THE FUTURE OF THE HANNA HOUSE

OMA PRIETA AND ITS AFTERMATH

Leaving a devastating mark on all of Stanford University, the Loma Prieta earthquake of October 17, 1989 also took its toll on the Hanna House, which was closed immediately following the earthquake and has remained empty since that time. The main damage included cracked brick walls and fireplaces (integral to the structure's core support); displaced concrete floor slabs and steps; partially collapsed retaining walls; and shifted interior walls, doors, and cabinetry. Most of the damage can be attributed to inadequate soil compaction and the use of unreinforced masonry — features that reflect the state of construction practice of that era, and which can be remedied with modern technology. The closing of the Hanna House initiated not only a rigorous selection process for a group of qualified structural engineers and restoration architects, it also led to a period of reflection over the proper role of the house on campus.

THE PLAN TAKES SHAPE

Now, more than five years after the earthquake, the Hanna House Board of Governors and Stanford University staff, working with a team of consultants specializing in historic preservation, have completed a comprehensive plan for the future of the Hanna House. The structural elements of the plan include specifications for (1) repair of the earthquake damage; (2) seismic strengthening of the house to withstand future earthquakes, and (3) restoration of the house and grounds to their historic character. All work has been carefully planned to preserve the historic fabric and architectural integrity of the house. Where modifications must be made to meet current codes, they will be carried out in a manner that is sympathetic to the original architecture. In the seismic strengthening, for example, the reinforcing elements will be hidden within wall spaces and existing brickwork in a fashion that, when completed, will be largely invisible.

Consistent with the Hannas' original intent, the plan envisions a revitalized educational agenda for the Hanna House. This will include an expanded program of public tours and use of the house as a special meeting place for art and architecture classes, seminars, small musical performances, and other appropriate University events. Once again, the Hanna House will resound with lively intellectual discourse and beautiful music and will play a major role in the life of the University and the surrounding community.

"Many important historic properties have been altered by well-intentioned but uninformed individuals, to the great detriment of the original character of the work. This house by Frank Lloyd Wright deserves to be preserved without change, as an example of his creative work."

Paul R. and Jean S. Hanna

From Frank Lloyd Wright's Hanna House: The Clients' Report
The fundraising program for the Hanna House is part of the Stanford Restoration Fund, the University's overall $50 million fundraising effort to repair damage from the Loma Prieta earthquake and to strengthen the campus for the future. All donors of $50,000 or more to the Restoration Fund — including donors for the Hanna House — will be acknowledged on a historic plaque to be located in the Inner Quad.

Gifts of every level are welcome. To acknowledge donors to the Hanna House, a historic plaque including the names of all who have contributed $5,000 or more will be placed at the house.

If you are interested in helping preserve this masterpiece of American design for future generations, please call or write:

Mr. L. Timothy Portwood
Associate Director of Development
301 Encina Hall
Stanford, California 94305-6076
Telephone: (415) 723-0070
Fax (415) 725-4365
Electronic Mail: CT.LTP@Forsythe.Stanford.EDU

"WE...remain hopeful that our dream may be fulfilled...Such long-range cooperative endeavors are the essence of great communities, justifying the pains, adjustments, and privileges that have been features of our life with the Hanna House on the campus of Stanford University."

PAUL R. HANNA, 1981
Living Rm 1961?
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Renewing the Vision

The Stanford Restoration Fund
"Each of us had the extraordinary privilege of living in the Hanna House during our tenure as Provost. The special quality of the buildings, their organic unity with their terrain, and the lively interest evoked from all who visited it made the experience an unforgettable one. We are deeply grateful for the chance to have lived in such a place, and we are in a good position to know how much the house has contributed to the artistic and cultural richness of the University. Thanks to Paul and Jean Hanna it has become a part of Stanford history, as well as a vital place of the Frank Lloyd Wright legacy. We are deeply interested in the success of this fundraising effort, and have each contributed to it. We hope very much that you will do so as well."

William Miller
(1970-1979)

Donald Kennedy
(1979-1981)

Albert H. Hastorf
(1981-1984)

James N. Rosse
(1984-1989)

"Stanford's greatest artistic treasures, I believe, are the Hanna House, the Quadrangle, and the Rodin Sculpture Garden -- perhaps in that order. The presence of the Hanna House has been a factor in the decisions of many Stanford undergraduates, over the years, to pursue careers in architecture. It has also been an important resource for graduate students. I look forward to the time when the Hanna House is again accessible to Stanford students for their study and inspiration."

Paul V. Turner
Chairman, Hanna House Board of Governors
Professor of Architectural History
Art Department, Stanford University

"It is our desire to have this architectural piece stand permanently on the Stanford campus as a living example of the philosophy and of the design principle of this genius."

Paul R. and Jean S. Hanna
In Letter to Stanford University Trustees, February 21, 1974
An Invitation

Frank Lloyd Wright's Hanna House is one of Stanford University's greatest treasures, an invaluable educational resource for its faculty, students, and the surrounding community. Sadly, the Hanna House, along with many other Stanford buildings and the Bay Area as a whole, suffered severe damage from the Loma Prieta earthquake of October 17, 1989. It has been closed and empty -- surrounded by a chain-link fence -- since that date.

Today, the University and the Hanna House Board of Governors have commissioned a plan to restore this masterpiece of American architecture. Beyond the physical restoration, which itself will require considerable expertise in planning and execution, Stanford is committed to renewing the broad educational vision of Paul and Jean Hanna. In making their priceless gift, the Hannas stated not only that "no change will destroy the harmony and unity Mr. Wright fashioned for this home" but also that the house should "be preserved in such a manner that it would serve educational ends." After its restoration, the Hanna House will serve an expanded role as an educational resource for the University and the surrounding community.

We at Stanford University invite all who love architecture and recognize genius to help us renew the bold vision of Hanna House -- a vision jointly conjured by one of America's most daring architects and two of his most inspiring clients.

[signature]

Gerhard Casper
President
Stanford University
A Brief History

Built in 1937 by Frank Lloyd Wright for Jean and Paul Hanna and their three small children, the redwood, brick, and glass Hanna House is sited in a residential neighborhood in the foothills above the Stanford campus. One of the most innovative of Wright's works, the house is the first based entirely on hexagonal geometry (60- and 120-degree angles) and signals a design breakthrough in the architect's quest to "break open the box" of traditional architecture.

Jean Hanna, an English teacher, and Paul Hanna, the Lee L. Jacks Professor of Child Education and a Senior Research Fellow in Education at the Hoover Institution, lived in their home for thirty-nine years. In 1974 they gave their architectural masterpiece to the University. From 1977 to 1989, the Hanna House served as residence for the University Provost and was shared with the public through bi-monthly tours conducted by docents from the Stanford University Museum of Art. In October 1989, the Hanna House was severely damaged by the Loma Prieta earthquake. It has been closed since that time.

The Significance of the Hanna House

The Hanna House is undeniably beautiful. Most visitors are quickly won over by the open floor plan and the natural flow of the house from room to room and from the interior to the surrounding patios and gardens. Indeed, many of the features incorporated into the Hanna House -- the carport, the L-shaped living room-dining room, and the open-space kitchen-family room -- became ubiquitous features of the suburban single-family house two decades later. Thus, to today's casual visitor, the house seems not only exquisitely designed but entirely livable and contemporary.

But the Hanna House is more than a beautiful house. A bold experiment in residential design, the house -- Wright's first in Northern California -- is most significant architecturally in its abandonment of rectangular geometry. The entire layout is based on the hexagonal module, much like a bee's honeycomb, that determines the angles of all joined walls, windows, and partitions and that gives the house an unusually open feeling.
Wright's success with the Hanna House encouraged him to continue his exploration of forms unconstrained by the conventional 90 degree angle -- triangles, hexagons, and circles for example -- a process that later produced such buildings as the spiraling Guggenheim Museum in New York. The Hanna House at Stanford inaugurated this revolutionary phase of Wright's work, and thus is one of the most significant structures in the history of American architecture. It is, in fact, comparable in importance to Wright's Robie House, the Johnson Wax building, Taliesin West, and Fallingwater.

"The Hanna House, in my opinion, is the most important architectural work in the Bay Area -- perhaps in all of California. It was pivotal in Frank Lloyd Wright's career as the first built design that fully used his revolutionary concepts of non-rectilinear geometry. It exemplifies the modern exploration of free, open spatial planning and it is one of America's architectural treasures."

Paul V. Turner
Chairman, Hanna House Board of Governors
Professor of Architectural History
Art Department, Stanford University

[photos, with caption (and source) as follows:
--- Plan for Hanna House, 1936 (from page 80 of book)
--- Entrance Court to Hanna House (from page 79 of book)
--- Frank Lloyd Wright in the Hanna House (from page 84 of book)\]
But the Hanna House is even more than a manifesto of architectural daring and foresight. It is also testament to the synergistic relationship and co-mingled philosophies of client and architect. Professor Paul Hanna was one of the most distinguished American educators of the mid-20th century, a leader in international education and, in collaboration with Jean, author of seminal educational textbooks. The Hannas taught and practiced John Dewey's educational principles of activity and science, principles that inspired Wright's use of the hexagon as a "direct pattern for simple living." In the Hanna House, Wright created a flow of space and a series of views from one room to the next that perfectly complemented the Hannas' deeply held belief that design could affect social behavior.

The essence of this long and fruitful architect-client relationship has been documented in extraordinary fashion in the Hannas' book Frank Lloyd Wright's Hanna House: The Clients' Report. This unique and highly personal chronicle, together with the original plans and correspondence now housed in Stanford's Archives, make the Hanna House one of Wright's best documented commissions.

"It seems likely that the Hannas contributed both directly and indirectly to Wright's perception of the hexagon as a fundamental sociological tool. The Hanna commission served to realize architectural ideals latent in Wright's work since the 1920s, ultimately determining the future course of his development."

Richard Joncas
Lecturer in Architectural History
Stanford University

[photos, with caption (and source), as follows:]

-- The Playroom (from page 85 of book)
-- A Terrace, 1938 (from page 89 of book)
-- Paul R. and Jean S. Hanna (still need photo)
The Future of Hanna House

Loma Prieta and Its Aftermath

Leaving a devastating mark on all of Stanford University, the Loma Prieta earthquake of October 17, 1989 also took its toll on the Hanna House, which closed immediately following the earthquake and has remained empty since that time. The main damage included cracked brick walls and fireplaces (integral to the structure's core support); displaced concrete floor slabs and steps; partially collapsed retaining walls; and shifted interior walls, doors, and cabinetry. Most of the damage can be attributed to inadequate soil compaction and the use of unreinforced masonry -- features that reflect the state of construction practice of that era but which can be remedied with modern technology. The closing of the Hanna House initiated not only a rigorous selection process for a group of qualified structural engineers, it also led to a period of reflection over the proper role of the house on campus.

The Plan Takes Shape

Now, more than five years after the earthquake, the Hanna House Board of Governors and Stanford University staff, working with a team of architects specializing in historic preservation, have completed a comprehensive plan for the future of the Hanna House. The structural elements of the plan include specifications for (1) repair of the earthquake damage, (2) seismic strengthening of the house to withstand future earthquakes, and (3) restoration of the house, interior and grounds to their historic character. All work has been carefully planned to preserve the historic fabric and architectural integrity of the house. Where modifications must be made to meet current codes, they will be carried out in a manner that is sympathetic to the original architecture. In the seismic strengthening, for example, the reinforcing elements will be hidden within wall spaces and existing brickwork in a fashion that, when completed, will be largely invisible.
The equally important educational elements of the plan will ready the house for functions consistent with the Hannas' original educational intent. This revitalized educational agenda will include an expanded program of public tours and use of the house as a meeting place for art and architecture classes, seminars, small musical performances, and other appropriate University events. Once again, the Hanna House will resound with lively intellectual discourse and beautiful music and will play a major role in the life the University and the surrounding community.

"Many important historic properties have been altered by well-intentioned but uninformed individuals, to the great detriment of the original character of the work. This house by Frank Lloyd Wright deserves to be preserved without change, as an example of his creative work."

Paul R. Hanna
From "Frank Lloyd Wright's Hanna House: The Clients' Report"

"The historical and architectural significance of the Hanna House requires that the entire site be given the level of care that is provided for artifacts of great cultural and historical value."

From the Restoration Architect's Report, April 30, 1995

[photos, including selection of before-after photos/captions w/dates of Hanna House prepared by University archeologist (living room, fireplace, kitchen)]
Renewing the Vision of the Hanna House

In recovering from the earthquake, Stanford University has displayed its underlying commitment to the arts and historic preservation. While attending to the critical restorations of classrooms, lecture halls, and faculty offices, the University's administration, alumni, and friends have at the same time found the energy and resources to support the magnificent restoration of Memorial Church. These friends are now rallying support for the ambitious expansion of the Art Museum and the continuing revitalization of the Main Quad. The same spirit that has moved the friends of the University to preserve the history so resonant in these most prominent campus landmarks must now be harnessed to preserve the historic beauty residing in Stanford's most exquisite architectural gem, the Hanna House.

The total cost of the Hanna House project will be approximately $1.75 million. While funds provided by the Federal Emergency Management Agency are expected to meet part of this need, it is estimated that private gifts totaling $1 million or more will be required to preserve this architectural masterpiece. Toward this end, Stanford University is now seeking help from alumni and friends who have a special interest in architecture and historic preservation. With successful fundraising, construction can begin as soon as Spring of 1996 and be completed by Fall of that year.

[photos, including continuation from selection of before-after photos/captions w/dates of Hanna House prepared by University archeologist (dining area)]
How to Help

The fundraising program for the Hanna House is part of the Stanford Restoration Fund, the University’s overall $50 million fundraising effort to repair damage from the Loma Prieta earthquake and to strengthen the campus for the future. All donors of $50,000 or more to the Restoration Fund -- including donors for the Hanna House -- will be acknowledged on a historic plaque to be located in the Inner Quad.

Gifts of every level are welcome. To acknowledge donors to the Hanna House, a historic plaque including the names of all who have contributed $5,000 or more will be placed at the house.

If you are interested in helping to preserve this masterpiece of American design for future generations, please call or write:

Mr. L. Timothy Portwood
Associate Director of Development
301 Encina Hall
Stanford, California 94305-6076
Telephone: (415) 723-0070; Fax (415) 725-4365.

"We... remain hopeful that our dream may be fulfilled... Such long-range cooperative endeavors are the essence of great communities, justifying the pains, adjustments, and privileges that have been features of our life with the Hanna House on the campus of Stanford University."

Paul R. Hanna, 1981
Hanna House
Board of Governors

[list names]
TO: Paul Turner  
David Neuman  
Laura Jones  
Maggie Kimball  
Marilyn Fogel  

FROM: Tim Portwood  

RE: Hanna House Brochure - Latest Draft for your review  

DATE: 9 July 1995  

Here is the latest draft from Paul Courter, which incorporates suggestions and ideas from a number of sources. I think it is much more compelling now than before. We should be pretty close to going to press. Please review and comment as soon as possible. We are most interested in making sure that we have nothing is inaccurate or misleading.

Thanks for your help. Send your comments to me at 723-0070 (you can leave voice mail) or at CT.LTP@forsythe.

This sheet plus 11 pages.
Frank Lloyd Wright's
Hanna House

Masterpiece of American Architecture

[photo: original FLW rendering of Hanna House, 1936, no caption (from page 12 of book)]

Renewing the Vision

The Stanford Restoration Fund
"Each of us had the extraordinary privilege of living in Hanna Honeycomb House during our tenure as Provost. The special quality of the buildings, their organic unity with their terrain, and the lively interest evoked from all who visited it made the experience an unforgettable one. We are deeply grateful for the chance to have lived in such a place, and we are in a good position to know how much the house has contributed to the artistic and cultural richness of the University. Thanks to Paul and Jean Hanna it has become a part of Stanford history, as well as a vital place of the Frank Lloyd Wright legacy. We are deeply interested in the success of this fundraising effort, and have each contributed to it. We hope very much that you will do so as well."

William Miller (1970-1979)
Donald Kennedy (1979-1981)

"Stanford's greatest artistic treasures, I believe, are the Hanna House, the Quadrangle, and the Rodin Sculpture Garden -- perhaps in that order. The presence of the Hanna House has been a factor, I think, in the decisions of many Stanford undergraduates, over the years, to pursue careers in architecture. It has also been an important resource for graduate students. I look forward to the time when the Hanna House is again accessible to Stanford students for their study and inspiration."

Paul V. Turner
Chairman, Hanna House Board of Governors
Professor of Architectural History
Art Department, Stanford University

[Quote to come from Paul/ Jean Hanna book or from Hanna family member(s); e.g., from John Paul Hanna's remarks at dedication]
An Invitation

Frank Lloyd Wright's Hanna House is one of Stanford University's greatest treasures, an invaluable educational resource for its faculty, students, and the surrounding community. Sadly, the Hanna House, along with many other Stanford buildings and the Bay Area as a whole, suffered severe damage from the Loma Prieta earthquake of October 17, 1989. It has been closed and empty -- surrounded by a chain-link fence -- since that date.

Today, the University and the Hanna House Board of Governors have commissioned a plan to restore this masterpiece of American architecture. Beyond the physical restoration, which itself will require considerable expertise in planning and execution, Stanford is committed to renewing the broad educational vision of Paul and Jean Hanna. In making their priceless gift, the Hannas stated not only that "no change will destroy the harmony and unity Mr. Wright fashioned for this home" but also that the house should "be preserved in such a manner that it would serve educational ends." After its restoration, the Hanna House will serve an expanded role as an educational resource for the University and the surrounding community.

We at Stanford University invite all who love architecture and recognize genius to help us renew the bold vision of Hanna House -- a vision jointly conjured by one of America's most daring architects and two of his most inspiring clients.

Gerhard Casper
President
Stanford University
Wright's success with the Hanna House encouraged him to continue his exploration of forms unconstrained by the conventional 90 degree angle -- triangles, hexagons, and circles for example -- a process that later produced such buildings as the spiraling Guggenheim Museum in New York. The Hanna House at Stanford inaugurated this revolutionary phase of Wright's work, and thus is one of the most significant structures in the history of American architecture. It is, in fact, comparable in importance to Wright's Robie House, the Johnson Wax building, Taliesin West, and Fallingwater.

"The Hanna House, in my opinion, is the most important architectural work in the Bay Area -- perhaps in all of California. It was pivotal in Frank Lloyd Wright's career as the first built design that fully used his revolutionary concepts of non-rectilinear geometry. It exemplifies the modern exploration of free, open spatial planning and it is one of America's architectural treasures."

Paul V. Turner  
Chairman, Hanna House Board of Governors  
Professor of Architectural History  
Art Department, Stanford University

[photos, with caption (and source) as follows:  
-- Plan for Hanna House, 1936 (from page 80 of book)  
-- Entrance Court to Hanna House (from page 79 of book)  
-- Frank Lloyd Wright in the Hanna House (from page 84 of book)]
A Brief History

Built in 1937 by Frank Lloyd Wright for Jean and Paul Hanna and their three small children, the redwood, brick, and glass Hanna House is sited in a residential neighborhood in the foothills above the Stanford campus. One of the most innovative of Wright's works, the house is the first based entirely on hexagonal geometry (60- and 120-degree angles) and signals a design breakthrough in the architect's quest to "break open the box" of traditional architecture.

Jean Hanna, an English teacher, and Paul Hanna, the Lee L. Jacks Professor of Child Education and a Senior Research Fellow in Education at the Hoover Institution, lived in their home for thirty-nine years. In 1974 they gave their architectural masterpiece to the University. From 1977 to 1989, the Hanna House served as residence for the University Provost and was shared with the public through bi-monthly tours conducted by docents from the Stanford University Museum of Art. In October 1989, the Hanna House was severely damaged by the Loma Prieta earthquake. It has been closed since that time.

The Significance of the Hanna House

The Hanna House is undeniably beautiful. Most visitors are quickly won over by the open floor plan and the natural flow of the house from room to room and from the interior to the surrounding patios and gardens. Indeed, many of the features incorporated into the Hanna House -- the carport, the L-shaped living room-dining room, and the open-space kitchen-family room -- became ubiquitous features of the suburban single-family house two decades later. Thus, to today's casual visitor, the house seems not only exquisitely designed but entirely livable and contemporary.

But the Hanna House is more than a beautiful house. A bold experiment in residential design, the house -- Wright's first in Northern California -- is significant architecturally in its abandonment of rectangular geometry. The entire layout is based on the hexagonal module, much like a bee's honeycomb, that determines the angles of all joined walls, windows, and partitions and that gives the house an unusually open feeling.
But the Hanna House is even more than a manifesto of architectural daring and foresight. It is also testament to the synergistic relationship and co-mingled philosophies of client and architect. Professor Paul Hanna was one of the most distinguished American educators of the mid-20th Century, a leader in international education and, in collaboration with Jean, author of seminal educational textbooks. The Hannas taught and practiced John Dewey’s educational principles of activity and science, principles that inspired Wright’s use of the hexagon as a “direct pattern for simple living.” In the Hanna House, Wright created a flow of space and a series of views from one room to the next that perfectly complemented the Hannas’ deeply held belief that design could affect social behavior.

The essence of this long and fruitful architect-client relationship has been documented in extraordinary fashion in the Hannas’ book "Frank Lloyd Wright’s Hanna House: The Clients’ Report." This unique and highly personal chronicle, together with the original plans and correspondence now housed in Stanford’s Archives, make the Hanna House one of Wright’s best documented commissions.

"It seems likely that the Hannas contributed both directly and indirectly to Wright’s perception of the hexagon as a fundamental sociological tool. The Hanna commission served to realize architectural ideals latent in Wright’s work since the 1920s, ultimately determining the future course of his development."

Richard Joncas
Lecturer in Architectural History
Stanford University

[photos with caption (and source), as follows.

-- The Playroom (from page 85 of book)
-- A Terrace, 1938 (from page 89 of book)
-- Paul R. and Jean S. Hanna (still need photo)]
The Future of Hanna House

Loma Prieta and its Aftermath

Leaving a devastating mark on all of Stanford University, the Loma Prieta earthquake of October 17, 1989 also took its toll on the Hanna House, which closed immediately following the earthquake and has remained empty since that time. The main damage included cracked brick walls and fireplaces (integral to the structure's core support); displaced concrete floor slabs and steps; partially collapsed retaining walls; and shifted interior walls, doors, and cabinetry. Most of the damage can be attributed to inadequate soil compaction and the use of unreinforced masonry -- features that reflect the state of earthquake engineering knowledge of that era but which can be remedied with modern technology.

