Clark County, Washington
Historic Preservation Commission

Clark County Heritage Register
Nomination Form

This form is for use in nominating or requesting determinations for individual properties and properties. See instructions in How to Complete the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form (National Register Bulletin 16A) http://www.nps.gov/history/nr/publications/bulletins/nrb16a/. Complete each item by marking "x" in the appropriate box or by entering the information requested. This form is similar but not exact to the National Register of Historic Places nomination form. Some sections of the National Register form were not applicable to the local register therefore were not included. When using the National Register Bulletin 16A to fill out the form, look for the section names for information on completing the specific section. If any item does not apply to the property being documented, enter "N/A" for "not applicable." For functions, architectural classification, materials, and areas of significance, enter only categories and subcategories from the instructions. Place additional entries and narrative items on continuation sheets. Use a typewriter, word processor, or computer, to complete all items.

1. Name of Property

Historic name Clark County Poor Farm; Southwestern Washington Experiment Station
Other names/site number Washington State University Southwest Washington Research Unit; 78th Street Heritage Farm

2. Location

street & number 1919 NE 78th Street
not for publication
city or town Vancouver
State Washington code WA county Clark code 011 zip code 98665

3. Classification

Ownership of Property
(Check as many boxes as apply)
private
x public-local
___ public-State
___ public-Federal

Category of Property
(Check only one box)
x building(s)
property
x site
structure
object

Number of Resources within Property
(Do not incl. previously listed resources in the count.)
Contributing Non-Contributing
buildings 7 6
sites 2 1
structures 2
objects 2

Total 9 9

Name of related multiple property listing:
(Enter "N/A" if property is not part of a multiple property listing.)

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the Clark County Heritage Register

4. Owner Consent for Nomination, Designation and Listing

I (we) consent to the nomination, and designation of the above property on the Clark County Heritage Register.
I (we) also certify that I am/we are the legal owner(s) of the above property.

Owner signature Date

Owner signature Date
5. Functions or Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Functions</th>
<th>Current Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH CARE: Sanitarium</td>
<td>AGRICULTURE/SUBSISTENCE: Horticultural Facility, Agricultural Outbuilding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE/SUBSISTENCE: Agricultural field, Animal facility, Horticultural facility</td>
<td>EDUCATION: Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Outbuilding</td>
<td>GOVERNMENT: Government office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION: Research</td>
<td>LANDSCAPE: Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNERARY: Cemetery</td>
<td>FUNERARY: Cemetery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Description

**Architectural Classification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Narrative Description**

(Describe the historic and current condition of the property.)

**Summary Paragraph**

The Clark County Poor Farm is comprised of 99 acres, most of which is agricultural farmland. The historic property has 18 resources, including 13 buildings, 3 sites and 2 structures. The resources are grouped into 5 clusters based on geographic location and resource type:

1. Administration buildings
   a. 3 contributing buildings (Administration building, Garage, and Milk House)

2. Greenhouses and Agricultural buildings:
   a. 1 contributing building (Shop)
   b. 3 non-contributing buildings (Tool Room, Head House and the Pesticide Shed)
   c. 1 non-contributing site (Greenhouses site)

3. Central outbuildings
   a. 3 contributing buildings (Machine Shed, Bunk House and Hog Barn)
   b. 1 non-contributing building (Well House)

4. Cemetery
   a. 1 contributing site (Poor Farm Cemetery)

5. Hazel Dell Park
   a. 1 contributing site (Hazel Dell Park)
   b. 2 non-contributing structures (Picnic Shelters)
   c. 2 non-contributing buildings (Bathrooms and Utility Shed)
In general, the non-contributing resources are secondary resources and outbuildings, while the more prominent resources are all contributing. Nearly all of the non-contributing resources are located in two specific clusters, the Greenhouses and Agricultural Buildings Cluster and within the Hazel Dell Park Cluster, and thus do not detract from the overall character and integrity of the property. The contributing resources and agricultural landscape convey their association with the property’s early 20th Century history as the Clark County Poor Farm and the property’s mid-century history as the Southwestern Washington Experiment Station. The historic property is locally significant under Criterion A for its associations with both the Clark County Poor Farm (1913-1943) and Southwestern Washington Experiment Station (1943-1966).

Narrative Description

LOCATION

The Clark County Poor Farm historic property includes approximately 99 acres in the Hazel Dell vicinity between NE 78th and NE 68th Streets to the north and south and between NE 19th and NE 24th Avenues to the east and west, approximately 0.5 miles east of Highway 99 and 0.7 miles east of Interstate 5. Hazel Dell is a community of around 19,500 people, located approximately four miles north of Vancouver in unincorporated Clark County, although the Poor Farm site has a Vancouver address and zip code. The property is comprised of two separate tax lots that are all currently owned by Clark County: the 78.92 acre lot which contains all Poor Farm and Experiment Station resources, the bulk of the farm landscape, and the cemetery near the southwest corner of the property, and the 20 acre Hazel Dell Park at the southeast corner of the property.

SETTING

The landscape is uneven and increases in elevation at the south half of the property, delivering views of the Hazel Dell area and the property’s rural farm setting, agricultural plots, and primary buildings. A paved driveway provides the main entrance to the property from NE 78th Street near the northwest corner of the property, extending east through a parking lot to the greenhouses. One main gravel road navigates through the rest of the property, traveling south through the center of the property, then heading east up over a hill and then curving west again toward the cemetery. Separate access roads exist along NE 68th Street for Hazel Dell Park and Clark County Cemetery. A power line utility corridor traverses the center of the property, travelling north to south nearly in line with a 15-foot wide waterworks easement. Some small copses of trees are scattered throughout the property, with the 20-acre wooded Hazel Dell Park being the largest, and a garden landscape with trees, shrubs, and perennials creates a more formal setting around the main Administration Building. The property is located in both the Salmon Creek and Burnt Bridge Creek Watersheds. Cougar Creek, which is part of a Palustrine Scrub-shrub Seasonally Flooded (PSSC) wetland, runs east - west through the property. Hazel Dell Estates, a mobile home development, is adjacent to the west edge of the property. Although the Hazel Dell area historically was primarily agricultural, very few farmsteads remain. The Clark County Poor Farm property, now called the 78th St. Heritage Farm, is currently the largest single-owned parcel in Hazel Dell.

RESOURCE GROUPING 1 – ADMINISTRATION BUILDINGS

The administration buildings include the 2-story Administration and poor farm residence building, constructed in 1926, and which later housed the Southwestern Washington Experiment Station administration and research offices, as well as a detached 4-car garage also constructed in 1926 and a single-story milk house constructed circa 1936. All three resources are contributing to the nominated historic property. These resources are grouped together at the north end of the property near NE 78th Street and are all constructed of concrete and stucco in an Italian Renaissance architectural style. The main access to the property is from NE 78th Street, along a drive at the west end of this cluster, although...
historically, access was to the west of the milk house, with a drive meandering between the milk house and garage before extending south through the agricultural fields. The grounds surrounding the main building and garage are landscaped with conifers, evergreen shrubs and grass. There are parking lots at the south and east ends of the main building.

ADMINISTRATION BUILDING – EXTERIOR (contributing)
The Clark County Poor Farm Administration building is a 2-story brick building constructed in 1926 in the Italian Renaissance style. The brick building is clad in stucco and has a board form concrete foundation and basement. The building faces north to NE 78th Street and is comprised of a two-story, hipped roofed central mass with one-story, forward-projecting, gabled wings at each end. The board form concrete daylight basement is ornamented with horizontal grooves and topped by a concrete belt course. The walls above the belt course are stucco and feature brick quoins at all outside corners. Centered on the front (north) elevation of each gabled wing is a large, Palladian-motif window with a central 10-over-10 wood sash window flanked by 2-over-2 wood sash windows, all capped by a heavy entablature. The central window is topped by a molded arch with a brick diamond in the center. The gables have heavily-moulded cornices and cornice returns, while the elaborated cornice along the hipped roof of the main central mass features Doric ornamental triglyphs and pendant guttae across the principal (north) elevation. The cornice continues across the side and rear elevations of the building’s central mass, but without the triglyphs and guttae. A 1926 architectural sketch of the Clark County Poor Farm Administration Building by DeYoung and Roald Architects illustrates the building heavily ornamented with the existing Italian Renaissance details (Figure 5). Although several of the windows and the front entrance have been altered, the building retains sufficient integrity of the building’s Italian Renaissance design through its form, cladding materials, and ornamentation.

The original entrance was recessed into the façade, surrounded by an entablature and capped by a molded arch with a large medallion in the center. The doors themselves were paired, and the doorway was flanked by half-round columns and was accessed by concrete or brick stairs. This entrance was removed in 1968 and infilled with stucco and a multi-light fixed window (Figure 6). The windows, overall, are generally 1-over-1 replacement steel or vinyl windows, though some of the original 6-over-1 wood sash windows remain, as do two original diamond-pattern windows at the second floor front (north) elevation. All of the original 3-over-1 wood sash basement windows are intact, except the rear elevation, where two of the original 6-over-1 wood windows have been replaced with an aluminum slider and a steel fixed window. Most first floor windows have been replaced with 1-over-1 steel or vinyl windows, though the original openings and brick sills remain intact. An exterior fire escape is attached to the second floor at the center-east window on the front (north) elevation.

The west elevation of the west wing has a doorway on the first floor. This door is no longer in use, and though the door itself is intact, the short interior staircase that led down to the door has been covered over with a ramp. Exterior steps from this door were also removed in the construction of an exterior wheel-chair accessible ramp. On the rear (south) elevation, the west wing is wider than the east, but is consistent in ornamentation with the rest of the building. Photographs of the elevation dating to the 1940s show the oblong elevation to be part of the original design (Figure 8). On the rear (south) of the central mass is a large, rectangular porch with a very low-pitched hipped roof supported by box posts, which are tripled at the corners. Concrete pillars provide the foundation for the porch. The porch ornamentation repeats the same cornice molding as the rest of the building. Aside from concrete infill between the concrete piers and lattice applied to the rails, the porch appears intact. Flanking the porch on both sides are modern, paired steel basement entry doors. On the south end of the east elevation of the east wing, a smaller, matching porch provides access to the original kitchen area.

Despite alterations to the north entrance and the replacement of several 1-over-1 wood sash windows, the exterior of the building retains sufficient integrity to convey the building’s significant association with both the Poor Farm and Southwestern Washington Experiment Station histories.

iv DeYoung and Roald Architects, “Preliminary Sketch of Administration Building for Clark County Poor Farm,” in DeYoung and Roald Architectural Plans and Photographs Collection, Box 131, University of Oregon Library, 1926.

v Washington State University, “History of Vancouver Research & Extension Unit,” 2004. (Clark County Community Planning)
ADMINISTRATION BUILDING - INTERIOR
The interior of the main building has a daylight basement and first floor, and a partial second floor that encompasses only the central mass. The daylight basement was originally open space, but was subsequently subdivided into smaller sleeping quarters for inmates in the mid-1930s. At that time, showers were also installed in the basement, as well as a restaurant-size walk-in refrigerator, which remains in the basement today. The character and condition of the basement is intact from these 1936 alterations, with the exception of the 1980 removal of a rear staircase that allowed direct access from the kitchen area to the basement. The main stairway to the basement, located in the central entrance hall, is intact. Throughout the building, the original steam radiators are also intact. The basement retains its character from these 1936 alterations, although the floor was subsequently altered in 1960 for the development of agricultural research rooms for the Southwestern Washington Experiment Station.

