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I. INTRODUCTION

A. PURPOSE AND SCOPE
Kelley & VerPlanck Historical Resources Consulting, LLC (KVP) prepared this Historic Structure Report (HSR) for the California Student Center/Lower Sproul Plaza at the request of the Department of Physical and Environmental Planning of the University of California, Berkeley. The purpose of this HSR is to inform and assist master planning work centered on the California Student Center and the entire Lower Sproul Plaza area. A historic structure report is prepared to evaluate the existing conditions and historic status of a potential historic resource prior to the commencement of any major rehabilitation, restoration, or any other work that may affect the resource. According to the National Park Service’s “NPS-28: Cultural Resource Management Guideline:"

A Historic Structure Report (HSR) is prepared whenever there is to be a major intervention into historic structures or where activities are programmed that affect the qualities and characteristics that make the property eligible for inclusion in the National Register. The report consists of the collection, presentation, and evaluation of anthropological/archeological, historical and architectural/engineering research findings on a historic or pre-historic structure, and their setting...It analyzes and records all periods of construction (not just significant periods), modifications, source materials, building techniques, other evidence of use, and setting.1

Falling solidly within the realm of what has become known as the “Recent Past,” this HSR explains the significance of a complex that is not yet fifty years old. Designed in 1957 by the joint venture of DeMars & Reay and Donald Hardison & Associates and constructed between 1958 and 1968, the California Student Center comprises Lower Sproul Plaza and the buildings that surround it, including César Chávez Student Center, Martin Luther King Student Union, Eshleman Hall, and Zellerbach Hall. This HSR documents the existing conditions and character-defining features of these buildings and landscapes, as well as an examination of their eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (National Register). This HSR aims to establish a hierarchy of spaces and elements, understanding that parts of the complex are more significant and intact than others due to their inherent architectural value or historical associations. Throughout this report we have sought to identify the most characteristic features and spaces worthy of retention as well as other features or spaces that may be better-suited to change.

In terms of its organization, this HSR includes seven chapters and a bibliography. Following the Introduction (Chapter I) is the Historical Context (Chapter II). This chapter provides an extensive historical background on a range of subjects ranging from the founding of the University of California to the history of the design competition, construction history, alteration chronology, concluding with the careers of Vernon DeMars and other architects and artists associated with the commission. This chapter is followed by the Description (Chapter III), which contains a detailed description of each component of the California Student Center, including Lower Sproul Plaza and each of the three buildings that are the subject of this study. Chapter IV describes the significance of each building and their constituent materials, features, and spaces. Chapter V

1 UC Berkeley 2020 LRDP EIR Continuing Best Practice CUL-2-a states in part: “If a project could cause a substantial adverse change in features that convey the significance of a primary or secondary resource, an Historic Structures Assessment (HSA) would be prepared.” University of California, Berkeley 2020 LRDP EIR, Volume 1, 4.4-54.
analyzes the eligibility of the complex for listing in the National Register. Chapter VI contains a series of recommendations on how to retain the most significant aspects of the California Student Center, as well as general maintenance information. This HSR concludes with Chapter VII (Conclusion) and a bibliography (Chapter VIII). An appendix containing significance diagrams and original Competition drawings rounds out this HSR.

B. SUBJECT OF THIS STUDY
The subject of this report is the California Student Center, more popularly known as Lower Sproul Plaza. It occupies an approximately 15-acre site on the southern edge of the University of California campus between the south branch of Strawberry Creek and Bancroft Way (Figure 1). Prior to site clearance in 1957, the site was part of the Southside neighborhood of Berkeley. Presently the complex consists of four buildings surrounding a hardscaped plaza originally called the Student Center Square. Upper Sproul Plaza (originally called the Telegraph Avenue Mall) is east of the project site. Although part of the original California Student Center, it is not directly analyzed in this HSR. Completed in 1960 as the first component of the project, the University Dining Commons (now César Chávez Student Center) occupies the northernmost part of the California Student Center complex. Terraced into its site bordering Strawberry Creek, the four-level office building and restaurant merges with Upper Sproul Plaza to the east. Chávez Student Center is connected below grade to the Martin Luther King Jr. Student Union (originally the California Memorial Student Union). King Student Union, at six levels, is the largest building in the complex. Completed in 1961, it stands at the northwest corner of Telegraph Avenue and Bancroft Way. The building also stands at the juncture of Upper and Lower Sproul Plazas, with stairs descending one full story to Lower Sproul Plaza on the north and south sides of the building. Occupying a portion of the south end of Lower Sproul Plaza is Eshleman Hall, an eight-story office tower completed in 1965 to house the offices of the Associated Students of the University of California (ASUC). Completed in 1967 on the west side of Lower Sproul Plaza is Zellerbach Hall, the final component of the California Student Center. Also excluded from detailed analysis in this HSR, the building is a performing arts theater of local and regional importance. Located to the north of Zellerbach Hall is the Alumni House. Completed in 1954, Alumni House predates the California Student Center, although it was designed in a modernist vocabulary in anticipation of the complex.
Figure 1. Competition Rendering of California Student Center Complex by Hardison & DeMars
Annotated by Kelley & VerPlanck
Source: DeMars Papers
C. METHODOLOGY

Fieldwork
The methodology used to prepare this HSR relies on two phases of preparatory work: field work and archival research. Using standards established by the National Park Service (NPS) and the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP), KVP completed a survey and analysis of existing conditions at the California Student Center complex in the summer of 2008. Firm partners Christopher P. VerPlanck and Timothy J. Kelley documented the landscape and all accessible exterior and interior spaces of the three buildings that are the direct subject of this HSR: Chávez Student Center, King Student Union, and Eshleman Hall. We also documented the principal façade of Zellerbach Hall.\(^2\) Using digital cameras and hand-held personal digital assistants (PDAs) loaded with spreadsheets, we documented each exterior elevation and interior space. We did not perform any destructive physical testing; nor did we use sensing equipment to gather information on concealed materials or elements. We then transferred the data to a searchable database that inventories the characteristic materials, elements, and spaces of the California Student Center, including our notes on physical condition (Good, Fair, and Poor) and significance (Very Significant, Significant, Contributing, and Non-contributing).

Research
Throughout the summer of 2008, Christopher VerPlanck and University of California, Berkeley Planning Analyst/Historian Steven Finacom conducted research at various local and regional repositories including the UC Berkeley Capital Projects and Facilities Management Archives, the Bancroft Library, the UC Berkeley Environmental Design Library, the UC Berkeley Environmental Design Archives, the UC Berkeley Earth Sciences & Map Library, the Berkeley Public Library, the San Francisco Public Library, and the Stanford University Library. Mr. Finacom provided the raw research to KVP which we reviewed and used to prepare Chapter II.

Contributors
Other contributors to this HSR include noted Stanford University Professor Emeritus Paul V. Turner, author of Campus: An American Planning Tradition; and David B. Stewart, a well-known expert in modernism and author of The Making of A Modern Japanese Architecture: 1868 to the Present.

Evaluation
This HSR uses National Register criteria to evaluate the California Student Center. The National Register of Historic Places is the official federal roster of historic properties. The Keeper of the Register and National Park Service (NPS) developed the four eligibility criteria under which potential resources are evaluated for inclusion in the National Register. The NPS, state agencies, and other government and professionals in private practice have relied on the National Register criteria for decades to determine whether properties are historically or architecturally significant, and to identify the level of significance, area(s) of significance, and

---

\(^2\) Only the façade of Zellerbach Hall was surveyed because of its relationship to Lower Sproul Plaza. It is not undergoing any changes as part of the master planning work underway.
historical context(s) of eligible properties. The criteria provide invaluable guidance and authoritative consistency in determining whether resources retain their historical integrity and what their character-defining features are. The National Register criteria underlie the hierarchy of significance and the assessment of condition used in this HSR for materials and elements.

II. HISTORICAL CONTEXT

A. EARLY HISTORY OF BERKELEY: 1820-1859

In 1820, King Ferdinand VII of Spain granted the land that encompasses what are now the cities of Berkeley and Oakland, including the campus of the University of California, to Luis Maria Peralta of San Jose. Peralta named the 48,000-acre parcel Rancho San Antonio for Saint Anthony of Padua. After receiving the grant, Peralta continued living in San Jose, sending his four sons to live at the ranch. In 1842, Peralta divided the rancho between his sons, giving most of what is now Berkeley to Jose Domingo Peralta.

In 1848, by the terms of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, California became part of the United States. Soon, the discovery of gold at Coloma lured thousands of “Forty-niners” to the remote region. Although holders of Spanish and Mexican ranchos, like Peralta, were guaranteed possessory rights under the California Constitution of 1850, the influx of so many land-hungry settlers quickly brought about their demise, particularly in the San Francisco Bay Region. In April 1852, the California State Legislature passed a law stating that any settler could gain possession of land “not reasonably known to be claimed under an existing title.” Essentially enshrining “squatters’ rights,” the law required only that the settler make at least two hundred dollars worth of improvements and reside on the land in question. Since American settlers generally viewed Spanish and Mexican titles as illegitimate, the new law was effectively used to dismantle the ranchos. 3

Vicente and Jose Domingo Peralta filed claims to confirm their title to Rancho San Antonio in January 1852. Although their claim were eventually upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1855 and 1856, the cost of legal counsel and combating squatters had nearly bankrupted them, forcing them to sell off most of the rancho during the early 1850s. 4

In 1852, Captain Orrin Simmons claimed 160 acres of Rancho San Antonio bounded by Strawberry Creek to the north and the future site of the Clark Kerr Campus to the south, a tract that includes the present-day California Student Center. Meanwhile, in the summer of 1852, a consortium of men including William Hillegass, James Leonard, Francis Kittredge Shattuck, and George Blake, filed claim to a square-mile tract of land encompassing what is now downtown Berkeley, just west of Simmons’ claim. 5 None of these men physically occupied their land and consequently what is now Berkeley remained effectively uninhabited for at least two decades following American occupation. 6

5 Susan Dinkenspiel Cerny, Berkeley Landmarks (Berkeley, California: Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association, 1994), 64.
B. COLLEGE OF CALIFORNIA: 1860-1868

In 1853, Reverend Henry Durant established a preparatory school in Oakland that he named Contra Costa Academy.7 Two years later, Durant reincorporated the school as a private college and renamed it the College of California. Soon thereafter, the trustees of the College of California began searching for a campus site somewhat removed from the urban temptations of fast-growing Oakland. Captain Orrin Simmons invited the Trustees to consider his land north of the city as a possible site. Simmons argued that his land had a temperate climate, ample fresh water from Strawberry Creek, and spectacular views of San Francisco Bay and the Golden Gate. After consideration, the Trustees decided to relocate the campus to Simmons’ land and on April 16 1860, Reverend Samuel Hopkins Wiley, Reverend Henry Durant, and other Trustees of the College of California dedicated the 140-acre campus at Founders’ Rock.8

Over the next few years, the Trustees of the College of California continued to enlarge the still-as-yet undeveloped campus, purchasing additional tracts from F.K. Shattuck, G.M. Blake, William Hillegass, and James Leonard.9 In August 1864, the College of California purchased another tract from Captain Simmons encompassing part of what became the Berkeley Property Tract. This tract was particularly desirable because it came with enhanced water rights to Strawberry Creek.10

In need of funds to develop the campus, the Trustees of the College of California formed the College Homestead Association to sell residential lots south of the proposed campus. On September 1, 1864, the venture was launched with an initial offering of 125 shares at $500 apiece. Each share entitled its holder to a one-acre lot. Shareholders were also responsible for paying a $25 fee per-share to pay for improvements such as street grading and tree planting. The Trustees actively promoted the new tract, citing its fog-free climate and relative proximity to the cities of Oakland and San Francisco. The Trustees also touted the higher land values that would accrue to investors in a community that would be primarily inhabited by college professors.11

In June 1865, the Trustees of the College of California hired landscape architect Frederick Law Olmsted to develop a picturesque plan for the new campus and the adjoining lands laying to the north and east of the College Park Homestead Association tract.12 Olmsted did not resurvey the College Park Homestead Association tract south of the proposed campus, which remained laid out in a simple gridiron street plan that largely remains intact to this day.

---

8 Ibid., 4.
10 Ibid.
11 Ibid., 53-57.
C. UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA: 1869-1941

In 1866, one year after Olmsted laid out the College of California campus, Governor F.F. Low established the California Agricultural, Mining and Mechanical Arts College under the provisions of the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862.\(^{13}\) Impressed with the natural beauty of the area, Governor Low initially wanted to build the new public university next to the College of California. In 1867, after becoming aware that the College of California had little money to build its campus, Governor Low proposed that the two colleges merge into one institution.\(^{14}\) After some debate, the Trustees of the College of California voted on October 7, 1867 to dissolve the college and donate its physical assets to the State of California. In return, the Trustees stipulated that the new school would include a College of Letters for the study of humanities and liberal arts. The State agreed and on March 23, 1868, Governor Henry H. Haight signed the Organic Act, forming the University of California.\(^{15}\)

One of the first responsibilities of the newly constituted Board of Regents of the University of California was to commission a new plan for the new campus. The 1866 Olmsted Plan, which had been prepared for a small private college, would clearly not work for a major flagship state university. Consequently, in 1868, the Board of Regents selected the San Francisco firm of Wright & Sanders. Wright & Sanders proposed a formal plan consisting of a symmetrical arrangement of buildings placed around a plaza next to Strawberry Creek. Although enthusiastically adopted by the Regents, several of their number began to complain about the architects’ fees, causing Wright & Sanders to withdraw their proposal in September 1868.\(^{16}\)

In August 1869, nearly a year-and-a-half after the passage of the Organic Act, the Board of Regents hired the San Francisco firm of David Farquharson and Henry Kenitzer to develop a new plan for the University of California. The firm proposed a campus plan consisting of six buildings arranged asymmetrically around a central plaza although the Farquharson Plan also retained elements of Olmsted’s plan, particularly the primary east-west axis toward the Golden Gate.\(^{17}\) The plan was adopted by the Regents and in 1873, South Hall, the first permanent structure built for the university, was completed. Designed by Farquharson in an eclectic Victorian mode, the brick and cast iron building still stands at the heart of the campus (Figure 2). North Hall was completed next in 1874, followed shortly by several student

\(^{16}\) Ibid., 7.
\(^{17}\) Ibid., 8.
residences. That same year, the Regents hired Golden Gate Park Superintendent William Hammond Hall to lay out the grounds. Influenced by Olmsted’s initial plan for the College of California, Hall’s laid out the roads and paths to follow the natural contours of the land, opening up scenic vistas in all directions.\textsuperscript{18}

Throughout the rest of the nineteenth century, the University of California continued to grow, mostly on an ad hoc basis. New buildings were completed when funds became available with little thought given to the overall aesthetic unity of the campus. By 1897, several major buildings had joined North and South Halls, including Alfred A. Bennett’s Harmon Gymnasium and the Mining and Mechanical Arts Building (1879), John A. Remer’s Bacon Library (1881), Clinton A. Day’s Chemistry Building (1891), and William Curlett’s Mechanical and Electrical Engineering Building (1893).\textsuperscript{19}

Despite its nickname as the “Athens of the West,” by the end of the nineteenth century the campus of the University of California fell far short of its namesake. Composed of a hodgepodge of buildings scattered across the 245-acre campus, the University of California paled in comparison with the recently completed Stanford University in nearby Palo Alto, designed by the firm of Shepley, Rutan & Coolidge.\textsuperscript{20} Enrollment had grown to more than 1,300 students in 1895, seven times what it had been when the campus opened in 1873. Several Regents recognized that the time had come to prepare a comprehensive plan that would restore order and beauty to the campus as well as accommodate further growth.\textsuperscript{21}

In October 1895, Phoebe Apperson Hearst approached University President Martin Kellogg with a proposal to fund two new buildings in honor of her late husband, mining magnate and State Senator George Hearst. Kellogg approached Bernard Maybeck, the only architect on staff at the University, to develop conceptual plans for the two proposed buildings: Hearst Memorial Mining Building and Hearst Hall. The question of where to put the buildings prompted Maybeck and his ally Regent Jacob Reinstein to prod the University to consider developing a comprehensive plan for the university. Persuaded of the wisdom of this approach, Phoebe Hearst agreed to fund not only the two buildings but also a competition to develop a comprehensive plan for the University.\textsuperscript{22} Phoebe Apperson Hearst was duly elected as a Regent in 1897. In December the Regents released a detailed program for the competition. In addition to the 245 acres the university already owned, the program encompassed the Hillegass Tract south of the creek. The plan called for the construction of 28 new buildings and implied that none of the existing campus buildings would be retained.\textsuperscript{23}

The Hearst Competition was opened to an international field of competitors, who had January through June of 1898 to submit their designs. In the first round of entries 105 entries were received. Judged by a jury in Antwerp, the field was winnowed down to eleven finalists.\textsuperscript{24} The second and final stage of the selection process was held at the Ferry Building in San Francisco in the fall of 1899. French architect Henri Jean

\textsuperscript{19} ibid.  
\textsuperscript{22} ibid., 10.  
\textsuperscript{23} ibid., 12.  
\textsuperscript{24} Sally B. Woodbridge, \textit{John Galen Howard and the University of California} (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 30.
Emile Bénard was awarded First Prize on the basis of his grandiose Beaux Arts-inspired plan, but his reluctance to work with Phoebe Hearst aroused her ire. Other Regents criticized Bénard’s scheme for not adequately addressing the topography of the site. In 1900, the Regents fired Bénard and in 1901, hired John Galen Howard, an architect from Boston whose firm had placed fourth in the competition.

As University Architect, John Galen Howard extensively revised Bénard’s plan, melding it with his own fourth-place entry. Although he retained the primary east-west axis, he reorganized the campus into distinct sections dedicated to each of the academic departments. He likened the plan to a house, with a ceremonial entrance/forecourt to the west, a secluded retreat to the east, playgrounds and fields to the south, with the “house” at the center consisting of a “monumental group of buildings.”

Howard’s first completed building was the Greek Theater (1902), built into the hillside above the campus. Howard’s plan was formally adopted by the Regents in 1908, by which time he had also completed California Hall and the Hearst Mining Building. Doe Library, the centerpiece of the new campus, was also underway with construction of Durant Hall and Sather Gate about to start. In 1914, Howard had completed his second plan for the University of California (Figure 3). By the time he was dismissed in 1924, Howard had designed 22 extant buildings, the largest number of any university architect.

Architect George Kelham was appointed the second Supervising Architect of the University of California in 1927. Kelham retained the basic approach of the 1914 Howard Plan, preserving the primary east-west axis and the subsidiary north-south axis along the alignment of Telegraph Avenue. Like Howard, Kelham was primarily a Classicist although much of his later work for the University embodies characteristics of the Art Deco and “Stripped Classical” styles. During his tenure, which lasted from 1927 until 1936, Kelham designed nine permanent buildings and one addition, including Harmon Gymnasium, Davis Hall, Valley Life Sciences Building, an addition to Hesse Hall, Bowles Hall, and the first Eshleman Hall (now Moses Hall).

Appointed Supervising Architect in 1938, famed Classicist Arthur Brown Jr. was the last architect to occupy this position before World War II. Although Brown was clearly committed to the Classical tradition established by Howard and sustained by Kelham, Brown also recognized the need for major changes in the planning of the University, particularly after the war. It was during this period that momentum began to build

---

26 Ibid., 17.
27 Ibid., 20.
toward overturning the Beaux Arts tradition in favor of a more dynamic approach toward planning and design, including the use of a modernist vocabulary for new buildings.

The site of the future California Student Center complex was not part of the original University of California campus. Rather, it was part of the oldest section of the city of Berkeley, an area once known as the Southside community. As mentioned above, in 1864, the College of California attempted to finance the construction of its campus by platting a speculative town site south of the proposed campus. In contrast to the sweeping picturesque roads and paths depicted in Olmsted’s campus plan, shear economics dictated that the new residential community was laid out in a conventional gridiron pattern, a typical American method of efficiently subdividing and selling property. As can be seen on the accompanying College Homestead Association map, the site of the future California Student Center actually lay just beyond the northerly boundary of the tract at Bancroft Way (Figure 4). Sitting within an interstitial space between the College Homestead Association tract and the campus proper, the site of the California Student Center – roughly defined by Choate (now Telegraph) Avenue, Bancroft Way, Dana Street, and Strawberry Creek – remained unsubdivided within an area labeled on the map as the “Villa Lots.”

The new town established by the Trustees of the College of California was called Berkeley, in honor of Bishop George Berkeley, a theologian who coined the famous line: “Westward the course of empire takes its
way. The sale of lots in the new town flagged, mostly due to the community's distance from existing urban centers and lack of adequate transportation. In 1872, a horse-drawn streetcar began providing service between Berkeley and Oakland but it was slow and irregular, deterring potential commuters. University President Daniel C. Gilman commented on the situation to the Board of Regents in 1875:

> The neighborhood of Berkeley grows but slowly. There is in it no school, no practicing physician, and but few and indifferent stores. The walks and roads are in a bad condition most of the year, and the inconveniences of family life are great.

Berkeley finally began to grow in the late 1870s and early 1880s. In 1876, rail service arrived in Berkeley with a station at the intersection of Center Street and Shattuck Avenue. By 1877, the trains connected Berkeley residents to San Francisco via the ferry in West Berkeley. The construction of the railroad station in 1876 caused the business center of Berkeley to move west from Telegraph Avenue closer to Shattuck Avenue. Berkeley incorporated in 1878, compelled to do so against the ambitions of an expansionist Oakland. The built-up portion of the town, which remained concentrated along Bancroft Way from Piedmont Way to Shattuck Avenue, barely contained 2,000 people. A map of Berkeley made in 1880 depicts the Southside community in some detail, including the site of the future California Student Center. Still undeveloped, the Villa Lots tract had been bisected from north to south by Union Street (Figure 5).

By the early 1890s, Berkeley had evolved into a thriving community of a little over five thousand. "East Berkeley," as the community south of the university became known, was but one node within the city. West Berkeley, the bayshore working-class enclave formerly known as Ocean View dominated the western part of the city. Meanwhile, a mixed-use commercial and residential node had grown up around the railroad depot along Shattuck Avenue. Gradually the belt of ranchland and farmland separating the settlements was filled in by residential and commercial development, softening some of the obvious differences between the communities.

---

30 Ibid.
Figure 5. Detail of map of Berkeley, ca. 1880
Site of California Student Center outlined in red
Source: University of California
E. Site History: 1894-1950

1894 Sanborn Maps

According to the 1894 Sanborn maps, the first such maps published for Berkeley, the site of the future California Student Union—an area bounded by Allston Way and Strawberry Creek to the north, Telegraph Avenue (now Sproul Plaza) to the east, Bancroft Way to the south, and Dana Street to the west—was moderately developed (Figure 6). Encompassing two small blocks divided down the center by Union Street, the site consisted of large house lots—some probably at least half an acre—containing one-and two-story, wood-frame dwellings. The site was separated from the University of California campus by a narrow path-like section of Allston Way and Strawberry Creek. Allston Way, which does not appear on older maps, appears to be a passable street, although the Sanborn maps indicate that it was only 25’ wide near the creek. Small foot bridges at the northerly end of Telegraph Avenue, Union Street, and Dana Street, provided pedestrian access across Strawberry Creek into the campus.
Whereas the population of Berkeley in 1900 had only been 13,214, by 1910 it had mushroomed to 40,434. The Sanborn maps indicate that urban development had linked the three formerly independent communities of Berkeley, Shattuck Station, and Ocean View, creating a swath of urbanized territory that extended from the Berkeley Hills in the east to San Francisco Bay on the west and from Oakland on the south to Albany on the north. According to the 1911 Sanborn maps, the site of the future California Student Center was still largely residential, although several single-family dwellings had been converted into boarding houses (Figure 7). A large three-story boarding house is shown at the northwest corner of Bancroft Way and Telegraph Avenue, on the site of what is now the Student Union. Several business blocks were located along Bancroft Way and Telegraph Avenue, indicating the growing importance of this area as a student-serving commercial node. The only non-residential or commercial building on the site was the First Unitarian Church, an early First Bay Region Tradition church designed by the San Francisco architect Albert Schweinfurth and built in 1898.
1929 Sanborn Maps

The 1929 Sanborn Maps indicate that the future site of the California Student Union had become more urban in character in the nearly two decades since the 1911 Sanborn Maps were published (Figure 8). With the exception of a single surviving wood-frame dwelling, Telegraph Avenue was entirely lined with one-and two-story frame and masonry commercial buildings including a dry cleaner, several stores and restaurants, and the three-story Hotel Bancroft, located on the northwest corner of Telegraph Avenue and Bancroft Way. Other non-residential uses had displaced older single-family frame dwellings on the rest of the site, including a large YWCA building located on the southeast corner of Allston Way and Union Street. The lowest-intensity use on the site was the Pacific Unitarian School for the Ministry, a triangular-shaped campus on the south side of Allston Way between Dana and Union streets.
The 1950 Sanborn maps indicate that non-residential uses had displaced most of the remaining dwellings on the site of the future California Student Center (Figure 9). The University of California, which had been buying land south of Allston Way for several decades, had acquired most of the site, including most of the block bounded by Dana, Street, Allston Way, Union Street, and Bancroft Way. The northern third of the block was occupied by the UC Department of Social Welfare, housed in several temporary World War II-era buildings. The middle third of the block contained a ball field, called the Union Play Field, and the southern third was the location of the First Unitarian Church and the University of California Extension Division. The block bounded by Allston Way, Telegraph Avenue, Bancroft Way, and Union Street was primarily occupied by commercial blocks, particularly along Telegraph Avenue and Bancroft Way. The YWCA Building, otherwise known as Stiles Hall – later to become famous as the site of 1950s-era political activity – occupied the northwest corner of the block. Several UC-occupied buildings were also located along the east side of Union Street. West of Dana Street, the University had absorbed all of the blocks north of Bancroft Way to Oxford Street. East of Telegraph was the university’s new Administration Building (1940), later renamed Sproul Hall.
F. THE EVOLUTION OF THE STUDENT UNION IN AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES: 1836-1965

It was around 1900 that facilities devoted to student activities, on college and university campuses, began to appear in forms we could recognize today as student unions or student centers. However, the origins of the building type go back much further and reflect basic issues that have shaped the development of higher education over the centuries.

At various times and places, schools of higher education have shown very different degrees of concern for the extracurricular lives of their students. Continental European universities typically provided little support outside the classroom, leaving students to find room and board on their own. In contrast, the English universities of Oxford and Cambridge, starting in the late medieval period, developed a system in which students lived and dined in separate colleges, which typically consisted of buildings arranged around an enclosed courtyard and included a chapel, dining hall, dormitory rooms, classrooms, and lodging for the headmaster.

This "collegiate" system was adopted by the English colonies in America for the institutions they created, starting with Harvard in 1636, and it established the model for most subsequent higher education in the United States. There were American modifications of this model, for example with the opening-up of the enclosed courtyard and a preference for separate buildings, placed in landscaped open space—which inspired the adoption of the word "campus" for college grounds (apparently used first at Princeton in the 1770s). But the prevailing ideal remained that of students living together in a distinctive place, with facilities that provided for their physical and spiritual needs.

There have been exceptions to this tradition in America, especially in institutions modeled on the German universities—a notable case being Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, founded in 1867, which originally had no dormitories or other non-academic facilities. But for the most part, American colleges and universities have followed the English collegiate tradition and the student union is an outgrowth of this ideal.

In the early 19th century, some precursors of the student union appeared. Among the first were the "literary" and "debating" societies that became popular with students, to create places for congregating and entertaining themselves apart from their professors. At first these clubs met in any available space on or off campus; but then some colleges erected buildings for them, for example at the University of Georgia in 1836 (Phi Kappa Literary Society Hall), at Princeton in 1837 (Whig and Closiochic Halls), and at Davidson College in North Carolina in 1849 (Eumenean and Philanthropic Halls). These buildings were usually in the form of small temples, typical of the Greek Revival style of architecture and reflecting the classical ideal predominant at American colleges during this period.

---
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Later in the 19th century, these literary societies waned in popularity, as fraternity houses became more common on college campuses, providing a different kind of social setting. And the widespread appearance of gymnasiums and other athletic facilities created additional types of spaces for extracurricular life.

But as colleges and universities grew in size and complexity, there were new needs in their student populations. Student unions, as we know them, were developed partly to serve students who did not belong to fraternities or to the exclusive "eating clubs" found at the more prestigious schools. Harvard College created one of the first of these new facilities in 1900: the Harvard Union, a large Georgian Revival-style structure that was "intended by its donor to provide an attractive gathering place for students not wealthy enough to afford the luxuries of a club (Figure 10)."36 A Harvard historian has written that it represented "an attempt to encourage an esprit de corps among the rank and file of students"—a goal that could be seen as the principal motive for all American student unions, up to the present time.37

In the following years, student unions were constructed at large numbers of American colleges and universities, especially at the larger institutions. When Charles Klauder and Herbert Wise produced the first substantial book on American college architecture in 1929, they devoted a section to the student union and presented it as an established building type.38 They wrote that the student union "should be homelike" and serve as a student's "club... where he and his friends meet, talk, eat, work and play."39

Klauder and Wise described in detail a student union "of the most comprehensive type," which might include a wealth of facilities, including: coat and check room, information desk and administrative offices, lounge ("a large beautiful room with huge fireplaces, bays and alcoves"), library, music room ("large enough for recitals"), room for writing and study, billiard room, large and small dining rooms, faculty dining room ("if there is no faculty club-house on campus"), tap room, ballroom, auditorium, offices for undergraduate activities, rooms for societies, student-publication offices, card room, barber shop, bowling alleys, bookstore,

---
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post-office, and hotel rooms (“for accredited guests and visiting teams”). They added, “Circumstances may warrant a swimming pool or a theatre or both.” But they noted that in a college or university in a large town, “some of these facilities should be omitted because of the competition of a commercial district.” And they recognized that smaller institutions would likely have more modest facilities.

Klauder and Wise identified a number of colleges and universities with notable student unions, pointing in particular to the University of Michigan Union (Figure 11), Willard Straight Hall at Cornell, Hart House at the University of Toronto, and “the attractive Stephens Union at Berkeley.”

The Depression years saw reduced construction at colleges and universities, and it came to a near stand-still during the Second World War. But with the surge of institutional growth following the war, student unions were built in large numbers, and the planning and management of them became a specialized occupation. In 1946, the Association of College Unions produced a publication that dealt with the history, purposes, and operation of student unions, and surveyed thirty of them in detail. The author estimated that in 1940 about 150 American colleges and universities had student union buildings, but that in 1946 alone “more than seventy institutions were making definite plans for new unions.”

In the 1950s and 1960s, increased attention was given to the programming needs for the design of student unions, with publications such as Planning a College Union Building (1960) and Planning College Union Facilities for Multiple-Use (1966). The latter work described and illustrated many recently-constructed facilities, focusing on practical solutions of specific needs. The titles of the book’s main sections suggest some of the issues in campus planners’ minds at the time: “Coping with Change,” “Combining the Union and the Conference Center,” “Combining the Union and the Faculty Club,” “Facilities that Lend Themselves to Multi-use and Savings,” “An Expanding and Contracting Entrance Lobby,” “Main Lounge as a Reception and Program Area,” “Accommodating the Noon-time Peak Load,” “Using the Bowling Spectator Area More Ways than One,” and other discussions of multi-use possibilities and ways of economizing.
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In 1963, Richard Dober's *Campus Planning* appeared, which remained for some time the most widely used planning guide for university architects and planners.\(^{45}\) The book presented the campus as an ensemble of functional components—Instructional Facilities, Libraries, Housing, etc.—of which one was Centers of Extracurricular Life.\(^{46}\) Dober’s choice of this term, rather than the more traditional "student unions" or "student union buildings," suggested that the facilities might consist of more than a single building. As representative of this, the first case study presented by Dober was the newly-designed California Student Center at the University of California, Berkeley, composed of several buildings. At this time, the Union Building and the Dining Commons had been executed, but the remaining components of the UC Berkeley design—theater, auditorium, and office building—were shown in the architects' plans and a model.\(^{47}\) Dober's glowing description of this complex of buildings and spaces introduced a new mode of thinking into the student union dialogue—conceiving of the facility more urbanistically than merely architecturally:

The four buildings and related open spaces [of the Student Center at Berkeley] constitute a major landmark in American college and university architecture. The designers have cleverly sited their composition at a central juncture of town and campus so that existing campus buildings and adjacent off-campus activities...can be pulled together into a rational land-use area. The result is an urban center, with the town uses reinforcing the gown uses.... The architecture and landscape, and the elements of industrial design which permeate both, reflect an atmosphere that is urbane and alive with the excitement of a core area.... [It is] a unique design in the tradition of urban centers in Western civilization.\(^{48}\)

This Student Center at U. C. Berkeley, when it was designed and constructed in the 1960s, was thus seen as a new paradigm in the history of the student union. It was conceived as an urbanistic complex, and was integrated not only into the campus but into the larger urban environment.

**G. HISTORY OF STUDENT UNIONS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA: 1869-1947**

The University of California was organized on a “German model” of higher education in which student facilities beyond classrooms, libraries, and laboratories, were not provided by the University. Students were largely left to their own devices for housing, recreation, and student activities beyond the classroom.

The primary student facilities in the nineteenth century at the Berkeley campus were the donor-funded Harmon Gymnasium, which doubled as an event venue for student dances, rallies, and meetings, and a few rooms in the basement of North Hall where the student-organized Cooperative Store had its headquarters, along with some early student organizations. Off-campus, privately built facilities such as the University YMCA (Stiles Hall) also served as important venues for student events and organizational headquarters, a role that it would continue to fill (in various buildings) up through the 1950s.

Students independently organized their own cooperative store—initially to provide affordable textbooks and school supplies—in 1884, and a student government—the Associated Students (ASUC) in 1887, and well as numerous other activities from singing groups to debating societies, the independent *Daily Californian*

---
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newspaper, and athletic teams. The ASUC expanded into the early twentieth century and by the 1910s, it had assumed a direct role in most phases of non-academic “student life”, ranging from operating student publications to managing the intercollegiate athletic activities. In the early twentieth century two new facilities for student life were added to the campus through private philanthropy: Senior Hall, a two-room “log cabin” for use by the men of the senior class; and Hearst Hall, given by UC Regent Phoebe Apperson Hearst, which became both women’s gymnasion and activity center for women students. Still, however, there was no central location for student life and activities; “permanent” facilities built by the University in this era were all academic in nature.

The need for a student activity center at the University of California became acute from 1900 onward, especially when the total enrollment reached around 2,000. By the early 1920s, it exceeded 10,000, making the Berkeley campus one of the largest universities in the United States.

In November 1900, University of California President Benjamin Ide Wheeler called for, in his first annual report to the Governor, an “Alumni hall which shall form the center of the daily social life of the students, alumni, and teachers.” Wheeler used as his model Houston Hall (1895) at the University of Pennsylvania, generally regarded as the first purpose-built student union in the country. Houston Hall was designed in a competition by Penn students William C. Hays and M.B. Medary, Jr. Wheeler wrote: “Like that building (Houston Hall), Berkeley’s hall would resemble a student club, equipped with lounges, billiard rooms, dining facilities, shops, and offices for the Associated Students, organizations, and college publications. It was also seen as a place where students and faculty could meet and returning alumni could visit.”

**Stephens Memorial Union**

In 1923, private and public resources were combined to construct the first real “student union” at the Berkeley campus, the Henry Morse Stephens Memorial Union (Figure 12). Named for a popular and recently deceased faculty member in the Department of History who had been a long-time supporter of student organizations, the Gothic Revival-style building accommodated the student store, cafeteria/dining facilities, offices of the ASUC and the California Alumni Association,
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and a variety of other meeting, activity, and service spaces ranging from baronial lounges to an on-campus barber shop. Supplemented with the adjacent Eshleman Memorial Publications Building (now Moses Hall) in 1931, Stephens Union would remain a primary center for student life and on-campus activities for nearly 30 years.50

In the 1920s, students participated and directly invested in the planning and construction of a vast athletic plant on the campus, including a track and field and baseball stadium and California Memorial Stadium. Private gifts funded a new women’s gymnasium and part of a new men’s gymnasium, which was also funded with student gifts and state money.

_Eshleman (Moses) Hall_

Designed by University Architect George Kelham, the original Eshleman Publications Building—now Moses Hall—was built to the west of Stephens Memorial Union (Figure 13). Together, the two buildings bounded a small courtyard between them which became, over the next three decades, a primary outdoor intersection for student activities, with student groups staffing tables, distributing flyers, selling tickets to performances, and hosting special events – essentially a precursor to Sproul Plaza. Eshleman Hall honored John Morton Eshleman, a former President of the ASUC, editor of the _Daily Californian_, as well as Lieutenant Governor of California before his untimely death in 1916. The building housed the _Daily Californian_, other student publications, offices and practice space for student musical groups (including the California Marching Band in the basement), and a publications library.51

Eshleman Hall began the ASUC tradition of having a “publications library.” The library—later called Eshleman Library—contains complete runs of student publications as well as reference books and other books of general interest to journalists and writers. Initially it was reserved for use by students who were staff members of one of the student publications; at the time there are several publications with large staffs. This tradition of having a library focused on campus publications was continued, in physical and operational form, in the new Eshleman Hall completed in 1965.

51 Ibid., 84. The Stephens / Eshleman courtyard was for sanctioned student activities only; it had none of the unfettered expression of political or “off-campus” causes seen on Sproul Plaza today.
The Berkeley campus underwent considerable growth in enrollment following World War II. It soon became apparent that existing campus facilities were inadequate to accommodate the influx of returning and new students. At the same time, regional conditions applied additional pressure on traditional student facilities. The completion of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge in 1936 brought a rush of vehicle commuters who overwhelmed campus roadways and nearby city streets. Many of the traditional sources of student housing in Berkeley—particularly private rooming and boarding houses—faced physical obsolescence, and local housing facilities became increasingly overcrowded as a result of an influx of wartime workers to the East Bay. Compounding these factors were the consequences of the Depression, in which little new housing was constructed. Seeking to accommodate students, many traditional recreational spaces and some playing fields on the campus had been built over with new academic buildings. As the student population at Berkeley had grown to more than 25,000 – more than double the number enrolled when Stephens Union was built – students, faculty, and alumni began to lobby for new and improved non-academic facilities. In response, the California Alumni Association appointed a committee to study student life issues at the Berkeley campus and prepare a report on how to address questions of overcrowding and deteriorated and obsolete facilities.52


Students at Berkeley

The report, entitled: Students at Berkeley: A Study of their Extracurricular Activities with Suggestions for Improvements on and off Campus to Broaden their Preparation for Citizenship, was issued by the California Alumni Association on May 28, 1948. The report assessed the inadequate and overburdened condition of student facilities in several areas and recommended a number of sweeping programs, including an extensive network of University-constructed and operated residence halls, acquisition of off-campus land for expansive playing fields and parking structures, and, as a centerpiece, a new Student Center complex. In addition to incorporating and expanding all the traditional facilities offered by Stephens Union and Eshleman Hall, the new Student Union would have a major campus performance hall/auditorium and a large new campus cafeteria/dining commons. The study noted that the students were the university and that “a great university will be concerned with the living problems of its students.” In addition to calling for essential academic structures, playing fields, and dormitories, the report asserted that a new Student Union would be “the college living room or hearthstone and the center of education in human relationships.” The report concluded that a new Student Union would not just benefit students but the region by providing world-class recreational and cultural facilities to the entire Bay Area.54

At the most basic level, the authors of Students at Berkeley argued that a modern Student Union should provide a “living room” for Cal students by providing an agglomeration of services – public telephones, study rooms, lockers, post office, candy and cigarette vendors, a snack bar, student book store, a parking garage,
and even a hotel. In addition these functions, the modern Student Union proposed in the study would offer social, cultural, and recreational spaces, such as a tap room, game rooms, a bowling alley, a dance hall, card rooms, a hobby shop, an auditorium, an art gallery, and a radio station. Interestingly, the proponents of the Student Union thought that it would do much to draw together an increasingly diverse postwar student body composed of disparate groups including sorority and fraternity members, returning war veterans, commuters, and foreign students.

Much of the data behind the recommendations in Students at Berkeley came from student surveys. Based on these results, the report recommended that the Student Union ought to be at least 300,000 square feet and that it should be located on or adjoining the campus in a heavily trafficked area. After evaluating several sites, the study recommended two city blocks located north of Bancroft Way and west of Telegraph Avenue, portions of which were already owned by the University. The site was chosen primarily for its strategic location near the busy intersection of Bancroft Way and Telegraph Avenue – the commercial and residential heart of the Southside community – as well as for its proximity to Sather Gate, the primary entrance to the campus on the south side (Figure 14). This location differed from many other contemporary student unions in that it did not attempt to isolate or sequester students on-campus. In contrast, the authors of Students at Berkeley seemed to recognize the interdependency of the University of California and the city of Berkeley.

55 Ibid., 96.
56 California Alumni Association, Students At Berkeley: A Study of Their Extracurricular Activities with Suggestions for Improvements On and Off Campus to Broaden Their Preparation for Citizenship (Berkeley: California Alumni Association, 1948), 95-6.
57 Ibid., 97-101.
As mentioned above, the tract chosen for the future Student Union was by no means exclusively University-owned, although property acquisition in the area had begun as early as 1927. Other acquisitions took place during the 1930s, 1940s, and early 1950s; the final land purchase to complete the Student Center site was not until 1960.  

In addition to establishing the site of the proposed Student Union, Students at Berkeley initiated several programmatic elements that would come to be realized in the completed complex. Among them were closing Telegraph Way to vehicular traffic between Bancroft Way and Allston Way, creating several outdoor terraces for gathering and dining, and providing a theater, a concert hall, and an underground parking structure. The report also recommended that the complex be built in stages. Presumably included to generate excitement and financial support, the report included a conceptual rendering of the proposed Student Union. The rendering depicted an accretion of linked concrete structures with flat roofs, ribbon windows, and thin projecting canopies and simplified bezel moldings, all characteristics of the Late Moderne style, a style favored for many State government buildings in California during the postwar era (Figure 15).

![Figure 15. Schematic drawing of proposed Student Union in Students at Berkeley, 1948](source: Students at Berkeley)

1949 Memorandum

Following on the heels of Students at Berkeley, a coalition of 150 faculty members signed a memorandum drafted by Philosopher Stephen Pepper, City Planning professor T.J. “Jack” Kent, and Professor of Art Walter Horn and sent to UC Berkeley President Robert Gordon Sproul in March 1949. The memorandum expressed “grave concern over the functional and aesthetic deterioration of the campus” and called for a “flexible, up-to-date master plan.” Seeking a major departure from the Picturesque and City Beautiful campus planning of the previous 80 years, the memorandum suggested that the campus abandon “an aesthetic concept which is obsolete and which obstructs effective solutions of the University’s architectural problems.” Future Chancellor Clark Kerr, who presided over the construction of the California Student Center, was one of the signatories.  
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Two years later, in 1951, UC Berkeley’s Office of Architects and Engineers published a document entitled: *Planning the Physical Development of the Berkeley Campus*. This report, which endorsed the recommendations of the 1949 Memorandum, encouraged giving priority to academic programs and their spatial demands over “out-of-date” planning practices. In the future, new buildings would be placed where it made sense for them to be in regard to their function and program, an action that essentially tossed out the Howard Plan that had guided campus development for nearly half a century. The plan also changed the University’s traditional approach to planning and construction by eliminating the position of the Supervising Architect and devolving the responsibilities to various committees that reported instead to the University Chancellor. These policy changes made possible the construction of several buildings that would never have been allowed under the Howard Plan, including Moffitt Undergraduate Library and the California Student Center.60

**Chancellor Clark Kerr**

The publication of *Planning the Physical Development of the Berkeley Campus* in 1951 set the stage for the physical transformation of the Berkeley campus during the late 1950s and early 1960s. The man most responsible for implementing the changes, including the construction of the California Student Center, was Chancellor, and later President, Clark Kerr (Figure 16). Appointed as the first Chancellor of the Berkeley campus in 1952, Chancellor Kerr put into motion a series of planning studies and projects that would realize virtually every recommendation of the 1951 report. By the time he became President six years later, the Berkeley campus was about to break ground on several large off-campus residence hall complexes and firm plans had been established for the new California Student Center complex.

