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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to provide an ethnohistoric and ethnographic assessment of selected contemporary communities along the Old Spanish Trail (OST). Text from the initial study design is provided in this and the next three sections of this chapter. It is important to understand the two levels at which this project is being and will be discussed. There is a larger effort designed to provide data which potentially can be used for in the management of the Old Spanish National Historic Trail, which was placed in National Trails System by an act of Congress in 2002. The current study, however, is limited in scope to a few Hispanic communities who were located along the trail when it was being used for pack-trains between Santa Fe, New Mexico and Los Angeles, California.

Findings from this study will be used by various federal agencies to manage cultural and natural resources in an effective and culturally informed manner. Federal agencies engaged in planning actions often require that historic, ethnohistoric and/or ethnographic analysis be conducted. These studies are conducted to provide a context within which agencies can identify and assess important resources within the study area. The key to these assessments is determining the social and cultural values placed on specific sites or resources within the study area by members of communities that have an affiliation with the project area. The results of this study will be used for the following purposes:
1. To craft management policies or actions that serve to preserve or protect important resources and provide accurate interpretation of these resources to the general public.

2. To identify and evaluate sensitive issues related to the OST. An assessment of these community based issues will inform trail planners and help in the development and implementation of culturally appropriate resource management strategies.

3. To identify and evaluate community requests for access to culturally significant places or resources (both natural and cultural), and to identify resources that require special management treatment and assess potential impacts on these resources in the face of proposed cooperating agency actions.

4. To identify places on or near the trail that may meet eligibility requirements to be listed with the National Register of Historic Places as Traditional Cultural Properties (TCP) or as regular historic properties.

1.1 Old Spanish Trail Plan

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and the National Park Service (NPS) are developing a comprehensive management plan and environmental impact statement (EIS) for the Old Spanish National Historic Trail, in accordance with the National Trails System Act (P.L. 90-543, October 2, 1968, as amended). The Old Spanish National Historic Trail was added to the National Trails System Act by Public Law 107-325 on December 4, 2002. The Secretary of Interior designated the BLM and the NPS as joint administering agencies for the trail in 2003.

The purpose of the comprehensive management plan will be to establish the administrative objectives, policies, processes, and management actions needed to fulfill the preservation and public use goals of the Old Spanish National Historic Trail. The plan will be comprehensive in nature, and will address and resolve issues along the Old Spanish National Historic Trail that are identified through agency and interagency discussions, public scoping efforts, and through studies such as the one described here.

1.2 Background to the Old Spanish Trail Comprehensive Plan

The Old Spanish National Historic Trail commemorates the overland trade route between the far northern Mexican provinces of New Mexico and Alta California. It includes over 2,700 miles of trail alignments through New Mexico, Colorado, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, and California, connecting Santa Fe with Los Angeles. Between 1829 and 1848, the OST was the primary land route between the two provincial outposts of Santa Fe and Los Angeles. During these years, it was used extensively by Mexican and American traders who traded New Mexico woolen goods for California-bred horses and mules. The establishment of the OST enhanced Santa Fe’s position as the hub of an overland continental trade network that linked American and Mexican markets through the Santa Fe Trail (western Missouri to Santa Fe), El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro (Central Mexico to Santa Fe) and the OST (Santa Fe to southern California).
The trail was used by members of Hispanic communities in northern New Mexico, southern Colorado, and southern California, and by entrepreneurs drawn to the interior of the West from Mexico and the eastern United States. The lands it crossed were occupied by small settlements of primarily Hispanic and Native American origin, and used as sustaining territories by a number of Native American tribes for many centuries. Hispanic settlements at the eastern and western ends of the trail were established from the 1600s through the 1800s. Anglo populations began to enter the country in significant numbers only shortly before the trail was blazed. The trail corridor crosses lands of interest to rural populations, Native American sovereign nations, and communities and municipalities ranging in size from small hamlets to the metropolitan areas of greater Los Angeles, California, and Las Vegas, Nevada. Some of these communities hold ancestral affiliation to the lands crossed by the trail, some are connected to the trail through the presence of descendant populations (populations descended from trail users of the early 19th century, as well as populations descended from communities in place during the period of trail significance), and some are associated with the trail through the historical development of transportation networks only tangentially linked to the OST commercial enterprise of the early 19th century. The economic and historic interests of each of these populations must be assessed and evaluated independently.

California emigration and colonization from New Mexico by Hispanic and Anglo settlers was also a notable activity that occurred on the trail. Many early settlers in California came by way of the OST. One community, Agua Mansa, near present day Riverside and San Bernardino, was settled in the 1830s entirely by emigrants from New Mexico who had traveled over the OST.

After the U.S. cession of the American Southwest in 1848, other routes to California increased in importance, and the OST faded in significance and use. Portions of it, particularly along its western half, were used by Mormon travelers to southern California, and military exploratory expeditions were known to follow portions of its eastern half to reach the Great Basin.

1.3 The Hispanic Communities Study

The overall objective of this study is to compile the ethnohistory and contemporary perspectives of selected historically connected Hispanic communities that were affected by the OST. The project can be divided into two parts: 1) a brief history of each community under study and its historic relationship to the OST, and 2) a description of contemporary community views of the trail. Of special interest will be any contemporary knowledge related to the role played by the trail (and/or events related to the trail’s history and use) that affected the history and perspective of each community. Also of interest will be any places or resources along the trail that have significant cultural meaning to the subject communities. Specifically, the objectives of the study are to provide:

1. A historic or ethnohistoric profile of the communities selected for the study. These profiles will focus on those elements of history that provide a description of the relationship between the communities and the trail;
2. An analysis of each community’s oral history and contemporary ties to the OST. Information on contemporary perspectives can be obtained through interviews with selected community leaders or by other means deemed appropriate by the principal investigator.

3. An identification of places of significant ethnographic importance linked to the trail and still considered significant by the selected communities. Emphasis should be placed on properties that have the potential to be significant enough to warrant additional work for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Place of significant ethnographic importance are referred to as “Traditional Cultural Properties.”

4. The period of significance for this ethnohistoric and ethnographic assessment is the period between 1829 and 1849. Information related to the OST before and after this period is important and should be reported to provide appropriate historic and cultural context. However, the major focus of the scope of work is the period between 1829 and 1849.

1.4 Study Communities

The selected communities targeted by this project are intended to sample the range of ethnic, geographic, and historically-connected populations along the trail routes. These include Hispanic communities associated with the development of the trail, communities founded by emigrant populations known to have used sections of the trail as migration routes in the 19th century, communities that were established to support trail trade, and communities that were founded along the trail after its period of historic use. The following communities participated in this study (see Map 1.2):

**New Mexico**

Abiquiú
Gallina

**Colorado**

San Luis (in San Luis Valley)

**California**

Agua Mansa
San Gabriel
This list is not exhaustive in terms of the number of Hispanic settlements and communities directly or indirectly affected by the establishment and use of the OST. People interviewed during this study pointed to the communities of Coyote, Youngsville, La Cienega and Cañones, New Mexico and Vacaville and San Luis Obispo, California as places that have been affected by trail establishment and trail traffic. Other communities which respondents felt were possibly affected by the OST include Davis, Fairfield, New Almaden, San Juan Bautista and San Diego, California. The sample of communities involved in this study, however, does provide useful insights into the lasting effects that the trail has had on Hispanic settlement patterns across the Southwest.

1.5 Summary of Interviews

Appropriate historical and community oriented entities such as the San Bernardino County Museum – Agua Mansa Branch, and the San Gabriel Mission Museum, Colorado Chapter of the Old Spanish Trail Association, and the San Luis Museum and Cultural Center were contacted in order to assist in identifying local people who are knowledgeable about community history and the OST. Once these organizations identified community members, the
UofA team contacted the individuals and separate trips to each community were organized. The trips were designed to be two day visits to each community with the requirement that a minimum of two people be interviewed per community. A breakdown of the interviews is provided in Table 1.1. A total of sixteen interviews have occurred. An attempt was made to balance the interviews by gender because knowledge is not often distributed equally. However, in some communities only certain groups were active in retaining and preserving cultural and historical knowledge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abiquiú</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallina</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agua Mansa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1 Number of Interviews per Community

1.6 The BARA Research Methodology

For this project we have adopted a similar methodological approach that we used with our American Indian projects. Our research involves the use of mixed methods (Tashakkori and Teddlie 1998; Beebe 2001) and triangulation (Campbell and Fisk 1959). The mixed methods approach involves collecting qualitative and quantitative data, and where there is convergence, confidence in the findings grows considerably (Jick 1979). As part of our mixed methods approach, we have developed seven survey instruments that have been used at various times during the past twenty years. All survey instruments used by our research team have been developed with the assistance of official tribal representatives and these forms have been approved by participating tribal governments. These forms have been successfully used and adapted for various projects with Native Americans across the United States and with traditional Scandinavian fishers in the Great Lakes region.

For this project, we worked with the assumption that members of these Hispanic communities have deep cultural connections to places along the trail in addition to their settlements. We developed a survey instrument that looks at traditional use, meaning, and connections of a place and how these factors were impacted by movement along the OST (see Appendix A). This instrument is similar to the form used in the American Indian study in that incorporates questions from the BARA Site and Cultural Landscapes Forms and is divided into three sections. The first section has questions pertaining to site use history and types of ethnographic resources, such as water, plants, animals, minerals, landforms, and archaeological remains. This section also includes questions regarding impacts to the place and its resources which was the result of the presence of non-Indian travelers. The second section of the form has questions pertaining to the site’s relationship to other areas and how they are connected—local landscapes. Like the section on use and meaning, there are also questions focusing on OST related impacts. The landscape impact questions are meant to examine how trail traffic impacted the interconnectedness and relationships of places and people. The last section guides the interview from a localized place specific discussion of the OST to a broader frame in order to
understand how the trail and trail traffic impacted members of the Hispanic community as a whole.

Experienced ethnographers administer these forms in a private session with community experts. The interviews are kept private in order to allow people to speak freely without fear of reprisals, and to ensure that all individual viewpoints are collected without a dominant voice overriding the others. After these viewpoints are collected, they are analyzed, drafted into a report, and submitted to the interviewee for review prior to final publication. Through this process, the individual voices reach agreement that the report represents a community perspective. The interviews were recorded and transcribed into a database for accuracy and comparative analysis.

Additionally archival research was conducted at the San Bernardino County Library and the Diocese of San Bernardino Archives. This archival research provided valuable information pertaining to the communities of Agua Mansa and San Gabriel.

1.6.1 Research Team Qualifications

Richard Stoffle, P.I.

Dr. Stoffle is a senior research anthropologist at BARA. Dr. Stoffle has worked on American Indian environmental issues since 1976, when he participated in the first American Indian social impact assessment in the United States. This project was for an Environmental Impact Study of the Devers-Palo Verde Power-Line proposed to run from the Buckeye Atomic power plant near Phoenix, Arizona to the Palo Verde substation of Southern California Edison in California. Since that first study, Dr. Stoffle has worked successfully with more than a hundred American Indian tribes and most federal agencies to represent Indian environmental issues in land management decisions. Dr. Stoffle has a record of scholarly publications and research reports, which are available on request. Recent articles that reflect his current scholarly partnerships with Indian people (Stoffle, 2000; Stoffle, et al. 2008) His most recent co-edited book (Stoffle, Zedeño and Halmo 2001) is a model of long-term research and consultation with Numic-speaking tribes and organizations in Nevada, California, Utah, and Arizona.

Rebecca Toupal

Dr. Toupal is an Assistant Research Scientist at BARA. Since 1987, she has worked on natural resource management issues with landowners, agencies, and tribal groups in the western U.S. She has degrees in range management, landscape architecture, and natural resource management. Since 1998, she has focused on human-nature relationships and cultural landscapes. Her publications include articles on conservation partnerships (High Plains Applied Anthropologist), the use of ethnography with geographic information systems (Environmental Science and Policy), and the identification of cultural landscapes to understand natural resource management impacts (Conservation Ecology, now Ecology and Society).
Jessica Medwied-Savage

Miss Medwied-Savage is an honors undergraduate majoring in Anthropology and Spanish at the University of Arizona. She has worked with BARA as an undergraduate Research Assistant since 2006 on federally funded projects to address Native American and Hispanic concerns in the western United States.

Sean O’Meara

Mr. O’Meara received a B.A. in History from the University of Arizona. He has worked with BARA as a Research Assistant since 2007 on federally-funded projects to address Native American and Hispanic concerns in the western United States.

Kathleen Van Vlack

Miss Van Vlack is a Ph.D. student in the American Indian Studies Program at the University of Arizona. She has a B.A. in Anthropology, and a Master’s in American Indian Studies, both from UA. Her Master’s thesis focused on the traditional leadership system of the Southern Paiute Nation. She has worked with BARA as a Research Assistant for six years, as an undergraduate and graduate student, on federally-funded projects to address Native American concerns in the western United States, and Bahamian concerns in the Caribbean.

Henry F. Dobyns

Dr. Dobyns is a noted anthropologist and ethnohistorian. Throughout his career, he has worked on topics addressing Native American and Spanish relations and borderlands issues and is considered by many an expert in this area. He has contributed dozens of essays, which have expanded our understanding of Spanish borderlands. He has written a history of Peru and was in-country field director of the famous Cornell Peru Project. He is a recognized expert on traditional American Indian culture and the cultural and environmental changes, which have resulting from their contact with European society. Dobyns is the former President of the Society for American Ethnohistory and a lifetime member of the Arizona Historical Society.

---

Heather Fauland

Ms. Fauland received a B.A. in Anthropology from the University of Arizona. She worked with BARA as an undergraduate Research Assistant from 2005-2007 on federally-funded projects to address Native American and Hispanic concerns in the western United States and Bahamian concerns in the Caribbean.

1.7 Report Structure

The following seven chapters provide readers with important historical and ethnographic contexts of the OST and its relationships with the five communities involved in this study. The analysis is divided by specific communities with each receiving its individual chapter. Each of the community chapters describes community history with the OST, geological and ecological information and the impacts of the trail on the Hispanic people.

Chapter two of the report, written by Dr. Henry Dobyns, provides an analysis of the route taken by Antonio Armijo. This analysis offers a new perspective on what can be considered the first route taken by Mexican traders from Abiquiú to the Mission at San Gabriel. Following this chapter are the five community chapters. Chapter Three focuses on the start of the trail in Abiquiú and is followed by the communities of, Agua Mansa, San Gabriel, San Luis and Gallina.

When deciding the placement of these communities in this report, the UofA team was confronted with the non-linear nature of the communities on the trail. The two predominate issues concerning the community’s founding dates and their locations on the three branches of the OST. Gallina is on the southern or Armijo branch. Abiquiú is on the southern and middle branch. San Luis is on the northern branch. Agua Mansa and San Gabriel are on all three. The UofA team believes that the placement of Abiquiú, Agua Mansa and San Gabriel as the first three of the community chapters is representative of the main route followed by the majority of the OST caravans. San Luis and Gallina are placed at the end of the report because of their later founding dates and their alternate branch locations. These last two communities also help to contextualize the lasting effects of the OST and provide a clear example of inter-migration between people Hispanic settlers between all of the communities on the trail.

The final chapter in this report lists, by community, the recommendations made by participants in this study, as well as recommendations for future studies.
Chapter Two
Re-examination of Armijo’s Route

Antonio Armijo undertook the first commercial caravan from New Mexico to California along what would become the Old Spanish Trail on November 7, 1829. This trip marked the beginning of twenty years of bi-annual trade caravans who sought to bring woolen goods from New Mexico in exchange for horses in California. The route taken by Armijo’s first journey has been documented and analyzed in the Hafens’ *Old Spanish Trail: Santa Fe to Los Angeles* (1954). However, a rereading of Armijo’s diary with new insights provides a different interpretation of Armijo’s route as asserted by Hafen and Hafen. The following chapter analyzes the difficulties in reconstructing the route between New Mexico and southern California taken by the Antonio Armijo expedition in 1829-30 and provides updated maps\(^1\) to orient the reader and illustrate the route we believe Armijo’s expedition followed.

While providing a new interpretation of Armijo’s route, this analysis discusses the many difficulties in determining the location of historic trails, especially as place names and landscapes have changed. As the OST was further developed and utilized, deviations to the route may have emerged as a result of impacts to areas frequented by travelers and as travelers became more familiar with the terrain. Thus while the middle branch of the OST is considered the main route used for commercial traffic during the 1829-1849 period, it may be more accurate to view the area traveled by traders from New Mexico to California as a trail corridor, that is a larger and more fluid route, rather than a single, specific trail. This would also allow for a discussion of sites and areas that were impacted by OST travelers but which are not located directly on the current, recognized trail.

For the purposes of reconstructing the route (Map 2.1) that Antonio Armijo’s expedition took in 1829-30, the journey between Abiquiú and Mission San Gabriel can be divided into three sections: 1) From Abiquiú to the Crossing of the Fathers and the ford across the Colorado River at Glen Canyon, 2) From the Crossing of the Fathers to the point where the expedition left the lower Colorado River, 3) The upland arid section between Mission San Gabriel and that point where the expedition left the lower Colorado River.

### 2.1 Propositions

We employ several general propositions in this analysis. Spaniards/Mexicans riding horse or muleback typically watered their mounts as regularly as possible. This usually meant that such travelers or explorers followed watercourses with surface flows. Crossing terrain lacking surface flows of water, Spaniards/Mexicans (typically following Native American guides) tried to travel as directly as possible from spring to spring. The Armijo

---

\(^1\) The Maps accompanying this chapter can be viewed at 300% for optimal detail. The dotted green lines mark the route as we believe it to have occurred. Red and light green dotted lines mark the currently accepted route.
expedition plainly traveled in this manner between the lower Colorado River and San Gabriel Mission.

Riding horses or mules and leading a pack train, the New Mexicans preferred smooth terrain to slopes, avoiding steep slopes when they could. Given the mountainous terrain between the Rio Grande and the Pacific Ocean, they could not avoid climbing and descending.

2.1.1 Data

The Armijo expedition traveled from the Mancos River confluence with the San Juan River to the Crossing of the Fathers in 15 days. The distance between these two locations is 150 miles. Therefore, the expedition moved on the average of ten miles per day across high altitude steppe cut by incised canyons with significant mountain ranges.

The Armijo expedition traveled the entire distance from Abiquiú to San Gabriel in 86 days, including 12 days of rest. It departed Abiquiú on November 7, 1829 and reached San Gabriel on January 31, 1830.
Map 2.1 Overview of Armijo’s Route with Specific Dates
Map 2.2 The Route from Abiquiú to the Crossing of the Fathers
2.2 Eastern Section: From Abiquiú to the Crossing of the Fathers
30 days—7 Nov. to 6 December (Map 2.2)

7 Nov – Depart Abiquiú, reach Rio Puerco, Pig or Dirty River (Hafen and Hafen 1954: 159).

Dominguez & Escalante ascended the Chama River box canon for a league, then crossed 3 ½ leagues of rocky ground, took a siesta near a dry arroyo on the north side of the Valley of Piedra Alumbre. Then two more leagues, for 7 total – c. a. 18.5 miles (Domínguez 1956: 5). The Armijo expedition took a westerly rather than northerly course.

8 Nov – Layover

9 Nov – Arroyo del Agua

Oral history places the expedition at modern Gallina. The modern Río Gallina would be Armijo’s Arroyo de Agua. The expedition traveled 8+ miles this day.

Velez turned north through wooden canyon, viewed upper Arroyo de Canjilon, rested at Rio de la Cebolla; rode 3 leagues to Río de Las Nutrias (Domínguez 1776: 5-6).

10 Nov – Capulín (Choke cherry)

The expedition rode west 3+ miles, turned south 1+ mile to avoid hogbacks, and veered northwest 6+ miles to the Capulín uplands, nearly on the modern road route. This place name persists.

11 Nov – Cañada Larga, and eastside tributary of Cañon Largo; water

We think that the expedition traveled 6+ miles this day. This place name persists.

12 Nov – At the mouth of Cañon Largo

Traveled 6+ miles. This entry refers to the mouth of the main cañon, where Cañon Largo joins near modern Lindreth Pumping Station and modern lakes, about 10+ miles from the head of Cañada Larga.

13 Nov – Still at the mouth of Cañon Largo – layover

14 Nov – Lake of Cañon Largo; Navajo settlement

This “lake” was likely a beaver pond affording the Navajos a copious water supply. After 1830, erosion arguably destroyed it. The expedition traveled at least 10 miles northwest via a very tortuous cañon.
At 5+ miles from the mouth of Cañon Largo, the expedition passed a west side tributary shown on modern maps as Palluche Wash. This is an alternate spelling of Payuche, Armijo’s label for Paiutes. This suggests a Numic salient toward the east of later Paiute residence as Navajo forced them westward.

15 Nov – San Juan River; The expedition forded to the north side.

The Armijo diary entries concerning Cañada Largo are apparently confusing. The Hafens stated that the expedition required four days to traverse it (Hafen and Hafen 1954: 165). Actually, Armijo traveled only two days from the confluence of Cañada Largo with Cañon Largo to the confluence of the San Juan River with Cañon Largo. The expedition traveled at least 38 miles along the Cañada Largo and Cañon Largo (Map 2.3).

Map 2.3 Armijo’s Route along Cañon Largo to the San Juan River
Our postulate concerning travel along surface flowing streams is supported by contemporary practice and oral history. In the nineteenth century, the federal government forced Jicarilla Apaches onto a reservation in northwestern New Mexico. The southern portion of that reservation includes the headwaters of both Cañada Largo and Cañón Largo. A Jicarilla Apache rancher holding some 1,400 acres recounted that ethnic oral history identifies the cañon as the route of the Old Spanish Trail. Moreover, that the trail along the creek at the bottom of the cañon continues to be used by sheep owners. Shepards drive sheep up the cañon/creek in the spring to higher altitude summer pastures, then drive the sheep down the cañon/creek in the fall to lower altitude winter pastures.

This pattern of sheep management historically has been quite widespread in the Southwestern United States. The role that the Cañón Largo catchment plays in the northwestern New Mexico portion of the greater system attests to the power of the geographic feature in funneling animal travel across the greater landscape.

16 Nov – Layover

17 Nov – Animas River confluence

The expedition traveled at least 11 miles this day.

18 Nov – Springs on bank of Río Plata

The expedition traveled at least 2 miles this day.

19 Nov – Mancos River confluence (San Lázaro)

Armijo had diverged from the Dominguez-Velez route, being downstream on the Mancos whereas the Franciscans were at the headwaters. Armijo traveled at least 21 miles this day in a tortuous cañon.

20 Nov – Layover (See Map 2.4 for San Juan River Crossing)

21 Nov – At San Juan River again

The expedition passed near the Four Corners (where Arizona, New Mexico, Utah and Colorado adjoin each other). The expedition spent four days descending the San Juan River (with two rest days). Next, it arguably exited the San Juan River Canyon via Toadastone Wash, but followed it for only a short distance before turning south-southwest toward Teek Nos Pos. The Hafens wrote that the expedition crossed Chinle Creek and continued westward to Paiute Creek (Hafen and Hafen 1954: 165).
22 Nov – Carrizo Mountains Spring

Armijo’s diary labels the mountains here as “Navajo Mountain.” What is now called Navajo Mountain (more accurately, Paiute Mountain) is located approximately 75 miles farther west overlooking Glen Canyon on the South Rim. The Hafen and Hafen map consequently shows the expedition’s route more or less straight west from the Four Corners, whereas it in fact looped some distance to the south in order to circle around, if not cross over, the Carrizo Mountains to visit a Navajo settlement and water livestock.
from a surface flowing stream. We estimate that the expedition traveled at least 15 miles this day.

23 Nov – Blackhorse Creek (southward flowing)

Blackhorse Creek is the river that comes down the other side of Navajo Mountain. The expedition traded with Navajos living along this stream, and hired a Navajo guide for 9 mares.

At least two routes through or around the Carrizo Mountains were available. One would have ascended Teek Nos Pos Canyon to Pastora Peak, crossing the summit to Blackhorse Creek on the southern slope. This required climbing perhaps 2,000-3,000 feet (traveling 21+ miles). The other possible route curved east of the mountains more or less via the route of modern U. S. Highway 64, then curved southwest across the bajada slope to Blackhorse Creek, a distance of at least 23 miles, which, despite being slightly longer, avoided the climb past Pastora Peak. In accordance with our postulate, we conclude that the expedition took the longer but more level path around the mountains.

24 Nov – Hasbidito Creek

From Blackhorse Creek the expedition swung westward across the southern portion of the Carrizo Mountains, perhaps via Cove Mesa to Escondido (Hidden Spring). Arguably this site is now referred to as Hasbidito Spring on Hasbitidito Creek in recent terminology.

If the expedition crossed the mountain, it descended Blackhorse Creek far enough to turn almost due west across Cove Mesa in order to cross a mountain pass, where minerals were mined in historic times, and to strike Hasbidito Creek and descend it. Traveled 21+ miles.

25 Nov – Chelli Creek Canyon (not Canyon de Chelly)

Traveled 16+ miles.

26 Nov – Layover, perhaps at Rock Point (Map 2.5)

27 Nov – At rock artesenales [Rock art? Petroglyphs?]

From Rock Point to Laguna Creek at or near Dennehotso would require traveling 20+ miles.

28 Nov – Lake in mountain pass of Las Lemitas -- following Laguna Creek.

Dennehotso to Church Rock via Laguna Creek required 18+ miles travel.

29 Nov – Water holes of el Cuervo (Crow)
Map 2.5 The Two Possible Routes through the Carizo Mountains to Rock Point

30 Nov – Waterholes of Payuchos (Paiutes)

The expedition hand carried baggage down and up canyon walls: arguably Tsegi Canyon veering northwestward (Map 2.6).

The mouth of Tsegi Canyon required 18+ miles travel from Church Rock passing modern Kayenta.

1 Dec – Lake Las Milpitas (Little maize fields); the expedition worked its way down canon.
The expedition would have turned westward to climb out of the Tsegi Canyon to Little Salt Canyon. Next it would have followed the route of the modern road across the plateau and then would have crossed Begashibito Wash to upper Navajo Creek at about Inscription House Ruin, traveling 20+ miles.

2 Dec– Picacho Springs; the expedition reconnoitered.

This spring would have been located in the southern portion of the mountains.
3 Dec– Navajo Creek; Craggy Canyon down grade and up grade on trail of “Padres.” Expeditionaries carry baggage again.

Actually, the Dominguez-Velez expedition did not pass this way, having made straight south from the Crossing of the Fathers to the Hopi Pueblos. The Armijo expedition would have moved due west to the headwaters of Navajo Creek.

4 Dec– Stopped (Map 2.7)

5 Dec– At the south rim of Glen Canyon at the edge of the mesa without water

From Inscription House to the south rim would require 30+ miles of downgrade travel, but twists and turns would lengthen the distance.

6 Dec– At the ford immediately downstream from the Crossing of the Fathers steps

The expedition tests the ford. The expedition descended from the south rim to the Colorado River in a single day. The distance would be 20+ miles downhill (Map 2.8 and photograph in Herbert E. Bolton’s monograph).

7 Dec – Layover day

8 Dec– The expedition paused and “repaired the upgrade of the canyon” worked by the Franciscan Fathers (Hafen and Hafen 1954: 160).
Map 2.7 The Trail along Navajo Creek
Map 2.8 Armijo’s Route to the Crossing of the Fathers
Map 2.9 Armijo’s Route from the Crossing of the Fathers to Las Vegas Creek
2.3 Central Section: From the Crossing of the Fathers to the Colorado River Confluence with Las Vegas Creek
30 days - 9 Dec - 8 Jan (Map 2.9)

This is the most difficult section of the Armijo expedition’s route to reconstruct.

9 Dec– The expedition climbed toward north rim of Glen Canyon via White Canyon (white wall).

We estimate that the expedition traveled 8 to 10 miles uphill.

The Hafens mapped the expedition’s exodus from Glen Canyon as going west down the Colorado River and then ascending Wahweap Canyon. The diary does not mention descending the river. We consider lower Paria Canyon to be too deeply and steeply incised to permit its use for climbing out of Glen Canyon. We conclude that the Hafen and Hafen map is incorrect.

The diary records the expedition’s immediate climb from the Colorado River at Crossing of the Fathers. Last Chance Creek and Canyon is almost directly north of the Crossing. Moreover, the white wall on the western flank of Last Chance Canyon is so conspicuous here that it is labeled as such (White Rocks) on the DeLorme Utah map. The correlation between Armijo’s terminology and the color of lower Last Chance Canyon rather conclusively confirms this as the location where the expedition actually exited Glen Canyon.

10 Dec– Red slope or Red ridge (the brief time spent climbing also militates against the expedition’s exiting via Wahweap Canyon). Payuches settlement.

The expedition climbed from white wall to red wall along Last Chance Canyon. Southern Paiutes were evidently gardening on the canyon bottom with stream flow irrigation. We estimate that the expedition traveled at least 8 miles this day.

11 Dec– To creek in Red Canyon

The stream may have sunk into gravelly fill in the lower portion of Last Chance Canyon, but flowed on the surface upstream. We estimate that the expedition traveled at least 8 miles this day, following Last Chance Creek, and not Dry Canyon nor Reese Canyon.

12 Dec– North Rim of Glen Canyon – dry plateau camp. Tree covered “ridge.”

The expedition reached the Kaiparowits Plateau in four days climbing, gaining considerable altitude, and traveling a significant distance northward. The Hafens’ text does not mention this portion of trip (Hafen and Hafen 1954: 166). We estimate that the expedition traveled about 5 miles this day.
13 Dec– At Colorado Pueblo, no water. The expedition used snow.

