



DAVIS HOUSE

Milestone 6



DECEMBER 11, 2015

SACHI KAGAMI

SAMANTHA GONZALES

SARAH NOBLE-SPANGARO

NICHOLAS ESKOW

Table of Contents

	Page
Executive Summary -----	2
Background -----	3
Appraisal -----	6
Implementation (Action Plan) -----	10

~Executive Summary~

Davis House was originally commissioned by Richard Clark, manager of the George Hearst estate. It was designed by the architect Julia Morgan, famous for her design of Hearst Castle in San Simeon, California. The construction finished in 1913. In the middle of 1920's, the house was purchased by the Alpha Xi Delta sorority but, with the decline of membership, the sorority was closed in the late 1960. At the same time, Berkeley Student Cooperative was facing a shortage of student housing; thus, Davis House became the newest of Berkeley's student-run cooperative houses in the winter of 1970.

Currently the property is owned by Berkeley Student Cooperative and run by residents, following guidelines set by BSC. Since BSC owns the property, they are one of the main stakeholders. Residents are indeed however, the most immediate stakeholders and stewards. Moreover, immediate neighbors, fans of Julia Morgan, of architectural history, and of Bay Area history in general, are stakeholders as well. Various groups of people are interested in Davis House as previously described. In other words, Davis House is significant to many people.

With its unique history in this 102 years of its existence, Davis House has a significance to be recognized as a historical heritage. It's not only the property that has value, but also the impact Davis House has had in the community and will continue to have. Hundreds of students were able to accomplish their educational goals and build friendships in the house. Davis House is the place they remember when each of them reaches back to their memories. Residents, BSC, fans of Julia Morgan, architecture, and history have attachment to Davis House. Davis House has to be recognized as a cultural heritage, and sustained as much as possible.

~Background~

Davis House Cooperative sits at 2833 Bancroft Steps in Berkeley, California. It is a short walk from the University of California's campus, uphill from the International House and shares a parking lot with Memorial Stadium. In its 102-year history, it has changed little despite its role has changed in the community.

An exterior of brick leads to a second floor of white stucco. A carved wooden trim, painted green, highlights the entire facade. Wrought-iron balustrades sit under the windows and iron lanterns sit by the front door. A gabled roof barely peeks above the neighboring trees and shrubbery; the house is so effectively hidden by its landscaping that it can be difficult to get an impression of the whole building from the outside. Yet the interior reveals a lush reminder of Berkeley's past: heavy oak doors give way to grand halls with intricately carved wood paneling, mixing natural and classical themes in their scrollwork. Four large fireplaces feature heavy mantelpieces and marble framing. Elaborate neoclassical light fixtures hang from high, vaulted ceilings.

It was originally commissioned by Richard Clark, cousin of Phoebe Hearst and manager of the George Hearst estate. It was designed by the architect Julia Morgan, famous for her design of Hearst Castle in San Simeon, California. Morgan designed more than 700 buildings along the California Coast, and was a prime example of early 20th century California architecture. According to accounts from Morgan's niece, Clark often served as an intermediary between Hearst and Morgan during her work on Hearst Castle, and Morgan was fond of Clark despite the demands of his capricious boss.

When construction finished in 1913, the Clark house was in a fairly quiet hillside neighborhood; they were only a few steps from what was then open country in Strawberry Canyon. The house was a luxury dwelling, equipped with electric lighting, indoor plumbing, and three marble fireplaces. These features have remained, as have certain features of the house's accessibility. Berkeley is a very walkable city, and the house's construction in 1913 did not account for the expansive popularity of the automobile. As a result, the house is uniquely inaccessible. No entrances are near the street, and the main entryway of the house can only be reached by climbing Bancroft steps, far from the street. Morgan built the house to feature a dramatic interplay of natural lighting and shadow, a feature that is still very noticeable today despite the addition of landscaping, particularly in the dining room. As described by Sara Holmes Boutelle in her book *Julia Morgan: Architect*: "Morgan gave free play to her love of complexity in the wood-paneled living room, dining room, and library, all of which have fireplaces with elaborate mantels. The living-room mantel is carved of oak, showing acorns, leaves, birds, and squirrels; another has classical details; brackets in the hall and on yet another fireplace, in the library, repeat the Tudor rose."