**California Alumni Center**

In 1951, planning commenced for a new Alumni Center. In 1952, the California Alumni Association committee, chaired by alumnus Stephen Bechtel, evaluated four sites for the proposed Alumni House, including its present site on the south bank of Strawberry Creek, just north and west of the proposed Student Union. The Alumni Association, which had been so instrumental in advocating for the construction of a new Student Union, identified the site – then occupied by temporary wood-frame buildings housing the Department of Social Welfare – as an ideal site for the Alumni House because of its proximity to the proposed Student Union.61 Throughout 1952 and 1953, the Association undertook a public campaign to raise funds for the building citing its value for offices, meeting and conference space, and as “a lounge, where alumni through the world can come and feel at home…a campus headquarters for returning alumni.”
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Although not officially part of the California Student Center, the Alumni House – which was completed in September 1954 – was designed in a modernist architectural vocabulary and intended to be an integral part of the future complex.63

Early Planning for the California Student Center

Building on discussions started in 1948 with Students at Berkeley, the May 27, 1953 edition of The Daily Californian included eight articles on the proposed Student Union complex. The headlines indicated that fund-raising had not gotten very far: “New Student Union building plan suffers common trouble – money,” and even that the program was still up in the air: “New student 'hangout' may contain everything from fish to xylophones.” Aware that details of the program would need to be nailed down before donors could be asked for money, the University Regents hired Porter Butts, director of the Wisconsin Student Union, to draft a program for the new facility. Butts had a significant amount of expertise in the field, having presided over the development of one of the most modern student unions in the nation. The articles in the May 27th Daily Californian showed photographs of several of the more modern student unions (most of them in the Midwest) and listed their amenities, including bowling alleys, beauty parlors, barber shops, cafeterias, and well-upholstered lounges stocked with new furniture and baronial fireplaces.64

Fund-raising for the new California Student Center

As early as 1953, the University administration under Chancellor Kerr began to develop strategies to pay for the design and construction of the proposed Student Center. Several funding schemes for the project, which was estimated to cost $9,700,000 if built all at once, were featured in an article in the May 27, 1953 edition of The Daily Californian. As part of the fundraising efforts, the California Alumni Association published a brochure entitled: “Classes are out, where will they now?” The cover showed several students walking through Sather Gate toward the “honky-tonk” restaurants of Telegraph Avenue. The text of the brochure indicated that if students could not find adequate facilities for recreation on campus, they would find it off-campus, harming “their identification with their fellow students.” The direct appeals helped to garner alumni support. Nevertheless, the most important step was taken in 1955, when the University and the ASUC launched a successful campaign for the Universal Card system, which made all students members of the ASUC and thereby financial contributors to the new California Memorial Union, the working name of the proposed Student Union.65

In December 1956, fundraising for the California Memorial Union received a needed boost with the University Regents’ endorsement of the project. In addition, two Regents pledged large donations. Regent Edward H. Heller pledged $1 million for the building, eventually earning him the honor of naming the lounge in the Student Union for his mother, Clara Hellman Heller. In addition, Regent Edwin W. Pauley pledged $2 million, giving him the right to name the ballroom in honor of his wife, Barbara McHenry Pauley.66

---
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Kerr-McLaughlin-Wurster Plan of 1956

The location and design of the proposed California Memorial Student California were further solidified in the Kerr-McLaughlin-Wurster Long Range Plan of 1956. The plan established six major principles, among them: "building location, design, and use," which established that buildings on the central campus would be limited to no more than 25% of the total land area. Reacting to the proliferation of informal parking lots and traffic-choked roads, the plan established a pedestrian-focused circulation plan, banishing surface parking lots from the central campus and separating pedestrian and vehicular traffic. Most important, the plan reaffirmed the 1951 Plan’s prioritization of academic needs when locating and designing new buildings. Aside from the preservation of the central campus area around Sather Tower and Doe Library, the plan dispensed entirely with older planning strategies.67

The 1956 Long Range Plan was the most essential step in the planning process behind the California Student Center. First, the limitation of new construction to just 25% of the central campus effectively rendered obsolete the traditional low-rise buildings of earlier eras, arguing in favor of mid-and high-rise construction. Second, the elevation of pedestrian circulation networks made possible the elimination of vehicular streets to build new facilities. Third, the banishment of surface parking from most of the central campus made underground parking structures a centerpiece of postwar planning projects. Fourth, the decision to discontinue the Beaux Arts planning principles that had guided campus development for nearly 50 years allowed the Office of Architects and Engineers and the various committees in charge of planning new buildings to consider non-traditional and modernist solutions that would have been impossible before the war. All of these policies were realized to a large degree in the design of the California Student Center.

Vernon DeMars

In addition to Chancellor Kerr, the most important individual behind the planning and construction of the proposed Memorial Union was Vernon DeMars. DeMars, whose biography is summarized below in Section L, graduated from School of Architecture of the University of California in 1931. A native of San Francisco, DeMars left the state to build war workers’ housing in Puerto Rico and the East Coast during World War II. From 1947 until 1949 he taught architecture at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where he met fellow Californian William W. Wurster. DeMars followed Wurster back to the Bay Area in 1950. In 1951, DeMars was hired as a lecturer in the School of Architecture at UC Berkeley. Two years later, he was promoted to full Professor. During this time DeMars actively solicited the Chief of the Office of Architects and Engineers for the job of designing the California Student Center, writing in December 1952 that he would “give [his] remaining eye and tooth to land [the commission]” and “sweat blood to see it through.”68 In 1955, DeMars formed a partnership with Donald Reay to bid on the design of several off-campus dormitories.69 After the project was awarded to Carl Warnecke, DeMars redirected his attention to the proposed Student Union, directing an independent design studio that resulted in plans and renderings of a student center project prepared by students Richard Hanna and James Hastings. The drawings and a model were

68 Letter from Vernon DeMars to Robert Evans (December 12, 1952), in DeMars Papers, Environmental Design Archives, University of California, Berkeley.
published in the January 7, 1955 edition of *The Daily Californian*. The model, which depicted a complex of several individual buildings, a courtyard, and an office tower, was placed on view in the lobby of Wheeler Hall (Figure 17).

As can be seen from the model, the basic outline of the California Student Center – as it was built several years later – was already present. Notable similarities between the two schemes include the closure of Telegraph Avenue between Bancroft Way and Sather Gate, as well as the donut-plan consisting of a central plaza surrounded by distinct but linked structures, including the dining commons to the north, the theater/auditorium to the west, and a mid-rise office tower to the south. It is interesting to note, however, that in the model the office tower is oriented with its long axis parallel to Telegraph Avenue. This is in direct contrast to the as-built Eshleman Hall, which is oriented east-west along Bancroft Way. The north-south orientation of the tower in this earlier scheme was probably intended to avoid shading the plaza during winter.

---

1957 Design Competition

After the publication of the DeMars/Hanna/Hastings California Student Center scheme in 1955, Dean of Architecture William Wurster evidently desired to simply grant the contract for architectural services to Vernon DeMars' firm with assistance from fellow faculty member Joseph Esherick and Ernest Kump. Probably hoping to avoid the appearance of nepotism, University officials decided to hold an official architectural competition in 1957. The “Program of Competition,” heavily influenced by the recommendations of Porter Butts, was issued by Joseph Esherick in March of that year. The Program, which in addition to describing the parameters of the project, listed the six primary functions to be performed by the new California Student Center:
• An Education Center, supplementing the classroom in integrating academic and non-academic interests and experiences, in stimulating responsibility, in developing the whole student.

• A Social Center, fostering contacts and interchanges among all the varied elements of the student body.

• A Cultural Center, providing facilities for discussion, lectures, music, drama, and the visual arts.

• A Recreation Center, offering opportunities for games and diversions as well as for rest and relaxation.

• A Service Center, satisfying those needs which must be organized and shared in common, such as eating facilities, clubs, and conveniences of many types.

• A Public Relations Center, providing a tangible point of contact for parents, friends, and visitors to campus, disseminating information and furthering good will toward the University.70

The Competition Program listed the four major elements that would be included in the proposed complex, including a “University Cafeteria,” “Student Union,” “Student Offices,” and “University Auditorium-Theater.”

The Competition Program required that the “University Cafeteria” be completed first. It was also to be sited close to campus near Strawberry Creek and Sather Gate. In addition to containing an 800-seat main cafeteria, the building would house a restaurant, private dining rooms, and several coffee and snack bars. According to the program, the “Student Union” would be built next. It would contain the following functions: “an information center, lounge and terrace, meeting rooms, ballroom and banquet hall, the campus store and bookshop, facilities for exhibitions, craftwork, games, billiards, bowling and table tennis; a roof garden retreat, the “Tilden Room” for quiet and meditation, and finally the “Bear’s Lair” a kind of ratskeller (sic) type of campus hangout.” The third and fourth elements of the complex were to be the student office building and theater/auditorium. The theater was to seat 2,000 in a large hall with complete stage facilities for drama, concerts, and opera. There was also to be a smaller hall accommodating a 500-seat, experimental, “black box” theater with space for a radio and television studio. The student office building would house the editorial offices of The Daily Californian and the Blue and Gold, athletic directors, ASUC offices, and a ticket office for university athletics.71 The Competition Program also laid out some guidelines for the complex as a whole:

The buildings are to be grouped around a large paved plaza which covers a parking garage and the service facilities of all the buildings. The plaza, with the surrounding terraces which overlook it will accommodate many thousands for University meetings, impromptu rallies or academic festivals. It will be the location of fountains, sculpture and art works of appropriate symbolic interest. The $10,000,000 Center as a whole will be a focal point of interest and activity for student, faculty, alumni and visitors as well.72

The Competition Program described the site as comprising two former city blocks bounded by Telegraph Avenue, Bancroft Way, Dana Street, and Strawberry Creek. In order to maximize the site, Union Street would be abandoned and Telegraph Avenue and Dana Street closed to vehicular traffic. The entire site was to be cleared of all existing buildings with the exception of the architecturally significant Unitarian Church at

---

71 Ibid.
72 Ibid., 4-5.
the corner of Bancroft Way and Dana Street and the recently completed Alumni House. Other programmatic requirements stated that the winning competition entry would not impede existing circulation patterns and that the constituent buildings should be designed to be compatible with the nearby Administration Building and the adjoining commercial district of Berkeley. It is also interesting to note that the program required that the entire complex be made accessible to wheelchair users. This was more than three decades before the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.73

Student Center Competition Entries

Entries were solicited from a restricted pool of well-known architects and planners – all modernists – including three teams from Northern California: Gardner Daily, Hardison & DeMars, and John Funk and Kitchen & Hunt; and three from Southern California: Honnold & Rex, Pereira & Luckman, and Risley & Gould. In April 1957, the Competition Jury, which included Regents Heller and Paulcy and architects Pietro Belluschi FAIA, Richard M. Bennett FAIA, and John E. Dinwiddie AIA; met to begin the process of selecting the winning entry. On June 14, 1957, they decided to award the job and the $25,200 fee to Hardison & DeMars, with the second place spot going to Gardner Daily and third place to John Funk and Kitchen & Hunt. Much to their chagrin, the Southern California firms rounded out the last three spots, resulting in some grumbling that the jury was rigged in favor of Bay Area firms.74

The Competition Entry submitted by Hardison & DeMars was developed as a joint venture of the firms of DeMars & Reay and Hardison & Komatsu. DeMars & Reay, consisting of Vernon DeMars and Donald Reay – the British-born designer of postwar new towns and fellow UC Berkeley faculty member – was to be the primary design firm. Meanwhile, Hardison (Donald) & Komatsu (S. Richard) was to take charge of much of the space programming and the production of detailed design and construction drawings. DeMars respected the competence of the larger firm, with whom he had collaborated before. DeMars believed that the participation of Hardison & Komatsu was essential because they were larger and more technically able to handle construction administration tasks than the small two-man firm of DeMars & Reay. Rounding out the team were several recent graduates of the School of Architecture, landscape architect Lawrence O. Halprin and Harry B. Clausen.75
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Hardison & DeMars Win the Competition

The Jury was effusive in its praise for the Hardison & DeMars scheme and in their written statement they gave several reasons why they favored it over the five other entries. First and foremost, the Jury admired the siting of the proposed Student Union complex and how it respected the surrounding buildings and landscapes, seamlessly integrating the campus with the urban context south of Bancroft Way. Second, the Jury praised the scheme for providing effective pedestrian circulation networks throughout the complex while simultaneously preserving important view corridors and fostering an intimate urban scale. Third, the Jury liked the varied character of the four component buildings and how their individual designs avoided modish clichés and pretentiousness (Figure 18). Fourth, the Jury thought that the underground parking garage beneath the lower plaza was the most effective solution of the six entries. Fifth, the Jury admired the “folded concrete” roof and monitor windows of the Dining Commons, admiring this feature for its inventiveness and “originality and charm.” Sixth, the Hardison & DeMars entry was some 50,000 square feet smaller than the other entries, saving at least a million dollars in construction costs. The Jury concluded its discussion with the following statement: “It is the hope of the jury that this design be implemented and built with as little
change as possible. Any change contemplated should be approached with great care, for here is a delicate balance of values which should not be disturbed."76

Figure 19. Hardison & DeMars’ model for the California Student Center
Dining Commons at center, Eshleman Hall at top center, Zellerbach Hall at upper right and Student Union at upper left.
Source: Vernon DeMars Papers, University of California, Berkeley, Environmental Design Archives

Vernon DeMars’ Statements about the design of the Student Center
It is informative at this point to take note of what Vernon DeMars had to say about his team’s winning the Student Center Competition. According to his written responses to an inquiry from a writer at Western Architect & Engineer, the design of the California Student Center could be distilled to three major objectives. The first objective was to accommodate a “number of diverse, but related activities, totaling over 500,000 sq. ft. in area” within a facility that avoided “the creation of a giant, monolithic, and overpowering structure.” DeMars’ second goal was to “maintain a recognizable human scale in the face of the need to accommodate thousands of students daily.” The third and final aim was to create “a design spirit that would foster student identification with the center and clearly distinguish it as non-academic.” In his memorandum, DeMars justified his decision to break down the four major functions: dining, student union, offices, and theater into separate buildings, “each with its own distinctive character, the whole somewhat suggesting a medieval town center (Figure 19).” DeMars used medieval analogy again to describe the relationship of the proposed student center with the smaller-scale commercial blocks along Bancroft Way.77

DeMars concluded his response to Western Architect & Engineer with a discussion of how the design responded to the Administration Building (Sproul Hall) located directly across from the California Student Center site. Designed by Arthur Brown Jr. – UC Berkeley’s last Supervising Architect – and constructed in

77 Ibid., 2.
1940-41, the building marked the initial extension of the campus’ north-south axis into Berkeley’s Southside commercial district. Designed in a stripped neoclassical style, the building signaled the last hurrah of the Beaux Arts-inspired planning that had characterized the University until World War II. DeMars was not impressed with its looming presence but knew that it had to “be recognized and given its due.” His solution was to create a brick “carpet” in front of the building (Upper Sproul Plaza) terminating on the west in a “monumental staircase on axis leading to the Student Center Square (Lower Sproul Plaza).” But DeMars also believed that the formal relationship between the Administration Building and Lower Sproul Plaza must, in his words, “be gradually weaned away.” Accordingly, DeMars placed a covered walkway between the Dining Commons and the Student Union, screening the Administration Building from view from much of the plaza below. Asserting the symbolic importance of minimizing the visual impact of the Administration Building, DeMars wrote: “…while the great four-columned portico (of the Administration Building) is still visible from most of the square, it no longer has control – neither over the space nor the students.”

In other articles about the Student Center, De Mars discussed his sources of inspiration. In an undated article that appeared in the Daily Californian, DeMars stated that he was seeking to avoid the “inhuman bareness” of modern architecture: “We’re trying hard NOT to make it resemble a shopping center – you know, that boxy, glassy look.” DeMars further explained how he wanted the Student Center “to be more human and frankly, more interesting than run of the mill ‘modern.’” As an alternative to the oft-cited placelessness and sterility of modern architecture, DeMars cited his efforts to engender a “fresh look” that “combines a dash of Paris’ Left Bank with something of the feeling of Copenhagen’s 19th century Tivoli Gardens and St. Mark’s Square in Venice.”

References to St. Mark’s Square, or Piazza San Marco, are fairly obvious, beginning with the visual axes across Lower Sproul Plaza to John Galen Howard’s Campanile, itself a replica of the Campanile San Marco. Much of the layout of the Student Union complex was determined by a desire to maintain important sight lines of this preeminent landmark (Figure 20). The formal colonnaded facades of the component buildings, which provide shelter and visually tie the ensemble together, also reveal contrast in their varied heights, massing, and materials, all suggestive of the seemingly random elements that work together in concert to
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create an Italian Renaissance cityscape. Finally, the roof of the Dining Commons (which was purposely kept low to avoid blocking views of the Campanile), composed of thin, tent-like concrete shells, was to DeMars "a continuum of shelters and terraces filling the end of the square like the stalls and booths of a great market." 80 The geometrical paving pattern of Lower Sproul Plaza also recalls the paving of Piazza San Marco. DeMars planned to carry the Venetian analogy even further by erecting a column crowned by a California Golden Brown Bear in the Student Center Square, an obvious reference to the Winged Lion of St. Mark. Although included in the original drawings, the Golden Bear Column was not installed until 1980.

The Bay Area’s own First Bay Region Tradition is another current readily detected in the design of the California Student Center. The First Bay Region Tradition was an indigenous school of architecture pioneered by leading California architects including Bernard Maybeck, Willis Polk, Ernest Coxhead, A.C. Schweinfurth, Julia Morgan, and artists such as William Keith. Hallmarks of the school, which was more of a philosophy than a style, emphasizing regionally sourced and/or organically treated materials, hand-crafted wood joinery, and an aesthetic that takes its cue from the natural landscapes and flora and fauna of the Bay Area.

The California Student Center references the First Bay Region Tradition in several areas. One of the most explicit references is DeMars’ incorporation of a metal cornice/pergola at the parapet level of the Student Union. Embellished with decorative finials resembling native California poppies, this element is a direct nod to the wood pergolas that surround Bernard Maybeck’s First Church of Christ Scientist in Berkeley (Figure 21). The wood pergola that originally sheltered al fresco diners outside the Dining Commons is another reference to Maybeck’s work. Although built of concrete, DeMars clearly embraced the versatility of the material, avoiding imparting a heavy, monolithic appearance by incorporating accents of warm-toned stucco, rough board-formed concrete with the impressions of the rough-sawn plank board forms left exposed, red clay tiled paving, and other warm, organic detailing. Perhaps the most important nod to his predecessors was DeMars’ incorporation of works of art by local artists and craftspeople.


Dining Commons

The Dining Commons (Chávez) was the first of the four buildings begun in the $12 million California Student Center complex. In need of a central dining facility to accommodate the campus’ fast-growing student population, the 2,300-seat Dining Commons was given priority in the construction sequence. Demolition and site clearing took place during the spring of 1958 and construction got under way in June of that year, with completion estimated to occur in July 1959. The Student Union was to begin next, with ground breaking scheduled for December 1958 and completion forecast for September 1960. The theater/auditorium was to follow the Student Center, with construction supposed to commence in July 1960. The ASUC office building was to be started last, with construction originally scheduled to begin in July 1961. However, lack of funds and shifting priorities delayed the construction of the office building (Eshleman Hall) and the theater (Zellerbach Hall), with completion of the complex delayed until 1968, ten years after site clearing began.

Even before the Dining Commons had begun to rise next to Strawberry Creek, the California Student Center had already begun to win awards and praise in the architectural press. First illustrated in the October 1957 edition of *Architectural Forum*, the design won the *Progressive Architecture* Design Award for 1958.81 That same year, DeMars won a Special Service Award from the California Alumni Association. What caught the attention of many writers were the unusual hyperbolic-paraboloid roof forms of the Dining Commons (Figure 22). Based on the thin-shell concrete construction techniques pioneered by Mexican architect Felix Candella and Italian engineer Pier Luigi Nervi, the umbrella-like roof forms of the Dining Commons earned it praise in several articles published in regional and national architectural journals. A caption in the September 1959 edition of *Western Architect & Engineer* described the appearance and the function of the distinctive hyperbolic-paraboloid roof:

Jagged patterns are formed by hyperbolic paraboloids which will shelter dining commons of Student Center at Berkeley, now under construction. The umbrella-like shells are 24 ft square and 3 in. thick; since each forms a shallow saucer, rain will be carried down the center of the pedestals. Scale of commons building is massive, but shells will provide “a
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variety of spaces and intimate corner: small rooms, large; high ceilings, low: some sunny, some shady," in the architects’ words. 82

The Dining Commons structure was completed and opened to students in 1960. An undated photograph illustrates the Dining Commons shortly after it opened (Figure 23).

Student Union Opens
Meanwhile the Student Union, which was well underway when the Western Architect & Engineer article was published, was completed in March 1961 at a recorded cost of $3,729,500 (Figure 24). Facilities available at time of its opening included the following: "ASUC store, bowling lanes, barber shop, art activities center, game rooms, meditation room, ballroom, meeting rooms, lounges, coffee shop (Bear’s Lair, seats 306 inside, 142 outside), box office, and the offices of elected and employed officers of the ASUC." 83 Final funding for the building came from the following sources: a $1,000,000 gift from Regent Edwin W. Pauley, a $100,000 gift from Mr. and Mrs. C.L. Tilden Jr, $2,385,000 in alumni contributions, ASUC funds from the sale of Stephens Union to the University, a $800,000 state appropriation, and a Housing and Home Finance Agency loan. 84

Much of the University community was swept up in the celebrations and events that marked the completion of the Student Union. Beginning the week of March 13, 1961, The Daily Californian reported on various formal and informal events taking place during “Dedication Week.” On Friday, March 17, the University held
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a public “Dedication Convocation” in the “plaza of the Student Center (now Lower Sproul Plaza).” The keynote speakers were President Clark Kerr and Governor Edmund “Pat” Brown. An Open House followed the next day from 2 pm until midnight, giving students, faculty, alumni, and other interested parties an opportunity to tour the building. A “Dedication Ball” was held on the evening of March 18 in the Pauley Ballroom from 9 pm to 1 am. The festivities for Dedication Week wrapped up on Monday, March 20 at 7:30 pm with the annual Charter Day Banquet, also held in Pauley Ballroom.  

Other articles published in *The Daily Californian* during Dedication Week described the features of the new “Memorial Student Union,” as it was then called. One such article published in the March 15, 1961 edition of the *Daily Californian* described the Arts Center – located at the northern end of the first floor – as the first of its kind in the nation. The Arts Center, which still exists, provided art materials and studio space free of charge for the use of students and faculty members. The Arts Center anchored the northern end of a red clay tile-paved central corridor that extended the length of the first floor (plaza level) of the Student Union. Heading south along the corridor, the next space was the Games Room, a facility operated by the ASUC in an area now occupied by the Travel Center and Naia Lounge. Readily accessible from the Bear’s Lair via Lower Sproul Plaza, the room contained eight tables for ping pong and twelve other tables for snooker, billiards, and pool. Also operated by the ASUC was a 16-lane bowling alley in the basement of the Student Union, a space presently occupied by the ASUC Textbook Store. Continuing south from the Games Room, visitors to the newly opened Student Union would have passed men’s and women’s toilet rooms, two “Quiet Rooms” – one for men and the other for women – a shoe shine stand, a barber shop, and several offices before entering the ASUC Store. The ASUC Store, which sold books, clothing, magazines, art supplies, stationery, and sundry items, occupied the bulk of the first floor level, as it continues to do today.
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The Bear’s Lair was also described. Divided into two sections: the “rathskellar-type” bar and the “collegiate-type” coffee shop, the facility was designed to serve 300 students and other patrons with an indoor dining room as well as an outdoor area within the Student Center Square. The Bear’s Lair was originally operated by the University’s food service department, providing “mainly hamburgers and milkshakes.”

Just as today, stairs at the northern end of the ASUC Store connected the first floor level with the second floor (Sproul Plaza) level. Originally designed as an open ceremonial space, the first floor contained the main reception desk and coat check, a post office, Heller Lounge, and the Main Lobby for accessing Pauley Ballroom at the southern end of the space (Figure 25). This space, originally furnished with Knoll furnishings, faced Upper Sproul Plaza with large sheet glass window walls framing views of the exterior from the interior and vice versa.
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An undated article in the *Daily Californian*, probably published during Dedication Week, called Heller Lounge the “Family room” of the Student Union. The article describes the lounge – a space spanning the entire western wall of the Student Union – as a place for “relaxation, conversation, bridge, chess, and other such games and reading or writing letters.” The article itemizes the features of the room, including “a large hooded fireplace near the center of the Union” that will extend deeply into the lounge itself…to give the impression of grater intimacy and of two large rooms rather than one (Figure 26).” The article concludes with a description of how the furnishings will be moveable, thereby allowing it to be arranged to accommodate a variety of social functions. Unlike its predecessor, the old Stephens Memorial Union, the Memorial Student Union did not have separate areas for men and women.89

The same undated article described the Pauley Ballroom on the third-floor level of the Student Union (Figure 27). Designed to accommodate “proms, dances, and banquets,” the Ballroom was oriented toward the north, with two-story window walls taking in both Upper and Lower Sproul Plazas, the Campanile, Sather Gate, and the Berkeley Hills beyond. The Pauley Ballroom was intended to accommodate virtually any type of large gathering, reducing the need to take such events off campus. The ballroom also included a moveable center partition that could be retracted and concealed within a pocket at the south side of the room to create two smaller event venues if necessary. The upper level of the south wall contained a projection room, allowing films to be shown in the Pauley Ballroom. Also located on the third floor was Stephens Memorial Lounge. Named for the old Stephens Memorial Union, this meeting room stood at the top of the ceremonial stair from the Main Lobby. Between the ballroom and the lounge was a plywood-clad utility core containing a small catering kitchen, coat check rooms, storage, and telephone booths.

The fourth floor level of the Student Union featured four meeting rooms that could be divided into eight smaller rooms by means of moveable partitions. Clad in polished hardwood plywood paneling, like most of the interior of the Student Union, the meeting rooms were designed to be used as meeting spaces or
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classrooms for various student and faculty groups. The *Daily Californian* noted that upon opening the Student Union, ASUC officers moved from the old Stephens Student Union into these fourth-floor meeting rooms. The ASUC President was located “at the extreme end of the fifth (sic) floor” and “representatives at large” were assigned to offices “located on the first floor next to the information desk and the ASUC Box Office.” All of these assignments were to be temporary until the Student Office Building (Eshleman Hall) was completed.90

The last article in *Daily Californian* series described the Tilden Meditation Room, a non-denominational meditation space/chapel housed within the penthouse of the Student Center. The $100,000 structure was paid for by Mr. and Mrs. Charles Lee Tilden, parents of Charles Lee Tilden III, a former student of the University. The article described the room as a place for “individual meditation,” where meetings will be banned in the interest of preserving peace and quiet. The room receives its architectural distinction from its thin-shelled, hyperbolic-paraboloid roof, as well as a stained glass window at the south end of the room. The window, designed by Robert Pinard of Paris, depicts – in an abstract vocabulary – an angel in a great flash of light. The Tilden Meditation Room was also surrounded by a landscaped “terrace” filled with potted trees and shrub and vines and replete with outdoor furniture for quiet gathering and meditation.91 Vernon DeMars provided additional details on the evolution of the Tilden Room design:

I don’t think they (the Competition Program) said it should be on the roof or whatever, but we thought that a kind of a penthouse situation with a little garden would make some sense. The more we talked about that, we thought, Well, if they want something Gothic we have these umbrella-like concrete shells that occur elsewhere in the student center, where they form the roof of the dining commons, and of the bridge that connects it to the student union. They already fit the twenty-four foot module that spaces the structural supports for everything in the student union.92

**Student Feedback**

*Daily Californian* reporters polled students about what they thought about the Student Union during Dedication Week. On the balance, most seemed impressed with the new facilities. Kiki McCarthy, a senior history major said: “I think it’s great. It’s really a fantastic place.” Sheila Lewis, a freshman sociology student, said: “I think it’s really nice. The lounge reminds me of a resort. It’s great to come here and forget about school.” Others were less effusive, praising the project as a whole but criticizing certain elements. John Kibre, a sophomore architecture student, said: “On the whole it’s completely successful, except for the Bear’s Lair and the roof on the Meditation Room.” Several students polled criticized what they viewed to be an extravagant use of money. Karen Halling, a senior English major, said “I think it’s great and it’s beautiful, if you think about nothing but the building. I consider the money and I’d rather have more theaters than this. It’s completely overwhelming.”93 In another undated article in *The Daily Californian* titled: “Are New Buildings at UC Too Fancy?” the reporter asked students more specifically about the architecture of the new California
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Student Center. Of the eight students quoted in the article, most seemed to like the modern design. Bruce McMillan, a senior geology student said:

The new buildings carry out the tradition in which each new building is supposed to represent the era's architecture. Every new design is hard to get used to, but only for a while. They new buildings are very impressive. 94

Others who were questioned did not care for the modern vocabulary. Carol Ackerman, a sophomore political science major said:

I don’t care for the design of the Student Union Building. It sticks out like a sore thumb. I prefer the Sproul Hall type. 95

The opening of the Memorial Student Union in 1961 – originally named in honor of University of California students who had served in the Second World War – attracted at least as much attention as the opening of the Dining Commons. Following the end of the festivities of Dedication Week, the University Regents adopted a resolution to “congratulate Architects Vernon DeMars and Donald Hardison on an impressive achievement, and thank them for a job well done...” 96

Allan Temko’s Article in Architectural Forum

Not all of the attention focused on the California Student Center was positive. In 1961, architectural critic Allan Temko delivered a critical appraisal of the California Student Center complex in the October edition of the Architectural Forum. The article, titled: “Planned Chaos on the Piazza,” contains mixed reviews of the complex. Although Temko admired Hardison & DeMars’ efforts to embrace the notion of civitas “in the midst of the widening wasteland of our urban environment,” he criticized DeMars’ ideology of “planned chaos,” by which Temko interpreted as attempting to recreate, from the ground up, the “inexhaustible phenomena of a historical citiescape.” Temko elaborates by stating: “In the student center, the expression by Hardison & DeMars of the notion of “planned chaos” comes out like a veritable architectural “stream of consciousness” disgorging random detail.” He sums up his basic reaction to the entire project in the following statement:

What is “planned” is all to be found in the basic planning, and this is largely admirable. ‘Chaos’ unerringly describes the architecture. In view of all this, it seems fair to call the center a schizoid creation, torn between rational planning premises and their irrational architectural expression. 97

In the six-page article, Temko praises in some detail what he admires most about the project, including the siting of the individual buildings and landscape elements in relationship to each other and to the “pseudo-classical mass” of the Administration Building. He admired the French allée-like qualities of Upper Sproul Plaza, the enhancement of primary axial relationships, and the carpet-like geometry of the “handsome brick pavement, striped with black diagonals.” However, Temko ripped into the attempts of the architects to contrive a European-like urban setting, writing: “Yet such innocent touches do not make Berkeley into Paris
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overnight. There is a perceptible absence of *savoir-faire*, which is not surprising considering how much the designers tried to achieve at a single stroke.”

But it was the architecture of the Dining Commons and the Student Union that truly raised Temko’s ire, making, in the critic’s opinion, DeMars’ doctrine of ‘planned’ chaos painfully clear. Temko believed that the two completed buildings of the Student Center complex did not relate to each other in regard to relative scale and that the universal 24-foot square module did not seem to carry through the entire complex. Unlike other critics who admired the hyperbolic-paraboloid roof forms, Temko dismissed them as “primitive.” He also labeled the redwood trellises of the Dining Commons – an obvious nod to Bernard Maybeck – as “carelessness tinged with sentimentalism.” Overall, Temko disliked the juxtaposition of materials seen throughout the completed portions of the complex:

Pavements change quickly from brick to blacktop, to concrete aggregate, sometimes held in cheap back-yard-type grids. Walls shift from poured concrete to stone masonry to concrete block, and again to concrete in a different pattern. Metal balustrades suddenly give way, for no apparent purpose, to redwood fences, and then, around a corner, there are solid concrete barriers.

In regard to the recently completed Student Union, Temko asserted that Hardison & DeMars had done an excellent job of programming the space and laying out a rational plan for the complex that seamlessly tied together such disparate and diverse functions in a “formal monumental composition” suitable for “an imposing urban institution such as the Bohemian Club in San Francisco.” However, Temko took issue with the exterior materials and detailing of the Student Union, calling the board-formed concrete podium of the building: “abstract expressionism in concrete by carpenters.” He also castigated the steel “cornicelike trellis” as “another nostalgic tribute to the Maybeck tradition.” Within the interior of the Student Union, Temko called into question DeMars’ use of color and varied types of wood paneling “displayed one after another in no discernable order.”

DeMars Responds

Vernon DeMars was given an opportunity to respond to Allan Temko’s review, which was printed at the end of the article in the October 1961 edition of *Architectural Forum*. In his response, DeMars began by stating “One man’s meat is another man’s poison,” insinuating that architectural criticism was merely a matter of personal taste and “should not be confused with the absolute merit of what is liked or disliked.” DeMars continued his response, acknowledging Temko’s appreciation for his “deliberately city-like concept.” Changing tack, DeMars tried to refute Temko’s characterization of the architecture of the Student Center as “planned chaos,” arguing that Temko’s criticism of his attempts to replicate the “accidental or semiplanned” urban condition of Europe was unfair because it is the architect’s duty and prerogative to study what makes such places special and “perhaps evoke similar experiences in a fragment of citiescape under single design control.” DeMars then argued that the obvious differences between the Dining Commons and The Student
Union was not the result of contrived artifice, but rather the sincere attempt of the designers to “develop an expression appropriate to its purpose.” DeMars concluded his response with a statement that the Student Center complex was by its very nature a complex entity, something that “cannot be achieved with the doctrine of ‘less is more,’” a direct jab at Temko’s perceived Mies-ian allegiances.102

1962 Campus Plan
In 1962, University officials adopted a new Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) for the Berkeley campus, replacing the 1956 Plan. Among other things, the 1962 Plan restated the goal of the eventual build-out of the “California Student Center as well a new “Student Services Building” on Bancroft across the street from the future Zellerbach Hall site. The illustrations accompanying the Plan show the Student Center complex built as designed although Eshleman Hall was reduced by one story to eight above-ground stories. The future Eshleman Hall was described in the LRDP as a 50,000 gross square foot student office building, and the future (and as yet unnamed) Zellerbach Hall was described as an “Auditorium-Theater” of 148,000 gross square feet.103 The 1962 LRDP, with amendments, would remain in place as the University’s primary planning document until a new Long Range Development Plan was published in 1990.104

Two Year Anniversary of the Memorial Student Union
The two-year anniversary of the completion of the Memorial Student Union was marked by celebrations at the University of California in March 1963. According to an undated article appearing in The Daily Californian, the Student Union complex had become “a necessary part of the student’s life.” Among the many programs and series offered by UPD (Union Program Board) were: the Bear’s Lair Jazz Series, the Folksong Coffee Hour in Heller Lounge, Sunday Night Movies (in Pauley Ballroom), contemporary and foreign films, a variety of art exhibits, bridge and dance lessons, lectures by prominent leaders, poetry readings and many others.”105

Hardison & DeMars Win More Awards
In 1964, Hardison & DeMars won the Community Facilities Administration’s First Honor Award for the California Student Center. Two years later, in 1966, they won the Governor’s Design Awards’ Certificate of Excellence for the Student Union, awarded by Governor Pat Brown. These awards increased by two the existing total of two awards already won by the firms for their work on the California Student Center, including the California Alumni Association and the Progressive Architecture awards of 1958.106
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Eshleman Hall

Progress on the California Student Center took an unexplained hiatus following the completion of the Memorial Student Union in 1961. Meanwhile, the Student Center Square (now Lower Sproul Plaza) remained only half-built, with the remainder to be finished after the completion of the two remaining members of the Student Center complex. Construction on the $1,315,000 Eshleman Hall – the eight-story student office building – did not begin until January 1963. An article appearing in the December 2, 1963 edition of The Daily Californian described the program of Eshleman Hall, then well underway along the south end of the California Student Center complex. According to Forrest Tregea, Executive Director of the ASUC, ASUC offices would move from their temporary quarters in the fourth floor meeting rooms of the Student Union to Eshleman Hall by the fall of 1964. The article reiterated that the new office building would house the offices of the ASUC, the offices of the Daily Californian, offices of athletic directors, coaches, and managers; an athletic ticket sales office in the basement, the ASUC Senate chamber on the first floor, and a publications library on the top floor. Financial backing for Eshleman Hall was derived in part from state grants and in part from the sale of Stephens Memorial Union and the old Eshleman Hall (Moses Hall) by the ASUC to the Regents of the University.

Eshleman Hall was a difficult building for DeMars in many ways; in later statements and correspondence, he often insinuates that many of its shortcomings were the result of outside meddling and budgetary restrictions. Although early models and drawings show it oriented with its long axis intersecting Bancroft Way, the building as constructed was reoriented with its long axis oriented parallel to Bancroft Way, probably in order to avoid encroaching on Lower Sproul Plaza. The end result, however, was intermittent shading of the plaza by the eight-story slab, especially during winter. The building’s design also aroused controversy. According to DeMars, as he and Donald Hardison were finalizing the design of Eshleman Hall, they received a visit from Regent Don McLaughlin, a member of the Regents’ Building Committee. McLaughlin, apparently disappointed with the utilitarian feeling of Eshleman, asked DeMars if the top floor (the location of the loggia) could not have arched openings instead of flat lintels. DeMars initially demurred on the grounds that arches were not structurally necessary but he ultimately relented. In response to another request from McLaughlin, DeMars changed the design of the narrow east and west facades,

adding balconies to provide additional visual interest to what were otherwise very plain concrete walls (Figure 28). 109

Eshleman Hall was not completed until the fall of 1965, one year later than hoped for by the Executive Director of the ASUC. The building was dedicated September 18, 1965, the morning of the big Cal/Notre Dame football game. Speakers at the Dedication included President Kerr, Chancellor Havens, and President Emeritus Sproul. The Daily Californian transferred its operations to the 6th floor thereafter.

Eshleman Glockenspiel
In 1967, two years after Eshleman Hall was completed, Vernon DeMars designed a glockenspiel for the east façade of the building, above the first-floor entrance. Influenced by the glockenspiels of Germany, the Netherlands, and Switzerland, and especially the one located in the Piazza San Marco in Venice, DeMars had long thought about adding one to the otherwise unembellished building. In 1967 he worked out a design consisting of two characters: a Bear representing the University of California and an “Indian” representing Stanford University. The Bear and the Indian were to follow each other as they rotated through four different cycles. The fourth and final cycle depended on the results of the “Big Game” between the University of California and Stanford. If Cal won that year the Bear would emerge from the glockenspiel triumphantly clutching the Stanford Axe and the scalp of the Indian. In contrast, if Stanford won, the Indian would emerge clasping the axe and the hide of the Bear (Figure 29). DeMars spent quite a bit of his own time developing the design and even traveled to Amsterdam to discuss the design with a maker of glockenspiels and to determine the cost of making and installing such a device, which DeMars figured to be around $35,000 to $40,000. DeMars could never get authorization from the University Administration to install the glockenspiel. In 1970, his plans were permanently dashed by Stanford’s decision to eliminate its mascot due to pressure from Native American students.

Zellerbach Hall

An article in the December 2, 1963 edition of The Daily Californian provided a report on the status of the long-delayed Auditorium and Concert Hall (Zellerbach Hall) (Figure 30). The article mentioned that the plans for the “massive theater-auditorium and little theater” had been submitted to the Board of Regents two weeks prior to the publication of the article. Lack of funds seems to have been an obstacle; the article mentioned that University Administration was contemplating placing bonds on the state ballot, delaying the estimated final completion until 1967.110

There were further delays in the construction of Zellerbach Hall. One final hiccup occurred in 1965 when the parish house – part of the A.S. Schweinfurth-designed old First Unitarian Church on Bancroft Way – was demolished preparatory to the construction of the permanent entrance to the Student Union Garage and preliminary site work for Zellerbach Hall. Unitarians (who had relocated to new quarters in Kensington, after selling the property to the University in 1961) objected to the demolition in an article in The Daily Californian. DeMars responded with a letter to the editor in which he stated:

The entire church was to be torn down and the Unitarians moved to North Berkeley…The architects for the Student Center as well as the University’s Campus Planning Committee and the University’s office of Architects and Engineers all agreed that it would be fine to save as much as possible of the old church building with its rich stand of redwoods and wisteria. To achieve this required the re-negotiation of a major agreement with the city of Berkeley on a widening of Bancroft that would have taken out most of these trees. There never was any question that the Sunday School wing of the church or the 1868 (sic) Parish house could be saved. Had this been so, the Unitarians need not have moved at all.111

The Auditorium and Theater building opened in 1968. The building was named in honor of Isadore and Jennie Zellerbach, in recognition of their $1 million dollar gift toward the completion of the $7 million facility. In order to open in time for the University’s Centennial celebrations, the unfinished auditorium was prepared for an event featuring the music of composer Igor Stravinsky and an appearance by actor Gregory Peck (Class of 1938). Completed last due to funding issues and evolving University priorities, the building

---

111 Letter from Vernon DeMars to the Editor, The Daily Californian (n.d., December 1965?). In DeMars Papers, University of California, Berkeley, Environmental Design Archives, Folder VI 19.
nonetheless reflects Vernon DeMars’ love for the theatrical arts, an interest that he acquired learning to perform Southwestern Indian dances as a child and as a set designer during the Depression. Preparatory to the design of Zellerbach, DeMars toured several of the best modern and historic theaters of Europe and consulted with prominent theater experts in order to incorporate the most modern theater and acoustic technology. The theater, which is composed of a 2,100-seat auditorium facing Lower Sproul Plaza and a 500-seat multi-form playhouse for the Department of Dramatic Art to the south, anchors the western side of the Plaza with its colonnaded façade. \(^{112}\) Still considered one of the best live performance venues in the Bay Area, Zellerbach Hall is of regional importance to local theater and live music communities.

**Public Art**

Although frequently challenged by budgetary issues and political infighting, Vernon DeMars continued to push for “enriching” the California Student Center complex with works of public art, most of which were not realized until after the completion of the four buildings. His original “wish list” is included within a memorandum entitled “Art Works or Enrichment for the University of California Student Center.”\(^{113}\) Although a few pieces were realized during the initial construction phase (1959-1968) – most notably Emmy Lou Packard’s mural on the exterior of the Dining Commons – most were never completed, such as the proposed Zellerbach glockenspiel. Nevertheless, throughout the 1970s DeMars personally shepherded several pet projects through to completion, including the Golden Bear door handles for the Student Union and the Golden Bear Column in Lower Sproul Plaza.

Today, the California Student Center contains several major pieces of public art, several of which appear to date to the original construction phase. The oldest and most visible work is the 85-foot long, 5-foot high bas-relief mural by artist Emmy Lou Packard (Class of 1936). The mural is attached to the parapet of the Upper Terrace of the Dining Commons (Chávez Student Center). The modernist mural, which Packard designed to “bear a formal relationship to the surrounding architecture,” depicts California landscape features, including coastal bluffs, cultivated fields, mountains, and rivers. Made of molded, poured concrete attached to wallboard, the murals derive much of their texture from the physical impression of vegetables and grains grown in California. Installed in 1960 as the Dining Commons were under construction, the work was directly supervised by Emmy Lou Packard and Vernon DeMars. The mural was paid for in part by a donation by an unnamed former student of the

---


\(^{113}\) Vernon DeMars, “Proposed Art Works or Enrichment for the University of California Student Center” (May 25, 1959). In DeMars Papers, University of California, Berkeley, Environmental Design Archives, Folder VI 19.
The Dining Commons were supposed to have several pieces of art installed within the interior dining areas. If these were ever installed, they were evidently removed when the building was remodeled as an office building in 1990.