Probably “red pueblo” was a prehistoric Puebloan ruin constructed with red rocks. Arguably this ruin was located about 10 miles upstream from the North Rim of Glen Canyon in Paradise Canyon.

14 Dec– Carnero (ram) Creek. First stream.

Arguably near the source of Wahweap Creek’s west fork about 10 miles from Colorado Pueblo. The route went 2+ miles northwest via Paradise Canyon, then 6+ miles more or less due west across the plateau to upper Wahweap Creek (Map 2.10).
An alternate but longer path went up Paradise Creek virtually to its source, then turned west for three miles to upper Wahweap Creek.

15 Dec– Agua de la Vieja – Old Woman Water

Some earlier analysts have equated Agua de la Vieja with Pipe Springs in the Arizona Strip. Exiting Glen Canyon via Last Chance Creek, the Armijo expedition was considerably north of the latitude of Pipe Springs. This was the second water reached in Utah. The Hafens wrote that the expedition took 3 days (from an unidentified point) to reach Paria Creek, then 3 more days to reach Kanab Creek (Hafen and Hafen 1954: 166). We think the expedition descended Wahweap Creek for 8+ miles to the confluence of Blue Wash, and then turned west another mile to a southward flowing tributary.

16 Dec– Coyote plain – waterless campsite

We think that the expedition traveled west for 1 ½ mile, crossed Cottonwood Canyon and went 4 ½ miles via Butler Valley to the head of Round Valley Draw.

17 Dec– Caloso (Limestone) Canyon – water holes

We correlate Rock Springs with these “water holes” inferring that the expedition traveled this day 7+ miles from Round Valley Draw.

18 Dec– Layover, reconnaissance

The exploration’s pause suggests that the relatively short distances traversed the previous days indicated that the travelers did not really know where they should go.

19 Dec– Stinking Water Canyon; permanent water supply. Third water/stream encountered.

Arguably modern upper Paria River, 5+ miles from Rock Spring, reached by descending Dry Valley Creek for 5 miles.

20 Dec– At Severo River – Fourth Stream

Arguably the expedition never crossed the northward flowing headwaters of the East Fork of the Sevier River, the massif on which it rises and flows militating against any east-west crossing. Instead, the expedition ascended Sheep Creek for about 1 mile, and then took Bull Valley Gorge for 5+ miles northwest to Papoose Creek.

Papoose Creek rises on the south side of the high plateau on which the East Fork of the Sevier River originates and flows northward. It is not inconceivable, therefore, that Armijo took proximity to the Sevier River to justify referring to Papoose Creek the Sevier (if he knew from oral tradition of the Dominguez-Velez expedition or later New Mexico explorations that the Sevier River in fact was across the divide).
21 Dec– Layover and reconnaissance

Another day’s exploration suggests that the expedition did not really know exactly where it was or where to advance.

22 Dec– Milpas [Maize field] River – Fifth stream

Again, the expedition saw Southern Paiute irrigated maize fields. Arguably these maize fields were on the southward flowing Podunk Creek. From Papoose Creek, Armijo started southwestward across the bajada slope to more or less the same elevation, traversed by the modern vehicle road, and traveled 1 mile to Podunk Creek (Map 2.11).
23 Dec– Calabacillas (Little Wild Squash) Arroyo

The Spanish word does not necessarily include the concept wild, unless this was New Mexico colloquialism. The plants might have been Paiute cultivars. Given how laconic Armijo was, this reference indicates that the plants impressed him, arguably suggesting at least subsurface irrigation of the distinctive plants. Arguably, the squash were growing along the west fork – Thompson Creek – of Johnson Canyon. The expedition traversed an estimated 12+ miles from Podunk Creek across uplands.

24 Dec– Beyond Milpas River again – Sixth stream

We think that the expedition traveled 11+ miles this day, from the west fork of Johnson Canyon along or near the modern road route past Bald Knob to lower Sink Valley Wash, down that drainage to upper Kanab Creek and about one mile farther “beyond” this Maizefield River (i.e., Kanab Creek).

25 Dec– Hit Servero River for the second time – Seventh stream

In view of the fairly clear geography of the lower reaches of this stream, it was not the Sevier, but the Virgin. We infer that the expedition struck the East Fork after skirting Bryce Canyon on the south. The Hafens placed the expedition this day near Littlefields, Arizona, which is rather far downstream to be feasible (Hafen and Hafen 1954: 167). The Hafens’ text is thus quite inconsistent with the Hafens’ map. Arguably, the expedition struck the East Fork on the Virgin River at or near modern Glendale. The decent into the river valley from the east is precipitous and dangerous even on the contemporary four-wheel drive vehicle road.

26 Dec– Follow this “Servero” River downstream

The expedition traveled 16+ miles downstream along the Virgin River to the confluence with Meadow Creek.

27 Dec– The expedition met natives wearing (shell) rings through their noses; following the “Severo” River downstream.

We estimate the expedition traveled 20+ miles to about Willow Springs, passing the site of modern Rockville.

28 Dec– Following this “Severo” River downstream

Expedition traveled 20+ miles, passing the confluence with the North Fork of the Virgin River, the sites of modern Verkin and Hurricane.

29 Dec– Pass slough in this “Severo” River
We estimate the expedition traveled 20+ miles down the Virgin River, passing its confluence with the Santa Clara River, and site of modern St. George (probable slough location).

30 Dec—Following this “Severo” River downstream

Jedediah Smith had a “difficult” time descending the Virgin River downstream from later St. George, traveling in the riverbed through a “rough” canyon (Morgan 1953: 198).

31 Dec—Following this “Severo” River downstream

We estimate the expedition made another 20+ miles this day. Passing the confluence of Muddy River with the Virgin and going some 6 miles south along the Virgin.

1 Jan 1830—Again reach Rio Grande; Rafael Rivera went missing on an individual exploration

This “Severo” River the expedition followed downstream for 6+ days was the Virgin River. Compare Jedediah Smith’s description of this descent of that stream. Smith took 10 days to descend the Virgin River (his Adams River), from its confluence with Ash Creek to its confluence with the Colorado River.

2 Jan—Descend Rio Grande via “rugged trail.”

3 Jan—travel downstream along Rio Grande

Travel along the entrenched Colorado River would necessarily have been relatively slow.

4 Jan—Layover and reconnaissance


6 Jan—Yerba del Manso Arroyo, and reconnaissance

Yerba del Manso appears to be the phreatophyte, indicating an abundant water supply, subterranean if not surface.

7 Jan—Encamped; Rivera rejoined the expedition, having seen the ford where he crossed the “Río Grande” the previous year. He saw Cuchas Payuches and Hayatas.

The Ford River revisited was necessarily that in Mojave Valley. The Cuchas Payuches were Chemehuevi. On the face of the text, the Hayatas would have been Mojaves, but the diary later places Hayatas on then western slope of the Coast Range.
Was there in 1830 a colony of Mojave traders at the western edge of the Mojave Desert on the multi-tribal trade route?

The Hafens placed the pack train at the mouth of Las Vegas Wash, (Hafen and Hafen 1954: 167) which emptied into the Colorado River downstream from the Virgin-Muddy River confluence with the main stream.

8 Jan – Encamp; layover and reconnaissance
Map 2.12 The Route from Las Vegas Creek to San Gabriel Mission
2.4 Western or Desert Section: From the Las Vegas Creek Confluence with the Colorado River to San Gabriel Mission
23 days – 9 Jan- 31 Jan (Map 2.12)

9 Jan – Salado Arroyo (Saline wash)

10 Jan – Dry Lake

12 Jan – Pass without water

Did the expedition unknowingly miss Mountain Spring in the Spring Mountains, with its Indian village (Steiner 1999: 153)?


Map 2.14 The Trail through Stump Springs

14 Jan – Paiute River; saw Paiute village. The Hafens identified the stream as the Amargosa River (Hafen and Hafen 1954: 167, 168).

15 Jan – Down the same river
16 Jan – Confluence with Alkali River – Salitrosa


Map 2.15 The Trail through Salt Creek near Salt Springs and Dumont Dunes

18 Jan – Miracle Lake. Lake Mud or Red Pass Lake, 6 miles north of Bitter springs (Hafen and Hafen 1954: 167) (Map 2.16).
Map 2.16 The Trail near Red Pass Lake

19 Jan – Malpais spring, later Bitter Spring, near a hill covered with lava (Steiner 1999: 182; Hafen and Hafen 1954: 168) (Map 2.17).

20 Jan – A day’s journey without water

Physical traces of the trail mark the route southwestward from Malpais/Bitter Spring (Steiner 1999: 184). The route traversed Spanish Canyon in the arid Alvord Mountains.
Map 2.17 The Trail through Bitter Springs


22 Jan – Ascend arroyo of Mojave River

23 Jan – Ascend arroyo of Mojave River – Ate a horse

24 Jan – Ascend arroyo of Mojave River

25 Jan – Ascend arroyo of Mojave River
26 Jan – Ascend arroyo of Mojave River – Ate a mule

27 Jan – Ascend arroyo of Mojave River; six days on Mojave River.

Francisco T. H. Garcés took 21 days to travel from Mojave Valley to San Gabriel Mission in 1776.

In 1826, Jedadiah S. Smith crossed from Mojave Valley to the mission in 17 days, including two layover days. He ascended the Mojave River for six days (Brooks 1977:
85-100) to Summit, (Morgan 1953: 201) crossing the San Bernardino Mountains via the multi-tribal (Hopi, Pai, Mojave, Chemehuevi, etc.) trading path.

In 1829 Ewing Young crossed in 13 days—three from Mojaves to Mojave River, ascending that river for six days, then four days to the mission.

28 Jan – San Bernardino Canyon via Cajon Pass according to the Hafens, (Hafen and Hafen 1954: 169) but actually via the multi-tribal trading trail.

29 Jan – Parage de San Juan. St. John’s place

30 Jan – Fountain


The trail from Summit to the mission ran down hill and then more or less level across contemporary metropolitan Los Angeles. It did not run straight so the various expeditions apparently averaged some 40 miles’ travel per day.
CHAPTER 3:
ABIQUIÚ, NEW MEXICO

Abiquiú, New Mexico is a community of ancient traditions that are masked by contemporary cultural icons. The Hispanic community identifies with its genízaro ancestors as much as with its Spanish ancestors. Most of these residents have homes within the Abiquiú merced, or land grant Abiquiú is often viewed from the outside as only home to artist Georgia O’Keefe and the Ghost Ranch. The community’s rich history is not widely recognized, although several individuals have contributed financially to improvements to support the local community.

This chapter is concerned with that community of genízaro-Hispanic descendants and their centuries-old relationship to what became the Old Spanish Trail. An overview of the geology and ecology of the area provides the setting for a synopsis of the history of the area and its cultures relative to the OST. Contemporary perspectives of the community and trail from some of Abiquiú’s genízaro descendants reveal a persistent community relationship with the trail. The chapter concludes with an ethnographic summary.

3.1 Geology and Ecology of the Abiquiú Area

Abiquiú lies in the lower Rio Chama Valley, which ranges in elevation from 1,700m to 3,000m (5,600’-9,800’). The area is characterized by thick sandstone formations from the Cretaceous and Jurassic periods that are overlain by more recent basalt flows (Figure 3.1). The narrow floodplains of the lower Rio Chama Valley are bordered by broad river terraces beyond which lie badlands formations (Figure 3.2) (Maxwell 2000). The area’s topography is characterized by moderate to steep slopes that are dissected by many drainages (Maker, Anderson and Anderson 1973). Bounded on the northwest by the Chama Basin, the lower portion of the valley lies in the Española Basin fault zone. The two basins are separated by the Abiquiú-El Rito Embayment (Budding, Pitart and Smith1960). Volcanic episodes from two to nine million years ago left basalt-capped areas throughout the valley. Glacial melting from the uplands left staggered alluvial benches, each marking a melting episode (Muehlberger and Muehlberger 1982).
The Abiquiú area receives an average precipitation of 250mm-280mm (10”-11”). Approximately two-thirds of that rainfall comes between May and October with the remainder occurring as snowfall mostly in December and January. While the Rio Chama and its tributaries likely provided an adequate water supply prehistorically for farming and domestic use, these waterways tended to bring severe spring floods that required re-establishment of acequias, or community ditches, and fields. Such flooding along with modern water demands led to the construction of a dam on the Rio Chama about seven miles upstream of Abiquiú that was completed in February 1963 (Woodley 2005).
Biotically, the lower Rio Chama Valley is within the Southern Rocky Mountain Province of the Colorado Plateau (Fenneman 1931). The predominant plant community is Great Basin Conifer Woodland, which is characterized by juniper (*Juniperus communis, J. scopulorum, J. monosperma*) and piñon pine (*Juniperus edulis*), rocky habitats, and thin soils, and generally restricted to elevations of 1,500m to 2,300m (5,000’-7,500’) (Figure 3.3). Common subdominant and understory plants include big sagebrush (*Artemisia tridentata*), rabbitbrush (*Chrysothamnus* spp.), winterfat (*Ceratoides lanata*), shadscale (*Atriplex confertifolia*), black sagebrush (*Artemisia nova*), snakeweed (*Gutierrezia* spp.), galleta grass (*Pleuraphis jamesii*), and Indian ricegrass (*Oryzopsis hymenoides*) (Brown 1982).

![Figure 3.3 An Example of Great Basin Conifer Woodland near Abiquiú Dam](image)

At lower elevations, between 1,200m and 1,700m (3,900’-5,600’), the Plains and Great Basin Grasslands community predominates. This plant community is characterized by four-wing saltbush (*Atriplex canescens*), sagebrush (*Artemisia* spp.), winterfat, rabbitbrush, snakeweed, sod-forming species of blue grama (*Bouteloua gracilis*), buffalo grass (*Buchloe dactyloides*), Indian ricegrass, galleta grass, and alkali sacaton (*Sporobolus airoides*) (Brown 1982).

A third plant community, Rocky Mountain Montane Conifer Forest, is found at higher elevations between 2,200m and 2,900m (7,200’-9,500’). It is characterized by ponderosa pine (*Pinus ponderosa*) at the lower elevations, and Douglas fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*), white fir (*Abies concolor*), and limber pine (*Pinus flexilis*) at the higher elevations (Brown 1982).

A fourth plant community occupies the riparian areas along the Rio Chama (Figure 3.4). Typical woody riparian species include cottonwoods (*Populus deltoides, P. fremontii*), willows (*Salix exigua, S. gooddingii*), netleaf hackberry (*Celtis laevigata*), skunkbush sumac (*Rhus trilobata*), Arizona walnut (*Juglans major*), Arizona sycamore (*Platanus wrightii*), Arizona alder (*Alnus oblongifolia*), seepwillow (*Baccharis salicifolia*), and velvet ash (*Fraxinus velutina*). Non-woody species include sideoats grama (*Bouteloua curtipendula*), yerba mansa (*Anemopsis californica*), water sedge (*Carex aquatilis*), smooth horsetail (*Equisetum laevigatum*), spikerush (*Eleocharis palustris*), broadleaf cattail (*Typha latifolia*), and rice cutgrass (*Leersia oryzoides*) (Durkin et al. 1996).
As a community along the OST, Abiquiú was a major trade center and launching place. Its roots go much deeper, however, with people living in the Rio Chama valley and at the Abiquiú site for thousands of years. Historic accounts note early names for the site as coming from the Indians of San Juan who knew the old Pueblo at Abiquiú as *Fe-jiu*. Others knew it as *Jo-so-ge*, *Jo-so* being the Tehuas’ name for the Moquis (Twitchell 1914).

The story of Abiquiú is tied to the trail along the Rio Chama that was a precursor to the OST. This trail has been known over the years as the Ute Trail, *El Camino Real*, the Rio Chama Trail, and the California Trail, and was used before Spanish contact by Ute bands to reach the pueblos along the Rio Grande. In the early to mid-1700s, Spanish *entradas* (explorations) were made up the Rio Chama, and efforts were made to settle the Chama Valley. Ute and Comanche raids held the Spanish to Santa Cruz de la Cañada east of present day Española. Such attacks would recede, settlers would return to the valley, and renewed attacks would drive them out again.
While the relationship between the OST and Abiquiú is characterized heavily by trade, attacks, and raids, it also involves other activities. Natural resource procurement and use, slavery, Hispanicization, and Christianization reflect shifting populations and cultural changes to this part of northern New Mexico. This account of Abiquiú’s history begins in the 16th century but includes pre-contact roots of the OST.

The lower Rio Chama and Piedra Lumbre Valleys were occupied by a variety of ethnic groups since before Spanish contact in the 16th century including Navajo, Ute, Jicarilla Apache, and Hispanic peoples (Hudspeth 2000). The Tewa people occupied the Chama Valley until the early 17th century but continued to visit the area, including the Piedra Lumbre Valley, to graze sheep, goats, and cattle (Anschuetz 1995; Kemrer 1992), to harvest *piedra alumbre*, a highly valued aluminum salt, and as a trade route to the Ute country of southern Colorado (Wozniak 1992). Salmeron (1966) noted that the Tewa people brought trains of pack animals with them along the Rio Chama route when they engaged in trade with the Utes. The traditional activities of the Tewa continued up to the mid-1700s when Hispanic settlers moved in with their own sheep and Hispanic traders took over the Puebloan trading expeditions to Ute country (Wozniak 1992).

The Ute people were known to use the Rio Chama route to come to the *llanos* (flats) in the winter for antelope prior to Spanish contact. After contact, the Apaches de Navajo, seventeenth century Athapaskan speakers who lived between the Rio Chama and the San Juan River to the north, used the Rio Chama route to drive the Spaniards from their capital at San Gabriel de Yunque in 1608. They continued to use this trail to raid and harass the settlers in the La Cañada jurisdiction for more than a century (Wozniak 1992).

In the 17th century, the Rio Chama was considered the easiest route to both Navajo country and Ute country from the San Juan and Santa Clara Pueblos, and other places to the south. In the *Piedra Lumbre*, travelers usually crossed the Rio Chama to follow the Arroyo Seco north since following the Rio Chama through Cañon de Chama was a greater challenge (Map 3.1). Friar Salmeron wrote about the northwest route from Santa Fe through these areas in 1604: “If one goes from New Mexico on this exploration, one ought to go by way of the Rio Zama [Chama] traveling to the northwest. That is what the Indians of New Mexico told me when I questioned them” (Milich 1966).

Abiquiú was established in the early 1730s along the Rio Chama. The settlement was confirmed with a merced to Bartolomé Trujillo and others in 1734 (Carson 1998). The original plaza was known as Santa Rosa de Lima de Abiquiú and was located downstream from present-day Abiquiú (Salazar 1976). The repeated attacks by the Utes drove the settlers away until the early 1750s when, with the help of some genízaros, the settlers reestablished their community at the present site near an old Pueblo still known as Moki (Twitchell 1914), and renamed it Santo Tomás de Abiquiú. The term genízaro generally refers to either Indians bought as captives by the Spanish or ethnically mixed Indians who fought for the Spanish. The treatment of Indian captives varied from slave treatment to familial inclusion, although they had specific rights even if only nominally. Indian captives played an important role economically and demographically, while Indian fighters played equally important roles in the defense of Spanish communities in the area (Brooks 2002). The genizaros were given a merced and supervised by the Franciscan mission that was established there (Kutsche and Van Ness 1981). Abiquiú and other Chama
Valley settlements differed from those along the Rio Grande in that they were somewhat distant from other Spanish and Pueblo villages. The genizaros preferred this arrangement having found more economic and social opportunities along the outskirts of civilization. In addition to their importance individually as captives and fighters, genizaro communities, established a buffer between the raiding tribes and the Spanish settlements (Carson 1998). Abiquiú, as one of those settlements and situated along an Indian trail favored by Apaches, Utes, Navajos, and Comanches, consequently, suffered frequent attacks (Sánchez 1997) when they were not engaged in trade fairs with the Utes and other natives (Carson 1998). Most of this trade, including the annual trade fair at Abiquiú, was illegal and carried out between individuals (SANM 1914:II,7:36, 398, 552; Swadesh 1974; Works 1992).

The Utes established peaceful relations with the Spanish in the mid-1700s when their former allies, the Comanches, acquired guns from the French and abandoned the Utes. Comanche and Ute raids on the Rio Chama settlers did not end, however, and Governor Cachupín had to issue a bando (proclamation) that prohibited the settlers from abandoning the Rio Chama lands. Not wanting to lose their land grant, the settlers, who included 100 genizaros, stayed. Abiquiú’s plaza was now established as the staging ground for expeditions northwest (Carson 1998).

In 1783, some Abiquiú residents were tried for illegal trading. In an effort to restrict the activity, the commander general issued another bando that prohibited residents from leaving their districts without his permission. Sheer necessity, however, drove many New Mexicans to
continue illegal trading in spite of the bando. Early 19th century trade traffic along the Rio Chama continued to be vital to the outlying communities. New Mexicans would head northwest with their packed muladas (mule trains) as soon as the winter storms had subsided. The Ute, Comanche, Apache, and Kiowa peoples traveled down the Rio Chama for the trade fairs. All trade travel was suspended by winter storms in November until spring time (Carson 1998).

The trade restrictions imposed by the Spanish government were lifted when Mexico gained its independence in 1821. Armijo made the first successful, round-trip, commercial venture to Los Angeles in 1829-1830 establishing the southern branch of the trail (Warren 2004). Abiquiu became even more important as the last stop for supplies before traders and others headed northwest. Concurrent with the lifting of the trade restrictions was a relatively peaceful period when attacks and raids by the Utes and other native populations on the Spanish settlements declined. In light of the reduced threat, “restless New Mexico families hungry for fresh opportunity packed their belongings in carretas, gathered their modest flocks, and rode, walked, and herded” in all directions beyond the existing settlements (Carson 1998:194). The Rio Chama Trail became a migratory trail as well as a trade route.

The OST grew in importance during the nineteenth century as slaves and sheep from New Mexico were traded for horses and mules from California and western Mexico. Abiquiu’s importance as a trade center continued to grow with its main exports including sheep, sheepskins, wool, piñon nuts, and hides, Indian blankets, and dried meats obtained from the Utes (Works 1992). Its importance as a trade and migratory route declined following the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo when the U.S. acquired northern Mexican territory including New Mexico. The U.S. military became the primary user of the trail as it sought to control the various native populations.

Contemporary documentation of the OST from Santa Fé through Abiquiu places the route along the Rio Chama. Salmeron’s, Rivera’s, and Dominguez’ and Escalante’s accounts reflect this portrayal but also seem to support ethnohistoric, ethnogeographic, and ethnographic records that suggest that in protohistoric and historic times the traditional route up the Chama drainage tended to avoid the valley and instead traversed the upland plateaus at the foot of the Sierra del Valle Grande (Douglass 1917; Harrington 1916; Hill and Lange 1982) (Map 3.2). Routes from Santa Clara went north or west up the Cañada de Santa Clara until one reached the foot of the sierra where the route divided (Douglass 1917). One route went over the mountain to the headwaters of the Rio San Antonio and followed the watercourse to Jemez Pueblo (Douglass 1917). The route that went north and northwest along the rolling uplands at the foot of the mountain avoided the major secondary drainages, their confluences with the Rio de Chama, and the seasonal flooding and flash floods that characterized these places. This northern route continued into the Valle de la piedra lumbre near Coyote or Youngsville where a western branch continued along the foot of the mountain westward up the valley of the Rio Puerco (Court of Private Land Claims, Abiquiu Land Grant, Case #52). Wozniak (1992) interpreted these findings as indicating that when Pueblo Indians said a route followed a river, they did not necessarily mean that one should follow the river streamside but rather upland along trails across the bordering plateaus.
Map 3.2 Major Indian Trails (-----) before the Old Spanish Trail (-------) Based on Court of Private Land Claims, Abiquiú Land Grant, Case #52; Douglass 1917; Harrington 1916; Hill and Lange 1982; New Mexico Land Grant Records, Records of the Surveyor General, Town of Abiquiú Grant, Report No. 140 (Wozniak 1992)
3.3 Contemporary Views of Abiquiú

Abiquiú is home to many descendants of the original inhabitants and Spanish immigrants including the participants of this study. These individuals view Abiquiú as a Pueblo, not a Hispanic community, though they also identify quite strongly with the 1754 merced. The mission remains central to the community as do the remnants of the OST (Figures 3.6 and 3.7). The names by which they know Abiquiú reflect their multi-generational and multi-cultural relationship with the place. The participants’ responses to the interview questions are listed together, but denoted by different bullet symbols. A dark dot, for example, represents a given participant throughout the responses. Some responses contain quotation marks, which indicate direct quotes within paraphrased responses.

Figure 3.6 Abiquiú Merced and Mission
Figure 3.7 Remnants of the Old Spanish Trail through Abiquiu and along the Rio Chama
**Community Settlement**

**What is the name of this place?**
- Abiquiú
  - Abiquiú
  - Abiquiú

**Are there other names for this place?**
- Yes
  - No
  - Yes

**If Yes, what are they?**
- The Pueblo of Abiquiú and Santo Tomás de Aposte de Abiquiú (the latter in 1754). Moque is the oldest part of Abiquiú. Probably before Columbus, maybe as old as Chaco or Mesa Verde. A half mile east of here is an immense structure on a mesa. There is much prehistoric archaeological evidence throughout the area. Abiquiú is a pueblo and a jurisdiction, *not* an Hispanic community. The jurisdiction is about 25 townships in size (576,000 acres). Today, the boundaries are the Rio Chama on the north, an arroyo adjacent to Santa Rosa de Lima on the east, the trail of the Tehua [preferred spelling of Tewa] to Navajo – Rio Vereda del Tehua al Navajo – on the south, and the San Jose de la Barranco community on the west. Abiquiú is a destination and on the way back and forth from Hopi and Tewa.
  - Although “chokecherry place” fits.
  - Santo Tomás. It’s interesting that all the pueblos that have saints’ names had Indian names but Abiquiú is the only one that kept it’s original name. Some say it means the hooting of an owl. Others say it started as “abi-shoo,” which means “chokecherry place.” That’s what Santa Clara called us. South of here is the Grande Quivera or unknown wilderness. Abiquiú was a pueblo but never quite part of the Spanish and never quite part of the indigenous. They were genízaros, which comes from the Turkish soldier. Genízaros were ransomed as children by Spanish households. When they worked off their ransom, they were free but couldn’t return to their plains origins or marry into the Spanish families. They needed places so Abiquiú and other genízaro villages were established by the Spanish. There were large trade fairs in Abiquiú with the tribes and later the Spanish but the Spanish didn’t like them because they wanted to tax them. The genízaros were keeping the peace in more ways than one.
  - Sometimes Santa Rosa de Lima, the old church ruins nearby, but that was created as a Spanish colony and Abiquiú already existed as a pueblo.
Why were Hispanic people attracted to this place?

- Because of the resources. The Spaniards came to establish a buffer zone. The Spaniards came for sustenance and shelter, and to bond, although they also tried to avoid bonding with Native Americans. They saw good land that they thought was unpopulated and unfarmed. They came because all roads lead to Abiquiú. It’s on the way to the Ute Nation, the Navajo Nation, the Hopi Nation ... Abiquiú was the Pueblo de Indios los Genízaros. Genízaro means a soldier in the service of a foreign government. Spanish law allowed for buffer and prevented Pueblos from being parceled or sold to Spanish people. Mexican law reversed the latter.
  - Looking for land.
  - Scouting and assessing the resources, and friars with them were looking to convert souls. Also to protect their acquired lands.
  - Looking for the Seven Cities of Gold.

Were there natural and/or social features that attracted them?

- Yes
  - Yes
  - Yes

What characteristics do you think attracted them?

| Water             | Yes, salt springs, sulphur springs, fresh water springs, rivers. |
|                  | Yes |
| Plants           | Yes, for grazing.         |
|                  | Yes, grazing land.       |
|                  | Yes, and farmland.       |
| Animals          | Yes. Not so much the wildlife as for the sheep, which have been here since the 1600s. |
|                  | Yes, turkey, mule deer, some elk, some antelope, rabbits, desert bighorns nearby. |
|                  | Yes, and the lobos were a problem. They took a lot of wildlife – had to eat everyday. |
| Evidence of previous use | Yes, the Pueblos. Pueblos mean food storage so they knew they could get food. |
| Geological features | Yes, farmland. |
|                  | No |
|                  | Only in the sense of grazing land. |
Other features

- Yes
  - Yes, they found peace with the people who were here – the Indians here weren’t aggressive.

Was this site the Hispanic people’s first choice for a community?

- Yes. “Because the primary record is not available on what the pueblo may have thought at the time, the Spanish record that’s available says that they felt confident enough coming to resources in this area that they requested the Spanish government to let them have *tierra despoblada* (unpopulated), *tierra dehesa* (uncultivated).” They saw the land as available and without encumbrances. “The Spaniards moved in knowing the extent of the law and the law did not allow them to encroach upon pueblo lands. So when these 1734 documents were written for Geronimo Martin on the west and Bartolomé Trujillo on the east and company, Valdes and Bustos on the north, and company, they looked to using uncultivated, available, and unpopulated lands fully knowing that they could not pasture their animals within a league and a half of the place, ten miles. It’s a buffer zone between the pueblos and the encroaching Spanish.”

- No

If not, where was their first choice, and why didn’t they settle or stay there?

- ---
  - The first settlement was Santa Cruz de la Cañada.

Where did the Hispanic people come from?

