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THE PAUL HANNA HOUSE

STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

Asset Number: H84.100.1

Location: temporarily housed at the Buck Estate

Designer: Frank Lloyd Wright

Form: Armchair

Material: Redwood, upholstery

Description: Thirteen rectangular-in-section spindles extend from rear seat rail upward to crest rail which extends around a fitted, upholstered back cushion to form short, slightly downwardly slanted arm supports; four legs support a five-sided seat frame which is gently curved at the back and V-shaped at the front; legs extend from mitered joints of the seat frame. Back and seat upholstered in blue linen.

Overall Dimensions: 29 x 28 1/2 x 32 1/4 inches

Identification Markings: None
Condition: [orientation for all the seating furniture is from the sitter's right and left] Structure is sound. Refinish is uneven but stable. Minor scratching and loss of finish at right, left, and front seat rails. Small gouge (1 1/2 to 2 inches long) on triangular support under right armrest. Upholstery is in good condition, though slightly faded.

History:

Exhibitions and Bibliography:

Source of gift or purchase:

Credit line:

Insurance valuation: $40,000

Comments: Conservation should include filling in scratches and abrasions, and making finish of all parts uniform.

Inventory recorded by: Date: October 8, 1990
David A. Hanks and Associates
THE PAUL HANNA HOUSE

STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

Asset Number: H84.100.2

Location: temporarily housed at the Buck Estate

Designer: Frank Lloyd Wright

Form: Armchair

Material: Redwood, upholstery

Description: Thirteen rectangular-in-section spindles extend from rear seat rail upward to crest rail which extends around a fitted, upholstered back cushion to form short, slightly downwardly slanted arm supports; four legs support a five-sided seat frame which is gently curved at the back and V-shaped at the front; legs extend from mitered joints of the seat frame. Back and seat upholstered in blue linen.

Overall Dimensions: 29 x 28 1/2 x 32 1/4 inches

Identification Markings: None
Condition: Structure is sound. Refinish is uneven but stable. Finish loss on top surface of left arm rest; small gouge on side of triangular support under left arm rest and on apex of back crest rail; minor scratching and uneven distribution of finish on rear spindles; minor scratching and loss of finish on rear legs; minor scratching on front legs.

History:

Exhibitions and Bibliography:

Source of gift or purchase:

Credit line:

Insurance valuation: $40,000

Comments: Conservation should include filling in scratches and gouges, and making finish of all parts uniform.

Inventory recorded by: Date: October 8, 1990
David A. Hanks and Associates
THE PAUL HANNA HOUSE

STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

Asset Number: H84.102.2

Location: temporarily housed in the Buck Estate

Designer: Frank Lloyd Wright

Form: Ottoman

Material: Redwood, upholstery

Description: Hexagonal-in-plan ottoman with attached seat cushion, all upholstered in blue linen, supported on a platform which is raised slightly off the ground by a triangular-shaped lattice bracing unit attached to the underside of the platform.

Overall Dimensions: 15 x 27 x 23 inches

Identification Markings: None
Condition: Visible edges of platform are badly gouged and scratched. Upholstery is in good condition, though substantially faded. Upholstery is not original.

History:

Exhibitions and Bibliography:

Source of gift or purchase:

Credit line:

Insurance valuation: $5,000

Comments: Conservation should include filling in gouges and scratches, and refinishing filled-in areas.

Inventory recorded by: Date: October 8, 1990
David A. Hanks and Associates
THE PAUL HANNA HOUSE
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

Asset Number: H84.102.3

Location: temporarily housed in the Buck Estate

Designer: Frank Lloyd Wright

Form: Ottoman

Material: Redwood, upholstery

Description: Hexagonal-in-plan ottoman with attached seat cushion, all upholstered in blue linen, supported on a platform which is raised slightly off the ground by a triangular-shaped lattice bracing unit attached to the underside of the platform.

Overall Dimensions:

Identification Markings: Paper upholstery label at center of base with 1927 and 1929 fire code marks, possible original
Condition: Structure stable. Finish (varnish) added to wooden base. Visible edges of wooden base are scratched, gouged, and abraded. Struts on triangular brace have wood loss measuring 1 1/2 x 1 inch on one end, 1 1/8 x 1/2 inch on second end, 1 x 1/8 on third end, and 1 x 1/2 on fourth end. One strut is renailed and thereby damaged with hammer marks. Upholstery is in good condition, but slightly faded.

History:

Exhibitions and Bibliography:

Source of gift or purchase:

Credit line:

Insurance valuation: $5,000

Comments: Conservation should include repairing renailed strut, filling in gouges and scratches, and refinishing filled-in areas.

Inventory recorded by: Date: October 8, 1990
David A. Hanks and Associates
THE PAUL HANNA HOUSE

STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

Asset Number: H84.100.3

Location: temporarily housed at the Buck Estate

Designer: Frank Lloyd Wright

Form: Armchair

Material: Redwood, upholstery

Description: Thirteen rectangular-in-section spindles extend from rear seat rail upward to crest rail which extends around a fitted, upholstered back cushion to form short, slightly downwardly slanted arm supports; four canted legs support a five-sided seat frame which is gently curved at the back and V-shaped at the front; legs extend from mitered joints of the seat frame. Back and seat upholstered in green linen.

Overall Dimensions: 29 x 28 1/2 x 32 1/4 inches

Identification Markings: None
Condition: Structure is sound and upholstery is sound, though substantially faded. Refinish is uneven but stable. Front seat rail has uneven striations of finish. Minor scratching and loss of finish to left arm rest and triangular support. Left rear leg has minor gouges and scratching. Scratching and abrasions on rear spindles. Minor scratches and abrasions to right rear leg. Deep gouge measuring approximately 1/4 inch near edge of right triangular support. Minor scratches and abrasions to both front legs. Deep abrasions to left front seat rail.

History:

Exhibitions and Bibliography:

Source of gift or purchase:

Credit line:

Insurance valuation: $40,000

Comments: Conservation should include filling in gouges and scratches and refinishing filled-in areas, and making finish of all parts uniform.

Inventory recorded by: Date: October 8, 1990
David A. Hanks and Associates
Asset Number: Metropolitan Museum of Art number L.1986.20.1

Location: Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City (on loan)

Designer: Frank Lloyd Wright

Form: Armchair

Material: Redwood, upholstery

Description: Thirteen rectangular-in-section spindles extend from rear seat rail upward to crest rail which extends around a fitted, upholstered back cushion to form short, slightly downwardly slanted arm supports; four canted legs support a five-sided seat frame which is gently curved at the back and V-shaped at the front; legs extend from mitered joints of the seat frame. Back and seat upholstered in green linen.

Overall Dimensions: 29 x 28 1/2 x 32 1/4 inches

Identification Markings: None

History:

Exhibitions and Bibliography:

Source of gift or purchase:

Credit line:

Insurance valuation: $40,000

Comments: Conservation should include filling in nicks and scratches and refinishing filled-in areas. Currently the chair bears only the Metropolitan Museum loan number, and is displayed behind glass in the Henry Luce Study Center.

Inventory recorded by: Date: October 8, 1990
David A. Hanks and Associates
THE PAUL HANNA HOUSE
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

Asset Number: H84.101.1
Location: temporarily housed at the Buck Estate
Designer: Frank Lloyd Wright
Form: Reading chair
Material: Redwood, upholstery

Description: Hexagonal-in-section wing chair, with shaped seat, back and arms upholstered in a stiff, burgundy-colored plush-type upholstery. Angular-shaped arms terminate in ends cut at 25 degree angles. Solid wood frame tapers inwardly toward the base. Buttressed angular back support terminates in a pair of stepped runners extending through the underside of the chair up to front seat rail.

Overall Dimensions: 34 x 32 x 30 inches
Identification Markings: None
Condition: Structure is sound. Upholstery in good condition. Refinish is even and stable. Wear to left wing at top. Gouging to veneer at rear top. 1/8 inch gouge at top edge of left wing. Missing section of veneer at rear side. Minor scratching and abrasions to rear buttress. Heavy wear and abrasions at bottom of buttress. 1/2 inch long abrasions on right wing at rear, near center. Base has large abraded areas at right corner.

History:

Exhibitions and Bibliography:

Source of gift or purchase:

Credit line:

Insurance valuation: $45,000

Comments: Conservation should include filling in gouges and scratches, and replacing missing veneer, and refinishing repairs, making all parts of existing finish uniform.

Inventory recorded by: Date: October 8, 1991
David A. Hanks and Associates
THE PAUL HANNA HOUSE  
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

Asset Number: H84.102.1
Location: temporarily housed at the Buck Estate
Designer: Frank Lloyd Wright
Form: Ottoman
Material: Redwood, upholstery

Description: Hexagonal-in-plan ottoman with attached top cushion, all upholstered in stiff, maroon-colored plush, supported on a platform which is raised slightly off the ground by a triangular shaped, strutted bracing unit attached to the underside of the platform.

Overall Dimensions: 15 x 27 x 23 inches
Identification Markings: None
Condition: Structure is sound. Refinish is uneven, poorly applied, and unstable in some areas. Base structure loose at struts. Entire wooden base has scratches and abrasions along visible edges, especially at corners. Upholstery is in good condition.

History:

Exhibitions and Bibliography:

Source of gift or purchase:

Credit line:

Insurance valuation: $ 5,000

Comments: Conservation should include reinforcing loose struts, and filling in gouges and scratches, and refinishing wooden base.

Inventory recorded by: Date: October 8, 1990
David A. Hanks and Associates
Asset Number: H84.105.1a,b
Location: temporarily housed at the Buck Estate
Designer: Frank Lloyd Wright
Form: Dining chair (reproduction)
Material: Redwood, upholstery

Description: Hexagonal-in-section with loose, orange seat cushion. Apex of three-sided crest rail cantilevers out over top of back rest and is supported by a triangular-shaped bracket support. Three joined panels supporting the seat are pierced with geometric-shaped cutouts.

Overall Dimensions: 34 1/8 x 23 1/4 x 19 1/4 inches
Identification Markings: None
Condition: Structure is sound. Finish is good. Minor scratches on edges of back and sides. Upholstery is in good condition.

History:

Exhibitions and Bibliography:

Source of gift or purchase: Metropolitan Museum of Art
Credit line:
Insurance valuation: $3,000
Comments: Conservation should include filling in scratches and refinishing filled-in areas. This chair was built in 1985 by Rudy Colban, a conservator at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, replicating the dining chair currently on loan to that museum.

Inventory recorded by: Date: October 8, 1991
David A. Hanks and Associates
THE PAUL HANNA HOUSE

Asset Number: Metropolitan Museum of Art number L.1986.20.2

Location: Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City

Designer: Frank Lloyd Wright

Form: Dining chair

Material: Redwood, upholstery

Description: Hexagonal-in-section with loose cushion upholstered in beige linen. Apex of three-sided crest rail cantilevers out over top of back rest and is supported by a triangular-shaped bracket support. Three joined panels supporting the seat are pierced with geometric-shaped cutouts.

Overall Dimensions: 34 1/8 x 23 1/4 x 19 1/4 inches

Identification Markings: None
Condition: Structure is sound. Scuffing and splintering at cantilevered apex section of crest rail. Minor scratches and gouges at rear side of chair back. Three-inch crack running between two of the geometric cutouts at the center of the three joined panels supporting the seat. Six-inch horizontal crack at the left edge of the back rest. Two areas (each measuring approximately 4 x 4 inches) of red colored stains on the rear of the chair back at the sitter's right.

History:

Exhibitions and Bibliography:

Source of gift or purchase:

Credit line:

Insurance valuation: $30,000

Comments: Conservation should include filling in gouges, scratches, and splintered areas, and removing stains from back, and refinishing filled-in and cleaned areas.

Inventory recorded by: Date: October 8, 1990
David A. Hanks and Associates
THE PAUL HANNA HOUSE                   STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

Asset Number:  H84.104.1a-m, 2

Location: temporarily housed at the Buck Estate

Designer: Frank Lloyd Wright

Form: Dining table with extension leaves (two end units and thirteen leaves) and extension unit

Material: Redwood

Description of leaves: rectangular shaped with 2-inch aprons at the outside edges, with 4 dowels and 4 mortises at the inside edges, respectively.

Description of end units: Pentagonal-in-section top supported by triangular-in-section, three-sided solid paneled base.

Description of extension unit: Hexagonal top with two triangular-shaped folding leaves attached with piano hinges, supported on triangular-in-section base matching the two end units of the dining table.

Overall Dimensions: each leaf: 2 x 11 1/2 x 43 inches
                        each base: 27 1/4 x 38 x 43 inches
                        ext. unit: 27 1/2 x 48 x 42 inches

Identification Markings: None
Condition of leaves: Structurally sound. Minor loss of finish and minor scratches throughout.

Condition of end unit A: Structurally sound. Six inch, arched gouge in top surface; smaller scratches and gouges to top. Base has scratches and wear throughout. Top has been refinished.

Condition of end unit B: Structurally sound. Top surface has one water mark and one small gouge four inches from the edge. Top has been refinished throughout. Scratching and wear throughout the triangular base.

Condition of extension unit: Structurally sound. Minor gouges and scratches throughout top. Deep and multiple scratching to one side of base support. Veneer separating from apron running along edge of top. Areas of veneer on top have been replaced with thick, crudely formed patches.

History:

Exhibitions and Bibliography:

Source of gift or purchase:

Credit line:

Insurance valuation: $55,000

Comments: Conservation should include filling in gouges and scratches where needed and refinishing filled-in areas, and repairing and replacing missing and damaged veneer.

Inventory recorded by: Date: October 8, 1991
David A. Hanks and Associates
Asset Number: none (chair is currently on loan to Milwaukee Art Museum; no loan number has been assigned)

Location: Milwaukee Art Museum

Designer: Frank Lloyd Wright

Form: Reading chair

Material: Redwood, upholstery

Description: Hexagonal-in-section wing chair, with shaped seat, back and arms upholstered in a burgundy-colored Thai silk. Angular-shaped arms terminate in ends cut at 25 degree angles. Solid wood frame tapers inwardly toward the base. Buttressed angular back support terminates in a pair of stepped runners extending through the underside of the chair up to front seat rail.

Overall Dimensions: 34 x 32 x 30 inches

Identification Markings: None
Condition: Structure is sound. Minor dents, scuffs, and scratches throughout. Areas of worn upholstery on both arms (see attached condition report from Milwaukee Art Museum).

History:

Exhibitions and Bibliography:

Source of gift or purchase:

Credit line:

Insurance valuation: $50,000

Comments: Conservation should include filling in gouges and scratches and refinishing filled-in areas.

Inventory recorded by: Date: October 8, 1991
David A. Hanks and Associates
THE PAUL HANNA HOUSE

STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

Asset Number: H84.105.1

Location: temporarily housed at the Peter Coutts residence

Designer: Frank Lloyd Wright

Form: End table

Material: Redwood

Description: Triangular-in-section with three tapering, round-in-section legs (replacement) with metal caps.

Overall Dimensions: 21 1/2 x 33 3/4 x 29 1/2 inches

Identification Markings: None
Condition: Structure is sound. Table has been refinished. The three legs are not original. One 5 inch long, deep scratch near edge. One gouge measuring 1/4 inch on edge. Minor scratching on top.

History:

Exhibitions and Bibliography:

Source of gift or purchase:
Credit line:
Insurance valuation: $1,500
Comments: Conservation should include filling in gouges and refinishing filled-in areas.

Inventory recorded by: Date: October 8, 1991
David A. Hanks and Associates
THE PAUL HANNA HOUSE

STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

Asset Number: H84.105.2

Location: temporarily housed in the Peter Coutts residence

Designer: Frank Lloyd Wright

Form: End table

Material: Redwood

Description: Triangular-in-section with three tapering, round-in-section legs (replacements) with metal caps.

Overall Dimensions: 21 1/2 x 33 3/4 x 29 1/2 inches

Identification Markings: None
Condition: Structure is sound. Table has been refinished. Original legs have been replaced. Gouges near bottom edge on two aprons. Deep scratch 1/2 inch above one of these gouges. Deep scratch in center of one apron. Small nicks on edges and corners of top.

History:

Exhibitions and Bibliography:

Source of gift or purchase:

Credit line:

Insurance valuation: $1,500

Comments: Conservation should include filling in gouges and scratches, and refinishing filled-in areas.

Inventory recorded by: Date: October 8, 1990
David A. Hanks and Associates
THE PAUL HANNA HOUSE STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

Asset Number: H84.103.1

Location: temporarily housed at Buck Estate

Designer: Frank Lloyd Wright

Form: End table

Material: Redwood

Description: Triangular-in-section with triangular-in-plan legs chamfered on two inside edges.

Overall Dimensions: 21 1/2 x 14 x 11 3/4 inches

Identification Markings: None
Condition: Structurally sound. Refinish is uneven. Metal and rubber glides are not original. Corner veneer is replaced with mismmatched wood veneer 1 3/4 inches. Scratches and gouges to three legs. Three small, deeper gouges to top of lower shelf. Discoloration on top surface.

History:

Exhibitions and Bibliography:

Source of gift or purchase:

Credit line:

Insurance valuation: $5,000

Comments: Conservation should include filling in gouges and scratches, and replacing mismatched wood veneer, and refinishing filled-in and repaired areas.

Inventory recorded by: David A. Hanks and Associates  
Date: October 8, 1991
Asset Number:  H84.103.2
Location:  temporarily housed at the Buck Estate
Designer:  Frank Lloyd Wright
Form:  End table
Material:  Redwood
Description:  Triangular-in-section form with triangular-in-section legs, chamfered on two inside edges.

Overall Dimensions:  21 1/2 x 14 x 11 3/4 inches
Identification Markings:  None

History:

Exhibitions and Bibliography:

Source of gift or purchase:

Credit line:

Insurance valuation: $5,000

Comments: Conservation should include filling in gouges and scratches, repairing cracked veneer, and refinishing repaired and filled-in areas.

Inventory recorded by: Date: October 8, 1990
David A. Hanks and Associates
THE PAUL HANNA HOUSE

Asset Number: None
Location: temporarily housed at the Buck Estate
Designer: see Comments section
Form: Pair of library desks
Material: Philippine hardwood
Description:

Overall Dimensions:
Identification Markings:
Comments: A pair of redwood desks designed by Frank Lloyd Wright for the new library were replaced by the Hannas in 1952 with desks cut from a type of Philippine hardwood called narra. The Hannas brought these hardwood boards back from their visit to the Philippines. See pp. 116 and 117 of Frank Lloyd Wright's Hanna House: The Clients' Report, ed. by Paul R. and Jean S. Hanna (Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale, Ill.)
APPENDIX

catalogue sheets for objects
not designed by Frank Lloyd Wright
THE PAUL HANNA HOUSE
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

Asset Number: None
Location: temporarily housed at the Buck Estate
Designer: unknown
Form: Sofa
Material: upholstery, wood

Description: Contemporary, rectilinear-shaped, upholstered sofa with three seat cushions and three back cushions, all removable.

Overall Dimensions: 24 x 91 x 34 inches
Identification Markings: None
Condition: good

History:

Exhibitions and Bibliography:

Source of gift or purchase:

Credit line:

Insurance valuation: $3,000

Comments: No conservation is needed.

Inventory recorded by: Date: October 8, 1990
David A. Hanks and Associates
Asset Number: None

Location: temporarily housed at the Buck Estate

Designer: unknown

Form: Loveseat

Material: upholstery, wood

Description: Contemporary, rectilinear-shaped, upholstered loveseat with two seat cushions, two back cushions, and two side cushions, all removeable.

Overall Dimensions: 24 x 55 x 34 inches

Identification Markings: None
Condition: Good

History:

Exhibitions and Bibliography:

Source of gift or purchase:

Credit line:

Insurance valuation: $2,000

Comments: No conservation is needed.

Inventory recorded by: Date: October 8, 1990
David A. Hanks and Associates
THE PAUL HANNA HOUSE  STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

Asset Number: None

Location: temporarily housed at the Buck Estate

Designer: Frank Lloyd Wright

Form: Loveseat

Material: upholstery, wood

Description: Contemporary, rectilinear-shaped, upholstered loveseat with two seat cushions, two back cushions, and two side cushions, all removable.

Overall Dimensions: 24 x 55 x 34 inches

Identification Markings: None
Condition: Good

History:

Exhibitions and Bibliography:

Source of gift or purchase:
Credit line:
Insurance valuation: $2,000
Comments: No conservation is needed.

Inventory recorded by: Date: October 8, 1990
David A. Hanks and Associates
HANNA HOUSE BOARD OF GOVERNORS
NOVEMBER 1994
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Margaret Kimball
University Archivist

David Neuman
University Architect and Director of Planning
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The University is committed to restoring Hanna House. The first phase will be the repair of the brick retaining walls. This work will be paid for with payout from the Nissan Fund and additional support from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). It is expected to be completed by early 1995, but much remains to be done beyond that before the house can once again be used and occupied.

The Future

Future restoration plans are still being developed, but will likely include repairs to the chimneys which support the central core of the house, the living room and north terrace floor slabs, and miscellaneous masonry and concrete. In addition, racked doors, panels and cabinetry need to be repaired. Seismic reinforcement will be added because another major earthquake would almost certainly cause serious damage without it. The preservation of the historic fabric of the building will be a key design objective in this restoration project.

The full cost of the restoration and repair of the Hanna House has not yet been determined, but is likely to be in the range of $2 - 3 million. We anticipate that FEMA will contribute a significant portion of these costs and accumulated payout from the Nissan Fund will also be an important source of funds. Nevertheless, we believe that additional fundraising will be necessary to complete this project.

The Board of Governors is considering a significant change in the house’s designated use. The Hanna House will no longer be used as the Provost’s residence but will serve the University community in a variety of important ways that are more consistent with the Hannas’ original vision when they made their magnificent gift to Stanford. The house will be made available for various kinds of classes, academic gatherings, University functions, and official meetings where the numbers of participants are relatively small and the activities pose no threat to the house or its furnishings. Also, the house will continue to be open to the public for tours.

The Board is also proposing that a caretaker (possibly a graduate student at Stanford) live in the Hobby House apartment to assist in providing for the security of the house and oversight of the maintenance of the house and grounds.

The annual cost of maintenance and insurance for the house, once it is repaired, is estimated to be in the range of $100,000. The Nissan Fund will therefore play a critical role in ensuring that the Hanna House remains an architectural masterpiece as well as an important asset to the Stanford community.
Use of the Endowment Income

As specified in the original grant, Stanford has used the payout from the Nissan Fund for the maintenance, preservation, and improvement of the Hanna House and its grounds. We are pleased to report that an independent architectural firm specializing in Frank Lloyd Wright designs has commended Stanford for its serious commitment to excellent care of the Hanna House.

Maintenance and related services are provided by Stanford University personnel or by outside specialists, depending on what is necessary or appropriate in particular situations. The activities that have been carried out under the support provided by the Nissan Fund include, but are not limited to:

- regular grounds maintenance, including the services of a professional arborist to care for the trees which are an integral part of the house and its design;
- installation of fences to protect the house and site;
- installation of an irrigation system, which is important in a region subject to drought;
- regular maintenance of the redwood framing and siding by professional contractors, including oiling and termite inspections;
- janitorial housekeeping services for the interior; and
- installation and maintenance of a security alarm system.

The largest single project thus far was the 1982 remodeling of the Hobby House, located at the back of the property. This project was funded by income from the Nissan Fund. The remodeling included upgrading the Hobby House to a full living space by installing drywall and insulation and by adding a kitchen, bathroom, laundry room, and heating system. While the Hanna House was used as the Provost's residence, the Hobby House served as an office. As described more fully below, the current plan is to have a caretaker live in the Hobby House in the future.

The House and the Earthquake

Stanford University suffered over $170 million in damage during the Loma Prieta Earthquake of October 17, 1989. This same earthquake also severely damaged the Hanna House including:

- brick retaining walls failed;
- fireplaces and brick walls cracked, bricks crumbled;
- the concrete slab of the dining room was displaced 1.5 inches;
- the steps from the dining room to the living room cracked;
- the door sill between the dining room and the patio dropped 1.5 inches;
- the north patio and steps dropped .5 to 2 inches; and
- the upper portion of the Imperial Hotel urn (a gift to the Hannas from the Imperial Hotel owners) collapsed.
Financial History of the Fund

Nissan's gift has enabled the University to maintain and preserve Hanna House through the years. The original gift of $500,000 has grown and now has a market value of over $1.9 million due to market appreciation and a strong investment strategy. The following chart shows principal and payout growth between 1976 and 1994:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Market Value of Fund</th>
<th>Payout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1976/77</td>
<td>$496,633.00</td>
<td>$10,920.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977/78</td>
<td>548,576.00</td>
<td>28,396.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978/79</td>
<td>576,248.00</td>
<td>24,703.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979/80</td>
<td>597,645.00</td>
<td>41,933.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980/81</td>
<td>611,644.00</td>
<td>51,554.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982/83</td>
<td>844,471.00</td>
<td>46,297.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983/84</td>
<td>878,339.00</td>
<td>45,402.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984/85</td>
<td>953,211.00</td>
<td>43,396.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985/86</td>
<td>1,193,040.00</td>
<td>49,553.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986/87</td>
<td>1,436,283.00</td>
<td>46,629.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987/88</td>
<td>1,278,818.00</td>
<td>52,111.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988/89</td>
<td>1,513,363.00</td>
<td>57,060.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989/90</td>
<td>1,433,050.00</td>
<td>65,102.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990/91</td>
<td>1,593,130.00</td>
<td>70,713.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991/92</td>
<td>1,633,823.00</td>
<td>72,159.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992/93</td>
<td>1,842,783.00</td>
<td>110,359.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993/94</td>
<td>1,909,057.00*</td>
<td>116,913.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*estimated

Payout is the portion of total annual return that is made available to be spent for the Fund's purposes, in this case the maintenance and preservation of Hanna House. The difference between the payout amount and the total annual return is reinvested in the fund to help keep pace with inflation.

Since the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake, ongoing maintenance needs of the house have been substantially reduced, primarily because the house is not occupied. Consequently, a significant amount of the payout from the Nissan Fund, in the range of $240,000, is available for use, but has not been expended. The University plans to utilize these accumulated funds in the restoration of the Hanna House.
The Hanna House, designed by Frank Lloyd Wright and constructed in 1936 - 37, was given to Stanford University in 1974 by Professor and Mrs. Paul R. Hanna. The house is considered to be one of the best and most representative examples of Mr. Wright's residential style. It is the first Wright house designed and built based on the hexagon, much like a bee's honeycomb (indeed, the house is sometimes referred to as "Honeycomb House" or "Hanna-Honeycomb House"). Mr. Wright is said to have created the house so that from it, one could see the four elements -- earth, fire, wind, and water. Located on a knoll in the southeastern part of the Stanford campus, it has been designated a National Historic Landmark and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

In December, 1976, Mr. Katsuji Kawamata, Chairman of Nissan Motor Company, Ltd., wrote to Stanford President Richard W. Lyman, announcing a gift of $500,000, from Nissan Motor Company USA, to endow a fund for the maintenance, preservation, and improvement of the Hanna House and its grounds. The endowment was formally presented in a ceremony at the Hanna House on March 1, 1977. Present on behalf of Nissan were Mr. Yutaka Katayama, Chairman of Nissan USA and Mr. Hiroshi Majima, President of Nissan USA. Mr. Mitsuya Goto, Assistant to the Chairman and President, Nissan Motor Company, Ltd., also participated in the discussions which preceded this generous gift.

This report has been prepared to update the Nissan Motor Company about the use of its gift since that time.

**Use of the Hanna House 1976 - 1989**

A Board of Governors was established to monitor the use and care of Hanna House after the Hannas deeded it to the University. From 1976 until 1989, the house served as the official residence of the Provost, the University's chief academic officer.

The four Provosts who lived in the house also made it available for official University functions for donors, alumni, and friends. Several foreign dignitaries have been entertained there, including the King of Sweden and the Prince of Belgium. The house was also available for bi-monthly docent-led tours that were open to the public. These tours were very popular. For example, our records show that over 2,500 people visited in 1986 alone.

After the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake, the house was closed pending complete restoration. The Provost moved to other quarters, and the house has remained vacant while plans for its repair are prepared. Those plans are now nearing completion. We expect the Nissan Fund to play a key role in this important restoration project.
STANFORD UNIVERSITY

A REPORT TO
NISSAN MOTOR COMPANY, LTD.

ON

THE NISSAN MOTOR COMPANY FUND
FOR THE HANNA HOUSE

November 1994
23 November 1994

Mr. Noboru Miura
Executive Managing Director
Nissan Motor Company, Ltd.
560-2, Okatsukoku, Atsugi-City
Kanagawa, 243-01
Japan

Dear Mr. Miura:

As chairman of the Hanna House Board of Governors, I am pleased to provide you with the attached report, which summarizes how Stanford University has used the Nissan Fund to maintain, preserve and improve the Hanna House.

I look forward to further communication with you and your colleagues. If you wish to have more information about the use of the Nissan Fund, or about the Hanna House in general, please do not hesitate to ask me.

I also hope you may have the opportunity to visit Stanford University. In that event, I would be delighted to accompany you to see the Hanna House.

Sincerely yours,

Paul V. Turner
Professor of Architectural History
REHABILITATION

is defined as the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values.

STANDARDS FOR REHABILITATION

1. A property shall be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property shall be avoided.

3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, shall not be undertaken.

4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.

6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

Treatments that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used.

8. Archeological resources shall be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

REHABILITATION AS A TREATMENT.

When repair and replacement of deteriorated features are necessary; when alterations or additions to the property are planned for a new or continued use; and when its depiction at a particular period of time is not appropriate, Rehabilitation may be considered as a treatment. Prior to undertaking work, a documentation plan for Rehabilitation should be developed.
PRESERVATION
is defined as the act or process of applying measures necessary to sustain the existing form, integrity, and materials of an historic property. Work including preliminary measures to protect and stabilize the property, generally focuses upon the ongoing maintenance and repair of historic materials and features rather than extensive replacement and new construction. New exterior additions are not within the scope of this treatment; however, the limited and sensitive upgrading of mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems and other code-required work to make properties functional is appropriate within a preservation project.

STANDARDS FOR PRESERVATION

1. A property shall be used as it was historically, or be given a new use that maximizes the retention of distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships. Where a treatment and use have not been identified, a property shall be protected and, if necessary, stabilized until additional work may be undertaken.

2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The replacement of intact or repairable historic materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property shall be avoided.

3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Work needed to stabilize, consolidate, and conserve existing historic materials and features shall be physically and visually compatible, identifiable upon close inspection, and properly documented for future research.

4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.

6. The existing condition of historic features shall be evaluated to determine the appropriate level of intervention needed. Where the severity of deterioration requires repair or limited replacement of a distinctive feature, the new material shall match the old in composition, design, color, and texture.

7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used.

8. Archeological resources shall be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.

PRESERVATION AS A TREATMENT.

When the property's distinctive materials, features, and spaces are essentially intact and thus convey the historic significance without extensive repair or replacement; when depiction at a particular period of time is not appropriate; and when a continuing or new use does not require additions or extensive alterations, Preservation may be considered as a treatment. Prior to undertaking work, a documentation plan for Preservation should be developed.
TREATMENTS
There are Standards for four distinct, but inter-related, approaches to the treatment of historic properties—Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration, and Reconstruction. Preservation focuses on the maintenance and repair of existing historic materials and retention of a property's form as it has evolved over time. (Protection and Stabilization have now been consolidated under this treatment.) Rehabilitation acknowledges the need to alter or add to a historic property to meet continuing or changing uses while retaining the property's historic character. Restoration is undertaken to depict a property at a particular period of time in its history, while removing evidence of other periods. Reconstruction re-creates vanished or non-surviving portions of a property for interpretive purposes.

In summary, the simplification and sharpened focus of these revised sets of treatment Standards is intended to assist users in making sound historic preservation decisions. Choosing an appropriate treatment for a historic property, whether preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, or reconstruction is critical. This choice always depends on a variety of factors, including the property's historical significance, physical condition, proposed use, and intended interpretation.

Alamo Square Historic District, San Francisco, California. Photo: Charles A. Birnbaum.
The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties 1992

The Secretary of the Interior is responsible for establishing professional standards and providing advice on the preservation and protection of all cultural resources listed on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

Mt. Auburn Cemetery, Cambridge, Massachusetts. Photo: Charles A. Birnbaum.

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, initially developed in 1975 and revised in 1983 and 1992, are intended to be applied to a wide variety of resource types, including buildings, sites, structures, objects, and districts. The Standards are not codified as program regulations and may be used as a guide by anyone planning work on historic properties. Note: this 1992 revision of the Standards replaces the Federal Register Notice, Vol. 48, N. 190, September, 1983.

A slightly modified version of the Standards for Rehabilitation was codified in 36 CFR 67, and focuses on “certified historic structures” as defined by the IRS Code of 1986. These regulations are used in the Preservation Tax Incentives program. The 1992 Standards in this leaflet do not replace the Tax Incentives regulations; 37 CFR 67 should continue to be used when property owners are seeking certification for Federal tax benefits.
Hanna House Board of Governors
Minutes
November 3, 1994

Members Present: Paul Turner (Chair)
Marilyn Fogel
James Gibbons
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood

Members Absent: Michael Hannan

Others Present: Herb Fong, Facilities Operations Manager
Tiffany Gravlee, Planning Office Staff
John Paul Hanna, Guest
Laura Jones, Campus Archeologist
Warren Jacobsen, Project Manager

I. Review of Minutes - September 29, 1994
Approved as given.

II. Introduction: Laura Jones, Campus Archeologist
Laura Jones will be assuming some of T. Gravlee's historic preservation responsibilities while she is on leave next spring. Laura studied archeology at Stanford, and her dissertation was on American folk art. As a graduate student she worked with the previous Campus Archeologist.

III. Status of Proposal for Use
David Neuman
Gerhard Casper has verbally approved the proposal for use for the Hanna House, and thought that a memo had been written several months ago to that effect. D. Neuman will verify with the Provost that the future Provosts' residence will be at the Lake House.

M. Kimball: will the change in use be a problem?

D. Neuman: it should not be an issue with FEMA.
T. Gravlee: the use will essentially be the same, that is some light entertainment and meetings, and tours, only the Provost will not reside here.

M. Kimball: it will need to be worded carefully.

D. Neuman: the real issue will probably be with regards to relations with the Stanford Campus Residential Leaseholders group.

M. Fogel: tours will help to control sightseers.

IV. Project Status
Mark Jones / Warren Jacobsen

FEMA is still reviewing the structural engineer's proposal (Rutherford & Chekene) for the combined house and wall scheme. We may proceed once we have written confirmation.

T. Portwood: does this mean that the funding will be settled? When will we know what the funding gap is?

W. Jacobsen: the confirmation we are waiting for is to allow us to develop a scheme, which will then be reviewed by FEMA, and funding discussed. We should have a preliminary idea of the budget toward the end of this year, or early next year. The design of the wall solution is proceeding (Please see Attachment A.).

T. Gravlee: Once we have settled on a structural scheme that both we and FEMA agree to, then FEMA will pay something between their current commitment ($206,000) and 75% of the construction cost of the agreed upon structural scheme. We expect the amount to be considerably more than their current commitment.

V. Landscape Care Status Report
Herb Fong

Trees have been trimmed according to the recommendations in the arborists report. The turf (lawn) around the oak trees has been mulched, and the irrigation turned off to those areas. Rock has been removed from around the base of the oak tree at the far end of the house, and soil and plantings removed from around the base of the oak tree at the retaining wall at the near end of the building. It appears that drainage holes are needed at the wall around the tree at the far end of the building, in order to prevent root rot. Additional spraying and other maintenance of the trees will occur over the year as appropriate.

P. Turner: we need a plan of the house to look at during the meetings.
VI. **Fundraising Brochure and Nissan Stewardship**

T. Portwood: after researching the files, it was clear that a stewardship report had never been given to the Nissan donors. A draft report has been prepared, and is awaiting your review for corrections (*Please see Attachment B)*.

D. Neuman: consider including photographs of the house in the report, including photographs of the earthquake damage.

T. Gravlee: there is a book of photographs of the dinner held at the Hanna House in Nissan's honor after the donation was made. Archives has a copy.

M. Fogel: the house should be referred to as the "Hanna House", not the "Hanna Honeycomb House."

J. Hanna: that is true. My parents used to like the title "Hanna Honeycomb House", but changed their minds, and definitely last preferred that it go by "Hanna House".

J. Gibbons: who will the report be sent to? I will be at Nissan in Japan in November, meeting with the Senior Vice President for engineering. What was Mr. Goto's title? I could bring the report with me to give to Nissan.

J. Hanna: Mr. Goto is currently in a separate consulting firm; he may still be interested in donating. He could provide contacts at Nissan. He was Chairman at Nissan.

T. Portwood: I need the corrections to the draft by November 18th in order to have the report ready for J. Gibbons' trip to Japan.

VII. **Misc. Items**

1. Videotape and Photo surveys (*Please see Attachment C*)

T. Portwood: Kristine Hanna has sent a proposal for making a 20 minute film of the history, restoration process, and completion of the Hanna House. This could be used for sale at tours, and also would have historic value as documentation. She is not charging for her time, and her other rates are reduced; as such, the film making is essentially a gift. The small cost she has initially proposed ($7,300), would however, need to be covered. Could this be covered as part of the project budget as a part of project documentation? or would it need separate funding?
P. Turner: the film could have two purposes: 1) documenting the process
2) a product for sale. This documentation would be helpful, but we need more
than a 20 minute film to document the process adequately. We need archival
material.

M. Kimball: film does not hold up well as archival material for long-term
documentation.

T. Gravlee: archival long-term documentation could be at least partially
accomplished by a Historic Americans Buildings Survey (photos and drawings),
which will likely be required through the Section 106 process regardless of what
else we do.

M. Jones: There will be a contract for periodic documentation of the restoration
work as it is being done; the film offer is really a gift that could be used for other
purposes.

P. Turner: the film could be used for promotion, and as a gift to Nissan, etc.

M. Kimball: it could also be supplemental to the archival documentation.

J. Gibbons: this is really a very good offer. We should give her all the
background information we can, and the film could be educational about the
archival documentation as well.

T. Portwood: I suggest that we invite Kristine to come to a meeting to discuss
scope and adjust the budget accordingly. We can vote now on the concept,
without necessarily approving the funds now.

D. Neuman: I suggest a subgroup made up of M. Kimball, T. Portwood and M.
Fogel meet with Kristine to discuss the concept.

T. Portwood: Do we have access to funds for this film? Can we use Nissan
funds?

M. Fogel: where will the proceeds from sale of the film go, assuming that
Kristine would approve this use?

M. Kimball: proceeds should go into the endowment, or some other fund for the
house.

The Board of Governors voted and approved the general concept of the film as proposed by
Kristine Hanna, with the understanding that the concept and budget will be further
refined.

2. Hanna's property at Shasta
J. Hanna mentioned that his parents had sold a piece of land they owned in Shasta (at Lake Shastina), and proceeds were to go to the Hanna House. It was probably a small amount of money, but may have been $100/month or so.

T. Portwood will look into this.

3. Russ Beatty's Landscape Survey proposal

T. Gravlee: We received a proposal from Russ Beatty to prepare a Historic Survey of the landscape at the Hanna House, and to propose alterations in keeping with the restoration of the house. We need to decide whether to have him begin his work now, so that he can coordinate with the architects.

The Board of Governors voted and approved the proposal that Russ Beatty's work be merged with the restoration of the house.
HANNA HOUSE RESTORATION

- COMBINED PROJECT (COMPLETE STRUCTURAL)

  AWAITING FINAL APPROVAL FROM FEMA ON RUTHERFORD & CHEKENE REVISED PROPOSAL.

- RETAINING WALL REPAIRS (NORTH/WEST TERRACE WALL)

  NEGOTIATED CONTRACT WITH RUTHERFORD & CHEKENE.

  SCHEDULE:

  SITE INVESTIGATION (BOTH PROJECTS) WEEK OF 11/7
  CONCEPTS (RETAINING WALL) DUE BY 11/18
  REVIEWS COMPLETE BY 12/2
  CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS DUE BY 12/16
  REVIEWS, PERMITS, BIDS BY 1/13/95
  CONSTRUCTION ...(WEATHER PERMITTING)
The Hanna-Honeycomb House, designed by Frank Lloyd Wright, was given to Stanford in 1974 by Professor and Mrs. Paul Hanna. The house is considered to be one of the best and most representative examples of Mr. Wright's residential style. Its design is based on the hexagon, much like a bee's honeycomb, from which it gets its name. Mr. Wright is said to have created the house so that from it, one could see the four elements -- earth, fire, wind, and water. Located on a knoll in the southeastern part of the campus, it has been designated an historical landmark by the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

In December, 1976, Mr. Yutaka Katayama, Chairman of Nissan Japan, and his associate, Mr. Mitsuya Goto, presented Stanford with a gift of $500,000 from Nissan Motor Company USA to endow a fund for the maintenance, preservation and improvement of the house and its grounds. This report has been prepared to inform the Nissan Motor Company about the use of its gift since that time.

1976-1989

A Board of Governors was established in 1976 to monitor the use and care of Hanna-Honeycomb House after the Hannas deeded it to the university. At the same time, the house became the official residence of the university's provosts whose names and dates of occupancy follow:

Professor and Mrs. William Miller 1976-1978
Professor and Mrs. Donald Kennedy 1979-1980
Professor and Mrs. Albert Hastorf 1980-1984
Professor and Mrs. James Rosse 1984-1989

The provosts both lived in the house and made it available for official university functions for donors, alumni and friends. Several foreign dignitaries have also been entertained there including the King of Sweden and the Prince of Belgium. Until 1989, the house was also available for bi-monthly docent-led tours that were open to the public. Our records show that over 2,500 people visited it in 1986.
FINANCIAL HISTORY OF THE FUND

Nissan's gift has enabled the university to maintain and preserve the house through the years. The original gift of $500,000 has grown and now has a market value of over $1.8 million due to market appreciation and a strong investment strategy. The following chart shows principal and payout growth between 1976 and 1994:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Market Value of Fund</th>
<th>Payout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1976/77</td>
<td>$496,633.00</td>
<td>$10,920.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977/78</td>
<td>548,576.00</td>
<td>28,396.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978/79</td>
<td>576,248.00</td>
<td>24,703.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979/80</td>
<td>597,645.00</td>
<td>41,933.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980/81</td>
<td>611,644.00</td>
<td>51,554.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982/83</td>
<td>844,471.00</td>
<td>46,297.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983/84</td>
<td>878,339.00</td>
<td>45,402.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984/85</td>
<td>953,211.00</td>
<td>43,396.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985/86</td>
<td>1,193,040.00</td>
<td>49,553.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986/87</td>
<td>1,436,283.00</td>
<td>46,629.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987/88</td>
<td>1,278,818.00</td>
<td>52,111.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988/89</td>
<td>1,513,363.00</td>
<td>57,060.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989/90</td>
<td>1,433,050.00</td>
<td>65,102.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990/91</td>
<td>1,593,130.00</td>
<td>70,713.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991/92</td>
<td>1,633,823.00</td>
<td>72,159.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992/93</td>
<td>1,842,783.00</td>
<td>110,359.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993/94</td>
<td>[                    ]</td>
<td>116,913.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Payout is the amount of total annual return that is made available to be spent for the fund's purposes, in this case the maintenance and preservation of Hanna Honeycomb House. The difference between the payout amount and the annual total return is reinvested in the fund to ensure that it will keep pace with inflation in the years to come. Since 1976, there have been several years in which the payout amount was not spent in its entirety. In those years, the ending balance was reinvested in the fund, again to strengthen it against future inflation and to ensure a larger payout the following year.

After the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake, the house was condemned pending complete restoration. The provost moved to other quarters, and the house has remained vacant while plans for its repair were prepared and funding sought. Those plans have now been completed, and the Nissan fund payout has been earmarked for the reconstruction.
USE OF THE ENDOWMENT INCOME

We are pleased to report to you that an independent architectural firm specializing in Frank Lloyd Wright designs has commended Stanford for its serious commitment to excellent maintenance and renovation of the Hanna-Honeycomb House. The following is just a sample of the kinds of maintenance that have been carried out:

Grounds: The house's location on a knoll covered with native vegetation was a strong influence on Mr. Wright's design. He paid special attention to the nearby trees and designed the house around several gnarled oaks and a cypress. In fact, the trees appear to grow into the house. The trees are such an integral part of the house they are cared for by a professional arborist. Herbaceous perennials have been used throughout the grounds to enhance the beauty of the site and to add color. Fences and an irrigation system were added to further protect the house and its site.

Exterior and interior of the house: The house is built on a concrete slab set into the hillside. Because of the geological formation of the area, settling and cracking on both vertical and horizontal planes are constant phenomena needing careful attention to prevent further damage. The university has consulted with a number of expert engineers for ideas on dealing with this movement and the stresses it imposes on the house.

The house was constructed primarily of redwood, glass, and brick. The redwood is regularly oiled and maintained by a contractor specializing in its care. The contractor's work is widely admired, and the university regularly receives calls from owners of other Wright houses for advice and guidance.

Unfortunately, the house was framed with a type of wood that is especially prone to termite infestation. For this reason, the house is professionally inspected at least twice a year.

The open design of the house and generous use of glass creates additional problems. All windows require careful weatherstripping. However, even with the latest techniques, the utility bills are high.

The house has a multi-level, terraced, tar-and-gravel roof. A permanent copper roof had been planned but was postponed by the 1989 earthquake. It is hoped that this can be done during the upcoming renovation.

The largest maintenance and preservation project thus far has been remodeling the Hobby House which is located at the back of the property. The Hobby House was remodeled so a caretaker or student could live in it to oversee the Hanna-Honeycomb House property. The remodeling included upgrading the Hobby House to a full living space by installing drywall and insulation and by adding a kitchen, bathroom, laundry room, and heating system. This project was entirely funded by income from the Nissan fund.
THE HOUSE AND THE EARTHQUAKE

Stanford University suffered over $170 million in damage during the Loma Prieta Earthquake of October 17, 1989. This same earthquake also severely damaged the Hanna-Honeycomb House, causing an estimated $1 million of damage:

- brick retaining walls failed;
- fireplaces and brick walls cracked, bricks crumbled;
- the concrete slab of the dining room was displaced 1.5 inches;
- the steps from the dining room to the living room cracked;
- the door sill between the dining room and the patio dropped 1.5 inches;
- the north patio and steps raised or lowered .5 to 2 inches;

and

- the upper portion of the Imperial Hotel urn (a gift to the Hannas from the Imperial Hotel owners) collapsed.