The Student Union contains several individual works of art that appear to date to the original period of construction. Located within Stair J, the stairwell that formerly connected Lower Sproul Plaza with the pedestrian bridge (demolished in 1998) between the Dining Commons and the Student Union is a strap-iron sculpture mounted on the rear wall of the landing between the first and second floor levels. Designed and fabricated by artist Robert Howard, son of UC Berkeley Supervising Architect John Galen Howard and Mary Bradbury, the 1934 sculpture depicts several human figures (three men and three women) dressed in 1930s-era garb (Figure 31). Howard was a prolific and well-respected decorative artist who studied under Ralph Stackpole and whose career flourished during the WPA era, executing hundreds of relief sculpture, murals, and other pieces until his death in 1983. It is not known when the sculpture was installed in the Student Union.

Other notable pieces in the Student Union that probably date to the original construction period include an unattributed wood, wall-mounted sculpture in Stair E between the first and second floor levels of the Student Union (Figure 32), the stained glass window by Robert Pinard in the Tilden Meditation Room (described above), and the Stanford Axe display case in the Main Lobby designed by Vernon DeMars. In addition to these, there are decorative light fixtures, paneling, and other elements that are described in more detail in Chapter III below. Works of art installed after 1968 are described in Section J below.

**Stanford Axe Case**

One of the last “works of art and enrichment” completed during the period of construction was the Stanford Axe case. Of course, the football rivalry between the University of California and Stanford University goes back more than a century, with the first ‘Big Game’ played in 1892. The story of the Stanford Axe is well-known and need not be retold here but suffice it to say that the winning team in any particular year gets to keep the Axe until the next game is played. Security has always been an issue as representatives of both Stanford and the University of California have stolen the Axe in the past. In 1968, DeMars was asked by two

Cal students, John Welborne and James. S. Bennett, to design and build a tamper-proof case where the Axe could be displayed when in the possession of the University of California. In response, DeMars designed a hand-fabricated, two-legged, steel box with a glass lid. Featuring two locked doors and an alarm, the box is painted blue and utilitarian with the exception of two gold-leafed finials designed –like the cornice of the Student Union – to resemble California poppies. 115 The case is located at the foot of the stair to the Pauley Ballroom on the Upper Sproul Plaza level of the Student Union.

J. SUBSEQUENT ALTERATIONS TO THE CALIFORNIA STUDENT CENTER: 1968-2008

As with any growing institution facing changing priorities, the University of California began altering the California Student Center complex not long after it was completed. Despite the best intentions of its designers, it is often not known how a facility will actually function on a day-to-day basis until it is put to the test by its users. Most of the information within this section is culled from construction drawings in the collections of the Department of Physical and Environmental Planning, the Environmental Design Archives’ Vernon DeMars Collections, and articles in The Daily Californian. This catalog of alterations is not exhaustive due to the limitations of the source materials but it does record the bulk of the most substantial changes to the complex since 1968.

1968-69 Remodel of the Student Union

The first recorded alteration of the California Student Center occurred in 1968-69, when the ASUC Store was expanded for the first time beyond its original footprint. Responding to need for more room, the ASUC enlarged the Store by rearranging interior partitions and annexing previously un-programmed or other “underutilized” areas. According to drawings prepared by Hardison & DeMars in 1968, most of the ASUC Bookstore offices were built in 1968. 116 The drawings also indicate that alterations were made to the fourth-floor meeting rooms, including paneling them in oak and madrone, and other hardwoods which exist today. Having been used temporarily as offices for the ASUC until they moved to Eshleman Hall, it is possible that these meeting rooms were not actually finished until 1968.

The Daily Californian Moves from Eshleman Hall

Occurring in 1971 in response to The Daily Californian becoming independent of the ASUC, the newspaper moved its offices out of Eshleman Hall to new quarters in a second-floor office on the corner of Telegraph Avenue and Channing Way. The Daily Californian remained off-campus until the early 1990s, at which point it returned to Eshleman Hall. The physical impact of this move on the building appears to have been minimal. 117

Games Rooms Relocated

In 1973, the ASUC moved the Games Room from the first-floor level of the Student Union downstairs to an area adjoining the ASUC Bowling Alley. The ASUC then remodeled the area formerly occupied by the

116 Information provided by Steve Finacom, University of California Department of Capital Projects, December 2008.
Games Room for retail use, renaming it the ASUC Mall.¹¹⁸ This was the first major reprogramming of space within the Student Union and was a harbinger of things to come as the ASUC began inserting income-generating retail space into formerly recreational parts of the building. Based on an article that appeared three years earlier in The Daily Californian, the ASUC Recreation Center offered bowling (including bowling leagues) and a “Games Room” with billiards, three cushion, pocket, and snooker”, and table tennis. Rates ranged from 50 cents per person to 50 cents per hour per table. The center was open seven days a week from 9 AM until 1 AM. The Center advertised itself as a “good place to take a date.”¹¹⁹

1974-75 Remodel of the Student Union

The second major alteration of the Student Union took place between 1974 and 1975. By this time, the Student Union was almost fifteen years old and had scarcely been updated despite the heavy use it received. In early spring 1974, the University Administration appointed the “Lower Sproul Committee” to develop a plan to revitalize the entire California Student Center complex. The committee included various stakeholders, including several student and faculty members, and also Vernon DeMars, who continued to take great interest in the fate of the Student Center. The committee focused on a wide range of relatively minor refurbishments and alterations, although the cumulative effects were sometimes substantial.

One of the topics of discussion was whether to build a portable stage for Lower Sproul Plaza, as the Student Center Square had become known. This alteration was eagerly promoted by DeMars who had long lobbied for it, but aside from temporary facilities, the stage never seems to have been built. Small improvements to the complex were also proposed, including new furniture for Heller Lounge, box office upgrades for the Athletic Ticket Office in the basement level of Eshleman Hall, new outdoor furniture in various locations, removal of the doors and improvements to signage in the breezeway between Lower Sproul Plaza and Strawberry Creek, new directional signage throughout the complex, and refurbishment of the Bear’s Lair and the expansion of what was then described as the “mini-mall” area between the Plaza level of the ASUC Store and the Art Studio to the north, and new awnings for ASUC Store on the south (facing Bancroft).¹²⁰

It is unclear how many of these projects were actually undertaken, nearly all of which were at least sketched out by committee member Vernon DeMars. As evidenced by the record, most of the changes were aesthetic in nature and intended merely to replace worn-out finish materials and furnishings. The two alterations that had the most significant physical impact on the facility included the conversion most of the first floor level into the ASUC “Mini Mall” and the removal of the doors on either end of the breezeway to improve communication between Lower Sproul Plaza and the path along Strawberry Creek. Both Vernon DeMars and Donald Hardison participated in the work on the Mini Mall, which consisted largely of reconfiguring interior walls, designing new storefronts and signage and other changes to finish materials to tie the work together. Some faculty members wanted the scope of the remodel to be more extensive.

¹¹⁸ In DeMars Papers, University of California, Berkeley, Environmental Design Archives, Folder VI 19.
¹²⁰ In DeMars Papers, University of California, Berkeley, Environmental Design Archives, Folder VI 38.
Evidently a dispute arose among campus officials during the early 1970s concerning what spaces within the Student Union should be renovated first. Some, including student and faculty representatives advocated for refurbishing the upper levels of the Student Union – in particular Heller Lounge - and ASUC representatives who instead wanted to focus remodeling activity on the Bear’s Lair and the rest of the first floor level, presumably to help bolster income from retail activity. Flyers and receipts for signage and other products indicate that many of the alterations to the Bear's Lair and adjoining food court were completed and that several new concessionaires moved into the ASUC Mini Mall, including the Western Corral Barbeque restaurant and the Missing Link Bicycle Shop.121

Two other physical changes to the California Student Center complex that were proposed in the early 1970s were never followed through on. In 1974, an artist named Kyril Calsoyas proposed to paint a mural on the south wall of the Dining Commons. This appears to have been a freelance idea, with the artist taking his inspiration from “this continuing event of African style drumming” on Lower Sproul.” The idea was considered but apparently rejected.122

New signage proposed for the Student Union in 1974 was completed in 1975, as illustrated in a photograph in the October 3, 1975 edition of The Monday Paper (Figure 33). Notes prepared in 1975 to study where the signage should go are instructive for determining what uses were housed in the California Student Center complex. The basement level of the Student Union contained the ASUC Textbook Store (within the western part of the ASUC Bookstore warehouse), the ASUC Bowling Alley/Games Room, and the Barber Shop. The first floor level of the Student Union (Lower Sproul Plaza) contained the ASUC Book Store/Mini Mall, the Arts and Crafts/Project Area, and The Bears Lair Coffee House/Pub and Food Court. The second floor level of the Student Union (Upper Sproul Plaza) housed the Reception/Information Desk, Exhibits, Heller Lounge, Campus Box Office, and Visitor’s Bureau. The notes cite the third floor as being the location of the Pauley Ballroom and Stephens Lounge. No mention is made of fourth floor meeting rooms, but they appeared on the 1968 remodel plans as being complete. The fifth floor level was simply identified as the Tilden Room.

121 In DeMars Papers, University of California, Berkeley, Environmental Design Archives, Folder VI 38.
122 In DeMars Papers, University of California, Berkeley, Environmental Design Archives, Folder VI 19.
A similar summary for the Dining Commons noted that the Music Club and practice rooms were situated in the basement levels. The first floor level (Lower Sproul Plaza) contained “The Cafeteria: Full course menu, moderate prices, lunch only;” “The Deli: Gourmet sandwiches, soups, salads, pastries,” “The Ice Creamery: Cones, sodas, shakes & sundaes,” and “The Coin Café: vending machines for a quick snack.” The second floor level (Upper Sproul Plaza) featured “The Terrace: Grill—Breakfast, Lunch, Snacks.”

1975 also saw the creation of a semi-permanent outdoor dining area to the west of the Bear’s Lair achieved by setting up chairs and tables in Lower Sproul Plaza and rearranging the planters to delineate the area. This work corresponded with a general updating and remodeling of the food court area north of the Bears’ Lair Pub. The Bear’s Lair was rededicated in the fall of 1975 upon completion of the remodel. Other associated work undertaken during this period includes revitalization of the landscaping, including the planting of bamboo on the roof of the Bears’ Lair, planting of Chrysanthemums in planter boxes “surrounding outside section of Bear’s Lair,” and Hollywood Juniper in unspecified areas. 123

Eshleman Hall
Although not an architectural change, in 1975, the Athletics Division offices were moved from Eshleman Hall to Harmon Gymnasium, presumably to be closer to practice and sports venues. 124

Changes to the Student Union: 1976-1980
Throughout the rest of the 1970s, Vernon DeMars continued to maintain a personal interest in the California Student Center, even after he retired from teaching at the University in 1975. Much of his work appears to have been pro bono or at least not entirely recollected, in particular embellishments to the Student Union that DeMars had originally planned but that were not executed due to lack of funds. One of the first of these “improvements” included the installation of a chrome-plated chandelier in the Student Union in 1976. The chandelier was custom-made by the Lightolier Company and placed in the Main Stair between the second and third floor levels. A letter from an ASUC staffer to DeMars noted: “It certainly was a strange bit of fate that made us choose the almost identical chandelier that you have been thinking about for years.” 125 Additional changes to the south end of the Student Union included remodeling the “Memorial Lobby” at the southeast corner of the second floor (Upper Sproul Plaza) level. These changes were relatively minor, including the addition of redwood plank cladding behind the Main Stair, and the reconfiguration and rehabilitation of several exhibits in the space, including moving the Stanford Axe Case, the former Bear Case (no longer extant), and several other displays. In addition, the southern end of Heller Lounge was evidently reconfigured to provide space three small offices. Some of the drawings that DeMars prepared appear to be for work that was not completed, including a proposal to clad the walls of the fifth-floor lobby in redwood to match the interior of the adjoining Tilden Room. 126

123 In DeMars Papers, University of California, Berkeley, Environmental Design Archives, Folder 74-77.
124 Information provided by Steve Finacom, University of California Department of Capital Projects, December 2008.
126 In DeMars Papers, University of California, Berkeley, Environmental Design Archives, Folder VI-39.
Additional work occurred in the Bears’ Lair, the ASUC Mini Mall, and the ASUC Bookstore to accommodate new retail tenants. Businesses that signed agreements with the ASUC and apparently moved into the Student Union during this period include The Original Cookie Company, which proposed to open a cookie and frozen yoghurt parlor in the Bear’s Lair in 1977; The Otis Spunkmeyer Company, which opened a store in the ASUC Store that same year; and the Black Lighting lecture note service, which opened an office in the ASUC Mini Mall. In 1978, a jewelry store in the ASUC Mini Mall was forced to close when it was discovered that it sold South African diamonds. Soon thereafter, the Missing Link Bicycle Shop departed for space off-campus. Additional work carried out in the Student Union included general maintenance and replacement of worn-out carpeting, drapes, furniture, elevator cabs, and lighting.\(^{127}\)

*Changes to the Dining Commons: 1976-1980*

With the work in the Student Union completed, most of the alterations to the California Student Center that occurred during the rest of the 1970s occurred in the Dining Commons. Since it was completed in 1960, the Dining Commons had been scarcely touched. However, by the mid-1970s, the facility had become unprofitable, challenged by changing tastes and increasingly inadequate preparation and serving facilities. Accordingly, in 1977, a proposal was floated to convert much of the Dining Commons into an “International Food Market.” An untitled document in the DeMars Papers describes the concept:

> It is essential to upgrade the Cafeteria with innovative changes in service. The International Food Market concept will provide four popular styles of food, namely; Mexican, Oriental, Italian, and Hofbrau…The redecoration of the present cafeteria dining areas in the lower plaza level (will) provide a more cozy restaurant-like atmosphere combined with introductions of the International Food Market concept of service operation.

The project also included “redecorating and improving the general appearance, arrangement and the use of the dining commons rooms…partitions, dividers, new furniture…flooring, painting, plants, interior landscaping…lighting, heating and ventilation…demolition of unused conveyor belt housing and existing partitions…$75,000 to purchase food service equipment…”\(^{128}\) Two years later the project began, with the Lower Sproul Plaza level of the Dining Commons completed first. The architect of record was Hunt & Company with John Wells enlisted as associated architect.

*Press and Awards*

Ten years after its completion, the California Student Center won the American Institute of Architects (AIA) Honor Award, which was presented at the San Francisco and East Bay AIA Chapter's April 23, 1978 meeting at the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art. That same year, *San Francisco Chronicle* architecture critic Allan Temko revisited the now ten-year-old California Student Center complex that he had strongly criticized almost two decades earlier in 1961. This time, in his Environmental Design column, Temko strongly praised the California Student Center. Initially unsure of DeMars’ concept of “controlled chaos,” Temko seemed to delight in “built-in disorder” and “planned chaos” of the Student Center:

\(^{127}\) Information provided by Steve Finacom, University of California Department of Capital Projects, December 2008.

\(^{128}\) In DeMars Papers, University of California, Berkeley, Environmental Design Archives, Folder 74-77.
These are contradictions in terms, but what they really mean is a refutation of modern “purism,” which has created so many arid abstractions of urban space in city after city, and sometimes whole cities such as Brasilia or Chandigarh, India. These buildings, or all their formal elegance, never spring into life with the unpredictable vitality, variety, and even outright vulgarity – vulgar in the sense of being the common speech of ordinary people – that is almost a birthright in ancient cities with their bewildering webs of narrow streets, alternating light and shadow, and sudden openings into the splendor of public squares.  

Temko had not forgotten all of his criticisms of the architecture of the California Student Center but he wrote that the landscape did a remarkable job of tying the disparate elements together:

The UC architects who deliberately enriched the whole environment had the very considerable help of landscape architect Lawrence Halprin. He laid down some of the most handsome paving of his career in front of Sproul in beautifully proportioned squares of red brick, framed and crossed by diagonals of black – a reversal of the scheme on the lower plaza.

In fact, these strongly organized surfaces hold together what might otherwise seem simply a mess, with concrete of different textures and shapes, and all sorts of other materials – stucco, metal, wood – sometimes cutting across columns in trellises that confuse and weaken the overall architectural effect.

Golden Bear Column
Ever since the original Competition, Vernon DeMars had long dreamed of building a column in Lower Sproul Plaza. Realized in 1980 as a gift of the Class of 1929, the Golden Bear Column – more popularly known as “The Bear in the Air” – is arguably one of the most prominent pieces of public art on the entire University Campus and a place maker for Lower Sproul Plaza. In his Oral History, Vernon DeMars spoke about the inspiration behind the piece:

I think we discussed earlier that the image we had for what we wanted to do with the main plaza was the Piazza San Marco in Venice. We had a plan of the piazza on the wall. Someone had a copy of it and brought it in. This was kind of our inspiration. We were trying to get this to be that kind of place.

In Venice there are these two columns, and one of them has the symbol of the city, which is the Winged Lion of St. Mark’s, on the top of this high column. We said, Wouldn’t it be great to have the symbol of the state, and of the University, a golden bear, on a column high enough up so you can’t get at it easily?

So then, where would it go? Well, it should be just as it is in San Marco. In a way there is an opening from the buildings where you look at the sea beyond, so that you can see it against this clear background. In our case, we found a place where if you entered the square from the Bancroft area, the bear would be seen against the trees of the eucalyptus grove, and that would be in that opening.

Unfortunately for DeMars, there was no money in the budget to construct the Golden Bear Column during the original period of construction (1959-1968). The opportunity to build it only presented itself in 1977 after DeMars ran into Ned Maher, a classmate from the Class of 1929, in a local grocery store. Maher approached DeMars about drawing up plans for a gift from the Class of 1929 to the University of California.

130 Ibid. 
DeMars mentioned that he had already made designs for a bear on a column for Lower Sproul Plaza and a glockenspiel for Eshleman Hall. At a later meeting with additional class members, DeMars made a presentation and showed them models of both the bear and the glockenspiel. After deliberating, the Class of 1929 chose the bear. Raising enough money to cast the sculpture and to build the concrete column took some time and the Class of 1929 consequently missed the opportunity to complete the column for its fifty year anniversary. It was not until 1980 that the “Bear in the Air” was unveiled in Lower Sproul Plaza in a ceremony held on November 21, 1980.132

The sculptural figure of the bear was designed by a sculptor named Tom Hardy, a faculty member in the Art Department in 1957 when Hardison & DeMars were working on the Student Center Competition (Figure 34). DeMars had admired Hardy’s work and asked him to do some sketches of a bear because he felt that the sculptor would not design a “cute bear” like those of Benjamin Bufano, but a rugged, aggressive bear similar to the state flag.133 Over the years, the design of the bear was revised several times, becoming more abstract over time. The final 500-pound sculpture was made of a framework of bronze rods covered by sheets of bronze hammered into shape and then covered with a thin covering of gold leaf.134

Another long-delayed project seen through by Vernon DeMars in 1979-80 was the installation of brass bear door pulls on the doors on the second floor (Upper Sproul Plaza) level of the Student Union. The pulls (14, or seven sets in all) were designed by Vernon DeMars and fabricated by the Arthur Schmitt Company of San Francisco.

Changes to the California Student Center: 1980-1990
The Memorial Student Union continued to evolve during the course of the 1980s, with the majority of the changes affecting the basement and first floor spaces, in particular the ASUC Mini Mall, Bears’ Lair, and ASUC Store. For the University this was a period of slower growth. Despite California’s mushrooming population and increasingly competitive admissions at state universities, the University of California, Berkeley was restricted from expanding due to budget cut backs and lack of available land. Much of the growth that occurred during this period occurred either as infill development or as repurposed existing buildings.

Eshleman Hall: 1980-1990

Eshleman Hall, the student office building, suffered a fire in 1981. Set by a transient, the fire destroyed the majority of the first floor level of the building: the home of the ASUC Senate. Rebuilt in 1981 or 1982, this part of Eshleman Hall bears little resemblance to its original design. In June 1981, the Office of Relations with Schools and Student Advising, both University-run units, vacated the fourth floor level of Eshleman Hall, which had been leased from the ASUC. The ASUC had terminated the organizations’ leases, citing the need for additional office space for student organizations. This was the last non-ASUC use of Eshleman Hall through to the present day, save for the return of the Daily Californian to rental space in the building.135

Student Union: 1980-1990

In 1982, the ASUC leased a storefront in the ASUC Mini Mall facing Lower Sproul Plaza to Hibernia Bank. Hibernia Bank, a San Francisco-based institution, occupied the space located immediately north of the stairs to upper Sproul Plaza, an area that is now the location of the Credit Union for Berkeley Students (CUBS). Vernon DeMars designed the storefront for the Hibernia Bank branch. Other changes to the Student Union include yet another remodeling of the Bear’s Lair by the Servomation Corporation. The facility reopened on September 20, 1982. A month later, the ASUC terminated its contract with the Otis Spunkmeyer Company which had been operating a “Cookie Bear” in the ASUC Store since 1977.136 The space was subsequently left vacant.

Growing social concerns caused the ASUC to provide space in the basement of the Student Union to two non-profit organizations in 1982: the Student Recycling Program and the Berkeley Student Food Cooperative. The exact location of either facility is unknown.137

In 1984, the ASUC and the University Administration voted to rename the Memorial Student Union after slain civil rights leader Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. This was the first building named for King on the University of California-Berkeley campus and it was also the first building in the California Student Center complex to be renamed.138

The newly renamed Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Student Union suffered a fire on November 12, 1985. The fire, which was caused by a faulty light fixture in a display case in the Store, severely damaged the first floor of the Student Union and its contents. The southern half of the first floor level, in particular the ASUC Store, was damaged by fire and smoke. Water damage occurred in the rest of the mall and the textbook area in the basement. There was also some smoke damage in the upper levels of the building. It was estimated that it would cost nearly $1,400,000 to rehabilitate the building. Businesses temporarily relocated from the damaged Student Union included Black Lightning Notes, the Photo Cell, UC Berkeley Federal Credit Union,

135 Information provided by Steve Finacom, University of California Department of Capital Projects, December 2008.
136 The Daily Californian (October 22, 1982).
137 Information provided by Steve Finacom, University of California Department of Capital Projects, December 2008.
138 Ibid.
and the Travel Center. The ASUC erected a tent in Lower Sproul Plaza in late November to house a “fire sale” of damaged goods from the ASUC Store.139

In 1988, The Bear’s Lair was remodeled for at least a third time. Expansion of the “south terrace of the Bear’s Lair Pub” was also contemplated at this time. DeMars was involved as a consultant on the new awnings for this terrace.

On August 2, 1989, the ASUC adopted a policy document entitled: “Student Union Mission Statement.” The main policy statement, in some regard, reinforced the original purpose of the Student Union:

> The Martin Luther King, Jr. Student Union exists to serve the students, faculty, staff and community of the University of California at Berkeley by providing job opportunities and learning experiences for Cal students through recreation, meeting space, entertainment, information and education through cost effective and affordable programs which supplement and support the academic mission of the University.”

Although they no longer faced the same degree of student unrest prevalent when the California Student Center opened in the 1960s, by the late 1980s, the University Administration and the ASUC found themselves confronted with many different but no less challenging conditions. In contrast to the flush coffers of the 1960s, increasing population pressure and falling tax revenue (particularly after the passage of Proposition 13) undermined the ability of the University to provide adequate funds to build and, more important, maintain existing non-academic programs and facilities.

Free Speech Monument
In recognition of the Free Speech Movement (discussed in more depth below in Section K) that had taken place twenty-five years earlier in 1964-65, University officials hosted a design competition in 1989 for a memorial to be installed in Upper Sproul Plaza. Initially suggested by veterans of the Free Speech Movement (FSM) who simply wanted a plaque, the project soon evolved into a more substantial art project. Initially Vernon DeMars opposed the project because he did not want a large monument to interrupt the sweeping expanse of Upper Sproul Plaza. Eventually he and his longtime business partner Donald Reay relented and entered the Competition with their own submission but they did not place among the finalists. DeMars did not approve of the final winning “conceptual” piece – a granite disk containing a 6” hole at the center that was legally redefined as “a circle of earth, its extension below, and the column of air above, (that) belongs to no nation (Figure 35).” In his Oral History, De Mars described the
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monument, which is embedded within the brick paving of Upper Sproul Plaza, as having “nothing to do with the purpose of commemoration and touching on the subject of free speech; its message is anarchic, and the opposite of what FSM was about.”

Dining Commons: 1980-1990

The decade started with Vernon DeMars preparing plans for the renovation of the “Coin Café,” an area on the first floor (Lower Sproul Plaza) level of the Dining Commons. This area is now occupied by the offices issuing photo identification cards for University Students.

On May 13, 1982, Vice Chancellor Norvell Smith wrote to Vernon DeMars outlining his thinking about new student service facilities within the California Student Center. Within the letter he noted three possibilities: “A Sproul Hall Annex,” “Remodeling of reassigned space in Stephens and Moses Halls,” and “the possibility of a third floor being built on the Dining Commons.” Smith believed that the third floor level could house the counseling center, career center, and student learning center, which would be relocated from the temporary “T-Buildings” in the Central Glade north of Doe Library. DeMars wrote back on May 21 and in no uncertain terms he argued that adding a third floor would be “…just barely conceivable (like atomic warfare) but undesirable on a number of counts. It would be an aesthetic disaster and its impact on campus views, vistas and settings would be as unfortunate as that done by Barrows and Evans Halls.” DeMars advocated for the Stephens/Moses option. DeMars’ position was probably not as strong as it could have been given the increasingly shaky financial situation confronted by the Dining Commons, emphasized by the closure of the Golden Bear Restaurant on the second floor (Sproul Plaza) level of the building in June 1982. The ASUC also opposed Smith’s proposal, stating in September 1982 that they needed the space for expanding the ASUC Bookstore.

Vernon DeMars Speaks Out

In part responding to the proposed addition to the Dining Commons, Vernon DeMars wrote to Chancellor Ira Heyman with a laundry list of complaints regarding the lack of maintenance and consideration for the architectural integrity of the California Student Center—then approaching the three-decade mark. He wrote:

> To the general public, the Student Center area, from Sproul Hall to Harmon Gym, must be one of the most highly visible—and visited—areas on the campus. Any negative details of upkeep and housekeeping must make an exaggerated, negative impression, particularly on the first-time visitor...Of more continuing and fundamental concern should be the impression being made on generations of students (and professors?) learning to accept something other than the highest standards for their general environment, particularly in urban spaces and places."

In his letter to Chancellor Heyman, DeMars also took the liberty of protesting the lack of attention to the decorative class banners and pennants that the architect, his wife Betty DeMars, and others had designed for display on both the Student Union and Zellerbach Hall:

---
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There are several provisions in the Student Center area for flags and banners on festive occasions. There seems to be no policy or interest in when these should be broken out. Zellerbach Hall has six flagpoles crowning the lower plaza façade. Henry May designed a set of colorful pennants for these which I have not seen displayed for a year or more (and) the column for the Golden Bear has provision for the mounting of two flags for special occasions. To my knowledge they have only been shown twice since the Bears' installation in 1980 (they) should consist of the State (Bear) flag and the University's—L to R, in that order, looking west.\textsuperscript{142}

DeMars concluded his letter by complaining about the persistent vandalism and lack of consistent repair and maintenance of the Student Center, noting vandalism of the up-lights on the Golden Bear Column and the lack of a “special enclosure of redwood slats for the cardboard trash containers” in Lower Sproul Plaza. He also noted the non-functional neon sign at the entrance to the Terrace restaurant and deplored the increasingly decrepit state of the complex, stating:

The roofed-over stair leading to the breezeway below looks more like the entrance to a New York subway with each passing year. The catsup on the blue wall and the anarchist graffiti over each of Robert Howard’s strap-iron sculptures of 1934 are still there, unnoticed, I suppose, except by first-time visitors\ldots\textsuperscript{143}

\textit{Plans Made to Convert the Dining Commons to Student Services Office Building}

Although the University Administration eventually backed away from plans to add a third story to the Dining Commons, they continued to envision converting the now money-losing facility to an office building. The removal of the dining facilities from the Dining Commons building was part of a larger policy shift underway during the late 1980s to de-centralize the food service to smaller satellite dining facilities scattered throughout the campus and off-campus dormitories. Throughout 1988, architect John Wells – in association with Kennedy Jenks & Chilton – developed plans for the $4,200,000 conversion project, which got underway in late 1989. The project called for the removal of the majority of the kitchen and dining areas on the first and second floors and the insertion of hundreds of small offices into the space.\textsuperscript{144}

The occupants of these offices, which would be moved from several “temporary” World War II-era buildings on The Glade, included the following: Student Learning Center (SLC), Student Life Advising Services (SLAS), Transfer Re-Entry & Student Parents (TRSP), and Athletic Study Center (ASC) on the first floor (Lower Sproul Plaza) level; and the Disabled Students' Program (DSP), Multi-Cultural Student Development (MSD), and Gender Equity Center (GenEq) on the second floor (Terrace, or Upper Sproul Plaza) level.

Although the sub-basement and basement – long home to the California Marching Band, UC Jazz Ensemble, and UC Choral Ensemble – were not as extensively changed, a portion of the former Catering Department was remodeled to make way for a wheelchair shop (now the Educational Technical Services Department). A section of the kitchen within the basement was also retained to serve the newly reopened Golden Bear Restaurant on the second floor level.\textsuperscript{145}

\textsuperscript{142} Vern DeMars to Chancellor Ira Heyman (May 13, 1985). In DeMars Papers, University of California, Berkeley, Environmental Design Archives, Folder VI-19.

\textsuperscript{143} Ibid.
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\textsuperscript{145} Kennedy/Jenks/Chilton, Architectural Drawings: “Dining Commons Renovation, Student Services and Food Services, University of California Berkeley,” (August 4, 1989).
In addition to the interior offices, an approximately 2,400 square-foot office “bump out” was constructed on the Terrace (Upper Sproul Plaza) level facing south. Planning documents indicate that the intent was to remove the trellis on the face of the building in this location and reinstall it outboard of the new addition. Although initially opposed to this intervention, Vernon DeMars supported it if it would preclude the insertion of offices within the northwest corner of the Dining Commons (Dining Room 2, now Chávez Atrium). DeMars also noted in his correspondence that the architects should follow his recommendation to retain as many of the original exterior entrances as possible.146

California Student Center: 1990-2008
The last two decades have witnessed continued incremental changes to the California Student Center although none have exceeded the ambitious scope of the conversion of the Dining Commons into the Golden Bear Student Services Building (renamed after farm worker and union activist César Chávez in 1997). Published in June 1990, a “needs assessment for ASUC facilities” prepared by Robinson Mills & Williams provides a snapshot of facilities use in the Student Union and Eshleman Hall. Eshleman was noted as containing approximately 13,000 square feet of student activities/publications space, 8,300 square feet of student government/senate/library space, 3,300 square feet for business operations, and 2,300 square feet of miscellaneous space. King Student Union contained 51,000 square feet of “Student Union” space and 33,700 square feet of “store” space. A further breakdown of King Student Union space assigned 3,700 square feet to the Art Studio, 300 square feet to the “Information Center”, 21,500 square feet to “reservation services,” 8,000 square feet to “Food and Pub,” 500 square feet to “student stands,” 14,200 square feet to the “Underground recreation center,” 800 square feet to “Travel,” 600 square feet to SUPERB (ASUC’s entertainment board), and 400 square feet to “administration.” From the information provided above it can be determined that the ASUC Bowling Alley and Games Room were still located in the basement of the Student Union and that the Information Center had not been replaced by the ASUC Sportswear store. It can also be determined that the Publications Library remained on the top floor of Eshleman Hall.

Eshleman Hall: 1990-2008
During the early 1990s, the concrete sunshades on the south façade of Eshleman Hall were repaired for seismic safety and to correct deterioration.147

King Student Union: 1990-2008
The evolution of the Student Union from 1990 until the present day can best be characterized by the continued expansion of the ASUC Store into what had previously been recreational and public gathering space. Induced in part by the need to generate much-needed revenue in an era of budgetary shortfalls and anti-tax crusaders, the gradual demise of the non-retail-oriented parts of the building may also be attributed to the decline of “social capital” in American culture as outlined in Robert D. Putnam’s “Bowling Alone, as well as changing tastes in how we consume entertainment. During the 1990s, most of the remaining non-
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retail uses were removed from the Student Union, displaced by the ever-expanding store. The first major area to go was the ASUC Bowling Alley and Games Room, displaced to make way for an expanded ASUC Textbook Store. Meanwhile, the area that used to house the Textbook Store in the basement warehouse was converted to office space and additional storage for sportswear. In 1991, the southernmost part of the ASUC Store (Sales Area 1 – the original Sportswear Department), was converted into a convenience store. This project resulted in the rearrangement of several interior partitions, new refrigeration units and mechanical equipment, and installation of the tile mosaic floor. The design and build-out of the project was overseen by “store consultant Ken White.” Additional projects completed in the early 1990s include the construction of walls partitioning off Heller Lounge from the rest of the first floor (Upper Sproul Plaza) level of the Student Union as a life safety project.

In 2000, the offices at the southern end of Heller Lounge were converted into a satellite Open Computing Facility, essentially one of several rooms on campus where students could go to make use of shared computers and printers.\footnote{Information provided by Steve Finacom, University of California Department of Capital Projects, December 2008.} Heller Lounge, which was originally envisioned as a gathering place for all students was redesignated as The Multicultural Center in 2004. The Multicultural Center resulted from the 1999 Ethnic Studies agreement reached between ethnic students and Chancellor Robert Berdahl.\footnote{University of California, Berkeley, “Multicultural Student Development,” \texttt{http://multicultural.berkeley.edu/multicultural.html}, Accessed February 24, 2009.} Although the original Knoll furnishings are long gone, Heller Lounge still retains its original hooded fireplace and wall and ceiling finishes.

In 2000, the ASUC invited off-campus restaurant operators to bid on the management of the Bear’s Lair, including the tap room with the fireplace, previously known as “Pappy’s Pub.” As part of this project the southern storefront / window wall of the space was apparently reconstructed.\footnote{Information provided by Steve Finacom, University of California Department of Capital Projects, December 2008.} In 2001, the Bear’s Lair outdoor patios acquired new perimeter fencing and planters installed as part of a design project managed by Levitch Associates, Inc.\footnote{Ibid.}

Also in 2000, University Administration commissioned an updated seismic evaluation of the King Student Union, which assigned it a rating of “poor,” primarily due to the hazard associated with the (possible) collapse of the Tilden Room penthouse structure. The Tilden Room, which is enclosed by a massive concrete shell roof supported by four circular reinforced concrete columns, was found to not possess adequate strength of ductility. Other issues include the expected breakage of the windows surrounding the Pauley Ballroom and the likely shedding of concrete encasement material from around the perimeter steel columns that support the roof. The report suggests lateral strengthening of the Tilden Room, possibility including perimeter bracing or shear walls; bracing of the ballroom roof diaphragm at the north end of the building, and strengthening the north and south shear walls of the building.

\footnote{Information provided by Steve Finacom, University of California Department of Capital Projects, December 2008.}
Between 2000 and 2004 the following alterations to the King Student Union were completed. A secondary emergency exit staircase was added from the exterior balcony at the Pauley Ballroom level of the Student Union down to the Upper Sproul Plaza level. The original staircase is an “X” shaped double stair, with open risers, on the north end of the Union; a matching staircase was added on the southern end. An exterior handicapped ramp was also added to the extreme northeast corner of the Student Union, at the Upper Sproul Plaza level. Within the Main Lobby, the north and west walls of the elevator lobby space were altered with a silver-colored veneer displaying graphics, advertisements, and providing computer terminals.\(^\text{152}\)

In 2002, the ASUC installed solar panels on the roof of the Student Union, both as a demonstration project for photovoltaics and as an income source. Installation of panels on the metal trellis around the top of the Union building was initially considered, but ultimately deferred.\(^\text{153}\)

In 2005, Follett Stores – the lessee of the ASUC Store since 1996, expanded the “general book” department into the hallway area at the east entrance to the Bear’s Lair and the base of the stairs to the upper plaza level. In April of that same year Follett Stores converted the east side of the first floor (Upper Sproul Plaza) level of the Student Union into a sportswear and gift store. The Information Desk was removed and new toilet rooms installed as part of this project.\(^\text{154}\)

### Chávez Student Center: 1990-2008

Following the 1988-89 conversion of the building into offices, the former Dining Commons has undergone few, if any, notable changes aside from the demolition of the pedestrian bridge that formerly connected the Student Union and the Dining Commons. The demolition, which was undertaken for seismic reasons, altered the character of the Lower Sproul Plaza area, revealing the columned façade of Sproul Hall, which DeMars had deliberately tried to conceal with the bridge.

### Vernon DeMars’ Reactions

It seems likely that one reason that the California Student Center remained as intact as it did for so long was because of the continued interest – one might say vigilance – exercised by Vernon DeMars. By the early 1990s, DeMars was growing increasingly frustrated with how the complex was being treated by the University and the ASUC. Nevertheless, by this time he was in his eighties and maybe less able to keep abreast of the increasingly complex political situation at the University. Summarizing his views, Vernon DeMars noted in the conclusion to his 1992 Oral History:

> I’ve decided to concentrate on the student center as a thing that I think I can have some impact on. It’s not that I’m following, like a mother hen every other project that I’ve been involved in…I’d like to get this glockenspiel done. I would like to get the management of the whole student center in some kind of organizational hands where it is not like sort of a rundown shopping center in Milpitas. I now get the impression that the administration says, ‘Thank God that’s off our neck. If the students want to run it, let them run it.’ They let

\(^\text{152}\) Information provided by Steve Finacom, University of California Department of Capital Projects, December 2008.
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them do almost anything. They hardly draw the line anywhere of what they're allowed to get a way with. And here I am talking about architecturally (sic).155

K. SOCIAL AND CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CALIFORNIA STUDENT CENTER

Known to some as the “Haymarket Square” of the Vietnam-era, the California Student Center is one of the most important sites of the 1960s-era protest movements in the United States.156 Although it was obviously not designed for the pivotal role it occupied in this most turbulent of decades at Berkeley, the California Student Center nonetheless provided an ideal setting for the events that followed. According to architecture critic Roger Montgomery, the layout and design of the complex made it “a natural center for people to meet, for things to happen.”157 Veteran student activist Jo Freeman backed up this observation by stating that Sproul Plaza created an ideal location for student demonstrations, calling the California Student Center a “bifurcated town square.”158 Its strategic location between Sather Gate and the intersection of Telegraph Avenue and Bancroft Way – the primary stomping ground of undergraduate humanities students – combined with its large paved plazas, made the California Student Center a logical staging area for many of the most important events in the Free Speech Movement of 1964-65.159

Before the Free Speech Movement, politically oriented activity, including demonstrations, fundraising, and distribution of political literature on campus, was forbidden by Article IX of the California State Constitution.160 During the early 1950s, President Robert Sproul enacted several rules – in particular Rule 17, to quash left wing political activity on campus.161 Prior to the construction of the California Student Center, political groups met off campus at Stiles Hall – the YMCA – to discuss issues or participate in political activity not allowed on campus. This facility was demolished to build the California Student Center. SLATE, an early important off-campus group dedicated to securing basic political rights for students, was also based just off campus, in a building on Telegraph Avenue, also demolished in 1959 to make way for the California Student Union.162
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Sather Gate Tradition

Because political activity was banned on campus, students participated in what became known as the “Sather Gate Tradition,” meaning that demonstrations, leafleting, and other activity could occur on City property just outside Sather Gate (Figure 36). After the University acquired the properties along Telegraph Avenue between Bancroft and Allston Ways in 1958 to build the California Student Center, Vice-Chancellor Sherwood announced that this “valued tradition” would be moved one block south to City property at the intersection of Telegraph Avenue and Bancroft Way.

Despite the opposition of SLATE and the ASUC and others, the University rejected proposals to make Sather Gate an “island of free speech” on campus. In a gesture of conciliation, Chancellor Clark Kerr suggested that the University would deed a small section of land immediately north of the intersection of Telegraph and Bancroft to the City and ask the architects of the new Student Union to design a small plaza for the purpose of accommodating off-campus political activity. Although the plaza was built, the land was never deeded to the City, causing misunderstandings during the Free Speech Movement several years later.163

Free Speech Movement Demonstrations

The newly completed Dining Commons and Student Union played important roles in showdown between students and administration during the events leading up to the Free Speech Movement. The opening salvo occurred on September 28, 1964 when Art Goldberg and Sandor Fuchs of SLATE, Danny Rosenthal of Cal Students for Goldwater, and Mario Savio of Friends of Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), marched from Dwinelle Plaza to the half-completed Student Center Square (now Lower Sproul Plaza) – where Chancellor Strong was presiding over the Convocation – to protest the Administration’s revocation of the students’ right to distribute literature from tables in the new pedestrian mall along Telegraph Avenue (now Upper Sproul Plaza) (Figure 37).164

Student demonstrations gathered steam in the face of opposition from the University’s Administration and the Board of Regents. On October 1, 1964, members of the United Front (a precursor to the Free Speech Movement) gathered in what is now Upper Sproul Plaza to prevent the Berkeley Police from arresting activist Jack Weinberg. In the famous scene documented on film and in photographs, Mario Savio stood
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atop the disabled police car in front of Sproul Hall to address the crowd of several hundred students and their allies. Savio and other speakers used an improvised public address system plugged into the Student Union (Figure 38). Acc to participants, much of the planning for the activities of those heady days occurred around the dining tables located on the Upper Terrace of the Dining Commons or in the Student Union, where telephone booths provided communication links to the outside world and stairs and offices provided impromptu venues for organizing prior to and during the occupation of Sproul Hall on October 2.

In early 1965 the Free Speech Movement took a turn into uncharted territory when John Thompson, an unemployed street poet newly arrived from New York, sat down on a planter next to the Student Union with a hand-written sign spelling “FUCK.” In an era in which comedian Lenny Bruce was convicted on obscenity charges for saying the word, Thompson was promptly arrested and thrown in jail. Although many participants in the Free Speech Movement thought that Thompson’s act was gratuitous, others gathered to support his right to use the word in public. The next day a rally was held for Thompson on the stairs between Upper and Lower Sproul Plazas. At a nearby table, students collected money for a “Fuck Defense Fund.”

Although the movement to protect the use of profanity in public did not gain widespread support from most members of the Free Speech Movement’s Executive Committee, the episode prompted a media feeding frenzy. Local and national newspapers quickly renamed the movement the “Filthy Speech Movement” and conservative politicians began to call for the resignation of Chancellor Clark Kerr. Democratic Governor Pat Brown, concerned about his prospects for re-election, encouraged Clark to crack down on the participants. The effect of this latest incarnation of the Free Speech Movement, which was also centered in and around the California Student Center, ultimately led to the election of Ronald Reagan in 1966, who ran on a platform that included “clean(ing) up the mess in Berkeley.” One of Regan’s first actions upon taking office in January 1967 was to fire Clark Kerr, a scapegoat for many conservatives in the wake of the Berkeley protests.