- Santa Cruz de la Cañada at the confluence of Rio Chimayo. It was the Spanish capital north of Santa Fe. To go to California, they would have to go through Abiquiu. Better to come from Taos across Black Mesa.
  - From Spain through Mexico.

Why did the Hispanic people leave that place?

- They were exploring, seeking more farmland.
  - Exploring.
  - Looking for land, gold, and souls to save.

Were any of your ancestors among those who came here?

- Yes
Who were they and when did they come?

- They came from Santa Fe and Santa Cruz de la Cañada. The Trujillos are one side of it, the Abeytas are the other side of it. Andres Abeyta was recorded on the Rio Chama in 1806. There were Abeytas as far back as before the Pueblo revolt [in 1680]. Diego Abeya was in Santa Fe. His grandkids were in the San Juan District, Ojo Caliente. Two of those Abeytas came to San Jose de la Barranco and married into Jose Martin Serrano’s family. Andres Abeyta married Gregoria Serrano. Their son Jose Miguel Abeyta was out there with Capitan de Rivera. Andres’ father-in-law Jose Martin Serrano was there also. Jose Miguel Abeyta was the father of Jose Miguel Antonio Abeyta, who was the father of Juan Pablo Abeyta, who was the father of José Dion Abeyta. José Dion’s daughter, was my mother. The Old Spanish Trail has three prongs. There are physical features to go through, around, and over. In this case, you go through the Cañon de Chama, perhaps the most picturesque canyon in the vicinity. Andres and his son Jose Miguel lived there in 1806. They were taken there by Lieutenant Francisco Salazar to establish a community, and we have a huge land grant out there we’re trying to recover – half a million acres. It had 33 original inhabitants in addition to Andres. The OST cuts through the middle of the San Joaquin de Cañon, La Merced de San Joaquin de Cañon de Rio Chama. Juan Francisco Andres Abeyta is another relative there. Other ancestors included Martin Serrano, José Trujillo, Vargas Machuca, Juan Esteban Trujillo who married into Abiquiu, and a Martinez. Manuel Lorenzo Trujillo, a first or second cousin, is descended from Bartolomé Trujillo. I’m not acquainted with the pre-Spanish names of my ancestors because those were taken from them when they were given Spanish names. I suspect some of them were Hopi, or Moqui, and some of them were Tewa. The parchment tells me of the Abiquiu baptisms there were many Moqui, many from San Jose de Barranco. I’m Lopez. Carlos Lopez is in a 1750 list for Chama, which is by Española. Adjacent to the list of 1750 genizarios, there was a separate list of what I call the 1750 census. In that, I find Carlos Lopez and he has a son Jose Miguel Lopez, who has a son Jose Miguel Antonio Lopez. Jose Miguel Antonio married into Lieutenant Josef Martin Serrano’s family. The Lopezes were soldiers. Trujillo’s descendants eventually married into the pueblo, and that was my grandmother,
Bernardita Garcia de Abeyta. So my mother is a descendant of the Abiquiú pueblo. The Garcias go back to the Pueblo Revolt.

- Lorenzo Trujillo. Trujillo means three sons but we had four. I have a close cousin named Lorenzo Trujillo. We share Grandpa Trujillo.
- Other names included Lopez and Herrera. There were six Trujillo land grants around El Rito and the Rio Chama where they come together.
- Salazar on my father’s side and Velasquez on my mother’s side. Salazar may be Spanish and Moorish, from Salas and Azar.

Has your family remained here?
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes

OST Community Impacts

Did the Hispanic people of this community use the Old Spanish Trail for purposes other than moving here?
- Yes
  - Yes, but then it was called the Camino de California.
  - Yes

If Yes or Maybe, for what other purposes did they use the trail?
- One guy from the pueblo but many from the jurisdiction used the trail for slaving. The pueblo didn’t do slaving. Pedro Leon Luján was a captain in the militia in 1851. He was associated with the money-making [slaving] part of the jurisdiction. He used the trail to return to Abiquiú after his trial.¹
  - Traveling to California and back – Lorenzo.
  - Herds of cattle, sheep, and horses were moved into the Tierra Amarilla area.

Did use of the Old Spanish Trail impact the Hispanic people who lived here?
- Yes
  - Yes

¹ Pedro Léon’s trial was in Manti, Utah so when he returned to Abiquiú along the Old Spanish Trail, he traveled a significant portion of the trail (Hill 1921).
### If Yes or Maybe, how were they impacted?

- Mexican and American use of the trail led to the loss of the Pueblo [lands]. Abiquiu formed a bridge between the Old Spanish Trail and the Santa Fe Trail, which brought U.S. capitalism to the Spanish form of capitalism – that’s the bridge. Abiquiu was a vehicle for Spanish economic advancement.
  - It was a way out like for Lorenzo and others who were looking for land, a place for their families.
  - The trade goods brought in.

### Did use of the Old Spanish Trail impact the resources at this site that you identified earlier?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Animals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence of previous use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geological features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### If Yes or Maybe, how were the resources impacted?

- Abiquiu was the starting point of the Old Spanish Trail. There were small impacts that accumulated over time [and became noticeable] but the Old Spanish Trail ceased when the U.S. made it a military trail, and that’s when impacts started to be noticed, felt.
  - There was more use.
  - More use.

- There were small impacts that accumulated over time. Piñon
also was a trade item to Los Angeles.
- There was more use.
  - More use.

**Animals**
- Trade in buffalo hides, beaver pelts, wool and serapes for horses and mules.
- There was more use.
  - More use.

**Evidence of previous use**
- ---
  - Economic opportunities but mostly the people in Abiquiu were here to stay.

**Geological features**
- ---
  - ---

**Other features**
- Changes in goods and technologies, loss of land during the period 1870 forward due to railroad races and boom economy.
  - ---

---

**Community Connections - Local Landscapes**

*Are there places traditionally used by the Hispanic people that are connected to this place?*

- Yes
  - Yes

*If Yes or Maybe, what are those places and how are they connected to this place?*

**Place 1**

- Jemez Trails, roads
  - Yes. South of here are 30 miles of wilderness and an 11,000’ plateau so travel directly south lands you in Jemez Pueblo. It was migratory between pueblos.

- Historic events
  - Yes

- Daily events

- Family

- Friends
  - Yes

- Other

**Place 2**

- Taos Trails, roads
  - Yes

- Historic events

- Daily events

- Family
  - Yes, family ties.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place 3</th>
<th>Trails, roads</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic events</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily events</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place 4</th>
<th>Trails, roads</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic events</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily events</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place 5</th>
<th>Trails, roads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place 6</th>
<th>Trails, roads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place 7</th>
<th>Trails, roads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic events</td>
<td>Barranco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Barranco. It’s not Barranca like you see in books or how some people say. That’s modern. It’s wrong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other**

- Spanish times became military; they only traveled by horse or foot.
- Santa Cruz de la Cañada
- The connection between Santa Fe and Abiquiú is in industry and economics.
- Cañones, Cañones de San Miguel.
- Cañones, nine miles southwest of here, where I was born.
- When people died at Cañones, they were brought here to Abiquiú to be buried.
- Frijoles, south of here. Maybe six families there.
- Barranco
- Because of nomadic Indians and raids. Abiquiú was once
4000 inhabitants.

**Daily events**

**Family**
- Yes

**Friends**
- Yes

**Other**
- Yes

**Place 8**

**Trails, roads**
- Yes

**Historic events**
- Yes

**Daily events**

**Family**

**Friends**

**Other**

**Place 9**

**Trails, roads**

**Historic events**
- This was the last stop for supplies on your way north.
- Don’t know

**Daily events**

**Family**

**Friends**

**Other**

**Were those places impacted by travelers on the Old Spanish Trail?**
- It brought trade that supported the families of those communities.
- Including fruits and vegetables grown here.

**If Yes or Maybe, how were those places impacted?**
- How far did the ripples from Abiquiú go?
- Taos by back roads or highway or historic trail with four-wheel. Santa Cruz de la Cañada is still there. Jemez by jeep routes around the caldera – the straight shot is blocked by barbed wire. Changes in land ownership changed routes and physical connections but didn’t break connections.

**Are those places still connected to this community?**
- Yes

**If Yes or Maybe, any other comments?**
- To a certain extent with Cañones and Barranco. Frijoles doesn’t exist anymore. Abiquiú provides mail service and
Are there other trails traditionally used by Hispanic people that are connected to this place?

If Yes or Maybe, where were those trails and how were they connected to this place?

**Trail 1**

- Yes
  - Yes

**Trails, roads**

**Historic events**

- Yes
  - Yes

**Daily events**

**Family**

**Friends**

**Other**

- Twenty yards north of this building [Santo Tomás de Abiquiú Church] is the Camino Real. I have a document from 1850 that calls it the Camino Real. While we’re talking about the Spanish Trail, we’re only talking about an instance in time and space in which somebody else gets to look at things Spanish from their point of view. I don’t think it was the Spanish that called it the Spanish Trail. I think it J. C. Fremont and other like him. Abiquiú, Taos, and San Miguel de Vado are terminuses of the Camino Real, the road that brought the Spaniards here. The Camino Real, the King’s Road, came from Chihuahua north and ended either in Abiquiú in great trade fairs, or Taos with its Comanche and Ute trade fairs, or San Miguel de Vado where the Santa Fe Trail began. The Camino Real enters Rio Arriba at three points [Figure 3.8].

**Trail 2**

- The Tehua Trail. The merced, the original land grant, noted the Tehua to Navajo trail in describing the Abiquiú land grant.
Trail 3

- The Spanish loop from Abiquiú. Abiquiú forms a bridge between the Santa Fe Trail and the Old Spanish Trail.

Were those trails impacted by travelers on the Old Spanish Trail?

- Yes
  - Yes
  - ---
    - There was more use.

Are those trails still connected to this community?

- Yes
  - Yes

If Yes or Maybe, any other comments?

- Rio Arriba County has sister cities, sister areas in Mexico, and what they use to connect them is Camino Real. And they have that in resolution or memorial or I don’t know what they call it.
  - That part of the trail on the map going to El Vado goes to the monastery [Figures 3.8 and 3.9]. It’s not the Old Spanish Trail, it’s part of Camino Real. The Old Spanish Trail went to Tierra Amarilla. Those following the Camino Real were following the springs and rivers. Those following the Old Spanish Trail carried water with them because they wanted a more direct route and knew that part of the country [family members like Lorenzo Trujillo]. They rode horses, no wagons could go there.

Do you have any other comments about the Old Spanish Trail or the impacts from travelers on the Old Spanish Trail?

- The Hunt Oil person wants to buy property where important trails go including the Old Spanish Trail. “The property to which she aspires encompasses a wagon and foot trail that runs from the eastern boundary of the pueblo through the pueblo and out through the western boundary at Barranco. Today’s highway from Abiquiú west, from the pueblo grounds west, crosses the Rio Chama and enters another time
zone so that when this was really called the Spanish Trail, we would not have found a road there. Today’s highway nor its consideration…west from the Rio Chama, into the Rio Chama Canyon, did not exist. That is a 1928 to 1936 construction. The Camino Real, through the Pueblo of Abiquiú, begins at Santa Rosa de Lima, enters the Pueblo Grant, rises into the Pueblo Ejido or town to the Pueblo grounds, exits the Pueblo grounds on the western boundary of the mesa, enters its Pueblo farmlands, courses then south-southwest deeper into Pueblo grounds, skirts several marshes and springs onto another plateau, then exits the Pueblo grounds at San Jose de la Barranco. From San Jose de la Barranco, it courses through the Pueblo of San Jose de la Barranco, the ancient Pueblo of San Jose de la Barranco…before it became known as a Spanish land grant, there was a pueblo there. I live on it. I’m constantly overturning bones [and artifacts]. And then exits the ancient Pueblo of Barranco, courses along the south bank of the Rio Chama entering the mouth of the Rio de Chama Canyon, or Cañon de Rio Chama, thence crosses the river and begins the steepest climb of the Spanish Trail in New Mexico up the Quest de la Piedra Lumbe. Questa is Spanish for hill, only to say ‘slope containing a road.’ A road that courses up a hillside is called a *questa*. It courses the Quest de la Piedra Lumbe to the Piedra Lumbe, an ancient 1760s land grant. Opens into a vast plain of, containing a series of arroyos, from which questa the traveler has to make a decision whether to take one of three forks of the Spanish Trail. There is no Spanish Trail on the north side of the river. At what is called Buena Vista [on the map], there are only four houses. There are twenty others right here [about 0.1 miles west, Figure 3.10]. This is where I live. The town of Abiquiú grant is right here [Figure 3.10]. By the time anybody called anything a road here, there were already people traveling between Abiquiú along the south bank of the Rio Chama to Barranco, and that they gained a foothold at the Quest de la Piedra Lumbe and crossed the Rio Chama [Figure 3.11]. When you get up on top of the Quest de la Piedra Lumbe, today’s road, you can only look onto the lake itself, in which case you don’t move on it but there used to be a road that went into the dam and then up the cañon to … the Piedra Lumbe is an immense area [Figure 3.11 covering Abiquiú Lake], it’s an old Spanish land grant, from there, they decided to go along the foothills of the Piedra Lumbe on the north side, into the Cañon de Navajo, and then exit at any of the places up in here they could be [Figure 3.10]…El Vado
is important in these considerations because El Vado means ‘the ford,’ the fording of the river. You have to ford the Rio Chama there because it just keeps on going into the Tierra Amarilla, and then into Chama, the present Chama. Any one of these points [Figure 3.12] north of El Vado, into Lumberton and into Chromo and into Pagosa Springs will get you, because of the geological features, it’ll channel you into these areas over here [Figures 3.12 and 3.13]. It’s too much up and down, there are too many cliffs all along there. All of this was documented in 1871 by Lt. Roughner who did the lines of communication between southern Colorado and northern New Mexico, and he did a wonderful Figure of all this area. To follow the Spanish Trail up the Cañon de Rio Chama, up the Cañon de Navajo, at the point where this is located is a cliff [Figures 3.11 and 3.12] so you have to come up…this area here is called the Mesas de las Viejas [Figure 3.12], I suspect the ‘Mesas of the Ancients.’ This is all one huge escarpment, a cliff. When the trail came up out of the canyon and headed to El Vado, it had to go up further than what is shown on the maps. They had go up much further. In fact, to Tierra Amarilla. It is not unreasonable to expect that mule travel will not go up a mountain to get to the other side but will follow the river. If you follow the river, you end up in Cañon de Chama and you don’t have to get on here [steep areas]. When you get into the Cañon de Rio Chama, and this is the Monastery de Christ of the Desert, and this whole area here is an archaeological wonderland [Figure 3.11, upper left]. There’s a Castle of the Ancients in here. It isn’t unreasonable to expect hooved travel from Abiquiú up the Rio Chama into the Cañon, because at this point you cease following the Rio Chama in here and then separate into the Rio de la Vayena. These are 700’ high cliffs. There is a trail for hooved through here [Figures 3.10 and 3.12] and up into the…this map [Figure 3.12] says you keep on going up the Rio Chama to El Vado [but] you can’t do this here. You cannot do this here because it’s white water and there are points here where you put your animals to swim upriver in a…you just can’t do it. So you have to escape and come out to, past the Continental Divide and up into this area. Now you’ve got clear vision out into all this [Figure 3.12]. The geography determines for you taking the route from La Vena de Reyaño, which is Abiquiú Lake itself, and moving out into the plains adjacent to this area or to follow the present road system that leads you to Coyote. There’s only one way and that’s through here. All the way to 1861 where there isn’t anybody going out there to farm and
stuff like that. It’s really iffey as to whether this community [Regina] even existed. For sure Regina didn’t exist. There were others out here. So your map begins to lose its self way out here in the Jemez Mountains. This obstacle tells you that you just go that way or that way [around cliff areas] but this way’s not kosher so you go down here. [All the travel] was on the southern bank [of the Rio Chama], no northern bank travel through here. If this is the terminus [Abiquiú] of the Old Spanish Trail, one should even be talking about where the Santa Cruz de la Cañada traffic heads northwest to get over this huge sierva. But there is a way at Hernandez, up Rio Roso, then down into Barranco or down into this area and north into here. This is the trail of the Tehua Basin to the Navajo and points west [Figure 3.11]. This is the Avareda de Tehua a Navajo from which we get to say the land grant is right here and it forms our southern boundary so it’s really not a rectangle. Cerro del Grant is named for an Anglo fellow named Grant but it’s wrong to call it that. Abiquiú Peak is within the original 1754 Abiquiú land grant of 44,000 acres but outside the contemporary 16,000 acre land grant. The original land grant also noted the Tehua to Navajo trail in describing the Abiquiú land grant. Rio Arriba county, which encompasses Abiquiú and Abiquiú jurisdiction, is here [Figure 3.12]. If there are any structures along the Old Spanish Trail, they’ll be jacales, made of cedar poles and bark. Gallina has jacales. By 1693, things Spanish had filtered through things indigenous including people and families. The Moyas were from Silvestre about three miles away. A bunch of us tend to speak Spanish and a bunch of us tend to be Catholic and the vast majority of us tend to be poor. That’s it on the Hispanic side. Some of us have chosen the relative coolness of the adobe structure, some of us still live in jacales. If any structure existed along the Spanish Trail, it would have been the most long lasting structure as compared to the tepee, and that would have been the jical...an easily constructed, long-lasting architectural feature employed by sheep herders and poor classes. You take cedar poles, dig a ditch in the ground, put those upright along with the bark, form a long beam on top on which you lay the characteristic viga and then the raja, which are smaller cedar branches with the bark still on them. You take bunches of bark and lay them on the cedar and then you throw a ton of dirt on top of that and you hope that the weeds don’t cut a hole through and cause a leak. Also, cisterns for individual overnight or week-long accommodations, composed of a circular arrangement of rocks about two or three feet from
the ground, and maybe one layer of rocks below upon which you laid a bunch of grasses and put yourself in overnight. There are bunches of those up and down the Spanish Trail out from Abiquiú. Gallina has evidences of just those houses, of the jacal, and towered buildings and defensive units placed on high ground. Those are pre-Spanish. Tewa informants told John Peabody Harrington that Abiquiú was Hopi land: “They live in the town at the end of a long stick laying on the ground. This long stick happens to turn chokecherry red – that’s that mountain right there.” The mountain looks like a tree lying down. When the Spanish brought their language, we were already making tortillas here. Genízaro is not a direct reference to a person who is detribalized and Hispanicized. It’s a person who has willingly sold his services in defense of the Spanish government, as a soldier. It comes from an Arabic military strategy of divide and conquer. Basically, everybody in Abiquiú is related to each other.

The Trujillo family [grandfather and father] were loggers. Georgia O’Keefe’s house belonged to the Chavez family who almost cost Abiquiú their grant. But we caught it in time. O’Keefe is more recent history. The Old Spanish Trail and Abiquiú deserve more recognition. The Old Spanish Trail goes right by O’Keefe’s house, which is over 100 years old. She restored it.

For many, many years we have not been able to chart our destiny. Abiquiú is pretty challenged. We feel threatened with all the tourism, perhaps because we see people driving on our roads and walking by our houses, which we may not be used to but feel we should be in control of. We’re losing our privacy to some of that. But we should share our history, it shouldn’t come from outside the community.

We speak an ancient Spanish. I asked my doctor who’s from Venezuela if he heard any ancient words when we spoke and he said yes, you use some very ancient words. There’s a place called Trujillo Meadows in Colorado near the Colorado-New Mexico border. They [NPS] should work with the Abiquiú library on interpretation.
Figure 3.8 Abiquiú Details along the Old Spanish Trail (Abiquiú Consultant #2)
Figure 3.9 Abiquiú Details along the Old Spanish Trail (Abiquiú Consultant #2)
Figure 3.10 Abiquiu Details along the Old Spanish Trail (Abiquiu Consultant #1)
Figure 3.11 Abiquiú Details along the Old Spanish Trail (Abiquiú Consultant #1)
Figure 3.12 Abiquiú Details along the Old Spanish Trail (Abiquiú Consultant #1)
3.4 Ethnographic Summary

While the geologic features of northern New Mexico presented some challenges to the Spanish, the ecological features attracted them to the Rio Chama Valley and the Abiquiú area. The Spanish engaged in trade with the Ute people including the “ransoming” of captive Indian children who were raised as Hispanic Christians, the genízaros. The genízaros, as individual captives and fighters, and as communities served many important functions in the success of the communities founded by the Spanish in what is currently New Mexico. Descendants of the genízaros consider what they call the Abiquiú jurisdiction to be their homelands and are desirous of regaining those lands that lie beyond the boundaries of their merced. They also consider the OST to be an important part of their heritage.

Some study participants referred to the OST through Abiquiú as the Camino Real. While popular belief is that the Camino Real ended in Santa Fe, genízaro descendants of Abiquiú view it as extending north of the Arroyo Seco because the Spanish followed the Ute or Rio Chama trail that far before concentrating on settlements along the Rio Chama from Santa Fe. Where the OST is known to pass through the genízaro community, residents have visions of native revegetation and interpretation projects that would involve their youth and strengthen their community. They described having their teenagers help remove Russian olives, plant natives species, and provide historic and community narratives as they lead walking or riding tours from the Abiquiú Inn along the OST past the mission and former market (Figures 3.14–3.23).

Figure 3.14 Heading up the Old Spanish Trail from the Abiquiú Inn.
Figure 3.15 Proposed Old Spanish Trail Interpretation and Revegetation.

Figure 3.16 An Old Well House along side the Old Spanish Trail.

Figure 3.17 The Old Spanish Trail Runs past the Georgia O’Keefe House to the Right.
Figure 3.18 The Old Spanish Trail Runs past an Old Market. The Mission is to the Left.

Figure 3.19 Another Old Market. The Old Spanish Trail Passes behind it.

Figure 3.20 Beyond the Old Market, the Old Spanish Trail drops to the Rio Chama Floodplain.
Figure 3.21 Looking back up the Old Spanish Trail from the Rio Chama Floodplain

Figure 3.22 From the Same Location, Making a 90° Turn to the Right, is Another Old Well near the Old Spanish Trail
Study participants are concerned about outside influences on their community and the potential loss of traditional values. As described above by one participant, a wealthy outsider is buying approximately 12.5 acres of land that some Abiquiú residents believe is within their merced. It seems to have slipped away when the church was given some land for crops and the Archdiocese of Santa Fe later sold it without consulting the merced (Babcock 2007). The loss of any of the merced is viewed as a threat to the survival of the genízaros community, some of whom would like to see it gain federal recognition as a pueblo.

Another impact from outsiders is their lack of understanding that the merced is private property. Visitors frequently drive up the hill, take pictures without permission, or attempt to visit the mission, which has restricted access. The O’Keefe house is popular as well, but since the Santa Fe Foundation took it over, the community has been less involved than before, which compounds the impacts from visitor impositions.

The genízaros of New Mexico, including the Abiquiú community, have gained recognition and respect at the state level. Two memorials were signed that recognize the role and legacy of the genízaros in New Mexico’s history. House Memorial 40 was signed on February 23, 2007 and Senate Memorial 59 was signed on March 2, 2007. Such recognition designates the genízaros as part of New Mexico’s heritage, suggesting historic protections would not be inappropriate. Recognizing and protecting the segment of the OST through Abiquiú, as well as the role of the genízaros in its success, would compliment the state’s recognition. The trail and the merced are two significant ethnographic resources that offer a cooperative management opportunity with the Abiquiú community.
CHAPTER 4:
AGUA MANSA, CALIFORNIA

The story of Agua Mansa\(^1\) begins in Abiquiú, New Mexico, another community profiled in this report. In 1838, the founders of Agua Mansa, who had recently arrived from Abiquiú, received an allotment of land that would later become Agua Mansa. Agua Mansa itself was formally established in 1842 when the first families settled there. The history of the area in southern California where Agua Mansa was built had a direct influence on its location. This chapter provides geological, ecological, and historical overviews of the community and its relationship to the Old Spanish Trail, along with contemporary perspectives of the community and trail from Agua Mansa descendants. It concludes with a summary of places or features of significant ethnographic importance.

4.1 Geology and Ecology

Agua Mansa was established along the Santa Ana River, which drains the Santa Ana Watershed of southern California. Predominant features of the watershed include the Santa Ana River and the San Gabriel, San Bernardino, San Gorgonio, and San Jacinto Mountains.

The Santa Ana River is southern California's largest stream system with the main channel extending over 100 miles southwest toward the Pacific Ocean, dropping almost 6,000 feet, and having more than 50 tributaries. Its watershed drains almost 3200 square miles of southern California in parts of San Bernardino, Riverside, and Orange Counties, which have a population of approximately five million people. Headwaters for the Santa Ana are found in the San Gabriel, San Bernardino, San Gorgonio, and San Jacinto Mountains. Elevations in the watershed range from sea level to over 11,000 feet (Map 4.1) (CA Coastal Conservancy 2001; Larson 1994; Mitchell 2006).

The Santa Ana watershed has seen many large floods over the years. The largest one occurred in winter of 1861-1862 when a series of storms swelled the Santa Ana River beyond its banks. Up to four feet of water ran through Anaheim and destroyed the area's cattle industry, drowning 200,000 cattle and washing away much of the soil. Prior to the flood, the river upstream of what is now Redlands was narrow and meandering with alder, willow, sycamore, and cottonwood trees along its banks. The flood washed out the trees and left sand, gravel, and boulders in the riverbed and adjacent floodplain. Afterward, the Santa Ana ran in several channels from the canyon mouth rather than in a well-defined course (CA Coastal Conservancy 2001).

---

\(^{1}\) Also known as San Salvador de Jurupa; Agua Mansa referred to both community and locale.
The Santa Ana River watershed lies within an active seismic area that is subdivided by a complex of intersecting or interlocking fault zones, many of which are active (Figure 4.1). Some of these zones record repeated movements beginning before 15 Ma². Dikes and irregular intrusive bodies of distinctive Oligocene biotite dacite, and hornblende latite and felsite occur widely in the central and eastern San Gabriel Mountains of southern California. Mountain Meadows Dacite is present beneath Middle Miocene Topanga Group Glendora Volcanics at the northeastern edge of the Los Angeles Basin (McCulloh, Beyer, and Morin 2002). This material is 27.6-Ma and a distinctive intrusive igneous complex that straddles several major fault zones including the San Andreas Fault, the San Jacinto Fault, the Elsinore-Whittier Fault, and the Newport-Inglewood Fault (McCulloh, Beyer, and Morin 2002; Nourse, Weigand and Hazelton 1998; Shelton 1955).

² Million years ago
The main mountain axis and subordinate ranges consist principally of granitic formations with occasional outcroppings of limestones. A range of tertiary hills, conglomerates, sandstones and shales stretches from Pasadena to the Santa Ana River (Parish 1903). The Santa Ana watershed is geologically young and dates to the Quaternary Period. It includes sandy and gravelly mesas, rich loams, ferruginous clays, and black adobe much of which contains soda salts in varying amounts (Parish 1903).

The climate of the Santa Ana watershed is Mediterranean with hot, dry summers and cooler, wetter winters. Precipitation amounts, most of which comes in the winter months, are wide-ranging from 12-40 inches per year, the amount increasing with elevation from the coastal plain (12") to the inland valleys (18") to the San Bernardino Mountains (40") (USGS 2006). Temperatures vary with elevation and topography with the coastal areas tending to be cooler than the inland areas.

The Santa Ana River and its tributaries were characterized by sandy streambeds, willows, cottonwoods, and live oaks. Pre-settlement habitats included treeless mountains, which were managed annually with traditional Native American burns (Redway 1894). The plains surrounding the Santa Ana were treeless as well although the river banks had some woody species.

Excepting the willows along the banks of the Santa Ana River, there was hardly a stick of timber growing in the entire plain. But in the seventies, during an unusually rainy winter, the Santa Ana rose above its banks and inundated an area many square miles in extent. The flood carried with it the seeds of a species of willow unknown in the immediate locality, and in the course of a few years the inundated area was covered with a forest of willow (Redway 1894:212).

Today, the vegetation along the Santa Ana in the vicinity of the Agua Mansa site is a mix of introduced species with coastal sagescrub (Table 4.1).

Through Riverside, below the leved section, streamside vegetation becomes more abundant. The species here include Fremont’s cottonwood (Populus fremontii), California walnut (Juglans californica), Mexican elderberry (Sambucus mexicana), white alder (Alnus rhombifolia), mule fat (Baccharis salicifolia), California wild rose (Rosa californica), poison hemlock (Conium maculatum), wild grape (Vitis girdiana), willows (Salix spp.), salt grass (Distichlis spicata), wild cucumber (Marah macrocarpus), mugwort (Artemisia douglasiana), stinging nettle (Urtica dioica), poison oak (Toxicodendron diversilobum), and the invasive giant reed (Arundo donax) (CA Coastal Conservancy 2001; Holland and Keil 1995).
Table 4.1 Coastal Sage Scrub Species.

4.2 A History of Agua Mansa

Within a decade of the OST becoming a viable route to Los Angeles, southern California ranchos decided to recruit genízaros, acculturated Indians who helped defend Spanish communities from surrounding Indian populations, from Abiquiú, New Mexico to protect their livestock from raiding Indians (Brooks 2002). Seven Abiqueños - Lorenzo Trujillo, Hipolito Espinosa, Jose Antonio Garcia, brothers Diego and Antonio Lobato, Santiago Martinez and his wife, Manuelita Renaga3 - made the trek in the fall of 1838, departing Abiquiú September 22nd and arriving December 12th at Sycamore Grove (Garcia 1993; Harley 2000). Manuelita Renaga was pregnant when they left Abiquiú, but thought she could reach California before giving birth. Her son, Apolinario Martinez, however, was born along the trail4 (Garcia 1993).