Alterations have occurred on the first floor, although some of the original layout, materials and ornamental features remain, such as the main stair to the second floor apartment, the French doors leading to the east wing, the arched doorways that lead to the west wing, and the east dining room. At the south end of the east wing, the living room area retains the original brick fireplace, carved wood mantelpiece, and French doors. The kitchen, located in the southeast corner of the building, retains some of the original built-in cabinets. In the dining room, original window trim at the Palladian-motif window is intact, as well as much of the interior window, door, and wall trim. The most notable alterations occurred in 1968, with the removal of the recessed central entry on the north end and enclosure of the corridor for use as a reception office. vi

The second floor apartment has excellent integrity, retaining the original window, wall, and door trim, all original doors, and all but one original window. The kitchen retains the original cabinetry, and the bathroom retains the original sink and fixtures. The stairway and hall are intact. The historically residential apartment is currently used for offices.

DETACHED GARAGE (contributing)
To the east of the main building is a four-bay garage building, built in 1926, that has a hipped roof and stylistic details that match the main building, including stucco finish, brick quoin and a moulded cornice. The garage retains excellent integrity, including all original 3-over-1 wood sash windows, and what appear to be original wood bay doors on the north elevation, the center two of which are upward operating, and the outer two of which are sliding doors.

MILK HOUSE (contributing)
The Milk House is a single story building constructed circa 1936, located northeast of the garage and east of the main Administration Building. Although built later than the main building and garage, this building is designed with similar Italian Renaissance stylistic features, including a hipped roof, molded cornice (slightly different in profile from the garage), and brick quoin. The cornice is slightly different in profile from the garage, and the brick quoin are raked, while the brick on the 1926 buildings is smooth-faced. The windows are 1-over-1 wood sash, and there are paired wood vehicle doors on the west elevation, as well as a wood entry door on the east elevation. The resource has excellent integrity to convey its historic materials, design and workmanship, as well as the building’s association with the Clark County Poor Farm operation. The building is currently used for fertilizer storage. Although the building is located adjacent to the Greenhouses and Agricultural Storage Buildings Grouping and has a related use, this resource is included in the Administration Buildings grouping due to its Italian Renaissance features and earlier construction date.

RESOURCE GROUPING 2: GREENHOUSES AND AGRICULTURAL BUILDINGS
The Greenhouses and Agricultural Storage Buildings grouping includes one site and four buildings, located at the central north end of the property near 78th Street, to the east of the Administration Buildings grouping and west of the central road that runs south through the property. Four out of the five resources in this grouping are non-contributing, although buildings and structures formerly existed in this grouping that had similar uses to the current resources, including the original wood frame and gambrel roof barn that was demolished in 1963 as part of a road widening project.

for NE 78th Street, a 1952 greenhouse constructed specifically for the research of garden chrysanthemum varieties (demolished), and other outbuildings (Figures 7, 11, 12). vii

GREENHOUSES SITE (non-contributing)
The Greenhouses site is a non-contributing resource within the property. The site encompasses 11 greenhouses, clustered tightly together at the east end of the grouping. The greenhouses are primarily arched metal frame structures with fiberglass walls that were constructed at various times between 1970 and 2012.

The greenhouses are best treated as a single unit due to their temporary nature and thus are considered as a whole to be one non-contributing site within the property. Temporary materials, including easy-to-assemble and -dismantle metal frames, Plexiglas, fiberglass and plastic walls primarily comprise the greenhouse structures. The walls are often altered or removed depending on the climate needs of the plants inside, and at times, additional temporary greenhouses are seasonally installed in the fields. The greenhouses are placed tightly together with very little space in between each structure, and are located in a concentrated area that does not detract or interfere with the rest of the property. Greenhouse structures existed on the site as early as 1952, although all the greenhouses from the period of significance were demolished and replaced in the late 1960s and 1970s with fiberglass structures. The greenhouses range in size from 30 x 55 feet to 12 x 40 feet.

AGRICULTURAL BUILDINGS (1 contributing and 3 non-contributing)
The four agricultural buildings are generally one- or two-room utilitarian buildings with low pitched sheet metal roofs and corrugated sheet metal siding. The buildings are located among the greenhouses in generally the same area as the barn and early agricultural outbuildings (all demolished). viii Small signs label each building as the Shop, Tool Room, Pesticide Shed, and Head House. The earliest of these buildings (currently labeled as the “Shop”) was assembled on site in 1962, although the three others were constructed circa 1980. The 1962 building is contributing, but the three 1980s buildings do not contribute to the significance of the historic property and are considered non-contributing resources.

Reports show that in 1962, the “Shop”, a 20 x 40 foot shop building from the Hanford Site in Hanford, WA was dismantled and moved to the Southwestern Washington Experiment Station.ix This single-story building is located at the southwest corner of the greenhouse cluster and is a contributing resource. The Shop has a poured concrete foundation and is clad with sheet metal siding and has a low-pitch sheet metal roof. Historic multi-pane wood windows remain, but overall, the building is in poor condition.

RESOURCE GROUPING 3: CENTRAL OUTBUILDINGSx
This resource grouping includes four outbuildings, centrally located on the property approximately 400 meters (1,300 feet) southeast of the main building along a gravel access road that connects from the main entrance and continues to the south fields and cemetery. Three of the buildings, the machine shed, bunk house and hog barn, are contributing resources while one, the Well House, is non-contributing. All four resources are subsidiary buildings, and are far more vernacular in style than the Italian Renaissance style buildings in the Administration resource grouping, but they contribute to the overall agricultural landscape of the property and convey the property’s historic use both as a poor farm and as an agricultural research station. A wood silo from a different site is currently stored on its side in the area of this grouping. The silo has no association with the property and the location is not permanent, however, there was originally a silo on the property (as seen in circa 1945 photograph – Figure 7), located near NE 78th Street near the current location of the Greenhouse site.

---

x The section “Resource Grouping 3 – Central Outbuildings” in this document is largely paraphrased from the document by SWCA Environmental Consultants, Intensive-level Documentation of the Clark County Poor Farm buildings and Poor Farm Cemetery Remote Sensing Project, Clark County, Washington (Portland, OR: Clark County, WA, 2010), 27-33.
**BUNK HOUSE (contributing)**

The bunk house, located immediately to the east of the machine shed, is a single-story building constructed circa 1925. The building has a front gable roof, clad in asphalt shingle, with exposed purlins and rafter tails. The bunk house is approximately 22-feet by 22-feet, and is clad with v-notched shiplap siding. There are two entry doors on the north (front) elevation, both originally covered with a gabled entry hood supported by knee braces, although this feature only remains over the easterly door and the other has been removed. Windows are 1-over-1 wood sash, and all are intact, though currently covered with sheets of corrugated fiberglass. The interior is divided into two rooms, the larger a large open room and the kitchen occupying the northwest corner of the building. The interior walls are clad with beaded tongue-in-groove wood, and the kitchen appears to retain its original cabinetry. The building is set on concrete blocks and structural tile to protect the structure from ground moisture. Overall, the bunk house is in poor condition, with significant leaking in the roof causing decay in the ceiling. The building is currently used for storage.

Aerial photographs demonstrate that the building was moved to this location between 1955 and 1959 during the property’s period of significance. A building with matching dimensions appears nearby, approximately 100 feet southwest of its current location along the east edge of the road in the 1955 photograph, as well as in a 1943 sketch of the property. This suggests that the bunk house may only have been moved a short distance and has always been part of this resource grouping, although this assumption has not been confirmed. Prior investigations have reported the bunk house originally being located near the main building along NE 78th Street, but no evidence was provided to support this documentation.

**HOG BARN (contributing)**

The Hog Barn, constructed circa 1920, is located to the east of the bunk house. The building, approximately 80-feet long and 25-feet wide, has a rectangular plan and sits parallel to the road on a wood post foundation. The side gable roof, clad in corrugated steel, has open eaves and exposed rafter tails. It is clad with wood drop with corner boards, and has 4-by-4 wood slider windows on all four elevations. The barn has sliding wood vehicle doors at both ends. The building is currently used for storage.

Design features of typical hog barns include a long and narrow one or two story building with a low pitch side gable roof and evenly spaced simple fenestration. Entries appear to generally be located at the gable end elevations. Although many hog barns feature a shed roof along one elevation with two stories of windows for function and ventilation, this resource fits a more simplistic form of the resource type.

It has been reported that the Hog Barn structure was moved to its current location, due to newer posts that comprise the building’s foundation. It is known that the Clark County Poor Farm activities included raising pigs, suggesting that this structure is original to the farm, even if it was moved to its current location sometime during the period of significance. Photographs from the 1940s show a building with similar form and fenestration to the Hog House to the east of the barn (Figure 7). It is possible that the Hog Barn may originally have been constructed in the Greenhouses and Agricultural Buildings grouping along NE 78th Street. A site plan sketch from 1943 does not show the Hog Barn in this location, and there is a “barn lot” at the north end of the property (Figure 9).xi By 1955, according to aerial photographs, the Hog Barn was its current location (Figure 12).

**MACHINE SHED (contributing)**

The Machine Shed, built circa 1930 is the only historic building in this cluster in its original location. The building is a three-bay, side-gabled machine shed with v-notched shiplap siding, corner boards, and exposed rafter tails. The front (north) elevation has three open garage bays with no doors, supported by wood king brace posts and angled upper corners in the outer bays. The building has a dirt floor, and rests on a concrete stemwall foundation on the south, west, and east elevations, but posts comprise the foundation of the front (north) elevation. There are 4-light wood windows on the south (rear), east and west (side) elevations, including a four-light window in both of the gable peaks. The roof is clad with corrugated steel. The building appears in this location on a 1943 sketch of the property (Figure 9).xii The

---

xi “Memorandum of Understanding between the Experiment Station, State College of Washington and the County Commissioners and Welfare Department of Clark County,” 1943, Book V, Page 470-473, (Clark County Historical Society, Farm, Clark Co, 1944-1946).

xii Memorandum of Understanding, 1943.
Machine Shed is currently in fair condition but has excellent integrity, retaining the original materials and craftsmanship from its time of construction and conveys the property's historic agricultural use.

**WELL HOUSE (non-contributing)**
The Well House, a concrete block building rectangular in plan, was constructed circa 1990 and has a galvanized sheet metal roof. Although the building is a non-contributing resource, the well itself is a significant component of the property’s historic landscape and function. A circa 1945 water pump is located just outside the well house near the road. Proposals to replace the pump date to 1945, and it is known that the experiment station drilled an 80-foot well on the property in 1951 for water for domestic use and irrigation studies, and drilled an additional 225-foot irrigation well in 1956.

