TO: Chris Christofferson
    Marilyn Fogel
    James Gibbons
    Rosemary Hornby
    Maggie Kimball
    David Neuman
    Tim Portwood
    Jack Rakove
    Paul Turner, Chair

FROM: Laura Jones

Ex-Officio:
    Maggie Burgett
    John P. Hanna

cc:
    Ann Fletcher

AGENDA

Thursday May 7, 1998 - 8:30-10:00 a.m.
Hobby House at the Hanna House

1. Approval of Minutes, Meeting of April 1, 1998
   (Attachment)

2. Reports

3. Project Status

4. Calendar Request
Stanford University
Hanna House Board of Governors
Minutes of Meeting - April 1, 1998
Hobby House

Members Present: Marilyn Fogel
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball

Members Absent: Chris Christofferson
James Gibbons
Jack Rakove
Paul Turner, Chair

Ex-Officio Present: Laura Jones

Others Present: Michael Fox

I. Review of Minutes - March 4, 1998

Approved with corrections.

II. Reports:

Meeting started with Laura reporting on loan agreement for the two chairs that will be on display at the Stanford Museum. The agreement will expire in 2001. Laura also discussed that the Provost should be part of the loan agreement. Marilyn asked to know if we had photos of the chairs, it was reported that we did. Marilyn also mentioned that Hilary wanted to display photos of the furniture in Hanna House.

Regarding the construction project, Laura reported that everything was on schedule with bid packages. Photo documentation should be underway this month.

Construction start date is the first of May. On April 8th there will be a neighborhood meeting to discuss what will be involved in the construction. A meeting with the County was held on April 2nd, which Andy Coe, Maggie and Laura attended, where the County approved the Special Use Permit. Plans will be reviewed by the County the week of 4-6-98 for building permits.
Rosemary asked about an update regarding parking plans for visitors. The Board of Governors doesn’t want visitor parking in the street. They prefer to have visitor parking in the driveway. Driveway improvements to accommodate additional parking are not in the Phase II budget, however.

The Phase III list was discussed. David mentioned concerns regarding the furnace. Michael informed the committee the gas has not been turned back on. David asked about repairs to the carport, which Michael informed him was on the Phase III list. Tim inquired about the bricks that have been replaced and what has happened to the old bricks. Laura said they are stored in the garage. Tim would like the old bricks mounted or embellished to give donors as momentos of Hanna House.

Last to be discussed were repairs to the student apartment and if someone would be moving into the apartment in the fall. Michael said the apartment improvements would be more expensive than was anticipated. Michael informed the committee the bid for the kitchen remodeling in the apartment is $8,000.00. Laura and Michael will follow-up with apartment remodeling alternatives.

Minutes prepared by Alana Doyle
AGENDA

Wednesday, May 5, 1999 - 9:00 - 10:00 a.m.

Hobby House

1. Approval of Minutes, Meeting of April 7, 1999
   (Attachment)

2. Reports

3. Proposal for formal expression of gratitude

4. Phase III update - need to raise $ for

   Phase III

   issue of neighborhood

   Sunday May 9 - 30 reserved 20 show.
   Some booked (not solidly) thru Oct.
   Fee issue of no shows -
   Some income
   EPLG permit -
   Collection of $/permit $17.00

   issue of act -
   Who is responsible -
   $250 fee - event permit
Stanford University
Hanna House Board of Governors

Minutes of Meeting – April 7, 1999
Hobby House

Members Present: Maggie Kimball
Tim Portwood
Marilyn Fogel

Members Absent: James Gibbons
Chris Christofferson
Paul Turner, Chair

Ex-Officio Absent: John P. Hanna

Ex-Officio Present: Laura Jones

Others Present: Michael Fox
Merry Weeks

Ex-Officio List: Alan Cummings
Merry Weeks

I. Review of March 2, 1999 Minutes:

Reviewed – No comments, no action taken.

II. Reports:

The Board meeting started with a walk through of Hanna House. Board members met in the living room for remainder of the meeting. The opening events were discussed including the need to have the handicap lift in place. Michael informed the Board the ramp would be operational before the opening events.

The ceiling in the living room and dining room had a textured paint applied which is a backing for the new grass cloth, which will be installed later.

Discussion reverted back to usage of the house. Laura informed the Board that Marilyn Banwell is the contact person for scheduling conferences, meetings or other functions. Hanna House has been re-keyed and Marilyn Banwell has the master key.

The Board requested that documentary photographs be taken at the Donor dinner on Tuesday and also at the reception following the symposium on Wednesday.
The Planning Office offered to coordinate volunteers for public tours on Friday and Saturday.

Alan Acosta, Paul Turner and Laura will have a walk through Hanna House with the media.

Recognition was given to Marlene Bumbera for designing the Hanna House sign.
The Board of Governors recommends that a program meet two objectives: 1) provide unique experience for advanced Stanford University security for the house and grounds.

The award will include: payment of Stanford stipend for expenses. The amount of the award fellowships, less the cost of housing.

SELECTION PROCESS

The Board of Governors will award the role of to an advanced graduate student. Students will second year at Stanford. The Board of Governors to the Schools, which will identify and nominate.

The Board of Governors will form a selection committee should weigh academic achievements when making its selection. Preference should and/or professional interests that would benefit from association with the Hanna House.

In the event that a suitable student cannot be selected, the Scholar-in-Residence position might be awarded to a suitable member of the University, also on an annual basis.

PRIVILEGES

Living Quarters
The Scholar-in-Residence will occupy the Guest Room on the ground floor of the Hobby House, with a private bathroom and small kitchen. The scholar's quarters will not be on public tours of the house. Facilities Operations will schedule cleaning and landscaping to assure the privacy of the occupant.

Use of the House and Grounds
The Scholar-in-Residence will have access to the main house and grounds when there are no scheduled events (however, this would not include the use of the master bedroom to entertain guests). The Board of Governors would not object, for example, to the Scholar-in-Residence hosting a small study group meeting in the house as long as the guidelines on food and hours of use were observed. The Board of Governors
expects the Scholar-in-Residence to use good judgment in exercising these privileges; failure to do so would be grounds for revoking the award.

RESPONSIBILITIES

**Security**
The Board of Governors expects the Scholar-in-Residence to concern him/herself with the security of the property and persons visiting Hanna House. The Scholar-in-Residence should report unauthorized and/or irresponsible use of the property to the appropriate offices.

The Scholar-in-Residence should be on-site every night, expect when arrangements have been made in advance for an absence. S/he should perform a nightly check of doors and windows, alarm system and visual inspection of the house interior.

**Housekeeping**
The Scholar-in-Residence is responsible for keeping the studio clean; it will be included during regular condition inspections of the house.

In addition, during the nightly visual inspection of the house the Scholar-in-residence should perform any urgent housekeeping actions – such as removing glasses from furniture, mopping up spills, and/or removing trash from the house. While it is the Board’s intent to hold caterers responsible for removing all reception/dinner party supplies and/or debris, the Scholar-in-Residence can serve an important role in preventing damage from overlooked items or conditions. The Scholar-in-Residence should report instances of damage or unacceptable conditions caused by events to both the Scheduler and Facilities Operations.

**Physical Plant**
The Scholar-in-Residence should report malfunctioning appliances, lights, heating systems, drains, roof leaks, et cetera to Facilities Operations.

RESTRICTIONS

**Fire hazards**
Smoking is not permitted in any of the Hanna House buildings, the garage area, or under the eaves of the house. The use of candles, incense and/or torches is not permitted at any time, with the exception of candles on the dining room table during formal dinners.

**Alcohol Use**
No abuse of alcohol is permitted at Hanna House. The Scholar-in-Residence should not allow any obviously intoxicated person to drive a car or other vehicle away from Hanna House.
Drug Use
The Board of Governors expects compliance with the University's policies prohibiting the use of illegal drugs. Use of drugs would be considered evidence of poor judgment and lack of responsibility that would be grounds for termination of the award.

Pets
Scholars-in-Residence will not have pets at Hanna House.

TRAINING
Facilities Operations staff will train the Scholar-in-Residence in the use of the alarm system and emergency procedures.

The Scholar-in-Residence should undergo additional orientation by the Hanna House docents to improve his/her general knowledge of the house and its significance.
OPERATING COSTS

FINANCIAL STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense category</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake Repair</td>
<td></td>
<td>FEMA/Donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>Housekeeping</td>
<td>Event charges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Repairs</td>
<td>Endowment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Furnishings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restoration projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>Scholar-in-Residence</td>
<td>Donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>Exhibits</td>
<td>Tour receipts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretive materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speakers/Events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ESTIMATING OPERATING COSTS

Assumptions

In order to obtain estimates from housekeeping services, we are assuming that an average of four events per week would take place at Hanna House. This is somewhat more activity than currently takes place at Lake House, however, given the higher visibility of Hanna House we felt it would be prudent to plan for a busier schedule.

We also assume that caterers will be responsible for clearing away leftover food, tablecloths, rented chairs and tables, and refuse associated with catered events. They will leave the house and grounds in the same condition as when they arrived, with the possible exception of washing dishes from dinner parties.

Current Status

Merry Weeks and Laura Jones are working with records of expenses from the pre-earthquake years and collecting estimates for housekeeping, landscape and other services.
Our current best guess is that approximately $50,000 would be needed to support the program of events. This would include housekeeping, window cleaning, basic landscaping service, and utilities.

**EVENT FEES**

In order to reserve endowment income for major repair projects which will be periodically necessary to preserve the fabric and grounds of the house, we propose that event fees be structured to support operating costs. Any shortfall could be met either through special event fundraising, or with endowment funds. The Board of Governors prefers a per-event charge, rather than a per-person charge. Here are some suggested event categories and fees for discussion:

- **Meeting (less than 20 people)**: $200
- **Dinner (less than 20 people, inside)**: $300
- **Dinner (20 - 100 people, outside)**: $400
- **Reception (less than 20 people)**: $200
- **Reception (20 - 100, inside)**: $400
- **Reception (100 - 300, outside)**: $500
- **Overnight guest**: $500

These fees are intended to reflect the cost of housekeeping after each event and a proportion of other operating costs. These fees are lower than many historic houses available for event rental. The fee structure should encourage responsible uses without precluding use by less affluent members of the University community.
INTRODUCTION

The Hanna House Board of Governors, in its advisory capacity, recommends these policies and procedures to ensure the preservation of this National Historic Landmark house after it reopens.

The Board proposes the following operating principles for use during a trial period of three years, along with a program of data collection designed to determine the effects of events on the historic fabric of the house and grounds. The Board of Governors will review data on use, maintenance and cumulative wear and adjust policies where necessary.

BASIC POLICY

The highest priority of the Hanna House Board of Governors is the preservation of the house, furnishings and grounds in service of the University's missions of teaching and research. A secondary concern is to provide for educational programs designed to illustrate and explain the innovative, artistic character of Frank Lloyd Wright's design for this remarkable house.¹

In keeping with its historic character as the home of the Hanna family and, in later years, the University Provost, the house will maintain its residential character and will serve as a special venue for university events such as educational gatherings, social functions and artistic performances. All events will be limited to University sponsorship.

The house will also be open for small, regularly scheduled public tours. Tours will be by reservation only and guided by trained docents.

Due to the Hanna House's importance as an academic resource and in keeping with its former use as the Provost's residence, event scheduling and administration will be performed through the Provost's Office. The Board of Governors will continue to serve in an advisory role to review policy and preservation issues and make recommendations to the President when necessary.

SCHEDULING

Scheduling during the trial period will be at the discretion of the Provost's Office. The following restrictions will limit event size and frequency:

¹ Educational programming will be addressed in an Interpretative Program, to be developed by the Board of Governors with the assistance of the Hanna House docents.
• Maximum room capacities for fire safety shall not be exceeded. The house shall have an Emergency Procedures Plan reviewed by the Fire and Police Departments and a building conservator to insure proper treatment of the building in the event of an emergency.

• The department sponsoring an event will designate a "responsible party" who will attend a house tour prior to the event, review the house security and emergency procedures documents, and be present during the event.

• On-site parking will be limited to a maximum of fifteen cars. Street parking is to be kept to a minimum.

• Facilities Operations will have the house inspected and cleaned following each event (seminar, conference, reception, dinner).

• Schedulers should plan events to respect the residential nature of the neighborhood.

• Facilities Operations should coordinate regular garden and landscape maintenance so as not to conflict with scheduled events.

RENTAL FEES

Fees will be charged for all events including tours.²

CATERERS

Caterers must be approved by the Provost's Office and complete an orientation program before working in the house.

Caterers are to use the kitchen for serving sit-down dinners in the dining room; no actual food preparation should occur on-site and there should be no buffet service in the house.

Facilities for food storage, preparation and event staging are limited to the Garage storage area.

PROTECTION OF FURNISHINGS

All food and beverages for receptions, conferences, seminars or other events (other than sit-down dinners) are to be served on the terraces. This is to

² To be determined.
TO: Chris Christofferson
   Marilyn Fogel
   James Gibbons
   Rosemary Hornby
   Maggie Kimball
   David Neuman
   Tim Portwood
   Jack Rakove
   Paul Turner, Chair

FROM: Laura Jones

AGENDA

Wednesday April 1, 1998 - 8:30-10:00 a.m.
Hobby House at the Hanna House

1. Approval of Minutes, Meeting of March 4, 1998
   (Attachment)

2. Reports

3. Project Status

4. Museum Loan Request

   2 On schedule of bid pages.
   ARD will begin photos documentation in late Apr.
   April 18 - local neighbors to meet at house
   County hearing use permit Apr 2 - (as issue?)
   week of April 6 - review of plan.

   Phase 3 list has been compiled.

   Marilyn will come to look at 1148 photos for selection to go on
   loan or on loan.
Stanford University
Hanna House Board of Governors
Minutes of Meeting - March 4, 1998
Hobby House

Members Present:  Marilyn Fogel  Tim Portwood
                 Rosemary Hornby  Jack Rakove
                 Maggie Kimball  Paul Turner, Chair
                 David Neuman

Members Absent:  C. Christofferson  James Gibbons

Ex-Officio Present:

Ex-Officio Absent:  Laura Jones

Others present:  Michael Fox

I.  Review of Minutes - February 20, 1998

Approved with corrections.

II.  Reports:

Paul Turner and Tim Portwood reported on their meeting with Owner's Representative Maggie Burgett, who provided them with copies of the Cost and Time Summary (CATS) and Form 1 (Attachment #1). There is still some confusion regarding the exact sources of funds, but the current belief is that necessary funds for the seismic rehabilitation are in place with a modest contingency. Bids will be taken in March and April with the expectation of starting work by the end of April with completion planned for November 1998. Chris Christofferson assured Maggie Burgett that the loan from the Nissan Fund income was acceptable to him and that he was of the belief that the Provost would support this proposal.

David Neuman reported that the Stanford Museum's curator of contemporary art and artifacts, Hilarie Faberman had approached Laura Jones regarding the status of the Hanna House furniture. The Museum is expected make a proposal to the Board regarding the display of the Frank Lloyd Wright designed pieces to be displayed at Museum. Marilyn Fogel reported that she had explored this request recently and that space for two pieces of these furnishings was currently planned in one of the Museum galleries. Tim Portwood suggested that any negotiation should involve the entire relationship between the House and the Museum, i.e., Docent tours, sale of Frank
Lloyd Wright related materials, etc. David Neuman moved that a subcommittee representing the Board should review the Museum’s proposal. This subcommittee would be Maggie Kimball, Marilyn Fogel and Laura Jones.

Marilyn Fogel seconded. It was passed unanimously.

Other Items:

Marilyn Pogel reported that the current issue of the *Quarterly Newsletter of the FLW Building Conservancy* has a report on the Hanna House and its repair status. Paul Turner read the report to the Board members present. (Attachment #2.)

David Neuman reported that the AIA National Convention would be held in San Francisco in May, 1998 and that a Stanford tour is an optional event for participants on Saturday, May 17, 1998. Although the tour will not include the Hanna House, there will be a table with donor related information at the Stanford Museum-Rodin Garden assembly area. Also, some guests may attempt to visit the site. Maggie Burgett should alert the contractor of this possibility.

Minutes prepared by David Neuman
March 30, 1998

Ms. Laura Jones
Planning Office
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305-6115

Dear Laura,

Many thanks for your ongoing efforts to facilitate the loan of the two chairs from Hanna House to the museum. We’re deeply grateful to you for all your help and for working the request through the appropriate individuals at Stanford and at the Metropolitan Museum of Art.

Enclosed are the loan forms for the works. I believe you spoke to Noreen and that you will assist us in obtaining the appropriate signatures. Once it is signed, could you return the museum’s copy of the loan form in the stamped, self-addressed envelope? In particular, could you also please let us know if the credit line seems OK? We’ve seen the house identified both as the Hanna House and the Hanna-Honeycomb House, so we are not sure which is actually the preferred credit.

We are very grateful to you for your efforts on behalf of the museum and look forward to speaking with you further when the chairs are actually returned to Stanford. Thanks to you, Paul Turner, and the other Stanford staff who have assisted us.

With best wishes and thanks,

Hilarie Faberman
Robert M. and Ruth L. Halperin
Curator of Modern and Contemporary Art

encl.
## STANFORD UNIVERSITY
Facilities Project Management

### PROJECT BUDGET LOG SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant Acct #</th>
<th>Project Location</th>
<th>Gross Area (sf)</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>Current Project Phase</th>
<th>Permit - %</th>
<th>Project Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9VDQ047</td>
<td>HONEYCOMB HOUSE</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nov 1998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CATS Line / Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>CATS Budget</th>
<th>Current Commtts</th>
<th>Anticp Commtts</th>
<th>Anticp Final Cost</th>
<th>Anticp Balance</th>
<th>Amt Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A Basic Constr</td>
<td>$1,295,866</td>
<td>$41,683</td>
<td>$1,301,313</td>
<td>$1,342,996</td>
<td>($47,130)</td>
<td>$41,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B Other Constr</td>
<td>71,850</td>
<td>44,070</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>72,070</td>
<td>(220)</td>
<td>39,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 FF&amp;E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Prof Svcs</td>
<td>524,348</td>
<td>458,967</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>628,967</td>
<td>(104,619)</td>
<td>429,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Stanford $5</td>
<td>178,450</td>
<td>149,041</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>187,041</td>
<td>(8,591)</td>
<td>148,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Activation</td>
<td>8,440</td>
<td>3,424</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>15,424</td>
<td>(6,984)</td>
<td>15,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Contingcy</td>
<td>205,157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 SIP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Parking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>(305)</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** Project Totals</td>
<td>$2,284,111</td>
<td>$697,290</td>
<td>$1,549,513</td>
<td>$2,246,803</td>
<td>$37,307</td>
<td>$673,317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Project Manager's Budget Log Notes

- Project has been increased to reflect revised funding 11/11/97. Non board level project to follow with Landscape and Furnishings restoration. R&S reviewing scope and budget before final drawings are produced. VB exercise continuing. Basic construction now reflects base project as seismic upgrade only. Historic restoration, landscape and furnishing restoration have moved to future project.

---

LAST REVIEWED
BY PM: 03/02/98

---

March 2, 1998
discourage the casual placing of beverages on the built-in wood furnishings and/or spilling same on floors or furnishings. In case of inclement weather, food service might be accommodated in Hobby House.

During sit-down dinners the dining room table should be covered with a pad, and built-in wood furnishings should have decorative coverings to protect their finishes. No smoking will be permitted.

Hanna House users are to be instructed that they may not attach charts, objects, decorations, etc. to the walls and/or furniture.

Facilities Operations shall arrange for cleaning and landscape service by personnel specifically trained to protect the historic fabric of the house and grounds.
Form 1 - Facilities Request
Capital Planning & Management 655 Serra St. 725-9253

1. Project Title: Hanna House Seismic Upgrade
   (Brief description of work) 11-330
   (Bldg. Name & Number)

2. Program Representative: Maggie Burgett
   School/Dept. Capital Planning & Management
   Tel.: 650-725-0662 E-mail: burgett@leland.stanford.edu Date: 2/27/98

3. Please describe the building space need/problem:

   The Hanna House is a significant donor gift which must be maintained. It was damaged in the Loma Prieta Earthquake and has been closed since 1989. The mixtures of proposed uses for the site include tours, University seminars, small scale University entertaining, cultural events, and limited residential uses for distinguished visitors and a possible live-in graduate student.

4. Optional: Please describe, in your own words, a potential solution:

   The repair and strengthening concept will repair damage caused by the Loma Prieta Earthquake. It will also improve the anticipated seismic performance of the main residence to be consistent with Stanford's 'Class C' objectives. Class 'C' is intended to provide reasonable life safety protection. It will serve as a reduction in the risk of collapse, thus permitting the reopening of the building. The design meets stringent preservation goals and causes little impact on the existing historical fabric.

5. Indicate any scheduling constraints: Construction documents are in final stages. Construction is scheduled to begin in late March or early April.

6. Approximate Cost:

   Formulation/Study Cost $ N/A
   Project Cost $2,284,210
   Total $2,284,210
   Funding Sources:

   Long Term Debt $______________
   Gifts in Hand $673,000
   FEMA $386,000
   Other (specify) Nissan Fund $695,500
   Other (specify) Nissan Loan $529,710

   Provide Account Name & Number If Available: Hanna House 9VDO047

7. Approvals:

   Dept. Chair/ Facility Dean/Cognizant Capital Planning & Mgmt. Representative Provost
   Representative University Officer

   Signature ___________________________ Signature ___________________________ Signature ___________________________ Signature ___________________________
   Date: ___________ Date: ___________ Date: ___________ Date: ___________

   Please return completed form to Ray Collins, Projects Coordinator, Capital Planning & Management at 655 Serra St. 2nd Floor. Tel: 725-9253 and E-Mail: Ray2@Leland.Stanford

   Special Instructions From CP&M:
March 6, 1998

TO: Hanna House Board members
FROM: Paul Turner
SUBJECT: Loan of chairs

Dear colleagues,

I'm enclosing a copy of a letter Tom Seligman wrote me, dated February 26th. (I never received the original letter, but Marilyn Fogel faxed me a copy this morning.) As you'll see, Tom proposes a temporary loan of two chairs—the dining chair currently at the Met in New York, and one of the armchairs. I've talked with the other members of our furnishings subcommittee (Marilyn, Maggie, and Laura), and we all feel that this loan is a good thing to do.

Since Tom asks for a response before the end of this month, which is before our next board meeting, I'm asking each of you to vote on whether to approve the loan. You can respond by e-mail (ptturner@leland) or telephone (723-3306).

By the way, you may notice in Tom's letter that he indicates that the copy of the dining chair is to be returned to the Met when they return the original to us. Laura thinks the Met will let us keep it. Also, Laura says the loan with the Met has not been expired since 1995, as suggested in the letter, but was renewed on a yearly basis. Marilyn will be investigating various matters having to do with insurance, shipping, conservation, etc., to make sure the Board is not assuming expenses we shouldn't be responsible for. But I don't think these details should delay our making a decision on the general question of whether to approve the loan proposed by Tom.

As soon as I hear from all of you, I'll respond to the proposal.
Dear Paul,

I am writing to you in your capacity as chair of the board of Hanna House in order to request the loan to the museum of two original chairs by Frank Lloyd Wright—a dining room chair and an armchair—that were designed for the Hanna residence. The museum would very much like to showcase these chairs and draw attention to the Hanna House by featuring the furniture in a central position in its newly refurbished early modern gallery, where it will be displayed with works by other American and European masters who practiced prior to 1960.

The museum and Stanford community regard Hanna House as one of the university’s great architectural resources, and the display of the dining room chair and armchair with interpretive material would publicize the House and enhance the museum’s educational function by teaching about one of this century’s great architects and designers. Moreover, the loan of the chairs to the museum would make access to Wright’s design more immediate for Stanford students and the university community and further the cooperative ties between the museum and Hanna House.

Specifically, the museum would like to borrow one of the armchairs currently stored in Lake House (a selection could be made from several possibilities) and the original dining room chair which is part of the loan to the Metropolitan Museum of Art that expired in 1995. As you may know, at the time of the expiration of the loan, it was planned that the facsimile dining room chair at Stanford, currently stored at Lake House, would be exchanged for the original dining room chair at the Metropolitan, where it is on display in the Henry R. Luce Study Center. It is our understanding that the facsimile chair was made for Stanford by craftsmen at the Metropolitan Museum and it was anticipated that Stanford would request the return of the original chair after the loan expired in 1995.
If it is agreeable to you, we would like to propose a long-term loan of the two chairs until the end of 2001. Because it may be necessary for the chairs to have some minor conservation work, we would be grateful if it would be possible to receive a reply to this request as soon as possible, and no later than the beginning of April. Hilarie Faberman and Susan Roberts-Manganelli of our staff are happy to work with Laura Jones to coordinate this loan.

I would be glad to answer any questions you or the board may have about the loan or its significant role in the gallery and our modern installation. We hope the board will look favorably upon this request as the museum and Hanna House reopenings usher in an exciting new period of increased visibility for all of the arts at Stanford University. Our thanks to you and the board for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Thomas K. Seligman

cc: Condoleezza Rice, Laura Jones
Dear Paul,

I am writing to you in your capacity as chair of the board of Hanna House in order to request the loan to the museum of two original chairs by Frank Lloyd Wright—a dining room chair and an armchair—that were designed for the Hanna residence. The museum would very much like to showcase these chairs and draw attention to the Hanna House by featuring the furniture in a central position in its newly refurbished early modern gallery, where it will be displayed with works by other American and European masters who practiced prior to 1960.

The museum and Stanford community regard Hanna House as one of the university’s great architectural resources, and the display of the dining room chair and armchair with interpretive material would publicize the House and enhance the museum’s educational function by teaching about one of this century’s great architects and designers. Moreover, the loan of the chairs to the museum would make access to Wright’s design more immediate for Stanford students and the university community and further the cooperative ties between the museum and Hanna House.

Specifically, the museum would like to borrow one of the armchairs currently stored in Lake House (a selection could be made from several possibilities) and the original dining room chair which is part of the loan to the Metropolitan Museum of Art that expired in 1995. As you may know, at the time of the expiration of the loan, it was planned that the facsimile dining room chair at Stanford, currently stored at Lake House, would be exchanged for the original dining room chair at the Metropolitan, where it is on display in the Henry R. Luce Study Center. It is our understanding that the facsimile chair was made for Stanford by craftsmen at the Metropolitan Museum and it was anticipated that Stanford would request the return of the original chair after the loan expired in 1995.
If it is agreeable to you, we would like to propose a long-term loan of the two chairs until the end of 2001. Because it may be necessary for the chairs to have some minor conservation work, we would be grateful if it would be possible to receive a reply to this request as soon as possible, and no later than the beginning of April. Hilarie Faberman and Susan Roberts-Manganelli of our staff are happy to work with Laura Jones to coordinate this loan.

I would be glad to answer any questions you or the board may have about the loan or its significant role in the gallery and our modern installation. We hope the board will look favorably upon this request as the museum and Hanna House reopenings usher in an exciting new period of increased visibility for all of the arts at Stanford University. Our thanks to you and the board for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Thomas K. Seligman

cc: Condoleezza Rice, Laura Jones
Maggie, attached is a copy of Tom Seligman's letter to Paul Turner regarding the loan of Hanna House chairs to the museum.

Also attached is a copy of the FLLW Building Conservancy Guidelines for the Conservation of Frank Lloyd Wright Decorative Arts. These are the guidelines to which I referred during Wednesday's Hanna House board meeting.
TO: Professor Paul Turner  
Department of Art  
Stanford University  
fax 725-0140  

SUBJECT: Frank Lloyd Wright furnishings  

DATE: March 6, 1998  
PAGES: cover plus 3  

Paul, attached is a copy of the FLW Building Conservancy Guidelines for the Conservation of FLW Decorative Arts. It includes the conservancy’s statement that furnishings should be kept in the locations for which they were intended, when possible, and lists issues to consider regarding loaning pieces.  
These are the guidelines to which I referred during the Hanna House board meeting Wednesday.  