In the next ten years, the neighborhood would radically change with the construction of Memorial Stadium only a few hundred feet from the Clarks' backdoor. Although we found no evidence to support this, co-op lore says that the house was built as a home for the Clark's eldest son while he attended Boalt Law School. Regardless, whether it be because of graduation or the changing neighborhood, the Clark's sold the house and left by the middle of the 1920s. Richard Clark house was then been purchased by the Omicron chapter of the Alpha Xi Delta sorority. Sorority houses became very popular during the depression as a cheap means of housing women attending school, and became a place of safety for women leaving home for the first time. Houses like Alpha Xi Delta often had (and still do today) "house mothers," a matron who would

live with the girls and ensure that they behaved morally by curtailing drinking and monitoring activities with the opposite sex. Although our documentation is limited, it is almost certain that Alpha Xi Delta had a “House Mother” fulfilling such a role, as a house of so many young women living unsupervised would have been scandalous. Around sixty young women lived in the house during this time, and the sorority added two large sleeper porches onto Morgan’s original design to house them all. The surrounding houses are still mostly owned by other sororities, fraternities, and some co-ops. In 1930, the imposing International House was built at the bottom of the hill, bringing students from all around the world to what had previously been an all-white neighborhood.

The sorority resided in Davis house until the 1960s when the popularity of sororities and fraternities at UC Berkeley began to decline, and Alpha Xi Delta was forced to close their Berkeley chapter. Meanwhile, the Berkeley Student Cooperative was trying to decide how to make up for a shortage of student housing; each passing year had meant a long waiting list for entry into co-op housing. Over the summer of 1969, the Berkeley Student Cooperative purchased the old Alpha Xi Delta house for \$75,000. Richard Clark house was renamed Davis house, purportedly in honor of a local community activist affiliated with the BSC. It was opened formally to junior, senior, and graduate student residents in 1970. Residency was eventually expanded to include lowerclassmen as well, but Davis has earned a reputation for being clean and quiet. The house has remained a part of the student co-op housing system ever since, with nearby neighbors of Sherman Hall and Castro co-op.

Today the house remains clean and quiet. The Berkeley Student Cooperative made several changes to the house upon purchase, including the conversion of the sleeping porches to a balcony and individual bedrooms. There are currently 8 single bedrooms, 11 double bedrooms, and 2 triples. Students often room in mixed gender pairs, and murals grace the walls in most rooms, and are allowed to paint the walls of their room however they wish. It is a unique type of student housing, and student residents owe five hours of work shift per week (in the form of duties such as cooking, cleaning, or managerial roles.) in addition to rent in order to ensure that the collective runs smoothly. Dinner is served six nights a week, and meals are often eaten communally. House governance is guided by a student written constitution, and the house meets once a week on Sunday evenings to vote on house issues and actions as a democratic body, with each house member receiving one vote. Issues big and small must be voted on at council, from the purchase of a rice cooker to work shift policy, everything permanent must be voted on. House members frequently gather for formal and informal social events often organized by the house social managers, with supplies purchased through an independent buyers club.

Houses in the Berkeley Student Cooperative (BSC) are largely student run and follow policies set forth by their central governance and democratically elected board. In effect this gives the BSC a role as passive stewards and grants the students a great deal of autonomy over their living space. It is the residents who are most directly responsible for the stewardship of the house; maintenance of the property is paid for out of a house budget administered by the house collectively. They are also the stakeholders with the most immediate interest in the house. Yet because they are students, residents do not typically live in a co-op for an especially long time. As a result, the individuals who make up the house’s democratic body change much more frequently than they might elsewhere, and so the stewardship responsibilities placed on any single resident may be relatively brief. However, their roles as stakeholders and stewards in the heritage of the house may last longer.