The university is committed to restoring Hanna-Honeycomb House and is about to begin work on repairing the brick retaining walls. This work will be paid for from the Nissan Fund and additional support from the Federal Emergency Management Act. It is expected to be completed by early 1995, but much remains to be done beyond that before the house is once again habitable.

THE FUTURE

Future renovation plans include mending the chimneys which support the central core of the house, removing and replacing living room and north terrace floor slabs, and patching and repairing miscellaneous masonry and concrete. In addition, racked doors, panels and cabinetry need to be repaired. Seismic reinforcement will be added to the house because another major earthquake would almost certainly cause serious damage without it.

The house's Board of Governors is considering several changes in the house's designated use including making it available for various kinds of university social functions and official meetings where the numbers of participants are relatively small and the activities pose no threat to the house or its furnishings. The Board is also proposing that a caretaker live in the Hobby House apartment to take responsibility for the security of the house and the maintenance of the house and grounds.

The annual cost of maintenance and insurance for the house, once it is repaired, is estimated at $100,000. The Nissan endowment will play a critical role in ensuring that the Hanna-Honeycomb House remains an architectural masterpiece as well as an integral part of the Stanford campus.
To: Tim Portwood  
From: Kristine Hanna  
Date: November 2, 1994  
Re: Proposal for film on Hanna House  
Cc: Mike Dondero, John Hanna

I have enclosed a preliminary budget for a 20-minute film on the Hanna House. The budget is an estimate only, and could go up or down, depending on what direction the Board of Governors takes with the film. If the Board does see a film as a viable option, a meeting should be set up to get a clearer picture of their desired results.

What I am able to offer in the making of this film is an incredibly high quality project for an extremely low price. The items in the enclosed budget that are "no charge" would run tens of thousands of dollars. By shooting on film and not video, the final product will look infinitely glossier and more professional.

I have met with Mike Dondero who I feel would be the best person to direct this film. He has shot numerous scenes for our Young Indiana Jones television series at Lucasfilm, has boundless energy, enthusiasm, ingenuity, and is definitely not afraid of hard work.

For the content of the film, we envision the history of the house to be intertwined with its restoration and completion. We would animate still photographs from the past with a motion control camera, add narration to bring the history alive; and we would use 3-D graphics for some of the blueprints to make them interesting and intelligible. For the modern day footage, we will shoot the house as it is being restored, in all its' different phases, and we would stage interviews with individuals associated with the house, past and present.

This should you a general idea of where Mike and I are headed with this project. True, it is never easy doing a project like this on a limited budget. However, with 11 years each in the film and television industry, we are both up to the challenge!

An historical event like this should not go unrecorded. A document should be made for students and teachers and the general public to be able to look at, learn from, and enjoy. The Hanna House has brought joy to so many people, it should continue to do so. This film can make that happen!
### Preliminary Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Producer</td>
<td>n/c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kristine Hanna)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director/D.P./Camera</td>
<td>pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mike Dondero)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting &amp; Sound Man</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pat Sirk)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16mm camera</td>
<td>n/c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16mm raw stock</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lights/Grip Equipment</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripod and camera equipment</td>
<td>n/c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagra (Sound recorder)</td>
<td>n/c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4&quot; Sound tape</td>
<td>n/c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film to Tape Transfer</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cheryl Narpi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture Editor</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cheryl Narpi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing system</td>
<td>n/c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta Sp Tape stock</td>
<td>n/c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animation Stand &amp; Shooting</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Mix &amp; Sound Editing</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Scott Urkhardt)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11/4/94
Hanna House film -

Possibility of broader audience for film eg. PBS -

Filing in City for 3D coverage - arrangement of transportation & handling of material

Construction - filming during - needs to be discussed w/ contractor

- Review of Hanna collection one weekend & possibly shooting one weekend

- Video from celebration for 50th anniversary ??
- Films ?? / audio ?? - Hanna?

To Be Covered

- Background on earthquake
- Relationship of Hannas & FLW
- Lifestyle - residential architecture - (development of FLW's architectural style)
- Restoration philosophy
- Use before restoration
- Niessen endowment - development opp.

Background on Hanna

Photos / drawings / letters

Educational philosophy

Copyright - belong to Univ.

Richard's what text?
To: Tim Portwood
From: Kristine Hanna
Date: November 2, 1994
Re: Proposal for film on Hanna House
Cc: Mike Dondero, John Hanna

I have enclosed a preliminary budget for a 20 minute film on the Hanna House. The budget is an estimate only, and could go up or down, depending on what direction the Board of Governors takes with the film. If the Board does see a film as a viable option, a meeting should be set up to get a clearer picture of their desired results.

What I am able to offer in the making of this film is an incredibly high quality project for an extremely low price. The items in the enclosed budget that are "no charge" would run tens of thousands of dollars. By shooting on film and not video, the final product will look infinitely glossier and more professional.

I have met with Mike Dondero who I feel would be the best person to direct this film. He has shot numerous scenes for our Young Indiana Jones television series at Lucasfilm, has boundless energy, enthusiasm, ingenuity, and is definitely not afraid of hard work.

For the content of the film, we envision the history of the house to be intertwined with its' restoration and completion. We would animate still photographs from the past with a motion control camera, add narration to bring the history alive, and we would use 3-D graphics for some of the blueprints to make them interesting and intelligible. For the modern day footage, we will shoot the house as it is being restored, in all its' different phases, and we would stage interviews with individuals associated with the house, past and present.

This should you a general idea of where Mike and I are headed with this project. True, it is never easy doing a project like this on a limited budget. However, with 11 years each in the film and television industry, we are both up to the challenge!

An historical event like this should not go unrecorded. A document should be made for students and teachers and the general public to be able to look at, learn from, and enjoy. The Hanna House has brought joy to so many people, it should continue to do so. This film can make that happen!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Producer</td>
<td>n/c</td>
<td>(Kristine Hanna)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director/D.P./Camera</td>
<td>pending</td>
<td>(Mike Dondero)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting &amp; Sound Man</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>(Pat Sirks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16mm camera</td>
<td>n/c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16mm raw stock</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lights/Grip Equipment</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripod and camera equipment</td>
<td>n/c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagra (Sound recorder)</td>
<td>n/c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4&quot; Sound tape</td>
<td>n/c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film to Tape Transfer</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture Editor</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>(Cheryl Nardol)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing system</td>
<td>n/c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta Sp Tape stock</td>
<td>n/c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animation Stand &amp; Shooting</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Mix &amp; Sound Editing</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>(Scott Urkhardt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. **Review of Minutes - September 29, 1994** (10 minutes) *Please see Attachment*

Please review the Minutes from the Meeting of September 29, 1994 and raise any comments or concerns.

II. **Introduction:** Laura Jones, Campus Archeologist (5 min)

III. **Status of Proposal for Use** (10 min) *Mixed use proposal approved verbally by Casper.*

   David Neuman

IV. **Project Status** (15 min)

   Mark Jones / Warren Jacobsen

V. **Landscape Care Status Report** (15 min) 

   Herb Fong

VI. **Fundraising Brochure and Nissan Stewardship** (15 min)

   Tim Portwood

VII. **Misc. Items** (15 minutes)

   1. Draft artifact inventory
   2. Videotape and Photo surveys
Hanna House built in 1937 on the Stanford University campus forty miles south of San Francisco, was the first home Frank Lloyd Wright designed based on the hexagonal module and the 120 degree obtuse angle, which the architect believed to be more harmonious with human movement than the conventional 90 degree angle. Building materials are redwood board and battens, brick, concrete and glass. The house is sited on a knoll on 1 1/2 acres, with views of San Francisco Bay to the east and the Pacific Coast foothills to the west.

The home is a contemporary of other Wright masterpieces from the mid-1930’s, including Fallingwater, the Johnson Wax Administration Building, Taliesin West and Usonian houses. The residence is listed on the National Register of Historic Places by the United States Department of the Interior and has been designated by the American Institute of Architects as one of 17 buildings by Mr. Wright that exemplify his contribution to American culture.

The clients, a young Stanford professor of education and his wife, lived in the home from 1937 to 1976, when they gave the house to Stanford University. Since 1977, the home has been the residence of the University Provost and has been open for public tours twice a month year round.

Hanna House was one of the structures on campus seriously damaged by the October 17, 1989, Loma Prieta earthquake. A list of damages follows:

- fireplaces and brick walls cracked, bricks crumbled and disengaged
- concrete slab of dining room displaced 1 1/2 inches
- steps from dining room to living room cracked
- door sill between dining room and patio dropped 1 1/2 inches
- north patio and steps raised or lowered 1/2 to 2 inches
- brick retaining walls failed
- upper portion of Imperial Hotel urn (gift to Hannas from hotel owners) collapsed

The occupants have vacated the house and structural engineers have temporarily braced the central fireplace and brick wall.

The University is committed to restoring Hanna House and is assembling a team of structural engineers, soil engineers and preservation architects for the project. Initial estimates for restoration and upgrading seismic safety total $1,000,000. It is anticipated that the Federal Emergency Management Agency (F.E.M.A.) will provide some financial assistance. Stanford is planning a fund raising program to make up the difference.

Campus-wide, damage caused by the October 17, 1989 earthquake has been estimated at $171,000,000. This includes a number of buildings of historic significance in addition to Hanna House. Stanford is currently in the final stages of preparing an Earthquake Recovery Marketing Plan for its fundraising goal of $40,000,000 (including Hanna House). Other funding sources anticipated include money from F.E.M.A., State funds, University funds and debt.

For further information, please contact Emily W. Hernandez, at 415-723-9975.
HANNA HOUSE RESTORATION

. COMBINED PROJECT (COMPLETE STRUCTURAL)

AWAITING FINAL APPROVAL FROM FEMA ON RUTHERFORD & CHEKENE REVISED PROPOSAL.

. RETAINING WALL REPAIRS (NORTH/WEST TERRACE WALL)

NEGOTIATED CONTRACT WITH RUTHERFORD & CHEKENE.

SCHEDULE:

- SITE INVESTIGATION (BOTH PROJECTS) WEEK OF 11/7
- CONCEPTS (RETAINING WALL) DUE BY 11/18
- REVIEWS COMPLETE BY 12/2
- CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS DUE BY 12/16
- REVIEWS, PERMITS, BIDS BY 1/13/95
- CONSTRUCTION (WEATHER PERMITTING)
Hanna House Board of Governors
Minutes
September 29, 1994

Members Present: Paul Turner (Chair)
Marilyn Fogel
James Gibbons
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood

Members Absent: Michael Hannan
Rosemary Hornby

Others Present: Herb Fong, Facilities Operations Manager
Tiffany Gravlee, Planning Office Staff
John Paul Hanna, Guest
Warren Jacobsen, Project Manager

I. Review of Minutes - July 28, 1994

Approved as given.

II. Report on Engineering Proposals, and FEMA status Please see Attachment A
Mark Jones

The Rutherford and Chekene report states that it is not necessary to expedite the retaining wall work to stabilize the rest of the house structure. After surveying the floor slab and walls of the building, they found that the living room floor had settled downward, but that the walls themselves had not moved. This indicated to them that the walls (and the house walls they support) are not in immediate danger.

This presents two options: 1) strengthen the walls now, and the house later, or 2) wait to strengthen the walls with the house.

An initial proposal for vote was made by Paul Turner: to repair the retaining wall along with the rest of the house, rather than repairing it first. The majority was uncomfortable with this proposal, and further discussion ensued:

J. Gibbons: why is this structural report so different from the last structural report?
This structural engineer gathered more information on the floor slab elevations, and wall elevations, which led them to their conclusion.

D. Neuman: will the tree be in danger from pressure from the wall?

H. Fong: difficult to tell whether the tree is stressing or being supported by the wall. We could carefully remove a few bricks to relieve the pressure.

D. Neuman / M. Kimball: we need to show due diligence in repairing at least the collapsed section of the wall. This is important for fundraising. We also need to secure the loose bricks on the site from the collapsed section of wall. Some of the bricks have been removed from the site.

T. Gravlee: we have a window of opportunity with FEMA when they are willing to consider a higher level of funding for the Hanna House project as a whole, if we can bring forward a scheme for the entire building soon.

M. Jones: if the west retaining wall (the wall under the house walls, and forming the dining room terrace) is repaired independently of the rest of the house, the face of the wall will need to be disturbed in order to either rebuild it or insert tie-backs. If this section of wall is repaired along with the house, it may be possible to strengthen this section from behind, if the concrete floor is at least partially removed and replaced.

Currently it is expected that the concept study and estimate will be completed this calendar year. (Please see Attachment A)

J. Gibbons: we should strengthen at least the section of wall which has collapsed at the terrace near the remaining tree.

It was moved, seconded, and unanimously agreed to repair the northwest section of the retaining wall as soon as possible, but repair the rest of the retaining wall along with the house structure proper. The design for the house proper and the remaining retaining wall should proceed.

M. Jones clarified that project management can indeed strengthen the section of wall which has collapsed, while simultaneously going ahead with Rutherford and Chekene’s proposal (Please see Attachment B).

T. Portwood: proposal mentions preserving "appearance" rather than fabric. This does not seem consistent with the preservation philosophy which the Board already endorsed.

P. Turner: the Board has voted to pursue a scheme which puts a priority on preserving the fabric of the building.
D. Neuman: a memo from the Chair of the Board of Governors could be written to Phyllis Perreault requesting a report on the fund accounts.

III. **Landscape Care Status Report**
Herb Fong

H. Fong: received within the week the work order to perform the landscape work recommended in the two arborists reports. The turf below the house will be removed, and replaced with mulch. Above the house, the turf will be removed directly below the trees. Any other trees or work mentioned in the report will also be attended to. A progress report will be given at the next Board of Governors meeting.

IV. **Photo-documentation**

M. Fogel: what photo-documentation do we need? How do we meet the need? We need documentation of any changes made, or discoveries, such as the tunnel. Slides would be useful for presentations; a film of the house or its reconstruction could be used for fundraising, etc. Guidelines should be created and followed, or photographer should work with M. Kimball.

M. Kimball: any photography is better than none at all. But perhaps someone like Richard Joncas would be interested in doing some documentation if we helped to fund the film and developing.

D. Neuman: we need to know the scope of the documentation needed, so that funds may be raised to cover it, perhaps as part of the student stipend.

M. Jones: for any discreet project with a facilities project manager, photography of the project will be done in the course of the project. Tree work should also be photographed.

T. Gravlee: it is important to set a standard that copies of the photographs are given to Special Collections, and not just left in the files.

J. Hanna: daughter works at Lucas Film, and was at one point interested in doing a piece on the Hanna House; will see if she's still interested in such a project.

P. Turner: given that project management will photo-document any work done at the Hanna House, I move that we table the discussion of a student photographing the house.
V.  Misc. Items

Fundraising  *(Please see Attachment C)*
T. Portwood: passed out a brochure on reconstruction fundraising at Stanford, and an information sheet on the Hanna House as an example of what we might use for fundraising for the Hanna House. He asked that the Board review the information sheet and return any comments to him at the next meeting.

Inventory of furniture
T. Gravlee: an inventory of all of the furniture, art pieces, rugs, etc. that were in the Hanna House is being drafted (this is in addition to the David Hanks furniture survey). It will be given to Marilyn Fogel and Paul Turner to review before being finalized.

T. Gravlee will verify the status of the chair being returned from Milwaukee.

The library desk tops and file cabinets are still at the Buck Estate due to lack of storage space at the Lake House. The Board agreed that they should be moved to the Hanna Hobby House.

Project Update
W. Jacobsen: The tunnel will be closed soon as previously discussed, but he will first finish photo-documenting the tunnel. The campus archeologist has checked the metal pieces that were in the tunnel, and saved a few for further review. After the tunnel is closed, the geologists would like to dig an additional ten foot long trench below the tunnel opening, to complete their investigation.
The Hanna-Honeycomb House, designed by Frank Lloyd Wright, was given to Stanford in 1974 by Professor and Mrs. Paul Hanna. The house is considered to be one of the best and most representative examples of Mr. Wright's residential style. Its design is based on the hexagon, much like a bee's honeycomb, from which it gets its name. Mr. Wright is said to have created the house so that from it, one could see the four elements -- earth, fire, wind, and water. Located on a knoll in the southeastern part of the campus, it has been designated an historical landmark by the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

In December, 1976, Mr. Yutaka Katayama, Chairman of Nissan Japan, and his associate, Mr. Mitsuya Goto, presented Stanford with a gift of $500,000 from Nissan Motor Company USA to endow a fund for the maintenance, preservation and improvement of the house and its grounds. This report has been prepared to inform the Nissan Motor Company about the use of its gift since that time.

**1976-1989**

A Board of Governors was established in 1976 to monitor the use and care of Hanna-Honeycomb House after the Hannas deeded it to the university. At the same time, the house became the official residence of the university's provosts whose names and dates of occupancy follow:

- Professor and Mrs. William Miller 1976-1978
- Professor and Mrs. Donald Kennedy 1979-1980
- Professor and Mrs. Albert Hastorf 1980-1984
- Professor and Mrs. James Rosse 1984-1989

The provosts both lived in the house and made it available for official university functions for donors, alumni and friends. Several foreign dignitaries have also been entertained there including the King of Sweden and the Prince of Belgium. Until 1989, the house was also available for bi-monthly docent-led tours that were open to the public. Our records show that over 2,500 people visited it in 1986.
FINANCIAL HISTORY OF THE FUND

Nissan's gift has enabled the university to maintain and preserve the house through the years. The original gift of $500,000 has grown and now has a market value of over $1.8 million due to market appreciation and a strong investment strategy. The following chart shows principal and payout growth between 1976 and 1994:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Market Value of Fund</th>
<th>Payout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1976/77</td>
<td>$496,633.00</td>
<td>$10,920.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977/78</td>
<td>548,576.00</td>
<td>28,396.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978/79</td>
<td>576,248.00</td>
<td>24,703.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979/80</td>
<td>597,645.00</td>
<td>41,933.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980/81</td>
<td>611,644.00</td>
<td>51,554.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982/83</td>
<td>844,471.00</td>
<td>46,297.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983/84</td>
<td>878,339.00</td>
<td>45,402.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984/85</td>
<td>953,211.00</td>
<td>43,396.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985/86</td>
<td>1,193,040.00</td>
<td>49,553.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986/87</td>
<td>1,436,283.00</td>
<td>46,629.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987/88</td>
<td>1,278,818.00</td>
<td>52,111.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988/89</td>
<td>1,513,363.00</td>
<td>57,060.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989/90</td>
<td>1,433,050.00</td>
<td>65,102.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990/91</td>
<td>1,593,130.00</td>
<td>70,713.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991/92</td>
<td>1,633,823.00</td>
<td>72,159.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992/93</td>
<td>1,842,783.00</td>
<td>110,359.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993/94</td>
<td>[                    ]</td>
<td>116,913.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Payout is the amount of total annual return that is made available to be spent for the fund's purposes, in this case the maintenance and preservation of Hanna Honeycomb House. The difference between the payout amount and the annual total return is reinvested in the fund to ensure that it will keep pace with inflation in the years to come. Since 1976, there have been several years in which the payout amount was not spent in its entirety. In those years, the ending balance was reinvested in the fund, again to strengthen it against future inflation and to ensure a larger payout the following year.

After the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake, the house was condemned pending complete restoration. The provost moved to other quarters, and the house has remained vacant while plans for its repair were prepared and funding sought. Those plans have now been completed, and the Nissan fund payout has been earmarked for the reconstruction.
USE OF THE ENDOWMENT INCOME

We are pleased to report to you that an independent architectural firm specializing in Frank Lloyd Wright designs has commended Stanford for its serious commitment to excellent maintenance and renovation of the Hanna-Honeycomb House. The following is just a sample of the kinds of maintenance that have been carried out:

**Grounds:** The house's location on a knoll covered with native vegetation was a strong influence on Mr. Wright's design. He paid special attention to the nearby trees and designed the house around several gnarled oaks and a cypress. In fact, the trees appear to grow into the house. The trees are such an integral part of the house they are cared for by a professional arborist. Herbaceous perennials have been used throughout the grounds to enhance the beauty of the site and to add color. Fences and an irrigation system were added to further protect the house and its site.

**Exterior and interior of the house:** The house is built on a concrete slab set into the hillside. Because of the geological formation of the area, settling and cracking on both vertical and horizontal planes are constant phenomena needing careful attention to prevent further damage. The university has consulted with a number of expert engineers for ideas on dealing with this movement and the stresses it imposes on the house.

The house was constructed primarily of redwood, glass, and brick. The redwood is regularly oiled and maintained by a contractor specializing in its care. The contractor's work is widely admired, and the university regularly receives calls from owners of other Wright houses for advice and guidance.

Unfortunately, the house was framed with a type of wood that is especially prone to termite infestation. For this reason, the house is professionally inspected at least twice a year.

The open design of the house and generous use of glass creates additional problems. All windows require careful weatherstripping. However, even with the latest techniques, the utility bills are high.

The house has a multi-level, terraced, tar-and-gravel roof. A permanent copper roof had been planned but was postponed by the 1989 earthquake. It is hoped that this can be done during the upcoming renovation.

The largest maintenance and preservation project thus far has been remodeling the Hobby House which is located at the back of the property. The Hobby House was remodeled so a caretaker or student could live in it to oversee the Hanna-Honeycomb House property. The remodeling included upgrading the Hobby House to a full living space by installing drywall and insulation and by adding a kitchen, bathroom, laundry room, and heating system. This project was entirely funded by income from the Nissan fund.
THE HOUSE AND THE EARTHQUAKE

Stanford University suffered over $170 million in damage during the Loma Prieta Earthquake of October 17, 1989. This same earthquake also severely damaged the Hanna-Honeycomb House, causing an estimated $1 million of damage:

- brick retaining walls failed;
- fireplaces and brick walls cracked, bricks crumbled;
- the concrete slab of the dining room was displaced 1.5 inches;
- the steps from the dining room to the living room cracked;
- the door sill between the dining room and the patio dropped 1.5 inches;
- the north patio and steps raised or lowered .5 to 2 inches; and
- the upper portion of the Imperial Hotel urn (a gift to the Hannas from the Imperial Hotel owners) collapsed.

The university is committed to restoring Hanna-Honeycomb House and is about to begin work on repairing the brick retaining walls. This work will be paid for from the Nissan Fund and additional support from the Federal Emergency Management Act. It is expected to be completed by early 1995, but much remains to be done beyond that before the house is once again habitable.

THE FUTURE

Future renovation plans include mending the chimneys which support the central core of the house, removing and replacing living room and north terrace floor slabs, and patching and repairing miscellaneous masonry and concrete. In addition, racked doors, panels and cabinetry need to be repaired. Seismic reinforcement will be added to the house because another major earthquake would almost certainly cause serious damage without it.

The house's Board of Governors is considering several changes in the house's designated use including making it available for various kinds of university social functions and official meetings where the numbers of participants are relatively small and the activities pose no threat to the house or its furnishings. The Board is also proposing that a caretaker live in the Hobby House apartment to take responsibility for the security of the house and the maintenance of the house and grounds.

The annual cost of maintenance and insurance for the house, once it is repaired, is estimated at $100,000. The Nissan endowment will play a critical role in ensuring that the Hanna-Honeycomb House remains an architectural masterpiece as well as an integral part of the Stanford campus.
The Stanford Restoration Fund
DATE: October 28, 1994

TO: Hanna House Board of Governors

FROM: Tiffany Gravlee

SUBJECT: Hanna House Board of Governors November 3, 1994 Agenda

Dear Colleagues:

Enclosed please find the agenda for the meeting of November 3, 1994, with attachments. Please review the minutes of our last meeting of September 29, 1994, and bring any corrections you may have. The meeting will begin at 8:30 AM, and will be held at the Hobby House at the Hanna House.

Thank you

* Marilyn Fogel
  James Gibbons
  Michael Hannan
  Rosemary Hornby
  Maggie Kimball
  David Neuman
  Tim Portwood
  Paul Turner

CC: Gerhard Casper
   Kemel Dawkins
   Herb Fong
   John Paul Hanna
   Warren Jacobsen
   Laura Jones
   Mark Jones
   Academic Secretary
Hanna House Board of Governors
Agenda
September 29, 1994
8:30 - 10:00 am
Hobby House at the Hanna House

I. Review of Minutes - July 28, 1994 (10 minutes) Please see Attachment #1

Please review the Minutes from the Meeting of July 28, 1994 and raise any comments or concerns.

II. Report on Engineering Proposals (20 min)
Mark Jones - Wall seems to be supporting wall of house - poor compaction has contributed to sinking of slab. There is drop of terrace wall. Easier & more cost effective to do retaining w/ rest of the house.

III. Landscape Care Status Report (15 min)
Herb Fong - Clear out under each tree
Herb will report in Oct.

IV. Report on Nissan Account (10 min)
Income $7 & $2K → $7n for 1994/5
35K - 70% paid - monies remain.

V. Photo-documentation (15 minutes)
Marilyn Fogel, General Discussion
Standard photo-documentation Plus → will be handled by FPM.

VI. Misc. Items (10 minutes)
1. Inventory of furniture and other items, Tiffany Gravlee
Hanna House Board of Governors
Minutes
July 28, 1994

Members Present:  Paul Turner (Chair)
                 Marilyn Fogel
                 James Gibbons
                 Maggie Kimball
                 David Neuman
                 Tim Portwood

Members Absent:   Michael Hannan
                 Rosemary Hornby
                 Bill Witscher

Others Present:  Tiffany Gravlee, Planning Office Staff
                 John Paul Hanna, Guest
                 Warren Jacobsen, Project Manager

I.  Review of Minutes - June 30, 1994  Please see Attachment  A

P. Turner: alter first sentence of section IV to read "P. Turner raised the issue of the extent to which the fellowship position is educational, and provides security."

T. Portwood: the consensus at the end of section IV should include "A formalized relationship between the Hanna House and the Stanford Museum should also be explored." Also, the second paragraph of section V should read: "T. Portwood was concerned whether an approval to proceed in this manner might be beyond the scope of the Board of Governors' authority."

II. Consultation with FEMA  Please see Attachment B
David Neuman / Tiffany Gravlee / Warren Jacobsen

It is the opinion of the engineering consultant (John Rutherford and John Burton) which has been hired to review the design of the wall strengthening, that the walls are not in immediate danger, and that it would be most efficient, in design and in cost, to repair the walls along with the rest of the house.

Concern was raised that the new consultant's opinion differs from the previous engineers' opinion. Also, concern was raised about the condition and safety of the remaining oak tree, which appears to be leaning against the wall (or the wall is leaning on it). (see motion below)
A request for proposal (RFP) has been drafted to send to the engineers for an analysis of the entire house structure. FEMA has agreed to give Stanford $25K up-front for consultants' fees. Once we have re-evaluated the structural scheme, FEMA has indicated that they would like to renegotiate the amount which they will fund, taking into account appropriate strengthening and mitigation measures. They may pay as much as 75% of the construction cost of the agreed-upon strengthening scheme. The change in FEMA's approach to the Hanna House appears to be partially due to a change in staff, and partly due to pressure to repair significant National Register properties.

T. Portwood: if we proceed with the house repair as a whole, then the Nissan money that would have been spent for the wall alone can be applied to the 25% funding gap.

J. Gibbons and others expressed concern that FEMA may not follow-through with the funding.

D. Neuman moved, P. Turner seconded and it was unanimously agreed that a report be requested from Mark Jones in Facilities Project Management which analyzes the new recommendations by our structural engineers to postpone strengthening the walls to include strengthening the house, and the situation with FEMA, to determine whether Stanford should proceed with the wall scheme, or with strengthening the entire house. The report should also include recommendations by tree specialists regarding interim protection of the oak tree next to the wall.

Proposal for Use

D. Neuman: No news yet from the President, however the Provost had a question about the resident fellowship. D. Neuman will check with Jean Fetter to see if the President had left a response for the Board of Governors before leaving on his trip.

M. Kimball: will the Hanna House be moved up in the queue of strengthening projects if it has this additional funding from FEMA? Or will it still be considered as competition with other projects?

T. Portwood: Once the three major questions are answered:

1) what will the use be?
2) what is the restoration philosophy?
3) what is the cost or funding gap?

then it may be that the cost of the project will not be large, and may fall within the overall restoration fundraising effort. Raising funds for financial aid for graduate students (for the resident fellow) is fairly standard.
D. Neuman: the Buck Estate is being closed, so there may be a greater need for meeting space near campus. Proposals are still being considered to turn the Estate into a University Inn, with meeting space for the University still available. What will be done with the Hanna House furniture which is currently being stored at the Buck Estate? Lee Morgan, the caretaker (who has moved out), has stated that Mr. Hanna gave him one of the hassocks.

T. Gravlee: the furniture will be moved on Monday to the Lake House, which is patrolled, and has a burglar and fire alarm.

J. Hanna was unaware that his parents had given Lee Morgan a piece of furniture.

M. Fogel: a piece of the bookshelf from the library, which was removed during the Provost's residence, may be in one of the boxes or crates.

It was requested that M. Fogel and T. Gravlee be present when the furniture is moved, to verify what pieces are moved, and what condition they are in.

III. Report on Retaining Wall Project
Warren Jacobsen

1. Report on the findings of initial analysis (see above)

W. Jacobsen will prepare a draft project schedule based on the assumption that the project will encompasses the entire house.

In order to keep the Board of Governors advised and involved with the discussions about the project, D. Neuman moved, J. Gibbons seconded, and it was unanimously approved that Paul Turner be a part of the project team.

2. Geotechnical exploration update

Tunnel has been opened and documented by the geologists. Scrap metal objects were used to fill the mouth of the tunnel before it was back-filled; all of this material has been removed and is awaiting inspection by the campus archeologist. The tunnel does not extend under the house or retaining walls adjacent to the house, but may be close to the retaining wall along the lower driveway. The tunnel will be located on the site plan by surveyors so that its relationship to the house and walls will be clear.

The Frenchman's fault does not run through the tunnel. The tunnel is in rock. The geologists would like to dig a temporary trench (approx. 20' long, and a few feet wide) along the road to determine the location of the fault itself.

3. Tunnel reclosure
W. Jacobsen proposed to reclose the tunnel by inserting a manhole culvert with a ladder, and then backfilling again the culvert. The manhole could be locked, but still provide access when desired.

IV. Misc. Business

1. Neighboring construction

T. Gravlee: neighboring structure is apparently replacing an existing fence or small outbuilding structure and appears to be more than five feet from the property line, which is in accordance with the County, but within fifteen feet, which should have required Stanford review of the project.

It is unknown currently whether the current neighbors are renters or leaseholders.

T. Portwood: since we may be increasing the activity at the Hanna House in the future, we should be careful to not be heavy-handed and alienate the neighbors.

D. Neuman: perhaps we could offer to paint the wall a darker color, or to plant shrubs to screen the structure.

2. Wright chair returning from Milwaukee Art Museum

T. Gravlee: reading chair will be crated and shipped by Fine Arts Express in a climate-controlled truck for arrival after September 1st. We will be advised of the delivery date. Please see Attachment C

3. Landscape care status

Operations Maintenance will be implementing the remedial landscaping modifications recommended in the recent Mayne Tree arborists' report, and in a report prepared in 1990, which they had not previously received.

4. Documentation of changes in the house

M. Fogel: is there documentation of any changes in the house over the years since the earthquake? Is the length and width of crack damage being monitored after small earthquakes?

P. Turner: is anyone monitoring the motion of the floor slabs?

D. Neuman: the house is generally watched, but specific documentation has not been made beyond that in the structural reports. The floor elevations, which the engineers recently documented, are probably most critical.
M. Fogel suggested that the house should be photodocumented, and any changes documented and monitored.

5. Photo - documentation

This issue will be addressed at the next meeting.

6. Board of Governors membership

D. Neuman: Michael Hannan may not be on the UCLBD (University Committee for Land and Building Development) next year. If not, the new UCLBD representative will attend next fall.

Also, the Board might recommend that the membership of the Board of Governors include either the Associate Vice President for Facilities (Kemel Dawkins), or both the director of Operations Maintenance (Bill Witscher) and the Director of Facilities Project Management (Mark Jones), since these are the groups which are involved with the house.

Concern was voiced that the Associate Vice President may be too busy to attend, and that Mark Jones has had experience with the Greene & Greene Gamble House which is valuable to the Hanna House Board of Governors.

7. Fundraising

J. Hanna: how do I direct people who approach me with interest in contributing to the restoration of the Hanna House? A brochure with information on the project that could be handed out would be helpful.

T. Portwood: if the gift is small, then it can be given now, made payable to Stanford University and designated for the Hanna House. If the gift is large, then it may be better to wait until we know how much is needed.

P. Turner: a flyer would be helpful.

T. Portwood will put together a brief brochure on the Hanna House.

V. Tour of Tunnel
DATE: September 26, 1994

TO: Hanna House Board of Governors*

FROM: Tiffany Gravlee

SUBJECT: Hanna House Board of Governors September 29, 1994 Agenda

Dear Colleagues:

Enclosed please find the agenda for the meeting of September 29, 1994, with attachments. Please review the minutes of our last meeting of July 28, 1994, and bring any corrections you may have. The meeting will begin at 8:30 AM, and will be held at the Hobby House at the Hanna House.

Thank you

* Marilyn Fogel
* James Gibbons
* Michael Hannan
* Rosemary Hornby
* Maggie Kimball
* David Neuman
* Tim Portwood
* Paul Turner

CC: Gerhard Casper
* Kemel Dawkins
* Herb Fong
* John Paul Hanna
* Mark Jones
* Olivier Pieron/ Warren Jacobsen
* Academic Secretary
27 September 1994

Mr. Warren Jacobsen  
Facilities Project Management  
Stanford University  
855 Serra Street, 2nd Floor  
Stanford, CA 94305

Subject: HANNA HOUSE  
STRUCTURAL CONCEPT FOR SEISMIC REPAIR  
REVISED PROPOSAL FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES

Dear Warren:

We are pleased to present our revised proposal to furnish Structural and Geotechnical Engineering Services for the subject proposal. Given below is a description of the project as we understand it, along with our proposed scope of services and our estimated fee.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Based upon your Request For Proposal, dated July 27, 1994, and our subsequent meeting on September 22, we understand that Stanford wishes to develop a structural engineering concept for the seismic repair of the Hanna House. The main portion of this residence was designed by Frank Lloyd Wright for Paul and Jean Hanna in 1939. A contiguous wing containing a hobby shop and guest quarters was added later as was a separate garden court structure. The complex is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The main residence and various retaining walls surrounding it were damaged during the October 17, 1989 Loma Prieta Earthquake, and the complex was closed by the Santa Clara County Building Official as unsafe. Previously, we provided a report dated July 26, 1994 and entitled "Concept Studies: Retaining Wall Restoration, Hanna House, Stanford, California," which addressed repair of the damaged retaining walls and recommended that such work be incorporated in repair of the residence itself. The subject project addresses both repair of the retaining walls and the main residence.
As noted in the RFP, Stanford's goal for the seismic repair scheme is two-fold:

1. The structural concept will allow reoccupancy of the residence and is intended to provide a reasonable degree of life safety protection similar to that envisioned by the Stanford Class C Guideline (see attachment).

2. The rehabilitation design will be developed with due consideration of the important historic nature of the residence. Innovative solutions using existing materials will be used wherever possible. The preservation of the authentic appearance of the building, as well as its historic fabric, are key design objectives.

**SCOPE OF SERVICES**

We will provide the following Structural and Geotechnical Services for the subject project:

**Phase I: Investigations**

1. Brief review of existing documentation previously sent to us, including drawings and repair schemes prepared by others.

2. Review of other materials contained in the Hanna Archives, such as plans and construction photographs, which have previously been obtained by the architectural consultant.

3. Review of report on trenching near the residence being performed by Stanford geologists. The trenching is designed to provide information regarding a potential "Frenchman's Road Fault."

4. Site visits to review as-built field construction details and earthquake damage. As part of this review, some finish removal may be necessary. We assume Stanford personnel will be available to perform any necessary removal work.
5. Logging of test pits at the bottom of the exterior face of the Main and Upper Terrace retaining walls recommended in our July 26, 1994 report. The purpose of digging these test pits is to examine the soil outboard of the retaining walls and to disclose the nature of the soil and/or stone rubble under the footings. It is unlikely that the excavation will allow us to measure the width of the wall footings. The test pits will probably be about 18 inches square and less than four feet deep, and can be dug by hand. We estimate that up to four or five pits may be required, at locations to be determined by our office in consultation with the restoration architect. Digging will be done by Stanford personnel; we will log the results.

6. A preliminary water level survey was performed for the July 26, 1994 report. Additional water level survey work will be done in the Living Room floor slab and other critical portions of the main residence, to further determine the patterns and magnitude of settlement.

7. Provide recommendations for a proposed surveying program of the exterior of the building. The program will supplement previous work, and the surveying will be performed by others.

Phase II: Preliminary Concept Development

8. Structural analysis to determine critical elements of the main residence with respect to seismic performance. Qualitative discussion will be provided on the importance of the element to the lateral force-resisting system, the likelihood of failure of the element, and the relative risk to life safety posed by failure of the element. This information can later be judgmentally compared to the cost of reducing the risk.

9. Development of preliminary conceptual mitigative measures to address any deficiencies in performance of critical items. Only one preliminary repair concept will be developed.

10. Periodic consultation with Stanford staff and with historic preservation experts, landscape architects, and other consultants hired by Stanford directly.
11. Advise cost estimator during development of preliminary cost information on the preliminary repair concept. The cost estimator will be selected by Stanford and subcontracted by Rutherford & Chekene.

12. One meeting with Stanford staff and consultants to present the preliminary repair concept.

13. One meeting with OES/FEMA/SHPO representatives to discuss the concept. Depending on scheduling, this meeting may be held during Phase III.

**Phase III: Concept Finalization**

14. Finalize concept development for the recommended scheme. While we may review drawings and devote a portion of our site visit time to observing construction details at the guest/hobby shop wing and garden house, a repair and/or strengthening scheme for these structures is not included in the scope of services. Prepare draft report for Stanford review.

15. Advise cost estimator during preparation of a final budgetary cost estimate for the recommended concept.

16. Presentation of the recommended concept to the Stanford Seismic Criteria Panel for their review and approval.

17. Preparation of a final report to Stanford.

**PERSONNEL**

The project team will be led by John Rutherford who will have direct decision-making involvement in all aspects of the project. John has a wealth of diverse experience with wood frame construction, historic buildings, seismic repair and strengthening, and unusual civil and geotechnical engineering problems which make him uniquely qualified for this project. A resume of John's relevant experience and qualifications is included. John will be assisted where appropriate by two members of the Rutherford & Chekene Consulting Engineers staff:
Mr. Warren Jacobsen
Stanford University, FPM

John Burton, a principal of the firm, who will consult and advise on geotechnical matters and Bret Lizundia, who will assist John Rutherford with field work, structural analysis and development of mitigation measures. John Burton has many years of geotechnical experience at the Stanford campus particularly with retrofit construction, and Bret Lizundia has been the project manager for a number of seismic retrofitting projects for Stanford's historic buildings.

WORK PLAN

The attached tentative work plan has been scheduled using the tasks listed above.

FEE

We will perform these services on a time-and-expenses basis, billed monthly in accordance with our attached current hourly rates. An estimate of total fees by phase is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Investigations</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Preliminary Concept Development</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Concept Finalization</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for Cost Estimator</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Estimated Fee: $35,000

We assume that, if acceptable, this proposal will be formalized by using a Stanford University standard agreement or by issuing an amendment to our existing contract. In the meantime, please return a signed copy of this proposal to us to acknowledge your acceptance and to authorize us to proceed.
Mr. Warren Jacobsen  
Stanford University, FPM

We greatly appreciate the opportunity to propose on this exciting project, and we hope our performance will encourage your continuing confidence in using our services.

Sincerely,

John C. Burton  
Principal

Accepted by: ____________________________

Title: ____________________________

Date: ____________________________
# Preliminary Design Guidelines for Existing Buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Class</th>
<th>Performance Goals</th>
<th>Down Time</th>
<th>Load Level</th>
<th>Analysis/Design</th>
<th>Quality Assurance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>• Occupant Safety</td>
<td>1 Day</td>
<td>• Approx. UBC88 with I=1.5</td>
<td>• Equivalent Static Load</td>
<td>• Upfront Criteria Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Continuous Function</td>
<td></td>
<td>Refs.: Title 24 (hosp.)</td>
<td>• Dynamic Analysis</td>
<td>• Peer Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hazard Confinement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tri-Services Manual For Essential Facilities. (Attachment 1)</td>
<td>• Complete Lateral Load System</td>
<td>• Full Time FPM Inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No Collapse</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Special Consideration to Nonstructural Elements and to Confm. of Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>• Peer Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Minor Structural Damage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Review Elements Related to Life Safety and Downtime</td>
<td>• Field Observations by Design Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Compatible with DownTime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Minor Nonstructural Damage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>• Occupant Safety</td>
<td>2 Weeks</td>
<td>• UBC 88 with Modifications (Attachment 2)</td>
<td>• Equivalent Static Load</td>
<td>• Upfront Criteria Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Damage Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Complete Lateral Load System</td>
<td>• Peer Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No Collapse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Review of Elements Related to Life Safety and Downtime</td>
<td>• Frequent FPM Structural Inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Minor Structural Damage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Field Observations by Design Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Compatible with DownTime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Moderate Nonstructural Damage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>• Occupant Safety</td>
<td>3 Months to 2 years</td>
<td>• Div. C3 with Modifications (Attachment 3)</td>
<td>• Equivalent Static Load</td>
<td>• Upfront Criteria Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Protection of Life Safety from Structural and Nonstructural Hazards</td>
<td></td>
<td>• &lt;UBC 88</td>
<td>• Complete Lateral Load System</td>
<td>• Peer Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Review Elements Related to Life Safety</td>
<td>• Normal FPM Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Field Observations by Design Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Footnotes:

1. The intent of the Preliminary Design Guidelines for Existing Buildings is to achieve the stated performance goals under a Richter Magnitude 7.0 to 7.5 earthquake on the Peninsula Section of the San Andreas Fault (Stanford Earthquake I). However, it is understood that the Guidelines may not assure achievement of all performance goals because of the present limitations in predicting building performance during an earthquake, inconsistencies in design and construction practices, and economic considerations.

2. Minor Structural Damage means damage that does not significantly reduce the load-resisting capacity of the structure, and is not expected to require significant repair before re-occupancy of the building.

3. Dynamic Analysis is not proposed as rigid requirement; its implementation will be evaluated by Stanford Seismic Criteria Panel on a building-by-building basis.

---

*Design Guidelines*

FMB (5/18/90)

*Note: This document is expected to be revised and updated periodically.*
### Hanna House Work Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Name</th>
<th>1994</th>
<th>1995</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHASE I: INVESTIGATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Review previous documents</td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Review Archives documents</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Review trenching report</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Site visits</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,6. Log test pits/water level survey</td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Exterior survey recommendations</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHASE II. PRELIMINARY CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Structural analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Preliminary concept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Consult with Stanford/consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Prepare preliminary budget costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Meet with Stanford/consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Meet with OES/FEMA/SHPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHASE III: CONCEPT FINALIZATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Prepare draft report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford review of draft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Final budget cost estimate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Stanford Criteria Panel review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Prepare final report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SCHEDULE OF CHARGES
Effective January 1994

PERSONNEL:
Billed within the following categories:

- Executive Principals ................................................................. $153/hour
- Principals (ex. T. Rutherford & J. Furr) ................................ $109/hour
- Senior Engineers ................................................................. $89 - 114/hour
- Engineers ................................................................. $60 - 93/hour
- Designers ................................................................. $49 - 67/hour
- CADD Operators ................................................................. $57 - 68/hour
- Draftpersons ................................................................. $26 - 59/hour

LABORATORY TESTING
On a per test basis:

- Moisture Content and/or Dry Density ............................................... $10.00
- Dry Sieve Analysis ......................................................... $40.00
- Atterberg Limits - Liquid and Plastic Limits ................................ $50.00
- Wash Analysis - #200 Sieve ................................................ $30.00
- Expansion Index ................................................................. $150.00
- Consolidation Test - Six Load and Two Unload Increments .......... $300.00
- Compaction Curve (Moisture/Density) - ASTM D1557-78 .......... $120.00
- R-Value ................................................................. $150.00
- Triaxial Shear Testing .............................................................. Hourly
- Unconfined Compression ..................................................... $15.00
- Specific Gravity ................................................................. $50.00

OTHER PROJECT EXPENSES

- Mileage ................................................................. $0.29/mile
- Drilling, Exploration or Testing Services by Subcontractors .......... Cost + 10%
- Incidental Costs - Reproduction, Photo Processing, Maps, Postage, Delivery, etc .............................................. Cost + 10%
JOHN RUTHERFORD, Consulting Engineer

Mr. Rutherford is a founding partner and past chairman of Rutherford & Chekene, Consulting Engineers, located at 303 Second Street, Suite 800 North, San Francisco, California.

During his 32 years as principal of this firm, he has been in charge of many sizeable projects involving all phases of structural and civil engineering. In the past 18 years, Mr. Rutherford's professional efforts have included civil engineering aspects of projects involving soils investigation, geologic hazard studies, site evaluation, marine engineering, and design of water pumping and processing facilities. He was Principal in Charge of the firm's geotechnical work. In February of 1993 he retired from Rutherford & Chekene and established a consulting practice.

His current projects include restoration of the Steinhart Aquarium Roundabout, consultation on the seismic retrofit of the San Francisco Conservatory and seismic upgrading and restoration of the Green Gulch Zendo and relocation of the Tassajara Bath House.