**RESOURCE GROUPING 4: CEMETERY (contributing)**
The Clark County Cemetery is located along the west edge of the property near the southwest corner. The 1913 cemetery plat and year of the cemetery’s first burials marks the beginning of the period of significance for the property. The plat, which uses the county’s former spelling of “Clarke,” illustrates eight rows with 39 burial plots in each row, equaling a total of 312 plots (Figure 13). The plat map describes each grave as 4 x 5 feet in dimension with 5-foot wide paths running east and west between the graves and 6-foot wide paths running north and south between the rows. A road, 18 feet in width, travels south through the center of the cemetery toward NE 68th Street with four rows of burial plots on each side. Parallel, narrower roads delineate the east and west boundaries of the cemetery.

Remaining features above ground include the center and west roads, which are currently grass paths, as well as the rural setting and rolling landscape. No permanent grave markers were ever used at the cemetery, only metal stakes placed in the ground with names of the buried individuals (Figure 14). These metal markers have all been removed, although the Clark County Community Planning department retains one as an artifact and remote sensing data suggests that some markers may be buried underground. A chain-link fence surrounds the west half of the cemetery enclosing the plot roughly along the west edge of the center road for the entire north-south length of the cemetery before angling west to an easement that accesses the property from NE 68th Street. The cemetery’s east road and above-grade gravesites are not fenced and have been tilled into berry fields, dating back to early 1940s research projects conducted by the Southwest Experiment Station. A boulder, approximately 3’ x 4’ was placed near the northwest corner of the cemetery in 1966 to commemorate the cemetery and those buried there. Perhaps one of the more significant features of the cemetery is its lack of headstones or cemetery amenities. Likely due to the resource’s association with the County Poor Farm, a social institution of low prestige during the period of significance, metal markers staked into the ground were all that identified the burial sites.

A remote sensing investigation and report indicate that below ground, the cemetery burials remain intact. The investigation discovered that interments in the cemetery conform to the plat diagram for the cemetery, and that the plat generally represents an accurate view of burial locations. Although alterations occurred above ground to the east half of the cemetery, this resource retains sufficient integrity above and below ground to convey its significant association with the Clark County Poor Farm.

**RESOURCE GROUPING 5: HAZEL DELL PARK (1 contributing, 3 non-contributing)**
Hazel Dell Park includes one site located at the southeast corner of the property. This contributing resource includes 20 acres of a forest setting of douglas fir trees. There are two circa 1960 wood frame covered picnic structures, the smaller one located on the east side of the site and the larger one on the west side, just north of the parking lot. Both open shelters have log uprights supporting simple A-frame gabled roofs. The smaller of the two is approximately 20x30 feet and has simple open gabled roof over eleven log upright supports. The larger shelter is approximately 40x60 feet and has twenty log upright supports. Both shelters house picnic tables. There is also a small circa 1980 20x20 feet wood

---

xv SWCA Environmental Consultants, 49.
xvi SWCA Environmental Consultants, 49.
restroom building and a 12x12 feet utility shed. A circa 1950 ranch style caretaker residence with 1970s additions once occupied the park, but was demolished in 2011. The site was designated as a park in 1950 during the property’s period of significance, although the park had no association with the Southwestern Washington Experiment Station. However, the park site retains significant integrity of setting to convey its former use as a wooded pasture during the Poor Farm era and therefore is a contributing resource. The three park structures are non-contributing.

CONCLUSION
Overall, the property has excellent integrity of setting, materials, association, and feeling. Although some alterations occurred to the exterior of the Administration building and stabilization efforts have occurred to some outbuildings, the property retains good integrity of design and workmanship. Two buildings were re-located during the period of significance to other areas of the same property, but the property still maintains good integrity of location. The agricultural landscape and associated buildings and sites convey the historic significance of the property’s association with welfare support and agricultural development throughout its use as the Clark County Poor Farm (1913-1943), and the Southwestern Washington Experiment Station (1943-1966). Although the poor farm existed on the property prior to 1913 and state agricultural research occurred after 1966, this period of significance is most reflective of the existing significant resources that comprise the historic property.
### 7. Statement of Significance

#### Applicable Clark County Heritage Register Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of national, state, or local history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>It embodies the distinctive architectural characteristics of a type, period, style, or method of design or construction, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>It is an outstanding work of a designer, builder, or architect who has made a substantial contribution to their field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>It exemplifies or reflects special elements of the county’s history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>It is associated with the lives of persons significant in national, state, or local history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>It has yielded or may be likely to yield important archaeological information related to history or prehistory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>It is an historic building or cultural resource removed from its original location but which is significant for architectural value, or association with an historic person or event, or prehistory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>It is a birthplace of grave of a prehistoric or historical Figure of outstanding importance and is the only surviving structure or site associated with that person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>It is a cemetery or burial site which derives its primary significance from age, from distinctive design features, or from association with historic events, or cultural patterns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>It is a reconstructed building that has been executed in a historically accurate manner on the original site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>It is a creative and unique example of folk architecture and design created by persons not formally trained in the architectural or design professions, and which does not fit into formal architectural or historical categories.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Areas of Significance

- AGRICULTURE;
- HEALTH/MEDICINE;
- SOCIAL HISTORY

#### Period of Significance

1913-1966

#### Significant Dates

1913, 1926, 1943, 1949, 1966

#### Significant Person

(Complete if Criterion 3 is marked above)

#### Cultural Affiliation

- **Architect/Builder**
  - DeYoung & Roald (Architects)
  - Anderson Construction (Builder)
Narrative Statement of Significance
(Explain the significance of the property.)

Period of Significance (justification)
The period of significance begins with the platting of the Clark County Poor Farm Cemetery and first burials in 1913 and ends in 1966, when extension programs were re-organized at the state institutional level and the Southwestern Washington Experiment Station changed its name to the Southwest Washington Research Unit. The period encompasses the platting of the cemetery and construction of the existing poor farm buildings, thirty years of use as the Clark County Poor Farm (1913-1943), and twenty-three years of development and operation of the Southwestern Washington Experiment Station (1943-1966). Although a county poor farm existed on the property prior to 1913, and state agricultural research occurred after 1966, this period of significance is most reflective of the existing resources that comprise the historic property.

Criteria Considerations
Although the ending date of the period of significance is outside the usual 50-year mark, it is felt that the site is still historically significant that nearly fifty years of its 53-year period of significance is older than fifty years. In addition, being that the ending date of 1966 is only a few years short of being within the 50-year mark, to cut off the period of significance at exactly fifty years would be arbitrary in this case rather than illustrative of the significance of the Southwestern Washington Experiment Station’s involvement on the property.

Statement of Significance Summary Paragraph
The property is locally significant under Criterion 1 for its association with social welfare and early twentieth century poor farm relief programs. Counties operated poor farms throughout the United States until the system was reorganized in the 1930s, and then largely discontinued following the Roosevelt administration’s passage and implementation of social security legislation. Clark County operated a poor farm on the historic property from as early as 1873 until 1943, although the earliest remaining resource, the cemetery, dates to 1913. The property is representative of the commitment to poor relief that was shouldered by counties prior to the federal government’s assumption of social welfare responsibilities.

In addition, the property is locally significant under Criterion 1 for its association with mid-20th century state-operated agricultural extension centers implemented to aid individual counties with agricultural research and development. Washington State College (now Washington State University) established the Southwestern Washington Experiment Station on the property to “increase production of agricultural products in Clark County by determining the adaptability of new crops and by developing improved varieties, cultural practices and fertilizer recommendations for the important agricultural soils of the region.” The station conducted research in commercial vegetables and fruit crops, insect and disease control, fertilizer development, irrigation, animal science, soils, seeds, Christmas trees, and other horticultural studies. The historic property conveys this significant contribution to local agricultural growth and is representative of the agricultural research and education provided to local farmers in Clark County and the Southwest Washington region.

AGRICULTURAL HISTORY OF CLARK COUNTY
Vancouver, the county seat of Clark County, was settled by the Hudson’s Bay Company in 1825 as a fur trading post. Agriculture and lumber quickly became the primary industries, and most transportation occurred on the river. Prune farming was established in Clark County in the 1890s and became a prominent industry in the Hazel Dell area. An advertisement in The Oregonian referred to the area as the “rich Clarke County prune belt, 5 miles from Vancouver.”

Vancouver had a large cooperative cannery and several prune drying operations throughout the county. Logging was an
additional leading industry in the area, as well as cutting cordwood and some gold mining along Chicken and Gold Creeks.\textsuperscript{xx}

Until the end of World War II, Clark County, particularly Hazel Dell, was primarily an agricultural community with smaller family-owned and operated farms and prune orchards.\textsuperscript{xxi} Seventy-three families operated farms in Hazel Dell circa 1925.\textsuperscript{xxii} E.A. Taylor and F. R. Yoder provide a description of Clark County’s agricultural economy in \textit{Rural and Social Organization of Clark County}, published in 1928.

“The agriculture of the county is diversified. Dairy ing, and the growing of forage crops and prunes are leading types of farming along the river bottoms. In the terrace lands between the river bottoms and mountains, a wide variety of crops are grown, including prunes, other orchard fruits, berries, nuts, potatoes, hay, grain, and garden truck. Poultry and dairy products are extensively produced. In the mountainous and hilly lands in the northern and eastern parts of the county, general farming, dairying, grazing, and poultry raising are the leading types of agriculture.”\textsuperscript{xxiii}

Prune production in Clark County reached its height in the 1930s, but began to diminish during World War II.\textsuperscript{xxiv} Seasonal impacts, such as brown rot and cold pollination periods, or insect infestations affected harvests, as well as property neglect during World War II. An article describes that “During the period previous to the war, prices received by growers were frequently insufficient to provide a profit. With little incentive to take care of the trees, many growers abandoned their orchards, with the result that commercial production ceased. During the war, little concerted effort has been made to bring these orchards back into production.”\textsuperscript{xxv} Acute labor shortage, and focus on primary incomes or crops also contributed to the decline.\textsuperscript{xxvi} After World War II, canning and freezing of fruit, including prunes, became widely popular and the demands of fruit orchards increased, reestablishing the importance of fruit crops in the area. The Southwestern Washington Experiment Station initiated a series of experiments to determine appropriate spacing, fertilizers, insecticides and fungicides to develop more resilient varieties and improve conditions for orchards in the county.\textsuperscript{xxvii}

In the 1940s, aluminum reduction plants were established in Clark County. As aluminum use grew rapidly, its industrial production provided a good source of employment for the area. However, aluminum reduction plants interfered with the agricultural economy, “emitting gases and fumes destructive of cattle and crops,” and causing controversy among the two prominent industries in Clark County.\textsuperscript{xxviii} According to a newspaper article in \textit{The Columbian}, “Research done at the center in 1949 showed the harmfulness to crops and cattle of fluorine gas given off by aluminum production. In turn, the aluminum industry developed a filtering system to remove toxic levels of fluorine in the air and protect the crops and animals.”\textsuperscript{xxix}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{xxi} Harley Mays, “HD history dates to 1854,” \textit{The Columbian}, Feb 20, 1976.
\textsuperscript{xxii} \ E. A. Taylor and F. R. Yoder, \textit{Rural Social Organization of Clark County} (Pullman, WA: State College of Washington Agricultural Experiment Station, 1928), 18.
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ANDERSON DONATION LAND CLAIM

The historic property was originally part of the William Reese Anderson and Sarah Jane Anderson Donation Land Claim. William Anderson was born in 1822 in Washington County, Virginia, and arrived in Oregon around 1848. In 1851, he married Sarah Jane Sturgess, a 14-year-old woman who lived in Clackamas County, Oregon. They lived in Linnton, Oregon, a small settlement along the west shore of the Willamette River, downstream from Portland. Federal land records show that the Anderson’s secured a Donation Land Claim north of Vancouver in 1865. The Andersons, including their 13 children, were important early pioneers of the Hazel Dell area. The family donated land for education, and roads and schools have since been named in their honor.