The need for multiple major repairs combined with the desire to maintain the house's unique character has complicated and delayed the planning for the physical restoration of the Hanna House. Identifying a group of structural engineers qualified for such a task required a long search. The closing of the Hanna House also initiated a period of reflection over the proper role of the house on the campus.

The Plan Takes Shape

Now, more than five years after the earthquake, the Hanna House Board of Governors and Stanford University staff, working with a team of architects specializing in historic preservation, have completed a comprehensive plan for the future of the Hanna House. The structural elements of the plan include specifications for (1) repair of the earthquake damage, (2) seismic strengthening of the house to withstand future earthquakes, and (3) restoration of the house, interior and grounds to their historic character. All work has been carefully planned to preserve the historic fabric and architectural integrity of the house. Where modifications must be made to meet current codes, they will be carried out in a manner that is sympathetic to the original architecture. In the seismic strengthening, for example, the reinforcing elements will be hidden within wall spaces and existing brickwork in a fashion that, when completed, will be largely invisible.
The equally important educational elements of the plan will ready the house for functions consistent with the Hannas' original educational intent. This revitalized educational agenda will include an expanded program of public tours and use of the house as a meeting place for art and architecture classes, seminars, small musical performances, and other appropriate university events. Once again, the Hanna House will resound with lively intellectual discourse and beautiful music and will play a major role in the life the University and the surrounding community.

"The historical and architectural significance of the Hanna House requires that the entire site be given the level of care that is provided for artifacts of great cultural and historical value."

From the Restoration Architect's Report, April 30, 1995

[photos, including selection of before-after photos/captions w/dates of Hanna House prepared by University archeologist (living room, fireplace, kitchen)]
Renewing the Vision of the Hanna House

In recovering from the earthquake, Stanford University has displayed its underlying commitment to the arts and historic preservation. While attending to the critical restorations of classrooms, lecture halls, and faculty offices, the University's administration, alumni, and friends have at the same time found the energy and resources to support the magnificent restoration of Memorial Church. These friends are now rallying support for the ambitious expansion of the Art Museum and the continuing revitalization of the Main Quad. The same spirit that has moved the friends of the University to preserve the history so resonant in these most prominent of Stanford's landmark structures must now be harnessed to preserve the historic beauty residing in the campus's most exquisite architectural gem: the Hanna House.

The total cost of the Hanna House project will be approximately $1.75 million. While funds provided by the Federal Emergency Management Agency are expected to meet part of this need, it is estimated that private gifts of $1 million or more will be required to preserve this architectural masterpiece. Toward this end, Stanford University is now seeking help from alumni and friends who have a special interest in architecture and historic preservation. If fundraising for the Hanna House is successful, construction can begin as soon as Spring of 1996 and be completed by Fall of that year.

[photos, including continuation from selection of before-after photos/captions with dates of Hanna House prepared by University archeologist (dining area)]
How to Help

The fundraising program for the Hanna House is part of the Stanford Restoration Fund, the University's overall $50 million fundraising effort to repair damage from the Loma Prieta Earthquake and to strengthen the campus for the future. All donors of $50,000 or more to the Restoration Fund -- including donors for the Hanna House -- will be acknowledged on a historic plaque to be located in the Inner Quad.

Gifts of every level are welcome. To acknowledge donors to the Hanna House, a historic plaque including the names of all who have contributed $5,000 or more will be placed at the house.

If you are interested in helping to preserve this masterpiece of American design for future generations, please call or write:

Mr. I. Timothy Portwood
Associate Director of Development
301 Encina Hall
Stanford, California 94305-6076
Telephone: (415) 723-0070, Fax (415) 725-4365.

"We... remain hopeful that our dream may be fulfilled. Such long-range cooperative endeavors are the essence of great communities: justifying the pains, adjustments, and privileges that have been features of our life with the Hanna House on the campus of Stanford University."

Paul R. Hanna, 1981
[back cover]

Hanna House
Board of Governors

[list names]
**ARCHITECTURE**

**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 loose 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 68, 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 dismaying..."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 gems, 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 Veroinin, 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, Veroinin 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 bad 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-re-warming. "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 Vincenti
A CELEBRATION OF THE HANNAS
AND THEIR HOUSE
15 Nov 87, 3-5 PM
at Hanna House
Remarks Prepared By
James N. Rosse

Could I ask all of you to gather near the East end of the garden?

Would you gather around me so that we can get this afternoon's program started?

We have a half hour program if we can get it underway.

Students interested in public service have been organizing an interesting kind of conference in recent years. It's called the "You Can Make A Difference" conference.

We have a different kind of conference here this afternoon. You might call it a "They Made A Difference" conference.

We are gathered here to celebrate the Hannas and their House.

It was fifty years ago this month that Paul and Jean Hanna moved into their newly completed home, the home that stands around us here today. That is the occasion that brings us together this afternoon.
But as important as that house has been, is and will continue to be to Stanford, it is not just the house that we celebrate.

It is fifty-four years since Paul Hanna first came to the Stanford faculty as Acting Assistant Professor of Education and fifty-two years since he joined the faculty permanently. It is in fact fifty years ago that he was promoted to the rank of professor.

It is altogether fitting, in this period where we celebrate the first one hundred years of our history, that we celebrate a house, a person, and a family.

All bear the name Hanna -- Hanna House, our esteemed colleague Paul Hanna, and his family, many of whom have been able to join us today.

It is especially fitting that we remember Jean Hanna, the bright spirit who lit the house, the person and the family named Hanna. All of us who have had the privilege of knowing Jean Hanna mourn her absence today.

This is the celebration, then, of a partnership that has lasted for half of our first hundred years -- the partnership of the Hannas and their house with Stanford University.

To help commemorate that partnership, I would like to call on Art Coladarci to remember some of Paul Hanna's contributions to his profession of educator and public servant. Art is Paul's long time colleague in the School of Education, and past Dean of the School.

Art, would you please step up here?

------------------

Part of the dream that brought the Hannas to California was their dream of creating a home that was a work of art. Paul and
Jean have told us about that dream and its realization in their book Frank Lloyd Wright's Hanna House: The Clients' Report. It is a beautiful story and one that I commend to those of you who have not read it. Incidentally, the book has been reprinted this year by the University of Illinois Press. The realization of that part of the Hannas' dream stands around us now, a living and perpetual monument to that dream and the artist who brought it to life.

Though the art of that structure was an important part of the Hannas' dream, it was, after all, also their dream to create a home for themselves and their children.

I have asked John Hanna to remember for us what life at Hanna House was like for the Hannas.

John, would you please step up here?

Paul Hanna became Lee L. Jacks Professor Emeritus twenty years ago this Fall. Notice I did not use the word retire -- Paul Hanna did not retire, he simply changed his main line of activity.

Paul continued his professional activities, simply taking them out of the classroom and into the public arena. The Faculty Report that he prepared as he passed into Emeritus status listed more than two pages of continuing affiliations ranging from trusteeships to editorships to active professional committee memberships to professional society memberships. As we all know, he continues many of these activities twenty years later!

In addition to his many professional activities, Emeritus status also brought Paul the time needed to put the finishing touches on the house that bears so much of his mark as well as Frank Lloyd Wright's. He also had time to throw himself into the planning of the Pierce Mitchell development.
An important event happened in 1976. In that year, Paul Hanna became a Senior Research Fellow at the Hoover Institution, invited by Director Glenn Campbell to build a collection of archives on the role of education in war, peace and revolution.

Not only did Paul contribute his vision and effort to this project, he and Jean made substantial contributions of financial support. Their personal support exceeds one million dollars in amount.

Gerald Dorfman is Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution and Curator of The Hanna Collection. I have asked Gerry if he would say a few words about the collection and Paul's role in its creation.

Gerry, would you please step up here?

-------------------

If you look at the program, you will see that I am listed as the next speaker, with my remarks titled "University Contributions". There are many things that can and should be said beyond those that we have already heard. Of necessity, I must limit myself, especially since I must save some time to tell you about life in Hanna House.

The most important contribution that a faculty member can make to the university is simply to do that faculty job superbly well. Paul Hanna was a faculty member par excellence -- teacher, mentor, scholar, university servant, public servant, world servant -- he set an example that continues to motivate those of us who have followed. But Paul's efforts went beyond that which we expect as a part of faculty roles.

Paul and Jean early discovered an effective role in fundraising for the University. The four Jacks chairs held by members of the School of Education are among the results of
that activity. When Margaret Jacks passed away in 1958, her bequest of $10 million was the largest gift received by the University since its founding grants. To put matters in perspective, remember that $10 million in 1958 dollars is worth about $40 in 1987 dollars!

A little known aspect of Paul's career at Stanford is his service here during the Second World War.

During the years of that war, Paul was named Director of University Services. As such, he was the officer of the university responsible for bringing training and research grants from the Federal Government. With student enrollments low, the university was an underused resource with significant financial problems.

Paul brought to Stanford training programs for military personnel that made use of those facilities and helped repair the university's financial condition.

The number of personnel trained at Stanford during the war was only exceeded at an unmentionable eastern institution whose name begins with the letter H.

Paul and Jean have made many contributions to Stanford, but the one that we see before us as we talk is among the most notable and enduring.

Paul and Jean began the process of giving Hanna House to Stanford even as they planned their retirement in 1966. That gift was completed early in 1975 -- those of you who follow real estate values will be amused to note that Hanna House was valued at $300,000 at that time.

The true value of Hanna House to Stanford is not measurable. It is the value of an exquisite piece of art. It is that piece of art together with the history of its conception and...
the details of its realization. It is all of that plus financial endowment to support is maintenance.

What Paul and Jean presented to Stanford was something all too rare -- not only did they give the piece of art, they provided for its sustenance as a piece of art.

The dream that the Hannas had for their house was as a living memorial to the architect, a living monument to and of the genius of Frank Lloyd Wright. You see the fulfillment of that dream here today.

Today Hanna House serves as the residence of the University's Provost. My wife Janice and I have lived here for three years, two months and eleven days!

It has been our pleasure to know the Hannas through their house. It has been our pleasure to serve as custodians of this great treasure. It has been our pleasure to continue and extend its use by the community as a great piece of art.

During the past academic year, for instance, there were over a thousand invited guests to forty-two provostial functions. Two hundred seventy-nine faculty and faculty guests came to seventeen Faculty Dinners, two hundred seventeen alumni and friends came to seven University Seminar Dinners, seventy-six guests attended the celebration of three new professorships, and nearly five hundred guests come to fifteen other events.

Those other events included dinners for several university committees, dinners for prominent visitors from the US and abroad, and dinners for external advisory boards to Stanford units.

Hanna House has very much become a part of the functioning of the Provost's Office in ways that permit its
beauty to be appreciated at first hand by many hundreds of people each year.

Additional hundreds come each year to enjoy the house through the tours developed and managed by the Hanna House Docents led by Marilyn Fogel. The Docents now give four tours each of two Thursdays per month for twelve months of the year -- as many as forty seven visitors per tour day. Architects, students of architecture, interested citizens from all over the world keep these tours booked up as much as six weeks in advance.

Hanna House has become the living monument to the genius of Frank Lloyd Wright about which the Hannas dreamed. It is also a living memory of the Hannas, for you cannot live here as Janice and I have without appreciating the fact that it was not just Frank Lloyd Wright that made this a great house. It truly is and always will be Hanna House. The Hannas, Paul, Jean and their children, are as much a part of Hanna House as is the great architect himself.

And so, Paul, we come to the part of the program where you can speak for yourself.

Before doing so, I want to give you something that will help you remember this day.

I have here a Stanford University Couroc tray.

The image of Stanford that appears on the tray was designed by Hans Wehrli, an artist in Stanford's Publications Service.

The tray was crafted by Couroc's artisans in Monterey in 1967. It was produced in a limited edition all 200 of which came to Stanford. We have given about 140 of them to such persons as Wally and Anne Sterling, Dick and Jing Lyman, Gerald and Betty Ford, French President Pompidou and other heads of state.
It is my pleasure to present one of the trays to you today, Paul, and then to ask you if you want to speak a few words.

----------

Concluding remarks.

- However you made a difference you will go on making a difference for a very long time to come.

- Food
It is fitting for Stanford to host such a celebration for at least two reasons. The university owns an extensive collection of Wright's historical materials, focusing primarily on the architect's work with Darwin D. Martin and Stanford professor Paul R. Hanna and his wife Jean Hanna, that has never been displayed in public. The university grounds also contain one of the most important homes designed by Wright: the Hanna House.

The house commissioned by the Hannas in the early 1930s was also one of the architect's personal favorites. At the time he started its design, he was coming out of a period of relative obscurity. Wright had begun his design work in the 1880s, in the early 1900s, he developed and became famous for the revolutionary, "Prairie House" - the long, low "ranch-style" . . . . .

Maggie - I copied this article on the printer, editing but it didn't come out so I wrote down these 2 paragraphs by hand.
Hanna House: Information About the Restoration Project

In October 1989, the Frank Lloyd Wright-designed Hanna House, located on the Stanford campus, was severely damaged by the Loma Prieta earthquake. Stanford University has embarked on a $1 million campaign to repair, restore, and strengthen Hanna House.

The Hanna House is an architectural masterpiece, a single story of redwood, brick, concrete, and glass sitting congruously among the oaks and grasses in the low foothills above the Stanford University campus. It is the first Wright house based upon the geometric unit of the hexagon, producing a house with opened-up 120 degree corners rather than traditional 90 degree corners.

Professor Hanna and his wife had worked closely with Wright on their home's design and placement, and they made several modifications and additions as they lived in and raised their children in the "honeycomb house." The Hannas gave their house to the University about 20 years ago, at which time it began serving as the Provost's residence and providing an architectural showcase for University functions and dinners. Thousands of people visited the house each year during the bi-monthly tours.

Hanna House has been closed and unoccupied since the earthquake, its walls temporarily braced. The main damage (some of which was already apparent, to a lesser degree, before the earthquake) includes: cracked brick walls and fireplace; displaced concrete floor slabs and steps; partially collapsed retaining walls; broken windows and tiles; bent door and cabinet frames.

The Hanna House Restoration, already in planning and scheduled to occur in 1995, will: repair the earthquake damage; seismically strengthen the house to withstand future earthquakes; restore the house, interior, and grounds to their historic character; and prepare the house for uses more consistent with the Hanna's original intent. These flexible uses will include public tours; scholarship and teaching on architecture and art; scholarly gatherings; small University social functions; and a short-stay guest house for distinguished University visitors.

The gap between what the Federal Emergency Management Agency will provide and that needed for restoration is anticipated to be in excess of $1 million. We are now seeking help from alumni and friends who have a special interest in architecture and historic preservation to help close that gap. A special plaque at the Hanna House will recognize donors to the restoration and preservation of this unique West Coast habitat.
A Frank Lloyd Wright Masterpiece

A contemporary of other Frank Lloyd Wright structures of the mid-1930's — including Fallingwater, Taliesin West and the Usonian houses — the Hanna House is considered to be one of the best and most representative of Wright's residential style. Most strikingly, the house's entire layout is based on a geometric grid of hexagons. The interior partitions and exterior walls — all of redwood, glass, or brick — were joined only at the 120 degree angles formed by the intersecting 4-foot-diameter hexagon tiles laid in the house's concrete foundation. This honeycomb design spreads beyond the floor-to-ceiling glass and out into the surrounding patios, driveway, and gardens. With expansive views of the Stanford campus and San Francisco Bay to the east and the Pacific Coast Range foothills to the west, the Hanna House — like so many Wright structures — now seems integral to the surrounding landscape.

Hanna House Facts
- Located on 1 1/2 acres on Frenchman's Hill in residential area of the Stanford campus
- Designed and constructed in 1936-1937
- One-story wood frame with slab-on-grade floor system
- Original estimate for design/construction: not to exceed $15,000
- Actual cost: $37,000
- Hobby House added in 1950; lower parking area in 1952; bedroom terrace, fountain and garden house in 1963
- Many furnishings were also designed by Wright

Unique Features
- First Wright commission using the hexagon as the modular building block of residential design
- Unusual in the degree of owner participation in original design and modifications
- First Wright house completed in San Francisco Bay Area
- Listed on National Register of Historic Places
- Designated by American Institute of Architects as one of 17 Wright buildings that exemplify his contribution to American culture

Note on Restoration
All restoration work will aim to preserve the historic fabric and architectural integrity of Hanna House. Where modifications must be made to meet current codes, they will be carried out in a manner that is sympathetic to the character of the original architectural elements.

What People Say about Hanna House

"While the plan is spacious and spreads itself, it is not unduly extravagant, I think."

"I imagine [the sketches] will be something of a shock."

1936 Wright letter to Hanna's accompanying original sketches

"the most beautiful ... of all Wright's houses."

Brendan Gill, architectural writer for The New Yorker

"...the house is completely free of the obstruction of heavy walls, sharp angles, and the usual holes in the walls... A clear, inspiring conception relates this California honeycomb house to the climate, the locality, and the human activity of the Hannas."

Wright apprentice L. Cornelia Brierly in 1936 article

"It is our desire to have this architectural piece stand permanently on the Stanford University campus as a living example of the philosophy and of the design principle of this genius."

1974 Hanna letter of intent to University trustees
The Family Inside Hanna House

From the time they met as college freshmen, Jean and Paul Hanna dreamed of building their own special home. Married in 1926, they immediately began filling folders with architectural ideas. But only after discovering Frank Lloyd Wright's lectures in Modern Architecture were they won over by any one philosophy of design. They stayed up all night reading the book, wrote Wright the next day, and began a life-long correspondance and friendship with the architect.

When Stanford University invited Paul Hanna to join the faculty of the School of Education in 1935, "we made two phone calls: one to accept the Stanford appointment, and one to Mr. Wright asking him to think about a house for us in California." After a visit to the sloping lot on Stanford's Frenchman's Hill, Wright sent his plans and elevations for the house in April of 1936. The collaboration had begun.

"The Hannas are as much a part of the story as Frank Lloyd Wright," says Stephen Farneth, an architect with the firm leading the current restoration. "They hired him, worked with him and even made some changes on their own. Their life in the house is really an important part of the story of how this house was designed and how it evolved."

Living with their three small children in a rented house in Palo Alto, the Hannas engaged Wright constantly as they watched their dream house grow through late 1936 and 1937. Long distance, they debated Wright on wall placements, windows, room additions, budget overruns, design theory, and bathtub sizes. Meanwhile, at the job site, "both of us, husband and wife, had worked with the laborers and craftsmen on the job. We took part in every type of construction: we mixed concrete, we laid brick, sawed redwood, screwed on battens, set plate glass, put on insulation, held pipe for plumbers, made light fixtures. The children aided in cleaning away waste materials and running errands." At last, at double the original budget, Hanna House was complete.

Living in the house over the next thirty years, the Hanna family grew into the space and made significant and thoughtful modifications as their lives warranted. The modifications were merely executions of plans harbored in the original design — most of them aimed at providing more space for guests and for study. With the children on their own by 1956, the Hannas initiated the final round of changes — the playroom becoming the dining room, the three children's rooms becoming a single master bedroom, and the library and study expanding — leaving Hanna House much as we recognize it today. During this time, Paul Hanna was Professor of Education at Stanford while Jean Hanna taught English. Together, they authored and edited several widely used textbooks for elementary schools. A collection of the couple's publications on education are currently archived at Stanford's Hoover Institution, where Dr. Hanna was also Senior Research Fellow.

In 1976, nearing retirement, the Hannas moved into a condominium on campus, gave their home to the University, and helped secure a $500,000 grant from the Nissan Motor Company to provide for maintenance of the architectural treasure. "It is our desire" they wrote "to have this architectural piece stand permanently on the Stanford University campus as a living example of the philosophy and of the design principle of this genius." Anticipating a need for future fund raising, Paul Hanna stated in the book on the building of Hanna House (Frank Lloyd Wright's Hanna House: The Clients' Report) that "such long-range cooperative endeavors are the essence of great communities, justifying the pains, adjustments, and privileges that have been features of our life with the Hanna House on the campus of Stanford University." Jean Hanna died in 1987 and Paul Hanna died in 19__. The bold ideas they gave shape will last.
October 17, 1989

The Loma Prieta Earthquake left a devastating mark on Stanford University. In just 15 minutes of violent shaking on that late afternoon in Fall, over 240 buildings were damaged, including Green Library West, the Museum of Art, Memorial Church, three departmental libraries, 12 laboratories, 39 classrooms, and 205 academic offices. The overall cost of repairing the damage, plus the cost of seismically girding buildings against future earthquakes, was estimated at $150 million.

Six years later, much of that $150 million has yet to be raised — or spent. Buildings are closed and sandstone archs are braced. Temporary classroom structures, boarded windows, and chain link fences still serve as painful reminders of the earthquake’s legacy. But, as recent visitors to the campus will recognize, much progress has been made. Memorial Church, the Graduate School of Business, and several buildings on the main Quad have been repaired and reopened. And with last year’s conclusion of negotiations with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) — resulting in a commitment of nearly $40 million of federal disaster relief funds — the University is now finally positioned to accelerate its restoration efforts.

Significant private funding for these efforts has already emerged from major contributors such as Helen and Peter Bing, Melvin and Joan Lane, Iris and B. Gerald Cantor, the Kresge Foundation, and the Schwab Family Foundation. The Stanford Restoration Fund was created to encourage other individuals and groups to step forward and help Stanford complete the recovery from the Loma Prieta earthquake. The Fund’s goal is $50 million. To acknowledge donors, an historic plaque located in the Main Quad will list the names of all friends and members of the Stanford family who contribute $50,000 or more.

"The early challenges to Stanford were not mere inconveniences. The 1906 earthquake that shook down the non-denominational chapel and left the statue of Agassiz buried head down in the ground was an authentic disaster, as was the second earthquake in 1989. This dream was realized against difficulty all the way. So can the renewed dream be, the one that is to take us the year 2091."

Wallace Stegner,
[bom-died] Writer, Stanford Professor and long-time resident of coast foothills, speaking on the dream of Leland and Jane Stanford at Stanford 1991 Centennial

The Quake’s Impact on Hanna House
The Loma Prieta earthquake seriously damaged Hanna House. Structural engineers have determined that the main damage included cracked brick walls and fireplaces (integral to the structure’s core support, many of these are currently braced); displaced concrete floor slabs and steps; partially collapsed retaining walls; and shifted interior walls, doors, and cabinetry. All told, the need for structural repair and strengthening, combined with need to maintain the house’s unique architectural character, makes restoration a complex rehabilitation project.