Mr. Rutherford spent three seasons (1977 thru 1979) in Egypt with the Brooklyn Museum Archaeological Expeditions and one season (1986) with the Metropolitan Museum's El-Lisht Expedition. His latest expeditions to the Valley of the Kings were sponsored by Pacific Lutheran University in 1991 and 1993. His special interests are building techniques employed by ancient artisans, and preservation of historic structures and ancient artifacts.

academic experience

B.S., Civil Engineering, Lehigh University, 1949
M.S., Structural Engineering, California Institute of Technology, 1950
Special studies at Stanford University

professional registration and development

Registered Civil Engineer, California, 1952
Registered Structural Engineer, California, 1957
Registered Geotechnical Engineer, California, 1987
Member: Structural Engineers Association of Northern California; American Society of Civil Engineers; American Concrete Institute; Construction Specifications Institute; American Research Center in Egypt; International Association of Egyptologists; International Society for Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering; The Explorers Club

professional experience
1993 to Present: Owner, John Rutherford, Consulting Engineer
1960 to 1993: Principal, Rutherford & Chekene, Consulting Engineers
1958 to 1960: Principal, J.B. Rutherford, Consulting Engineer
1954 to 1958: Head, Civil & Structural Dept., Western Knapp Engineering Company (now Arthur McKee, Inc.)
1950 to 1954: Designer, Isadore Thompson, Consulting Structural Engineer
1949 to 1950: Junior Designer, City of San Francisco, Dept. of Public Works
JOHN RUTHERFORD, Consulting Engineer

selected project experience

California State Property Development Evaluations, Monterey, San Mateo, and Santa Cruz Counties, California (Consultant to State of California)
US Embassy Site Feasibility Study, La Paz, Bolivia (Site consultant)
College #8 Site Feasibility Study & Site Development, UC Santa Cruz, California
Research & Development Park Site Evaluation, UC Santa Cruz, California
Physical Site Development Evaluation, Spreckels Sugar Plant Site, Spreckels, California
Monterey Bay Aquarium, Monterey, California
Long Marine Laboratory, UC Santa Cruz, California
Hopkins Marine Laboratory & Seawall, Pacific Grove, California
Oregon Coast Aquarium Feasibility Review, Newport, Oregon
Salmon Farm Facility, Bodega Bay, California
San Francisco Zoo Expansion, San Francisco, California
Forest Hill Station Modernization, San Francisco, California
Japan Air Lines Cargo Building, San Francisco International Airport, California
Jerry L. Pettis Memorial Veterans Hospital, Loma Linda, California
Hi Desert Memorial Hospital, Joshua Tree, California
Saddleback Community Hospital, Laguna Hills, California
Ball Metal Container Fabrication Plant, Fairfield, California
Jameson Canyon Water Treatment Plant, Napa, California
Royal Tallow Rendering Plant, San Francisco, California
Theban Royal Tomb Project, Egypt, Brooklyn Museum, Brooklyn
Dewatering Feasibility: Pyramid of Sesostris I, Egypt, Metropolitan Museum, New York
Valley of the Kings Project, Egypt, Pacific Lutheran University
Crane Beach Resort Development Study, Barbados, West Indies
Arashi Resort Development, Aruba, Netherlands Antilles
Hester Miguel Site Development Study, Half Moon Bay, California
Praia Grande Resort Development, Algarve, Portugal
Sapphire Bay Resort Development Study, Virgin Islands
Landslide & Storm Damage Investigation, Seacliff, Aptos, Glenwood, Inverness, Whitehorse Creek, Love Creek, Aptos Creek, Pescadero Creek, California (Consultant to State of California)
Sharp Park Coastal Erosion Investigation, Pacifica, California
Twin Lakes State Beach Investigation, Santa Cruz County, California
Shore Protection & Tidal Studies, Int'l Shellfish Oyster Farm, Moss Landing, California
UC Santa Cruz Long Range Development Plan & Update, Santa Cruz, California
Cross-Campus Road Feasibility Study, UC Santa Cruz, California
Eastern Access Road Feasibility Study, UC Santa Cruz, California
Hawthorne Avenue Relocation, Oakland, California
Tassajara Zen Mountain Center Site Development, Tassajara, California
Residential Site Development, Redwood Shores, California
Residential Site Development, Foster City, California
Industrial Park Development Feasibility Study, Spreckels, California
Oiled Wildlife Facility, Department of Fish and Game, State of California
UC Santa Cruz Seawater Intake Augmentation Feasibility Study, Santa Cruz, CA
JOHN RUTHERFORD, Consulting Engineer

selected site evaluation and development experience

Hurricane Flood Protection, Hyatt Hotel, Sarasota, Florida
Landslide and Storm Damage Investigation, Seacliff, Aptos, Glenwood, Inverness, Whitehorse Creek, Love Creek, Aptos Creek, Pescadero Creek, California (Consultant to State of CA)
Flood Studies & Physical Site Development Evaluation, Spreckels Sugar Plant Site, Spreckels, California
Shore Protection, Tatum Residence, Pothbelly Beach, Santa Cruz County, CA
California State Property Development Evaluation, Monterey, San Mateo & Santa Cruz Counties, CA (Consultant to State of California)
Crane Beach Resort Development Study, Barbados, West Indies
Arashi Resort Development Study, Aruba, Netherlands Antilles
Hester Miguel Site Development Study, Half Moon Bay, California
Praia Grande Resort Development, Algarve, Portugal
Sapphire Bay Resort Development Study, Virgin Islands
Twin Lakes State Beach Investigation, Santa Cruz County, California
Sharp Park Coastal Erosion Investigation, Pacifica, California
UC Santa Cruz Long Range Development Plan, Santa Cruz, California
Monterey Bay Aquarium, Monterey, California
Long Marine Laboratory, UC Santa Cruz, California
Hopkins Marine Laboratory & Seawall, Pacific Grove, California
Salmon Farm Facility, Bodega Bay, California
Theban Royal Tomb Project, Egypt
Site Feasibility Study, U.S. Embassy, La Paz, Bolivia (Site Consultant)
Jerry L. Pettis Memorial Veterans Hospital Site Development, Loma Linda, California
Hi Desert Memorial Hospital Site Development, Joshua Tree, California
Shore Protection & Tidal Studies, Int'l Shellfish Oyster Facility, Moss Landing, CA
Creek Erosion Protection, Lucky Lanes Bowl, San Pablo, California
Flood Protection Study, Jordan and Hines Residences, Ketchum, Idaho
College 8 Site Feasibility Study, UC Santa Cruz, California
Hawthorne Avenue Relocation, Oakland, California
Ball Container Corporation Site Development, Fairfield, California
Oregon Coast Aquarium Feasibility Review, Newport, Oregon
Research and Development Center Site Evaluation, UC Santa Cruz, California
Tassajara Zen Mountain Center Site Development, Tassajara, California
Cross-Campus Road & Eastern Access Road Feasibility Studies, UC Santa Cruz, California
Dewatering Feasibility: Pyramid of Sesostris I, Metropolitan Museum, NYC
Residential Site Development, Redwood Shores & Foster City, California
Hewlett Packard Distribution Center, Roseville, California
UC Irvine Residence Halls Unit 5, Irvine, California
Silver King Salmon Farm, Davenport, California
Hopkins Marine Station Library, Pacific Grove, California
MBA Research Institute, Moss Landing, Monterey County, California
Sterling Environmental Center, Sand City, Monterey County, California
Pacific Mariculture Sand Hill Bluff Facility, Santa Cruz County, California
Town of Spreckels Sewage Treatment, Monterey County, California
Nuclear Reactor Conversion to Deep Sea Movie Production Set, Gaffney, South Carolina
JOHN RUTHERFORD, Consulting Engineer

selected publications, lectures, etc.

"Recommended Foundation Criteria, Foster City, California." Report to the Department of Housing and Urban Development on foundation design for residential structures on soft Bay Mud subject to differential settlement, 1964.


"Site Development Report, Crane Beach, Barbados, West Indies." (with Dr. Garniss Curtis). Report on hydrology, ocean flooding, earthquakes, geology and foundations for a resort complex on limestone containing extensive natural caves and solution channels, 1974.

"Recommended Foundation Design Criteria: One- and Two-Story Residences on Lots Having a Predicted Differential Settlement of Less than 4 inches Vertical in 50 feet Horizontal." Report to the City of Redwood City, subsequently incorporated into the Redwood City Building Code, including recommendations for earthquake-resistant foundations, 1974.


JOHN RUTHERFORD, Consulting Engineer

selected publications, lectures, etc. (continued)

"Site Stormwater Detention at Hi Desert Memorial Hospital, Joshua Tree, California." Water Systems '79 Conference, University of Houston, Houston, Texas, 1979.

Aquarium seawater systems and site evaluation lectures. Graduate School of Environmental Design, University of California at Berkeley, 1979.


"Protecting the Royal Tombs in the Valley of the Kings." Description of recommended construction to protect the tombs of New Kingdom pharaohs from flood damage and rock movement. Third International Congress of Egyptology, Toronto, Canada, September 1982.


"Specifying Concrete for Coastal Structures." (with Harold Davis). West Coast Regional Coastal Design Conference, Oakland, California, November 1985.


JOHN RUTHERFORD, Consulting Engineer

selected publications, lectures, etc. (continued)

"Evaluation of Lime-Treated Base Failure, Tracy Solar Drying Pad." Report to Holly Sugar Company. 1987


"A Proposal for Clearance and Conservation of the Tomb of Ramesses II (KV7)." Annual Meeting of the American Research Center in Egypt, Berkeley, California, April 1990.

"Why Save the Tomb of Ramesses II." K.M.T., Vol. One, No. 3, Fall 1990.

"Field Archaeology: Groundwater Problems" Annual Meeting of the American Research Center in Egypt, Boston, Massachusetts, April 1991.


"Civil Engineering and Archaeology." Sixth International Congress of Egyptology, Turin, Italy, September 1991.


"Ancient Egyptian Engineering and Construction Methods." American Society of Civil Engineers Construction Congress III, San Francisco, California, February, 1993

27 September 1994

Mr. Warren Jacobsen
Facilities Project Management
Stanford University
855 Serra Street, 2nd Floor
Stanford, CA 94305

Subject: HANNA HOUSE
STRUCTURAL CONCEPT FOR SEISMIC REPAIR
REVISED PROPOSAL FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES

Dear Warren:

We are pleased to present our revised proposal to furnish Structural and Geotechnical Engineering Services for the subject proposal. Given below is a description of the project as we understand it, along with our proposed scope of services and our estimated fee.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Based upon your Request For Proposal, dated July 27, 1994, and our subsequent meeting on September 22, we understand that Stanford wishes to develop a structural engineering concept for the seismic repair of the Hanna House. The main portion of this residence was designed by Frank Lloyd Wright for Paul and Jean Hanna in 1939. A contiguous wing containing a hobby shop and guest quarters was added later as was a separate garden court structure. The complex is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The main residence and various retaining walls surrounding it were damaged during the October 17, 1989 Loma Prieta Earthquake, and the complex was closed by the Santa Clara County Building Official as unsafe. Previously, we provided a report dated July 26, 1994 and entitled "Concept Studies: Retaining Wall Restoration, Hanna House, Stanford, California," which addressed repair of the damaged retaining walls and recommended that such work be incorporated in repair of the residence itself. The subject project addresses both repair of the retaining walls and the main residence.
As noted in the RFP, Stanford’s goal for the seismic repair scheme is two-fold:

1. The structural concept will allow reoccupancy of the residence and is intended to provide a reasonable degree of life safety protection similar to that envisioned by the Stanford Class C Guideline (see attachment).

2. The rehabilitation design will be developed with due consideration of the important historic nature of the residence. Innovative solutions using existing materials will be used wherever possible. The preservation of the authentic appearance of the building, as well as its historic fabric, are key design objectives.

SCOPE OF SERVICES

We will provide the following Structural and Geotechnical Services for the subject project:

Phase I: Investigations

1. Brief review of existing documentation previously sent to us, including drawings and repair schemes prepared by others.

2. Review of other materials contained in the Hanna Archives, such as plans and construction photographs, which have previously been obtained by the architectural consultant.

3. Review of report on trenching near the residence being performed by Stanford geologists. The trenching is designed to provide information regarding a potential "Frenchman's Road Fault."

4. Site visits to review as-built field construction details and earthquake damage. As part of this review, some finish removal may be necessary. We assume Stanford personnel will be available to perform any necessary removal work.
5. Logging of test pits at the bottom of the exterior face of the Main and Upper Terrace retaining walls recommended in our July 26, 1994 report. The purpose of digging these test pits is to examine the soil outboard of the retaining walls and to disclose the nature of the soil and/or stone rubble under the footings. It is unlikely that the excavation will allow us to measure the width of the wall footings. The test pits will probably be about 18 inches square and less than four feet deep, and can be dug by hand. We estimate that up to four or five pits may be required, at locations to be determined by our office in consultation with the restoration architect. Digging will be done by Stanford personnel; we will log the results.

6. A preliminary water level survey was performed for the July 26, 1994 report. Additional water level survey work will be done in the Living Room floor slab and other critical portions of the main residence, to further determine the patterns and magnitude of settlement.

7. Provide recommendations for a proposed surveying program of the exterior of the building. The program will supplement previous work, and the surveying will be performed by others.

Phase II: Preliminary Concept Development

8. Structural analysis to determine critical elements of the main residence with respect to seismic performance. Qualitative discussion will be provided on the importance of the element to the lateral force-resisting system, the likelihood of failure of the element, and the relative risk to life safety posed by failure of the element. This information can later be judgmentally compared to the cost of reducing the risk.

9. Development of preliminary conceptual mitigative measures to address any deficiencies in performance of critical items. Only one preliminary repair concept will be developed.

10. Periodic consultation with Stanford staff and with historic preservation experts, landscape architects, and other consultants hired by Stanford directly.
11. Advise cost estimator during development of preliminary cost information on the preliminary repair concept. The cost estimator will be selected by Stanford and subcontracted by Rutherford & Chekene.

12. One meeting with Stanford staff and consultants to present the preliminary repair concept.

13. One meeting with OES/FEMA/SHPO representatives to discuss the concept. Depending on scheduling, this meeting may be held during Phase III.

Phase III: Concept Finalization

14. Finalize concept development for the recommended scheme. While we may review drawings and devote a portion of our site visit time to observing construction details at the guest/hobby shop wing and garden house, a repair and/or strengthening scheme for these structures is not included in the scope of services. Prepare draft report for Stanford review.

15. Advise cost estimator during preparation of a final budgetary cost estimate for the recommended concept.

16. Presentation of the recommended concept to the Stanford Seismic Criteria Panel for their review and approval.

17. Preparation of a final report to Stanford.

PERSONNEL

The project team will be led by John Rutherford who will have direct decision-making involvement in all aspects of the project. John has a wealth of diverse experience with wood frame construction, historic buildings, seismic repair and strengthening, and unusual civil and geotechnical engineering problems which make him uniquely qualified for this project. A resume of John’s relevant experience and qualifications is included. John will be assisted where appropriate by two members of the Rutherford & Chekene Consulting Engineers staff:
John Burton, a principal of the firm, who will consult and advise on geotechnical matters and Bret Lizundia, who will assist John Rutherford with field work, structural analysis and development of mitigation measures. John Burton has many years of geotechnical experience at the Stanford campus particularly with retrofit construction, and Bret Lizundia has been the project manager for a number of seismic retrofitting projects for Stanford's historic buildings.

WORK PLAN

The attached tentative work plan has been scheduled using the tasks listed above.

FEE

We will perform these services on a time-and-expenses basis, billed monthly in accordance with our attached current hourly rates. An estimate of total fees by phase is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Investigations</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Preliminary Concept Development</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Concept Finalization</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for Cost Estimator</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Estimated Fee: $35,000

We assume that, if acceptable, this proposal will be formalized by using a Stanford University standard agreement or by issuing an amendment to our existing contract. In the meantime, please return a signed copy of this proposal to us to acknowledge your acceptance and to authorize us to proceed.
We greatly appreciate the opportunity to propose on this exciting project, and we hope our performance will encourage your continuing confidence in using our services.

Sincerely,

RUTHERFORD & CHEKENE

John C. Burton  
Principal

JOHN RUTHERFORD, CONSULTING ENGINEER

Accepted by: ____________________________

Title: ____________________________

Date: ____________________________
## Preliminary Design Guidelines for Existing Buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Class</th>
<th>Functional</th>
<th>Structural</th>
<th>Load Level</th>
<th>Analysis/Design</th>
<th>Quality Assurance</th>
<th>Quality Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A             | - Occupant Safety  
- Continuous Function  
- Hazard Confinement | - No Collapse  
- Minor Structural Damage 2  
Compatible with DownTime  
- Minor Nonstructural Damage | 1 Day | - Approx. UBC88 with $I=1.5$  
Refs.: Title 24 (hosp.)  
Tri-Services Manual for Essential Facilities (Attachment 1) | - Equivalent Static Load  
- Dynamic Analysis 3  
- Complete Lateral Load System  
- Special Consideration to Nonstructural Elements and to Confinmt. of Hazardous Materials | - Upfront Criteria Review  
(Attachment 4)  
- Peer Review (Attachment 5)  
- Full Time FPM Inspection  
- Field Observations by Design Team |
| B             | - Occupant Safety  
- Damage Control | - No Collapse  
- Minor Structural Damage  
Compatible with DownTime  
- Moderate Nonstructural Damage | 2 Weeks | - UBC 88 with Modifications (Attachment 2) | - Equivalent Static Load  
- Complete Lateral Load System  
- Review of Elements Related to Life Safety and Downtime | - Upfront Criteria Review  
- Peer Review  
- Frequent FPM Structural Inspection  
- Field Observations by Design Team |
| C             | - Occupant Safety  
- Protection of Life Safety from Structural and Nonstructural Hazards | - No Collapse  
- Minor Structural Damage  
Compatible with DownTime  
- Minor Nonstructural Damage | 3 Months to 2 years | - Div. C3 with Modifications (Attachment 3)  
<UBC 88 | - Equivalent Static Load  
- Complete Lateral Load System  
- Review Elements Related to Life Safety | - Upfront Criteria Review  
- Peer Review  
- Normal FPM Procedures  
- Field Observations by Design Team |

**Footnotes:**

1. The intent of the Preliminary Design Guidelines for Existing Buildings is to achieve the stated performance goals under a Richter Magnitude 7.0 to 7.5 Earthquake on the Peninsula Section of the San Andreas Fault (Stanford Earthquake 1). However, it is understood that the Guidelines may not assure achievement of all performance goals because of the present limitations in predicting building performance during an earthquake, inconsistencies in design and construction practices, and economic considerations.

2. Minor Structural Damage means damage that does not significantly reduce the load-resisting capacity of the structure, and is not expected to require significant repair before re-occupancy of the building.

3. Dynamic Analysis is not proposed as rigid requirement; its implementation will be evaluated by Stanford Seismic Criteria Panel on a building-by-building basis.

---

**Design Guidelines**

FMB (5/18/90)

Note: This document is expected to be revised and updated periodically.
## Hanna House Work Plan

### Task Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE I: INVESTIGATIONS</th>
<th>1994</th>
<th>1995</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Review previous documents</td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Review Archives documents</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Review trenching report</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>Jan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Site visits</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 6. Log test pits/water level survey</td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Exterior survey recommendations</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PHASE II: PRELIMINARY CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Structural analysis</th>
<th>1994</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Preliminary concept</td>
<td>Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Consult with Stanford/consultants</td>
<td>Jan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Prepare preliminary budget costs</td>
<td>Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Meet with Stanford/consultants</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Meet with OES/FEMA/SHPO Agency review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PHASE III: CONCEPT FINALIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stanford review of draft</td>
<td>Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Final budget cost estimate</td>
<td>Jan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Stanford Criteria Panel review</td>
<td>Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Prepare final report</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SCHEDULE OF CHARGES
Effective January 1994

PERSONNEL
Billed within the following categories:

- Executive Principals .............................................................. $153/hour
- Principals (Ex. T. Rutherford & J. Buura) ................................ $109/hour
- Senior Engineers ................................................................. $89 - 114/hour
- Engineers ................................................................. $60 - 93/hour
- Designers ................................................................. $49 - 67/hour
- CADD Operators ............................................................... $57 - 68/hour
- Draftpersons ................................................................. $26 - 59/hour

LABORATORY TESTING
On a per test basis:

- Moisture Content and/or Dry Density ........................................ $10.00
- Dry Sieve Analysis ................................................................ $40.00
- Atterberg Limits - Liquid and Plastic Limits ......................... $50.00
- Wash Analysis - #200 Sieve ............................................... $30.00
- Expansion Index ..................................................................... $150.00
- Consolidation Test - Six Load and Two Unload Increments .... $300.00
- Compaction Curve (Moisture/Density) - ASTM D1557-78 .... $120.00
- R-Value ................................................................................ $150.00
- Triaxial Shear Testing ......................................................... Hourly
- Unconfined Compression .................................................... $15.00
- Specific Gravity ..................................................................... $50.00

OTHER PROJECT EXPENSES

- Mileage .............................................................................. $0.29/mile
- Drilling, Exploration or Testing Services by Subcontractors .... Cost + 10%
- Incidental Costs - Reproduction, Photo Processing, Maps, Postage, Delivery, etc. .................... Cost + 10%
JOHN RUTHERFORD, Consulting Engineer

Mr. Rutherford is a founding partner and past chairman of Rutherford & Chekene, Consulting Engineers, located at 303 Second Street, Suite 800 North, San Francisco, California.

During his 32 years as principal of this firm, he has been in charge of many sizeable projects involving all phases of structural and civil engineering. In the past 18 years, Mr. Rutherford's professional efforts have included civil engineering aspects of projects involving soils investigation, geologic hazard studies, site evaluation, marine engineering, and design of water pumping and processing facilities. He was Principal in Charge of the firm's geotechnical work. In February of 1993 he retired from Rutherford & Chekene and established a consulting practice.

His current projects include restoration of the Steinhart Aquarium Roundabout, consultation on the seismic retrofit of the San Francisco Conservatory and seismic upgrading and restoration of the Green Gulch Zendo and relocation of the Tassajara Bath House.

Mr. Rutherford spent three seasons (1977 thru 1979) in Egypt with the Brooklyn Museum Archaeological Expeditions and one season (1986) with the Metropolitan Museum's El-Lish Expedition. His latest expeditions to the Valley of the Kings were sponsored by Pacific Lutheran University in 1991 and 1993. His special interests are building techniques employed by ancient artisans, and preservation of historic structures and ancient artifacts.

academic experience

B.S., Civil Engineering, Lehigh University, 1949
M.S., Structural Engineering, California Institute of Technology, 1950
Special studies at Stanford University

professional registration and development

Registered Civil Engineer, California, 1952
Registered Structural Engineer, California, 1957
Registered Geotechnical Engineer, California, 1987
Member: Structural Engineers Association of Northern California; American Society of Civil Engineers; American Concrete Institute; Construction Specifications Institute; American Research Center in Egypt; International Association of Egyptologists; International Society for Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering; The Explorers Club

professional experience

1993 to Present: Owner, John Rutherford, Consulting Engineer
1960 to 1993: Principal, Rutherford & Chekene, Consulting Engineers
1958 to 1960: Principal, J.B. Rutherford, Consulting Engineer
1954 to 1958: Head, Civil & Structural Dept., Western Knapp Engineering Company (now Arthur McKee, Inc.)
1950 to 1954: Designer, Isadore Thompson, Consulting Structural Engineer
1949 to 1950: Junior Designer, City of San Francisco, Dept. of Public Works


JOHN RUTHERFORD, Consulting Engineer

selected project experience

California State Property Development Evaluations, Monterey, San Mateo, and Santa Cruz Counties, California (Consultant to State of California)
US Embassy Site Feasibility Study, La Paz, Bolivia (Site consultant)
College #8 Site Feasibility Study & Site Development, UC Santa Cruz, California
Research & Development Park Site Evaluation, UC Santa Cruz, California
Physical Site Development Evaluation, Spreckels Sugar Plant Site, Spreckels, California
Monterey Bay Aquarium, Monterey, California
Long Marine Laboratory, UC Santa Cruz, California
Hopkins Marine Laboratory & Seawall, Pacific Grove, California
Oregon Coast Aquarium Feasibility Review, Newport, Oregon
Salmon Farm Facility, Bodega Bay, California
San Francisco Zoo Expansion, San Francisco, California
Forest Hill Station Modernization, San Francisco, California
Japan Air Lines Cargo Building, San Francisco International Airport, California
Jerry L. Pettis Memorial Veterans Hospital, Loma Linda, California
Hi Desert Memorial Hospital, Joshua Tree, California
Saddleback Community Hospital, Laguna Hills, California
Ball Metal Container Fabrication Plant, Fairfield, California
Jameson Canyon Water Treatment Plant, Napa, California
Royal Tallow Rendering Plant, San Francisco, California
Theban Royal Tomb Project, Egypt, Brooklyn Museum, Brooklyn
Dewatering Feasibility: Pyramid of Sesostris I, Egypt, Metropolitan Museum, New York
Valley of the Kings Project, Egypt, Pacific Lutheran University
Crane Beach Resort Development Study, Barbados, West Indies
Arashi Resort Development Study, Aruba, Netherlands Antilles
Hester Miguel Site Development Study, Half Moon Bay, California
Praia Grande Resort Development, Algarve, Portugal
Sapphire Bay Resort Development Study, Virgin Islands
Landslide & Storm Damage Investigation, Seacliff, Aptos, Glenwood, Inverness, Whitehorse Creek, Love Creek, Aptos Creek, Pescadero Creek, California (Consultant to State of California)
Sharp Park Coastal Erosion Investigation, Pacifica, California
Twin Lakes State Beach Investigation, Santa Cruz County, California
Shore Protection & Tidal Studies, Int'l Shellfish Oyster Farm, Moss Landing, California
UC Santa Cruz Long Range Development Plan & Update, Santa Cruz, California
Cross-Campus Road Feasibility Study, UC Santa Cruz, California
Eastern Access Road Feasibility Study, UC Santa Cruz, California
Hawthorne Avenue Relocation, Oakland, California
Tassajara Zen Mountain Center Site Development, Tassajara, California
Residential Site Development, Redwood Shores, California
Residential Site Development, Foster City, California
Industrial Park Development Feasibility Study, Spreckels, California
Oiled Wildlife Facility, Department of Fish and Game, State of California
UC Santa Cruz Seawater Intake Augmentation Feasibility Study, Santa Cruz, CA
selected site evaluation and development experience

Hurricane Flood Protection, Hyatt Hotel, Sarasota, Florida
Landslide and Storm Damage Investigation, Seaciff, Aptos, Glenwood, Inverness, Whitehorse Creek, Love Creek, Aptos Creek, Pescadero Creek, California (Consultant to State of CA)
Flood Studies & Physical Site Development Evaluation, Spreckels Sugar Plant Site, Spreckels, California
Shore Protection, Tatum Residence, Pothbelly Beach, Santa Cruz County, CA
California State Property Development Evaluation, Monterey, San Mateo & Santa Cruz Counties, CA (Consultant to State of California)
Crane Beach Resort Development Study, Barbados, West Indies
Arashi Resort Development Study, Aruba, Netherlands Antilles
Hester Miguel Site Development Study, Half Moon Bay, California
Praia Grande Resort Development, Algarve, Portugal
Sapphire Bay Resort Development Study, Virgin Islands
Twin Lakes State Beach Investigation, Santa Cruz County, California
Sharp Park Coastal Erosion Investigation, Pacifica, California
UC Santa Cruz Long Range Development Plan, Santa Cruz, California
Monterey Bay Aquarium, Monterey, California
Long Marine Laboratory, UC Santa Cruz, California
Hopkins Marine Laboratory & Seawall, Pacific Grove, California
Salmon Farm Facility, Bodega Bay, California
Theban Royal Tomb Project, Egypt
Site Feasibility Study, U.S. Embassy, La Paz, Bolivia (Site Consultant)
Jerry L. Pettis Memorial Veterans Hospital Site Development, Loma Linda, California
Hi Desert Memorial Hospital Site Development, Joshua Tree, California
Shore Protection & Tidal Studies, Int'l Shellfish Oyster Facility, Moss Landing, CA
Creek Erosion Protection, Lucky Lanes Bowl, San Pablo, California
Flood Protection Study, Jordan and Hines Residences, Ketchum, Idaho
College 8 Site Feasibility Study, UC Santa Cruz, California
Hawthorne Avenue Relocation, Oakland, California
Ball Container Corporation Site Development, Fairfield, California
Oregon Coast Aquarium Feasibility Review, Newport, Oregon
Research and Development Center Site Evaluation, UC Santa Cruz, California
Tassajara Zen Mountain Center Site Development, Tassajara, California
Cross-Campus Road & Eastern Access Road Feasibility Studies, UC Santa Cruz, California
Dewatering Feasibility: Pyramid of Sesostris I, Metropolitan Museum, NYC
Residential Site Development, Redwood Shores & Foster City, California
Hewlett Packard Distribution Center, Roseville, California
UC Irvine Residence Halls Unit 5, Irvine, California
Silver King Salmon Farm, Davenport, California
Hopkins Marine Station Library, Pacific Grove, California
MBA Research Institute, Moss Landing, Monterey County, California
Sterling Environmental Center, Sand City, Monterey County, California
Pacific Mariculture Sand Hill Bluff Facility, Santa Cruz County, California
Town of Spreckels Sewage Treatment, Monterey County, California
Nuclear Reactor Conversion to Deep Sea Movie Production Set, Gaffney, South Carolina
JOHN RUTHERFORD, Consulting Engineer

selected publications, lectures, etc.

"Recommended Foundation Criteria, Foster City, California." Report to the Department of Housing and Urban Development on foundation design for residential structures on soft Bay Mud subject to differential settlement, 1964.


"Site Development Report, Crane Beach, Barbados, West Indies." (with Dr. Gamiss Curtis). Report on hydrology, ocean flooding, earthquakes, geology and foundations for a resort complex on limestone containing extensive natural caves and solution channels, 1974.

"Recommended Foundation Design Criteria: One- and Two-Story Residences on Lots Having a Predicted Differential Settlement of Less than 4 inches Vertical in 50 feet Horizontal." Report to the City of Redwood City, subsequently incorporated into the Redwood City Building Code, including recommendations for earthquake-resistant foundations, 1974.


JOHN RUTHERFORD, Consulting Engineer

selected publications, lectures, etc. (continued)

"Site Stormwater Detention at Hi Desert Memorial Hospital, Joshua Tree, California." Water Systems '79 Conference, University of Houston, Houston, Texas, 1979.

Aquarium seawater systems and site evaluation lectures. Graduate School of Environmental Design, University of California at Berkeley, 1979.


"Protecting the Royal Tombs in the Valley of the Kings." Description of recommended construction to protect the tombs of New Kingdom pharaohs from flood damage and rock movement. Third International Congress of Egyptology, Toronto, Canada, September 1982.


"Specifying Concrete for Coastal Structures." (with Harold Davis). West Coast Regional Coastal Design Conference, Oakland, California, November 1985.


JOHN RUTHERFORD, Consulting Engineer

selected publications, lectures, etc. (continued)

"Evaluation of Lime-Treated Base Failure, Tracy Solar Drying Pad." Report to Holly Sugar Company. 1987


"A Proposal for Clearance and Conservation of the Tomb of Ramesses II (KV7)." Annual Meeting of the American Research Center in Egypt, Berkeley, California, April 1990.

"Why Save the Tomb of Ramesses II." K.M.T., Vol. One, No. 3, Fall 1990.

"Field Archaeology: Groundwater Problems" Annual Meeting of the American Research Center in Egypt, Boston, Massachusetts, April 1991.


"Civil Engineering and Archaeology." Sixth International Congress of Egyptology, Turin, Italy, September 1991.


"Ancient Egyptian Engineering and Construction Methods." American Society of Civil Engineers Construction Congress III, San Francisco, California, February, 1993

Hanna House built in 1937 on the Stanford University campus forty miles south of San Francisco, was the first home Frank Lloyd Wright designed based on the hexagonal module and the 120 degree obtuse angle, which the architect believed to be more harmonious with human movement than the conventional 90 degree angle. Building materials are redwood board and battens, brick, concrete and glass. The house is sited on a knoll on 1 1/2 acres, with views of San Francisco Bay to the east and the Pacific Coast foothills to the west.

The home is a contemporary of other Wright masterpieces from the mid-1930's, including Fallingwater, the Johnson Wax Administration Building, Taliesin West and Usonian houses. The residence is listed on the National Register of Historic Places by the United States Department of the Interior and has been designated by the American Institute of Architects as one of 17 buildings by Mr. Wright that exemplify his contribution to American culture.

The clients, a young Stanford professor of education and his wife, lived in the home from 1937 to 1976, when they gave the house to Stanford University. Since 1977, the home has been the residence of the University Provost and has been open for public tours twice a month year round.

Hanna House was one of the structures on campus seriously damaged by the October 17, 1989, Loma Prieta earthquake. A list of damages follows:

- fireplaces and brick walls cracked, bricks crumbled and disengaged
- concrete slab of dining room displaced 1 1/2 inches
- steps from dining room to living room cracked
- door sill between dining room and patio dropped 1 1/2 inches
- north patio and steps raised or lowered 1/2 to 2 inches
- brick retaining walls failed
- upper portion of Imperial Hotel urn (gift to Hannas from hotel owners) collapsed

The occupants have vacated the house and structural engineers have temporarily braced the central fireplace and brick wall.

The University is committed to restoring Hanna House and is assembling a team of structural engineers, soil engineers and preservation architects for the project. Initial estimates for restoration and upgrading seismic safety total $1,000,000. It is anticipated that the Federal Emergency Management Agency (F.E.M.A.) will provide some financial assistance. Stanford is planning a fund raising program to make up the difference.

Campus-wide, damage caused by the October 17, 1989 earthquake has been estimated at $171,000,000. This includes a number of buildings of historic significance in addition to Hanna House. Stanford is currently in the final stages of preparing an Earthquake Recovery Marketing Plan for its fundraising goal of $40,000,000 (including Hanna House). Other funding sources anticipated include money from F.E.M.A., State funds, University funds and debt.

For further information, please contact Emily W. Hernandez, at 415-723-9975.
DATE: September 26, 1994

TO: Hanna House Board of Governors

FROM: Tiffany Gravlee

SUBJECT: Hanna House Board of Governors September 29, 1994 Agenda

Dear Colleagues:

Enclosed please find the agenda for the meeting of September 29, 1994, with attachments. Please review the minutes of our last meeting of July 28, 1994, and bring any corrections you may have. The meeting will begin at 8:30 AM, and will be held at the Hobby House at the Hanna House.

Thank you

* Marilyn Fogel
James Gibbons
Michael Hannan
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood
Paul Turner

cc: Gerhard Casper
Kemel Dawkins
Herb Iong
John Paul Hanna
Mark Jones
Olivier Pieron/ Warren Jacobsen
Academic Secretary
Hanna House Board of Governors
Agenda
September 29, 1994
8:30 - 10:00 am
Hobby House at the Hanna House

I. Review of Minutes - July 28, 1994 (10 minutes) Please see Attachment #1

Please review the Minutes from the Meeting of July 28, 1994 and raise any comments or concerns.

II. Report on Engineering Proposals (20 min)
Mark Jones

III. Landscape Care Status Report (15 min)
Herb Fong

IV. Report on Nissan Account (10 min)

V. Photo-documentation (15 minutes)
Marilyn Fogel, General Discussion

VI. Misc. Items (10 minutes)

1. Inventory of furniture and other items, Tiffany Gravloc

TLG, Planning Office
September 23, 1994
Hanna House Board of Governors
Minutes
July 28, 1994

Members Present: Paul Turner (Chair)
Marilyn Fogel
James Gibbons
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood

Members Absent: Michael Hannan
Rosemary Hornby
Bill Witscher

Others Present: Tiffany Gravlee, Planning Office Staff
John Paul Hanna, Guest
Warren Jacobsen, Project Manager

I. Review of Minutes - June 30, 1994 Please see Attachment A

P. Turner: alter first sentence of section IV to read "P. Turner raised the issue of the extent to which the fellowship position is educational, and provides security."

T. Portwood: the consensus at the end of section IV should include "A formalized relationship between the Hanna House and the Stanford Museum should also be explored." Also, the second paragraph of section V should read: "T. Portwood was concerned whether an approval to proceed in this manner might be beyond the scope of the Board of Governors' authority."

II. Consultation with FEMA Please see Attachment B

David Neuman / Tiffany Gravlee / Warren Jacobsen

It is the opinion of the engineering consultant (John Rutherford and John Burton) which has been hired to review the design of the wall strengthening, that the walls are not in immediate danger, and that it would be most efficient, in design and in cost, to repair the walls along with the rest of the house.

Concern was raised that the new consultant's opinion differs from the previous engineers' opinion. Also, concern was raised about the condition and safety of the remaining oak tree, which appears to be leaning against the wall (or the wall is leaning on it). (see motion below)
A request for proposal (RFP) has been drafted to send to the engineers for an analysis of the entire house structure. FEMA has agreed to give Stanford $25K up-front for consultants' fees. Once we have re-evaluated the structural scheme, FEMA has indicated that they would like to renegotiate the amount which they will fund, taking into account appropriate strengthening and mitigation measures. They may pay as much as 75% of the construction cost of the agreed-upon strengthening scheme. The change in FEMA's approach to the Hanna House appears to be partially due to a change in staff, and partly due to pressure to repair significant National Register properties.

T. Portwood: if we proceed with the house repair as a whole, then the Nissan money that would have been spent for the wall alone can be applied to the 25% funding gap.

J. Gibbons and others expressed concern that FEMA may not follow-through with the funding.

D. Neuman moved, P. Turner seconded and it was unanimously agreed that a report be requested from Mark Jones in Facilities Project Management which analyzes the new recommendations by our structural engineers to postpone strengthening the walls to include strengthening the house, and the situation with FEMA, to determine whether Stanford should proceed with the wall scheme, or with strengthening the entire house. The report should also include recommendations by tree specialists regarding interim protection of the oak tree next to the wall.

Proposal for Use

D. Neuman: No news yet from the President, however the Provost had a question about the resident fellowship. D. Neuman will check with Jean Fetter to see if the President had left a response for the Board of Governors before leaving on his trip.

M. Kimball: will the Hanna House be moved up in the queue of strengthening projects if it has this additional funding from FEMA? Or will it still be considered as competition with other projects?

T. Portwood: Once the three major questions are answered:

1) what will the use be?
2) what is the restoration philosophy?
3) what is the cost or funding gap?

then it may be that the cost of the project will not be large, and may fall within the overall restoration fundraising effort. Raising funds for financial aid for graduate students (for the resident fellow) is fairly standard.
D. Neuman: the Buck Estate is being closed, so there may be a greater need for meeting space near campus. Proposals are still being considered to turn the Estate into a University Inn, with meeting space for the University still available. What will be done with the Hanna House furniture which is currently being stored at the Buck Estate? Lee Morgan, the caretaker (who has moved out), has stated that Mr. Hanna gave him one of the hassocks.

T. Gravlee: the furniture will be moved on Monday to the Lake House, which is patrolled, and has a burglar and fire alarm.

J. Hanna was unaware that his parents had given Lee Morgan a piece of furniture.

M. Fogel: a piece of the bookshelf from the library, which was removed during the Provost's residence, may be in one of the boxes or crates.

It was requested that M. Fogel and T. Gravlee be present when the furniture is moved, to verify what pieces are moved, and what condition they are in.

III. Report on Retaining Wall Project
Warren Jacobsen

1. Report on the findings of initial analysis (see above)

W. Jacobsen will prepare a draft project schedule based on the assumption that the project will encompasses the entire house.

In order to keep the Board of Governors advised and involved with the discussions about the project, D. Neuman moved, J. Gibbons seconded, and it was unanimously approved that Paul Turner be a part of the project team.

2. Geotechnical exploration update

Tunnel has been opened and documented by the geologists. Scrap metal objects were used to fill the mouth of the tunnel before it was back-filled; all of this material has been removed and is awaiting inspection by the campus archeologist. The tunnel does not extend under the house or retaining walls adjacent to the house, but may be close to the retaining wall along the lower driveway. The tunnel will be located on the site plan by surveyors so that its relationship to the house and walls will be clear.

The Frenchman's fault does not run through the tunnel. The tunnel is in rock. The geologists would like to dig a temporary trench (approx. 20' long, and a few feet wide) along the road to determine the location of the fault itself.

3. Tunnel reclosure
W. Jacobsen proposed to reclose the tunnel by inserting a manhole culvert with a ladder, and then backfilling again the culvert. The manhole could be locked, but still provide access when desired.

IV. Misc. Business

1. Neighboring construction

T. Gravlee: neighboring structure is apparently replacing an existing fence or small outbuilding structure and appears to be more than five feet from the property line, which is in accordance with the County, but within fifteen feet, which should have required Stanford review of the project.

It is unknown currently whether the current neighbors are renters or leaseholders.

T. Portwood: since we may be increasing the activity at the Hanna House in the future, we should be careful to not be heavy-handed and alienate the neighbors.

D. Neuman: perhaps we could offer to paint the wall a darker color, or to plant shrubs to screen the structure.

2. Wright chair returning from Milwaukee Art Museum

T. Gravlee: reading chair will be crated and shipped by Fine Arts Express in a climate-controlled truck for arrival after September 1st. We will be advised of the delivery date. Please see Attachment C

3. Landscape care status

Operations Maintenance will be implementing the remedial landscaping modifications recommended in the recent Mayne Tree arborists' report, and in a report prepared in 1990, which they had not previously received.

4. Documentation of changes in the house

M. Fogel: is there documentation of any changes in the house over the years since the earthquake? Is the length and width of crack damage being monitored after small earthquakes?

P. Turner: is anyone monitoring the motion of the floor slabs?

D. Neuman: the house is generally watched, but specific documentation has not been made beyond that in the structural reports. The floor elevations, which the engineers recently documented, are probably most critical.
M. Fogel suggested that the house should be photodocumented, and any changes documented and monitored.

5. Photo-documentation

This issue will be addressed at the next meeting.

6. Board of Governors membership

D. Neuman: Michael Hannan may not be on the UCLBD (University Committee for Land and Building Development) next year. If not, the new UCLBD representative will attend next fall.

Also, the Board might recommend that the membership of the Board of Governors include either the Associate Vice President for Facilities (Kemel Dawkins), or both the director of Operations Maintenance (Bill Witscher) and the Director of Facilities Project Management (Mark Jones), since these are the groups which are involved with the house.

Concern was voiced that the Associate Vice President may be too busy to attend, and that Mark Jones has had experience with the Greene & Greene Gamble House which is valuable to the Hanna House Board of Governors.

7. Fundraising

J. Hanna: how do I direct people who approach me with interest in contributing to the restoration of the Hanna House? A brochure with information on the project that could be handed out would be helpful.

T. Portwood: if the gift is small, then it can be given now, made payable to Stanford University and designated for the Hanna House. If the gift is large, then it may be better to wait until we know how much is needed.

P. Turner: a flyer would be helpful.

T. Portwood will put together a brief brochure on the Hanna House.

V. Tour of Tunnel
DATE: August 16, 1994

TO: Hanna House Board of Governors*

FROM: Tiffany Gray

SUBJECT: Hanna House Board of Governors Meeting Cancellation

Dear Colleagues:

The August meeting has been cancelled, because over half of the members of the Board of Governors will not be able to attend, and because of a lack of new information at this time. Our next meeting will be on September 29, 1994, as previously scheduled. Enclosed please find a copy of the report titled "Concept Studies Retaining Wall Restoration, Hanna House, Stanford, California," dated 26 July 1994. This is the report that was mentioned at the last Board of Governors meeting, for your information.

Thank you

* Marilyn Fogel
James Gibbons
Michael Hannan
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood
Paul Turner
William Witscher

CC: Gerhard Casper
John Paul Hanna
Mark Jones
Olivier Pieron/ Warren Jacobsen
Academic Secretary
CONCEPT STUDIES:
RETAINING WALL RESTORATION
HANNA HOUSE
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

26 July 1994

Prepared by:
Rutherford & Chekene
393 Second Street, Suite 800 North
San Francisco, California 94107
Rutherford & Chekene Job Number: 94024G

Prepared for:
Facilities Project Management
Stanford University

RUTHERFORD & CHEKENE | CONSULTING ENGINEERS
Subject: CONCEPT STUDIES
RETAINING WALL RESTORATION
HANNA HOUSE
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

Dear Mr. Jacobsen:

We are very pleased to submit the attached report in fulfillment of our proposal for engineering services, dated 9 June 1994, to develop conceptual studies for restoring the retaining walls within the Hanna House site. As our report states, we find that the retaining walls immediately adjacent to the perimeter of the Hanna residence have not suffered significant damage and reinforcing these walls, although desirable, is not a high priority for restoration of the residence. The Parking Area retaining wall which collapsed during the Loma Prieta earthquake must be rebuilt, but immediate restoration is not critical for the safety of the residence.

Our report recommends that 1) rebuilding of the collapsed Parking Area retaining wall be deferred until the residence is restored and 2) the retaining walls immediately adjacent to the residence be studied during the design of the residence restoration and, if strengthening is advisable, that this work be combined with the restoration of the residence.

Both of us have enjoyed working with you on this project and have found the challenge to devise new interesting solutions for the problems arising from the unique and unorthodox construction of Hanna House an invigorating experience. We would welcome the opportunity to work with you in the future.

Sincerely,

RUTHERFORD & CHEKENE

John C. Burton
Geotechnical Engineer #117
Civil Engineer #31503
Principal

John Rutherford, Consulting Engineer
Geotechnical Engineer #742
Structural Engineer #866
BACKGROUND

At the request of Stanford University’s Facilities Project Management, we have performed a concept study for the restoration and possible strengthening of the Hanna House retaining walls at 737 Frenchman’s Road on the Stanford Campus. The Hanna House was designed by Frank Lloyd Wright for Paul and Jean Hanna, constructed during 1935-1937, and enlarged and modified several times thereafter. After the October 17, 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake the residence was found to have suffered significant damage, including a collapsed retaining wall and a damaged brick masonry fireplace. A soils investigation by Lowney Associates determined that much of the residence’s concrete slab-on-grade floor is founded on poorly compacted fill and expressed concern about the integrity of the retaining walls along the north side of the residence. An architectural study performed by Architectural Resources Group and an engineering study prepared by Forell/Elsesser Engineers addressed the problems of seismic repair and conservation of historic features of the Hanna House. A landscape report evaluated the major trees on the property and discusses the possible impact of seismic repairs on the existing landscaping.