Beginning in 1965, students at the University of California began protesting the escalation of American military involvement in Vietnam. On May 21-22, 1965, mathematics professor Stephen Smale and ex-

---
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student Jerry Rubin sponsored a massive “teach-in” in Lower Sproul Plaza. During those two days an estimated 30,000 people passed through the plaza to listen to speakers, collect information, and demonstrate their opposition to the Vietnam War. Teach-ins based on the Berkeley model became a standard means to disseminate information about the war on college campuses across the country.\footnote{Ibid., 257.}

**Cultural Significance of the Student Center**

The cultural significance of the California Student Center, especially the Student Union, was not limited to its role in the Free Speech Movement and anti-Vietnam War demonstrations of the 1960s. During the 1960s and 1970s, the building hosted dozens of important – and not so important – concerts, lectures, plays, and other public events. One early important concert to take place there was Peter Paul and Mary on March 22, 1962. Described as ‘cool folksingers,’ they performed in the Bear’s Lair to an overflow crowd.\footnote{The *Daily Californian* (March 23, 1962).}

A playbill from the Bear’s Lair in 1965 reveals a fall evening program of “Cabarets and Hootenannies.” The publicity implies this was a program that had taken place in past years. Some of the programs continued until 1:00 am, implying that the Student Union was open beyond midnight on a regular basis. A sampling of other activities offered in the Student Union includes movie showings, dance instruction, Nisei Dance, Chinese Student Association Welcome Dance, and the “AWS Big-Little Sister Fashion Show” in the Pauley Ballroom, receptions in Stephens Lounge for various student organizations, and art exhibits on the main entrance / lobby level.\footnote{Information provided by Steve Finacom, University of California Department of Capital Projects, December 2008.}

**Peoples’ Park**

Student protests returned to the California Student Center in 1969 with the dispute over the fate of Peoples’ Park, a disputed piece of real estate in Berkeley recently cleared for a high-rise dormitory that activists wished to turn into a public park. A rally was held in Sproul Plaza on May 15, 1969 at which the ASUC President-elect called for the public to “take back the Park.” The impromptu march that followed started at Sproul Plaza and continued down Telegraph Avenue to Peoples’ Park. The demonstration precipitated an event subsequently called “Bloody Thursday,” in which students and other protestors battled for control over the park with Berkeley Police and the California Highway Patrol, resulting in
numerous injuries and the shooting death of a student named James Rector. A memorial held in Rector’s honor at Sproul Plaza on May 21, 1969 was confronted by National Guard troops dispatched by Governor Ronald Reagan. Troops armed with rifles surrounded the California Student Center with bayonets pointed inward to prevent escape (Figure 39). Then a National Guard helicopter flew overhead spraying tear gas over the plaza. This was the first documented use of tear gas by the U.S. military against its own citizens. A year later, while addressing the California Council of Growers at Yosemite, Reagan defended his actions: "If it takes a bloodbath, let's get it over with. No more appeasement."  

**Childcare**

In 1971, the Parent Childcare Cooperative, founded with space provided by the ASUC in Eshleman Hall in 1969, became an official University program. One of the first workplace childcare facilities in the nation, the institution (now called the Early Childhood Education Center) presently operates eight childcare centers on or near the Berkeley campus.

**Later Uses of Lower Sproul Plaza**

According to several articles in *The Daily Californian* published throughout the 1970s and early 1980s, it is evident that the California Student Center complex had become a magnet for all sorts of uses, student-sponsored or otherwise. Street vendors frequently set up shop around the perimeter of the complex, much to the chagrin of local merchants and the University Administration. Stated a writer in the September 10, 1970 edition of *The Daily Californian*:

> On a non-winter day in Berkeley anywhere from five to ten street peddlers set up their stands on the sidewalk area at the corner of Bancroft & Telegraph, selling products that vary from hotdogs and fruit to buttons. Other merchants, though not facing direct competition, say the ‘circus appearance’ next to the Student Union detracts from their business, that the peddlers give ‘no dignity to the community,’ and that ‘peddlers do not belong in a modern city of the 70s.

The City instituted an ordinance requiring street peddlers to pay $90 a year for a license and, if using a vehicle, to move the vehicle every five minutes, although that provision was not rigorously enforced. Other less desirable activities on the Plaza included vagrants camping in the vicinity and using the facilities, including two exterior toilet rooms in the breezeway, which were eventually locked. In 1974, the Lower Sproul Plaza Committee discussed the ongoing issue of “bongo drumming in Lower Sproul Plaza.” That same year the Lower Sproul Plaza Committee asked the Administration to prohibit “tables and portable easels” from the plaza.

---
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L. **VERNON ARMAND DEMARS: 1908-2005**

Vernon Armand DeMars is one of the most important figures in the architectural community of the postwar Bay Area. A Bay Area native, DeMars’ work was imbued with a strong notion of regional identity informed by his familiarity with, and affection for, the Bay Region’s stunning topography, sparkling light and temperate climate, and distinctive social and artistic culture (Figure 40). Just as important was his career-long interest in progressive causes, as evidenced by his early Depression-era work designing multi-family housing for migrant farm workers in the Central Valley. As one of the founders of the progressive design community, Telesis, DeMars was not one to remain satisfied designing houses for the idle rich. Throughout his career he tirelessly worked to advance Telesis’ stated goal of nurturing a "Second Bay Area Regional Tradition." Coined by architectural historian Lewis Mumford, the label refers back to the seminal work of the early “First Bay Area Tradition” designers, architects, and artists such as architects Bernard Maybeck, Julia Morgan, Willis Polk, and artist William Keith. Although conscious of his debt to his predecessors, DeMars also embraced the modernist notion of progress, playing critical roles in major postwar redevelopment projects like the Golden Gateway Center and Diamond Heights Redevelopment Agency projects in San Francisco and the Capitol Towers in Sacramento. Interestingly, his later work focused on the reversal of some of the most egregious excesses of postwar urban planning, in particular the removal of the Embarcadero Freeway from San Francisco’s Northeast Waterfront. Throughout his career the California Student Center remained one of DeMars’ favorite completed projects and the one that occupied his attention for the rest of his career.

Vernon DeMars was born February 26, 1908 in San Francisco to Louis A. DeMars of Montreal and Bessie Wells DeMars of Little Rock, Arkansas. DeMars grew up in Oakland. As an Eagle Scout, he became fascinated with the culture of the Pueblo and Hopi peoples of Arizona and New Mexico, an interest that would remain with him for his entire life and eventually inspire him to learn many of their songs and dances.174 He received his Bachelor of Arts in Architecture from the University of California in 1931, winning three medals for his student projects and a special design prize from John Galen Howard. After graduating, he headed to Arizona where he made measured drawings of pictographs in the Twin Caves Ruins in Tsegi Canyon for the Museum of Arizona.175

---


175 Ibid., 580. Despite graduating in 1931, DeMars identified with the Class of 1929, the class he would have graduated with if he had completed his studies in time.
In 1936, in the middle of the Depression, DeMars was hired on as a draftsman by the New Deal Resettlement Agency. In 1937 he transferred to the Farm Security Administration where he became the District Architect for the western states, a position he held until 1943. In this position, DeMars worked to alleviate the misery of California’s migrant farm workers—mostly Dust Bowl refugees from Oklahoma, Texas, and Arkansas (Figure 41)—by designing forty farm workers’ communities across the western United States, the best known of which include Yuba City and Mendota, California. The communities included seasonal and permanent housing, schools, clinics, hospitals, farm buildings, and site planning. DeMars’ work for the Farm Security Administration was known for its practicality—much of it was inexpensive and modular so it could be moved from site to site—as well as for its modernist styling and use of regionally appropriate materials such as adobe in Arizona and redwood in Northern California. 176

In 1939, Vernon DeMars married Betty Bates, a talented costume designer and dancer. Throughout the rest of their lives Vernon and Betty would remain comrades and co-conspirators, collaborating on projects ranging from the performance of Indian Dances to the adornment of the Zellerbach Hall at UC Berkeley. The two lived and worked together until Betty died in 1987. 177

While working for the Farm Security Administration, Vernon DeMars co-founded a group called Telesis in 1939. 178 The word *telesis* was coined by the American sociologist Lester Frank Ward in the late nineteenth century to represent his theory of planned social progress, wherein mankind, using the power of education and the scientific method, would direct the evolution of human society. Taking the name from Ward’s writings, founding members of the organization—including Vernon DeMars, Francis Violich, William Wurster, Catherine Bauer, Thomas Church, and others—sought to encourage and guide progressive urban planning within the Bay Region. The group was founded within the context of several larger international architectural movements, including CIAM (Congrès International d’Architecture Moderne) and MARS (Modern Architectural Research Group). As set forth in their founding statement, the group believed that “People and the Land make up the environment which has four distinct parts—a place to Live, Work, Play, and the Services which integrate these and make them operate. These components must be integrated in the community and urban region through rational planning, and through the use of modern building
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technology." Many of the principles and ideas generated by Telesis would become important strains within the University of California's College of Environmental Design as well as the San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association (SPUR). Indeed, the California Student Center – Vernon DeMars' largest single work – can be interpreted as a project that incorporates many of the principles of the movement.

In 1943, Vernon DeMars was appointed Chief of Housing Standards in the Technical Division of the National Housing Agency in Washington D.C. In 1945, DeMars became a Lieutenant in the U.S. Navy and from 1945 until 1946 he served as an aid to the Governor of Puerto Rico, specializing in addressing housing shortages and other urban planning issues on the island. After World War II, DeMars traveled to Germany where he worked for the U.S. State Department as an architectural consultant designing housing for German miners in the Ruhr Valley region.

DeMars acquired his first teaching position in architecture at MIT when he was appointed Visiting Professor in the Department of Architecture by fellow Californian William W. Wurster (Figure 42). DeMars held this position from 1947 until 1949, alternating teaching responsibilities with famed Finnish architect Alvar Aalto. In 1951, DeMars accepted a position as a Lecturer in the College of Architecture at the University of California, Berkeley. Two years later, in 1953, DeMars was promoted to the rank of Full Professor. From 1953 until 1963, DeMars taught a full course load at all levels, ranging from introduction to design, to design studios, to thesis projects. He also taught freehand drawing, pen-and-ink rendering, and watercolor techniques. It was during this phase of DeMars' career that he first became interested in the proposed California Student Center, initially assigning it to his students as a thesis project and then subsequently lobbying the University Administration for the commission. In 1958, after he received the California Student Center commission, DeMars was appointed Chairman of the Department of Architecture, a position he held until 1962.

In 1959, Vernon DeMars, Joseph Esherick, and William Wurster co-founded the College of Environmental Design at the University of California, Berkeley. Combining the Departments of Architecture, City and Regional Planning, and Landscape Architecture, the college was the first in the country to bring together
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these three disciplines under one roof. The college reflected many of the progressive ideals espoused by Telesis, including the integration of allied disciplines and the nurturing of a regional mode of urban design reflective of the landscape, climate, and culture of the Bay Region. DeMars went on to design the new quarters for the College of Environmental Design in 1964 in association with his colleagues Joseph Esherick and Donald Olsen. Considered by some to be the “ugliest building on campus,” Wurster Hall is admired by others for its straightforward, “no-fuss” Brutalist vocabulary and functional design (Figure 43).

Throughout his tenure at the University of California, DeMars competed in architectural competitions and realized several significant projects, many of which had a distinctive urban design bent. In 1951, DeMars became an architectural consultant to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, in which role he developed an urban design and master plan for the Diamond Heights and Western Addition Redevelopment Areas, both of which were partially realized during the 1960s. One of DeMars’ first major built projects, however, was Easter Hill Village, a 300-unit mixed market-rate and subsidized housing project in Richmond, California. Completed in 1954, the project was a joint venture of DeMars – who was responsible for design – and Donald Hardison, who developed construction drawings and oversaw the construction administration phase.

In 1956, DeMars formed a partnership with fellow Department of Architecture professor Donald Reay. The partnership lasted until 1965. Major projects completed by the firm include the first three buildings of the California Student Center: University Dining Commons (1960), Memorial Student Union (1961), and Eshleman Hall (1965). The fourth building of the complex – Zellerbach Hall (1967) – was completed by DeMars & Wells. Other major projects completed by DeMars & Reay include: Capitol Towers Garden Apartments (with Wurster, Bernardi & Emmons), a major residential redevelopment project completed in Sacramento between 1958-1965; Marin City, a 200-unit public housing project completed north of Sausalito in 1965; the College of Environmental Design at UC Berkeley (with Esherick & Olsen), completed in 1965; the Sonoma County Courthouse (with Clarence Feliciano), completed in 1965; and the Golden Gateway Redevelopment Project, a massive mixed-use residential/commercial project completed in San Francisco in 1965 (Phase I) (Figure 44) and 1966 (Phase II).
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Following the dissolution of the partnership of DeMars & Reay, Vernon DeMars formed a new firm with John Wells. Within a short time the new firm was retained to serve as architect of record and to oversee the construction of the Alvar Aalto-designed Mount Angel Abbey Library in St. Benedict, Oregon. Completed in 1970, this building was only Aalto’s second building completed in the United States. DeMars & Wells completed several buildings and master plans for projects throughout Northern California. Examples include the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) stations at El Cerrito Plaza and El Cerrito del Norte (1971), Grattan Elementary School in San Francisco (1971), reconstruction of the auditorium of Wheeler Hall at UC Berkeley (1973), and Aster Park, a moderate-income townhouse community built in Sunnyvale in 1973. 189

Vernon DeMars retired from UC Berkeley in 1975, although he retained the status of Professor Emeritus. Although formally retired, DeMars did not withdraw from an active professional life, keeping his practice and maintaining his involvement in University affairs, particularly the California Student Center. As a member of the Lower Sproul Plaza Committee, DeMars participated in several subsequent alterations to the complex, as well as making sure that several of his long-term pet projects were completed, especially the Golden Bear Column in Lower Sproul Plaza and the Golden Bear brass door pulls, both of which were completed in 1979-80 as a gift of the Class of 1929. DeMars also remained vigilant against ill-conceived alterations to his master work, responding in writing to projects that he deemed intrusive or incompatible. He also encouraged the University Administration to better maintain the facility and the associated plazas, excoriating the vandalism and neglect that he saw. Beyond Berkeley, DeMars continued to remain involved in urban planning work, advocating for the removal of the Embarcadero Freeway viaduct from the San Francisco waterfront.

Throughout his career, DeMars won over 20 major design awards, including Progressive Architecture’s Design Award for the California Student Center in 1958 and a first-place Progressive Architecture Design Award for the Capitol Towers Garden Apartments in Sacramento in 1959. In 1975, he received the Berkeley Citation, the highest honor bestowed by UC Berkeley. 190 In 2003, the American Institute of Architects California Council honored DeMars with its lifetime achievement award. DeMars published eleven articles and reports in various publications, ranging from professional journals such as Architectural Record and
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Architectural Forum, to trade journals such as the Daily Pacific Builder.\textsuperscript{197} He was an avid speaker, presenting papers at various professional and academic conferences including the American Institute of Architects and the American Institute of Planners, state-sponsored conferences, university lecture series, and others.\textsuperscript{192} DeMars belonged to several professional organizations; he was a Fellow of American Institute of Architects (FAIA) and a member of the Northern California Chapter of the AIA, Lambda Alpha, the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB), the American Society of Planners and Architects, and the Regional Planning Council of America.\textsuperscript{193}

Vernon DeMars died April 29, 2005 of complications from a stroke. He was 97.\textsuperscript{194} He will long be known as one of the leading figures in Northern California’s architectural community. His life work is perhaps best encapsulated by his longstanding advocacy for “environmental design,” a term defined by his friend and colleague Francis Violich as “the deep-seated belief in the interconnectedness of all elements…and an understanding that design must happen within a comprehensive framework that deals with the environment as a whole.”\textsuperscript{195} The California Student Center, one of DeMars’ largest and most significant built projects, embodies his design philosophy. As originally designed and used, the complex was a self-contained urban ecosystem but that was also an integral part of both the University of California campus and the City of Berkeley, physically and symbolically spanning the realm of the town and the gown.

\section*{M. Donald P. Reay: 1914-2002}

Donald Patterson Reay, architect and city planner, was Vernon DeMars’ business partner throughout the design and much of the construction phase of the California Student Center. Born on July 17, 1914 in Liverpool, England, Reay showed an early interest in drawing, as well as more physical pursuits like biking, mountaineering, and sailing. He graduated from the University of Liverpool in 1936 with a degree in Architecture and was subsequently admitted to the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA). The following year he was awarded the Commonwealth Fellowship. Using the proceeds of his fellowship, Reay studied at Columbia University in New York where he received a Master’s degree in city and regional planning in 1939. While at Columbia, Donald Reay married Sylvia Shimberg, a fellow student who would also become a well-known architect.\textsuperscript{196}

Donald Reay, in the United States when World War II broke, was unable to return to England. Instead, he moved to Halifax, Nova Scotia and joined the Royal Canadian Air Force (RCAF), soon receiving a promotion to Chief Architect. During the war he was responsible for building flight training schools and installing

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{192} Ibid., 580.
\bibitem{194} Mary Rourke, “Vernon DeMars, 97; Architect Helped Start Design College at UC Berkeley,” Los Angeles Times (May 7, 2005).
\bibitem{196} Henry Lagorio, Donald Olsen, and Claude Stoller, In Memoriam: Donald P. Reay, Professor of Architecture, Emeritus, Berkeley, 1914-2002 (Berkeley: University of California Academic Senate, 2002).
\end{thebibliography}
camouflage for installations along the east coast of Canada. He also designed and oversaw the construction of Goose Bay Aerodrome, which at one point was the largest air base on the North American continent.\footnote{197}

After World War II, Reay returned home to the war-torn United Kingdom with his young family. There he was promptly hired on by the government to assist in designing “New Towns” around war-torn London, Glasgow, and other cities to house refugees. From 1945 to 1947, Reay, along with Sir William Holford, contributed to the drafting of the 1946 New Towns Act. After the passage of the act, Reay served as the chief architect and planner for East Kilbride New Town in Scotland (1947-51) and Stevenage (1951-55), one of several new towns built north of outside London after the war (Figure 45).\footnote{198}

In 1955, Donald Reay accepted the position of visiting lecturer at UC Berkeley. Recognized as a giant in the field of architecture, and particularly city planning, Reay was soon promoted to the rank of Full Professor. In 1956, he formed a business partnership with fellow faculty member Vernon DeMars. Notable projects executed by the firm of DeMars & Reay are discussed above in Section L. In 1966, following the dissolution of DeMars & Reay, Donald Reay formed the firm of Reay & Tsuruta Associates and in 1975 he began a solo practice known as Reay Associates. Active in design work for the rest of his life, Donald Reay died in Berkeley on January 2, 2002.\footnote{199}

N. DONALD L. HARDISON: 1916-

Donald Leigh Hardison was born March 23, 1916 in rural Ventura County, California. He was raised on his parents’ citrus and avocado ranch several miles outside of the town of Fillmore. As a high school student Hardison displayed an early interest in drawing. In 1934, he graduated from high school and matriculated at UC Berkeley to study architecture.\footnote{200} During summers he worked as an apprentice in the offices of architect Roy Wilson in Santa Paula, not far from his family’s ranch. Hardison was trained during a transitional period characterized by tension between his Beaux-Arts-trained professors and students influenced by the work of Frank Lloyd Wright and the Bauhaus.\footnote{201}
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Hardison graduated from UC Berkeley in December 1938. Initially unable to find work in his field because of the Depression, Hardison took a job as a union carpenter in Los Angeles. Within two years he had moved back to Northern California, initially taking a job with the Hawaiian Raymond-Turner Company, a contracting firm hired by the U.S. military to build Pacific air bases. Based in Alameda, Hardison’s job involved checking to make sure that pre-fabricated and pre-drilled steel elements matched the shop drawings before being shipped out. After this work dried up, he transferred to Mare Island Naval Shipyard in Vallejo where he drew up plans to repair destroyers damaged in the attacks on Pearl Harbor. While stationed in Vallejo, Donald Hardison met his future wife, Betty Decker. The two were married on June 14, 1942. The newlyweds took up residence in Atchison Village in Richmond where Hardison was employed as a draftsman in the Production Drafting Department at Henry J. Kaiser’s famous California-Todd Shipyard. There Hardison spent the rest of World War II developing construction drawings for Victory Ships, Liberty Ships, and C-4 transports.

After the war, Hardison joined up with two fellow Cal graduates in Kaiser’s Drafting Department: George Rhoda and Ted Moist, and together they started a design firm on 12th Street in Richmond. At the time Hardison’s firm was the only architecture firm in Richmond and they quickly earned several commissions, including a schematic design for the Richmond Arts Center in the new Richmond Civic Center (Milton Pflueger was the architect of record for the entire project) and a storefront beautification project in downtown Richmond encompassing a block of MacDonald Avenue between 11th and 12th streets. Initially none of the three men were licensed architects, so initially they were limited to non-structural design projects. In 1948, Hardison obtained his architecture license and founded Donald Hardison & Associates. His first two projects were the First Presbyterian Church and the Richmond YMCA (both 1950). Soon thereafter he was hired by the City of Richmond Housing Authority to design Easter Hill Village, a 300-unit, mixed-income public housing development completed in 1954. Throughout the early 1950s, Hardison & Associates earned several major school commissions, beginning with Richmond High School and continuing with several schools and additions to existing schools in Richmond and nearby Berkeley.

The Easter Hill Village project was the first collaboration between Hardison and Vernon DeMars. After receiving the commission, Hardison contacted Vernon DeMars – who had just arrived at Berkeley from MIT – and asked him to consult on the job. Soon after, DeMars introduced Hardison to landscape architect Lawrence Halprin. Hardison asked DeMars to join his firm for the duration of the Easter Hill Village project due to the long-term nature of the job. During this project the firm was known as Hardison & DeMars, Architects Associated. Built on the site of a World War II-era quarry, the project was well-received by the architectural community for its innovative landscape design that made use of the dramatic topography, as well as the layout of the individual buildings that fostered family life through the integration of private and public realms.
Hardison & DeMars worked together on several other social housing projects in Richmond throughout the 1950s and 1960s, including the IC Project (1957), Eastshore Park Renewal Project (1952-71), and the Potrero Redevelopment Agency Project (1960-73). The partnership of Hardison, DeMars, and Halprin proved to be fruitful. Forecasting their roles in the later California Student Center project, DeMars was largely responsible for the overall design concept, Hardison for generating construction drawings and performing construction administration, and Halprin, landscape design and site layout.

Eventually, Donald Hardison formed a partnership with Shigego “Richard” Komatsu, a longtime friend and colleague. The pair founded the firm of Hardison & Komatsu, which still exists as the firm of HKIT.

**O. LAWRENCE HALPRIN: 1916-**

Lawrence Halprin, one of the most important living American landscape architects, was born July 1, 1916 in New York City (Figure 46). Raised mostly in New York, Halprin spent three years in Palestine on a kibbutz after graduating from high school. In 1935, he entered Cornell University to study plant sciences and play basketball for the Cornell team. In 1941, he received a Master’s degree in horticulture from the University of Wisconsin. While there, he married Anna Schuman, a dance student who would go on to influence many of Halprin’s later ideas of applying movement to landscape.

While he lived in Wisconsin Halprin visited Frank Lloyd Wright’s Taliesien, inspiring him to study landscape architecture. In 1942, he entered the Landscape Architecture program at the Harvard Graduate School of Design. While enrolled at Harvard, Halprin came under the influence of Walter Gropius and Marcel Breuer, both veterans of the Bauhaus.209

Upon graduating from Harvard, Halprin’s career was temporarily cut short by World War II. He enlisted in the U.S. Navy and served in the Pacific Theater. In early 1945, Halprin returned to the United States and joined Thomas Church’s landscape architecture firm in San Francisco. He spent four years in Church’s firm and while there he collaborated with George Rockrise on the famous Donnell garden outside Sonoma.210

In 1949, Halprin opened his own landscape architecture firm in San Francisco. By the mid-1950s, his office concentrated on residential gardens for individual clients as well as larger landscapes for residential housing projects, campus master plans, and shopping centers. By the 1960s, Halprin’s office had grown to nearly 60 and during this time he completed some of his biggest and best-known projects, including the California
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Emmy Lou Packard, the artist who designed and executed the mural on the exterior of the Dining Commons, was born in the Imperial Valley of California in 1914 to social activist parents. Throughout her childhood Packard was exposed to the harsh realities of life in the hardscrabble Imperial Valley, and she quickly learned to express these feelings through her art. At the age of 13 she first met and befriended Mexican artists Diego Rivera and Frida Kahlo (Figure 47). Exposure to thinkers and artists such as these encouraged Packard to study art as a vehicle for advancing free political speech and human rights activism. In 1935, Packard received her Bachelor of Arts at UC Berkeley, where she became the first woman art editor of The Daily Californian, the
Occident (campus magazine), and The Pelican (campus humor magazine). She went on to study sculpture and frescoes at the San Francisco Art Institute.

While Packard was in San Francisco, she worked with Diego Rivera on his fresco for the Golden Gate International Exposition and afterward moved to Mexico City with Diego and Frida. She stayed there for a year working on her photography, and painting in oils and watercolors, eventually returning to exhibit them at the San Francisco Museum of Art (now SF MOMA). In the following years, Packard worked on many murals, mosaics, oil paintings, prints, and photographs. She worked to achieve a universal human spirit in her work that corresponded with the world's wars and turmoil. Throughout the Korean and Vietnam wars, her powerful prints of wounded babies sketched in black lines punctuated by an explosion of blood red, created visceral responses in their viewers. Packard, like Vernon DeMars, was also a native daughter of California and she shared the innate appreciation for its landscape and culture that DeMars did. Much of her later work focused on farm workers, a theme close to her heart from growing up in the Imperial Valley. Although injected with political viewpoint, Packard's work was rarely didactic.
III. DESCRIPTION & CONDITIONS ASSESSMENT

A. SITE AND LANDSCAPE: LOWER SPROUL PLAZA

The California Student Center consists of four buildings arrayed around the U-shaped Lower Sproul Plaza. César Chávez Student Center (completed 1960) extends along the north side of the plaza. Its umbrella-like hyperbolic-paraboloid roof forms, designed to remind one of a Renaissance Italian marketplace, maintain a low profile in order to avoid blocking views of Sather Tower (The Campanile) and the redwoods alongside Strawberry Creek. Martin Luther King Student Union (completed 1961) straddles the juncture between Upper and Lower Sproul Plazas, exerting a monumental presence at the center of the composition recalling the Parthenon or Jacopo Sansovino’s Libreria di San Marco in Venice. Eshleman Hall (completed 1965), an eight-story, slab-like office tower, occupies the southwestern corner of the plaza. Zellerbach Hall (completed 1967), the last addition to the ensemble, forms the western boundary of Lower Sproul Plaza (Figure 48).214

Lower Sproul Plaza measures 150 by 250 feet and it is linked to Upper Sproul Plaza by a three-tier concrete stair located between Chávez Student Center and King Student Union (Figure 49). The stair is bounded on either side by concrete retaining walls made of rough board-formed concrete displaying a formwork pattern of 1-inch thick, rough mill-sawn lumber placed in random widths (4 to 12 inches).
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A pedestrian bridge originally spanned Lower Sproul Plaza at the foot of the stairs, connecting Chávez Student Center and King Student Union. Due to concerns about the stability of this bridge, the structure was removed in 1998.\textsuperscript{215} The abutments of the bridge are still visible at either end of the stair (Figure 50).

A secondary stair linking Upper and Lower Sproul Plazas is located between King Student Union and Bancroft Way, at the southern end of the site. Additional access points to Lower Sproul Plaza are located at the northwestern corner, where a concrete stair between Zellerbach Hall and Chávez Student Union connects the plaza with Strawberry Creek and the Alumni House, and at the southwestern corner, where Lower Sproul Plaza is accessed from Bancroft Way by a paved path. The path is partially sheltered beneath a canopy that links Eshleman and Zellerbach Halls (Figure 51).

As explained in more detail above in Chapter II, Vernon DeMars and Lawrence Halprin derived their principal inspiration for Lower Sproul Plaza from Piazza San Marco in Venice. This in part accounts for the use of decorative geometric paving and the arrangement of colonnaded buildings of different heights to define the perimeter of the L-shaped plaza in a seemingly organic and urbanistic manner. The plaza floor is paved in large concrete panels made with heavy gravel aggregate. The concrete panels are divided into a grid by red brick pavers (Figure 52). The pavers, six courses wide and laid in running bond, form the borders of 24-foot-squares that correspond to the basic

construction module repeated throughout the complex. The plaza’s geometry is further defined by a network of single-width black tile pavers that intersect the orthogonal grid at a 45 degree angle.

Lower Sproul Plaza is a largely unobstructed public open space although street furniture and several permanent architectonic elements are situated throughout the plaza, including concrete planters and benches, trash receptacles, fencing, and public art. Some original features and plantings remain, although many of the original shrubs and flowering plants have been replaced with hardier drought-tolerant species. The most notable furnishings in Lower Sproul Plaza are four pre-cast concrete planters located south of Chávez Student Center (Figure 53). The planters, which contain ornamental fruitless olive trees and ornamental ground cover (Gazania), are trapezoidal, tapering inward toward the lip of the planter. Slatted wood benches attached to the sides of the planters, providing a shaded place to sit on sunny days. There are also six identical planters located in front of Eshleman Hall toward the southern end of Lower Sproul Plaza. Historic landscape drawings indicate that these planters originally contained alders, but all appear to have been subsequently replanted with ornamental olive trees matching the planters on the north side of the plaza.

In addition to the free-standing planters, two integral concrete planting beds flank the stairs to Upper Sproul Plaza between Chávez Student Center King Student Union. The planters are finished in rough board-formed concrete with river rock studded borders and contain drought-tolerant shrubs. According to the original landscape drawings, the larger planter to the north originally held six junipers (Juniper pfitzer) with a ground cover of Hann’s ivy (Figure 54). The narrower south planting bed originally contained 15 Grisolinia littoralis.
Other planting beds are located near the east entrance to Chávez Student Center. These contain *Juniper pfitzeri*. North of the Student Center, along Strawberry Creek, are several planting beds planted with Mann’s ivy and tree ferns. Historic drawings indicate that azaleas and camellias were planted here, but these do not appear to have survived. Several *Pittosporum tobira* continue to flourish along the north side of Chávez Student Center.

Additional elements in the plaza include several dozen non-historic concrete waste receptacles placed at regular intervals around the perimeter of the plaza and on the terrace level of Chávez Student Center. Similarly detailed non-historic concrete planters are used to demarcate seating areas for the Bear’s Lair Terrace. In addition to the concrete planters, the Bear’s Lair Terrace features non-historic black-painted iron fencing, historic steel pole light fixtures, and non-historic steel and wood tables and benches (Figure 55).

The most significant element within Lower Sproul Plaza is a column capped by a gilded sculpture of a California Brown Bear (*Ursus arctos californicus*) formally known as *The Golden Bear Column*, and more informally as “The Bear in the Air.” The California Brown Bear is the mascot of the University of California, Berkeley, as well as California’s state symbol. Architect Vernon DeMars intended *The Golden Bear* to be analogous to the winged lion of St. Mark located in *Piazza San Marco* in Venice.216
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The 18-foot high pre-cast pillar is made of gold-tinted concrete formed to resemble a stylized Doric column (Figure 56). The column sits atop a two-tiered plinth also made of gold-tinted concrete. The upper tier is capped in brick and inscribed with the year ‘1980.’ The column supports a flattened board-formed concrete capital, upon which crouches the 500-pound, gilded bear sculpture. The underside of the capital is inscribed with the words: ‘GIFT OF THE CLASS OF NINETEEN TWENTY NINE.’ Completed nearly twenty years after the plaza, the bear was made by Berkeley sculptor Tom Hardy. DeMars chose Hardy’s aggressive looking bear to contrast with the other cuddlier bear statues seen around the campus. Donated by DeMars’ own Class of 1929 to commemorate its fiftieth reunion, the Golden Bear was unveiled in Lower Sproul Plaza in 1980.217

The preservation of historic view corridors and creation of new ones was of critical importance to Vernon DeMars in the design of Lower Sproul Plaza. Taking another cue from Piazza San Marco, the L-shaped plaza has two principal axes that intersect at right angles near the northern end. The primary north-south axis runs along the center of the plaza, visually linking the primary entrance of Chávez Student Center with Bancroft Way. The secondary east-west axis visually aligns the portico of Sproul Hall on the east and Alumni Hall to the west. Additional subsidiary diagonal axes frame views of Sather Tower, the redwoods along Strawberry Creek, and the Berkeley Hills to the east of campus.

Assessment of Physical Condition

The present section identifies important materials and features of Lower Sproul Plaza. It also identifies the condition of each element based on the following categories:

- **Excellent (E)** – The element is in near original condition.
- **Good (G)** – The element is mostly intact.
- **Fair (F)** – The element is showing signs of wear or deterioration.
- **Poor (P)** – The element is badly damaged, missing, or not functioning.
- **Unknown (U)** – The element was not accessible for inspection.

Paving

Lower Sproul Plaza is paved in rough aggregate concrete. The paving is divided into panels by brick pavers and black tiles. These materials are original and in fair condition, with some cracking and deterioration evident.

Stairs and Walkways

Three concrete stairs with associated walkways connect Lower Sproul Plaza to Upper Sproul Plaza, Bancroft Way, and the Strawberry Creek Trail. The stairs are original and in good condition.

Pedestrian Bridge

Originally a concrete bridge bearing a thin-shelled concrete paraboloid roof connected Chávez Student Center and King Student Union. This element was demolished in 1998. Presently only the abutments of this bridge remain. This element is in poor condition.

Planters

Lower Sproul Plaza contains ten historic pre-cast concrete planters. Wood slatted benches supported by steel brackets are attached to the planters. The planters are original and in good condition. The wood benches are weathered and gouged or broken in some locations and are in fair condition.

Planting Beds

Lower Sproul Plaza contains a variety of plantings, some historic and others not, located in planters and in planter beds throughout Lower Sproul Plaza, the Terrace level of Chávez Student Center, and around the perimeter of the building. Although the olive trees in the northern part of the plaza and the *Juniper pfitzer*, *Pittosporum tobira*, and *Griselinia littoralis* in the planter beds appear to be original, other beds have been replanted with non-historic drought-tolerant shrubs. The planter beds appear to be in good condition but many of the original species have been replaced.

Public Art

*The Golden Bear Column* occupies an important place both physically and historically within Lower Sproul Plaza. Installed in 1980 and re-gilded on a regular basis, the sculpture and column base appear to be in good condition.
B. CHÁVEZ STUDENT CENTER

Occupying the north end of Lower Sproul Plaza, Chávez Student Center was completed in 1960, the first building finished within the California Student Center complex. The building was originally known as the University Dining Commons and until 1990 it served as the on-campus dining facility for the entire university. The basement levels contain storage and quarters for the California Marching Band. In 1990, the two above-grade floors were converted into offices and renamed the Golden Bear Center, retaining a small take-out establishment called the Golden Bear Restaurant in the eastern third of the second floor. In 1997, the building was renamed Chávez Student Center in honor of United Farm Workers’ Union leader César E. Chávez. Alterations performed in the conversion of the building from dining to office use have radically reconfigured the interior and parts of the exterior of the building, diminishing its original design integrity.

Chávez Student Center is a four-level (two above grade and two below), 105,500-square-foot, reinforced-concrete structure connected to the King Student Union at both the basement and first floor levels. The building is designed in a modernist style embodying many hallmarks of the Second Bay Region Tradition, namely the organically inspired roof form, incorporation of indoor-outdoor landscaping, and the use of natural materials like wood or board-formed concrete bearing the imprint of wood or other natural materials to give the building a more naturalistic appearance. The hyperbolic-paraboloid roof of Chávez Student Center was designed to recall the tented market stalls of Renaissance Italy, particular Venice. Embracing DeMars’ notionally ideal of “controlled chaos,” the building features an irregularly shaped yet roughly rectangular floor-plan that alternately jogs inward and outward along the north and south sides of the building. Taking advantage of its sloping site, the building accommodates an ambitious program without intruding upon view corridors to the north or overshadowing Lower Sproul Plaza to the south.

Figure 57. South façade of Chávez Student Center
Source: KVP Consulting
Exterior: South Façade

The south façade of Chávez Student Center is the building’s primary façade and it is the location of the principal entrance (Figure 57). In contrast to its taller neighbors, Chávez presents a horizontal profile toward Lower Sproul Plaza, preserving important view corridors and providing a dramatic counterpoint to the vertical masses of King, Eshleman, and Zellerbach. As structurally determined, this façade is 22 bays of syncopated contrasting horizontal and vertical elements, recessed and extruded volumes, and alternating areas of solid and void, as illustrated in a photograph of the westernmost four bays (Figure 58). Dominated by a concrete stair, the westernmost four bays are further defined by a horizontal concrete parapet at the Terrace level and the thin-shelled, board-formed hyperbolic-paraboloid roof above. Contrasting vertical elements include the tube-formed concrete columns that support the roof and the thick painted steel mullions that divide the window wall. Sheltered beneath the concrete parapet, the ground floor level comprises a glazed window wall subdivided into a grid of historic fixed and operable steel sash windows. The steel window mullions and frames have been repainted but most are original. Pairs of non-historic glazed anodized aluminum doors are located in the second, sixth, ninth, and eleventh bays. The primary entrance is located in the eleventh bay (Figure 59).

The central section of the Terrace parapet is embellished with an 85-foot long, 5-foot high bas-relief mural by artist Emmy Lou Packard. The modernist mural depicts California landscape features, including coastal bluffs, cultivated fields, mountains, and rivers. Vegetables and grains grown in California were used to achieve the mural's varied textures (Figure 60).218
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The Terrace Level of Chávez Student Center is accessed at grade from Upper Sproul Plaza. This space, originally used as an outdoor dining area, continues to hold several tables and chairs for al fresco dining as well as several square concrete waste receptacles, none of which are historic. Original painted steel, pole-mounted, top-lit light fixtures with polycarbonate white globes illuminate the Terrace. The hyperbolic-paraboloid roof’s umbrella-like units shade sections of the Terrace. Presently the Terrace meets the south façade close to the drip line of the roof. Much of the second-floor level façade is non-historic work constructed in 1989-90, when the building was converted into offices. In this project bays 2-5 and 8-16 were demolished and reconstructed outboard of the original exterior wall to create additional enclosed office space. A portion of the wood pergola that formerly sheltered diners on the Terrace survives, supported by non-historic black-painted steel I-beam columns. The window wall in this area is also non-historic; its anodized-aluminum sliding windows contrast with the larger fixed steel window wall on the ground floor level (Figure 61).

There are five pedestrian entrances on the Terrace level. The principal entrance, which consists of two pairs of non-historic glazed aluminum doors, is located in bays 6-7. A sign above the entrance reads: CHAVEZ STUDENT CENTER. Other pedestrian entrances are located in bays 2, 17, and 19. None of the doors are historic, all having been replaced in 1989-90 when the building was converted to office use. In addition there is a steel barricade located in bay 20 to prevent access to the open-air service stair. The service stair within bays 20-22 is enclosed behind a decorative concrete masonry unit (CMU) wall. The CMU blocks are laid in stacked bond with every fourth course alternately shifted to the left or to the right. This detail gives this section of the south façade a three-
dimensional, sculptured effect that changes as the sun moves across the sky, casting varied shadows over the relief details. Narrow, lancet-like windows punctuate the wall and illuminate the interior (Figure 62).

**Exterior: East Façade**

The east façade of Chávez Student Center faces a concrete terrace that is also the roof of King Student Union’s “Mall” level (Figure 63). The terrace, which is used by patrons of the Golden Bear Restaurant for *al fresco* dining, is illuminated by historic steel, top-lit, pole-mounted globe fixtures with polycarbonate shades and similar sconces mounted on the exterior of the building. Much of the terrace is sheltered beneath the umbrella-like hyperbolic-paraboloid roof. A brown-painted steel fence and a stone retaining wall, both of which are original, demarcate the building site from adjoining Upper Sproul Plaza.

The east façade of Chávez Student Center is six bays wide. Bays 1, 2, 3, and part of 4 are made of CMU detailed identically to the south façade. Bays 3 and 4 contain the principal entrance, which is accessed by a flight of three concrete steps. The entrance contains a pair of historic glazed aluminum doors flanked by painted steel side lights and surmounted by six gable-profile clerestory windows (Figure 64). A gilded sign above the doors reads: GOLDEN BEAR RESTAURANT. The entrance is illuminated by historic wall-mounted globe sconces attached to the tube-formed concrete columns that define the entrance bays. Bays 5 and 6 contain a section of steel and glass window wall, also bracketed by white-painted concrete columns. The entire east façade is sheltered beneath the umbrella-like hyperbolic-paraboloid roof elements.
Exterior: North Façade

The north façade of Chávez Student Center faces Strawberry Creek. In contrast to the urban character of Lower Sproul Plaza, the Strawberry Creek area is secluded and shaded beneath redwoods. This façade responds to its orientation and the grade of the site, which slopes downhill toward the creek to the north and to the west. Like its southern counterpart, the north façade is 22 bays wide as defined by the building’s structural module. In contrast to the south façade, the north façade is largely symmetrical in nature, with evenly spaced tube-formed concrete columns bracketing large window walls on both the first and second floors. Due to the proximity of the north façade to Strawberry Creek and its mature tree canopy, it was impossible to photograph the entire façade in one view (Figure 66).

The north façade of Chávez Student Center begins at the subterranean passage that connects Lower Sproul Plaza and Strawberry Creek. On the north side of the passage is the Mall level of King Student Union. The east wall of Chávez Student Center (within the passage) is plain painted concrete, with a pair of non-historic aluminum doors at the north end of the passage. A sign above the north portal of the passage reads: CESAR E. CHAVEZ STUDENT CENTER. The first three bays of the north façade feature areas of textured CMU alternating with sections of window wall. As elsewhere, the original window wall consists of thick painted steel mullions and sheet glass. Most window units are fixed, with smaller horizontally oriented lights at the bottom and a larger rectangular light above. Some units accommodate a single operable casement. The first floor level is sheltered beneath a concrete balcony supported by the tube-formed columns. Recessed spot lights mounted in the underside of the balcony illuminate the first floor level (Figure 67).
The concrete balcony with a steel balustrade extends along the eastern two-thirds of the north façade (bays 1-15). The western third of the façade, which corresponds to Chávez Atrium inside the building, is unencumbered by any structural elements that might detract from its transparent character. Instead, this section is a full-height window wall composed of steel mullions and sheet glass. The otherwise regular intercolumniation of the north façade is adjusted to provide unobstructed views from Chávez Atrium (formerly the dining room) toward Strawberry Creek. The concrete balcony in this section of the building is accessed from Chávez Atrium by pairs of historic glazed aluminum doors. As the grade slopes downhill toward the west, the basement level gradually becomes exposed. Made of rough board-formed concrete displaying a pattern of 1-inch thick mill-sawn lumber placed in random widths, the basement has no visible openings aside from two pairs of non-historic aluminum doors and six fixed aluminum “daylight” windows that illuminate interior offices and practice rooms (Figure 68).

*Exterior: West Façade*

The west façade of Chávez Student Center faces a brick plaza located between it and the Alumni House. Due to the sloping grade of the site, the west façade is two levels higher than the corresponding east façade. It is 10 structural bays wide although the wider spacing of the columns makes it appear to be five bays wide. The basement level comprises five concrete sectional wall panels, each cantled toward the southwest to create a distinctive zigzag pattern. Presently only one of the cantled bays contains an operational steel pedestrian door. Above the basement level, the balcony continues around from the north façade. It is illuminated by five top-lit, pole-mounted globe light fixtures. Above the balcony, the first floor level consists of a steel and sheet glass window wall. Above this is a decorative screen composed of thin
aluminum bars that creates a mesh-like pattern of diamond-shaped voids. A stucco panel backs the screen. Mirroring its eastern counterpart, the west façade is capped by five cantilevered hyperbolic-paraboloid roof elements (Figure 69).

Exterior: Roof
The roof of Chávez Student Center is designed to serve as its principal architectonic element. As the lowest-profile structure of the four buildings that surround Lower Sproul Plaza, the building and its roof are visible from the upper floors of both King Student Union and Eshleman Hall. Instead of abandoning the roof to mechanical equipment, DeMars used the umbrella-like hyperbolic-paraboloid roof forms to create a decorative architectonic element that would be attractive when seen from taller buildings or the Berkeley Hills to the east. This notion of making the roof an architectural element derives from the Bauhaus-inspired notion that a building’s roof serves as a “fifth façade,” especially in an age of ubiquitous air travel. Viewed from above, each roof bay is offset from its neighbor so that the valley of one aligns with the ridge of the other, creating gaps that are filled with diamond-shaped clerestory windows. Presently, the roof is sheathed in built-up materials colored red to blend in with the red clay tile roofs of Sproul Hall and most other university buildings.