A special fund-raising campaign has been initiated to repair the Hanna House and, simultaneously, to prepare the house for uses more fitting with the original intent of the Paul and Jean Hanna. The anticipated gap between the FEMA contribution to Hanna House and the actual cost of repairing, restoring, and strengthening the house is approximately $1 million.

[if possible, add Stegner quote on Ca. earthquakes/architecture/foothills (from interviews in his house)]
Hanna House: Restoration and Future Use

The Hanna House Board of Governors has now approved a comprehensive set of plans for the repair, restoration, and seismic strengthening of this Frank Lloyd Wright architectural gem in the foothills above the Stanford campus. All work will be done with the philosophy and goal of preserving the architectural integrity and historic fabric of the house and grounds.

When reopened, it will no longer serve as the Provost's residence. Instead, it will be employed by the University in ways that are much more consistent with the original "educational" vision conveyed by the Paul and Jean Hanna along with their magnificent gift to Stanford in 1976. Thus, the house will be opened for classes on art and architecture, for academic gatherings, and as a venue for small-scale University meetings or entertaining. Distinguished visitors to the University may be hosted in Hanna House for short-periods of time. A Stanford graduate student with interests in architecture will live in Hobby House and act as caretaker, providing security and maintenance oversight. And, as before the earthquake, the house will be opened for regular public tours.

Final design review and permit applications for the restoration are scheduled to occur in late 1995. Depending on funding, construction can begin as soon as Spring of 1996.

The Campaign for Hanna House Restoration

The total cost of restoring Hanna House and preparing it for new functions is estimated to be $1.5 million. Funds from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and endowment income from the Nissan Motor Company's Hanna House Fund have already played a key role in initiating the restoration project. The Hanna House Board of Governors now anticipates a need for an additional $1 million in private gifts to finish the restoration; thus, they are now seeking help from alumni and friends who have a special interest in architecture and historic preservation. Because of the Nissan permanent endowment for maintenance and insurance (currently paying about $100,000 per year), those making gifts for Hanna House Restoration can be assured that their investment in the rebirth of this architectural masterpiece will remain a quality asset to the Stanford community for years to come.

Opportunities to Support

Gifts of every level are welcome. To acknowledge donors to Hanna House Restoration, an historic plaque including the names of all who have contributed $5,000 or more will be placed at the house. For gifts above $50,000, Stanford will also add donors' names to the historic earthquake plaque to be located in the main Quad. If you are interested in helping restore and preserve this architectural masterpiece for future generations, please contact:

L. Timothy Portwood '76
Associate Director of Development
Stanford University
301 Encina Hall
Stanford, California 94305-6076

(415) 723-0070
(415) 725-4365 (fax)
e-mail ct.ltp@forsythe.stanford.edu
DATE: May 22, 1995

TO: Hanna House Board of Governors*

FROM: Laura Jones

SUBJECT: Hanna House Board of Governors May 25, 1995 Agenda

Dear Colleagues:

Enclosed please find the agenda for the meeting of May 25, with attachments. Please review the minutes of our last meeting of April 27, 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 Harua House.

Thank you

Marilyn Fogel
James Gibbons
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood
Jack Rakove
Paul Turner

CC: Marlene Bumbera
Gerhard Casper
John Paul Hanna
Warren Jacobsen
Mark Jones
Academic Secretary
Hanna House Board of Governors
Agenda
May 25, 1995
8:30 - 10:00 am
Hobby House at the Hanna House

I. Review of Minutes - April 27, 1995 Meeting Please see Attachment

Please review the Minutes from the Meeting of April 27, 1995 and raise any comments or concerns.

II. Announcements
1. fundraising — review brochure —
2. film — accepted — Niven & Laura — will be in contact w/Kristie
3. trip to Los Angeles
4. cleaning — light cleaning happening — June 12 - Monday — Gamble
   Rancho Los Mientos
   Cherry Beach
   gardens designed mentioned

III. Cost estimate —

IV. Review of Programming Document

5. 3878
   Women
   by 11/15

Austin
   4thares
Stanford University
Hanna House Board of Governors

Minutes of Meeting - April 27, 1995
Hobby House at the Hanna House

Members Present: Marilyn Fogel
                 Maggie Kimball
                 David Neuman
                 Tim Portwood
                 Jack Rakove

Members Absent:  James Gibbons
                 Rosemary Hornby
                 Paul Turner, Chair

Others Present: Marlene Bumbera
                 John Paul Hanna
                 Warren Jacobsen
                 Laura Jones
                 Mark Jones

In the absence of the Chair, Paul Turner, David Neuman opened the meeting.

1. **Review of Minutes, March 30, 1995**

Corrected the spelling of member Rakove’s name. The minutes of the meeting of March 30, 1995 were then approved.

2. **Reports**

   a. **Fundraising**

      Tim Portwood reported that a meeting has been scheduled for tomorrow afternoon (April 28) with Development Office Vice President, John Ford, and representatives of the Provost and President’s offices to discuss the fundraising potential for the project.

      John Paul Hanna has provided a list of prospective donors; a potential New York donor has been identified, however the gift is viewed as a donation for either the Hanna House or for Building 30.

      In December, a donation of $10,000 was received from former Provost, James Rosse, which was not previously reported to the Board.

      Portwood met with Laura Jones to discuss content and format for an inexpensive informational brochure on the Hanna House Restoration.
project. Development Office staff will prepare text to accompany photos provided by L. Jones. A draft of the brochure will be available by next month's meeting.

b. **Repairs**

Warren Jacobsen stated that the roof has been repaired, with gravel affixed over an adhesive to those areas of the roof where gravel was thin. The flashing and leak have been repaired which was causing water to collect in the Hobby House studio on the first floor.

A building permit for the repair of the drive wall has been issued, and the repair is scheduled to begin about mid-June. Cost for the repair is estimated at $30,000 to $35,000, to be taken from project funds.

With the Program document nearing completion and the cost for a minimum fix to the house available tomorrow, a meeting with FEMA can be scheduled to finalize their dollar contribution.

A topographic map of the house, grounds and parking has been completed.

The Landscape Architect's recommendations regarding rehabilitating the grounds are underway. Some work on the drains and patios has been proceeding, as well as the clearing of storm debris. Work on the oak root crowns is not known. L. Jones is to follow-up.

c. **Hanna House Funds Financial Summary/Project Budget**

Jacobsen distributed a financial summary of Hanna House funds through February, 1995, and a project status report through March 31, 1995. In summary, there is $181,000 uncommitted in the Plant Account, but an additional $72,000 can be added to this from the endowment, resulting in a total of $270,000 available. The repair of the wall, and work on the oak trees will need to come from this figure.

Portwood stated that there is an additional $40,000 in gifts in the original account. These are the Rosse $10,000 gift for earthquake restoration; $25,000 from a London donor, and the $5,000 gift from the three Hanna children. He said that he expects that any major donations to the restoration will be in 5-year gifts, and that it will be necessary for the University to lend money to the project for construction (bridge fund).

Neuman said that of the $100,000 annual income produced by the Nissan Endowment, funds for the past few years have been allocated at $25,000 for maintenance with the other $75,000 available for other expenditures. He said that when the buildings are again open, it is quite likely that this
ratio will be reversed -- that the dollar figure for maintenance will be approximately $75,000/year, leaving only $25,000 for other expenditures.

Neuman said that with the FEMA contribution, we may have $275,000 to $300,000 in available money by next February or March, but that $1.5 million will probably be needed. Mark Jones added that there will be a lot of soft costs to the project, which indicate the need to have a high contingency.

d. **Fact-Finding Tour to Los Angeles**

Jacobsen stated that he has been in touch with Martin Weil, the project's consultant Restoration Architect, regarding the proposed visit to similar historic houses that are operational in the Los Angeles area. A tentative date of June 12th has been selected for this visit. At the present time, there are four houses which Weil has identified for the visit -- Gamble House, Workman Temple, Rancho Alamitos and the Hollyhock House.

Board members stressed that it is important that visits be made to historic houses similar to the Hanna House that are presently open and operational, and that the main focus for the visit is to investigate operations, management of the houses, and on-going cost issues. It was stated that a visit to the Gamble House is a high priority, and that a visit to the Freeman House would be another high priority request. If four houses are to be toured in one day, it will probably require traveling to southern California on Sunday evening. Jacobsen will refine the itinerary with Weil.

e. **Museum Relations**

The meeting proposed last month with Museum representatives to discuss the Wright designed furniture has not yet been scheduled, due to the difficulty in locating the furniture photos as well as the Chair's accident preventing his participation. L. Jones said that she has now acquired the photos, including the negatives, and that five sets of photos have been produced for distribution. She said that she had shown Diana Strazdes the furniture at the Lake House and that Strazdes expressed some concern regarding potential damage to the furniture fabric from dust and sun. L. Jones and W. Jacobsen will investigate the best supplier for dusting and covering the furniture and make arrangements for this to be done. L. Jones said that the current Museum thinking is to display the furniture as sculpture in the Twentieth Century Art Gallery. The Museum would like to curate all the furniture and arrange for loans to other institutions. L. Jones said that the Museum will prepare a proposal for the Board's consideration.
L. Jones continued that the Museum is also interested in the Imperial Hotel (Tokyo) urn. Neuman stated that there is an account of $70,000 in funds available to repair the urn, and that several options were investigated in August 1989, including epoxy injections to stabilize the granite, which may not be the state-of-the-art solution today. In any event, ultraviolet rays, rain, cleaning, etc., would probably result in continuing deterioration if the urn were sited outdoors without a roof. He also said that an indoor location previously considered was the lobby of the Education (Cubberly) Building. Maggie Kimball said that if placed in such an open location, vandalism would probably occur.

A committee comprised of Marilyn Fogel, Paul Turner, Maggie Kimball and Laura Jones was formed to meet to format an agenda prior to scheduling a meeting with Museum staff, and that subsequently, a meeting be arranged with Tom Seligman and Diane Strazdes to discuss and explore these and other issues.

3. **Review of Program Document**

Neuman said that since the program document had just been distributed, an in-depth discussion was not feasible. He requested that comments be sent to Warren Jacobsen by Friday, May 19th so that they could be forwarded to the Architectural Resources Group (ARG) to compile and have back for distribution and discussion at the meeting of May 25th.

4. **House Management**

Neuman reported that the Provost's Office (Ann Fleming), in a summary memo following the charrette, would like for the Hanna House to be more available for use to the faculty. The current recommendation of the Board (in the Draft Program document) is to limit dinner events, for example, to 1-2 per week. It is Fleming's view that there may be many more requests during the summer months for such use, and very few in the winter months. More flexibility in adjusting to seasonal ebb and flow is suggested, not necessarily raising the number of events per year. It is hoped that the house will be treated more as a resource than as an "artifact".

A committee to meet with Fleming and Marilyn Banwell to discuss utilization and other issues, such as a restriction to only one catering firm, etc. was formed. Members will be faculty representatives Jack Rakove and Jim Gibbons with Marilyn Fogel as the third committee member. Laura Jones is to coordinate this meeting, and is to send a copy of the Draft Program to the Provost's Office for their information.

Information which would be helpful to this committee prior to their meeting -- in understanding the number of use requests to expect in the future, as well as other house management issues, etc. -- were suggested. These were:
Lake House events guidelines (to be used as a format for future Hanna House guidelines)

Event statistics for Hanna House prior to the 1989 earthquake (possibly in files stored in the Commissary Building)

Gather information and data from Bruce Wiggins relative to post-event(s) maintenance needed in the past which might relate to the number of people hosted (pre-October 1989). Retrieve his annual maintenance costs for years preceding Loma Prieta.

5. **New Business and Announcements**

John Paul Hanna said that there needs to be an inventory of the grounds, including the Japanese lanterns and some of the plantings, for example the Juniper outside Hobby House, which probably needs replacement since it has not been pruned in several years. T. Jones said that this is one of the tasks assigned to the landscape consultant, she added that some of the lanterns have been placed in the garage for safekeeping. M. Jones inquired if there has been an assessment of some of the large oak limbs which extend over the roof. Some may need to be removed. Jacobsen said that several of the limbs had been lightened during the roof repair.

Marilyn Fogel said that Robie House, owned by the University of Chicago, is to be transferred for use from an Alumni resource to a museum house, and that they are currently launching a $2.5 million fundraising effort. She reported that Charnley House, currently owned by the architectural firm, Skidmore, Owings and Merrill will be transferred to use as a facility for the Society of Architectural Historians. She also announced that there will be a tour of historic residences on San Juan Hill this Sunday, April 29th, and that the Frank Lloyd Wright Conservancy will hold their annual meeting in Madison, Wisconsin in October.

Fogel continued that she has requested a page of space with the publication “Wright Site” to begin once the house is opened and she suggested that we submit an article regarding the restoration, and where to send donations, to the *Quarterly Newsletter of the Frank Lloyd Wright Building Conservancy*.

Portwood suggested that when the FEMA settlement is reached (two to three months), it would be a good time to issue a press release regarding the restoration effort.

Maggie Kimball and Marilyn Fogel will follow up with the *Stanford Magazine* as to the possibility of a feature article on the restoration/fundraising effort for the fall issue.

Minutes prepared by M. Bumbera
May 3, 1995

Hi Tim:

I have attached the proposed budget for the documentary.

Please let me know your thoughts, and how we should proceed from here.

You will probably have questions or suggestions on some of the items - please give me a call at 415 662 1795 at your convenience.

Looking forward to moving forward!

Kristine Hanna
SCHEDULE

1 day       Shoot Hanna House as it is now
7 days      Research
3 days      Shoot Interviews
tba days    Shoot house as it is being restored
4 days      Animation
2 days      Lab & Telecine
14 days     Editing
4 days      Online
3 days      Sound
2 days      Misc.

TOTAL = 40 days, plus shooting of restoration.
# Worksheet HH

## Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Producer &amp; Misc.</td>
<td>Kristine Hanna</td>
<td>No charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director/D.P.</td>
<td>Mike Dondro</td>
<td>$5000 ($250 a day for 20 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting/Sound</td>
<td>Patrick Sirk</td>
<td>$600 ($150 a day for 4 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/Script/Lighting</td>
<td>John Boatwright</td>
<td>$750 ($150 a day 5 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture Editor</td>
<td>tba</td>
<td>$750 (flat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Assistants</td>
<td>tba</td>
<td>No charge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16mm camera</td>
<td>No charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16mm Raw Stock</td>
<td>$1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lights/Grip Equipment</td>
<td>$1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera Equipment</td>
<td>$1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4&quot; Nagra</td>
<td>No charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4&quot; Tape</td>
<td>No charge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Post Production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lab - Develop &amp; Prep for Video Transfer</td>
<td>$1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film to Tape Transfers</td>
<td>$1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing System</td>
<td>No charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape stock</td>
<td>No charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online - General Assembly</td>
<td>No charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online - Effects &amp; Credits</td>
<td>$1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animation Stand</td>
<td>$1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice Over Recordings</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Editing &amp; Mixing</td>
<td>$750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>No charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock Footage</td>
<td>No charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc./Expansible</td>
<td>$1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xerox &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 16950
Hanna House Board of Governors
Agenda
April 27, 1995
8:30 - 10:00 am
Hobby House at the Hanna House

I. Review of Minutes - March 30, 1995 Meeting  Please see Attachment

Please review the Minutes from the Meeting of March 30, 1995 and raise any comments or concerns.

II. Announcements
1. fundraising - re: John Focht re: discussions have occurred with John Hanna.
2. repairs - roof/flashings repaired.
3. trip to Los Angeles
4. Museum

III. Review of Programming Document
- Review by May 18 - to Warren.

IV. House Management

- bid permit for wall applied for - #30K
- hope is 2-3 weeks
- construction anticipated mid-June
- #5 on repair will be received 4/29
- landscape repair not fully completed

1/5/94
$1.25M needed in fundraising

- Museum
- interested in buying furniture
- was still an issue

V. LA trip -
- Tentatively June 12 &
- 4 residences
- #753 W. Vermont Temple
- Ravea Amenities
- Hollywood

IV. David had discussions w/ Ann Fleming -
- demand for house -
- may have been underestimated

$75m small group to meet w/ Ann
- use issues
- Laura, Jim Jack, Mark

Comment - Records of Povorst's office??
- files on Hanna Home??
Hanna House Board of Governors
Minutes
March 30, 1995
Hobby House at the Hanna House

Members Present:  Rosemary Hornby
                 Maggie Kimball
                 David Neuman
                 Jack Račkove
                 Paul Turner

Members Absent:   Marilyn Fogel
                 James Gibbons
                 Michael Hannan
                 Tim Portwood

Others Present:   Marlene Bumbera
                 Warren Jacobsen
                 Laura Jones
                 Mark Jones

I.  Review of Minutes - February 23, 1995
    Approved.

II. Announcements

During a brief discussion of the fundraising campaign, D. Neuman reported that T. Portwood is developing the prospect list with some assistance from J.P. Hanna. P. Turner raised the issue of provostial "backstopping" funds to which D. Neuman replied that the request would be premature before the fundraising program and FEMA negotiations are well underway. It was further decided that a group of members would meet with John Ford of the Development Office to discuss the campaign.

W. Jacobsen and M. Kimball reported discussions on the film with Kristine Hanna. She will visit the house and Special Collections and then begin filming during repair of the wall.

W. Jacobsen reported that selection of a contractor and a construction manager for the wall repair are underway. D. Neuman suggested several
firms with experience in historic preservation work. M. Jones asked if the board would like to appoint a representative to assist with selection of the construction manager and M. Fogel was suggested, with M. Kimball agreeing to serve should she decline.

L. Jones reported on the status of the furniture loan to the Metropolitan Museum. P. Turner requested copies of photographs of the Wright furniture. M. Kimball suggested asking for current photographs of the chairs on exhibit at the Metropolitan and updating their insurance valuations as well. She then moved to approve a one year extension of the loan, P. Turner seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

L. Jones also reported a conversation with D. Strazdes, Curator of American Art at the Stanford Museum in which the Museum indicated an interest in curating and displaying the Hanna House Wright furniture. D. Neuman reported some ideas that Martin Weil had regarding possible uses of the furniture and his recommendation that the most valuable pieces be curated outside of the house. M. Kimball suggested a small group meet with the Museum of Art to discuss the furnishings, docent programs and the general issue of a relationship between the Museum and Hanna House programs in the future. P. Turner agreed with the condition that the Board have access to good photographs of the furnishings in advance.

D. Neuman reported that Martin Weil has offered to guide a tour of Wright houses in Los Angeles for the Board designed to review issues of house operation and management.

III. Budget Report

M. Jones made the first of what will be a quarterly report on the financial status of the house accounts, with hand outs summarizing assets and expenses. W. Jacobsen further reported that the note on the Shasta property had been paid off in June 1991.

IV. House Maintenance

W. Jacobsen reported that roof repairs are being scheduled. L. Jones suggested that the house needs more extensive maintenance and cleaning. Members suggested some concerns with the cost of cosmetic cleaning but agreed the repairs to drains for example should take place in any case.
V. **Design Charette Follow Up**

W. Jacobsen reported that the consultants are at work on a report summarizing the results of the design charette that should be available for review at the April Board meeting.

VI. **House Manager/Curator**

M. Kimball suggested that a committee be formed to lay out elements of a management program for the house, following the outcome of discussions with the Museum of Art.
DATE: April 25, 1995

TO: Hanna House Board of Governors

FROM: Laura Jones

SUBJECT: Hanna House Board of Governors April 27, 1995 Agenda

Dear Colleagues:

Enclosed please find the agenda for the meeting of April 27, with attachments. Please review the minutes of our last meeting of March 30, 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
   Jack Rakove
   Paul Turner

CC: Marlene Bumbera
    Gerhard Casper
    John Paul Hanna
    Warren Jacobsen
    Mark Jones
    Academic Secretary
### Financial Summary - Hanna House Funds

#### Spendable Funds from Nissan Endowment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>FY1993-94</th>
<th>FY1994-95 (Thru 2/95)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance 9/1</td>
<td>$184,066</td>
<td>($2,897)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Allocation</td>
<td>83,110</td>
<td>$100,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$267,176</td>
<td>$97,137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Acct.</td>
<td>$23,823</td>
<td>$29,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Project Acct (9VDQ047)</td>
<td>246,250</td>
<td>($4,697)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$270,073</td>
<td>$24,591</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Balance 8/31                | ($2,897)  |                      |
| Balance After Six Months    |           | $72,546              |

#### Operation & Maintenance Fund

| Transfer in                 | $35,000   | $29,288              |
| Use During Year             | $23,823   | $10,476              |
| Amount Returned             | $11,177   |                      |
| Balance After Six Months    | $16,012   |                      |

#### Fund Balances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nissan Endowment:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book Value of Principal (No Change)</td>
<td>$641,690</td>
<td>$641,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Value</td>
<td>$1,909,057</td>
<td>$1,835,517</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Earthquake Project Accounts

**Current Account:**

- Amount Funded: $325,000
- Commitments thru 3/95: $144,071
- Expenditures thru 3/95: $115,377
- Uncommitted Balance: $180,929

**Original Account:**

- Amount Funded: $217,592
- Commitments: $217,592
- Expenditures thru: $217,592
- Uncommitted Balance: $0

---

*Notes:
- May go to restoration with some $217,592 uncommitted.
- Expenses for maintenance with 1% of annual endowment.
- $80k spent.*
**BUDGET STATUS AS OF: 04/26/95**  
**PROJ: 6050  EQ HANNA HOUSE**  
**EXPENDITURE TO 03/31/95**

**ACCOUNT: 9VDQ010**  
**MANAGER: JACOBSEN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOUNT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>COMMITMENT</th>
<th>EXPENDED</th>
<th>UNEXPENDED COMMITMENTS</th>
<th>BALANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A BASIC CONSTRUCTION TO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B Other Construction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,789</td>
<td>12,789</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-12,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 CONSTRUCTION BUDGET</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,789</td>
<td>12,789</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-12,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 EQUIPMENT &amp; FURNISHING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 PROFESSIONAL SRVS TOTA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>145,363</td>
<td>145,363</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-145,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ADMINISTRATIVE SRVS TO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59,438</td>
<td>59,438</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-59,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 ACTIVATION TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 PROJECT CONTINGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 GPI PRO RATA TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 REPLACEMENT PRKG TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 OTHER PROJ COSTS TOTAL</td>
<td>209,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>209,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 CONSTR FINANCING ALLO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PROJECT</td>
<td>209,000</td>
<td>217,592</td>
<td>217,592</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-8,592</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hanna House Board of Governors
Agenda
March 30, 1995
8:30 - 10:00 am
Hobby House at the Hanna House

I. **Review of Minutes - February 23, 1995 Meeting**  *Please see Attachment*

Please review the Minutes from the Meeting of February 23, 1995 and raise any comments or concerns.