Marilyn  
copy to Maggie and Laura
TO: Chris Christofferson
Marilyn Fogel
James Gibbons
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood
Jack Rakove
Paul Turner, Chair

FROM: Laura Jones

Ex-Officio:
Maggie Burgett
John P. Hanna

cc:
Ann Fletcher

AGENDA

Wednesday March 4, 1998 - 8:30-10:00 a.m.
Hobby House at the Hanna House

1. Approval of Minutes, Meeting of February 20, 1998
   (Attachment)

2. Reports

3. Project Funding Status

4. Museum Loan Request
Hanna House Board of Governors
Minutes
February 20, 1998
Hobby House at the Hanna House

Members Present:  Marilyn Fogel
                 Maggie Kimball
                 Tim Portwood
                 Jack Rackove
                 Paul Turner

Members Absent: Chris Christoffersen
                James Gibbons
                Rosemary Hornby
                David Neuman

Others Present: Maggie Burgett
                Michael Fox
                Laura Jones

I.  Review of Minutes - January 7, 1998

Approved with corrections.

II.  Reports

Paul Turner reported on a meeting with Capital Planning and Management Director Michael Rosenthal in which the Phase II schedule and budget were discussed. It was agreed by those present (including Paul Turner, David Neuman, and Tim Portwood) that the project is at a critical stage and significant budget issues need to be resolved in order to avoid additional delays in beginning construction.

Some concern was expressed regarding the resolution of the Phase II budget. Paul Turner and Tim Portwood requested an update on the approval of the loan against future endowment earnings. Members requested a project funding update to be presented at the March 4 Board of Governors’ meeting.
III. Project Update

Maggie Burgett reported the successful completion of the testing of the mock up shear wall at the American Plywood Association laboratory in Tacoma. Testing was supervised and recorded by the project structural engineer, Brett Lizundia. Minor modifications will be made to the design and structural drawings will now be complete. Laura Jones will provide a report on the testing results to the State Office of Historic Preservation, per their request.

Maggie Burgett also reported that Rudolph and Sletton has assigned a new project manager to Hanna House, Ken Vandroff and that Rudolph and Sletton Vice-President of Operations, Martin Sizemore will be overseeing the project in this critical phase. Rudolph and Sletton has submitted detailed budget estimates which are under review by the project team. Contractor and subcontractor bids are expected in March, in time to begin construction in April as planned. County permitting should also be completed in March now that the geological report has been submitted and the structural drawings are nearly finished.

Marilyn Fogel asked what assistance the Board of Governors could provide to the project at this point. Maggie Burgett indicated that the project would be best served by Board input on the prioritization and phasing of the “shopping list” of items that will be added to Phase II once the basic seismic repair items have been covered. The project team will prepare a list of items for the Board to review at a future meeting.

IV. Hobby House Issues

Michael Fox reported that Facilities Operations has been studying two categories of maintenance and repair: 1) the renovation of the proposed student studio apartment in the Hobby House and 2) other maintenance needs that will need to be covered with the limited maintenance funds available over the next two years, including the Hobby House roof. Based on current estimates, Facilities Operations staff recommend delaying the improvements to the student apartment until the full scope of the Hobby House roof repairs are known, as well as the list of Phase II items has been finalized. The new goal is to aim for renovation of the apartment in time to house a student in the next academic year.
TO: Chris Christofferson
Marilyn Fogel
James Gibbons
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood
Jack Rakove
Paul Turner, Chair

FROM: Laura Jones

AGENDA

Wednesday January 7, 1998 - 8:30-10:00 a.m.
Hobby House at the Hanna House

1. Approval of Minutes, Meeting of December 3, 1997
   (Attachment)

2. Reports
   a) New commitment of $50K. - (Milligan family total $150K).
   b) Video - Krishne is now working on visuals for video; does want to meet w/subcommittee.

3. Project Update - April construction commence /discuss w/contractor - goals 1/2 "guaranteed price" geologist report sent to county.

4. Hobby House Issues

5. Phase III Committee

Video - issue of timeframe/visuals.
The meeting was opened by Chairman, Paul Turner.

1. **Review of Minutes - October 29, 1997**

Approved with corrections.

2. **Reports**

Paul Turner gave an update on the video that Kristine Hanna is producing. One of the guidelines that were given to Kristine from the Film Subcommittee was to keep the film no more than 25 minutes in length. Paul did a draft script which was submitted to Kristine. Kristine has been emailing her suggestions and requests to the committee. She has indicated that she wants a longer script with more inclusion of material of Hanna family material. The Film Subcommittee still wants to limit the time and Paul suggests that she will need to cut his script if she wants to add more Hanna information. Laura questioned whether a face to face meeting was necessary, but Paul said with the time constraints, email seems to be working fine. Chris Christofferson agreed that the length as defined is a good one. The Board supports the video length as proposed.

Laura Jones reported that she met with media consultants from Taliesin West and gave them a tour of Hanna House. They want to film it eventually. Their project is several years in the making and they will be sending a full description and proposal of their project.
3. Project Update

Laura Jones reported that a new project manager, Maggie Burgett, has been named for Hanna House.

David Neuman said that Maggie Burgett had been requested for project manager because she has worked with Rudolph & Sletten before and has a good relationship with them.

Laura said that there have been discussions with Kevin Pryor and Deborah Mullen about closing out the Phase I account and opening new accounts for the new Phases II and III.

4. Loan Structure

Chris Christofferson reported that he supports the idea of borrowing construction money from the interest earned by the Nissan fund. This can be paid back over a period of 20 years with variable interest. There is some concern about what is going to happen to the stock market and for future maintenance of the facility a use fee may be needed. An internal loan from the University should make up the difference.

Chris questioned whether the proposal called for using the appreciation as well as the interest. Tim Portwood said that the Provost had said no a year ago.

David said there should be a discussion with Tim Warner before talking to the Provost, but there would need to be a firm number and guaranteed maximum price set first.

5. Phase III Committee

Laura Jones reported that the Committee met prioritized a list of items. Their criteria for prioritizing items was a) Essential, b) Important, c) Desirable but not urgent. Merry Weeks, Michael Fox, and Laura are following up on costs for possible new heater, air conditioner and other items.

The gas was shut off when the retaining wall was built and Merry is negotiating to get it hooked up again. The heat has been turned off since 1989, but there is a question of whether the furnace needs to be replaced and if so, if an air conditioner should be added too. Once the gas is reconnected, the furnace can be tested to see if it needs to be replaced.

An upholsterer is going to give estimates on reupholstering the furniture. David questioned whether the furniture should be a separate issue. He said that it should be in a museum rather than the house since it is very valuable. Paul
Turner pointed out that it is not all FLW furniture and that probably only 15 pieces with 5 chairs are actually FLW. Tim volunteered that he knew a good upholsterer in San Francisco who would give a good price.

Laura suggested that the Board can come up with a philosophy of how to furnish the Hanna House.

Laura reported that for the ceiling in the Dining Room, the project team is looking for grass cloth that is close to the original and questioning whether the celatex can be replaced with something cheaper and more durable. David and Marilyn Fogel agreed that the celatex should be replaced with celatex if the company is still available. Chris suggested that it was an opportunity to get a donation of the celatex from the company.

The Phase III Committee will meet again soon and discuss the furniture, drainage issues, outdoor lighting and security issues, the kitchen and equipment. All ADA issues are still in Phase II.

6. Other

David Neuman questioned what was happening about the possibility of a student living in the apartment at the Hobby House since Housing and Dining is all supporting this project. Also, the neighbors want to have someone living on the premises for safety considerations.

Laura said that there is no hot water at this point. Decisions should be made as to how to choose the student and then decisions need to be made about phone service and other issues.

Chris said that the board should be impaneled to do interviews for choosing the tenant.

Marilyn asked if Rudolph and Sletten had checked their insurance for this.

Paul asked if the tenant had to be a student and David said that the Housing office wants a student.

Chris and David will discuss this with Maggie Burgett and report back to the board in January.

Minutes prepared by Susan Harwood
AGENDA

Wednesday February 4, 1998 - 8:30-10:00 a.m.
Hobby House at the Hanna House

1. Approval of Minutes, Meeting of January 7, 1998 (Attachment)

2. Reports

3. Project Update

4. Hobby House Issues

5. Phase III Committee
The meeting was opened by Chairman, Paul Turner.

1. Review of Minutes - December 3, 1997

   Approved with corrections.

2. Reports

   Tim Portwood reported that another new commitment of $50,000 has come in from the Milligan family in Santa Barbara. With this gift, the Milligans are our largest donors.

   Paul Turner reported on the video project. He has been in email correspondence with Kristine Hanna and told her the committee decisions about length and script. The proposed script seems acceptable to her and she is going forward with the visuals. She suggested that she meet with the subcommittee and the subcommittee agreed to meet with her in the near future.

3. Project Update

   Laura Jones reported that she had spoken to Maggie Burgett and construction was scheduled to start in April. Maggie will be meeting with Rudolph and
Sletten to fine tune beginning and ending dates as well as budgets. The construction will take approximately 6 months.

A geological study has been done and sent to the County which is necessary for the permitting process.

Chris and David are waiting for the project cost before going to the Provost for the loan. This will probably happen in early February.

Tim pointed out that the new money would probably go to Phase II and therefore it would reduce the loan.

Maggie Burgett has introduced herself to the Porteus family next door and wants to set up another neighborhood meeting.

4. Hobby House Issues

Michael Fox reported that they have been meeting and deciding what needs to be done for moving a student into the Hobby House. There is approximately $30,000 available, but there is a question about whether it is enough. There is a roof proposal from Rudolph and Sletten for $18,000 in design fees. Facilities Operation are still working on figuring out the costs for other items to see if they have enough for the next 2 years.

The downstairs kitchen needs improvement, it is an old unit that is now a fire hazard and not up to code. The electrical service in general will be covered by Phase II. Maggie Burgett said that the electrical work to replace the service panel could go through first and she would transfer the money. There are questions about the tile in the bathroom and whether it can be done with a quick fix or needs replacement.

5. Phase III Committee

Laura Jones presented a list from 1990 of all the FLW furniture and its location. There are approximately 17 pieces. Laura has photos of all of the furniture. Some of the furniture was built by Mr. Hanna with Frank Lloyd Wright's approval of the design.

Marilyn recommended finding out what standards there were for other "museum houses" and said that she try to find this out.

John Hanna said that he thought that they would designate one or two areas in the house where things would not be used so that some of the furniture would stay in the house. It was pointed out that there would be a need for security for those pieces and that there would be no full-time staff person. Laura said that the chairs could be alarmed.
Marilyn spoke about the Stanford Museum and that pieces that they had would either be displayed or stored for preservation. Tim said that the museum display would add to the Hanna House experience.

Paul mentioned the Thoreson House in Berkeley which is beautifully preserved although a fraternity lives in it. Marilyn will contact the conservancy there.

It was decided that there was a consensus to keep some furniture in the house.

Discussion started about displaying and storing pieces at the Stanford Museum. Maggie Kimball said that we ought to be moving fast since they are setting it up now.

Laura said that the museum had been talking about what they would do and she had asked for a proposal to present to the board and had not received it, but the curator she was working with is no longer there.

Tim pointed out that it would be mutually beneficial to Hanna House and the museum to have a collaborative relation including docents, loans from Hanna House and loans from the museum.

Paul articulated a consensus that a proposal be made to the museum that 2-3 pieces be placed there if they are being displayed.

Marilyn said that we should check that they would be displayed not just stored. John questioned whether the video might be shown at the museum with the display.

Marilyn is meeting with Patience Young from the museum today and will follow up on these issues.

Minutes prepared by Susan Harwood
Greetings:

The following is a confirmation of the Hanna House Board of Governors Meeting:

When: Friday, February 20, 1998 @ 8:30 - 10:00 a.m.
Where: Hobby House
Attendees: Paul Turner, Chair
Maggie Burgett
Michael Fox for Chris Christofferson
Marilyn Fogel
John P. Hanna
Rosemary Hornby
Laura Jones
Maggie Kimball
Tim Portwood
Jack Rakove

If you have any questions regarding the agenda, kindly contact Paul Turner at 723-3306.
Thank you. Barbara A. Jones, Planning Office 650-723-7773
TO: Chris Christofferson / Marilyn Fogel / James Gibbons / Rosemary Hornby / Maggie Kimball / David Neuman / Tim Portwood / Jack Rakove / Paul Turner, Chair  

FROM: Laura Jones  

AGENDA  

Wednesday December 3, 1997 - 8:30-10:00 a.m.  
Hobby House at the Hanna House  

1. Approval of Minutes, Meeting of October 29, 1997  
   (Attachment)  

2. Reports  

3. Project Update  

4. Loan Structure  
   - Covering the gap - still do not have firm numbers  
     (Note: makes the loan from endowment - variable interest rate / current  
     7%) [does not include dipping into appreciation]  

5. Phase III Committee  
   - List of items made  
     - Costs are being compiled - (new furnace?; feasibility for putting in air conditioning?)  
       - Furnishings costs to be considered  
       - NEW furniture, non-NEW; costs of new furnishings.  

- Video -  

- Funding  
  - still exists - discrepancy between estimates & constructed firm estimates, concern is  
    that costs won't come down.  
    - Check file for furnishings list  

   (pool removal - may be required by county -)  
   Currently not part of Phase III  
   Parking / drainage / landscaping  
   Outdoor lighting -  
   Kitchens & more -  
   (ADA still un part of Phase II)
Hanna House Board of Governors
Minutes
October 29, 1997
Hobby House at the Hanna House

Members Present: Marilyn Fogel
Rosemary Hornby
David Neuman
Tim Portwood
Jack Rackove
Paul Turner

Members Absent: Chris Christofferson
James Gibbons
Maggie Kimball

Others Present: Greg Gehlen
John Hanna
Laura Jones

I. Review of Minutes - September 24, 1997

Approved with corrections.

II. Reports

Marilyn Fogel relayed the complements of the members of the Frank Lloyd Wright Conservancy who visited Hanna House last year, whom she encountered at the Conservancy meeting in Buffalo. Paul Turner added that the resulting goodwill and support for the restoration approach by the Frank Lloyd Wright “establishment” was a notable result.

Laura Jones reported that the Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation is preparing a film project for a new museum at Taliesan West that may include Hanna House. Discussion of the proposal, once it is received, was referred to the Film Committee.

Paul Turner gave an update on the Film Committee activities and ongoing discussions with Kristine Hanna, which he described as very positive. Paul also reported that his Alumni Weekend lecture on Hanna House was well received.
III. Meeting Schedule

Meetings have been moved from the last Wednesday of each month to the first Wednesday for the remainder of Academic Year 97-98. A schedule of meeting dates was distributed.

IV. Project Update

Greg Gehlen reported that the full-size mock-up wall section has been completed for the shear wall tests. The wall will be shipped to the American Plywood Association for testing the first week in December. Greg answered questions about the testing methodology and assured the Board that the testing process would be documented.

David Neuman reported the recommendation from the Finance Committee to explore a loan arrangement to meet a projected $630,000 shortfall for Phase II construction. The loan would be repaid with future income from the Nissan Fund. Facilities Operations, the Controller’s Office and Planning have studied the projected future earnings and operating expenses and feel confident that a 20 year loan could be supported without compromising the ongoing maintenance and preservation needs. Alternatives, in the form of cutting the scope of the Phase II project, were discussed but not recommended. Laura Jones agreed to forward questions regarding the loan arrangement to Chris Christofferson, whose office now manages the Nissan Fund payout so that he may make a report at the December meeting. Paul Turner made a motion to support exploration of the loan concept which was seconded by Tim Portwood and unanimously approved. The next steps will be the report on the loan structure and a recommendation to the Provost regarding project financing early next year.

Fundraising for Phase III was discussed and a Phase III Committee formed to discuss the scope and goals of the Phase III grounds and furnishings restoration project. The Phase III Committee will have a review session and report to the December Board of Governor’s meeting.
TO: Chris Christofferson
    Marilyn Fogel
    James Gibbons
    Rosemary Hornby
    Maggie Kimball
    David Neuman
    Tim Portwood
    Jack Rakove
    Paul Turner, Chair

FROM: Laura Jones

Ex-Officio:
Marlene Bumbera
Greg Gehlen
Greg Gill
John P. Hanna

cc:
Ann Fletcher

AGENDA

Wednesday, October 29, 1997 - 8:30-10:00 a.m.
Hobby House at the Hanna House

1. Approval of Minutes, Meeting of September 24, 1997
   (Attachment)

2. Reports

3. Meeting Schedule

4. Project Update
Stanford University
Hanna House Board of Governors

Minutes of Meeting - September 24, 1997
Hobby House

Members Present: Marilyn Fogel
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman

Marilyn Fogel
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman

Members Absent: C. Christofferson

C. Christofferson

Ex-Officio Present: Marlene Bumbera
Greg Gehlen

Marlene Bumbera
Greg Gehlen

Ex-Officio Absent: Greg Gill

Greg Gill

The meeting was opened by Chairman, Paul Turner.

Paul Turner announced that he will be presenting a modification of his original lecture on the Hanna House to alumni this Saturday, September 27, at 2:30 pm in the Annenberg Auditorium.

Also, Lois Gottleib, a former Frank Lloyd Wright apprentice, will give a lecture on November 20, 1997 at 5:30 pm in Room 2 of the Cummings Art Building. This lecture is co-sponsored by the Hanna House Board of Governors and the Art Department. A reception will follow the lecture, probably in the Art Department lobby. The Planning Office will provide interest cards to be distributed to audiences at each event.

A discussion regarding the need for the Board of Governors to have a modest account for operating expenses, such as the cost of the reception, ensued. At the present time, there are only two accounts. One is the Nissan Fund maintenance account, and the second is the Project account. A third account for the interpretive center and education is envisioned, but the grant application has not yet been submitted.

1. Review of Minutes

The Minutes of August 27, 1997 were amended and approved.
2. **Reports**

a. **Fundraising**

Tim Portwood said that there is a need to devise a strategy to raise the final funding for Phase 3. David Neuman suggested that the Phase 3 items be prioritized, as the half million dollar target will not cover all the items anticipated in Phase 3 due to inflation, and the current high cost of construction.

Tim Portwood asked if the refurbishment of the graduate student's room in the Hobby House could be funded from another source. David Neuman said this is unlikely, but that it might be possible for furnishings to be provided by Housing and Dining.

Laura Jones said that the Nissan Fund's earning statement will be available this week, and that FEMA has not yet transferred their funds for the project. She stated that the grant application for an interpretive and educational grant is nearing completion.

A sub-committee, consisting of Tim Portwood, Paul Turner, Marilyn Fogel and Chris Christofferson (or appointee) was appointed to consider Phase 3 items. A meeting will be coordinated by Laura Jones.

b. **Project Schedule**

Greg Gehlen reported that bids for the project subcontractors are going out, and that drawings are being reviewed by the county. A full-scale mock-up wall is being constructed for testing. He said that there is concern about beginning construction in November because of the anticipated rains. There is the potential for considerable damage if the roof were off during a storm. There may be extra expense if the contractor needs to take elaborate measures to protect the house interior. He said that we may get a construction discount if we delay the onset of construction until March.

David Neuman said that it is very risky to begin demolition before all the sub-contractor bids are in. We need to have a backup plan in case the bids are high. Gehlen said that a cost estimate and contingency will be ready in early October, and that he will ask for two schedules and figures (November construction start, and March construction start). It was pointed out that the Guaranteed Maximum Bid (GMP) of Rudolph and Sletten did not include the sub-contractors' bids. David Neuman suggested that a “Project Finance Committee” composed of Greg Gehlen, Laura Jones, Chris Christofferson and he review and discuss bid options; that if the need exists to tap into Nissan Funds, that enough time is
allowed to process the request through the Provost’s Office and the Board of Trustees.

3. Documentation Proposal

Laura Jones said that the proposal to perform photo documentation through construction was for $2,000. Maggie Kimball has reviewed this proposal, and is considering if the library can assume this obligation.

4. Landscape Plan

The landscape plan will be reviewed by the Phase 3 committee.

5. Film Committee

Paul Turner said that the committee held a meeting to discuss what sort of film (tape) and length was needed. It was decided that the film should be approximately 20-25 minutes in length, and should be a complete record of the whole renovation process. Since that committee meeting, Turner said that he had discussed how this might be done with Kristine Hanna. He said that she is enthusiastic about the project, and is pleased to have some Board support. Turner said he will be helping to prepare an outline and script. He stated that Kristine thinks the film needs to be about 30 minutes long, and not to be all narration; with few if any “talking head” interviews.

Further details will be worked out by the committee and other interested members. Rosemary Hornby said that she would like to join this committee.

Laura Jones said that she is working on a budget, and that if an education account is established, funding will be from that account.

6. Other

It was stated that the Hanna House Board of Governors needs a modest operating account. Laura Jones said that such an account can be set up under the future education account.

Marilyn Fogel said she would give a report on the FLW Conservancy Meeting in Chicago at the October meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 10:10 am.

Minutes prepared by M. Bumbera
TO: Chris Christofferson
     Marilyn Fogel
     James Gibbons
     Rosemary Hornby
     Maggie Kimball
     David Neuman
     Tim Portwood
     Jack Rakove
     Paul Turner, Chair

FROM: Laura Jones

AGENDA

Wednesday, May 28, 1997 - 8:30-10:00 a.m.
Hobby House at the Hanna House

1. Approval of Minutes, Meeting of April 30, 1997 (Attachment)

2. Reports
   - Fundraising
   - Project Manager
   - Other

3. Parking Plan

Meeting w/neighbors → Crucial to have parking plan to present to homeowners (construction parking)

- New project manager to replace Warren Jacobsen
  (Peter Ebert from USC)
- Early June for interviews for construction
- Issue of roof - copper roof - 71 lbs/ft²
  - Granul - 22 lbs/ft²
Is there an issue of putting that much additional weight on the light weight structure? Raised by a master's student (Steele)?

Annual report due to Board in June.
Medline to draft for Paul J.
The meeting was opened by Chairman, Paul Turner.

1. **Review of Minutes**

The Minutes of March 26, 1997 were approved.

2. **Reports**

a. **Fundraising**

Tim Portwood reported that several small gifts have been received, with some of these in response to the information letter that was sent last month by Chair Turner to those who had attended the lectures last year and/or had previously made donations.

b. **Architectural Documents**

Warren Jacobsen said that the Construction documents are 65% completed, and that bids are expected to go out the end of May or early June. The review of contractor’s qualifications, and interviews will be held on May 13th. Jacobsen requested that a member of the Board of Governors serve as one of the reviewing committee. Paul Turner was appointed for this task contingent on his calendar being clear to do so.

Discussion ensued regarding the need to have the construction photographed, both for documentation and future educational purposes. It was deemed
important for the film leading up to the construction which is currently being prepared by Christine Hanna, to have material available to “complete the story”. This video would probably be a good item to have available for sale to future Hanna House visitors. Funding will need to be identified for the photography, and it will need to be determined if there will be black/white archival photos only, color or video. It may be possible to identify a volunteer photographer. Laura Jones will provide instructions for the specifications for archival-quality photographs.

Final interviews of Board members for Christine’s film will be conducted in May.

c. County Permits

Laura Jones said that a letter has been received from the County specifying that a Special Use Permit will be required for the house as the building will be going from a “Residential” to a “Non-Residential” use. The County has, however, granted our request to proceed with acquiring building permits for the restoration prior to submittal of the application for the Special Use Permit.

During the next few months, a parking plan will be prepared, and meetings with the SCRL and neighbors will be held as a part of the application process.

d. Other

Warren Jacobsen said that Stanford has officially received a letter from the Santa Clara Valley Chapter of the American Institute of Architects to act as sponsors of a tour of Stanford during the national convention of the AIA in May, 1998 which is to be held in San Francisco. Senior administration will make a decision as to whether or not Stanford will accede to this request. If so, the Hanna House has been requested as one of the tour destinations.

Marilyn Fogel circulated a copy of the Tokyo National Museum’s catalog describing their presentation of the “World’s Colombian Exposition of 1893”. She said that this depicts items that Wright saw which influenced his designs.

3. Interpretive Program

Marilyn Fogel reported that twelve of the current Museum docents have expressed interest in serving as docents for the Hanna House when it reopens next year. She said that with this many volunteers, it may not be necessary to recruit additional docents.
She said that a training program will need to begin shortly to prepare the docents. In the past, a requirement has been to audit architectural history classes, and that if possible, this should be required again.

Marilyn led a discussion of the number of hours the Board thought should be assigned for tours – both “open” and tours arranged by reservation; whether or not an entrance fee would be levied and how this would be collected; use of fees; transportation to the Hanna House, and how tours would be advertised. Laura Jones said that when the program is completed, it will be reviewed with the Provost’s Office.

Guidelines agreed upon by the Board to guide Fogel in her preparation of a Draft Interpretive Program to submit to the Board, were as follows:

Tours

One afternoon, of four tours, or two afternoons of two tours per week. Each of these “open” tours to accommodate ten people. Group tours by reservation, for example other-university groups, are not included in this schedule. It was estimated that tours by reservation might reach one per month.

Tickets

Ticket price and place(s) of sale to be investigated. Perhaps at the campus and museum bookstores. Funds collected will be used for educational programming, for example in an interpretive center in the House library, sponsorship of a lecture, etc., as was proposed in the project’s funding statement.

Advertising

Advertisement of tours would not be aggressive – perhaps in Wright Sights, and “Sunset” magazine.

Transportation

Transportation to the House for tours will be investigated. In addition to walking, it might be possible to arrange for a “Marguerite” to travel up Frenchman’s Road on tour days if a line is initiated along Mayfield Avenue in the future.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 am.

Minutes prepared by M. Bumbera
 Mon, 28 May 1997

PROJECT SCHEDULE REPORT

Project: 6110  Eq: Hanna House Repair-phase II  Pit Mgr: Jacobsen  GSF: 3,800

PROJECT TIMELINE
DEC 1996 - MAY 1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01• HH -Schematic</td>
<td>12/09/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02• Landscape R Plan</td>
<td>02/10/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03• DD-Main Resid.</td>
<td>12/16/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04• CE/BT/SU/PR</td>
<td>03/03/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05• CD-Main Resid.</td>
<td>06/17/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06• SCC Permit</td>
<td>06/17/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07• Bidding</td>
<td>06/17/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08• Construction</td>
<td>07/22/97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT PHASES & KEY DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase + Activity</th>
<th>curr%</th>
<th>earliest</th>
<th>wks</th>
<th>start</th>
<th>end</th>
<th>notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01• HH -Schematic</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>12/09/96</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>01/20/97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02• Landscape R Plan</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>02/10/97</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>02/10/97</td>
<td>03/31/97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03• DD-Main Resid.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>12/16/96</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>12/16/96</td>
<td>02/10/97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04• CE/BT/SU/PR</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>03/03/97</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>03/03/97</td>
<td>04/07/97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05• CD-Main Resid.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>02/24/97</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>02/24/97</td>
<td>06/16/97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06• SCC Permit</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>06/17/97</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>06/17/97</td>
<td>08/05/97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07• Bidding</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>06/17/97</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>06/17/97</td>
<td>07/22/97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08• Construction</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>07/22/97</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>07/22/97</td>
<td>05/26/98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Garden/Landscape History Synopsis

The Hanna Honeycomb House
Stanford University

Russell A. Beatty, ASLA
Landscape Architect

March, 13, 1995

The Hanna Honeycomb House (1937) and its landscape evolved over a period of nearly 40 years with the active participation of a single ownership, that of Professor Paul and Jean Hanna. The landscape and garden reflect the fusion of inspired site planning and design by Frank Lloyd Wright as well as the needs, desires and care of the Hannas. The involvement of landscape architects came only after the Hannas left for the refinement of plantings (1980) and the enhancement of a new swimming pool (c. 1985).

The terms “landscape” and “garden” are used together here because the property became both a setting (landscape) for this unique house and a garden for the family to enjoy. As such the landscape/garden evolved based on four discernible themes:

1. marriage of site and building
2. landscape as setting for the house
3. Garden as a personal expression of horticultural productivity
4. garden as setting for family activities and entertainment

All of the following stages of landscape and garden development relate to one or more of these themes.

Pre 1936:

Coutts Farm
Grazing land owned by Peter Coutts who planned a French chateau and planted many trees likely to have included the existing Monterey Cypress (Cypress macrocarpa).