Exterior: Assessment of Physical Condition
The present section identifies important materials and features of the site. It also identifies the condition of each element based on the following categories:

• **Excellent (E)** – The element is in near original condition.
• **Good (G)** – The element is mostly intact.
• **Fair (F)** – The element is showing signs of wear or deterioration.
• **Poor (P)** – The element is badly damaged, missing, or not functioning.
• **Unknown (U)** – The element was not accessible for inspection.

Steel and Glass Window Walls
Much of the exterior of Chávez Student Center is comprised of historic steel and glass window walls. This feature is intact except for a portion of the south façade at the Terrace level where the wall was reconstructed outboard of the original exterior envelope with non-historic anodized aluminum systems. Where historic window walls remain, they are typically articulated in two sections: a horizontal light below with a larger vertical light above. The sizable steel mullions serve both a structural and an architectonic role. The large panes of sheet glass are held in place by caulking and narrow steel parting beads. Several
of the original steel mullions show evidence of corrosion, particularly along the shaded north façade. Accounting for missing sections of window wall, the overall condition of this element is fair.

Glazed Aluminum Doors

The exterior of Chávez Student Center contains a variety of glazed aluminum doors, most of which are non-historic replacements, particularly along the south façade where all original doors have been replaced with contemporary anodized aluminum systems. Historic glazed aluminum doors, easily distinguished by their natural aluminum finish, are located along the east façade and at the Terrace level along the south and west façades. These doors are either single or paired and consist of a single pane of glass surrounded by a thick aluminum frame. Hardware consists either of historic pull handles or contemporary levers on the exterior and push bars on the interior. Taking into account the missing historic aluminum doors, the overall condition of this element is fair.

Concrete Elements

Much of the exterior of Chávez Student Center is concrete, either smooth-painted concrete such as the hyperbolic-paraboloid roof forms; rough board-formed concrete, such as along the basement level; or CMU, such as around the utility stair and the east façade. Other concrete elements include the cylindrical tube-formed columns that support the roof and interior floors. In large part, these concrete elements appear to be in good condition, with little evidence of spalling or other forms of deterioration. A few concrete elements have discolored as a result of biological growth and mold formation, especially along the north façade. The overall condition of this material component is good.

Miscellaneous Metal Elements

The exterior of Chávez Student Center contains several metallic features. On the north and south façades aluminum letters spell the name of the building. These clearly date to after 1997 when the building was renamed but they are of a period-appropriate material and font. Located along the perimeter of the building are several dozen steel top-lit pole fixtures with white polycarbonate globe shades. Matching sconces flank several entrances. These are all elements of the original design and all appear to be in good condition. The west façade features an aluminum mesh screen. This element also appears to be in good condition. Steel fencing lines portions of the Terrace level. This element is original and in good condition.

Miscellaneous Wood Elements

The south façade of Chávez Student Center retains remnants of the original wood pergola that originally provided shade to diners on the Terrace. This element was altered in 1989 when the south wall of the terrace level was pushed out to accommodate additional office space within the building. Sections of the pergola roof remain but are encased in later construction and only partially visible. This element is in fair condition.
Interior: Overview of Interior Scheme

As mentioned above, the first and second levels of Chávez Student Center were converted to office space in 1989-90. Most of the original dining rooms, kitchens, and ancillary spaces were demolished and replaced with new materials. Nevertheless, several interior spaces retain some aspects of the original design, in particular Chávez Atrium, which was left largely intact due to lobbying from Vernon DeMars in 1989. Because the rest of the interior has been so overwhelmingly remodeled, this section will describe most of the non-historic spaces in global terms, discussing in detail only spaces that retain elements of the original design.

The interior of Chávez Student Center contains two above-ground levels, a basement, and a sub-basement. The sub-basement and western third of the basement contain storage and practice areas for the California Marching Band, Choral Society, Jazz Ensemble, Dining Services, and Education Technology Services (ETS). The first floor is occupied by several student service departments, including the Student Learning Center (SLC), Student Life Advising Services (SLAS), Transfer and Re-entry and Student Parents (TRSP), and the Athletic Study Center (ASC). The Cal 1 Card office is accessed independently from Lower Sproul Plaza on the south side of the building, within an area that was historically the Coin Café. The second floor contains the following departments: Disabled Students’ Program (DSP), Multicultural Student Development (MSD), and the Gender Equity Center (GenEq). Accessed independently from Upper Sproul Plaza is the Golden Bear Restaurant, the only remnant of the building’s original food service program.

Interior: Sub-basement

The Sub-basement of Chávez Student Center occupies approximately the western third of the building’s floorplate. It is accessed internally from the basement level by two concrete internal stairs. It is entirely windowless and contains utilitarian mechanical spaces. In addition, there are several practice rooms used by musical groups. The sub-basement is entirely utilitarian and lacks spaces or features of architectural or historical significance.

Corridor

A narrow corridor links the four practice rooms in the sub-basement to stairs that lead up to the basement level. The corridor is finished in the same materials as the practice rooms, with concrete floors covered in resilient vinyl tiles and walls and ceilings finished in perforated acoustical gypsum board tiles. The corridor is illuminated by flush-mounted fluorescent luminaires. Utilitarian concrete stairs with steel pipe railings provide access to the basement.
level above (Figure 70).

**Mechanical Room**

The majority of the sub-basement is occupied by the mechanical room. The southern portion of the space is an undifferentiated expanse of concrete floors, walls, and ceilings housing mechanical equipment, primarily HVAC machinery. Along the mid-point of the east wall of the mechanical room is the elevator machine room, a small enclosure containing elevator machinery. North of the elevator machine room is the building’s fresh air intake and a transformer vault. The mechanical room itself was inaccessible and therefore not surveyed.

**Practice Rooms**

The California Marching Band maintains four small practice rooms in the sub-basement. These rooms (Rooms A-D) are finished in utilitarian materials that date from the building's original period of construction, including concrete floors covered in resilient vinyl tiles, stud-frame walls finished in sound-proofing materials, including fabric and perforated gypsum board; and ceilings finished in sprayed-on acoustical plaster or perforated gypsum board panels (Figure 71). The doors are solid-core wood with small glazed apertures, metal moldings, and contemporary brushed aluminum hardware. The rooms are illuminated by flush-mounted fluorescent luminaires. Metal ceiling-mounted diffusers are located at the center of each room.

**Interior: Basement**

The basement level of Chávez Student Center occupies the majority of the floorplate of the building. It is presently jointly occupied by the California Marching Band, UC Jazz Ensemble, UC Choral Ensemble, the Educational Technology Services department, and Dining Services. Windowless except along the north wall, the basement level is accessed both by stairs and the elevator from the first and second floors, from the adjoining King Student Union by a door at the southeast corner of the building, from the parking lot beneath Lower Sproul Plaza, and from Strawberry Creek via a pair of doors located midway along the north wall. With regard to plan, the basement features a primary east-west double-loaded corridor along the northern part of the building. Subsidiary north-south corridors extend south from the main corridor, providing access to a dense network of offices, locker rooms, shops, and utility rooms. Short flights of concrete stairs accommodate grade changes between the east and west ends of the building. Because of the consistency of materials and elements encountered in various zones of the basement, the description will describe them in global terms.
Corridors
The basement of Chávez Student Center features a primary east-west corridor that runs along the north side of the building. Intersecting north-south corridors branch off of the corridor along its south side, providing access to the two large rehearsal halls at the west end of the space, as well as locker rooms, utility core, and food storage areas. The corridors are utilitarian, consisting of polished concrete floors, painted gypsum board and concrete walls, and either suspended T-bar ceilings or applied cellulose acoustical tiles. Short runs of concrete stairs with steel pipe railings tie the various levels of the basement together. The basement is illuminated by a combination of recessed fluorescent fixtures and flush-mounted luminaires.

Rehearsal Halls
Originally housed in North Hall, and after 1931 in old Eshleman Hall (now Moses Hall), the California Marching Band and the UC Choral Ensemble have occupied a significant portion of the basement level of Chávez Student Center since the building was completed in 1960. Designed for the use of these two groups are two rehearsal halls located at the west end of the building. Room 3 is used by the Marching Band and Room 20 by the Choral Ensemble. Both are roughly square spaces with tiered floors and high ceilings accessed by small sound-proofed vestibules (Rooms 3B and 20A, respectively). In addition, both have storage and maintenance rooms between the two rehearsal halls (Rooms 3A and 20B). With regard to materials and finishes, both rooms feature carpeted concrete floors, walls clad in square acoustical tiles, and suspended T-bar ceilings. Cylindrical concrete columns penetrate the spaces at irregular intervals. The rehearsal halls are slightly different, befitting their separate uses. Room 3, the Marching Band's rehearsal hall features a relatively tight, horseshoe-shaped tiered floor configuration and smooth suspended ceiling materials. The lighting fixtures are also different, consisting of suspended fluorescent...
luminaires (Figure 72). In contrast, Room 20, the Choral Ensemble’s rehearsal hall has a more traditional semi-circular tiered floor, a distinctive suspended ceiling composed of pyramidal panels, and recessed fluorescent box fixtures (Figure 73). Room 20 also has a row of wood cabinets along the east wall. These appear to predate the building and may have been moved from the old Eshleman Hall.

**Locker Rooms and Associated Storage Rooms**

Separated from the two rehearsal halls by a north-south corridor is a suite of rooms comprising the men’s and women’s locker rooms (Rooms 32, 32A, 34, and 34A) a storage room for band uniforms (Room 36), and men’s and women’s toilet rooms (Rooms 40 and 42). The locker rooms were originally all one space because women were not admitted as members of the California Marching Band until 1975. The locker rooms feature polished concrete floors, gypsum board walls, and concrete ceilings with exposed mechanical equipment. Suspended fluorescent luminaires illuminate the space (Figure 74). Green painted steel lockers line the walls of the locker rooms. The lockers appear to predate the building and may have been moved from the band’s earlier quarters at old Eshleman Hall.

Room 36, the storage room is entirely utilitarian, with polished concrete floors, gypsum board walls, and painted concrete ceilings. Rooms 40 and 42, the toilet rooms, are original to the 1960 completion of Chávez Student Center and match other original toilet rooms throughout the California Student Center complex. They have tiled floors of differing colors (blue and red for men and pink and gray for women), gypsum board walls clad in cream-colored ceramic tiles, gypsum board ceilings, and standard toilet rooms fixtures including painted steel partitions, brushed stainless steel shelves and mirrors, and white porcelain sinks, urinals, and toilets (Figure 75). Both toilet rooms are illuminated by flush-mounted fluorescent luminaires.

**Offices: North Side**

A row of six offices (Rooms 41A-47) and one studio (Room 41) are located along the north wall of the primary east-west corridor. These spaces, which are original to the building, are similar in regard to materials and finishes.
Their most distinguishing features are the “daylight” windows along the north wall. The concrete floors are covered in resilient tile flooring or carpet. The perimeter walls are concrete covered in plaster and the interior partition walls are stud-frame and gypsum board with assorted acoustical soundproofing materials, including burlap and perforated cellulose acoustical tiles. The concrete ceilings are finished with cellulose acoustical tiles. Flush-mounted fluorescent fixtures illuminate each room. Rooms 41 and 41A and 43 and 43A are connected internally and feature wood-paneled walls with clerestory windows above. Doors are solid-core wood with metal moldings. Room 41, presently used as a practice studio, is slightly larger than the neighboring offices. It is further distinguished by its wood-frame window wall along the south wall (Figure 76).

Student Musical Activities/
UC Jazz Ensemble Suite

The eastern end of the basement is occupied by a suite of offices housing the Student Musical Activities department and the UC Jazz Ensemble (Rooms 71-76). All are windowless and entirely utilitarian in character. Several offices appear to be of recent construction as the finish materials do not match the older offices described above. Rooms 71, 71A, 73, 74, 75, and 76 are assigned to the UC Jazz Ensemble. Rooms 71, 71A, and 73 are located along the north side of the main corridor. Room 71 is a vestibule and Room 71A is an office. Room 73 is a large rehearsal room (Figure 77). Room 71 has a polished concrete floor, gypsum board walls and a suspended ceiling. Rooms 71A and 73 have carpeted concrete floors, gypsum board walls, and suspended T-bar ceilings with recessed fluorescent box light fixtures. The doors are solid-core wood with metal moldings. Room 74 is an office with carpeted concrete floors, gypsum board walls, and an exposed concrete ceiling. Room 75 is a studio with carpeted floors, and gypsum board walls and ceiling. Room 76 is a storage room.
room with concrete floors, concrete and gypsum board walls and an exposed concrete ceiling. All the rooms described above have solid-core wood doors with metal moldings and suspended fluorescent light fixtures.

Rooms 72, 72A and 72B comprise the Student Musical Activities suite. All three appear to be of recent origin and all have identical materials and features, including carpeted concrete floors, gypsum board walls, and exposed concrete ceilings with suspended mechanical equipment and fluorescent light fixtures.

**Dining Services Suite**

The Dining Services suite occupies the central part of the basement of Chávez Student Center, including Rooms 15, 17, 50, 51, 53, 53A, 54, 55, 62, 62A, 64, 66, and 68. Arrayed around the central utility core, the Dining Services suite includes offices (Rooms 15 and 17), food storage rooms (Rooms 50, 51, 66, and 68), cold storage rooms (Rooms 62, 62A, and 64), a locker room (Room 53A), and toilet rooms (Rooms 53 and 54). The Dining Services suite is a remnant of the original program of the building and appears to be largely original in regard to plan, although many materials appear to have been replaced. The overall character of this part of the basement is utilitarian, as befitting food service and storage functions (Figure 78). Floors throughout the Dining Services suite (except the toilet rooms) are polished concrete tinted red, although some rooms (such as Room 51) have added resilient tile flooring. The perimeter walls are painted concrete and all interior partition walls are stud-frame and gypsum board. Interior corridors within the suite feature a non-historic embossed stainless steel wainscot to protect against damage. Rooms 62, 62A, and 64 are walk-in coolers; these rooms are paneled stainless steel in their entirety. Ceilings throughout the Dining Services suite are mostly non-historic suspended T-bar systems, although several of the larger storage rooms, including rooms 66 and 68 have exposed concrete ceilings. Rooms with suspended ceilings feature recessed box fluorescent fixtures whereas the areas with exposed concrete ceilings have suspended fluorescent luminaires.

**Toilet Rooms**

The Dining Services suite contains three toilet rooms: one men’s, one women’s, and one unisex. The men’s and women’s toilet rooms are original to the building and match the other two basement-level toilet rooms described above. The unisex toilet appears on original plans as a locker room.
Utility Core
At the center of the Dining Services suite is the stair and utility core for the entire building. Containing a pair of non-historic passenger elevators, a non-historic stair, and a non-historic telecom closet, the utility core is located in its original position but it appears to have been heavily reconfigured. Originally consisting of a single elevator and no stair, the utility core achieved its present configuration in 1989-90. The stair is concrete with a painted steel pipe railing.

Education Technical Services Suite
The Educational Technical Services suite (Rooms 16, 16A, 60, 60A, 60B, 60C, and 60D), is located in the south-central portion of the basement. The suite encompasses a part of the basement that was originally occupied by several small offices, a food preparation area, and storage rooms. The space was subsequently reconfigured as a repair facility operated by the Disabled Students Program ca. 1990; the original partition walls were torn out and reconfigured as a central workroom surrounded by smaller work and storage areas. Presently the suite consists of a polished concrete floor, stud-frame and gypsum board walls, and a concrete ceiling with exposed duct work and suspended fluorescent luminaires.

Interior: First Floor
The first floor of Chávez Student Center is almost entirely the product of the 1989-90 remodel that converted the building into offices. Presently, most of the first floor is a warren of small offices finished in standard office materials, including carpeted or resilient tile-covered concrete floors, stud and gypsum board partition walls, suspended acoustical T-bar ceilings, solid-core wood doors with aluminum sidelights, and fluorescent box light fixtures. Several spaces retain elements of the original design, in particular César Chávez Atrium, which has kept much of its original open character as well as most of its original finishes.

Lobby
The main lobby (Room 118) is accessed from Lower Sproul Plaza through two non-historic anodized aluminum doors set within the main entrance. Originally the location of a corridor, Room 118 retains several original features and materials, including its charcoal-colored terrazzo floor and steel and perimeter sheet glass window wall. Otherwise, the materials were installed in 1989-90, including gypsum board walls and suspended T-bar ceilings. The lobby has flush-mounted halogen spotlights and a large non-historic built-in reception desk (Figure 79).
Corridors
At the rear (north end) of the lobby is the main north-south corridor. Subsidiary east-west corridors branch off to the left and right, but all have similar materials and features, including concrete floors with resilient tile flooring, gypsum board walls, and suspended T-bar acoustical ceiling systems which conceal the mechanical equipment. The ceilings contain flush-mounted fluorescent box light fixtures, diffusers, and other mechanical equipment. Painted aluminum-framed side-lights allow light into the offices that line the double-loaded corridors.

Stairs
Not including the stair within Chávez Atrium (described below), there are two interior stairs that join the first and second floors. Stair A is located east of Chávez Atrium. It is a non-historic quarter-turn steel fire stair with resilient rubberized treads and riser covers and a utilitarian steel balustrade and pipe railing (Figure 80). Stair B is located adjacent to the elevator core. It is a non-historic utilitarian concrete dogleg stair added ca. 1989-90.

Offices and Classrooms
The first floor of Chávez Student Center contains 78 numbered rooms (Rooms 100-178), all of which, with the exception of Rooms 100 (Transfer/Re-entry Center), 118 (lobby), 120 (atrium), 122 (copy room), 162 and 164 (telecommunications), and the Cal 1 Card office, are either private staff offices or small classrooms. Although some offices or classrooms vary in size depending on their location and/or use, the standard office measures roughly 324 square feet with 9-foot ceilings. All are products of the 1989-90 remodel and all have carpeted concrete floors, gypsum board partition walls, suspended T-bar ceilings, and solid core wood doors with aluminum frames and hardware. The interior offices are windowless except for steel and wire glass side-lights located next to each door along every corridor (Figure 81). Exterior offices and classrooms are finished in the same materials except that
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their perimeter walls are composed of original steel and sheet glass window units with fixed and operable casement sashes (Figure 82).

**Chávez Atrium**

Chávez Atrium (Room 120) is an important remnant of the original University Dining Commons. Preserved as part of the 1989-90 remodel as a study hall/tutoring center, Chávez Atrium preserves a semblance of the building’s historic interior. Chávez Atrium is a double-height space with a mezzanine accessed by a central stair. Historically used for dining, the space is now filled with tables for the use of students and student tutors (Figure 83).

The concrete floors of Chávez Atrium are carpeted and the walls range from gypsum board (interior) to steel and glass window walls (perimeter). The upper two-thirds of the west wall are covered in perforated Masonite panels. Originally left in their natural unfinished state, the panels have been painted flat white, along with the rest of the interior surfaces. Attached to the panels toward the northern end of the west wall is a large clock made by American Clock Co. The clock is made of flat circular discs representing the numerals and narrow metal bars as the hands (Figure 84).

The window walls along the north and west walls are modular systems composed of six sections – two small lights at the bottom of each unit and four large lights above – divided by structural steel mullions. Some units include operable casements. There are four historic aluminum doors penetrating the exterior walls of the atrium (three paired and one single door).
Unlike the rest of the interior, the cylindrical concrete columns are necessarily exposed within Chávez Atrium. Rising a full 25 feet like giant tree trunks, these white-painted columns support the cast-in-place hyperbolic-paraboloid roof. The ceiling panels are alternately covered in acoustical plaster (better known as “popcorn”) or painted board-formed concrete. The double-height room is illuminated by the massive windows on the north side as well as by diamond-shaped clerestory windows located at regular intervals in the ceiling. Natural light is augmented by suspended fluorescent fixtures. Industrial in character, these light fixtures are not original but do not detract from the space (Figure 85).

The freestanding stair occupying the center of Chávez Atrium is one of the most significant features remaining within the interior of Chávez Student Center. Made of steel with terrazzo risers and treads, the stair also has a steel balustrade. The dogleg stair features an elegant curved landing, providing a place to look out over the space (Figure 86).
Interior: Second Floor
The second floor of Chávez Student Center accommodates suites for four student organizations as well as the Golden Bear Restaurant. It has a somewhat smaller floorplate than the first floor due to the presence of the double-height Chávez Atrium in the northwest corner of the building. Aside from the atrium and the Golden Bear Restaurant, the second floor is entirely a product of the 1989-90 remodel.

Lobby
Chávez Student Center has a secondary lobby near the main entrance on the Terrace level. This space includes a resilient tiled floor, non-historic anodized aluminum door, gypsum board and steel and glass walls, and an exposed wood ceiling, part of the wood pergola that originally extended the length of the south façade (Figure 87).

Corridors
At the rear of the lobby is the main north-south corridor. Subsidiary corridors branch off to the east; all have similar materials and features, including resilient tiled concrete floors, gypsum board walls, and either gypsum board or suspended “T-bar” acoustical ceiling systems which conceal the mechanical equipment. The ceilings contain flush-mounted fluorescent box fixtures, diffusers, and other mechanical equipment.

Elevators
There are at present two passenger elevators located within the utility core of Chávez Student Center. Located next to Stair B, the non-historic elevators have brushed steel doors and utilitarian cabs.

Student Learning Center Suite
The Student Learning Center (Rooms 201, 201A, 201B, 201C, and 240 and 240A) is located in the southwestern corner of the second floor of Chávez Student Center. Located in what was historically the Terrace dining area, the space continues to retain elements of the
building's original design, in particular the exposed hyperbolic-paraboloid ceiling (Figure 88). Most of the rest of the mezzanine has been infilled with modern offices and classrooms.

**Gender Equity Center Suite**
The Gender Equity Center occupies a suite of offices (Rooms 202, 202A, 202B, 203, 204, 207, 209, and 212) located just inside the main entrance. Room 202 is a vestibule/waiting room; Rooms 202A, 202B, and 204 are closets; Rooms 207 and 209 are staff offices; Room 212 is a conference room; Room 212B is a reception area; and Room 212A is a work room. With the exception of Rooms 202 and 212, which both retain their original vaulted ceilings and globe sconces, this suite is a product of the 1989-1990 remodel (Figure 89). Finishes and features are consistent with other offices previously described on the first floor, including carpeted concrete floors, gypsum board walls, suspended “T”-bar ceilings, and solid-core wood doors with metal casings and wire-glass sidelights. Rooms 207 and 209 were appended to the south side of the building in 1989-90 and contain no historic materials.

**Disabled Students’ Program Suite**
The Disabled Students’ Program occupies a suite of offices (Rooms 211, 213, 260, 260A, 260B, 260C, 260D, 260E, 260F, 260G, 260J, 260K, 260L, 260M, 260N, 260P, 260Q, 260R, and 260S) in the southeastern part of the second floor. Formerly part of the Terrace dining area, the suite presently centers on a large open office (Room 260). The suite is accessed by its own entrance from the Terrace outside. With the exception of Rooms 260F and 260G (closets) and Rooms 260N and 260P (toilet rooms), the suite is entirely composed of offices. Rooms 260A,
260B, 260C, 260D and 260E, as well as Rooms 211 and 213 (accessed separately from the Gender Equity Center) all have non-historic exterior window walls (Figure 90). Otherwise they share the same materials observed in the interior offices (Rooms 260J, 260K, 260L, 260M, 260Q, 260R, and 260S): carpeted concrete floors, gypsum board partition walls, suspended T-bar ceilings, and solid-core wood doors with metal frames and wire-glass sidelights. Room 260 retains several features of the original building interior, including elements of the exposed vaulted ceiling, globe sconces, and a section of the modified wood pergola (Figure 91).

**Multicultural Student Development Center Suite**

The Multicultural Student Development Center makes use of a suite of rooms on the north side of Chávez Student Center. These rooms survive from the original plan and were historically used as meeting rooms. The rooms include:

- Room 241 (Native American Advisory Council)
- Room 242 (conference room)
- Room 243 (Cross Cultural Student Development)
- Room 245 (Chicano/Latino Affairs)
- Room 247 (African-American Student Development)
- Room 249 (Asian American Student Development).

With the exception of Room 242, all of these rooms are offices. All have historic steel and glass window walls along their northerly perimeter wall and all have exposed concrete vaulted ceilings. Otherwise these offices have carpeted concrete floors, gypsum board partition walls, and solid-core wood doors with metal casings. Furthermore, because they do not have suspended ceilings, the rooms are fitted with pendant-mounted direct/indirect luminaires (Figure 92).
Golden Bear Restaurant

The Golden Bear Restaurant offers the only remaining food service within Chávez Student Center. A short-order restaurant has occupied this roughly L-shaped space, with several intervals, since 1960. Accessed via its own entrance from Upper Sproul Plaza, the Golden Bear Restaurant is connected to kitchens and back-of-house spaces in the basement by stairs at the rear of the space. The Golden Bear Restaurant has polished, brown-tinted concrete floors. The interior walls are gypsum board and historic steel and glass window walls form the perimeter (Figure 93). Some wall surfaces within the food preparation areas are clad in non-historic stainless steel paneling. The main entrance is located on the east wall, with five additional pedestrian entrances situated along the east and north walls. All have historic glazed aluminum doors (Figure 94). The ceiling is exposed, revealing the hyperbolic-paraboloid vaults and diamond-shaped windows formed at the intersection of the vaults. Electrical conduit and other mechanical equipment and halogen track lighting are suspended from the ceiling by wires. The columns that support the vaults have been wrapped in stainless steel paneling (Figure 95).
Toilet Rooms

There is one men’s and one women’s toilet room on the second floor of Chávez Student Center. Both are located just east of Chávez Atrium. The men’s room is entirely original, featuring glazed red and blue mosaic clay tile flooring, beige ceramic tile wall cladding, and an acoustical tile ceiling with flush-mounted fluorescent luminaires. The toilet partitions are brushed steel and the fixtures are all white porcelain (Figure 96). The women’s toilet room was not surveyed although it is said to resemble the other original toilet room in the basement.

Figure 96. Men’s Toilet Room
View toward south
Source: KVP Consulting
Interior: Assessment of Physical Condition

This section identifies important materials and features of the interior of Chávez Student Center. It also identifies the condition of each element based on the following categories:

- **Excellent (E)** – The element is in near original condition.
- **Good (G)** – The element is mostly intact.
- **Fair (F)** – The element is showing signs of wear or deterioration.
- **Poor (P)** – The element is badly damaged, missing, or not functioning.
- **Unknown (U)** – The element was not accessible for inspection.

Please note that windows and doors are described and assessed in the exterior section above. In addition, this section does not inventory non-historic materials or features.

**Concrete Elements**

Very little historic fabric is left exposed within Chávez Student Center. Aside from the window walls, the only significant fabric remaining within the building are concrete elements, including the cylindrical concrete columns, several sections of exposed hyperbolic-paraboloid roof, and the stairs in Chávez Atrium. Within the basement, several areas retain exposed concrete floors, walls, and ceilings. Most concrete elements appear to be in good condition, with few signs of spalling, efflorescence or cracking.

**Miscellaneous Metal Elements**

The interior of Chávez Student Center contains several significant metal features. The Dining Services area in the basement contains several steel coolers with doors and walls clad in steel or brushed aluminum. Throughout the building, the toilet rooms contain brushed aluminum or stainless steel partitions, shelving, and hardware. On the first floor is a historic American Clock Co. clock located on the west wall of Chávez Atrium. Throughout second floor level there are several dozen steel top-lit sconces with white globe shades. All of these features appear to be well-maintained and are in good condition.

**Toilet Rooms**

The basement of Chávez Student Center contains four original toilet rooms and the second floor, two. None have been remodeled, containing their original floor and wall tiles and plumbing fixtures. All appear to be well-maintained and in good condition.
C. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. STUDENT UNION

Completed in 1961, Martin Luther King Student Union (originally the California Memorial Student Union) was the second building completed within the California Student Center complex (Figure 97). The building originally housed – among other facilities – a bowling alley, restaurants, a pub, bookstore, “quiet” rooms, game rooms, a ballroom, meeting rooms, and a non-denominational “meditation room.” In 1985, the building was renamed the Martin Luther King, Jr. Student Union in honor of the slain Civil Rights leader. Still used as the main student union for the campus, alterations over the last 47 years have replaced many of the original recreational uses with an expanded ASUC Book Store. To accommodate new uses, the basement and first floors have been heavily altered. In contrast, the second, third, fourth and fifth floors are largely intact despite incremental programmatic changes. Similarly, the exterior of King Student Union has undergone very few changes, appearing much as it did in 1961.

King Student Union is a six-level (five floors above grade and one basement level below), 84,700 square-foot, reinforced-concrete structure. It is connected to Chávez Student Center at the first floor level and to a subterranean parking structure (not surveyed) beneath Lower Sproul Plaza. Designed as a joint venture of DeMars & Reay and Hardison & Associates, the building’s design embodies principles of both the Second Bay Region and New Formalist traditions. In terms of its planning and basic articulation it also resembles Jacopo Sansovino’s Libreria di San Marco in Venice.

Because of its large size and prominent location at the intersection of Upper and Lower Sproul Plazas, King Student Union exerts a monumental presence within the southern portion of the University of California campus and Berkeley’s Telegraph Avenue shopping district. The building’s main entrance, which faces the intersection of Telegraph Avenue and Bancroft Way, acknowledges this important confluence of “town” and “gown.” In comparison with the more organically inspired design of Chávez Student Center, King Student Union deliberately embodies a classically influenced design that acknowledges the formal character of Upper Sproul Plaza and the Neoclassical Revival style Sproul Hall. King Student Union’s primary designer, Vernon DeMars, understood the importance of contextualism and the interrelationships between contiguous but very different environments.
Exterior: East Façade

The east façade of King Student Union is 15 bays wide and four levels (floors 2-5) above grade (Figure 98). The building surmounts a concrete plinth consisting of from three to seven concrete steps. The steps provide access to a walkway sheltered beneath the peripteral colonnade at the second floor level (Upper Sproul Plaza). A wheelchair ramp installed in the 1990s is located at the northeastern corner of the building to facilitate access to the walkway. The colonnade is formed by equally spaced, board-formed concrete columns. These columns are poured-in-place concrete, unpainted, and reveal impressions of the formwork used to construct them. Rising the full height of the building, the columns are intersected by a cantilevered balcony at the third floor level. Fenestration at the second floor level consists of a window wall of full-height sheet glass windows demarcated by thick painted steel mullions. Every second bay allows for a partial transom where the beams supported by the exterior colonnade penetrate the window wall.

The southernmost five bays of the east façade contain the principal entrance to the Student Union (Figure 99). The entrance is recessed within the colonnade and features two pairs of anodized bronze doors surrounded by sections of steel and glass window wall. The doors are original and feature stylized brass California Brown Bear pulls installed in 1979 (Figure 100). The pulls (14, or seven sets in all) were designed by Vernon DeMars and fabricated by the Arthur Schmitt Company of San Francisco. Just north of the primary entrance is an integral stair tower enclosing Stair C. The tower is made of concrete masonry units (CMU) laid in a distinctive pattern consisting of paired sections laid in stacked bond (12 courses high) flanking a narrow recessed lancet infilled...
with stucco. Each recessed band is capped by a protruding header. Every twelfth course the pattern begins again, offset to create a rhythmic pattern (Figure 101). North of the stair tower are eight additional bays consisting of a full-height window wall composed of steel mullions and sheet glass punctuated at regular intervals by three pairs of historic glazed aluminum doors. The colonnade walkway is illuminated by painted steel sconces with round polycarbonate globe shades (Figure 102).
The colonnade is intersected by a balcony at the third floor level. The balcony level of the east façade carries a band of fixed aluminum windows enclosed within steel mullions. Every second bay contains a pair of historic glazed aluminum doors that open into the Pauley Ballroom inside. Portions of the third and fourth-floor levels are finished in historic salmon-tinted stucco. Narrow aluminum channel moldings/expansion joints divide the stuccoed portions into vertical panels. The southern portion of the fourth floor level is fenestrated with pairs of original operable aluminum casement windows. The east façade (as well as the other three façades) terminates in a concrete frieze articulated by exposed board form marks and narrow vertical channels. Above this is a delicate pergola made of steel channel columns and horizontal struts bolted together. The pergola is capped by finials designed to resemble California poppies.

Exterior: South Façade
Owing to the change in grade between Upper and Lower Sproul Plazas, the south façade encompasses an additional above-grade floor: the first floor (Figure 103). The first floor level, which faces the partially below-grade southerly arm of Lower Sproul Plaza, is partially concealed from view along Bancroft Way by a broad retaining wall. The first floor level is accessed by two stairs: one from Upper Sproul Plaza and the other directly from Bancroft Way.

Including the one-story wing comprising the Bear’s Lair, the south façade is eleven bays wide at the first floor level and then ten bays wide at the second through the fourth floor levels. Starting at the west end of the first floor level begins with the rectangular concrete wing that houses the Bear’s Lair Pub. The wing, which is finished in rough board-formed concrete, features a non-historic central glazed window wall facing a small enclosed patio. The wing is capped by a soffit emblazoned with a gilded sign that reads: THE BEAR’S LAIR PUB (Figure 104).
The soffit is capped by a historic steel balustrade matching those found elsewhere throughout the California Student Center complex.

East of the Bear’s Lair, the south façade of the Student Union juts out toward Bancroft Way. This portion is also finished in rough board-formed concrete. The first four bays each contain a single fixed, painted aluminum glazed display window (Figure 105). Moving east, the next two bays face a recessed vestibule containing a similar horizontal display window. The next bay to the east contains a recessed pedestrian entrance fitted with a non-historic anodized aluminum bi-fold door. The last visible bay contains an aluminum display window and the two easternmost bays are not visible because they are below grade.

Floors 2-4 of the south façade are divided into ten bays by the colonnade and fenestrated with a combination of fixed steel windows and operable aluminum casements. The two center bays are clad in CMU identical to the enclosure of Stair C described above under the East Façade section. The center bays also contain a steel-framed concrete stair that connects the second and third floors. The third and fourth floor levels are finished in salmon-colored stucco and punctuated by a grid of aluminum window units each composed of a larger fixed sash and a smaller rectangular casement (Figure 106). The south façade terminates with the same concrete frieze and steel pergola described above in the East Façade section. Visible above the frieze from the south side of Bancroft Way is the thin-shell concrete roof and art glass window of the Tilden Room, a non-denominational meditation/meeting room set back at the roof level of the building.
Exterior: West Façade

Mirroring the configuration of the east façade, the west façade of King Student Union is 15 bays wide (Figure 107). The first floor level encompasses the one-story wing that houses the Bear’s Lair. The wing projects westward from the main body of the building, allowing room for a landscaped terrace above the structure at the Upper Sproul Plaza level.

Beginning at the northern end of the wing, the west façade features a one-story pavilion made of rough board-formed concrete with a parapet clad in vertical stained wood planks. Attached to the parapet is a carved wood sign featuring a California Brown Bear and painted lettering that reads: THE BEAR’S LAIR.” The paneling is original but the signage is not. Recessed beneath the parapet is a non-historic window wall containing ten aluminum casement windows (Figure 108).

South of the pavilion described above is a non-historic window wall recessed beneath a concrete soffit. The window wall contains non-historic anodized aluminum fixed and casement windows and two pairs of non-historic glazed anodized aluminum doors. At the southern end of this section is a historic steel-framed concrete stair with a steel balustrade that links Lower Sproul Plaza with the rooftop terrace above the Bear’s Lair (Figure 109). South of the stair is the rectangular concrete volume that houses the Bear’s Lair Pub. This element of the building is extruded outward from the main body of the building. Essentially windowless, this part of the west façade is made of rough board-formed concrete. Small square apertures placed at random provide additional visual interest (Figure 110).
The roof of the Bear's Lair constitutes an outdoor gathering place on the same level as Upper Sproul Plaza. Paved in salmon-tinted concrete and lined with benches, this part of the complex is used for special events (Figure 111). Above the second floor level, the west façade of King Student Union mirrors the east façade described above in the East Façade section except that it lacks a ceremonial entrance similar at Bancroft Way. Instead, the doors of the west façade are unfinished aluminum with standard hardware (Figure 112).
Exterior: North Façade

The north façade of King Student Union is ten bays wide; it faces Chávez Student Center across the stairs linking Upper and Lower Sproul Plazas. Due to the grade change between the east and west sides, only the westernmost portion of the first floor level is above grade. Otherwise, the major part of the north façade (floors 2-5) is above grade (Figure 113).

There are two pedestrian entries at the first floor level: one located in bay 8 and the other in bay 9. The east entry (bay 8) provides access to the ASUC Bookstore and the west entry (bay 9) accesses the Bear’s Lair. These entrances, which are recessed beneath the southern abutment of the pedestrian bridge demolished in 1998, both contain non-historic anodized aluminum doors. To the west of these two entrances is the one-story concrete wing housing the Bear’s Lair. It is finished in rough board-formed concrete detailed similarly to the rest of the first floor and punctuated with square apertures that provide visual interest and illuminate the interior.

The second floor level of the north façade is enclosed behind the building’s colonnade, described in more detail above in the East Façade section. The colonnade shelters a paved walkway accessed from Upper Sproul Plaza by a short flight of concrete steps (Figure 114). Similar to the south façade, the corner bays and the two center bays at the second floor level are clad in CMU laid in a decorative pattern described in more detail above (Figure 115). The center bays of the north façade shelter an inserted open-riser stair (Stair F) composed of concrete treads and a steel balustrade. The stair, composed of two intersecting runs, links the second and third floors (Figure 116). The remainder of the second floor level is devoted to full-height window walls composed of two-part fixed windows demarcated by
steel mullions. The second floor level also features two pairs of bronze doors with the stylized brass Golden Bear door pulls designed by Vernon DeMars and installed in 1979 (Figure 117).

In contrast to the south façade, the third and fourth floor levels of the north façade are not stuccoed. Instead, they are articulated by a double-height window wall that allows abundant natural light into the Pauley Ballroom on the third floor (Figure 118). The window wall features a tripartite pattern of fixed windows interspersed with pairs of historic aluminum doors that provide access from the ballroom to the third-floor floor balcony. The north façade terminates with the same concrete frieze and steel and aluminum cornice/pergola described above in the East Façade section. Not visible from the plaza level is the mechanical penthouse that occupies a portion of the fifth floor level. Finished in stucco, the penthouse is windowless.
Exterior: Roof

As with Chávez Student Center, the roof of King Student Union is designed to be viewed from above. The southern portion of the roof is occupied by the Tilden Room, a concrete structure with a thin-shelled folded-plate concrete roof that matches the roof of Chávez Student Center. To the east and west of the Tilden Room are roof-top gardens known as the East and West Terraces. Enclosed within the decorative steel and aluminum cornice/pergola structure, these gardens include benches for quiet reflection set among raised planters. North of the Tilden Room and the East and West Terraces are the utilitarian mechanical penthouse and stair towers. The mechanical penthouse contains elevator equipment, toilet rooms, and storage. The stair towers house the upper portion of Stairs B and C, both internal fire stairs. Both the mechanical penthouse and stair towers are utilitarian, windowless, flat-roofed boxes finished in salmon-tinted stucco matching the other stuccoed areas of the building’s exterior. North of the penthouses, the flat roof of King Student Union is covered with a rubberized membrane and non-historic photovoltaic cells.
Exterior: Assessment of Physical Condition

The present section identifies important materials and features of the exterior of King Student Union. It also identifies the condition of each element based on the following categories:

- **Excellent (E)** – The element is in near original condition.
- **Good (G)** – The element is mostly intact.
- **Fair (F)** – The element is showing signs of wear or deterioration.
- **Poor (P)** – The element is badly damaged, missing, or not functioning.
- **Unknown (U)** – The element was not accessible for inspection.

**Steel and Glass Window Walls**

Much of the exterior of King Student Union is made up of historic steel and glass window walls, including two-part fixed units at the second floor level and larger three-part units on the third and fourth floor levels. With their painted structural steel mullions and large expanses of sheet glass, the window walls are one of the most significant character-defining features of the building. The large panes of sheet glass are held in place by caulking and narrow steel parting beads. Although in generally good condition, the nearly fifty-year-old steel mullions now display evidence of paint delamination and some minor surface corrosion. Based on the findings of a recent report, the larger ballroom window walls are believed to be susceptible to cracking and breakage during an earthquake. All windows on the first floor level (Bear’s Lair) have been replaced with non-historic anodized aluminum windows.

**Aluminum Windows**

King Student Union incorporates a selection of historic fixed and operable aluminum windows located at the third and fourth floor levels along the east, west, and south façades. This window type is generally used to provide light and air to classroom and meeting rooms within the upper floors of the building. In general, the condition of this building element is good. Some windows display an accumulation of minor organic growth but very little if any actual corrosion. These windows, tested for functionality, opened and closed easily although windows of this age and size can be expected to have some deflection.

**Glazed Aluminum and Anodized Bronze Doors**

The exterior of King Student Union contains several glazed aluminum and anodized bronze doors, most of which are original. Historic glazed aluminum doors, which are easily distinguished by their natural finish and color, are located around the perimeter of the building, particularly at the second, third, and fifth floor levels. These doors are either single or paired and consist of a single pane of glass surrounded by a thick aluminum frame. Hardware consists either of historic pull handles or contemporary levers on the exterior and push bars on the interior. The anodized bronze doors were used in important public entrances, in particular at the second floor level facing Upper Sproul Plaza. These anodized bronze doors are further distinguished by their distinctive handmade brass “California Bear” pulls. Remarkably, every door of either type above the first floor level appears to be original. All doors on the first floor level (Bear’s Lair) have been replaced with non-historic anodized aluminum counterparts.
Concrete Elements

Board-formed concrete elements and CMU cladding constitute large areas of the exterior of King Student Union. Board-formed concrete walls at the first floor level bear the impression of random-width board forms, giving the exterior of the Bear’s Lair its distinctive naturalistic and handmade texture. The colonnade and the exterior balconies reveal a more subtle board form pattern. Decorative CMU are used extensively on the exterior of King Student Union. Used as cladding for fire stairs on the north and south sides of the building as well as for detailing on the center bays of the second and third floor levels, this CMU cladding is a distinctive exterior material consistent with Vernon DeMars’ interest in using materials of contrasting texture and shape that engender a more organic feel. While generally in good condition, much of the concrete has discolored as a result of biological growth, especially along the north façade and other areas that are in shade for much of the day, or where condensation is an issue. Vehicle exhaust and soot have also discolored the rough-textured exterior concrete work. Efflorescence, or the extrusion of whitish salt compounds from masonry, is also evident throughout the exterior. Structurally, the concrete elements appear to be in sound condition, bearing little evidence of spalling, cracking or other damage resulting from improperly cured concrete or corroded rebar.

Miscellaneous Metal Elements

The exterior of King Student Center displays several metallic features. On the north and south façades are aluminum letters that spell out the name of the building. The signs clearly date to 1985 when the building was renamed in honor of Martin Luther King, although based on its location and the font used it appears that it may constitute an “in kind” replacement of earlier signage. Simple balustrades protect users of all exterior balconies and stairs. These elements all appear to be original and in good condition. Around the exterior of the building are several dozen steel top-lit pole fixtures with white globe shades. There are also matching sconces flanking several entrances. Most important of the metal elements is the steel trellis/cornice that caps the building. This is a historic element of the original design and is in good condition.
**Interior: Overview of Interior Scheme**

The centerpiece of the California Student Center complex and the impetus that drove the entire competition, King Student Union was designed to accommodate a complicated program within a relatively compact footprint. The interior of the building is divided into five above-ground floors and a basement. The character of each of the six levels ranges from heavily altered and overwhelmingly utilitarian spaces such as the basement and first floor, to highly intact ceremonial spaces, such as the Pauley Ballroom on the third floor and the Tilden Room on the fifth floor.