In 1871, the Andersons forfeited 100 acres of their Donation Land Claim to Clark County due to a sheriff’s bond held against the property in the late 1860s. The situation began in 1868 when William Anderson sold this property to Jared Van Vleet, but continued to live on the property. In 1870, Anderson defaulted on his repayment of the sheriff’s bond, and a lien was placed on the property against Anderson, although he technically was no longer the owner. In 1871 Van Vleet died, and during the disposal of his property, the details of the land transfer became apparent to the county. The court nullified the sale of the property to Van Vleet and the county seized the 100-acre tract in settlement for the bond default. By 1873, this tract was established as the Clark County Poor Farm and remained in county ownership until 1949. The property returned again to the county in 2008 and currently operates as Clark County-owned land.

HISTORIC CONTEXT OF POOR FARMS

Poor farms in the United States resembled a British model, which placed responsibility on the local community to care for its impoverished citizens. Local church parishes often held this responsibility in England. In the United States, local government took over the care of those in poverty. The purpose of the poor farm was “to be a place, supported by the local community, where the intelligent poor, unable to support themselves, may find comfort in their old age, and for the relief of the intelligent, indigent adults of any age.” However, the implementation of poor farms often resulted in unsatisfactory and unsanitary conditions. Residents, generally referred to as “inmates,” were commonly mistreated. In Olympia, Washington in 1925, a 76-year-old inmate of the Thurston County Poor Farm set the barn on fire at the claiming that he was “driven to it by alleged mistreatment at the hands of the superintendent.”

Harry C. Evans’ 1926 book, The American Poorfarm and its Inmates, provides a diatribe against the existence of poor farms. He asserts that “living in this mess of insanity and depravity, this prison place for criminals and the insane, are several thousand children and respectable, intelligent old folk, whose only offense is that they are poor.” The author implies that although physical abuse is not common, inmates unable to work are generally ignored and neglected, and that “little opportunity is made to amuse or entertain them.”
Poor farms, developed as a social welfare system, were wrought with politics, financial constraints and social stigmas against elderly and indigent persons. Jane Morrison and Julie Koler’s National Register documentation for the Multnomah County Poor Farm in nearby Troutdale, Oregon describes the intentions and shortcomings of the Poor Farm system. “Public health and welfare institutions of the early 20th Century were distinguished by the concept of self-sufficiency through farm operations, a secondary purpose of which was to provide inmates of the institution healthful occupation in a rural environment.”xliii Despite intentions of financial autonomy, only 18 farms in the United States were reported to be financially self-supporting in 1923-24.xliv

Evans’ book, *The American Poorfarm and its Inmates*, includes an analysis of poor farms throughout the United States with details for each individual state and selective case study summaries of individual facilities. In 1926, Washington had $1,677,828 invested in 24 poor farms for 862 individuals, 87% of whom were male.xlv xlv The ten farms had ten or fewer inmates. The operation costs of these smaller facilities were estimated to be more than twice as expensive per person as larger facilities.xlvi Of the seven Washington poor farms included in the summary, all but King County’s facility were cited as poorly maintained and unsanitary, with unclean conditions, cesspools, vermin, and fire hazards. xlvii King County, apparently was “the only poor farm in the state where inmates [had] a clean sheet a week.”xlviii

A variety of financial and contract systems were used to operate the poor farms. Contracts may have included a county appointed superintendent that received a salary, a lease agreement to rent the property, or a contract bid to operate the facility. In some situations profits from selling the farm produce were counted as county revenue, while in other situations, these profits went to the superintendent as part of the payment structure. Often extremely low bids were accepted and operators only made money by “grossly neglecting his charges.”li The operator may have been paid a stipend for each inmate, and was given ownership of the farm production and profits from selling produce. lii The financial system at the Clark County Poor Farm varied. Documentation shows that at times, the superintendent was paid a salary to oversee the farm. Stipends were allocated for the inmates, but profits from selling produce were deposited as county income. liii In the 1940s however, the superintendent rented the property from the county for farm production and his own profit.

Poor farms began to decline in the 1930s as other, national services became available to serve those facing poverty. Morrison and Koler state that “labor laws, old age pensions, and poor relief—when combined with a growing concern for sanitation and health care—made the undifferentiated workhouse (poor farm) a primary target for early 20th Century reform.”lix The Social Security Act of 1935 had the largest impact on discontinuing the need for county-funded poor farms by providing a federal system to support the nation’s increasing elderly and retired workers. State welfare pensions for the elderly were practically non-existent before 1930. liv During the Great Depression, poverty among the elderly increased dramatically and could not be ignored. By 1935, thirty states had passed legislation to develop old-age welfare pension programs.lv

---
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A summary of the Social Security Administration’s history summarizes the threshold of change that influenced the development and implementation of a new federal aid program:

As 1934 dawned, the nation was deep in the throes of the Depression. Confidence in the old institutions was shaken. Social changes that started with the Industrial Revolution had long ago passed the point of no return. The traditional sources of economic security: assets; labor; family; and charity, had all failed in one degree or another. Radical proposals for action were springing like weeds from the soil of the nation's discontent. President Franklin Roosevelt would choose the social insurance approach as the ‘cornerstone” of his attempts to deal with the problem of economic security. lvvi

The extreme poverty and economic dependence caused by the Great Depression catalyzed several social movements to initiate programs that ensured minimum family incomes, monthly pensions for the elderly, and reform for state economies. lvii President Roosevelt addressed economic security concerns by initiating a Social Insurance Movement and the eventual passing of the Social Security Act in 1935. The federal Social Security Act provided programs for general welfare and income and benefits for retired workers, and was paid for through Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA) taxes. lviii Benefit payments began in 1937 in annual lump sums, and monthly benefits were initiated in 1940. lix

CLARK COUNTY POOR FARM (1913-1943) lx

Beginning in 1873, Clark County operated a poor farm on the nominated property, although a two-story Colonial Revival house, constructed circa 1898, is the earliest known building to house poor farm residents. An 1898 article in the Vancouver Independent states that the county had built a $3,000 house on the poor farm property. lxi The superintendent also built a wagon shed “to take care of the wagon which former superintendents allowed to stand out in the weather until it was all but ruined.” lxii These resources no longer remain on the property.

In 1898, the property served sixteen poor farm inmates, including nine children, with approximately seven acres of land in cultivation. lxiii Census records for 1910 show Andrew Remington and his wife operating as Poor Farm superintendents with Delia Steelman, age 13 as a servant for the 8 inmates. The majority of the inmates were between the ages of 50 and 78 aside from three young siblings ages 1, 3, and 8. lxiv Census records from 1920 list Edward J. Harris as Superintendent with his wife and 3 sons also living at the farm. lxv Hattie Robertson, 57 years old, is listed as a servant. Thirteen inmates were included in the 1920 Census, all between the ages of 53 and 88. lxvi

The early poor farm residential building burned in a May 1923 fire. An article in the Morning Oregonian reported that “the Clarke county poor house, a one-story frame building, three miles north of Vancouver, was destroyed by fire . . . with a loss estimated at $5,000. Fourteen men, the inmates of the institution, and two women cooks were removed to safety.” The inmates were sent to the county “pest house,” an antiquated term for a hospital for those with communicable diseases, meaning “house of pestilence.” This temporary facility was located approximately six miles east of the property off of what is currently Fourth Plain Boulevard. lxvii
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lx The introductory paragraphs to the section “Clark County Poor Farm (1913-1943)” in this document is largely paraphrased from the document by SWCA Environmental Consultants, Intensive-level Documentation of the Clark County Poor Farm buildings and Poor Farm Cemetery Remote Sensing Project, Clark County, Washington (Portland, OR: Clark County, WA, 2010), 4-9.
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Discussions about rebuilding the Poor Farm residence began almost immediately, and by November 1923, the County Commissioners had proposed erecting a “two story fireproof building 75 by 100 feet in size, with foundations strong enough to carry a third story. The structure would be strictly modern as to conveniences and sanitation.” However, paying for the building proved to be a challenge. The appropriation of $25,000 for construction costs was vetoed by County commissioners in 1925. The argument supporting the veto suggested that the land, located near the then recent construction of the Pacific Highway, was far too valuable for a county use. The commissioners argued that the potential value of the property sale could have been used to purchase a new plot of land and pay for construction without expense to taxpayers.

However, in 1924, Clark County commissioners approved funds and allocated $80,000 “for the construction and equipment of a building to be erected upon the farm ... for housing the aged and infirm.” The money was appropriated for construction, but the Commissioners choose to delay construction and discuss bond financing to secure the budget. Portland architect William Wallace Lucius prepared plans and specifications for a Poor Farm building in 1924, and was paid $2,000 for his services. Lucius practiced architecture in Portland from 1913 to c. 1932, and was in a partnership with architect Earl G. Cash from 1923 to 1926. Lucius did not become the architect of record for the Poor Farm, presumably because his business partnership with Cash ended around the same time Clark County was prepared to move forward with the building.

CONSTRUCTION OF POOR FARM ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

In January 1926, Clark County entered into a contract with the Portland architecture firm of DeYoung and Roald Architects to design a new Poor Farm facility to replace the one that had burned in 1922. James W. DeYoung (active from 1909 to 1959) and Knud A. Roald (active from 1910 to ca. 1960) worked in partnership from 1919 until 1930 and were responsible for the designs of several buildings in Washington and Oregon, particularly in Portland, OR. Some of their designs, such as the New Heathman Hotel, at 712 SW Salmon Street in Portland, built in 1927, the Paramount Theater, at 1037 SW Broadway, built in 1927, and the Children’s Farm Home School in Benton County, OR, built in 1926, are listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

DeYoung arrived in Portland in 1907. He worked as a draftsman for Doyle & Patterson in 1909, and as a superintendent and architect for the L.R. Baily Company from 1911-1917 before partnering with Roald. When the partnership dissolved in 1930, DeYoung continued practicing by himself until 1959.