OBJECTIVES

The objectives of our study were 1) to evaluate the condition of the retaining walls on the Hanna House property, 2) to develop alternate methods of strengthening the walls where required, and 3) to determine the feasibility of strengthening the walls on a separate contract prior to restoring and strengthening the residence.

SUMMARY

• Evaluation of Wall Condition:

See Figure 1 for the locations of the walls discussed below.

• The Lower Driveway Walls are in good condition and do not require strengthening.

• The Main Walls adjacent to the residence are apparently undamaged and in good condition. Immediate strengthening is not required.

• The Parking Area Wall has collapsed. Immediate replacement is not required.

• The Upper Terrace Wall is bowed and may require strengthening. Immediate strengthening is not required.
Methods of Wall Strengthening:

Two methods of strengthening are available: External and internal, based on the location of new construction.

- External Strengthening is feasible, but would require removal and replacement of some of the existing brick facing. This method would not prevent further settlement of the residence or correct the existing differential settlement of the floor slab.

- Internal Strengthening of the Main Walls in conjunction with repair and restoration of the residence could be designed to provide support for the fireplace and prevent differential settlement of the living room floor.

Feasibility of Strengthening Walls Prior to Restoring the Residence:

The retaining walls can be externally strengthened under separate contract before the residence is seismically strengthened and restored, but this approach is neither necessary nor advisable for the reasons listed below.

- Immediate rebuilding of the Parking Area Wall and strengthening of the Upper Terrace Walls is not essential to the safety of the residence.

- Although the Main Walls may require strengthening to resist the design earthquake, they survived the Loma Prieta Earthquake in good condition and immediate strengthening is not required. In their present condition and based on their seismic behavior, these walls are not a critical deficiency, or "weak link", in the overall seismic resistance of the structure.

- The details of the existing retaining wall construction are not clear. Further investigation in conjunction with design of the residence seismic strengthening may reveal information which will affect the extent of wall strengthening measures.

- Internal strengthening of the walls may be less intrusive and may preserve the exterior fabric of the retaining walls, except for the Parking Area Wall which must be rebuilt.

- Wall strengthening in conjunction with residence restoration and seismic strengthening will very likely cost less than letting separate contracts for the work.
RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Design Scheduling**: Defer the design for rebuilding and strengthening the retaining walls until it can be incorporated into the design of the residence seismic strengthening.

- **Field Investigations**: Perform certain field investigations prior to the design of comprehensive seismic strengthening and restoration measures. A detailed list of recommended investigations appears at the end of this report.

- **Wall Strengthening**: Study the feasibility of strengthening the retaining walls as an integral part of the residence restoration and strengthening measures.

- **Construction Contract**: Incorporate wall rebuilding and strengthening into the residence restoration and seismic strengthening contract.

The balance of this report describes the scope of our investigation and presents a detailed discussion of our findings and recommendations.

SCOPE OF INVESTIGATION

During our study we carried out the tasks listed below:

- **Document Review**: We read reports on Hanna House prepared by others, examined all available architectural and engineering drawings prepared for the residence construction and subsequent additions, selected appropriate drawings for further scrutiny, and examined geologic maps of the faults in the area.

- **Field Visits**: We visited the site four times during April, June and July to examine the site and confer with Stanford staff members and with Stanford geologists.

- **Design Standards**: We reviewed applicable design standards to determine appropriate design criteria for the retaining walls.

- **Topographic Survey**: We prepared criteria for a topographic survey of the north retaining walls and terraces to determine the amount of differential settlement and the height of earth retention.

- **Floor Elevation Survey**: We performed a floor elevation survey of the Living Room perimeter to determine the location and amount of differential settlement.
Floor Location: We reviewed a proposal to locate, map and evaluate the activity of the Frenchman's Road Fault and met with members of Stanford's Department of Geophysics to examine the seismic data from this fault and determine the probable location of the fault with relation to the residence.

Location of Tunnels: We reviewed accounts of tunnels dug by Peter Coutts below the residence and prepared criteria for locating and mapping the tunnels as necessary to evaluate the effect of the tunnel's presence on the restoration of the retaining walls. We examined one tunnel on 25 July 1994 after the entrance was uncovered.

Development of Conceptual Design Approaches: We prepared sketches of two alternate design approaches to the strengthening of the retaining walls in order to evaluate the feasibility of restoring the retaining walls prior to restoring the residence.

Presentation: On July 8, 1994 we presented the findings of our investigation to interested members of the facilities management staff and a representative from the project architectural consultant.

Recommended Interim Activities: We have prepared a list of recommendations for field investigations which will develop essential or desirable information for the next phase of design.

TOPOGRAPHIC AND FLOOR EVALUATION SURVEYS

Figure 2 presents the results of an elevation survey performed on June 22, 1994 to determine the amount of differential settlement around the perimeter of the Living Room floor. A water level was used to obtain the relative floor elevations and all elevations are tied to a benchmark elevation appearing on the Ruth and Going topographic survey of the building exterior. Although water levels can be read within 0.005 foot, the accuracy of this survey is plus or minus 0.01 foot. The elevations of Figure 2 are shown in feet, with differences between relevant points expressed in inches, in order to clearly indicate the amount of differential floor settlement. Figure 2 also shows the top of retaining wall elevations recorded by Ruth and Going for the walls beneath and immediately adjacent to the residence perimeter.

The topographic and floor elevation surveys disclose the following information:

- Retaining Wall Settlement: The tops of the Main Walls adjacent to the residence are relatively level compared with the residence floor, indicating that these walls have not undergone significant differential settlement. The top of wall elevations are discussed in the "Retaining Wall Evaluation" section of this report.
Residence Floor Settlement: Assuming the floor was originally constructed level within the tolerances prevailing during the 1930’s, (within plus or minus 1/4 inch of true level) the floor slab has undergone differential movement attributable to the poor compaction of the fill underneath. Where the perimeter wall is supported on a wall directly beneath, the adjacent floor is almost level. This is also true adjacent to the Living Room fireplace. In some areas the perimeter wall appears to rest on the floor slab with no wall or deep footing beneath. In these areas there is differential movement, resulting in a gap of more than an inch between the wall sill and the slab top at one exterior wall. In general, the slab appears to be unsuccessfully attempting to span between the relatively stable retaining walls and the fireplace area as the fill between has settled, leaving a void space immediately below the slab. As a result, the slab surface is now concave upward, with the dishing effect clearly visible as one sights at floor level along the slab. This slab movement has caused vertical displacement of several of the scored concrete hexagons from the topping slab, with vertical offsets of up to 1/2 inch.

An example of the slab settlement pattern can be seen on Figure 2 by comparing the series of floor elevations between the south corner of the fireplace and the west perimeter wall at the south end of the small exterior planter. The slab at the fireplace is 5/8 inch higher than the slab at the residence wall, but midway between these two points the slab is more than 2 inches lower than the slab at the fireplace.

Terrace Settlement and Displacement: The concrete paving of the exterior terraces has settled significantly relative to the retaining walls in several areas, causing ponding of water during rains and in some instances causing runoff to flow back toward the residence rather than through the scuppers in the retaining walls. The original drawings show a pattern of small vertical drainage pipes at the intersection of the hexagon score lines, presumably to conduct water through the terrace slab into the fill beneath. There is no evidence that this drainage scheme was ever constructed. The fact that the terrace concrete has settled relative to the retaining walls is further evidence that these walls may rest on firm soil.

Where the Parking Area Wall has collapsed, the adjacent concrete steps have moved away from the residence more than 2 inches. This is the only significant instance of outboard movement of the retaining wall tops. In general, the Main Walls appear either plumb or leaning slightly inboard at the top, indicating they are still adequate to resist the pressure of the retained fills, which range up to more than 8 feet in depth.
General Pattern of Apparent Differential Movement: The top of retaining wall elevations and the floor slab elevations shown on Figure 2 indicate a general trend of slope downward to the northeast, where the greatest amount of damage occurs. The northeast corner of the Living Room fireplace suffered the heaviest damage and the northeast segment of the exterior retaining wall adjacent to the parking area was destroyed. This consistent pattern of differential movement seems significant and should be addressed in final design.

RETAINING WALL EVALUATION

All of the visible retaining walls appear to be of similar construction consisting of a structural concrete wall faced on the exterior side with brick. We have placed the retaining walls in four categories for purposes of evaluation. Each category has a different relation to the stability of Hanna House. Figure 1 shows the location and approximate extent of each category of wall.

• Lower Driveway Walls: These walls retain a relatively shallow depth of soil along the upslope borders of the driveways. According to the available drawings, portions of these walls have been strengthened by retrofitting them with concrete anchors and tieback rods. These walls appear to be in good condition and would not directly affect the residence if they ever failed.

• Main Walls: The main walls either support the residence perimeter wall directly or are immediately adjacent to it. The walls support the lateral pressure from retained earth beneath the residence ranging in depth from 7 feet to 9 feet. They are essential to the stability of the residence and would cause significant damage if they failed. Fortunately, these walls are in good condition and the survey data discussed above indicates that they have not undergone significant vertical or lateral displacement. The original drawings suggest that they are not designed and constructed to meet present requirements for either earth retention or lateral pressure imposed by a design earthquake and strengthening may be desirable if done as part of the residence restoration. The top of wall elevations on Figure 2 show a maximum difference of less than 1 1/4 inches between the high point of the wall and the lowest point. The general slope is downward to the northeast.

• Parking Area Walls: The wall along the north side of the upper driveway collapsed during the Loma Prieta Earthquake and the brick facing has fallen away from the 8 inch thick concrete retaining wall. The retaining wall failed at a horizontal construction joint which appears to incorporate no reinforcing bars. The wall retained no more than five feet of earth and was lower than many of the walls which show no signs of distress. The wall failure has revealed a terra cotta open joint pipe drain behind the wall, a method of sub-drainage typical of the period. The drain is plugged
with earth, which is also typical of this type of drain construction. The method of rebuilding this wall is contingent on the nature and extent of restoration of the paved area and adjacent concrete steps behind the wall.

The southwest wall of the garage retains an adjacent planting area containing a large cypress tree. This wall is leaning, causing bowing of the wooden wall facing within the garage. Although the configuration of this wall is unknown, failure does not appear to be imminent. Failure of the wall would damage the garage and expose the tree roof system; the main portion of the house and garage would not be affected. The method of strengthening this wall will depend on details for tree protection and restoration of the garage wall surface.

• Upper Terrace Wall: The wall at the north Upper Terrace retains from 6 to 7 feet of earth and is probably leaning on the one remaining Valley Oak in front of the wall. The wall is visibly bowed outward at midheight. Although the wall is distressed it has not failed. Wall failure would damage the terrace paving behind the wall but would not immediately threaten the residence. It is desirable to strengthen this wall, but the method of strengthening should be integrated with restoration of the residence.

This wall exhibits more differential movement than the Main Wall. The difference in elevation between the high point and the low point is over 2½ inches and the slope is downward toward the east with the lowest point adjacent to the failed Parking Area Wall. The wall adjacent to the west Upper Terrace is in good condition and the top of the wall is almost level. It retains from 3 feet to 5 feet of earth. This portion of the Upper Terrace Wall does not require strengthening.

ALTERNATE STRENGTHENING METHODS

There are two general approaches to strengthening the portions of the retaining walls which are found to require strengthening: external strengthening, or reinforcing the walls from the exterior side, and internal strengthening, or reinforcing the walls either from within the wall structure or adding strengthening elements to the interior side of the wall. These general approaches are discussed below.

• External Strengthening: This can be accomplished in several ways. The least intrusive method is slant-drilled tiebacks, which requires the following steps:

1. Remove several bricks from selected locations on the face of the walls.
2. Drill a downward slanting hole through the concrete wall structure and into firm soil beneath the residence or parking area.
3. Insert a steel anchor bar into the hole and grout it in place.
4. Anchor the bar to the concrete structure and proof test it.
5. Replace the bricks which were removed from the facing.

This method has the advantage of working entirely from outside the residence. The disadvantages include:

- External tiebacks do not completely prevent further settlement of the floor slab.
- Downward sloping tiebacks impose a vertical load on the retaining wall which may exceed its present capacity and require the addition of reinforced concrete footings or other form of underpinning beneath the wall to minimize differential settlement of the wall under the added vertical load.
- All utilities, basements, and other improvements must be carefully located to avoid interferences with the tiebacks.
- Plans of the original residence construction indicate that the area under the planter outside the south end of the Living Room has double concrete walls beneath the planter with a void space between the walls. If the walls were actually constructed in this fashion, special measures will be required to anchor the tiebacks.

- **Internal Strengthening:** There are several methods of strengthening the wall from the interior side of the wall. The disadvantages include the requirement to remove and replace all or portions of the existing residence floor slab and terrace paving, and to shore some portions of the residence structure while strengthening is constructed. The advantages include:
  - An opportunity to combine wall strengthening with releveling or stabilizing the Living Room floor and providing support for the Living Room fireplace.
  - No removal of the existing brick retaining wall facing.
  - Possible overall cost savings.
SITE DRAINAGE

As is the case with all the exterior retaining walls exposed to earth saturation, rainfall runoff should be prevented from saturating the earth retained behind the walls, either by placing a drain line immediately behind the bottom of the wall, or by sealing the paved areas behind the walls. The soils report notes that the site fill is potentially expansive, which could exert greatly increased lateral pressure on the wall. Access for installation of adequate drainage behind the retaining walls will be greatly improved if the walls are rebuilt or strengthened from the interior.

The Lowney Associates geotechnical report notes that a soils sample taken from the upper fill beneath the residence has a moisture content of 23%, higher than would normally be expected. This may indicate a failure of the site drainage system and should be investigated during final design. Water entering the soil beneath the residence slab and footing could cause substantial damage where the soil is loosely compacted or highly expansive.

TUNNEL

The geotechnical report refers to the existence of a tunnel excavated beneath the Hanna House property by Peter Coutts, an early settler of the area who was seeking a water supply. John Hanna verified the existence of two tunnels beneath the property and indicated the approximate location of the entrance of the longer tunnel. The entrance has been found and although the tunnel apparently ends some distance from the residence, the tunnel should be measured and plotted.

FRENCHMAN'S ROAD FAULT

The existence of a fault thought to extend beneath the Hanna House property was pointed out by Bailey Willis, a member of Stanford's Geology Department, before the residence was built. On June 2, 1994, Professors Robert Kovach and Benjamin Page submitted a proposal to locate the fault with reference to the Hanna House and attempt to determine whether the fault has been active within the last 10,000 years. Although ground surface fault rupture seems highly unlikely along this fault trace, verification of this conjecture would be useful.

We have reviewed the proposal and are in sympathy with its objectives, which have value for several Stanford projects other than the Hanna House restoration. After meeting with Professor Page, Professors Kovach, and Professor Zoback, Chairman of the Department of Geophysics, we recommended that at least the first phase of opening a tunnel and locating the fault at Frenchman's Road be carried out. The tunnel entrance has since been located and the tunnel is being cleared of debris. The tunnel allegedly makes a right angle turn eastward, perhaps toward the fault, and study of the tunnel surfaces may yield information regarding the fault.
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER FIELD INVESTIGATIONS

The field investigations listed below will yield information which in some cases will be necessary and, in other cases, very useful for final design of the retaining wall strengthening:

- **Test Pits**: Dig test pits adjacent to the bottom of the exterior face of the Main Walls and Upper Terrace Walls. The purpose of digging these test pits is to examine the soil outboard from the walls, to disclose the nature of the soil and/or stone rubble under the footings, and, if possible, provide access to measure the width of the wall footings. This information is essential for final design of any required wall strengthening measures or for establishing areas where no strengthening is required.

  The test pits will probably be about 18 inches square and less than 4 feet deep, and can be dug by hand. Shoring may not be necessary if the soil is firm and the pits are shallow. We estimate that up to 5 or 6 pits may be required, at locations to be determined by our office in consultation with the restoration architect.

- **Site Topographic Survey**: Perform a topographic survey to extend the existing survey around the entire residence and the adjacent buildings and terraces. Locate the test pits and record the ground surface elevation at each. This information will help define the scope of restoration and strengthening required and should be included in the contract documents as existing conditions information.

- **Floor Elevation Survey**: Extend the present floor elevation survey to include the central area of the Living Room floor slab and survey the remaining floor areas within the main residence.

- **Investigation of Living Room Planter Support**: As noted in the discussion of external wall strengthening, the exterior planter at the southwest corner of the Living Room is shown to be supported by double walls. This must be verified before final design by removing the soil from the planter and temporarily removing what appears to be a sheet metal planter liner to permit examination of the space between the walls.
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DATE: July 26, 1994

TO: Hanna House Board of Governors

FROM: Tiffany Gravlee

SUBJECT: Hanna House Board of Governors July 28, 1994 Agenda

Dear Colleagues:

Enclosed please find the agenda for the meeting of July 28, 1994, with attachments. Please review the minutes of our last meeting of June 30, 1994, and bring any corrections you may have. The meeting will begin at 8:30 AM, and will be held at the Hobby House at the Hanna House.

If you wish to tour the tunnel after the meeting, you may do so. Flashlights and hard-hats will be provided. Bring flat shoes for walking in the tunnel.

Thank you

Marilyn Fogel
James Gibbons
Michael Hannan
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood
Paul Turner
William Witscher

CC: Gerhard Casper
John Paul Hanna
Mark Jones
Olivier Piron/ Warren Jacobsen
Academic Secretary
Hanna House Board of Governors
Agenda
July 28, 1994
8:30 - 10:00 am
Hobby House at the Hanna House

I. Review of Minutes - June 30, 1994 (5 minutes) Please see Attachment #1

Please review the Minutes from the Meeting of June 30, 1994 and raise any comments or concerns.

II. Consultation with FEMA (15 minutes)
David Neuman / Tiffany Gravlee

Report on current status

III. Report on Retaining Wall Project (15 min)
Olivier Pieron / Warren Jacobsen

1. Report on the findings of initial analysis
2. Geotechnical exploration update
3. Tunnel reclosure

IV. Misc. Business (20 minutes)

1. Neighboring construction
2. Wright chair returning from Milwaukee Art Museum
3. Landscape care status

V. Action for Next Meeting (5 minutes)

VI. Tour of Tunnel (optional: 20 minutes)

Fundraising
> w/fema funding - reason to be optimistic (TP)

TLC, Planning Office,
July 26, 1994
Hanna House Board of Governors
Minutes
June 30, 1994

Members Present: Paul Turner (Chair)
Marilyn Fogel
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
Tim Portwood

Members Absent: James Gibbons
Michael Hannan
David Neuman
Bill Witscher

Others Present: Tiffany Gravlee, Planning Office Staff
John Paul Hanna, Guest
Warren Jacobsen, Project Manager
Mark Jones, Director of Facilities Project Management
Olivier Pieron, Project Manager

I. Review of Minutes - June 2, 1994

J. Hanna requested that the second sentence under the subject of "Insurance" be modified to reflect the intent of his letter of June 24, 1994, which clarifies his concern about insuring gifts. The minutes will be modified to read: "all gifts may not need to be insured, but donors should be reassured that those valuable gifts of a category which can be restored or rebuilt in the case of damage, will be insured rather than relying on the self-insurance policy for University property in general." (Please see Attachment A)

II. Report on Retaining Wall Project
Olivier Pieron / Warren Jacobsen

1. Report on the findings of initial analysis
Rutherford & Chekene, the engineers who are further analyzing the retaining walls, will be presenting and discussing options next week for the retaining walls. However, preliminary information seems to indicate that the southwest wall, under the house, should be strengthened along with the house strengthening, while the northwest terrace, near the driveway and oak trees, could be strengthened now. Their preliminary assessment assumes that the tunnels do not run directly beneath the house, and there is no significant danger from the fault. M. Jones noted that the project is currently on schedule.
2. Tunnels and Geotechnical exploration proposal.

Peter Coutts, the previous owner of the Stanford land in the vicinity of the Hanna House and east campus, apparently dug a number of tunnels in the area in search of water. At least two of these tunnels began at the hillside along Frenchman's road, below the driveway to the Hanna House. J. Hanna remembers playing in the tunnels as a child, and recalls his father filling the entries to the tunnels.

The larger of the two tunnels which J. Hanna has identified is shown on F. L. Wright's drawings, with a door at the entry incorporated into the entry wall at the driveway (this was not constructed). The entry of the longest of the tunnels has been identified, and trees in the area will be trimmed slightly so that the entry may be excavated. The actual digging will occur in the next few days. The process and actual tunnel will be documented with photographs, and will be surveyed and recorded for the use of our consulting engineers and others.

A number of faculty and emeritus faculty in the Geology department have raised the concern that the Frenchman's Fault may run very close, or actually under, the house itself. They would like to dig a trench to expose the fault in order to study it, and to verify its precise location. If they cannot find sufficient information in the tunnel, then they will propose that a trench be temporarily opened along Frenchman's Road to expose the fault. The cost for this additional trenching is considered to be negligible.

III. Discussion of status of "Proposal for Use"
Paul Turner

The proposal was modified as discussed previously, recognizing that there will likely be a funding gap that will need to be covered through fund-raising, and that the Board of Governors is still evaluating options for the caretaker or fellowship position.

IV. Caretaker / Curator / Resident Fellow
General discussion about the purpose and responsibilities of each position.

P. Turner noted that the purpose of the fellowship position is educational, and for security. M. Fogel added that a curatorial function is also needed, but that maybe both a live-in student fellow and curator could oversee the house, each with their own responsibilities. Day to day oversight of maintenance and activities was the other function which may be necessary. Various options for achieving this responsibility were discussed, including: oversight by the curator, oversight by the student fellow, or oversight by other university staff. The Board of Governors plays an important role in ultimate oversight of maintenance and general activities. Phyllis Perrault's office currently handles scheduling of events at the special houses.
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Resident Fellow

Students from various departments could be considered, but would there always be a student interested? Students from other institutions might also be considered, although this would get complicated due to the need for funding for tuition, administration, etc. Faculty might also be considered. T. Portwood pointed out that an endowed fellowship could be raised, and that this would be a great educational experience for a student to study the house and contribute a document that would add to the knowledge about the house. The question of continuity of oversight was raised. After viewing the studio apartment, it was generally thought that it was adequate for one or two graduate students, if the wiring could accommodate a computer, and the kitchenette were upgraded a bit.

Curator

A curator would have special knowledge of the house, and would keep track of the House's artifacts and records, making them available for researchers, and providing oversight by a specialist; however this would not likely be a full-time position. The Stanford Museum might provide administration of such a position, or an actual part-time curator. M. Fogel noted that the Museum has a part-time curator of American Art. T. Portwood and M. Kimball noted the benefits of continuity of such a curator position, and the benefits of oversight by an existing structure at the Museum, as well as ties to the future visitor's center at the Museum. Some archival functions of the curator might be handled by Special Collections. M. Fogel noted that it would be important to define the specific responsibilities of the curator before deciding who would administer the position.

Currently, the budget for the part-time person who scheduled tours for the Hanna House came from the Committee for Art, while all additional docent functions are voluntary. However it is important to note that the tours were free of charge previously (approx. 80 people/month), and if a fee were charged, revenues might be used to help support a curator position.

Live-in Caretaker

A caretaker would live in the house, which is of some concern due to the small size of the studio apartment, and the desirability of keeping the upstairs of the Hobby House open for other uses. Currently, Rose Guntly and Bruce Wiggins oversee the maintenance of the house and grounds, and hire specialists when needed. With the oversight of the Board, this system seems to work well. Our facilities department also maintains the Hoover House.

The consensus of the members present was that the best solution appears to be a combination of a curator, who would ideally be academic or associated with the Museum,
and a resident fellow, who would study the house and provide some security. In addition to this, a formalized relationship with Facilities Maintenance would be necessary, with a specific person assigned to the Hanna House.

V. Consultation with FEMA

Tiffany Gravlee

FEMA is interested in renegotiating the amount of the construction cost they are willing to fund, in order to more accurately reflect the true cost of repair. At least one group within FEMA would like to proceed with reviews using the second, less intrusive structural scheme, and then modifying it as necessary later.

T. Portwood was concerned that an approval to go ahead was beyond the scope of the Board of Governors' authority.

This item will be brought back to the Board of Governors next month.

VI. Other Business / Action for Next Meeting

Tiffany Gravlee

Russ Beatty, the landscape architect who provided the landscape assessment for ARG in the original Hanna House Report, has submitted a proposal for the historic landscape survey, and proposed landscape alterations. In addition, he submitted an urgent letter in which he stated his concern that the recommendations in his previous report to remove the soil over the root crowns of the oak trees had not been carried out. He felt that the oak tree which fell might have been saved if this work had been done, and that the other oak remain endangered.

T. Portwood moved, P. Turner seconded, and all unanimously approved that this recommended work be carried out without delay, using the allotted maintenance funds from the Nissan Endowment. (Please see Attachment B)

M. Fogel asked that the specifications of photodocumentation be discussed further in a future meeting.
June 24, 1994

Stanford University
Planning Office
855 Serra Street
Stanford, CA 94305-6115

Attn: Tiffany Gravlee

Re: Minutes of Board of Governors Meeting of June 2

Dear Tiffany:

I wonder if you could make one change in the second paragraph under IV of your minutes where you are referring to my concern about the University insuring gifts. The way that the minutes read results in expanding my suggestion about insurance beyond the point I had intended. What I meant to say, and the point I was trying to make, is this: the owner of a valuable property of a certain category who is considering making a gift of that property to the University with the expectation that the University desires to accept the gift and continue to own and maintain that property, ought to be reassured that some arrangements will be made to place that property in a category different from those University buildings which Stanford self-insures. So long as Stanford continues to self-insure against catastrophic loss from fire, earthquake etc., the donation of property in the category of the Hanna House should be accompanied by some insurance program. The insurance could be included in an endowment fund accompanying the gift, or the University could commit to the donor that the University will assume an obligation to insure the property as a condition of accepting the gift. The Hanna House is an obvious candidate for the special category because the type of loss that is the major concern, such as earthquake or fire, can be insured against, and the kind of damage that would be suffered in an earthquake or fire can be repaired. The same may or may not be true of a donation of valuable paintings. If the paintings were totally destroyed in a fire, they obviously could not be replaced by any amount of money. On the other hand if some canvases were damaged but not destroyed, by either earthquake or fire, it's possible that they could be restored given the funds necessary to pay for the restoration. The point is that when something like the Hanna House is being given to the University, there should be a policy that says let's look at this donation and see
whether it fits in the category where we should depart from the usual policy of self-insurance and see that this particular item is adequately insured, and will be adequately insured, before we agree to accept the gift. Gifts of that category should not have to be dependent upon future fund-raising campaigns in order to pay for repair and/or restoration.

I’m sure the foregoing is longer than you want to put in the minutes, but maybe you can boil it down somewhat and still make the point. Thank you for your consideration.

Cordially yours,

John Paul Hanna
June 27, 1994

Architectural Resources Group
Attn: Naomi Miroglio
Pier 9, The Embarcadero
San Francisco, CA 94111

Re: Tree Care at Hanna House, Stanford University

Dear Naomi:

On June 23rd I visited the Hanna House site in preparation for submitting a proposal for a landscape management plan. While there I inspected the trees for which I had reported and made recommendations in my portion of the Recommendations for Seismic Repair and Conservation of Historic Features Final Report, February 1991. As you know, one of the large Valley Oaks below the North Terrace wall has fallen due to crown rot. I am very concerned about the other tree at that location and, for that matter, all of the other oaks throughout the garden.

As far as I could tell, none of the recommendations contained in either the report of Barrie Coate dated October 24, 1990 or the report of Ken Meyer of Mayne Tree Experts, dated May 12, 1994, have been implemented. As for the fallen oak, we recommended excavating and exposing the root crown to determine the extent of crown rot and damage from oak root fungus and to clean out infected tissue. Had that been accomplished, the seriousness of the decay that led to its falling might have been detected.

I believe there is an urgent need for the staff at Stanford to implement the recommendations contained in the Coate report and those by Meyer last May which corroborate the 1990 recommendations. This is especially critical for the oaks around the house. It would be a tragedy if other trees were lost due to buried root crowns, crown rot and undetected oak root fungus.

Therefore, I urge you to convey these concerns to the appropriate staff persons at Stanford and apprise them of the urgency relative to preserving these trees. I enclose a copy of the 1990 report of Barrie Coate. Although these recommendations relate to Item #2 in the RFP of 21 June, I will include further tree inspections and recommendations as a part of my proposal.

Sincerely,

Russell A. Beatty, ASLA
Landscape Architect

- Historic Restoration  - Horticulture  - Urban Forestry  - Vegetation Management
DATE: July 26, 1994

TO: Hanna House Board of Governors

FROM: Tiffany Graylee

SUBJECT: Hanna House Board of Governors' May 1994 Agenda

Dear Colleagues,

Please be reminded that the May 1994 meeting of the Hanna House Board of Governors will be held on Friday, May 25, 1994 at 2:00 PM in the Meeting Room of the Stanford University Main Quad. The agenda for the meeting will include:

- Approval of minutes from the April 1994 meeting
- Update on current projects and programs
- Discussion of upcoming events and fundraising activities
- Review of financial reports
- Consideration of new members

Please join us at this important meeting to contribute to the continued success of Hanna House.

Thank you

Marilyn Fögel
James Gibbons
Michael Hannan
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood
Paul Turner
William Witsch
Hanna House Board of Governors
Agenda
July 28, 1994
8:30 - 10:00 am
Hobby House at the Hanna House

I. Review of Minutes - June 30, 1994 (5 minutes) Please see Attachment #1

Please review the Minutes from the Meeting of June 30, 1994 and raise any comments or concerns.

II. Consultation with FEMA (15 minutes)
David Neuman / Tiffany Gravlee

Report on current status

III. Report on Retaining Wall Project (15 minutes)
Olivier Pieron / Warren Jacobsen

1. Report on the findings of initial analysis
2. Geotechnical exploration update
3. Tunnel reclosure

IV. Misc. Business (20 minutes)

1. Neighboring construction
2. Wright chair returning from Milwaukee Art Museum
3. Landscape care status

V. Action for Next Meeting (5 minutes)

VI. Tour of Tunnel (optional 20 minutes)
Hanna House Board of Governors
Minutes
June 30, 1994

Members Present
Paul Turner (Chair)
Marilyn Fogel
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
Tim Portwood

Members Absent
James Gibbons
Michael Hanna
David Netman
Bill Witscher

Others Present
Tiffany Gravicy, Planning Office Staff
John Paul Hanna, Guest
Warren Jacobsen, Project Manager
Mark Jones, Director of Facilities Project Management
Olivier Pieron, Project Manager

I. Review of Minutes, June 2, 1994

J. Hanna requested that the second sentence under the subject of “Insurance” be modified to reflect the intent of his letter of June 24, 1994, which clarifies his concern about insuring gifts. The minutes will be modified to read: “all gifts may not need to be insured, but donors should be reassured that those valuable gifts of a category which can be restored or rebuilt in the case of damage, will be insured rather than relying on the self-insurance policy for University property in general.” (Please see Attachment A)

II. Report on Retaining Wall Project
Olivier Pieron / Warren Jacobsen

1 Report on the findings of initial analysis
Rutherford & Chekene, the engineers who are further analyzing the retaining walls, will be presenting and discussing options next week for the retaining walls. However, preliminary information seems to indicate that the southwest wall, under the house, should be strengthened along with the house strengthening, while the northwest terrace, near the driveway and oak trees, could be strengthened now. Their preliminary assessment assumes that the tunnels do not run directly beneath the house, and there is no significant danger from the fault. M. Jones noted that the project is currently on schedule.
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2. Tunnels and Geotechnical exploration proposal:

Peter Cottis, the previous owner of the Stanford land in the vicinity of the Hanna House and east campus, apparently dug a number of tunnels in the area in search of water. At least two of these tunnels began at the hillside along Frenchman's road, below the driveway to the Hanna House. J. Hanna remembers playing in the tunnels as a child, and recalls his father filling the entries to the tunnels.

The larger of the two tunnels which J. Hanna has identified is shown on F. L. Wright's drawings, with a door at the entry incorporated into the entry wall at the driveway (this was not constructed). The entry of the longest of the tunnels has been identified, and trees in the area will be trimmed slightly so that the entry may be excavated. The actual digging will occur in the next few days. The process and actual tunnel will be documented with photographs, and will be surveyed and recorded for the use of our consulting engineers and others.

A number of faculty and emeritus faculty in the Geology department have raised the concern that the Frenchman's fault may run very close, or actually under, the house itself. They would like to dig a trench to expose the fault in order to study it, and to verify its precise location. If they cannot find sufficient information in the tunnel, then they will propose that a trench be temporarily opened along Frenchman's Road to expose the fault. The cost for this additional trenching is considered to be negligible.

III. Discussion of status of Proposal for Use
Paul Turner

The proposal was modified as discussed previously, recognizing that there will likely be a funding gap that will need to be covered through fund-raising, and that the Board of Governors is still evaluating options for the caretaker or fellowship position.

IV. Caretaker / Curator / Resident Fellow:
General discussion about the purpose and responsibilities of each position.

P. Turner noted that the purpose of the fellowship position is educational, and for security. M. Hogel added that a curatorial function is also needed, but that may be both a live-in student fellow and curator could oversee the house, each with their own responsibilities. Day to day oversight of maintenance and activities was the other function which may be necessary. Various options for achieving this responsibility were discussed including oversight by the curator, oversight by the student fellow, or oversight by other university staff. The Board of Governors plays an important role in ultimate oversight of maintenance and general activities. Phyllis Ferrault's office currently handles scheduling of events at the special houses.
Resident Fellow

Students from various departments could be considered, but would there always be a student interested? Students from other institutions might also be considered, although this would get complicated due to the need for funding for tuition, administration, etc. Faculty might also be considered. T. Portwood pointed out that an endowed fellowship could be raised, and that this would be a great educational experience for a student to study the house and contribute a document that would add to the knowledge about the house. The question of continuity of oversight was raised. After viewing the studio apartment, it was generally thought that it was adequate for one or two graduate students, if the wiring could accommodate a computer, and the kitchenette were upgraded a bit.

Curator

A curator would have special knowledge of the house, and would keep track of the house's artifacts and records, making them available for researchers, and providing oversight by a specialist; however this would not likely be a full-time position. The Stanford Museum might provide administration of such a position, or an actual part-time curator. M. Fogel noted that the Museum has a part-time curator of American Art. T. Portwood and M. Kimball noted the benefits of continuity of such a curator position, and the benefits of oversight by an existing structure at the Museum, as well as ties to the future visitor's center at the Museum. Some archival functions of the curator might be handled by Special Collections. M. Fogel noted that it would be important to define the specific responsibilities of the curator before deciding who would administrate the position.

Currently, the budget for the part-time person who scheduled tours for the Hanna House came from the Committee for Art, while all additional docent functions are voluntary. However, it is important to note that the tours were free or charge previously (approx. 30 people/month), and if a fee were charged, revenues might be used to help support a curator position.

Live-in Caretaker

A caretaker would live in the house, which is of some concern due to the small size of the studio apartment, and the desirability of keeping the upstairs of the Hobby House open for other uses. Currently, Rose Gunthi and Bruce Wiggins oversee the maintenance of the house and grounds, and hire specialists when needed. With the oversight of the Board, this system seems to work well. Our facilities department also maintains the Hoover House.

The consensus of the members present was that the best solution appears to be a combination of a curator who would ideally be academic or associated with the Museum,
and a resident fellow, who would staff the house and provide some security. In addition to this, a formalized relationship with Facilities Maintenance would be necessary, with a specific person assigned to the Hanna House.

V. Consultation with FEMA
Tiffany Gravlee

FEMA is interested in renegotiating the amount of the construction cost they are willing to fund, in order to more accurately reflect the true cost of repair. At least one group within FEMA would like to proceed with reviews using the second, less intrusive structural scheme, and then modifying it as necessary later.

T. Portwood was concerned that an approval to go ahead was beyond the scope of the Board of Governors' authority.

This item will be brought back to the Board of Governors next month.

VI. Other Business / Action for Next Meeting
Tiffany Gravlee

Russ Beatty, the landscape architect who provided the landscape assessment for ARG in the original Hanna House Report, has submitted a proposal for the historic landscape survey, and proposed landscape alterations. In addition, he submitted an urgent letter in which he stated his concern that the recommendations in his previous report to remove the soil over the root crowns of the oak trees had not been carried out. He felt that the oak tree which fell might have been saved if this work had been done, and that the other oak remain endangered.

T. Portwood moved, P. Turner seconded, and all unanimously approved that this recommended work be carried out without delay, using the allotted maintenance funds from the Nissen Endowment (Please see Attachment B)

M. Fogel asked that the specifications of photodocumentation be discussed further in a future meeting.
June 24, 1994

Stanford University
Planning Office
855 Serra Street
Stanford, CA 94305-6115

Attn: Tiffany Gravlee

Re: Minutes of Board of Governors Meeting of June 2

Dear Tiffany:

I wonder if you could make one change in the second paragraph under IV of your minutes where you are referring to my concern about the University insuring gifts. The way that the minutes read results in expanding my suggestion about insurance beyond the point I had intended. What I meant to say, and the point I was trying to make, is this: the owner of a valuable property of a certain category who is considering making a gift of that property to the University with the expectation that the University desires to accept the gift and continue to own and maintain that property, ought to be reassured that some arrangements will be made to place that property in a category different from those University buildings which Stanford self-insures. So long as Stanford continues to self-insure against catastrophic loss from fire, earthquake etc., the donation of property in the category of the Hanna House should be accompanied by some insurance program. The insurance could be included in an endowment fund accompanying the gift, or the University could commit to the donor that the University will assume an obligation to insure the property as a condition of accepting the gift. The Hanna House is an obvious candidate for the special category because the type of loss that is the major concern, such as earthquake or fire, can be insured against, and the kind of damage that would be suffered in an earthquake or fire can be repaired. The same may or may not be true of a donation of valuable paintings. If the paintings were totally destroyed in a fire, they obviously could not be replaced by any amount of money. On the other hand if some canvases were damaged but not destroyed, by either earthquake or fire, it’s possible that they could be restored given the funds necessary to pay for the restoration. The point is that when something like the Hanna House is being given to the University, there should be a policy that says let’s look at this donation and see
whether it fits in the category where we should depart from the usual policy of self-insurance and see that this particular item is adequately insured, and will be adequately insured, before we agree to accept the gift. Gifts of that category should not have to be dependent upon future fund-raising campaigns in order to pay for repair and/or restoration.

I'm sure the foregoing is longer than you want to put in the minutes, but maybe you can boil it down somewhat and still make the point. Thank you for your consideration.

Cordially yours,

John Paul Hanna
June 27, 1994

Architectural Resources Group
Attn: Naomi Mirogho
Pier 9, The Embarcadero
San Francisco, CA 94111

Re: Tree Care at Hanna House, Stanford University

Dear Naomi,

On June 23rd I visited the Hanna House site in preparation for submitting a proposal for a landscape management plan. While there I inspected the trees for which I had reported and made recommendations in my portion of the Recommendations for Seismic Repair and Conservation of Historic Features Final Report, February 1991. As you know, one of the large Valley Oaks below the North Terrace wall has fallen due to crown rot. I am very concerned about the other tree at that location and, for that matter, all of the other oaks throughout the garden.

As far as I could tell, none of the recommendations contained in either report of Barrie Coate dated October 24, 1990 or the report of Ken Meyer of Mayne Tree Experts, dated May 12, 1991, have been implemented. As for the fallen oak, we recommended excavating and exposing the root crown to determine the extent of crown rot and damage from oak root fungus and to clean out infected tissue. Had that been accomplished, the seriousness of the decay that led to its falling might have been detected.

I believe there is an urgent need for the staff at Stanford to implement the recommendations contained in the Coate report and those by Meyer last May which corroborate the 1990 recommendations. This is especially critical for the oaks around the house. It would be a tragedy if other trees were lost due to buried root crowns, crown rot and undetected oak root fungus.

Therefore, I urge you to convey these concerns to the appropriate staff persons at Stanford and apprise them of the urgency relative to preserving these trees. I enclose a copy of the 1990 report of Barrie Coate. Although these recommendations relate to Item #2 in the RFP of 21 June, I will include further tree inspections and recommendations as a part of my proposal.

Sincerely,

Russell A. Beatty, ASLA
Landscape Architect

- Historic Restoration  - Horticulture  - Urban Forestry  - Vegetation Management
Date: 7/26/94
TO: Hanna House Bd of Gov Members
FROM: Tiffany Gravlee
COMMENTS: Please call Sue Harwood at 723-7773 if there are any questions.

Fax followed-up with:
- Paul Turner
- Marilyn Fogel
- Dean Gibbons
- Michael Hannan
- Rosemary Hornby
- Maggie Kimball
- Tim Harwood
- Bill Witscher
- John Hanna

855 Serra Street, Stanford, CA 94305-6115 • 415-723-3181 • FAX: 415-725-8598
Hanna House Board of Governors
Agenda
June 30, 1994
8:30 - 10:00 am
Hobby House at the Hanna House

I. Review of Minutes - June 2, 1994 (5 minutes) Please see Attachment A

Please review the Minutes from the Meeting of June 2, 1994 and raise any comments or concerns.

II. Report on Retaining Wall Project (15 min)
Olivier Pieron / Warren Jacobsen

1. Report on the findings of initial analysis.
2. Geotechnical exploration proposal.

III. Discussion of status of "Proposal for Use" (15 minutes)
Paul Turner

General discussion of the response, and identification of next steps.

IV. Caretaker / Curator / Resident Fellow (20 minutes)
Paul Turner

Discussion of options, and definition of responsibilities

V. Consultation with FEMA (15 minutes) →
Tiffany Gravlee

Update, and review of next steps.

VI. Other Business / Action for Next Meeting (5 minutes)
Hanna House Board of Governors
Minutes
June 2, 1994

Members Present: Paul Turner (Chair)
Marilyn Fogel
James Gibbons
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood

Members Absent: Michael Hannan
Bill Witscher

Others Present: Tiffany Gravlee, Planning Office Staff
John Paul Hanna, Guest
Warren Jacobsen, Project Manager
Mark Jones, Director of Facilities Project Management
Olivier Pieron, Project Manager

I. Review of Minutes - April 7, 1994 Please see Attachment #1

In section III.2. "Tree damage and grounds maintenance", the first sentence of the second paragraph should read as follows: "A crew was trimming the oak at the opposite end of the house during the Board of Governor's meeting, using ladders propped against the house, and on the house roof, to gain access to the roof."

II. Introduction of Mark Jones, Dir. of Facilities Project Management

D. Neuman introduced Mark Jones, who was previously the Campus Architect and Planner at the University of Southern California. At USC he was involved with the Freeman house (Frank Lloyd Wright) and the Gamble house (Greene & Greene, see previous survey), where he served on the Board of Directors. He mentioned that the Gamble house, donated in 1966, is maintained in a joint venture between the city and the university, has a well-developed program including a bookstore and visitors program.

III. Report on Project Status and Schedule

O. Pieron introduced W. Jacobsen, who is assisting in the management of the Hanna House retaining wall project. W. Jacobsen distributed a project schedule (Please see attachment #3)
M. Kimball expressed concern that a month might not be adequate to obtain a permit. M. Jones gave an overview of Facilities Project Management’s efforts to improve relations with the county, particularly with regard to project schedules, and confirmed that a month should be adequate.

T. Gravlee clarified that the first FEMA review is actually a meeting at one point in time, and the second is a review of 90% completed construction drawings.

The project has been divided into phases, with architectural fees for the first phase not to exceed $10,000. John Rutherford, of Rutherford and Chekene, is both a structural and civil engineer, with expertise in creative solutions for sensitive projects. The architect (Architectural Resource Group, Steve Farneth), will provide parameters for the structural solution, and will research the materials questions while the structural option is developed. O. Pieron did not believe that the architectural consultant fees for all phases would reach or exceed the previously proposed $60,000 fee.

IV. Discussion of status of "Proposal for Use"

P. Turner distributed copies of a draft response to President Casper's request for additional information, and read portions of Bill Witscher's letter dated May 27, 1994 which provided some background for the cost estimates in the draft (Please see Attachment #2). Discussion focused on several topics:

Insurance
The cost of insurance for the house has been estimated at approximately $35,000 a year for insurance at a $3,000,000 level with a 10% deductible ($300,000). When the question of "self-insurance" was raised, J. Hanna reiterated the concern that donors should be assured that their gifts to the University are insured; he feels that it should be a matter of policy that the University insures gifts.

M. Jones asked about liability insurance. D. Neuman believed that the University's general policy would cover the Hanna House, but this should be verified.

D. Neuman: our next step should be to get an appraisal of the house, and a revised version of the estimate based on the house after it is strengthened.

Cost Estimate
Concern was raised by J. Gibbons that the annual operating cost estimate was too low. Maintenance should be of the caliber of the Hoover House maintenance, rather than the Buck Estate maintenance. It was suggested that a revised operational maintenance plan based on the level of maintenance at the Hoover House, and with deferred maintenance divided out from on-going maintenance, would provide a more accurate estimate.
Resident Fellow / Caretaker

M. Kimball pointed out that the fellowship would have administrative costs associated with it, even if no stipend were included. T. Portwood suggested that it be made clear that the fellowship will be part of the fund raising effort for the house.

M. Jones: important to define the responsibilities of the resident fellow. Would this individual have maintenance responsibilities?

There was discussion regarding which department would sponsor the fellowship (the Art Department, Engineering, Provost's Office, etc.), concluding that it could be any of these.

The purposes of the fellowship were discussed: security, maintaining the residential character of the house, someone to call 911 in an emergency, someone to oversee maintenance, to see changes over time, etc. A question was raised with regard to a schedule for the resident fellow, so that the house would always be watched. However it was noted that the Provost was not always present in the house, and the housekeeper was only present during the day.