Led by Trujillo, the group met with Antonio Lugo at his Rancho San Bernardino, and Juan Bandini at his Rancho Jurupa. The Abiqueños took Lugo’s proposal of a 2,200 acre allotment to be held in common in exchange for protecting Lugo’s herds and property from raiding Indians, marauders, and horse thieves. Martinez and his wife settled on a bluff overlooking the Santa Ana River while the others wintered nearby. They assisted Los Angeles authorities who were preparing a large herd of horses and mules to take back to Santa Fe over the OST in the spring of 1839 (Harley 2000).

Espinosa returned to Rancho San Bernardino with his family in 1840 and settled near Martinez; the fledgling settlement was called Politana (Figure 4.2). Trujillo returned with his family in 1841 traveling with the Rowland-Workman caravan, which included 1,200 sheep.

3 Some believe her name was Manuelita Martín y Larrañaga.
4 He was born at Resting Springs, California. The party was delayed two days so that the boy could be baptized.
The Trujillos settled near Espinosa and the following spring had the first wedding among the settlers when their eldest daughter married Enrique Anselmo Sepulveda at San Gabriel Mission (Harley 2000).

Trujillo and Espinosa returned to Abiquiú to assist other families who wanted to move to southern California (Garcia 1993; Harley 2000). They escorted ten families in 1842 who settled near their homes at Politana. Ten more families arrived in 1843 (Vickery 1977). Problems with Lugo’s family and employees had become intolerable by this time, and Trujillo, in consultation with the other heads of the families, decided to take Bandini’s 1838 offer and relocate to Rancho Jurupa (Figures 4.3 and 4.4). Some of the families moved in 1844 and settled on the south bank of the Santa Ana River about four miles south of Politana; their community was called as La Placita de los Trujillos5 (Figure 4.5). The others joined them the following year and settled Agua Mansa on the north bank (Figure 4.6) (Harley 2000). The area encompassing the two communities was known as Agua Mansa (Harley 1992).

5 Known by some as San Salvador (Harley 2000).
Figure 4.4 Bandini’s Rancho Jurupa, Granted by the Mexican Government September 28, 1838
(Courtesy The Bancroft Library, UC-Berkeley, http://content.cdlib.org/ark:/13030/hb8r29p1vz/?brand=oac)

Figure 4.5 La Placita at the Turn of the Century. Drawn from Memory by Salvador Alvarado, 1976
(Harley 2000) (note: Don Luis Robidoux’s Home is Mislabeled; was across the River East of Jose
Jensen’s Home (Hagglund, N.d)
When the Mexican-American War came to California in 1846, the Agua Mansans fought for Mexico, but resigned themselves to American rule when their country lost in 1848. The gold rush of 1849 was the next big event in Agua Mansa life, although it did not include the Agua Mansans. The impact came from the increasing population as gold seekers were unsuccessful and decided to buy land to settle and farm in California (Harley 2000).

The first federal census of 1850 listed 16 families of 86 people for Agua Mansa. Lorenzo Trujillo was still the community don, a position he retained until his death in 1855. Trujillo had been instrumental in bringing priests from San Gabriel Mission for local services and eventually succeeded in establishing the new parish of San Salvador de Jurupa in 1852. Unfortunately, the site was a poor choice, as it turned to quicksand causing the church to collapse. The second site was on the north side of the river and the church was completed in 1853. Lorenzo’s final contribution to his community was to establish a cemetery on the hill behind the church in 1854.

The winter of 1861-1862 was a severe season for the community of Agua Mansa. In November 1861, rain began falling in southern California and continued for 15 days, saturating the ground (Engstrom 1996). The wet weather was followed by a relatively dry
period through much of December (Friis 1965). In the nearby mountains, these conditions produced a heavy snowfall and runoff that exceeded the drainage capacity of the valley (Harley 1991b). The rains came again on December 24th and lasted for almost four weeks, although there were two brief interruptions (Friis 1965). The Santa Ana River became a raging torrent and all of the communities along its banks were inundated. The storms produced a peak flow of 320,000 cubic feet per second in the upper river and created an inland sea in Orange County. Flood waters were four feet deep up to four miles from the river (Saltzman 1995).

The communities of Agua Mansa and La Placita were destroyed, however, no lives were lost. Father Borgatta heard the roar of approaching flood waters in the early morning hours of January 22nd, 1862. He rang the church bell to warn his people who hurried to higher ground. The flood waters filled the little valley bluff to bluff, just reaching the church steps. The two communities lost everything including their sheep and chickens. Cornelius Jensen, who had replaced Lorenzo Trujillo as community don, sent word that the people of Agua Mansa and La Placita could kill his cattle as they needed them (Harley 1991b).

Both settlements were rebuilt but neither achieved the former prosperity. Even the parish declined and ceased to have a resident priest by 1867. Through the remainder of the 1800s, many members of the community relocated to Riverside and Colton. La Placita, however, replaced Agua Mansa as the community focus (Harley 1991b). Today, Colton is considered the home of the Agua Mansans. The town was founded in 1874 to service the Southern Pacific Railway, an industry that attracted many Agua Mansans. By 1893, Agua Mansa existed only through its relocated people.

### 4.3 Contemporary Views of Agua Mansa

Agua Mansa continues to exist as a community within the city limits of Colton, California and in the minds of the participants who gave different names to the place that reflect their relationships with historic Agua Mansa. Participants’ responses are listed together by question but denoted by different bullet symbols.

**Community Settlement**

**What is the name of this place?**

- Politana
  - Agua Mansa Cemetery. It’s just above the former Agua Mansa settlement.
  - Agua Mansa

**Are there other names for this place?**

- Yes
  - No
  - Yes

**If Yes, what are they?**

- Lugo Ranch, Rancho San Bernardino, Site of the trekkers, Path of the Abiquiu or Agua Mansa trekkers (coined by Bruce Harley for the original settlers).
The English translation is Gentle Water. We still call it Agua Mansa but the outside people, “I’m going to Colton.” Agua Mansa was a village with all these other little villages around. The one distinction about Agua Mansa is that it was the only place in California settled in the northern New Mexico manner the people had their own place to live, usually with some land around it for household gardening and vegetables, but all the land around it was held in common so that you could graze, everybody could graze their stock on it. One of the reasons for doing that was that everyone in the community, you could raise sheep or whatever and be sure that there was land. And the community decided which lands were to be grazed at what time and it also meant if there was water there, everyone had access to the waters.

Why were Hispanic people attracted to this place?

- Water. It was the lone place along the trail for traders.
  - It was a stopping place.
- They were asked to come out. Lugo wanted them from Abiquiu because they were good Indian fighters. He sought at least 20 families. Lugo couldn’t follow through with the land on Lytle Creek so Bandini suggested the Santa Ana River sites. The California tribes raided the stock. Trujillo and Martinez made the Old Spanish Trail trek many times. They were livestock traders and guides. The lands were divied up when the Mexicans took over from the Spanish.

Were there natural and/or social features that attracted them?

- Yes
  - Yes
  - Yes

What characteristics do you think attracted them?

Water
- Yes, the Santa Ana River.
  - Yes, the Santa Ana River and the springs in San Bernardino.
  - Yes, the Santa Ana River.

Plants
- Yes. It was referred to as the garden of Eden, related to extensive gardens, orchards; originally vegetable rich. They provided travelers with food.
  - Maybe, but there weren’t any cactus, the nopales.
  - No
### Animals
- No
  - Probably. There were rabbits, quail, pheasant, and black bears in the hills.
  
### Evidence of previous use
- No
  - No
  
  - Bandini selected the area they could have.

### Geological features
- Maybe. There are nice views of the Santa Ana valley and floodplain.
  - The springs and nearby mountains.
  
  - Yes, the high mesa above the river.

### Other features
- Yes. The climate and the tribes were less fierce than in Abiquiú.
  - The mission wasn’t too far away.
  
  - No

### Was this site the Hispanic people’s first choice for a community?
- Yes
  - Yes
  
  - No

### If not, where was their first choice, and why didn't they settle or stay there?
- Yes
  - Yes
  
  - No

### Where did the Hispanic people come from?
- Abiquiú
  - New Mexico and Arizona
  
  - Abiquiú, New Mexico families were recruited. Some may have come from nearby Abiquiú but my understanding is that they were from Abiquiú.
Why did the Hispanic people leave that place?

- Lugo sent Espinosa and Trujillo and Martinez to New Mexico to recruit settlers. There were fierce Indians in New Mexico. They were looking for a better way of life. They lived on the river in Abiquiú too.
  - They were looking for better country. My grandfather used to herd cattle down to Long Beach.
  ✱ Probably economic reasons.

Were any of your ancestors among those who came here?

- Yes
- Yes
- Yes

Who were they and when did they come?

- In 1842, Jose Joaquin Moya (my great-uncle), Jose Gregorio Atencio (my g-g-grandfather), his mother Maria Guadalupe Lucero de Godoy (my g-g-g-grandmother) and father Gregorio de Jesus Atencio (my g-g-g-grandfather). In 1843, Juan de Dios Moya (my great-grandfather). In 1844, Jose Ygnacio Moya (great-uncle & g-g-g-grandfather), Jose’s wife Maria Rufina Martinez/Martin (g-g-g-grandmother), and their daughter Juana Gertrudis Moya (g-g-grandmother). Jose Joaquin, Juan, and Jose Ygnacio were brothers.
  ¶ I was born in San Fernando, California. A lot of my relatives came from Spain and Sonora through Tubac to here (Agua Mansa), then to San Gabriel. My grandfather was Gregorio de la Cruz Sepulveda and his parents originally came from the town of Sepulveda in Spain. He was born in the San Fernando area and baptized at the old plaza church in L.A. He was raised by the Dominguez family, his godparents, after his father died. He was raised in Santa Ana Canyon. There were so many children and his widow needed help. He didn’t know he was a Sepulveda until he was grown, they told him before he got married. Then he took Sepulveda back. But some always knew him as Gregorio Dominguez. On my mother’s side, the Alvarados married into the Yorba family. My grandmother was Yorba, and Serrano. There’s a Jensen part – that’s Agua Mansa. Some of my ancestors came with Anza and some with Rivera.
  ✱ Moya through my maternal grandmother who was a Romero and the great-granddaughter of Jose Ignacio Moya who came out in 1845 and the granddaughter of Josepha Moya. The Romeros were New Mexicans who didn’t come to California. Grandfather of Josepha Moya. My maternal grandmother’s mother was a Young. My mother was a
Valdez, that was her father; they [the Valdezes] were all New Mexicans but didn’t come to California until after 1900. And the Youngs who came to California. The Moya families were a very large family and they were all married, there may have been a daughter who wasn’t, and three of four sons came, but they didn’t come in the same groups. One came and probably sent back word and then the others came. None of the daughters came. Mariana was born in Agua Mansa in 1857. The Moya families are the only ones I’ve been able to trace to Abiquiú. Josepha Moya and Joaquin Young traveled the Old Spanish Trail repeatedly visiting and sometimes staying in New Mexico, Colorado, and California for a time before traveling the trail again. The Romeros from Taos, east of the mountains. The Valdez families from Questa on the other side [west] of the Sangre de Cristo Mountains (Abiquiú was also on the west side). Ewing Young came from a Scot-Irish family who originally settled in Virginia and then they migrated south into North Carolina and settled in an area historically was called the Watauga. The Scots traveled in groups. Ewing Young, who Joaquin Young’s father, his father, grandfather (Robert), and several uncles fought in the Revolutionary War. Robert called his rifle “Sweet Lips” after his wife. In May 1822, Ewing, who was 26, joined William Becknell on his second trip from Missouri to Santa Fé. He became a leader of trapping parties and set up his home base in Taos, also opening a store there with William Wolfskill. He had a common-law marriage with Josefa Tafoya and they had a son in April 1831 who they named José Joaquin Young. Joaquin eventually settled in Agua Mansa where he married Josefa Moya in 1855. She was the daughter of a former alcalde of Agua Mansa. Joaquin died in Colton in 1903, and Josefa died there in 1933.

Has your family remained here?

- Yes. The 1862 flood had an influence on relocations. Today, we’re scattered from here (Colton) to Los Angeles to Perris. Some of the relocation may be related to the railroad.
  - Yes
  - Yes, throughout San Bernardino County and Los Angeles County, and cousins still at the original place. Some of my cousins still own the original properties.

OST Community Impacts

Did the Hispanic people of this community use the Old Spanish Trail
for purposes other than moving here?

- No
  - Don’t know
  - Yes

If Yes or Maybe, for what other purposes did they use the trail?

- There were two main trails between here and San Gabriel. The one not the Old Spanish Trail may have been used for interactions with San Gabriel Mission.
  - ---
  - The Youngs used it for traveling back and forth for visits. Joaquin’s mother and half siblings were in Taos, New Mexico. His father, Ewing, left when Joaquin was two because there was a warrant for Ewing’s arrest in New Mexico. We know of one visit Joaquin and Josefa made in 1860, and another to Trinidad, Colorado in 1870. In 1872, they returned to California for good because he had been a deputy sheriff for his uncle Juan Cristobal Tafoya, Sheriff of Las Animas County, and three Texans killed his uncle in February of that year.

Did use of the Old Spanish Trail impact the Hispanic people who lived here?

- Yes
  - Yes
  - Yes

If Yes or Maybe, how were they impacted?

- Some travelers raided the ranchos for cattle. The trail brought “new blood” to marry into settlements, which were also an impact of the Gold Rush of 1848-1849, and fur trappers settled in Agua Mansa.
  - If they got here, they knew they could get back. If they left relatives where they were coming from, they’d use it go back. The ones moving herds between here and Santa Fe would use it as a supply and rest stop.
  - Agua Mansa was considered the “end of the trail.” For some, Agua Mansa was the goal, for others it was a provision stop. There was correspondence along the trail between the California families and the families who remained in New Mexico and Colorado. The trade had some impact but what?

Did use of the Old Spanish Trail impact the resources at this site that you identified earlier?

Water

- No
Plants
- No
- Yes
- No response

Animals
- Yes
- No response

Evidence of previous use
- No
- No
- No response

Geological features
- No
- Yes
- Yes

Other features
- No
- Yes
- No response

If Yes or Maybe, how were the resources impacted?

Water
- ---
- ---
- There was use by the livestock association and with the trade business.

Plants
- ---
- Yes. They probably brought plants and seeds with them.
- ---

Animals
- Livestock raiding, but there were more attempts than successes.
- The people’s presence disturbed the wildlife, and they hunted them. They hunted deer.
- ---

Evidence of previous use
- ---
- ---
- ---

Geological features
- ---
- The springs may have been impacted during the dry years [more people].
- The community grew.

Other features
- ---
- They worked at the missions.
- ---
Community Connections - Local Landscapes

Are there places traditionally used by the Hispanic people that are connected to this place?

- Yes
  - Yes
  - Yes

If Yes or Maybe, what are those places and how are they connected to this place?

Place 1
- Abiquiú
- Trails, roads: Yes
- Historic events: The 1862 flood forced relocations.
- Daily events: Parties, marriages, baptisms.
- Family: Yes
- Friends: Yes
- Other: The church, San Gabriel Mission.

Place 2
- All the rancheros from here to Los Angeles and San Diego.
- Trails, roads: Yes
- Historic events: Parties, marriages, baptisms.
- Daily events: Parties, marriages, baptisms.
- Family: Yes
- Friends: Yes
- Other: The church, missions.

Place 3
- San Bernardino hot spring
- Trails, roads
- Historic events
- Daily events
- Family
- Friends
- Other: They went there for healing.

Place 4
- San Gabriel Mission
- Trails, roads
- Historic events
- Daily events: Baptisms
- Family
- Friends
- Other

Place 5
- The Plaza Church in Los Angeles.
Were those places impacted by travelers on the Old Spanish Trail?

- Maybe
  - Yes
  - Yes

If Yes or Maybe, how were those places impacted?

- ---
  - More people used them for healing.
  - On one of Young’s trips, he brought Kit Carson. I’m not sure if it was on the Old Spanish Trail but it probably was. Also, if travelers needed an official ceremony.

Are those places still connected to this community?

- Yes
  - Don’t know
  - No

If Yes or Maybe, any other comments?

- ---
  - ---

Are there other trails traditionally used by Hispanic people that are connected to this place?

- Yes
  - Yes
  - Yes

If Yes or Maybe, where were those trails and how were they connected to this place?

- The trail from Sinaloa to San Gabriel.
• It is like the Old Spanish Trail in that it brought settlers but it’s not connected to it [physically].

• Up the Santa Ana River from the south.

Trail 3

▫ The Anza Trail

▫ Some of my ancestors came here along that trail. My dad went on the reenactment of the Anza trail in 1977. They went down to Mexico City and he rode his horse. He didn’t take his horse down to Mexico; I think he had to rent a horse down there but I think he trailered his horse to Arizona. They followed the diary and stopped and camped. And they came home between times to check on things. It was pretty hard on my uncle; he was a year or two older than my dad, and he almost had a nervous breakdown when it was over with. It was just the trauma and schedule that they were on. Just worn out.

Trail 4

▫ The Gila Trail south out of Santa Fe to San Diego.

▫ Yes

Trail 5

▫ There were three others from New Mexico to California via Agua Mansa and San Gabriel.

▫ Yes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Friends</strong></th>
<th><strong>Other</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Were those trails impacted by travelers on the Old Spanish Trail?** | • Maybe  
  □ Maybe  
  ▪ Yes |
| **If Yes or Maybe, how were those trails impacted?** | • It wasn’t established as a route as the Old Spanish Trail was; it was more exploratory to other places.  
  □ The Anza Trail may have crossed the Old Spanish Trail somewhere. There’s a sign on the 15 before you hit Highway 10 for the Anza Trail. It goes right through town. There’s a sign in Ontario...there’s a statue in Riverside of Anza.  
  ▪ They used all the trails depending on the time of year, their purpose, the type of group. |
| **Are those trails still connected to this community?** | • Don’t know  
  □ Yes  
  ▪ Yes |
| **If Yes or Maybe, any other comments?** | • ---  
  □ There are historic signs along the trail and the statue of Anza in Riverside.  
  ▪ Some are now highways and still used. |
| **Do you have any other comments about the Old Spanish Trail or the impacts from travelers on the Old Spanish Trail?** | • The bears were plentiful and there were fish in the river. This was a gathering place for traders. They had to stop here to get clearance to enter San Gabriel. The Old Spanish Trail didn’t have any influence in site selection. Agua Mansa was an Asistencia Mission. It was established as an outpost for San Gabriel Mission before the San Salvador church was built. That was the first church in Agua Mansa and the father came from San Gabriel. Juan de Dios Moya’s second wife was Mercede Rondan. She was born in Louisiana and her father was a ranchero, Mariano Rondan. He was born in France and was the first alcalde of Los Angeles. Juan’s brother Jose Ygnacio came with his wife and daughter Juana who later married another pioneer settler, Jose Gregorio Atencio. He came to Agua Mansa in 1842. They married either at San Gabriel or San Salvador. The bell from the |
Agua Mansa church is now at the Mission Inn Museum in Riverside (Figures). The Thomas Winery was established in 1839 in what is now Rancho Cucamonga (east of San Gabriel). Agua Mansa was the Jurupa Rancho and Politana was San Bernardino Rancho. The Old Spanish Trail brought non-Hispanic settlers here. The Mormons settled the town site of San Bernardino. They purchased it from Lugo but didn’t stay long. Many of them returned to Utah. The settlements were here for such a short time.

I know in the old days [when her mother was young] it was quite a chore just to go from Orange County to Riverside County. We had a great-aunt that lived in Santa Ana Canyon just out of Corona, and Mother used to say she’d ride her horse, when it was vacation time, up to ... she was born on that ranch there. Now there’s a Green River golf course there. My grandmother was born on the Slaughter Ranch. I’d be curious to follow it [Old Spanish Trail]. My husband found out from his cousin that the Mormons came through or were supposed to come through Hastings Pass. It was named for Lansford Hastings, one of my husband’s ancestors. Probably a distant cousin.

La Politana was in San Bernardino near the springs. The Culver City historian is a Lugo descendant. Without the Old Spanish Trail, there wouldn’t be this very unique community, Agua Mansa. Even after the flood [1862], they rebuilt, stayed, kept their identity and community.
4.4 Ethnographic Summary

The Agua Mansa site today shows several traces of the former community (Figure 4.7). The community’s cemetery, which is on a bench above the floodplain, remains as does an old adobe, which is now fenced but in poor condition. The church bell also remains but is located now at the Riverside Mission Inn courtyard. This is the second Agua Mansa bell, which replaced the original bell around 1866. The original bell, along with the church, had survived the 1862 flood, but developed a crack in 1863 that prevented further use. It was the ringing of the original bell that alerted the Agua Mansans to the flood and prevented loss of life. The new bell was slightly disfigured and not as pleasant-sounding as the original bell but it served the community for over fifty years (Figure 4.10) (Harley 1991a). Also surviving are several Stations of the Cross, which mark where Agua Mansa founder Lorenzo Trujillo’s casket rested on its journey to the Agua Mansa cemetery from the church. The stations were small piles of rocks surmounted with a wooden cross. Trujillo died in 1855 and his stations miraculously survived the 1862 flood (Harley 1991c).

Figure 4.7 The Agua Mansa Site Today from the West Bank (Left) and the East Bank (Right)
Figure 4.8 The Agua Mansa Cemetery Inscription Reads: This Historic Site Marks the Resting Place of the Pioneers of the Agua Mansa Area which was Started about 1840. The Preservation of this Cemetery began in 1951. This Plaque Placed by Jurupa Parlor No. 296 Native Daughters of the Golden West, June 11, 1961.

Figure 4.9 The Agua Mansa Cemetery is now California State Historical Landmark #121. The Chapel is a Replica of the Agua Mansa de San Salvador Chapel that Survived the 1862 Flood.
Descendants of the Abiquiú Agua Mansans, including those of Lorenzo Trujillo, live throughout southern California, many in Colton just a few miles from the original settlements (Harley 1992). In recent years, renewed interest in genealogy and history has drawn descendants to the cemetery where they have organized walks and other small-scale events. The San Bernardino County Museum has worked with them to record the burials and make
them accessible in an online database.\textsuperscript{6} Descendants have expressed interest in improving the cemetery, protecting the dilapidated adobe, and retrieving the church bell.

The relationship between the OST and Agua Mansa is one that lives on today among the descendants. Those from California as well as from Abiquiú, New Mexico have expressed interest in finding relatives and sharing their histories. While Santa Fe and Los Angeles are considered the end points of the OST, Abiquiú and Agua Mansa were the last settlements before the long journey between them. To reiterate what community participants stated earlier in this report, Agua Mansa served both as a endpoint for community members traveling the trail to trade or reconnect with Abiquiú, as well as a place to re-supply. They believe the trail maintained a strong connection between Abiquiú and Agua Mansa and that Agua Mansa wouldn’t have existed without the OST. Agua Mansa supported travel on the OST while the OST and the resulting trade were vital to the founding and success of Agua Mansa. Agua Mansa’s role in the OST is a story that descendants feel has been ignored. Their interest in their history and the role of their ancestors in the development of southern California provides the seeds for local collaboration to recognize the community and trail.

\textsuperscript{6} http://www.co.san-bernardino.ca.us/museum/branches/agua.htm
CHAPTER 5
SAN GABRIEL MISSION, CALIFORNIA

The story of San Gabriel Mission (Figure 5.1) begins during the early Spanish colonial days, which are known more commonly as the mission era. Preceding the Old Spanish Trail era by almost 60 years, San Gabriel Mission was used by travelers as a place for rest, food, and water. This chapter provides geological, ecological, and historical overviews of the mission and its relationship to the OST along with contemporary perspectives of the community and trail from San Gabriel descendants. It concludes with a summary of places or features of significant ethnographic importance.

Figure 5.1 Mission San Gabriel
5.1 Geology and Ecology of the San Gabriel Mission Area

San Gabriel Mission was established initially near the present-day Montebello along the Rio Hondo, which is in the Los Angeles River Watershed\(^1\) of southern California (Figure 5.2). Predominant features of the watershed include the Los Angeles River and the San Gabriel Mountains. Whittier Narrows is another significant feature in the landscape that lies along the boundary of the Los Angeles River and San Gabriel River watersheds.

![Figure 5.2 The Los Angeles River Watershed](image)

Geologically, San Gabriel Mission lies in the Peninsular Ranges Province near the boundary with the Transverse Ranges Province (Figure 5.3). The area varies from Precambrian metamorphic rocks (1.7 billion years old) to more recent alluvial deposits from mountain canyons. The San Gabriel Mountains are geologically young and continue to rise at a rate of nearly three-quarters of an inch per year. They are composed of ancient crystalline rocks and are bounded by the San Andreas Fault zone on the north, the Cucamonga-Sierra Madre fault complex on the south and southwest, and the San Jacinto fault zone on the east. Most of the crystalline rock structure is separated by the Vincent Thrust, a low-angle tectonic fault zone running through most of the range. Lower-plate rocks beneath this fault zone are Pelona Schist, a complex of metamorphosed sedimentary (Mesozoic marine deep-water sand, silt, and calcareous and siliceous muds) and volcanic rocks (basaltic flows). Upper-plate rocks above the Vincent Thrust include ancient (Proterozoic) metamorphic and plutonic rocks, which are most abundant in the central and western part of the range (California Resources Agency 2001; CGS and GS 2004).

Fault-ridden southern California (Figure 5.4) has a long history of earthquakes. The first documented quake in the Los Angeles Basin occurred in 1769 and is estimated to have been a magnitude 6.0. Four other LA Basin quakes were documented during the first half of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century concurrent with activity along the OST. Two earthquakes in 1812, the first on December 8 and the second around December 21, caused major damage to San Gabriel Mission. These quakes have been estimated at magnitudes of above 7.0 and at 8.3

\(^{1}\) When San Gabriel was initially established until after 1825, it was in the San Gabriel River Watershed.
respectively (Francisco 1987). A quake estimated at magnitude 5.5 was recorded in 1827, and a quake estimated at magnitude 6.0 was recorded in 1855 (Ellsworth 1990). Nineteen earthquakes, ranging in magnitude from 4.8 to 6.7, have been recorded in the Los Angeles Basin since 1920 (USGS 2006). The 1987 Whittier Narrows quake, which registered a magnitude 5.9, was the closest to San Gabriel Mission (Southern CA Earthquake Data Center 2005).

The Whittier Narrows quake occurred along a previously unknown fault. The Los Angeles Region Seismic Experiment (LARSE) was initiated to develop an accurate picture of the network of active faults and other geologic structures that underlie the Los Angeles region. By 1998, the LARSE project had obtained images of the sedimentary basin beneath the San Gabriel Valley revealing that it has a depth of 3 miles, which is 50% more than earlier estimates (Figure 5.5). Deeper sedimentary basins have greater shaking potential so the earthquake hazards in the San Gabriel Valley are greater than previously thought (Henyey et al. 2002).

Topography in the Los Angeles River watershed ranges from sea level to over 10,000 feet in the San Gabriel Mountains. San Gabriel Mission is in a Mediterranean climate zone with wet winters and long dry summers (California Resources Agency 2001). From 1750 to 1905, the southern California climate was characterized by cycles of higher-than-average rainfall and runoff (Stein et al. 2007). Most of the annual precipitation occurs between November and March in a few major storm events. Average annual rainfall varies from 12 to 27 inches as one moves from the coast to the mountains (California Resources Agency 2001).
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Figure 5.4 The Los Angeles Basin and Surrounding Uplifts (Bjorklund 2002)

Figure 5.5 Seismographic Recordings of Subsurface Structure of that Part of the Los Angeles Area Containing San Gabriel Mission. Cooler Colors are Less Dense Rock. The Deep Zone beneath the San Gabriel Mountains is a "master" Blind Thrust Fault that Transfers Stress and Strain from the San Andreas Fault to the Network of Faults in the San Gabriel Valley and Los Angeles Basin (Graphics by Sara Boore, Susan Mayfield, and Stephen Scott in Henyey et al. 2002)
Much of the Los Angeles River flow comes from snowmelt, surface runoff from storms, springs, and groundwater. The river was shallow with braided channels and wide floodplains. It frequently made new channels through the floodplains during heavy winter storms and shifted its courses several times. During the late 18th and 19th centuries, ranching and agriculture dominated the Los Angeles River basin. Water was diverted from the river for irrigation and consumption and as the area’s population increased, the natural flow was reduced. The river’s tendency to flood during the winter continued into the 20th century until more than seventy-five percent of its channels were concrete-lined for flood protection purposes (California Resources Agency 2001).

Extensive wetlands, both fresh and saltwater, characterized the Los Angeles River basin before Europeans arrived. The river supported extensive riparian habitats that included marsh grasses, willow, cottonwood, mulefat, and sycamore, and supported steelhead trout. Approximately 98% of these historic wetlands have been lost to urbanization, marinas, flood protection measures, or stream channelization (California Resources Agency 2001).

The native vegetation communities in the San Gabriel Mission area were typical of southern California and included coastal sage and alluvial scrub, wetlands, grasslands, chaparral, oak savanna, and oak woodland. The varying topography created myriad microclimates that contributed to a diversity of mixed plant communities and locally unique habitats. The basin and surrounding hills also supported a variety of wildlife including large predators such as grizzly bear and mountain lion (California Resources Agency 2001).