Residents move out, but their memories of Davis House and the friendships they made at the house, mean that the house remains significant in their life histories. They may therefore remain stewards of these social and cultural dimensions long after they stop being responsible for the upkeep of the house itself. A recent reunion brought alumni of Davis House, from many decades ago, together again under the same roof; this speaks to these enduring bonds.

Other stakeholders include the BSC itself, given that they own the property. Neighboring houses, as well, have a stake in it; property values reflect, to a degree, the state of the houses around them. It is also of interest for fans of Julia Morgan, of architectural history and of Bay Area history in general such as Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association (BAHA) - its history is tied in with the history of Berkeley and of the university.

With a history stretching back more than a century, Davis House speaks to a large number of people. Current and former residents, either from the sorority or the co-op, have a personal stake in this site as a notable part of their lives. So too can the general public appreciate this site for its architectural, historical, and cultural significance. Our goal is therefore to engage all of these groups while still respecting the fact that this is a private residence. For nonresidents, this means using virtual tours instead of physical access, as well as neighborhood tours to help ground Davis House in its historical and cultural settings. Current residents may use the same, as well as material that speaks to the history of the house and of the organization to which they belong.

~Appraisal~

The aim of this management plan is to enhance Davis House's visibility as a part of several different intersecting histories. Its heritage is related to local Berkeley history, to that of the University of California, as well as to the culture of student living, sororities, and cooperatives. In order to accomplish this, we must identify and address key issues affecting the house today in order to ensure that the building remains standing in the years to come, and we must focus on ways to highlight its heritage in ways that will be both representative of its history, and engaging for a wide variety of audiences.

Despite its history, Davis House is not especially well-known outside the Berkeley community. Books on Julia Morgan only mention it in passing. It's barely visible from the street. It has been, in effect, overshadowed by its neighbors and by some of the more significant works of its architect. As a site of general appreciation, its accessibility is therefore somewhat limited by its obscurity. More importantly, it is also a private residence: while other sites may be easily accessible for tourists or stakeholders, Davis House must remain closed to the general public in order to maintain the privacy of its residents.

However, the fact that it is a private residence has also helped to keep the house in reasonably good shape. If nothing else, it is out of the student-resident's own self-interest that they have kept the house standing and in good, usable condition. This does not mean there is no pressing need for work and indeed one of the major financial considerations for house residents is the expensive maintenance that must be performed. This, again, speaks to the centrality of the residents as primary stakeholders and stewards of Davis House.

The house has now been a co-op longer than anything else in its history. The cooperative system relies largely on oral tradition, knowledge is passed through generations of students from member to member, rather than in any formal capacity, and the turnover rate is high. That makes retention of history or purpose inherently difficult in this setting and as such, co-op history and culture is constantly in a state of flux. Long term projects are also difficult to complete because of the state of impermanent residence. The concern is that and as time wears on, the further reaching histories of the house will be lost. Today, the house contains furniture left from the Alpha Xi Delta years, but it is unclear which furniture is from what era, and many items of potential significance are at risk of being discarded. In addition, Co-op culture holds values of self-expression and legacy highly; painting murals for the house's enjoyment is encouraged. However this property has wallpaper in many of the interior rooms which makes painting murals difficult. Should the residents remove the wallpaper in order to preserve and continue their own culture? Or should they leave the house's original aesthetic in place?