1935-37:

Design and Construction of Hanna’s House by Frank Lloyd Wright
House sited carefully among oaks and cypress to afford fine views, capture cooling breezes and warming sun, and to marry house to site.

Initial concept for garden described by FLW on drawings (“flower boxes filled with...low lying junipers to overhang edge...trumpet vines or English ivy...trained on all trellises” and massed evergreens along the driveway with a grass terrace above the wall near the two oaks.

1937-40:

Garden planted by Hannas to include pyracantha hedge, junipers, fruit trees (some 60 varieties of trees and shrubs) and lawns.

Terrace confined to house perimeter; brick path from south terrace to barbecue; high wooden fence along west side of south lawn.

1940-45:

Victory garden below front terrace.
1952: Construction of paved driveway, parking area and brick wall and steps to playroom terrace; floodlights in parking area.

Planting of rose hedge and junipers along driveway.

1952-61: Planting continues (Arizona cypress, pyracantha, hedge along playroom terrace; plowshare fountain installed by PRH in brick planter box.

Drinking fountain and horseshoe seat wall (date unknown).

1961-62: Wooden fence and brick walk removed; Cascade, Garden House, brick retaining walls built and bedroom terrace extended; removable chess tables installed; lawn triangle replaces with tree stump fountain and river rock.

1963: Japanese urn installed from Imperial Hotel, Tokyo.


1980: Garden Master Plan by Peter Shaw, Landscape Architect of Palo Alto; extent of improvements not known.

1985: Swimming pool installed by Aquarius Pools

1987: Swimming pool area enhanced with brick steps, walls, iron security fence, enlarged pool terrace and new plantings by Jack Stafford, Landscape Architect.

1993: Valley Oak below front terrace falls due to crown rot.
Maggie, Here is the landscape chronology that was done by Russell Beatty. It should give you an idea of the type of information we are looking for. Please call with any questions and thank you very much for your help.
AGENDA

Wednesday, April 30, 1997 - 8:30-10:00 a.m.
Hobby House at the Hanna House

1. Approval of Minutes, Meeting of March 25, 1997
(Attachment)

2. Reports
   • Fundraising
   • Architectural Documents -
   • County Permits
   • Other -
     AIA mtg May '98 -

3. Interpretive program -
   - Tours by schedule -
   - Tours by reservation -

May 13 - mtg w/ contractors
check fax from Krishna
-> (Men's box)

Documentation of construction process -
photo plus written documentation

World's Columbian Exposition of
1893 Revised
19thc. Japanese art shown
in Chicago USA

Tokyo National Museum
1957
Stanford University
Hanna House Board of Governors

Minutes of Meeting - April 26, 1997
Hobby House

Members Present: Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman

Tim Portwood
Paul Turner, Chair

Members Absent: Chris Christofferson
Marilyn Fogel

James Gibbons
Jack Rakove

Ex-Officio Present: Marlene Bumbera
John Hanna

Warren Jacobsen
Laura Jones

Ex-Officio Absent: Mark Jones

The meeting was opened by Chairman, Paul Turner.

1. **Review of Minutes**

The Minutes of January 29, 1997 were approved with corrections.

2. **Reports**

a. **Fundraising**

Warren Jacobsen said that when he last talked to Tim Portwood, there were no additional contributions to report. He also said that Phase 3 (furnishings and landscaping) will not begin until funding is in hand.

b. **Architectural Documents**

Warren Jacobsen reiterated that the Board of Trustees have approved the project, and that since the project is estimated to be under $3 million, new procedures recently adopted by the Board will allow the project to receive Construction approval without going to the full Board – it will be reviewed by a sub-committee.

He said that Design Development drawings are being reviewed. A Request for Proposal (RFP) will be issued to approximately three contractors in order to pre-qualify them to receive a bid package. Firms currently being considered are Dinwiddie, Plant Construction, and Rudolph & Sletten.
Firms will be interviewed, and if necessary, work comparable to that expected on the Hanna House will be viewed (finish carpentry; woodworking, quality of craftsmanship, etc.) It is expected that the Bids will be received the end of May.

It was suggested that one member of the Board of Governors be a member of the Contractor Pre-Qualification Committee, in addition to Ex-Officio members involved in the process.

Jacobsen reported that the American Plywood Association of Tacoma, Washington will donate their testing of the strengthening method for interior walls.

c. County Permits

Laura Jones said that a Conditional Use Permit will be required by Santa Clara County for the project, as when complete, the building will be going from a "Residential" to a "Non-Residential" use. A request will be made to the County to submit the use permit application after construction begins -- and that it not be tied to the Building Permit, as is usually the case. This will allow time to prepare a submittal which will include neighbors' comments, etc. She said that the first thing to be done is to prepare a parking plan, and this will need to reflect any changes to the driveway and landscaping. It could be a combination of on-site parking, valet parking or shuttle from the central campus area, depending on the type of event.

The protocol is to work through Faculty/Staff Housing Office and the Stanford Campus Residential Leaseholders (SCRL). Laura has a meeting with a task force from the SCRL dealing with Junipero Serra Boulevard, and its spillover parking issues along Frenchman's Road. Some of the solutions to current parking problems on Frenchman’s Road may influence how the Hanna House Parking Plan is finalized. The next step will be to submit the Parking Plan to Faculty/Staff Housing. From there it will go to the SCRL, and then to the neighbors and our presentation to them.

3. Planning Elements

a. Operations

Laura Jones stated that the goal is to complete an operations plan and a Draft of an operating handbook within the next six months.

b. Furnishings

An assessment needs to be made to determine details of House furnishings. Ruth Todd, of the Planning Office, will be preparing pictorial/graphic options for different eras, listing furniture that we have
in storage for each; recommending additional pieces, if needed, etc. A presentation will be made to the Board to discuss the various options.

c. Landscape

Laura reported that the Landscape Architect, Cheryl Barton, has been researching some of the landscaping issues. These include a study of how to treat the pool/drive and parking area. The Board recommended that both the filling in of the pool, and its complete demolition be studied as to cost. Warren Jacobsen reiterated that the pool removal, currently estimated at $25,000-$35,000 is not in the current Phase 2 Construction budget. He noted that if Phase 3 fundraising is successful, Phase 3 items, such as the pool demolition might be completed during Phase 2.

d. Interpretation

Laura Jones said that Marilyn Fogel will be focusing on the docent’s training program, visitor plan, displays, etc.

4. Newsletter

Marlene Bumbera said that a database has been completed with the names and addresses of all those completing interest cards at last year’s lectures and the Taliesin/Conservancy Meeting and Tour to the Hanna House. Since we had promised to keep these (almost 300) people informed of our progress, she solicited ideas for contacting them. Discussion favored a letter, in the form of a progress report, from Chairman Turner. It was pointed out that it would be more appropriate for an on-going newsletter to be undertaken at a later date, perhaps under the aegis of the docents.

5. Other Business

Warren Jacobsen said that in May 1998, the American Institute of Architects (AIA) will be holding their national convention in San Francisco. The organizing committee has asked that Stanford be one of the destinations for a tour during the convention period. They have also expressed great interest in having a tour of the Hanna House as a part of the Stanford tour. As there is more information, he will keep the Board apprised.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 am.

Minutes prepared by M. Bumbera
TO: Chris Christofferson
Marilyn Fogel
James Gibbons
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood
Jack Rakove
Paul Turner, Chair

Ex-Officio:
Marlene Bumbera
John P. Hanna
Warren Jacobsen
Mark Jones

cc: Ann Fletcher

FROM: Laura Jones

AGENDA

Wednesday, March 26, 1997 - 8:30-10:00 a.m.
Hobby House at the Hanna House

1. Approval of Minutes, Meeting of January 29, 1997
   (Attachment)

2. Reports
   - Fundraising
   - Architectural Documents - Construction documents ready by end of May
   - County Permits
   - Other

3. Planning Elements
   - Operations
   - Furnishings - how to furnish house - plan
   - Landscape
   - Interpretation

4. Newsletter - call, email Marlene

Frenchmen's Triangle - make into path?
or, 4-5 lots might be possible in upper part

"Groundbreaking" Ceremony - July?
Construction process - late June/early July?
The meeting was opened by Laura Jones (and turned over to Chairman, Paul Turner on his arrival).

1. **Review of Minutes**

   The Minutes of November 21, 1996 were approved with corrections.

2. **Reports**

   a. **Retaining Wall**

      Warren Jacobsen reported that the retaining wall has been completed with a couple of modifications. Some asphalt has not been laid because it would need to be removed during construction of the steps in the summer. The mortar color and cap are being reviewed with the contractor, and may be replaced. Jacobsen said that although the modifications added cost to the project, the overall bid was lower than expected, and the project is essentially on budget.

   b. **Hobby House Use**

      Laura Jones stated that a letter has been received from Provost Condoleezza Rice stating that with construction beginning in the summer, that she does
not think it worthwhile to open Hobby House to events for just a few months, and that when the property is fully ready and a management plan in place that would be the time to begin these operations.

c. FEMA - Section 106 Review

Laura Jones also related that the meeting with SHPO two weeks ago went well. One of the questions brought up in the meeting was in the way that plywood would be used within the stud system as seismic bracing. There were questions both as to its bracing value, and the method for fastening (screws versus nails). Steve Farneth, of ARG said that the engineers will need to make both a replica and a full scale mock-up to evaluate these issues.

d. Program Approval

Paul Turner said that Mark Jones and he had met with the University Cabinet on January 16th, after first meeting with the Provost and receiving her approval. With funding for the seismic work for Hanna House resolved, the Cabinet did not have any questions except for the President's inquiry on how the fundraising was proceeding. Program Approval will be requested from the Board of Trustees at their February 10th meeting.

Warren Jacobsen described how the funding plan has been revised. He said that the seismic repair of the Hanna House has been separated out from the furnishings, landscape improvements and Hobby House work. With this phasing plan, we currently have enough funding (without going into principal of the Nissan Fund) to complete the seismic work. Phase 1 work (Retaining Wall, etc.) has been completed; Phase 2 will be the actual repair of the Hanna House, and Phase 3 will consist of furnishings, landscape and Hobby House. Phase 3 improvements will be under the dollar limits, and will not need to have Board approvals, so can proceed as funding is received. Jacobsen pointed out that if funding is identified, Phase 3 work can occur concurrently with Phase 2 construction.

3. Project Funding

Tim Portwood reported that as of today, $666,376 has been raised in gifts and pledges since January, 1995. Prior to December 31, 1994, $17,000 in gifts had been received. He said that Nissan USA has decided not to make any additional gift, but has stated that they have no objection to removing principal from the Nissan Endowment, if we find it necessary, and that they are willing to write a letter stating so.

Alternative endowment possibilities are being pursued, including the possibility of a $500,000 gift for Phase 3 projects, and the naming of the Hobby House meeting room.
A discussion ensued as to the appropriateness of naming a room. Comments as to any potential room title, such as the “ABC Conference Center” were rejected in favor for a room designation, e.g. “ABC Conference Room”. John Hanna said that he feels that a room designation should be at least $500,000 in value. There being no strong objections to this fund raising plan, Tim was encouraged to proceed.

4. Other Business

Marilyn Fogel inquired when public tours of the house might begin. Warren Jacobsen said that they could begin in June, 1998 if construction proceeds as expected. Marilyn said that the education program goals should be discussed, and requested that this be placed on an early agenda.

Maggie Kimball said that Stanford Magazine will be publishing an article on the Hanna House in the next issue. She asked if the text could be reviewed and brought up to date, that is to inform readers that the project has been approved, etc. Warren Jacobsen said that he will call the article reporter, Larry Gordon, and see if an update or a sidebar can be added to the article.

5. Architectural Update

Steve Farneth, of Architectural Resources Group (ARG) said that measure drawings have been completed, and that the early assumptions relating to the seismic repair seem to have been correct.

Farneth gave a brief explanation of how disabled access relates to historic buildings, and described several options which had been investigated:

a. Hanna House

Originally, the scheme was to utilize a lift in the carport area to provide disabled access to the patio area for upper level (dining room) access, and the front door for lower area access. This plan has been re-evaluated, and it now seems more feasible to delete the lift, and provide a ramp through the carport’s northern 2-step area to give patio access. This plan has several advantages – it would remove the lift, which would be very obvious; eliminate the need for lift maintenance, and will allow the carport area to maintain its present character. It will also be easier to designate the upper parking level for handicapped parking. John Hanna asked if it is possible to have a portable ramp (wood) up the steps. Farneth said that this is a probable solution, and has the advantage of being reversible.

ARG recommends converting the carport storage room to a caterer’s staging area and a disabled access toilet. This would mean that modifications would not need to be made to the House powder room.
Farneth said that he, Laura Jones and Warren Jacobsen had met with caterers regarding carport area and kitchen needs. Recommendations from the caterers as to electric service requirements in the carport area (for plugging in the food catering carts for outdoor events), as well kitchen requirements for indoor dining were solicited. It is the Provost Office's desire that formal dining opportunities return to the Hanna House, and that "brought-in" food is not acceptable.

To provide formal dining, the caterers would need to be able to cook in the kitchen, not just bring in food for reheating. While the working area is limited, state-of-the-art appliances could be installed which would alleviate concerns about grease and/or smoke stains on the redwood walls. The installation of a second dishwasher is another request.

Laura Jones pointed out that it is not the intent to remodel the kitchen in any way, but since new equipment will be needed in any event, now is the time to specify what equipment is to be installed.

Members discussed the proposal. While there was no disagreement regarding the limited cooking that might take place in the kitchen, it was also pointed out that the Board expects that the majority of events would be of food distribution from the carport area.

The point was raised that caterers tend to spill foods and liquids (staff turn-over), and that the issue of Hanna House kitchen-prepared food should be discussed by the Provost and the caterer as to providing this service responsibly in a historic building before proceeding.

Also mentioned was the fact that the kitchen is immediately adjacent to the dining room, and that there is no easy way to acoustically buffer the kitchen.

The Board did not agree or disagree with the concept, but would like further information regarding the caterer's responsibilities to the House and whether or not kitchen noise is acceptable.

b. Hobby House

While the original plan had been to exclude Hobby House from ADA considerations, it has been found that with a minimum of grading, it is possible to put a path on the western perimeter of the lot which could be integrated into a landscape plan. The path could be made of grass-crete, and be almost invisible. Such a path would need to be "assisted access", but this is not a problem because there will not be any "independent access" in any event, as all access to either Hanna House or Hobby House will be either with a group or a guided tour.
If a path is put in, then it is also possible to adapt the bathroom in the Hobby House (by removal of the shower, which is a recent installation) for a disabled access toilet facility.

The meeting adjourned at 10:25 am.

Minutes prepared by M. Bumbera
TO: Chris Christofferson
Marilyn Fogel
James Gibbons
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood
Jack Rakove
Paul Turner, Chair

FROM: Laura Jones

AGENDA

Wednesday, January 29, 1997 - 8:30-10:00 a.m.
Hobby House at the Hanna House

1. Approval of Minutes, Meeting of November 21, 1996
(Attachment)

2. Reports
   - Retaining Wall - Completed, $5-6 w/Arts.
   - Hobby House - Like from Provost.
   - Section 106 Consultation - Successful.
   - Program Approval - UC Cabinet mtg
   - Other

3. Project Funding –

4. Architectural Update — Steve Farneth —
   Disabled access issues
   - Bathroom proposal for storage room off entry
   - Stair issues
   - Mop over 2 steps to house
   - Fundraising: $666,376. as of 1/29/97
   - Funds raised/committed: 1/1/95 - 1/29/97

   > Milligan Family: $100K
   > Marsh & Gretchen & B. Milligan
   > Reid Dennis & wife: $100K
Hanna House Board of Governors
Minutes
November 21, 1996
Hobby House at the Hanna House

Members Present: Marilyn Fogel
Jim Gibbons
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
Tim Portwood
Jack Raškove
Paul Turner

Members Absent: Chris Christofferson
David Neuman

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

I. Review of Minutes - October 31, 1996

Approved.

II. Reports

Warren Jacobsen reported on the status of the retaining wall construction, which is nearly complete. He also reported that Architectural Resources Group is at work preparing construction documents.

Tim Portwood reported that the fundraising campaign has received several new major gifts, bringing the total to nearly $600,000.

Laura Jones reported that representatives of FEMA and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation would be visiting the campus, and had asked for a tour of the house. We expect their support for the repair proposal in the Section 106 consultation that is required to collect the FEMA award for the repair project.
Jack Rackove reported that he will be in England Winter Quarter.

III. **Hobby House Reactivation**

Paul Turner reported his conversation with Provost Rice inviting her to use Hobby House for events in the period prior to construction. Warren Jacobsen and Laura Jones will follow up on this proposal with the Provost's staff. Laura Jones distributed a draft of guidelines for the use of Hobby House and asked for comments.

IV. **Program Approval**

Mark Jones described the process for taking the project to the Board of Trustees for Program Approval at the February meeting. The key will be to have the project financing proposal prepared and accepted by the Provost. Laura Jones presented the operating cost estimate prepared by Facilities Operations staff and reported that no scholarship will be required (or allowed under University rules) for the student caretaker.

A general discussion followed regarding the use of Nissan Fund income for the construction project. It was generally accepted that income from the fund should be used but the use of principal for the repair project is less attractive. However, the Board felt that the fund principal could be used, with the Provost's approval, under the intent of the gift. Jim Gibbons advised that the Provost would be more likely to approve use of Nissan fund principal than to draw on Facilities Reserve funds. An working group was formed to prepare the financing proposal for provostial review, composed of David Neuman, Chris Christofferson, Paul Turner, Mark Jones, and Warren Jacobsen.
Hanna House Seismic Repair and Strengthening - Revised Concept and Program Approval

That this committee recommends:

A) Approval of the revised concept and program for the seismic repair and conservation of historical features and adaptive reuse of the building.

B) That the total project budget of $1,740,000 be authorized.

C) That the funding be authorized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gifts and Pledges in hand</td>
<td>$664,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td>384,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spendable Income from the Nissan Endowment</td>
<td>692,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background:

A) Previous Board Actions

In April 1996, the Board approved the concept for the seismic repair and conservation of historical features and adaptive reuse of building and grounds for the Hanna House. This house was designed by Frank Lloyd Wright with Paul and Jean Hanna in 1935 and was their residence from 1937 to 1975 when the entire complex was bequeathed to Stanford University.

B) Overview

In order to align scope with available funding, the Hanna House Board of Governors proposes to reduce scope to only include seismic strengthening and repairs to damages caused by the Loma Prieta earthquake. A subsequent non-Board level project will follow that will address grounds and furnishings restoration as funding becomes available.

C) Program

The proposed repair and strengthening concept is intended to repair damage caused by the Loma Prieta earthquake. It will also improve the anticipated seismic performance of the main residence to be consistent with Stanford’s “Class C” objectives. Class “C” is intended to provide reasonable life safety protection. It will serve as a reduction in the risk of collapse, thus permitting the reopening of the building.

In addition to providing the requisite level of seismic protection, the proposed concept is designed to meet stringent preservation goals and cause little impact on the existing historical fabric.

The proposed program allows for preservation of the existing chimneys and minimization of disassembly of impacted architectural elements, such as built-in cabinets and porches. A goal is to eliminate any visible evidence of strengthening work, (except where damaged elements such as terrace and living room slabs will temporarily be removed to allow for re-leveling and repair) and eliminate the need to modify existing architectural trim to accommodate structural work. The proposed uses
of the Hanna House are responsive to the historic character of the buildings, furnishings and landscape features. The mixtures of proposed uses for the site include tours, University seminars, small scale University entertaining, cultural events, and limited residential uses for distinguished visitors and a possible live-in graduate student. All work at this complex will preserve the evolutionary character of the building from 1937 to 1975. The project will conform to the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation.

The square footage totals for the revised concept and program are as follows:

Area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Total (gsf)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Residence</td>
<td>3,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basement</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carport Storage Area</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D) Cost and Funding

The total project budget for the seismic strengthening and repair is $1,740,000. The Hanna House has an endowment fund for maintenance, preservation and improvement of the house and grounds, created through a gift by the Nissan Corporation received in 1977. The current market value of the Nissan Fund is $2,368,270.00. The project will draw on spendable interest income from the Nissan Fund endowment during the period that the house is closed and under construction, through FY 97-98. The Nissan Fund will generate more than sufficient income in FY 98-99 and subsequent years to support ongoing operating costs and routine repairs.

Funding Strategy for the seismic strengthening and repair budget is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gifts and Pledges in hand</td>
<td>$664,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td>$384,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spendable Income from the Nissan Endowment</td>
<td>$692,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,740,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E) Schedule/Timing

Design efforts are currently underway with the project scheduled to be resubmitted to the Board for construction approval in June of 1997. Project completion is scheduled for June of 1998.

F) Detailed Cost Estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Construction</td>
<td>$1,048,000</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Contingency</td>
<td>$157,000</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Professional Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Architect</td>
<td>$298,000</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Other Consultants</td>
<td>$82,000</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Stanford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) SU Recharge Costs</td>
<td>$139,000</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Chris Christofferson
    Marilyn Fogel
    James Gibbons
    Rosemary Hornby
    Maggie Kimball
    David Neuman
    Tim Portwood
    Jack Rakove
    Paul Turner, Chair

FROM: Laura Jones

AGENDA

Wednesday, January 29, 1997 - 8:30-10:00 a.m.
Hobby House at the Hanna House

1. Approval of Minutes, Meeting of November 21, 1996
   (Attachment)

2. Reports
   • Retaining Wall
   • Hobby House
   • Section 106 Consultation
   • Program Approval
   • Other

3. Project Funding

4. Architectural Update

Ex-Officio:
Marlene Bumbera
John P. Hanna
Warren Jacobsen
Mark Jones

cc:
Ann Fletcher
Hanna House Board of Governors
Minutes
November 21, 1996
Hobby House at the Hanna House

Members Present: Marilyn Fogel
Jim Gibbons
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
Tim Portwood
Jack Rackove
Paul Turner

Members Absent: Chris Christofferson
David Neuman

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

I. Review of Minutes - October 31, 1996

Approved.

II. Reports

Warren Jacobsen reported on the status of the retaining wall construction, which is nearly complete. He also reported that Architectural Resources Group is at work preparing construction documents.

Tim Portwood reported that the fundraising campaign has received several new major gifts, bringing the total to nearly $600,000.

Laura Jones reported that representatives of FEMA and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation would be visiting the campus, and had asked for a tour of the house. We expect their support for the repair proposal in the Section 106 consultation that is required to collect the FEMA award for the repair project.
Jack Rackove reported that he will be in England Winter Quarter.

III. **Hobby House Reactivation**

Paul Turner reported his conversation with Provost Rice inviting her to use Hobby House for events in the period prior to construction. Warren Jacobsen and Laura Jones will follow up on this proposal with the Provost's staff. Laura Jones distributed a draft of guidelines for the use of Hobby House and asked for comments.

IV. **Program Approval**

Mark Jones described the process for taking the project to the Board of Trustees for Program Approval at the February meeting. The key will be to have the project financing proposal prepared and accepted by the Provost. Laura Jones presented the operating cost estimate prepared by Facilities Operations staff and reported that no scholarship will be required (or allowed under University rules) for the student caretaker.

A general discussion followed regarding the use of Nissan Fund income for the construction project. It was generally accepted that income from the fund should be used but the use of principal for the repair project is less attractive. However, the Board felt that the fund principal could be used, with the Provost's approval, under the intent of the gift. Jim Gibbons advised that the Provost would be more likely to approve use of Nissan fund principal than to draw on Facilities Reserve funds. An working group was formed to prepare the financing proposal for provostial review, composed of David Neuman, Chris Christofferson, Paul Turner, Mark Jones, and Warren Jacobsen.
TO: Chris Christofferson
Marilyn Fogel
James Gibbons
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood
Jack Rakove
Paul Turner, Chair

Ex-Officio:
Marlene Bumbera
John P. Hanna
Warren Jacobsen
Mark Jones

FROM: Laura Jones

AGENDA

Thursday, November 21, 1996 - 8:30-10:00 a.m.
Hobby House at the Hanna House

1. Approval of Minutes, Meeting of October 31, 1996
   (Attachment)

2. Reports

3. Opening Hobby House
   - moving forward on making Hobby House available

4. Moving Forward to Program Approval
   - operating cost estimate - moving prep for estimate
   - student caretaker
   - endowment spending
   - next steps

5. FEMA/ACHP Visit

   $413,000 - gifts & pledge
   (365,000 funds considered out there)
   $500,000 - Construction for fundraising
   $1 - 1.3M target
Minutes of Meeting - October 31, 1996
Hobby House

Members Present:  Alan Cummings
                  for Chris Christofferson
                  Marilyn Fogel
                  Maggie Kimball
                  David Neuman
                  Tim Portwood
                  Paul Turner, Chair

Members Absent:   Rosemary Hornby
                  James Gibbons
                  Jack Rakove

Ex-Officio Present:  Marlene Bumbera
                  John Hanna
                  Warren Jacobsen
                  Laura Jones

Ex-Officio Absent:  Mark Jones

Others Present:    Merry Weeks

Chairman, Paul Turner, opened the meeting.

1.  Review of Minutes

   The Minutes of September 27, 1996 were approved.

2.  Reports

   a.  Architectural Progress

      Warren Jacobsen reported on the progress of the architectural drawings.
      He said that the As-Builts for both the Main House and Hobby House are
      almost complete, and that Schematic drawings will be submitted for
      Board review in November. The architects are on schedule, and working
      drawings will be completed in mid-Spring.

      Jacobsen also said that the Board of Trustees will receive the request for
      Program Approval in February, and Construction Approval will be
      submitted to the Trustees at their June meeting. These dates are
      contingent on funding plans being complete.

   b.  Retaining Wall

      Jacobsen said that the retaining wall has been straightened approximately
      4 1/2 to 5 inches, so it is almost plumb. The brick veneer will be
      reapplied. It was discovered that drainage from the back yard had been
routed under the carport and drained into the area being repaired. Re-routing of this drainage has become a part of the project. The area will be backfilled, and will be complete.

c. **FEMA - Section 106 Review**

Laura Jones said that prior to release of the FEMA funding allocated to the project, the Historic Preservation Act requires a final review to assure that little impact will occur under the proposed renovation plan. A meeting will be scheduled in November for this review. It should be planned that Chairman, Paul Turner, and members of the Historical Society be present at this review, particularly Board member, Rosemary Hornby.

In addition, it was suggested that the National Park Service be notified on the status of the project.

d. **Conference Facilities at Hobby House**

Following up on the recommendation to activate conference facilities at Hobby House, David Neuman stated that he had talked with the Provost about the plan, and she has agreed. Rice has stated that she has no one available for scheduling the Hobby House, so details will need to be worked out. Chair Turner is to contact the Provost to begin the process. Laura Jones said that she will excerpt use guidelines from the operating guidelines document for the Hobby House so they can be tested when the facility is opened for use. Furnishings will need to be arranged — acquire a conference table, and move the boxed furnishings — perhaps to the lower level.

e. **Financial Statement**

Warren Jacobsen distributed several financial summaries. The first was the overall financial status of all accounts for fiscal year 1995-96. Another was the financial summary of the Nissan Endowment, and potential for using some of the endowment to fund the short-fall for renovation construction. Several options to complete the fundraising effort and completely fund the seismic repair and renovations to the Hanna House were discussed. It was determined that a funding scheme needs to be finalized in December in order for the Board of Trustees to hear the item at their February meeting.

Tim Portwood said that an anonymous contributor from Chicago has donated $100,000 and that another local contributor has indicated that a $50,000 to $100,000 contribution can be expected. Portwood said that there are good-prospects for both a Student Fellowship Endowment, and a Maintenance Endowment, as named gifts.
f. Maintenance Costs

Laura Jones said that an estimate of future operating expenses has been made by Facilities Operations. It is expected that $60,000 will be needed each year for operating expenses; $12,000 each year to be put aside in a sinking fund for unusual or replacement expenses, and an additional $20,000 per year will be needed to maintain a student caretaker. She also said that some income ($30,000 to $50,000) might be expected in fees when fully operational, although it may be necessary to fund an employee for scheduling with fee income produced.