M. Jones noted that at the Gamble house, there was both a full-time curator who was present during the days, and two resident fellows (fifth-year graduate students in the architecture department) who lived in the house.

It was agreed that this issue should be the focus of another meeting, and that the letter to the President should state that we are investigating whether the position should be a resident fellow, or a full time caretaker or curator.

V. Arborist's report

T. Gravlee briefly discussed the arborists report, in B. Witscher's absence. Generally the trees were considered healthy but need maintenance, with the exception of a Bailey acacia tree between the driveway and Frenchmans Road which has died and needs to be removed. The report also recommended that the root crowns of the oaks and a few other trees be exposed. D. Neuman suggested that a historic survey of the landscaping be combined with the arborists report, and an action plan with cost estimates be generated based on the two documents.

VI. Estimate for pool removal

T. Gravlee reported in B. Witscher's absence (Please see attachment #2). There had been no reported unauthorized use of the pool. The cost for removing the pool, based on costs at the Buck Estate, was between $30,000 and $40,000, with an additional $5,000 - $30,000 for relandscaping the area.

TLG, Planning Office
June 20, 1994
P. Turner asked what landscaping had previously been in the location of the pool. J. Hanna remembered a garden, and confirmed M. Fogel's comment that there had been fruit trees there.

P. Turner suggested that the decision regarding the relandscaping of the pool area wait until the historic landscape survey has been completed.

J. Gibbons expressed concern that the options for removal or filling of the pool and the use of the site be further reviewed.

VII. Consultation with FEMA

D. Neuman explained that the house and the wall would be reviewed separately. FEMA is willing to reconsider the funding for the Hanna House, so we should try to review the house project with them as soon as possible. The structural engineer will review the two structural designs for the house, and the schemes will be brought back to this group.

VIII. Other Business / Action for Next Meeting

Rose Guntly in Facilities Maintenance found the door to the storage area in the back of the garage open, and a collection of ceramic tiles inside. M. Fogel and J. Hanna confirmed that this was probably a collection of the Hannas. The collection has been boxed, and is currently in storage at the Stanford Facilities Maintenance offices; M. Fogel suggested that the collection be catalogued and kept in a secure location at the Hanna House until the rehabilitation, since some of the tiles match those in the bathrooms in the house, and might be used as replacements.

TLC, Planning Office
June 20, 1994
DATE: June 20, 1994

TO: Hanna House Board of Governors*

FROM: Tiffany Gravlee

SUBJECT: Hanna House Board of Governors June 30, 1994 Agenda

Dear Colleagues:

Enclosed please find the agenda for the meeting of June 30, 1994, with attachments. Please review the minutes of our last meeting of June 2, 1994, and bring any corrections you may have. The meeting will begin at 8:30 AM, and will be held at the Hobby House at the Hanna House.

Thank you

Marilyn Fogel
James Gibbons
Michael Hannan
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood
Paul Turner
William Witscher

CC: Gerhard Casper
John Paul Hanna
Mark Jones
Olivier Pieron/ Warren Jacobsen
Academic Secretary
Resident Fellow / Caretaker / Curator Options

I. Resident Fellow (graduate student)

Graduate student lives in studio apartment in the lower level of the Hobby House.

Responsibilities:

1. Being present, and alerting Facilities Maintenance and Public Safety when absent for more than an evening.
2. checklist of items to keep an eye on, alert Facilities Maintenance of any problems
3. Educational benefits

Costs:

- administration
- time of someone to coordinate use of the house
- operating maintenance.

Benefits:

- educational use of house, in keeping with donor's wishes
- security of someone there at night
- oversight of use and maintenance
- residential use of house
- upper level of Hobby House free for meetings

II. Live-in caretaker

Full time caretaker would live in the house. Would probably need to use the entire Hobby House, rather than the downstairs studio only.

Responsibilities:

1. Being present, and alerting Facilities Maintenance and Public Safety when absent for more than an evening.
2. Some maintenance of the house and grounds.
3. Alerting Facilities Maintenance or hiring a contractor for more extensive / specialized work
4. Coordinate set-up and clean-up for events at the house.

Costs:

- administration
- salary
- loss of use of the upper room of the Hanna House for meetings
Benefits:
- security of someone there at night
- oversight of use and maintenance
- residential use of house

III. Curator / Caretaker

Full-time curator / caretaker would work 8:00 - 5:00 in an office at the house (probably the Hobby House studio)

Responsibilities:
1. Being present during the day, and to coordinate evening events
2. Overseeing maintenance of the house and grounds.
3. Alerting Facilities Maintenance or hiring a contractor for more extensive / specialized work
4. Coordinate set-up and clean-up for events at the house.

Costs:
- administration
- salary

Benefits:
- oversight of use and maintenance
- specialist or expert
- upper level of Hobby House free for meetings
## Hanna House Caretaker Cost/Benefit Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Live-in Resident Fellow</th>
<th>Live-in Caretaker</th>
<th>Day-time Curator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BENEFITS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site days</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site nights</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational use</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perform maint.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversee maint.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep resid. use</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversee events</td>
<td>+-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COSTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaried</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space need</td>
<td>+-</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project Schedule

**Project No. 6110**

**HANNA HOUSE RETAINING WALL STABILIZATION / RESTORATION**

| ID | Name                                      | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov |
|----|-------------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1  | REVIEW/SELECT STRUCTURAL ENGINEER         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 2  | DEVELOP/GATHER INFORMATION FOR S.E.       |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 3  | DEV. DESIGN CRITERIA ENG/G CONCEPTS       |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 4  | INVESTIGATE HISTORIC FAB. MATERIALS       |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 5  | DEV. STRUC. ENGINEERING CONCEPTS          |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 6  | REVIEW DESIGN CONCEPTS                    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 7  | FEMA REVIEW                               |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 8  | CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS                     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 9  | FEMA REVIEW                               |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 10 | PLANS / REVIEW / BUILDING PERMIT           |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 11 | BID / NEGOTIATION                         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 12 | CONSTRUCTION                              |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |

**Critical Milestone**

**Noncritical**

**Summary**

**Progress**

ARG - architects

Civil engineering firm hired to review area

John Rutherford - structural engineer (also a civil engineer).

---

**Project:**

**Date:** 6/1/94
June 23, 1994

TO: Hanna House Board of Governors

FROM: Olivier Pieron, Project Manager
Facilities Project Management

RE: Work at the Hanna House, 737 Frenchmans Road

This is a note to notify the Hanna House Board of Governors of some minor earthwork which will be occurring along Frenchman's Road at the Hanna House property next week. Our structural engineers for the rehabilitation of the Hanna House retaining walls have confirmed this week that we need to verify the location of two tunnels which may run under or nearby the House, before they can proceed with their design. Members of Stanford's Geology department would also like to investigate the tunnels for evidence of the Frenchman's Fault, which may run close to or under the House. I apologize for the late notice, but because the project is on a tight schedule in order to reinforce the walls before the next rainy season, we would like to expedite this exploratory work.

The work is currently scheduled to take place on Tuesday or Wednesday of next week, June 28th or 29th. It will likely involve the use of a small back-hoe to uncover the entrances to the caves which are on the hillside above Frenchmans Road and below the driveway (John Paul Hanna helped to identify the probable location of the entrances at the site earlier this week). The entrances will be secured from unauthorized entry while they are open. We currently plan to re-seal the entries after our engineers have documented them, and members of the Geology department have investigated them.

This work will be discussed in greater detail at the next Board of Governors meeting. If you have any questions or concerns before then, please do not hesitate to call me at 723-3185, or you may call Tiffany Gravlee at 725-3734.
cc: Tiffany Gravlee  
     John Paul Hanna  
     Mark Jones  
     David Neuman

Print requested by CN.MJK on 06/23/94 at 18:40:38 from CN.MJK's message file.
Hanna House Board of Governors
Agenda
June 2, 1994
8:30 - 10:00 am
Hobby House at the Hanna House

I. Review of Minutes - April 7, 1994 (5 minutes) Please see Attachment #1

Please review the Minutes from the Meeting of April 7, 1994 and raise any comments or concerns.

II. Introduction of Mark Jones, Dir. of Facilities Project Management (10 minutes)
David Neuman

III. Discussion of status of "Proposal for Use" (15 minutes)
Paul Turner

General discussion of the response, and identification of next steps.

IV. Arborist's report (15 minutes)
Rep. from Facilities Maintenance

Report and discussion of next steps.

V. Estimate for pool removal (10 minutes) $30,000 - $40,000
Rep. from Facilities Maintenance $5,000 - $10,000 for landscaping

Complete removal Cost of just filling up in 3 years

VI. Report on Project Status and Schedule (15 minutes)
Olivier Pieron

VII. Consultation with FEMA (10 minutes)
David Neuman

Discussion of next steps.

VIII. Other Business / Action for Next Meeting (5 minutes)

TLC, Planning Office
May 31, 1994
June 1, 1994

To: Gerhard Casper
    President’s Office

From: Paul V. Turner
    Art Department

Re: Proposal for Use of the Hanna House

Dear Gerhard:

In response to your letter of March, 1994, I would like to provide the following clarifications to our draft Proposal for Use for the Hanna House:

The Board of Governors voiced in the Proposal for Use that the house should be utilized for "...various kinds of University functions, including receptions, dinners, conferences and other kinds of meetings, if the numbers of people involved are relatively small and the activities pose no threat of damage to the house or its furnishings." This function would be very similar to the usage of the house for entertainment while the Provost lived there, only with increased access to the facilities for small conferences and other meetings, since the house would not be used as a residence and would be available for a greater portion of the day. We envision a usage similar to the current use of the Buck Estate.

According to an estimate from Facilities Maintenance, the annual cost of maintenance and insurance for the house, once repaired, would be on the order of $100,000 (in 1994 dollars). To cover this cost, the endowment principle needs to be $1,900,000; as of March, 1993, the market value of the endowment fund was $1,870,000. Thus the endowment is currently in the neighborhood to support our required level of maintenance and insurance once we get the House back into operation. We expect to obtain a more recent evaluation of the endowment value in the Fall.

The cost of the caretaker is not included in this estimate. We are proposing that the caretaker be a fellowship position which offers the opportunity to a graduate student to live in, and study, the Hanna House. This approach has been used successfully at the Greene and Greene Gamble House, owned by the University of Southern California. The student would live in the small studio apartment below the Hobby House, and would not prevent use of the main room of the Hobby House above. The primary benefit of the fellowship is expected to be residence in the Hanna House, rather than a large stipend.

With your endorsement of the Proposal for Use, we can conduct further analysis of specific capital and operating costs; and identify whether a slight increase in the endowment will be necessary. However, at this time it appears that the endowment is adequate to cover the expected maintenance and insurance costs.
May 4, 1994

To: Hanna House Board of Governors

From: Tiffany Gravlee

RE: Board of Governors meeting cancelled

Dear Colleagues,

Due to a lack of information to report and act on at this time and a conflict with Gerhard Casper's Management Forum, tomorrow's Hanna House Board of Governors is being cancelled. We expect this to be a busy month, and the agenda for the next meeting on June 2 to be very full, with action required on a number of items.

The new Director of Facilities Project Management, Mark Jones, will also be introduced; he comes to us from USC, where he served on the Board of Directors for the Gamble house.

Project management would like to report that the architect's contract for the retaining wall portion of the project has been successfully negotiated, and the architects are commencing work. Olivier Pieron will report on the project schedule and give an update at the next meeting.

Tiffany

Print requested by CN.MJK on 05/04/94 at 10:03:10 from CN.MJK's message file.
Hanna House Board of Governors
Minutes
April 7, 1994

Members Present: Paul Turner (Chair)
Marilyn Fogel
Michael Hannan
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood

Members Absent: James Gibbons
Bill Witscher

Others Present: Tiffany Gravlee, Planning Office Staff
John Paul Hanna, Guest
Olivier Pieron, Project Manager

I. Review of Minutes - March 4, 1994

T. Portwood requested that the word "can" be changed to "should" to more accurately reflect the decision made regarding the pool, in section V., first paragraph: "T. Portwood moved that the pool which had been added after the Hannas turned the house over to the university in 1975 is not historically significant, and should be removed." See Attachment A

II. Discussion of Pres. Casper's response to "Proposal for Use"

President Casper is requesting further information regarding the proposal for use. In specific, he is concerned that the building be available for university use, and that the endowment will be sufficient to cover operating costs and insurance for the house. In response, the Board needs to provide 1) an estimate of what the endowment would need to be to cover these costs, and 2) an executive summary which clearly outlines both the proposed use, and the costs. It was suggested that Bill Witscher, together with Tim Warner, prepare an estimate of the necessary increase in the endowment.

III. Report on Project Status and Schedule

1. FEMA may reconsider their level of funding for the Hanna House: Randolph Langenbach at FEMA has offered to reconsider the cost of the repair for the Hanna House. The amount has not yet been determined
D. Neuman: The cost for the first structural scheme (rebuilding the fireplaces) was on the order of $2.7 million, and the cost of the second structural scheme (core-drilling the fireplaces and using steel trusses to strengthen) was on the order of $2 million. At this point, FEMA has offered approximately $500 - 600K. It is this amount that they are willing to reconsider. We will meet with them again as soon as we have a schematic design that we are ready to discuss with them.

2. Tree damage and grounds maintenance
One of the large oak trees at the living room terrace has fallen since the last Board of Governor's meeting, due to an interior fungal rot which had not been previously detected by the arborist. The rot was likely due to the watered lawn which surrounds the base of the tree. A section of the security fence had been removed after the oak tree had fallen on it, and had not yet been replaced.

A crew was trimming the oak at the opposite end of the house during the Board of Governors meeting, using ladders propped against the house to gain access to the roof. There was strong concern among the Board members that damage to the house might be occurring, and that the Board should have known about this work before it happened.

In order to better handle such situations in the future, the Board requested that:

1) An up-to-date arborist’s report on the grounds and condition of all of the trees, with recommendations for maintaining the oaks and any other imperiled trees or shrubs shall be presented to the Board for action (preferably at the next Board of Governor's meeting).

2) The Board shall be alerted of any significant grounds work, and be notified before any action is taken (i.e. before any tree is removed, or trees over the house are limbed).

3) Any crew working on the premises shall be alerted to the significance and precarious condition of the house. Such crews shall avoid contact with house, or notify the Board if contact is unavoidable, before performing the work.

3. Report on the Retaining Wall project:
O. Pieron: We will be hiring another structural engineer to give a second opinion on the strengthening of the retaining wall, and this scheme will then be presented to the historic reviewers.

TLG, Planning Office
May 27, 1994
Steve Farneth, of Architectural Resource Group (ARG), and Martin Weil, were selected among the four architectural teams interviewed shortly after the earthquake. ARG's fee proposal for the work on the retaining walls was too high ($60,000, not including structural consultant fees). Steve and Martin prepared the original report on the damage at the Hanna House, are highly regarded for their preservation work, and are known and respected by the SHPO and the Advisory Council. The fee for this part of their work will be negotiated before considering other options.

IV. Other Business / Action for Next Meeting

Pool:
D. Neuman: the pool at the Buck Estate is currently being removed. We may want to consider removing the pool at the Hanna House now as well. T. Portwood: if the pool is a liability, then there may be another funding source for removing it. To help inform this decision, the Board needs to see: 1) a report on any unauthorized use of the pool, and 2) the cost of removing the pool.

Motion approved: the Hanna House Board of Governors requests from Facilities Maintenance 1) any record of unauthorized use of the pool, and 2) a cost estimate for the removal, regrading, and landscaping of the pool area. This motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

J. Hanna: proposed the alternative of filling the pool, rather than removing it.

Term of office for Board of Governors:
A question was raised regarding the term of office served. The positions, according to the initial invitation from the President, are representative of various offices (the letter from Casper indicates the term to be two years in length; the current term ending May, 1995).
DATE: May 27, 1994

TO: Hanna House Board of Governors*

FROM: Tiffany Gravlee

SUBJECT: Hanna House Board of Governors June 2, 1994 Agenda

Dear Colleagues:

Enclosed please find the agenda for the meeting of June 2, 1994, with attachments. Please review the minutes of our last meeting of April 7, 1994, and bring any corrections you may have. The meeting will begin at 8:30 AM, and will be held at the Hobby House at the Hanna House.

Thank you

* Marilyn Fogel
James Gibbons
Michael Hannan
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood
Paul Turner
William Witscher

CC: Gerhard Casper
John Paul Hanna
Mark Jones
Olivier Pieron/ Warren Jacobsen
Academic Secretary
I. **Review of Minutes - March 4, 1994** (5 minutes) *Please see Attachment #1*

Please review the Minutes from the Meeting of March 4, 1994 and raise any comments or concerns.

II. **Discussion of Pres. Casper's response to "Proposal for Use"** (30 minutes)

Paul Turner

Paul will draft response to Casper's response.

General discussion of the response, and identification of next steps.

III. **Report on Project Status and Schedule** (20 minutes)

David Neuman

1. FEMA may reconsider their level of funding for the Hanna House
2. Tree damage - tree fell, root at core, probably due to lawn around base.
3. Project Management

IV. **Other Business / Action for Next Meeting** (5 minutes)

*Handwritten notes:*
- Present endorsement needs to be increased
- Source of income - tours?
- Architectural proposal is very high - Architectural Review Group
- Scope of work must be reviewed
- Olivier - may be supervising another program, who will supervise project
- Funding authorization for work on retaining wall received

TLC, Planning Office
March 31, 1994
Hanna House Board of Governors
Minutes
January 27, 1994

Members Present:  Paul Turner (Chair)
                 Marilyn Fogel
                 James Gibbons
                 Michael Hannan
                 Rosemary Hornby
                 David Neuman
                 Tim Portwood
                 Bill Witscher

Members Absent:  Maggie Kimball

Others Present:  Tiffany Gravlee, Planning Office Staff
                 John Paul Hanna, Guest
                 Olivier Pieron, Facilities Project Manager

I.  Introductions
    Paul Turner introduced Olivier Pieron, Project Manager for the Hanna
    House retaining walls project.

II.  Review of Minutes - Dec. 9, 1993

    Approved in original form.

III. Discussion of "Proposal for Use"
     Paul Turner

    Discussion of draft "Proposal for Use of the Hanna House." The draft was
    written by Paul Turner, and was reviewed by the subgroup assisting with
    this effort.

    There was discussion about whether the issue of who would manage
    the house should be brought up in the body of the proposal for use, or in
    the cover letter, as an issue for further consideration. Generally, it was
    considered better to keep the use issue separate from other issues such as
    management, parking and shuttle service, and other logistical issues.

    J. Gibbons voiced the concern that uses might be too restricted by current
    wording in the proposal about not moving furniture. The group generally
agreed that specifying "low intensity uses" would be more appropriate. Specific language about tours should also be limited, as the number and frequency of tours at the house has yet to be determined.

J. Hanna asked whether the proposed use for the house would constitute a "change in use" which the County or neighbors might legally oppose.

D. Neuman: this shouldn't be a problem with the County, as the neighborhood is within the General Use Permit area of campus. The campus residential lots are all leaseholds, with a mix of private residences and some student residence leaseholds, so although the leaseholders should be informed and consulted, the University ultimately has jurisdiction in the use of the land. In any case, the use won't really be changing significantly, as a graduate student fellow or caretaker will still be in residence. The proposal for use should be sent to the Stanford Campus Residential Leaseholders Group as well as to Pres. Casper. Their concern will likely be with parking. The President and Provost are aware that the proposal for use is coming, and know its general content, so it is not inappropriate for the leaseholders to also receive a copy at this time. The Provost has indicated that she does not wish to live at the Hanna House, but is concerned that there be the option of a residence for future Provosts. This might be the Lake House, or possibly even the Buck Estate.

B. Witscher noted that the proposal for use should be presented to the Stanford Campus Residential Leaseholders Group as soon as possible, as they will be meeting soon.

The proposal for use, as amended at the meeting, was unanimously approved by the Board members. Please see Attachment A

IV. Report on History of Development Efforts for Hanna House

D. Neuman: The Getty Trust had been contacted by the Office of Development and Don Kennedy, but that the amount of funding to be gained was not worth the amount of time spent to secure it, and the amount of constraint to the project associated with it. They were contacted more recently, but indicated that funding for the Hanna House was not likely.

Earthquake Restoration is a high priority University fundraising objective, and Hanna House is included within that objective. However, other projects (such as Quad corners, Green Library West, and the Museum) have a higher relative priority. In any event, it is not feasible for us to begin fundraising for Hanna House until the three "pending questions" (Please see Attachment B) are answered. Once they are, we can proceed as outlined in Attachment B.
Fundraising may include augmenting the endowment for maintenance of the house, insurance, and possibly a fellowship for a live-in graduate student.

Some donors will be very concerned with the preservation philosophy used for the rehabilitation. The philosophy will need to address at least three issues: 1) the level of structural strengthening, 2) the point in time to which the house will be restored, and 3) the specific conservation points, as mentioned by the Taliesin Fellowship, the Hannas, etc.

V. Report on Nissan Endowment and Maintenance Needs
Bill Witscher

Nissan Endowment:
The accrued interest on the Nissan fund is currently at approximately $184K. Another $115K - $118K should accrue this year. The budget last year was set at $35K, the year before was $27K, and the year before that was $20K. The annual budget includes general maintenance and cleaning as well as inspection for termites and other such damage. Bruce Wiggins estimated that maintenance for light usage of the house may be approximately $60K / year. The current endowment is adequate to pay $80K / year.

Over half of the current maintenance cost is for grounds and pool maintenance. The pool may cost as much as $10K per year to maintain. It would likely cost less than $10K to remove. John P. Hanna noted that the pool was not designed by F.L. Wright, nor installed by the Hanna family. The issue of the pool will be considered with other "preservation philosophy" items.

Insurance:
The house is essentially uninsurable in its unrepaired state. Once repaired, it will either be considered either a residence or a work of art for the purposes of insurance. Likely a $200K - $300K deductible (10%) would apply, with a $35K /year premium. This will need to be considered further.

D. Neuman: The level of structural strengthening will affect the insurance rates, as well as how much damage will occur in the next earthquake.

VI. Report on Project Status and Schedule
Olivier Pieron

O. Pieron has been a project manager at Stanford for twelve years, and has managed the Memorial Church restoration, the Gates building, and the
Museum restoration. He should be receiving a proposal from the Architectural Resource Group architectural firm next week. He expects two to three months of design, including architectural, civil, and landscape work; one to two months to secure a permit; and construction in June or July, which will take approximately two to three months.

D. Neuman: the FEMA historic review is a wild card, and may upset the schedule.

J. Hanna asked what would happen there were insufficient funds to complete the project.

T. Portwood: two options if project can’t be scaled back:
1) Borrow against Nissan endowment
2) Potential donors may respond to urgent and specific need

VII. **Other Business / Action for Next Meeting**
David Neuman

Next meeting: review conservation issues -
1) level of structural strengthening
2) date to which to restore the building
3) specific conservation issues

T. Portwood will bring a video of the 1989 Meyer May House restoration to the next meeting
Hanna House Board of Governors
Minutes
March 4, 1994

Members Present: Paul Turner (Chair)
Marilyn Fogel
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood
Bill Witscher

Members Absent: James Gibbons
Michael Hannan
Rosemary Hornby

Others Present: Tiffany Gravlee, Planning Office Staff
John Paul Hanna, Guest

I. Review of Minutes - Jan. 27, 1994  Please see Attachment A for revised text

D. Neuman, rather than T. Portwood, was responsible for the first paragraph of section IV. "Report on History of Development Efforts for Hanna House" regarding previous fundraising efforts with the Getty Trust. T. Portwood asked that the word "should" in the third paragraph be changed to "may", and requested that the second paragraph be substituted with the following:

"Earthquake Restoration is a high priority University fundraising objective, and Hanna House is included within that objective. However, other projects (such as Quad corners, Green Library West, and the Museum) have a higher relative priority. In any event, it is not feasible for us to begin fundraising for Hanna House until the three "pending questions" (Please see Attachment B) are answered. Once they are, we can proceed as outlined in Attachment B."  See original meeting minutes of Jan. 27, 1994 for Attachments.

II. Report on "Proposal for Use"
P. Turner reported that he had not yet received a response from Gerhard Casper regarding the proposed use. D. Neuman noted that Provost Rice is concerned that a residence be available, if desired, for the future Provost; the Lake House is one possibility for this use.

III. Video: the Meyer May House Restoration

The Meyer May house was carefully restored to "museum quality" as a place for company entertainment uses and public tours; the half-hour video was funded by Steelcase. The roof structure of the house was rebuilt using steel in place of...
wood framing. Bricks were saved and used to rebuild some portions of the house where the steel columns were hidden inside of brick piers. This craftsman/Prairie style house contains highly crafted details (stained glass, cast metal work, carpets, etc.), and a brick pier structure which differs from the innovative structure and straightforward details of the Usonian houses, such as the Hanna House.

IV. Discussion of Preservation Philosophy

D. Neuman: The two structural schemes which have been investigated at this point are:

Scheme 1: "Umbrella"
All of the chimneys would be rebuilt over new footings with new brick, and the frame structure would be supported by them without the need for extensive bracing in addition to the fireplaces. In this solution, the fireplaces would essentially be replicas, and sections of the concrete double-slab floor would have to be replaced to pour the footings (sections of wall adjacent to the fireplaces would also likely be disturbed). This scheme replicates historic fabric rather than preserving it.

Scheme 2: "Steel Cage"
Core drill the chimneys to support their own weight (as the structural design evolves, it may be possible for them to carry additional building weight as well). Steel columns would be inserted as unobtrusively as possible, in restrooms, closets, or behind built-in bookcases. Most of the supports would be hidden, and those which would be visible could be detailed to be compatible with the hexagonal design of the building. One steel member on the roof would likely be visible from the Hobby House. Where earthquake-damaged brick needs to be replaced, it could either be made to match the existing brick and carefully documented, or allowed to look slightly different, and thus identified as earthquake repair. This scheme preserves the most original fabric intact, and allows for "reversibility," so that the steel supports could be removed in the future and replaced by some new strengthening technology.1

Both of these schemes preserve life safety and should keep the building from collapsing. The use of the building (residential, tours, or meetings) may affect the level of seismic strengthening, and other code requirements.

Use may also affect what level of preservation is desirable - if the building is used for educating about architecture, or preservation, then a higher level of preservation ("restoration," such as at the Meyer May house) may be desired; however if the building is used primarily for university meetings and

1 J. Hanna's memorandum of 3/7/94 to the Hanna House file also describes the discussion of the alternatives, and will be included with the minutes in the Hanna House Board of Governor's file.
entertaining, "restoration" is less important, and a moderate "preservation" or "rehabilitation" would be appropriate. In any case, M. Kimball pointed out that documentation of the changes made would be very important. The "Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, 1992," (the Standards) defines these terms and outlines the standards for each level of treatment.

T. Gravlee briefly explained the Standards for Rehabilitation, which will be used by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and the National Advisory Council for Historic Preservation when they review the design for the Hanna House (see the agenda package for the March 4, 1994 meeting for excerpts). The Standards for Rehabilitation emphasize retaining historic fabric, and making changes which are reversible.

Motion approved: P. Turner moved that, based on the information currently available, and on the Standards for Rehabilitation, the Hanna House Board of Governors thinks that the structural scheme 2 ("steel cage") is the appropriate direction to pursue. This motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

V. Other Business / Action for Next Meeting

Motion approved: T. Portwood moved that the pool which had been added after the Hannas turned the house over to the university in 1975 is not historically significant, and can be removed. This motion was seconded and unanimously approved. However a motion was not made to actually remove the pool at this time.

The questions was raised by P. Turner whether the Hannas had wanted to return to the copper roof that was part of Wright's original design. J. Hanna didn't remember their wanting to put the copper roof back, but knew that they had the original copper roof removed and replaced with a built-up roof because the roof had leaked badly. The copper roof had been difficult to maintain.

M. Fogel remembered the Hannas wanting to put the copper roof back, but with vertical standing seams as shown in Wright's drawings, rather than with the horizontal seams which had been installed. D. Neuman noted that the horizontal seams had been installed "backward", such that leaking was very likely. The cost of a new copper roof is considerable, and warrants additional discussion.

P. Turner pointed out that some flexibility is warranted with regards to preserving the house as it was in 1975, since the copper roof had been removed prior to that time, but it still may be desirable to reinstall it.
DATE: March 31, 1994

TO: Hanna House Board of Governors*

FROM: Tiffany Gravlee

SUBJECT: Hanna House Board of Governors April 7, 1994 Agenda

Dear Colleagues:

Enclosed please find the agenda for the meeting of April 7, 1994, with attachments. Please review the minutes of our last meeting of March 4, 1994, and bring any corrections you may have. The meeting will begin at 8:30 AM, and will be held at the Hobby House at the Hanna House.

Thank you

Marilyn Fogel
James Gibbons
Michael Hannan
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood
Paul Turner
William Witscher

CC: President Casper
John Paul Hanna
Olivier Pieron
Academic Secretary
STANFORD UNIVERSITY MEMORANDUM

1 February 1994

To: Gerhard Casper  
   President's Office

From: Paul V. Turner  
   Art Department

Re: Proposal for use of the Hanna House

Dear Gerhard,

As chair of the Hanna House Board of Governors, I am sending you a statement we have just formulated, regarding the future use of the house.

It recently became evident to us (especially after consulting with a couple of architectural-preservation experts) that we cannot make a determination about the full structural restoration of the Hanna House until decisions about the use of the building are made. Following discussion of the question, we have drafted the proposal enclosed here, which has the unanimous endorsement of the board.

Related to the issue of the use of the house, of course, is the matter of how it will ultimately be governed and managed. We have discussed this, but we feel that it should be kept separate, for the time being, from the question of the building's use. The board members have asked me to communicate to you, however, our general recommendation that the day-to-day management of the Hanna House (once it is restored) be handled by an appropriate office of the University, but that overall supervision should continue to be vested in a board of governors, concerned with the architectural preservation of the building and the donors' wishes.

Just let me know if you wish additional information or clarification about any of the points in our proposal for use.

Cordially yours,

cc: David Neuman
PROPOSAL FOR USE OF THE HANNA HOUSE

The Hanna House Board of Governors, in deliberating on the repair and restoration of the house, has addressed the question of its future use. After consultation with experts in architectural preservation and a member of the Hanna family, we have formulated the following guidelines.

The principal goal should be to preserve the Hanna House as one of the great architectural works of Frank Lloyd Wright, and to make it accessible to faculty, students and others for study and inspiration. We feel that it should be made available for appropriate, low-intensity uses by the University, but that it should not be used as a full-time residence.

We believe that the house should be restored and preserved, as much as possible, in its form as Wright designed it and the Hannas lived in it. The clients' life in the house is especially important, in this case, because Wright conceived the building with the intention that it would evolve as the Hannas' needs changed, and because the Hannas conferred closely with Wright over the years about their use of the house. To an unusual degree, the architectural significance of this building involves the clients and their relationship with the architect. In this regard, we feel that it is important to preserve as much as possible the original furnishings of the house, especially those that were designed or approved by Wright.

The Hanna House can play an important educational role, both within the University, through visits by classes and seminars, and for the larger community, through public tours. This will continue the tradition begun by the Hannas themselves, who welcomed visitors and enjoyed explaining the house to them -- a function later served by the Hanna House docents (from the Committee for Art), who led tours of the building when it was used as the Provost's residence. These activities have the potential of generating increased interest in the house, and in the University at a whole, among Bay Area residents and visitors from elsewhere. In this regard, a link between the activities of the Hanna House and those of the Stanford Museum may be appropriate.

The house should also be used, we believe, for various kinds of University functions, provided that they do not conflict with the preservation of the building and its architectural character. These functions could include receptions, dinners, conferences and other kinds of meetings, if the numbers of people involved are relatively small and the activities pose no threat of damage to the house or its furnishings. Another possible use would be small chamber-music concerts, which were a favorite activity of the Hannas themselves. Events involving larger numbers of people than are appropriate inside the house might be held on the terraces and other outdoor areas.
It might also be appropriate to use the house occasionally for the short-term lodging (one or two nights) of special visitors to the University. This would provide such visitors a unique experience of Wright's architecture, and would perpetuate, to some degree, the original function of the building as a residence.

To aid in the security of the Hanna House and its grounds, we believe it is necessary to have a live-in caretaker or guardian. This person should reside in the studio apartment on the lower level of the Hobby House (the separate structure east of the main house). It might be possible to create a fellowship, allowing a graduate student in the University to assume this position as Hanna House guardian. If this student had a special interest in architecture, he or she might also be involved in the docent activities for the house, or in research projects related to the building.

The activities proposed above, we believe, are appropriate to the architectural preservation and integrity of the Hanna House, would maximize its accessibility to scholars and visitors, and would allow for other uses by the University. These proposals also are compatible with the Hannas' intentions. Paul and Jean Hanna's original wish was that the house be used "as a center for teaching and research in architecture and art." When discouraged in this intention by the University administration, the Hannas conceived the idea of housing distinguished visiting faculty in the building. The uses proposed here, we think, combine the most feasible aspects of the Hannas' own intentions, and will ensure the preservation of this architectural masterpiece in a manner benefiting the University.

Hanna House Board of Governors
January, 1994
I. Review of Minutes - Jan. 27, 1994 (5 minutes) Please see Attachment #1

Please review the Minutes from the Meeting of January 27, 1994 and raise any comments or concerns.

II. Report on "Proposal for Use" (10 minutes)
Paul Turner

III. Video: the Meyer May House Restoration (20 minutes)

IV. Discussion of Preservation Philosophy (35 minutes)
David Neuman / Tiffany Gravlee

1. Level of Structural Repair
2. Date to Which to Restore the Building
3. Preservation Issues (Please see Attachment #2, see also minutes from 11/2/93)

V. Report on Project Status and Schedule (5 minutes)
Tiffany Gravlee

VI. Other Business / Action for Next Meeting (10 minutes)
David Neuman

- Buck documentation
- Copper roof issue - ok records
Hanna House Board of Governors
January 27, 1993

Summary of Fundraising Activities to Date

Funds Raised

* $29,100 from 9 donors (12 gifts)
* $25,000 from 1 anonymous donor, $2,000 from Ntl Trust for Hist Pres
* All funds have been spent (architectural, engineering, testing)

Previous Contacts

* Getty Trust
* Thomas Monaghan (philanthropy refocused on parish churches)
* S. C. Johnson Wax Co. (maintain their headquarters building)
* Johnson Foundation (maintain their headquarters at Wingspread)
* Whirlpool (underwrote traveling FIW exhibit in 1989-90)
* Steelcase (restored/maintain Meyer May house in Grand Rapids)
* Domino’s Pizza (focus on Monaghan collection/museum in Ann Arbor)
* FIW Bldg Conservancy Assn (don’t make grants; may help strategize)
* FIW Home & Studio Fdn (focus on Oak Park home & neighborhood)
* Kohler Co (supported travelling exhibit; give in Wisconsin only)
* Lois Gottlieb (has made four small annual gifts since meeting DN)
* FIW Foundation

Potential Prospects (for money and/or help)

* Previous Donors
* Samuel Johnson
* Stanford architecture alumni
* Provosts who have lived in Hanna House
* Nissan (provided maintenance endowment in 1977)
* Other Japanese companies
* Miscellaneous individuals suggested from time to time
* Docents/other "Friends of the Hanna House"
* Any mailing lists of those who have toured in the past?
* Phillips Petroleum (hq's bldg in Tulsa is by FIW)
* American Institute of Architects
* Stanford Historical Society; Palo Alto Stanford Heritage (PAST)
* George M. Goodwin, PhD (has corresponded with John Paul Hanna)
* J. Irwin Miller (architectural patron in Columbus, Indiana)

Pending Questions Affecting Fundraising (goal, strategy, prospects)

* How will the house will be used?
* What will be the operative restoration philosophy?
* What will the project cost be? (FEMA Contribution?)

Once these questions are answered, we can:

* define our fundraising goal
* seek a higher priority within overall University objectives
* enlist the assistance of the President, Provost, and OOD
* develop and implement a fundraising plan
Hanna House Board of Governors
Minutes
January 27, 1994

Members Present:  
Paul Turner (Chair)
Marilyn Fogel
James Gibbons
Michael Hannan
Rosemary Hornby
David Neuman
Tim Portwood
Bill Witscher

Members Absent:  
Maggie Kimball

Others Present:  
Tiffany Gravlee, Planning Office Staff
John Paul Hanna, Guest
Olivier Pieron, Facilities Project Manager

I. Introductions
Paul Turner introduced Olivier Pieron, Project Manager for the Hanna House retaining walls project.

II. Review of Minutes - Dec. 9, 1993
Approved in original form.

III. Discussion of "Proposal for Use"
Paul Turner
Discussion of draft "Proposal for Use of the Hanna House." The draft was written by Paul Turner, and was reviewed by the subgroup assisting with this effort.

There was discussion about whether the issue of who would manage the house should be brought up in the body of the proposal for use, or in the cover letter, as an issue for further consideration. Generally, it was considered better to keep the use issue separate from other issues such as management, parking and shuttle service, and other logistical issues.

J. Gibbons voiced the concern that uses might be too restricted by current wording in the proposal about not moving furniture. The group generally

Minutes prepared by T. Gravlee, Planning Office,
February 25, 1994
agreed that specifying "low intensity uses" would be more appropriate. Specific language about tours should also be limited, as the number and frequency of tours at the house has yet to be determined.

J. Hanna asked whether the proposed use for the house would constitute a "change in use" which the County or neighbors might legally oppose.

D. Neuman: this shouldn't be a problem with the County, as the neighborhood is within the General Use Permit area of campus. The campus residential lots are all leaseholds, with a mix of private residences and some student residence leaseholds, so although the leaseholders should be informed and consulted, the University ultimately has jurisdiction in the use of the land. In any case, the use won't really be changing significantly, as a graduate student fellow or caretaker will still be in residence. The proposal for use should be sent to the Stanford Campus Residential Leaseholders Group as well as to Pres. Casper. Their concern will likely be with parking. The President and Provost are aware that the proposal for use is coming, and know its general content, so it is not inappropriate for the leaseholders to also receive a copy at this time. The Provost has indicated that she does not wish to live at the Hanna House, but is concerned that there be the option of a residence for future Provosts. This might be the Lake House, or possibly even the Buck Estate.

B. Witscher noted that the proposal for use should be presented to the Stanford Campus Residential Leaseholders Group as soon as possible, as they will be meeting soon.

The proposal for use, as amended at the meeting, was unanimously approved by the Board members. Please see Attachment #A

IV. Report on History of Development Efforts for Hanna House
Tim Portwood

Please see Attachment #B
The Getty Trust had been contacted by the Office of Development and Don Kennedy, but that the amount of funding to be gained was not worth the amount of time spent to secure it, and the amount of constraint to the project associated with it. They were contacted more recently, but indicated that funding for the Hanna House was not likely.

Current University priorities have the earthquake restoration and unreinforced masonry projects before the Hanna House for fundraising. However, Tom Ford has agreed that after the three pending questions are answered, it may be possible to begin fundraising for the house.
Fundraising should include augmenting the endowment for maintenance of the house, insurance, and possibly a fellowship for a live-in graduate student.

Some donors will be very concerned with the preservation philosophy used for the rehabilitation. The philosophy will need to address at least three issues: 1) the level of structural strengthening, 2) the point in time to which the house will be restored, and 3) the specific conservation points, as mentioned by the Taliesin Fellowship, the Hannas, etc.

V. Report on Nissan Endowment and Maintenance Needs
Bill Witscher

Nissan Endowment:
The accrued interest on the Nissan fund is currently at approximately $184K. Another $115K - $118K should accrue this year. The budget last year was set at $35K, the year before was $27K, and the year before that was $20K. The annual budget includes general maintenance and cleaning as well as inspection for termites and other such damage. Bruce Wiggins estimated that maintenance for light usage of the house may be approximately $60K / year. The current endowment is adequate to pay $80K / year.

Over half of the current maintenance cost is for grounds and pool maintenance. The pool may cost as much as $10K per year to maintain. It would likely cost less than $10K to remove. John P. Hanna noted that the pool was not designed by F.L. Wright, nor installed by the Hanna family. The issue of the pool will be considered with other "preservation philosophy" items.

Insurance:
The house is essentially uninsurable in its unrepaired state. Once repaired, it will either be considered either a residence or a work of art for the purposes of insurance. Likely a $200K - $300K deductible (10%) would apply, with a $35K /year premium. This will need to be considered further.

D. Neuman: The level of structural strengthening will affect the insurance rates, as well as how much damage will occur in the next earthquake.

VI. Report on Project Status and Schedule
Olivier Pieron

O. Pieron has been a project manager at Stanford for twelve years, and has managed the Memorial Church restoration, the Gates building, and the Museum restoration. He should be receiving a proposal from the
Architectural Resource Group architectural firm next week. He expects two to three months of design, including architectural, civil, and landscape work; one to two months to secure a permit; and construction in June or July, which will take approximately two to three months.

D. Neuman: the FEMA historic review is a wild card, and may upset the schedule.

J. Hanna asked what would happen there were insufficient funds to complete the project.

T. Portwood: two options if project can't be scaled back:
1) Borrow against Nissan endowment
2) Potential donors may respond to urgent and specific need

VII. Other Business / Action for Next Meeting
David Neuman

Next meeting: review conservation issues -
1) level of structural strengthening
2) date to which to restore the building
3) specific conservation issues

T. Portwood will bring a video of the 1989 Meyer May House restoration to the next meeting
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DATE: February 25, 1994

TO: Hanna House Board of Governors*

FROM: Tiffany Gravlee [Signature]

SUBJECT: Hanna House Board of Governors March 4, 1994 Agenda

Dear Colleagues:

Enclosed please find the agenda for the meeting of March 4, 1994, with attachments. Please note that we are meeting on Friday rather than Thursday, and at 855 Serra Street rather than at the Hanna House. Please review the minutes of our last meeting of January 27, 1994, and bring any corrections you may have. The meeting will begin at 8:30 AM, and will be held at 855 Serra, in Conference Room B on the second floor. We are meeting at 855 Serra rather than at the Hanna House in order to view a video of Meyer May house restoration project.

Thank you

* Marilyn Fogel
James Gibbons
Michael Hannan
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood
Paul Turner
William Witscher

CC: President Casper
John Paul Hanna
Olivier Pieron
Valerie Veronin
Academic Secretary
DATE: January 24, 1994

TO: Hanna House Board of Governors

FROM: Tiffany Gravlee

SUBJECT: Hanna House Board of Governors January 27, 1994 Agenda

Dear Colleagues:

Enclosed please find the agenda for the meeting of January 27, 1994, with attachments. Please review the minutes of our last meeting of December 9, 1993, and bring any corrections you may have. The meeting will begin at 8:30 AM, at the Hobby House (on the grounds of the Hanna House).

Thank you

* Marilyn Fogel
James Gibbons
Michael Hannan
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood
Paul Turner
William Witscher

CC: President Casper
John Paul Hanna
Olivier Pieron
Valerie Veronin
Academic Secretary
Hanna House Board of Governors
Agenda
January 27, 1994
8:30 - 10:00 am
Hobby House, at the Hanna House

I. Introductions
Paul Turner will introduce Olivier Pieron, Project Manager for the Hanna House retaining walls project.

II. Review of Minutes - Dec. 9, 1993 (5 minutes) Please see attachment #1
Please review the Minutes from the Meeting of December 9, 1993 and raise any comments or concerns.

III. Discussion of "Proposal for Use" (20 minutes) Please see attachment #2
Paul Turner

Discussion of draft "Proposal for Use of the Hanna House." The draft was written by Paul Turner, and has been reviewed by the subgroup assisting with this effort.

IV. Report on History of Development Efforts for Hanna House (20 minutes)
Tim Portwood

Report on the History of fund-raising efforts for the Hanna House, as foundation for the Development sub-groups' efforts.

V. Report on Nissan Endowment and Maintenance Needs (20 minutes)
Bill Witscher

Report on the status of the Nissan Endowment, and on the current and future funding requirements for maintenance, and for insuring the house against future earthquake or other damage.

VI. Report on Project Status and Schedule (10 minutes)
Olivier Pieron

VII. Other Business / Action for Next Meeting (10 minutes)
David Neuman

Agenda prepared by T. Gravlee, Planning Office, January 24, 1994
PROPOSAL FOR USE OF THE HANNA HOUSE

The Hanna House Board of Governors, as part of its deliberations on the repair and restoration of the house, has studied the question of its future use. In consultation with experts in architectural preservation and with a member of the Hanna family, the Board has formulated the following general principles.

The fundamental goal should be to preserve the Hanna House, as one of the prime works of Frank Lloyd Wright, and to make it accessible to students and others for study and inspiration. At the same time, it can be made available for appropriate uses by the University.

The house should be restored and preserved, as much as possible, in its form as Wright designed it and as the Hannas lived in it. The clients' life in the house is especially important, in this case, because Wright designed the building with the intention that it would evolve as the Hannas' needs changed, and because the Hannas conferred closely with Wright over the years about their use of the house. To an unusual degree, the architectural significance of this building involves the clients and their relationship with the architect. In this regard, it is important to preserve as much as possible the original furnishings of the house, especially those that were designed or approved by Wright.

The house can play an important educational role, both within the University, through visits by classes and seminars in art, architectural history and other subjects; and for the larger community, through public tours. This will continue the tradition begun by the Hannas themselves, who always welcomed visitors and enjoyed explaining the house to them—a function later served by the Hanna House docents (from the Committee for Art) during the period when the house was used as the Provost's residence. Without permanent residents in the house, the docent tours can be made more frequent and will have the potential of generating increased interest in the house, and in the University as a whole, among Bay Area residents and visitors from elsewhere. In this regard, a link with the Stanford Museum may be especially appropriate. Visitors to the Museum and the Rodin Sculpture Garden, for instance, might by transported by minibus to the Hanna House, as part of a tour of Stanford's artistic treasures.