Roald arrived in Portland in 1910, where he worked as a draftsman for Henry Hefty, David Chambers Lewis, and later for the L.P. Bailey Co., Architects and Builders. After working with DeYoung, Roald practiced on his own until the
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early 1940s, when he went into partnership with John T. Schneider. After World War II, he formed a new partnership known as Roald, Schmeer, & Harrington (with Millard H. Schmeer and Elmer G. Harrington). Roald retired in 1963 and died in 1965. lxxxiv lxxxv

The style chosen for the Poor Farm Administration Building and Garage is a scaled-down iteration of the Italian Renaissance style, commonly used for government buildings and large-scale commercial buildings. Identifying features of the style include a low-pitch hipped roof often clad in tile, arches above doors, and small classical columns or pilasters supported entrances and porches. lxxxvi The Italian Renaissance style evokes a sense of responsibility, orderliness, and prosperity. lxxxvii These institutional characteristics were achieved through the massing and ornamentation of the Clark County Poor Farm Administration building and its contemporary subordinate buildings, the Garage and Milk House.

DeYoung and Roald’s architectural specifications called for:

a building 105 x 45 feet, of stucco construction, one story, except at the center, where an upper story will be built containing five rooms for the use of the superintendent and his family. The structure will contain dormitories for men and women, kitchen, dining room and living room, and will house 35 inmates. lxxxviii

A 1926 insurance policy for the property described the building as a “two story brick and tile roof composition dwelling house building,” lxxxix issued in 1928, an additional policy covered the barn building known as the “Private County Barn,” which was the wood gambrel roof building that was demolished in 1963. xc

The Clark County Board of Commissioners called for contractor bids for building construction in January 1926. xci The project budget was $25,000, although at the hearing, several commissioners still protested against the project, due to the possibilities of other uses at the site. xcii Anderson Construction, a Portland construction company, was awarded the contract with a bid of $21,481 and began construction in March 1926. xciii Construction moved quickly. By March 11, the excavation had been completed, and forms for the concrete were in place. xcv The company completed the project in June 1926 and the building was scheduled to be occupied by June 21. xcv The 4-bay garage was part of this construction. xcvi The county appointed Mr. and Mrs. W. L. Vest as Superintendent and Matron of the “County Farm” in January 1925 while the residents were still at their temporary location. xcvii The residents transferred back to the Poor Farm property. The facility on Fourth Plain Boulevard was replaced in 1933 with the Clark County Hospital. xcviii
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SOCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL HISTORY OF CLARK COUNTY POOR FARM

The 1926 article describing the progress being made on the new building also indicates that the Poor Farm had about 50 acres under cultivation in hay, grain and potatoes, and a large garden was also planned to supply food for the residents. Livestock maintained at the farm included 11 cows, 38 chickens, and an unreported number of hogs. The article explained that all the labor on the farm, including harvesting crops and cutting wood, was performed by county prisoners. Dairy farming was also an important aspect of the Poor Farm. The property included the dairy barn and a herd of Guernsey cattle.

Newspaper articles from various years provided accounts and observations of operations costs, crops, and resident conditions. For example, a 1932 Morning Oregonian article describes the farm’s operations costs. The farm cost $8,488 to operate in 1931 and provided an $864 return on produce sales. These numbers were used quite critically to admonish the farm superintendent who, according to the article, was considered “physically unable to do hard work and extravagant in his management of the farm,” which ideally would have been a self-sufficient operation. A 1936 article in The Columbian provides a detailed account of the Poor Farm, its living conditions and recent improvements. There were 28 residents in 1936 between the ages of 47 and 88, including four women, and the building reportedly could accommodate up to 38 individuals. Recent renovations provided more privacy in the basement for the residents, as described in the 1936 newspaper article:

The basement once was mainly one large room, little more than a bare barracks space, where the men had their cots. There was no privacy. Now it is divided by cleanly-enamelled partitions. They are cubby-holes, to be sure, but they afford dearly-prized privacy of one-bed or two-bed rooms to the inmates.

Showers were also installed. Other improvements included the construction of the Milk House to the east of the main Administration building. This building was built to separate the milk-handling from the laundry, which were located together until this new construction. The Milk House was also intended for vegetable storage.

The 1936 newspaper article continues with a description of the farm production. Under the direction of Superintendent John Gretsch, unlike the 1932 account, the farm was almost fully self-sufficient. Surplus produce was used for trade or distributed to other county facilities, such as the hospital.

The farm produces everything possible for its own use. The seven head of purebred dairy cattle which were on the farm when Gretsch took over have been increased to 16 head of purebreds, plus two steers and a heifer which are to furnish meat for the home this winter. Gretsch does his own butchering, and places the meat in cold storage until needed. The dairy furnishes butter and milk to both home and hospital. There are three big Chester White brood sows on the farm and a huge boar, along with a couple of shoats. Last year Gretsch butchered and smoked 13 hogs; this year there will be more after the summer litters. All year the home has had all the potatoes it could use, and now Gretsch is trading the surplus, at Scotchman’s prices, for a hayrake he needs in the fields. The farm’s strawberry patch turned out, in addition to all the fresh berries that were needed, 840 pounds of frozen berries both this year and last – enough so that the inmates have had fresh berries every Sunday this year. The farm’s 750 chickens supply it with eggs, and 13 turkeys will provide repasts at the traditional feast days next fall. The farm’s truck garden supplies it with fresh vegetables in season; and 2700
quarts are canned by hand each year to tide over during winter. The farm owns a team of horses and a truck but no tractor. The work is done by Gretsch and his hired hands, assisted by such of the inmates that are able-bodied.\textsuperscript{cx}

Poor Farm residents who could work were expected to contribute to farm production. In addition, Mr. and Mrs. Gretsch had two paid assistants at the Poor Farm.\textsuperscript{cxi} Newspaper documentation suggests that prisoners from the county jail were also brought to the property as temporary laborers, and on some occasions, escaped while under the superintendent’s supervision.\textsuperscript{cxii cxiii}

The reporter continues with remarks about the living conditions for the residents:

As for conditions at the home, they appear to be reasonably good, considering the fact that the inmates are persons who are coming to the end of the trail in empty purses and discouragement in one way or another. . . . But they have a warm and fairly comfortable place to stay and it is kept sanitary kitchen, laundry and other facilities and the general atmosphere seems to be peaceful. Several of them said they were mighty glad to have been able to come to such a place.

The Poor Farm’s living situation may not have been as positive as the \textit{Columbian} reporter described in 1936. Clark County Poor Farm resident L. B. Lamar wrote a letter to the editor of \textit{The Oregonian} in October 1932.\textsuperscript{cxiv Excerpts from this article describe the collective experience of “that peculiar pseudo eleemosynary, quasi-panel institution, the poor farm,” as having one’s life erased from the social world.\textsuperscript{cxv The inmates’ “commitment to a home or farm maintained at public expense marks their virtual erasure from the list of remembered names, of remembered faces, or remembered accomplishments. Concerned by the loss of identity in this system, he lamented that “Their past is easily forgotten. Their present is but a fleeting of dismal hours. Their future is horizoned by a potter’s field.”\textsuperscript{cxvi Lamar also acknowledged the political disagreements and budgeting challenges surrounding county supported poor farms and that such debates became especially evident during elections.\textsuperscript{cxvii}}

In 1938, the management of the poor farm was reorganized, and the operation of the farm was moved from the former Clark County Indigent Department to the newly formed Clark County Welfare Department under the supervision of the County Institutional Manager who oversaw operation of the poor farm, county hospital, and county clinic.\textsuperscript{cxviii A report from 1938 indicates that the farm then had 12 cows, 21 pigs, 100 chickens, 350 chicks, and two horses.\textsuperscript{cxix A similar report from the following year indicates that the farm cared for 30 residents, had one part-time four full-time employees, and operated at a cost of 70 cents per inmate per day.\textsuperscript{cxx}}

Although the Poor Farm property began its transition to becoming the State Extension facility in 1943, the property continued to operate as a residence for the elderly for a short time longer as the Evergreen Convalescent Home.\textsuperscript{cxxi A 1946 article in \textit{The Clark County Sun} indicated that R.W. Brossard had been leasing the property from Clark County since

\textsuperscript{cx “County Farm,” \textit{The Columbian}, June 19, 1936.}
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1943 and continued to operate the residence “as a home for old people.”

Brossard’s lease agreement includes an inventory of the farm, including food supplies, sundries, furniture, bedding, tools and equipment. Twenty rocking chairs and 7 upholstered arm chairs are listed in the inventory, as well as 57 straight chairs and various quantities of bedding sheets, pillows and blankets.

A 1943 sketch of the property illustrated the house and garden near the northwest corner, with the barn lot adjacent and corn fields in the northeast corner (Figure 9). Two long narrow pastures enclosed with electric fence were located to the south on either side of the farm’s central road. A large vegetable garden was at the center of the property along the east side of the road, while 14 acres on the west side was fenced off for the state experiment station. An alfalfa field was located just south of this area. Clover and stubble were identified on the hill beyond the Central Outbuildings grouping and to the east of the vegetable garden. What would become Hazel Dell Park at the southeast corner of the property was fenced off as pasture and woods, with another 14 acres fenced off to the west for the state experiment station beyond the crest of the hill. The cemetery is delineated along the west edge of the property, although it overlaps into the state’s southern research plot.

**CLARK COUNTY CEMETERY**

Platted and used for burials in 1913, the Clark County Cemetery is the earliest resource remaining in the nominated property associated with the Clark County Poor Farm and marks the beginning of the period of significance. Records reviewed and collected by Rose Marie Harshman, Kitty R. Oman, and Mary Snell indicate that approximately 200 burials took place in the cemetery between 1913 and 1937. Although several poor farm residents were buried in the cemetery, many of the burials are not associated with the poor farm. Funerals and burial in the county farm cemetery were provided by Clark County for anyone whose relatives were unable to pay, up to $35. Often, transients, or those with no family or no known family who died were also buried at the county cemetery. Clark County negotiated deals with five local funeral homes to provide a basic funeral service, a simple, lidded pine coffin, and transportation of the body to the cemetery. Limber Funeral Home and Knapp’s funeral home provided the majority of burials. The grave markers were county-issued, metal stakes. An access road/path was completed from NE 68th Street to access the site in 1966. Reports indicate that several bodies were later transferred to other cemeteries by descendants who had funds to provide a different burial place.

The cemetery was unused and essentially forgotten once the Southwestern Washington Experiment Station took over the property. A Clark County commissioner visited the cemetery in 1966 and, according to an article in *The Columbian*, observed that “the graves were unmarked and untended. Nameplates used to identify the dead had rusted away. Grass, brush and briers created an impassable jungle.”

In response to the commissioner’s visit, the cemetery was cleaned and enclosed with chain link fencing. A boulder was placed on the site as a monument. The boulder has one brass plate outlining a brief history of the cemetery and a dedication to those buried there, and another brass plate bearing the inscription:

**IN LIFE FORSAKEN**

---

cxxii “Inclusion of 75 More Acres Asked,” *The Clark County Sun*, June 14, 1946.

cxxiii *Inventory Clark County Farm March 31, 1944,* Clark County Historical Society, Farm, Clark Co, 1944-1946, Book X, Pg. 11-14.

cxxiv Ibid.

cxxv “Memorandum of Understanding between the Experiment Station, State College of Washington and the County Commissioners and Welfare Department of Clark County,” Clark County Historical Society, Farm, Clark Co, 1944-1946, Book V, Page 470-473.

cxxvi Harshman et al, xii.

cxxvii A.B. Larson, “Letter to Mr. H.K. Ghormley regarding County Burials, January 22, 1935,” Funerals Folder, Clark County Hospital and Poor Farm Box 1, Clark County Historical Museum.

cxxviii Harshman et al, xii.