The basement of King Student Union, which is significantly larger than the building's above-ground footprint, adjoins both Chávez Student Center and the underground parking garage beneath Lower Sproul Plaza (not surveyed). The basement contains the ASUC Bookstore warehouse, offices and maintenance shops, mechanical equipment, toilet rooms, storage, and the ASUC Bookstore's textbook shop, the latter housed in what was originally a bowling alley. Most of this floor is utilitarian in character and contains no spaces or features of architectural significance.

The first floor, which is partially below grade, extends beneath part of Upper Sproul Plaza. Although this floor contains several intact original spaces, many historic programmatic spaces such as the quiet rooms, game rooms, and showers have been removed to make way for an ever-expanding ASUC Bookstore and ancillary retail uses. Although some original detailing survives within the bookstore proper, it too has been reconfigured and remodeled many times. Accessed independently from Lower Sproul Plaza, the first floor also includes the Bear's Lair, a combination food court and pub. Some original materials and details survive in this area, although it too has been remodeled several times.

The second floor is the first entirely above-grade floor level of the Student Union and it is restricted to the footprint of the building proper. Originally a largely public space consisting of the Information Desk, Main Lobby, and Heller Lounge, much of the second floor was converted into the sportswear department of the ASUC Student Bookstore ca. 2005. Heller Lounge, which is moderately intact, presently houses the Multicultural Center and a non-historic computer lab. Heller Lounge has also been cut off from the rest of the second floor level by a partition wall. Despite the changes in use, the second floor retains the majority of its original fabric and materials.

The third floor is the most architecturally significant of the six levels within King Student Union and it is virtually unchanged in regard to both program and design. Accessed from the second floor by a sweeping ceremonial stair, the third floor contains a large public lobby, Stephens Conference Room, and the Pauley Ballroom.

Because the Pauley Ballroom on the third floor is a double-height space, the fourth floor occupies only the southern third of King Student Union’s floorplate. Containing eight conference/meeting rooms, paneled in
different types of wood, this space is largely intact from the building's early history, although there is evidence that they were finished after the rest of the building.

The fifth floor level of King Student Union holds several roof-top structures, including the Tilden Room, a meditation room/non-denominational chapel; mechanical penthouse, and two stair enclosures. The Tilden Room contains several works of art and is flanked on either side by two outdoor gardens: East and West Terrace.

*Interior: Basement*
As stated above, the basement has the largest footprint of all six interior levels within King Student Union. Historically the location of back-of-house functions such as maintenance, storage, and mechanical rooms, the basement originally contained a large bowling alley and barber shop, both of which were subsequently converted into the ASUC Textbook Store in 1992. On account of its location and primary functions, the basement is windowless and utilitarian in appearance, consisting for the most part of plain industrial finishes without significant architectural features or materials. Presently, the basement is divided into three major sections: the ASUC Bookstore warehouse (Rooms 1-5F), the Facilities Operations and Event Services offices and shops (Rooms 20-40), and the ASUC Textbook Store. In addition to these, there are also custodial rooms and coolers and storage for the Bear’s Lair restaurant and pub.

*Lobby and Corridor*
The basement lobby is located between the elevator core and the ASUC Warehouse. The elevator doors are stainless steel. This space, including the primary north-south corridor, features historic red terra cotta tiles, concrete walls finished in plaster, and spray-on acoustical plaster ceilings. The ceiling supports flush-mounted, rectangular fluorescent box fixtures. The doors are solid-core wood and glazed with wire glass with narrow 2-inch wood casings. Wood crown moldings and baseboards extend around the perimeter of the space, which is the most significant area in the entire basement (Figure 119).

*ASUC Bookstore Warehouse*
The ASUC Bookstore warehouse (Room 5) occupies the eastern third of the basement floorplate. Largely a utilitarian work space bounded by staff offices and workrooms, the warehouse is utilitarian in character, with
polished concrete floors, windowless board-formed concrete walls, exposed concrete post and beam structural frame, concrete ceilings with track-mounted fluorescent luminaires, and exposed mechanical equipment. Steel shelving units arranged in rows hold store stock with chain link fencing guarding more valuable goods (Figure 120).

**Staff Offices and Workrooms**
A cluster of staff offices and workrooms (Rooms 5A-5F) is located around the perimeter of the ASUC Warehouse. Room 5F, a typical example, is utilitarian in character, featuring a carpeted concrete floor, painted stud-frame and gypsum board walls, applied acoustical tile ceilings, flush-mounted fluorescent box light fixtures, and solid-core wood doors and internal windows with 2-inch wood casings (Figure 121).

**Facilities Operations/Event Services**
Several storage and mechanical rooms, including Rooms 22, 26, and 26A, occupy a small area west of the main north-south corridor. Elevator 3, a utilitarian space utilized by janitorial staff, occupies the same area. East of the corridor are several offices, shops, and mechanical rooms. Storage rooms for the Bear’s Lair, including a chiller, pantry, and other storage occupy Rooms 12 and 14 and part of Suite 20C. Facilities Operations occupies Rooms 20, 20A, part of Suite 20C, 24, 24A, and 24B. Room 20 is a vestibule adjoining the main corridor. Room 20A houses HVAC and other mechanical equipment.

Formerly the Repair Shop and Student Union storage, Rooms 24, 24A, and 24B presently house the offices of the Facilities Operations and Event Services departments. Room 28, the ASUC Cash Office, was subdivided from the repair shop after 1978. Similar in character to the ASUC Bookstore warehouse, the Facilities Operations and Event Services Department is windowless with concrete floors and painted
concrete or stud-framed gypsum board walls penetrated by wood-framed windows and glazed solid-core wood doors. The ceilings are painted concrete and feature exposed mechanical equipment. Light fixtures are suspended aluminum fluorescent luminaires (Figure 122).

**Toilet Rooms**

At the far northern end of the main corridor is a pair of doors leading to the underground parking structure beneath Lower Sproul Plaza. At this point the corridor makes a ninety-degree turn to the east. Along the north side of the corridor are Rooms 31 (staff room), 37 (women’s toilet), and 39 (men’s toilet). According to 1978 alteration drawings prepared by Hardison & Komatsu, Rooms 37 and 38 were originally a large men’s toilet room. The toilet rooms were remodeled to their present configuration ca. 1992.

**Student Textbook Store**

The ASUC Textbook Store, historically the location of the ASUC Bowling Alley and barber shop, occupies the northernmost section of the basement level. It is accessed from the shops area through a door at the southern end of the space as well as by a staircase from the ASUC Bookstore on the first floor level. The space features an upper and lower level. The eastern (upper) level is at approximately the same level as the rest of the basement. Presently this area contains sales desks, men’s and women’s toilets, and several small mechanical and storage rooms, including Rooms 40 (janitors’ closet), 51 (customer service manager), and 51A (elevator machine room). The western section of the Textbook Store steps down even further below grade. This area, historically occupied by the bowling lanes, presently contains shelving for textbooks. A flight of carpeted concrete stairs leads down to this space. The entire space is windowless and has been finished in
contemporary industrial materials, including carpeted concrete floors, texture-painted concrete walls and columns, and suspended T-bar ceilings (Figure 123).

Interior: First Floor

Encompassing the entire floorplate of King Student Union proper as well as the subterranean "mall" beneath Upper Sproul Plaza, the first floor level of the Student Union is accessed externally from several points, including from Chávez Student Center, Lower Sproul Plaza, and also via stairs from the basement and the second floor levels of the Student Union itself. Long since replaced with retail and office uses, the first floor level once contained the Games Room, men’s and women’s toilets, and men’s and women’s "quiet rooms." During the 1970s, the northern end of the first floor was converted into the ASUC Mini Mall and this area continues to house retail and office uses. The first floor is still the location of the ASUC Bookstore and the Bear’s Lair, which have both been heavily remodeled several times in the past. Orientation of the first floor is linear; all spaces are tied together by a north-south corridor paved in red brick pavers that match Lower Sproul Plaza’s paving. The spaces are described in order, beginning at the south end and working north along the corridor.

Storage

Located east of the main (southern) entrance is a pair of utilitarian storage rooms (Rooms 102 and 102A). These spaces were locked and not surveyed.

South Vestibule

Entering the Student Union from the south, one passes through a set of non-historic anodized aluminum bi-fold doors into a vestibule (Room 104). The vestibule, which is located between the ASUC Bookstore and the Campus Convenience Store, dates from a 1991 remodel. The space features non-historic anodized aluminum window walls, a historic red tiled floor, and an exposed concrete beam ceiling partially concealed behind historic wood furring. The vestibule is the starting point for the central corridor that bisects the first floor from south to north. Historic recessed fluorescent box fixtures punctuate the vestibule’s ceiling. Painted concrete columns bracket the north and south walls (Figure 124).
**Campus Convenience Store**

Located south of the vestibule is the Campus Convenience Store (Room 105). Originally the location of the sportswear department of the ASUC Bookstore, the space was converted into a convenience store in 1991. Presently the space features floors covered in non-historic white hexagonal tiles, non-historic gypsum board walls, and a suspended T-Bar ceiling with recessed fluorescent box fixtures (Figure 125). The convenience store contains a small freight elevator at the southwest corner and an ancillary kitchen and storage area (Room 105B). Aside from its ceiling and the exterior walls, the Campus Convenience Store is entirely non-historic.

**ASUC Bookstore**

The ASUC Bookstore (Room 120) occupies the greater part of the first floor level of King Student Union. The space consists of an open sales floor bisected by the red brick walkway that is part of the main north-south corridor. Apart from the walkway, the ASUC Bookstore sales floor is entirely carpeted. The ceiling of the bookstore sales floor consists of exposed concrete beams with wood furring above the central walkway, and suspended T-bar ceilings with square recessed fluorescent box fixtures elsewhere (Figure 126). The ASUC Bookstore has been reconfigured several times, mostly notably in 1985 after a fire, and although it retains aspects of its original design, it remains largely a product of later remodeling campaigns.

**ASUC Bookstore Offices**

Stud-frame and gypsum board partition walls demarcate several small staff offices (Rooms 117-119 and 129-134) located at regular intervals around the perimeter of the bookstore. Built in 1974, and all windowless, the offices have carpeted concrete floors, stud-frame gypsum board walls, and suspended T-bar ceilings with square recessed
fluorescent box fixtures. The doors are wood solid-core with aluminum hardware and 2-inch wood moldings. Several of the offices are arranged in small suites with wood-framed windows providing additional light into inner offices (Figure 127).

**Corridors**

The central corridor (Rooms 167-169) runs the length of the first floor from the south entrance to the north end of the ASUC “Mall” (Figure 128). It is divided into three numbered sections: the southerly section which bisects the ASUC Bookstore (Room 167), the central section that runs through the former ASUC Mini Mall (Room 168), and a northerly east-west ramped corridor that links Lower Sproul Plaza with the art studio/projects room (Room 169). The floor of all three sections is covered with red brick tiles matching Lower Sproul Plaza. In addition to tying together indoor and outdoors paces, the corridors demarcate the primary circulation route through the building. The walls, where they exist, are stud frame and finished in either gypsum board or painted wood paneling. The ceiling is made of concrete beams screened behind painted wood furring. The corridor is illuminated by recessed fluorescent box fixtures. The central section of the central corridor (Room 168) is bracketed on either end by pairs of doors, including one pair of historic glazed wood doors on the north end and a pair of non-historic glazed metal doors on the south end. About midway along the east wall of the central corridor is a wall-mounted birch plywood display case with glass doors (Figure 129).
In addition to the ramped east-west corridor (Room 169) there is a secondary east-west corridor (not numbered) that links the central corridor with Lower Sproul Plaza. Its red brick flooring matches the paving of Lower Sproul Plaza and the rest of the corridor, creating a seamless transition between indoor and outdoor spaces, a principal tenet of Modernism and the Second Bay Region Tradition. The exterior doors of both east-west corridors are historic glazed aluminum units that match the rest of the complex. The northernmost section of the corridor (Room 169) ramps upward toward the plaza. This section of the corridor contains a historic drinking fountain on the north wall that matches several others located throughout the building (Figure 130).

**Stairs**

The first floor level of King Student Union has five stairs linking it to other levels within the building. Stair D is located at the south end of the ASUC Bookstore and it connects the first floor to the basement. Paved with red clay tiles that match the central corridor, the steel frame stair has a steel balustrade and hardwood hand rails. Stair E, which connects the first and second floors, is symmetrically located at the north end of the ASUC Bookstore. Stair E is steel-framed and has terrazzo risers and treads, steel balusters, and a sculpted hardwood handrail (Figure 131). Stair G is located to the east of the north entrance to the ASUC Bookstore; it links the first floor with the ASUC Textbook Store in the basement. This stair is concrete and has a steel pipe hand railing. Stair H is located at the east end of the first floor, behind the abandoned men’s and women’s toilet rooms along the central corridor. This stair is inaccessible and not surveyed. Stair J is located at the west end of the northern east-west corridor. Prior to 1998 it linked the first floor to the bridge between King Student Union and
Chávez Student Center. Constructed of concrete with steel balusters and wood hand rails, Stair J is a composite dogleg stair. The walls are concrete and concrete block and the ceiling features sprayed-on acoustical plaster. A strap iron sculpture of human figures by artist Robert Howard is attached to the east wall at the first landing (Figure 132). A suspended globe light fixture illuminates the space. Stair K is located at the northwest corner of the first floor level. It provides access from the first floor to the basement of Chávez Student Center. This stair is a concrete quarter turn stair with steel pipe railings. The floors, walls, and ceilings are concrete with fluorescent wall-mounted fixtures. Aside from changes in paint color, all of the stairs surveyed retain their original materials and elements.

**Toilet Rooms**

There are two abandoned toilet/shower rooms (one men’s and one women’s – not numbered) located on the east side of the central corridor just north of the ASUC Bookstore. There are also two toilet rooms (men’s – Room 165 and women’s – Room 166) located on either side of the east-west corridor. The toilet rooms contain original 1960s-era finishes including tiled floors and walls and porcelain fixtures, including toilets, sinks, and showers. Brushed stainless steel partitions and shelving is used in the toilet rooms. The toilet rooms feature gypsum board ceilings finished in sprayed-on acoustical plaster. They are illuminated by flush-mounted fluorescent luminaires (Figure 133). The doors are solid-core wood. The toilet rooms surveyed retain their original materials and fixtures and help convey the original character of the building.

**Quiet Rooms**

Located along the east wall of the central corridor are two rooms labeled on original plans as the “Women’s Quiet Room” (Room 152) and the “Men’s Quiet Room” (Room 158). These two rooms were intended to be used by students to nap or rest. Both were subsequently vacated and remodeled for retail space and storage after 1978 and retain little historic fabric. Both have carpeted concrete floors, gypsum board and wood-panel walls, and suspended
T-bar ceilings. The rooms are illuminated by recessed fluorescent fixtures and ventilated by circular metal diffusers.

Storage
Located on the west side of the central corridor, across from the Quiet Rooms, is a storage area (Room 159). The space is carpeted and retains a variety of various types of wood paneling on the walls. This room connects to a crawl space beneath the exterior stairs that link Upper and Lower Sproul Plazas.

Shoeshine Booth
Located on the west side of the central corridor, just north of the entrance to Room 159, is a vacant commercial space (Room 157). Labeled “Shoe Shine” on original plans of the Student Union, the space is presently vacant and secured by a steel security gate. The walls are gypsum board and there are several built-in wood cabinets located along the west wall.

STA Travel Center/C.U.B.S.
Located on the west side of the central corridor, just north of the southernmost of the east-west corridors, is the STA Travel Center (Room 161) and C.U.B.S (Room 162). Occupying part of what was originally the Games Room, these two spaces were created in 1974 by building a wall through the middle of the room. The exterior of Room 161 is clad in painted vertical wood paneling with continuous fixed wood windows above. Inside the office, the floor has been carpeted and the walls are gypsum board. The ceilings are suspended T-bar systems with recessed fluorescent box fixtures. The doors are wood, each with a glazed center panel (Figure 134).
162 was inaccessible and therefore not surveyed.

**Naia Lounge**
Located on the east side of the central corridor is an informal restaurant facility occupying a space that was originally part of the Games Room (Rooms 160 & 160A) before it was moved to the basement in 1974. This space has been entirely remodeled, featuring exposed concrete floors and columns, gypsum board walls with fixed wood sash windows fitted with wire glass along the corridor, and concrete ceilings with exposed beams and mechanical equipment. A non-historic food service counter occupies the southern end of the space, with a small kitchen behind (Figure 135).

**Projects Room/Art Studio**
The Projects Room/Art Studio (Room 163) is located at the northern end of the central corridor. The room contains a ceramics and photography studio, darkrooms, kiln rooms, and other ancillary space. Unlike the rest of the first floor level, Room 163 has undergone few significant changes since the building was completed in 1961. The room is utilitarian, with concrete floors, walls, and ceilings. Exposed concrete columns and beams reveal the structural system of the building. Glazed aluminum partitions divide the ceramics and photography studios. Built-in wood cabinets are located throughout the space to store materials and supplies. Room 163 is illuminated in part by natural light provided by windows along the west wall and supplemented by suspended historic metal fluorescent luminaire fixtures (Figure 136).

**Campus Restaurants Suite**
Functionally associated with Chávez Student Center next door, the far northwestern corner of King Student Center's first floor contains a pair of offices presently occupied by the offices of Campus Restaurants (Rooms 164 & 165). These rooms, which appear to be largely original, feature linoleum and carpeted concrete floors, concrete block exterior walls,
gypsum board interior partitions, and suspended T-bar ceilings.

**Bear’s Lair**

The Bear’s Lair was part of the original program for the Student Union. Although the plan of the space appears to have changed little since the building was completed, the finish materials have been changed many times and consequently very little remains from the original design. The space presently consists of a row of five individual take-out restaurants arrayed along the east wall of the space (Rooms 149A-149D), an open dining area to the west (Room 149), and a separate “tap room,” or bar historically known as the “Sibley Room” or Pappy’s Pub (Room 141). Rooms 149 and 149A-149D have tinted and polished concrete floors, gypsum board and glazed window walls, and exposed concrete beam ceilings. The rooms are illuminated by fluorescent luminaires and halogen track lighting fixtures (Figure 137).

The Sibley Room (Room 161) is more elaborate than the food court area. It is also more intact in regard to materials and finishes. Like the dining area, Room 161 has tinted and polished concrete floors, gypsum board and glazed window walls, and exposed concrete beam ceilings. In addition to these more utilitarian finishes, the walls feature a decorative staggered-pattern wood wainscoting (Figure 138). A non-historic birch plywood bar occupies the center of the room and at the northeast corner of the room is a historic “inglenook” containing a stone fireplace, slate flooring, and wood mantel (Figure 139).
Interior: Second Floor

The second floor level of King Student Union is the building’s first entirely above-grade level and unlike either the basement or first floor, it occupies only the footprint of the Student Union proper. In contrast to the lower two floors, the second floor has a simple, largely open plan consisting of a contemporary central utility core surrounded by three historic formerly public spaces. Originally configured with the Main Lobby and Information Desk occupying the eastern half of the floor plate, with the interconnected Heller Lounge to the rear (west), the second floor presently contains ASUC Bookstore’s sportswear department and the now renamed Heller Multicultural Center. The second floor level is accessed from the first floor by Stair E at the northern end of the floor plate as well as from outside by twelve pedestrian entrances located around the building’s perimeter.
Main Lobby

King Student Union’s formal entrance is situated at the southeastern corner of the second floor. Two pairs of anodized bronze doors provide access from the exterior into the Main Lobby (Room 200), originally known as the Memorial Lobby. One of the most significant interior spaces in the Student Union, the Memorial Lobby features tinted and polished concrete floors embellished with cast stone accents and scored joints. The perimeter walls are steel and glass window walls, with an area of decorative CMU behind Stair C. Behind the main stair on the south wall is an area clad in redwood planks added in 1979. The interior partition walls are gypsum board. The ceiling features exposed concrete beams, between which are recessed panels covered in sprayed-on acoustical plaster. The lobby is amply illuminated by natural light, fluorescent luminaires, and unusual suspended plastic and metal incandescent fixtures and matching sconces that resemble jelly fish (Figure 140).

The dominant architectural feature in the Main Lobby is Stair A, a “C”-shaped stair located at the south end of the space (Figure 141). Constructed atop a steel frame with steel balusters, travertine risers and treads, and sculpted wood hand rails, the stair unfolds as a dramatic processionial sequence up to the third floor level and the Pauley Ballroom. The Main Lobby also contains the case designed by Vernon DeMars that houses the famous “Stanford Axe.”
Heller Multicultural Center

Heller Multicultural Center (Room 205) occupies the entire western third of the second floor level. Originally used as a multi-purpose lounge for all Cal students, the room has been redesignated as an assembly space for multicultural students. Aside from the computer laboratory carved out of the southern end of the space in the 1980s and the removal of the original Knoll furnishings, the former Heller Lounge is largely unchanged from its original design. Presently most of the floor is carpeted, although the space originally had tinted and polished concrete floors matching those of the lobby (Figure 142). The north, south, and west exterior walls are steel and glass window walls and the east interior wall is clad in two tiers of rough milled wood planks (Figure 143). In addition, a small section of the west wall adjoining Stair B is made of decorative CMU. The floor adjoining the CMU wall has a concrete base made of a heavy pebble aggregate, upon which is mounted a mid-century-styled freestanding hooded fireplace with a sheet metal flue (Figure 144). The ceiling of Room 205 is composed of exposed concrete beams interspersed with areas of unpainted wood furring. The room is illuminated naturally and by flush-mounted fluorescent luminaire fixtures.
Information Desk Area

Originally the location of a reception area and the University Information Desk, the northeasterly corner of King Student Union presently contains the ASUC sportswear department. The space is accessed from the main ASUC Bookstore on the first floor by Stair E. The stair walls are clad in painted board and batten embellished with an abstract wood sculpture of unknown origin (Figure 145). The floors of the space are tinted and polished concrete with scored joints and cast stone accents. The north and east exterior walls are steel and glass window walls and the south and west walls are non-historic gypsum board.

The ceiling consists of painted concrete beams with sprayed-on acoustical plaster. The space is illuminated by natural light and suspended fluorescent luminaire fixtures that appear to be original (Figure 146).

Offices

Rooms 225 and 225A are offices located between the former reception area and the second-floor utility core. Early plans show three additional offices as well as a ticket sales counter in this area. These were removed in 2005 when the ASUC sportswear department moved to the second floor level. The two remaining offices are windowless and are similar to other non-historic offices in King Student Union, with carpeted concrete floors, gypsum board walls, and suspended T-bar ceilings. The doors are solid-core wood and the offices are illuminated by recessed fluorescent box fixtures.
**Toilet Rooms**

Rooms W215 (women’s) and M217 (men’s) toilet rooms are located within the utility core. They are the only toilet rooms on the second floor level. Remodeled ca. 2005, the two toilet rooms feature non-historic floor and wall tiles and white porcelain fixtures divided by brushed steel partitions. The toilet rooms, which were originally accessed from the east side of the second floor, are now accessed from a corridor that enters the utility core from the south.

**Third Floor**

Since King Student Union was completed in 1961, the third floor has been the location of Stephens Memorial Lounge, the Pauley Ballroom, and several support spaces including a catering kitchen, telephone booths, and storage. The third floor level is accessed from the second floor by Stair A from the lobby. It is accessed from the upper floors by Stairs B and C. The third floor is also served by a pair of elevators (Elevators 1 and 2) located in the building’s utility core. Unlike the lower floors of the building, the third floor has not undergone any changes in use, resulting in few physical alterations over the years.

**Lobby**

The Main Stair provides a dramatic entry sequence from the Main Lobby on the second floor to the third floor lobby (Room 300), an open promenade and reception area. Above the stair is a circular recessed soffit containing an elaborate chrome-plated chandelier (Figure 147). This feature, custom-made made by the Lightolier Company, was not installed until 1976, although it is compatible with the building’s original design. Matching multi-pod chrome sconces line the walls of the lobby (Figure 148). As one of the most important public spaces within the Student Union and the venue for many high-profile events, the third-floor lobby features a higher level of detailing and more expensive materials than what was used elsewhere in the building.
The lobby floors are laid in a distinctive parquet pattern composed of parallel bands of 1 x 4-inch strips of white oak. The walls are finished in several varieties of wood paneling, including rough dark-stained vertical planks on the south wall above Stair A, an area that also features a black and white photograph of Martin Luther King, Jr. speaking in Sproul Plaza. The other three walls are clad in mahogany veneer paneling bent to fit the curved profile of the walls of Stephens Lounge and the utility core (Figure 149). The paneling is finished with a narrow 2-inch wood base board molding and similar moldings surrounding doors and transoms. Thin battens are used to conceal the joints between individual panels. Each row of paneling is offset from the row beneath it, creating a decorative patterned effect.

The suspended ceiling within the lobby is finished in a sprayed-on acoustical plaster (Figure 150). A thin soffit reveal extends around the perimeter of the ceiling, concealing HVAC equipment. The lobby is illuminated by both natural light and by recessed spot incandescent fixtures arranged a random decorative pattern.

The windows of the lobby are steel-framed with fixed steel sash. Glazed aluminum doors provide access to the balcony level outside. Non-historic solid-core wood doors provide access to Stephens Lounge and historic solid core wood doors open to Pauley Ballroom. Pairs of historic wood doors (two on either side of the elevators) provide access to what were originally telephone booths and coat check rooms (Rooms 300A and 300B) (Figure 151). The telephones have been removed from the telephone booths and the west coat check room has been merged with the storage room (Room 302). Fire-rated steel double doors provide access to Stairs B and C. The elevator doors are brushed steel housed within painted steel enclosures. A historic porcelain drinking fountain is located at the west end of the lobby; this matches several others that remain within the building.
Plans show a temporary lounge space (Room 307) situated in the southwest corner of the lobby. The mirror-image counterpart of Stephens Lounge, Room 307 was evidently formed by pulling curtains around the space although tracks for a curtain do not now exist in the ceiling.

![Figure 151. Room 300, third floor lobby](image)
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Pauley Ballroom

Named for the wife of former UC Regent Edwin Pauley, the Pauley Ballroom (Rooms 301A and 301B) occupies the western two-thirds of the third floor level. The ballroom is divided into two smaller spaces by a moveable divider. The divider, clad in mahogany veneer, runs on tracks and folds into a niche along the rear wall, allowing the rooms to be combined into one large space. The west ballroom (Room 301A) is the larger of the two, occupying the westernmost two-thirds of the ballroom (Figure 152). The floors of both spaces feature 2-inch maple flooring. A steel-frame window wall forms the north wall of the space (Figure 153). In contrast, the south wall of the ballroom is a double-height stud partition wall clad in spaced 3 ¼-inch wood strips attached to panels of fabric-covered acoustical material (Figure 154). The east and west walls of the Pauley Ballroom are composed of fixed steel windows and aluminum double doors with acoustical panels above. The ceiling consists of exposed concrete beams and mechanical equipment concealed behind suspended, pivoting acoustical baffles. The space is illuminated by suspended incandescent spotlights and wall-mounted sconces with paired globe-shaped glass shades.

Storage

Room 302 is used for storing tables and other demountable equipment and furnishings used in the ballroom. The room is utilitarian, with concrete floors, gypsum board and wood-paneled walls, and gypsum board ceilings. Mechanical equipment intrudes into the space.
**Kitchen**

A catering kitchen consisting of four rooms (Rooms 303A-303D) occupies most of the third-floor utility core. Accessed by Elevator 2, the suite is comprised of a prep area (Room 303A), a kitchen (Room 303B), and two small storage rooms (Rooms 303C and 303D). The rooms are windowless and utilitarian in character. The floors are covered in resilient tile flooring. The walls of the food preparation spaces are finished in a buff-colored tile wainscoting with gypsum board above. The ceilings are gypsum board and covered in flush-mounted acoustical tiles. The doors are solid-core wood. Built-in equipment includes professional-grade steel appliances, counters, and shelving units as well as an exhaust hood (Figure 155).

**Stephens Memorial Lounge**

Stephens Memorial Lounge (Room 305), named in honor of history professor Henry Morse Stephens (1857-1919 – the individual for whom the previous student union was named), occupies the southeast corner of the third floor. Utilized as a meeting room and classroom, Stephens Memorial Lounge is finished with the same materials and detailing as the third floor lobby.
Fourth Floor
Due to the double-height Pauley Ballroom on the third floor, the fourth floor of King Student Union occupies only the eastern third of building's floorplate. The fourth floor includes a central lobby and eight meeting room/classrooms, named for their wood paneling, that are located along the south wall of the lobby. Several of the classrooms are separated by moveable partitions, allowing the rooms to be reconfigured into larger spaces if needed. The utility core on the north side of the lobby contains men's and women's toilet rooms and several storage rooms. Like the third floor, the fourth floor has undergone few major changes since the building was completed in 1961.

Lobby
The fourth floor is accessed by Stairs B and C and by Elevators 1 and 2. The fourth-floor lobby (Room 400) extends the width of the building, providing direct access to all eight classrooms on the south side and the toilet rooms and storage areas on the north side. The floors of the lobby are concrete covered with carpet. The south wall is finished in gypsum board and the north wall is clad in vertical tongue and groove wood paneling. Solid core wood doors provide access to the classrooms and meeting rooms on the south side of the corridor and a combination of wood and steel doors access the utility rooms north of the corridor. The ceiling is gypsum board and covered in sprayed-on acoustical plaster. The lobby is illuminated by flush-mounted fluorescent luminaire fixtures (Figure 156).

Toilet Rooms
There are two four-room toilet room suites: one for men (Rooms 401-401C) and the other for women (Rooms 411-411C). Both suites consist of a small corridor (Rooms 401 and 411), wash rooms (Rooms 401B and 411B), toilet rooms (Rooms 401C and 411C), and rooms labeled on early as-built plans as "cot rooms"
(Rooms 401A and 411A). The original function of the cot rooms is not known but they may have been used for napping. The women’s toilet room was not surveyed. The men’s toilet room appears entirely unchanged from the building’s original design (Figure 157). The floors are finished in red terra cotta-tinted mosaic tiles. The walls are gypsum board, with some areas finished in buff-colored ceramic tiles. The ceilings are gypsum board with flush-mounted fluorescent luminaire fixtures. Fixtures include porcelain sinks and toilets and built-in items include brushed-steel toilet partitions and shelving units.

**Black Oak Room**

The Black Oak Room (Room 402) is a small classroom located in the southwest corner of the fourth floor. The room, which is accessed by a door on the north wall, is carpeted. The walls are clad in oak plywood paneling with gypsum board clad columns along the west wall. The west wall has two aluminum casement windows. The doors and windows are trimmed out with 2-inch wood moldings. The ceiling is clad in applied acoustical tiles and has two flush-mounted fluorescent box fixtures (Figure 158).

**Storage Rooms**

The fourth floor has three storage rooms located along the north side of the lobby. They include rooms 403 (labeled as a pantry on the original as-built drawings), 405 (storage), and 409 (labeled as projector storage on the original as-built drawings). Rooms 403 and 405 are directly linked to the third-floor kitchen by Elevator 2 and are used for storage of tables and other catering equipment. Part of Room 405 serves as a pocket to store the moveable partition in the Pauley Ballroom. All three rooms are utilitarian, with concrete floors, concrete or gypsum board walls and ceilings, wood solid-core doors, and a combination of incandescent and fluorescent lighting fixtures.
Douglas Fir Room
The Douglas Fir Room (Room 404) is an L-shaped classroom located at the southwest corner of the fourth floor (Figure 159). It is accessed by a narrow corridor between Rooms 402 and 406. The walls of the Douglas Fir Room are finished in fir placed in strips. Otherwise, its finishes and materials are the same as the Black Oak Room.

Tan Oak Room – East and West
The Tan Oak Room is located on the south side of the lobby between the Douglas Fir and Madrone Rooms. It is divided into two classrooms (Rooms 406 and 408) by a moveable partition. Aside from its oak paneling, the room is identical in every other respect to the Madrone Room described below.

Telephone Room
A small telephone closet (Room 407) is located on the north side of the lobby. Paneled in wood, the closet no longer contains a public telephone.

Madrone Room – East and West
The Madrone Room is located on the south side of the lobby between the Tan Oak and the Chinquapin Rooms. Like the Tan Oak Room, it is divided into two classrooms (Rooms 410 and 412) by a moveable partition. The room features a carpeted floor, hardwood paneled walls, solid-core wood doors, aluminum casement windows, and a suspended T-bar ceiling with recessed fluorescent box fixtures (Figure 160). The room is illuminated by aluminum casement windows.
**Chinquapin Room**

The Chinquapin Room (Room 414) occupies the southeast corner of the fourth floor. Its plan is mirrored in the Douglas Fir Room (Room 404) at the opposite corner of the floor. The room is accessed by a narrow corridor on the south side of the lobby. The floor is carpeted and the walls are clad in varnished hardwood plywood paneling (Figure 161). The doors are solid core wood and the windows are aluminum casements. The ceiling is covered with applied acoustical tiles and the room is illuminated by flush-mounted fluorescent box fixtures. Two boxed columns occupy the eastern part of the room.

**Office**

A small office (Room 416) anchors the east end of the belt of classrooms on the south side of the lobby. In plan it mirrors the Black Oak Room (Room 402) on the opposite end of the building. This room was locked and therefore not surveyed.

**Fifth Floor**

The fifth floor level of King Student Union is occupied by four roof-top penthouses and two outdoor gardens giving it the smallest square footage of the six floor levels in the building. The overall plan includes an enclosed elevator lobby, the Tilden Room – a non-denominational chapel/meeting room – a mechanical penthouse, and two stair towers. North of the mechanical penthouse, the roof is covered in photovoltaics.

**Lobby**

The fifth-floor lobby (Room 500) is located between the Tilden Room (Room 501) and the utility core. It is very simple in both plan and detailing. The floor is clad in brown ceramic tiles, with a matching base molding. The walls and ceiling are white-painted gypsum board. Doors on the east and west walls are glazed aluminum units. The space is illuminated by three flush-mounted fluorescent luminaire fixtures (Figure 162).
There is a porcelain drinking fountain matching others in the Student Union. The lobby appears to be in original condition.

**Tilden Room**

The Tilden Room (Room 501) is a small non-denominational meditation room perched on the roof of the King Student Union. Flanked to either side by the East and West Terraces, the room is a free-standing structure linked to the utility core by the lobby. Consisting of a steel frame with CMU perimeter walls, the structure terminates with a thin-shell, hyperbolic-paraboloid roof matching the roof of the nearby Chávez Student Center. The interior is one of the most significant spaces within King Student Union. The walls are comprised of a combination of materials, including exposed CMU at the corners and around the doors, gypsum board, wood paneling, and an elaborate stained glass window by artist Robert Pinard along the entire south wall (*Figure 163*). Four pairs of varnished wood doors open onto the East and West Terraces. An additional pair of wood panel doors opens into the lobby. An inscription above the door reads: “In Memory of Charles Lee Tilden III, A Student of the University.” The ceiling is unpainted and unfinished. The room is illuminated by incandescent spotlights as well as a skylight at the apex of the roof.

**Toilet Rooms**

The fifth-floor utility core has two small toilet room suites: women’s (Rooms 502 and 502A) and men’s (503 and 503A) located opposite the Tilden Room. The women’s toilet room was not surveyed. The men’s toilet room matches other toilet rooms in the California Student Center. The floor is clad in red mosaic tiles and the walls and ceiling are gypsum board, with some surfaces finished in cream-colored ceramic tiles. The men’s toilet room contains two porcelain toilet fixtures, a urinal, and a sink (*Figure 164*). The partitions are painted steel and the doors are solid-core wood. The toilet rooms are windowless and illuminated by two flush-mounted fluorescent luminaire fixtures.

**Storage Rooms**

The fifth floor contains two small storage rooms (Rooms 503B and 505). Room 503B is part of the men’s toilet room suite and used to store custodial supplies. The windowless room is utilitarian in nature, with concrete floors, gypsum board walls and ceilings, and incandescent spot fixtures. Room 505 is a small closet. It was locked and therefore not surveyed.
**Mechanical Room**
The fifth floor mechanical room (Room 504) occupies the majority of the utility core. The room contains elevator equipment. It was locked and therefore not surveyed.

**Stairs B and C**
Stairs B and C are fire egress stairs capped by stair towers that rise above the roof level as penthouses. Stair B is located along the east wall of King Student Union and Stair C along the west wall. The stairs link each of the above-grade floors (second–fifth floors) with Upper and Lower Sproul Plazas. The stairs terminate at the fifth floor level within small one-story concrete-block structures finished in salmon-colored stucco (Figure 165). Both contain concrete quarter-turn stairs with metal pipe railings (Figure 166). The walls and ceilings are painted concrete and illuminated by flush-mounted fluorescent luminaire fixtures.

**East and West Terraces**
The East and West Terraces are outdoor gardens that flank the Tilden Room (Room 501). The terraces function as outdoor rooms, with steel-frame pergolas employed to provide shade and planters defining the boundaries and providing a space to sit. They are finished similarly to Lower Sproul Plaza, using identical materials and features, notably brick pavers and concrete planters with attached wood benches (Figure 167). A delicate steel pergola, visible from the plazas and streets below, outlines the perimeter of each terrace (Figures 168 and 169).
Figure 167. West Terrace
View toward southwest
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Figure 168. West Terrace
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Figure 169. West Terrace
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**Interior: Assessment of Physical Condition**

The present section identifies important materials and features of the interior of King Student Union. It also identifies the condition of each element based on the following categories:

- **Excellent (E)** – The element is in near original condition.
- **Good (G)** – The element is mostly intact.
- **Fair (F)** – The element is showing signs of wear or deterioration.
- **Poor (P)** – The element is badly damaged, missing, or not functioning.
- **Unknown (U)** – The element was not accessible for inspection.

Please note that windows and doors are described and assessed in the exterior section above. In addition, this section does not cover non-historic materials or features.

**Concrete Elements**

The interior of King Student Union contains ample areas of exposed or painted concrete, particularly within the basement and the first and second floors. Concrete elements include floors, walls, stairs, and beamed ceilings. Most interior concrete elements have a smooth finish and some are painted. Some concrete elements are not painted, in particular within the ASUC Bookstore warehouse in the basement and the floors on the first and second floors, which are tinted and polished. Exposed concrete beams are present throughout much of the interior. Although concealed in some areas, in other areas such as the Bear’s Lair or the first floor lobby, they are treated architectonically. Decorative CMU walls are also used throughout the interior of King Student Union, particularly around the perimeter of Stairs B and C. The interior concrete elements appear to be in good condition showing few signs of spalling, efflorescence, or other signs of decay.

**Tiles**

The corridors of the basement and first floor of King Student Union are finished in red brick tiles that match the pavers in Lower Sproul Plaza. Coated in layers of wax, the tiles have a polished finish that contrasts with the true nature of the material. The pavers appear to be in good condition.

The fifth floor lobby features dark gray tiles in the lobby floor. These appear to be original and in good condition.

**Office Finishes**

Parts of the interior of King Student Union, especially the basement and first floor, are divided into a network of small utilitarian staff offices that feature carpeted or tiled concrete floors, fenestrated stud-frame and gypsum board partition walls, and suspended T-bar ceilings containing recessed fluorescent box lighting fixtures. Most doors are solid-core wood with brushed aluminum hardware. The majority of these offices appear to have undergone few significant changes although they are of low overall significance and many are not original to the building. In general, the condition of these offices and their constituent materials is good.
Wood Elements

Wood is used throughout the interior of King Student Union for decorative features, hand rails, flooring, and for wall paneling, in particular on the second, third, and fourth floors. Solid-core wood doors are also commonly used throughout the building. Significant wood interior features include the wood plank furring above the corridors at the first floor level. Now painted, this element was originally naturally finished. It appears to be in fair condition.

Wood hand rails are used on several interior stairs, including Stairs E, G, and Stair A. Aside from normal wear and tear, in particular gouges and chips, the rails appear to be in good condition.

Wood flooring is used extensively throughout the third floor of the student union. Parts of the lobby (Room 300) are clad in 2-inch by 4-inch white oak block flooring and Pauley Ballroom features 4-inch maple tongue-and-groove flooring. Heavily worn and gouged in many places, most of the wood floors within King Student Union are in fair condition and heavily in need of sanding and refinishing.

Wood paneling is used in several locations, including unfinished wood wall paneling and ceiling furring in the Heller Multicultural Center on the second floor and unfinished wood paneling on the south wall of Stair A. Polished hardwood plywood paneling is used throughout the third floor and in several of the fourth-floor meeting rooms. Thin strips of wood are used on the south walls of the ballroom on the third floor. In addition, the divider separating the two ballrooms is clad in wood veneer. The majority of the wood elements are in fair-to-good condition. Heavily used over the past half century, wood paneling shows evidence of scuffing, gouging, and some delamination of varnish and more seriously, of veneer, particularly on the ballroom dividers. Wood paneling must be regularly maintained to control and contain damage from heavy use and preferably coated with varnish or polyurethane to preserve its color and condition.

Stone Elements

Stone is not a common interior finish in King Student Union. Travertine is used on Stair A and cast stone accents are used to create a decorative grid pattern on the concrete floor on the second floor level. Stone elements are durable and resistant to sustained use. Overall the stone elements are in good condition, showing few signs of damage, cracking, or spalling.

Metal Elements

Metal is used throughout the interior of King Student Union. Common applications include hardware and machinery, stair frames and balustrades, and decorative features such as chandeliers and light fixtures.

The majority of interior hardware is bushed aluminum or steel, including hinges, door pulls, door handles and knobs, and switchplates and escutcheons. Owing to this durable material, these elements appear to be in good condition.
Metal balustrades and pipe railing is used on all stairs. Sometimes painted, in other instances they are left unfinished. These elements appear to be in good condition.

One notable unique metal element in the student union is the free-standing metal fireplace in Heller Multicultural Center. Original to the building, this feature is made of shaped sheet metal and mounted on a brick hearth. It appears to be in good condition.

Another unique metal element at the second floor level is the welded metal case built to house the Stanford Axe. This element is original and appears to be in good condition.

**Light Fixtures**

The majority of the spaces in King Student Union are illuminated by original fluorescent light fixtures, including recessed box fixtures, flush-mounted and suspended luminaires, and ornamental incandescent fixtures.

Recessed box fixtures and flush-mounted luminaires are most common; they are mounted within the suspended T-bar ceilings in a grid pattern on the first floor and within offices and meeting rooms throughout the building. Strongly utilitarian, these fixtures appear to have been well maintained and are in good condition.

Chrome-plated light fixtures are located in the Main Lobby on the second floor as well as throughout the entire third floor level. These units, which are configured as drop fixtures, wall-mounted sconces, and chandeliers, have chrome-plated housings and escutcheons and clear glass shades. The Pauley Ballroom on the third floor has brass-plated sconces with frosted white globe shades. All appear to be intact and in good condition.

**Soundproofing Materials**

Soundproofing materials are used throughout King Student Union, especially on the third floor level where acoustical baffles are attached to the ceiling of the ballroom area and along the perimeter walls. These are important character-defining features and are original to the building. Several of the ceiling-mounted baffles are missing but otherwise the ensemble appears to be in good condition.

**Toilet Rooms**

With the exception of the third floor, each floor of King Student Union has one men’s and one women’s toilet rooms, although the first floor originally had two for each sex. In addition, the Bear’s Lair, which is physically separate from the rest of the first floor, has a pair of toilet rooms. With the exception of those in the Bear’s Lair and on the second floor, all toilet rooms in the student union appear to be original. Original materials include floors tiled in small 1-inch red or red and blue mosaic tiles, gypsum board walls with speckle-finished cream-colored tile wainscoting, stainless steel toilet partitions, shelves, and mirrors, and
white porcelain plumbing fixtures with chrome hardware. Displaying durable if utilitarian materials and features, these toilet rooms have endured nearly a half-century of continuous use.

