only in Alan Brown’s 2001 translation of Crespi’s journal, which contradicts previous speculation that the expedition route followed the west to east ridgeline from the north end of Pacifica State Beach to its intersection with the main north-south ridge (now called Sweeney Ridge). Consequently, a route that places the right turn of the expedition in the hollow of Rockaway Beach and its entry into the mountains via the ascending valley (or hollow) to the east is supported by Brown’s translation.

Clearly, a steep climb at the eastern end of the hollow was faced by Portolá and his men. An equestrian traveling from the riding stable on the easterly boundary of Pacifica (at the east end of Cape Breton Drive) can experience that today’s horse trail “ascending Sweeney Ridge” is comparably steep. The expedition, then, might well have gained the west to east ridgeline about .4 of a mile east of Cattle Hill, continued 2 miles east via the route of the current Baquiano Trail to Sweeney Ridge and, from the summit, beheld El Grandeoso Estero.

The last campsite to be verified is the one farthest south and was the first stopping-place for the Portolá expedition in San Mateo County (Portolá Camp #1). It was a distinct place in the description of the diarists,
since the expedition campsite was adjacent to a village that surrounded the Casa Grande, an unusual structure big enough to accommodate the 200 or so Ohlones. There are few, if any, diary references to native villages with permanent or significant buildings that the expedition encountered and, thus, the Casa Grande, as well as the pine-woven homes of the residents, were worthy of note.

If the location of the Casa Grande is finally unearthed there will be little doubt as to the campsite’s adjacency. However, previous contemporary location assumptions vary from the mouth of Gazos Creek (where a State Historic Marker once stood) to inland on Whitehouse Creek. Cloverdale Road is also cited as an inland route for the Portolá expedition.

Crespi’s diary provides clues, and one reference, in particular, seems most significant. First, Crespi relates that the Casa Grande village is in “a little valley between hills” and “at the foot of the mountains opposite a gorge.” Given that the expedition’s route had been, according to Costansó, on the “high level land” of the coastal plain above the ocean, Crespi’s reference to the foot of the mountains would seem to confirm an inland village site, and the “gorge” opposite fits well with the prominent canyon of Gazos Creek. The 1909 translation and narration, places Casa Grande as opposite (easterly) of Pigeon Point. Since this observation was, by conjecture, made east to west with a hand compass, magnetic declination of 13 degrees (as observed by Ayala in that epoch), this would place the village somewhat south of true east on today’s topographic maps. A gently sloping valley site at the foot of the hills of Año Nuevo State Reserve with an evident route of the main Whitehouse Creek at the foot of the valley, as well as its position just south of the true east parallel from Pigeon Point, responds well to the array of descriptions that can be extracted from various translations of Crespi’s diary. In particular, this 257-acre site, called Quiroste Valley to commemorate the indigenous tribe that built Casa Grande, was recommended for Cultural Preserve designation by the State Parks and Recreation Commission. Governor Schwarzenegger so proclaimed in 2008 and identified Quiroste Valley as the site of Casa Grande, the important Quiroste Ohlone village that surrounded it and Portolá’s first campsite in what is now San Mateo County. Excavation by an archaeology team from UC Berkeley is now underway in the valley and the unearthing of middens has already verified the village site. Confirmation of Casa Grande’s building site has yet to be announced. From the diaries, we know it was hemispherical and resembled a huge half an orange with the outside downward on the ground.

In addition, Crespi characterizes the next day’s march (October 24, 1769), departing the Casa Grande campsite with Ohlone guides, as “north over a high knoll not far from the seashore” (also confirmed by Costansó’s more cryptic “north over high hill”). A prominent knoll (elevation 627 feet) stands out as visible to the north of the Casa Grande site beyond Gazos Creek. In fact it is the sole knoll to the immediate north and places the expedition’s guided route toward the Pescadero Ohlone village as well within the Cloverdale Ranch property and across “The Mesa” identified on current topographic maps of the area (see page 14).
not visible from Cloverdale Road, and there would seem to be no other rationale for emphasizing the knoll except as gateway to the flat and easily traversed mesa from which watch for the hoped-for supply ship could continue.

Summary

Sufficient terrain references can be found in the translated diaries of Portolá, Crespi and Costansó to place the Portolá expedition’s six campsites along the route of the north-bound passage from the southern tip of San Mateo County at Año Nuevo to the San Francisco Bay Discovery Site just east of Pacifica. Since the campsites provide locational control, it appears possible to conjecture a trail between and to find, in reasonable proximity, a route that takes advantage of existing publically held properties or rights-of-way that could be designated as the continuous Portolá Trail. Attention to access points and parking will be particularly important since a trail of fifty plus miles in length will not lend itself to end-to-end hiking use. Instead, trail access that allows the route to be broken into day walks re-creating the expedition’s progress between campsites can add to its appeal.