IN DEATH FORGOTTEN
THESE UNKNOWN PIONEERS
BUILT OUR DESTINY

The dedication plaque states that 200 burials were performed in the cemetery between 1873 and 1935, although this is not determined. The year 1873 is the generally accepted date of the acquisition of the property by Clark County, and the closing date appears to be speculation. Harshman, et al, in their exhaustive review of death certificates, newspaper obituaries, and funeral home records, have found that burials at the farm continued until as late as 1937. cxxxi

HISTORIC CONTEXT OF WASHINGTON STATE EXTENSION FACILITIES

A state legislative act in 1891 set up the experiment station program in conjunction with Washington State University (then the Washington Agricultural College) and provided for stations both east and west of the Cascade Mountains. In 1894, the Ross Station (now WSU Puyallup Research and Extension Center) was established on 60 acres of land in Puyallup. The facility had an unsteady beginning. In 1897, the legislature failed to appropriate money for the station and it closed. It reopened in 1899 only to close again in 1903. The facility reopened as the Western Washington Station in 1907 and has remained in operation since. J.W. Kalkus, superintendent from 1926-1953 was instrumental in expanding the station’s functions to include research as well as extension services and demonstrations. D.P. Allmendinger left the Southwestern Washington Experiment Station to become superintendent in 1953 and served until 1975. cxxxii

The President of the College was in direct control of the Western Washington Experiment Station until 1943 when Board of Regents appointed a single director, E.C. Johnson, to manage all the college’s agricultural experiment work throughout the state. cxxiii The Board’s goal was to have more coordination and cooperation between the various experiment stations. In 1965, the Institute of Agricultural Sciences was incorporated into the newly established College of Agriculture and all experiment stations were renamed. As part of this restructuring, the Southwestern Washington Experiment Center became the Southwest Washington Research Unit in 1966. cxxxiv The Puyallup facility, the largest in Western Washington, has grown to 330 acres and research activities include work in horticulture, crops and soils, entomology, plant pathology, poultry science, dairy science, air pollution and other extension services. cxxxv

SOUTHWESTERN WASHINGTON EXPERIMENT STATION (1943-1966)

Negotiations began in 1943 among Clark County, the Governor’s office under Governor Arthur B. Langlie’s direction, and Washington State College (now Washington State University) to convert a portion of the Poor Farm facility to an experimental farm under the direction of the Washington State College. The state chose Clark County for the experimental station to train many of Vancouver’s Kaiser Shipyard workers to become farmers in the northwest, as an economic opportunity for those who would stay in the area once World War II was over. cxxxvi An article in The Columbian argues that the Poor Farm is no longer a necessary part of county services with the new implementation of federal Social Security programs:

Poor Farms, as such, are out of date now that the government is taking care of everybody from the cradle to the grave. We don’t advocate turning the present inmates of the county farm adrift, but a few acres could be set aside for their maintenance and the rest of the land turned over to the state, provided a binding agreement could be reached for its permanent maintenance and use by the Western Washington experimental station. cxxxvii

cxxxi Harshman, et al, vi.

cxxxiii Ibid.
cxxxv Washington State University Libraries, Archives 33.
cxxxvi “Use the County Farm,” The Columbian, July 28, 1943.
cxxxvii Ibid.
Washington State Governor Langlie supported this transition and educational opportunity by stating his belief that improved farming opportunities would largely offset unemployment after the war. **cxviii**

In September 1943, Washington State College agreed to lease 28-acres for approximately two years at no charge, as decided by Clark County Board of Commissioners. **cxxxix** The state was allowed use of the farm’s machinery on a rental basis when John Gretsch, then superintendent of the Poor Farm, deemed available. **cx** Gretsch’s time to assist with the farm was an additional service available to the state in exchange of payment to the county, and the county Welfare Department was given the opportunity to purchase produce grown on the experimental grounds at wholesale prices. **cxli** The state’s $15,000 grant to fund the program was supplemented with funds for salaries and travelling expenses by Washington State College in Pullman. **cxlii**

The transfer took place in October 1943, and the property was renamed as the Southwestern Washington Experimental Station with Dr. D. F. Allmendinger appointed as Superintendent. **cxliii** The experimental farm planned for the County Poor Farm was unique. According to a newspaper article that quoted director Allmendinger, the project’s goals were “the development and perfection of crops and growing methods for this southwest part of the state.” **cxlv** Soil type was particularly important for the research, and the 14 acre state plots were divided by their Felida silt loam or “Lauren” soils. **cxliv** Felida soils are compact and derived from basalt and alluvial deposits and occupy slopes and elevated eroded terraces. **cxlv** Lauren soils are derived mainly from basalt, have good drainage, and occupy elevated terraces near stream valleys. **cxlvii** The north section had Felida soil, which was used for strawberries, raspberries, loganberries, boysenberries, oats (standard and new) soy beans, and sweet corn, as well as meadow grasses and pasture grass crops. **cxlviii** The south section consisted of Lauren sandy loam soil. Prunes plums, peaches, apricots, and grapes were tested in the south section for their suitability to Clark County. The state also conducted experiments at private orchards throughout Clark County on prunes, pears, peaches, and apples. **cxlix**

Allmendinger’s program for 1944, the first full year the station was in production, included 17 kinds of vegetables as well as blackberry, raspberry, peach, prune, and grape projects, and a special emphasis on strawberry planting trials to identify a disease resistant variety. **cl** Identifying optimum varieties of crops was essential to the program, as Dean Edward Johnson of the Western Washington experiment station described in a newspaper article:

To most people sweet corn is just sweet corn, berries are berries, and a peach is a peach, but to the experimenter, corn and other vegetables, berries and other fruits, are made up of many varieties, each with its own characteristics and qualities and the tests now under way will help to determine which are the best and most desirable in Clark County. **cli**

A 1945 account of the farm’s vegetable trials included carrots, beets, chard, onions, lima beans, white navy beans, kidney beans, soy beans, bush beans, potatoes, cabbage, tomatoes, sweet corn, pole beans and cucumbers. **clii** A half-

---


**cxxxix** “Memorandum of Understanding,” 1943.

**cx** Ibid.

**cxli** Ibid.

**cxlii** Wilma Morrison, “Clark County Experimental Farm Designed to Aid Newcomers Attracted to Area by War Industries in Vancouver, Vicinity,” *The Sunday Oregonian*, Jan. 9, 1944.

**cxliii** Washington State University, 2004.


**cxlv** “Memorandum of Understanding,” 1943.


**cxlviii** Ibid, 693.


**cli** Wilma Morrison, “Clark County Experimental Farm Designed to Aid Newcomers Attracted to Area by War Industries in Vancouver, Vicinity,” *The Sunday Oregonian*, Jan. 9, 1944.

**cli** “Dean Visits Experiment Farm Plots,” *The Columbian*, July 26, 1943.

acres plot was planted with flax, a relatively new crop to Clark County in 1945.\textsuperscript{ciii} The “shiny round seed-pods” of the flax was popular both for oil production for paints, and the stalks were used for “long-wearing linen.” Both products were scarce during World War II and were in high demand.\textsuperscript{clv} The peach tree orchard was grown from seed due to the “impossibility of obtaining new trees.” The farm manager intended to graft the seedlings during fall transplanting.\textsuperscript{clv}

Strawberries were a substantial crop at the experimental site. Over 150 types of strawberries developed at the Puayallup, WA experiment facility were brought to the Southwestern Washington Experiment Station to test their adaptability to the local soil and climate.\textsuperscript{clvi} The strawberry tests were performed on the north section of the farm in the section’s Felida silt loam soil.\textsuperscript{clvii} The experiment intended to find the best varieties for commercial and large quantity production.\textsuperscript{clviii} Later research at the Southwestern Washington Experiment Station resulted in the development of Simazine, a systemic herbicide to control weeds among strawberry crops.\textsuperscript{clix}

STATE OWNERSHIP OF SOUTHWESTERN WASHINGTON EXPERIMENT STATION

In 1946, the state approached Clark County to extend its 28 acre operation to the entire Poor Farm site to include pear and filbert orchards in the farm experiments.\textsuperscript{clx} Brossard, who had been managing the Evergreen Convalescent Home in the Poor Farm buildings with his wife, was approximately 6 months from the end of his three year lease of the farm. Allmendinger, the experimental farm’s director announced his intention to move his offices from the county courthouse to the farm premises, which would terminate the building’s use as a convalescent home.\textsuperscript{clxi}

An alternative idea proposed for the property was a “boys’ ranch” to serve as a training school and youth rehabilitation center for delinquent male foster children between the ages of 12 and 16.\textsuperscript{clxii} It was eventually determined that the site was best suited for the agricultural experiment station due to the representative soil types, and that a boys’ camp could more easily be established at a different site.\textsuperscript{clxiii} The Washington State College (now Washington State University) appointed $54,930 in the budget for operation of the Southwestern Washington Experiment Station for 1949-1950 biennium.\textsuperscript{clxiv}

The transfer occurred in April 1949, and was amended in November 1949, deeding 80 acres of the property to the state at a cost of $1.00 for the experiment station.\textsuperscript{clxv} Washington State College moved into the building, and assumed control of all but 21 acres of the original 99 acre tract, which were retained by Clark County. The deed specifically stated that in the event that Washington State College vacated the property or the experiment farm was discontinued and the land was not used for farming for six consecutive months, it would automatically revert back to county ownership.\textsuperscript{clxvi} The retained 21 acres included the one acre cemetery platted in 1913 along the western property line toward the southern end of the property, and a 20-acre portion in the southeastern corner of the property, which was reserved for “county shops,” but became Hazel Dell Park in 1950.\textsuperscript{clxvii clxviii}
Dr. David Allmendinger served as superintendent of the Southwestern Washington Experiment Station from its early trial program in 1943 until 1953, when Dr. R. M. Bullock transferred into the position. clxix 

A sign was installed on the transferred site in 1951 that said:

SOUTHWESTERN WASHINGTON EXPERIMENT STATION

STATE COLLEGE OF WASHINGTON

D.F. ALLMENDINGER SUPERINTENDENT

Allmendinger left the position to become superintendent of the state’s Western Washington experiment station in Puyallup. clx At the time in 1953, the Southwest Washington station had 8 individuals on staff. clxi

In 1966, the name changed again, this time from Southwestern Washington Experiment Station to Southwestern Washington Research Unit. clxii However, this change coincided with the institutional restructuring of the statewide program and marks the end of the period of significance for the nominated property. The Washington State University Institute of Agricultural Sciences, which formerly operated the program, was absorbed by the College of Agriculture in 1965 as part of a revised operations system. clxiii