John Hanna inquired if the projected maintenance costs include earthquake and fire insurance. Alan Cummings said that the spreadsheet produced for maintenance did include insurance, but that it should be reviewed, as it is probably not high enough.

Hanna also asked if improvements to the landscaping are included in the project costs. Warren Jacobsen said that there is $35,000 allocated for landscape work, not including the removal of the swimming pool. It was suggested that this figure would need to be increased.

Action Items:

1) Warren Jacobsen and Tim Portwood are to investigate the mechanism for removing dollars from the Nissan Endowment.

2) Warren Jacobsen is to abstract the construction budget to the core amount for basic restoration, with other items and a contingency reflecting a possible 10 to 20% rise in construction costs.

3) An operating pro forma that includes insurance and scheduling staffing (portion of an FTE) is to be prepared.

All this information is to be prepared for Board of Governors review and approval at the meeting on November 21st. The plan is then to be presented to the Provost in December by Chairman Turner, David Neuman, Chris Christofferson and Mark Jones. This meeting is to be scheduled immediately.

3. Other Business

1. Warren Jacobsen distributed a copy of a letter he received from The Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation in thanks for their tour of the Hanna House last month.

Marilyn Fogel said that she had attended the annual meeting of the Conservancy and that she had received positive remarks on the tour.
2. Paul Turner said that he had given his talk on the Hanna House two times to alumni during Homecoming. He said both sessions were well attended and that additional interest/donor cards had been distributed, collected and transmitted to Tim Portwood.

3. If a student resident scholarship should be established, what department will administer it – should it be the Provost’s Office?

4. Assuming that the Hobby House will be operational early next year, it will be necessary to inform the neighbors of these plans. A neighborhood meeting should be scheduled for January or February, at the latest.

5. A special notice is to be sent to members of the Board via E-Mail or FAX as soon as possible informing them that the November meeting of the Board of Governors is extremely important. That decisions will need to be made, and plans finalized since there is no December meeting scheduled.

The meeting adjourned at 9:50 am.

Minutes prepared by M. Bumbera
### PROJECT COST AND TIME SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>6110</th>
<th>Eq: Hanna House Repair-phase I</th>
<th>Pjt Mgr</th>
<th>Jacobsen</th>
<th>GSF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1A. Basic Construction (Prime Consultant’s Scope)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Pct</th>
<th>$ / SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>$1,122,287</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment in Contract</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal (1A1 thru 1A2)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,122,287</strong></td>
<td><strong>49.7%</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Pct</th>
<th>$ / SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Work</td>
<td>31,512</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal (1A1 thru 1A3)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,153,799</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.1%</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Pct</th>
<th>$ / SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Escalation</td>
<td>207,026</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic Construction Budget (1A)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,360,825</strong></td>
<td><strong>60.3%</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1B. Other Construction  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Pct</th>
<th>$ / SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixtures, Furniture &amp; Equipment (FF&amp;E)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>382,848</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford Costs</td>
<td>173,740</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activation</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Subtotal (1 thru 5)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,048,263</strong></td>
<td><strong>90.8%</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Pct</th>
<th>$ / SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Contingency</td>
<td>208,151</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford Infrastructure Program (SIP)*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• campus plan &amp; facility improvements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• parking / transportation system</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Replacement Parking spaces | 0.0% | ? |

9. Other Project Costs | 0.0% | ? |

**Total Project Budget** | **$2,256,414** | **100.0%** | ? |

* All academic, auxiliary, Stanford Management Company development within SIP boundaries, capital and renovation projects will be assessed the 9% fee except renovation projects of less than $750,000 construction cost.

Prepared by:  
Reviewed by:  
Approved by:

Date:  
Date:  
Date:

November 21, 1996  
CATS Summary Report
# PROJECT COST AND TIME SUMMARY

## Project: 6110 Eq: Hanna House Repair-phase I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Pct</th>
<th>$ / SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A. Basic Construction (Prime Consultant's Scope)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Building</td>
<td>$1,122,287</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Equipment in Contract</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal (1A1 thru 1A2)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,122,287</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.6%</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Site Work</td>
<td>31,512</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal (1A1 thru 1A3)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,153,799</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.2%</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Construction Escalation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic Construction Budget (1A)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,153,799</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.2%</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B. Other Construction</td>
<td>26,850</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Construction Budget (1)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,180,649</strong></td>
<td><strong>58.5%</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fixtures, Furniture &amp; Equipment (FF&amp;E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Not in Construction Contract)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Professional Services</td>
<td>382,848</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Stanford Costs</td>
<td>173,740</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Activation</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Subtotal (1 thru 5)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,841,237</strong></td>
<td><strong>91.2%</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Project Contingency</td>
<td>177,097</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Stanford Infrastructure Program (SIP)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* campus plan &amp; facility improvements</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* parking / transportation system</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Replacement Parking</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other Project Costs</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Budget</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,018,334</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All academic, auxiliary, Stanford Management Company development within SIP boundaries, capital and renovation projects will be assessed the 9% fee except renovation projects of less than $750,000 construction cost.*

Prepared by: __________________________ Date: ________________
Reviewed by: __________________________ Date: ________________
Approved by: __________________________ Date: ________________

November 21, 1996 CATS Summary Report
## FINANCIAL SUMMARY - HANNA HOSE FUNDS

### SPENDABLE FUNDS FROM NISSAN ENDOWMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources:</th>
<th>FY 1993-94</th>
<th>FY 1994-95</th>
<th>FY 1995-96</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance 9/1</td>
<td>$184,066</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$87,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Allocation</td>
<td>$83,110</td>
<td>$111,194</td>
<td>$109,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sources</strong></td>
<td><strong>$267,176</strong></td>
<td><strong>$111,194</strong></td>
<td><strong>$196,407</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Account</td>
<td>$23,823</td>
<td>$21,272</td>
<td>$14,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Project Acct. 9VDQ047</td>
<td>$246,250</td>
<td>$2,897</td>
<td>$133,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Uses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$270,073</strong></td>
<td><strong>$24,169</strong></td>
<td><strong>$148,337</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>($2,897)</td>
<td>$87,025</td>
<td>$48,070</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OPERATION & MAINTENANCE FUND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer In</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$29,288</td>
<td>$28,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use During Year</td>
<td>$23,823</td>
<td>$21,272</td>
<td>$14,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount Returned</td>
<td>$11,177</td>
<td>$8,016</td>
<td>$14,009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FUND BALANCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></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>
<td>$641,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Value</td>
<td>$1,909,057</td>
<td>$2,061,750</td>
<td>$2,368,272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EARTHQUAKE PROJECT ACCOUNTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Account:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount Funded</td>
<td>$568,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitments thru 8/96</td>
<td>$260,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures thru 8/95</td>
<td>$246,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncommitted Balance</td>
<td>$61,491</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Account:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount Funded</td>
<td>$217,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitments</td>
<td>$217,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>$217,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncommitted Balance</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MWD-Finance Support Services 10/31/96
TO: Chris Christoffersen  
   Marilyn Fogel  
   James Gibbons  
   Rosemary Hornby  
   Maggie Kimball  
   David Neuman  
   Tim Portwood  
   Jack Rakove  
   Paul Turner, Chair  

FROM: Laura Jones  

AGENDA  

Thursday, October 31, 1996 - 8:30-10:00 a.m.  
Hobby House at the Hanna House  

1. Approval of Minutes, Meeting of September 26, 1996  
   (Attachment)  

2. Reports  
   Architectural drawings  
   Retaining wall  
   Section 106 Consultation  
   Other  

3. Construction funding and schedule  

Ex-Officio:  
   Marlene Bumbera  
   John P. Hanna  
   Warren Jacobsen  
   Mark Jones
NISSAN ENDOWMENT TO COVER FUNDING SHORTFALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNDING SHORTFALL</th>
<th>REVISED 1997 MARKET VALUE</th>
<th>'97 INCOME ALLOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$736,320</td>
<td>$1,631,946</td>
<td>$81,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$1,768,272</td>
<td>$88,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$1,968,272</td>
<td>$98,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$2,168,272</td>
<td>$108,413</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$100K - Operating $60K General $12K Endowment Fund
Student Assistantship - $20K

Program Approval - By July - February
Funding Strategy needed by Dec.

855 SERRA STREET, STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305-6114 • PHONE (415) 725-3415 FAX (415) 723-7444
$2,000,000. Estimated Project Cost

$736,326. Shortfall 10/28/96

$500,000. Fund raising thru 10/28/96

$123,500. Additional Funding - Nissan Income 95-96

$246,250. Original Funding - Nissan Income

$232,463. FEMA DSR 68897 ($302,951.)

$151,461 FEMA DSR 8G195 ($205,949.)

Project Funding

Hanna House Seismic Repair and Strengthening

10/28/96
Stanford University  
Hanna House Board of Governors  

Minutes of Meeting - September 27, 1996  
Hobby House

Members Present:  
Chris Christofferson  
Marilyn Fogel  
Rosemary Homby  
Maggie Kimball  
Tim Portwood  
Jack Rakove  
Paul Turner, Chair

Members Absent:  
David Neuman  
James Gibbons

Ex-Officio Present:  
Marlene Bumbera  
John Hanna  
Warren Jacobsen  
Laura Jones

Ex-Officio Absent:  
Mark Jones

Chairman, Paul Turner, opened the meeting.

1. **Review of Minutes**

Since the June meeting did not draw a quorum, no minutes were prepared.

2. **Reports**

a. **Fundraising**

Tim Portwood reported that $313,336 in gifts and pledges have been received to date. He said that the commitment from FEMA is less than originally expected, and that there is still $1 million to go.

b. **Architectural Contract**

Warren Jacobsen reported that the contract is in place with Architectural Resources Group (ARG), and that construction documents are expected to be completed about the end of January. Jacobsen said that program approval should be taken to the Board of Trustees in November. He also stated that the goal is to complete fundraising by the end of the year and begin construction early in 1997.

c. **Maintenance Costs**

Laura Jones and Chris Christofferson are working on maintenance costs and the amount of endowment needed to support these repairs. It is
expected that the report will be ready for the October Board of Governors meeting.

d. Other

1. Paul Turner recapped the visit to the Hanna House by the Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation and Taliesin Associates. He said that he attended several of the group's events in San Francisco.

He stated that he was surprised when Martin Weil stated, during his presentation to the group, that the house would be restored to the mid-1970's. Laura Jones replied that ARG had suggested this in the charrette, but that no decision had been reached as to a particular restoration year. She said perhaps this should join the list of unfinished Board business.

2. Maggie Kibball suggested that we make the Hobby House available immediately for use by future users. Tim Portwood suggested that this concept be offered to the Provost by Paul Turner. Among details to be worked out is who would do the actual scheduling. It was pointed out that the use of the Hobby House would be an interim meeting place solution, and that rules established for maintaining the property would need to be in place.

3. Neighborhood Meeting

Laura Jones said that we need to plan our neighborhood meeting, and asked if anyone knows of special timing issues. It was suggested that we schedule this event right after school begins in the fall. The SCRL Board and immediate neighbors should be invited, with the possibility of inviting the slightly larger group of neighbors who were sent invitations to the Turner lecture. Items to be discussed could be the site and parking.

4. Other Business

John Hanna requested that the ceramic pots stored along the back fence be cleaned, appraised and properly stored. He said that he is willing to handle this himself if it proves to be a burden.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:30 am.

Minutes prepared by M. Bumbera
TO:          Chris Christofferson
            Marilyn Fogel
            James Gibbons
            Rosemary Hornby
            Maggie Kimball
            David Neuman
            Tim Portwood
            Jack Rakove
            Paul Turner, Chair

Ex-Officio:  Marlene Bumbera
            John P. Hanna
            Warren Jacobsen
            Mark Jones

FROM:        Laura Jones

AGENDA

Thursday, September 26, 1996 - 8:30-10:00 a.m.
Hobby House at the Hanna House

1. Approval of Minutes, Meeting of June 27, 1996

2. Reports
   Fundraising
   Architectural contract  inplace w/ ARG/Construction docs - late 96/early 97
   Other
   Neighbors Spring 98
   FEMA-total $520k

3. Schedule for 1996-1997 Meetings
   (Attachment)

Review program document -
Neighbors meeting - October '96 -
TO:          Chris Christofferson
           Marilyn Fogel
           James Gibbons
           Rosemary Hornby
           Maggie Kimball
           David Neuman
           Tim Portwood
           Jack Rakove
           Paul Turner, Chair

FROM:        Laura Jones

AGENDA

Thursday, September 26, 1996 - 8:30-10:00 a.m.
Hobby House at the Hanna House

1. Approval of Minutes, Meeting of June 27, 1996

2. Reports
   Fundraising
   Architectural contract
   Other

3. Schedule for 1996-1997 Meetings
   (Attachment)
AGENDA

Thursday, June 27, 1996 - 8:30-10:00 a.m.
Hobby House at the Hanna House

1. Approval of Minutes, Meeting of May 30, 1996
   (Attachment)

2. Reports
   FEMA award
   Retaining wall - subcontractor drilling needed to go to another subcontractor
   Other

3. Schedule for 1996-1997 Meetings →

FLW Conservancy Meeting - premeeting in SF
Sunday Sep 22 - Two (24) hours at Hanna House am
Paul Turner 1-3 tall ×
Minutes of Meeting - May 30, 1996
Hobby House

Members Present: Rosemary Hornby
David Neuman
Jack Rakove
Paul Turner, Chair

Members Absent: Chris Christofferson
Marilyn Fogel
James Gibbons
Maggie Kimball
Tim Portwood

Ex-Officio Present: Marlene Bumbera
John Hanna
Warren Jacobsen
Laura Jones

Chairman, Paul Turner, opened the meeting.

1. Review of Minutes, April 25, 1996

   The minutes of the meeting of March 28, 1996 were approved.

2. Reports

   a. Video

   Laura Jones will continue with arrangements for re-editing, with
   additional feeds, etc. Since most of the funding for the tape of
   Paul Turner's lecture came from Hanna House funds, it is important that we
   should have an acceptable product for uses other than the Stanford
   Channel airing.

   b. Retaining Wall

   Warren Jacobsen said that the excavation has revealed several code
   upgrades that will be necessary while the gas and electrical lines are
   exposed. There is a need to move the light, and add a footing. The work
   is expected to be completed in the next three to four weeks.

   c. Architectural Contract

   Warren Jacobsen reported that negotiations have taken place with ARG
   and the engineers, Rutherford and Chekene. They have modified their
   proposal, which has led to a fee reduction of approximately 8-9%. The
   contract will be signed next week, and the consultants will begin with the
   schematic design phase of the work.
e. Other

1. David Neuman said that we should investigate the possibility of installing and stabilizing the [Imperial Hotel] Urn. He said that there had been a $100,000 fund established for its stabilization and installation about 1990, and that it was his belief that these funds are still available. He said that at that time, it was proposed to stabilize the Urn with epoxy injection, although that procedure would have changed the Urn color, over time. New methods are now available, which might provide a better stabilization solution. He continued that now would be a good time for installing the Urn, since if there were the need for any additional foundation work, it could be completed with the retaining wall project.

Laura Jones reported that a source of matching stone has been found in Japan, in case we need to replicate portions of the Urn. Warren Jacobsen added that he has a copy of the stabilization report prepared by ARG in 1990.

2. FEMA

Laura Jones said that although FEMA had promised a decision on funding by January, we have not yet received any further information, except that the paperwork has been sent to Washington. David Neuman suggested that we exert some pressure on FEMA for a decision, with mention of the National Historic Building Status of the Hanna House, and its link to the National Park Service. Paul Turner said that he knows the Director of the National Park Service, Roger Kennedy, if that might be of use.

After discussion, the Board decided to take two actions: 1) To have Larry Horton get in touch with our Representatives to see if our funding request can be expedited, and 2) to Schedule the 106 Consultation.

3. Frank Lloyd Wright Conservancy Meeting

Laura Jones said that Tim Portwood had asked her to inquire if a Board member would be traveling to the September meeting of the Frank Lloyd Wright Conservancy Annual Meeting in Seattle, for fund-raising purposes. Warren Jacobsen said that there would be a Pre-Meeting in San Francisco before the Seattle meeting.
4. **House Memorabilia**

Laura Jones said that she had received a letter from Kristine Hanna requesting some bit of memorabilia for George Lucas, who is installing theme guest rooms at his "Skywalker Ranch". John Hanna suggested a framed copy of an early blueprint of the house; a photo, or the like, as an appropriate memento. Marlene Bumbera suggested that original, but no longer needed, ceiling or wall fabric might be used as a matt for a framed item. Laura Jones and Maggie Kimball were assigned to recommend something appropriate.

5. **Historic Context/House Details and Materials**

Paul Turner said that in meeting with some of the Taliesin Fellows, they have pointed out some items that are "not original" to the Hanna House. Warren Jacobsen said we would be making decisions on some of these during the schematic design. David Neuman pointed out that the concept has been endorsed to keep the house in the time context of the Hanna's gift to the University. Warren Jacobsen said that he has a status report on the House from the late 1980's which will prove helpful during these reviews. Warren also said that ARG/Rutherford and Chekene will do an analysis of the Hobby House, as a part of their contract, and that some money has been set aside for work at the Hobby House, if necessary.

6. **House Operations**

Laura Jones said that she has had a meeting with the Provost's representative. That office expects that any House staffing will be borne by Hanna House accounts, and that the Provost's Office would like to receive some funding for their staff scheduler.

David Neuman said that in a meeting with the Provost, he was told that for use of the house, a higher rate structure than for other special sites is endorsed, not only to make the Hanna House self-supporting, but to discourage "frivolous use".

7. **Hanna House Architects**

Paul Turner said that on several occasions, he has been asked why we are not using Taliesin Associates for the Hanna House work. David Neuman explained that following the Loma Prieta Earthquake, he contacted and met with Wesley Peters, Director of Taliesin West, who told him that Taliesin Associates would re-build to contemporary standards, but that they do not do archival
research or restoration work; Peters also said he would be happy to confer on our project, but he has since passed away.

When the Request for Proposal was sent to historic restoration architects in 1990, Martin Weil was reported to be the best Frank Lloyd Wright restoration architect on the west coast. He, however, declined to be a lead architect, and suggested that he be a consultant to The Architectural Resources Group (ARG), of San Francisco.

3. Neighborhood Meeting

Laura Jones said that we need to plan our neighborhood meeting, and asked if anyone knows of special timing issues. It was suggested that we schedule this event right after school begins in the fall. The SCRL Board and immediate neighbors should be invited; with the possibility of inviting the slightly larger group of neighbors who were sent invitations to the Turner lecture. Items to be discussed could be the site, and parking.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:30 am.

Minutes prepared by M. Bumbera
Financial Summary - Hanna House
6/24/96

**Earthquake Project Account**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount Funded to date</td>
<td>$ 325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Commitments thru 5/96</td>
<td>309,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures thru 5/96</td>
<td>230,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncommitted Balance</td>
<td>$ 15,524</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operations & Maintenance Account**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount Funded</td>
<td>$ 28,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures thru 5/96</td>
<td>11,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncommitted Balance</td>
<td>$ 17,096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed Professional Services thru Construction Documents**

(Negotiated) - ARG - (Arch., Struct., Mech., Elec., Landscape)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>3/22/96</th>
<th>6/24/96</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schematics</td>
<td>$ 41,000</td>
<td>$ 43,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Development</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>55,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Documents</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>88,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursables</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>7,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Services thru CD's</td>
<td>$232,000</td>
<td>$194,648</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nissan Account**

An additional uncommitted $160,000 is available in the Nissan Capital Account for Project Use. This is accumulated from FY 1994-95 and FY 1995-96. Nissan Fund will add +/- $100,000 on 9-1-96.

* Includes cost of

Lucasfilm Video –
Measured Drawings
2,000,000. ESTIMATED PROJECT COST

1,200,820. REQUIRED FUNDRAISING

310,000 FUND RAISING EffORTS THRU 6/24/96

400,250. NISSAN INCOME ACCOUNT
240,250. ORIGINAL FUNDING
160,000. ADDITIONAL AVAILABLE

232,463. FEMA DSR 68897 (309,951) 75%

154,461. FEMA DSR 00135 (205,343)

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCE

HANNA HOUSE SEISMIC REPAIR AND STRENGTHENING

855 SERRA STREET, STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305-6114 • PHONE (415) 725-3415 FAX (415) 723-7444
TO: Chris Christofferson
    Marilyn Fogel
    James Gibbons
    Rosemary Hornby
    Maggie Kimball
    David Neuman
    Tim Portwood
    Jack Rakove
    Paul Turner, Chair

FROM: Laura Jones

AGENDA

Thursday, June 27, 1996 - 8:30-10:00 a.m.
Hobby House at the Hanna House

1. Approval of Minutes, Meeting of May 30, 1996
   (Attachment)

2. Reports
   FEMA award
   Retaining wall
   Other

3. Schedule for 1996-1997 Meetings
Members Present: Rosemary Hornby
David Neuman
Jack Rakove
Paul Turner, Chair

Members Absent: Chris Christofferson
Marilyn Fogel
James Gibbons

Ex-Officio Present: Marlene Bumbera
John Hanna
Warren Jacobsen
Laura Jones

Chairman, Paul Turner, opened the meeting.

1. Review of Minutes, April 25, 1996

The minutes of the meeting of March 26, 1996 were approved.

b. Retaining Wall

Warren Jacobsen said that the excavation has revealed several code
upgrades that will be necessary while the gas and electrical lines are
exposed. There is a need to move the light, and add a footing. The work
is expected to be completed in the next three to four weeks.

c. Architectural Contract

Warren Jacobsen reported that negotiations have taken place with ARG
and the engineers, Rutherford and Chekene. They have modified their
proposal, which has led to a fee reduction of approximately 8-9%. The
contract will be signed next week, and the consultants will begin with the
schematic design phase of the work.
Other

1. David Neuman said that we should investigate the possibility of installing and stabilizing the [Imperial Hotel] Urn. He said that there had been a $100,000 fund established for its stabilization and installation about 1990, and that it was his belief that these funds are still available. He said that at that time, it was proposed to stabilize the Urn with epoxy injection, although that procedure would have changed the Urn color, over time. New methods are now available, which might provide a better stabilization solution. He continued that now would be a good time for installing the Urn, since if there were the need for any additional foundation work, it could be completed with the retaining wall project.

Laura Jones reported that a source of matching stone has been found in Japan, in case we need to replicate portions of the Urn. Warren Jacobsen added that he has a copy of the stabilization report prepared by ARG in 1990.

2. FEMA

Laura Jones said that although FEMA had promised a decision on funding by January, we have not yet received any further information, except that the paperwork has been sent to Washington. David Neuman suggested that we exert some pressure on FEMA for a decision, with mention of the National Historic Building Status of the Hanua House, and its link to the National Park Service. Paul Turner said that he knows the Director of the National Park Service, Roger Kennedy, if that might be of use.

After discussion, the Board decided to take two actions: 1) To have Larry Horton get in touch with our Representatives to see if our funding request can be expedited, and 2) to Schedule the 106 Consultation.

3. Frank Lloyd Wright Conservancy Meeting

Laura Jones said that Tim Portwood had asked her to inquire if a Board member would be traveling to the September meeting of the Frank Lloyd Wright Conservancy Annual Meeting in Seattle, for fund-raising purposes. Warren Jacobsen said that there would be a Pre-Meeting in San Francisco before the Seattle meeting.
4. **House Memorabilia**

Laura Jones said that she had received a letter from Kristine Hanna requesting some bit of memorabilia for George Lucas, who is installing theme guest rooms at his “Skywalker Ranch”. John Hanna suggested a framed copy of an early blueprint of the house; a photo, or the like, as an appropriate memento. Marlene Bumbera suggested that original, but no longer needed, ceiling or wall fabric might be used as a mat for a framed item. Laura Jones and Maggie Kimball were assigned to recommend something appropriate.

5. **Historic Context/House Details and Materials**

Paul Turner said that in meeting with some of the Taliesin Fellows, they have pointed out some items that are “not original” to the Hanna House. Warren Jacobsen said we would be making decisions on some of these during the schematic design. David Neuman pointed out that the concept has been endorsed to keep the house in the time context of the Hanna’s gift to the University. Warren Jacobsen said that he has a status report on the House from the late 1980’s which will prove helpful during these reviews. Warren also said that ARG/Rutherford and Chekene will do an analysis of the Hobby House, as a part of their contract, and that some money has been set aside for work at the Hobby House, if necessary.

6. **House Operations**

Laura Jones said that she has had a meeting with the Provost’s representative. That office expects that any House staffing will be borne by Hanna House accounts, and that the Provost’s Office would like to receive some funding for their staff scheduler.

David Neuman said that in a meeting with the Provost, he was told that for use of the house, a higher rate structure than for other special sites is endorsed, not only to make the Hanna House self-supporting, but to discourage "frivolous use".

7. **Hanna House Architects**

Paul Turner said that on several occasions, he has been asked why we are not using Taliesin Associates for the Hanna House work. David Neuman explained that following the Loma Prieta Earthquake, he contacted and met with Wesley Peters, Director of Taliesin West, who told him that Taliesin Associates would re-build to contemporary standards, but that they do not do archival
research or restoration work; Peters also said he would be happy to confer on our project, but he has since passed away.

When the Request for Proposal was sent to historic restoration architects in 1990, Martin Weil was reported to be the best Frank Lloyd Wright restoration architect on the west coast. He, however, declined to be a lead architect, and suggested that he be a consultant to The Architectural Resources Group (ARG), of San Francisco.

3. Neighborhood Meeting

Laura Jones said that we need to plan our neighborhood meeting, and asked if anyone knows of special timing issues. It was suggested that we schedule this event right after school begins in the fall. The SCRL Board and immediate neighbors should be invited, with the possibility of inviting the slightly larger group of neighbors who were sent invitations to the Turner lecture. Items to be discussed could be the site, and parking.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:30 am.

Minutes prepared by M. Bumbera
Hanna House

Paul's slides to check w/ [name]

Binder on Peter Coutts from John Paul Hanna — he will contact his sister abt having the binder come to the Archives.

Rose Cuttley's documentation on Hanna House — contact Hanna or [name] abt assuming it comes to Archives.

HT exhibit for library —? Sept '96 Conservancy coming through? Possibility for this fall? Close exhibit?*

> More substantial exhibit/program when house reopens
STANFORD'S DAMAGED TREASURE: FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT'S HANNA HOUSE

The Hanna House at Stanford University, one of Frank Lloyd Wright's most important works, has been closed since it was damaged in the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake. The history of the house, its significance in American architecture, and the plans for its restoration will be described in an illustrated talk by Paul V. Turner, Professor of Architectural History in the Art Department, entitled "Stanford's Damaged Treasure: Frank Lloyd Wright's Hanna House." The event will take place on Thursday, February 29, at 5:00 p.m., in Annenberg Auditorium in Cummings Art Building on the Stanford campus.

The talk, free and open to the public, will be introduced by Gerhard Casper, president of the University, and will be followed by a question-and-answer session with Professor Turner and David Neuman, Stanford University Architect. The program is sponsored by the Art Department, the Stanford Historical Society, and the Board of Governors of the Hanna House.

Built in 1937 by Stanford professor Paul R. Hanna and his wife, Jean, the Hanna House was one of Wright's most innovative designs, especially in its hexagonal floor plan. In the 1920s and '30s, Wright was fascinated with the idea of replacing traditional, rectangular plans with new geometries based on triangles, hexagons, or circles. The Hannas were his first clients willing to build such a radically different house, and the Hanna House thus inaugurated the period of Wright's great non-rectilinear buildings, such as the Guggenheim Museum in New York.

Other innovations in the Hanna House include a system of thin wood wall construction, and a provision for flexible planning, allowing the house to adapt to the changing needs of the family over time. The Hannas, experts on childhood education, worked closely with Wright in the process of designing and building the house, and Wright considered their architect-client relationship to be unusually productive. He also considered the house to be one of his most successful works. Following its construction, the Hanna House was published widely in architectural magazines, and an entire issue of House Beautiful was devoted to it in 1963. The American Institute of Architects has included the Hanna House on a list of the seventeen buildings by Frank Lloyd Wright most worthy of preservation.