The arrival of Europeans brought changes to the native vegetation surrounding the rivers; much was cleared to make way for farms and villages. Abundant water and favorable climate encouraged growth of a variety of crops. Water was diverted from the rivers to support the Europeans and their agriculture. As the population increased, more water was diverted, and eventually the rivers ceased to reach the ocean (California Resources Agency 2001).

5.2 A History of San Gabriel Mission

As part of the Spanish crown’s exploration and claim of new territory, soldiers and priests were dispersed in three northward directions from Mexico. The Baja Peninsula, sometimes referred to as Baja California, was the starting point of many who came to Alta California, including today’s southern California (Gutiérrez and Orsi 1998). San Gabriel Mission, fourth in a 21-mission plan of the Franciscan Order and the Spanish government, was established in 1771 by Fray Junipero Serra (Figures 5.6 and 5.7). Fathers Fr. Angel Somera and Fr. Pedro Benito Cambón were the first priests appointed to San Gabriel (James 1913).
Figure 5.6 San Gabriel Mission with Indian Huts in the Foreground. The Mission’s Flocks and Herds Once Covered the Country for Miles Around (Blackmar 1891; Sanchez 1914:67).

Figure 5.7 Monument of Father Junipero Serra at San Gabriel Mission.
The missions were pioneer institutions and involved exploration, pacification of the native inhabitants, and the introduction of a new civilization and religion (Gentilcore 1961). Mission locations were based on adequate lands for farming and a dependable water supply for irrigation (James 1913). Nearby Indian populations, the availability of timber and access to the ocean for trade purposes also were requisite for mission sites (Gentilcore 1961). The site chosen for San Gabriel Mission had these features. This location, however, was immediately below Whittier Narrows through which both the Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers pass, and the area was subject to severe flooding. The Indians there also proved to be hostile so in 1775, San Gabriel Mission was relocated to its present site (Priestley 1920).

Attempts to bring settlers to California followed closely on the heels of the first missions. Juan Bautista de Anza established an overland route to California in 1775. During a period of 138 days, de Anza guided 240 colonists and 1000 head of livestock to California (Hornbeck 1984). Among the colonists were 198 settlers and over half of the party were 12 years of age or younger. The group followed the Santa Cruz River north to the Gila River where they turned west to follow it to the Colorado River. Crossing the sand dunes and deserts of southern California, the travelers turned northwest toward the Santa Ana Valley. Passing through the Riverside area, they arrived at Mission San Gabriel Arcángel on January 4, 1776. Some stayed at San Gabriel while others continued up the California coast ended near Monterey on March 10, 1776 (Bolton 1930). Many of the San Gabriel settlers relocated to El Pueblo de Nuestra Señora la Reina de los Angeles de Porciúncula, which was established in 1781 and later became Los Angeles (California Resources Agency 2001).

In its new location, San Gabriel Mission became one of the largest and most productive of the missions. It had seventeen ranchos for horses and cattle, and fifteen ranchos for sheep, goats, and pigs (Phillips 1975). As the Spanish installed irrigation systems, they struggled with the extremes of flooding and low water flows (Gentilcore 1961; Moriarty 1983). Eventually, they built a huge system of aqueducts throughout California to irrigate extensive gardens, orchards, and vineyards. The missions prospered until 1821 when Mexico separated from Spain.

In 1833, the Secularization Act brought an end to the Mission Era by taking ownership of the mission lands to make the vast acreages available to ranchers seeking new lands (Sparkman 1908). As Spanish and Mexican ranchers acquired land grants, they were able to establish large ranchos. Along the Los Angeles River, early ranchos included Rancho Encino at the head of the river, Rancho Los Nietos, and Rancho Los Cerritos (Kielsba 1998). Along the Santa Ana, the early ranchos included Rancho San Juan Cajon de Santa Ana, established in 1837 (CA Conservancy 2001); Rancho Jurupa, established in 1838; Rancho San Bernardino, established in 1842 (Avina 1973).

The effects of the Mission program and settlement of the more arable lands by ranchers resulted in the disruption and dissemination of the Indian settlement and land use pattern and populations. With the end of the Mission era, some Indian people chose to find jobs and continue to pursue their Christianized lifestyle while others joined those who had resisted the Spanish (Sparkman 1908). The latter were those who drove the ranchos to seek
protection of their livestock, which eventually led to the recruitment of settlers from Abiquiú, New Mexico.

In spite of the secularization of the missions, San Gabriel Mission continued to provide the settlers with religious services. Distant communities such as those associated with Rancho San Bernardino and Rancho Jurupa had small churches at San Bernardino and Agua Mansa that were outposts or estancias to San Gabriel Mission. The Old Plaza Church in Los Angeles was San Gabriel’s only asistencia\(^2\) (Harley 2003).

Greater changes came to the San Gabriel Valley in the latter 1840s. The Mexican-America War brought fighting from 1846 to 1848 when the Treaties of Cahuenga (1847) and Guadalupe Hidalgo (1848) were signed and America acquired the contemporary southwest. Mexican ranching gave way to American farming, mining, and urban development. The American farms tended to be smaller acreages and the farmers used the land more intensively. The end of the war coincided with the discovery of gold in northern California, which increased the population over 500% between 1848 to 1850, and 1900% by 1852 (Lightfoot 2004). The arrival of the transcontinental railroads in 1876 provided access to distant markets, and agricultural production expanded greatly. The railroads also brought more people eager to take advantage of the abundant sunshine, farmland, water, and business opportunities in southern California (California Resources Agency 2001).

5.3 Contemporary Views of San Gabriel Mission

San Gabriel Mission is still a culturally central place to the people who took part in this study. The responses below reflect the relationships their ancestors and they themselves have with the mission and the OST. Participants’ responses are listed together by question but denoted by different bullet symbols.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Settlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What is the name of this place?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- San Gabriel Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- San Gabriel Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are there other names for this place?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>If Yes, what are they?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- But Tongva and Gabrieleño villages were associated with the mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- San Gabriel of the Archangels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Why were Hispanic people attracted to this place?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It’s supposed to be one day’s walk between the missions. They were looking for water and farm land.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\) A mission on a small scale with all the requisites for a mission, and with Divine service held regularly on days of obligation, except that it lacked a resident priest.
It was by a river and the soil was great for growing crops; they brought cocoa with them. They wanted to Christianize the Indians. They ended up with vast land holdings.

Were there natural and/or social features that attracted them?
- Yes
- Yes

What characteristics do you think attracted them?

Water
- The springs and rivers.
- The San Gabriel River.

Plants
- The grass, some crops like corn, maize, probably beans.
- No

Animals
- They could raise cattle here. In the 1820s, cattle hides and tallow were worth a lot of money.
- No

Evidence of previous use
- Other missions for religious needs like confirmations. This was a stopping point along the trail, almost like a hotel.
- The seasonal Indian villages.

Geological features
- The mission lands so they could raise cattle and crops.
- The soils and weather reminded them of home.

Other features
- No
- No

Was this site the Hispanic people’s first choice for a community?
- No
- No

If not, where was their first choice, and why didn’t they settle or stay there?
- The first mission was in Montebello. It washed away in a flood, now it’s just a monument with a plaque. So they moved to this location.
- Their first choice was downstream from here.

Where did the Hispanic people come from?
- The Jesuits had missions in Baja but they were kicked out in 1776. Spanish soldiers came from Sonora and Baja.
- Rio Fuerte to Baja, then up here.

---

3 A little over five miles downstream from San Gabriel.
Why did the Hispanic people leave that place?

- A lot of Spanish soldiers were disillusioned and came here from Sonora and Baja. People who were mixed breed couldn’t get land, they were peons, pobladores (settlers) looking for a chance to better themselves.
  - The soldiers were promised land.

Were any of your ancestors among those who came here?

- Yes
  - Yes

Who were they and when did they come?

- Claudio Lopez who was majordomo of San Gabriel. His sons were Esteban, Chico, and Ignacio. Esteban was my great-great-grandfather. He was born at Mission San Gabriel. One of my pobladores was a mulatto. Roque Jacinto de Cota was my great-great-great-grandfather and one of the founders of Los Angeles in 1781. Also, his wife Juana Maria Verdugo. They came here with their daughter Maria Luisa de Cota, my great-great-grandmother. They all are on my father’s side.
  - Andrés Cota was a “soldado de quera” born in Rio Fuerte, Mexico in the 1600s. His son Antonio Cota was born in Rio Fuerte in 1732. Antonio’s daughter Matilde Cota was born in the late 1700s at San Gabriel. She was the third child. She married Nicolas Lizalda, a Basque who was a lead scout who came with De Anza. His father was Pedro Lizalda. Matilde and Nicolas had Juana who was born in L.A. Juana’s daughter Andrea was born in LA too. She married a Yorba first, then later a Pio.

Has your family remained here?

- Yes. I’m 7th generation and I have 10th generation [great grand-] children. Also descendants [cousins] from the three Cota brothers, one whose daughter Claudio Lopez married.
  - Sort of. We’re mostly in LA and Santa Barbara since 1829.

OST Community Impacts

Did the Hispanic people of this community use the Old Spanish Trail for purposes other than moving here?

- No response
  - No

If Yes or Maybe, for what other purposes did
they use the trail?  

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did use of the Old Spanish Trail impact the Hispanic people who lived here?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If Yes or Maybe, how were they impacted?

- The traders brought goods. Hides were traded for manufactured goods, wool, serapes. They also stole horses and cattle.
- It brought more people here, increased the population in LA, which is where the jobs were. San Gabriel was for rest, “refueling” before heading to LA.

Did use of the Old Spanish Trail impact the resources at this site that you identified earlier?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plants</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animals</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence of previous use</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geological features</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other features</th>
<th>---</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If Yes or Maybe, how were the resources impacted?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water</th>
<th>The 1860 drought was followed by floods in 1862 and 1864. So just through staying here, the normal daily use was greater. Traders and gold rush miners used more of the water.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plants</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animals</th>
<th>The livestock were stolen and taken back to Santa Fe; horses and cattle. The herds were made up of bought and stolen animals. The trade dropped off around 1847-1848.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Evidence of previous use**

- The Indians were servants. They weren’t treated badly but still were nothing but servants. Some Spanish married Indian women from here.

**Geological features**

- ---
  - ---

**Other features**

- ---
  - ---

**Community Connections - Local Landscapes**

Are there places traditionally used by the Hispanic people that are connected to this place?

- Yes
  - Yes

If Yes or Maybe, what are those places and how are they connected to this place?

**Place 1**

- All the missions.
  - ---

**Trails, roads**

- El Camino Real from Baja to San Francisco. It was originally an Indian trail. Expeditions were the only way to get into California. Most of the De Anza Trail travelers ended up in San Francisco.
  - ---

**Historic events**

- ---
  - ---

**Daily events**

- The congregations.
  - ---

**Family**

- Yes
  - ---

**Friends**

- Yes
  - ---

**Other**

- These were places to rest on the way to other places.
  - ---

**Place 2**

- The pueblo (Los Angeles).
  - LA

**Trails, roads**

- El Camino Real
  - ---

**Historic events**

- ---
Daily events
• It had a plaza church instead of a mission. It was used for weddings, funerals, and baptisms.

Family
• Yes

Friends
• Yes

Other
• The church was built there as LA grew. San Gabriel was too far for many to come for church.

Place 3
• Ranches.
  • The Yorba Ranch, which ran from Corona to Newport Beach. Really, all the ranches and communities east of here.

Trails, roads
• El Camino Real

Historic events
• Some traders stayed at ranches.

Daily events
• They came here for weddings, funerals, and baptisms. It was the nearest mission for church needs.

Family
• 

Friends
• 

Other
• 

Place 4
• La Casa Vieja de Lopez in San Gabriel (Figure 5.8).

Trails, roads
• 

Historic events
• 

Daily events
• 

Family
• It\textsuperscript{4} was built around 1792 by Jose Maria Claudio Lopez, Majordomo of Mission San Gabriel. He’s my great-great-great-grandfather I mentioned earlier. He was born in Baja California, married in Mission San Gabriel, and buried

\textsuperscript{4} Purchased in the early 1860s by Don Juan Nepomuceno Lopez, the building was returned to San Gabriel Mission in the late 1970s and underwent restoration in the 1990s.
beneath the Holy water font at Mission San Gabriel. His son Esteban Ygnacio Maria de los Angeles Lopez, my great-great-grandfather was born and married in Mission San Gabriel. Esteban’s son Jose Francisco Mauricio Lopez, my great-grandfather, was married in Mission San Gabriel.

Figure 5.8 Historic American Buildings Survey Photographed by Henry F. Withey, May 1937. Street front from southwest (330 North Santa Anita Avenue, San Gabriel). http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.pnp/hhh.ca0290

**Friends**

**Other**

**Were those places impacted by travelers on the Old Spanish Trail?**

- Yes
  - No. Californios were very hospitable. They would even give or loan a horse if it was needed.

**If Yes or Maybe, how were those places impacted?**

- It was the same as the impacts to San Gabriel. The missions and ranches were used by traders as hotels.

**Are those places still connected to this community?**

- Yes
  - No

**If Yes or Maybe, any other comments?**

- We participate in Los Pobladores 200. All the members are descendants of the original founding families of Los Angeles
and each year we have a history walk where we gather at Mission San Gabriel where we reenact the 1781 trek of the original settlers of Los Angeles. It’s a nine mile walk to Olvera Street. We did it from the 1920s to September 4, 1941 then stopped because of World War II for 40 years. It was started up again by Los Pobladores in 1981, the 200th anniversary of LA.

- Only through the cemeteries where their ancestors are buried.

Are there other trails traditionally used by Hispanic people that are connected to this place?

If Yes or Maybe, where were those trails and how were they connected to this place?

**Trail 1**

- **De Anza**
  - Yes

Trails, roads

- **De Anza**
  - Yes
  - ---

Historic events

- Expeditions, immigrations.
  - Travelers, and the first settlers came this way.

Daily events

- ---
  - ---

Family

- ---
  - ---

Friends

- ---
  - ---

Other

- ---
  - ---

**Trail 2**

- **El Camino Real**
  - Yes

Trails, roads

- **El Camino Real**
  - Yes
  - ---

Historic events

- Expeditions, immigrations, missions, Indian fights.
  - The first travelers came this way.

Daily events

- ---
  - ---

Family

- ---
  - ---

Friends

- ---
**Other**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Were those trails impacted by travelers on the Old Spanish Trail?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¬</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If Yes or Maybe, how were those trails impacted?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¬</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are those trails still connected to this community?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¬</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If Yes or Maybe, any other comments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¬</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you have any other comments about the Old Spanish Trail or the impacts from travelers on the Old Spanish Trail?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¬</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Not really.
  - No

- Yes
  - No

- Yes
  - No

- The De Anza Trail is Highway 8. El Camino Real is 101, Highway 1. At La Parisa Mission some of the dirt trail is still there.
  - ¬

- Lots of early Californians are still here and know their history. They’re all cousins. You can still see parts of it. We had a big party in 1999 for the Old Spanish Trail; there was a dedication of a plaque at Olvera Street in the gazebo on the Old Plaza. Some people used to bike parts of it annually. The Pobladores web site has lots of information [http://lospobladores.org/index.htm](http://lospobladores.org/index.htm). The Pobladores leave San Gabriel Mission and follow Mission Road passed Lincoln Park for about seven miles. They take Cesar Chavez for about two more miles into the Plaza. In 1833, the missions were taken from the fathers supposedly to get the land from the missions.
  - ¬

- My ancestors did chase Indians toward Cajon Pass to keep them from stealing horses. Mass was celebrated annually for those lost in the Mohave Massacre at the Colorado River. El Monte High School was at the end of the Santa Fe Trail. Los Pobladores walk from here to the Plaza. The Salazars on my mom’s side came here from San Luis in the 1920s. They came over Cajon Pass. We knew the Temple descendants who came from Taos.
As descendants of some of the original San Gabriel Mission families, the participants in this study remain closely connected to the mission and its history, which is their history. The Los Pobladores annual walk, a reenactment of the original settlers final nine-mile trek from San Gabriel Mission to El Pueblo de la Reina de Los Angeles on September 4th, 1781, is perhaps the most visible remnant of that history. Many of the participants in the walk are over 50 years of age, some are over 70 years of age. The route they follow is also the last leg of the OST.

The San Gabriel Mission, or Mission San Gabriel Arcángel, is recognized for its role in California’s history as California State Historic Landmark 158. The Old Plaza, the final destination of Los Pobladores, is recognized as well as California State Historic Landmark 156. In spite of being in a heavily developed area, the “trail” between these two points presents nine miles of opportunity for OST interpretation. Collaboration with Los Pobladores would aid identification of the best opportunities.

Descendants of San Gabriel Mission and Agua Mansa families are familiar with, and in some cases related to, each other. The historic and contemporary relationships between San Gabriel Mission and Agua Mansa could be recognized with trail markers between the mission and Colton that recognize the trail and those relationships. Collaboration with study participants offers the best opportunity for recognizing this part of the OST.

Like Agua Mansa, San Gabriel was one of the last stops along the OST in California. As community participants previously noted, San Gabriel was a place for travelers along the OST to stay and resupply. The OST brought trade to San Gabriel, but travelers also stole cattle and horses from community members. Along with economic impacts, community participants also felt that the OST brought more settlers looking for land, some of whom then married local Indian women. Similarly to Agua Mansa, genizaros from Abiquiú were also brought in to protect settler’s cattle. Due to San Gabriel and Agua Mansa’s close location and function along the Old Spanish, they were also similarly impacted and descendents recognize a connection both within families and experiences.
CHAPTER 6:
SAN LUIS, COLORADO

The community of San Luis is located on the northern branch of the OST in southern Colorado (Map 6.1). The town is approximately 67 miles north of Taos, 190 miles east of Durango, 100 miles west of Trinidad, CO and 41 miles south of Alamosa. The portion of the OST, which intersects San Luis, begins in Santa Fe and heads towards Taos and the San Luis Valley (SLV). Once the trail reaches the SLV, it veers west through the mountainous passes of the San Juan Range and towards the present day community of Gunnison, Colorado. From Gunnison, the trail heads towards the Green River Crossing on the Colorado and Utah boarder. For the community of San Luis, travel through the valley and along this northern route played an important role in its settlement and history.

Figure 6.1 The Town of San Luis
Map 6.1 San Luis Area
6.1 Geology and Ecology of the San Luis Area

The SLV is located in the northern section of the Rio Grande Rift, which is found on the southern section of the Rocky Mountain Range. The Rio Grande Rift is the result of two northsouth faults created during the mid-Tertiary period. These faults created volcanic flows and hot springs throughout the area, and there is evidence that movement is still occurring along these faults. The rift’s base is formed of Precambrian rock, while volcanic material and sediments make up the additional 5,000 to 13,000 feet (Chronic and Williams 2002).

The valley is bordered by the Arkansas Valley to the north, which makes up the northernmost section of the Rio Grande Rift, the San Juan Mountains to the west, and the Sangre de Cristo Range to the east. The southern end of the valley is made up of the San Luis volcanic field, which extends almost as far as the state line to the south (Chronic and Williams 2002).

The valley has an elevation of approximately 7,600 feet, with sand dunes ranging in size from 100 to 700 feet. The dunes are formed by a southwest wind that carries desert sand, consisting of quartz and volcanic material, to a location just north of Blanca Peak known as the “Great Sand Dunes.” Spring snowmelt reinvigorates Medano Creek, which prevents the eastern encroachment of the dunes and which often flows directly through the dunes, rather than around them. The dunes were most likely created during the Pleistocene and currently show little movement. Tracks of animal species from millions of years ago are preserved in the sedimentary rock (Chronic and Williams 2002; USFWS 2006).

Figure 6.2 Sage Brush in the San Luis Valley
The northern section of the SLV is a basin, while the southern half is drained by the Rio Grande. It averages less than 8 inches of rain per year, which makes it the only official desert in the Colorado Rockies (Chronic and Williams 2002).

In the 1800s, the area contained bountiful game species, including bison. Coyote, porcupine, and beaver are among some of the other more common species. The wetlands of the SLV also provide a habitat for over 200 migratory bird species (Blackhawk 2006; USFWS 2006). San Luis is classified as Great Basin Grasslands biome. The San Luis Valley receives between 7-9 inches of rain per year, one of the lowest averages in this biome making it one of the most arid regions in all of Colorado. This biome is also extremely susceptible to loss of moisture due to long windy periods and high solar radiation. Furthermore, these areas require frequent burning, often brought on by lightening during the windy thunderstorms, to maintain diversity. However over grazing in many parts have reduced native fuel loads and restricted fires and the rejuvenation of soil and dispersing of seeds. Grasses and scrub species tend to dominate the landscape, allowing for few woody species or cacti. The most common plants in this region are big sagebrush (*Artemisia tridenta*), shadscale (*Chenopodiaceae* spp.), Alkalai sacaton (*Sporobolus airoides*), galleta (*Hilaria jamesii*), blue grama (* Bouteloua gracilis*) and Indian ricegrass (*Oryzopsis hymenoides*) Unlike other deserts in the region, plants do not tend to congregate around areas with more favorable moisture content, nor are there species that are particular to minor riparian areas (Brown 1994).

### 6.2 A History of San Luis

The SLV lies within the traditional territory of the Capote band of Ute Indians. In addition to the Utes, Tewas from San Juan Pueblo also had contacts to the SLV because it was there that they traditionally gathered “ceremonial water fowl feathers from the valley’s wetlands and turquoise from the hills” (Carson 1998: 22). Beginning in the 17th century Utes in this area began having contact with Spaniards and the early 19th century saw the first contact between Euro-Americans and Utes in the SLV. The following paragraphs will provide a brief, chronological history of the SLV beginning with Spanish contact in the late 17th century and ending in the 20th century. Although some of this information falls outside of the SOW focus dates, it has been provided here to give the reader an understanding of the forces that helped shaped the settlement of SLV and the OST as well as the lasting consequences the OST had on the community and the area.

The earliest recorded contact between the Spanish and the Utes living in the SLV was documented in 1694 during an expedition led by Governor Diego de Vargas. Although this is the earliest detailed travel record that exists today, Vargas’ journal reveals that many of the places in the SLV already had Spanish names, suggesting that the area had been traveled prior to the Pueblo Revolt of 1680 (Kessler 1998). Throughout the Spanish period, the Utes remained focused on defensively maintaining their territory against Plains groups, especially areas such as the SLV, which provided them with ample natural resources. The Utes constructed stone blinds into the valley, as well as other defensive structures made of logs (Blackhawk 2006).

In 1779, Juan Bautista de Anza led a military campaign into the San Luis Valley against Comanches who had been raiding Santa Fe. Anza noted in his diary during his 1779 campaign
that three previous expeditions had traveled the valley using the same route. Kessler (1998) documented that Anza followed the same trail through the valley that was taken by Diego de Vargas in 1694, Zebulon Montgomery Pike in 1807, Jacob Fowler in 1822, Edward Beale and Gwinn Heap in 1853, Juan Bautista Silva in 1859 and John Lawrence in 1867\(^1\). Anza’s diary also reveals that he and his men traveled the trail largely at night implying that the trail through the SLV was worn well enough to see by moonlight (Kessler 1998).

In 1807 the first recorded United States citizen, Lt. Zebulon Montgomery Pike, moved into the SLV and erected a stockade before the Spanish arrested him. The Mexican government offered gifts to the Utes throughout the 1820s, and the Utes granted the Mexicans passage on the OST without disturbance by any Ute bands (Carson 1998; O’Neil 1972).

![Figure 6.3 The People’s Ditch in San Luis](image)

In the 1840s, the first permanent settlers, generally poor Hispanic farmers who were migrating north in search of new land, began to reach the SLV. For their homes, they constructed jacleles, or close posts that were then plastered with adobe. When these settlements were not abandoned, the townspeople created acequias, an irrigation system that utilizes gravity-based ditches to create common watershed areas, which insured equal and fair access to the regions,

\(^1\) For additional information and translated copies of diaries from these and other expeditions through the SLV, see Ron Kessler, Old Spanish Trail North Branch and Its Travelers, 1998.
limited water supply. Acequias, such as the San Luis Peoples Ditch (Figure 6.3), which was constructed in April of 1852, represent the oldest water rights in Colorado (Carson 1998; Nazarea 1999). Initially, the Utes were resistant to settlement of the area by Mexicans, and often used violence or destruction of property to force such settlers out. However, in 1847, the Utes permitted Atanasio Trujillo and his family to settle along the San Luis River in an attempt to maintain their land through cooperation with the Mexican government. The Utes pledged peace and assisted foreigners in the area. In addition, the Utes found the New Mexican settlers to be an excellent source of income through the leasing of land (Blackhawk 2006).

In 1851, the town of San Luis was officially founded in what was then New Mexico. Today it is the oldest town in Colorado. Hispanic settlers from Taos who had only recently become American citizens subsequently founded other towns, such as San Pedro and San Acacia. (Carson 1998).

As the bison population was forced to compete more and more heavily with settler’s livestock, its numbers decreased which forced the Utes into raiding as an economic necessity. The local settler communities understood the raiding as an unpleasant necessity, but the U.S. government saw it as a violation of their peace treaty, and began to attack the Utes. The Utes retaliated, and after attacking Fort Pueblo on Christmas day, 1854, they began to attack settlements in the SLV, killing several settlers. The Utes, quickly realizing they were outnumbered and out-gunned, called for peace again.

In 1855, the U.S. Army fought the Utes from Fort Massachusetts in the final unremitting military conflict between the two groups. Although the Utes continued their cooperative policies, they also continuously criticized the U.S. government’s failure to protect the SLV from Plains groups as promised (Carson 1998).

Blackhawk (2006) noted that shortly after peace was declared, Utes who assisted in the recovery of stolen livestock and an accused murderer, received U.S. military officers’ coats, from which many contracted smallpox and subsequently died. The remains of those Utes who died of small pox were left along the San Luis River later to be found by settlers moving up into the SLV.

In the 1880s, a canal system was built that brought water from the Rio Grande tributaries to irrigate the fields of the area. As a result, groundwater gradually rose until the crops became damaged from an excess of salt and water. Farmers adapted by utilizing snowmelt and runoff from the surrounding mountains and deep wells, instead of the canals, for irrigation purposes, and created drainage ditches around their fields in order to prevent the leached salt in the water table from damaging their crops. Unfortunately, due to inadequate inspection of nearby mines, cyanide and dissolved minerals contaminated irrigation water and killed local fish populations. Since 1993, the Environmental Protection Agency has spent over $100 million in an attempt to decontaminate the area (Chronic and Williams 2002).
6.3 The Sangre de Cristo and Land Granting in New Mexico, 1821-1863

Upon gaining control of vast tracts of land from the Spanish in 1821, the recently established Mexican Republic was intent upon protecting their land claims from American Indian groups internally, and American settlers who were attempting to settle in the area. One of the programs instituted to induce settlement of what was considered to be harsh regions, involved offering land to foreign nationals in exchange for a vow of loyalty to the Mexican government. This project proved disastrous in Texas, where it was met with an American response so enthusiastic, Mexico nearly lost control of the territory in 1836. Of the nearly two hundred land grants that were issued by Spain, and subsequently the Mexican Republic, since 1598, sixty-nine date to the 19th century; twenty-three of those were instituted between 1840 and 1847. This rapid land handout led to encroachment problems however, with grantees often overlapping because of vague language and poorly defined borders between grants (Lamar 1962; Hafen 1927).

This method of land grabbing by foreign nationals proved to be especially popular to traders centered at Taos. In New Mexico, land speculation had become the third largest source of income, behind the fur and horse trade along the Santa Fe Trail (Missouri to Santa Fe) and the OST. As such, the competition for grants in Taos was fierce. Eleven grants were approved within six years and the Governor openly played favorites, which made the allotment of land a major political and economic force (Lamar 1962).
The settlement of lands in the SLV became legal with the approval of the Sangre de Cristo Land Grant in 1843. The approval of this land grant involved Carlos Beaubien, the son of a Canadian fur trader and three other New Mexican’s of high esteem. Beaubien was a wealthy landowner who was one of the first recipients of a Mexico Land Grant in 1832. By 1843, his wealth made him ineligible for additional grants, so he applied for the grants for his son Narcisco and Stephen Luis Lee, a Missourian living in Taos. With these two listed as the recipients, Beaubien was able to get approval for the Sangre de Cristo land grant (Lamar 1962; Hafen 1927; Rael v. Taylor 876 P. 2d 1210 [1994]).

The Sangre de Cristo land grant was perhaps one of the richest and most profitable awards presented before the Mexican War. Though its boundaries were largely undefined, as was the case with most land awards, it included “the greater part of the valleys of Costilla, Culebra and Trinchera rivers in the SLV and extend[ed] from the Rio Grande to the summit of the Sangre de Cristo range,” covering over a million acres. The land was granted with the express purpose of settling it. Two major factors, however, prevented permanent settlement until the 1850s. One of the major issues was that of resources. The SLV is high mountain desert grasslands with limited rainfall and thus required extensive cooperation between settlers with regards to water. This cooperation would eventually require the construction of a communal water channel in order to insure that all members of the community had access to water for irrigation and consumption for daily needs. Furthermore, the Ute, who had a series of traditional trails running through the valley continued to control the SLV and maintained their resistance to settlers for a period of 8 years after the issuing of the land grant.