II. **Announcements**
1. fundraising - beginning of a prospect list - Tim / follow-up with Nissen?
2. film -
3. wall repair - construction document due week of April 3
4. furniture -

III. **Budget Report**
Mark Jones/Warren Jacobsen

IV. **House Maintenance**
Laura Jones/Warren Jacobsen

V. **Design Charette Follow Up**

VI. **House Manager/ Curator**

> David Banks report - in Provost's office -
Hanna House Board of Governors
Minutes
February 23, 1995
Hobby House at the Hanna House

Members Present: Marilyn Fogel
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood

Members Absent: James Gibbons
Michael Hannan
Paul Turner

Others Present: Marlene Bumbera
Tiffany Gravlee
John Paul Hanna
Warren Jacobsen
Laura Jones
Mark Jones

I. Review of Minutes - January 26, 1995

Approved with minor typographical corrections.

II. Announcements

D. Neuman introduced Planning Office staff person Marlene Bumbera, who will be providing staff support to the Board. He added that this was Tiffany Gravlee's last Board meeting and thanked her for her contributions. He brought the Board's attention to a newspaper article from the Metro that appeared on February 22 that was described as supportive of the Hanna House rehabilitation.

T. Portwood reported that he was researching the income from the note on the Shasta property and that he had informed John Ford that we were about to begin our fundraising campaign. He raised the issue of backstopping funds from the Provost's Office and there was general discussion about the possibility. He added that three items needed to be resolved prior to launching the campaign: the use of the house, the
philosophy guiding the restoration, and the cost. The importance of securing pledges for major gifts, the role of financing, and the possibility of staging the restoration project in two steps to speed up the major reconstruction project were discussed.

L. Jones reported that the Wright chair on loan to the Milwaukee Museum of Art had been returned in good condition, and that the loan to the Metropolitan Museum of Art of two chairs was coming due as well and would be discussed at an upcoming Board meeting.

III. Report of Roof Repair Plan

W. Jacobsen reported on the results of a roofing inspection recommending minor repairs to the tar and gravel roof at a cost of approximately $1500. M. Fogel motioned to approve, seconded by T. Portwood and unanimously approved by the Board.

IV. Format for Design Charette

W. Jacobsen outlined the format for the charette, to be held on March 14. It was determined that the charette would be held in Hobby House. M. Jones suggested some changes to the proposed format to allow for a working session, expanding the schedule, which was met with general agreement. In response to questions L. Jones assured the board that there would be a written report from the charette that would serve as the basis for the design of the restoration project.

V. House Manager

D. Neuman reported that the Provost's Office has shown interest in handling the scheduling of house events and routine maintenance, with a member of their staff acting as house manager similar to how they manage Lake House currently, following policies written by the Board of Governors. General discussion of the role of manager in overseeing budgets and maintenance and funding of the position followed. A motion was made by M. Kimball to invite a representative from the Provost's Office to the design charette, seconded by M. Fogel and approved unanimously. It was suggested that further discussion on the role of house manager would be required in a future meeting.
**FINANCIAL SUMMARY - HANNA HOUSE FUNDS**

### SPENDABLE FUNDS FROM NISSAN ENDOWMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY1993-94</th>
<th>FY1994-95 (Thru 2/95)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sources:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance 9/1</td>
<td>$184,066</td>
<td>($2,897)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Allocation</td>
<td>83,110</td>
<td>$100,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Acct.</td>
<td>$23,823</td>
<td>$29,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Project Acct (9VDQ047)</td>
<td>$246,250</td>
<td>($4,697)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$270,073</td>
<td>$24,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance 8/31</td>
<td>($2,897)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance After Six Months</td>
<td>$72,546</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OPERATION & MAINTENANCE FUND

|                   |           |                       |
|-------------------|-----------|                       |
| **Transfer In**   | $35,000   | $29,288               |
| **Use During Year** | $23,823 | $10,476   |
| Amount Returned   | $11,177   |                       |
| Balance After Six Months | $18,812 |                 |

### FUND BALANCES

|                   |           |                       |
|-------------------|-----------|                       |
| Nissan Endowment: |           |                       |
| Book Value of Principal (No Change) | $641,690 | $641,690 |
| Market Value      | $1,909,057| $1,835,517            |

### EARTHQUAKE PROJECT ACCOUNT

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount Funded</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitments thru 2/95</td>
<td>138,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures thru 2/95</td>
<td>88,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncommitted Balance</td>
<td>$186,926</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MWD                       Page 1

3/29/95
DATE: March 28, 1995

TO: Hanna House Board of Governors

FROM: Laura Jones

SUBJECT: Hanna House Board of Governors March 30, 1995 Agenda

Dear Colleagues:

Enclosed please find the agenda for the meeting on March 30, with attachments. Please review the minutes of our last meeting of February 23, 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
Jack Rakove
Paul Turner

CC: Marlene Bumbera
Gerhard Casper
Herb Fong
Tiffany Gravlee
John Paul Hanna
Warren Jacobsen
Mark Jones
Academic Secretary
Hanna House

- Issue of "curator" for house.

- Original furniture v. replicas.
  - Tours, interpretation v. use/impact

- Issue of use - level, sort, other limits - impacts on house.

Use -

Seminars

House - tours plus limited - special events -

Hobby House - use for seminars -> ADA problems.

Library - secondary option to Hobby House

Dining Rm - third option - selective

Carpet - flat weave - not well to wall? any background? [ ]

Prod. Notes
# Hanna House: Proposed Seismic Repair and Strengthening Concept

## Superstructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Roof-to-chimney ties</td>
<td>Reduces the risk of local collapse by completing the load path, reducing pounding, and improving vertical support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>General roof work</td>
<td>Roof-to-wall ties, blocking and collectors are needed to complete the load path, the diaphragm requires strengthening, and the flitch plates may need supplementing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Center coring at the three chimneys</td>
<td>Improves the bending capacity of the chimneys and reduces stress concentrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Several strengthened wood walls and closets</td>
<td>Reduces diaphragm rotation, limits wall drift and improves stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Improved high roof lateral framing</td>
<td>Reduces diaphragm rotation and provides a reliable system for east-west loads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Improved high roof vertical framing</td>
<td>Increases redundancy and improves load path</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Substructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Rebuild parking area wall</td>
<td>Repair and strengthening of damaged wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>New veneer ties</td>
<td>Reduce the risk of veneer delamination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Grade beams connecting retaining walls back to main chimney</td>
<td>Props the top of retaining wall against overturning, provides necessary overturning resistance for chimney, and provides a grade beam hinge that yields before center core rebar reaches yield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Concrete backing against retaining walls</td>
<td>Provides necessary out-of-plane bending resistance for retaining wall (which will span between the new horizontal tie beam at top of the wall and footing at the base of the wall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>New underslab at living room spanning between grade beams</td>
<td>Pavers should be releveled, access is required for grade beams and using a suspended slab eliminates settlement problem as well as need to compact the backfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>New suspended slab and tie beams at north upper terrace wall</td>
<td>Pavers should be releveled and using a suspended slab allows fill to be removed to reduce active pressure on walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>New foundation work at bedroom chimney</td>
<td>Provides necessary overturning resistance and opportunity to relevel pavers to reduce the ponding problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Foundation work at library chimney</td>
<td>Provides necessary overturning resistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Steel angle ties at underside of library floor to retaining walls</td>
<td>Reduces risk of slab sliding off its retaining wall supports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES GROUP (ARG)

Pier 9, The Embarcadero
San Francisco, CA 94111
(415) 421-1680

HANNA HOUSE
Charette Agenda
March 13, 1995

Location: Hobby House

It is our understanding that the entire Board of Governors will not attend for the entire charette. Please note that the most significant presentation and discussion periods will be from 10:30 - 12:00 AM, 12:15 - 2:00 PM, and 2:00 - 3:30 PM.

Charette Objective: To test the proposed program uses in relationship to the structural scheme, the historic building and site and compliance with code requirements.

10:00 AM • Introduction - Charette Agenda and Goals

10:15 AM • Structural Concept Plan

10:30 AM to 12:00
- Program Exploration
  Proposed use requirements
  Definition of specific problems of use to be solved

12:00 PM Break

12:15 PM to 2:00
- Development of Alternative Responses to Program Needs
  Re-evaluation of limitations building and site to program

2:00 PM to 3:30 PM
- Consolidation of Concept Plan and Program Statement

3:30 PM to 4:00 PM
- Wrap Up/Summation

Presentation by ARG
Presentation by Rutherford & Chekene
All
All
Summation by ARG
Hanna House Board of Governors
Agenda
February 23, 1995
8:30 - 10:00 am
Hobby House at the Hanna House

I. Review of Minutes - January 26, 1995 (10 minutes) Please see Attachment

Please review the Minutes from the Meeting of January 26, 1995 and raise any comments or concerns.

II. Announcements (15 min)
   1. fundraising
   2. film
   3. wall repair
   4. chairs
   5. FEMA funding negotiation

III. Report on Roof Repair Plan (10 min)
    Warren Jacobsen - will take roof out at same time

IV. Format for Design Charette (20 min) -
    General Discussion March 18 10-2pm
    Rapid Fire Charette & Lunch

V. House Manager (25 minutes) Scheduler for HHH
    David Neuman
    Ann Fletcher, assistant to Provost - managing Hanna House
    Currently have new position I would like to add Hanna House - scheduling
    under our guidelines

    Monthly financial accounting - for presentation to Board -
Hanna House Board of Governors
Minutes
January 26, 1995
8:30 - 10:00 am
Hobby House at the Hanna House

Members Present: Marilyn Fogel
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood

Members Absent: James Gibbons
Michael Hannan
Paul Turner

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

I. Review of Minutes - December 1, 1994

Approved as submitted.

II. Reports

L. Jones read President Casper's letter approving the new use of the house, which
was received by Paul Turner on December 2nd.

L. Jones reported that the chair on loan to the Milwaukee Art Museum would
return to the campus in early February. M. Kimball suggested that crated
furnishings should periodically be opened and inspected and that temperature
and humidity control in the storage area should be investigated. L. Jones agreed
to investigate and report at the February meeting. D. Neuman asked if the chair
was on the Hanks furniture inventory and whether Hanks saw the chairs that are
on loan to the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York. T. Gravlee and L. Jones
affirmed that all of the chairs on loan were seen by Hanks and are on the
inventory.

D. Neuman asked for an update on J. Gibbons recent visit to Nissan headquarters
in Japan. T. Portwood reported that contact was made and was cordial but the
persons Gibbons met with did not speak English so there was some difficulty in
communicating, but the gifts were well received. D. Neuman asked what the
general plan for fundraising should be as we expect to have cost estimates soon. T. Portwood replied that knowing the funding gap and the projected maintenance costs will be important to development planning. W. Jacobsen suggested that we might prepare a graphic presentation on the funding situation when the figures are ready. T. Portwood suggested that next steps would include developing a fundraising plan, establishing a committee to work on a prospect list, and a meeting with John Ford to fit Hanna House into the overall development plan. These steps could proceed at the same time as funding negotiations and section 106 review with FEMA.

T. Gravlee predicted that we could have a notion of the FEMA contribution by April but before that funding figures would be speculative. T. Portwood asked what the ballpark cost of the projected funding gap might be. T. Gravlee replied that depending on the scope of the project we could expect between $500,000 and $1,000,000 for a minimal repair scheme. T. Portwood suggested that the endowment needs further investigation to assure adequate maintenance funds. D. Neuman replied that Bill Witcher was comfortable with the endowment for maintenance but that additional wear and tear due to new uses might require more maintenance funds.

J. Hanna remarked that a patch of roof had no gravel and suggested that the roof be inspected. W. Jacobsen agreed to arrange a roofing inspection. J. Hanna also asked that a tree planted by the Hanna family in memory of his parents is apparently over the neighboring property line and needs to be relocated as part of the new landscaping, preferably with a plaque indicating its significance. W. Jacobsen agreed to bring the issue to the attention of the landscape designers.

D. Neuman raised the issue of who will manage the House when it reopens. He suggested that the Board identify an operator and consider the issue of charging rental fees to use towards the maintenance of the house. T. Portwood added that major donors will want to know how the house will be managed and we should have a plan before approaching any donors. D. Neuman suggested that we investigate operators of other facilities such as Lake House and the Buck Estate. T. Gravlee asked if the Museum of Art might be considered and D. Neuman replied that they had no interest and further that the docents shouldn't be asked to carry the scheduling burden. General discussion followed including the observations that the Alumni Association, the graduate student caretaker, and Operations and Maintenance should not be considered as operators. It was suggested that we investigate the operation of Lake House and operation of Gamble House in Los Angeles for information. L. Jones agreed to follow up and report at the February meeting.

M. Kimball asked for a report on the Kristine Hanna film project. T. Portwood replied that Kristine Hanna wanted to visit the House with the scriptwriter and was concerned to be notified before any construction begins, and that no cleaning
take place before their first filming. L. Jones agreed to speak to Maintenance about the cleaning issue.

T. Portwood, M. Kimball, T. Gravlee and D. Neuman discussed contacts with two local reporters (Gordon Young of the Metro and Alan Hess from the Mercury News) writing stories about Hanna House, and the potential for promoting appreciation and public interest in the restoration project. D. Neuman warned that any criticism of FEMA in the media would be harmful to funding negotiations. M. Kimball indicated that she was asked about FEMA and couldn't answer. M. Fogel suggested that we issue a press release, T. Portwood and D. Neuman agreed that a press release on the wall reconstruction, restoration plan and FEMA negotiation might be appropriate. D. Neuman suggested that Stanford News Service be contacted to make arrangements on publicity, including press release, Campus Report and the Stanford Magazine. J. Hanna suggested we might indicate where gifts could be sent, T. Portwood replied that we could have gifts sent to Hanna House restoration for the gift fund but that larger gifts require personal contact with donors. D. Neuman suggested that security may need to be reviewed after the press release as members of the public may try to visit the house. The subject of tours of the house — a press tour and a public tour — was discussed and it was agreed that tours of the exterior would pose no liability risk, and that visitors would be informed of the hazard.

T. Portwood mentioned a cd-rom tour of Wright Houses as an example of a fundraising and educational tool, M. Fogel suggested that we consider such tools in planning our campaign. T. Portwood offered to send Kristine Hanna a copy of the article describing the cd-rom tour for her consideration.

D. Neuman made a motion to contact the Stanford News Service. T. Portwood seconded the motion, adding that at this stage we are planning a publicity strategy with the News Service, not making a press release at this time. M. Kimball noted that we would need to manage the News Service approach carefully, and D. Neuman agreed to take on this task. The Board approved this action unanimously.

III. Report on FEMA Negotiation Schedule

W. Jacobsen reported that we have approval from FEMA for a contract with Rutherford and Chekene to prepare a design for the structural repair. Rutherford and Chekene are at work on the contract and we expect a proposal for a minimal repair scheme with costs in early March, and a improved project proposal defined by the end of March (see handouts). T. Gravlee explained that the minimal repair scheme is to restore the house to its original use as well as some hazard mitigation while the improved project is what we will in fact propose to implement including changes to the structure and its use. While FEMA bases funding on the minimal repair scheme, it is the improved project that is subject to section 106 historic preservation standards. She noted further that it is important
to develop the two proposals simultaneously as FEMA will consider our actual project costs (the improved project) during negotiations around their contribution to the minimal repair costs. D.Neuman added that almost every project is built as an improved project and offered the example in Hanna House of a minimal repair to the two damaged chimneys that would be eligible for FEMA funding and an improved project including reinforcement of the third chimney where we would have to bear 100% of the cost.

W.Jacobsen added that we need approval of the program document in order to arrange a contract with Architectural Resources Group to prepare the improved project scheme and costs by the end of March. He informed the Board of the plan to hold a half day design charrette for the Board to meet with the architects from ARG and the engineers from R&C and discuss development of the improved project plans.

IV. Presentation of Retaining Wall Repair Alternatives

W.Jacobsen described three schemes for the retaining wall fix (see handout): 1) a minimal repair of the fallen section and anchoring the brick facade as a short term cosmetic and preventative solution, 2) rebuilding the entire north terrace retaining wall now, and 3) waiting for the structural repair concept from R&C in March before proceeding with the wall repair. D.Neuman suggested that we focus on scheme 1 as opposed to doing nothing or getting ahead of ourselves by fixing the entire wall in order to make progress and address possible damage from the heavy rains this winter. T.Gravlee reported that the engineers aren’t worried about the stability of the wall and that they are satisfied that the soils are not moving downslope.

T.Portwood added that we have been discussing the wall repair since June 1993 and it would be some progress to report to donors; on the other hand the collapsed wall has some fundraising appeal. T.Portwood considering these factors comes out on the side of doing something, as in scheme 1. M.Fogel suggested that they had already approved scheme 1, but T.Portwood pointed out that the repair scheme keeps getting smaller. T.Gravlee explains that the repair of the entire wall is tied into the repair of the house foundations and terrace. R. Hornsby asked if scheme 1 will prevent continuing deterioration of the wall. T. Gravlee replied that scheme 1 would prevent more bricks falling off the wall but may not help much in the event of another earthquake. T.Portwood made a motion to approve scheme 1, M.Kimball seconded the motion which was then unanimously approved. W. Jacobsen agreed to arrange the contract process for work to begin in March.

V. Presentation of Program Document

D.Neuman introduced the draft Program Document explaining that its role is to clarify with the project architects the scope and intent of the restoration project to
aid in their interpretation of building code issues. He offered his support for the
design charrette idea to further Board of Governors involvement in development
of the project.

T.Portwood suggested that house tours might start at the Museum of Art with
shuttle buses to the house to minimize street parking and possibly take
advantage of the Museum Shop to market house materials. D.Neuman suggested
a presentation to the residential leaseholders (neighbors) once the house
operation has been defined in order to address their concerns.

R.Hornsby asked for clarification on the proposed display area. T.Gravlee
explained that the architects will identify possible areas for a display of changes
in the house over time for example. T.Portwood questioned whether there would
be a role for the Museum in any display that might be housed at the museum
instead as most visitors would tour both facilities and tours could begin at the
museum. M. Kimball suggested inviting Tom Seligman to a meeting to discuss
the possibilities. D.Neuman cautioned that shuttle buses would be expensive, in
the neighborhood of $500,000 if done through the endowment. T.Portwood asked
if we would charge for tours. M.Fogel replied that tours were very simple in the
past -- limited to 10 people/tour and a total of eight tours/month and asked if
we were proposing a more ambitious program. D. Neuman offered to discuss the
museum's role with Tom Seligman and T.Portwood added that the roles of the
house operator and the docents with regard to tour management would need to
addressed in a future board meeting.

T.Portwood suggested approval of the Program Document. M.Fogel made
several suggestions on changes to wording. M. Kimball asked that copies of the
final document be provided at the February meeting.
HANNA HOUSE PROGRAM DOCUMENT

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES,
based on the Hanna House Board of Governors' Proposal for Use,
with assignments for the architects

Preservation according to Conservation Standards¹
- preserve the historic fabric of the House
  - identify and date alterations to structure and fabric
  - identify areas where restoration is advisable (to 1975 standard)
  - identify restoration alternatives
  - employ methods of strengthening and upgrades which minimize impact on the House
  - recommend schedule for deferred maintenance
- preserve the furnishings of the House
  - identify restoration needs and alternatives
  - consider furniture placement in relation to proposed uses
  - upgrade environmental controls if necessary
- preserve the landscape of the House grounds
  - review report from landscape consultant and make recommendations based on preservation standards and programming
  - identify and date garden furnishings and make recommendations on reuse and maintenance
- increase site security
  - review exterior lighting plan
  - review alarm system

¹ Conservation Standards as modified and approved by the Hanna House Board of Governors on December 1, 1994.
Promote availability of the House for Academic and University Functions

- promote appreciation of the House as a work of art through public tours
  - identify accessibility requirements for historic structures
  - identify parking requirements / solutions
  - identify space, requirements for docent office
  - identify possible display areas

- promote scholarship and teaching concerning architecture and art
  - ensure complete documentation of restoration procedures

- host scholarly functions
  - plan for academic groups (seminars) meeting at the house
  - suggest maximum occupancies for preservation
  - identify minimum code requirements based on occupancy and State Hist. building code
  - identify parking requirements / solutions

- host small scale University meetings or entertainment functions
  - identify minimum upgrades for catering
  - identify minimum upgrades for musical performances
  - suggest maximum occupancies for preservation
  - identify minimum code requirements based on occupancy and State Hist. building code
  - identify parking requirements / solutions
  - identify appropriate outdoor entertainment areas, and desired/required upgrades

- host distinguished visitors to the University for short periods of time in the main house
  - upgrade facilities as minimum required for occupancy
  - consider security issues

- provide facilities for live-in graduate student
  - upgrade apartment facilities in Hobby House guest quarters as minimum required for occupancy
Hanna House Board of Governors
Agenda
February 23, 1995
8:30 - 10:00 am
Hobby House at the Hanna House

I. Review of Minutes - January 26, 1995 (10 minutes) Please see Attachment

Please review the Minutes from the Meeting of January 26, 1995 and raise any comments or concerns.

II. Announcements (15 min)
   1. fundraising
   2. film
   3. wall repair
   4. chairs
   5. FEMA funding negotiation

III. Report on Roof Repair Plan (10 min)
    Warren Jacobsen

IV. Format for Design Charette (20 min)
    General Discussion

V. House Manager (25 minutes)
    David Neuman
Hanna House Board of Governors
Minutes
January 26, 1995
8:30 - 10:00 am
Hobby House at the Hanna House

Members Present:
Marilyn Fogel
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood

Members Absent:
James Gibbons
Michael Hannan
Paul Turner

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

I. Review of Minutes - December 1, 1994

Approved as submitted.