On a fundamental level, what the house needs is maintenance and upkeep. This is primarily an economic concern, because the upkeep of a house this age is neither simple nor inexpensive. The area's property values mean that the owners (the Berkeley Student Cooperative) have very little incentive to change the house, other than to ensure its continued usage and safety. It is off the street and although it takes a lot of wear, is generally well maintained by both the central office and the residency. However, building materials may degrade over time, and both wood and brick - the primary components of this house - are subject to cracking and erosion. This fall, the residents passed a \$4,000 budget for wood restoration, with the BSC central account agreeing to contribute an additional \$2,500. On top of this, the house is situated almost directly over the Hayward Fault; brick buildings are especially at risk for damage in earthquakes, and extensive seismic retrofitting is badly needed in order to ensure the

safety of the building and its residents. It is currently in great danger of structural damage and collapse should a large earthquake hit the fault line upon which it is located. Although the BSC does have a plan to retrofit within the next five years, this retrofitting may cost as much as \$100,000 to fully implement (similar retrofitting was undertaken nearby at the University's Archeological Research Facility, but this was a campus project and costs were upwards of \$75,000).

Maintenance and upkeep is also important for the preservation of the site's cultural heritage. The structure and design alone are significant because they are the work of Julia Morgan. Smaller-scale details, such as wood paneling, carved scrollwork, and wrought iron balustrades are equally important. The house is, on every level, aesthetically pleasing, and it may also serve to record what was, at the time of the house's construction, some of the best and most sought-after design in this part of California. That is to say, the house, in its design and form, is beautiful from a modern perspective, but it also holds significant value from the perspectives of art history and architectural heritage.

However, the maintenance of both this aesthetic form, as well as the fundamental structure (especially with regards to earthquake safety), costs a great deal of money. Even setting aside the need for structural improvements, routine work on brickwork or molding can run up five-figure costs. Some of these costs may be borne by the house itself, given that they are somewhat autonomous within the co-op system; students in residence are responsible for finding and paying contractors to perform this maintenance work. This work may be paid for out of the house committee's own budget. Larger projects, however, such as the structural retrofitting, are beyond the means of the house committee and need to be appealed to the greater Berkeley Student Cooperative. The BSC sits on a large amount of money (to pay for the purchase of new properties, and other large investments), but this is administered by a central committee. It is therefore important that the Davis House heritage site appeals to the BSC for funding that would otherwise be beyond the means of the house committee alone.

Here is where local and even national interest groups may be able to help. The Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association (BAHA) works closely with historic properties in and around Berkeley, and often advocates on behalf of threatened sites. BAHA has previously visited Davis House, and they may be a very valuable resource going forward; cooperation with BAHA could help connect Davis House to larger heritage programs such as the National Trust for Historic Preservation. These organizations may help secure large grants that are intended for sites like Davis House, that can help cover the large costs involved in ensuring its continued existence - or at least to keep the property standing and safe to use.

In addition to the physical, the cultural heritage of the site is also wrapped up tightly in what has been a three-stage history: first as private residence, then as Alpha Xi Delta sorority, and finally as student cooperative. The first of these is important from a historical angle (which is not to say there cannot be a social component as well). However, the second two represent very important aspects of the history of student life at the University of California. We need to be sure that our implementation plan takes into account these different phases. Alpha Xi Delta may no longer be key players in the house, but a greater understanding of the sorority's role in the house's history is certainly an important part of preserving its cultural heritage. Indeed, much of the physical layout of the house appears to have been modified by the sorority (according to some extant blueprints), and so theirs is not simply an intangible heritage.

The sorority may also serve as a point of discussion for reflection: what did the sorority represent in the 1920s, and what had it come to represent by the 1960s? The early history of the

University of California was marked by a steadily increasing proportion of women among the student body. In what ways did the appearance of sororities like this one reflect the growing acceptance of women in academic settings? How, then, did this sorority come to reflect outmoded and conservative ideals of femininity that fell out of favor in the climate of late-60s Berkeley? Reflecting on the heritage of this site should necessarily include a discussion of what it meant to have been a place for gender-segregated student life.