**Drinking Fountains**

Historic drinking fountains survive within King Student Union on the first, third, and fifth floors. Made of porcelain with stainless steel spigots, these features are important character-defining features. They appear to be in good condition.

**D. ESHLEMAN HALL**

Occupying the southwestern corner of Lower Sproul Plaza, Eshleman Hall (1965), is a narrow eight-story, reinforced-concrete, administrative office tower with a library on the recessed top floor and the meeting chamber for the Senate of the Associated Students of the University of California (ASUC) on the double-height ground floor. The rest of the interior is divided into a warren of small office used by student organizations (Figure 170).

A simple rectangle in plan, Eshleman Hall is designed in a blend of New Formalist and Second Bay Region Tradition influences. Each façade is composed of full-height cast-in-place concrete piers defining four bays along the east and west façades, and ten on the north and south. The dominant exterior finish material is board-formed concrete. The building possesses one level below grade that communicates with the parking garage beneath Lower Sproul Plaza. Above ground the building contains seven levels. Exterior half-turn stairs of concrete and brick lead from the garage level to the Lower Sproul Plaza level at the northeast corner of the building. At the plaza level is the main entrance and a lobby opening to Lower Sproul Plaza to the north and Bancroft Way to the south, thus inviting access both from the campus and the city of Berkeley. As befits this role linking city with campus, the building has two primary façades, one facing north toward the campus, and the other facing south to the city.

![Figure 170. Eshleman Hall](Source: KVP Consulting)
The exterior envelope of Eshleman Hall is recessed behind the colonnade that marches around the perimeter of the building at plaza level. Floors two through six are both nearly flush with the plane of the columns, while the seventh floor is also pulled back, creating a partially enclosed arcade open to the sky. The resulting three-part vertical composition created by arcades and the shaft dominated by a giant order of columns presents a classical composition that recalls the buildings that surround Piazza San Marco, although Eshleman Hall is not based on any Venetian building in particular.

*Exterior: Base*

The set back base, held within the colonnade, is a tall single story, consisting of three sections faced in either board-formed concrete or tinted and textured concrete masonry units (CMU). The concrete panels are cast in relief creating an irregular pattern of vertical board forms, with most boards pivoted outward from the plane of the wall and overlapping the adjacent plank form (Figure 171). The widths of individual form boards and their angle varies and the wall is composed of rectangular panels displaying this surface, assembled in an asymmetric, random pattern. The areas finished in CMU feature blocks laid in stacked bond with vertical niches between pairs of stacks (Figure 172). Each niche has a projecting rowlock brick at the top. Both treatments are familiar from the nearby Chávez Student Center and King Student Union, both discussed in more detail above.

From the east, the first freestanding volume of the north façade houses the elevators and stairs. It is faced in textured CMU panels. This section terminates westward of the entrance lobby, which is a glazed hyphen with doors on both the north and the south. Above these doors an embossed bronze sign reads: ESHLEMAN HALL. Moving west is the central section – the Senate Chamber – which is also faced in textured CMU. At the west end of this volume is an open walkway connecting Lower Sproul Plaza with Bancroft Way. To the west of the
walkway is a third volume which houses fire stairs and mechanical equipment. This section is also clad in textured CMU panels.

Fenestration along the base is minimal and asymmetrical. Within the board-formed concrete sections, there is one recessed and louvered slit window above the exterior stairs along the north side, and two solid metal doors in the fire stair/mechanical pavilion at the west end. In the central CMU-clad volume, four fixed rectangular windows face Lower Sproul Plaza to the north, with four more facing south to Bancroft Way. The easternmost windows contain fixed aluminum sash with two tall rectangular fixed lights surmounted by square louvered transom lights. The remaining windows are fixed anodized aluminum sash windows, with one-over-two lights on the north and one-over-one on the south. There is also a solid metal utility door in this section. The lobby section on the north wall contains a recessed entrance containing a pair of non-historic glazed anodized aluminum doors surrounded by historic aluminum framed fixed glazing, including sidelights and a transom (Figure 173).

The area within the colonnade is paved in concrete distinguished by its heavy pebble aggregate. This material, as well as the red brick pavers, form an extension of Lower Sproul Plaza. Square anodized metal light fixtures protrude from the soffit formed by the underside of the second floor slab. The piers are chamfered rectangles in section, of smooth finished concrete tinted a dull tan, straight sided, and without base or capital. At this level the columns are monolithic, while in the shaft region they consist of pre-cast piers with visible joints.

**Exterior: Shaft**

Floors 2 through 6 present a regular grid defined by engaged columns and recessed board-formed concrete spandrels (Figure 174). At every level of the north and south façades, each of the ten bays contain a large rectangular window holding a pair of anodized aluminum sliders. On the east and west façades there are four bays. The second bay from the
south on each of these façades contains a full-height tier of cantilevered concrete balconies with peripheral metal balustrades. In each balcony bay, the curtain wall is bisected symmetrically. On the west façade, each balcony has a door with a symmetrical glazed sidelight as opposed to the east façade where the corresponding sidelight is blind. Otherwise, the east and west façades are entirely without fenestration, with pre-cast concrete panels filling the remaining bays.

Piers in this region are constructed of pre-cast sections. The joints between sections match the lines of the spandrel panels, creating continuous horizontal lines subordinate to the shaft region.

**Exterior: Capital**

The seventh floor forms the capital, so to speak, of Eshleman Hall’s overall elevational scheme. Here, the concrete piers are capped by concrete beams of similar cross section, creating open vertically proportioned apertures with flat arches and radiused corners. Set within the resulting peripteral arcade is a recessed penthouse containing Eshleman Library. Concrete beams span the long axis of the building, forming transverse ceiling beams within the library volume.

The library penthouse is rectangular in plan, with a flat roof, and faced in painted stucco. Along both the north and south façades are eight rectangular windows containing fixed anodized aluminum sash windows. On the north façade, the windows contain pairs of fixed sash above louvered bottom sections. On the south façade are single fixed sashes above single louvers. A recessed glazed door with sidelights and transom pierces the east façade of the library, providing access to the exterior arcade and the small projecting balcony. The west façade has a solid metal door leading to the colonnade, from which the fire stair is accessed. The corners of the penthouse are notched, creating shallow alcoves which contain built-in wood benches.

Non-slip concrete is used as paving within the upper colonnade, and wall-washer lights with metal shields are mounted on each pier. On the north and south façades, metal balustrades close the open apertures. On the east and west façades, concrete parapets are surmounted by single metal rails.

**Exterior: North Façade**

Facing Lower Sproul Plaza, the north façade is the primary public face of Eshleman Hall (Figure 175). The base region, a tall single story, is recessed within the colonnade formed by the stark

![Figure 175. Detail of north elevation View toward south Source: KVP Consulting](image)
verticals of light tan concrete columns set against the darker concrete and CMU finishes behind. At the east side of the north façade, a concrete balcony with metal balustrade projects above bays 2-5, providing the only visual cue to the location of the principal entrance and the stairs to the lower level. In the shaft region, slightly recessed spandrel panels of board-formed concrete combine with the piers to form a continuous grid across the façade. Pairs of anodized aluminum sliding windows containing clear glazing fill each bay. The seventh-floor “capital” region presents a regular series of ten flat arches with the recessed penthouse, finished in darker stucco, visible from a certain distance into Lower Sproul Plaza. With the corner arches unobstructed, the post-and-beam structure is fully visible.

**Exterior: South Façade**

The south façade of Eshleman Hall is of secondary importance, facing Bancroft Way and the city of Berkeley. The composition and materials mirror those of the north façade but with the addition of a T-shaped pre-cast concrete fin bisecting and surmounting each window within the shaft. Composed of concrete slabs approximately three inches thick and eighteen inches deep, these are intended serve as *bris soleil* to shade the south-facing windows from the afternoon sun. The units extend the full height and width of each window, with the leg of the T bisecting the window bay and the crossbar acting as an awning (Figure 176). As Bancroft Way slopes slightly uphill to the east, Lower Sproul Plaza and Eshleman Hall are both at sidewalk grade at the west end of this facade, but require four steps down from sidewalk grade at the east end.

**Exterior: West Façade**

The west façade of Eshleman Hall is of tertiary significance; nonetheless it is well-composed and remains prominent due to its position in the overall plan of Lower Sproul Plaza (Figure 177). Many visitors will first experience Eshleman Hall from this perspective, while walking east on Bancroft Way from the center of downtown Berkeley. Just west of the building, a paved walkway diverges from the sidewalk to the northeast, leaving a...
triangular open space planted in grass. Those who take this path are presented with a vista that is one of the defining features of Lower Sproul Plaza, a view of Eshleman Hall in the foreground with Sather Tower distant across the plaza. The triangular grassy plot nicely isolates the west façade of Eshleman Hall at ground level. A large tree, concrete bollards, and a boulder at the apex of the triangle further this effect. Even though the base of the west façade is unfenestrated, revealing the rear wall of the mechanical and fire stair enclosure, this area is nonetheless finished in deeply textured concrete panels as described above.

In the shaft region, the west façade presents a blind face in three of the four bays. The second bay from the right displays a stack of small projecting balconies composed of cantilevered concrete slabs with metal balustrades. Each balcony bay is bisected by a subordinate concrete pier, with the left half of each bay infilled by a full-height fixed window. The right half is a deeply recessed space and contains two doors: a glazed metal door that opens to the interior and a metal fire door that opens to the stair shaft. The three remaining blind bays are filled by board-formed concrete panels. There are two panels within each bay of each story and the horizontal joints between the panels align with those of the pre-cast columns, creating horizontal lines across the face. At the seventh floor, the four flat arches of the capital are open, with the penthouse partially visible through the center two.

Exterior: East Façade

The east façade of Eshleman Hall is nearly identical to the west façade (Figure 178). The only difference is that the balcony bays have a glazed aluminum door on the right, leading to the elevator lobby, and a concrete panel in the left half bay, showing light form-board marks similar to the remaining three blind bays. An elevator and mechanical penthouse is also fully visible through the central two arches of the seventh floor at this end of the building. The penthouse is faced in board-formed concrete.
Exterior: Assessment of Physical Condition

The present section identifies important materials and features of the exterior of Eshleman Hall. It also identifies the condition of each element based on the following categories:

- **Excellent (E)** – The element is in near original condition.
- **Good (G)** – The element is mostly intact.
- **Fair (F)** – The element is showing signs of wear or deterioration.
- **Poor (P)** – The element is badly damaged, missing, or not functioning.
- **Unknown (U)** – The element was not accessible for inspection.

Concrete Elements

Board-formed concrete elements and CMU cladding constitute large areas of the exterior of Eshleman Hall. Board-formed concrete walls at the first floor level bear the impression of random-width board forms, giving the exterior of the colonnade area its distinctive handmade texture, a characteristic of the Second Bay Region Tradition. The rest of the exterior, including columns, spandrel panels, as well as the exterior balconies on the east and west elevations, reveal a more subtle board form pattern; stucco was never used to conceal the construction processes.

Decorative CMUs are used extensively on the exterior of Eshleman Hall. Used as cladding for fire stairs on the north and south sides of the building as well as for detailing within the first-floor colonnade, this CMU cladding is a distinctive exterior material consistent with Vernon DeMars’ interest in using materials of contrasting texture and shape that engender a more organic, regional feel.

While generally in good condition, much of the concrete has discolored as a result of biological growth, especially along the north façade and other areas that are in shade for much of the day, or where condensation is an issue. Vehicle exhaust and soot have also discolored the rough-textured exterior concrete work. Efflorescence, or the extrusion of whitish salt compounds from masonry, is also evident throughout the exterior. Structurally, the concrete elements appear to be in sound condition, bearing little evidence of spalling, cracking or other damage resulting from improperly cured concrete or corroded rebar. However, recently completed studies suggest that Eshleman Hall is structurally vulnerable to seismic forces. The overall condition of the exterior concrete elements, taking into account the documented seismic instability, is fair-to-poor.

Aluminum Windows

Eshleman Hall incorporates a selection of historic fixed and operable anodized aluminum windows located around the perimeter of the building. Aluminum sliders are commonly used on the shaft to provide light and air to offices throughout the building. In general, the condition of this building element is good. Some windows display an accumulation of minor organic growth but very little if any actual corrosion. These windows, tested for functionality, opened and closed easily.
Glazed Aluminum and Steel Doors
The exterior of Eshleman Hall contains several glazed aluminum, steel, and anodized aluminum doors, most of which are original. Historic glazed aluminum doors, which are easily distinguished by their natural finish and color, were originally located at the main entrance on the first floor level, on the exterior balconies, and on the ground floor. These doors are either single or paired and consist of a single pane of glass surrounded by a thick aluminum frame. Hardware consists either of historic pull handles or contemporary levers on the exterior and push bars on the interior. The doors within the main entrance have been replaced with non-historic anodized aluminum doors. Steel doors are located within the fire stairs. In general, the doors of Eshleman Hall appear to be well-maintained and in overall good condition. Paint build-up and corrosion is a factor with some of the steel doors but the aluminum doors appear to be in good condition.

Miscellaneous Metal Elements
The exterior of Eshleman Hall displays several metallic features. On the north and south façades are aluminum letters that spell out the name of the building. Simple balustrades protect users of all exterior balconies and stairs. These elements all appear to be original and in good condition. Around the exterior of the building are several dozen steel sconces. These are historic elements of the original design and are in good condition.
**Interior: Overview**

Floors 2-6 of Eshleman Hall house offices of the ASUC and other student organizations. The same basic plan occurs over all five office floors with minor variations. Materials and finishes are also the same throughout this region, and thus, they are treated together in one section. Note that the basement level located beneath the plaza level, though somewhat different in plan, is also described under Offices. The first floor and the seventh floor are quite distinct from the office region and from each other. They are therefore described in separate sections. The elevator lobbies and stairwells, virtually identical at all levels, are described together for all floors. Finally, the mechanical spaces and restrooms are also grouped for description.

**Interior: Offices**

On each floor of this region, pairs of glazed wood doors lead from the elevator lobby at the east end to the office spaces. Entry is afforded by a small vestibule that on floors with a single tenant also serves as a reception lobby. Individual peripheral offices with large sliding windows are accessed from double-loaded corridors on floors 2, 3, and 5. On some floors there is a central zone of interior offices surrounded by a peripheral corridor, including the ground floor and floors 4 and 6. Floors 1 and 8 do not have corridors. All corridors typically feature resilient tile-covered concrete floors, gypsum board walls with rubber base moldings, and suspended acoustical ceilings. Metal-framed solid-core wood doors provide access to each office (Figure 179).

Throughout each of the office floors, partition walls are made of gypsum board on metal studs. The typical finish is simply painted white drywall. However there are small examples of grass textured wall coverings in several areas. Painted metal door frames hold solid-
core wood doors. Suspended acoustical ceilings hold recessed fluorescent box light fixtures, with chrome sprinkler heads protruding. Floor coverings that are not tiled feature low-pile industrial carpet.

Perimeter offices have continuous metal consoles beneath the windows housing heat ducts and electrical wiring. Their tops are chamfered, discouraging their use as a shelf. They are finished in tan enamel paint, and have two rows of louvered vents. The electrical fixtures here and throughout the Offices are a variety of ordinary commercial types. Perimeter offices also feature pairs of operable aluminum casement windows. Interior offices are windowless (Figure 180).

The so-called ground floor, at garage level, differs somewhat from the rest of the Offices region. Although its plan and finish details are similar to the upper floor offices, there are no windows, and there is also a double-door entrance at the foot of the external stairs, corresponding to the main entrance on the Lower Sproul Plaza level. Additional exits are located in room 25A at the northwest corner of the building, and off the elevator lobby in the eastern wall. All of these doors access the garage level beneath Lower Sproul Plaza. From the elevator lobby or the doorway by the external stairs entry is made into a lobby that has four sliding windows with wood sash, likely to have been used historically for cashiers or ticket sales (Figure 181).

Interior: First Floor

The first floor, at the Lower Sproul Plaza level, houses the Senate Chamber of the ASUC, the main entrance lobby, and the elevator lobby. The entrance lobby is a glazed pavilion located between the elevator/stairway module and the Senate Chamber module. Double glazed doors in the
north and south walls of the entrance lobby provide access to an open space measuring approximately 10 feet by 25 feet, with double doors leading to the Senate Chamber on the west, and an opening to the elevator lobby on the east. Flooring in both entrance and elevator lobby is waxed red brick pavers matching those used in Lower Sproul Plaza and inside King Student Union (Figure 182).

The east and west walls of the lobby feature the same rough board-formed concrete panels and CMU finishes of the exterior; the former faces the elevator lobby and the latter, the Senate Chamber. The deeply textured board-formed concrete panels of the elevator module walls have been painted white, whereas the CMU of the Senate Chamber module are left their natural brown color. The ceiling of the entrance lobby is covered in a heavily textured sprayed-on plaster, better known as a “popcorn ceiling.” A rectangular florescent luminaire hangs at the center of the ceiling.

In the elevator lobby, a varnished wood counter opens from a small room at the northwest corner (Room 103) of the lobby. Apparently used historically as either a cloakroom or ticket office, dark redwood paneling is fixed above and below the glazed opening. The room has a solid-core wood door that matches the rest of the building (Figure 183). Two additional wood doors lead to the main stairway.

On the west side of the lobby, a pair of anodized aluminum glazed doors with sidelights leads to the Senate Chamber. Serving as an antechamber, is a ten-foot-wide passage with two small ancillary rooms (Rooms 111 and 112), opening off it.

The ASUC Senate Chamber itself is a clear span 35 foot by 35 foot space with a 15 foot suspended ceiling containing recessed rectangular fluorescent box fixtures and protruding brass sprinkler heads. Three tall rectangular fixed windows penetrate both the north and south walls. A deep angled
soffit extends along both walls, dividing the windows horizontally and creating a clerestory, and dark wood paneling covers the walls between windows. A large conference table in the shape of an elongated D occupies the center of the room, with twenty chrome and fabric chairs arranged around it. The flat leg of the D, at the west end of the room, is the presiding chair’s desk. Behind it are two screens for visual projections, flanked by dark wood panels forming a shallow chevron. Above the screens, raised lettering reads: ASUC Associated Students of the University of California Student Government surmounting a round shield with the ASUC seal depicted (Figure 184). There are small storage spaces behind the panels, the southern one closed by a solid metal door with louvers. The ASUC Chamber was destroyed by fire in the 1980s and everything in it was rebuilt at that time.

Low carpeted platforms are cantilevered along the north and south walls. The east wall of the chamber has two horizontal rectangular apertures with fixed glazing opening into Rooms 111 and 112. These windows are housed in deep recesses and appear to have once housed projection equipment. Carpeted benches are located beneath each of them. Above the projection rooms is a mezzanine level containing a men’s toilet room and a storage closet. Quarter-turn stairs provide access to these spaces on the mezzanine.

Rooms 111 and 112 are currently used for storage. It is likely, however, that their fittings and materials are completely original. Their north, south, and east walls display the obverse of the CMU walls described in the exterior section above, with the recessed lancets on the exterior expressed as low relief moldings inside the rooms. Both rooms have high ceilings – approximately 18 feet – finished with sprayed-on acoustical plaster. At the center of each ceiling panel is a hanging incandescent light fixture with an elongated cylindrical fabric shade.
(Figure 185). Each of the projection rooms is illuminated by a tall rectangular window described in the exterior section. The entrance doors are solid-core wood stained a dark color to match the paneling in the chamber. The west walls of the rooms, facing the chamber, are painted gypsum board.

**Interior: Eshleman Library**

Eshleman Library occupies the entire built portion of the seventh floor of Eshleman Hall. Access from the elevator lobby is provided through double glazed wood doors on the east end of the library. The library itself is a clear-span space measuring approximately 78 feet by 37 feet, with approximately ten-foot high ceilings. Eight cross beams span the ceiling from north to south, with chrome sprinkler fixtures protruding from them. Two longitudinal false “beams” of dark wood and containing ventilation ducts run at right angles to the beams. The ceiling itself, which is divided into panels by the beams, is finished in sprayed-on acoustical plaster. Each panel is punctuated by a pair of rectangular fluorescent luminaires. Patterned industrial carpeting covers the floor (Figure 186).

The walls of Eshleman Library are painted gypsum board. The north and south walls are punctuated by ranges of eight vertically proportioned fixed-sash windows. Those on the north side have a single fixed pane over a louvered section, while those on the south side are paired. At the west end of the room, V-groove plywood paneling forms two small storage areas, and a metal fire door accesses the seventh floor colonnade. At the east end, the elevator lobby projects into the library, forming alcoves on the north and south sides. The south alcove is an extension of the library whereas the north alcove is enclosed behind a solid metal door (Figure 187).
**Interior: Elevator Lobbies**

At the east end of Eshleman Hall, there are two elevators located side by side serving all floors ([Figure 188]). On each floor, they occupy the south wall of a small elevator lobby. The walls of the lobbies are painted gypsum board.

Located to the east of the elevators on each floor is a small janitorial closet with a solid-core wood door. The east wall of each lobby features a small area of window wall as well as a glazed aluminum door accessing the exterior balconies. The west walls of the lobbies (except for single-tenant floors) contain pairs of glazed metal doors leading to the office spaces beyond. Along the north wall are metal fire doors leading to the main stairway and another door accessing a toilet room. Between them are enclosed bulletin boards set into metal frames. Other fixtures include formed metal drinking fountains and recessed glazed fire hose cabinets.

The floors of the lobbies are covered in resilient vinyl tiles except for the first floor, where red brick pavers are used. The ceilings in the elevator lobbies are finished in sprayed-on acoustical plaster and are punctuated by circular recessed fluorescent light fixtures with plastic diffusers. Each lobby has a round metal ventilator at the center of the ceiling.

**Interior: Stairwells**

The east stairwell, located opposite the elevators, serves all floors, including the elevator and mechanical penthouse. The stairwell is finished in painted concrete and has no openings aside from the metal fire doors located at each floor. A quarter-turn metal stair with vinyl treads and a continuous bronze metal railing on steel balusters extends along the wall of the stairwell ([Figure 189]). Wall sconces and fluorescent overhead
luminaires illuminate each landing. This stair terminates at the ground floor elevator lobby, which has a glazed door leading to the parking garage beneath Lower Sproul Plaza. The west stairwell is an exterior fire stair serving all floors. It is not accessible directly from the occupied spaces, but is instead accessed from an exterior landing at each floor. Finally, an exterior stair connects Lower Sproul Plaza and the ground floor at the northeast corner of the building. It is a concrete half-turn stair with red brick treads and a metal balustrade. It rises in an open well within the colonnade (Figure 190).

**Interior: Mechanical Spaces**

There are two main mechanical spaces in Eshleman Hall. The primary mechanical room is located in a penthouse at the east end of the building. The penthouse contains elevator machinery. Mechanical equipment is also located in Rooms 25 and 25A at the northeast corner of the ground floor. Room 25 contains telephone equipment, and room 25A houses heating and ventilating equipment. These spaces are all utilitarian in finish and design, with exposed concrete surfaces and metal fire doors.

**Interior: Toilet Rooms**

Eshleman Hall has one toilet room per floor. Historically, the toilet rooms on each floor were designated either for men or women, alternating by floor. Women’s toilet rooms were historically located on the odd-numbered floors and the men’s toilet rooms on the even-numbered floors. All are now unisex. Except for the ground and first floors, where the toilet rooms are located on a mezzanine, the toilet rooms in Eshleman Hall are uniformly located on the north side of the elevator lobby and are accessed by a steel door. Walls are gypsum board and covered with an off-white glazed tile, floors are covered with glazed mosaic tiles in pink or yellow shades, and the ceilings are sprayed-on acoustical plaster with rectangular fluorescent luminaires (Figure 191). The former men’s rooms each have two urinals and a wall mounted toilet, whereas the former women’s rooms have a single toilet. All have wall-mounted sinks and various dispensers for towels and toilet seat shields.
Interior: Assessment of Physical Condition

The present section identifies important materials and features of the interior of Eshleman Hall. It also identifies the condition of each element based on the following categories:

- **Excellent (E)** – The element is in near original condition.
- **Good (G)** – The element is mostly intact.
- **Fair (F)** – The element is showing signs of wear or deterioration.
- **Poor (P)** – The element is badly damaged, missing, or not functioning.
- **Unknown (U)** – The element was not accessible for inspection.

Please note that windows and doors are described and assessed in the exterior section above. In addition, this section does not cover non-historic materials or features.

**Tiles**

The first floor elevator lobby of Eshleman Hall is finished in red brick tiles that match the pavers in Lower Sproul Plaza. Coated in layers of wax, the tiles have a polished finish that contrasts with the true nature of the material. The tiles appear to be in good condition.

**Resilient Tile Flooring**

The floors of the elevator lobbies and corridors of Eshleman Hall feature are covered in what appears to be original resilient tile flooring. The tiles are white with a dark gray veined pattern. The tiles are scuffed and worn in high traffic area and appear to be in overall fair condition.

**Office Finishes**

Aside from the ground, first, and eighth floors, each floor of Eshleman Hall is divided into a network of offices that feature carpeted or tiled concrete floors, fenestrated stud-frame and gypsum board interior partition walls, and suspended T-bar ceilings containing recessed fluorescent box lighting fixtures. Doors are solid-core wood with brushed aluminum hardware. The majority of these offices appear to have undergone few significant changes although they are of low overall significance. In general, the condition of these offices and their constituent materials is good.

**Wood Elements**

Wood is used throughout the interior of Eshleman Hall for paneling and other decorative features, particularly on the first floor and the eighth floor. Solid core wood doors are also commonly used throughout the building. Significant wood interior features include the wood-paneled first floor elevator lobby and the ASUC Library on the eighth floor, which contains wood-encased box beams. All elements in Eshleman Hall appear to be maintained and in good condition.

**Metal Elements**

Metal is used throughout the interior of Eshleman Hall. Common applications include hardware and machinery, stair frames and balustrades, and more decorative features such as light fixtures. The majority...
of interior hardware is brushed steel or aluminum, including hinges, door pulls, door handles and knobs, and switchplates and escutcheons. Made of durable materials, these elements appear to be in good condition. Metal balustrades and pipe railing is used on all stairs. Normal wear and tear aside, the metal elements in Eshleman Hall appear to be in good condition.

**Light Fixtures**

The majority of the spaces in Eshleman Hall are illuminated by original fluorescent light fixtures, including recessed box fixtures, flush-mounted, and suspended luminaires. Ornamental incandescent fixtures also occur. Recessed box fixtures and flush-mounted luminaires are most common; they are mounted within the suspended T-bar ceilings in a grid pattern throughout the first floor and within offices and meeting rooms throughout the building. Strongly utilitarian, these fixtures appear to have been maintained and to be in good condition.

**Toilet Rooms**

Each floor of Eshleman Hall has a toilet room. Originally alternating by floor as men's or women's rooms, all appear to be original. Original features include floors tiled in small 1-inch red or red and blue mosaic tiles, gypsum board walls with speckle-finished cream-colored tile wainscoting, stainless steel toilet partitions, shelves, and mirrors, and white porcelain plumbing fixtures with chrome hardware. Built of high-quality if utilitarian materials and features, these toilet rooms have endured nearly a half-century of continual use. Most are original aside from alterations made to conform with ADA regulations and appear to be in good condition.
E. ZELLE RBACH HALL (FAÇADE)

Description: Zellerbach Hall

Occupying the western end of Lower Sproul Plaza, Zellerbach Hall was the fourth and final building completed within the California Student Center complex (1967). For several years after the completion of the Dining Commons and the Student Union, the western half of Lower Sproul Plaza remained unfinished, the University awaiting the completion of Zellerbach Hall to complete the entire ensemble. Designed by Hardison & DeMars, the building represents Vernon DeMars' love of the theatrical arts. The exterior has undergone very few notable changes and the building looks much the same as it did in 1967.

Zellerbach Hall is a two-level, steel-frame and reinforced-concrete structure containing two theaters: a 2,100-seat auditorium entered from Lower Sproul Plaza and a 500-seat playhouse for the Department of Dramatic Art entered opposite the Alumni House. Like King Student Union on the east side of Lower Sproul Plaza, Zellerbach Hall is designed in a mode embodying influences of the Second Bay Region Tradition and New Formalism, namely the building's monumental presence and usage of classical design motifs, including the symmetry of the exterior elevations and the building's massive colonnade. Similar to the rest of the California Student Center, Zellerbach Hall is loosely based on an element in Venice's Piazza San Marco, in this case Andrea Palladio's Palazzo della Ragione (Basilica). For the purposes of this HSR, only the façade facing Lower Sproul Plaza is described below.

East Elevation

The east elevation of Zellerbach Hall is the building's primary public façade. It is symmetrical, consisting of six structural bays of equal width demarcated by square concrete columns. The columns begin at the plaza level, creating an arcade at grade. The columns support a two-level concrete-framed glass pavilion containing the entrance hall. The hall is accessed by concrete stairs located in the fourth bay. Each bay contains large fixed glass windows divided into two sections by vertical mullions. A concrete balcony is cantilevered out over the plaza in bays 3-5. The pavilion terminates with a concrete parapet crowned by seven steel flag poles. Visible behind the pavilion is the window-less brick-clad auditorium volume (Figure 192).
IV. AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE

This chapter identifies the major character-defining materials, features, and spaces of the California Student Center and assesses their historical significance. The landscape is assessed in a similar manner, describing character-defining features of Lower Sproul Plaza that contribute to the historic character of the California Student Center. When evaluating the significance and condition of a resource, architectural historians use a rating scale to rank the architectural and historic value of the resource and its individual elements. The typical rating scale employs four categories: “Very Significant,” “Significant,” “Contributing,” and “Non-Contributing.” The use of the terms “Very Significant” or “Significant” here does not necessarily equate to the same meaning for those words as they are used in the context of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The fact that a space or feature is called “Very Significant” or “Significant” in the Historic Structure Report does not of necessity mean that the alteration or removal of that space or the entire structure would meet the CEQA criteria for what is called a “Significant impact on the environment.”

In summary, Very Significant and Significant spaces encompass the most important character-defining materials, features, and spaces that are sensitive to change. In general terms, exterior elements on principal façades and publicly accessible interior spaces are the most significant. Contributing materials, features, and spaces tend to be secondary or tertiary façades or non-publicly accessible interior spaces. Contributing materials, features, and spaces are largely original but lack architectural significance and are therefore less sensitive to change. Non-contributing materials, features, and spaces are either not historic or have been heavily altered and are therefore not sensitive to change. Due to the large number of spaces within the California Student Center, we have only identified materials, features, and spaces that fall within the categories of Very Significant or Significant. The significance diagrams at the conclusion of this chapter indicate the various levels of significance throughout the entire complex.

**Very Significant (VS)**

- The element was built during the period of significance.
- It is architecturally significant.
- It contributes significantly to the overall character.
- It remains intact or with only minor alterations.
- It is in good condition.

VS elements are highly sensitive to change.

**Significant (S)**

- The element was built during the period of significance, but it is of secondary importance.
- It has been altered, and/or
- It is in fair or poor condition, or
- The element was not built during the period of significance, but is architecturally significant.

S elements are sensitive to change.
Contributing (C)

- The element was built during the period of significance, but is not architecturally significant, or
- The element was not built during the period of significance, but is architecturally compatible with the original.

C elements are less sensitive to change.

Non-Contributing (NC)

- The element was not built during the period of significance, or
- It has been subjected to major additions or incompatible alterations, or
- It is incompatible in style, material, scale, character or use with the original building, or
- It is in poor condition.

NC elements are not particularly sensitive to change.

Because the California Student Center consists of four buildings and a major landscape element (Lower Sproul Plaza), each will be assessed separately in the sections below. In accordance with the scope of work Zellerbach Hall is not assessed. Throughout this section character-defining features are prioritized in their order of importance with the most important features listed first and the least important, last.

A. LANDSCAPE

Hardscape Character-Defining Elements

The majority of the Lawrence Halprin-designed Lower Sproul Plaza, as well as Upper Sproul Plaza, which is not assessed in this report – is original and intact and is therefore Very Significant. Character-defining features of this hardscaped plaza include the following features:

Category: Very Significant

Character-Defining Materials and Features:

- Open character of the L-shaped plaza whose design is based on Piazza San Marco, with unobstructed sight lines of redwoods, hills, and the Campanile.
- Paving pattern consisting of large concrete panels with orthogonal borders of brick pavers and single-width black pavers that intersect the orthogonal grid at a 45 degree angle.
- Golden Bear Column.
- Concrete planters and benches.
- Stairs (three) to Upper Sproul Plaza and one set of stairs to the Alumni House.
- Plantings; most original plantings have been replaced but historic species that remain include ornamental olive trees located in the planters near Chávez Student Center.

B. CHÁVEZ STUDENT CENTER

Exterior

Of the four Vernon DeMars-designed buildings that comprise the California Student Center, Chávez Student Center has undergone the most extensive alterations, mostly performed when the building was converted from the central campus Dining Commons into an office building in 1989-90. However, even this conversion spared most of the historic exterior, particularly along the north, east, and west walls. As part of the remodel, the second-floor (Terrace) level of the south façade was demolished and pushed out one structural bay to the south. The original redwood pergola feature was evidently salvaged and reinstalled in its present location but the glass window wall was reconstructed out of compatible if non-historic materials, altering the
massing and articulation of the south façade. With the exception of the altered Terrace area, the exterior of Chávez Student Center is Very Significant.

Category: Very Significant
Character-Defining Materials, Features, and Spaces:
- Concrete elements, including rough board-formed concrete walls at the basement level facing Strawberry Creek, concrete masonry unit walls, terraces to the south and east of the building, cylindrical tube-formed columns, and hyperbolic-paraboloid vaulted roof.
- Overall footprint and massing of the building.
- Glass and steel window walls along the north, east, west and the first floor level of the south façade.
- Miscellaneous metallic elements, including top-lit incandescent globe fixtures with white globe shades and matching sconces, decorative aluminum mesh on the west façade, and steel balustrade on the Terrace level.
- Glazed aluminum doors; most of the original glazed aluminum doors were removed during the 1988-89 remodel. The remaining original doors are easily distinguished by their natural aluminum finish, wide rails and stiles, and one-over-one light pattern. Non-historic doors have a darker-colored anodized aluminum finish.
- Miscellaneous wood elements, including remnant of wood pergola on second floor (Terrace) level of the south façade.

Interior
The interior of Chávez Student Center has been more extensively altered than any of the four buildings that comprise the California Student Center. Remodeled as a student services center in 1989-90, the project gutted nearly the entire first and second floors of the interior – historically a largely open volume containing dining rooms and kitchens. The majority of the interior was rebuilt as a warren of offices demarcated by steel stud and gypsum board walls penetrated by a network of corridors finished in typical off-the-shelf materials. Some Significant spaces remain, mostly in the basement where the UC Marching Band and Choral groups continue to occupy their original practice rooms, offices, and rehearsal halls. Presently the only Very Significant space remaining within the building is Chávez Atrium, a double-height space located in the northwest corner of the building. Spared from remodeling due to lobbying from Vernon DeMars, Chávez Atrium retains the open quality of the original design as well as several significant features, including a terrazzo stair, a wall-mounted clock, and exposed sections of window wall and the thin-shell vaulted ceiling. Of lesser significance but still retaining some historic fabric are the five exterior-facing offices occupied by the Multicultural Development Center Suite on the north side of the second floor.

Category: Very Significant
Character-Defining Materials, Features, and Spaces:
- Miscellaneous concrete elements; mostly concentrated in Chávez Atrium, include exposed tube-formed columns, hyperbolic-paraboloid roof, and stairs.
- Miscellaneous metallic elements, mostly concentrated in Chávez Atrium, include several top-lit incandescent globe sconces, metal stair balustrade, and a historic wall-mounted clock on the west wall of Chávez Atrium.

Category: Significant
Character-Defining Materials, Features, and Spaces:
- Basement Rehearsal Halls; these two rehearsal halls in the basement are still used by the California Marching Band and various other musical and choral groups. The spaces appear largely original, featuring stepped concrete floors, acoustical-tiled ceilings, dropped
acoustical ceilings, and wood and metal storage cabinets that appear to have been salvaged from the old Eshleman Hall.

- Multicultural Development Center Suite; this suite of five offices: Rooms 241, 243, 245, 247, and 249, retain their original steel and glass window walls, most of their original partition walls, and their vaulted hyperbolic-paraboloid ceilings.

C. KING STUDENT UNION

Exterior

The exterior of King Student Union – the centerpiece of the four-building California Student Center complex – has undergone few exterior alterations since the building opened in 1961. Clad in a variety of materials, including glass and steel window walls, poured-in-place concrete, decorative CMU, stucco, and steel, the exterior of the King Student Union displays many characteristics of the Second Bay Region Tradition, including organically inspired color palettes and textures, and references to natural materials. The design is also inspired by Renaissance precedent in terms of its massing and façade organization consisting of a base, shaft, and capital; peripteral colonnade, and piano nobile, taking its inspiration from Jacopo Sansovino’s Il Libreria di San Marco in Venice. The only significant alterations to the exterior of the building include new storefronts on the first floor (Lower Sproul Hall) level of the Bear’s Lair, the addition of a second stair (matching the historic stair) on the north façade, and the addition of solar panels on the roof. Because the exterior is largely original, its central location between Upper and Lower Sproul Plazas, and because it has four principal character-defining façades, we have coded virtually the entire exterior Very Significant.

Category: Very Significant

Character-Defining Materials, Features, and Spaces:

- Concrete elements, including rough board-formed concrete walls at the basement level, board-formed concrete columns, concrete masonry unit walls, and a hyperbolic-paraboloid vaulted roof atop the Tilden room.
- Overall footprint and massing.
- Glass and steel window walls along the north, east, west and south façades.
- Miscellaneous metallic elements, including top-lit incandescent globe fixtures with white globe shades and matching sconces, metal “cornice,” and stair and balcony balustrades.
- Glazed aluminum and anodized aluminum doors. The doors on the second floor (Upper Sproul Plaza) level feature fourteen (seven pairs) brass bear doors pulls designed by Vernon DeMars and fabricated and installed in 1979.
- Stucco finish at third and fourth floor levels.
- Aluminum windows on third and fourth floor levels.

Interior

In contrast to its pristine exterior, the interior of King Student Union has undergone considerable changes, especially in the basement, first, and second floor levels. Many of the alterations occurred as the direct result of the expansion of the ASUC Store into areas of the building once dedicated to recreational and social uses. The basement, which is entirely utilitarian in character, retains much of its original plan but no significant interior spaces remain. The first floor level, heavily damaged by fire in 1985, retains several small contributing spaces but no Significant or Very Significant zones aside from several outdoor vestibules and one internal stair. On the second floor (Upper Sproul Plaza) level some Significant and Very Significant interior spaces survive, in particular the Main Lobby (Very Significant), and to a lesser extent, Heller Lounge (Significant). In contrast, nearly the entire third floor level (Pauley Ballroom and Stephens Memorial Lounge)
is either significant or very significant. The fourth floor meeting rooms are significant spaces, and the Tilden Room on the fifth floor level is Very Significant.

**Category: Very Significant**

**Character-Defining Materials, Features, and Spaces:**
- The fifth floor level contains the most important Very Significant interior space: the Tilden Room, a non-denominational meditation room/chapel. Essentially a roof-mounted penthouse capped by a hyperbolic-paraboloid roof, the Tilden Room features a large stained glass window, extensive areas of wood paneling, and several other art works and inscriptions of note. While technically outdoor spaces, the East and West Terraces to either side of the Tilden Room are also Very Significant spaces.
- The second floor level is the location of the Main Lobby, a Very Significant space anchoring the southeast corner of the Student Union at the Upper Sproul Plaza level. Although this space has undergone some alterations, it retains the bulk of its original materials, including tinted and polished concrete floors with cast stone accents, steel and glass window walls, concrete and acoustical material ceilings. The most significant features in the space are the terrazzo “Grand Stair” and the Lucite incandescent suspended light fixtures and matching sconces. Another important feature is the Stanford Axe case near the Grand Stair.
- The Pauley Ballroom is the primary Very Significant space on the third floor level. Divided into two smaller spaces (East and West Pauley Ballrooms) by a moveable partition clad in mahogany paneling, the ballroom features maple flooring, wood-paneled interior walls, steel and glass exterior window walls, and double-height concrete ceilings concealed behind suspended acoustical baffles which trap sound and create architectonic interest.
- The third floor is another location of Very Significant character-defining spaces within the entire Student Union. The Grand Stair terminates at the third floor level lobby, which is clad in mahogany paneling with oak floors and dropped acoustical ceilings. There is a custom-made chandelier by Lightolier installed in 1976 above the Grand Stair.
- Stairs: Stair E between the first and second floor levels features terrazzo risers and treads, steel balusters, and molded wood handrails. This stair was used by student activists during the Free Speech Movement to strategize prior to the occupation of Sproul Hall. Stair J features concrete risers and treads and steel balusters. This stair is also the location of the 1934 strap iron sculpture by Robert Howard.

**Category: Significant**

**Character-Defining Materials, Features, and Spaces:**
- The fourth floor only occupies a small portion of the building footprint due to the double-height Pauley Ballroom on the third floor level. The fourth floor contains five Significant classroom/meeting rooms. These rooms are clad in various hardwoods that are reflected in the names of the rooms: Black Oak, Douglas Fir, Tan Oak (East and West), Madrone (East and West), and Chinquapin. These rooms open onto a similarly detailed, wood-panel lobby.
- The second floor level also contains Heller Lounge (now the Multicultural Center), which runs along the west wall of the Student Union. This Significant space is largely original, with scored and polished concrete floors, wood-clad walls and ceilings, and a very significant hooded fireplace at the center of the space.

D. **Eshleman Hall**

**Exterior**

Eshleman Hall has undergone very few, if any, significant exterior alterations since the building was completed in 1965. Of the four component buildings of the California Student Center, Eshleman Hall is by far the most utilitarian and can be characterized as a rectangular concrete slab sitting atop a recessed podium embellished by colonnades at the Lower Sproul Plaza level and the top floor. Certain elements tie the building into the entire composition, namely the ochre-tinted, board-formed concrete – including the
distinctive rough board-formed concrete pattern at the first floor level – as well as the distinctive dark-red CMU cladding. In contrast to the other three structures, Eshleman Hall fills a largely functional role, serving as a large “filing cabinet” for ASUC offices and other student organizations. The primary responsibility for its design seems to have devolved mostly to Donald Hardison and not to Vernon DeMars. In addition, there is evidence to suggest that the Board of Regents and other University Administration figures were not happy with Eshleman Hall, in particular how it blocks much of the southern light from entering Lower Sproul Plaza – particularly during the winter. Furthermore, prior to construction, Eshleman Hall’s design was modified in several instances in response to criticism from Regent Don McLaughlin, in particular substitution of arches for flat lintels on the uppermost story and the addition of balconies on the narrow east and west facades.

Category: Very Significant
Character-Defining Materials, Features, and Spaces:
- Overall footprint and massing.
- Concrete elements, including rough board-formed concrete walls at the basement level, board-formed concrete columns, and concrete masonry unit walls.
- Concrete solar shades on the south façade.
- Miscellaneous metallic elements, including top-lit incandescent globe fixtures with white globe shades and matching sconces and stair and balcony balustrades.
- Aluminum transom and sidelights around primary entrances.
- Aluminum windows on floors 2-8.

Interior
The interior of Eshleman Hall is largely devoted to office space. The only exceptions are the basement, which contains the ticket office; the first floor, which contains the ASUC Senate Chamber, and the eighth floor, which houses the Publications Library. Because as-built drawings of the interior plans have not been located it is difficult to determine the original floor plan. The original Competition drawings are not detailed enough and the final design appears to have been changed from the original Competition in the course of construction. Our field survey work suggests that much of the office space on floors 2-8 is original although it is also clear that new partitions have been inserted and others either removed or reconfigured. Nevertheless, there are no Significant or Very Significant materials, features, or spaces within the building aside from the first floor (Lower Sproul Plaza) level lobby.