II. Reports

L. Jones read President Casper's letter approving the new use of the house, which was received by Paul Turner on December 2nd.

L. Jones reported that the chair on loan to the Milwaukee Art Museum would return to the campus in early February. M. Kimball suggested that crated furnishings should periodically be opened and inspected and that temperature and humidity control in the storage area should be investigated. L. Jones agreed to investigate and report at the February meeting. D. Neuman asked if the chair was on the Hanks furniture inventory and whether Hanks saw the chairs that are on loan to the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York. T. Gravlee and L. Jones affirmed that all of the chairs on loan were seen by Hanks and are on the inventory.

D. Neuman asked for an update on J. Gibbons recent visit to Nissan headquarters in Japan. T. Portwood reported that contact was made and was cordial but the persons Gibbons met with did not speak English so there was some difficulty in communicating, but the gifts were well received. D. Neuman asked what the
general plan for fundraising should be as we expect to have cost estimates soon. T. Portwood replied that knowing the funding gap and the projected maintenance costs will be important to development planning. W. Jacobsen suggested that we might prepare a graphic presentation on the funding situation when the figures are ready. T. Portwood suggested that next steps would include developing a fundraising plan, establishing a committee to work on a prospect list, and a meeting with John Ford to fit Hanna House into the overall development plan. These steps could proceed at the same time as funding negotiations and section 106 review with FEMA.

T. Gravlee predicted that we could have a notion of the FEMA contribution by April but before that funding figures would be speculative. T. Portwood asked what the ballpark cost of the projected funding gap might be. T. Gravlee replied that depending on the scope of the project we could expect between $500,000 and $1,000,000 for a minimal repair scheme. T. Portwood suggested that the endowment needs further investigation to assure adequate maintenance funds. D. Neuman replied that Bill Witcher was comfortable with the endowment for maintenance but that additional wear and tear due to new uses might require more maintenance funds.

J. Hanna remarked that a patch of roof had no gravel and suggested that the roof be inspected. W. Jacobsen agreed to arrange a roofing inspection. J. Hanna also asked that a tree planted by the Hanna family in memory of his parents is apparently over the neighboring property line and needs to be relocated as part of the new landscaping, preferably with a plaque indicating its significance. W. Jacobsen agreed to bring the issue to the attention of the landscape designers.

D. Neuman raised the issue of who will manage the House when it reopens. He suggested that the Board identify an operator and consider the issue of charging rental fees to use towards the maintenance of the house. T. Portwood added that major donors will want to know how the house will be managed and we should have a plan before approaching any donors. D. Neuman suggested that we investigate operators of other facilities such as Lake House and the Buck Estate. T. Gravlee asked if the Museum of Art might be considered and D. Neuman replied that they had no interest and further that the docents shouldn’t be asked to carry the scheduling burden. General discussion followed including the observations that the Alumni Association, the graduate student caretaker, and Operations and Maintenance should not be considered as operators. It was suggested that we investigate the operation of Lake House and operation of Gamble House in Los Angeles for information. L. Jones agreed to follow up and report at the February meeting.

M. Kimball asked for a report on the Kristine Hanna film project. T. Portwood replied that Kristine Hanna wanted to visit the House with the scriptwriter and was concerned to be notified before any construction begins, and that no cleaning
take place before their first filming. L. Jones agreed to speak to Maintenance about the cleaning issue.

T. Portwood, M. Kimball, T. Gravlee and D. Neuman discussed contacts with two local reporters (Gordon Young of the Metro and Alan Hess from the Mercury News) writing stories about Hanna House, and the potential for promoting appreciation and public interest in the restoration project. D. Neuman warned that any criticism of FEMA in the media would be harmful to funding negotiations. M. Kimball indicated that she was asked about FEMA and couldn't answer. M. Fogel suggested that we issue a press release, T. Portwood and D. Neuman agreed that a press release on the wall reconstruction, restoration plan and FEMA negotiation might be appropriate. D. Neuman suggested that Stanford News Service be contacted to make arrangements on publicity, including press release, Campus Report and the Stanford Magazine. J. Hanna suggested we might indicate where gifts could be sent, T. Portwood replied that we could have gifts sent to Hanna House restoration for the gift fund but that larger gifts require personal contact with donors. D. Neuman suggested that security may need to be reviewed after the press release as members of the public may try to visit the house. The subject of tours of the house—a press tour and a public tour—was discussed and it was agreed that tours of the exterior would pose no liability risk, and that visitors would be informed of the hazard.

T. Portwood mentioned a CD-ROM tour of Wright Houses as an example of a fundraising and educational tool, M. Fogel suggested that we consider such tools in planning our campaign. T. Portwood offered to send Kristine Hanna a copy of the article describing the CD-ROM tour for her consideration.

D. Neuman made a motion to contact the Stanford News Service. T. Portwood seconded the motion, adding that at this stage we are planning a publicity strategy with the News Service, not making a press release at this time. M. Kimball noted that we would need to manage the News Service approach carefully, and D. Neuman agreed to take on this task. The Board approved this action unanimously.

III. Report on FEMA Negotiation Schedule

W. Jacobsen reported that we have approval from FEMA for a contract with Rutherford and Chekene to prepare a design for the structural repair. Rutherford and Chekene are at work on the contract and we expect a proposal for a minimal repair scheme with costs in early March, and a improved project proposal defined by the end of March (see handouts). T. Gravlee explained that the minimal repair scheme is to restore the house to its original use as well as some hazard mitigation while the improved project is what we will in fact propose to implement including changes to the structure and its use. While FEMA bases funding on the minimal repair scheme, it is the improved project that is subject to section 106 historic preservation standards. She noted further that it is important
to develop the two proposals simultaneously as FEMA will consider our actual project costs (the improved project) during negotiations around their contribution to the minimal repair costs. D.Neuman added that almost every project is built as an improved project and offered the example in Hanna House of a minimal repair to the two damaged chimneys that would be eligible for FEMA funding and an improved project including reinforcement of the third chimney where we would have to bear 100% of the cost.

W.Jacobsen added that we need approval of the program document in order to arrange a contract with Architectural Resources Group to prepare the improved project scheme and costs by the end of March. He informed the Board of the plan to hold a half day design charrette for the Board to meet with the architects from ARG and the engineers from R&C and discuss development of the improved project plans.

IV. Presentation of Retaining Wall Repair Alternatives

W.Jacobsen described three schemes for the retaining wall fix (see handout): 1) a minimal repair of the fallen section and anchoring the brick facade as a short term cosmetic and preventative solution, 2) rebuilding the entire north terrace retaining wall now, and 3) waiting for the structural repair concept from R&C in March before proceeding with the wall repair. D.Neuman suggested that we focus on scheme 1 as opposed to doing nothing or getting ahead of ourselves by fixing the entire wall in order to make progress and address possible damage from the heavy rains this winter. T.Gravlee reported that the engineers aren’t worried about the stability of the wall and that they are satisfied that the soils are not moving downslope.

T.Portwood added that we have been discussing the wall repair since June 1993 and it would be some progress to report to donors; on the other hand the collapsed wall has some fundraising appeal. T.Portwood considering these factors comes out on the side of doing something, as in scheme 1. M.Fogel suggested that they had already approved scheme 1, but T.Portwood pointed out that the repair scheme keeps getting smaller. T.Gravlee explains that the repair of the entire wall is tied into the repair of the house foundations and terrace. R.Hornsby asked if scheme 1 will prevent continuing deterioration of the wall. T.Gravlee replied that scheme 1 would prevent more bricks falling off the wall but may not help much in the event of another earthquake. T.Portwood made a motion to approve scheme 1, M.Kimball seconded the motion which was then unanimously approved. W. Jacobsen agreed to arrange the contract process for work to begin in March.

V. Presentation of Program Document

D.Neuman introduced the draft Program Document explaining that its role is to clarify with the project architects the scope and intent of the restoration project to
aid in their interpretation of building code issues. He offered his support for the design charrette idea to further Board of Governors involvement in development of the project.

T.Portwood suggested that house tours might start at the Museum of Art with shuttle buses to the house to minimize street parking and possibly take advantage of the Museum Shop to market house materials. D.Neuman suggested a presentation to the residential leaseholders (neighbors) once the house operation has been defined in order to address their concerns.

R.Hornsby asked for clarification on the proposed display area. T.Gravlee explained that the architects will identify possible areas for a display of changes in the house over time for example. T.Portwood questioned whether there would be a role for the Museum in any display that might be housed at the museum instead as most visitors would tour both facilities and tours could begin at the museum. M. Kimball suggested inviting Tom Seligman to a meeting to discuss the possibilities. D.Neuman cautioned that shuttle buses would be expensive, in the neighborhood of $500,000 if done through the endowment. T.Portwood asked if we would charge for tours. M.Fogel replied that tours were very simple in the past -- limited to 10 people/tour and a total of eight tours/month and asked if we were proposing a more ambitious program. D. Neuman offered to discuss the museum's role with Tom Seligman and T.Portwood added that the roles of the house operator and the docents with regard to tour management would need to addressed in a future board meeting.

T.Portwood suggested approval of the Program Document. M.Fogel made several suggestions on changes to wording. M. Kimball asked that copies of the final document be provided at the February meeting.
HANNA HOUSE

COLLECTIONS MANAGEMENT PLAN

Objectives: To identify and preserve furnishings from the Hanna family's occupation of the house for reinstallation. Over the long term, to insure the appropriate care of the collections.

Step One: Inventory
An inventory of the furnishings of the Hanna House is being prepared. The inventory includes objects in storage, objects on loan, and objects still at the House. The inventory will be expanded to include sculptural elements from the garden. The inventory will be made to conform with Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation standards and a copy forwarded to the Foundation to promote scholarly access to the collections. A photographic record of the objects is also being prepared for planning purposes and will include color and black-and-white views of each type of object (e.g. a place setting of silver, not each piece of silverware).

Step Two: Documentation
In keeping with our objective to limit the house contents to those in place when the Hanna's made their gift, we will attempt to identify those objects belonging to the house from that period, and to separate those left by subsequent occupants. Using the photographic records we will interview members of the Hanna family, docents, and prior occupants regarding the provenance of the collections.

Step Three: Deaccession
For those objects left in the house by occupants other than the Hannas, we will send letters to these individuals asking them to recover their belongings or to cede ownership to the University. Those objects left with us will be deaccessioned from the Hanna House collections through donation to other institutions or sold.

Step Four: Conservation
The physical condition of the permanent collections will need to be recorded with a Condition Report for each of the objects. The collection should be assessed by a professional conservator, who will prepare a conservation program. The goals of this step are to stabilize the collection for long-term storage during construction on the house, and to provide direction for environmental and security planning for the house renovations.

Step Five: Interior design
Documentation of the furnishing and decoration of the House will be completed and will be used to plan for reinstallation for the collections. We will consider whether repairs and other changes to the collections are advisable given the projected new uses for the House.

Step Six: Reinstallation
The collections will be reinstalled in the House following the interior design guidelines approved by the Board. Collections care policies will be developed with a conservator to insure proper maintenance of the collections and avoid accidental damage from inappropriate uses or cleaning practices.
Hanna House Board of Governors
Agenda
January 26, 1995
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 December 1, 1994 and raise any comments or concerns.

II. **Announcements** (10 min)

1. Casper letter - Feb 1, June 21, 1995 - letters to Casper →
2. Milwaukee Art Museum - need more info on long-term loan
3. Fundraising - need more info on long-term loan
4. Film - no new budget, wants to come down Feb 2 →

III. **Report on Schedule for FEMA Submittals** (10 min) Warren Jacobsen

IV. **Review of Program Document** (25 min) *Please see Attachment #2*

General Discussion

V. **Retaining Wall Repair** (15 minutes)
David Neuman, Mark Jones

VI. **Misc. Items** (10 minutes)

1. Collections Management Plan, Laura Jones

- Endowment/fundraising - extent to which endowment needs to be increased
- $5 - $1M may need to be raised
- How much payout from insurance will be available in future?
- March/April will be clearer on needs
- Management/Scheduling of house → if scheduling handled by events/Services → for someone from EPS or board
- Back Estate - leaving to management? In essence → might be some group who could manage house
DATE: January 24, 1995

TO: Hanna House Board of Governors

FROM: Laura Jones

SUBJECT: Hanna House Board of Governors January 26, 1995 Agenda

Dear Colleagues:

Enclosed please find the agenda for the meeting of January 26, 1995, with attachments. Please review the minutes of our last meeting of December 1, 1994, and bring any corrections you may have. Please note that there is an additional attachment from David Neuman, the Program Document, that will also be discussed at this week's meeting. 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
    Herb Fong
    Tiffany Gravlee
    John Paul Hanna
    Warren Jacobsen
    Mark Jones
    Academic Secretary
Possible press release — how gifts are made —
Contact Pete Rapolus — contact to Jim

Contact Kristine M: Feb. 2

Hard hat tour — of Hanna House —
Campaign in Spring?
HANNA HOUSE

NORTH TERRACE RETAINING WALL SCHEMES FOR BOARD OF GOVERNORS

JANUARY 26, 1995
**SCHEME NO 1**

- **REBUILD PARKING AREA RETAINING WALL**
  1. REMOVE EXISTING PAVING & BACKFILL
  2. STRENGTHEN THE BOTTOM OF WALL TO RESIST EARTHQUAKE FORCES AS WELL AS RETAINED EARTH PRESSURES
  3. RECONSTRUCT TOP OF DAMAGED WALL
  4. ADD A NEW DRAIN LINE
  5. PLACE AN ENGINEERED BACKFILL BEHIND THE WALL
  6. TIE THE EXISTING BRICK FACING ON THE NORTH TERRACE RETAINING WALL TO THE CONCRETE WALL

- **IMPLICATIONS**
  1. FEMA - NO CONCERNS
  2. SECTION 106 - ?
  3. NO INTERFERENCE WITH HOUSE FOUNDATIONS
  4. NO NEED TO DECIDE ON STRAIGHTENING OF TERRACE WALL
  5. SHORT TERM STRUCTURAL SOLUTION ACCEPTABLE
  6. MARCH - 1986 CONSTRUCTION
  7. COST - +/- $30,000.00
SCHEME NO. 2

1. REBUILD ENTIRE NORTH TERRACE RETAINING WALL
   1. IN ADDITION TO SCHEME 1 REPAIRS
      • TERRACE FINISH WOULD NEED TO BE REMOVED AND REPLACED
      • TERRACE ENTRY STEPS FROM PARKING LOT WOULD BE REUSE/REPLACED
      • ENTIRE WALL STRENGTHEN
      • DRAIN SYSTEM BEHIND ENTIRE WALL
      • ENGINEERED BACKFILL ENTIRE LENGTH OF WALL

2. IMPLICATIONS
   1. FEMA - ?
   2. SECTION 106 - ?
   3. PROBABLE CONFLICT WITH FOOTING AT HOUSE
   4. STRAIGHTENING OF WALL WILL NEED TO BE ADDRESSED
   5. WILL IMPACT SCHEDULE FOR MINIMUM STRUCTURAL FIX AND IMPROVED PROJECT SCOPE
   6. MAY - 1995 CONSTRUCTION
   7. COST - +/- $100,000.00
SCHEME NO. 3

- WAIT ON EITHER SCHEME NO.1 OR SCHEME NO. 2 NOW THAT RUTHERFORD & CHEKENE HAVE EMPLOYED AS STRUCTURAL CONSULTANTS TO DEFINE STRUCTURAL CONCEPT FOR REOCCUPANCY OF THE RESIDENCE.

- IMPLICATIONS
  1. NO IMMEDIATE WORK ON NORTH TERRACE RETAINING WALL
  2. ALLOWS RUTHERFORD & CHEKENE, ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCE GROUP, AND STAFF TO CONCENTRATE ON MINIMUM STRUCTURAL SOLUTION & IMPROVED TOTAL PROJECT
  3. TIMING: MINIMUM STRUCTURAL SOLUTIONS BY END OF MARCH 1995
IMPROVED PROJECT COMPLETE PROJECT COSTS + 25% THAT STANFORD IS REQUIRED TO PROVIDE.

(FUND RAISING)

MINIMUM STRUCTURAL SOLUTION TO ALLOW REOCCUPANCY - SUPPLEMENTAL TO EXISTING DSR - S.U. RECEIVES 75%

EXISTING DSR $204,949, STANFORD RECEIVES 75%

HANNA HOUSE

JAN. 26, 1995
January 23, 1995

TO:       Hanna House Board of Governors

FROM:     David Neuman

SUBJECT:  Program document

Planning Office and Facilities staff are working with a renewed sense of urgency to prepare our project for review by FEMA in order to secure an additional funding commitment from that agency as soon as possible. We will present an updated timetable and explain the process fully in our regularly scheduled meeting next week. However, it would be helpful if you could review the attached document in advance of the meeting as we will have a full agenda.

The Program Document is our instructions to the architectural firm that will be designing the house repair and restoration scheme for FEMA review. The attached section on program goals and objectives was prepared by Warren, Tiffany and Laura based on the proposed uses for the Hanna House as described in correspondence between Paul Turner and Gerhard Casper. They would like you to review the instructions to the architectural firm to insure that they meet the Board's understanding of the program for the house.

We will have additional opportunities to work with the architects as they prepare the design. This document is a necessary preliminary step in putting them to work. We appreciate any suggestions you might have on how to improve this draft, which we will discuss next Thursday.

cc:        Jean Barnes
           Tom Fenner
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES, based on the Proposal for Use

Preservation according to Conservation Standards

- preserve the historic fabric of the House
  - identify and date alterations to structure and fabric
  - identify areas where restoration is advisable (to 1975 standard)
  - identify restoration alternatives
  - employ methods of strengthening and upgrades which minimize impact on the House
  - recommend schedule for deferred maintenance

- preserve the furnishings of the House
  - identify and date alterations to furnishings
  - identify restoration needs and alternatives
  - upgrade environmental controls if necessary

- preserve the landscape of the House grounds
  - review report from landscape consultant and make recommendations based on preservation standards and programming
  - identify and date garden furnishings and make recommendations on reuse and maintenance

- increase site security
  - review exterior lighting plan
  - review alarm system

Promote availability of the House for Academic and University Functions

- promote appreciation of the House as a work of art through public tours
  - identify accessibility requirements for historic structures
  - identify parking requirements/solutions
  - identify space, requirements for docent office
  - identify possible display areas

---

1 Conservation Standards as modified and approved by the Hanna House Board of Governors on December 1, 1994.
• promote scholarship and teaching concerning architecture and art
  - ensure complete documentation of restoration procedures
• host scholarly functions
  - plan for academic groups (seminars) meeting at the house
  - identify maximum occupancies for preservation
  - minimum code requirements based on occupancy and State Hist. building code
  - identify parking requirements / solutions
• host small scale University meetings or entertainment functions
  - minimum upgrades for catering
  - minimum upgrades for musical performances
  - identify maximum occupancies for preservation
  - minimum code requirements based on occupancy and State Hist. building code
  - identify parking requirements / solutions
  - identify appropriate outdoor entertainment areas, and desired/required upgrades
• host distinguished visitors to the University for short periods of time in the main house
  - upgrade facilities as minimum required for occupancy
  - consider security issues
• provide facilities for live-in caretaker
  - upgrade apartment facilities in Hobby House as minimum required for occupancy
Hanna House Board of Governors
Minutes
December 1, 1994
8:30 - 10:00 am
Hobby House at the Hanna House

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

Members Absent: James Gibbons
Michael Hannan

Others Present: Herb Fong, Manager of Grounds Maintenance
Tiffany Gravlee, Planning Office Staff
John Paul Hanna, Guest
Laura Jones, Campus Archeologist
Mark Jones, Director, Facilities Project Management

I. Review of Minutes - November 3, 1994

Approved as submitted.

II. Report on Film Documentation and Nissan Stewardship

T. Portwood: Jim Gibbons took a letter (Please see Attachment A),
and two books - the Hanna House Report from the Clients, and a
hardback book on Frank Lloyd Wright in California, as gifts to the
Nissan Corporation. He will identify the appropriate contact at Nissan
for the future.

T. Portwood, M. Kimball and M. Fogel met with Kristine Hanna and
her film director to discuss the scope of the film. The following
issues were raised:

1. She needs access to the house early in the new year to capture the
current condition of the house. She asked that the house not be
cleaned before then, so that the cobwebs and broken brick can be filmed.

2. She would like to be present for the retaining wall construction; we will need a direct notification system so that she doesn't miss any critical steps of construction.

3. It was clarified that since Stanford is funding this endeavor, Stanford would own the copyright to the film.

4. Kristine will adjust and refine the budget estimate for the January 26th Board of Governors' meeting.

M. Kimball: it should be indicated in the construction contract that filming will be going on during construction.

M. Jones: This shouldn't be a problem; the contractors will be pre-qualified, and will be made aware of the filming. Most will probably be interested in the publicity. We can also write the photo documentation into the contract, once the Board has defined how they want the work to be documented.

T. Portwood: how will we be paying for the film and photo documentation? Could it be considered as being involved with the maintenance and improvement of the house, so that Nissan funds could be used? If not, what other sources do we have? The cost will probably be on the order of $10,000 for the film.

D. Neuman: It would probably be acceptable to use Nissan funds, but first we should check with Accounting to be certain that this would be auditable.

T. Portwood: the film has to do with preserving the House, so it seems that using Nissan funds could be justifiable.

M. Kimball: Archives could probably contribute a small amount, on the order of $1,000 or $2,000.

T. Portwood / R. Hornby: the Historic Society may also be able to contribute a small amount.
M. Fogel: Kristine requested copies of any articles we might have, such as the 1938 Architectural Record, House Beautiful issues, John Sargent's Usonian Houses, Richard Joncas's article, etc.

M. Kimball: Archives has extra copies of some of these.

M. Kimball and M. Fogel will coordinate providing the articles for Kristine.

III. Discussion of Conservation Standards

T. Gravlee: these Standards were developed in 1990 by our consultants together with the Board of Governors. Do they need to be revised? Once approved by this current Board of Governors, we can give them to our architectural and structural consultants to use as they continue to design the repair and strengthening. (Please see Attachment B)

In general, there was some question about the rigidity of items #3 and #4 in the Standards, which specify that restoration shall be to precisely 1975, and not before or after.