The house can also be used for various kinds of University functions, provided they do not conflict with the preservation of the building and its architectural character. These functions could include receptions, conferences and other kinds of meetings, if the numbers of people involved are relatively small and the activities do not require the rearrangement of furniture or pose a threat of damage. It would be appropriate also to have catered dinners at the house, if the guests could be accommodated at the Hannas' dining table. Another appropriate use would be small chamber-music concerts, which were a favorite activity of the Hannas themselves. Events involving larger numbers of people than are appropriate inside the house could be held on the terraces and other outdoor areas.
It might also be appropriate to use the house occasionally for the short-term lodging (one or two nights) of special visitors to the University. This would provide such visitors with a unique experience of Wright's architecture. And it would perpetuate, at least to some extent, the original function of the building as a residence.

To aid in security for the house, it is advisable to have a live-in caretaker or guardian. This person could reside in the studio apartment on the lower level of the Hobby House (the separate structure, east of the main house). Perhaps it would be possible to create a fellowship, allowing a graduate student in the University to assume this position as Hanna House guardian; and if this student had a special interest in architecture, he or she might also be involved in the docent activities for the house, or in research projects related to the building.

The activities proposed above would be appropriate to the architectural preservation and integrity of the Hanna House, would maximize its accessibility to scholars and visitors, and would allow for other uses beneficial to the University. These proposals are also compatible with the Hannas' intentions. Paul and Jean Hanna's original wish was that the house be used "as a center for teaching and research in architecture and art." When discouraged in this intention by the University administration, the Hannas conceived the idea of housing distinguished visiting faculty in the building. The uses proposed here, we believe, combine the most feasible aspects of the Hannas' own intentions, and will ensure the preservation of this architectural masterpiece.

Paul V. Turner
9 December 1993
Hanna House Board of Governors
Agenda
December 9, 1993
8:30 - 10:00 am
Hobby House, at the Hanna House

Members Present: Paul Turner (Chair)
Marilyn Fogel
Michael Hannan
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood
Bill Witscher

Members Absent: James Gibbons

Others Present: Tiffany Gravlee, Planning Office Staff
John Paul Hanna, Guest

I. **Introduction**

Paul Turner introduced John Paul Hanna, who had been invited to be a guest at the Hanna House Board of Governors meeting.

David Neuman gave a Mr. Hanna brief history of the project to date, including background on the FEMA and SHPO historic preservation reviews, dividing the project into two phases, applications for National Park Service grants, the Nissan Endowment update, etc. He gave a brief overview of the strengthening schemes and strengthening classifications, and preservation philosophies, ending with the need to propose a use before deciding the strengthening scheme (previous meeting minutes describe these issues - JH's notes also describe this section, and will be kept on file with the official meeting notes).

JH was interested in the status of fund-raising for the project. DN suggested that a sub-committee be established to look specifically at development issues. Tim Portwood will chair the committee. Other members suggested and approved: Jim Gibbons, John P. Hanna (Guest), David Neuman, (and also someone from the central Development Office).

II. **Review of Minutes - Dec. 9, 1993**

M. Fogel: Eighty visitors per month, not week.

Minutes prepared by T. Gravlee, Planning Office,
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Discussion of Survey / Potential Uses

The telephone survey of the use and management of Frank Lloyd Wright houses (and other special houses) at other academic institutions was briefly discussed (see attachment to agenda for the Dec. 9 meeting for a summary of the telephone survey). Discussion touched on: level of tour use in relation to the surroundings of the houses - whether on campus, or in residential area- parking is an issue in residential area; some institutions use income from tours, gift shop, etc. to offset cost of maintenance, and some split cost of maintenance with the city. In general, the reaction to the survey seemed to confirm the appropriateness of the uses which were discussed at the last Board of Governors meeting.

Summary of Proposed Use:

PT: Review of consensus from the last meeting regarding appropriate usage of the house (he will draft this as a "Proposal for Use," with Marilyn Fogel's and Bill Witscher's assistance):

1) **Museum / tours (not residence):**
Use as a permanent or rotating residence is discouraged due to the wear and tear on the house, as well as the changes residents will want to implement; using the house as a residence limits its usage for other University purposes, including light conferencing, entertainment, and keeping it open for tours. PT pointed out that while the Hanna's had finally requested that the house be used for a visiting distinguished professor, their original idea was that the house be used as a center for teaching and research in architecture and education. JH generally agreed - a good compromise use would be as a museum used for tours, special conferences and entertainment, occasional VIP guest house. More permanent residents would likely want to make inappropriate changes to the house.

2) **Small conferences and events/light entertaining:**
Indoor events could include appropriate small classes, seminars, musical performances, etc. RH noted that it would be important to define "compatible" uses. Hannas were interested in education, family issues, often held small musical performances, kept their house open for tours, etc. Wedding receptions would not be an appropriate use. Parking would be an issue, would need to present potential use to lease-holders in neighborhood. TP noted that the possibility has been raised of campus tours which start at the Main Quad or Museum with shuttle service to various other locations. Hanna House could be a stop on the tour. Perhaps Museum could have oversight.
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3) **VIP guest house:**
Use as a VIP guest house would need to be limited in duration, so that tours are not interrupted. Use as guest house should be occasional, for heads of state or the like, and not last more than a few days.

4) **Caretaker:**
It was generally agreed that it would be important to have a live-in caretaker on site. The caretakers would likely not actually maintain the house, but rather provide an element of security. They might be graduate students in Art History or Museum Studies, on fellowship. TP noted that a fellowship would have fundraising potential. JH: caretakers should live in the downstairs guest apartment of the Hobby House.

IV. **General Business**

**Financial Status:**
JH raised some questions regarding the financial status and the Nissan Endowment. He suggested that a study be conducted evaluating the future income and costs for the house. The need to include earthquake insurance in the future costs was also discussed. The previously prepared assessment of the Nissan Endowment could be used as a base for this evaluation.

**Photograph of furniture**
The Board approved the use of a photograph of a Hanna House chair (on loan at the Milwaukee Art Museum) in a book on the furniture and interiors of Frank Lloyd Wright, as long as proper credits are given.
Hanna House Board of Governors
Agenda
December 9, 1993
8:30 - 10:00 am
Hobby House, at the Hanna House

I. Introduction
Paul Turner will introduce John Paul Hanna Please see attachment #1

II. Review of Minutes - Nov. 2, 1993 (5 minutes) Please see attachment #2
David Neuman

Please review the Minutes from the Meeting of November 2, 1993 and raise any comments or concerns.

III. Discussion of Survey / Potential Uses (40 minutes) Please see attachment #3

Discussion of telephone survey of the use and management of Frank Lloyd Wright houses (and other special houses) at other academic institutions, and applicability at Stanford.

IV. General Business (15 minutes)
David Neuman

1. Letters received, and responses. Please see attachment #4
2. Potential use of a photograph of a Hanna House chair (on loan at the Milwaukee Art Museum) in a book on the furniture and interiors of Frank Lloyd Wright. Please see attachment #5

Agenda prepared by T. Gravlee, Planning Office, December 3, 1993
Issues

- Responsibility for house
  - primary
- Size of house
  - Area
  - Tour
- Architectural relevance

Use

- Options - permanent residence, even rel. short-term is not good

1) Special visitors - overnight guests

2) Conference - small

3) Special events - receptions small. / Class use as appropriate. / Tours on regular basis. / Outside receptions could be larger. / Architectural studies

4) Tours on regular basis.

5) Live-in caretaker

Management of the House

- Graduate student - fellowship to support but in grad. student to live in guest room.
University of Chicago - Robie House
Lynn Bender, Dir. of Planning/Facilities, (312) 702-1700

1. Usage:
Current: Headquarters of the Alumni Office
ground floor: offices; main floor: open for social functions & daily tours; third level
(sleeping quarters) more offices - off-limits to tours; servants' wing & garage: more
alumni offices.

Draft proposals for future, after restoration: ground, main floors open for tours, social
events; gift shop/docent office on ground floor; sleeping areas for VIP guests, managed
by faculty club; servants' quarters/garage: apartment for graduate student couple as
caretakers.

2. Oversight:
Current: Planning Office heads a committee with rep from city of Chicago HP office,
rep from Univ. of Illinois Arch. school, reps from art history faculty. Provost not
currently involved, but Casper signed an agreement that Provost would be more
involved just prior to coming to Stanford.

3. Upkeep/Maintenance:
Current: Planning Office set up fund from their own budget, supplemented by
revenues from volunteer donations from tours. Will be developing guidelines for
maintenance.

4. Funding for maintenance/restoration:
Getty Foundation Grant for restoration of ground and main floors, reproduction of
furniture, etc., to museum quality.

5. On-site attention:
Alumni Office, one member was FLW aficionado

6. Other institutions:
Talk to Richard Bumstead in the Planning Office for more information.

7. Context
State University of New York (SUNY) at Buffalo

1. Usage:
Was President's residence until 1960's. When Pres. moved out, the house was empty and has fallen into some disrepair. Restoration cost estimated at approx. $2-3 million.

2. Oversight:
President and wife, while in house. Changes were made which were damaging to the character and fabric of the house.

3. Maintenance:

4. Funding:

5. On-site attention:

6. Other
Restoration costs were too great. As a result, the house was "sold" to the State Park system, which will restore it to museum quality, conduct tours, etc. Some connection with the school may continue.

7. Context
University of Southern California - Gamble (Greene & Greene) House
Mark Jones, Univ. Architect (213) 740-5310
Ted Bosley, Dir. of Gamble House (818) 793-6721

1. Usage:
Daily tours (broadly and aggressively advertised, $10/person), led by group of volunteer docents (50-60 individuals). Bookstore in carriage house. Resident scholars: two - three graduate architecture students live in the house each term as a part of a scholarship program - they also provide the house with nighttime occupancy.

2. Oversight:
Board of overseers includes Mr. Gamble, representatives from the City, representatives from the University, the "Gamble House Management"
House/grounds are jointly owned by the University and the City.

3. Maintenance:
The University maintains the house, and the city maintains the grounds.

4. Funding:
Endowment, proceeds from the bookstore, fund-raising events held at the Gamble House.

5. On-site attention:
Docent's office, resident students, bookstore.

6. Other
Occasional visiting dignitaries who are associated with Gamble house lectures or other in-building programs are allowed to stay overnight. This is not, however, an on-going "bed and breakfast" program.

7. Context:
Grounds consist of four acres on a major street in upscale area. A church is one of the neighbors. Not much complaint from other neighbors.
1. Usage:
House is in need of considerable restoration and is unoccupied. Limited tours are conducted, once a week ($10/person). Upon completion of the restoration, the house will be used as a residence for visiting distinguished faculty. Because of difficulty in staffing, and the distance from the campus, it is envisioned that a minimum stay would be one week. It is hoped to use the house as a resident for visiting faculty that would be in attendance for a full quarter or more. Honoraria which normally would be spent on housing for the visitor will be applied to costs for keeping the house open.

2. Oversight:
Oversight Board, headed by Bob Harris, Prof. of Architecture. Architectural Guild also supports the house.

3. Maintenance:
Maintenance costs are currently being carried by tour fees. The property is in the Hollywood Hills, and there is no grounds maintenance necessary except for driveway and terracing.

4. Funding:
The affiliated support group plans to launch a restoration and endowment campaign in the spring quarter.

5. On-site attention:
None at present, other than tour oversight on Saturdays, the only day the building is open.

6. Other
Experiences in the operation of the Gamble House, which is also operated by USC have been applied to the future plans for the Freeman House.

7. Context
In a neighborhood with limited parking.
University of Southern California - Forthmann House (Victorian House - 1888)
Mark Jones, Univ. Architect (213) 740-5310

1. Usage:
First floor has been fully renovated, and is in use as a real estate office. Other floors have been adapted for use as professional offices (leased). This is a seed project, to encourage revitalization of a neighborhood adjacent to the University.

2. Oversight:
Real Estate Development Corporation

3. Maintenance:
Lease holders

4. Funding:
Lease income

5. On-site attention:
Lease holders

6. Other

7. Context
Neighborhood in decline, adjacent to University (within two blocks)
University of Southern California - Cockins House (Victorian House)
Mark Jones, Univ. Architect (213) 740-5310

1. Usage:
Was planned to be used as a Bed & Breakfast, to sell or lease, but recession put this on hold. Currently boarded-up, in need of rehabilitation/restoration.

2. Oversight:

3. Maintenance:

4. Funding:

5. On-site attention:

6. Other

7. Context
Neighborhood in decline, adjacent to University (within three blocks)
University of Southern California - San Marino House
Mark Jones, Univ. Architect (213) 740-5310

1. **Usage:**
   President's residence.

2. **Oversight:**
   Created a Foundation and deeded the property to the foundation. The Foundation then reports to the University.

3. **Maintenance:**

4. **Funding:**
   Donated by S. Mudd

5. **On-site attention:**

6. **Other**

7. **Context**
Hanna House Board of Governors
Minutes
November 2, 1993
8:30 - 10:00 am
Hobby House, at the Hanna House

Members Present: 
Paul Turner (Chair)
Marilyn Fogel
James Gibbons
Michael Hannan
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Bill Witscher

Members Absent: 
Tim Portwood

Others Present: 
Tiffany Gravlee, Planning Office Staff
Steve Farneth, Architectural Resource Group
Martin Weil, Restoration Architect

I. Introduction of New Member
P. Turner introduced Michael Hannan, Chair of the University Committee on Land and Building Development.

II. Review of Minutes - Sept. 30, 1993
M. Fogel noted that D. Neuman had been responsible for the discussion regarding monitoring changes and Form 1's.

III. Discussion of Historic Preservation Philosophies

Brief discussion of the "Tenants of Architectural Conservation Philosophy, Theory and Practice Pertinent to the Hanna House"

a. International Council of Monuments and Sites Venice Charter
General points: Buildings should not be restored to one period. Additions and changes are also part of the building, and important evolution. Also - it is acceptable to see strengthening if this will preserve original building fabric.

b. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation Projects
Standard for Rehabilitation #10 states that "New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would
be unimpaired." Important to maintain reversibility of strengthening, so that it may be removed or replaced in the future.

Gibbons: what would F.L. Wright have done to repair the house?
Martin: would have demolished and rebuilt
Farneth: this is dangerous, since we can't read his mind, or know how he would rebuild it.

Weil: The decision has been made to encapsulate the house of 1975, when the Hannas gave it to the University. The changes they made are part of the character of the house, and were made, for the most part, with Wright's knowledge or design.

Farneth: there's a strong argument for reconstruction at this house, because it was designed to be machine built (in theory) and assembled. The craft of the details aren't as important.

Turner: it's important to think of the Hanna House as an historic object of art, rather than trying to determine what Wright would do. (like a painting - one wouldn't restore a Picasso by repainting it)  

Neuman: what level of structural integrity do we want to establish? How much damage is acceptable? First scheme was designed to the 1988 Uniform Building Code, which is comparable to a new building. Current scheme is designed to less stringent code - may allow more damage, but less intrusive.

Farneth: State Historic Building Code allows more flexibility in solution - the 1973 seismic code can be used.

Turner: What standards makes sense to you - which are acceptable?

Farneth/Weil: if the building can be strengthened without damage, then strengthen. But if strengthening is more damaging than an earthquake, then back away from full strengthening.

Neuman: important to weigh acceptable risks, and to consider the level of risk dependent on use: whether residence or conference rooms, etc. Decision regarding scheme involves weighing concerns for 1) conservation, 2) structural strength, and 3) use, or occupancy.

Turner: won't engineers be conservative?

Neuman: depends on 1) risk - whether the engineer or the owner takes liability, 2) the engineer's style, and 3) their own philosophy of "what Wright would do"

Farneth: Two structural schemes have been proposed so far:
First scheme: rebuilds chimneys, puts foundations under them, and supports the house from the chimneys.
Second scheme: core-drills the chimneys, so that they can support their own weight, and add four or five steel frame elements to carry loads.

Questions were raised regarding the floor slab:
Farneth: some settling occurred before the earthquake, but there was additional movement during the earthquake. Have begun to explore grouting the fill under the slab, but this is difficult in clay soil.

Weil: Need to decide use, and give the architects a document describing what is needed programmatically (objectives and guidelines). This will help to determine which strengthening/rehabilitation scheme makes the most sense.

Fogel: need to consider at what point a building becomes a replica rather than the original. Is the Storer house a replica or an original?

Weil: Storer house is an original, historic preservation attempts to preserve the fabric rather than replace.

Neuman: we should review objectives (after deciding uses). Would this preclude going forward with the site stabilization?

Turner: would different uses mean changes to the site stabilization?

Fogel: accessibility issues - people in wheelchairs have been on the tour, with assistance, however there is need for accessible restrooms.

Farneth: wear and tear on the house should be considered, special needs such as increased lighting, etc. for some uses.

Weil: wear and tear on furnishings should also be considered.

Witscher: should consider the use of this house in the context of the other special houses the University owns.

Kimball: consider what the house can handle, what is the benefit cost?

Turner: guidelines should be in place for any use.

Weil: consider the budget in place for maintenance, the cost of maintenance for various uses, etc.

Witscher: it would be helpful to start laying our possible uses, with their respective effects and costs, similar to the Buck Estate study.
Hornby: keep in the background that the house should be considered as an artifact.

Weil: best use would likely be as a social reception area. This would keep furnishings intact, but not be intensively used. Light conferencing use might also work.

Farneth: the space in the house lends itself more to single social gatherings rather than a use which needs separate spaces.

Brainstorming possible uses (all):

- special outside events
- conference center
- domestic house
- receptions
- house museum (can be a tie to community, fund-raising, volunteers, etc.)
- visiting professor
- small musical performances
- VIP guesthouse
- academic uses
- tours (previously approximately 80 people/week)
- offices
- display of drawings, history, etc., as a branch of the Stanford Museum

Weil: a combination of a museum house, special guest house and reception place would be possible. Other houses: the Gamble house - students scholars live there; Hollyhock house - rented for some events which are compatible (events occur outside). Some of the special Los Angeles houses are owned by the city, or co-owned, with a semi-autonomous Board of Directors. Oversight of Board of Directors is very important, regardless of use.

IV. Report on Status

1. D. Neuman: President Casper has responded positively to the request to proceed with phase I (site stabilization).
2. T. Gravlee: A telephone survey of the use and management of Frank Lloyd Wright houses at other academic institutions is being conducted, beginning with the University of Chicago, and the Robie house. Also being surveyed are SUNY Buffalo, which has the Martin house, Univ. of So. Calif., and UCLA. The results of the survey will be provided with the agenda for discussion at the next meeting.

cc: Academic Secretary
Gerhard Casper
November 16, 1993

Stanford University Planning Office  
Stanford, CA  94305

Attn: David J. Neuman  
University Architect/Director of Planning

Re: Hanna House

Dear Mr. Neuman:

Thank you for your letter of November 2nd (received November 15th). I am delighted to know that the Hanna House Board of Governors has been reconstituted and that the Advisory Committee has been holding regular meetings. I was also very pleased to learn that the first phase of the work (site stabilization) will be implemented as soon as possible and will be completed within fiscal year 1994.

I also am glad to know that the Board will not consider selling furniture or furnishings, or plans, etc., but instead will rely on fund raising activities to come up with the money for the restoration.

As of now, I plan on attending the December 9th meeting at the Hobby House from 8:30 - 10:00 AM, and I thank you for the invitation.

Very truly yours,

John Paul Hanna

JPH:vs/n/16stanford

cc: Emily Hanna Johnson, 135 Mt. Whitney Court, San Rafael, CA  94903  
Robert Hanna, 5407 N.E. Salmon Creek Street, Vancouver, WA  98686  
Dr. George M. Goodwin, 198 Laurel Avenue, Providence, RI  02906
November 5, 1993

Rose Guntly  
Stanford University  
315 Bonaire Siding  
Stanford, California  84305-7270

Dear Ms. Guntly,

I am writing to you regarding the Hannah House Chair which is on loan from Stanford University to the Milwaukee Art Museum for exhibition along with other works by Frank Lloyd Wright.

Recently, the Art Museum was approached by Mr. Tom Heinz, who would like to use a photograph of the chair in an upcoming book on the interiors and furniture of Frank Lloyd Wright. The book will be distributed by Saint Martin’s Press, and it will have approximately 275 pages and 400 illustrations. It will have an annotated bibliography and appendices.

The Art Museum already has a photograph of the chair on file (see photocopy, attached). I am asking for reproduction rights to reproduce this photo on Mr. Heinz’ behalf. (He is also reproducing works from the Art Museum collection.) Please advise me as to whether you grant permission for this project.

Sincerely,

Claire F. Fox  
Rights and Reproductions

enc.

cc: Leigh Albritton  
Registrar
From: Rose Gunty
Date: Thu, Nov 18, 1993 10:43 AM

RFC Header:
Received: by Agora.Stanford.Edu with SMTP; 18 Nov 1993 10:42:57 U
Date: Thu, 18 Nov 93 10:42:27 PST
From: "Rose Gunty" <Rose.Gunty@Forsythe.Stanford.EDU>

To: Valerie Veronin
From: Rose Gunty

Subj: Frank Lloyd Wright Chair

Forwarding (via ID mail) a letter I received from Claire Fox of the Milwaukee Art Museum which is self explanatory. Ms. Fox called me about this a couple of weeks ago and I asked her to make the request in writing. Did not give her permission -- feel that I do not have the authority to do so.

The Museum wants to keep the chair for a couple more months which is okay - it is insured and safe.

Let us know your decision.

Thanks, Val

cc: Bruce Wiggins
University of Chicago - Robie House
Lynn Bender, Dir. of Planning/Facilities, (312) 702-1700

1. Usage:
Current: Headquarters of the Alumni Office
ground floor: offices; main floor: open for social functions & daily tours; third level
(sleeping quarters) more offices - off-limits to tours; servants' wing & garage: more
alumni offices.

Draft proposals for future, after restoration: ground, main floors open for tours, social
events; gift shop/docent office on ground floor; sleeping areas for VIP guests, managed
by faculty club; servants' quarters/ garage: apartment for graduate student couple as
caretakers.

2. Oversight:
Current: Planning Office heads a committee with rep from city of Chicago HP office,
rep from Univ. of Illinois Arch. school, reps from art history faculty. Provost not
currently involved, but Casper signed an agreement that Provost would be more
involved just prior to coming to Stanford.

3. Upkeep/Maintenance:
Current: Planning Office set up fund from their own budget, supplemented by
revenues from volunteer donations from tours. Will be developing guidelines for
maintenance.

4. Funding for maintenance/restoration:
Getty Foundation Grant for restoration of ground and main floors, reproduction of
furniture, etc., to museum quality.

5. On-site attention:
Alumni Office, one member was FLW aficionado

6. Other institutions:
Talk to Richard Bumstead in the Planning Office for more information.

7. Context
State University of New York (SUNY) at Buffalo

1. Usage:
   Was President's residence until 1960's. When Pres. moved out, the house was empty and has fallen into some disrepair. Restoration cost estimated at approx. $2-3 million.

2. Oversight:
   President and wife, while in house. Changes were made which were damaging to the character and fabric of the house.

3. Maintenance:

4. Funding:

5. On-site attention:

6. Other
   Restoration costs were too great. As a result, the house was "sold" to the State Park system, which will restore it to museum quality, conduct tours, etc. Some connection with the school may continue.

7. Context

December 3, 1993
Survey of Special Houses
Stanford University Planning Office
University of Southern California - Gamble (Greene & Greene) House
Mark Jones, Univ. Architect (213) 740-5310
Ted Bosley, Dir. of Gamble House (818) 793-6721

1. Usage:
Daily tours (broadly and aggressively advertised, $10/person), led by group of
volunteer docents (50-60 individuals). Bookstore in carriage house. Resident scholars:
two - three graduate architecture students may live in the house each term as a part of a
scholarship program.

2. Oversight:
Board of overseers includes Mr. Gamble, representatives from the City, representatives
from the University, the "Gamble House Management"
House/grounds are jointly owned by the University and the City.

3. Maintenance:
The University maintains the house, and the city maintains the grounds.

4. Funding:
Endowment, proceeds from the bookstore, fund-raising events held at the Gamble
House.

5. On-site attention:
Docent's office, resident students, bookstore.

6. Other

7. Context:
Grounds consist of four acres on a major street in upscale area. A church is one of the
neighbors. Not much complaint from other neighbors.
University of Southern California - Freman House (Frank Lloyd Wright)
Mark Jones, Univ. Architect (213) 740-5310
Jeff Chusid, Dir. of Freeman House (213) 851-0671
Bob Harris, Prof. of Architecture (213) 740-9341

1. Usage:
House is in need of considerable restoration. Limited tours are conducted, once a week ($10/person). Being considered for use as a residence for visiting distinguished faculty.

2. Oversight:
Oversight Board, headed by Bob Harris, Prof. of Architecture. Architectural Guild also supports the house.

3. Maintenance:

4. Funding:

5. On-site attention:

6. Other

7. Context
In a neighborhood with limited parking.
1. Usage:
First floor has been fully renovated, and is in use as a real estate office. Other floors have been adapted for use as professional offices (leased). This is a seed project, to encourage revitalization of a neighborhood adjacent to the University.

2. Oversight:
Real Estate Development Corporation

3. Maintenance:
Lease holders

4. Funding:
Lease income

5. On-site attention:
Lease holders

6. Other

7. Context
Neighborhood in decline, adjacent to University (within two blocks)
University of Southern California - Cockins House (Victorian House)
Mark Jones, Univ. Architect (213) 740-5310

1. Usage:
Was planned to be used as a Bed & Breakfast, to sell or lease, but recession put this on hold. Currently boarded-up, in need of rehabilitation/restoration.

2. Oversight:

3. Maintenance:

4. Funding:

5. On-site attention:

6. Other

7. Context
Neighborhood in decline, adjacent to University (within three blocks)
1. Usage:
President's residence.

2. Oversight:
Created a Foundation and deeded the property to the foundation. The Foundation then reports to the University.

3. Maintenance:

4. Funding:
Donated by S. Mudd

5. On-site attention:

6. Other

7. Context
DATE: December 3, 1993

TO: Hanna House Board of Governors
FROM: Tiffany Gravlee

SUBJECT: Hanna House Board of Governors December 9, 1993 Agenda

Dear Colleagues:

Enclosed please find the agenda for the meeting of December 9, 1993, with attachments. Please review the minutes for our last meeting of November 2, 1993, and bring any corrections you may have. Please also review the survey results, and be prepared for discussion. The meeting will begin at 8:30 AM, at the Hobby House (on the grounds of the Hanna House).

Thank you

* Marilyn Fogel
* James Gibbons
* Michael Hannan
* Rosemary Hornby
* Maggie Kimball
* David Neuman
* Tim Portwood
* Paul Turner
* William Witscher

cc: President Casper
    John Paul Hanna
    Valerie Veronin
    Academic Secretary
I. Introduction of New Member  Please see attachment #1
Paul Turner will introduce Michael Hannan, Chair of the University Committee on Land and Building Development

II. Review of Minutes - Sept. 30, 1993 (5 minutes)  Please see attachment #2
David Neuman

Please review the Minutes from the Meeting of September 30, 1993 and raise any comments or concerns.

III. Discussion of Historic Preservation Philosophies (50 minutes)

IV. Report on Status (15 minutes)
David Neuman

1. President's letter of response  Please see attachment #3

2. A brief report on a telephone survey of the use and management of Frank Lloyd Wright houses at other academic institutions.

V. General Business (10 minutes)
All

VI. Future Meetings (5 minutes)  Please see attachment #4
Paul Turner

Agenda prepared by T. Gravlee, Planning Office,
October 28, 1993
Hanna House Board of Governors
Committee Membership 8/19/93

Turner, Paul (Chair)
Professor of Art
University Architectural Historian
Cummings Art Building 101
Tel. 5-0142 EM: HF.EMM@Forsythe Mail Code: 2018

Fogel, Marilyn
Head, Hanna House Docents
27950 Roble Blanco
Los Altos Hills, CA 94022
Tel. 941-1304, 3-3469 Fax: 948-9599 Mail Code: 5060

Gibbons, James
Dean, School of Engineering
Representative of the President's Cabinet
Terman 214a
Tel. 3-3938 EM: Gibbons@Sierra Mail Code: 4027

Hannan, Michael
Chair of the UCLBD
Prof. Sociology, Graduate School of Business
Building 1-120, Room 238 EM: Hannan@Leland Mail Code: 2047
Tel. 3-1194

Hornby, Rosemary
Representative of the Stanford Historical Society
501 Portola Road, Box 8028
Portola Valley, California 94028
Tel. 851-2291

Kimball, Maggie
University Archivist
Special Collections, Green Library
Tel. 5-1161, 5-1022 EM: CN.MJK@Forsythe Mail Code: 6004

Neuman, David (Secretary)
University Architect / Director of Planning
855 Serra, Second Floor
Tel. 5-7845 EM: AR.DJN@Forsythe Mail Code: 6114

Portwood, Tim
Associate Director of External Relations, School of Engineering
Representative of the Office of Development
Terman Room 211
Tel. 3-0070 EM: Tim.Portwood@Forsythe Mail Code: 4027

Witscher, William
Director, Facilities Operations
315 Bonair
Tel. 5-0296 EM: Bill.Witscher@Forsythe Mail Code: 7270
Hanna House Board of Governors
Minutes
September 30, 1993
8:30 - 9:30 am
Hobby House, at the Hanna House

Members Present:  
Paul Turner (Chair)
Marilyn Fogel
James Gibbons
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood
Bill Witscher

Members Absent:  
James Ingle

Others Present:  
Tiffany Gravlee, Planning Office Staff
Valerie Veronin, Facilities Project Management

I. Review of Minutes - August 19, 1993  
Please see attachment #1

T. Portwood: the minutes should be revised to reflect that the Board decided on retaining wall repair and strengthening option 2 rather than option 3. The final design will need to be approved by the Section 106 reviewers, who may require some modification. Significant modifications, if required, will be brought back to the Board for consideration.

II. Status Report on Reconstruction Issues

Report on the letter to the President: Please see attachment #2

P. Turner read the letter to the President. He has not received a response to date. Approval from the President is necessary before reconstruction can proceed. N. Neuman will contact the President's Office regarding a response.

National Park Service Cost Sharing Program: Please see attachment #3

D. Neuman: the Hanna House was not selected for funding. Although strongly supported by the regional NPS office for National Register properties, the reviewing committee had assumed that Stanford could pay for the repairs. The regional office had suggested that a "friends of the Hanna House" group might have more success with finding funding, however it would not be worth setting
up such a group for this amount of funding. The regional office also suggested revisiting the Getty Grant. This could be looked into, however D. Neuman noted that previous discussion with the Director of the program had revealed that there are many hardship cases, including many other Frank Lloyd Wright houses, which are also applying for, or receiving, funds from this source.

**Progress of the Section 106 review:**

D. Neuman reported that Stanford is in the process of setting up a Programmatic Agreement (PA) with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), the Office of Emergency Services (OES), the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and the National Advisory Council for Historic Preservation (ACHP), which will outline the Section 106 (historic preservation review) process for the remainder of the seismic rehabilitation projects resulting from the Loma Prieta Earthquake.

The PA addresses the buildings in various groupings. The first group is minor repairs and small projects which do not require review if repaired in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. The remainder of the buildings are grouped according to construction type (sandstone, unreinforced brick, wood frame, concrete and steel), with a few unique projects which will be reviewed separately (Green Library, Hanna House, Stanford Museum and Anatomy). It is in the University's interest to concentrate on establishing the PA before proceeding to specific reviews.

Although FEMA pays for only 75% of the eligible repair/rehabilitation costs, the entire project is subject to the Section 106 review by the historic preservation arm of FEMA, the SHPO, and the National ACHP.

**III. General Discussion**  
*Please see attachment #4*

**Question #1:** How best to proceed, in determining a plan for the Hanna House reconstruction? (e.g., how to evaluate the different approaches to architectural preservation; invite a professional, such as our consultants, to talk with us on the subject?)

P. Turner: since experts disagree on preservation philosophies, it might be useful for the Board of Governors to be informed in order to make decisions regarding the degree of reconstruction/rehabilitation appropriate, whether to preserve original fabric or original appearance, and how to establish structural standards. It is important to hear various views. For instance, Randolph Langenbach, an historic preservationist and FEMA employee, might be invited to speak to the group.

D. Neuman: Steve Farneth and Martin Weil, our consultants for the Hanna House project, are well-known, prominent preservation architects who could
present the various views to the Board. An article on Martin Weil will be circulated (please see attachment #5).

In past conversations with Wesley Peters at Taliesin, his opinion is that the Hanna House was the work of many people, and that it is difficult to know to which point to restore the house. Randolph Langenbach had also spoken to D. Neuman about the possibility of a seminar, however it should be cautioned that Randolph is part of the Section 106 reviewing group for the Hanna House, as well as for the rest of the campus. As such, there possibly exists a conflict of interests. Such a review could also open the door for additional reviews for other campus buildings, upsetting a sensitive process which is already in place.

T. Portwood: this question should be considered in light of question #4 (potential appropriate uses of the Hanna House). We need to be aware of what uses the President and Provost have in mind.

J. Gibbons: how much would it cost to bring in the project's preservationists to talk with the Board?

D. Neuman: the cost would not be significant.

J. Gibbons: did Wright really remain interested in this building? Other than the American Institute of Architects (AIA designated this house as one of 17 of Wright's most significant works), do others consider this to be a significant building?

P. Turner: Wright definitely kept very interested in the house, and kept in contact with the Hannas, who maintained the integrity of the house. The Hanna House was a significant house in Wright's career (note: the Hanna House is a National Historic Landmark, listed in the National Register of Historic Places).

M. Fogel: Agreed with P. Turner, and added that only the summer house was designed by Wesley Peters; the rest of the house was designed by Wright, and he visited it frequently.

**Question #4: What are some potential appropriate future uses of the Hanna House?**

T. Portwood: who should be brought in to discuss uses with the Board?

**Involvement of President and Provost**

D. Neuman: President Casper is very interested in the Hanna House. He potentially sees the Hanna House as one of several houses, along with the Lake House and Buck Estate, which could be used for special University events. This is what he was thinking before the Hanna House Board of Governors was
reconvened. The Board of Governors has now been charged with advising the President as to the appropriate uses of the buildings.

Hannas' wishes

T. Portwood: the Hannas asked for an endowment for maintenance, and a chair for a visiting professor, but Nissan provided the endowment only. The Board needs to show that it has considered the donor's wishes.

P. Turner: their first choice was that the house be used for academic purposes, particularly architectural study. Their second choice was a residence for visiting professors. P. Turner expressed to the Hannas, on at least one occasion, that using the house as a residence for a rotating professorship might not be the best use of the house (each resident would want to make changes, excessive wear and tear on the house, etc.).

Conference space

J. Gibbons: although limited in size, the Hanna House could be used very well as conference space, as well as for entertainment. There is an extraordinary need for conference space; reservations for the Buck Estate have to be made a year in advance. The Board should find out the demand for additional conference space.

T. Portwood: the use of the house for conferences rather than as a residence might allow more tours, which would make the house more available for students of architecture, in keeping with the donor's wishes.

Other Universities' use of Wright houses

D. Neuman: some research should be done (action: T. Gravlee) on how Frank Lloyd Wright houses are being used/maintained at other institutions; e.g., the Robie House at the University of Chicago.

Costs/codes associated with various uses

J. Gibbons: uses need to be decided on before moving into extensive fund-raising efforts. What capital and operating expenses would be tied to the various proposed uses?

R. Hornby: would codes preclude any uses?

Guidelines for use, monitoring of proposed changes

M. Fogel: regardless of use, strict guidelines for use should be in place. Monitoring of any changes were performed by the Provost's office in the past; this was a conflict of interest which allowed some changes to be made which
should not have been made; e.g., the swimming pool. Monitoring by the Development Office might also constitute a conflict of interest. Strict oversight by a neutral body of any work orders, Form 1's or proposed changes would be necessary. Perhaps the University Architect should do this review.

T. Portwood: whoever reviews potential changes should report any and all proposed changes to the Board of Governors for comment at each meeting.

P. Turner: use of the house for special events may be best, with careful monitoring.

Caretaker, neighborhood relations

M. Fogel: the Hobby Shop was originally supposed to be a caretaker's cottage. The caretaker would have overseen use of the house, but the University has taken this role. Some sort of on-site caretaker might be reinstated.

D. Neuman: perhaps the Docent's office could be on-site in the Hobby House, in order to monitor day to day use of the house. Also, neighborhood relations will need to be considered. Parking will likely be an issue.

Question #5: How shall the Hanna House Furnishings be conserved and/or used?

M. Kimball: There appear to be some errors in the Furniture Inventory regarding where the furniture is stored. Also, the furniture should be carefully crated and conserved in order to protect it in storage. How is the furniture being stored currently?

T. Gravlee: Much of the furniture is at the Buck Estate, and some is on loan. Current storage locations and methods will be verified, and the record updated.

IV. Future Meetings

It was proposed and agreed that the Hanna House Board of Governors meet on the last Thursday of every month, at 8:30 - 10:00 AM. Martin Weil and Steve Farneth will be invited to the next session.
October 14, 1993

Professor Paul V. Turner
Department of Art
Stanford University

Dear Paul:

I am sorry that your letter of August 31 has received no response until now. Unfortunately, it arrived at the beginning of an unusually busy month and there has been little respite. In any case, I wanted you to know how much Condi Rice and I appreciate your leadership of the reactivated Hanna House Board of Governors.

It is not surprising that the Board is focusing on the damage suffered at Hanna House in the Loma Prieta earthquake, and I can understand the importance of the stabilization that you have recommended. Tim Warner has confirmed that the necessary money for the stabilization is available through the Nissan Endowment and, by copy of this letter, I am requesting that David Neuman work with Tim to settle the details of the financial arrangements.

Thanks for your patience in waiting to hear of my acceptance of your recommendation on this action. I hope that the stabilization project can be completed before the end of fiscal year 1994, as you suggested.

Sincerely,

Gerhard Casper

cc: Condoleezza Rice
    David Neuman
    Tim Warner
Note for Gravlee, Tiffany

From: Velez, Virginia
Date: Fri, Oct 8, 1993 2:00 PM
Subject: Reschedule of Hanna House Board of Governors Meetings
To: Gibbons, James; Hannan, Michael; Kimball, Margaret J.; Neuman, David; Portwood, Tim; Turner, Paul; Veronin, Valerie; Witscher, Bill
Cc: Angus, Debby; Gravlee, Tiffany

This memorandum overrides the prior one regarding the above-referenced meetings. The meetings will still be held from 8:30 - 10:00 a.m. at Hobby House, however, there have been a substantial number of changes. Please note your calendars as follows:

November 2, 1993
December 9, 1993
January 27, 1994
March 4, 1994
April 7, 1994
May 5, 1994
June 2, 1994
June 30, 1994
July 28, 1994
August 25, 1994
September 29, 1994
November 3, 1994
December 1, 1994

Hopefully, this new schedule will meet everyone's needs. If it does not, please let me know 723-7773.

Thank you.
DATE: October 28, 1993

TO: Hanna House Board of Governors*
FROM: Tiffany Gravlee

SUBJECT: Hanna House Board of Governors November 2, 1993 Agenda

Dear Colleagues:

Enclosed please find the agenda for the meeting of November 2, 1993, with attachments. We look forward to a presentation by our historic preservation consultants Steve Farneth and Martin Weil. The meeting will begin at 8:30 AM, at the Hobby House (on the grounds of the Hanna House).

Thank you

Marilyn Fogel
James Gibbons
Michael Hannan
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood
Paul Turner
William Witscher

CC: President Casper
Academic Secretary
Valerie Veronin
DATE: October 12, 1993

TO: Hanna House Board of Governors
FROM: Tiffany Gravlee

SUBJECT: Hanna House Board of Governors August 30, 1993 meeting minutes

Dear Colleagues:

Enclosed please find the minutes from the meeting of August 30th. Please take a moment to review the minutes and bring any corrections to the next meeting on Tuesday, November 2nd. An agenda for the next meeting will follow.

Thank you

* Marilyn Fogel
James Gibbons
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood
Paul Turner
William Witscher

CC: President Casper
Academic Secretary
Valerie Veronin
Hanna House Board of Governors
Minutes
September 30, 1993
8:30 - 9:30 am
Hobby House, at the Hanna House

Members Present: Paul Turner (Chair)
Marilyn Fogel
James Gibbons
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood
Bill Witscher

Members Absent: James Ingle

Others Present: Tiffany Gravlee, Planning Office Staff
Valerie Veronin, Facilities Project Management

I. Review of Minutes - August 19, 1993 Please see attachment #1

T. Portwood: the minutes should be revised to reflect that the Board decided on retaining wall repair and strengthening option 2 rather than option 3. The final design will need to be approved by the Section 106 reviewers, who may require some modification. Significant modifications, if required, will be brought back to the Board for consideration.

II. Status Report on Reconstruction Issues

Report on the letter to the President: Please see attachment #2

P. Turner read the letter to the President. He has not received a response to date. Approval from the President is necessary before reconstruction can proceed. N. Neuman will contact the President's Office regarding a response.

National Park Service Cost Sharing Program: Please see attachment #3

D. Neuman: the Hanna House was not selected for funding. Although strongly supported by the regional NPS office for National Register properties, the reviewing committee had assumed that Stanford could pay for the repairs. The regional office had suggested that a "friends of the Hanna House" group might have more success with finding funding, however it would not be worth setting
up such a group for this amount of funding. The regional office also suggested revisiting the Getty Grant. This could be looked into, however D. Neuman noted that previous discussion with the Director of the program had revealed that there are many hardship cases, including many other Frank Lloyd Wright houses, which are also applying for, or receiving, funds from this source.

Progress of the Section 106 review:

D. Neuman reported that Stanford is in the process of setting up a Programmatic Agreement (PA) with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), the Office of Emergency Services (OES), the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and the National Advisory Council for Historic Preservation (ACHP), which will outline the Section 106 (historic preservation review) process for the remainder of the seismic rehabilitation projects resulting from the Loma Prieta Earthquake.

The PA addresses the buildings in various groupings. The first group is minor repairs and small projects which do not require review if repaired in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. The remainder of the buildings are grouped according to construction type (sandstone, unreinforced brick, wood frame, concrete and steel), with a few unique projects which will be reviewed separately (Green Library, Hanna House, Stanford Museum and Anatomy). It is in the University's interest to concentrate on establishing the PA before proceeding to specific reviews.

Although FEMA pays for only 75% of the eligible repair/rehabilitation costs, the entire project is subject to the Section 106 review by the historic preservation arm of FEMA, the SHPO, and the National ACHP.

III. General Discussion  Please see attachment #4

Question #1: How best to proceed, in determining a plan for the Hanna House reconstruction? (e.g., how to evaluate the different approaches to architectural preservation; invite a professional, such as our consultants, to talk with us on the subject?)

P. Turner: the experts disagree on preservation philosophies, and yet the Board of Governors needs to be informed in order to make decisions regarding the degree of reconstruction/rehabilitation appropriate, whether to preserve original fabric or original appearance, and how to establish structural standards. It is important to hear various views. Randolph Langenbaugh, an historic preservationist and FEMA employee, may want to speak to the group.

D. Neuman: Steve Farneth and Martin Weil, our consultants for the Hanna House project, are well-known, prominent preservation architects who could
present the various views to the Board. An article on Martin Weil will be circulated (please see attachment #5).

In past conversations with Wesley Peters at Taliesin, his opinion is that the Hanna House was the work of many people, and that it is difficult to know to which point to restore the house. Randolph Langenbaugh had also spoken to D. Neuman about the possibility of a seminar, however it should be cautioned that Randolph is part of the Section 106 reviewing group for the Hanna House, as well as for the rest of the campus. As such, there possibly exists a conflict of interests. Such a review could also open the door for additional reviews for other campus buildings, upsetting a sensitive process which is already in place.

T. Portwood: this question should be considered in light of question #4 (potential appropriate uses of the Hanna House). We need to be aware of what uses the President and Provost have in mind.

J. Gibbons: how much would it cost to bring in the project's preservationists to talk with the Board?

D. Neuman: the cost would not be significant.

J. Gibbons: did Wright really remain interested in this building? Other than the American Institute of Architects (AIA designated this house as one of 17 of Wright's most significant works), do others consider this to be a significant building?

P. Turner: Wright definitely kept very interested in the house, and kept in contact with the Hannas, who maintained the integrity of the house. The Hanna House was a significant house in Wright's career (note: the Hanna House is a National Historic Landmark, listed in the National Register of Historic Places).

M. Fogel: Agreed with P. Turner, and added that only the summer house was designed by Wesley Peters; the rest of the house was designed by Wright, and he visited it frequently.

**Question #4: What are some potential appropriate future uses of the Hanna House?**

T. Portwood: who should be brought in to discuss uses with the Board?

**Involvement of President and Provost**

D. Neuman: President Casper is very interested in the Hanna House. He potentially sees the Hanna House as one of several houses, along with the Lake House and Buck Estate, which could be used for special University events. This is what he was thinking before the Hanna House Board of Governors was
reconvened. The Board of Governors has now been charged with advising the President as to the appropriate uses of the buildings.

Hannas' wishes

T. Portwood: the Hannas asked for an endowment for maintenance, and a chair for a visiting professor, but Nissan provided the endowment only. The Board needs to show that it has considered the donor's wishes.

P. Turner: their first choice was that the house be used for academic purposes, particularly architectural study. Their second choice was a residence for visiting professors. P. Turner spoke with the Hannas and tried to convince them that using the house as a residence for a rotating professorship was not the best use of the house (each resident would want to make changes, excessive wear and tear on the house, etc.), and they agreed that it might be a problem.

Conference space

J. Gibbons: although limited in size, the Hanna House could be used very well as conference space, as well as for entertainment. There is an extraordinary need for conference space; reservations for the Buck Estate have to be made a year in advance. The Board should find out the demand for additional conference space.

T. Portwood: the use of the house for conferences rather than as a residence might allow more tours, which would make the house more available for students of architecture, in keeping with the donor's wishes.

Other Universities' use of Wright houses

D. Neuman: some research should be done (action: T. Gravlee) on how Frank Lloyd Wright houses are being used/maintained at other institutions; e.g., the Robie House at the University of Chicago.

Costs/codes associated with various uses

J. Gibbons: uses need to be decided on before moving into extensive fund-raising efforts. What capital and operating expenses would be tied to the various proposed uses?