During their life in the house, the Hannas always made it accessible to students, architects and other visitors who came from many parts of the world to see it. They also assembled an archive of documentation of the house's design, construction and use over the years. This archive, now in the Special Collections division of the Stanford Library, is
the source of many of the photographs, drawings, and other visual material that will be seen in Professor Turner's talk.

The Hannas gave their house to Stanford University in 1975, to be used for university purposes and to be preserved as a demonstration of Wright's architectural principles. From that time until the Loma Prieta earthquake, the house was used as the official residence of Stanford's provost. In October of 1989, the earthquake damaged several parts of the house, especially the central fireplace structure and sections of the concrete pad on which the house sits. The building has been closed since the earthquake.

The Hanna House Board of Governors, reestablished by President Casper in 1993, has been working since then on the planning of the restoration and future use of the house, in consultation with structural and architectural-preservation experts from both within and outside the University. The recently-formulated plans for repairing the house will retain its form and materials, while increasing its structural strength, and will restore the house to its condition when the Hannas occupied it. In accordance with the Hannas' original wishes, the house will be used largely for educational purposes. It will be more accessible than previously to students and the general public, through tours and special visits, and will be used by the University for classes, seminars, conferences, receptions and other events.

A campaign has now begun to raise the funds needed to restore the house and ensure its continued preservation. The total amount required is about two million dollars. While funds from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the Nissan Corporation will meet part of this need, private gifts totaling approximately one million dollars will be required.

Further information can be obtained by calling Professor Paul V. Turner (723-3306); David Neuman, University Architect (725-7845); or Timothy Portwood, of the Stanford Development Office (723-0070).
I missed the Board of Governors meeting last Thursday, but wanted to pass along some thoughts about the draft guidelines that were attached to the agenda and discussed at that meeting. I think they generally look good, but wanted to make a couple of comments.

On page 2, scheduling priority is given to educational and cultural events over purely social functions. I would propose that priority should also be given to important development events, such as professorship dinners or other functions involving the president, the provost, a dean, or very senior development officers (VP or Associate VP for example).

Also on page 2, there are points on protection of furniture. This seem quite restrictive, perhaps appropriately so. I wonder though if we couldn’t provide more flexible policies vis-à-vis the Hobby House. For example, if there is a conference where beverages are to be served and it is raining outside, couldn’t beverages be served in the Hobby House as an alternative to the terraces?

Finally, I wonder if the 10:00 p.m. closing time isn’t a bit too restrictive as well. If a dinner for 15 people extended to 11:00, would that really be a problem?

Please let me know if you want to discuss any of these points further.
TO: Chris Christofferson
Marilyn Fogel
James Gibbons
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood
Jack Rakove
Paul Turner, Chair

FROM: Laura Jones

AGENDA

Thursday, May 30, 1996 - 8:30-10:00 a.m.
Hobby House at the Hanna House

1. Approval of Minutes, Meeting of April 25, 1996
   (Attachment)

2. Reports
   Retaining wall
   Architectural contract
   Other

3. Neighborhood Meeting

Ex-Officio:
Marlene Bumbera
John P. Hanna
Warren Jacobsen
Mark Jones
Stanford University
Hanna House Board of Governors

Minutes of Meeting - April 25, 1996
Hanna House Terrace

Members Present: Marilyn Fogel
                 Maggie Kimball
                 Tim Portwood

Members Absent:  Chris Christopherson
                 James Gibbons

Ex-Officio Present: Marlene Bumbera
                    John Hanna
                    Warren Jacobsen

Jack Rakove
Paul Turner, Chair
Rosemary Hornby
David Neuman
Laura Jones
Mark Jones

Chairman, Paul Turner, opened the meeting.

1. Review of Minutes, March 28, 1996

The minutes of the meeting of March 28, 1996 were approved as corrected.

2. Reports

a. Fundraising

Tim Portwood reported that Taliesin Associate, H. Harrold has sent a proposal to St. Louis for a project grant, and that he will assist in our fund-raising efforts. He also stated that the recent publicity about the restoration has been helping -- he received a $300 donation from a person in San Diego.

The gift staff from the Development Office will tour the House tomorrow, so they can be informed as to what the project is about. Many have never visited the Hanna House.

b. Video

Paul Turner said that he was disappointed in the editing for the videotape of his lecture -- the descriptions did not synchronize with the slides. Following discussion, it was determined that the tape be re-edited before further showings or print production.

For the video taping of the House, Laura Jones reported that Kristine Hanna will be videotaping on May 3rd, 4th and 5th. In a related item, she
said the Webmaster from the library will provide a demo before placing the page on-line.

c. Retaining Wall

Warren Jacobsen reported that cuts have been marked on the wall, and that construction will begin on Tuesday, April 30th. He said that one part of the tree will need to be trimmed so that equipment can get in.

d. Budget

Mark Jones reported that the Trustees approved the project concept at their last meeting, and that the architectural contract is being negotiated. Tim Portwood said that $100,000 will be transferred from gift funding into the Project account to begin the design development and construction drawings.

e. FEMA

Warren Jacobsen stated that there has been no news from FEMA -- that the DSR is written and is probably on someone's desk. FEMA may be waiting for their funding. Warren is conferring with Craig Comartin. It may be necessary to contact our Congressman to unstick the paperwork. Tim Portwood said that when FEMA approves the funding, a press release will be prepared.

Laura Jones said that the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) is generally in agreement as to the repair plan -- and that a 106 review meeting will be arranged.

f. Other

Warren Jacobsen said that ceiling panel is sagging in the House, and that it has been propped up.

3. Hanna House Operations Guidelines - Draft

Laura Jones said that the guidelines have been edited again, (a new draft was distributed) and that a meeting to discuss both these and Buck Estate guidelines has been set for May 6th. She said that if any members would like additional changes to the document to let her know before this meeting.

Jones also reported that information on projected operating costs are being collected. So far, it has been estimated that costs are about $45,000 for utilities, window cleaning and landscape costs. Possible additional annual
costs might include a separate insurance policy for the House; security service, and potential staffing costs.

She said that fees for use need to be established, for example an "event" minimum -- perhaps $100 to $150 to cover cleaning costs including a contribution. She said that class tours would probably not be included in such a fee schedule, as there would be no fee for Stanford students when accompanied. It is envisioned that the contribution portion of fees could be used to cover an operating fund. Other separate accounts might be a Maintenance Fund for repairs and furnishings from the Nissan account; a Scholar in Residence Fund, and an Interpretation Fund from tour receipts. There is a need for rates for various types of events, perhaps linked to the number of people using the House.

Mark Jones said that perhaps there should be a Board sponsored fund-raiser for Operating Costs for the House.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:30 am.

Minutes prepared by M. Bumbera
TO:      Chris Christofferson
         Marilyn Fogel
         James Gibbons
         Rosemary Hornby
         Maggie Kimball
         David Neuman
         Tim Portwood
         Jack Rakove
         Paul Turner, Chair

FROM:    Laura Jones

Ex-Officio:
Marlene Bumbera
John P. Hanna
Warren Jacobsen
Mark Jones

AGENDA

Thursday, April 25, 1996 - 8:30-10:00 a.m.
Hobby House at the Hanna House

1. Approval of Minutes, Meeting of March 28, 1996
   (Attachment)

2. Reports
   Fundraising
   Video/Film/Web Page
   Retaining wall
   Budget
   Other

3. Operating Guidelines

4. Operating Costs/Fee Schedule
Stanford University
Hanna House Board of Governors

Minutes of Meeting - March 28, 1996
Hobby House at the Hanna House

Members Present: Marilyn Fogel  Tim Portwood
                 Rosemary Hornby  Jack Rakove
                 Maggie Kimball  Paul Turner, Chair
                 David Neuman

Members Absent: Chris Christoffersen  James Gibbons

Ex-Officio Present: Marlene Bumbera  Laura Jones
                     Warren Jacobsen  Mark Jones

Chairman, Paul Turner, opened the meeting.

1. **Review of Minutes, February 29, 1996**

   The minutes of the meeting of February 29, 1996 were approved as corrected.

2. **Reports**

   a. **Fundraising**

   Tim Portwood reported that there is approximately $250,000 in commitments to the restoration of the Hanna House. He stated that the Nissan Corporation is in contact with another Japanese firm regarding a possible gift, which might be split with half for the reconstruction, and half for a named fellowship.

   Henry Herrold, of the Taliesin Associates, will discuss our project with others at the opening of the Midwest Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation in Saint Louis next month. Paul Turner commented that he will be in Saint Louis also, and that he will try to coordinate so that he can attend.

   Portwood said that he is planning a field trip of the House for officers of the Development Office so that they will have a better understanding of the reconstruction project, and that Rosemary Hornby has offered to assist him with follow-up calls to those who indicated an interest in making a donation on their interest cards distributed at the Turner lectures.

   b. **Mailing List**

   Marlene Bumbera distributed a summary of responses to the Turner lectures. She said that a grand total of 177 interest cards were received,
with 50 of those indicating a possible contribution. Comments were also added to some cards, and that those requesting answers would be handled within the week.

c. **Retaining Wall**

Warren Jacobsen reported that the kick-off meeting for the project has been held, and that material and color samples are being collected.

d. **Budget**

Jacobsen distributed a financial summary for the House accounts. He reported that funds have been committed for the retaining wall, measured drawings of the House, architectural services, and for the video, leaving approximately $18,000 in uncommitted funds available. The Operations and Maintenance Account has a balance of $22,846. An additional $160,000 is available in the Nissan Capital Account for the project.

Approximately $230,000 will be needed to continue with professional services through completion of the construction documents. The Board discussed the various approaches and timing of beginning with this next phase of the project. Some of the details discussed were the need for detailed operating costs; a possible grounds maintenance endowment, and the fact that fundraising will be easier when completed drawings are available. It was also pointed out that a set period of fund-raising time, say six months, can be assigned when the drawings have been completed.

On a motion by David Neuman, seconded by Marilyn Fogel, and unanimously approved, it was decided that Facilities Project Management begin negotiations and sign with the project architects when successfully concluded.

e. **FEMA**

Laura Jones stated that a meeting with FEMA and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) is scheduled for Monday [April 1], to review the restoration scheme.

f. **Video**

Laura Jones reported that she is working with Maggie Kimball on a Webmaster video of the Hanna House. This will be a three-dimensional walk-through of the House, to assist in fundraising efforts. Kimball is handling copyright issues regarding the use of photos in Special Collections at Green Library.
3. **Hanna House Operations Guidelines - Draft**

Laura Jones said that changes to the draft guidelines have been made as suggested at the last meeting. She said that she plans to have a meeting with the Provost's Office for additional comments. Another meeting will be held with those on the task force to discuss additional items to the guidelines.

Paul Turner suggested that the library of the Hanna House be used as an interpretive center. Maggie Kimball suggested that a brochure on the House be provided to all users.

4. **Student Caretaker Guidelines - Draft**

Laura Jones requested that Board members forward any thoughts on a student caretaker to her, following review of the Draft document.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:15am.

Minutes prepared by M. Bumbera
TO: Chris Christiansen, Marilyn Fogel, James Gibbons, Rosemary Horbay, Maggie Kimball, David Neuman, Tim Portwood, Jack Rakove, Paul Turner, Chair

FROM: Laura Jones

YOUNBA

Thursday, March 28, 1996 - 9:30-10:00 a.m.
Hobby House at the Marina House

Approval of Minutes, Meeting of February 24, 1996 (Attachment)

Reports

Fundraising
Mailing list
Video
Retaining wall
Badger
Other

Final Guidelines (Draft) (Attachment)

Final Guidelines (Draft) (Attachment)

Ex-Officio:

Marlene Bumbera
John P. Hanna
Warren Jacobsen
Mark Jones

April 26

April 1, 9 pm - Channel 51

Call Marian re:

Copy -> Archives

Gifts made now will be important
SCHOLAR IN RESIDENCE

The Hanna House Scholar-in-Residence program is recommended to meet two objectives: 1) to provide unique educational, cultural and professional experience for advanced students and 2) to provide a measure of security for the house and grounds.

SELECTION PROCESS

The Board of Governors would award the role of Scholar-in-Residence on an annual basis to a graduate student from the Schools of Education, Engineering or Humanities and Sciences. Students would become eligible after their first year at Stanford. The Board of Governors would circulate application information to the Schools, who would identify and nominate candidates for the award.

The Board of Governors would form a selection committee to review applications, conduct interviews and recommend a first and second choice for the position (the second as an alternate to the first). The selection committee should weigh academic achievement and evidence of a responsible character when making their selection. Preference should be given to candidates with research and/or professional interests that would benefit from association with the Hanna House.

In the event that a suitable student cannot be selected, the Scholar-in-Residence position might be awarded to a suitable member of the University, also on an annual basis.

PRIVILEGES

Living Quarters
The Scholar-in-Residence will occupy a studio on the ground floor of the Hobby House, with a private bathroom and small kitchen. The studio will not be on public tours of the house and Facilities Operations should coordinate cleaning and landscaping to assure the privacy of the occupant.

Use of the House and Grounds
The Scholar-in-Residence will have access to the main house and grounds when there are no scheduled events (however, this would not include the use of the master bedroom to entertain guests). The Board of Governors would not object, for example, to the Scholar-in-Residence hosting a small study group meeting in the house as long as the guidelines on food and hours of use were observed. The Board of Governors expects the Scholar-in-Residence to use good judgment in exercising these privileges, failure to do so would be grounds for revoking the award.
RESPONSIBILITIES

Security
The Board of Governors expect the Scholar-in-Residence to concern him/herself with the security of the property and persons visiting Hanna House. The Scholar-in-Residence should report unauthorized and/or irresponsible use of the property to the appropriate offices.

The Scholar-in-Residence should be on-site every night, expect when arrangements have been made in advance for an absence. A nightly check of doors and windows, alarm system and visual inspection of the house interior should be performed.

Housekeeping
The Scholar-in-Residence is responsible for keeping the studio clean; it will be included during regular condition inspections of the house.

In addition, during the nightly visual inspection of the house the Scholar-in-residence should perform any urgent housekeeping actions -- such as removing glasses from furniture, mopping up spills, and/or removing trash from the house. While it is the Board’s intent to hold caterers responsible for removing all reception/dinner party supplies and/or debris, the Scholar-in-Residence can serve an important role in preventing damage from overlooked items or conditions. The Scholar-in-Residence should report instances of damage or unacceptable conditions caused by events to both the Scheduler and Facilities Operations.

Physical Plant
The Scholar-in-Residence should report malfunctioning appliances, lights, heating systems, drains, root leaks, etcetera to Facilities Operations.

RESTRICTIONS

Fire hazards
Smoking is not permitted in any of the Hanna House buildings, the garage area, or under the eaves of the house. The use of candles, incense and/or torches is not permitted at any time, with the exception of candles on the dining room table during formal dinners.

Fireplace use? Barbeque?

Alcohol Use

The abuse of alcohol is prohibited at Hanna House. The Scholar-in-Residence should not allow any obviously intoxicated person, to drive a car or other vehicle away from Hanna House.
Drug Use
The Board of Governors expects the University's policies prohibiting the use of illegal drugs to be complied with. Use of drugs would be considered evidence of poor judgment and lack of responsibility that would be grounds for termination of the award.

TRAINING

Facilities Operations staff will train the Scholar-in-Residence in use of the alarm system and emergency procedures.

The Scholar-in-Residence should undergo additional orientation by the Hanna House docents to improve their general knowledge of the house and its significance.
HANNA HOUSE OPERATIONS

INTRODUCTION

The Hanna House Board of Governors, in its advisory capacity, recommends that policies and procedures be established to ensure preservation of this National Historic Landmark house after it reopens.

The Board proposes that the following operating principles be used during a trial period of three years, along with a program of data collection designed to determine the effects of events on the historic fabric of the house and grounds. The data on use, maintenance and cumulative wear will be reviewed by the Board of Governors, and policies adjusted where necessary.

BASIC POLICY

The highest priority of the Hanna House Board of Governors is the preservation of the house, furnishings, and grounds in service of the University’s missions of teaching and research. Programs at the house should benefit from exposure to Frank Lloyd Wright’s innovative and artistic design for Hanna House.

In keeping with the historic character of the house as the home of the Hanna family and in later years, the University Provost, the house will maintain its residential character and will serve as special venue for formal educational gatherings, social functions and performances.

The house will also be open for small, regularly scheduled public tours. Tours will be by reservation only and guided by a trained docent.

*Scheduling

Scheduling during the trial period will be at the discretion of the Provost’s Office. The following restrictions will limit events size and frequency:

1. Maximum room capacities for fire safety shall not be exceeded. The house shall have an emergency procedures plan reviewed by the Fire and Police Departments, and a building conservator to ensure proper treatment of the building in the event of an emergency.

*Firstrager: that for each event a person from the sponsoring department, who will be present during the event, be designated the
"responsible party" and required to attend a house tour prior to the event and to have read the house security and emergency procedures documents.

- On-site parking will be limited to a maximum of fifteen cars. On street parking is to be kept to a minimum.

- Facilities Operations should have the house inspected and cleaned following each event (seminar, conference, reception, dinner).

- Schedulers should plan events no earlier than 9 am and no later than 10 pm, to respect the residential nature of the area.

- Schedulers should give priority to educational and cultural events over purely social functions.

- Facilities Operations should coordinate regular garden and landscape maintenance so as not to conflict with scheduled events.

RENTAL FEES

Fees will be charged for all events including tours.

CATERERS

Only caterers who have completed a special orientation to working in the house and are authorized by the Provost's Office, will be permitted. Facilities for food storage, preparation and event staging are limited to the Garage storage area.

Caterers are to use the kitchen for serving purposes only for formal dinners in the dining room, no actual food preparation should occur on site.

PROTECTION OF FURNISHINGS

All food and beverages for receptions, conferences, seminars or other events are to be served on the terraces. This is to discourage the casual placing of beverages on the built-in wood furnishings and/or spilling same on floors or furnishings. In case of spill, food service might be accommodated in Hobby House.

Inclined walls,

Formal dinner parties may take place in the dining room, however the table should be covered with a pad and built-in wood furnishings should have decorative coverings to protect their finishes. Food that may stain floors, furnishings or carpets should not be allowed. No smoking will be permitted.

To be determined.
Hanna House users are to be instructed that they may not attach charts, objects, decorations, etc. to the walls and/or furniture.

Facilities Operations shall arrange for cleaning and landscape service by personnel specifically trained to protect the historic fabric of the house and grounds.
Stanford University
Hanna House Board of Governors

Minutes of Meeting - February 29, 1996
Hobby House at the Hanna House

Members Present:  Chris Christoffersen  Maggie Kimball
                  Marilyn Fogel         David Neuman
                  Rosemary Hornby       Jack Rakove

Members Absent:   James Gibbons
                  Paul Turner, Chair

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

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

1. Review of Minutes, January 25, 1996

   The minutes of the meeting of January 25, 1996 were approved.

2. Reports

   a. Fundraising

      David Neuman said that Tim Portwood is in London, but will not be
      meeting with the potential donor this trip. He said that the Hanna family
      has made a significant pledge to the restoration of the House.

   b. Retaining Wall

      Warren Jacobsen said an analysis on the bids to repair the retaining wall
      has been completed. Bids ranged from a high of $67,000 to a low of
      $29,630. It is recommended that the contract be awarded to Rudolph
      and Sletten with their $29,630 bid. On a motion by Chris Christoffersen,
      seconded by Jack Rakove, the contract award was approved. Jacobsen
      said that construction time for the project will be approximately six weeks.

      Terry Barnham, Construction Superintendent with Rudolph and Sletten
      joined the meeting. He was introduced by Warren Jacobsen, who said that
      Barnham has previously worked on the restoration of Memorial Church,
      the San Jose Courthouse, and is currently working on the Museum. Terry
      will be the Construction Superintendent for the retaining wall project.
Laura Jones said that the repointing of the wall will be performed in a sub-contract, and that grout samples will be reviewed with Steve Farneth of ARG, as well as by SUI staff for historical accuracy before the work is performed.

Marilyn Fogel asked how the brickwork was to be handled. Jones said that there will be complete documentation, through photos of the wall before work commences, and that usable old bricks will be spread throughout the new construction. A formula of the new materials will be kept for the records.

**FEMA**

Warren Jacobsen stated that the meeting with Pat Dunn of FEMA went well, and that the addition of an additional $600,000 has been written and is being reviewed.

**Maintenance**

Jacobsen reported that a tree fell over into the neighbor's yard last week during a storm. It has been removed and replaced with a new olive tree. A tree survey was completed last month, and is being reviewed by Herb Fong.

**Project Management**

Mark Jones said that an item for concept approval of the Hanna House Restoration will be taken to the Board of Trustees in April. This is the first in three required approvals for the main project, and will authorize expenditures of money for consultant's design work, etc. For example, we only have measured drawings of the building, and will need additional information. Jones said that a progress report outlining commitments, as well as time schedules, will be presented at the next meeting.

**Hanna House Operations Guidelines Draft**

In general discussion of the draft document, several modifications were suggested for further review.

Laura Jones explained that this is the first Draft of the document and that more information needs to be included, such as fee schedules, student caretaker, etc. She said that there should probably be a trial period of two or three years to define a use demand. This can be reviewed on a monthly basis by the Board, and modified.

Criteria for the use of the House by overnight guests will need to be drafted in the "Mission Statement", for example, is it, or isn't it a guest house? It used
infrequently, perhaps it should be an "exception to the policy." It was pointed out that if the house is to be used for overnight guests, it will change the house maintenance plan. Fees should be assessed for overnight use.

Room capacities will need to be established. The Fire Marshal will be requested to provide the room capacities on a House plan by the April meeting.

4. **Hanna House Talk**

Paul Turner will be presenting his talk, "Stanford's Damaged Treasure, Frank Lloyd Wright's Hanna House" at 5pm today, at the Annenberg Auditorium. Marlene Bumbera reported that flyers were sent by the Stanford Art Department to their mailing list and that the Stanford Historical Society has sent flyers to their members. She said that the Planning Office has sent flyers to American Institute of Architect members on the peninsula, as well as to the Taliesin Associates mailing list. A return card of interest for notification of future Hanna House events, and/or an interest in donating to the restoration was inserted with this mailing. To date, thirty responses have been returned, with six offers of donations. The same interest card will be handed to each person attending the lecture tonight.

It was reported that the talk will be videotaped. With edits and subtitles, this can be used for other purposes. It was also reported that an article is being prepared by the *San Francisco Chronicle*, and one for the *Stanford Daily*.

5. **Additional Items**

**Facilities Operations Records**

Chris Christoffersen said the current maintenance records for work at the Hanna House have been pulled, and are being reviewed by the various shops so that maintenance costs can be projected.

Marilyn Fogle requested that records of the house changes be retained for the Archives.

**Student Study**

Laura Jones said that a student from the University of Pennsylvania, Christopher Frye will be studying the house for one day in mid-March. The study was approved by Paul Turner and Marilyn Fogle. We will receive copies of all the student's reports, which will go into our data bank for researchers and homeowners.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Minutes prepared by M. Bumbera
# Financial Summary - Hanna House

## Earthquake Project Account

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount Funded to date</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Commitments thru 2/96</td>
<td>307,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures thru 2/96</td>
<td>221,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncommitted Balance</td>
<td>$17,996</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Operations & Maintenance Account

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount Funded</td>
<td>$28,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures thru 2/96</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncommitted Balance</td>
<td>$22,846</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Proposed Professional Services thru Construction Documents

(Not Negotiated) - ARG - (Arch., Struct., Mech., Elec., Landscape)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schematics</td>
<td>$41,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Development</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Documents</td>
<td>115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursables</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Services thru CD's</td>
<td>$232,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Nissan Account

An additional uncommitted $160,000 is available in the Nissan Capital Account for Project Use. This is accumulated from FY 1994-95 and FY 1995-96. Nissan Fund will add +/- $100,000 on 9-1-96.

* Includes cost of

- Retaining Wall Construction & Arch. Services
- Lucasfilm Video
- Measured Drawings

---

855 SERRA STREET, STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305-6114 • PHONE (415) 725-3415 FAX (415) 723-7444
March 27, 1996

TO: Hanna House Board of Governors

FROM: Marlene Bumbera

RE: Hanna House - Interest Card Responses (further activities and/or contributions) generated by Turner lectures and publicity - February/March 1996

The following represents the number of responses for each activity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Interest in future activities</th>
<th>Interest in future activities / possible contributor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mailing to peninsula Architects and Taliesin Fellows</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner lecture #1 February 29, 1996</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner lecture #2 March 7, 1996</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, many interest cards contained suggestions or comments:

1. Provide those responding with an address or phone number.  
   solution: Have Hanna House Board of Governors letterhead printed.

2. Has anyone approached the American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter about funding opportunities?

3. I will share any future activities information with the AAUW, Historic Preservation Section, San Carlos Branch (Belmont, San Carlos & Redwood City) and the San Carlos Heritage Association,

4. I am an architect; I volunteer my services in any capacity.

5. I am interested in receiving information about fund raising for the Hanna House.

---

1 Information forwarded to Development Office.
6. Interested in being a docent (when possible).

7. I would like to see the video on the Hanna House.

8. Repeat the exhibit of some years ago - telegrams, letters, house plans, etc. (all in the archives now)


10. I am interested in a tour [from an architect]
AGENDA

Thursday, February 29, 1996 - 8:30-10:00 a.m.
Hobby House at the Hanna House

1. Approval of Minutes, Meeting of January 25, 1996
   *(Attachment)*

2. Reports

3. Retaining Wall (Warren Jacobsen)

4. Draft Guidelines (Laura Jones)
   *(Attachment)*

5. Turner lecture

   F&W conservancy sending a student to do a report - mid-March
   - will produce report.

   Christopher Fry.
Stanford University
Hanna House Board of Governors

Minutes of Meeting - January 25, 1996
Hobby House at the Hanna House

Members Present: Marilyn Fogel
                 Rosemary Hornby
                 Maggie Kimball
                 David Neuman
                 Tim Portwood
                 Jack Rakove
                 Paul Turner, Chair

Members Absent: Chris Christofferson
                James Gibbons

Others Present: Marlene Bumbera
                Mark Jones
                John Hanna
                Ruth Todd
                Warren Jacobsen

Chairman, Paul Turner, opened the meeting.

1. **Review of Minutes, October 26, 1995**

   The minutes of the meeting of October 26, 1995 were approved, with minor corrections.

2. **Reports**

   a. **Hanna House Talk**

   Paul Turner said that President Casper has agreed to introduce him at the talk planned on the importance of the Hanna House, and that the date will be Thursday, February 29th at Annenberg Auditorium beginning at 5 pm. Flyers have been sent out by the Committee for Art, and a press release has been drafted. Turner distributed both the flyer and the press release to those present. He said that following the talk, there would be a question and answer period, with David Neuman and Warren Jacobsen assisting in responding to questions.

   Warren Jacobsen said that flyers will be sent to members of local American of Institute (AIA) chapters, and to the Taliesin Fellows.

   Tim Portwood said that in lieu of a formal reception, light refreshments will be provided in the lobby following the talk.

   Mark Jones asked if it would be prudent to have a sub-group of the Board meet to discuss answers to possible questions. Following discussion, it was determined that this would not be necessary at this time.
b. **FEMA**

Warren Jacobsen said that there was a January 4th walkthrough of the House, and that we expect to learn the exact funding proposal in the next few weeks.

c. **Retaining Wall**

Warren said that at the contractor’s suggestions, an addendum will be issued on February 13th.

John Hanna said that Marian Adams of Stanford’s Channel 51 will videotape the construction, and that Kristine (Hanna) will probably want to have access to that tape for her production.

d. **Fundraising**

Tim Portwood reported that commitments to date equal $175,000, with the potential of an additional $75,000, for a total of approximately $300,000, which includes some smaller gifts of $5,000 and under. He said he will be meeting with an anonymous donor in London.