D. Neuman: there may be elements which were pre-1975 that should be reintroduced.

M. Fogel: the Hannas added L-brackets to shelves which we might not want to put back.

P. Hanna: Prof. Hanna replaced part of the wooden wall near the garage with painted concrete, because it was hit so often.

T. Gravlee: if the House is to be used for University entertaining, the Board may not want to reinstall all of the interior finishes exactly as they were in 1975, such as the shag carpet.

M. Fogel: the Board of Governors may be composed of "less sensitive" members in the future.

T. Portwood: The Standards should be written to guide future decisions.

It was proposed that item #3 be revised to read as follows:

TLG, Planning Office
January 20, 1995
"No part of the site and/or the structures will be restored to a period earlier than its evolutionary state in 1975, unless the Board of Governors determines that an exception should be made for reasons of architectural or historic integrity."

And that item #11 be revised to read as follows:

"When an architectural feature cannot be moved intact or dismantled and reassembled, the new feature should be reconstructed matching the 1975 (or earlier) configuration, size, material, color and texture of the detail that was replaced, unless the Board of Governors determines that an exception should be made for reasons of architectural or historic integrity."

Five members voted in favor, one abstained. (Please see Attachment C for revised Standards)

T. Gravlee: in item #13, we may want to consider whether to use the word "preservation" or "rehabilitation." Our agreements with FEMA, the State Historic Preservation Office and the National Advisory Council for Historic Preservation refer to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation Projects. This allows for seismic strengthening, and any adjustments that need to be made to accommodate reuse of the building.

D. Neuman: we should ask our consultant Steve Farneth's opinion on this item.

M. Jones: is it dangerous to prescribe "compliance" to the Standards in item #13?

M. Fogel: it's important to keep a check & balance system in place for the Board of Governors. What if the Board of Governors is disbanded?

D. Neuman: building an endowment to support the work on the house will help to avoid compromise of standards as approved by the Board of Governors. Economic underpinning is very important. The Park Service will also be interested in the House, as it is a National Historic Landmark.

M. Jones: at the Gamble House, the set of values became stronger with time, such that poor decisions on "pink paint and shag carpet" would be difficult to make. They didn't have such tight guidelines as we are discussing.
D. Neuman: Kristine's film will also help to raise consciousness about the house.

M. Fogel: the Hanna House Board of Governors still needs outside reviewers.

M. Kimball: the University can always ignore its own guidelines, but the University also doesn't like outside involvement in its decisions. We need to build up a constituency that will be concerned for the welfare of the house.

D. Neuman: ultimately the Provost has authority over the Nissan fund account. The Board of Governors reports to the President.

M. Jones: We should discuss how the fund account is set up with Simone.
DATE: January 24, 1995

TO: Hanna House Board of Governors

FROM: Laura Jones

SUBJECT: Hanna House Board of Governors January 26, 1995 Agenda

Dear Colleagues:

Enclosed please find the agenda for the meeting of January 26, 1995, with attachments. Please review the minutes of our last meeting of December 1, 1994, and bring any corrections you may have. Please note that there is an additional attachment from David Neuman, the Program Document, that will also be discussed at this week's meeting. The meeting will begin at 8:30 A.M., 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
    Herb Fong
    Tiffany Gravlee
    John Paul Hanna
    Warren Jacobsen
    Mark Jones
    Academic Secretary
Hanna House Board of Governors
Agenda
January 26, 1995
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 December 1, 1994 and raise any comments or concerns.

II. Announcements (10 min)
   1. Casper letter
   2. Milwaukee Art Museum
   3. Fundraising
   4. Film

III. Report on Schedule for FEMA Submittals (10 min)
    Warren Jacobsen

IV. Review of Program Document (25 min) Please see Attachment #2
    General Discussion

V. Retaining Wall Repair (15 minutes)
   David Neuman, Mark Jones

VI. Misc. Items (10 minutes)
   1. Collections Management Plan, Laura Jones
Hanna House Board of Governors
Minutes
December 1, 1994
8:30 - 10:00 am
Hobby House at the Hanna House

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

Members Absent: James Gibbons
Michael Hannan

Others Present: Herb Fong, Manager of Grounds Maintenance
Tiffany Gravlee, Planning Office Staff
John Paul Hanna, Guest
Laura Jones, Campus Archeologist
Mark Jones, Director, Facilities Project Management

I. Review of Minutes - November 3, 1994

Approved as submitted.

II. Report on Film Documentation and Nissan Stewardship

T. Portwood: Jim Gibbons took a letter (Please see Attachment A),
and two books - the Hanna House Report from the Clients, and a
hardback book on Frank Lloyd Wright in California, as gifts to the
Nissan Corporation. He will identify the appropriate contact at Nissan
for the future.

T. Portwood, M. Kimball and M. Fogel met with Kristine Hanna and
her film director to discuss the scope of the film. The following
issues were raised:

1. She needs access to the house early in the new year to capture the
current condition of the house. She asked that the house not be
cleaned before then, so that the cobwebs and broken brick can be filmed.

2. She would like to be present for the retaining wall construction; we will need a direct notification system so that she doesn’t miss any critical steps of construction.

3. It was clarified that since Stanford is funding this endeavor, Stanford would own the copyright to the film.

4. Kristine will adjust and refine the budget estimate for the January 26th Board of Governors’ meeting.

M. Kimball: it should be indicated in the construction contract that filming will be going on during construction.

M. Jones: This shouldn’t be a problem; the contractors will be pre-qualified, and will be made aware of the filming. Most will probably be interested in the publicity. We can also write the photo documentation into the contract, once the Board has defined how they want the work to be documented.

T. Portwood: how will we be paying for the film and photo documentation? Could it be considered as being involved with the maintenance and improvement of the house, so that Nissan funds could be used? If not, what other sources do we have? The cost will probably be on the order of $10,000 for the film.

D. Neuman: It would probably be acceptable to use Nissan funds, but first we should check with Accounting to be certain that this would be auditable.

T. Portwood: the film has to do with preserving the House, so it seems that using Nissan funds could be justifiable.

M. Kimball: Archives could probably contribute a small amount, on the order of $1,000 or $2,000.

T. Portwood / R. Hornby: the Historic Society may also be able to contribute a small amount.
M. Fogel: Kristine requested copies of any articles we might have, such as the 1938 Architectural Record, House Beautiful issues, John Sargent's Usonian Houses, Richard Joncas's article, etc.

M. Kimball: Archives has extra copies of some of these.

M. Kimball and M. Fogel will coordinate providing the articles for Kristine.

III. Discussion of Conservation Standards

T. Gravlee: these Standards were developed in 1990 by our consultants together with the Board of Governors. Do they need to be revised? Once approved by this current Board of Governors, we can give them to our architectural and structural consultants to use as they continue to design the repair and strengthening. (Please see Attachment B)

In general, there was some question about the rigidity of items #3 and #4 in the Standards, which specify that restoration shall be to precisely 1975, and not before or after.

D. Neuman: there may be elements which were pre-1975 that should be reintroduced.

M. Fogel: the Hannas added L-brackets to shelves which we might not want to put back.

P. Hanna: Prof. Hanna replaced part of the wooden wall near the garage with painted concrete, because it was hit so often.

T. Gravlee: if the House is to be used for University entertaining, the Board may not want to reinstall all of the interior finishes exactly as they were in 1975, such as the shag carpet.

M. Fogel: the Board of Governors may be composed of "less sensitive" members in the future.

T. Portwood: The Standards should be written to guide future decisions.

*It was proposed that item #3 be revised to read as follows:*
"No part of the site and/or the structures will be restored to a period earlier than its evolutionary state in 1975, unless the Board of Governors determines that an exception should be made for reasons of architectural or historic integrity."

And that item #11 be revised to read as follows:

"When an architectural feature cannot be moved intact or dismantled and reassembled, the new feature should be reconstructed matching the 1975 (or earlier) configuration, size, material, color and texture of the detail that was replaced, unless the Board of Governors determines that an exception should be made for reasons of architectural or historic integrity."

Five members voted in favor, one abstained. (Please see Attachment C for revised Standards)

T. Gravlee: in item #13, we may want to consider whether to use the word "preservation" or "rehabilitation." Our agreements with FEMA, the State Historic Preservation Office and the National Advisory Council for Historic Preservation refer to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation Projects. This allows for seismic strengthening, and any adjustments that need to be made to accommodate reuse of the building.

D. Neuman: we should ask our consultant Steve Farneth's opinion on this item.

M. Jones: is it dangerous to prescribe "compliance" to the Standards in item #13?

M. Fogel: it's important to keep a check & balance system in place for the Board of Governors. What if the Board of Governors is disbanded?

D. Neuman: building an endowment to support the work on the house will help to avoid compromise of standards as approved by the Board of Governors. Economic underpinning is very important. The Park Service will also be interested in the House, as it is a National Historic Landmark.

M. Jones: at the Gamble House, the set of values became stronger with time, such that poor decisions on "pink paint and shag carpet" would be difficult to make. They didn't have such tight guidelines as we are discussing.

TLG, Planning Office
January 20, 1995
D. Neuman: Kristine's film will also help to raise consciousness about the house.

M. Fogel: the Hanna House Board of Governors still needs outside reviewers.

M. Kimball: the University can always ignore its own guidelines, but the University also doesn't like outside involvement in its decisions. We need to build up a constituency that will be concerned for the welfare of the house.

D. Neuman: ultimately the Provost has authority over the Nissan fund account. The Board of Governors reports to the President.

M. Jones: We should discuss how the fund account is set up with Simone.
January 23, 1995

TO: Hanna House Board of Governors

FROM: David Neuman

SUBJECT: Program document

Planning Office and Facilities staff are working with a renewed sense of urgency to prepare our project for review by FEMA in order to secure an additional funding commitment from that agency as soon as possible. We will present an updated timetable and explain the process fully in our regularly scheduled meeting next week. However, it would be helpful if you could review the attached document in advance of the meeting as we will have a full agenda.

The Program Document is our instructions to the architectural firm that will be designing the house repair and restoration scheme for FEMA review. The attached section on program goals and objectives was prepared by Warren, Tiffany and Laura based on the proposed uses for the Hanna House as described in correspondence between Paul Turner and Gerhard Casper. They would like you to review the instructions to the architectural firm to insure that they meet the Board’s understanding of the program for the house.

We will have additional opportunities to work with the architects as they prepare the design. This document is a necessary preliminary step in putting them to work. We appreciate any suggestions you might have on how to improve this draft, which we will discuss next Thursday.

cc: Jean Barnes
    Tom Fenner
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES, based on the Proposal for Use

Preservation according to Conservation Standards

- preserve the historic fabric of the House
  - identify and date alterations to structure and fabric
  - identify areas where restoration is advisable (to 1975 standard)
  - identify restoration alternatives
  - employ methods of strengthening and upgrades which minimize impact on the House
  - recommend schedule for deferred maintenance

- preserve the furnishings of the House
  - identify and date alterations to furnishings
  - identify restoration needs and alternatives
  - upgrade environmental controls if necessary

- preserve the landscape of the House grounds
  - review report from landscape consultant and make recommendations based on preservation standards and programming
  - identify and date garden furnishings and make recommendations on reuse and maintenance

- increase site security
  - review exterior lighting plan
  - review alarm system

Promote availability of the House for Academic and University Functions

- promote appreciation of the House as a work of art through public tours
  - identify accessibility requirements for historic structures
  - identify parking requirements / solutions
  - identify space, requirements for docent office
  - identify possible display areas

---

1 Conservation Standards as modified and approved by the Hanna House Board of Governors on December 1, 1994
- promote scholarship and teaching concerning architecture and art
  - ensure complete documentation of restoration procedures
- host scholarly functions
  - plan for academic groups (seminars) meeting at the house
  - identify maximum occupancies for preservation
  - minimum code requirements based on occupancy and State Historic building code
  - identify parking requirements / solutions
- host small scale University meetings or entertainment functions
  - minimum upgrades for catering
  - minimum upgrades for musical performances
  - identify maximum occupancies for preservation
  - minimum code requirements based on occupancy and State Hist. building code
  - identify parking requirements / solutions
  - identify appropriate outdoor entertainment areas, and desired/required upgrades
- host distinguished visitors to the University for short periods of time in the main house
  - upgrade facilities as minimum required for occupancy
  - consider security issues
- provide facilities for live-in caretaker
  - upgrade apartment facilities in Hobby House as minimum required for occupancy
Maggie,

I talked to some people at the Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation who gave me some good directions about standardizing our inventory so it fits with what the other Wright buildings have done (there's a system for cataloguing the furnishings -- with a building number, room number and object number -- that we will follow).

They suggested color slides and black and white contact prints showing the front, back and side of each style of object. I think we need color prints for the inventory and planning process but its easy to add rolls of film so we can do whatever you think is right. I expect that the inventory and photographs will end up in Archives eventually so if you have any directions on materials for example let me know. I'm just ordering supplies now then I'll go show the student who will be photographing the objects what to do -- probably week after next.

Laura

To: Jones, Laura
From: Maggie Kimball on Fri, Jan 6, 1995 4:33 PM
Subject: Re: hanna house collection photos
RFC Header: Received: by Agora.Stanford.Edu with SMTP; 6 Jan 1995 16:33:47 -0800
Date: Fri, 6 Jan 95 16:32:32 PST
From: "Maggie Kimball" <Maggie.Kimball@Forsythe.Stanford.EDU>
To: jones_m_laura.agora@agora.stanford.edu
Subject: Re: hanna house collection photos

REPLY TO 01/06/95 13:50 FROM laura_jones@agora.stanford.edu
"Jones, Laura":
hanna house collection photos

Laura,

I got your note and will formulate what I hope will be a coherent response early next week. A cold has me captive and the reply I just drafted to you didn't seem worthy to send.

Maggie
To: laura_jones@agora.stanford.edu

-------------------- Replies Sent -----------------------------
REPLY ON 01/06/95 16:43 FROM Maggie.Kimball "Maggie Kimball": RE: hanna house collection photos

Laura,

Definitely we should do black and white. They won't accomplish what you want in terms of refurnishing the house, but they will last longer as real documentation. As long as you are shooting the objects, might as well shoot them twice. I have one concern about the way you propose to do the inventory (which is actually how we did ours for Green West), and that is, can you still determine what rooms the items came from? Or will this be based on photos when the house was furnished? Or? It makes sense to do it that way, if you can. Once furniture has been removed from an area, it is sometime hard to recreate exactly.

Maggie

To: laura_jones@agora.stanford.edu

Print requested by CN.MJK on 01/09/95 at 15:48:40 from CN.MJK's message file.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSET NO.</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>DESIGNER</th>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H84.100.1</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Frank Lloyd Wright</td>
<td>Redwood; Back and seat upholstered in blue linen (Hastorf).</td>
<td>Armchair -- 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.</td>
<td>29x28.5x32.25</td>
<td>Lanka House Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H84.100.2</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Frank Lloyd Wright</td>
<td>Redwood; Back and seat upholstered in blue linen (Hastorf).</td>
<td>Armchair -- same description as H84.100.1</td>
<td>29x28.5x32.25</td>
<td>Hanna House Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H84.100.3</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Frank Lloyd Wright</td>
<td>Redwood; Back and seat upholstered in green linen.</td>
<td>Armchair -- same description as H84.100.1 (except linen is green)</td>
<td>29x28.5x32.25</td>
<td>Hanna House Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.1986.20.1</td>
<td>Museum of Modern Art, NY</td>
<td>Frank Lloyd Wright</td>
<td>Redwood; Back and seat upholstered in green linen.</td>
<td>Armchair -- same description as H84.100.3</td>
<td>29x28.5x32.25</td>
<td>Hanna House Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H84.101.1</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Frank Lloyd Wright</td>
<td>Redwood; Seat, back and arms upholstered in burgundy-colored plush.</td>
<td>Reading Chair -- Hexagonal-in-section wing chair. Angular-shaped arms terminate in ends cut at 25 degree angles. Solid wood frame tapers inwardly toward the base. Butressed angular back support terminates in a pair of stepped runners extending through the underside of the chair up to front seat rail.</td>
<td>34x32x30</td>
<td>Hanna House Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Milwaukee Art Museum</td>
<td>Frank Lloyd Wright</td>
<td>Redwood; Seat, back and arms upholstered in a burgundy-colored Thai silk.</td>
<td>Reading Chair -- same description as H84.101.1 (except upholstered in Thai silk).</td>
<td>34x32x30</td>
<td>Hanna House Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H84.102.1</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Frank Lloyd Wright</td>
<td>Redwood; Upholstered in stiff, maroon-colored plush.</td>
<td>Hexagonal-in-plan ottoman with attached top cushion, 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.</td>
<td>15x27x23</td>
<td>Hanna House Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H84.102.2</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Frank Lloyd Wright</td>
<td>Redwood; Upholstered in blue linen.</td>
<td>Hexagonal-in-plan Ottoman - same description as H84.102.1 (except upholstered in blue linen).</td>
<td>15x27x23</td>
<td>Hanna House Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H84.102.3</td>
<td>Buck Estate</td>
<td>Frank Lloyd Wright</td>
<td>Redwood; Upholstered in blue linen.</td>
<td>Hexagonal-in-plan Ottoman -- same description as H84.102.1 Markings: Paper upholstery label at center of base with 1927 and 1929 fire code marks, possibly original.</td>
<td>15x27x23</td>
<td>Hanna House Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSET NO.</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>DESIGNER</td>
<td>MATERIAL</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>DIMENSIONS</td>
<td>SOURCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H84.103.1</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Frank Lloyd Wright</td>
<td>Redwood.</td>
<td>End Table -- Triangular-in-section with triangular-in-plan legs chamfered on two inside edges.</td>
<td>21.5x14x11.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H84.103.2</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Frank Lloyd Wright</td>
<td>Redwood.</td>
<td>End Table -- same description as H84.103.1</td>
<td>21.5x14x11.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H84.105.1a, b</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Frank Lloyd Wright</td>
<td>Redwood; Orange upholstery.</td>
<td>Dining Chair (reproduction) -- Hexagonal-in-section with loose orange seat cushion. Apex of the 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.</td>
<td>34.125x23.25x19.25</td>
<td>Metropolitan Museum of Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.1986.20.2</td>
<td>Museum of Modern Art, NY</td>
<td>Frank Lloyd Wright</td>
<td>Redwood; Beige linen.</td>
<td>Dining Chair -- same description as H84.105.1a, b (except beige linen.)</td>
<td>34.125x23.25x19.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H84.104.1a-m, 2</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Frank Lloyd Wright</td>
<td>Redwood.</td>
<td>Dining Table with extension leaves (two end units and thirteen leaves) and extension unit. Leaves: rectangular shaped with 2-inch aprons at the outside edges, with 4 dowels and 4 mortises at the inside edges, respectively. End Units: Pentagonal-in-section top supported by triangular-in-section, 3-sided solid paneled base. Extension Unit: Hexagonal top with 2 triangular-shaped folding leaves attached with piano hinges, supported on triangular-in-section base matching the 2 end units.</td>
<td>Leaf: 2x11.5x43 Base: 27.25x38x43 Unit: 27.5x48x42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H84.105.1</td>
<td>Hobby House</td>
<td>Frank Lloyd Wright</td>
<td>Redwood.</td>
<td>End Table -- Triangular-in-section with three tapering, round-in-section legs (replacement) with metal caps.</td>
<td>21.5x33.75x29.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H84.105.2</td>
<td>Hobby House</td>
<td>Frank Lloyd Wright</td>
<td>Redwood.</td>
<td>End Table -- same description as H84.105.1</td>
<td>21.5x33.75x29.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Hobby House</td>
<td>Frank Lloyd Wright</td>
<td>Philippine hardwood.</td>
<td>Pair of library desks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Buck Estate</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Upholstery, wood.</td>
<td>Contemporary, rectilinear-shaped, upholstered sofa with three seat cushions and three back cushions, all removable.</td>
<td>24x91x34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Buck Estate</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Upholstery, wood.</td>
<td>Contemporary, rectilinear-shaped, upholstered loveseat with two seat cushions, two back cushions, and two side cushions, all removable.</td>
<td>24x55x34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Buck Estate</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Upholstery, wood.</td>
<td>Contemporary, rectilinear-shaped, upholstered loveseat with two seat cushions, two back cushions, and two side cushions, all removable.</td>
<td>24x55x34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Ceramic base, plastic/cloth shade</td>
<td>Lamp -- Dark brown ceramic base with a brown-trimmed beige shade.</td>
<td></td>
<td>36 tall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Ceramic base, plastic/cloth shade</td>
<td>Lamp -- Dark brown ceramic base with a brown-trimmed beige shade.</td>
<td></td>
<td>36 tall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Glass, plastic</td>
<td>Table -- Circular glass table top with beige cylindrical base.</td>
<td></td>
<td>42D glass, 23Dx21.5h base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Fireplace tools -- Five pieces plain, 2 larger pieces with textured surface</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSET NO.</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>DESIGNER</th>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HF100</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Orange wood</td>
<td>Stool with circular seat and short rectangular back</td>
<td>14x15x25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF101</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Brown towel rack</td>
<td>6x30x30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF102.1</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Upholstery, wood</td>
<td>Seat with black wood frame and square yellow silk patterned cushion.</td>
<td>16x16x18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF102.2</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Upholstery, wood</td>
<td>Seat -- same description as HF102.1</td>
<td>16x16x18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF103</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wood, textile</td>
<td>Oriental Screen with four panels trimmed with black wood</td>
<td>1x62x54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF104</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Upholstery, wood</td>
<td>Chair -- red wood frame and yellow flower-patterned cushion seat and back. Wood carving at the top of the chair back</td>
<td>17x17x42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TEXTILES**

| R=HR.1   | Rug       | --Red, orange, olive, blue design with beige fringe. |
| R=HR.2   | Rug       | --Red, black, gray, beige design                      |
| R=HR.3   | Rug       | --Multicolored design with blue border.               |
| R=HR.4   | Rug       | --Multicolored design with light brown border          |
| R=HR.5   | Rug       | --Multicolored design with brown-black border          |
| R=HR.6   | Rug       | --Multicolored design with black-white border          |
| R=HR.7   | Rug       | --Multicolored design with turquoise border            |
| R=HR.8   | Rug       | --Thick; multicolored design with navy trim            |

**TC=Table Cloth**

| HTC1.1   | Table Cloth | -- sheet with embroidered trim                        |
| HTC1.2   | Table Cloth | -- same description as HTC1.1                          |