Despite these obstacles it is widely noted that attempts to settle the area occurred as early as the 1840s, which follows the trend of settling a claim before it had been officially recognized (which could take a very long time). The first permanent settlement of the area is marked in 1851, with the building of the People’s Ditch, the oldest acequia in present-day Colorado. Both members of the San Luis Hispano community and Utes recount that following initial hostilities, the two groups came to an understanding that resulted in often-friendly relationships between the Utes and the Hispano settlers. Although the first attempt to establish an acequia community in 1850 was stopped due to resistance by the Utes, the following year saw the establishment of such a community at Culebra. This was more than a year before the U.S. military had a garrison in the area and three years before the official end to Ute resistance in the area. This suggests that Hispano settlers were able to come to an amicable agreement with the Utes without the need of the American or any other, military presence (Hicks and Pena 2003).

Settlement of the Sangre de Cristo land grant thus went about in much the same way as the other awards by the Mexican territorial government. This fertile track of land would have been nearly irresistible to a population when faced with either working in trade along the Old Spanish or Santa Fe trails or joining a settlement community in order to expand the influence of Mexico in the northern territory. Residents of these outlying Mexican communities were also rewarded for their efforts, which often materialized in communal property rights, such as grazing lands, non-commercial access to timber, and water privileges. This particular vestige of Spanish and Mexican land law would prove to be incompatible with the new American system (Hafen 1927; Colorado State Archives 2001; Hicks and Pena 2003).
The outbreak of the Mexican War complicated this procedure of land awards. The cession of Mexican-held territory in the North to the United States resulted in changes of loyalty by some Mexican citizens who quickly saw the advantage of supporting the U.S. Charles Bent and Charles Beaubien saw this as an advantageous move and affirmed their loyalty to the U.S. As a result the two were appointed governor and territorial judge respectively (Lamar 1962). These appointments, along with the added rumor that the land awards were soon to be registered with an American territorial secretary, led to the conclusion among Mexican citizens still within the territories that the American government would soon confiscate their land. These rumors led to a plan to overthrow Bent as Governor and chase all Americans from the territory in December of 1846. This plan led to what would be known as the Taos Rebellion, an event one consultant felt catalyzed his family’s relocation from Taos to the SLV area via the OST. Additionally this event impacted the Sangre de Cristo land grant. In January of 1847, a group of Pueblo Indians and Hispano families attacked Taos, killing Bent, Lee, and Narcisso Beaubien, among others. Both Charles Beaubien and St. Vrain managed to escape. To this incident, Lamar declares that:

It is too much of a coincidence that all those murdered were the largest land grantees and the most persistent aggressors of the Pueblo holdings in the Province. The Taos Rebellion of 1847 has been called a failure, but it held up the land schemes of a bunch of ambitious American speculators for a generation (Lamar 1962: 502).

With both of the original grantees of the Sangre de Cristo land grant killed at Taos, Beaubien was left to inherit his son’s property in the valley. The second half of the valley, owned by Lee, was auctioned off and purchased by Beaubien for $100 (Hafen 1927: 83; Colorado State Archives 2001: 2).

In addition to the importance of the Taos Rebellion in the history of the Sangre de Cristo land grant, it also necessitated the escape of John Albert, the ancestor of one consultant. On January 19, 1847, Albert and eight other American men blockaded themselves in Simeon Turley’s mill and attempted to defend themselves against their attackers. John Albert and Tom Tobin were the only two Americans who escaped Turley’s mill alive. From there, Albert followed the Taos trail to Pueblo, Colorado where he felt he would be safe. It is important to note that from Taos to San Luis, the Taos trail and the OST are “one and the same” (Kessler 1998: 328). Albert’s exposure to the SLV during his escape from and return to Taos inspired him to later move his family to the SLV area, where his family remains to this day. (Perkins 2005; Durand 2004; Porter, Porter and Hafen 1950; Hafen 1965)

Although the Taos Rebellion succeeded in killing Governor Bent and persuading the Albert family to leave Taos, it failed in its overall goal to rid the area of Americans. It still did, however, give cause for worry for the American government. Under the Treaty of Guadeloupe Hidalgo, all Mexican citizens were guaranteed their private property. Whether this concession included the land grants that had been granted to foreign nationals with a pledge of loyalty to Mexico City was unclear. This may be one reason that Beaubien and his comrades quickly switched from Mexican to American loyalty during the Mexican War. Despite having the obvious motivation to declare these new territories American, the insistence on keeping private
titles in the hands of formerly Mexican citizens also necessitated fast action to clear the confusion left surrounding unresolved claims.

The U.S. Congress did not give the state of land grants in the New Mexico territory due attention until July of 1854, when a provision appointing a “surveyor general of New Mexico,” who would carry out the terms of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, was passed. William Pelham, the first to hold the position, was not instituted until mid-January 1855. His office called upon all claimants to provide evidence of land claims prior to 1848, and testimony was taken to corroborate such evidence. Recommendations were then sent to Washington, D.C., for Congressional approval—the first of which is dated June 21, 1860. (Lamar 1962; Hafen 1927).

Pelham heard the claims against the Sangre de Cristo Grant in 1856. Past the verification of documents and signatures, attorneys for Beaubien argued that the land now contained “extensive settlements made on the tract,” as well as noting that “it was becoming rapidly populated.” Indeed, the surveyor general attached to the case noted that the land had been occupied in some form since the original approval of the award in 1843; the first permanent settlements of present-day Colorado were made here, on the Costilla River in 1849 and the Culebra River in 1851 (Hafen 1927: 85-86).
Shortly after gaining American approval of his grant, Beaubien sold his land to American entrepreneur William Gilpin, who was also the new territorial governor, in 1863. Gilpin paid approximately four cents per acre, or about $41,000 in total. The sale was made to avoid paying the taxes levied against the extensive property, and was split between Gilpin and several foreign investors. The group set out to portray the settlers of the grant as “squatters,” despite their introduction of domesticated livestock and their work to improve the land. The battle was intensified by a document written during the sale by Beaubien that outlined the communal rights of the settlers to grazing land, water, timber, and so on. The Beaubien Document noted that:

Each one should take scrupulous care in the use of water without causing damage with it to his neighbors nor to anyone. According to the corresponding rule all the inhabitants will have enjoyment of benefits of pastures, water, firewood and timber, always taking care that one does not injure another (Hicks and Pena 2003: 143).

The first attack upon these communal rights came in the form of water permission, from the U.S. Freehold Company, who in 1889 petitioned the territorial government to rule on the water rights of those settled in the SLV. Although the courts did not recognize U.S. Freehold’s authority over the area, it did recast the original assumption of communal rights (as Beaubien and his settlers believed that such Spanish legal precedents would still be considered applicable by the American government) into individual rights. This allowed the company to gain such rights later, on the basis that they could claim the water not being used by the residents. Such maneuvering eventually led to a declaration that the residents had no communal rights to the land in 1960.

Legal disputes over community rights to the Sangre de Cristo grant continue to this day (Hicks and Pena 2003; Colorado State Archives 2001:3; Rael v. Taylor 876 P. 2d 1210 [1994]; Howland 1997).

6.4 Contemporary Views of San Luis

San Luis is the oldest surviving town in the state of Colorado. While many of the traditional Spanish names have remained, others have been superceded with English terms. Some of the Spanish names, such as Sangre de Cristo and San Luis, are old enough that their origins are obscure. There is evidence of cultural continuity as well. Many of the areas folklore traditions have origins in the Iberian Peninsula. As well, many of the current residents can trace their families back to the early explorers and settlers of the area (Carson 1998). The responses below reflect the relationships between the community and the OST. Participants’ responses are listed together by question but denoted by different bullet symbols.
**Community Settlement**

*What is the name of this place?*

- San Luis
  - San Luis

*Are there other names for this place?*

- Yes

*If Yes, what are they?*

- San Luis de la Culebra

*Why were Hispanic people attracted to this place?*

- When they came, they started coming early in the 1800s and they would graze their animals here, you know, because of course we have the little valleys, and they followed up the Rio Grande. Explorations, fertile land.
  - Grazing and farming land and its location along the trail.

*Were there natural and/or social features that attracted them?*

- When they came, they started coming early in the 1800s and they would graze their animals here, you know, because of course we have the little valleys, and they followed up the Rio Grande.
What characteristics do you think attracted them?

Water

- There’s a big lake up here. Oh yeah, we have a lot of geothermal. Oh yeah, they say that they used it for sweat lodges and things like that, I think, and yea, and the springs very important, you know, because there isn’t much of hot springs, there’s springs that are with fresh water, very important to us, any kind of water is very important to us.

Yes, for both grazing and agriculture.

Plants

- They had a lot of pumpkins and stuff like that here and, you know the chicos, the dehydrated corn.
- This is champe [Rosehip, (Rosa spp.)], we use it as a jelly, and it’s highly concentrated vitamin C. So we also use it as a, it’s native here, you know you see it all over, as a tea. This is Capulin, chokecherry, and it’s very widely used here as a jelly, or as chokecherry syrup for your pancakes and stuff. There’s the pinto.
- This is coshaw, which was widely used for a lot of remedies; It’s a highly recommended remedio here. If your cough is persistent and you go to the doctor and nothing cures it or whatever, they start drinking the tea and it seems to alleviate it. Also they use it a lot for bathing your, say you have, you know, stitches or something, a wound or something, and it seems that it helps when it gets real red or blisterly or whatever.
- The piñon nut. Beans, potatoes do well… the corn that they use for the chicos, but it doesn’t grow too big, and it’s a white corn, but its very sweet. Sweet peas do real good.
- Rosehip is the English word for champe and Chokecherry for capulin, and of course, they used to, and we have some apples, you know, the summer apples.
- Elderberry is very common here.
- The gardens consist of calabacitas.

Animals

- I remember my grandmother still using something like that, they used to do, to grind like the, her she used to, I remember her using stuff like that, grinding or pounding down the beef jerky, or the jerky, you know cause they used to do a lot of,
• not just beef jerky, but they used to do the elk, and the deer.
  • We do have bears; a lot of fishing cause there’s a lot of streams.
    □ Huge antelope herds, buffalo, rabbits and turkeys.

Evidence of previous use
• The first business established in the state of Colorado. It’s still run by the same family. Right now it’s R&R supermarket. They just celebrated their 150-year anniversary.
• The arrowheads, most of them were found around this area.
• Matate, those were found here, around here, so we know they were, you know especially to the south of here, to the mountains, a lot of arrowheads and a lot things that, we know that there were some Indians camping here, a lot of Indians camping here. I remember my grandmother still using something like that.
  □ Rock art, from Conejos to del Norte and all along streams from Pagosa to San Luis; stone circles; mammoth and ancestral horse and camel remains; arrowheads.

Geological features
• The obsidian they probably traded with, you know, the newcomers or something.
• The Vega, of course, the commons very important to us. There was San Luis estate, somehow or another it on, that area there, got on tax rolls, I mean, they sold, because it had always been used by the people, you know. The people had always grazed up there, hunted, fished, recreation. It was a beautiful, beautiful place, you know, to gather wood.
  □ There is a hot Spring in Ojo Caliente, and I think everybody used that.
  □ About every day’s travel there is a stream until you get to the sand dunes.
  □ North and east of Suache there is a hot spring, Mineral Hot Springs.
  □ There’s two springs, Indian Springs and another here. You’ve got springs in certain locations and typically the trails [old game trails] ran above the springs.
  □ Towards Creed there is another hot spring.

Other features
• Shorter route than going down to Santa Fe and then on to California.
• Excellent travel for sheep.
• Its physical location meant a lot of local trade passed through.
**Was this site the Hispanic people’s first choice for a community?**

- Yes

**If not, where was their first choice, and why didn't they settle or stay there?**

- They had some conflicts with the Indians, or they weren’t prepared for the harsh winters.
- Attempts were made in the 1840s to settle the valley but Utes kept settlers out.

**Where did the Hispanic people come from?**

- Everybody came in from the New Mexico area. From the Taos area, from arrollo ondo area, and probably as far as the Espanola Valley.

**Why did the Hispanic people leave that place?**

- It was overcrowded.

**Were any of your ancestors among those who came here?**

- The grant goes into New Mexico, and of course they just chopped it up, you know, squared the Colorado line off. So, this was considered part of New Mexico at one time, and then of course when they did the territories and stuff like that, you know, they, I was raised just on the other side of the state line. Just 15 miles out of here, but my mother always lived here and a lot of our family.
- My great, great grandfather came here in the 1890s through Mosca Pass and settled on the east side of the valley.

**Who were they and when did they come?**

- He was a prisoner in Andersonville during the civil war.

**Has your family remained here?**

- My kids weren’t raised here when they were growing up, that was our thing, we were gone, you know, my husband had to get a job, and you know, and we had always planned on coming back, and wanted to get money to buy something and stuff, so my kids weren’t raised here. My kids were already nine and ten when we came back.
- Yes

**OST Community Impacts**

**Did the Hispanic people of this community use the Old Spanish Trail**
for purposes other than moving here?

If Yes or Maybe, for what other purposes did they use the trail?

- Don’t know
  - Yes

- They think guys stealing horses would stop here on their way to Santa Fe because the grass was lush and they could fatten up the horses and rest a week or two. Horses eating well would really increase their value.
- Travel Changed. It was originally going through Santa Fe but as this became more known, they started coming through the San Luis Valley to go to California.
- I think there were a lot of immigrant parties coming through here. We have Charles W. McClanahan’s journal. He came through here and brought 2,000 head of sheep and between three and four hundred head of cattle and you’re looking at several people to drive the sheep and cattle. They moved them from St. Louis to San Francisco, maybe. I don’t know, he promised another letter when he got to California but we don’t have it.
- Marcus Whitman in 1842 went through here on his way from Oregon to Washington D.C. and he figured the best way was through here.
- Trappers used the North Branch to access game.
- Gunnison used the route to establish a good route for the railroad 1853.

Did use of the Old Spanish Trail impact the Hispanic people who lived here?

If Yes or Maybe, how were they impacted?

- Maybe
  - Yes

- They probably used the area for timbering, the flourmills, lot of people stayed here. They were probably welcomed. There was probably an exchange of ideas and bartering.
- It brought settlers into the area.
- Stimulated trade.

Did use of the Old Spanish Trail impact the resources at this site that you identified earlier?

Water

- Don’t know
  - No
Plants
- Yes
- No

Animals
- Don’t know
- Yes

Evidence of previous use
- Don’t know
- No

Geological features
- Don’t know
- No

Other features
- Yes

If Yes or Maybe, how were the resources impacted?

Water
- They were impacted by timbering and grazing.

Plants
- Over hunting of one species, say the wolf, resulted in more antelope, which would then cause overgrazing.

Animals
- The travelers probably left most of the artifacts alone.

Evidence of previous use
- They probably had very little impact on the hot springs, either good or bad. Today there is a resort there.
- The hot springs were a neutral place; several groups would peacefully share the site...early people talk about how they wouldn’t squabble when they were there. Like trading posts; you would have different groups show up and even if they were at war they didn’t squabble while they were there.

Geological features
- No

Other features
- They probably would have traded, probably made business for the flourmill.

Community Connections - Local Landscapes
Are there places traditionally used by the Hispanic people that are connected to this place?
- Yes

If Yes or Maybe, what are those places and how are they connected to this place?
Place 1
- Trails, roads
  - Mt. Blanca
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place 2</th>
<th>Trails, roads</th>
<th>Historic events</th>
<th>Daily events</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Friends</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place 3</td>
<td>Trails, roads</td>
<td>Historic events</td>
<td>Daily events</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place 4</td>
<td>Trails, roads</td>
<td>Historic events</td>
<td>Daily events</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Historic events**
- Yes

**Daily events**
- Yes

**Family**
- Yes

**Friends**
- Yes

**Other**
- Yes

**Culebra Mountains**

- Used to protect settlers in the valley from Indians.

- Ft. Massachusetts was built in 1852; became Fort Garland in 1858.

**Mt. Blanca has religious significance. It is sacred. We use it to tell directions.**

**We fought to maintain common use of Taylor Ranch. We can wood gather, graze, and get timber for household use.**

**The Vega is the commons, although there has been some**
encroachment.

- Yes

- “California Trail”
- From Suache there is a trail coming out, an old road and it was marked ‘California Trail’ on survey maps going back to the late 1850s.

- Jacale Road
- Road that followed the water in San Luis.
- Jacales were built alongside of this road.

- Yes.
Do you have any other comments about the Old Spanish Trail or the impacts from travelers on the Old Spanish Trail?

- We could probably work with them.
  - [Do you think the trails up here were old Ute trails?] Definitely. They were mammoth and bison trails to start with. Animals, ancestral camels all traveled these routes and later the Utes.
  - In the Glen Harris Heap journal, they got to the Gunnison River and lost their supplies. So he headed back to Taos to get more supplies and when he was in the mountains here he ran into a band of Ute Indians and they assumed he was a trader and they wanted to trade. So he explained to them that they weren’t traders and that they hadn’t eaten for several days. So the Ute just piled off their horses and started cooking them a meal and fed the guys. Then they gave them enough supplies to get back to Taos. These are the stories that need to get out there because the Utes weren’t being cruel to the guys; they were rescuing them. This was in 1853.
  - I’m pretty well convinced that all of the Spanish names came from the Utes explaining to them what a place was and they just put the Spanish versions on them.
  - Today the trails are pretty much abandoned which in my opinion is fortunate because people aren’t defacing them.
  - I’m afraid that people with motorcycles and four wheelers will start traveling down the trail and damage it.
  - There is a portion of the trail that goes through here that needs to be kept secret, protected in my opinion.
  - [Would you like to see the trail clearly marked?] Nope. This portion, where it has worn into the stone, I don’t think people walking on it will do a lot of damage but I think if cars continue to drive over it in the next fifty years there won’t be much left.
6.5 Ethnographic Comments

The community of San Luis has a history of Hispanic settlement and interaction prior to the official founding of the town in 1851. This history was due in large part to the presence of the OST’s northern branch that ran through the SLV. The following will describe the relationship between San Luis and some New Mexican communities along the OST and how the OST facilitated movements between those communities, the use of the OST’s Northern Branch through the SLV during the 1829-1849 period and will conclude with a brief discussion concerning contemporary claims by the original founders of San Luis to communal rights in La Sierra.

The northern branch of the OST attracted people for a variety of reasons. For travelers and immigrants, who had no need to travel to Santa Fe, this branch of the trail offered a more direct route to California. This route provided travelers with a quicker route turning north at Taos, rather than south towards Santa Fe. There are accounts of several expeditions via this route before, during and after the OST period. Additionally, this route was utilized by John Albert to relocate his family to the SLV area after his escape from the Taos Rebellion. Finally, this route not only provided access to California but was also frequented by fur trappers who would migrate between Santa Fe, Taos and Colorado.

Ron Kessler reproduces the diaries of sixteen such expeditions through the SLV in his book *Old Spanish Trail North Branch and Its Travelers* (1998). Kessler reveals that the OST North Branch had two trails running through Colorado which split at San Juan Pueblo and rejoined at Saguache and then reconnected with the main branch of the OST at Crescent Junction, north of Moab (See Map 6.2). In addition to traveling the OST north branch for opportunities and quicker access, the route was also trafficked by expeditions both for exploration and as military and diplomatic utilized this area as well.
Map 6.2 The North Branch of the OST through the San Luis Valley (Ron Kessler 1998: 15) (Note: Color Added for Clarity)
fertile soil. Several accounts indicate that herders would fatten up livestock (sheep and horses) before bringing them down to trade in Santa Fe. While this type of use would not have resulted in the establishment of a permanent town, it did establish a relationship between the residents from northern New Mexico and the SLV. This relationship would become more developed after the passage of the Sangre de Cristo Land Grant in 1843 when the SLV was officially marked for settlement.

The Hispanic settlers of San Luis came from northern New Mexican communities that were intimately tied to the OST. The presence of the trail allowed many families to migrate north in search of more land for settlement. The early settlers of San Luis maintained close connections to their home communities throughout northern New Mexico. This is evident in both the ethnographic information collected during site visits as well as by census data from Gallina which indicated that many settlers, had ties not only to Culebra, but also to other communities affected by and near the trail, such as Ojo Caliente, Abiquiú, Los Angeles, Aqua Mansa, Coyote, Chama and Cañones.

![Figure 6.8 Ruts Left by Wagon Wheels on the OST](image)

Evidence from the 1880 census for Gallina (Ebright 2003) reveals that several families who were living in Gallina in 1880, had actually spent time in or were born in the SLV both prior to and after the official establishment of the town. Of the seventy-four families that are listed in the town, fourteen had at least one member who was born in what was then called Culebra or the SLV. The oldest of these individuals was Antonio José Jaquez, who is listed as being thirty-five
at the census, thus having a birthday in 1845, six years before the official founding of San Luis. This evidence helps to support the notion that, while the town was officially established in 1851, there were many settlers and others who were living in the Valley before this time.

Figure 6.9 Shrine and Stations of the Cross, which Overlooks the Town.

San Luis Court Case

A system of communal rights to natural resources has existed in San Luis since the town’s inception with the creation of the People’s Ditch. In addition to shared water rights within the town, the people of San Luis have held 77,000 acres of land (also known as la Sierra) in common in the Sangre de Cristo Mountains since the mid-1800s. The land was given to settlement members under the terms of the area land grant and has been continually used and managed from the mid-1800s until the early 1960s when a lumberjack from North Carolina named Jack Taylor bought the land from a group of Denver businessmen who sold it to him in 1960 for $500,000 with the understanding that the lands of La Sierra were “also subject to claims of the local people by prescription or otherwise to rights to pasturage, wood, and lumber and so-called settlement rights in, to, and upon said land (Hess and Wolf 1999). The common use rights that were in the deed were recognition of the original land grant and Spanish/Mexican law. The 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo preserved property rights when northern Mexico was ceded to the United States.
In 1965, the common property agreement was at odds with Taylor’s plans for the land. He successfully sued in federal court to gain full title of La Sierra and renamed it Taylor Ranch. He fenced off the land and proceeded to have trespassers detained and arrested.

The people of San Luis soon began the process of reclaiming their traditional use areas. In 1981, a group of San Luis citizens formed an organization known as the Land Rights Council and they sued to regain what was regarded as traditional rights to La Sierra. The people involved with the lawsuit traced their family history back to the original settlers of the Sangre de Cristo land grant. The claimants contended that they did not have adequate notice of Taylor’s federal court lawsuit and therefore they did not have an opportunity to prove their legal rights to access the land for hunting, fishing, animal grazing, and firewood collecting.

The Colorado Supreme Court issued decisions favorable to the plaintiffs in 1994, 2002, and 2003. The courts found that laws governing the commons in both Mexico and the United States supports the San Luis descendants’ traditional usufructory rights to la Sierra. These rights “are also supported by legal principles of custom, easement, and equitable trust” (Howland 1997: 14).

The OST and the SLV have a shared history, which differs from other communities on the trail such as Abiquiú and Agua Mansa. Most obvious is that while the two communities mentioned either predated the trail (Abiquiú) or was founded as an important aspect of the trail (Agua Mansa being the end point for travel) San Luis was not officially founded until after the closing of the OST in 1849. Despite this seeming conflict, census data and ethnographic research reveal that San Luis was actively utilized by other forms of travelers during the OST’s main operation dates and was settled and visited by Hispanic farmers from northern New Mexico prior to the towns founding. Additionally, San Luis relatives continue to identify strongly with the Hispanic origins of the towns as is evident in their struggle to maintain the communal rights granted to their ancestors by the Mexican system of land grants.
CHAPTER SEVEN
GALLINA, NEW MEXICO

Gallina is a Hispanic community in northern New Mexico. This community was one of the few Hispanic settlements located along the northern frontier of northern New Spain, and later the independent state of Mexico, during the early to late 1800s. The community is located approximately 35 miles west of the town of Abiquiú. Trading caravans heading along the southern portion of the OST to California left Abiquiú in 1829 and reached the Gallina area after a few days of travel. Given its location on the southern section of the OST, as well as its role as one of the few northern frontier communities during the 1800s, Gallina area history is deeply entwined with the both Spanish and Mexican periods and OST activities and impacts.

The relationship between the people of Gallina (note there is a nearby community of Capulín which is also considered under the single name reference of Gallina) and events occurring on the OST needs a bit of a discussion because the acequia-based settlement of Gallina was not established until 1876. The people who were to populate the acequia-based settlement were largely from families who had lived in the local region for generations before 1876 and as such had acquired traditional rights to use and settle the Gallina area as an acequia-based settlement. The logic for this statement is presented below, reinforced by the personal account of one of the family members later in this essay, and supported by a variety of references cited during the ethnographic discussion.

By 1800, portions of the frontier of northern New Spain was occupied by Spanish families who used these lands both as individuals seeking resources for themselves and future generations, but also they served as a buffer defining the boundary between Spanish lands and what was termed wild Indian lands. The Spanish term indios barbaros was often used to describe these uncontrolled Indian peoples or wild Indians (Brooks 2002). Unlike the various American Indian irrigated agricultural communities located elsewhere along major rivers, the hunting, gathering, and gardening lifestyles of Ute, Apache, Navajo, and Comanche peoples placed them beyond the direct control of the Spanish military and government command. After 1680, when the pueblo people’s (assisted by others) revolt removed the Spanish from most of northern New Spain, the resources of the Spanish were distributed to Indian communities and groups which had previously been denied access. Foremost among these resources was the horse, which would permit distant peoples to shift from previous ways of life and develop an economy and lifestyle centered on trading and raiding. These Indian people, the uncontrolled ones, would threaten the very existence of settlement in northern New Spain throughout the remainder of its existence, similarly during the Mexican state period, and finally during the early Anglo American state period until about 1878. So, for two hundred critical years, between 1680 until 1878, the northern frontier was a problematic place for Spanish settlers. Those settlers who were
Map 7.2 Close up Map of the Gallina Area
able to gain a foothold in this area by 1800 did so by developing unique and often officially illegal relationships with the wild Indian people.

It is important at this moment in the essay to point out that while it has been necessary to define the northern boundary of New Spain as the end of Spanish control over American Indian tribes, and that the uncontrolled tribes were considered by the Spanish to be wild (indio bararos), the Indian people who fall under this designation believe they were neither predisposed towards violence nor war any more than their pueblo Indian neighbors to the south who were controlled by the Spanish military. Instead, contemporary scholars, whose academic perspective is approved by these so-called wild Indian groups, go to great lengths to point out that before the Spanish arrived all Indian groups systematically traded in what was most often a peaceful social environment. Pre-Spanish conflicts did occur between Indian groups, including with the pueblo people, but trade was valued above war. Conflicts between the Spanish and Indian peoples were initiated as encroachment proceeded. The line between the outside-of-control and inside-of-control tribes defined for the Spanish the notion of being wild. So from the perspectives of the wild tribes this is a Spanish designation that does not reflect their views of themselves.

The northern boundary of northern New Spain served as a line of first warning of impending threat, as well as a place of possible defense. In fact, the latter function rarely occurred because the Spanish people of the northern frontier needed to maintain positive relationships with the Indian people in order to facilitate trade and peace. Given the Spanish shortage of troops and the cost of maintain them, no presidio (military base) was established north of Taos on the Rio Grande and none was established up the Rio Chama. The people in these unprotected areas thus had to be special. One way to establish settlements in these areas was to encourage genizaro people to settle here (Brooks 2002). Genizaros is a Spanish term for Indian people who had been captured by oppositional tribes and subsequently ransomed by the Spanish government. Actually the terms indios genizaros, indios de rescate, criados, and huerfanos were all used to refer to Indian people acquired by the Spanish through ransom (Brooks 2002: 125). After receiving their freedom, these ransomed Indians rarely returned to their natal tribal communities. Instead, they tended to be distributed amongst the Spanish colonists where they became domestic servants and laborers, and a new caste of person under Spanish law. Genizaros were given Christian names and were instructed in the ways of the Catholic Church. Often genizaros (with the support of the Franciscans) were granted permission to establish and join communities along the northern frontier. Such communities would have the advantage of multiculturalism. With a sufficient cultural combination of genizaro members, the members of a frontier Spanish-genizaro community would be able to speak all of the languages of the trading tribes, plus understand the protocols of trading, and even be in a position to intermarry and establish political alliances.

On the northern frontier, citizens of northern New Spain were given legal access to land by the Crown through a Land Grant which had a defined boundary and a list of people who could jointly use its resources. Grantees were thus made a part of common property organization which was designed to fully satisfy the needs of the members. There would be permanent water for irrigation, places for homes, a church, and a central plaza, grazing lands, hunting lands, forests for timber, and often mineral rights for mining. In a sense then, when the Crown gave a land grant, there was an expectation that it was there for all the grantees to use in common. Grantees
tended to already be established in the area and have a reputation of being both a good citizen and capable of successfully establishing and maintaining normal rural Spanish lifestyles. On the frontier, being able to stay and survive was probably the most important criteria for becoming a member of the Land Grant.

Many of the families who would settle the acequia community of Gallina between 1873 and 1877 came from near by communities, and some, such as those how had been living in the Pueblo of Santo Tomás and Canyon del Cobre (now Los Silvestres) in 1790 had been in the area for many generations. As population pressures increased demands for early Land Grant resources, the Crown established the San Joaquin del Rio de Chama Grant (1806-1819) which is the foundation land grant for this Gallina study. The twenty-nine settlers who were placed in possession of these lands would found Gallina and most of the nearby acequia settlements. The key here is that these people and their land grant communities (excepting Gallina) were present in 1829 when Antonio Armijo and his caravan traveled along a series of old Indian trails from Abiquiú to California passing through acequia settlements located in the southern portion of the San Joaquin del Rio de Chama Grant. Even though this southern route to California was rarely used thereafter for large state supported caravans to California, it is argued here that much of the route had been used for generations by the members of the San Joaquin land grant and subsequently they would continue to use portions of this trail until well into the 20th century. So the lives of the people living in San Joaquin land grant communities would be greatly impacted by trade passing along these trails, including the initial trip by Armijo to California.