R. Hornby: would codes preclude any uses?

Guidelines for use, monitoring of proposed changes

M. Fogel: regardless of use, strict guidelines for use should be in place. Monitoring of any changes were performed by the Provost's office in the past; this was a conflict of interest which allowed some changes to be made which
should not have been made; e.g., the swimming pool. Monitoring by the Development Office might also constitute a conflict of interest. Strict oversight by a neutral body of any work orders, Form 1's or proposed changes would be necessary. Perhaps the University Architect should do this review.

T. Portwood: whoever reviews potential changes should report any and all proposed changes to the Board of Governors for comment at each meeting.

P. Turner: use of the house for special events may be best, with careful monitoring.

Caretaker, neighborhood relations

M. Fogel: the Hobby Shop was originally supposed to be a caretaker's cottage. The caretaker would have overseen use of the house, but the University has taken this role. Some sort of on-site caretaker might be reinstated.

D. Neuman: perhaps the Docent's office could be on-site in the Hobby House, in order to monitor day to day use of the house. Also, neighborhood relations will need to be considered. Parking will likely be an issue.

Question #5: How shall the Hanna House Furnishings be conserved and/or used?

M. Kimball: There appear to be some errors in the Furniture Inventory regarding where the furniture is stored. Also, the furniture should be carefully crated and conserved in order to protect it in storage. How is the furniture being stored currently?

T. Gravlee: Much of the furniture is at the Buck Estate, and some is on loan. Current storage locations and methods will be verified, and the record updated.

IV. Future Meetings

It was proposed and agreed that the Hanna House Board of Governors meet on the last Thursday of every month, at 8:30 - 10:00 AM. Martin Weil and Steve Farneth will be invited to the next session.
Hanna House Board of Governors
Minutes
August 19, 1993
9:00 - 10:30 am
Hobby House, at the Hanna House

Members Present: Paul Turner (Chair)
Marilyn Fogel
James Gibbons
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood
Bill Witscher

Members Absent: James Ingle

Others Present: Tiffany Gravlee, Planning Office Staff
Valerie Veronin, Facilities Project Management

I. Review of Minutes - July 9, 1993

B. Witscher moved to accept the last meetings minutes, T. Portwood seconded the movement, and all were in favor.

II. General Discussion of Charge, continued from last meeting
P. Turner recommended that this discussion be postponed, in order to address more pressing issues.

III. Report on Structural Alternatives and Costs

Process:

D. Neuman: when the Board of Governors has agreed with the site stabilization scheme, it should recommend to the President that this work be done as soon as funding can be identified. The project would not be required to be approved by the Board of Trustees, due to its size. V. Veronin summarized the steps as 1) make decision to go through with the site stabilization, 2) advise the President, and 3) determine funding.
Site Stabilization Scheme:

V. Veronin: FEMA is willing to separate the project into site stabilization, and the remainder of the house strengthening. Two schemes have been proposed:

1. rebuild the collapsed wall, and build a new wall in front of the rest of the existing wall. Historic preservation effect: original fabric would be salvaged but hidden from view, and width of the wall would be at least doubled.

2. rebuild the collapsed wall, and insert tie-backs through the rest of the existing wall. Historic preservation effect: multiple patches in the wall will be difficult to match exactly, and will be somewhat visible, but much of the historic fabric of the wall will be salvaged.

V. Veronin provided a preliminary draft cost estimate that would apply to either of the options above (see attached). She emphasized that the project will be reviewed by State Historic Preservation Office, and the National Advisory Council for Historic Preservation, and the solution will be affected by this review. The Board of Governors reviewed the options at the site, and agreed with scheme 2, with an emphasis on the tie-backs rather than altering the width of the wall. T. Portwood moved, and J. Gibbons seconded, and all were in favor of the second scheme, as reviewed by these agencies. P. Turner will send a letter to the President, alerting him of this decision, as discussed above.

M. Fogel suggested a liaison with the Frank Lloyd Wright Conservancy. D. Neuman confirmed that we have been in contact with Taliesin West, and other Frank Lloyd Wright groups, but that groups should continue to be notified, through the architectural consultants, of work being done. He noted that there are three levels of work needing to be done at the Hanna House: Phase 1 - stabilization, Phase 2 - restoration/rehabilitation, and Phase 3 - conservation. FEMA is only responsible for repair, which falls into the first two phases. Only phases 1 and 2 are being considered at this time; phase 3 will likely be postponed.

Funding:

V. Veronin confirmed that all current funds in the Hanna House account have been used for architectural, engineering and testing services. The estimated outstanding cost to Stanford for the site stabilization is on the order of $220,000, and suggested that the letter to the President acknowledge that funds for the house will need to come from a source which would not compete for funds for other University activities. V.
Veronin emphasized that cost numbers can only be certain when the project is bid.

T. Portwood noted that fundraising for sitework is difficult, when the final opening date of the house is unknown. M. Fogel suggested that some professionals or materials suppliers might be willing to donate gifts in kind. Gladding Mc-Bean was mentioned as a possible supplier who might be interested. V. Veronin: Nissan endowment provides $50,000 per year for maintenance. There should be funds from the last few years which weren't used. B. Witscher: he suggested that borrowing against the endowment might be considered in order to accomplish the work expeditiously, since the endowment will be useless if the house is destroyed in the next earthquake. He will confirm what amount of funds are available. T. Portwood will look at the original documents of the endowment to see if it is possible to borrow against the endowment.

IV. General Business

National Park Service (NPS) Cost Share Program:

T. Gravlee: another possible source of funding is the NPS Cost Share Program, which will provide matching funds of up to $40,000. The NPS favors proposals which provide over-matches, and the project must be completed within the fiscal year, employ youth, provide accessibility, or encourage apprenticeships, etc. Due date for the proposal is August 30th. Information on the cost breakdown and other funds available are necessary for completion of the proposal. V. Veronin and B. Witscher confirmed that they would forward the pertinent information. It was unanimously agreed to submit this application, if matching funds from the Nissan endowment were available.

Furniture Inventory:

T. Gravlee: a photo copy of the Hanna House furniture inventory prepared by David Hanks has been located, however the original document has not. D. Hanks has negatives from which we can obtain color photos, if the original document cannot be found. M. Kimball, M. Fogel, P. Turner, T. Portwood, and R. Hornby wanted a copy of the document. (Rose Guntly and Phyllis Perrault will also receive a copy). D. Neuman noted that the furniture could be displayed as part of a fundraising effort, but that the Development Office has not looked favorably on this in the past. M. Kimball noted the need for adequate storage for antiques from other buildings as well. D. Neuman confirmed that this is currently being considered.

Agenda prepared by Tiffany Gravlee, Planning Office, for David Neuman and Paul Turner
October 5, 1993
Attachment #1
Historical Society Tour:

T. Portwood: the Stanford Historical Society would like to host a tour of the Hanna House in a publicity and fund-raising effort. M. Fogel and P. Turner agreed to help lead the tour. V. Veronin stressed that the tour should not enter the house, nor stand on the damaged terrace, in order to protect the house, and those on the tour.

VI. Future Meetings
P. Turner: next meeting should occur in late September. It was agreed that it would be helpful if P. Turner would send out a list of issues to be discussed at the next meeting, so that the members of the Board could be prepared.

VII. Optional Tour of the Hanna House

A brief tour was conducted.
Gerhard Casper
Office of the President
Building 10
Stanford University

Dear Gerhard:

As chairman of the newly reactivated Hanna House Board of Governors, I’m writing to report on our initial deliberations and recommendations.

The most urgent matter, of course, concerns the damage that the Hanna House suffered in the Loma Prieta earthquake. The board’s first two meetings focused on the seismic-engineering reports on the damage, proposals for reconstruction, and the costs these would entail. Several types of reconstruction have been proposed or discussed; they represent not only different structural solutions but different philosophies of architectural preservation, and the board will be considering these issues further before making recommendations on them.

We have determined, however, that one part of the Hanna House reconstruction is urgent and must be addressed immediately: the stabilization of the retaining walls and the soil supporting the house on its west side, in order to prevent much greater damage in the event of another earthquake. We are recommending, therefore, that site stabilization be separated from the repair of the rest of the house, and that this stabilization be accomplished as soon as possible.

We understand that the stabilization will cost approximately $220,000. The Hanna House Earthquake Repair account is currently depleted, as the funds have been used for engineering and architectural studies of the site and building. However, a sum of about $200,000 has accrued in the Nissan Endowment, established to provide funds for the maintenance of the Hanna House. Another $20,000 or more may be acquired through a National Park Service cost-sharing program, if the project is completed within the 1994 fiscal year. It therefore appears that funds will be available to carry out the stabilization of the house. We recommend that action be taken on this as quickly as possible.

If you have any questions or wish additional information, please contact me or David Neuman.

Cordially yours,

[Signature]

Paul V. Turner

copy: David Neuman
September 23, 1993

David Neuman, FAIA
University Architect
Stanford University Planning Office
855 Serra Street
Stanford, California 94305-6114

Re: Challenge Cost-Share Program

Dear Mr. Neuman:

Thank you very much for submitting a Challenge Cost-Share proposal for site stabilization at the Hanna Honeycomb House. We regret that your proposal was not selected for funding by the regional committee that ranked the projects. Although the final appropriation has not yet been determined, we believe that the Challenge Cost-Share Program will receive approximately $3 million for projects nationwide, instead of the hoped-for $5 million. Thus, fewer projects than anticipated will be funded this year.

We believe that your proposal demonstrated a very worthwhile project and we greatly appreciate the time and effort you put into developing the proposal. We will keep you informed as to the next deadline for Cost-Share proposals or as other funding opportunities come to our attention.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Margaret Pepin-Donat, Chief
Division of National Register Programs
HANNA HOUSE BOARD OF GOVERNORS:
POSSIBLE QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

1. How best to proceed, in determining a plan for the Hanna House reconstruction? (e.g., how to evaluate the different approaches to architectural preservation; invite a professional, such as our consultants, to talk with us on the subject?)

2. Should there be publicity on the Hanna House damage and plans for its reconstruction? (Possible motives for publicity: to stimulate gifts, to answer questions people are asking, to create good will. Possible target groups of publicity: the Stanford community, alumni, architectural community, general public. Possible kinds of publicity: a brochure, news releases, articles in architectural -- preservation or general -- interest magazines.)

3. Are there reasons to create a support group for the Hanna House?

4. What are some potential appropriate future uses of the Hanna House?

5. How shall the Hanna House furnishings be conserved and/or used?
You might think you had arrived at the wrong address. Architect Martin Eli Weil's Craftsman Style office and residence at 2175 Cambridge Street in the West Adams neighborhood of inner-city Los Angeles looks down-at-the-heels—not neglected. And Weil makes no excuses for the condition of his office and home of eight years. He explains that he is letting the twenty-year-old peeling and chipped white exterior paint disintegrate "in preparation for restoring it to its original nut-brown stain." While renovating the mechanical, heating, and plumbing systems, Weil has retained the building's "antique look," as he calls it, on the interior, and old layers of paint peek through newer ones. The effect resembles an archaeological site, which is Weil's precise intention, for he believes in allowing many of the buildings he restores to reveal their evolution over time.

The house on Cambridge Street is, in fact, an example of the work of the brothers Charles S. and Henry M. Greene of Pasadena, whose designs represent the apogee of the Craftsman Style bungalow. During the early years of the twentieth century, the Craftsman Style became the western equivalent of the contemporary Prairie Style, which was becoming increasingly popular in the middle sections of the country. Weil, whose expertise is paint analysis and restoration, has made a minor specialty of rehabilitating Craftsman Style houses. Among his other achievements have been the renovation of the El Capitan Theater in downtown Los Angeles; the refurbish-
ment of Frank Lloyd Wright's Hollyhock House and Storer House, also in Los Angeles; and the creation of urban revitalization plans for two small California communities, Porterville and La Verne.

Weil believes that his office serves as an advertisement—as a work in progress. His preferred approach to preservation calls for minimal intervention. Not that Weil intends to leave the interior of his house as raw-looking as it now is. He has begun to repaint the surfaces, using the original, mostly other colors for the ceilings and shades of gray-green, sea blue, and olive for the walls. "It's taken a long time to do because I take a long time to think about how to do it," Weil explains. He adds that some of what he tries to do is considered quite unconventional "because people want things to look pretty, and I'm not interested in pretty. I'm interested in the historical and cultural importance of a building—in the evolution of a building."

That Weil's own history is somewhat unusual should come as no surprise. "People look at me and think I grew up in New York," he says. In fact, he was born fifty-three years ago to a Jewish family in the small east Montana town of Glasgow, where his father was employed as a civil engineer by the federal government. After the age of four Weil grew up in Omaha, "always being programmed to go to college, choose a career that would do something for others, and then to move somewhere else. Making money was presented to my two brothers and me as being somehow suspect."

Weil's decision to become a restoration architect was, like many of his life choices, the result of intuition rather than analysis. "I think things happen in your life and you suddenly know that's what you're supposed to do," Weil says. "I didn't plan ahead like young people do today." One summer while he was in college at the University of Iowa, Weil worked for the National Park Service as a draftsman, helping an architect restore a fort in eastern Wyoming. That did it. Weil says, "I had never looked at historic buildings before, and I have no idea why this experience made me want to become a restoration architect."

Weil studied for his chosen profession at the University of Pennsylvania's architecture school and then at the Winterthur Museum in Winterthur, Delaware. That institution's approach of "studying history through material culture and using a building and its furniture as historical documents suited me very well." Weil says.

Because Weil was "crazy to go to New York," he started his career working in that city for a full-service architecture firm. During that period he was "thrilled" to rehab a house, working without pay. Then, in 1971—after working as a restoration consultant for four years and following another four-year stint with the Philadelphia restoration architect John Dickey—Weil accepted a position with the Canadian government's Indian and Northern Affairs Restoration Services Division in Ottawa.

Among the most memorable aspects of his eight-year stay in Ottawa, recalls Weil, was his emergence as an activist. It started with his involvement in saving Montreal's Romanesque Revival Style Windsor Station. How that came about was vintage Weil. After reading an article about the station's threatened demolition, he recalls, he "just got on a bus and went up to Montreal." He helped found The Friends of Windsor Station, which saved the structure, and helped write a report and a book about the station. Weil also founded the Society for the Study of Architecture in Canada, which he regards as his most important contribution to that country. His fondest memory from his Canadian experience, however, was of saving "some murals, whose roots went back to Eastern Europe, from a synagogue in Ottawa."
Weil's decision to move to Los Angeles in the winter of 1978 was, characteristically, somewhat impulsive. "I liked the architecture. I liked the sun, and it seemed easier than living in New York or Boston." In retrospect, says Weil, the move was "the most foolish thing I've ever done. It was like smashing my life to pieces." Weil knew no one and nothing about the city; he had no work and, shortly after his arrival, the real estate market collapsed. His response was to go to work for the Los Angeles Conservancy, which had just been launched and would become, with Weil's help, the largest preservation organization west of the Mississippi River. Eventually, of course, Weil's volunteer work for the Conservancy, which included two terms as president, brought him architecture commissions.

Today, Weil feels at home in Los Angeles and in his inner-city neighborhood. He has become accustomed to practicing restoration architecture in a region in which his 1905 house is regarded as "ante-diluvian," as he describes it, and in which most of the "old" architecture dates from between the 1920s and 1950s. The exception, he says, is Los Angeles's downtown, which dates from the turn of the century and is one of the few original American downtowns that has survived urban renewal intact. Weil points out that downtown Los Angeles's Broadway, a historic district that boasts sixteen movie palaces and serves as a Latino shopping area, "makes as much money per square foot as does Rodeo Drive." That hasn't kept Broadway from deteriorating, however. The upper stories of most of its buildings are vacant, and no one knows how to revitalize the area, says Weil.

His main contribution to renewing Los Angeles's downtown has been the renovation of the El Capitan theater, a product of the 1920s boom that recently reopened as a showcase for the Walt Disney Company's movies. The renowned contemporary architect Charles Moore characterized the original El Capitan as "controlledly frenzied... a kind of baroque in bondage." By the time Weil was hired to restore it, the theater had been camouflaged by a modern facade, which he stripped away. He then reproduced El Capitan's elaborate original exterior frieze from a few fragments and restored the lobby as a tropical fantasy of sorts.

What Weil is probably best known for, however, is his restoration of buildings by Frank Lloyd Wright. Among them is the 1923 Storer residence, now the property of the producer Joel Silver. It is one of four Wright-designed houses in Los Angeles, represents the architect's "baroque interlude," and, along with Wright's other Angeleno buildings, is differentiated by its so-called knit-block construction by which the blocks are knit together with a web of steel reinforcing rods. The most arduous part of renovating the Storer House, which was crumbling and overgrown when Silver bought it in 1975, was replacing almost all of the concrete blocks with new ones tinted with decomposed granite from the site. Frank Lloyd Wright's grandson Eric worked with Weil on the house, as did the interior decorator Linda Marder.

Wright's most ambitious work in Los Angeles was the complex he designed for the oil heiress Aline Barnsdall, who was as eccentric as Wright himself. Among other things, she supported the Russian revolution before it became fashionable to do so in the 1930s. Although Barnsdall wanted to build a performing artists' colony of more than forty buildings, only four structures were completed on the property: two studio residences, a kindergarten, and Hollyhock House, which was named for the flowers that grew wild on the site. Barnsdall, herself, never lived in Hollyhock House, which is today a house museum run by (Continued on Page 90)
**VINRGINIA**

**GUNSTON HALL**

Built 1755 by George Mason
Author of the Virginia Declaration of Rights
Framer of the United States Constitution

William Buckland masterpiece
18th-century furnishings

Formal gardens with 18th-century boxwood

Open Daily 9:30 to 5:00
Lorton, Virginia 22079
Follow signs from I-95 on U.S. 1
22 miles south of Washington
(703) 550-9220

---

**AFRICA**

**THE CIVILIZED ADVENTURE**

The historic past segues into the present as you explore and experience the wonders of a Continent: The Okavango Delta; The Great Zimbabwe Ruins; The Mount Nelson Hotel; The Blue Train and Rovos Rail; The private reserves of Kenya; Olduvai Gorge; Giraffe Manor; and, of course, the wildlife.

**SAFARIWORLD!**

800-366-0505

---

**ENGLAND**

**EXPLORE A UNIQUE CORNER**

of Britain

- Follow in the footsteps of great Roman legions
- Discover the medieval splendor of mighty Norman castles
- Explore magnificent medieval abbeys and quiet country churches
- Relax and enjoy the comfort and elegance of an English country estate

"Border Discoveries offers a rare opportunity to turn back the pages of British history in the glorious, unspoiled setting of the borderlands of Wales."

**Border Discoveries**

1324 Skipwith Road
McLean, Virginia 22101
(703) 366-1101
FAX 202/532-1601

---

**WISCONSIN**

**RESERVE YOUR PLACE IN HISTORY.**

The American Club® in Kohler, a AAA Five-Diamond resort hotel on the National Register of Historic Places, is located one hour north of Milwaukee. Experience renowned restaurants; Blackwolf Run championship golf course; complete health, racquet and spa facilities; and a 500-acre wilderness preserve.

Call for a free brochure and to reserve your place in history.

**The American Club**
Kohler, Wisconsin
1-800-344-2838

---

**THE ARCHITECT**

(Continued from Page 15) the Los Angeles Department of Cultural Affairs. Built in the Mayan style that Wright favored in the early 1920s, the house crowning Olive Hill was meant to express "a romanza that would be beautiful in the way that California herself is beautiful," wrote Wright in his autobiography. But because Wright was also busy at the time overseeing construction of Tokyo's Imperial Hotel, the completion of Hollyhock House was left to his son Lloyd Wright, to Rudolph Schindler, and to Richard Neutra. The fortresslike building conceals an inner courtyard through which a stream winds its way, disappearing under the house to reemerge within it as a moat surrounding a massive fireplace. "Nothing, in short, could be more outre. more Holly-

The majority of Weil's clients, however, come to him because of his reputation for restoring less prestigious residences, especially Craftsman Style houses like his own.

wood-in-the-nineteen-twenties in its romantic symbolism," writes Meryle Secrest in her recent biography, Frank Lloyd Wright.

Complicating the restoration of Hollyhock House were two previous renovations, both supervised by Lloyd Wright, who tried to "modernize" the building in 1946 and then to return it to its original state in 1975. With respect to the living room alone it took preservationists, led by curator Virginia Kazor, more than a decade to determine what the space had looked like when Frank Lloyd Wright's design was completed in 1921 and to raise funds for its restoration. Weil carried out a historic-structure report for the complex, Compiling the restoration of Hollyhock House were two previous renovations, both supervised by Lloyd Wright, who tried to "modernize" the building in 1946 and then to return it to its original state in 1975. With respect to the living room alone it took preservationists, led by curator Virginia Kazor, more than a decade to determine what the space had looked like when Frank Lloyd Wright's design was completed in 1921 and to raise funds for its restoration. Weil carried out a historic-structure report for the complex, Complicating the restoration of Hollyhock House were two previous renovations, both supervised by Lloyd Wright, who tried to "modernize" the building in 1946 and then to return it to its original state in 1975. With respect to the living room alone it took preservationists, led by curator Virginia Kazor, more than a decade to determine what the space had looked like when Frank Lloyd Wright's design was completed in 1921 and to raise funds for its restoration. Weil carried out a historic-structure report for the complex, Complicating the restoration of Hollyhock House were two previous renovations, both supervised by Lloyd Wright, who tried to "modernize" the building in 1946 and then to return it to its original state in 1975. With respect to the living room alone it took preservationists, led by curator Virginia Kazor, more than a decen...
DEEP IN THE HEART

(Continued from Page 37) Texas State University, which it hopes will produce Elderhostel programs, summer teaching institutes, chautauquas, and related economic opportunities. And it continues to champion small family businesses that promote the kind of “sharing” that Teskey admires. Places such as John Thomas’s Wildseed Incorporated, with its fields of poppies, or Oma’s Haus & Garden, an organic farm near Stonewall, or any of the half a dozen wineries that have cropped up in the Hill Country because of its low humidity and nonacidic soil.

Five years ago Ned Simes left the oil business and moved to Stonewall, where he and his son Lee, a psychiatrist recently returned from Montana, operate Grape Creek Vineyards. Together they produce 1,700 cases of wine a year on sixteen acres, and hope to increase that to 2,000 cases next year. The rest of the family operates a peach stand and makes special jellies, jams, and vinegars. Clearly no threat to Ernest and Julio Gallo, but then that’s not the goal. “This is not a hobby,” says Ned. “We are doing this to have something that we can pass on to our children and grandchildren.” He has already started by putting away a case of his best cabernet sauvignon for his granddaughter’s wedding.

In most respects the Heartland story could serve as a paradigm of rural conservation efforts around the country. Like people in rural Maine or southern Appalachia, the residents of Stonewall and Comfort and Sisterdale are struggling to preserve the work of local culture without throwing up fences or treating the Heartland as a rural museum. Fences never make good neighbors, and they don’t work anyway. Change is coming. The challenge for the Heartland Council is to steer it in the right direction. Away from blind exploitation.

In this role it can’t function as a chamber of commerce or an economic development commission. Its spirit and its finances preclude that. It must listen and encourage and occasionally provoke, and through these actions create a regional community where, like Carroll Smith, people can “choose the place” and still make a living without feeling that they must sacrifice everything that attracted them to the Heartland in the first place.

David Dillon is the architecture critic for the Dallas Morning News.

SHELL GAME

(Continued from Page 42) Shell would remedy the bandstand’s deficiencies. In 1916 Naumburg commissioned his nephew, William Gabriel Tachau, to design the shell. Tachau, a graduate of Columbia University and the École des Beaux-Arts, was an architect of synagogues, armories, college buildings, and the Aaron Naumburg apartment in New York’s Hotel des Artistes—rooms that have since been dismantled and reconstructed in Harvard University’s Fogg Museum. An announcement of the commencement of the band shell’s long-delayed construction was made in March 1923, and within six months it was built and dedicated.

Tachau’s reinforced-concrete structure, sheathed in Indiana limestone, was backed into the lower edge of the slope leading from the Wisteria Pergola, directly across the Mall from the site of Jacob Mould’s bandstand. The new structure’s coffered inner shell in the shape of a half-hemisphere must have reminded music lovers of the shell above Carnegie Hall’s stage. Tachau ingeniously buried within the slope two small changing rooms that are accessible through the door at the rear of the stage. He provided twin stone staircases that climb the hill while hugging the shell’s outer curve, join together behind the shell, then ascend in a single flight to the level of the pergola. And he placed a row of eleven low-relief limestone plaques around the rear of the shell to relieve the limestone expanse.

The New York Times reported that 10,000 persons attended the band shell’s dedication seventy years ago. Naumburg made two short speeches and turned the structure over to the acting mayor, the park commissioner, and the city chamberlain, who accepted Naumburg’s gift on behalf of the city. A sixty-piece orchestra and a soprano performed works by Beethoven, Rossini, Bizet, Verdi, and Tchaikovsky, and ended their concert with a march. “On the Mall,” composed and conducted by Edwin Franko Goldman and dedicated to Naumburg.

The following year, 1924, Naumburg died at the age of eighty-nine. But the Naumburg Concerts were continued in the band shell, underwritten by Elkan’s sons. Walter and George, and following their deaths by an endowment in Walter’s will. (Naumburg also left a foundation that annually sponsors the Naumburg Award for young musicians.) A 1980 list of musical artists who had performed in the Naumburg concert series during the preceding seventy-five years included conductors Max Rudolf, Robert Shaw, Julius Rudel, and Joseph Silverstein; vocalists Judith Raskin, Robert Rounsville, and William Warfield; and jazz clarinetist Benny Goodman.

Although a complete record of the band shell’s users apparently does not exist, such a list would include dance bands, glee clubs, barbershop quartets, politicians, orators, and magicians. Mayor Fiorello La Guardia and the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., spoke there. Leonard Bernstein conducted there, the Grateful Dead performed there, and John Lennon’s fans held a candlelight vigil there the evening that the former Beatle was murdered. For its first fifty years the
HANNA HOUSE BOARD OF GOVERNORS:
POSSIBLE QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

1. How best to proceed, in determining a plan for the Hanna House reconstruction? (e.g., how to evaluate the different approaches to architectural preservation; invite a professional, such as our consultants, to talk with us on the subject?)

2. Should there be publicity on the Hanna House damage and plans for its reconstruction? (Possible motives for publicity: to stimulate gifts, to answer questions people are asking, to create good will. Possible target groups of publicity: the Stanford community, alumni, architectural community, general public. Possible kinds of publicity: a brochure, news releases, articles in architectural -- preservation or general -- interest magazines.)

3. Are there reasons to create a support group for the Hanna House?

4. What are some potential appropriate future uses of the Hanna House?

5. How shall the Hanna House furnishings be conserved and/or used?

1. David Neumann spoke with Wes Peters, who had been intimately involved as a Hanna House design consultant.
July 14, 1993

TO: Hanna House Board of Governors

Paul Turner
Marilyn Fogel
James Gibbons
James Ingle

FROM: Tiffany Gravlee

RE: Minutes from the July 9th Meeting of the Hanna House Board of Governors

Friends:

Attached are the minutes from the July 9th meeting which David and I have compiled. If you have any comments, corrections, or additions to the minutes, please contact me (by phone, at 725-3734, or via Email at AR.UAS) and I will incorporate them into the minutes before they are made final.

Sincerely,

Tiffany Gravlee

cc: Craig Comartin
    Valerie Veronin

Attachments
Hanna House Board of Governors
Minutes
July 9, 1993

***DRAFT***DRAFT***DRAFT***

Members Present:  Paul Turner (Chair)
Marilyn Fogel
James Gibbons
James Ingle
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood
Bill Witscher

Members Absent:  Stanford Historical Society Representative
(To Be Announced)

Others Present:  Craig Comartin, Seismic Engineering Consultant
Steve Farneth, Architectural Resource Group
Tiffany Gravlee, Planning Office Staff
Naomi Miroglil, Architectural Resource Group
Valerie Veronin, Facilities Project Management

I.  Opening Remarks
Paul Turner opened the meeting with a brief discussion of the significance of the Hanna House, and the history of the Hanna House Board of Governors. He discussed how the Board of Governors had originally been established to oversee the use of and decisions regarding the Hanna House, and how the Board had included the Provost who lived in the house at the time. He noted that the closure of the house due to the Loma Prieta Earthquake offered an opportunity to revisit the constitution and responsibilities of the Board of Governors, as well as the use of the Hanna House. He indicated that President Casper supported these reviews.

II.  Introduction of Members
All

III.  Review of Charge
Paul Turner reviewed the "Hanna House Board of Governors' Responsibilities" which was distributed with the letter from the President's Office. Particularly, he visited the issue of determining the proper use for the Hanna House, whether as the Provost's house, as housing for a
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"specially-endowed visiting professor", as originally suggested by the Hannas, or some other use. Some of the various uses of the house over time were reviewed, including University functions, and the public tours which were given every two weeks by the Hanna House docents.

IV. General Discussion of Charge
Discussion continued regarding proper use of the house. J. Gibbons noted that the primary donors for the project may have some effect on the use decided upon. Other members discussed the need to keep the building available for the public, and yet protected from wear. Impact on the neighbors would also need to be assessed in the case of extensive public use. An evaluation of the house's various uses in the past has been conducted, and is available in the Planning Office file. The house has frequently been used for University dinners and entertaining. A suggestion was made that someone might contact other institutions which manage historic houses (e.g., University of Southern California, University of Chicago, SUNY-Buffalo, etc.) to compare uses and methods of maintenance, funding, etc.

V. Presentation of Current Status
David Neuman, with representative from Seismic Engineering, and Consultants

a. FEMA Damage Survey Report: Craig Comartin, Seismic Engineering

C. Comartin gave an overview of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and its role at Stanford. He explained the difference between FEMA's acceptable repair, and the County's acceptable, code-compliant repair, and that the amount of the DSR for the Hanna House is far less than the $2-3 M which has been estimated for the code-compliant repair of the house. Stanford has agreed to FEMA's DSR of approximately $206,000 as an initial point of departure, but will further study structural solutions for future action.

b. Outline of Stanford's Proposals to Date: Steve Farneth, ARG

Two structural solutions were outlined which exhibited different preservation philosophies. The first rebuilt the fireplaces entirely, and added a plywood diaphragm at the roof, etc. The second core-drills the existing fireplaces, and strives to insert steel-frames discretely at various locations in order to provide additional shear strength. The first solution results in replicas of the fireplaces, and necessitates removal of roofing, and much of the unique, hexagon-patterned concrete floor. The second solution preserves the original building materials intact, providing applied structural strengthening which attempts to reduce damage to the existing material of the building.

Minutes prepared by T. Gravlee
July 14, 1993
Both solutions require the stabilization and grouting of the hillside, as well as rebuilding retaining walls, and repairing one area of the patio terrace (these latter items are included in the FEMA DSR).

c. Historic Preservation Issues: Steve Farneth

Discussed the effect of the two schemes on the building, and differing preservation philosophies. Noted that ARG will continue to work on reducing the effect of the strengthening on the historic fabric of the original building. House is being preserved to the time that the Hannas gave it to the University, and their alterations are considered to be part of the character of the house.

d. Funding: David Neuman

Verification of the accuracy of the estimates of cost and time to completion were requested, for the purposes of fund-raising. Possible sources of fund-raising were discussed, including Stanford Architectural Alumni (list available in the Planning Office). However it was noted that many of the people who have interest in the Hanna House do not necessarily have the means to support it with substantial funds. M. Fogel noted that she had received calls from potential donors, but didn't know to whom to refer them. T. Portwood confirmed that such calls should be forwarded to him. V. Veronin noted that $150,000 has been raised to date. J. Gibbons suggested that we proceed with the first stage of work (stabilizing the hillside, leveling floors and rebuilding terrace and retaining walls), while completing the process with FEMA. It was moved, seconded, and all were in favor of going forward with the first phase of work, after a report verifying the extent of work, time, and costs is completed. V. Veronin and C. Comartin are coordinating the report, which will be presented at the next meeting.

VI. Future Meetings

The next meeting will be held at the Hanna Hobby House in approximately three weeks, and will address the findings of the report, and the results of the FEMA Section 106 meeting.

VII. Optional Tour of the Hanna House

Postponed until the next meeting.

cc: President Casper
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Hanna House Board of Governors
Agenda
September 30, 1993
8:30 - 9:30 am
Hobby House, at the Hanna House

I. Review of Minutes - August 19, 1993 (5 minutes)
   David Neuman Please see attachment #1

   Please review the Minutes from the Meeting of August 19, 1993 and raise any comments or concerns.

II. Status Report on Reconstruction Issues (10 minutes)
    David Neuman

    A brief report on the letter to the President, the Cost Sharing Program, and the progress of the Section 106 review.

III. General Discussion (40 minutes)
     Paul Turner, All Please see attachment #2

     Please review the attached possible questions for discussion.

IV. Future Meetings (5 minutes)
    Paul Turner - last Thurs. of ee. mth 8:30-10.

Furniture inventory - Risk management issues
   - at Peter Courts??
   - loaned material

Letter to Casper
Cost sharing - denied
Section 106 - overall agreement - N/FEMA / No historic tax

Agenda prepared by T. Gravlee, Planning Office,
September 24, 1993
DATE: September 21, 1993

TO: Hanna House Board of Governors*

FROM: Tiffany Gravlee

SUBJECT: Hanna House Board of Governors meeting on September 30, 1993

Dear Colleagues:

Enclosed please find the agenda for the upcoming meeting on Thursday, September 30, 1993, as well as minutes from the meeting of August 19th, and a list of possible questions for discussion. Please take a moment to review the minutes and list of questions, and bring any corrections or comments to the meeting on Thursday.

Thank you

* Marilyn Fogel
James Gibbons
Rosemary Hornby
James Ingle
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood
Paul Turner
William Witscher

CC: President Casper
Academic Secretary
Valerie Veronin
Hanna House Board of Governors
Minutes
August 19, 1993
9:00 - 10:30 am
Hobby House, at the Hanna House

Members Present: Paul Turner (Chair)
Marilyn Fogel
James Gibbons
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood
Bill Witscher

Members Absent: James Ingle

Others Present: Tiffany Gravlee, Planning Office Staff
Valerie Veronin, Facilities Project Management

I. Review of Minutes - July 9, 1993
B. Witscher moved to accept the last meetings minutes, T. Portwood seconded the movement, and all were in favor.

II. General Discussion of Charge, continued from last meeting
P. Turner recommended that this discussion be postponed, in order to address more pressing issues.

III. Report on Structural Alternatives and Costs

Process:

D. Neuman: when the Board of Governors has agreed with the site stabilization scheme, it should recommend to the President that this work be done as soon as funding can be identified. The project would not be required to be approved by the Board of Trustees, due to its size. V. Veronin summarized the steps as 1) make decision to go through with the site stabilization, 2) advise the President, and 3) determine funding.
Site Stabilization Scheme:

V. Veronin: FEMA is willing to separate the project into site stabilization, and the remainder of the house strengthening. Three schemes have been proposed (the historic preservation arm of FEMA currently prefers scheme 3):

1. rebuild the collapsed wall, and build a new wall in front of the rest of the existing wall. Historic preservation effect: original fabric would be salvaged but hidden from view, and width of the wall would be at least doubled.

2. rebuild the collapsed wall, and insert tie-backs through the rest of the existing wall. Historic preservation effect: multiple patches in the wall will be difficult to match exactly, and will be somewhat visible, but much of the historic fabric of the wall will be salvaged.

3. rebuild the collapsed wall, and utilize the best combination of the above methods for the rest of the wall. Historic preservation effect: see above.

V. Veronin provided a preliminary draft cost estimate that would apply to any of the options above (see attached). She emphasized that the project will be reviewed by State Historic Preservation Office, and the National Advisory Council for Historic Preservation. The Board of Governors reviewed the options at the site, and agreed with scheme 3, with an emphasis on the tie-backs rather than altering the width of the wall. T. Portwood moved, and J. Gibbons seconded, and all were in favor of the third scheme, as reviewed by these agencies. P. Turner will send a letter to the President, alerting him of this decision, as discussed above.

M. Fogel suggested a liaison with the Frank Lloyd Wright Conservancy. D. Neuman confirmed that we have been in contact with Taliesin West, and other Frank Lloyd Wright groups, but that groups should continue to be notified, through the architectural consultants, of work being done. He noted that there are three levels of work needing to be done at the Hanna House: Phase 1 - stabilization, Phase 2 - restoration/rehabilitation, and Phase 3 - conservation. FEMA is only responsible for repair, which falls into the first two phases. Only phases 1 and 2 are being considered at this time; phase 3 will likely be postponed.

Funding:

V. Veronin confirmed that all current funds in the Hanna House account have been used for architectural, engineering and testing services. The estimated outstanding cost to Stanford for the site stabilization is on the
order of $220,000, and suggested that the letter to the President acknowledge that funds for the house will need to come from a source which would not compete for funds for other University activities. V. Veronin emphasized that cost numbers can only be certain when the project is bid.

T. Portwood noted that fundraising for sitework is difficult, when the final opening date of the house is unknown. M. Fogel suggested that some professionals or materials suppliers might be willing to donate gifts in kind. Gladding Mc-Bean was mentioned as a possible supplier who might be interested. V. Veronin: Nissan endowment provides $50,000 per year for maintenance. There should be funds from the last few years which weren't used. B. Witscher: he suggested that borrowing against the endowment might be considered in order to accomplish the work expeditiously, since the endowment will be useless if the house is destroyed in the next earthquake. He will confirm what amount of funds are available. T. Portwood will look at the original documents of the endowment to see if it is possible to borrow against the endowment.

IV. General Business

National Park Service (NPS) Cost Share Program:

T. Gravlee: another possible source of funding is the NPS Cost Share Program, which will provide matching funds of up to $40,000. The NPS favors proposals which provide over-matches, and the project must be completed within the fiscal year, employ youth, provide accessibility, or encourage apprenticeships, etc. Due date for the proposal is August 30th. Information on the cost breakdown and other funds available are necessary for completion of the proposal. V. Veronin and B. Witscher confirmed that they would forward the pertinent information. It was unanimously agreed to submit this application, if matching funds from the Nissan endowment were available.

Furniture Inventory:

T. Gravlee: a photo copy of the Hanna House furniture inventory prepared by David Hanks has been located, however the original document has not. D. Hanks has negatives from which we can obtain color photos, if the original document cannot be found. M. Kimball, M. Fogel, P. Turner, T. Portwood, and R. Hornby wanted a copy of the document. (Rose Guntly and Phyllis Perrault will also receive a copy). D. Neuman noted that the furniture could be displayed as part of a fundraising effort, but that the Development Office has not looked favorably on this in the past. M. Kimball noted the need for adequate
storage for antiques from other buildings as well. D. Neuman confirmed that this is currently being considered.

Historical Society Tour:

T. Portwood: the Stanford Historical Society would like to host a tour of the Hanna House in a publicity and fund-raising effort. M. Fogel and P. Turner agreed to help lead the tour. V. Veronin stressed that the tour should not enter the house, nor stand on the damaged terrace, in order to protect the house, and those on the tour.

VI. Future Meetings
P. Turner: next meeting should occur in late September. It was agreed that it would be helpful if P. Turner would send out a list of issues to be discussed at the next meeting, so that the members of the Board could be prepared.

VII. Optional Tour of the Hanna House

A brief tour was conducted.

Agenda prepared by Tiffany Gravlee, Planning Office, for David Neuman and Paul Turner
September 20, 1993
DATE: September 2, 1993

TO: Marilyn Fogel
    Rose Guntly
    Rosemary Hornby
    Maggie Kimball
    Phyllis Perrault
    Tim Portwood
    Paul Turner
    Valerie Veronin

FROM: Tiffany Gravlee

SUBJECT: Hanna House Furniture Inventory

Attached is a copy of the Hanna House Furniture Inventory prepared by David Hanks and Assoc. in 1990, provided per your request.

* Stored in museum crates *
* Bruce Wiggins - in charge of checking crates items *

cc: David Neuman
TO: Paul Turner  
Chair, Hanna House Board of Governors  

FROM: Tim Portwood  

SUBJECT: Nissan Endowment  

DATE: August 30, 1993

Following up on our Board meeting and Bill Witscher’s memo of August 23, I have spoken with both John Ford and Iris Brest. Based on those conversations, I can confirm the following:

1) The use of funds in the income account for the structural work we are proposing is consistent with the terms of the gift, namely "...to maintain, preserve, and improve the structures and grounds..." of the Hanna House.

2) The gift allows Stanford to spend appreciation as well as income so long as the value of the fund does not drop below $500,000 (the amount of the original gift). If it is necessary to use this source of funds, we will need approval of the Board of Trustees.

One additional point to consider as we move forward toward full restoration: the original Nissan gift contemplated (but did not require) that the house was to be used as a residence for a distinguished visiting professor, for which an endowment would also be sought. This endowment was never raised, and, as we all know, the house was used as the official residence for the Provost until the 1989 earthquake.

cc: Members, Hanna House Board of Governors  
Valerie Veronin  
John Ford  
Iris Brest

Enclosures
TO: Valerie Veronin
FROM: Jon Cosovich
SUBJECT: Nissan Fund for Hanna-Honeycomb House

Attached is a copy of a letter from Mr. Kawamata (12/8/76) which sets out the terms of use for the Nissan gift for an endowment to support the Hanna-Honeycomb House. The Kawamata letter is supplemented by a memo for the record from Daryl Pearson (1/7/77) which clarifies points regarding the donor entity and expenditure of income and appreciation. A copy of the Pearson memo is attached. Also attached is a copy of the Board of Trustees' minute (4/12/77) which confirms the Board's acceptance of the gift on the terms offered.

As further background, I have attached a copy of the original proposal to Nissan. The proposal included a cover letter from Mr. Lyman requesting $500,000 for the preservation/maintenance fund and $1 million endowment for the distinguished visiting professorship, and a description of both packages -- the house and the professorship. The two were closely tied in the proposal and our contacts with Nissan were based on the concept that the house would serve as a residence for the visiting professor. However, it was understood that the University was not (and is not today) committed to proceed with the professorship program as a condition of the gift for the house fund alone, and further, that the house would not be activated as the professorship residence until a professorship endowment gift was received. Nissan declined to provide the professorship endowment.

We are free to use the Nissan Fund income and appreciation above the $500,500 book value while the house serves as the Provost's residence. However, while we are not legally required to do so, we should, as a matter of good donor relations, discuss the fact with both Nissan and the donors of the house if ever it is decided to permanently dedicate the house to serve as the Provost's residence.

Enclosures
Dear Dr. Lyman:

It was a great pleasure for me to have met you and Mrs. Lyman in the course of the Japan-California Association meeting in Sapporo in the summer of 1975. I enjoyed talking with you.

You have followed up on our conversation with a formal request for financial assistance from Nissan which was contained in your letter of August 20, 1976. I am pleased to inform you that we will make available $500,000 to your university through Nissan U.S.A. I hope it will be used as an endowment grant to maintain, preserve, and improve the structures and grounds of Hanna–Honeycomb House so that the distinguished visiting professor can be housed there. I regret that we are not in a position to provide an endowment in support of the distinguished visiting professorship, which you had also requested.

Please have someone from your office contact Mr. Majima, President of Nissan U.S.A., regarding the above grant.

With my kindest regards and best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

K. Kawamata

NISSAN MOTOR CO., LTD.
17-1, 6-chome, Ginza, Chuo-ku
Tokyo, Japan

Katsuji Kawamata
Chairman.

Dr. Richard W. Lyman
President
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305
U.S.A.

December 8, 1976

RECEIVED
DEC 13 1976
PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

 RECEIVED
DEC 14 1976
"OFFICE OF VICE-PRESIDENT AND PROVOST"

K. Kawamata

KK: mg: mi

cc Mr. Majima
Memorandum for the Record

TO: MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

DATE: 1/7/77

SUBJECT: Nissan in USA

Yesterday, Professor Robert Ward, Reid Briggs, and I met at Nissan, USA's office in Los Angeles with Messrs. Yutaka Katayama, Hiroshi Majima, and K. Hotta (Vice President for Finance) to discuss Nissan, USA's pledge to give $500,000 to Stanford. The meeting was extremely cordial and the Nissan group then took us to lunch.

The following points were made by the Nissan group:

1. The $500,000 is definitely a gift from Nissan, USA and not from Nissan in Japan. Stanford's records should clearly reflect this.

2. It is OK for Stanford to spend appreciation as well as ordinary income except that no expenditure of appreciation is to be made if that would bring the then value below $500,000.

3. They do not want a press release because they do not want to appear commercial; they are not seeking publicity. However, the gift is not completely anonymous; it should be classed as Anonymous-External -- construed liberally. Thus, if a reporter came and asked about the gift, Stanford is at liberty to tell of its being made. However, if such an inquiry is made, I suggest we try to contact Mr. Hotta or Mr. Majima before giving out the information.

4. It is OK with them to install a plaque or monument at Hanna-Honeycomb recognizing Nissan's contribution.

5. Mr. Hotta told Professor Ward they would deliver the check in person -- probably in late February.

6. We urged the three to visit the campus. They said they would and Professor Ward will follow through on this. Mr. Katayama said that on his last visit to the campus he especially enjoyed hearing the professors talk about their respective fields of expertise.

7. Mr. Katayama has a collection of handpainted kites and if Stanford wanted them I'm sure that would please him. He said the Smithsonian had a good kite collection.

8. The Nissan group said they had no objection to Stanford's approaching Toyota and Honda for the Distinguished Visiting Professorship.

Daryl H. Pearson

Cc: Mr. Eberle, Professor Ward, Professor Hanna, Mr. Herring, Mr. Organ, Mr. Glen, Processacing, David Fulton

Copies sent 1/12/77
August 20, 1976

Mr. Katsuji Kawamata
Chairman
Nissan Motor Company, Ltd.
17-1 Ginza, 6-chome
Chuo-ku, Tokyo
Japan

Dear Mr. Kawamata:

I recall with pleasure our meeting and conversation at Sapporo last year. I was sorry to learn that you will not be able to attend this year's JCA meeting, since Mrs. Lyman and I had hoped that it might be possible for you to visit Stanford on that occasion.