**P=Fabric**

| HP100.1,2,3 | Fabric | Dawn Pillows -- textured gray with pink trim           | 20x20   |
| HP101.1,2,3 | Fabric | Dawn Pillows -- khaki colors, hexagonal pattern        | 21x21   |
| HP102.1,2  | Fabric | Pillows -- Red/multicolored pillow with dark brown middle | 20x20   |
| HP102.2    | Fabric | Pillow -- Red/multicolored pillow with black middle    | 18x20   |

**C=Cushion**

| HC100.1   | Cushion | bench side; woven beige/tan fabric                     | 14x29x3 |
| HC100.2 a,b,c | Cushion | -- 3 hexagonal back cushions; woven beige/tan fabric | 25x25x5 |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSET NO.</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>DESIGNER</th>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HC100.3 a,b,c,d</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fabric</td>
<td>Cushion -- 4 long seat cushions; half-hexagonal-shaped; woven beige/tan fabric</td>
<td>2 @ 70 long, 2 @ 105 long</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC100.4 a,b,c,d</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fabric</td>
<td>Cushion -- 4 back cushions; woven beige/tan fabric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC101</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fabric</td>
<td>Cushion -- triangular-shaped, Khaki colored</td>
<td>16x29x3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC102</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fabric</td>
<td>Cushion -- long seat cushion with beige, embroider-like textile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA=Textile Art</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TA=Textile Art</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTA100</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fabric</td>
<td>Red textile with multi-colored design, two ends with fringe</td>
<td>14.5x32.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTWORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA100</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Metal urn with elliptical lip and two shaped side handles.</td>
<td>8x16x7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA101</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Glass, paper</td>
<td>Wood-framed Asian calligraphy</td>
<td>.75x8.5x24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA102</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Vase -- Olive and light blue spot-textured</td>
<td>14Dx20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA103</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>Indian pottery -- vase (broken) with reddish-brown/black design.</td>
<td>6 tall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA104</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>Indian pottery -- bowl with reddish-brown/black design</td>
<td>6Dx6 tall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA105</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>Indian pottery -- Tan bowl with dark brown design</td>
<td>8Dx7 tall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA106</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Sculpture -- woman figure</td>
<td>32 tall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA107</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Sculpture -- woman figure</td>
<td>40 tall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA108</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Metal/Rock-like</td>
<td>Sculpture -- figure/statue</td>
<td>40 tall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA109.1</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Dish -- wrapped in duct tape and wire</td>
<td>10D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA109.2</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Dish - same description as HA105.1</td>
<td>10D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA110</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Urn; vos-shaped with blue tarnish; perforated design</td>
<td>42 tall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA111</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Urn with blue tarnish and cylindrical neck.</td>
<td>42 tallx6D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA112</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Decorative circular piece with cast designs; raised middle.</td>
<td>30D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA113</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Straw</td>
<td>Woven hat with multi-brown colored pattern (edges beginning to fray)</td>
<td>19D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA114</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Straw</td>
<td>Circular, multi-brown colored, woven basket</td>
<td>12.5Dx3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA115</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Straw</td>
<td>Brown woven hat with intricate design, white knob and metal decorative piece at top</td>
<td>12Dx6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSET NO.</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>DESIGNER</th>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HA116</td>
<td>Stanford Museum</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Hexagonally-shaped bookstand</td>
<td></td>
<td>Emily H. Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TILES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT100</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ceramic/Clay</td>
<td>Square glazed decorative tile with blue trim; from the floor at sliding door of dining room</td>
<td>10x10x1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT101</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ceramic/Clay</td>
<td>Hexagonally-shaped, glazed tile with multicolor design; from the floor at sliding door of dining room</td>
<td>9x9x1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT102.1,2</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ceramic/Clay</td>
<td>Circular glazed decorative tiles with green trim; from the floor at sliding door of dining room</td>
<td>12.5Dx1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT103</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ceramic/Clay</td>
<td>Circular glazed decorative tile with reddish brown flower design; from floor at sliding door of dining room</td>
<td>12.5Dx1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SILVERWARE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS100.1-43</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Smooth-surfaced butter knives.</td>
<td>6.5 long</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS101.1-50</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Smooth-surfaced knives</td>
<td>8.5 long</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS102.1-16</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Knives with serrated edge on one side</td>
<td>8 long</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS103</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Cake knife with perforated surface</td>
<td>10.5 long</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS104.1-4</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Smooth-surfaced serving soup spoons</td>
<td>7 long</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS105.1-3</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Smooth-surfaced salad spoons</td>
<td>10.5 long</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS106.1-13</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Smooth-surfaced serving spoons</td>
<td>10.5 long</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS107.1-57</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Smooth-surfaced spoons</td>
<td>7.5 long</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS108.1-16</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Dessert spoons with long thin handles</td>
<td>7.75 long</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS109.1-28</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Soup spoons</td>
<td>7.5 long</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS110.1-96</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Smooth-surfaced forks</td>
<td>7 long</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS111.1-14</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Forks with engraved design on handle</td>
<td>7 long</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS112</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Fork with wide handle</td>
<td>6.5 long</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS113.1-16</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Cocktail forks with short handles</td>
<td>5.5 long</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLLECTIBLES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCL100.1</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Sugar jar with lid; brown exterior surface with dark engraving; glazed white interior surface; two handles on sides</td>
<td>3.5x6.5x5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCL100.2</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Teapot; brown exterior surface with dark engraving; glazed white interior surface</td>
<td>4.5x9x4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSET NO.</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>DESIGNER</th>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCL100.3</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Small hexagonally-shaped dishes; brown bottom surface, white glazed top surface</td>
<td>5x5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a-e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCL100.4</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Hexagonally-shaped teacups; brown exterior surface with dark engraving; glazed white interior surface; one handle</td>
<td>3x3x2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a-d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCL100.5</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Cream server with lid; brown exterior surface with dark engraving; glazed white interior surface; one handle and lip</td>
<td>2x5x4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCL101</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Circular dish with brown glazed top surface</td>
<td>6.25D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCL102.1</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Small circular piece with purple glazed surface and asian character design</td>
<td>4.25D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCL102.2</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Small circular piece with pink glazed surface</td>
<td>4.25 D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCL103</td>
<td>Lake House</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>White wedge-shaped dish with asian decorative border and fan-shaped design</td>
<td>4.5x5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. **Review of Minutes - November 3, 1994** (10 minutes) *Please see Attachment #1*

Please review the Minutes from the Meeting of November 3, 1994 and raise any comments or concerns.

II. **Project Status** (15 min)
Mark Jones

Work on wall on driveway
- should proceed
- may be that surface has poor composition, problem with wall or only will need.

III. **Report on Documentation and Nissan Stewardship** (15 min)

**General Discussion**

IV. **Discussion of Preservation Standards** (20 min) *Please see Attachment #2*
David Neuman

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

1. Draft artifact inventory

2. Next meeting

Film - K. Hanna

- access to house

Funding of film:
- Archives - $145
- Nissan endowment

Magazine articles on House - Kris

de w/ Pet M: What??
DATE: November 30, 1994

TO: Hanna House Board of Governors

FROM: Tiffany Gravlee

SUBJECT: Hanna House Board of Governors December 1, 1994 Agenda

Dear Colleagues:

Enclosed please find the agenda for the meeting of December 1, 1994, with attachments. Please review the minutes of our last meeting of November 3, 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
CONSERVATION OBJECTIVES

INTRODUCTION

The life of the Hanna House has not been static. After the house was constructed in 1937, the Hannas embarked on a lifelong relationship with their home. The care and attention that they gave to furnishing, landscaping and renovating their residence appears to have been an important aspect of their lives. The Hannas held Frank Lloyd Wright in high regard and continued to keep him involved in the evolution of their home. As they reached the end of their tenure as owners of the house they worked conscientiously to ensure that the special place that they and Frank Lloyd Wright had created would be preserved. Their gift of the Honeycomb House to Stanford University was a witness to their faith that the stewardship they had maintained for thirty-eight years would be honored by the institution that had been a major component in their life and the special place that they had built.

The gift of the house to Stanford in 1974 and the Hanna's move to a new residence in 1975, marked the end of the unique relationship between the Hanna's, Frank Lloyd Wright and the Honeycomb House. The changes and modifications that had been carried out embody the evolution of the Hanna's lifestyle and aesthetic judgement, the maturation of Frank Lloyd Wright's design sensibility and the changes in popular taste and design between 1937 and 1975.

During the fifteen years since the Hannas moved out of the Honeycomb House, Stanford University has maintained the buildings and the grounds in the manner in which they were received. There have been some changes to the site, but in general they have not altered the integrity of the house or the landscape. As the result of the earthquake, significant changes will be wrought on the house. It is therefore timely that the University consider not only the impact that the seismic repair will have on the house that the Hanna's built, but on the long range goals for maintaining the unique character of the site and the manner in which these goals will be implemented.

In order to assist the Board of Trustees of Leland Stanford Junior University and the Hanna House Board of Governors in setting goals for the use and care of the Hanna House, the following proposed goals and standards are listed below for their review and consideration.
PROPOSED GOALS FOR OWNERSHIP AND UTILIZATION OF THE HANNA HOUSE

1. The Hanna House including the house and grounds will be held in perpetuity by the Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University.

2. The main house and garage will continue to be used as a residence.

3. The hobby house will be used for purposes compatible to the residential characteristics on the site.

PROPOSED CONSERVATION STANDARDS

Preservation

1. The Hanna House, including the site and the structures, is a unique architectural monument created by the architectural genius of Frank Lloyd Wright and the lifelong stewardship of Jean and Paul Hanna.

2. The site and structures will be preserved in its present evolutionary state recognizing the cultural and historical value of the original structure built in 1937, the modifications made in 1950 and 1957 and the other changes made by the Hannas up to 1975 when they moved out of the house.

3. No part of the site and/or the structures will be restored to a period earlier than its evolutionary state in 1975, unless the BoS determines that an exception should be made for historic or architectural integrity.

4. Consideration will be given to removing modifications that have been made to the house between 1975 and 1990 and restoring details that were known to have existed in 1975.

5. Changes or additions that are required by the occupants of the site and buildings should be provided in a manner that does not significantly alter the appearance or condition of the site and structures.
6. Acknowledgement is made of the unique design details and construction practices which have caused ongoing deterioration to the site and the structures.

7. Recognition is given that due to the unique design of the Hanna House, certain repair and maintenance procedures may have to be more invasive than normal to preserve the visual integrity of the whole building.

8. Priority will be given to retention of existing historic materials in a deteriorated state until they can no longer function properly.

9. In order to correct seismic damage priority will be given to solutions that preserve the material integrity of the evolutionary character of the site and structures up to 1975.

10. When original features must be removed to correct seismic damage or unique design details and original construction practices, priority will be given to procedures that permit the feature to be moved intact or dismantled and reassembled after the repair work has been completed.

11. When an architectural feature cannot be moved intact or dismantled and reassembled, the new feature should be reconstructed matching the 1975 configuration, size, material, color and texture of the detail that was replaced.

12. All work proposed for the site and structures will be subject to review by the Hanna House Board of Governors.

13. The work on the site and structure will be in compliance with the Secretary of the Interiors Standards for Preservation Projects.

14. Maintenance records will be kept on all work carried out on the site and structures.

15. All work on the site and structures will be documented through the use of photo documentation, measured drawings and written narrative.
16. Copies of all written and iconographic material associated with the work on the site and structures shall be placed in the Hanna House archives.
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1.00 Introduction
1.00 INTRODUCTION

1.01 Scope

In October 1989 the Hanna House was damaged by the Loma Prieta earthquake. The Provost, who had occupied the house prior to the earthquake, moved out and the house, garage and Hobby House have remained unoccupied since that time. Immediately after the earthquake, Forell and Elsesser, Structural Engineers, were asked to determine the factors that contributed to the earthquake damage and to prepare recommendations for seismic repair. The structural damage from the earthquake and the need for improved structural resistance, in conjunction with the uniqueness of the structure, result in a complex rehabilitation project.

Since the Loma Prieta earthquake, considerable discussion within the University over the appropriate use or uses of the building has occurred. Over the same period of time, discussions with the Federal Emergency Management Agency over appropriate levels of structural repair and strengthening have also been ongoing.

In 1994, the Hanna House Board of Governors made the determination to discontinue the use of the Hanna House as the residence of the Provost. In December 1994, the Board of Governors developed a statement of goals and objectives in order to define the new use or uses for the property. These uses include public tours, University use for seminars, dinners and cultural events, and limited residential use for distinguished visitors.

Also in 1994, Rutherford & Chekene, Consulting Engineers, were retained by the University to review the objectives and solutions of the earlier structural study. A revised structural repair scheme has now been developed for the project. The structural repair and strengthening of the Hanna House will be accomplished in conjunction with rehabilitation and restoration of the house as needed for the new uses identified by the Hanna House Board of Governors.

The scope and purpose of this document is to further identify the needs and impacts of the new uses and to coordinate those needs with the structural repair of the house. The detailed structural analysis prepared by Rutherford & Chekene is included as Appendix B of this document. Budgets are developed for both the structural project and the "improved project" and are summarized in Section 7.00.
1.02 Project Background

The Hanna House was designed by Frank Lloyd Wright for Paul and Jean Hanna in 1937. The Hannas lived in the house from 1937, when it was completed, until 1975. The entire complex had been bequeathed to Stanford University by Dr. and Mrs. Hanna on February 21, 1974 with the intent that the buildings be preserved as a living example of the philosophy and the design principles of Frank Lloyd Wright. They wanted "the residence to be preserved in such manner that it would serve educational ends." They desired that the "buildings and grounds permanently display the art objects that the donors leave thereon and therein." The Hanna House site served as the residence for the University Provost until the Loma Prieta earthquake. Except for the construction of a swimming pool in 1987 few significant changes were made to the complex since 1975.

In the period following the Loma Prieta earthquake, the University has continued to maintain the buildings and grounds. The electrical and water continues to be in service as plans are developed for the seismic rehabilitation, conservation of historic features and adaptive reuse of the buildings and grounds. The Hanna House Board of Governors has made the decision that after the repairs of the house have been completed the buildings and gardens should be used in a manner that is in keeping with the original bequest.
1.03 Process

The process of developing the seismic repair program for the Hanna House and the creation of a program for the use of the site has evolved on parallel tracks.

The university retained Rutherford & Chekene to review the initial proposal for the repairs and seismic strengthening of the house and garage that had been developed in 1991. They were requested to revise the objectives and develop new proposals that would be more respectful of the architectural integrity of the house. In February 1995 Rutherford & Chekene prepared a Seismic Evaluation of the house and garage that evaluated the structural system of the buildings, proposed a concept for repairs and strengthening, articulated issues that needed to be resolved and tasks that had to be completed. In March 1995 the engineering firm presented conceptual repair and strengthening designs to the Hanna House Board of Governors. The conceptual design was reviewed favorably by the Board.

At the same time, the Hanna House Board of Governors began to develop a program for the use of the buildings and the grounds of the Hanna House. In December 1994 the Board modified the Conservation Standards that had been recommended in the 1991 report Hanna House Recommendations for Seismic Repair and Conservation of Historic Structures. In January 1995 the Board prepared the Hanna House Program Document, Goals and Objectives based on the Hanna House Board of Governors' Proposal for Use with Assignments for the Architects.

The Board of Governors requested Architectural Resources Group and Martin Eli Weil, Restoration Architect to convene a day long charette that would identify issues that had to be considered and resolved in order to use the buildings and grounds in a manner that would be consistent with the Goals and Objectives. The charette was held in March 1995. A proposed program was developed with the understanding that there were numerous issues that needed to be resolved and tasks to be carried out by the architects in order to further develop the program and prepare the appropriate documents to rehabilitate the buildings and grounds for the Improved Project.

Participants in the charette included the following:

Representatives of Stanford University:
- David Neuman, FAIA, Assistant Vice Provost and University Architect
- Mark Jones, Head, Facilities Project Management
- Warren Jacobsen, Project Manager
- Laura Jones, Campus Archeologist
- Tiffany Gravlee, Assistant to University Architect
- Marlene Bumbera, Architectural Associate
- Marilyn Banwell, Provost’s Office
- Ann Fletcher, Provost’s Office
Representatives of the Hanna House Board of Governors:
Paul Turner, Chair
James Gibbons
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman, FAIA
Tim Portwood
John Paul Hanna (ex officio member)
(Substitute for Marilyn Fågel)

Representatives of the Design Team:
Stephen J. Farneth, AIA, Architectural Resources Group
Martin Eli Weil, Restoration Architect
Russell Beatty, Landscape Architect
Bret Lizundia, Structural Engineer, Rutherford & Chekene
John Burton, Geotechnical Engineer, Rutherford & Chekene
1.04 Participants

The programming process is being conducted by the Planning Office representing the Hanna House Board of Governors together with the architectural consultants, Stephen Farneth of Architectural Resources Group and Martin Eli Weil, Restoration Architect.

The Planning Office is represented by:
   David Neuman, FAIA
   Tiffany Gravlee
   Laura Jones

Facilities Project Management is represented by:
   Warren Jacobsen, Project Manager

The Design Team includes:
   Architectural Resources Group, Architects
      Stephen J. Farneth, AIA, Principal-in-Charge
      Naomi Miroglio, Project Manager
   Martin Eli Weil, Consulting Architect
   Rutherford & Chekene, Structural Engineers
   William Mah Engineers, Mechanical Engineers
   Pete O. Lapid & Associates, Inc., Electrical Engineers
   Russell Beatty & Associates, Landscape Architects
2.00 Goals
2.00 GOALS

The goals and objectives for the Hanna House, as developed by the Hanna House Board of Governors in January 1995, are listed in the Hanna House Program Document Goals and Objectives:

**Preservation according to Conservation Standards**

- Preserve the historic fabric of the house.
- Preserve the furnishings of the house.
- Preserve the landscape of the house grounds.
- Increase site security.

**Promote availability of the house for academic and University functions:**

- Promote appreciation of the house as a work of art through public tours.
- Promote scholarship and teaching concerning architecture and art.
- Host scholarly functions.
- Host small scale University meetings or entertainment functions.
- Host distinguished visitors to the University for short periods of time.
- Provide facilities for live-in graduate students.
3.00 Users Space and Functional Requirements
3.00 USER'S SPACE AND FUNCTION REQUIREMENTS

3.01 Introduction

The Hanna House Board of Governors identified the initial program needs for tours, seminars, social gatherings, cultural events, short term use of the house by distinguished visitors, full time residence for a graduate student and staff facilities. While in many ways these uses are consistent with the Hanna's use of the property, some changes and rehabilitation will be necessary.

In addition to the space requirements for a wide range of activities, there are other issues that must be addressed. These include the restoration of the buildings and grounds, conservation of the original fabric of the site, physical capacity of the buildings and grounds for specific activities, parking capacity, bathroom capacity, disabled access, catering and food service requirements, support space needs, building systems, security and building and planning code requirements.
3.02 Programming Concepts

- Historic buildings, landscape features and furnishings
- Proposed uses
- Code compliance
- Disabled access
- Building systems/technology

The concepts developed during the programming phase will provide guidance to the design team as they continue with the project through subsequent phases of design. The use concepts provide insight into the issues that must be resolved to realize the project.

The Hanna House site, including all of the buildings, grounds and original furnishings, is architecturally and historically significant. The entire complex is the result of the ongoing collaboration of Paul and Jean Hanna, the owners of the house, with Frank Lloyd Wright, the architect. This joint effort resulted in significant changes to the buildings and the grounds from the time the house was completed until the Hannas bequeathed the residence to the university. All work on the complex should preserve the evolutionary character of the buildings, site features, landscape and furnishings from 1937 to 1975. The project will conform to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation.

The proposed uses of the Hanna House are responsive to the historical character of the buildings, furnishings and landscape features. The proposed uses for the complex have been developed with respect for the bequest of Dr. and Mrs. Hanna. The program has been developed to limit the number of participants for the different types of events. The capacity for each use is dictated by the existing features of the buildings and the site. These limitations have been consciously made in order to minimize changes required in the building, minimize ongoing wear and tear on the historic materials and furnishings, and to limit the impact of building and planning code requirements.

The mixture of proposed uses for the site include tours, University seminars, small-scale University entertaining and cultural events, and limited residential uses for distinguished visitors and a live-in graduate student. These uses will constitute a change of use and will result in both planning and building code impacts. Since the current zoning of the property is for single-family residential uses, the proposed uses will require a conditional use permit from Santa Clara County. This process may involve a public meeting with neighbors and a clear description of uses and limitations.

Under the Uniform Building Code, change of use would normally require bringing the building into compliance with all current code requirements for the new use, including structure, fire safety and disabled access requirements. Section 8-404 of the State Historic Building Code allows considerable latitude in the implementation of this requirement. With the use of the State Historic Building Code and the proposed limitations of the building program, most code requirements will be satisfied without extensive alterations.

As a residence, the Hanna House was exempted from designation as an unreinforced masonry building. With the change of use, it would be classified under that category (since the chimneys support the roof). However, current plans for the structural strengthening should be able to satisfy county requirements.
More active use by the University for educational and entertainment as well as public tours will require that some level of disabled access be provided. For historic properties, the Americans with Disabilities Act requires that complete access be provided unless doing so will "threaten or destroy" the historic significance of the property. In these cases, alternatives to complete access can be considered.

The Hanna House's multiple levels, angled walk and highly significant landscape, make providing complete disabled access extremely destructive to the property. Limited access to most areas of the site and provisions for a disabled-accessible restroom facility can be developed with relatively minor impacts. These provisions, in conjunction with careful scheduling of the facility and notification of the limitations of the site, are recommended.

The programmed uses for the property will have only limited needs for upgraded building systems. However, more extensive electrical and telecommunications improvements are recommended.
3.03 Existing Space Summary

- Anticipated Impacts

The seismic strengthening of the house and garage, and the rehabilitation for the adaptive reuse of the buildings and the grounds, will have minimal impact on the existing square footage of the buildings. The seismic strengthening work will be carried out within the existing walls and the original face of the finishes will be retained.