Tim said that he needs to have a mission statement, as well as some justification as to why the consultant architects were selected for this work. Warren Jacobsen said he would send copies of resumes for both ARG and Martin Weil to him. Paul Turner requested copies as background for his talk. David said that Laura Jones is finalizing a draft mission statement, which she will send to the relevant sub-committee members and to Paul Turner.

e. **Quillen/Barth House**

David Neuman said that the Barths have responded to the Board’s concerns, and that the residence will be redwood (not stained); roof to be composite shingle; and a color sample will be sent to the Board for review. Additional olive trees will be planted where there is a gap at the property line. The plans are currently being processed for a building permit by Santa Clara County. It is expected that construction will begin this Spring.

3. **Maintenance**

Warren Jacobsen reported for Chris Christofferson that the House has been inspected for pests, and that the alarm system logs in at the on-campus alarm shop. He said that alarms recorded from November to January numbered about eight, with half of them set off inadvertently by himself. He said that often the
wind will catch the front door, which triggers the alarms. No attempted break-ins were reported.

Jacobsen said that the December storm disclosed a continuous leak in the living room fireplace area. The flashing was repaired, but it did not fix the problem. The chimney/roof area now has protective sheeting, and the condition will continue to be monitored.

5. Neighborhood Meeting

David Neuman said that, generally, he understands that the neighbors have no objections to re-opening the house. They are, however, interested in the construction schedule and what is planned for improvements to the landscape.

It is his suggestion that Chris Christofferson attend a meeting, under the auspices of the SCRL, for residents of Frenchman's Road, to answer questions regarding the maintenance and future parking issues related to the property.

6. Additional Items

Materials for Archives

Maggie Kimball requested that Rose Guntley's maintenance files on the House be reviewed (or copied), and then be forward to her for the Archives.

Next Steps

The proposed sequence of events for moving forward with next steps toward the House repair:

- Paul Turner's lecture 2/29/96
- Receipt of FEMA funding letter
- Early April: Prepare fund-raising report; financial statement and estimated operating costs and meeting with the Provost (approval to submit to June Board of Trustees)
- April: Board of Trustees: Concept Item to allow gift-funding

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:40 am.

Minutes prepared by M. Bumbera
INTRODUCTION

The Hanna House Board of Governors, in its advisory capacity, recommends that policies and procedures be established to ensure preservation of the house after it reopens.

The Board proposes that the following operating principles be used during a trial period of up to two years, along with a program of data collection designed to determine the effects of events on the historic fabric of the house and grounds. After the trial period, the data on use, maintenance and cumulative wear will be reviewed by the Board of Governors and policies adjusted where necessary.

BASIC POLICY

The highest priority of the Hanna House Board of Governors is the preservation of the house, furnishings and grounds in service of the University's missions of teaching and research.

In keeping with the historic character of the house as the home of the Hanna family and in later years, the University Provost, the house will maintain its residential character and will serve as a special venue for informal educational gatherings, social functions and musical performances.

The house will also be open for small public tours. Tours will be by reservation only and guided by a trained docent.

All events will be limited to University sponsorship.

SCHEDULING

Scheduling during the trial period will be at the discretion of the Provost's Office. The following restrictions will limit event size and frequency:

- Maximum room capacities for fire safety shall not be exceeded. The house shall have a emergency procedures plan reviewed by the Fire and Police Departments and a building conservator to insure proper treatment of the building in the event of an emergency.

- We suggest that for each event a person from the sponsoring department, who will present during the event, be designated the "responsible party" and required to attend a house tour prior to the event and to have read the house security and emergency procedures documents.

- On-site parking will be limited to a maximum of fifteen cars. On street parking is to be kept to a minimum.

- The house must be inspected and cleaned following each event (seminar, conference, reception, dinner).
• Regular garden and landscape maintenance is to be scheduled so as not to conflict with scheduled events.

• Events are to be scheduled no earlier than 8 am or to extend beyond 10 pm, to respect the residential nature of the area.

The presence of overnight guests in the house will require adjustments to event scheduling (pre- and post-dates) to insure the guest's privacy and comfort. Issue of tour schedule.

• Scheduling priority is to be given to educational and cultural events over purely social functions.

RENTAL FEES

Fees will be charged for all events, tours, and overnight guests.

CATERERS

Only caterers who have completed a special orientation to working in the house and are authorized by the Provost's Office, will be permitted. Facilities for food storage, preparation and event staging are limited to the Garage storage area.

Caterers are to use the kitchen for serving dinners only. Overnight guest use of the kitchen facilities are to be determined.

PROTECTION OF FURNISHINGS

All food and beverages for large receptions, conferences, seminars or other events are to be served on the terraces. This is to discourage the casual placing of beverages on the built-in wood furnishings, where they will leave marks.

Formal dinner parties may take place in the dining room, however the table should be covered with a pad and built-in wood furnishings should have decorative coverings to protect their finishes. Food that may stain floors, furnishings or carpets should not be allowed. No smoking will be permitted.

Hanna House users are to be instructed that they may not attach charts, objects, etc. to the walls and/or furniture.

Facilities Operations shall arrange for cleaning and landscape service by personnel specifically trained to protect the historic fabric of the house and grounds.

---

1 To be determined.
That this Committee recommends approval of the concept of Hanna House seismic repair and adaptive reuse of the buildings and grounds. The Vice Provost & Dean for Institutional Planning and Operations or his designee is authorized to undertake the design of the proposed project.

A) Background

The Hanna House was designed by Frank Lloyd Wright with Paul and Jean Hanna in 1935. The Hannas lived in the house from 1937, when it was completed, until 1975. The entire complex was bequeathed to Stanford University by the Hannas on February 21, 1974, with the intent that the buildings be preserved as a living example of the philosophy and design principles of Frank Lloyd Wright. The Hannas in their donation letter wanted "the residence to be preserved in such a manner that it would serve educational ends." Further, 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. Minor modifications have been made to the complex since 1975, including the installation of a swimming pool and deck. The House has remained closed to this date due to severe earthquake damage.

In the period following the Loma Prieta earthquake, the University has continued to maintain the buildings and grounds. The security, electrical and water services continue to be in use as plans are developed for the seismic rehabilitation, restoration of historical features and adaptive reuse of the buildings and grounds. The Hanna House Board of Governors has made the recommendation, subsequently accepted by the President, providing that after the repairs of the House have been completed, the buildings and grounds should be used in a manner that is more in keeping with the original bequest; i.e., as an academic conference facility. The mixture of proposed uses include tours, University seminars, small scale University entertaining and cultural events, and limited residential use for distinguished visitors and a possible live-in graduate student. The proposed uses of the Hanna House are responsive to the historic character of the buildings, furnishing and landscape features.

B) Program

The proposed repair and strengthening concept is intended to repair damage caused by the Loma Prieta earthquake. It will also improve the anticipated seismic performance of the main residence to be consistent with Stanford's "Class C" objectives. Class C is intended to provide a reasonable improvement in life safety protection. This will reduce the risk of damage and collapse, thus permitting the reopening of the building.

In addition to providing the requisite level of seismic protection, the proposed concept is designed to meet historic preservation objectives in keeping with the House's status as Stanford's only National Historic Landmark. The proposed rehabilitation concept allows for stabilization of the existing chimneys, and minimization of the extent of impacted architectural elements. This concept relies on five key elements to address both the superstructure deficiencies and the substructure deficiencies; 1) Center coring of the main, library and bedroom chimneys to improve the strength of the chimney and connect the portions of the chimney above and below cracked planes caused by the earthquake. 2) A grade beam system beneath the living room floor which provides overturning resistance for the chimneys and retaining walls and a support system for the slab to eliminate the need to remove or compact the existing loose fill. 3) Several strengthened wood walls using
plywood inserts and additional screws placed within the wall sandwich. The thickness of the wall will not change. 4) Strengthening of three hexagonal closets with plywood and steel bent angles on the interior face. 5) Ties connecting the roof to the chimneys and wood walls. A new plywood roof will then be added.

All work will preserve the evolutionary character of the buildings, site features, landscape and furnishing from 1937 to 1975. The project will conform to the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Historic Preservation; and must be reviewed by the State Historic Preservation Office and National Park Service, as well as FEMA.

C) Cost and Funding

This project is anticipated to cost in the range of $1.8 million to $2 million. FEMA has already written a Damage Survey Report in the amount of $205,949 and a supplemental Damage Survey Report for $600,000 is currently being prepared. The additional funding will come principally from specific gifts currently being fundraised.

D) Schedule

This project is expected to be submitted for program and construction approvals later in 1996. The target for completion date is late in 1997.
Executive Summary

Based on the analysis set forth in this memorandum, Rudolph & Sletten, Inc. is hereby recommended for award of the above referenced project based on a proposal dated February 13, 1996 received in response to an Invitation to Bid dated January 26, 1996. The cost proposal that is recommended for acceptance is $29,630.00. The approved requisition amount is for $35,000.00.

Scope of Work

The repair and stabilization of the existing retaining wall at the driveway of the Frank Lloyd Wright Hanna House

Schedule

Contract completion by April 30, 1996.

Cost Estimate and Bid Results

The requisition estimate is for $35,000.00. An advertisement was published soliciting bidders with experience as follows: (1) successfully renovating or repairing historical structures, particularly those involving masonry construction; (2) brick veneer and parapet wall construction; and (3) performing repairs / renovations intermixing new and old brick.

Nine (9) firms responded to the advertisement and they were invited to the bid walk. Eight (8) firms attended the bid walk and were given Invitation to Bid Packages. They were:

- Alpha Restoration & Waterproofing
- N.L. Barnes Construction, Inc.
- Basic Modular Facilities
- Dinwiddie Construction
- Hunt Masonry
- Lem Construction, Inc.
- Power Engineering Contractors
- Rudolph and Sletten, Inc.
Cost proposals were received from six (6) bidders as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Barnes</th>
<th>Basic Modular</th>
<th>Dinwiddie</th>
<th>Lem</th>
<th>Power Engng.</th>
<th>Rudolph &amp; Sletten</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Base Bid Lump Sum Amount</td>
<td>$37,000</td>
<td>$42,900</td>
<td>$41,838</td>
<td>$67,623</td>
<td>$41,500</td>
<td>$29,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bid Security Received?</td>
<td>Bid Bond</td>
<td>Bid Bond &amp; $1,000</td>
<td>Bid Bond</td>
<td>Bid Bond</td>
<td>Bid Bond</td>
<td>Check for $3,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Addenda Acknowledged?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Break Out Prices -listed only in Spec.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Unit Price #1 Tie Backs</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>Ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Unit Price #2 Replacement Brick</td>
<td>$21.00</td>
<td>S.Q</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Unit Price #3 Repoint mortar.</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>Ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Subcontractors Named</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Brick / Masonry</td>
<td>Wismann</td>
<td>Creative Masonry</td>
<td>Wismann</td>
<td>Sullivan</td>
<td>Cal Masonry</td>
<td>Preservation Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Tie Backs / Drilling</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>Malcolm</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>Buylan, Inc /Aggressive</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Excavation</td>
<td>Digger Don's Backhoe</td>
<td>Esqival / Wagner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Paving</td>
<td>Alaniz</td>
<td>Esqival / Wagner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>B&amp;K</td>
<td>Jensen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Qualifications for masonry Historical Landmark renovation</td>
<td>Not Included</td>
<td>Listed 4 historic structures + references</td>
<td>Extensive listing</td>
<td>Listed 4 projects. Included 10 others by Sullivan.</td>
<td>Listed 3 Projects. Included 3 other small ones by Cal</td>
<td>Listed 8 projects. Sized from 149k to 19.8M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Qualifications and Exclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Analysis & Sensitivity

Based on the 6 bids received, Contracts Office recommends award to Rudolph & Sletten. The Rudolph & Sletten Bid was the lowest responsible bid, they presented a significant list of projects evidencing historic seismic strengthening. Additionally, their project team includes Terry Barnum who has particular experience in this area of expertise.

The second lowest bidder, Barnes Construction did not provide specific examples of experience related to historic structure renovations.

Dinwiddie Construction and Power Engineering both presented excellent bids, however, their costs were $12,000 higher than Rudolph and Sletten.
TO: Chris Christofferson
    Marilyn Fogel
    James Gibbons
    Rosemary Hornby
    Maggie Kimball
    David Neuman
    Tim Portwood
    Jack Rakove
    Paul Turner, Chair
    Ex-Officio: Marlene Bumbera
    John P. Hanna
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    Mark Jones

FROM: Laura Jones

AGENDA

Thursday, January 25, 1996 - 8:30-10:00 a.m.
Hobby House at the Hanna House

1. Approval of Minutes, Meeting of November 30, 1995

2. Reports

3. Maintenance (Warren Jacobsen, Chris Christofferson)

4. Neighborhood Meeting (David Neuman)

Feb 29 event -
Likely questions (pause -
Schedules -
Cost -
Publicity / invitations -
Retaining well - new bid date in Feb.

Channel 51 is videotaping Paul’s talk.

Revision of operating statement
In the absence of Chairman Paul Turner, David Neuman opened the meeting.

1. **Review of Minutes, October 26, 1995**

The minutes of the meeting of October 26, 1995 were approved.

2. **Reports**

   a. **Retaining Wall Update**

   Warren Jacobsen reported that the FEMA funded portion of the project was bid separately, and that he expects to receive them next week. He said that the work will not be delayed due to winter weather.

   b. **Hanna House Brochure**

   Maggie Kimball said that she had sent letters of thanks, as well as documentation for permission to use the photographs for the Hanna House Restoration brochure. She said that she had heard from Beatrice Born, daughter of the architect for the Quillen house who had provided one of the brochure photos.

   c. **Parking on Frenchman's Road**

   David Neuman said that Frenchman's Road inhabitants have noticed an increase in on-street parking, especially since Thanksgiving. Cars are parked, and people and dogs walk across Junipero Serra Boulevard to walk and jog. Several alternatives are being studied by the Planning Office along with other issues related to Junipero Serra Boulevard. There is a proposal to close the gate opposite Frenchman's Road and to limit
parking. Other entrances into the foothills are at Stanford Avenue (the most heavily used), and at Gerona (the most lightly used). Chris Christofferson said that if the Frenchman's Road gate is closed, it will probably be necessary to increase the asphalt road edges on Stanford Avenue to accommodate vehicles not using Frenchman's.

d. Hanna House Funds - FY 1994-95 Financial Summary

Warren Jacobsen distributed a financial summary for the past academic year. He noted that income from the Nissan endowment was $111,194. There were transfers to the Maintenance Account of $21,272, and to the Renovation Project Account of $2,897, leaving a balance of $87,025 in that account for the year. Maggie Kimball inquired if the fund was accruing interest. Neuman said if there is interest income, it is probably going into fund management. Jacobsen said that he would inquire further, and report back to the Board.

Other fund balances were discussed, including the earthquake repair fund. It is estimated that there is enough money to take the project through the construction document phase. Still needed is approximately one million dollars for the actual construction.

e. Hanna House Property Survey

Chris Christofferson said that the Faculty/Staff housing Office had made a property line adjustment in 1991, which parallels Hobby House with the adjoining property. Prior to 1991, the Hobby House had been "almost on" the property line. He said that the Porteus' trash structure is on the property line. The Porteuses have proposed easements on either side of the present drive for parking. Warren Jacobsen said that firm of Ruth & Going have prepared a site survey for the Hanna House, and that they could be used to finish the job with a metes and bounds survey. Christofferson said he would follow-up.

3. Maintenance

Warren Jacobsen said that plans are underway to clean the roof and gutters and to seal cracks between doors and walls on the south and west sides of the house. It is also proposed to check the tightness of the windows.

David Neuman suggested several additional maintenance reviews: a pest inspection/treatment; need to have the Hanna House hooked into the campus fire alarm system; and that a monitoring report on the alarm system -- number of calls, etc. -- should be reviewed by the Board. Christofferson said that he would follow-up on these items. Laura Jones said that the grounds should be checked as well, for weak tree limbs and or plantings that might need fertilizing.
4. **Fundraising**

Tim Portwood reported that commitments to date equal $175,000, with the potential of an additional $50,000. He said that there are several items that he could use in talking to potential donors. The first is regarding future uses of the Hanna House. He said that the Mission Statement should be completed as soon as possible. A second need is for a brief outline regarding the qualifications of the restoration consultant team.

Discussion regarding completion of a document with the Mission Statement, Goals and Objectives, Programs/Projects and Work Plans ensued. It was decided that Laura Jones will draft a document, excluding projects and work plans and circulate this draft document to the Board within the next two weeks for review and comment. It was suggested that different scenarios for the Programs portion of the document be written for further discussion.

Marlene Bumbera and Warren Jacobsen will prepare a brief description of the qualifications and selection process for the restoration project consultants.

5. **Small Fundraising Event**

Tim said that he has been working with Paul Turner to finalize plans for a lecture in Annenberg Auditorium on the Hanna House - its history and future. The event is tentatively scheduled for late February or early March to be co-sponsored by the Art Department, Historic Society and the Board of Governors of Hanna House. He would like to invite President Casper to attend this early evening event, and to ask him to introduce Paul at the beginning of the program. If the President accepts, the date will be determined by his availability.

Board members suggested the following: Have Architectural Resources Group (ARG), Rutherford and Chekene, and Martin Weil, attend as members of the project consultant team. Also, have Kristine Hanna attend. Invite not only former Stanford Architecture graduates, but members of the AIA, San Francisco Chapter, AIA Santa Clara Valley Chapter, and Taliesien Fellows of the North Bay. It was suggested that the video being completed by Kristine be shown. It was also suggested that there might be two receptions in conjunction with the lecture — a wine and cheese reception before the lecture in the lobby, and a smaller reception following the lecture at Hobby House. Maggie Kimball suggested that a date be selected as soon as possible so that the Historic Society can begin publicizing the event.

6. **Quillen/Barth House**

David Neuman said that there are new plans for the house next door. The current plan is to demolish all but the Pool House, and rebuild on the existing foundation. He explained that with the addition of a second floor, the building height will be raised approximately eight feet. Members of the Board then
visited the south end of the Hanna House site and observed the present Quillen/Barth residence and relationships to the new architectural drawings. It was the conclusion of the Board that there will probably not be a big impact on the off-site views from the Hanna House, and that additional tree plantings could be added on the Hanna House property if necessary. The Board did, however, ask that they have an opportunity to review both the roof materials and color, as well as the house color.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:40 am.

Minutes prepared by M. Bumbera
Date: January 24, 1996

To: Hanna House Board of Governors

From: Chris Christofferson
Director of Facilities Operations

Subject: Status of Maintenance Projects (Hanna House Board of Governors Minutes Section 3)

a) Pest Inspection/Treatment:

Crane Pest Control has a monthly work order for insects, rodents, and nuisance creatures at Hanna House.

Landscape Pests: Arranged for Mayne Tree Experts to conduct a follow-up inspection to the one they conducted on May 12, 1994 on the care and condition of trees. The inspection will take place during the week of January 29 and Facilities Operations will follow up with the recommended spray schedule.

b) Hanna House Fire Alarm:

Alarm system is wired into the campus Base-10 system. For the period 9/1/95 to 1/5/96 approximately 2 intrusion alarms were received.

Arlene Musci of the Fire Alarm Shop will be scheduling an inspection of the alarm sensors. It may be that the alarm sensors are calibrated at too low a level and are picking up vibrations from small animals outside or from shadows. A follow up report will be submitted to the Board on this item.

It is recommended that a campus phone line to the main house be re-established both for security reasons (report emergencies) as well as to intercede during false intrusion alarms and cancel police notification.
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James Gibbons  
Rosemary Hornby  
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FROM: Laura Jones  

AGENDA  
Thursday, January 25, 1996 - 8:30-10:00 a.m.  
Hobby House at the Hanna House  
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2. Reports  
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Stanford University
Hanna House Board of Governors

Minutes of Meeting - November 30, 1995
Hobby House at the Hanna House

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

Members Absent:  James Gibbons        Paul Turner
                 Rosemary Hornby

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

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

1. **Review of Minutes, October 26, 1995**

The minutes of the meeting of October 26, 1995 were approved.

2. **Reports**

   a. **Retaining Wall Update**

      Warren Jacobsen reported that the FEMA funded portion of the project was bid separately, and that he expects to receive them next week. He said that the work will not be delayed due to winter weather.

   b. **Hanna House Brochure**

      Maggie Kimball said that she had sent letters of thanks, as well as documentation for permission to use the photographs for the Hanna House Restoration brochure. She said that she had heard from Beatrice Born, daughter of the architect for the Quillen house who had provided one of the brochure photos.

   c. **Parking on Frenchman's Road**

      David Neuman said that Frenchman's Road inhabitants have noticed an increase in on-street parking, especially since Thanksgiving. Cars are parked, and people and dogs walk across Junipero Serra Boulevard to walk and jog. Several alternatives are being studied by the Planning Office along with other issues related to Junipero Serra Boulevard. There is a proposal to close the gate opposite Frenchman's Road and to limit
parking. Other entrances into the foothills are at Stanford Avenue (the most heavily used), and at Gerona (the most lightly used). Chris Christofferson said that if the Frenchman's Road gate is closed, it will probably be necessary to increase the asphalt road edges on Stanford Avenue to accommodate vehicles not using Frenchman's.

d. Hanna House Funds - FY 1994-95 Financial Summary

Warren Jacobsen distributed a financial summary for the past academic year. He noted that income from the Nissan endowment was $111,194. There were transfers to the Maintenance Account of $21,272, and to the Renovation Project Account of $2,897, leaving a balance of $87,025 in that account for the year. Maggie Kimball inquired if the fund was accruing interest. Neuman said if there is interest income, it is probably going into fund management. Jacobsen said that he would inquire further, and report back to the Board.

Other fund balances were discussed, including the earthquake repair fund. It is estimated that there is enough money to take the project through the construction document phase. Still needed is approximately one million dollars for the actual construction.

e. Hanna House Property Survey

Chris Christofferson said that the Faculty/Staff housing Office had made a property line adjustment in 1991, which parallels Hobby House with the adjoining property. Prior to 1991, the Hobby House had been "almost on" the property line. He said that the Porteus' trash structure is on the property line. The Porteuses have proposed easements on either side of the present drive for parking. Warren Jacobsen said that firm of Ruth & Going have prepared a site survey for the Hanna House, and that they could be used to finish the job with a metes and bounds survey. Christofferson said he would follow-up.

3. Maintenance

Warren Jacobsen said that plans are underway to clean the roof and gutters and to seal cracks between doors and walls on the south and west sides of the house. It is also proposed to check the tightness of the windows.

David Neuman suggested several additional maintenance reviews: a pest inspection/treatment; need to have the Hanna House hooked into the campus fire alarm system; and that a monitoring report on the alarm system -- number of calls, etc. -- should be reviewed by the Board. Christofferson said that he would follow-up on these items. Laura Jones said that the grounds should be checked as well, for weak tree limbs and or plantings that might need fertilizing.
4. **Fundraising**

Tim Portwood reported that commitments to date equal $175,000, with the potential of an additional $50,000. He said that there are several items that he could use in talking to potential donors. The first is regarding future uses of the Hanna House. He said that the Mission Statement should be completed as soon as possible. A second need is for a brief outline regarding the qualifications of the restoration consultant team.

Discussion regarding completion of a document with the Mission Statement, Goals and Objectives, Programs/Projects and Work Plans ensued. It was decided that Laura Jones will draft a document, excluding projects and work plans and circulate this draft document to the Board within the next two weeks for review and comment. It was suggested that different scenarios for the Programs portion of the document be written for further discussion.

Marlene Bumbera and Warren Jacobsen will prepare a brief description of the qualifications and selection process for the restoration project consultants.

5. **Small Fundraising Event**

Tim said that he has been working with Paul Turner to finalize plans for a lecture in Annenberg Auditorium on the Hanna House - its history and future. The event is tentatively scheduled for late February or early March to be co-sponsored by the Art Department, Historic Society and the Board of Governors of Hanna House. He would like to invite President Casper to attend this early evening event, and to ask him to introduce Paul at the beginning of the program. If the President accepts, the date will be determined by his availability.

Board members suggested the following: Have Architectural Resources Group (ARG), Rutherford and Chekene, and Martin Weil, attend as members of the project consultant team. Also, have Kristine Hanna attend. Invite not only former Stanford Architecture graduates, but members of the AIA, San Francisco Chapter, AIA Santa Clara Valley Chapter, and Taliesien Fellows of the North Bay.

It was suggested that the video being completed by Kristine be shown. It was also suggested that there might be two receptions in conjunction with the lecture - a wine and cheese reception before the lecture in the lobby, and a smaller reception following the lecture at Hobby House. Maggie Kimball suggested that a date be selected as soon as possible so that the Historic Society can begin publicizing the event.

6. **Quillen/Barth House**

David Neuman said that there are new plans for the house next door. The current plan is to demolish all but the Pool House, and rebuild on the existing foundation. He explained that with the addition of a second floor, the building height will be raised approximately eight feet. Members of the Board then
visited the south end of the Hanna House site and observed the present Quillen/Barth residence and relationships to the new architectural drawings. It was the conclusion of the Board that there will probably not be a big impact on the off-site views from the Hanna House, and that additional tree plantings could be added on the Hanna House property if necessary. The Board did, however, ask that they have an opportunity to review both the roof materials and color, as well as the house color.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:40 am.

Minutes prepared by M. Bumbera
TO: Hanna House Board of Governors

FROM: Laura Jones

SUBJECT: Follow up on last week's meeting

DATE: December 4, 1995

Marlene suggested that we circulate the draft Minutes from our last meeting this week, as there were many action items which will occur before our next meeting in January. Please feel free to call me directly if you have any questions or suggestions. My direct line is 723-9664. If we have news from FEMA, which we expect later this month, I will send out a memo to keep you all informed.

Happy Holidays!
Stanford University
Hanna House Board of Governors

Minutes of Meeting - November 30, 1995
Hobby House at the Hanna House

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

Members Absent: James Gibbons
Rosemary Hornby

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

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

1. **Review of Minutes, October 26, 1995**

   The minutes of the meeting of October 26, 1995 were approved.

2. **Reports**

   a. **Retaining Wall Update**

      Warren Jacobsen reported that the FEMA funded portion of the project was bid separately, and that he expects to receive them next week. He said that the work will not be delayed due to winter weather.

   b. **Hanna House Brochure**

      Maggie Kimball said that she had sent letters of thanks, as well as documentation for permission to use the photographs for the Hanna House Restoration brochure. She said that she had heard from Beatrice Born, daughter of the architect for the Quillen house who had provided one of the brochure photos.

   c. **Parking on Frenchman's Road**

      David Neuman said that Frenchman's Road inhabitants have noticed an increase in on-street parking, especially since Thanksgiving. Cars are parked, and people and dogs walk across Junipero Serra Boulevard to walk and jog. Several alternatives are being studied by the Planning Office along with other issues related to Junipero Serra Boulevard. There is a proposal to close the gate opposite Frenchman's Road and to limit
parking. Other entrances into the foothills are at Stanford Avenue (the most heavily used), and at Gerona (the most lightly used). Chris Christofferson said that if the Frenchman's Road gate is closed, it will probably be necessary to increase the asphalt road edges on Stanford Avenue to accommodate vehicles not using Frenchman's.

d. **Hanna House Funds - FY 1994-95 Financial Summary**

Warren Jacobsen distributed a financial summary for the past academic year. He noted that income from the Nissan endowment was $111,194. There were transfers to the Maintenance Account of $21,272, and to the Renovation Project Account of $2,897, leaving a balance of $87,025 in that account for the year. Maggie Kimball inquired if the fund was accruing interest. Neuman said if there is interest income, it is probably going into fund management. Jacobsen said that he would inquire further, and report back to the Board.

Other fund balances were discussed, including the earthquake repair fund. It is estimated that there is enough money to take the project through the construction document phase. Still needed is approximately one million dollars for the actual construction.

e. **Hanna House Property Survey**

Chris Christofferson said that the Faculty/Staff housing Office had made a property line adjustment in 1991, which parallels Hobby House with the adjoining property. Prior to 1991, the Hobby House had been "almost on" the property line. He said that the Dodds' trash structure is on the property line. The Dodds have proposed easements on either side of the present drive for parking. Warren Jacobsen said that firm of Ruth & Going have prepared a site survey for the Hanna House, and that they could be used to finish the job with a metes and bounds survey. Christofferson said he would follow-up.