In respect to a rough “first cut” Portolá Trail route, some 15.5 miles already exist as improved trails or sidewalks including most of the state-owned Old San Pedro Mountain Road. Twenty-two miles would be combined with the Coastal Trail Route of which over 10 miles is already in service. Nine miles would utilize San Mateo County road rights-of-way. Nine miles would be within properties already owned by Peninsula Open Space Trust or Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District, and 4.5 miles are now within State Parks and Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

The remaining 3 miles will require negotiations for easements with private property owners or entail trail route modifications that would then utilize existing Highway 1 right of way. Mileages are subject to review.

The Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District (MProsD) is in the process of receiving citizen input on its long-range plan. The MProsD ideally qualifies as the “established public jurisdiction dealing with land protection and outdoor recreation” as suggested on page 6. Current boundaries of the MProsD encompass all of San Mateo County south of Pacifica.

The author of this article has presented the concept of a Portolá Trail to the MProsD staff at a public hearing in Half Moon Bay as a citizen comment. Continued advocacy before the MProsD Board is a necessity.

The author suggests that San Mateo County’s historical community, in addition to an overview role, should commit to the tasks necessary to gain local, state and national acceptance of the Portolá Trail designation.

---
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Mapping the Portolá Trail

Fray Crespi’s diary was first edited by his Franciscan superiors seeking brevity. Overtime, his navigational observations and general historical competence have been questioned. Nonetheless, his diary notes are more descriptive than any other source associated with the Portolá expedition. This paper depends upon at least four Crespi translations and editing variations, namely those of Eldredge (1909), Bolton (1927), Stanger and Brown (1969) and Brown (2001), for descriptive information from which campsite locations can be deduced. Although this approach is selecting from several sources, the goal of utilizing the descriptions as a guide to the probable location of campsites and, in between, trail routing has been enhanced as the number of sources was expanded. Moreover, none of the previous translators/editors had in mind a recreation of a Portolá Trail. The basis for the “educated guess” assumptions are therefore annotated for scholarship purposes.

The maps are included so as to provide local orientation for those with interest in Portolá and his expedition. They are also a necessary exhibit if petition is made to include a Portolá Trail within the San Mateo County Trails Plan. According to the County rules, published as part of the Master Trails Plan in 1999, the County will only consider additional trail designations if right of way, easement, or existing public rights of way are made available.

The maps for a proposed 50+ mile Portolá Trail are presented in conventional north (San Francisco Bay Discovery Site) to south order (Año Nuevo State Park). They are of consistent scale and graphic scales are included on several maps themselves. This north to south order is opposite from the direction of Portolá’s initial march and the numbering of the expedition’s camps reflects the northward progress in October and November of 1769. This “educated guess” route, always subject to interpretation, is shown as a continuous yellow line (labeled Portolá 1769 Trail). The tentative, subject to review and adoption, designation of a Portolá Trail route is also intended to be continuous but is shown in multi-colors so that the right of way or easement providers can be readily identified. The maps themselves are a reduction from US Geological Survey quadrangle sheets.

Map 1
Paul Reimer

Paul Reimer is a retired Civil Engineer, native Californian and a resident of the Bay Area for fifty-eight years. He currently resides in Portola Valley. His firm, Reimer Associates, Consulting Civil Engineers, worked with Spanish land grants from Avila Bay in the south through Fort Ord and its vicinity to San Francisco on the north. It is that experience, as well as his residency, that has heightened his interest in the original Portolá Expedition.
Development of Foster City

T. Jack Foster, Jr.

August, 1960, marked the beginning of construction of Foster City. After two years, while the land was under option and we investigated and planned, that month was when the option was exercised, and we hit the ground running. Having determined that an enormous amount of fill was needed, the plan was to move the sand from San Bruno shoals, located under the Bay near San Francisco International Airport. In the mobilization of equipment to this end, two barges were purchased in Utah and cut into pieces and shipped via 86 freight cars to Oakland where they were reassembled. One of the launchings is pictured. In the reassembly, there was a modification to lower the barges so that they could get under the San Mateo bridge without the need to raise the bridge (in those days, the bridge was still a drawbridge). Each barge was large enough to carry 2,000 cubic yards of sand. That is the equivalent to over 100 double gondola truckloads.

Other earth moving equipment was assembled as needed. In three years time the initial map was approved, the land prepared in the first section to the degree that model homes could be built and sales commenced. A year after that, 1964, the first family moved in. Today, in contrast, the issue of development takes longer than that.