The only change to the buildings that will occur is the construction of a bathroom that is accessible for the disabled within the Powder Room in the house. This will not change the square footage of the two structures. The improvements to the electrical, mechanical, telecommunications, fire and safety and security systems will have no effect on the square footage.
### 3.04 Detailed Space Needs

- **Capacity**
- **Bathroom**
- **Food Service**
- **Parking**
- **Storage**

**Physical Capacity**

The number of people that can be accommodated for the various uses of the house has been calculated according to the capacity of the existing rooms, bathroom facilities in the residence and Hobby House, on-site and off-site parking facilities and conservation concerns for the house and furnishings. Listed below is the maximum capacity for each type of use planned for the site:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Space</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Tours</td>
<td>Entire site</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Small Group Seminar</td>
<td>Hobby House, Dining Room, Library</td>
<td>25, 20 (Alternative), 10 (Alternative)</td>
<td>Two per week, One per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dinner</td>
<td>Dining Room</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>One per week — increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cultural Events</td>
<td>Living Room or Dining Room, Terraces</td>
<td>20, 60</td>
<td>One per week, One per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dinner, Cocktails or Cultural Event</td>
<td>Terraces</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>One per month — increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Distinguished Visitors</td>
<td>Owners' Bedroom, TV Room and Bath</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Short term overnight stay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Bathroom Requirements

The code permits the use of one unisex bathroom that has disabled accessibility as long as the other bathrooms are also unisex. For seminars and dinner gatherings, existing toilet facilities are adequate.

For groups up to 60 the present bathroom facilities on site do not meet current code recommendations. However, based on the Hanna’s experience with larger events than those currently proposed, it is not recommended that additional toilet facilities be added.

Food Services

Catering and food service facilities will be needed for the provision of minimal refreshments to entire meals for various types of events. Refreshments or meals for a small group can be brought to the site. The Hanna House kitchen can be upgraded with minimal alterations to provide facilities for caterers to serve dinners in the house. Large social events will require on-site temporary catering facilities, outside the house. Distinguished guests and staff who work on-site will require minimal food preparation facilities. The live-in graduate student will require a kitchen. The Hanna House kitchen will be used for serving dinner in the dining room.

Storage

The seminars and cultural events require seating and conference tables. For day-to-day use, this seating would remain in the rooms. If necessary, this furniture can be stored on site in the store room adjacent to the garage, and in storage areas in both buildings. For larger events, tables and chairs will be brought in from an off-site location.

Audio visual equipment will not be installed in the residence or Hobby House. Any A-V equipment needed will be brought to the site.

Tours require minimal storage.

Housekeeping supplies for the house and the Hobby House will be stored on-site.

Facilities may be required for housekeeping staff, docents and staff required to operate the house and associated support groups. These facilities depend on the type of management system that is selected for the operation of the house and the tours. At present, it is proposed that all management staff will be housed off-site.
3.05 Deferred Maintenance and Conservation Work

The maintenance repair work for the buildings, furnishings and landscape features have been partially identified.

Hanna House and Garage

The 1991 Hanna House Recommendations for Seismic Repair and Conservation of Historic Features recommends repairs that were not associated with the seismic repair and strengthening program caused by the Loma Prieta earthquake. These recommendations include:

- Repair terrace paving
- Repoint terrace walls
- Repair and refinish exterior walls and trim
- Repair doors and windows
- Replace door and window sealants
- Refinish exterior door and window hardware
- Repair and refinish door and window trim
- Repair and refinish interior concrete floor
- Restore kitchen floor
- Install new carpeting in selected areas
- Repair and refinish interior wood paneling
- Replace missing fiberboard and saguran cloth
- Repair and refinish wood ceiling trim
- Repair and refinish casework
- Restore ceiling light fixtures
- Repair HVAC
- Upgrade electrical system
- Upgrade plumbing system
- Upgrade or replace security system
- Install new telecommunications system
- Restore original sound system built by Paul Hanna
- Restore or reconstruct original movable furniture
- Reupholster built-in furniture
- Conservation of original moveable Frank Lloyd Wright furniture
- Install new window treatment

Hobby House, Garden House, Terraces and Landscape Features

The condition of the Hobby House and other elements of the site have not been examined and evaluated. They will be examined as an extended part of this project.
4.00 Planning and Architectural Guidelines
4.00 PLANNING AND ARCHITECTURAL GUIDELINES

4.01 Historic Preservation Significance

Statement of Significance

The Hanna House designed by Frank Lloyd Wright for Paul and Jean Hanna in 1937 was Wright's first completed project in the San Francisco Bay area. The residence, which is also known as the Honeycomb House, was the first commission completed by Frank Lloyd Wright which introduced the use of the hexagon as the modular unit for the design. Dr. and Mrs. Hanna collaborated with Frank Lloyd Wright, and after his death the Taliesin Foundation, throughout the years in modifying the property. The buildings, furnishings and landscape features that exist today represent each stage of the evolution of the site.

In 1960 the Frank Lloyd Wright Memorial Committee of the American Institute of Architects named Hanna House and sixteen other buildings designed by Wright for special notice as being noteworthy as an example of Frank Lloyd Wright's contribution to American culture.

The historical and architectural significance of the Hanna House requires that the entire site be given the level of care that is provided for artifacts of great cultural and historical value.
4.02 Architectural and Landscape Design Criteria

The house and garage were constructed in 1937 and modified in 1957. The Hobby House was constructed in 1950. The lower parking area was built in 1952. In 1960 the Hannas modified the north terrace off the living room. The bedroom terrace, fountain and garden house were added in 1963. Plant material changed over the years as the Hannas altered the landscape. The built-in furnishings, surviving movable furniture and art objects donated with the house represent different periods of the house. All work on the buildings and the grounds will follow the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. The work on the furnishings and art objects will meet the standards for conservation that are appropriate for museum objects.

The exterior and interior of all buildings, the landscape features, furnishings and art objects have historical significance and will be preserved. Where modifications must be made to meet code and use requirements, they must be carried out in a manner that is sympathetic to the character and quality of the original elements. Wherever possible the State Historic Building Code will be utilized for specific code issues.

All of the features and finishes of the house are significant and should be rehabilitated to their historic appearance. Where features or finishes have to be removed for rehabilitation work they will be documented, catalogued, dismantled and stored for installation in their original location. New finishes will be based on laboratory analysis and documentary evidence of existing finishes.

The significant specimen plants and historical plant material will be maintained using appropriate horticultural procedures. Specific care will be given to protecting specimen plants adjacent to the buildings during the rehabilitation of the individual structures.
4.03 Existing Building Description

The Hanna House is a one-story wood frame structure with slab-on-grade floor system. Wood frame walls are actually a sandwich system of 3 - 1" nominal boards. The wood frame walls and extensive exterior glazing are anchored by several large unreinforced masonry walls and chimney structures. The house was constructed on a slope using a cut-and-fill grading plan, resulting in masonry veneered concrete retaining walls all around the downhill side of the house. The plan of the house is generated from a hexagonal module. This geometry was used to locate all walls and elements, creating a plan without 90 degree angles.

The description and space configuration of the house is extensively detailed in the 1991 Hanna House Recommendations for Seismic Repair and Conservation of Historic Features.

The Hobby House has not been examined and evaluated in detail. The Hobby House and guest quarters were constructed in 1950 and follow the pattern established by the Hanna House. Condition and recommendations for repair and conservation will be developed as part of this project.

The major specimen trees are described in the 1991 report. The remainder of the plant material and site features have not been examined and will be evaluated as part of this project.
HANNA HOUSE

4.04 Site Analysis

- Planning Code Issues
- Parking
- Site Disabled Access
- Service Access
- Pedestrian Access
- Site Utilities
- Catering Facilities
- Landscape Design Criteria

The Hanna House is located on Frenchman’s Road in a neighborhood that is zoned for single family residential use. The site is primarily accessible by automobile. The driveway is shared with a neighboring house to the north.

The Hanna House served as a private residence until the Loma Prieta earthquake. The proposed new uses have major implications related to the zoning of the property, changing the occupancy of the house from residential to institutional and requiring a conditional use permit.

The existing parking facilities at Hanna House consist of two parking places in a carport and one, possibly two cars in the forecourt area adjacent to the front door. It is not possible to park on the driveway. Below the house in the lower entry area, space exists for nine cars to park. It may be possible with valet parking to park an additional four cars in this area. Parking along Frenchman’s Road is available. There will be insufficient on-site parking for most Hanna House uses except for small events such as evening dinners attended by a maximum of 10 participants. Street parking for events at the house will have to be negotiated with the residents on the street. Parking for events with more than 30 participants will require parking in a university lot and a shuttle service.

Most areas of the building and grounds except for the living room are presently not disabled accessible due to the numerous level changes and stairs. Access from the driveway and the parking areas to any other part of the site is provided by stairs. Because of the unique relationship between the house and landscape, providing any level of disabled accessibility is very difficult. The Hobby House cannot be made to be disabled-accessible without destructive changes. The Main House can be made partially accessible by installing a chairlift in the garage, allowing access to the two primary levels of the house and grounds; and by limited remodeling of the powder room. See Appendix B for sketch plans. These changes will probably provide an acceptable level of disabled access for the proposed use of the house. Installation of the chairlift will require alteration of the brick wall at the rear of the garage and may have some impact on the existing tree roots. Alteration of the powder room will affect its interior slightly and will also affect the adjacent closet. These proposals require further study in conjunction with the site topographic survey, and also require review and discussion with Stanford University’s disabled access policy committee.

Vehicular access for service and emergency vehicles to the residence is from Frenchman’s Road via the driveway. Small service vehicles can access the upper entry area for deliveries. It is also possible to provide service access to the lower parking area.

There are no sidewalks along Frenchman’s Road via the driveway. Pedestrian traffic must share the street and driveway with vehicles. Pedestrian access to the property is via the driveway to upper or lower parking area. Although this is not an ideal situation, any alteration to the driveway would not be recommended.
The site is served by electrical service (overhead), water, sewer and natural gas. No increase in the size of any of the laterals is indicated. The condition of the laterals has not been evaluated.

Facilities for temporary catering will be required on the site for large outside events. The location for set-up and preparation is proposed to be in the garage and store room areas. Additional electrical outlets and water should be supplied to this area. There are other alternative locations on site for set-up depending on the type of event. It is assumed that other locations can be used without any necessary architectural or utility arrangements.

The landscaping program will require maintenance of the specimen trees and relocation of the irrigation system away from the live oak trees. The orchard developed by the Hannas will be restored. The remaining landscape will be developed to depict the evolution of the site. The swimming pool will be removed and the area redesigned. Handrails may be required on the numerous stairs throughout the site. This is an area which should be subjected to further discussion. Handrails would be a major change to the landscape and would not generally be recommended. However, with a more public use, safety concerns should be addressed. In some areas such as the fountain, public access can be restricted to mitigate safety concerns. Additional lighting will be required for evening use.
4.05 Architectural Analysis

There are very few alterations to the buildings necessitated by the proposed program. These alterations include:

- Disabled access remodeling to the powder room area (see Appendix B).
- Limited, if any, alteration to the kitchen for caterers.
- Consideration for safety concerns at stairways.

The bulk of the architectural work will be in repair and reinstallation of materials affected by the structural strengthening and by deferred maintenance.
4.06 Code Analysis

**Occupancy Classification**  
**Group B, Division 2**  
UBC Section 701: Buildings or portions of buildings having rooms used for educational purposes beyond 12th grade with less than 50 occupants in any room.

The rooms in the residence and the Hobby House are classified B-2 Occupancies based on limiting the capacity to less than 50 for seminars.

**Occupancy Classification**  
**Group R, Division 3**  
UBC Section 1201: Dwellings and lodging houses. Congregate residences each accommodating 10 persons or less.

This applies to the guest suite used for the graduate live-in and the bedroom wing of the main residence.

**Type of Construction**  
**V-N**  
UBC Table 17A: Combustible non-rated construction.

**Roof Construction and Covering**  
Wood roof trusses with 1x wood decking

**Height:**  
**One Story**

**Maximum Occupancy:**  
(based on square footage)  
NA

The occupancy will be limited by the program.
In addition to the requirements of the 1991 edition of the Uniform Building Code, the work will be constructed in accordance with the applicable laws, codes and requirements of regulatory agencies having jurisdiction including, but not limited to, the following:

A. California Code of Regulation, Title 24:
   1. State Building Code, Part 2
   2. State Historic Building Code, Part 8

B. Federal Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA)

C. Uniform Plumbing Code

D. Uniform Electrical Code

E. Uniform Mechanical Code

F. Current NFPA Regulations

G. Americans with Disabilities Act

H. Stanford University's Facility Design Standards

I. Santa Clara County Codes
HANNA HOUSE

4.07 Furnishings, Appliances and Art Objects

The Hanna House Board of Governors discussed the disposition of the furnishings and art objects that were left to the University by the Hannas in their bequest. The following decisions were made at the March 15, 1995, charette:

- All built-in furniture will be kept in its original position in the house.
- Movable furniture designed by Frank Lloyd Wright will be put in a museum situation.
- Further consideration will be given to the movable furniture made by Paul Hanna.
- Further consideration will be given to the manufactured furniture owned by the Hannas and used at the Hanna House.
- All art objects will be placed in their original location.
- New carpets should not be placed in the rooms of the house.

The furnishing plan for the house has not been developed. It will have to consider the period to which each room will be restored or interpreted, replacement of missing furniture and the use of existing furniture when the house is used for dinner, cultural events or distinguished guests. Given the fairly light level of proposed use, most elements of the Hanna’s original furniture can and should remain in the house. In those areas such as the Dining Room and Library, where more regular use is anticipated, furniture such as the Paul Hanna dining room table and chairs should be used with some method for protecting the table surface. Over time, this policy should be evaluated to determine the level of wear and tear occurring to the furnishings.

The furnishings of the Hobby House should be more functional as they will receive a higher level of use. All built-in furniture should remain in place. New seminar tables and chairs should be purchased that fit the character of the space.

The Hanna House Board of Governors decided at the March 15, 1995 charette that the kitchen would be used to serve the dinners held in the dining room and provide facilities for guests staying in the house. The inclusion of the kitchen in the tours of the house was not discussed; however, the kitchen was a major design feature of the house and should be an integral part of the tour. The conflict between showing the kitchen on tours and continuing to use it for catered dinners and light cooking should not be a major problem. Larger, outside events will be catered and staged outside the house, without use of the Hanna House kitchen.

The procedures and facilities for the preparation of food, serving and clean-up for a dinner in the dining room will be reviewed with a caterer. Modern equipment, such as a microwave oven or similar appliances, will be discouraged.

The physical condition of the kitchen appliances will be evaluated.

The period of each feature in the kitchen will be verified and an approved period for the presentation of the kitchen will be developed.

The Hanna House Board of Governors decided at the March 15, 1995, charette that all art objects will be returned to their original position in the house and grounds.
Further discussion will be held on the reinstallation of the urn from the Imperial Hotel. Due to its extremely friable and deteriorated condition, relocation to a museum setting may be recommended.
The Hanna House Board of Governors decided at the March 15, 1995 charette that all art objects will be returned to their original position in the house and grounds.

Further discussion will be held on the placement of the urn from the Imperial Hotel.

The period room settings for the residence will be developed to provide a sense of the evolution of the house. The choice of the period to which each room will be furnished and interpreted will depend on the available furnishings, documentary evidence, the period of the architectural features of the room, and the proposed use of the room. The year 1962 has been selected because of the comprehensive documentation of the house in the January 1963 issues of House Beautiful. The article documents the realization of the Hanna’s ongoing evolution of the house and apogee of their collaboration with Frank Lloyd Wright and Taliesin.

The Entry and Living Room will be restored to its appearance in 1937. This will permit interpretation of the original intent of Frank Lloyd Wright’s design and the early occupation of the house by the Hannas. The furnishings will consist of original available furnishings and reproductions of missing items.

The Dining Room and Kitchen will be restored to the 1962 period after the house had been remodeled. The Dining Room will be restored to its appearance in 1962 using the table made by Paul Hanna and the teak chairs purchased to go with the table. The Dining Room and Kitchen will interpret the rich cultural and social life that the Hannas conducted in their home.

The Library, TV Room and Bedroom will be restored to their appearance in 1962. The surviving built-in furniture and movable furniture will be replaced. Period commercially-manufactured furniture similar to furniture that is missing will be obtained to complete the furnishing program.

The Terraces will be restored to their appearance in 1962. The original checkerboard tables made by Paul Hanna will be restored. Period garden furniture similar to that which was used will be obtained to complete the terrace settings.

The Hobby House will be furnished with new furniture that is appropriate to the character of the Hanna House and the use of the room.
5.00 Technical Criteria
5.00 TECHNICAL CRITERIA

5.01 Utilities
   Water
   Sanitary Sewer
   Gas Heat
   Electrical System
   Telephone System
   Security System
   Audio/Speaker System
   Cable Television
   Fountain Equipment
   Swimming Pool Equipment
   Irrigation System

There is a domestic water supply to the main house, Hobby House and guest quarters. The main house has a Hoyt water heater (Model 75, 54.6 GPH recovery rate, 75 gallon storage, 65,000 BTUM). The water heaters for the Hobby House and guest quarters have not been examined.

The main house, Hobby House and guest quarters have existing sewer lines, which appear to be functioning adequately.

The main house is heated with three gas fired furnaces (Rudd, Model VGGD-10 NC-JR, 100,000 input BTUM). The heating system for the Hobby House and guest quarters has not been examined.

The existing service and meter is located in an electrical closet located on the exterior wall of the hobby shop behind the kitchen. From this location, the entire complex is served with a 200 amp service at 120/240V, 1 Phase, 2 Wire. Refer to Single Line Diagram on attached SK-1. The main Hanna House is served by a 60AMP/2-Pole disconnect switch terminating to a 60 AMP fuse box and a 24 circuit panel located in the kitchen. The hobby shop is served by three panels located in the same service closet. The other loads such as the swimming pool, fountain and irrigation system are served by a 100 AMP-pole disconnect switch and an exterior panel located in the west of the hobby shop.

The complex is served by a telephone system located in the exterior service closet with the electric service equipment.

The security alarm system is located in a closet near the front door of the main house. There are motion detectors located strategically throughout the house.

The audio/speaker system is set up with the amplifier located in the library and speakers located in the kitchen and owner’s bedroom.
Cable television outlets are located in the kitchen and TV room.

The fountain pump and wiring is in good condition.
The swimming pool equipment and wiring is in good condition.

The irrigation system equipment and wiring is in good condition.
5.02 Structural Engineering

The conceptual plan for seismic repair and strengthening program for the main house and the garage was approved by the Hanna House Board of Trustees at the March 1995 meeting. The conceptual plan will require modifications to the terrace retaining wall, chimneys, exterior walls of the house, the interior of closet walls and the roof framing system. There will be minimal impact on the existing original fabric or appearance of the building since all work will be concealed inside the original elements.

The concrete floor in the living room and some sections of the concrete pavers on the terrace will have to be removed. The concrete floors and paving will be rebuilt to match the original design, configuration, texture and color of the original.

The retaining wall on the north terrace will be rebuilt primarily using the existing bricks. If new bricks are needed, they will match the original. The new mortar will match the original and blend with the existing original mortar.

The extent and details of the structural repairs and strengthening project are detailed in the accompanying structural report, Appendix A. The structural capacity of the Hobby House has not been calculated but will be evaluated as part of the next phase of the project.
5.03 Mechanical Engineering

Mechanical (Heating and Ventilating)
Plumbing

The existing mechanical system in the main house will be rehabilitated using the existing furnaces. Modification of the supply duct to the living room will have to be made due to the structural repairs to the chimney. It will be necessary to route the supply grille to another position in the living room.

The heating system in the Hobby House and guest quarters have not been examined.

The plumbing system in the main house, guest house, Hobby House and fountain have not been examined in detail. It was operational in 1989. If the system is sound the existing system will not be altered except for the addition of a disabled accessible bathroom. It may be necessary to provide new gas, water and sewage lines for temporary catering facilities. The supply line for the swimming pool will be removed if the swimming pool is removed.

The irrigation system has not been examined. The 1991 Hanna House report recommends removing the lawn and irrigation system from the vicinity of the live oak trees.
5.04 Electrical System

The existing electrical system will be improved as part of the project. The electrical equipment which is relatively new and meets existing manufacturing standards will not be replaced. The electric panel for the main house is old and will be replaced. The existing two prong receptacles which are found throughout the building will be replaced with grounded three prong receptacles. Some loose cable will be secured in place. The wiring for the house has not been examined in detail. New electrical circuits may be needed in the kitchen and the garage. The condition of the electrical system for the Hobby House has not been examined.

The condition of the electrical wiring for the gardens, lower parking area and terraces has not been examined. Additional landscape light will require that new circuits, wiring and light fixtures be added.

Electrical service to the swimming pool equipment will be removed if the swimming pool is demolished.

The original lighting fixtures in the house will be restored to their original condition. New exterior lighting fixtures will be required on the exterior of the building and the grounds. Interior lighting systems will be the original historic fixtures throughout the house. If additional fixtures are needed for seminar lighting in the Dining Room or Library, they will be removable lamp type fixtures rather than built-in lighting fixtures.
5.05 Acoustical Engineering

No acoustical engineering is required.
5.06 Audio/Visual

The Hanna House Board of Governors has decided that built-in audio/visual systems will not be used for seminars conducted in the residence or the Hobby House. To the extent that Audio-Visual equipment is needed, it will be brought to the site for that event. No permanent changes to the house systems are recommended. The use of existing audio sound system in the main house has not been determined. Installation of a system for events on the terraces will be reviewed with the Board of Governors. This equipment, if necessary, will be set up for special events and removed after each event. The cable television system in the house should be retained for visitors who stay at the house and added for the graduate student live-in quarters.
5.07 Security System

The existing security system provides a reasonable level of security to the house itself. Expansion of the system to cover other areas of the site is recommended.
5.08 Telephone System

A new telephone system should be installed throughout the complex.
5.09 Hazardous Materials Treatment

An investigation to determine if there are hazardous materials on the site should be initiated.
6.00 Schedule
# Project Schedule

## Hanna House Rehabilitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
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<th></th>
<th></th>
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<tr>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford Project Review</td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schematic Design</td>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td>Peer Review</td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td>Stanford Project Review</td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Application(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidding &amp; Negotiation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legend</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford Review Period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer &amp; Seis. Criteria Reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect and Engineer Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.00  Project Budget
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EXISTING DOORS ALLOW ACCESS WITH ASSISTANCE
(CANT. INSTALL POWER ASSIST OPERATORS)

REMODEL CLOSET
INSTALL (N) BATH DOOR

INSTALL (N) LOW WALL INSIDE BATH
RELOCATE TOILET
INSTALL GRAB BARS
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Detailed Cost Estimate