Figure 7.1 Upper Rio Capulín and Meadows
Figure 7.2 Meadows near the Rio Gallina

Figure 7.3 Landscape near the Junction of the Rio Gallina and Rio Capulín
7.1 Geographic and Ecological of the Gallina Area

Gallina is situated near the southern end of the Rocky Mountains on the east side of the Continental Divide at an elevation of approximately 7,500 feet. Southwest of the community are the San Pedro Mountains and to the southeast are the Jemez Mountains. To the north is Capulín Mesa in the Cerro Blanco Mountains and on the north side of these mountains is the Rio Chama Basin.

The acequia community of Gallina is located on two distinct water sources (the upper Rio Gallina and the Rio Capulín) that combine to produce the Gallina River (see Figures 7.1 through 7.3). The upper Rio Gallina is a small creek with its headwaters in the northwest corner of the Jemez Mountains. From there the creek flows past the Gallina Plaza northwestward towards the Cerro Blanco Mountains. The Rio Capulín had its headwaters in the high pass to the east of Gallina fed by small flows from Cerro Blanco Mountains on the north and San Pedro Mountains to the south. The Rio Capulín flows west and joins the upper Rio Gallina west of the community. The Rio Gallina then flows north until it reaches southern flank of Dead Man Peak where it begins a southeasterly flow until it joins with the Rio Chama at a place called today Gallina Bench Ranch. From there, the Rio Chama feeds into the Rio Grande just north of the Pueblo of Santa Clara.

Ecologically, Gallina is located in the Rocky Mountain Subapline Conifer Forest. In the southern Rocky Mountains, this biotic community is largely the equivalent to spruce-fir forests. Engelmann spruce (Picea engelmannii) is the most common species of spruce found in the Southwest and they grow with subalpine firs (Abies lasiocarpa). These biotic communities tend to be cold and wet, and average anywhere between 25 inches (in the lower elevations) to more than 40 inches (in the higher elevations) of precipitation annually. Much of the precipitation falls as snow during the winter months (Brown 1994). Gallina is located in an elevated valley that acts as a warm radiating surface which provides areas for agriculture. People traditionally had home gardens in which they raised vegetables and grains, large fields with irrigated agriculture, and in some years rainfall is sufficient for dry farming.

Animal life in the Gallina area is abundant. The landscape is dominated by mountain lions, elk, mule deer, black bears, and various types of small animals, like squirrels, bats, prairie dogs, cottontails, coyotes, badgers, and lizards (Bailey 1919). Birds such as ducks, eagles, owls, turkeys, sparrows, falcons, and hummingbirds also inhabit the surrounding forest (Bailey 1928).

7.2 Gallina Resident’s OST Essays

Two residents of Gallina, Mr. Frank Chacon and Mrs. Ocaris Trujillo, have agreed to provide their own personal text regarding the history of their families and the role of trade in the lives of their communities. These essays, My Gallina and Mi Abuelo, highlight that their families were in the area well before Armijo passed through the valley on his way to California in 1829 and have remained in this area since. Trading stimulated by the OST supplemented trading activities with the regional tribes and eventually with communities along the lower Rio Chama and Rio Grande.
The following essay is a part of a family history project that has produced a large body of stories and photos and has been written specifically for this OST project report.

My Gallina and the Old Spanish Trail
By
Frank Chacon
Prepared on
October 3, 2007

The Hispanic communities of Northern New Mexico and the Indian tribes of the Southwest have always had an interesting relationship. The community of Gallina, New Mexico has been home to Hispanos and many different Indian Tribes. The Utes, Navajos, and the Apache have lived and coexisted in the Gallina area with Hispanos since the early 1800s. The relationship between Hispanos and the Utes has been of fighting, trading, and eventually, mutual respect.

1806 brought the eventual settlement of people into the Gallina area. Residents from the Abiquiú area had established peaceful trade relationship with the Utes. The residents began to look at the fertile valleys to the north of Abiquiú to grow their crops and raise their sheep and other livestock. In 1806, a group of farmers from Abiquiú petitioned for agricultural lands to the north and west of the village. Within two years, Governor Joaquín Real Alencaster approved the San Joaquin del Rio Chama Land Grant. The boundaries of the land grant would be the Cebolla River on the north, the Capulín Mountain on the south, the boundary of the Martínez on the east, and the cejita blanca on the west. Governor Alencaster was quite specific about the size of each tract of land, which was to be large enough to be “planted with three cuartillas of wheat, three almudes of corn, another three of beans, and to having built on them a small house with a garden.” Each settler was to receive a deed describing his land. The remaining land was to be used for grazing and other common uses.
José Antonio Chacón was one of thirty-one settlers who was placed in possession of land in the Cañón del Río Chama on March 1, 1808. Grantees built their homes and continued to use the land in accordance to the specifications of the Grant. Despite military troops being stationed around the area, Indian raids continued. In the winter of 1818-1819, Indian raids by the Utes and Navajos continued, thereby forcing the settlers back to Abiquiú. In 1828, another attempt at settling in the Cañón del Río Chama was made. This time it was further north, at the confluence of the Río Gallina and the Río Chama. Despite not settling the area permanently, grantees continued to use the land. In 1829, during the month of November, Antonio Armijo left Abiquiú on a trading trip to Los Angeles, California. On his diary, he wrote of traveling through the communities of Río Puerco, Arroyo de Agua, and Capulín. “…The 7th of November of 1829 I advanced as far as the Puerco River, stopping at said place on the 8th. 9. At Arroyo de Agua (Water Wash). 10. At Capulín (Choke Cherry). 11. At Agua de la Canada Larga (Water of the Long Canyon). 12. At the mouth of Cañon largo (Long Canyon). 13. At Cañon largo. 14. At the lake of Cañon largo, at this point we found a settlement of Navajos. 15. At the San Juan River. 16. Stopping at said river…”

Grantees also continued to use the land for wood gathering and grazing their livestock. Grantees would pasture their sheep in the Gallina area in the summer and then move them to winter pastures in the Cañon Largo area, west of Gallina. The areas to the west of Abiquiú in the Gallina area were lower in elevation and were ideal to pasture sheep during the winter and spring seasons. The areas around Cañon Largo and el Navajo were ideal for the lambing season or *el hijadero*.

New changes began to take place in New Mexico in the 1840s. In 1846, New Mexico became the property of the United States. These northern regions were now part of the United
States of America. Its citizens were now American citizens. Despite these new changes, the village of Abiquiú continued to serve as a regional center in the northern part of New Mexico. Abiquiú also continued to be the gateway to California via the Old Spanish Trail. Many traders would travel through the Gallina area on their way to Los Angeles and other California cities. Traders and travelers would continue to use the Antonio Armijo Route which had been used by Coyote and Gallina residents for many years while tending to their sheep in their winter pastures.

The relationship with the Indians worsened under the leadership of the American government. In northern New Mexico, Utes and other Indian groups continued to raid the villages. They also continued to steal women and children and then trade them. In an attempt to control this behavior, the American government established the Ute Indian Agency in Abiquiú.

An employee of the Ute Agency was Tomás Chacón. Tomás Chacón was the son of Jose Antonio Chacon who was one of the original grantees to the San Joaquín del Río de Chama Land Grant. His job at the Ute Agency was as an interpreter. Due to his knowledge of the area, his language skills, and his background in working with different Indian tribes, he was hired to serve as interpreter at the Abiquiú Indian Agency. He was fluent in Spanish, Capote Ute, Jicarilla Apache, and also spoke the English language. Tomás learned the Indian languages while he and his family traveled into the Gallina area on their journeys into the Cañon Largo area while trading with the different Indian tribes. In 1868, United States government officials and Native American officials met to sign the 1868 Treaty, also known as the “Kit Carson Treaty”. This treaty created one piece of land in Colorado for all the Ute Indians in Colorado and New Mexico. Tomás Chacon was requested to help negotiate and interpret for the proceedings. The meeting served to strengthen the relationship between the native groups and American government officials.
Once peace was established between the Indian Tribes and military officials, the Spanish Trail did not pose a threat to travelers. The Armijo Route of the Old Spanish Trail that connected Santa Fe, New Mexico to Los Angeles, California from 1829 – 1849 continued to be used by many people, including businessmen and merchants. Upon his return from California, Jose Maria Chavez and his family set up a store in the Gallina. In 1875, Patricio Chavez moved his property and family to Gallina. It was at this time that the Chavez family set up their store in Gallina. The Chavezes recognized the need for a store that would serve travelers on their way to California from New Mexico.

Over the years the Old Spanish Trail became known as the Cañon Largo Trail. A tollgate was created to charge traders who traveled to and from New Mexico to California. In later years, Tomás Chacon’s children and grandchildren continued to use the Trail as a way to transport their sheep into the Cuba area for winter and spring pastures. Other men from the Gallina and Coyote areas would use the Trail as they made their way to the Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming in search of employment on sheep and cattle ranches. The Trail also connected people from Gallina to family members in the Blanco and Durango areas.

The community of Gallina, New Mexico has a long and proud history. Many people from Gallina contributed to the making of the United States of America as they traveled the Old Spanish Trail through Southwestern states on their way to California. The Chacon family from Gallina contributed to our nation’s development by successfully negotiating treaties with Indian Tribes. Their knowledge of the area and their rapport with the Utes and Apaches ensured a peaceful relationship for all American citizens.
7.2.2 Mi Abuelo

The following essay was prepared for this study, but portions build on a previously published essay entitled “Herman Salazar: Youngsville’s Living Legend” by Ocaris Trujillo published in the journal *La Herencia* (2006: 24-25).

“Mi Abuelo”
By: Ocaris Trujillo
Essay Prepared On
December 5, 2007

As a young girl growing up in New Mexico, my vacations consisted of traveling from one point of interest to another. My mother insisted that getting to know places was better than theme parks. As a family, we traveled by automobile around New Mexico and neighboring states. When I grew older I noticed that there were no points of interest near my home and surrounding areas along state road 96. During college I chose to research the areas where I am from; how could this beautiful area with so much rich tradition, culture, and long family lines have nothing to contribute to the road side history of New Mexico. I was shocked to discover that the few written accounts were inaccurate and lacked the meat of the areas’ history. For an accurate account I chose to research my most valuable source, or what I considered a treasure.

At the bottom of the Perdernal a wonderful treasure exists, it holds a history that dates back to before this land was apart of the United States, when men walked thousands of miles for supplies and horses, and the beginning of a community. This treasure is my 100-year-old grandfather the most valuable source of my herencia, Herman Salazar.

In a small village called Youngsville Herman Salazar raised his family and contributed to his community in any way he could. My mother Rebecca Florinda Salazar recalls her childhood as tough at times and yet the reason for the closeness of her family. Born and raised in this village, my mother grew up in a community rich in culture and history. She is the second oldest of eleven children and is the oldest living child from my grandfather and grandmother’s
marriage. Herman Salazar married Georgia Montaño on February 26, 1926; they were married for seventy-six years until Georgia’s death on March 22, 2002.

Herman Salazar born on August 15, 1906 in Youngsville, New Mexico and is the son of Jose Salazar and Rebecca Jaramillo-Salazar, also of Youngville New Mexico. A resident of Youngsville all his life, my grandfather is witness to a great deal of history. My abuelo can recall several events throughout his life that have shaped and molded this small community. My grandfather's parents and grandparents date back to the 1800s, a time of transition and independence in New Mexico. My mother recalled the oral history of our family in the form of stories she recalls from her childhood. In the hallway of my grandfather’s home hung on the wall is a picture of two individuals sitting side by side with an extremely serious expression. They are my great grandparents. I asked my grandfather as to why they were not smiling and he responded that in those days no one did. This question was all it took to ignite my grandfather's story telling talent and from that point on I began my journey into the history of my family. He began with his parents' names. Born in 1866, Jose Salazar died of old age on July 26, 1930 at the age of 64. Rebecca Jaramillo-Salazar lived until age 81, born in March 19, 1881 and died on November of 1954. Jose Salazar's family originated in Canoñas, New Mexico, a small village in near the Abiquiu Dam. My grandfather recalled that many of his family members owned ranchitos there. My grandfather's family consisted of 5 siblings, Librita Salazar-Martinez, born in 1899, Zaqueo Salazar, born in 1901, Margarita Salazar-Moya, born in 1904, and Paul Salazar, born in 1909. My grandfather believes that his descendants arrived in Youngsville in the late 1700s. A man by the name of Antonio Valdez, along with a man by the name of Antonio Salazar, moved from Canoñas to Youngsville to build homes and ranches. Antonio Salazar is Jose Salazar's father. Antonio Salazar owned one of the first stores in Youngsville, shortly after
his death the store closed. The second store in Youngsville was owned by a man by the name of Jack Young. This store was located across from the road from where my Uncle, Joe Salazar currently lives now. After his death, the store closed as well. My grandfather asked me "que no te hace extraño que todas las comunidades tienen nombres español y Youngsville no? He told me that Youngsville was once named "El Rito de los Encinos". The name was changed because the post office from a village near by was also named “El Rito” near Ojo Calente, New Mexico. So El Rito de los Encinos became Youngsville named after Jack Young the storeowner.

During this time, El Rito de los Encinos was still considered part of Mexico up until the statehood of New Mexico in 1912. In the reconquest of 1692, many Spaniards returned to these parts in search of many things primarily on expeditions of exploration. My grandfather recalls the story of his mother’s father, Pablo Jaramillo, who’s descendents were apart of the reconquest. Pablo met his wife, Marcelina Valdez- Jaramillo, when passing through Cañones and decided to settle there.

In the 1800s, mountain men began to establish many of the trails later used for trade and transportation. My grandfather recounted one story from that period I found very interesting. In those days the people in surrounding areas did not have horses or good ones for that matter. A woman who lived down the road from my great-grandfather, Antonio Salazar, had a mule that he borrowed to pack his food and bed role when he took long trips. One trip in particular he used the mule to travel on foot to get horses from Pasadena, California. Five men from the community traveled by night and hid from hostile Native American tribes by day on their journey from Abiquiú to California. All but one man returned from the trip, he drowned while crossing a river on the return trip back. The men would hold on to the tails of the horses each time they crossed a river, this man let go too early and drowned. In 2001, a man by the name of Fritz Thompson
from the Albuquerque Journal interviewed my grandfather about the accounts of that trip. In this article a historian, Aaron Mahr, for the National Park Services in Santa Fe, claims that the 1829 Armijo expedition marked a trail from Abiquiú to California and established trade relations. This trail was a significant breakthrough that encouraged the expansion to the west.

Unfortunately Mahr could not convince the National Park Service to mark the Old Spanish Trail for national significance, partly because the claims made were that the route was used as a slave trade of Native Americans. In a time when the Mexican government outlawed slave trade, the trail was kept a secret. “Unlike the Camino Real, the Armijo Route was rough and rocky and wagons could not be used to transport trades and goods”. Armijo expedition took 86 days from New Mexico to San Gabriel Mission in Los Angles the return trip however, after trading woolen blankets for horses, would take 56 days. It was Armijo’s trail that Antonio Salazar and the other men traveled to obtain horses for the community and themselves for travel and farming.

Thompsons’ article describes the route my great-great grandfather took for his journey for horses, “a dirt road runs a couple miles southwest of Abiquiú Reservoir and is believed by local word of mouth to follows Armijo’s route.” There are a few who insist that the trail existed and that it should be given national significance. My grandfather is one of the few living individuals who can attest that the trail exists.

My grandfather said that in those days people lived simple and did what they had to do to survive. As a young child my grandfather recalled that school was a something that children attended if they did not have work. He attended school until the 5th grade and had to leave to attend the sheep for his father. In his teens he traveled to Utah to tend sheep and work on the railroad for $25 per month. He returned to New Mexico in his early twenties to work at Ghost Ranch for Charles Latrop Pack. He began to do odd jobs and handy work $1 a day. This is where
he met my grandmother, Georgia, and married at the age of 30. My grandmother was originally from Pasturas, New Mexico near Vaugh, New Mexico. Her grandfather obtained the land in Canilon, New Mexico after a man who owed him money could not pay and instead gave him this land. Ghost Ranch at this time employed and attracted all types of people. Georgia O’Keefe was one of them. Georgia O'Keefe would often call my grandfather to do handy work and other small jobs, and many times he would drive her to different locations to paint. My grandfather considered her a great friend and enjoyed her company. He once asked her why she enjoyed painting the “Cerdo Perdnal” so much, her response, “because of its beauty.” Later my grandfather was promoted to driver and earned $2.50 per day. He claims that once he learned how to drive he did not want to stop so they gave him the job of driver. In 1931, he purchased his first vehicle from Charles Latrop Pack for $96, the same Ford he used to drive O’Keefe in.

Charles Latrop Pack was a very influential man in those days. He donated the money to build the elementary school in Coyote that my mother and her siblings attended in the 1950s. Prior to that school my grandfather said that all the children attend school in a one-room building that still stands today located in Youngsville.

Prior to the construction of the church community members would travel by horse and later by automobile to El Rito, New Mexico when they wanted mass, weddings, or a funeral. Before the automobile, when a person passed away people did without a priest and had “velorios”, which is a vigil at a person’s home before the dead were buried. The Catholic Church was completed in 1932 built by Youngsville’s own community members, including my grandfather. Little by little materials were purchased and each community member took his or her turn working on the church. I asked him if they had mass without the priest and he replied that if the priest did not come they did not have mass. “It was not they we were not good
Catholics, we prayed every day in our own homes, but with out a priest there was no mass” he said. I asked my grandfather to recite me some of the prayers he learned as a child. He recited to me a very old payer from a prayer book that his grandfather Pablo Jaramillo brought with him from Spain. He said to make sure I prayed this payer once a day and I would go to heaven, and to pray it three times a day if I was need of help and guidance.

_En el monte de Santa Lucía estaba La Virgen María con un librito de oro, La mita rezaba, la mita leía. La preguntó Jesús ‘¿Qué haces, madre mía?’ ‘De antanoche soñé y vide tres cruces clavadas; en la más alta de ellas te vide crucificado.’ Verda que sería Madre María.’ El que esta oración recitaría todos los días la herencia del cielo ganaría._

Throughout my grandfather’s life he experienced a great deal of hardship; I asked him if the great depression was one of those hardships. He replied that people from the surrounding communities were not affected. The sheep, cattle, and gardens of corn, squash, melons and other food, fed their entire families and neighbors who would trade work for food. Without modern technologies, fruits, vegetables, and meat were dried to get through the long winters, also my grandmother and other ladies of the community began to can foods. My grandfather does not recall the events during World War I, he was too small, he does although recall getting drafted for World War II, but was not taken because of a medical condition. My great uncle Pablo Salazar, my grandfather’s brother, is a World War II Veteran.

Involved in many aspects of the community, my grandfather was a strong Republican and pioneered many firsts in Youngsville. Up until 1948, the Salazar family as well as other families in Youngsville, lived without electricity or running water indoors. With the help of a friend from Española to aid him in the wiring his home, the Salazar’s became one of the first families with electricity and later with running water in the kitchen. At this time, my grandfather was employed by the Forest Service until 1984. It seems like my grandfather worked all his life when
you add up the numbers; he worked at Ghost Ranch for fourteen years, for the Forest Service for twenty years, and the Highway Department for seven years which all together adds up to forty-one of employment. Just recently he received a phone call from the Bank of America in Española, New Mexico that he had been the oldest member. My grandfather recalls opening an account when he was twenty-one years old when the bank first opened, back then it was called American Legion. Most individuals change banks, not my grandfather he believed in leaving his affairs in the same place.

My grandfather is a living legend in so many ways. How many individuals can attest to knowing someone who traveled the Old Spanish Trial to California or trace their descendants to Spain? My grandfather shared conversations with one of the most famous artist of the southwest, Georgia O’Keeffe, and he built a community that included a church and homes with modern technology. When I asked my grandfather the secret for his longevity his response was “when I was younger a stranger wandered into our small village and told me that people would travel by automobiles, fly like birds and live like ants, and I did not believe him, I live so that I may witness it all.”
Figure 7.4 Mrs. Trujillo’s Grandfather
7.3 Contemporary Views of Gallina

The participants’ responses to the interview questions are listed together but denoted by different bullet symbols. A dark dot, for example, represents a given participant throughout the responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Settlement</th>
<th>Gallina.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What is the name of this place?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are there other names for this place?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Why were Hispanic people attracted to this place?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Were there natural</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Hispanic people moved into the area of Gallina for a number of reasons: 1.) Expansion-seeking land for homes, 2.) wood gathering, 3.) livestock grazing, and 4.) water for their acequias.
| and/or social features that attracted them? | • Yes  
| | ▫ Yes |
| What characteristics do you think attracted them? | • Gallina and Capulín Creeks for use in acequias.  
| Water | ▫ Water, which was turned into a ditch system for farming. |
| Plants | • Alfalfa, grama grass, and brome grass. |
| Animals | • Deer, turkey, and grouse are abundant in this area. |
| Evidence of previous use | • Cañon Largo Trail (the OST) connected families from Abiquiú to Durango. The jacales were used as the shepherders previously.  
| | ▫ Old buildings dating back to the original establishment of the village of Youngsville. |
| Geological features | • Mountains in the Gallina area have plenty of pasture and water for use. The area has a variety of trees for wood gathering.  
| | ▫ The mountains known as the Perdenal. |
| Other features | • People have been using the San Joaquin Land Grant for many reasons. People eventually settled the area after having successful relationships with Indian groups. |
| Was this site the Hispanic people’s first choice for a community? | • Yes  
| | ▫ Yes |
| Where did the Hispanic people come from? | • People from Gallina migrated from Abiquiú, San Luis, Colorado area and from Coyote/Cañones.  
| | ▫ Cañones, New Mexico. |
| Why did the Hispanic people leave that place? | • People wanted to acquire land to settle with their families. Gallina offered an opportunity for growth and expansion.  
| | ▫ My family acquired land and the hostile tribes had left the area. |
| Were any of your ancestors among those who came here? | • Yes  
| | ▫ Yes |
| Who were they and when did they come? | • The Chacon family was trading with Utes, Navajos, and Apaches for many years before the area was settled. They |
came to Gallina from the Abiquiú area. The Jacquez and Sanchez came from the San Luis Valley into Gallina. Grandfather Sanchez married a Ute woman.

- They came from Cañones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has your family remained here?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OST Community Impacts**

**Did the Hispanic people of this community use the Old Spanish Trail for purposes other than moving here?**

- Yes
- Yes

**If Yes or Maybe, for what other purposes did they use the trail?**

- My grandfather, Tomás Chacon used the trail to trade with Indian groups. He traded primarily with the Utes. People used the trail to transport sheep to winter and spring pastures. Others used the trail to visit family members in communities along the trail.
- To transport items for the family store and to obtain horses.

**Did use of the Old Spanish Trail impact the Hispanic people who lived here?**

- Yes
- Yes

**If Yes or Maybe, how were they impacted?**

- The trail meant survival. They could use it for ranching and trading.
- Resources made life easier. For example, the use of horses for travel, medical, social and religious.

**Did use of the Old Spanish Trail impact the resources at this site that you identified earlier?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plants</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evidence of previous use
- **No**
  - Don’t know

### Geological features
- **No**
  - Don’t know

### Other features
- **No**
  - Don’t know

#### If Yes or Maybe, how were the resources impacted?
- **Water**
  - A ditch system was developed.
- **Plants**
  - Trees, alfalfa and hay.
- **Animals**
  - Horses and other farm animals were brought using the trail.
- **Geological features**
  - Trail from Cañones to Youngsville.

### Community Connections - Local Landscapes

Are there places traditionally used by the Hispanic people that are connected to this place?

- **Yes**
  - Yes

If Yes or Maybe, what are those places and how are they connected to this place?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place 1</th>
<th>Trails, roads</th>
<th>Historic events</th>
<th>Daily events</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Friends</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place 2</th>
<th>Trails, roads</th>
<th>Historic events</th>
<th>Daily events</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Friends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Pastures</td>
<td>Blanco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place 3</td>
<td>FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails, roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place 4</td>
<td>Cañones</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails, roads</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic events</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily events</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Were those places impacted by travelers on the Old Spanish Trail?

If Yes or Maybe, how were those places impacted?

Helped form the village of Youngsville.

Are those places still connected to this community?

Yes

If Yes or Maybe, any other comments?

The trail continued to be used by travelers to and from Colorado and Utah in later years. Many people go into the area to hunt as was done in past years. People can still travel from Cañones to Youngsville using the old trail.

Are there other trails traditionally used by Hispanic people that are connected to this place?

Don’t know

Were those trails impacted by travelers on the Old Spanish Trail?

Yes
If Yes or Maybe, how were those trails impacted?  
Are those trails still connected to this community?  
Do you have any other comments about the Old Spanish Trail or the impacts from travelers on the Old Spanish Trail?

- Communication and trade with communities.  
- Yes  
- The trail made it possible for my great grandfather to open of the first store in Youngsville.

7.4 Ethnographic Comments

These ethnographic comments further contextualize key points regarding the relationship between local Hispanic communities (particularly Gallina) and the first official trading route to California established by Armijo in 1829. As mentioned in the beginning of this essay, the people of Gallina today stipulate that their families have been in the area since before the San Joaquin Land Grant was established by the Crown in 1880, that their families lived along the Armijo trading route to California in 1829, that the current site of the acequia settlement of Gallina was actually used before 1829 as a commons by nearby acequia communities, and that the Armijo trading event was and continues to be important in their collective identity.

It is important to note that the quality of the following observations are particularly high because they are based in part on two important legal documents (Ebright 2003; Salazar 2005) prepared for the Rio Gallina/Rio Capulín Acequia Association, The El Rito Ditch Association, and the Association de Acequias Nortenas Rio Ariba. Given that these documents were prepared for a water law case they have been prepared with great caution and little speculation. The documents were shared for limited use in this report inasmuch as it also addresses issues such as when certain kinds of commons rights were established for the people of these communities.

A general ethnographic observation that has emerged from this analysis, but certainly could be researched further, is that the many of the communities on the frontier of Northern New Spain and subsequently New Mexico, were connected by family ties, systems of friendship such as *compadrazgo*, mutual exchange of services and goods, and systems of protection and defense. Our analysis presented throughout this report, and especially revealed in the Gallina section, documents the movement of people to and from all five communities involved in this study: Agua Manse, CA; Gallina, NM; Abiquiú, NM; and Culebra, CO. The analysis documents that the families of these communities were largely in place in northern New Spain by the late 1700s and they developed these networks of relationships as a cultural adaptation to what was then and continued to be until the 1880s a hostile social environment due to American Indian perceptions of these settlers as illegal intruders. Trade was always a key dimension of their relationships with each other and with the surrounding American Indian peoples. Passage for trade was along
traditionally established Indian trails, some of which would be used by Armijo in 1829. After Armijo, these trails continued to serve their original functions.

7.5 A Model of Northern Frontier Spanish Settlements

On the northern frontier of Northern New Spain, the people tended to settle in small placitas (or nucleated villages). Each placita tended to consist of a series of homes built wall to wall encircling a small enclosure (Simmons 1979). These settlements resembled small fortresses, designed to protect the occupants from any attack by Indian people. Eventually, the spaces between the various nearby placitas would be occupied and then the settlement pattern can be described as a combination of plaza-centered and line settlements (rancherias) usually along the main route of communication.

In their valuable book Cañones: Values, Crisis, and Survival in a Northern New Mexico Village, Kutshue and Van Ness (1981: 18-19) present a model of a typical Land Grant village which is useful in the Gallina analysis. According to this analysis, in Spanish custom land is a source of livelihood. Mercedes (grants) are given to a group of persons who will subsequently make a community, which if it fails to prosper, relinquished access to the grant back to the Crown. The purpose of the mercedes from the Crown’s perspective is to provide a source of livelihood for respected citizens and to defend a portion of Crown territory. A typical community mercedes involves three categories of land (a) house plots of about a quarter-acre located in the placita or nearby, (b) irrigable farming plots located down slope of or just along water sources, and (c) common lands which were the bulk of the mercedes, were used and transferred through usufruct – that is, rights given because of being in continued use by members of a common ownership community. The common lands included grazing lands, gathering firewood, collection of wild foods and medicines. Common lands ranged from the irrigation field in the valley bottoms to the crest of mountain ridges or mesas. When extreme topography occurred in the mercedes, herding tended to transhumant, often involving moving long distances between winter and summer pastures.

7.6 San Joaquin del Rio de Chama Land Grant

Prior to Hispanic settlement in northern New Mexico, Indian people lived in and utilized the region’s resources. The Indian settlements have been documented in the archaeological record and different styles have been noted. One style in particular was found in the Gallina area. This style or culture phase is believed to have begun around 1000 AD. It covered an area spanning several hundred square miles during a 300-year span. The people who were associated with the Gallina culture phase abandoned the region by 1300 AD and apparently relocated to an area 60 miles away near Jemez Springs and Ponderosa (Mackey and Holbrook 1978). The present day Indian community of Jemez Pueblo is partially composed of the descendents of those who once inhabited the Gallina region (Ellis 1988). Following these early Indian inhabitants, the area became the territory of the Utes and then the Apache peoples. Spain began settling the northern frontier of Northern New Spain in the early 19th century.
7.6.1 San Joaquin del Rio de Chama Land Grant

Details regarding the San Joaquin del Rio de Chama Land Grant are available on the web at the official site [www.riodechamalandgrant.com], where the official association provides information about the grant and interacts with membership. In simple terms the purpose of the association is as follows: “The Herederos de San Joaquin del Rio De Chama shall assume complete responsibility for protecting and defending all rights and privileges that the crown and the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo establish for each real heir.”