3. **Maintenance**

Warren Jacobsen said that plans are underway to clean the roof and gutters and to seal cracks between doors and walls on the south and west sides of the house. It is also proposed to check the tightness of the windows.

David Neuman suggested several additional maintenance reviews: a pest inspection/treatment; need to have the Hanna House hooked into the campus fire alarm system; and that a monitoring report on the alarm system -- number of calls, etc. -- should be reviewed by the Board. Christofferson said that he would follow-up on these items. Laura Jones said that the grounds should be checked as well, for weak tree limbs and or plantings that might need fertilizing.
4. **Fundraising**

Tim Portwood reported that commitments to date equal $175,000, with the potential of an additional $50,000. He said that there are several items that he could use in talking to potential donors. The first is regarding future uses of the Hanna House. He said that the Mission Statement should be completed as soon as possible. A second need is for a brief outline regarding the qualifications of the restoration consultant team.

Discussion regarding completion of a document with the Mission Statement, Goals and Objectives, Programs/Projects and Work Plans ensued. It was decided that Laura Jones will draft a document, excluding projects and work plans and circulate this draft document to the Board within the next two weeks for review and comment. It was suggested that different scenarios for the Programs portion of the document be written for further discussion.

Marlene Bumbera and Warren Jacobsen will prepare a brief description of the qualifications and selection process for the restoration project consultants.

5. **Small Fundraising Event**

Tim said that he has been working with Paul Turner to finalize plans for a lecture in Annenberg Auditorium on the Hanna House - its history and future. The event is tentatively scheduled for late February or early March to be co-sponsored by the Art Department, Historic Society and the Board of Governors of Hanna House. He would like to invite President Casper to attend this early evening event, and to ask him to introduce Paul at the beginning of the program. If the President accepts, the date will be determined by his availability.

Board members suggested the following: Have Architectural Resources Group (ARG), Rutherford and Chekene, and Martin Weil, attend as members of the project consultant team. Also, have Kristine Hanna attend. Invite not only former Stanford Architecture graduates, but members of the AIA, San Francisco Chapter, AIA Santa Clara Valley Chapter, and Taliesen Fellows of the North Bay. It was suggested that the video being completed by Kristine be shown. It was also suggested that there might be two receptions in conjunction with the lecture -- a wine and cheese reception before the lecture in the lobby, and a smaller reception following the lecture at Hobby House. Maggie Kimball suggested that a date be selected as soon as possible so that the Historic Society can begin publicizing the event.

6. **Quillen/Barth House**

David Neuman said that there are new plans for the house next door. The current plan is to demolish all but the Pool House, and rebuild on the existing foundation. He explained that with the addition of a second floor, the building height will be raised approximately eight feet. Members of the Board then
visited the south end of the Hanna House site and observed the present Quillen/Barth residence and relationships to the new architectural drawings. It was the conclusion of the Board that there will probably not be a big impact on the off-site views from the Hanna House, and that additional tree plantings could be added on the Hanna House property if necessary. The Board did, however, ask that they have an opportunity to review both the roof materials and color, as well as the house color.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:40 am.

Minutes prepared by M. Bumbera
STRATEGIC PLANNING


"Strategic planning is one of the most important--and overlooked--responsibilities of nonprofit organizations. Through strategic planning, organizations define what they do, why they do it and how they get it done."(1)

"[T]he board is responsible for governing the organization. This is established by law. This usually involves setting governing policies. The most central of these governing policies is establishing the strategic direction of the organization--the mission statement and goals. Therefore, the primary responsibility for the mission statement and goals falls on the board of directors. The president, or chair of the board, is responsible to see that this takes place."(19)

"There are five important steps in the strategic planning process[.]

Assessment
"At its most basic, [assessment] is an attempt to understand the need for the organization to exist." It looks at issues that affect the organization's ability to fulfill its need to exist.(4)

Long-range planning
Long-range planning produces a mission statement and strategies to implement the mission.

"[T]he mission statement defines the purpose of the organization."(7) A good mission statement is clear, concise, and correct. In no more than twenty words, the statement clarifies what the organization does and distinguishes it from other, similar, organizations.(9)

Developing or reviewing the mission statement "is one of the most overlooked pieces of the strategic planning process."(7) "The most important aspect of developing or revising a mission statement is the process that goes with such a revision. . . . Organizations that provide regular opportunities for board reinvestment in the mission usually maintain a very high level of board commitment."(8)

"The mission is. . . the basis for much of the communication of the organization. Brochures and marketing materials refer directly to the language of the mission. Grant proposals use the mission as the starting point for defining the organization's programs. Board members quote the mission statement as they personally promote the organization in the community."(9)

The second aspect of long-range planning is the establishment of goals that define the strategies that the organization will implement over the next three to five years to achieve the mission.(7)
Short-term planning
Short-term planning establishes programs for the coming year to accomplish the mission. The plan establishes a priority for each program, determines starting and completion dates, and designates a coordinator for each project. Each program is defined so that its success can be measured. (5)

Implementation
Implementation of the programs involves the formation of committees, work plans, and budgets. (6)

"[T]he staff is responsible for implementing the programs of the organization. Along with the responsibility to implement the program... goes the authority to decide how it will be implemented. These decisions are embodied in the work plans and program budgets. Therefore, the primary responsibility for program development and implementation falls on the staff... Board members almost always are involved in some level of program development and implementation." (19)

Evaluation
"This step evaluates the strengths and shortcomings of past and current programs in an effort to guide future planning." (5)

Evaluation "is a badge of credibility among funders. Evaluation convinces funders that an organization is seeking results rather than just money." (18)
Fund-raising Report

Total Goal: $1,000,000

Commitments-to-date: $100,000

- 50,000 (possible additional $50,000 after 1/1/96)
- 20,000 ($30,000 total when added to previous $10,000 gift)
- 5,000 (verbal commitment)

TOTAL: $175,000

Additional Points:

1. Donor questions regarding use (need for mission statement?)

2. Donor concerns regarding selection/qualifications of architects/engineers

3. Paul Turner's lecture-in-preparation; invitation list?

   - Late Winter Qtr -
   - Cosponsored by Architecture Dept., SSH, B of Governors
   - Early evening event
   - Co-sponsor of invitees
STANFORD UNIVERSITY MEMORANDUM

November 28, 1995

TO: Chris Christofferson
    Marilyn Fogel
    James Gibbons
    Rosemary Hornby
    Maggie Kimball
    David Neuman
    Tim Portwood
    Jack Rakove
    Paul Turner, Chair
    Ex-Officio:
    Marlene Bumbera
    John P. Hanna
    Warren Jacobsen
    Mark Jones

FROM: Laura Jones

AGENDA

Thursday, November 30, 1995 - 8:30-10:00 a.m.
Hobby House at the Hanna House

1. Approval of Minutes, Meeting of October 26, 1995
2. Reports
3. Maintenance (Warren Jacobsen, Chris Christofferson)
4. Fundraising events (Laura Jones)
5. Stewardship Policies (Marilyn Fogel, Laura Jones)
6. Quillen/Barth House update (David Neuman)
   - Need to determine mission statement
   - Wine of caution...
Stanford University
Hanna House Board of Governors

Minutes of Meeting - October 26, 1995
Hobby House at the Hanna House

Members Present: Chris Christofferson David Neuman
Marilyn Fogel Tim Portwood
Rosemary Hornby Paul Turner, Chair
Maggie Kimball Jack Rakove

Members Absent: James Gibbons

Others Present: Marlene Bumbera Warren Jacobsen
John Hanna

Chair, Paul Turner, opened the meeting.

1. Review of Minutes, August 25, 1995

The minutes of the meeting of August 25, 1995 were approved.

2. Reports

a. Fundraising/Brochure: Tim Portwood said that because of cost savings in the brochure’s design, one thousand copies were produced. He distributed copies to those present. He said that he is planning to meet with prospective donors in southern California in the near future.

Warren Jacobsen suggested that former Stanford graduates in Architecture might be interested in contributing to the Hanna House restoration. Tim said that he has a copy of that graduate list. Paul Turner said that he has a list of those interested in the Hanna House from days when he conducted tours, and that this list might be used too. He added that he is preparing a new talk on the current restoration and that he will be available to make this presentation in any type of forum.

b. Frank Lloyd Wright Conservancy Annual Meeting: Warren Jacobsen reported that he met several Wright house owners on his recent trip to the Frank Lloyd Wright Conservancy meeting in Chicago, and that at least one person he met has indicated that a donation would be forthcoming. He also said that he is sending copies of the brochure to be placed in the Oak Park store.
The Conservancy will hold its next meeting near the end of September 1996 in Seattle. This meeting will be sponsored by the Taliesin Fellows, based in southern California. This group of from 20 to 60 persons has expressed interest in stopping on their way north to this meeting to visit the Hanna House. John Hanna said that there is another Taliesin group in the North Bay who hold monthly meetings. He suggested that perhaps these two groups could get together for this visit. In response to Jacobsen's query as to whether we are interested in pursuing such a visit, the response was unanimously in the positive.

3. **FEMA Update**

David Neuman distributed copies of the Draft Minutes of the meeting held on October 6th with FEMA representatives, State Office of Emergency Services and the American Council on Historic Preservation. He said that most of the meeting concerned the Museum, Green Library West and HRP/Anatomy. While the proposed repair scheme for the Hanna House had been received by the reviewers, they had not yet had time for a detailed analysis, as several of the FEMA personnel from the San Francisco office had been sent to the Virgin Islands to conduct preliminary hurricane damage reports.

FEMA representatives expected that they will return by the end of December to continue the discussions. Neuman said that we could receive $600,000 to $700,000 from FEMA of the $1,800,000 needed for the repair and restoration when negotiations are concluded.

4. **Retaining Wall Update**

Warren Jacobsen reported that the Building Permit for repair of the retaining wall has been issued, and that the project is being prepared for bid. He expects that bids will be available by the November meeting, and that construction will be completed early in 1996.

5. **Neighborhood Outreach**

David Neuman said that it will be important to inform the neighbors on two aspects of planning. The first is on what is to be expected when construction begins, for example, the hours for construction (which must follow County and Stanford regulations), contractor's parking, etc. He said that the other part will be to inform the neighbors of what to expect in terms of the program. He said that concerning the construction, that the Planning Office, Facilities Project Management and Facility Operations could be the conduit, but that programmatic plans should be presented by a member of the Board of Governors. He also said that it is important to follow the correct protocol in arranging meetings with the neighbors, and that he will make formal contact with Barbara Klein of the Faculty/Staff Housing Office first, then with the SCRL.
a. Miscellaneous Related Issues

Jack Rakove said that he has noticed an upsurge in the number of cars parking on Frenchman's Road, especially late in the afternoon. People park, and then walk in the foothills. Chris Christofferson said that his office has been working with the SCRL on this problem. David Neuman said that in the past week, students have been surveying those who have been parking in the residential area to identify and quantify who they are.

John Hanna said that the amount of garbage, lawn trimmings, etc. that is deposited at the back of the house next door needs to be addressed. He said that the use of the driveway was a neighbor agreement when his family lived in the house, but that the amount of debris has become unsightly. He suggested that we follow-up to see if the area can be beautified.

A question was raised about boundaries, and whether or not an easement for the driveway exists. Neuman said that in this area of the residential neighborhood, there are a web of informal use relationships that probably would remain unchanged. He said that the SCRL is currently surveying to establish boundaries. Chris Christofferson said he would check to see if Frenchman's Road is part of the survey, and that if not, he will have the survey done. When these steps are completed, further actions can be discussed.

6. Stewardship Policies

Marilyn Fogel distributed information that she had collected from several sources related to management and conservation policies at Fallingwater and at the Frank Lloyd Wright Home and Studio. She suggested that Board members read these at their convenience. She said that there were one or two things, however that she thought were important. She said that at Fallingwater, to protect the furnishings, the original pieces are kept on display, however when an event it held, they are removed and reproductions are used. She said this might be an idea for consideration for the Hanna House furnishings. Another item she mentioned related to approved caterers. She said that at Fallingwater, only one caterer is approved; at the Home/Studio, three caterers are approved. At both sites, staff are on-site to supervise these specially-trained caterers.

Marilyn also provided a checklist and reading list for stewardship of the house. These are from documents of the American Association of Museums, and the National Trust for Historic Preservation. She suggested that we begin a library, and that it might be a good idea to purchase a few booklets at this time. Paul Turner suggested that we get only one copy of a few of these booklets, to see if it is appropriate to order more so each member would have a copy. Maggie Kimball
said that she would review the book list to see whether or not they might already be available on the campus.

A sheet of information on the subject of stewardship was distributed by Marilyn, covering different aspects of management and operation, collections management, and public dimension. Tim Portwood suggested that a subcommittee on Stewardship be formed to explore in more detail these concerns, and to draft ideas and/or proposals in more detail to bring to the full Board for discussion and review. Paul Turner said that we have already explored some of these issues, which are documented in the approved proposal for use of the House, and in the Draft Guidelines which were completed following the charrette earlier this year. Several members of the Board agreed that it would be helpful for contact with neighbors, as well as for fundraising purposes to have a document of a few pages, with Mission statement, and guidelines available, including a policy statement about furniture; criteria for loans of furniture to museums, etc.

It was decided that a subcommittee be formed to develop a "Stewardship Program Document" for review at the November meeting. Serving on the committee will be: Laura Jones, Marilyn Fogel, Rosemary Hornby, and John Hanna. Also volunteering in a part-time capacity were Paul Turner and David Neuman.

7. **Walk-In Items**

David Neuman reported that a local architect had suggested that we license the reproduction of one or more pieces of Wright furniture for sale, which might produce some income. Questions were raised regarding ownership, and whether or not the Frank Lloyd Wright name can be used. Following discussion, Neuman said that he would pursue how ownership rights are established, if a copyright is needed, etc., with Stanford's legal consultants.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:20 am.

Minutes prepared by M. Bumbera
## Financial Summary - Hanna House Funds

### Spendable Funds from Nissan Endowment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources:</th>
<th>FY1993-94</th>
<th>FY1994-95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance 9/1</td>
<td>$184,066</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Allocation</td>
<td>$86,007</td>
<td>$111,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Acct.</td>
<td>$23,823</td>
<td>$21,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Project</td>
<td>$246,250</td>
<td>$2,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acct (9VDQ047)</td>
<td>$270,073</td>
<td>$24,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance 8/31</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$87,025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Operation & Maintenance Fund

| Transfer In | $35,000 | $29,288 |
| Use During Year | $23,823 | $21,272 |
| Amount Returned | $11,177 | $8,016 |

### Fund Balances

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

### Earthquake Project Accounts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Account:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount Funded</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitments thru 8/95</td>
<td>215,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures thru 8/95</td>
<td>201,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncommitted Balance</td>
<td>$109,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Account:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount Funded</td>
<td>$217,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitments</td>
<td>217,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>217,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncommitted Balance</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** According to the October fund statement, $28,846 has already been transferred to the operating maintenance account leaving a balance of $58,179 in the Nissan capital account. During the year, an additional $100,000 plus of earned income will be transferred into this account, leaving a revised balance of approximately $160,000 in the account at the end of FY 1995-96.
I. Management and Operation
   • purpose and mission
   • planning
   • governance
   • administration
   • collections and facilities
   • public programs
   • community support

   • demonstrate credibility to funding agencies and public by clearly communicating purpose, mission, goals, and needs
   • assure effective, efficient use of resources in fulfillment of stated purpose
   • understand professional museum [stewardship] standards

II. Collections Management
   • collections policies
   • documentation
   • inventory
   • storage
   • acquisition and deaccession
   • preservation
   • risk management
   • environmental control
   • loans

   • clearly articulated collections- care procedures reflect current professional standards
   • comprehensive collections policies fulfill stated purpose

III. Public Dimension
   • public perception
   • public experience
   • public involvement

   • communicate with the public about collections, research, interpretive activities
   • increase emphasis on educational mandate
   • understand image in community
   • improve service to current audience and attract new, diverse audiences
   • develop and improve marketing and public relations
   • improve scholarly research and public programs
   • strengthen and diversify funding base
STEWARDSHIP

Recommended by Martin Weil:

$125.00

$68.00

check on who might have these
October 23, 1995

TO: Gerhard Casper, President
FROM: Paul V. Turner, Chair
       David J. Neuman, Secretary
SUBJECT: 1994-95 Annual Report - Hanna House Board of Governors

Below is a summary of actions and activities undertaken by the Hanna House Board of Governors for the academic year 1994-95. Meetings were held monthly from September 1994 through August, 1995.

The Board of Governors during the past year focused on the following matters:

- Seismic strengthening and historic restoration of the Hanna House
- Fundraising strategies
- Future program of operations for the House
- Furnishings inventory and conservation
- House and garden maintenance

Seismic Strengthening and Historic Restoration

A new engineering study of the earthquake damage to the Hanna House, and a new structural design were completed. Subsequently, a programming session with the various restoration consultants, Board of Governors, Provost Office representatives and project staff members was held to develop an initial use program document.

Construction documents for repair of the retaining wall on the west end of the House have been completed and a building permit is being processed. It is expected that the work on this element will be completed by mid-January, 1996.

A revised submittal to FEMA was made in July with the new repair scheme. A meeting was held with FEMA, SHPO and the Advisory Committee on Historic Preservation (ACHP) the week of October 9, 1995 to review this submittal. A response from FEMA regarding the amount of its funding for repairs is expected by the end of 1995.
Fundraising Strategies

Fundraising strategies and identification of donors, with help from the Development Office, was on-going throughout the year. The Development Office staff met with several potential donors, both in this country and in Japan.

A fundraising brochure describing the Hanna House, earthquake damage and restoration plans was prepared (see attachment).

Future Program of Operations

Operational guidelines for the uses of the Hanna House, including management and staffing options, as well as on-going conservation and restoration of the House, have been studied. In June, several members of the Board and ex-officio staff members visited Los Angeles and spent the day visiting with the Directors/Curators of two similar facilities. Sites visited were the Gamble House in Pasadena designed by Greene and Greene (operated by the University of Southern California), and Rancho Los Alamitos in Long Beach, (operated as a non-profit foundation). Subjects such as space utilization, operating costs, and disabled access were discussed.

Furnishings

The inventory of furnishings originally in the house was revised. The furnishings which had been removed from the Hanna House following the Loma Prieta Earthquake were retrieved from various campus storage locations, consolidated, and placed in storage at the Lake House.

An original Frank Lloyd Wright living room chair was returned by the Milwaukee Art Museum where it had been on exhibit; and a one-year extension was made to a loan of two other original chairs to the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York.

House and Garden Maintenance

Repairs were made to the roof of the House, while several large unstable branches overhanging the roof were removed. Plumbing leaks were repaired and water damage repairs to the Hobby House guest quarters were completed. Garden debris was cleared, and an initial evaluation made of existing plantings.

In summary, the Board of Governors have proceeded on several fronts in preparing for the restoration and seismic repair to the Hanna House. Further analysis and study are expected during FY 95-96 toward finalization of a Use Program for future Hanna House operations; along with fundraising efforts and collaboration in the actual restoration process itself.

If you have specific questions, please contact either of us.

cc: Provost Condoleezza Rice
TO: Chris Christofferson
   Marilyn Fogel
   James Gibbons
   Rosemary Hornby
   Maggie Kimball
   David Neuman
   Tim Portwood
   Jack Rakove
   Paul Turner, Chair

FROM: Laura Jones

AGENDA

Thursday, October 26, 1995 - 8:30-10:00 a.m.
Hobby House at the Hanna House

1. Approval of Minutes, Meeting of August 25, 1995

2. Reports

3. FEMA Update (David Neuman)

4. Retaining Wall Update (Warren Jacobsen)

5. Neighborhood Outreach

6. Stewardship Policies (Marilyn Fogel)

FLW Conservancy meeting - Seattle Fall '96
   90-91 signs might be interested in visiting
   house before diode info.

SCRL...presentation re: E.L.'s house project
Stanford University
Hanna House Board of Governors

Minutes of Meeting - August 31, 1995
Hobby House at the Hanna House

Members Present: Chris Christoferson
                 Marilyn Fogel
                 Rosemary Hornby
                 Tim Portwood
                 Paul Turner, Chair
                 Jack Rakove

Members Absent:  James Gibbons
                 Maggie Kimball
                 David Neuman
                 Jack Rakove

Others Present:  Marlene Bumbera
                 Laura Jones
                 Mark Jones

John Hanna
            Warren Jacobsen

Chair, Paul Turner, opened the meeting.

New member of the Board of Governors, Chris Christoferson, was introduced to those
present, who each described their area of expertise on the Board for his information.

1. Review of Minutes, July 27, 1995

The minutes of the meeting of July 27, 1995 were approved following
corrections.

2. Reports

   a. Meeting Schedule: Laura Jones asked if the current Thursday morning
      meeting time of 8:30 to 10 am suits faculty members' schedules. She will
      follow-up with absent faculty.

   b. Fundraising/Brochure: Tim Portwood reported that the brochure is at the
      printers, and will be available in 10 to 14 days. He said that he was able to
      gain permission to use the Esther Born and Ezra Stoller photo which was
      used in Sunset Magazine for no fee. Portwood also said that John Ford had
      met with an unnamed potential donor and that the Development Office is
      still identifying other potential donors. He said that individual members of
      the Board of Governors can expect to be approached.

Paul Turner inquired if it would be advantageous to publish information
about Hanna House in other publications, such as the Conservancy
Newsletter; Society of Architectural Historians, or other preservation
magazines. Portwood said that such exposure would be good for
educational purposes, but would probably not be too useful for fundraising purposes.

Rosemary Hornby reminded the group that we had previously discussed a press release, and that there was to be some mention of the Hanna House in a fall issue of the *Stanford Magazine/Observer*. A brief discussion ensued, and it was decided that a press release about the restoration of the Hanna House will be made following reaching an agreement with FEMA. The evolution of the repair scheme for Hanna House might be a good topic for a future *Stanford Magazine* issue.

c. **Film**: Warren Jacobsen said that Christine Hanna has gone through the house. John Hanna said that Christine is planning on working on the script during the next weekend. Warren distributed a copy of the AIA College of Fellows 1996 Grants Program. He asked members to review it to see if we might be eligible to apply for a 2-year grant of up to $10,000 which we could use for the film or other areas.

3. **Budget Report**

Warren Jacobsen distributed a summary of funds and another on project costs. He said that there have been no changes in the Nissan funds since the last report, and that the Earthquake Account has $115,965, less current expenses (brochure).

4. **Project Forecast**

On the project account, costs to the Architect through construction documents will be $253,000. The repair of the retaining wall will be $338,000. These costs are beyond commitments in the financial summary, with a shortfall of approximately $200,000. It was pointed out that there is $100,000 annual income from the Nissan account which can be used. It was decided that while additional funds are being identified that we keep the project going. Warren explained that no FEMA funds are available until after the 106 Review, but once that is approved, we can get funds before construction begins. John Hanna said that if current funding is depleted in 2 1/2 to 3 months, that we either need backup funds, FEMA funds, or invade the principal. Warren said that to invade the principal, the Board would need the agreement of the Provost and the Board of Trustees. Marilyn Fogel said that there is a need to gain community interest, perhaps start a "Friends of Hanna House" group. Tim Portwood said that a small fund-raiser or names for the plaque at $5,000 each might be attempted.

Mark Jones said that the project needs to be taken to the Board of Trustees, and that the Board of Governors is the sponsor (analogous to a Dean). The project needs seismic approval; project program approval; Provost approval, and Program and Design Approval, with details as how the project is to be funded. If we go to the December Board of Trustees, materials need to be ready to go to the Cabinet by October 31.
On a motion by Tim Portwood, seconded by Marilyn Fogel and unanimously approved, expenditures were authorized to cover the architect's contract for measured drawings.

5. **Next Steps**

   a. **Space Planning:** Laura Jones said that following talks with Jacqueline Wender, she will have a report next month on special space programming for Hanna House. Marilyn Fogel said that a long-term agenda is needed for space programming, and that we should review current standards of stewardship. She said that if there is a standard list, this should be reviewed. Laura Jones said that there are guidelines in the Federal Register from the Department of the Interior. She will talk to Ruth Todd and Maggie Kimball to get a set of these standards for Board's use.

   b. **Neighborhood Concerns:** Laura Jones said that we need to invite the Frenchman Road faculty neighbors to a meeting to inform them of the plans for Hanna House. It was suggested that the best way to approach this would be through Terilynn Langsey-Burt from the Planning Office, who is currently meeting with some of these residents through the SCRL and Junipero Serra Boulevard road improvements. She will talk to Betty Kaplan of SCRL as well. Paul Turner in summary, said we should proceed with a neighborhood meeting for sometime in October.

There being no announcements, the meeting adjourned at 10:30 am.

Minutes prepared by M. Bumbera
October 23, 1995

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

Projects: Hanna House, HRP/Anatomy Buildings, Green Library West, Group 1 Masonry Specifications

Date: October 6, 1995

Place: 855 Serra Street, Stanford University, Stanford, CA

Subject: Status updates

Present: Jean Barnes, SU Facilities Project Management
Jim Barnes, OES
Craig Comartin, SU Seismic Engineer
Tom Dack, FEMA
Pat Dunn, FEMA
Steve Farneth, Architectural Resources Group
Laura Jones, SU Planning Office
Vance Kaminski, OES
Lee Keatinge, ACHP (by telephone) American Council on Historic Preservation
David Neuman, SU Planning Office
Cherilyn Widell, OHP Office of Historic Preservation (State)

Purpose: The primary purpose of the meeting was to review seismic repair studies for Hanna House and HRP/Anatomy for historical sensitivity and to establish process for requesting funding for repairs. Several ongoing seismic repair projects were also discussed.

Green Library West

As the architecture firm has changed for this project, from The Architect's Collaborative to Fields and Devereaux, the MOA needs to be amended with a new set of reference drawings as the Section 106 compliance criteria. FEMA asked SU to draft a one page amendment to the MOA and circulate this to the signatories on the MOA.

SU reported that Fields and Devereaux have prepared a new set of project drawings, which SU proposes to substitute as the criteria set. These drawings will be sent to FEMA and OHP for comment with a cover memo discussing the treatment of historic features described in the MOA and other historic preservation issues.

Group 1 Buildings Masonry Specifications

FEMA reported that they had drafted a new set of Masonry Grouting and Repointing specifications for the Group 1 Sandstone Buildings. SU will comment to FEMA on the draft, which will then be issued as the final specifications, to be incorporated into upcoming Group 2 seismic repair projects such as Buildings 01-090, 01-100, 01-110, the Freestanding Arcades and Memorial Court.
HRP/Anatomy

Steve Farneth presented three alternate repair schemes as outlined in an ARG study, that was requested by FEMA and OHP during an earlier Leland Stanford Junior Museum of Art Section 106 consultation. The three repair schemes have substantially similar seismic strengthening and repair schemes, and all three involve the demolition of the wings of the structure and the rehabilitation of the central rotunda. Three alternate program uses were studied with different minimum architectural features: a classroom/art studio, a library, and a visitor's center/exhibition space.

OHP enthusiastically supported the idea of a visitor's center to welcome visitors to the campus and requested an additional copy of the study be sent to Steade Craigo at OHP for review.

SU asked for comment on the ARG recommendation to remove a stair and walls added to the rotunda in a 1911 remodel when the School of Medicine replaced the Museum of Art as user of the building. The removal of these elements would allow for a more dramatic architectural interpretation of the rotunda as it was originally intended: as a single large, round space with abundant natural light. OHP expressed some reservations about removing additions to character defining features of the rotunda. ACHP recommended recordation of the 1911 interior additions and their removal. OHP concurred, and remarked that the HRP/Anatomy rotunda project might benefit from applying the standards for restoration rather than the standards for rehabilitation.

SU requested direction from FEMA on how to apply for funding for the repair of the rotunda. FEMA replied that they appreciated the study and the identification of possible program uses of the building, however FEMA feels under no obligation to provide additional funding. Nonetheless, FEMA recommended that SU write to OES to request additional funding for one of the three repair schemes.