Along the same lines of progress, a heritage site also creates an opportunity for critical examination of the notion of progress. It is tempting to look at the cooperative housing model as a move away from outmoded ways of living, but is it accurate to see Davis House in this light? We may compare it to one of its most significant neighbors, International House, which sits at the bottom of the same block. International House was built, in part, to inject a degree of diversity into what was, in 1930, a very white, wealthy neighborhood. 85 years later, Davis House remains a mostly white house, and here, too, our work with this heritage site may shed some light on the racial politics that persist at the University of California, and in Berkeley.

Davis House's role in the larger student community of Berkeley also intertwines with the importance of the site as a part of the urban student landscape. As far as environmental impact is concerned, Davis House was an early property on what had previously been an empty hillside adjacent to the open nature of nearby Strawberry Canyon. It is perhaps worth asking what a heritage site at this house could do to shed light on the transformation of Berkeley from a quiet farm town to the city it is today, in less than 150 years. Looking to the future, no new construction is planned (excepting, of course, structural retrofitting), and so it may appear that any environmental impact is all in the past. However, a heritage site at Davis House can also call attention to the way each individual house in a neighborhood may contribute to an evolving natural landscape, as well as the current urban landscape of which it is a part today.

On a larger scale, we may also view Davis House as a valuable part of the history of the University of California, both at Berkeley, and as a part of the larger UC system - since, after all, the early history of the Berkeley campus is also the early history of the University system at large. The Berkeley Student Cooperative is also a part of NASCO (North American Students of Cooperation), a larger network of cooperatives around the country. Archival material in the Bancroft Library shows that the BSC worked closely with NASCO in the 1960s, and Davis House may therefore be seen as representative of not only the BSC, but also as a model of American cooperative living.

Julia Morgan is certainly not an insignificant part of this site's heritage groups, and a number of groups may be interested in her work on this building, as well. The largest collection of Morgan's papers, original drawings, and other materials is housed at California Polytechnic State University in San Luis Obispo. The university proudly claims that Morgan's legacy lives on in its architecture students, and there is ongoing work through the university's Kennedy Library to continue to engage with Morgan's work and legacy. We may be able to encourage students from Cal Poly to document the site as it is today. Similarly, UC Berkeley's own College of Environmental Design may also take an interest in ongoing documentation of the site.

Less directly, the Julia Morgan School for Girls may be interested in partnering with a heritage site focused on Morgan's work. Davis House may not be the first or most significant of these, but it nonetheless represents a part of her broader legacy that could be of interest to young students at the Morgan School who might take an interest in architecture and design.

In spite of these potential interest groups, there are a number of natural limitations on what may be done with the site, and to whom it may be accessible. Davis House is too small for

a commercial space (shops, restaurants, etc.). It is, for all its historical and architectural significance, rather difficult to spot. It sits high at the top of the Bancroft Steps, largely hidden from view by trees and shrubbery. Its grandeur today is internal, which means visitors would have to be allowed inside in order to appreciate it. But regular tours, which at other sites may be able to generate income, would threaten the privacy of house residents. How can we share the property with a wider audience of stakeholders (immediate neighbors, enthusiasts of history, of architecture, of Julia Morgan, et al.), while at the same time respecting these boundaries?

It would be most effective to isolate the most important elements of the house that will serve the greatest preservation value (wood and structural work), and encourage a policy of protecting those elements, while encouraging co-op members to express their creativity in spaces and ways that are not erasing the house's origins. The difficulty with this lies in the fact that while house members typically appreciate the grandiose aesthetic of the house, its preservation is extremely susceptible to trends and attitudes of current members. However, that impermanence is part of the cooperative culture and combines elements of creation with destruction. There exists a lack of connectedness that residents feel to those who came before them and therefore there is little incentive to preserve their heritage. I propose that a clear written history of the house be made readily accessible to house members, perhaps in the form of a wall plaque, or some other feature that is not readily removed or lost. This will allow current members to feel a sense of heritage as well as ownership, which will perhaps incentivize them to keep the house intact without damaging the residents' autonomy.