LOCAL SIGNIFICANCE OF SOUTHWESTERN WASHINGTON EXPERIMENT STATION

From 1949 until 1966 the property was owned by Washington State University and operated as the Southwestern Washington Experiment Station. The property remained in university ownership until 2008, but the facility operated under a revised system with different names in later years, including the Southwest Washington Research Unit, Washington State University Vancouver Research Extension Unit, and Washington State University’s 78th Street Extension. In 1950, the Southwest Washington Experiment Station was one of seven similar facilities in Washington State. clxiv Agricultural research analyzed multiple crops, including tree fruits, vegetables, forages, small grains, ornamentals, Christmas trees, and berry crops. clxv The program also provided hands-on practical education on irrigation systems, fertilizer, and explanation of field experiments through annual farmers’ field days. Local equipment distributors and dealers also used the facility as an opportunity to draw audiences of potential buyers to give demonstrations of equipment. clxvi

Newspaper articles touted the trickle-down success the Southwestern Washington Experiment Station provided for local farmers. Research and training on disease control, resistant crops, soil conditions, fertilizers and irrigations provided a boon of knowledge, harvest yields, and profitability to farming practices in Southwestern Washington. The facility hosted annual “field days” to demonstrate research results of new crop strains, irrigation, fertilizing, and pruning techniques, and the test plots on the farm. cxvii For example, one experiment began in 1950, tested 44 varieties of peaches to identify the variety most adaptable and valuable to the local area. cxviii The experiment involved years of recording the varieties date of bloom, date of harvest, yield, and size of fruit. cxix Another experiment, conducted in 1950-1951, evaluated 100 varieties of tomatoes to determine the hardiest, most productive, and best suited varieties

clxix “10 Years Old; Much Research Under Way,” The Columbian, July 31, 1953, 5.
clxx Ibid.
clxxi Ibid.
clxxiii Washington State University Libraries, Archives 33.
clxxvii “Experiment Station Field Day on Friday,” The Columbian, Aug. 3, 1950.
clxxviii Ibid.
clxxix “10 Years Old; Much Research Under Way,” The Columbian, July 31, 1953, 5.
for the Southwest Washington climate and soil. Additional research implemented standard practices of spraying Boron in pear orchards to improve production.

One newspaper article summarizes the value of the Southwestern Washington Experiment Station:
Although we are becoming more and more of an industrial center, agriculture still remains the backbone of our community. Anything that enables the farmers of this county to produce more and better crops and thus increase their incomes is of benefit to everybody. The experiment station is designed to take as much guesswork out of farming as possible. Instead of the individual farmer wasting time and money finding out which are the most suitable crops for his land, the experimental farm undertakes this task with experts trained expressly for such a job. It is difficult to evaluate the seven experimental farms in this state in terms of dollars and cents but it is the consensus of economists that they are well worthwhile. Those in charge of the local station can cite facts and figures indicating that Clark County is profiting from the various phases of the crop experiments constantly being undertaken.

SOUTHWEST WASHINGTON RESEARCH STATION SITE DEVELOPMENT

Under Washington State ownership, additional development occurred at the Southwestern Washington Research Station property. Agricultural fields were maximized. Some subsidiary buildings were relocated to different groupings on the property, and several greenhouses and agricultural buildings were constructed. These changes include the following resources:

**Greenhouses (1952)**
The Men’s Amateur Chrysanthemum society of Vancouver conducted its own experiments at the Southwestern Washington experiment station to develop frost- and rot-resistant varieties for home gardens. The Station allocated a half-acre for chrysanthemum testing and cultivation, and director Allmendinger and Dr. E. J. Kraus of Oregon State College (now Oregon State University) assisted with the experiment. This local club provided funds and labor to construct a 20 x 40 foot greenhouse on the site in 1952 for the Chrysanthemum experiments (demolished). Through these efforts, eleven garden type chrysanthemum varieties were developed and introduced. All greenhouses constructed during the period of significance, have been demolished.

**Agricultural Buildings (1960s – 1980s)**
An agricultural storage building was dismantled from Hanford, WA and reassembled along the south side of the agricultural buildings grouping in 1962. The barn was demolished in 1963 and two storage sheds were built on its foundation during the early 1970s. During the 1980s more storage buildings and greenhouses were constructed.

**Central Outbuildings (1940s - 1950s)**
The Hog House was moved to its current location between c.1945 and 1955 from its likely original location east of the barn. The Bunk House was relocated from its original location along the east side of the property’s central road to its current location adjacent to the Machine Shed between 1955 and 1959, according to aerial photographs (Figures 11 and 12). Several improvements were made to the well and water pump in the Central Outbuildings grouping in the 1940s and 1950s.

**Administration Building (1968)**
The main building was renovated to hold staff offices and administrative space in the main floor and to provide indoor experimental laboratory space in the basement. The most notable alteration made during this time was the removal of the main entrance from the north elevation in 1968.

Cemetery

Berry fields, as part of the facility's agricultural experiments, were planted in the southwest fields. One of these fields was planted over the top of the east half of the Clark County Cemetery plat, diminishing all above-ground evidence of this part of the cemetery. However, a recent remote sensing investigation discovered that several of the burial anomalies remain intact below the ground.

HAZEL DELL PARK

In 1949, when the majority of the farm property was deeded to the State of Washington for the Southwestern Washington Experiment Station, 20 acres was reserved for “county shops.” However, Clark County Commissioner meeting minutes from April 1949 include a “letter of permission given to Hazel Dell Community to use County property for playground purposes, until it is to be used for other purposes.” The park was officially designated in 1950. A 1961 park summary provides an inventory of all developments on the property: Community kitchen with 8 coin operated electric plates, table shelter, 26 picnic tables, softball field, 2 horseshoe pits, slide, merry-go-round, barbeque pit, rest rooms, free play areas, 1 swing set, 3 tree swings. In 1972, park amenities were reported as including “tables, kitchen, shelter, restrooms, playground equipment, and a shade tree arboretum,” as well as a caretaker residence. The park maintains these developments and structures, aside from the demolished caretaker residence, within the property’s forest and meadow settings.

COMPARATIVE RESOURCES

The historic property’s local significance is distinctively unique for its associations with Clark County Poor Farm and Southwestern Washington Experiment Station. As Clark County’s only poor farm institution, the property is the sole representative example of a poor farm resource providing social welfare services to the county’s indigent population. Additionally, the property’s association with the Southwestern Washington Experiment Station is equally significant as the only example of Washington State University’s extension services that publically provided agricultural research and education to local farmers in Clark County and southwest Washington. For both areas of significance, the historic property is the only representative example at the local level and there are no comparative resources. Although not comparative resources, information on other similar resources in Washington is included to describe the context of both poor farms and extension services that remain throughout the state.

WASHINGTON STATE POOR FARMS

The Clark County Poor Farm is the only local example representing the poor farm system of social welfare and retains excellent integrity to convey this significant historic context. Although several poor farms once existed throughout the state, few remain, and most are in poor condition or retain little integrity. Below is a summary of existing poor farms in Washington. Although the Clark County Poor Farm is significant at a local level, this list provides context for other remaining similar resources throughout the state.

King County Poor Farm, Seattle, WA

SWCA Environmental Consultants, 49.

“The County Farm Decision to be Made on Friday,” The Columbian, March 15, 1949.

Clark County Board of Commissioners, “Commissioners Proceedings, April 8, 1949,” 1949.

Clark County Board of County Commissioners, “Resolution Relating to the Establishment of a County Park,” 1950, Bk. B-1, Pg. 425 (Clark County Historical Museum).

Rudolf Luepkel, Parks in S.W. Clark County Washington (Vancouver, WA: Clark County - Vancouver Regional Planning Commission, 1961), (Clark County Community Planning).

The King County, WA Poor Farm was established in 1877 by the Sisters of Providence along the Duwamish River in a two-story frame house. The more prominent poor farm complex in King County was the Georgetown Poor Farm Annex, originally a racetrack and then converted to a private sanitarium owned and operated by R.T. Russell during the 1930s for the care of alcoholics and persons with mental problems. In 1947-1948, C.D. Lords purchased the property and converted the buildings to apartments, primarily to house Boeing employees. King County then leased the property in the 1940s as an annex to the county poor farm in Duwamish. In the 1970s King County purchased the property with plans to demolish the structures and build hangers for small aircraft. All King County Poor Farm historic resources have since been demolished.

Spokane County Poor Farm, Spangle, WA
The Spokane County Poor Farm operated in Spangle, a small community south of the cities of Spokane and Spokane Valley, from 1889 until it was sold at an auction to the Yakima Valley Academy in 1945. The Seventh Day Adventist church currently owns the property and operates the buildings as part of the Upper Columbia Academy. The only resources remaining are the administration/infirmary building and the heating building. Others were demolished. The 2-story brick administration building, constructed in 1913 remains as the primary resource associated with the Spokane County Poor Farm. Some alterations have occurred to the front entrance and Palladian window in the 2nd story. The building’s National Register eligibility is undetermined.

Whitman County Poor Farm, Elberton, WA
The Whitman County Poor Farm buildings were listed as secondary buildings and sites in the 1976 documentation for the Elberton Historic District. The 123-acre farm included the superintendent’s residence, the men’s dormitory, several outbuildings, barns and springhouses. Several of the resources were brick buildings. The Elberton Poor Farm ceased operation in 1912 and was sold at a public auction. At the time of the inventory in 1977 and a follow-up review in 1986, five structures, including agricultural buildings moved from other locations not associated with the poor farm, occupied the site. Elberton is now a ghost town, located outside of Colfax, WA near the Washington and Idaho state border.

Pierce County Poor Farm, Sumner, WA
The Pierce County Poor Farm farmstead located at 7819 Riverside Road E in Sumner, WA was determined in 2009 to be locally significant under Criterion C for the integrity of its architectural character. The main building was constructed in 1900 in the Beaux Arts style with poured concrete and stucco walls. An additional single-family residence, constructed in 1935 is also on the site. American Autoclave Co., a research facility provider, currently occupies the site, although the main building appears to be vacant and in poor condition.

---


[cxcviii] Ibid, Section 8, p. 4.


Skamania County Poor Farm, Stevenson, WA

The Skamania County Poor Farm is a 2-story wood structure private residence that was constructed in 1905 and operated until 1916 as a Poor Farm. Approximately 6 inmates, on average, lived at the farm, supported through county subsidies.\(^{cci}\) The residence has been expanded and altered since its association with the Poor Farm.\(^{ccii}\)

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY EXPERIMENT STATIONS AND EXTENSION CENTERS

Locally, the Southwestern Washington Experiment Station was distinct to Clark County in the agricultural research and education services it provided during the period of significance and continued to provide after the period as the Southwest Washington Research Unit and Extension Center. No other property provided this level of research or education to local farmers in the local area.