The San Joaquin Land Grant was established by the Crown in 1806, and it included lands along the Chama River in the north and the lands of the Rio Gallina and Rio Capulín in the south. Where valleys were involved common rights extended to the surrounding crests of the mountains that defined the river valleys. Officially the boundaries were (1) to the north, the Rito de la Cebolla; to the south, the Rio Capulín; to the east, the Martinezes [the Pedra Lumbre Grant]; and to the west, the Cejita Blanca (Ebright 2003: 10).

The official web site of the San Joaquin Land Grant has an elaborate photo album, which illustrates all of the key places in the original land grant. Early settlement was along the Rio Chama, in 1808, where proximity to Abiquiu afforded some protection, and the latest settlements in the land grant were Gallina/Capulín beginning in 1873.

7.6.2 Establishment of Gallina

The initial settlers of the acequia community of Gallina came from various communities as is evidenced in the 1880 U.S. Census report for the Gallina and Capulín Communities. Ebright’s (2003: 43) analysis documents, with this census and other sources, three waves of settlement. The first came from nearby communities in 1873 and 1874, the second wave from the California communities of Spadra and Agua Mansa in 1875 and 1876, and the third wave came from the San Luis Valley, Colorado communities located along the Rio Culebra in 1876 and 1877.

Our analysis of the 1880 census data focuses on the place of birth of the parents and the last community of residence before coming to Gallina. The former data provide a sense of the difference between where people were born and where they recently lived. These data also document relationships between communities and the pattern of expanding out from established settlement to elsewhere in a Land Grant when resources are overtaxed by human and animal population pressures on natural resources.

Table 7.1 cross tabulates, based on Ebright’s reanalysis of the 1880 U.S. Census data, the birth place of household heads (both parents) and the last community in which they resided before settling in the new acequia community of Gallina. The last community data are established based on the place of birth of the last child or the place of birth of the household head if no other locations of birth are indicated. This is a procedure used by Ebright (2003: 43, see footnote 135).
The heads of households who settled Gallina, and who appear in the 1880 U.S. Census were primarily born in nearby communities located either in the San Joaquin or Abiquiú area Land Grants. Abiquiú (30%), Chama (28%), and Cañones (13%) are the three most frequent communities of birth for household heads. Unanalyzed here, but present in the birthplaces of household children, is a consistent pattern of moving from Land Grant community to Land Grant community. Coyote (41%), Abiquiú (23%), and Chama (19%) are most often the last community of residence for the families who moved to Gallina by the time of the 1880 U.S. Census.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Birth Places of Parents</th>
<th>Last Community of Residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abiquiú</td>
<td>39 (30%)</td>
<td>16 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chama</td>
<td>37 (28%)</td>
<td>13 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cañones</td>
<td>20 (15%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coyote</td>
<td>10 (8%)</td>
<td>28 (41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taos</td>
<td>10 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culebra</td>
<td>8 (6%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>7 (5%)</td>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1 Analysis of the 1880 Census

Clearly these people were largely from other northern New Mexico acequia communities. So why did they come to settle in Gallina, and why did they have the right to settle here? In the first instance, they probable came to settle Gallina because the natural resources of their previous community were overtaxed. Such natural resource pressures account for much movement between Land Grant communities. Second, the people who settled Gallina probably already had rights to settle because their ancestors were a part of the San Joaquin del Rio de Chama Land Grant (Ebright 2003: 43). A very interesting third reason why people settled Gallina in the late 1870s was that people wanted to enact their rights in the land grant even though they had been living elsewhere. For example, a number of people from nearby communities had gone to California in the 1830s and 1840s as part of the general relocation of families to California in order to take advantage of trading opportunities due to the OST (18-22). According to Ebright (2003: 19)

Settlers in the communities around Abiquiú continued their trading expeditions to Ute country learning more about the trails that would become the several branches of the Old Spanish Trail...In 1829 many of these individuals familiar with the country northwest of Santa Fe joined Antonio Armijo’s expedition that blazed the first complete route between Abiquiú and the San Gabriel mission near Los Angeles...Numerous expeditions followed this route to California, where settlers looking for farmland and grazing pastures found better locations than were available in New Mexico...Those who could afford the trip...stayed there temporarily until Indian-raiding on the northern New Mexican settlements subsided.
Some members of the families who would settle Gallina traveled back and forth to California. Jose Maria Chaves, for example, went to California in 1837 because he was on the wrong side of a political revolt (Ebright 2003: 19-20). He brought serapes with him to trade and presented himself to authorities in Los Angeles as a trader. He traveled back to New Mexico in 1838 after he, and probably his brothers who were living in California, were involved in another rebellion there. He returned permanently to New Mexico in 1840 after making several trips back and forth.

Many of the New Mexico families settled on new Land Grants in California and established settlements with names like San Salvador, Spadra, Machado, Ballona, and Agua Mansa. The OST became a place for what sociologists call “stem family migration” in which migrants move back and forth from natal communities to distant migrant communities (Schwarzweller, Brown, and Mangalam 1971: 90-94). The concept of stem family migration is important for this analysis because it involves families moving in and out of natal and arrival migrant communities and using this movement to maintain family ties and access to resources in both locales. In this way, the people of northern New Mexico were able to take advantage of resources in natal and migrant communities. Many of these families were to become relatively wealthy through trade and eventually set up key commercial stores back in New Mexico. While it is beyond extant data to prove this point, it is likely that these wealth differentials permitted the stem family migrants to both develop and assume membership in new elites on the frontier.

The return flow from California to Gallina is well documented by Ebright (2003: 24) as the following account illustrates:

Julian Chavez married into the Machado family after the death of his first wife, and lived on the Ballona Grant, Patricio Chavez and his family lived at Spadra. Rafael and Ignacio Velarde lived at Agua Mansa. A close examination of the Patricip Chavez papers and the 1880 New Mexico census makes it possible to determine the dates the families of Patricio Chavez, Ignacio Velarde, Rafael Velarde, and Leon Velarde left California in the mid-1870s to settle at Gallina and Capulín.

Two of the returning families became financially powerful and clearly a part of the new elite in Gallina. Candelario Sotelo and Patricio Chavez were business partners in California. They returned from California and settled next to each other in Gallina by 1875 (Ebright 2003: 54-55). Within three years Patricio Chavez had substantial livestock herds (probably managed by Sotelo), substantial farms, and owned a mercantile store in Gallina. Patricio sold wool in Alamosa, Colorado and cattle to the miners in Colorado. He and his servants’ homes were located in the most prestigious spot in Gallina near the church. Near these homes were those of the three Velarde families who had lived in California in Spradra and Agua Mansa.

While the return of the stem families is an interesting aspect of the acequia settlement of Gallina, most settlers had been living in Coyote before the move to establish Gallina. It can be argued that these settlers had already established a claim to the Gallina area through enactments of their rights of usufruct under the 1806 San Joaquin del Rio de Chama Land Grant. It can be argued that people living in the acequia community of Coyote were grazing their sheep herds west in the Gallina area and beyond before the area was passed through by Armijo in 1829 and that for a portion of his travels he passed along an old Indian trail that had been partially
transformed into a Hispanic herding trail. The argument for this is that the lands to the east of Coyote, which was established at least by 1812 (according to the birth date of a person who appeared in the 1880 U.S. Census), were already under grazing pressure from acequia communities like El Rito and Cañones.

If this hypothesized pattern of grazing to the west is accurate, then two additional points can be referred. First, the people of Coyote who moved to Gallina in the 1870s probably had agreed upon usufruct rights to not only graze in the Gallina area, but to establish *jacales* (simple summer shade homes) and gardens along the Rio Gallina and Rio Capulín waterways. Ebright (2003: 43) concluded that the first settlers in Gallina in 1873 were familiar with the area because they had been using it to graze their sheep and cattle. Herders spent whole grazing seasons with their flocks during which time they constructed simple houses for protection from the sun and rain and opened small gardens for fresh vegetables. Second, because it was the practice of subsequent Gallina herders, the Coyote sheep herders would have spent the winter with their herds miles further to the west across from the lakes of Cañon Largo, further west of what is today the Jicarilla Apache Indian reservation (see Map 7.3). This area has been used in recent years by Gallina herders because the Rio Gallina and Rio Capulín are at such high elevations (above 7,000 feet) that the sheep are endangered by winter cold and heavy snows (up to five feet in an event). Were this pattern of transhumant movement of sheep from summer pastures in the Gallina area to winter range west of Canyon Largo to have been established before 1829, then Armijo would have traveled a largely Spanish herding trail most of the way west from Coyote to near the present day town of Blanco, New Mexico.
Map 7.3 The Cañon Largo Area (note map can be blown up 300% of original size for detail)
Figure 7.6 Cañon Largo

Figure 7.7 Apache Toll Keeper Cabin
Evidence for the existence of an early Hispanic stock trail from the Gallina area down Canyon Largo Wash to the west comes from an interview with an Apache elder (name withheld pending his review of this text). This person offered an informal tour of the old Hispanic stock trail as it passed from Lindrith to the extreme eastern edge of the Jicarilla Apache Indian regeneration. The initial reservation, which was established in 1887 (Tiller 1983), was expended in 1907 the southern portion included a traditional Hispanic stock trail from the summer pastures near Gallina to the winter pastures west of the reservation (oral account). This trail, called today by the term Drive-a-way, had existed long before the southern portion of the reservation had been established so the Federal government told the Jicarilla Apache tribe they had to continue to permit the sheep to pass along the Drive-a-way. The Apache tribe, however, decided they could extract a head toll for each sheep that passed and so a toll keeper and toll house was built. The oral history of this place was told by a relative of the toll keeper. During the onsite visit to the Drive-a-way the Apache elder pointed out all of the springs where the sheep would have to drink during the drive. These springs occur at the edges of Cañon Largo Wash. At the large lakes near the western end of the Drive-a-way, the toll house (actually a series of buildings) was established by the tribe. Here the Hispanic herders rested near the good water and grass, so the herd could recover before traveling the remaining distance to the winter pastures. The Hispanic herders and the Apache toll keeper(s) had good relationships based on the exchange of various resources and services.
7.7 Conclusions

The frontier families of northern New Spain formed stable relationships based on exchange, kinship, Land Grant membership, residential proximity, communal natural resource use, and a common culture. Trade always influenced this frontier society. Early trade mostly involved exchanges with American Indian communities. This interethnic trade made for peaceful relationships and mutual benefits. Until the early 1800s Indian traders and trade goods came along established sacred trails from deep within Indian country to the west, north, and east of northern New Spain. Indian traders and trade goods came to Spanish-Indian communities, like Taos and Santa Clara, strategically located along the upper Rio Grande. Here rendezvous or trading fairs were established and regularly operated.

While the Spanish presence was never fully approved by the Indian people of northern New Spain, there were periods of relative peace when trade kept the relationship mutually satisfactory. Beginning around the Smallpox Pandemic of 1780 (John 1975), Indian peoples located along trading routes were devastated. Epidemics continued through the early 1800s until such a point that there were too few Indian people to control traditional trade routes and dominate intercultural trading relationships (Stoffle, Jones, and Dobyns 1995). So by 1829, when Armijo traveled under official permit to California for the purpose of establishing what we now call the OST, the Indian people had lost their ability to stop him from making this journey. While weakened Indian control over trade routes had permitted some expanded regional trading before this time, the year 1829 is a good marker for the renaming of trade routes using Spanish terms. It is also the time when a flood of trade and traders would move back and forth between the Mexican provinces of Mexico and California.

Indian communities were weakened by the early 1800s, but they did not disappear and the frontier Hispanic trader probably did more to maintain local peace than the Mexican national military. The caravans of mules loaded with woven goods that went to California to return with thousands of horses and mules would cause increased organized Indian-Hispanic hostilities between 1829 and 1849. During this time, small and largely unprotected frontier communities remained useful and in touch with traditional Indian trading partners. Their trade was influenced by demand, and thus a number of illegal items continued to flow back and forth in these interethnic exchanges. Indian people, who increasingly had less profit from the now Spanish dominated trading, increasingly brought Indian people for sale to the Spanish. Hispanic people continued to trade guns and shot to Indian people. A somewhat famous account, because it involved the arrest of so many frontier leaders, occurred on September 19, 1850, when twenty-seven frontier men (including Tomás Chacon, relative of Mr. Chacon who wrote an essay on his family above) were caught by the U.S. Army with a massive load of items to be traded with the Indians of Utah (Salazar 2005: 2).

A complex argument can be made that both the trading materials involved in this U.S. Army intervention and the need for the Indian trade itself were tied to commerce on the OST. In the first instance, there was a need for trade to preserve local peaceful relationships, which had worsened since 1829 when the official caravans began moving to California. In the second instance, the resources involved in the trade were not locally produced and thus themselves were
a product of a trading goods surplus made possible by successful trade on the OST. Therefore, to some extent, trade on the OST was both a cause and solution.

This often mentioned account was not so much evidence of the lawlessness of the frontier, as it was evidence of the intercultural adaptability of both Indian and Hispanic people of the frontier. Other men trading on the trail to Utah (probably the OST) would have been attacked and probably killed by the Utes at this time, but these were the leaders of various small frontier settlements taking a legal and personal risk to trade with the Ute Indians. The most probable reason was that they were maintaining friendly trading relationships, which mutually benefited Indian and Hispanic communities. Such relationships were maintained and protected by both sides and thus safety for both Hispanic and Indian communities derived from this situation. Indian removal from northern New Mexico would not occur until the latter 1870s, so until then Hispanic leaders had to trade and maintain the peace.

Direct evidence of the positive roles served by Hispanic frontier leaders occurs in a photo taken in 1868 in Santa Fe (Simmons 2000: 76). The photo contains images of 18 people gathered under the auspices of the U.S. Army to negotiate a peace treaty between the Utes, Jicarilla Apaches and settlers in New Mexico and Colorado, and the U.S. Government. The negotiator/translator in this photo is Tomás Chacon (Figure 7.9), the person arrested above in 1850 while he was en route to trade with the Utes. Given his status in the photo as sole negotiator for both Utes and Apache leaders, he fluently spoke both Indian languages, Spanish, and English. Perhaps more important, is the conclusion that Tomás Chacon was a respected intercultural negotiator and person who was trusted in four cultures. Thus, he could be trusted by all to tell the truth during the translation and to move the discussions toward mutually agreeable common ground.

Figure 7.9 Ute and Jicarilla Apache Delegation with Tomás Chacon in the Top Row Third from the Right
The research presented here for the settlement of Gallina, and earlier in this report for California, New Mexico, and Colorado Hispanic communities, documents that these communities were tied together for mutual support. When peaceful trading and interpersonal relationships between the Hispanic and Indian communities are considered, an even more complex story emerges that describes a multicultural interdependent frontier society. Peace was supported by certain types of trade, while it was threatened by other kinds of trade. Peace was established and maintained by members of the Indian-Hispanic frontier society, like Tomás Chacon.
CHAPTER EIGHT
RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents mitigation and management recommendations made by representatives from the five involved communities in the *Old Spanish Trail Hispanic Communities Ethnographic Study*. Representatives offered recommendations to help guide the National Park Service (NPS) and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) in creating policies and regulations in protecting and managing places identified as culturally significant and affected by Old Spanish Trail (OST) travel. The recommendations were discussed during the interview process, which took place on-site during the UofA field visits. All recommendations in this report have been reviewed by those who took part in the interviews. Also included with these recommendations are suggestions made by the UofA team in regards to future studies.

Table 8.1 lists each site discussed in the report and the types of management action that has been recommended. Following the table is a more detailed discussion on specific management recommendations for each community. The chapter concludes with general management recommendations in regards to the outcome of this study and all future studies pertaining to the OST and the Hispanic communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Notification of OST Activity</th>
<th>Direct Involvement in OST Activity</th>
<th>Protecting Trail Segments and Resources</th>
<th>Share Additional Community Stories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abiquiú</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agua Mansa</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallina</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.1 Types of Recommendations by Sites
8.1 Community Recommendations

**Abiquiú:** Descendants from the mercéd have plans for the segment of the OST, which runs from the Abiquiú Inn to their church, and they have begun vegetation management along that segment. They also stated that the trail and the mercéd are two significant and linked ethnographic resources that deserve an expanded story. They would welcome a partnership or other cooperative management opportunities with NPS and BLM that recognize and protect their genizaro interests and community, and that compliment New Mexico's recognition of their unique community.

**San Luis:** Community members requested that the San Luis Cultural Center be directly involved in any sort of planning activity along the northern branch of the OST. It was also recommended that trail segments north of the community be protected and limited to foot traffic only.

**Agua Mansa:** Descendants have expressed interest in improving the cemetery, protecting the dilapidated adobe, and retrieving the church bell. The Chapel site, the Cemetery and possible other remains on the Agua Mansa side, along with the Trujillo adobe, zanja and other remains on the La Placita side are all direly threatened. Because the San Salvador area is now divided between two counties, San Bernardino and Riverside, and three cities: Colton, Rialto and Riverside, it is felt by some that it will take a state or national agency to cut through the bureaucratic entropy and disinterest to preserve and monument what’s left. Participants would also like to have more Agua Mansa descendants, especially the eldest ones, contribute to an expanded account of Agua Mansa's history and its connection to Abiquiú. Also, additional efforts need to be made to interpret and identify opportunities along the Trail between San Salvador de Jurupa (Agua Mansa / La Placita) and San Gabriel. Finally, they would like to collaborate with NPS and BLM officials to recognize the community and trail.

**San Gabriel:** In spite of being in a heavily developed area, the “trail” between the mission and the plaza in Los Angeles presents nine miles of opportunity for OST interpretation and Los Pobladores would like to collaborate and aid identification of the best opportunities. Ramona Parlor of the Native Sons of the Golden West, the Historical Society of Southern California and Los Californianos have also been identified as possible groups for collaboration. Community representatives want the historic and contemporary relationships between San Gabriel Mission and Agua Mansa recognized with trail markers between the mission and Colton. Collaboration with study participants offers the best opportunity for recognizing this part of the OST.

**Gallina:** Community members were generally positive about their historic relationship with the Armijo route. That route to California made various kinds of contributions to local community development and these should be interpreted by the NPS and BLM. The people of Gallina recently had some conflicts with proponents and developers of the Continental Divide Trail and believe that early and continuous consultation will prevent such misunderstandings from reoccurring. Community members believe there are many more stories that need to be told and would like to find a way for these to become public.
8.2 Future Studies

The UofA team believes the relationships between these communities and the OST is just beginning to be understood and would like to recommend that follow up interviews occur in those communities who believe that their relationships with each other and neighboring American Indian communities are due in part to trade along the OST.

It has become clear that first interviews need to be conducted in Coyote, Youngsville, and Cañones, New Mexico because these three communities were directly impacted by the OST travel and trade. One story contained in the Gallina essay documents the essential impacts on community structure and survival that derived from OST trade.

Relationships between American Indian and Hispanic Communities created a special frontier society which operated for most of a 100 year period, largely independently from the nations around it. This special frontier society is an important component of U.S Folk Society and thus needs to be the focus of additional research in order to better understand its full contribution to the development of American Society.
REFERENCES

Anschuetz, Kurt F.

Avina, Rose Hollenbaugh

Babcock, Stephen

Bailey, F. M.
1928 Birds of New Mexico. New Mexico Department of Game and Fish in Cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture. Washington D.C: Bureau of Biological Survey.

Bailey, V.

Beebe, J.
2001 Rapid Assessment Process. Walnut Creek, California: Altamira Press.

Bjorklund, T. and Burke, K.

Blackhawk, Ned.

Blackmar, Frank W.

Bolton, Herbert Eugene, ed.

Brooks, George
Brooks, James F.

Brown, David E., ed.


Budding, A.J., C.W. Pitrat, and C.T. Smith

CA Coastal Conservancy

California Geological Survey and U.S. Geological Survey

California Resources Agency, San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy, and Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy

Campbell D. and D. Fiske

Carson, Phil

Chronic, Halka and Felicie Williams.

Colorado State Archives
Dobyns, Henry F.


Dobyns, Henry F. and Robert C. Euler
1971 The Havasupai People. Phoenix: Indian Tribal Series.

Dobyns, Henry F. and Paul H. Ezell

Dobyns, Henry F., Paul H. Ezell and Greta S. Ezell

Domínguez, Francisco A.
1956 The Missions of New Mexico, 1776: A Description by Fray Francisco Atanasio Domínguez, with Other Contemporary Documents. Eleanor B. Adams and Fray Angelico Chavez, trans. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.
Douglass, William B.

Durkin, Paula; Muldavin, Esteban; Bradley, Mike; Carr, Stacey E.

Durand, John

Ebright, Malcolm

Ellis, Florence Hawley

Ellsworth, William L.

Engstrom, W.N.

Fenneman, Nevin M.

Francisco, Harry

Friis, Leo J.
1965 Orange County through Four Centuries. Santa Ana, CA: Pioneer Press.
Garcia, Sr., David
1993 An Account of the Founding of the New Mexican Communities as Told to David Garcia, Sr. by his father, Jose Antonio Garcia. San Bernardino County Museum Association Quarterly. 40(4): 6-10.

Gentilcore, R. Louis


Hafen, Leroy R.


Hafen, Leroy R and Ann W. Hafen

Haggland, Mary H.

Harley, R. Bruce


2000 From New Mexico to California: San Bernardino Valley's First Settlers at Agua Mansa. San Bernardino County Museum Association Quarterly. 47(3, 4): 1-76.

Harrington, John P.


Hess, Karl and Tom Wolf

Hicks, Gregory A. and Devon G. Peña

Hill, Joseph J.

Hill, Willard W. and Charles H. Lange

Holland, V. L. and David J. Keil

Hornbeck, David

Howland, Todd

Hudspeth, William B.


Maker, H.J., G.W. Anderson and J.U. Anderson
1973 Soil Associations and Land Classification for Irrigation, Rio Arriba County. New Mexico State University Agricultural Experiment Station Research Report 254.

Maxwell, Timothy D.

McCullough, Thane H., Larry A. Beyer, and Ronald W. Morin

Mitchell, Patrick

Morgan, Dale L.

Moriarty, III, James Robert

Muehlberger, William R. and Muehlberger, Sally

Nabhan, Gary P., Alfred Whiting, Henry F. Dobyns, Richard Hevly and Robert C. Euler,

Nazarea, Virginia D.


O’Neil, Floyd A.
Parish, Samuel B.

Perkins, James E.

Phillips, George H.

Porter, Clyde, Mae Reed Porter, and Leroy R. Hafen

Priestley, Herbert I.
1920 Franciscan Exploration of California. Catholic Historical Review. 6(2): 139-155.

Redway, Jacques W.

Salazar, J. Richard


Salmeron, Zarate

Saltzman, Tracey

Sánchez, Joseph P.

Sanchez, Nellie Van de Grift
1914 Spanish and Indian Place Names of California: Their Meaning and Their Romance. San Francisco, CA: A.M. Robertson.

SANM
1914 Spanish Archives of New Mexico, 1621-1821. Santa Fe, NM: State of New Mexico Records Center.
Schwarzweller, Harry, James Brown, and J. J. Mangalam

Shelton, J. S.

Simmons, Marc

Simmons, Virginia

Southern CA Earthquake Data Center

Sparkman, Phillip S.
1908 The Culture of the Luiseño Indians. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology VIII.

Stein, E.D., S. Dark, T. Longcore, N. Hall, M. Beland, R. Grossinger, J. Casanova, and M. Sutula

Steiner, Harold
1999 The Old Spanish Trail Across the Mojave Desert. Las Vegas: The Haldor Company.

Stoffle, Richard W.

Stoffle, Richard, Henry Dobyns, and Kristine Jones

Stoffle, Richard W., Glen Rogers, Ferman Grayman, Gloria Bullets Benson, Kathleen Van Vlack and Jessica Medwied-Savage.
Stoffle, Richard W., Maria Nieves Zedeño, and David B. Halmo, eds.  

Stoller, Marianne L.  

Swadesh, Frances L.  

Tashakkori A. and C. Teddlie  

Tiller, Veronica  

Trujillo, Ocaris  

Twitchell, Ralph E.  

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  

U.S. Geological Survey  


Vickery, Joyce Carter  
1977 Defending Eden: New Mexican Pioneers in Southern California, 1830-1890. Riverside, CA : Department of History, University of California, Riverside
Warren, Elizabeth von Till  

Woodley, Jr., John Paul  

Works, Martha A.  

Wozniak, Frank  
APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENT USED DURING THIS STUDY
Ethnohistoric and Ethnographic Assessment
of Contemporary Communities Along the Old Spanish Trail

*** NOTE: Record a response for every question in order for answers to be comparable***

Interview Number: _________

Tape Number _____________

1. Date: _________________

2. Ethnographer ____________________________

3. Respondent’s Name: _____________________  3a. Respondent’s Title: _____________________

4. Gender: Male   Female

5. Date of Birth: ___/___/___  5a. Age _____

6. Place of Birth (Town, State): ______________

7. What is the name of this place? ______________

8. Are there other names for this place?
   1 = Yes _______  2 = No _______  3 = Maybe _______  8 = Don't Know _______  9 = No Response ______

8a. If Yes, what are they?
Community Settlement

9. Why were Hispanic people attracted to this place?

9a. Were there natural and/or social features that attracted them?

1 = Yes  
2 = No  
3 = Maybe  
8 = Don't Know  
9 = No Response

9b. If Yes or Maybe, then what characteristics do you think attracted them?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place Feature</th>
<th>1= YES</th>
<th>2= NO</th>
<th>List and Describe the Use each specific feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Previous Use e.g. historic structures, wagon roads, trails, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geological Features e.g. mountain, spring, landmarks, minerals, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Was this site the Hispanic people’s first choice for a community?
   1 = Yes ______  2 = No ______  3 = Maybe ______  8 = Don’t Know ______  9 = No Response ______
   10a. If No, where was their first choice, and why didn’t they settle or stay there?

11. Where did the Hispanic people come from?
11a. Why did the Hispanic people leave that place?

12. Were any of your ancestors among those who came here?
   1 = Yes ______  2 = No ______  3 = Maybe ______  8 = Don’t Know ______  9 = No Response ______
   12a. If Yes or Maybe, who were they and when did they come?

12b. If Yes or Maybe, has your family remained here?
OST Community Impacts

13. Did the Hispanic people of this community use the Old Spanish Trail for purposes other than moving here?

1 = Yes  2 = No  3 = Maybe  8 = Don't Know  9 = No Response

13a. If Yes or Maybe, for what other purposes did they use the trail?

14. Did use of the Old Spanish Trail impact the Hispanic people who lived here?

1 = Yes  2 = No  3 = Maybe  8 = Don't Know  9 = No Response

14a. If Yes or Maybe, how were they impacted?

15. Did use of the Old Spanish Trail impact the resources at this site that you identified earlier?

Water

1 = Yes  2 = No  3 = Maybe  8 = Don't Know  9 = No Response

Plants
1 = Yes ______  2 = No ______  3 = Maybe ______  8 = Don't Know ______  9 = No Response ______

Animals
1 = Yes ______  2 = No ______  3 = Maybe ______  8 = Don't Know ______  9 = No Response ______

Previous Use Features
1 = Yes ______  2 = No ______  3 = Maybe ______  8 = Don't Know ______  9 = No Response ______

Geologic Features
1 = Yes ______  2 = No ______  3 = Maybe ______  8 = Don't Know ______  9 = No Response ______

Other Features
1 = Yes ______  2 = No ______  3 = Maybe ______  8 = Don't Know ______  9 = No Response ______

15a. If Yes or Maybe, how were the resources impacted?

Water

Plants

Animals

Previous Use Features
Community Connections - Local Landscapes

16. Are there places traditionally used by the Hispanic people that are connected to this place?

1 = Yes  2 = No  3 = Maybe  8 = Don't Know  9 = No Response

16a. If Yes or Maybe, what are those places and how are they connected to this place?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trails, roads</th>
<th>Historic events</th>
<th>Daily events</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Friends</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Were those places impacted by travelers on the Old Spanish Trail?

1 = Yes  2 = No  3 = Maybe  8 = Don't Know  9 = No Response
17a. If Yes or Maybe, how were those places impacted?

17b. Are those places still connected to this community?
   
   1 = Yes  
   2 = No  
   3 = Maybe  
   8 = Don't Know  
   9 = No Response  

17c. If Yes or Maybe, any other comments?

18. Are there other trails traditionally used by Hispanic people that are connected to this place?
   
   1 = Yes  
   2 = No  
   3 = Maybe  
   8 = Don't Know  
   9 = No Response  

18a. If Yes or Maybe, where were those trails and how were they connected to this place?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trails, roads</th>
<th>Historic events</th>
<th>Daily events</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Friends</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trail 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Were those trails impacted by travelers on the Old Spanish Trail?
   
   1 = Yes  
   2 = No  
   3 = Maybe  
   8 = Don't Know  
   9 = No Response  

19a. If Yes or Maybe, how were those trails impacted?
19b. Are those trails still connected to this community?
   1 = Yes       2 = No       3 = Maybe       8 = Don't Know       9 = No Response

19c. If Yes or Maybe, any other comments?

20. Do you have any other comments about the Old Spanish Trail or the impacts from travelers on the Old Spanish Trail?
   1 = Yes       2 = No       3 = Maybe       8 = Don't Know       9 = No Response

20a. If Yes or Maybe, what would you add?