Action Plan

Our heritage site at Davis House focuses primarily on four major themes: community, gender, race, and progress. In the short term (5 years), our focus is on the immediate and pressing needs of the house, as outlined above; maintenance of structural and aesthetic features must necessarily be a priority because the house in its current state is so vulnerable to damage. This need for preservation does not, however, preclude the establishment of heritage projects in the property, and may in fact be helped by increased visibility and the procurement of grants and other funds available to heritage projects.

Long term goals (up to 25 years) focus more on the broader social, historical, and cultural footprints of the building. To attempt to preserve the legacy of the house without considering its functionality would be impossible, as it is still a home that houses 36 residents. Their needs must be considered and it is best if we view the house comprehensively as a living organism that will grow and adapt with changing times. Therefore, we are proposing a series of heritage projects that will speak to everyone from house members to people outside the community. All of these projects will consider how Davis House fits in with broader social and cultural trends, and how this particular site can serve as a focal point for these changes. At the same time, we ask “What are the changes still needed in today’s society, and how can Davis House help illustrate these for us?” Our interpretive plan looks to the past, present, and future as we examine this site and its place in our world.

Projects currently proposed for short-term implementation include a virtual tour, a plaque inside the house, an informative website, and a walking tour of the neighborhood based on mobile technology. Two of the projects are web-based and accessed from home, while the other two are site-specific, and, in the case of the plaque, restricted to current house residents or visitors, rather than the general public. Each of these projects includes one or more of the site’s themes, and each project has the capacity to bring these themes to different audiences. All projects could be active within the next five years, and we may examine the immediate benefits of these projects; considerations must be made for long-term goals.

Preservation of Davis House already costs a great deal of money. This money comes out of a house budget that is allocated by the BSC and managed by residents. Its advanced age means that this house needs more thorough upkeep than other, newer buildings. Therefore, before we may focus on any long-term goals for development and preservation, we should be looking to short-term economic and preservation needs. The preservation of cultural heritage, as currently envisioned, depends to a large degree on the house continuing to stand and serve as a functional living space. This is best served by identifying the structural and ornamental elements most in need of physical preservation. Such work costs a great deal of money. In our five year plan, Davis House is best served by ensuring that funding can be secured to help maintain the building itself. Historical and architectural organizations offer grants and other financial aid to heritage sites in need of preservation; therefore, in the short term we may guide the creation of this heritage site towards sharing the site with a wide audience, both to share its history and heritage, and to draw attention to its potentially vulnerable position.

The two heritage projects that best accomplish this are the web-based ones: the virtual tour and the informative web site. Web content can be reproduced indefinitely, so a site can be shared in as many places as needed to reach as wide an audience as possible. An informative web site can give a full, detailed history of the site and the many actors involved over the years. It can serve as a digital repository and showcase for historic ephemera, including maps, photographs,

and other materials that embody a visual, tangible link to history. This web site may also provide an opportunity for connection across space through an online bulletin board; visitors to the page could share/ their memories of the house, their thoughts on the significance of its history, or even insights into its intangible heritage.

A virtual tour, on the other hand, can give a sense of place to people who may not be able to access it; it can also provide a means of touring the site without disturbing the privacy of house residents. Click by click, virtual visitors may explore the house at their own pace, getting a sense of the building's physical layout. Ambient sound in each room may help enhance this sense of place, drawing on more than just the visual sense. The user may also interact with certain elements in a room, whether artworks or furniture, and get an up-close view of Davis House from anywhere on Earth. This could be especially useful for prospective students, or for people who would like to learn more about Julia Morgan's architecture, or even people who would like to see more of Berkeley's history from the inside.

One of the most important audiences for any heritage projects will be past, current, and future house residents. By having a public, fixed, accounting of the house's history house members can feel more connected to the heritage of their house and will feel a greater sense of collective ownership of legacy. Misinformation about the house's history is often spread because of the high turnover of occupancy. The nature of this turnover also means that artifacts of heritage are frequently lost, or their value overlooked. By affixing a plaque (that cannot be easily removed, covered, destroyed, or lost) to the house, house members will have an accessible point of documented memory from which to draw. This is an important part of preservation, because feeling connectedness to their heritage will hopefully incentivize current residents (who are the primary stewards of the house) to preserve that heritage rather than discarded it entirely. Making it "bulletproof" by bolting it down will ensure that it lasts for generations.