Within a statewide context, the Western Washington Research and Extension Center (WWREC), located near Puyallup has been Washington State University’s largest extension center in western Washington. Numerous smaller branch stations have been established throughout the state to facilitate a variety of agricultural research experiments, including:

- Waterville Branch Station
- Winthrop Branch Station
- Dry Land Research Unit (Adams Branch Station) near Lind
- Irrigated Agriculture Research and Extension Center (Irrigation Branch Station) near Prosser
- Tree Fruit Research Center (Tree Fruit Branch Station) near Wenatchee
- Coastal Washington Research and Extension Unit (Cranberry-Blueberry Laboratory) near Long Beach
- Northwestern Washington Research and Extension Unit (Northwest Seed and Truck Crop Laboratory) near Mount Vernon
- Southwestern Washington Research Unit (Clark County Experimental Farm) near Vancouver\(^{cciii}\)

Several of these facilities continue to operate as extension centers, including the Clark County Extension which still operates at the historic property location.
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**Previous documentation on file (CCHR):**

- Preliminary determination of individual listing
- Previously listed in the Clark County Heritage Register
- Previously determined eligible by the Clark County Heritage Register
- Recorded by Clark County Cultural Resources Inventory Survey

**Primary location of additional data:**

- State Historic Preservation Office
- Other State agency
- Federal agency
- Local government
- University
- Other

**Name of repository:**

---

**9. Geographical Data**

**Acreage of Property**

98.92 acres

**Latitude/Longitude Coordinates**

(Enter coordinates to 6 decimal places)

- Latitude: 45.678511  Longitude: -122.652955
- Latitude: 45.671501  Longitude: -122.652665
- Latitude: 45.971510  Longitude: -122.646148
- Latitude: 45.678616,  Longitude: -122.644393

**Verbal Boundary Description**

(Describe the boundaries of the property.)

The Clark County Poor Farm encompasses 98.98 acres in the Hazel Dell community of unincorporated Clark County. The property is located between NE 78th Street and NE 68th Street to the north and south, and between approximately NE 19th Court and NE 25th Avenue to the west and east, although neither of these streets extend beyond 78th Street to border the property. The boundary encompasses two tax lots that include what is currently known as the 78th Street Heritage Farm (tax lot 148084) and Hazel Dell Park (tax lot 147938). The Board of Clark County Commissioners Quit Claim Deed for the property (WSU Contract #17508), describes the boundaries for the entire property as follows:

That part of the W.R. Anderson Donation Land Claim as recorded in Book "I" of Page 507, Clark County Auditor's Records, more specifically described as follows: Beginning at a point 35 chains East of the quarter post between Sections 10 and 11, Township 2 North, Range 1 East of the Willamette Meridian, Clark county, Washington; and running thence North 39 chains 85 links to the South boundary line of the William Kelley Donation Land Claim; thence East 16 chains 30 links to the Southeast corner of said William Kelly Donation Land Claim; thence North 15 links; thence East 9 chains 7 links to the West boundary line of the Donation Land Claim of the heirs of J. Fitzgerald; thence South 40 chains; thence West to Point of Beginning, containing 100 acres, more or less.

**Boundary Justification**

(Explain why the boundaries were selected.)

The property boundary encompasses the entire historic Clark County Poor Farm property, based on the original property boundaries. The boundary encompasses two tax lots that include the 78th Street Heritage Farm and Hazel Dell Park. The Clark County Cemetery plat is part of the 78th Street Heritage Farm tax lot.
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Photographs

Name of Property: Clark County Poor Farm
City or Vicinity: Vancouver
County: Clark
State: WA
Photographer: Patience Stuart (photos 1-31)
Jacqueline Kamp (photos 32-35)
Date Photographed: April 11, 2012 (photos 1-31)
July 18, 2012 (photos 32-35)
Location of Original Digital Files: 1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver, WA 98666 (Clark County Community Planning)
Number of Photographs: 35

Description of Photograph(s) and number:

1 of 35. Overall view from center of property facing north
2 of 35. Overall view from south of property facing north
3 of 35. Overall view from parking lot facing south
4 of 35. Overall view from parking lot facing south along agricultural path
5 of 35. Overall view from east end of road facing northwest
6 of 35. Overall view from greenhouse cluster facing north along property road
7 of 35. Administration Buildings grouping, view from agricultural field facing north
8 of 35. Northeast corner of Administration building, view from north edge of property facing southwest
9 of 35. Southeast corner of Administration building, view from parking lot facing northwest
10 of 35. North façade of Administration building, view from north edge of property facing southwest
11 of 35. Northwest corner of Administration building, view from north edge of property facing southeast
12 of 35. Southwest corner of Administration building, view from parking lot facing northeast
13 of 35. Northeast corner of Administration building Garage, view from greenhouse grouping facing southwest
14 of 35. Milk House, view from Administration Buildings grouping facing northeast
15 of 35. Greenhouses and Agricultural Outbuildings grouping, view from north end of property road facing west
16 of 35. Greenhouses and Agricultural Outbuildings grouping, view from north end of agricultural path facing northeast
17 of 35. Greenhouses and Agricultural Outbuildings grouping, view from grouping facing east.
18 of 35. Greenhouses and Agricultural Outbuildings grouping, view from north edge of property facing south.
19 of 35. Agricultural Outbuilding from Hanford (Shop) and Tool Shed, view from grouping facing southeast
20 of 35. Central Outbuildings grouping, view from agricultural field facing south
21 of 35. Bunk House and Machine Shed in Agricultural Outbuildings grouping, view from north edge of road facing southwest
22 of 35. Hog House in Agricultural Outbuildings grouping, view from road facing southeast
23 of 35. Well House and pump in Agricultural Outbuildings grouping, view from road facing northeast
24 of 35. Irrigation ditch in road, view facing northwest
25 of 35. Agricultural fields and Hazel Dell Park, view from southeast end of property road facing southeast
26 of 35. Agricultural fields and Cemetery, view from south end of property road facing southwest
27 of 35. Cemetery, view from Cemetery facing south
28 of 35. Cemetery access road, view from southwest corner of property facing north
29 of 35. Commemorative boulder in Cemetery, view facing west
30 of 35. Hazel Dell Park structures and parking lot, view facing northwest
31 of 35. Hazel Dell Park field and sign, view from park access road facing east
32 of 35. Hazel Dell Park restroom building and landscape, view facing southwest
33 of 35. Hazel Dell Park gravel lot where caretaker residence was located, view facing northeast
34 of 35. Hazel Dell Park utility shed, view facing southwest
35 of 35. Hazel Dell Park small picnic shelter, view facing northwest
Figure 1. U. S. Geological Map of Vancouver Quadrangle, Washington-Oregon, 2011, 7.5-minute Series. Clark County Poor Farm Historic Property is outlined.
Figure 2. Site Plan of Clark County Poor Farm Historic Property. (Base aerial photograph courtesy of Bing maps)
Figure 3. Site plan of Clark County Poor Farm Historic property annotated with photo numbers and view directions. (Base aerial photograph courtesy of Bing maps)
Figure 4. Historic photograph of original Poor Farm building, constructed circa 1898. This building was destroyed by a fire in 1923 prior to the construction of the 1926 Administration building and related resources. (Image courtesy of Clark County Community Planning)
Figure 5. Architectural Sketch of Clark County Poor Farm Administration building by DeYoung and Roald Architects, circa 1926. (Image courtesy of University of Oregon Special Collections and University Archives)
Figure 6. Historic photograph of north (front) façade of Clark County Poor Farm Administration building, c. 1945. (Image courtesy of Clark County Community Planning)
Figure 7. Historic photograph of Clark County Poor Farm / Southwestern Washington Experiment Station, circa 1945. View is facing northeast from south ridge of property. The Bunk House is shown in its original location along the road at the right edge of the photograph, prior to its move to the current location in the Central Outbuildings cluster between 1955 and 1959. Although the original location of the hog house has not been verified, the building to the right of the barn in the central left area of the photograph matches the dimensions and fenestration of the hog house, which was also moved to the Central Outbuildings grouping between 1943 and 1955. (Image courtesy of Clark County Community Planning).
Figure 8. Historic photograph of Southwestern Washington Experiment Station in 1953, showing Poor Farm Administration Building, Garage, Milk House, and Barn (demolished in 1963). (Image courtesy of The Columbian).
Figure 9. Site Plan of historic property from 1943 Memorandum of Understanding between the Experiment Station, State College of Washington (now Washington State University) and the County Commissioners and Welfare Department of Clark County. The two lots leased to the state in this document are the two 14 acre squares shown at the left (west) edge of the plan that had Felida and Lauren soil types. What would become Hazel Dell Park was then identified as pasture and woods. (Image courtesy of Clark County Historical Society)
Figure 10. Planimetric Map of Portland area from 1947 showing the west edge of the historic property. The Poor Farm use had converted to a convalescent home while the state leased 28 acres of the property for the Southwestern Washington Experiment Station. The map illustrates the County Cemetery, property roads, Administration building and historic curved drive on the north end of the Administration building. (Image from U. S. Coast and Geodetic Survey, Planimetric Map – Portland Area, 1947).
Figure 11. Aerial photograph of historic property from 1955, showing entire property. The Bunk House is shown in its original location along the central road prior to being moved to its current location adjacent to the east side of the Machine Shed (see Figure 7 for additional view). (Image courtesy of Clark County Historical Society)
Figure 12. Aerial photograph of historic property from 1959. The Bunk House is shown in its current location adjacent to the east end of the Machine Shed. The Barn and early agricultural buildings (all demolished) are visible at the upper end of the image next to the Milk House. (Image courtesy of Clark County Historical Society)
Figure 13. Clark County Cemetery plat map, 1913.
NAMELESS GRAVES, about 200 of them, prompted recent dedication of plaque at old Clark County Cemetery north of Vancouver — also known as Potter’s Field. Grave markers, with identifications long ago erased by age or neglect, jut starkly as officials in background group around plaque. From left are Earl Johnson, County Park Board; Dr. John Brougher, president of Fort Vancouver Historical Society; Ken Teter, chairman of County board of commissioners. (Photo by Stone)

Figure 14. Photograph in Journal, Vancouver Bureau from 1966 showing metal grave markers. All markers have since been removed from the cemetery.
Figure 15. Clark County Assessor’s Map. Parcel’s indicated by hatch marks. Parcels 148084000 (Farm) and 147938000 (Park) heck with the CCHPC Staff)
Property Owner

name  Clark County  
street & number  1300 Franklin Street  telephone

city or town  Vancouver  state  WA  zip code  98666

4b.  CLARK COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION STAFF RECOMMENDATION

   In my opinion, the property ☑ meets / ☐ does not meet the Clark County Heritage Register criteria. (☐ See continuation sheet.)

__________________________________________  __________________________
Signature of commenting staff  Date

4c.  CLARK COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION / DECISION

   IN THE OPINION OF THE CLARK COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION, THE PROPERTY MEETS ☑ / DOES NOT MEET ☐ THE CLARK COUNTY HERITAGE REGISTER CRITERIA. (☐ See continuation sheet.)

__________________________________________  __________________________
CHAIRPERSON,  
Clark County Historic Preservation Commission  Date