Editor's Note

In 2014, T. Jack Foster, Jr., donated a collection of photographs and documents about the development of Foster City to the San Mateo County Historical Association. The images in this photo essay are from both that donation and earlier donations from the Foster Family.

A (l-r) Bob Foster, Dick Foster, T. Jack Foster, Sr. and T. Jack Foster, Jr. look at a plan for Foster City, c. 1961.
The Fosters acquired four square miles of land and transformed it into a new town.

B This aerial of Neighborhood 3 shows fill work just beginning in the pie-shaped area in the lower right, c. 1960.

C Drawn by Michael McDougan in 1961, this early rendering of the city was used extensively in promotions. The plan did change as development continued. Note that the proposed bridge to Ralston Avenue (lower left) was not built.
Bringing in Sand

The mudflats of the site needed to be covered with fill. Two barges for hauling sand were purchased in Salt Lake City. They were disassembled and shipped in 86 freight cars to Oakland where they were reassembled.

D  Gladys Foster christened a reassembled barge with a bottle of champagne in 1960. She is shown with (l-r) T. Jack Foster, Sr., Bob and Caroline Foster and T. Jack, Jr. and Pat Foster. Photo by Herrington Olson Photography.

E  After the barges were launched in Oakland, they carried sand from a deposit near San Francisco International Airport to Foster City. Pictured is one of the barges. Photo by Herrington Olson Photography.

F  The barges had to be redesigned to fit underneath the old San Mateo-Hayward Bridge (upper right) so the drawbridge would not need to be raised. White area on lower right is sand for dredging, 1962.

G  The barges dumped the sand here. When needed, it was available to be dredged for filling, 1962.
Construction

The Fosters purchased the land in 1960. The first house sold in 1963 with the first occupancy in 1964.

H On Island #6, 89 tons of crust-less topsoil need to be moved, 1961.

I Earthmoving equipment at work, 1961.

J In addition to homes, infrastructure such as roads needed to be built. A sprinkler wets roads, 1963.

K (l-r) T. Jack Foster, Sr., T. Jack Foster, Jr. and Bob Foster join paving company executives at the work site, 1963.
Homes

The homes in Foster City were built in many different styles.

L Eichlers under construction, c. 1963. Note the dredge in the background used to bring up the sand the barges had dumped in San Francisco Bay. Photo by Geoff Cook Studios.

M First townhouses built by Kay Homes near Hillsdale Boulevard, c. 1964.

N Custom waterfront home, c. 1964.
Near the Water

Foster City was built on Brewer Island.

O This aerial of Hillsdale Neighborhood #9 shows the water separating it from San Mateo in the background, c. 1966.

P The Twin Bridges at Hillsdale Boulevard was the first bridge from San Mateo, c. 1963.

Q Custom homes on the waterfront at Erckenbrack Park. The park was named for the man who sold the first bonds for Foster City in Seattle.

R T. Jack Foster, Sr. reads the paper on a pontoon boat in front of his home on Goldhunter Court. In front of him is the Captain’s House on Flying Cloud Isle.
Follow the Sailboats

Publicity for Foster City emphasized enjoying an outdoor lifestyle on the waterfront.

S  This advertisement on the Bayshore encouraged people to visit model homes, c. 1963.

T  This publicity picture featured actual residents of Flying Cloud Isle, c. 1964.

U  Potential residents were encouraged to shop at Port of Call Shopping Center and sail home in this publicity picture, c. 1964.

V  Used in advertisements, this publicity picture showed people enjoying outdoor activities from a barbecue to sailing, c. 1964.
The **PUTNAM**
Family of Dealerships
in Burlingame

PUTNAM (49)
YEARS IN BUSINESS

Come to us for All your automotive needs!
650 347-4800

SUBARU  VOLVO  DODGE

CHRYSLER  BUICK  TOYOTA

Cadillac  BUICK  Jeep

MAZDA  FIAT  SCION

NISSAN  FIAT  GMC

CHEVROLET  RAM  LEXUS

THE BAY AREA'S LARGEST
FAMILY OWNED DEALERSHIP GROUP

“Home of the Red Carpet Service since 1965”

www.putnамauto.com
We are proud to support the

SAN MATEO COUNTY HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

We look forward to the significant program of recognitions for the 250th anniversary of the discovery of the San Francisco Bay by the Portola party of 1769.

BOSTON PRIVATE BANK & TRUST COMPANY

BostonPrivateBank.com
Thank You
Redwood General Tire Pros

for your support of the
San Mateo County Historical Association