A plaque alone, however, will not suffice. We will also engage house residents with a living mural that actively encourages participation. Whereas the plaque may communicate history from a fixed, immovable perspective, a living mural is an opportunity for residents to share something of themselves for future generations. It is an opportunity to highlight the community aspect of this house, and to help foster a sense of belonging in the heritage of the place.

Finally, an augmented reality walking tour of the neighborhood is an opportunity for visitors and residents alike to gain a new perspective on history and heritage. Davis House becomes, in this case, a focal point for larger changes along all of the site's themes (community, race, gender, and progress). A walk through space becomes a walk through time, as audio (and possibly even visual) cues engage the visitor on a multisensorial level. Music, sound, and narration are paired with GPS technology to create a tour that is perfectly in sync with the walking pace of the visitor. People who have never been to the site get an insider's perspective; people who have walked these streets thousands of times will gain an entirely new sense of the neighborhood's histories and the thousands of stories that have played out here.

Access is limited to people with smart phones, but every year their ubiquity increases. As with the web-based projects, this walking tour requires no physical access to the interior of the house, so privacy of residents may be preserved. But it does offer a more tangible, physical experience than any of the other projects.

Each of these projects could be implemented within the next five years. Each has its own requirements in terms of money and other resources. In the short term, consideration needs to be given to the expense of each project. As the house finances are currently structured, and heritage

projects would most likely have to be paid for out of the house budget, unless outside funding can be secured. Therefore, it is important to reach out to historical and architectural preservation organizations, both at the local and national levels. With that in mind, the informative website may be the best project to start with, as it would allow Davis House to be quickly and easily shared with prospective backers. Web hosting and domain name services would likely be the only actual costs of this project, and those are relatively low. Research has already been conducted by this team, and may be incorporated into this website.

A plaque may also be relatively inexpensive to produce and install, and the heritage mural requires nothing more than setting aside some blank wall space. Because this project is primarily aimed at house residents, their awareness of the house's history and its needs is almost essential for any preservation at the residential level.

The virtual tour requires a large amount of photography and sound recording, which must then be stitched together into a complete tour. The walking tour most likely requires the most work, as it depends on fairly new technology and what is, effectively, a fully produced audio play. On top of that, however, it needs to be flexible enough to match the different walking paces of different individuals, to anticipate the need for directions, and other considerations that take it beyond what is feasible for the time being.

With all of this in mind, it is therefore best for Davis House to focus on the small-scale projects (web site and plaque) in the short term, and leave the larger scale projects (virtual and walking tours) for later. With these projects, cultural heritage may be preserved starting now, with little need to worry about economic considerations. So, too, may the social and community aspects, especially if our web site does an effective job of communicating the themes of community, race, gender, and progress. This website may be something for anyone in the community to access, and house residents may find a careful and thorough summary of the history of their house's place within the community, both historically and today. With that in mind, Davis House residents may be better prepared to engage with their larger community, independent of heritage work.

Going forward (in the next 25 years), if funding is secured and money is no longer an issue, then we may expand our scope with regards to cultural preservation and environmental impact, and we may deepen visitors' understanding of these issues. It is also crucial to remember that Davis House is a living site: the themes for this site are not simply a part of the past, but issues that need to be dealt with on an ongoing basis. Creating a heritage site out of Davis House is a way to inform everyone about these issues, and to set a solid foundation on which to shape everything from co-op policy on gender and race, to individual feelings about community and progress. In the next 25 years, the Davis House heritage site may become a model not only of responsible stewardship of Berkeley heritage, but a model of local community engagement as well.