I am writing now to submit to you and the Nissan Motor Company, Ltd. a proposal that I had hoped to be able to present personally.

The proposal involves the establishment at Stanford University of a Distinguished Visiting Professorship and, as a perquisite of that Professorship, the privilege of residing in Hanna-Honeycomb House, an architectural masterpiece designed by Frank Lloyd Wright and famed throughout the world as the first and best of his creations to employ the hexagonal scheme of design.

Hanna-Honeycomb House lies at the heart of our proposal. Commissioned originally in 1935 by Professor and Mrs. Paul Hanna, and later deeded by them as a gift to the University in 1974, the residence is located on the Stanford campus. The University is proud of the House which attracts visitors from all over the globe. We feel that the pleasure and distinction of living in Hanna-Honeycomb House during a period of residence at Stanford would add greatly to the attractiveness of the Visiting Professorship and would insure our continued ability to attract men or women of all nationalities who possess that high degree of international
eminence that we are seeking. This is the background against which I would like to request of the Nissan Motor Company, Ltd.: an endowment grant in the amount of $500,000 to maintain, preserve, and improve the structures and grounds of Hanna-Honeycomb House.

As the other major element of this proposal, Stanford hopes to establish a new form of endowed position: a Distinguished Visiting University Professorship. This would serve the University as a whole rather than any single School or Department. We conceive of it as a post of the very highest honor and prestige which would be held for all or most of an academic year by scholars, artists, or public figures of worldwide repute from many fields of professional endeavor and from many countries. I would like to request of the Nissan Motor Company, Ltd., an endowment in support of this Distinguished Visiting University Professorship in the amount of $1,000,000.

I am submitting this proposal in the light of Stanford's earlier discussions with Nissan that you doubtless recall and of the more detailed documentation prepared at that time. I enclose a copy of this for ready reference. It would be our hope, of course, that the name of Nissan could be conspicuously associated with both the Residence and the Professorship.

Since this proposal involves a large sum of money, I might mention that often gifts of this size are made in installments over a period of years. If, however, a firm pledge for the full endowment over an agreed time were received, it might be possible to activate the program in the fairly near future.

May I add a few words about Stanford. We are, as you may know, among the two or three leading private universities in the United States. For example, our Graduate School of Business -- under the direction of Dean Arjay Miller, formerly President of the Ford Motor Company -- and our School of Education are ranked first in the country by authoritative national surveys, our School of Engineering is second, our School of Medicine
third, etc. Stanford is, therefore, without a doubt the most distinguished private university in the entire western half of the United States. Our location on the eastern shores of the Pacific Ocean naturally orients us toward the West and toward Japan. Our ties with Japan go back to 1900 and have multiplied in the succeeding years. I mention these matters only because we feel that the vast and rapidly growing importance of the Western United States is sometimes overlooked abroad.

Let me conclude on the note that I hope that you will find it possible to stop off for a brief visit at Stanford in the course of one of your trips. Mrs. Lyman and I would very much enjoy an opportunity to show you the campus and renew our acquaintance.

Cordially yours,

Richard W. Lyman

Enclosure
Hanna Honeycomb House

Fund for Maintenance - Nissan Motor Company of U.S.A.

Principal $525,487 as of 8/31/80
Income Balance 19,615 as of 8/31/80

Income Statement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Income earned:</th>
<th>Income returned to principal</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Balance as of 8/31/80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>$10,920</td>
<td>(1,369)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$19,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>28,396</td>
<td>(4,048)</td>
<td>(28,383)</td>
<td>5,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>31,961</td>
<td>(7,258)</td>
<td></td>
<td>30,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>41,770</td>
<td>(12,812)</td>
<td>(39,562)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X-Filed: Paul Hanna
Nissan Motor Co.
Hanna Honeycomb House

- Jon Cosovich - Desk File
Mon, Aug 23, 1993

To: Paul Turner  
Chair, Hanna House Board of Governors

From: Bill Witscher

Subject: Availability of Maintenance Funds for Hanna House

At our meeting last week, I agreed to look into the availability of funds which might pay for some of the structural work which we agreed needed to be done. I have very good news to report. At this time there is somewhat in excess of $200,000 in the income account which we could use to fund this work. The better news is that we should receive another large amount added to this fund next year since the endowment payout rate remains high (this is a University-wide deficit reduction condition which will benefit our fund, too) and our expenses will remain low.

Here are some of the financial specifics which we have learned:

- The endowment principle is $574,153 (book value) but had a market value of $1,667,543 as of 11/30/92. It is this latter amount which generates the payout dividend which gives us our maintenance funding.
- Until the earthquake in 1989, we were spending all of our earnings (and more) from this "maintenance endowment" on regular annual maintenance. Since that time we have not spent the full earnings and they have been accumulating in an income account. Here is the recent history of income, expenditures and the balance in the fund.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Fund Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987–88</td>
<td>$48,859</td>
<td>$48,859</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988–89</td>
<td>$53,230</td>
<td>$52,559</td>
<td>$671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989–90</td>
<td>$60,307</td>
<td>$40,367</td>
<td>$20,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990–91</td>
<td>$59,756</td>
<td>$7,518</td>
<td>$72,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991–92</td>
<td>$54,988</td>
<td>$6,657</td>
<td>$121,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992–93</td>
<td>$110,359</td>
<td>(est.) $20,000</td>
<td>$211,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993–94</td>
<td>(est.) $115,000</td>
<td>(est.) $20,000</td>
<td>$306,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With this very good news in hand, it seems to me that as you write the letter to President Casper, we can now point to this source of funds to pay for the remainder of the recommended work which will not be paid by FEMA. Tim Portwood was going to make a check of the original endowment documentation so as to insure that this action was permissible. Unless his report turns up anything to the contrary—the notes with the accounting fund itself indicate that only the original $500,000 principle is untouchable—these funds are available for our recommended purpose.

I am glad that this investigation yielded us such positive results. Please let me know if you need any more information for your letter to President Casper.

cc Members, Hanna House Board of Governors
   Valerie Veronin
I. **Review of Minutes - July 9, 1993** (5 minutes)

David Neuman *Please see attachment*

Please review the Minutes from the Meeting of July 9, 1993 and raise any comments or concerns.

II. **General Discussion of Charge, continued from last meeting** (20 minutes)

Paul Turner, All

III. **Report on Structural Alternatives and Costs** (40 minutes)

Valerie Veronin, Craig Comartin, and Consultants

IV. **General Business** (15 minutes)

David Neuman

National Park Service Cost Share Program

Furniture Inventory

V. **Future Meetings** (5 minutes)

Paul Turner

---

VII. **Optional Tour of the Hanna House**
Architect on house - Martin Wyle - has previous experience on FLL house.

$220,000 needed to proceed.

4-6 month process to repair the wall.

No $ in gift account - spent on drawings/plans, taxes.

Endowment for Nissen for maintenance of home - possibility of increasing the principal

Sculpture at Anne House - at Museum?

Furniture - not stored in good condition - inventory will be distributed by Tiffany.

Publicity
Hanna House Board of Governors
Minutes
July 9, 1993

Members Present: Paul Turner (Chair)
Marilyn Fogel
James Gibbons
James Ingle
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood
Bill Witscher

Members Absent: Stanford Historical Society Representative
(To Be Announced)

Others Present: Craig Comartin, Seismic Engineering Consultant
Steve Farneth, Architectural Resource Group
Tiffany Gravlee, Planning Office Staff
Naomi Mirogil, Architectural Resource Group
Valerie Veronin, Facilities Project Management

I. Opening Remarks
Paul Turner opened the meeting with a brief discussion of the significance of the Hanna House, and the history of the Hanna House Board of Governors. He discussed how the Board of Governors had originally been established to oversee the use of and decisions regarding the Hanna House, and how the Board had included the Provost who lived in the house at the time. He noted that the closure of the house due to the Loma Prieta Earthquake offered an opportunity to reconstitute the Board of Governors to deal with the current circumstances. He indicated that President Casper supported these reviews.

II. Introduction of Members

All

III. Review of Charge
Paul Turner reviewed the "Hanna House Board of Governors' Responsibilities" which was distributed with the letter from the President's Office. He outlined several of the issues the Board will need to examine: the various proposals for dealing with the earthquake damage to the house and restoring it (and the architectural preservation questions involved); the problems of funding the restoration; and the matter of the eventual use of the house.
IV. General Discussion of Charge
Discussion continued regarding proper use of the house. J. Gibbons noted that the primary donors for the project may have some effect on the use decided upon. Other members discussed the need to keep the building available for the public, and yet protected from wear. Impact on the neighbors would also need to be assessed in the case of extensive public use. An evaluation of the house’s various uses in the past has been conducted, and is available in the Planning Office file. The house has frequently been used for University dinners and entertaining. A suggestion was made that someone might contact other institutions which manage historic houses (e.g., University of Southern California, University of Chicago, SUNY-Buffalo, etc.) to compare uses and methods of maintenance, funding, etc.

V. Presentation of Current Status
David Neuman, with representative from Seismic Engineering, and Consultants

a. FEMA Damage Survey Report: Craig Comartin, Seismic Engineering

Craig Comartin gave an overview of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and its role at Stanford. He explained the difference between FEMA's acceptable repair, and the County's acceptable, code-compliant repair, and that the amount of the DSR for the Hanna House is far less than the $2-3M which has been estimated for the code-compliant repair of the house. Stanford has agreed to FEMA's DSR of approximately $206,000 as an initial point of departure, but will further study structural solutions for future action.

b. Outline of Stanford's Proposals to Date: Steve Farneth, ARG

Two structural solutions were outlined which exhibited different preservation philosophies. The first rebuilt the fireplaces entirely, and added a plywood diaphragm at the roof, etc. The second core-drills the existing fireplaces, and strives to insert steel-frames discretely at various locations in order to provide additional shear strength. The first solution results in replicas of the fireplaces, and necessitates removal of roofing, and much of the unique, hexagon-patterned concrete floor. The second solution preserves the original building materials intact, providing applied structural strengthening which attempts to reduce damage to the existing material of the building. Both solutions require the stabilization and grouting of the hillside, as well as rebuilding retaining walls, and repairing one area of the patio terrace (these latter items are included in the FEMA DSR).
c. Historic Preservation Issues: Steve Farneth

Discussed the effect of the two schemes on the building, and differing preservation philosophies. Noted that ARG will continue to work on reducing the effect of the strengthening on the historic fabric of the original building. House is being preserved to the time that the Hannas gave it to the University, and their alterations are considered to be part of the character of the house.

d. Funding: David Neuman

Verification of the accuracy of the estimates of cost and time to completion were requested, for the purposes of fund-raising. Possible sources of fund-raising were discussed, including Stanford Architectural Alumni (list available in the Planning Office). However it was noted that many of the people who have interest in the Hanna House do not necessarily have the means to support it with substantial funds. M. Fogel noted that she had received calls from potential donors, but didn't know to whom to refer them. T. Portwood confirmed that such calls should be forwarded to him. V. Veronin noted that $150,000 has been raised to date.

J. Gibbons suggested that we proceed with the first stage of work (stabilizing the hillside, leveling floors and rebuilding terrace and retaining walls), while completing the process with FEMA. It was moved, seconded, and all were in favor of going forward with the first phase of work, after a report verifying the extent of work, time, and costs is completed. V. Veronin and C. Comartin are coordinating the report, which will be presented at the next meeting.

VI. Future Meetings

The next meeting will be held at the Hanna Hobby House in approximately three weeks, and will address the findings of the report, and the results of the FEMA Section 106 meeting.

VII. Optional Tour of the Hanna House

Postponed until the next meeting.

cc: President Casper
    Academic Secretary

Minutes prepared by T. Gravlee
    7/14/93; rev. 8/93
## Hanna House Retaining Wall Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>North Wall</th>
<th>Planter Wall</th>
<th>Remainder</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Construction</td>
<td>$82,365</td>
<td>$26,538</td>
<td>$141,709</td>
<td>$250,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Construction</td>
<td>$1,650</td>
<td>$850</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$4,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - Construction</strong></td>
<td>$84,015</td>
<td>$27,388</td>
<td>$144,209</td>
<td>$255,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services (10%)</td>
<td>$8,236</td>
<td>$2,654</td>
<td>$14,171</td>
<td>$25,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adds &amp; Reimbursables (2%)</td>
<td>$1,647</td>
<td>$531</td>
<td>$2,834</td>
<td>$5,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Administr (5%)</td>
<td>$4,201</td>
<td>$1,369</td>
<td>$7,210</td>
<td>$12,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - Services</strong></td>
<td>$14,084</td>
<td>$4,554</td>
<td>$24,215</td>
<td>$42,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Contingency</td>
<td>$8,401</td>
<td>$2,739</td>
<td>$14,421</td>
<td>$25,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Total Project Cost</strong></td>
<td>$106,501</td>
<td>$34,681</td>
<td>$182,845</td>
<td>$324,026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. Veronin - 8/18/93
DATE: 07/08/92
TIME: 08:28AM

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY
DAMAGE SURVEY REPORT

PART I - PROJECT DESCRIPTION

COUNTY - SANTA CLARA

INSPECTION DATE: 05/27/92

APPLICATION NAME - STANFORD UNIVERSITY

PROJECT TITLE - MISCELLANEOUS REPAIRS

DAMAGED FACILITY - HANNA HOUSE, QUAD 11, BUILDING 330

LOCATION - *11-330*

DAMAGE DESCRIPTION AND SCOPE OF ELIGIBLE WORK:

MISCELLANEOUS REPAIRS TO INCLUDE: BRICK REPAIR AND EPOXY INJECTION OF 2 FIREPLACES; SOIL ANCHORING AND REFACING RETAINING WALL; REPLACEMENT OF TERRACE SLAB, SOIL STABILIZATION BY PRESSURE LENS GROUTING; BRICK PLANTER WALL REBUILDING; AND MISCELLANEOUS INTERIOR REPAIRS.

RECOMMENDATION BY INSPECTOR

FEDERAL - DACK, TOM
STATE -
LOCAL -

PART II - ESTIMATED COST OF PROPOSED WORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>MATERIAL AND/OR DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9999</td>
<td>MAIN FIREPLACE REPAIR</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$65,362.00</td>
<td>$65,362.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9999</td>
<td>LIBRARY FIREPLACE REPAIR</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$2,450.00</td>
<td>$2,450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9999</td>
<td>TERRACE/RETAINING WALL REPAIR</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$95,150.00</td>
<td>$95,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9999</td>
<td>PLANTER WALL REPLACEMENT</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$9,222.00</td>
<td>$9,222.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9999</td>
<td>INTERIOR SLABJACKING</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$12,700.00</td>
<td>$12,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9999</td>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS REPAIRS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$21,065.00</td>
<td>$21,065.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL: $205,949.00

PART III - FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT/HAZARD MITIGATION REVIEW

IN OR AFFECTS FLOODPLAIN:
LOCATION: 11-330
% DAMAGE: 100
DISASTER: E
LAND USE: U
FPM RECOMMENDATION:

PART IV - FOR FEMA USE ONLY

SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS:
FLOODPLAIN REV. NO.: 34027
WORKSITE:

AMOUNT: $205,949.00
ELIGIBLE: Y

INSURANCE COMMITMENT REQUIRED TYPE: SUPP# 001 DATE PAPPED 08/11/92
AMOUNT: $205,949.00
YEARS: 14

COMMENTS/CHANGES

THIS DSR REPLACES DSRs 06195 AND 88615. (S.I.C.)-DEPARTMENT OF INSURANCE (R-9013231) WAIVER RECEIVED. (HPR)-THIS BUILDING IS HISTORIC. PROPOSED WORK MUST COMPLY WITH THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT, SECTION 106.

FEMA REVIEWER: DATE 7/8/92

DSR NO: 06195
DATE: August 16, 1993

TO: Hanna House Board of Governors*
FROM: Tiffany Gravlee

SUBJECT: Hanna House Board of Governors meeting on August 19, 1993

Dear Colleagues:

Enclosed please find the agenda for the upcoming meeting on Thursday, August 19, 1993, as well as minutes from the meeting of July 9th, and a revised list of Committee members. Please take a moment to review the minutes and list of Committee members, and bring any corrections to the meeting on Thursday.

Thank you

* Marilyn Fogel
James Gibbons
Rosemary Hornby
James Ingle
Maggie Kimball ✓
David Neuman
Tim Portwood
Paul Turner
William Witscher

cc: President Casper
Academic Secretary
Valerie Veronin
I. **Review of Minutes - July 9, 1993** (5 minutes)
   David Neuman  *Please see attachment*

   Please review the Minutes from the Meeting of July 9, 1993 and raise any comments or concerns.

II. **General Discussion of Charge, continued from last meeting** (20 minutes)
    Paul Turner, All

III. **Report on Structural Alternatives and Costs** (40 minutes)
     Valerie Veronin, Craig Comartin, and Consultants

IV. **General Business** (15 minutes)
    David Neuman

    National Park Service Cost Share Program
    Furniture Inventory

VI. **Future Meetings** (5 minutes)
    Paul Turner

VII. **Optional Tour of the Hanna House**
Hanna House Board of Governors
Committee Membership 8/19/93

Turner, Paul (Chair)
Professor of Art
University Architectural Historian
Cummings Art Building 101
Tel. 5-0142     EM: HF.EMM@Forsythe     Mail Code: 2018

Fogel, Marilyn
Head, Hanna House Docents
27905 Roble Blanco
Los Altos Hills, CA 94022
Tel. 941-1304, 3-3469     Mail Code: 5060

Gibbons, James
Dean, School of Engineering
Representative of the President's Cabinet
Terman 214a
Tel. 3-3938     EM: Gibbons@Sierra     Mail Code: 4027

Hornby, Rosemary
Representative of the Stanford Historical Society
501 Portola Road, Box 8028
Portola Valley, California 94028
Tel. 851-2291

Ingle, James
Professor of Geology
Chair of the University Committee on Land and Building Development
Mitchell Room 134
Tel. 3-3366, 3-2537     EM: Ingle@Pangea     Mail Code: 2115

Kimball, Maggie
University Archivist
Special Collections, Green Library
Tel. 5-1161, 5-1022     EM: CN.MJK@Forsythe     Mail Code: 6004

Neuman, David (Secretary)
University Architect / Director of Planning
855 Serra, Second Floor
Tel. 5-7845     EM: AR.DJN@Forsythe     Mail Code: 6114

Portwood, Tim
Associate Director of External Relations, School of Engineering
Representative of the Office of Development
Terman Room 211
Tel. 3-0070     EM: Tim.Portwood@Forsythe     Mail Code: 4027

Witscher, William
Director, Facilities Operations
315 Bonair
Tel. 5-0296     EM: Bill.Witscher@Forsythe     Mail Code: 7270
Use of the house

Endowment fund for the maintenance of the house

Issue of obilizations as a result of house's historic designation

[Handwritten text]

Damage survey report - C. Carocite

- Instability of site -
- 3rd of the house was built on fill which was not well compacted
  - retaining walls at edge - normal footing

No footing for chimney
  - no reinforcing at chimney

No studs - three layers of siding - 7 walls

Life safety - Santa Clara County 9.5 standard
  - slightly lower than 1.05 NEC

Reconstruction - more $3M

2nd scheme - $2.1M

Positive 3rd scheme

Historic is listed as pre-1920

Decision - determine cost of retaining wall
  & is available. What next to FLM
Hanna House Board of Governors
Agenda
July 9, 1993
3:00 - 4:30 pm
855 Serra, Conference Room A

I. **Opening Remarks** (5 minutes)
   Paul Turner

II. **Introduction of Members**
    All

III. **Review of Charge** (15 minutes)
     Paul Turner

IV. **General Discussion of Charge** (15 minutes)
    All

V. **Presentation of Current Status** (40 minutes)
   David Neuman, with representative from Seismic Engineering, and Consultants
   a. FEMA Damage Survey Report: Craig Comartin, Stanford University Seismic Engineering
   b. Outline of Stanford’s Proposals to Date: Steve Farneth, Architectural Resources Group
   c. Historic Preservation Issues: Steve Farneth
   d. Funding: David Neuman

VI. **Future Meetings** (5 minutes)
    Paul Turner

VII. **Optional Tour of the Hanna House**
Hanna House Board of Governors
Agenda
July 9, 1993
3:00 - 4:30 pm
855 Serra Conference Room A

I. Opening Remarks (5 minutes)
Paul Turner

II. Introduction of Members (10 minutes)
All

III. Review of Charge (15 minutes)
Paul Turner

IV. General Discussion of Charge (15 minutes)
All

V. Presentation of Current Status (40 minutes)
David Neuman, with representative from Seismic Engineering, and Consultants

a. FEMA Damage Survey Report: Fouad Bendimerad/Craig Comartin
b. Outline of Stanford's Proposals to Date: Steve Farneth (Architectural Resources Group), and Consultants
c. Historic Preservation Issues: Steve Farneth
d. Funding: David Neuman

VI. Future Meetings (5 minutes)
Paul Turner

VII. Closing Remarks

VIII. Optional Tour of the Hanna House

Agenda prepared by T. Gravlee for David Neuman and Paul Turner
July 7, 1993
Hanna House Board of Governors
July 9, 1993

Background information:

1. "Frank Lloyd Wright's Hanna House": a brief description and summary with accompanying photographs and plans


3. Phone/Email list of Board Members
Frank Lloyd Wright's Hanna House

The Hanna House, built in 1937 on the Stanford University campus forty miles south of San Francisco, is recognized by architects and historians as one of Frank Lloyd Wright's most important works. It was the first of his designs to utilize the 120 degree angle in a hexagonal floor plan grid, which the architect believed to be more harmonious with human movement. The house, built primarily of redwood, brick and glass, is contemporary with other Wright masterpieces of the 1930's, including Fallingwater, the Johnson Wax Administration Building, Taliesin West and Usonian houses, and shelters a gift urn from the Imperial Hotel. The residence is listed on the National Register of Historic Places by the United States Department of the Interior, and has been designated by the American Institute of Architects as one of 17 buildings by Mr. Wright that exemplify his contribution to architecture.

Unfortunately, the Loma Prieta earthquake of 1989 caused severe damage to certain parts of the house, due primarily to the shifting of soil beneath the structure. This motion caused the floor and patio slabs to separate and drop as much as two inches in places, the structural brickwork of the central fireplace to crack and be displaced, and a brick retaining wall to fail. As a result, the house has been vacated and the damaged structure braced while the University seeks funds to repair the damage. To date, two engineering plans have been developed in order to stabilize the soil under the house, to reconstruct damaged components, and to brace the house internally against future major earthquakes. The cost of these options range between two and three million dollars. Campus-wide damage caused by the 1989 earthquake involved many buildings, a number of which are also historically significant, and has been estimated at $171 million dollars.

Extensive deliberations with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) have resulted in minimal funding aid, amounting to approximately $154,000. A significant funding gap of between two and three million dollars remains. Because many other university building repairs are a high priority for academic purposes and life-safety reasons, university funds have not been available to date for the repair of the Hanna House. As a result, the Hanna House currently sits closed and secured, though quite vulnerable to another earthquake.
WARNING: Check sign designations before parking. All conditions, regulations, and parking area designations are subject to change at any time. For more information, see “The Stanford Transportation Book” or call 723-9362.

CAMPUS PARKING 1992-93

- **A Permit**: 6 am to 4 pm (Monday-Friday)
- **A and C Permits**: 6 am to 4 pm (Monday-Friday)
- **A, C, and Z Permits**: 6 am to 4 pm (Monday-Friday)
- **Designated Student Permit**: all hours
- **Meter or Time Limit**: 6 am to 5 pm (Monday-Friday)
- **Disabled Person Permit**: 24-hour enforcement every day. $100 minimum fine for parking in these zones without proper permit.
- **Motorcycles**: no permit required.

- **Public bus stop**
- **Multi-level parking structure**

---

**Campus events information**: 723-0336

**University telephone operator**: 723-2300

**Marguerite shuttle service**—FREE.
Monday through Friday all year. The Marguerite serves the campus, the two CalTrain stations in Palo Alto, downtown Palo Alto, and SLAC. For further information, call 723-9362.
View of the house from driveway

View of the dining room terrace

Plan of the Hanna House, 1936

View of the living room, 1936
1989 Loma Prieta Earthquake Damage

Earthquake damage at base of main chimney

Earthquake damage at living room terrace steps and planter

Shoring at main chimney
The Wright Stuff

For those who like their ironies on the tragic, Greek scale, there's a good example just now on campus. Atop a knoll toward the Stanford foothills, there stands—or rather, slouches—an architectural marvel: the "Honeycomb House" built in 1937 by Paul and Jean Hanna, and inimitably designed by Frank Lloyd Wright.

Fifty-two years after its construction, the house's house landfill slumped, at the urging of a 7.1 quake. The chimney resting upon it shivered, and the roof resting upon the chimney—cantilever-style, as Wright loved—wriggled sideways. And now the house, deeded to Stanford before the Hannas passed away, has its own miniature fault lines and is sealed off from use. Its reopening waits on detailed blueprints for repair and funding—plus the repair work itself. The wait could be three years, and the bill will be an estimated $2 million.

As for the monumental irony, it has to do with the god and mortals who created what is now famous as "Hanna House."

In 1936, the Hannas—in their 30s, with three youngsters—had just moved to Stanford after Paul's appointment to the School of Education. Children of ministers, both, they had each grown up in a series of parsonages. They had dreamed of a house that would really be a home.

In 1936, Frank Lloyd Wright was making a brilliant comeback in a career that had gone on the skids. At 63, he was immersed in simultaneous projects, including Fallingwater in Mill Run, Pa., and the Johnson Wax administration building in Racine, Wis. Among the masterpieces of his earlier period was a spectacular, cantilevered creation that had survived the terrible 1923 Tokyo earthquake. Though a million people were left dead or homeless, the Imperial Hotel stood firm above the rubble, the only major building left standing after the 8.3 temblor.

One Sunday afternoon in 1936, Paul and Jean climbed their knoll with measuring tape, stakes and string and began imagining their home. The angles they set out were striking: all at 120 degrees. Because Wright had concluded that 90-degree angles were too pinched for human comfort, the house—and everything in it—would be shaped hexagonally. In the book that the Hannas wrote about their collaboration with Wright, they wrote:

"A voice startled us with, 'Young people, what are you doing?' We looked up to see Bailey Willis, world-famous geologist, looking disapprovingly at us and our equipment. We proudly showed him our plans. His reaction was dismayed, . . . 'I suggest you inform your architect that there is a branch of the San Andreas Fault running through this hill.' With that, Professor Willis continued his Sunday stroll." [There is in fact a fault line running through the hill, but it is not the San Andreas.]

The Hannas immediately telegraphed the famed architect. "As groundbreaking neared, the correspondence between the Hannas and Wright—living at Taliesin in Wisconsin—was voluminous and, from the Stanford end, brisk. The Hannas, as they blushingly confess in their book, behaved as impatiently as children at Christmas, while Wright would take some time to reply.

This time Wright didn't. He fired back a five-word telegram:

I BUILT THE IMPERIAL HOTEL.

Hanna House now is surrounded by chain-link fence, its chimney supported by two-by-fours. Traditionally the home of Stanford's provost, the house remains unoccupied and, worse, unvisited by the
architects, students, engineers and Wright-lovers who, from all over the world, used to visit by the thousands. Of Wright’s 437 buildings, 17 have been designated by the American Institute of Architects as his special genius, and one of them is Hanna House.

“It’s a tragedy,” says Stanford architectural historian Paul V. Turner. “The house is a milestone in Wright’s career, as his first executed building based on nonrectangular geometry—a major aspect of his work in the later decades.”

Undoing the tragedy is possible but expensive, and must wait upon the completion of other tasks.

“It’s very hard for us,” says Valerie Venmin, acting director of the Projects Group that is dealing with earthquake damage, “to use University funds anywhere but on the Main Quad, first.” She offers the example of Memorial Church, which, “like Hanna, would have come after the Language Corner, Geology Corner—those buildings we really need for teaching and research,” except for the fact that, ineligible for government relief, the church attracted quick, private support.

Still, Venmin says, plans for reconstruction have been sketched out (involving packing the landfill and reinforcing the chimney—the essentials of quake-proofing). The University is working with the Federal Emergency Management Agency to reach an agreement on repair methods, costs and federal funds, which inevitably must be supplemented by private funds.

In the meantime, says Marilyn Fogel, coordinator of the Hanna House docents, “We’re turning down requests every week. It’s sad to see how disappointed people are. Some called in ’89 or ’90, and we said, ‘Check back with us in six months.’ Now we’re saying, ‘Check back in a year.’”

One of the Hannas’ children, John (now an attorney in Palo Alto), would love to see an eventual house-rewarming. “It’s a shame that such a beautiful place has been taken out of the public realm,” he says. “It’s sad.” Yet, says someone who has known the house’s honeycomb crannies since he was 5, “I know it’s just a matter of time.”—Marc Venticin
Hanna House Board of Governors
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To Be Announced
June, 1993

Dear Colleagues:

Thank you for your willingness to serve on the Hanna House Board of Governors. This letter is to confirm your appointment to the Board for a term of service beginning May 1, 1993 and May 1, 1995.

The Committee membership will be as follows:

TURNER, Paul (Chair)
Professor of Art
University Architectural Historian

FOGEL, Marilyn
Head, Hanna House Docents

GIBBONS, James
Dean, School of Engineering
Representative of the President's Cabinet

INGLE, James
Professor of Geology
Chair of the University Committee on Land and Building Development

KIMBALL, Maggie
University Archivist

NEUMAN, David (Secretary)
University Architect/Director of Planning

PORTWOOD, Tim
Associate Director of External Relations, School of Engineering
Representative of the Office of Development
WITSCHER, William
Director, Facilities Operations

STANFORD HISTORICAL SOCIETY REPRESENTATIVE
To be announced

A copy of the Committee's responsibilities is included for your information. The Chairman is responsible for ensuring that copies of the agenda and minutes of each meeting are sent to me and to the Academic Secretary. The letter of instructions covers the question of confidentiality of meetings and minutes.

In addition, the Chairman should file with me, no later than October 1, a report for the preceding year; distribution of this report is to be to the same offices as the Board minutes, and I may then suggest further distribution. There is no dictated format, but the following guidelines may be helpful. The annual report should list recommendations, specify particular problems encountered by the Board, list unfinished agenda items for the year, estimate the usefulness of the Board's work, and offer (when appropriate) a recommendation on whether the Board should or should not be continued. When Board recommendations are accepted by the President, such decisions will be reported to the appropriate constituencies in the University.

The Chairman of the Committee, Professor Paul Turner, will be in touch with you about a meeting schedule. Best wishes for productive deliberations, and thank you for your anticipated contributions.

Sincerely,

Gerhard Casper

Enclosures
cc: Academic Secretary
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR HANNA HOUSE BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Background
The Hanna House, on Frenchman's Road on the Stanford campus, was designed by Frank Lloyd Wright in 1936 and constructed the following year by Paul and Jean Hanna. It is recognized by architects and historians as one of Wright's most important works, mainly for its geometric innovation. The architect's life-long quest to "break open the box" of traditional architecture produced first the Prairie Houses, around 1900, with their fluid interior spaces and extension into nature. By the 1920s Wright was exploring the use of non-rectangular geometry -- triangles, hexagons, circles -- to create even more dynamic architecture. The Hannas were the first clients who allowed Wright to execute such a building: a house based on a hexagonal floor-plan grid, producing an unprecedented degree of spatial dynamism. This inaugurated the later phase of the architect's career, with such non-rectangular works as Taliesin West and the Guggenheim Museum. The architectural significance of the Hanna House has been recognized in many ways. The AIA has included it on a list of the seventeen most important works of Frank Lloyd Wright; the National Park Service has put it on the National Historic Registry, and, subsequently, to the level of National Historic Landmark. It is the only Stanford University structure to have received this prestigious recognition.

In 1973 the Hannas gave the house to Stanford University. President Richard Lyman established a Board of Governors, to oversee "the use, management, maintenance, repair and protection" of the Hanna House. The Hannas' first wish was that the building be preserved as "a center for teaching and research in architecture and art." When University officials decided it should be used as a residence, the Hannas proposed that it serve as housing for a specially-endowed visiting professor, but the University decided to use it "temporarily" as the Provost's residence. Attempts by the Hannas to raise a one-million-dollar endowment for a visiting professorship were unsuccessful, but the Nissan Motor Company did give the University a half-million-dollar endowment to "maintain, preserve and improve the structures and grounds of the Hanna House" (information from P. & J. Hanna, Frank Lloyd Wright's Hanna House, pp. 121-132). A group of Stanford Museum docents was established to serve the function that Paul and Jean Hanna had previously performed: conducting tours of the house for the large number of people, from both inside and outside Stanford, who wished to visit it.

The Loma Prieta earthquake of 1989 caused severe damage to certain parts of the house, due mainly to the shifting of soil beneath the structure. To date, two engineering plans have been developed in order to stabilize the soil under the house, to reconstruct damaged components, and to brace the house internally against future major earthquakes. The cost of these options range between two and three million dollars. Extensive deliberations with the Federal Emergency
Management Agency (FEMA) have yet to be concluded successfully; and fundraising efforts have been sporadic and unrewarding as yet. The Hanna House currently sits closed and secured, though quite vulnerable to another earthquake.

Reconstitution of Board of Governors

The present time, when the Hanna House is unoccupied and decisions must be made about its repair, provides an opportunity to reorganize the Board of Governors with the goal of effecting the best possible preservation and use of the building. As stated in President Donald Kennedy's memo that reactivated the Board in July of 1989, its function shall be: "to advise [the President] regarding the use, maintenance and historic preservation of the Hanna House. In particular, the Board is charged with advisory responsibility to ensure that the Hanna House . . . is preserved as a unique example of the philosophy and design principles of its architect, Frank Lloyd Wright, as intended by the donors . . ." We feel, however, that the second part of this charge ("and [functions] as the official residence of the Provost of the University") should be reviewed, to give the Board the option of exploring various alternatives for the building.

We recommend that the revised membership of the Board consist of the following:

   The University Architect (David Neuman)  
   The University Archivist (Maggie Kimball)  
   The University's architectural historian (Paul Turner)  
   The Director of Operations and Maintenance (Bill Witscher)  
   The head of the Hanna House docents (Marilyn Fogel)  
   A representative from the Stanford Historical Society (to be determined)  
   A representative from the Development Office (to be determined)

The Board should also be able to recommend the establishment of a support group, consisting of people within and without the University who are interested in the Hanna House, with the purpose of publicizing the Hanna House restoration project and raising funds for it. One or more members of this support group would be from the Board of Governors.

[David J. Neuman and Paul V. Turner, 6 April 1993]
HANNA HOUSE BOARD OF GOVERNORS' RESPONSIBILITIES

Background
The Hanna House, on Frenchman's Road on the Stanford campus, was designed by Frank Lloyd Wright in 1936 and constructed the following year by Paul and Jean Hanna. It is recognized by architects and historians as one of Wright's most important works, mainly for its geometric innovation. The architect's life-long quest to "break open the box" of traditional architecture produced first the Prairie Houses, around 1900, with their fluid interior spaces and extension into nature. By the 1920s Wright was exploring the use of non-rectangular geometry -- triangles, hexagons, circles -- to create even more dynamic architecture. The Hannas were the first clients who allowed Wright to execute such a building: a house based on a hexagonal floor-plan grid, producing an unprecedented degree of spatial dynamism. This inaugurated the later phase of the architect's career, with such non-rectangular works as Taliesin West and the Guggenheim Museum. The architectural significance of the Hanna House has been recognized in many ways. The AIA has included it on a list of the seventeen most important works of Frank Lloyd Wright; the National Park Service has put it on the National Historic Registry, and, subsequently raised the House to the level of National Historic Landmark. It is the only Stanford University structure to have received this prestigious recognition.

In 1973 the Hannas gave the house to Stanford University. President Richard Lyman established a Board of Governors, to oversee "the use, management, maintenance, repair and protection" of the Hanna House. The Hannas' first wish was that the building be preserved as "a center for teaching and research in architecture and art." When University officials decided it should be used as a residence, the Hannas proposed that it serve as housing for a specially-endowed visiting professor; but the University decided to use it "temporarily" as the Provost's residence. Attempts by the Hannas to raise a one-million-dollar endowment for a visiting professorship were unsuccessful, but the Nissan Motor Company did give the University a half-million-dollar endowment to "maintain, preserve and improve the structures and grounds of the Hanna House" (information from P. & J. Hanna, Frank Lloyd Wright's Hanna House, pp. 121-132). A group of Stanford Museum docents was established to serve the function that Paul and Jean Hanna had previously performed; i.e., conducting tours of the house for the large number of people, from both inside and outside Stanford, who wished to visit it.

The Loma Prieta earthquake of 1989 caused severe damage to certain parts of the house, particularly retaining walls and fireplaces, due mainly to the shifting of soil beneath the structure. To date, two engineering plans have been developed in order to stabilize the soil under the house; to reconstruct damaged components; and to brace the house internally against future major earthquakes. The cost of these options range between two and three million dollars. Extensive
deliberations with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) have yet to be concluded successfully; and fundraising efforts have been sporadic and unrewarding as yet. The Hanna House currently sits closed, secured, and maintained, though quite vulnerable to another earthquake.

Reconstitution of Board of Governors

The present time, when the Hanna House is unoccupied and decisions must be made about its repair, provides an opportunity to reorganize the Board of Governors with the goal of effecting the best possible preservation and use of the building. As stated in President Donald Kennedy's memo that reactivated the Board in July of 1989, its function shall be: "to advise [the President] regarding the use, maintenance and historic preservation of the Hanna House. In particular, the Board is charged with advisory responsibility to ensure that the Hanna House ... is preserved as a unique example of the philosophy and design principles of its architect, Frank Lloyd Wright, as intended by the donors ..." We feel, however, that the second part of this charge ("and [functions] as the official residence of the Provost of the University") should be reviewed, to give the Board the option of exploring various alternatives for the building and its future use.

We recommend that the revised membership of the Board consist of the following:

- The University's architectural historian (Paul Turner) (chair)
- The University Architect (David Neuman)
- The University Archivist (Maggie Kimball)
- The Director of Operations and Maintenance (Bill Witscher)
- The head of the Hanna House docents (Marilyn Fogel)
- A representative from the Stanford Historical Society (to be determined)
- A representative from the Development Office (to be determined)
- The Chair of the University Committee on Land and Building Development (James Ingle)
- A representative of the President's Cabinet (James Gibbons)

The Board should also be able to recommend the establishment of a support group, consisting of people within and without the University who are interested in the Hanna House, with the purpose of publicizing the Hanna House restoration project and raising funds for it. Several members of this support group would be from the Board of Governors.

[15 April 1993]
HANNA HOUSE
CONSERVATION PHILOSOPHY AND OBJECTIVES

1. History of the Hanna House Project

2. Tenets of Architectural Conservation Philosophy, Theory and Practice Pertinent to the Hanna House
   a. International Council of Monuments and Sites Venice Charter
   b. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation Projects (1985-0-480-504)

3. Preservation Issues that are Pertinent to the Hanna House Project
   a. Structural condition of the Hanna House prior to the Loma Prieta earthquake
   b. Structural problems caused by the Loma Prieta earthquake
   c. Degradation of the architectural features of the Hanna House
   d. Evolution of the Hanna House from 1937 to 1975

4. Conservation Objectives for the Hanna House
   a. The Hanna House Conservation Standards
   b. Conflict between conservation considerations and structural requirements
   c. Concerns raised by FEMA concerning the two structural recommendations that have been made for the Hanna House Project
   d. Recommendations for investigation of additional structural solutions that are compatible with conservation objectives
DEFINITIONS for Historic Preservation Project Treatments

The following definitions are provided for treatments that may be undertaken on historic properties listed in the National Register of Historic Places:

Acquisition

Is defined as the act or process of acquiring fee title or interest other than fee title of real property (including the acquisition of development rights or remainder interest).

Protection

Is defined as the act or process of applying measures designed to affect the physical condition of a property by defending or guarding it from deterioration, loss or attack, or to cover or shield the property from danger or injury. In the case of buildings and structures, such treatment is generally of a temporary nature and anticipates future historic preservation treatment; in the case of archeological sites, the protective measure may be temporary or permanent.

Stabilization

Is defined as the act or process of applying measures designed to reestablish a weather resistant enclosure and the structural stability of an unsafe or deteriorated property while maintaining the essential form as it exists at present.

Preservation

Is defined as the act or process of applying measures to sustain the existing form, integrity, and material of a building or structure, and the existing form and vegetative cover of a site. It may include initial stabilization work, where necessary, as well as ongoing maintenance of the historic building materials.

Rehabilitation

Is defined as the act or process of returning a property to a state of utility through repair or alteration which makes possible an efficient contemporary use while preserving those portions or features of the property which are significant to its historical, architectural, and cultural values.

Restoration

Is defined as the act or process of accurately recovering the form and details of a property and its setting as it appeared at a particular period of time by means of the removal of later work or by the replacement of missing earlier work.

Reconstruction

Is defined as the act or process of reproducing by new construction the exact form and detail of a vanished building, structure, or object, or a part thereof, as it appeared at a specific period of time.
GENERAL STANDARDS for Historic Preservation Projects

The following general standards apply to all treatments undertaken on historic properties listed in the National Register:

1. Every reasonable effort shall be made to provide a compatible use for a property that requires minimal alteration of the building structure, or site and its environment, or to use a property for its originally intended purpose.

2. The distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure, or site and its environment shall not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural features should be avoided when possible.

3. All buildings, structures, and sites shall be recognized as products of their own time. Alterations which have no historical basis and which seek to create an earlier appearance shall be discouraged.

4. Changes which may have taken place in the course of time are evidence of the history and development of a building, structure, or site and its environment. These changes may have acquired significance in their own right, and this significance shall be recognized and respected.

5. Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize a building, structure, or site, shall be treated with sensitivity.

6. Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, wherever possible. In the event replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplications of features, substantiated by historical, physical, or pictorial evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other buildings or structures.

7. The surface cleaning of structures shall be undertaken with the gentlest means possible. Sandblasting and other cleaning methods that will damage the historic building materials shall not be undertaken.

8. Every reasonable effort shall be made to protect and preserve archeological resources affected by, or adjacent to, any acquisition, protection, stabilization, preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, or reconstruction project.
SPECIFIC STANDARDS for Historic Preservation Projects

The following specific standards for each treatment are to be used in conjunction with the eight general standards and, in each case, begin with number 9. For example, in evaluating acquisition projects, include the eight general standards plus the four specific standards listed under Standards for Acquisition.

Standards for Acquisition

9. Careful consideration shall be given to the type and extent of property rights which are required to assure the preservation of the historic resource. The preservation objectives shall determine the exact property rights to be acquired.

10. Properties shall be acquired in fee simple when absolute ownership is required to insure their preservation.

11. The purchase of less-than-fee-simple interests, such as open space or facade easements, shall be undertaken when a limited interest achieves the preservation objective.

12. Every reasonable effort shall be made to acquire sufficient property with the historic resource to protect its historical, archeological, architectural, or cultural significance.

Standards for Protection

9. Before applying protective measures which are generally of a temporary nature and imply future historic preservation work, an analysis of the actual or anticipated threats to the property shall be made.

10. Protection shall safeguard the physical condition or environment of a property or archeological site from further deterioration or damage caused by weather or other natural, animal, or human intrusions.

11. If any historic material or architectural features are removed, they shall be properly recorded and, if possible, stored for future study or reuse.

Standards for Stabilization

9. Stabilization shall reestablish the structural stability of a property through the reinforcement of loadbearing members or by arresting material deterioration leading to structural failure. Stabilization shall also reestablish weather resistant conditions for a property.

10. Stabilization shall be accomplished in such a manner that it detracts as little as possible from the property’s appearance. When reinforcement is required to reestablish structural stability, such work shall be concealed wherever possible so as not to intrude upon or detract from the aesthetic and historical quality of the property, except where concealment would result in the alteration or destruction of historically significant material or spaces.
Standards for Preservation

9. Preservation shall maintain the existing form, integrity, and materials of a building, structure, or site. Substantial reconstruction or restoration of lost features generally are not included in a preservation undertaking.

10. Preservation shall include techniques of arresting or retarding the deterioration of a property through a program of ongoing maintenance.

Standards for Rehabilitation

9. Contemporary design for alterations and additions to existing properties shall not be discouraged when such alterations and additions do not destroy significant historic, architectural, or cultural material and such design is compatible with the size, scale, color, material, and character of the property, neighborhood, or environment.

10. Wherever possible, new additions or alterations to structures shall be done in such a manner that if such additions or alterations were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the structure would be unimpaired.

Standards for Restoration

9. Every reasonable effort shall be made to use a property for its originally intended purpose or to provide a compatible use that will require minimum alteration to the property and its environment.

10. Reinforcement required for structural stability or the installation of protective or code required mechanical systems shall be concealed whenever possible so as not to intrude or detract from the property’s aesthetic and historical qualities, except where concealment would result in the alteration or destruction of historically significant materials or spaces.

11. When archeological resources must be disturbed by restoration work, recovery of archeological material shall be undertaken in conformance with current professional practices.

Standards for Reconstruction

9. Reconstruction of a part or all of a property shall be undertaken only when such work is essential to reproduce a significant missing feature in a historic district or scene, and when a contemporary design solution is not acceptable.
Standards for Reconstruction—continued

10. Reconstruction of all or a part of a historic property shall be appropriate when the reconstruction is essential for understanding and interpreting the value of a historic district, or when no other building, structure, object, or landscape feature with the same associative value has survived and sufficient historical documentation exists to insure an accurate reproduction of the original.

11. The reproduction of missing elements accomplished with new materials shall duplicate the composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities of the missing element. Reconstruction of missing architectural features shall be based upon accurate duplication of original features substantiated by historical, physical, or pictorial evidence rather than upon conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural features from other buildings.

12. Reconstruction of a building or structure on an original site shall be preceded by a thorough archeological investigation to locate and identify all subsurface features and artifacts.

13. Reconstruction shall include measures to preserve any remaining original fabric, including foundations, subsurface, and ancillary elements. The reconstruction of missing elements and features shall be done in such a manner that the essential form and integrity of the original surviving features are unimpaired.