Category: Significant
Character-Defining Materials, Features, and Spaces:
- Red clay tile pavers and wood paneled walls within the main lobby on the first floor (Lower Sproul Plaza) level.
- Light fixtures within ASUC Senate antechambers.
E. Significance Diagrams

The Significance Diagrams (Appendix Item A) are based on the most recent “as built” drawings available for Chávez Student Center, King Student Union, and Eshleman Hall provided to us by UC Berkeley’s Department of Capital Projects. KVP annotated these plans to indicate the various levels of significance present within each of the three buildings of the California Student Center that are the focus of this HSR. Very Significant spaces are coded in red, Significant in pink, Contributing in yellow, and non-contributing in green. It is understood that with the exception of the altered sections of the façade noted above, the exterior envelopes of the buildings are all Very Significant because they are mostly original and have undergone few notable changes. In addition, most of the buildings that comprise the California Student Center – in keeping with modernist practice – do not have principle façades. Designed like sculptures to be viewed from every direction, there is no real hierarchy which might argue for coding each of the façades differently. Because we assume that the exteriors are all Very Significant, we have only included plans and not sections or elevations. The list of drawings is presented below.

Chávez Student Center:
1. Sub-basement plan
2. Basement plan
3. 1st floor plan (Lower Sproul Plaza)
4. 2nd floor plan (Upper Sproul Plaza)

King Student Center
1. Basement plan
2. 1st floor plan (Lower Sproul Plaza)
3. 2nd floor plan (Upper Sproul Plaza)
4. 3rd floor plan
5. 4th floor plan
6. 5th floor plan

Eshleman Hall
1. Basement plan
2. 1st floor plan (Lower Sproul Plaza)
3. 2nd floor plan
4. 3rd floor plan
5. 4th floor plan
6. 5th floor plan
7. 6th floor plan
8. 7th floor plan
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V. ANALYSIS OF HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE

A. EXISTING HISTORIC STATUS
The California Student Center is currently not assigned a California Register of Historical Resources status code. California Register status codes, which range from “1” (individually listed in the National or California Register) to “7” (not evaluated), are assigned by the State of California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) to properties listed in or under review by OHP. Nor is the California Student Center listed as a local Berkeley City Landmark or Structure of Merit.

The primary reason why the complex has not been evaluated for eligibility is that even the oldest part of the complex (Chávez Student Center) is not yet fifty years of age, a basic threshold required for listing in either register unless it can be demonstrated that the property is “of exceptional importance,” under National Register Criteria Consideration G: “Properties that have achieved significance within the last fifty years.”

B. NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES
The National Register of Historic Places (National Register) is the nation’s most comprehensive inventory of historic resources. The National Register, administered by the National Park Service, includes buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts that possess historic, architectural, engineering, archaeological, or cultural significance at the national, state, or local level. Typically, only resources over fifty years of age are eligible for listing in the National Register if they meet any of the four nominating criteria and if they sufficiently retain historic integrity. However, resources under fifty years of age can be determined eligible if it can be demonstrated that they are of “exceptional importance,” or if they are contributors to a potential historic district. National Register criteria are defined in depth in National Register Bulletin Number 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation. There are four basic criteria under which a structure, site, building, district, or object can be considered eligible for listing in the National Register:

  Criterion A (Event): Properties associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;
  Criterion B (Person): Properties associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;
  Criterion C (Design/Construction): Properties that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction; and
  Criterion D (Information Potential): Properties that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

A resource can be considered significant on a national, state, or local level to American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture.

---

As mentioned above, in addition to qualifying for listing under at least one of the four National Register criteria, a property must be shown to retain sufficient historic integrity. The concept of integrity is essential to identifying the important physical characteristics of historical resources and hence, in evaluating adverse changes to them. Integrity is defined as “the authenticity of an historical resource’s physical identity evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource’s period of significance.”

According to the National Register Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation, the seven characteristics that define integrity are as follows:

- **Location** is the place where the historic property was constructed.
- **Design** is the combination of elements that create the form, plans, space, structure and style of the property.
- **Setting** addresses the physical environment of the historic property inclusive of the landscape and spatial relationships of the building(s).
- **Materials** refer to the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern of configuration to form the historic property.
- **Workmanship** is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history.
- **Feeling** is the property’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.
- **Association** is the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.

**C. EVALUATION OF HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE**

As a property that is still less than fifty years of age (the oldest member of the California Student Center – Chávez Student Center – is 49 years old in 2009) its significance must be reviewed in light of Criterion Consideration G: Properties that have achieved significance within the past fifty years. National Register Bulletin 22: Guidelines for Evaluating and Nominating Properties that Have Achieved Significance within the Past Fifty Years provides additional information on the topic. According to National Register Bulletin 22, the implementation of the so-called “Fifty Year Rule” was to “assure historical perspective and avoid judgments based on current or recent popular trends, the 50-year period was established as a guide for evaluating the historic resources worthy of preservation.” Criterion Consideration G does provide for an opportunity to list a property that is less than fifty years in age “if it is of exceptional importance at the national, State, or local level.”

**Criterion A**

The California Student Center appears eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion A (Events) for its association with the Free Speech Movement of 1964-65, the Peoples’ Park Movement of 1969, and many other lesser known student political activity during the 1960s and early 1970s. Completed during a heady period in the history of the University of California, Berkeley, the California Student Center played a significant role in the events of 1964-65 and beyond. As described in more depth in Chapter II, Section K above, the California Student Center was the epicenter of student political activity during the 1960s.

---

222 Ibid.
Beginning in the early 1960s with demonstrations against the University's restrictions on political activity outside Sather Gate, student activism blossomed with the Civil Rights movement. Student activists who cut their teeth on protests against racial discrimination soon redirected their attention toward overturning draconian restrictions against on-campus political activity. The Free Speech Movement, which took its name from efforts to ensure freedom to engage in political activity, began on September 28, 1964 when Art Goldberg and Sandor Fuchs of SLATE, Danny Rosenthal of Cal Students for Goldwater, and Mario Savio of Friends of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), marched from Dwinelle Plaza to Lower Sproul Plaza – where Chancellor Strong was presiding over the Convocation – to protest the Administration's revocation of the students' right to distribute literature from tables in Upper Sproul Plaza. This event is generally recognized as the opening salvo in the Free Speech Movement, a movement that quickly grew in proportion to occupy a national stage as other university campuses across the country began to emulate their counterparts at UC Berkeley.

As mentioned above, the California Student Center was "ground zero" of the Free Speech Movement of 1964-65. The facility was strategically located at the intersection of the campus and the city and directly opposite the Administration Building (Sproul Hall). Although obviously not designed for this purpose, the California Student Center turned out to be ideally laid out for student protests with its vast plazas and elevated balconies and terraces. The facility was located at the edge of the city, allowing students to easily slip back and forth to and from the campus but also near Sather Gate, the primary circulation route for liberal arts students, the primary participants in the Free Speech Movement. According to FSM member Jo Freeman, the California Student Center was "a bifurcated town square," whose strategic location between Sather Gate and Bancroft Way made it a logical staging area student activism and that is why the most important events of the Free Speech Movement of 1964-65 took place there.

Although there is no way he could have anticipated the student demonstrations of the mid-1960s, Vernon DeMars' design of the California Student Center did deliberately create a separate student precinct that was in many ways off limits to University authority. With its own distinctive landscaped plazas and modernist architecture delineating the complex from surrounding classically inspired University buildings, the California Student Center complex stands alone physically and aesthetically as a place for students. From the completion of the Dining Commons in 1960, the complex was largely under the control of the students under the aegis of the ASUC. In regard to its strategic location and as a largely student-controlled institution, the California Student Center became an ideal headquarters for the student activists.

Many of the leaders of the loosely defined group, including members of SLATE, Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), as well as other groups, planned their daily strategy on the Terrace of the Dining Commons or in the Bear’s Lair. The Student Union itself provided an excellent “command center,” communications hub, and place from which to view events unfolding in Upper and Lower Sproul Plazas. During the events of October 1-2, 1964, when Mario Savio and others addressed the crowd from the roof of a disabled police car in Upper Sproul Plaza, the public address system was plugged into outlets in the Student Union. Historic photographs show hundreds of onlookers and protesters lined up along the balconies of the Student Union.
watching the activity below. During the occupation of Sproul Hall on October 2, 1964, protesters gathered on
the stairs of the between the first and second floors of the Student Union to strategize. They also used the
public telephones in the Student Union to communicate with the Press and the outside world.

Four years later, on May 15, 1969, students protesting the construction of a large dormitory complex on the
site of what would become Peoples’ Park, held a rally in Sproul Plaza. After the rally they marched to
Peoples’ Park where they were met by a phalanx of Berkeley police and state highway patrolmen who
opened fire with birdshot, killing one man and injuring dozens of others. A week later, a memorial service
held in the victim’s honor in Sproul Plaza on May 21, 1969 came under attack by National Guardsmen who
sealed off the California Student Center at bayonet-point while helicopters flew overhead and dropped tear
gas amongst the demonstrators trapped in Sproul Plaza. Ordered as an appropriate response to “that mess
in Berkeley” by newly elected California governor Ronald Reagan, this use of tear gas by the American
government against its own citizens was unprecedented in our history.

As demonstrated by the events above, the California Student Center is of exceptional historical importance
under Criterion A (Events). Applying Criterion Consideration G, the California Student Union appears eligible
under Criterion A for its crucial role in one of the most influential American political movements of the latter
half of the twentieth century. The Free Speech Movement and subsequent 1960s-era political movements
on the UC Berkeley campus were seminal in the transformation of American political and social culture.
Although the protests may have achieved comparatively little in concrete terms at the time, they
strengthened their respective causes, advancing free speech, civil rights, and opposition to American
intervention in Vietnam. Perhaps even more important was the reaction that campus protests aroused
among the so-called “Silent Majority.” Ronald Reagan was elected governor of California in 1967 in large
part in response to his promise to “clean up that mess at Berkeley,” a policy he put into deadly effect in 1969
when he dispatched the National Guard to Berkeley to combat participants in the Peoples Park Movement.
Regan’s decision to send the California Highway Patrol and the National Guard in to occupy Berkeley was
apparently popular among many Californians, earning Reagan a second term as governor (1971-75). Reagan’s
popularity as an anti-tax crusader and suppressor of radicalism eventually contributed to his
election as the president of the United States in 1980, and the inception of nearly three decades of
subsequent Republican rule.

Criterion B
The California Student Center does not appear to be eligible for listing in the National Register under
Criterion B (Persons). Although many notable persons were associated with its design and construction and
subsequent uses, the California Student Center was a venue for important events and not a place
“associated with a person’s productive life.”

Criterion C
The California Student Center appears eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion C
(Design/Construction) as a resource embodying the “distinctive characteristics of a type, period, and method
of construction,” as “the work of a master,” and as a work that displays “high artistic values.” Designed as a
collaborative effort of the firms of DeMars & Reay and Donald Hardison & Associates, with landscape design by Lawrence Halprin, the layout of the complex and the individual designs of the Dining Commons, the Student Union, and Zellerbach Hall were largely by DeMars & Reay. The larger firm of Donald Hardison & Associates was primarily responsible for the design of Eshleman Hall, developing construction drawings, and overseeing construction. With Vernon DeMars as the principal author of the design, the complex naturally embodies many of the traits of the Second Bay Region Tradition, a loose movement of mostly Bay Area–born architects, landscape architects, artists, and designers who derived inspiration from the Bay Region’s dramatic topography, distinctive climate, and vegetation.

Criterion C: Type and Period
The California Student Center embodies the “distinctive characteristics of a type, period, and method of construction.” As a type and period, the complex is one of the largest and most well-developed student union complexes built in postwar America. As demonstrated in Chapter II, Section F above, the California Student Center was recognized by contemporary experts like Richard Dober, author of Campus Planning, as “a major landmark in American college and university architecture.” The complex was widely praised both during its construction and after its completion, winning several awards, including from the American Institute of Architects, Progressive Architecture, the California Alumni Association, and earning praise from members of the contemporary architecture community, art critics, and professionals involved in the field of campus planning.

The Competition Program, written by architect Joseph Esherick, outlined the need for four major components: a dining commons, a student union, an office building, and a theater. Although the Competition Program did not specify that the complex should be divided into four separate structures, that is what Vernon DeMars elected to do. For his design of the California Student Center, DeMars developed a site plan composed of four markedly different buildings surrounding a paved public plaza loosely modeled on Piazza San Marco in Venice. With regard to programming, DeMars was influenced by other prominent postwar student unions, including the University of Wisconsin, Ohio State, and Texas A & M. However, In contrast to these examples, DeMars dispensed with the prevailing prototype of a single building standing in isolation in a lush landscape and instead created a dynamic urban space that was deliberately intended to link the pastoral campus with the bustling city outside the campus gates. Unlike many of his contemporaries, DeMars and his Northern California contemporaries deliberately embraced the city and all of its inherent messiness and vitality, looking to traditional European prototypes for inspiration. The California Student Center is probably unique in postwar college planning for its deliberate celebration of urban design.

The design of the California Student Center was also greatly influenced by the ideology of Telesis, a group of Cal professors and self-proclaimed “Young Turks,” including Vernon DeMars, William Wurster, Joseph Esherick, Catherine Bauer, and others. As set forth in their founding statement, the group believed that “People and the Land make up the environment which has four distinct parts—a place to Live, Work, Play, and the Services which integrate these and make them operate. These components must be integrated in the community and urban region through rational planning, and through the use of modern building
technology. The design of the California Student Center physically embodies much of the Telesis program, in particular the integration of living, working, recreation, and service spaces in a discrete and rationally laid out modern complex consisting of multiple buildings tied together by a cohesive landscape.

DeMars’ design of the California Student Center is also heavily indebted to Piazza San Marco in Venice. Elements of the Venetian piazza incorporated into the California Student Center include its L-shaped footprint, patterned hardscaped plaza, and the use of its constituent buildings to focus sightlines toward local scenery, including Sather Tower, Strawberry Creek, and the Berkeley Hills. The individual buildings of the California Student Center also embody characteristics of their Venetian counterparts, with the Student Union resembling Sansovino’s Il Libreria di San Marco, Zellerbach Hall recalling Palladio’s Palazzo della Ragione, and the Dining Commons supposed to remind one of a Renaissance market.

Criterion C: Method of Construction
The California Student Center demonstrates several innovative methods of construction that make it stand out from typical postwar student unions, many of which were built of concrete in the then-popular “Brutalist” style. DeMars’ design deliberately avoided Brutalism, which he defined as “the creation of a giant, monolithic, and overpowering structure.” Instead, DeMars created a distinctive complex of modern concrete structures that still managed to “maintain a recognizable human scale” and encourage “a design spirit that would foster student identification with the center and clearly distinguish it as non-academic.” To achieve this goal DeMars de-emphasized the heavy mural nature of concrete construction by treating the concrete in various ways, including using board-formed concrete at the base of most of the buildings, contrasting warm-toned concrete block and stucco panels on the upper floors, and attenuated colonnades and thin-shell concrete hyperbolic-paraboloid roof forms to provide visual interest and lighten the visual character of the material. The umbrella-like hyperbolic-paraboloid roof vaults were innovative for their time, deriving from the work of Mexican architect Felix Candella and Italian engineer Pier Luigi Nervi.

Criterion C: Work of a Master
The California Student Center appears eligible under Criterion C as the work of a master, in particular for its association with architects Vernon DeMars (1908-2005) and Donald Reay (1914-2002) and landscape architect Lawrence Halprin (1916- ). As demonstrated in this report, Vernon DeMars was a significant figure in the architectural community of Northern California during the postwar period. Along with his UC Berkeley colleagues William Wurster and Joseph Esherick, DeMars was a proponent of a progressive school of design heavily influenced by European modernism as well as by the indigenous traditions of the First Bay Region Tradition. Active in the local group Telesis since its founding in the 1930s, DeMars always retained a social conscience, as evidenced by his work designing housing for migrant laborers and war workers during the 1930s and 1940s. DeMars was also instrumental in several major postwar redevelopment projects in San Francisco, including Diamond Heights and Golden Gateway Plaza, and Capitol Towers in Sacramento.
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Probably inspired by his business partner Donald Reay – a designer of several British new towns during the postwar period – DeMars always thought big, preferring to work on large urban planning projects over smaller projects. DeMars continued to remain involved in his field until his death in 2005, writing dozens of articles and speaking on architecture and design.

DeMars' longtime business partner Donald Reay – also a faculty member at UC Berkeley – is perhaps lesser known in the United States than in his native Britain but that makes him no less significant. Reay was primarily an urban designer who participated in the design and construction of several prominent post-World War II “New Towns” to house people bombed out of their homes during the war. From 1945 to 1947, Reay, along with Sir William Holford, contributed to the drafting of the 1946 New Towns Act. After the passage of the act, Reay served as the chief architect and planner for East Kilbride New Town in Scotland (1947-51) and Stevenage (1951-55), near London. As planned communities, the New Towns were designed to include virtually everything necessary to sustain an independent community, including housing, offices, retail, parks, churches, and community centers of various kinds. To economize on space, much of the housing in British New Towns consisted of high-rise towers, a feature of much of DeMars & Reay’s work, including Capital Towers in Sacramento, Golden Gateway Plaza and Diamond Heights (not built) in San Francisco, and the California Student Center.

One of the most prominent parts of the California Student Center is its landscaping. Comprising Upper Sproul Plaza (originally the Telegraph Avenue Mall), Lower Sproul Plaza (originally Student Center Square), East and West Terrace (atop the Student Union) as well as several smaller plazas, planters, and beds, the landscape of the California Student Center was very well-received, even by those who did not universally admire the buildings. The man primarily responsible for the landscape was Lawrence Halprin, a giant in the field of American landscape design. Halprin studied at Harvard under Walter Gropius and Marcel Breuer and then subsequently worked for famed Bay Area landscape architect Tommy Church. Influenced by his wife Anna Schuman – a dancer – Halprin became interested in combining movement and landscape architecture. His theoretical bent can be interpreted in the landscape plan of the California Student Center, which at the end of the day is mostly about circulation – yet circulation within a context of enhancing and framing dramatic vistas and screening out more objectionable elements. The California Student Center was one of Halprin’s earliest major projects and the one that propelled him to subsequent major works including Ghirardelli Square, Golden Gateway Plaza (in association with Vernon DeMars), Sea Ranch, and others.

**Criterion C: High Artistic Values**

Although designed as a state project with a limited budget, the California Student Center is notable for its incorporation of a significant public art program, much of it ushered to completion in subsequent years through the relentless efforts of Vernon DeMars. Probably the most notable and significant art work on the site is Emmy Lou Packard’s untitled mural on the south façade of the Dining Commons (Chávez Student Center), a molded concrete piece that commemorates California’s natural landscapes. Emmy Lou Packard (1914-1998) was an important artist. A graduate of UC Berkeley (Class of ’35), Packard studied mural making at the San Francisco Art Institute and assisted Diego Rivera on his mural for the Golden Gate...
Exposition of 1939-40 before going on to create a career for herself in painting and sculpture. Other significant artworks at the California Student Center include the stained glass window by Robert Pinard in the Tilden Room, the strap iron sculpture by Robert Howard in the now-abandoned stair between Lower and Upper Sproul Plazas, and the Golden Bear Column and Golden Bear Door Pulls by Vernon DeMars.

Beyond the inclusion of public art it is quite evident that Vernon DeMars had a great appreciation for artistry in his design of the California Student Center. Aware that state budgets would likely prevent the inclusion of too many “art works or enrichments,” DeMars manipulated the basic materials of the California Student Center to create unique richness of detail. DeMars stated that he was seeking to avoid the “inhuman bareness” of modern architecture: “We’re trying hard NOT to make it resemble a shopping center – you know, that boxy, glassy look.” DeMars further explained how he wanted the Student Center “to be more human and frankly, more interesting than run of the mill ‘modern.’” As an alternative to the often-cited placeless sterility of modern architecture, DeMars cited his efforts to bestow a “fresh look” that “combines a dash of Paris’ Left Bank with something of the feeling of Copenhagen’s 19th century Tivoli Gardens and St. Mark’s Square in Venice.”

Criterion D: Information Potential
Analysis of eligibility under Criterion D (Information Potential) is beyond the scope of this report.

Integrity
Once a resource has been identified as being potentially eligible for listing in the National Register, its historic integrity must be evaluated. The National Register recognizes seven aspects or qualities that, in various combinations, define integrity. These aspects are: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association. In order to be determined eligible for listing, these aspects must closely relate to the resource’s significance and must be intact.

As described above, the California Student Center has undergone a number of alterations since its completion in the late 1960s. Several of these alterations were envisioned in the original design but were only realized in subsequent years as political will and funds became available; examples include several of Vernon DeMars’ pet projects such as the Golden Bear Column and the Golden Bear door pulls. More commonly, alterations occurred as a result of changing patterns of use, in particular the incremental expansion of the ASUC Store and other retail uses into spaces once devoted to recreational use in the Student Union, or the conversion of most of the former Dining Commons into an office building in 1989-90. Still other alterations occurred in response to catastrophe, including the fire that gutted the first floor of Eshleman Hall in 1981 and the ASUC Bookstore in 1985. More recently, concerns over the apparent seismic deficiencies of the California Student Center have resulted in more drastic interventions, such as the removal of the pedestrian bridge between Chávez Student Center and King Student Union in 1998. Future projects will result in additional alterations to the Student Union, including the installation of internal seismic braces.
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Overall, the integrity of the California Student Center is surprisingly good for a heavily used institutional facility approaching fifty years of age. Aside from the demolition of the pedestrian bridge, the addition to the Terrace level of Chávez Student Center, and changes to the fenestration of the Bear’s Lair, the exterior of the California Student Center has barely changed. With the exception of the addition of the Golden Bear Column, Lower Sproul Plaza has also remained essentially unchanged since 1967. In contrast, many of the interior spaces of the California Student Center have undergone extensive remodeling, particularly Chávez Student Center, which retains very little of its historic interior fabric, and the first floor (Lower Sproul Plaza) level of the Student Union. On the other hand, many of the most architecturally significant interiors of the complex remain intact, especially the Main Lobby on the second floor (Upper Sproul Plaza) level of the Student Union, virtually the entire third floor level – including the Pauley Ballroom and Stephens Memorial Lounge, the fourth-floor meeting rooms and lobby, and the Tilden Room on the fifth floor level. In regard to Eshleman Hall, aside from the ASUC Senate Chamber on the first floor level, which was remodeled after the 1981 fire, the interior of the building appears largely original, although it is apparent that some interior partitions have been moved around at various times.

The following section goes through each of the seven aspects of integrity: design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association:

- **Location**: The California Student Center has clearly not been moved since it was completed; therefore it retains integrity of location.

- **Design**: The exterior of the California Student Center is largely intact. The construction of the addition on the Terrace Level of Chávez Student Center in 1988-89 and the demolition of the pedestrian bridge between Chávez and King Student Union in 1998 are the most deleterious to the overall design integrity of the complex. The Chávez addition resulted in the diminishment of the once-open character of the Terrace, replacing what was once a recessed and transparent window wall with a largely opaque expanse of tinted glass and metal spandrels located outboard of the roof eaves. However, the detailing of the addition is basically compatible with the original design so that it does not call undue attention to itself. The demolition of the pedestrian bridge is more harmful, removing a significant architectonic element and avenue of circulation from the composition. However, the demolition of this element is mitigated in part by the fact that its absence is not readily apparent to a casual observer and the architectural integrity of the buildings that it once linked do not suffer as a result of its loss. Portions of the interior of the complex have also been remodeled, in particular nearly the entire interior of Chávez and the first floor level of the Student Union. However, the significance of the design of the California Student Center is primarily invested in its site plan and exterior volumes, which are largely original. Only moderately altered, the California Student Center retains integrity of design.

- **Setting**: Since it was completed in 1967, the physical environment surrounding the California Student Center has scarcely changed. Sproul Hall continues to dominate the east side of Upper Sproul Plaza and Sather Gate and Strawberry Creek continue to
demarcate the boundary between it and the Central Campus. To the west are the Alumni House and Harmon Gymnasium/Haas Pavilion. Although partially demolished and remodeled in 1997, Harmon Gymnasium is mostly concealed behind Zellerbach Hall’s fly tower, minimizing its visual impact. To the south is Bancroft Way, still a busy commercial area dominated by a mixture of one and two-story commercial buildings. The California Student Center retains integrity of setting.

- **Materials**: The California Student Center is a catalog of various applications of concrete construction, including board-formed, patterned, cast, poured-in-place, and stacked concrete blocks. Other significant materials include the tiled accents and paving present throughout the complex, metal elements, including light fixtures, balustrades, stairs, and miscellaneous detailing; and interior wood paneling and built-in fixtures. Aside from the areas discussed above, most of the materials originally used to build the California Student Center remain present and largely intact. The interior of Chávez Student Center has been the most adversely impacted by the removal of original materials, although many of the most important features and materials appear to remain intact behind later additions. Although somewhat compromised, the California Student Center retains integrity of materials.

- **Workmanship**: Virtually all of the materials and features that display the characteristics of advanced workmanship remain intact and in place. Examples include the rough board-formed concrete base of the buildings, the delicate thin-shelled hyperbolic-paraboloid roof forms, the wood paneling present in the interior spaces of the Student Union, and the various art works discussed above. The California Student Center retains integrity of workmanship.

- **Feeling**: Based on the California Student Center’s retention of the majority of its historic fabric and setting, it is still capable of conveying the aesthetic sensibility of 1960s-era California, an era characterized by full state coffers and an ambitious public works program, as well as an era marked by political strife. The California Student Center retains integrity of Feeling.

- **Association**: The primary historical events associated with the California Student Center include the Free Speech Movement and Peoples’ Park (1964-65 and 1969, respectively). The California Student Center played a major role in both events. The areas affected by the two events, or patterns of events, are basically unchanged. The California Student Center retains integrity of Association.
VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. LANDSCAPE

Designed by Lawrence Halprin in association with Vernon DeMars, the landscape of the California Student Center is primarily urban and modern in character, consisting of hardscaped plazas, stairs, terraces, and molded concrete planters. Upper Sproul Plaza, which forms the eastern portion of the site, is the primary entry sequence for pedestrians entering the central campus via Telegraph Avenue. Lower Sproul Plaza, which is defined by King Student Union, Chávez Student Center, Eshleman Hall, and Zellerbach Hall, is similar in nature to Upper Sproul Plaza, although the paving pattern is reversed. The University of California, Berkeley New Century Plan addresses the landscape of the California Student Center, as well as the complex as a whole. While acknowledging its historic value, the plan recommends reprogramming and redesigning the complex to "renew its original role as a campus-wide center for student life and services." Specific recommendations include repaving Upper and Lower Sproul Plaza and redesigning the buildings so that there is a greater level of transparency and interaction with the surrounding landscapes.

The landscape of the California Student Center is largely intact, having undergone few significant alterations. It is in borderline fair-to-good condition, suffering from some deferred maintenance, resulting in cracked pavers, biological growth build-up, untended and missing plantings, and a general atmosphere of neglect. When the California Student Center first opened, its landscape was one of the features that most impressed the critics. Unfortunately, as the buildings around it have been repurposed (especially the conversion of the former Dining Commons into an office building), the number of people using the space has significantly declined, turning Lower Sproul Plaza into a dead space for much of the day. The Bear’s Lair is probably the most active user of the space, with patrons spilling out onto the plaza to sit and eat. Unfortunately, the furnishings and fencing installed by the operators of the Bear’s Lair are not compatible with the original design, visually detracting from the plaza with a cluttered assemblage of various types of furniture.

Given their role in the Free Speech Movement and subsequent 1960s-era protests, Upper and Lower Sproul Plaza are two of the most historic spaces within the California Student Center (and the campus as a whole). Regular maintenance would help to arrest and reverse some of the worst symptoms of deterioration evident in plazas today. Selective replacement and repair of damaged pavers and other features, such as planters, benches, and trash receptacles would improve the appearance of the landscape and make it more inviting to users. A comparison of existing conditions with the original landscape drawings indicate that with the exception of the olive trees in Lower Sproul Plaza, many of the plantings that were originally grown in the planters and the beds adjoining the buildings have been removed. Some planters are either empty or overgrown with what appears to be an ad hoc selection of non-historic plantings. Given concerns over water usage, the University may wish to develop a planting program that uses either native and/or drought-tolerant
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species that resemble the original plantings. Consistent maintenance of the plantings will keep them alive and establish a more cared-for appearance in the landscaped areas.

B. ARCHITECTURAL

Architectural features, materials, and spaces should be treated as described in the University's definitions of significance zones at the beginning of Chapter IV above. Features, materials, and spaces that are categorized as being either Significant or Very Significant should be treated according to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Rehabilitation of Historic Properties. Areas that are classified as Contributing are of lesser significance and in the case of the California Student Center primarily consist of original materials, features, and spaces that have a low level of significance and are therefore less sensitive to change. Non-contributing materials, features, and spaces are either not historic or historic elements that have been heavily altered, thereby having lost integrity.

Especially significant and vulnerable to loss of integrity are the exterior elevations of all four buildings. Having undergone comparatively few changes since they were each completed, the exterior façades of the four buildings are significant not only as individual structures but also as contributors to a cohesively designed complex that encompasses all four buildings and their associated landscapes. That is why we have coded all exterior elevations as being Very Significant with the exception of areas that have been altered, including the south Terrace level of Chávez Student Center and the storefronts of the Bear’s Lair.

Deferred maintenance is an ongoing issue afflicting the buildings of the California Student Center. Identified in detail in Chapter III, the general condition of the exterior of the four buildings is generally good. Most of the concrete elements are in good condition, although efflorescence and biological growth are evident in areas. Vehicular soot has also stained many rougher concrete finishes. The steel mullions of the window walls along the north façades of Chávez Student Center and King Student Union show some evidence of surface corrosion and biological growth. It is also been indicated in other reports that the double-height window walls of the north façade of King Student Union are vulnerable to seismic forces. These same reports indicate that Eshleman Hall and King Student Union face other serious seismic deficiencies.

As described above, the interior spaces of the California Student Center vary widely in regard to significance and integrity. Very Significant spaces include Chávez Atrium in the former Dining Commons and the Main Lobby, Pauley Ballroom, and the Tilden Room in the Student Union. Incompatible alterations and added features may be reversed, but otherwise any redesign should avoid visible changes. Spaces rated Very Significant should not be radically altered in plan or section unless it is unavoidable for mandatory code measures. Programming and maintenance decisions for Significant spaces, such as Heller Lounge in the Student Union, should also be designed to avoid unnecessary impacts. New openings and noticeable new features, such as building systems, lighting, signage, should be limited to those required by code or basic programmatic needs which cannot be provided elsewhere. Spaces rated Contributing are typically retained (with reversal of previous Non-Contributing work) to the degree feasible or desirable within code, programmatic, and architectural design requirements without altering their fundamental character. However, as mentioned above, many of the spaces identified as Contributing in the California Student Center are not
architecturally significant and perhaps more appropriately altered than a traditional pre World War II building where workmanship and quality materials are more apt to be encountered even within more utilitarian spaces. Therefore, it is our recommendation that Contributing spaces may be altered as needed for code and important programmatic requirements. Non-Contributing spaces may be altered, combined, or subdivided in any way deemed necessary.

Existing features and materials rated Very Significant or Significant should be retained and restored, such as flooring, wall cladding, and ceiling materials, and other important character-defining features including stairs, light fixtures, hardware, doors, and miscellaneous features such as the fireplace in Heller Lounge or the Stanford Axe case in the Main Lobby of the Student Union. Paint colors and stains and other finishes should be based on historic colors substantiated by documentation or paint analysis. Features which are Very Significant should be retained in place if feasible or moved to an appropriate location if necessary. Significant features should be retained in place or moved if feasible. Contributing features should be retained wherever achievable within the project goals. Non-Contributing features may be removed wherever they occur in the building.

C. LIFE SAFETY ISSUES
This HSR does not include a life safety study although it is understood that both Eshleman Hall and King Student Union have been identified as being vulnerable to seismic forces. Proposed programming needs and potential seismic retrofit techniques should be considered with an eye to retaining the most significant character-defining materials, features, and spaces. The State Historical Building Code (SHBC) and alternative technologies should be carefully studied for required code upgrades and the resolution of life-safety issues.

D. ACCESSIBILITY ISSUES
This HSR does not include an accessibility study and does not analyze the complex in detail for compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). It is interesting to note however that the original Competition Program for the California Student Center required that the entire complex be accessible to wheelchair users. This was more than three decades before the passage of the ADA in 1990.227 Nevertheless, it is clear that although more readily accessible than most buildings constructed before 1990, there are many challenging areas within the complex, some of which have been incrementally solved through the installation of disabled access ramps (King Student Union), or the construction of new ADA-compliant toilet rooms (second floor of King Student Union). The majority of the toilet rooms throughout the complex are original and most do not meet current accessibility requirements. While disabled students and visitors are able to access all four buildings through the main entrance, the path of travel from the entrance to the elevators is not always easy or unobstructed. In addition, many doors throughout the complex are either not wide enough or do not have enough clearance for a wheelchair to turn around. Nor do most have automatic door operators.
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E. **RECOMMENDATIONS: MATERIALS AND FEATURES: EXTERIOR**

*Exterior Walls*

The concrete used in all four buildings of the California Student Center complex exhibits signs of discoloration as a result of biological growth, and build-up of dirt and soot. Careful cleaning with a very mild agent (probably a simple detergent or a mild abrasive like tri-sodium phosphate (tsp) and application method is appropriate. Strong chemicals, excessive use of water, or high water pressure should be avoided. Sand-blasting should not be considered because this process may remove the outermost layer of cured concrete, exposing the interior aggregate possibly even the rebar, hastening deterioration.

Efflorescence build-up, the white staining visible on much of the exterior concrete, is caused by salt and lime leaching out of the concrete in response to contact with water. It will often appear and then disappear on its own due to the weather conditions. If it persists, dry brushing the affected area will usually remedy the situation. For more significant accumulation, stains can usually be removed with a mild and diluted solution of muriatic acid (one part acid to twelve parts water) and more scrubbing. More stubborn staining may require heavy-duty retail products. Reputable manufacturers of efflorescence removing compounds include Aldo, BrickClean100, and CreteClean. After restoring the appearance of the surface, future efflorescence issues can be avoided by applying a penetrating sealer. These penetrating sealers will work even if the water continues to come from behind or above the surface, by creating a barrier below the surface. The sealer will allow water vapor to evaporate, but prevent the water-soluble salts from migrating along with the water.

*Roofs*

The roofs of all four buildings in the California Student Center appear to be in good condition. The completeness and condition of each roof should be regularly verified. For the most part, the roofs of the California Student Center are of two types: flat with built-up tar and gravel and thin-shelled hyperbolic-paraboloid concrete shells. The flat roofs are generally not visible from public vantage points and therefore have roof-mounted mechanical equipment and solar panels. In the future the University should take care to make sure that new roof-mounted equipment is as unobtrusive as possible to avoid changing the overall massing of the structures.

The hyperbolic-paraboloid roofs of Chávez Student Center and the Tilden Room are one of the most distinctive features of the California Student Center and should be retained and preserved in any proposed rehabilitation of the complex. Meant to be seen from taller buildings and the Berkeley Hills, the roof of Chávez was originally unencumbered by roof-mounted equipment; it has since acquired roof-mounted HVAC equipment. In order to remain true to the building’s original design, this unit should optimally be relocated in any rehabilitation of the structure.
Doors
The exterior doors of the California Student Center include a mixture of original glazed aluminum doors (Chávez and King), original anodized bronze doors with brass bear door pulls (King), and non-historic anodized aluminum units (Chávez and Eshleman). Understanding that their hardware may need to be upgraded to meet ADA and life-safety codes and regulations, original doors – where present – should be retained or if necessary, replaced in kind. Optimally, non-historic anodized aluminum doors should be replaced with non-anodized aluminum doors that match the original.

Exterior Metals
The buildings of the California Student Center incorporate a variety of metal features, fixtures, and decorative elements, ranging from stairs and balconies to light fixtures, to decorative elements such as the mesh screen applied to the west façade of Chávez and the delicate cornice/pergola that runs along the top of King Student Union. In general most exterior metals appear to be in good condition. They should be cleaned using mild cleaners to remove surface soiling and repaired where mechanically damaged or locally deteriorated. It is not advisable to remove oxidation as a cosmetic approach, even if metals are immediately patinated chemically.

Windows
Again, the four buildings of the California Student Center feature a variety of different window types, ranging from large fixed steel and glass window walls (King and Chávez) to operable aluminum casements (King) to operable sliding anodized aluminum windows (Eshleman). With the notable exception of the second floor level of the south façade of Chávez and the storefronts of the Bear’s Lair, the majority of the windows within the California Student Center appear to be original. Most appear to be in fair-to-good condition although there is some corrosion visible in the steel mullions along the shaded north façade of Chávez Student Center and the double-height window walls of King Student Union are known to be vulnerable to seismic forces. Other challenges include thermal loss and insufficient soundproofing inherent in 50-year-old, single-pane, uninsulated windows.

Optimally, existing historic windows should be retained and preserved wherever possible. If a window is broken or the mullion deteriorated, it should usually be replaced in kind. Understanding that other factors may be at stake, such as energy performance, life-safety, and sound-proofing –and given that the windows of the California Student Center appear to have been largely mass-produced, stock products – it may be appropriate to replace them in kind using double-glazing or other systems so long as the profile and the color of the mullions and light pattern remains the same as the original. In addition, concealed weather stripping may be installed to reduce air infiltration and improve acoustic performance; and interior shades may be installed.
Non-Historic Features and Signage

The exterior of the buildings of the California Student Center feature a variety of signage types from different periods of construction, most of it concentrated at the first-floor (Lower Sproul Plaza) level of King Student Union. Stainless steel lettering spells out the names of each of the buildings above their primary entrances. Although the names of the buildings have changed, the signage appears to use the same material and font as the original and is therefore compatible with the architectural character of the complex. Retail signage at the Bear’s Lair and the ASUC Store has been installed in an incremental and ad hoc manner. While this signage is not particularly obtrusive, in the future it may be desirable to develop a coherent signage program for the complex.

F. RECOMMENDATIONS: MATERIALS AND FEATURES: INTERIOR

Flooring

The interior floors of the buildings in the California Student Center are all concrete with a variety of finishes. Some floors are exposed concrete or covered in resilient tile flooring such as in the basements of all buildings. The second floor of the Student Union has concrete floors that are tinted and highly polished with decorative inlay strips. The Golden Bear Restaurant has similar floors. Red clay tiles are overlaid on the concrete within the corridors of the first floor of the Student Union and the fifth floor elevator lobby. Wood floors of maple, oak, and birch are present on the third floor level of the Student Union. The toilet rooms feature flooring made of small ceramic tiles. Where original floors are present, they should be retained and preserved. Most of the flooring types appear to be in generally good condition although wax build-up and scratches mar their appearance. It is recommended that built up wax be removed from the concrete and tiled floors and that the wood floors be carefully sanded and refinished, restoring their luster and prolonging their useful life. Non-historic materials such as carpeting and resilient tile flooring can be removed and replaced if necessary.

Walls and Ceilings (including Plaster, Base, and Trim)

With the exception of certain Significant and Very Significant spaces, the majority of the interior of the California Student Center features relatively inexpensive off-the-shelf materials such as gypsum board walls with rubber baseboards and metal door frames. Only the most important ceremonial spaces feature other forms of cladding, including decorative concrete block (King Student Union and Eshleman Hall) and various types of wood paneling (Pauley Ballroom, Stephens Lounge, and Heller Lounge). Some non-contributing spaces have non-historic stud-frame/gypsum walls inserted within formerly open spaces like Chávez Student Center.

In general, the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards should apply to the treatment of interior walls within both Significant and Very Significant spaces. Contributing spaces are less sensitive to change and Non-contributing spaces are not sensitive to change.

Ceilings within the California Student Center are also varied, ranging from unfinished concrete in the basement levels to exposed concrete beams and acoustical tile infill on the first floor level of the Student
Union, to exposed concrete ceilings concealed behind suspended acoustical baffles in the Pauley Ballroom. Dropped wood strip ceilings characterize the corridors on the first floor level of the Student Union. Elsewhere, non-historic dropped “T-bar” ceilings are found in most other spaces throughout the complex.

Ceilings within Significant and Very Significant spaces should be retained and preserved whereas ceilings in Contributing spaces are less sensitive to change and Non-contributing spaces can be changed freely.

**Interior Metal Elements**
Individual metal interior elements within the California Student Center identified as being Significant or Very Significant should be retained and preserved. Examples include the fireplace in Heller Lounge, the Stanford Axe case in the Main Lobby of the Student Union, the clock in Chávez Atrium, and several internal stairs throughout the complex. Missing elements should be replaced in kind wherever feasible. Most of these elements are in good condition. The white paint on the clock in Chávez Atrium should be removed and the clock repaired.

**Light Fixtures**
The California Student Center complex contains several dozen original light fixtures, many of which are custom-designed. Examples include the Lucite ceiling-mounted fixtures and matching sconces within the Main Lobby of the Student Union and the Lightolier-made chandelier and matching sconces in the lobby of the Pauley Ballroom. These Significant and Very Significant character-defining fixtures should be retained and preserved. Elsewhere, much of the California Student Center is characterized by typical “off-the-shelf” modern lighting fixtures including fluorescent box fixtures, flush-mounted fluorescent luminaires, and non-historic incandescent fixtures.

As with other features and elements, those identified in the significance diagrams as being either Significant or Very Significant should be retained and preserved. Light fixtures within Contributing zones should optimally be retained and reused if feasible. Most light fixtures within Non-contributing spaces can be replaced.

**Building Systems**
Where possible, the significant visible elements of building systems, including plumbing fixtures, ventilation grilles, vacuum ports, fire hoses, and fire sprinkler heads should be retained in place or replaced with visually similar elements. Where new fixtures, fittings, and systems are required, they should be as unobtrusive as is practical.
VII. CONCLUSION

Designed as a joint venture of Hardison & DeMars, the California Student Center answered a need for a modern gathering space and “town center” for the students of the University of California during the fast-growing postwar era. Composed of four buildings and two landscapes, Telegraph Avenue Mall (now Upper Sproul Plaza) and the Dining Commons (now Chávez Student Center) were completed in 1960. Memorial Student Union – the centerpiece of the project – (now King Student Union) was completed in 1961. Eshleman Hall – the ASUC office building – was completed in 1965. The final parts of the complex – Zellerbach Hall and Lower Sproul Plaza – were not completed until 1968. Alumni House, although not technically part of the California Student Center, was completed in 1951, just to the west of the Dining Commons.

The design of the California Student Center complex while modernist in regard to its structural system, functions, and style, takes additional cues from the older traditions of Renaissance Venice and the locally grown First Bay Region Tradition. The complex also unapologetically embraces and celebrates the urban context and interface of the University of California campus and downtown Berkeley, rejecting the predominant suburban paradigm embraced by most designers of postwar student union complexes. Applauded by most architectural critics and the architectural press, the California Student Center was highly regarded as the most important student union complex of its era.

Midway through its construction, the California Student Center became a battleground of the Free Speech Movement, as well as the later pro-Civil Rights, Peoples Park, and anti-Vietnam War demonstrations. Viewed on the television sets of millions across the country, the events that played out at the California Student Center set the stage for massive countercultural protests throughout the nation, as well provoking the backlash of the Silent Majority, culminating with the election of Ronald Reagan as governor of California in 1966, and again in 1970.

Incrementally altered from the late 1960s through the late 1990s, the California Student Center, while not pristine, does retain a surprising number of its original features, materials, and spaces. The California Student Center appears eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion A (Events) and C (Design/Construction) based on its association with important historical events and its architectural significance.

Recommended for a complete overhaul in the New Century Plan and other University planning documents, plans are presently underway to significantly alter the complex. While the need to rehabilitate the aging facility is readily apparent, it is also important to recognize the historical and architectural significance of the California Student Center and to retain its most character-defining features, materials and spaces.
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