SU requested comment on whether the balance of the existing HRP/Anatomy DSR could be applied to the demolition of the wings of the building and the stabilization of the rotunda. FEMA allowed that Section 106 clearance to demolish the wings had been given at a previous consultation. FEMA and OES suggested that in addition to the letter to OES requesting supplemental funding, SU should send a letter requesting clarification on the various options for the use of the existing DSR, including the demolition of the wings, stabilization of the rotunda, fencing or related site work.

Hanna House

Craig Comartin presented the proposed seismic repair scheme, which was greeted by FEMA, OES, OHP and ACHP as a significant improvement in historical sensitivity from earlier proposals. The repair scheme was accepted as proposed.

FEMA stated that Hanna House is a unique project because FEMA's national representatives had initiated discussions with SU regarding funding for repair. FEMA expects to reevaluate the existing DSR for Hanna House in light of the new repair scheme and respond to SU's request for supplemental funding by the end of 1995. FEMA may request additional data regarding the extent of the Loma Prieta damage to the structure and the feasibility of the proposed seismic repair methodology.
FAX TRANSMITTAL

Marilyn Fogel
27950 Roble Blanco Los Altos Hills, CA 94022
(415) 941-1304 FAX (415) 948-9599

DATE: October 23, 1995
NUMBER OF PAGES TRANSMITTED: 20

TO: Laura Jones
Planning Office
FAX 725-8598

COMMENTS:

Laura, the Hanna House brochure looks terrific. Your photos juxtaposed with the earlier pictures are outstanding.

Attached is information regarding special event use at Fallingwater and the FLW Home and Studio, as well as excerpts from book lists from the National Trust and the American Association of Museums. Perhaps the material on governance and management would be pertinent to this non-museum historic property.
FALLINGWATER SPECIAL EVENTS POLICY

BASIC POLICY: The primary purpose of the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy's operation of Fallingwater is the preservation of the building and its collection in order to make them available for public education and appreciation. Therefore, the use of Fallingwater for private events that by their very nature have a social as opposed to educational focus, should be carefully controlled. Moreover, such utilization in a relaxed atmosphere that involves the active use of a very valuable furnishings and decorative arts collection, and thus places that collection in some jeopardy, a condition that is compounded when food and alcohol are included, should only be undertaken with the greatest caution and concern for the safety of the house and its collection.

AMOUNT OF USE: In addition to the above stated preservation issues, concern for a staff that is already strained by the high visitation at Fallingwater must be considered. Therefore, use of the building for after hour special events should be limited to 3 SPECIAL EVENTS ANNUALLY. Events during the months of October and August should be avoided. Inasmuch as the "Friends of Fallingwater" dinner is an annual event, this permits four additional events.

USE BY WHOM: The use of the building for special events is limited to those events that directly benefit Fallingwater or the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy and to use by not-for-profit organizations that are associated with Fallingwater or the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy. Private use of the building by an individual is strictly prohibited.

USE LIMITATIONS: The main house living room can be used for small dinner parties limited to 10 people. Larger events that include dinner should be held at the guest house terrace (limit 35) or, in case of bad weather, in the Conservancy lounge at the car port or in the cafe. All events involving more than 35 people must be held either in a tent or at the visitors pavilion. Any cocktail parties held in the house are to be limited to no more than 40 people. Such cocktail parties may last no longer than 2 hours. In addition, there must be 1 Fallingwater staff attendant for every 10 guests in addition to the regular maintenance and service personnel.

RENTAL FEES: Rental of the main house for a dinner party not to exceed 4 hours in length is $2,000. Rental of the living room for a cocktail party not to exceed 40 people and 2 hours in length is $2,000. A dinner party for 35 people
at the pool, or lounge $1,500. A dinner party at the
pavilion for 50 people $1,750. None of these fees include
the cost of food, liquor or the services of a caterer.

**CONSERVANCY EVENTS:** When special events that include dinner
are held for the Conservancy there is no rental fee but
rather an administrative fee of $200 for up to 40 people and
$3.00 per person for groups larger than 40. In addition,
Fallingwater should be reimbursed for all direct expenses
including tour staff costs and maintenance staff costs as
well as all out of pocket expenses and cleaning expenses.

**CATERERS:** Only caterers authorized by Fallingwater and
therefore familiar with our procedures will be employed for
such events.

**PROTECTION OF FURNISHINGS:** Reproductions of the two large
coffee tables in the living room and three of the low side
tables should be made and the originals removed for such
events. The originals should be wrapped in quilted
furniture moving pads and removed to safe storage. There
should be no small side tables next to the coffee tables for
special events as people tend to trip over them. The
following objects should be removed from the living room and
placed in storage: the archaic Greek bowl (west coffee
table); Negoro lacquer lidded bowl (west side table); Negoro
bowl (side table in music area); Ceramic bull (southern
coffee table); glass ashtray (table nr. fur throw). A high
quality padded table cover should be purchased for the
dining table. The table should never be used without a
cover nor should any heated dishes be placed on it. The
desk should be partially covered with a kilim throw in order
to protect its finish. A barrier sign should be made and
placed to the left at the top of the living room/second
floor stairs to prevent guests from wandering unattended
through the house.

**Programming not during regular hours:**

Although twilight tours, after hour tours, and private tours
during periods or on days we are normally closed provide
visitors a unique opportunity to see Fallingwater, we must
be very cautious not to over schedule such events.

For a private tour of Fallingwater the ticket cost is $35
for groups of 10 or under and $25 for groups over 10.
For such private showings we must, at the very least, cover
expenses. Typically, these include: tour staff expenses,
and maintenance expenses as well as any out of pocket
expenses.
Private showing should when possible be scheduled between 1 and 3 on Mondays so the house can still be cleaned and everyone gone by 4:30 p.m.

After hours tours are best begun at five o'clock and should not be scheduled for groups of more than 30 people. Larger groups should be scheduled as part of the last tour of the day and begun at 4 o'clock.

The kinds of events we can provide as incentives to potential friends or Conservancy supporters include a tour and luncheon with Curator on the private office terrace, or wine and cheese following the tour at either the guest house pool or in the member's lounge (this must occur as part of the last tour of the day). Other events can be developed in consultation with the Fallingwater administration.
FALLINGWATER MISSION STATEMENT
Board of Director's resolution adopted 9-20-90

The purpose of the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy's operation of Fallingwater is: 1) to preserve, maintain and make available for public education and appreciation, Frank Lloyd Wright's masterpiece, "Fallingwater"; 2) to demonstrate by the example of Fallingwater the powerful result that can be achieved through the harmonious union of man's work with nature; 3) to maintain in Fallingwater its character as a weekend home of the period it was occupied by its owners, Edgar and Liliane Kaufmann (occupied 1938 to 1955) and their son, Edgar Kaufmann Jr. (occupied 1938 to 1963); 4) to preserve its original furnishings, art and household objects, exhibiting them as naturally as possible in what is now a public museum; and 5) to conserve the land and watershed into which Fallingwater was designed to fit, as a continuing source of inspiration through a 4,600 acre nature reserve intended for both recreation and study.

The Western Pennsylvania Conservancy believes that Fallingwater is the sum of its parts: the architect, the client, the architecture, the art, the land and the period. It is the inspired coming together of these parts that make Fallingwater a great work worthy of preservation.

THE PRESERVATION PHILOSOPHY AS IT HAS DEVELOPED

Fallingwater's mission statement was developed from an examination of Edgar Kaufmann's statements concerning why he chose to entrust the site to Western Pennsylvania Conservancy and the trust document of 1968. The operative language of the trust document is as follows:

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD the same unto, and for the use of the said Conservancy, its successors and assigns forever, IN TRUST NEVERTHELESS exclusively for the charitable, scientific, literary and educational purposes of the Conservancy, and in that connection, to hold, manage and use the property hereby conveyed as a recreation and cultural center to stimulate and encourage man in his search for the beautiful and the lovely in nature, and in architecture, music, painting and the arts. The trust shall be known as "The Kaufmann Conservation on Bear Run, a Memorial to Edgar J. and Liliane S. Kaufmann". It shall be so administered that the great natural scenic and artistic beauties of the property may be available to the people of the United States and foreign countries, particularly interested scholars and lovers of nature and art. No
parking lot or structure of any kind shall be built within view from Fallingwater and its immediate grounds, the relationship of the house to its terrain and water shall be preserved; and the architectural design and structural soundness of the house shall be preserved and maintained to the end that this house with its world-wide reputation as a master work of modern architecture may serve the development of architecture and the spiritual and cultural advancement of those who come within its view and influence.

Edgar Kaufmann jr.'s stated his altruistic goal, to share the building with the public, in his dedication address,

"... it is a public resource not a private indulgence...."
"... it is a work by man for man, not by a man for a man..."

However he was also concerned for the future preservation of Fallingwater, though he said and wrote little regarding preservation:

"Finally, why are these acres and this house given as a conservation, in the care of the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy? Because preservation is stopping life to serve a future contingency; conservation is keeping life going."

"I believe the Conservancy will give nature the source, full due, and art, the human response to nature full respect."

Thus, the Conservancy's approach to the issues of preserving the building and its collection has always been one of trying to balance public access with responsible caretaking. In developing the approach to public access the Conservancy has felt an obligation to respect the specific requests of Mr. Kaufmann: 1) that the visitors be permitted to walk freely about in all of the rooms, except the bathrooms which have cork floors and kitchen which is reserved for staff; and 2) that museum-like devices be totally avoided such as ropes limiting access, carpet runners intended for defining areas where one can walk, curtains, including clear ones, to limit damaging ultra violet light, labels to identify art and vitrines to protect it. When we had discussions about controlling the humidity or air-conditioning the building, he pointed out the need to walk freely between the interiors and exteriors and spoke of his desire for the relationship between the interior and exterior spaces be expressed through open windows and terrace doors, weather permitting. He cautioned against Fallingwater becoming a traditional museum when he wrote,
"I'd rather see a dozen articles broken or stolen each year than infringe on the real character of a visit to
Fallingwater as established by the Western Pennsylvania
Conservancy."

Such a mandate for access brings with it inevitable
problems. People do bump into things, scratches on the
woodwork occur and frequently touched stones blacken with
human oils over time. Thus, aging resulting from human
use, frequent cleaning and the building's proximity to the
natural elements is to be expected and is acceptable as
long as the art value of the building is not seriously
affected.

Edgar Kaufmann, jr. gave great weight to the art value of
Fallingwater. He was concerned that the building look as
much as possible as it did when it was occupied by his
family but, again, cautioned against it becoming museum-
like. He wrote in Fallingwater: A Frank Lloyd Wright
Country House

Numerous decades and cultures enliven Fallingwater with art
and artifacts, and neither these supplements nor the house
and its setting remain static -- Fallingwater grew and
still grows. It might not be far wrong to call
Fallingwater an anti-museum, for it is rooted in the idea
of living relationships, not in the storing of isolated
treasures whether architectural or artistic.

He wanted it to remain "fresh;" to replace textiles and
upholstery whenever they become faded or worn and to begin
to stockpile the kinds of objects subject to damage by
visitors. The long-term result of this approach is that
perhaps as soon as 5 years from now there will be no
original textiles in the house. Perhaps, in 100 years a
substantial number of the more accessible objects will no
longer be original. Edgar Kaufmann was aware that this
would happen and suggested that both objects and textiles
be stockpiled for the future. When these or similar
objects are no longer available, reproductions or
facsimiles should be created. Thus, with regard to
furnishings the ultimate goal is to maintain the atmosphere
of the original house.

Periodically, structural work on the building and its
contents must be undertaken. Every effort is made to
preserve original materials, with the previously noted
exception of textiles. Therefore, a certain amount aging
is acceptable on and within the building as long as it does
not significantly detract from its aesthetic impact.
However, when the loss is too severe, as was the case with
several of the trellis beams that cross the driveway at the
main house, reconstruction has been undertaken. Likewise,
the Conservancy has not hesitated to use newer technology to replace older ones as long as the original look is maintained. The replacement of the asphalt roof with a rubber membrane roof is one such example. However, an earlier effort to remove the shellac finishes on the furnishings and replace them with polyurethane was seen as too intrusive and a clear departure from the original appearance.

The Conservancy is committed to an ongoing program of monitoring and care toward the preservation of Fallingwater. And while it is also committed to making the building accessible to a broad public, the Conservancy would not hesitate to limit access to all or any part of the building if it were demonstrated scientifically that continued public access presented a structural threat to the building. To that end, it believes that the best technological methods and expertise should be engaged on an ongoing basis to monitor the building's condition and guarantee its long-term preservation.
THE PHILOSOPHY OF PUBLIC VISITATION:

Fallingwater was entrusted to the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy in 1963 by Edgar Kaufmann jr. In his dedication address Mr. Kaufmann described why Fallingwater belongs in the public domain: 1) "it is recognized as one of the clearest successes of the American genius Frank Lloyd Wright"; 2) "it is one of the most beautiful works by man for man"; 3) "it has a beauty which remains fresh like that of nature into which it fits"; 4) "it forms the very image of man's desire to be at one with nature, equal and wedded to nature"; and 5) "it is a declaration that in nature man finds his spiritual as well as his physical energies, that a harmonious response to nature yields the poetry and joy that nourish human living." It is understood from these statements that Mr. Kaufmann saw in Fallingwater a work of art celebrating man's response to nature and his harmonious existence in nature. Moreover, that Fallingwater's very success in expressing these ideals warranted his sharing it with a greater public audience. Indeed, he said that by "its very intensity it is a public resource and not a private indulgence," and that its new life be one of "public service."

In 1985 Fallingwater's operation was reviewed by Diane Waldeman, Deputy Director of the Guggenheim Museum. She was particularly critical of the fact that curiosity rather than informed interest was what motivated most visitors. Edgar Kaufmann responded to her report in writing. "Fallingwater is not an institution, it is a humane experience, gauged to the whole gamut of public attendance so that mere curiosity and professional investigation, and all intermediate stages of interest, can find their ways unimpeded by any preconceived dogmas or standards." Indeed, he felt so strongly about the experience of Fallingwater being a humane one that he went on to write, "that the inevitable changes brought by time should when ever possible be tested against it."

Nevertheless, Mr. Kaufmann was concerned that Fallingwater should try to reach more architects, architectural historians, students and teachers of architecture and that foreigner visitors be encouraged to attend. He thought that these groups warranted "focused attention" and perhaps be invited to visit during slack days when some special visitation privileges could be extended.

Therefore, the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy believes that the expressed wishes of Edgar Kaufmann jr. should serve as the foremost guide in controlling and developing visitation. Those desires included: 1) that the tour be a humane experience; 2) that the house be made available to a broad spectrum of visitors; 3) that neither overcrowding
nor overly sophisticated interpretation be permitted to betray the special qualities of Fallingwater; and 4) that above all others, architecture students and professionals be encouraged to visit.
SPECIAL USE POLICY

We hope that you and your guests will enjoy the Frank Lloyd Wright Home and Studio. The following is a list of rules and procedures to assist you in your planning. Please remember that the Home and Studio is a museum property and a National Historic Landmark. As such, these buildings are a part of our cultural heritage. We consider it an honor and a privilege to use these spaces and depend on you to safeguard them for the future.

Who can host an event?
The Inglenook Society of the Frank Lloyd Wright Home and Studio Foundation is comprised of individuals or organizations making a contribution of $2,500 or several contributions totaling $2,500 in a single year. Inglenook Society members may host one “special use” event during the year.

Are there additional fees?
An after-hours use fee of $100 is required with the signed use agreement. An additional $250 damage deposit is required 30 days before your event and will be refunded within 30 days after the event, provided there has been no damage to the building or collections.

Checks should be made payable to the Frank Lloyd Wright Home and Studio Foundation and sent to the attention of “special use.”

What hours are available?
Regular group and individual tours are scheduled throughout the day, generally concluding by 4:45 pm. Caterers for special events may be scheduled to enter the building at 4:30 pm; guests should not arrive before 5:30 pm. Special use events should be scheduled to conclude by 9:00 pm so that caterers can complete clean-up no later than 10:00 pm.

What type of event can be held?
The buildings best accommodate receptions and seated dinners. Space requirements limit sit-down dining to 20 guests and standing hors d’oeuvres to 60 guests.

The Home and Studio may not be used for political or religious events. Fundraising events are limited to those that benefit the Foundation.

Where can the event be held?
Food and drink may be served in the studio or ginkgo courtyard only. The home is accessible for tours which may be informal, with Foundation volunteers stationed throughout the building to answer questions, or formal, with volunteer interpreters assigned to lead small groups. In either case, the Foundation will enlist a minimum of four volunteers to ensure the safety of guests and collections. In addition, at least one staff member will be present to serve as liaison for the function.

Who can cater?
Because of the special nature of the property, an approved caterer must be selected from the attached list. These businesses are familiar with the Home and Studio and have received special training in the procedures required to safeguard the museum and its collections. Please note insurance requirements and information for caterers for special restrictions.
Are there any general restrictions?
- There is no smoking in the buildings or on the porches.
- There can be no open flame in the building.
- Decoration is limited to table top arrangements on buffet tables or dining tables.
- Dancing and amplified music are not permitted.
- No original Frank Lloyd Wright furniture is to be used.
- No furniture or decorative object is to be moved by anyone except Foundation staff.
- Children under thirteen are not encouraged to attend events. In the event that a special use must include young guests, the Foundation must be informed in advance.
- Photography is not permitted inside the buildings.

What about insurance requirements?
Organizations and individuals must assume full financial responsibility for any damage to or loss of Frank Lloyd Wright Home and Studio Foundation property occurring as a result of or during the use of the property and for any personal injury that may occur during or as a result of such use.

"Special use" liability insurance must be on file with the Foundation twenty-one days prior to use. A certificate of insurance should be furnished, showing personal liability coverage with a single limit of not less than $1,000,000 per occurrence for bodily and property damage. The Foundation shall be listed as certificate holder on the certificate of insurance.
INFORMATION FOR CATERERS

Supplies and temporary furniture must be delivered and picked up at the convenience of the Foundation. Generally, this will mean that all food, serving utensils and other supplies will be delivered on the afternoon of the event and removed immediately following the event. Any exceptions to this schedule must be arranged in advance.

Please notify the staff liaison that you have arrived by going to the business office (931 Chicago Avenue) first. You will then be directed to the appropriate entrance to the museum. Vehicles are not permitted in the south drive of the museum.

Open flame chafing dishes are prohibited. Food that may stain the studio floor, such as red wine, sangria, strawberries, barbeque sauce or beets, is prohibited.

After the event, refuse will be placed in plastic garbage bags and deposited in the dumpsters located on the rear yard of the 931 Chicago Avenue building. All facilities must be left clean for the museum opening the following day.

All caterers must furnish a Certificate of Insurance showing personal liability coverage with a single limit of not less than $1,000,000 per occurrence for bodily and property damage. If liquor is to be served, caterers must have liquor liability insurance of not less than $1,000,000. The Frank Lloyd Wright Home and Studio Foundation is to be listed as certificate holder. Certificates must be on file twenty-one days prior to the event.
Stanford University
Hanna House Board of Governors

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

Members Present: Marilyn Fogel Tim Portwood
Rosemary Hornby Jack Rakove
Maggie Kilnball Paul Turner, Chair
David Neuman

Members Absent: James Gibbons Mark Jones

Others Present: Marlene Bumbera Laura Jones
John Hanna Martin Eli Weil
Warren Jacobsen

Chair, Paul Turner, opened the meeting.

1. **Review of Minutes, June 22, 1995**

The minutes of the meeting of June 22, 1995 were approved following corrections.

2. **Announcements**

   a. Laura Jones said that Chris Christofferson, the newly appointed Director of Operations and Maintenance, would be joining the Hanna House Board of Governors.

   b. Marilyn Fogel said that she had a communication from the Frank Lloyd Wright Conservancy regarding a contribution for a silent auction. She explained that at the moment we have nothing that could be donated. During the discussion, however, they have offered to print something about the Hanna House restoration in their publication. Paul Turner asked to see a sample copy of the publication.

   c. David Neuman reported that he has met with staff regarding the property on the south of the Hanna House, at 745 Frenchman's Road. The house is approximately 43 years old, and has had only one owner. It has recently been sold to owners who are planning to add to the home, perhaps with a second level. Neuman said that if the architect does well, this might be considered an improvement, and that in any case, the roof could be easily screened by the addition of a couple of trees. He said that the only place
where the house is visible is from the terrace outside the dining room, through a gap in the trees.

Neuman said that he informed the Faculty Housing Office that if the Planning Office can review the plans, and consult with the Hanna House Board of Governors, that he thought that the Board would probably not object to the expansion plans.

3. Reports

a. FEMA Status

Warren Jacobsen reported that the FEMA proposal has been submitted. Copies are available for those interested in reading the report.

b. Fundraising

Tim Portwood stated that he and Tom Ford had met with former Provost Jim Rosse and that Stephen Keeps had met with Mr. Goto in Japan regarding Nissan. Stephen reported that Goto had said that it is not a good time to meet with Japanese companies, that it would be better to approach US-based Japanese subsidiaries. He also said that Ford will be meeting with an unnamed potential donor next week.

Regarding the brochure, Tim said that he had met with Laura Jones, Paul Quarter and Sue from Artefact, a firm composed of former Stanford Press Service staff who have started a design services company in Palo Alto. Tim said that they transmitted the text and photos for the brochure to Artefact for the design of an eight page brochure, which will have 17 photos, including one color photo for the cover. The Development Office has agreed to fund the design for the brochure, with printing to be paid for by Hanna House. He said the printing estimate for 500 copies is $6,000.

Discussion ensued regarding the relative high cost per copy for the brochure. Questions were raised regarding the useability of a brochure that has fund-raising text as opposed to a more general brochure on the significance and history of the Hanna House which could be a more utilitarian piece. It was noted that the only publication about the Hanna House is the Hanna’s book, The Client Report, and that a general information booklet may be needed in the future.

A motion to proceed with a brochure was made by David Neuman, seconded by Maggie Kimball. Discussion led to the decision that Tim Portwood and Laura Jones work with the designer so that the removal of one unit from the brochure will delete fund-raising text and allow for any
reissue to be more of an all-purpose publication. With two abstentions, one no, and four yes votes, the motion carried.

c. **Programming Analysis - Hanna House and relationship to what was learned on the Field Trip.**

Discussion regarding future uses within Hanna House was introduced by Laura Jones. She said that following the information we received during the trip to the Gamble House and Rancho Los Alamitos, we need to develop an interpretive plan.

She also said that we need to plan a meeting with the neighbors so that they can be informed of how the construction will affect them, and to involve them in the decision-making process for number of tours, etc.

An information tour of what is to be accomplished by the construction needs to be finalized for the President and the Provost. Martin Weil suggested that the structural engineer be included on the tour to explain the structural rehabilitation. He suggested that other topics covered be the history and the conservatorship of the Hanna House. Maggie Kimball said that this visit should be scheduled soon.

d. **Rooms/Furniture and Use of the House**

Laura Jones said that we will need to decide on a room-by-room basis, which rooms will be available for meetings, receptions or dinners, and the time period in which the rooms are to be furnished.

Paul Hanna said that on a room-by-room basis, in his opinion the Dining Room (Playroom) could be used, as the floors are sturdy, as is the furniture, which was built by his father. The bedroom has a built-in bed, but all else is replaceable. He felt the bedroom could be used, too. He thought the study to be too small to be used, and that this room could be preserved for viewing. As for the living/dining room, he thought that the use of the built-ins was acceptable, and that the only question would be in the Frank Lloyd Wright chairs.

Several important points were raised. Martin Weil said that if original furniture is to be placed in the house (highly desirable), then the furniture should not be used. This, however, would not stop visitors from walking through the rooms and experiencing the house.

Another view raised was the limitations on actual use of the rooms, and the house, for example for dinner parties or seminars, if the furniture could not be used. Some members felt strongly that not only was this not the original intent of the Hanna family, but that Stanford and the
administration would not agree to such restrictions on this resource when there is such a need for conference and meeting spaces.

Also discussed was the option of placing the original furniture in the Museum, if it would be as a permanent exhibit, or if having the furniture at the Museum would create interest in the house by those visiting. Weil said that the identical situation exists at the Gamble House, with original Greene and Greene furniture in the house; on display at the Huntington, and in the County Museum. If reproduction furniture were to be used in the house (with the exception of the built-ins), more of the house itself could be used. On the other hand, it was conceded that similar houses with original furniture are much more desirable than those with reproductions.

While most members felt that the conservatorship of the house and furnishings should be high on the list of Board member's responsibilities, there are practical reasons why some accommodation to both views will need to be determined.

The conflicts of room use versus protection of the furniture need to be resolved. Weil suggested that specific scenarios be detailed for further consideration. Weil also suggested that other than the seismic repair, that the Board do not make any changes within the house, at least for the next few years. When asked his opinion regarding the kitchen, Weil said that its location next to the dining room, and in a small hard-surfaced area, would not produce a good result as a caterer's kitchen. He suggested that all catered food for Hanna House be handled elsewhere, perhaps in the carport area.

The meeting adjourned at 11:05 am.

Minutes prepared by M. Bumbera
HANNA HOUSE Board of Governors

Meeting Notes - June 12, 1995 - Visits to Gamble House (Pasadena) and Rancho Los Alamitos (Long Beach)

Attending:  Marlene Bumbera  Mark Jones  
Marilyn Fogel  Warren Jacobsen  
John Paul Hanna  Maggie Kimball  
Rosemary Hornby  Jack Rakove  
Laura Jones  Martin Weil

GAMBLE HOUSE

Meeting with Ted Bosley, Director/ Curator

History/Development

Gamble House, built by the Gamble Family, was the summer home of Mr. & Ms Gamble and family (Proctor and Gamble). The house was constructed in 1909, designed by Greene and Greene (Charles and Henry) Architects. This house is considered to be the epitome of Greene and Greene’s Craftsman style design. The family gave their house to the City of Pasadena in 1966, specifying that it should be under the direction of "a University with a School of Architecture". USC accepted this charge, and is the principal manager.

The first Director/Curator was Randell Mackinson, who spent a great deal of time in laying the groundwork and operating principles for the success and scope of today’s operation. He began with one volunteer secretary, a scholar in residence, and 7 or 8 volunteer Docents. His initial annual budget was $5,000. It took about five years before The Gamble House operations "broke even", when fees were charged for tours.

Governing Management

Management of the house is achieved through a three-party agreement, an "Advisory Board" made up of: City of Pasadena (2 votes), University of Southern California (including a representative from Facilities Maintenance), (2 votes), and members of the Gamble family (3 votes) meets three times a year. A unique portion of the agreement dictates that the three Gamble family votes must be given precedence in any disputed action. In practice, there have only been unanimous votes by the Advisory Board. Making recommendations on day-to-day operations, is a 12 member Board of Overseers, made up of primarily of members from various support organizations including The Docent Council of the Gamble House and Friends of the Gamble House.

1 Agreement between Gamble Heirs, City of Pasadena and University of Southern California available.  
2 Bylaws and Policies documents available.  
3 Bylaws available.
The City of Pasadena owns the house and the furniture -- transferred to them in 1966. Furnishings received after 1966 belong to USC. USC holds the endowments under its tax free 501-3c foundation. and the Gamble House endowments are a part of their investment pool, returning a level 5.5% per year. Actual income/expenditures appear as line items on the School of Architecture budget.

Gamble House has a $1 million endowment, raised from a campaign begun in 1984. This year they will kick off a campaign to raise an additional $3.75 million by the year 2000. A restoration fund campaign is anticipated, as the exterior needs major restoration work.

The second Gamble House Director/Curator/Site Director is Ted Bosley. His is a full-time position. He is also responsible for publicity, community outreach and publication of articles on the house. He reports to the Dean of the School of Architecture at USC. He has a staff of six, consisting of an Administrative/Financial Administrator (House Manager) - a full-time employee who keeps the calendar and arranges group tours; an Administrative Assistant - full time; Bookstore Manager - full-time; Assistant Bookstore Manager - part-time (weekends), and a Housekeeper (full-time, experienced in handling valuable objects, plus having had additional training). In addition there are two USC graduate architectural students living in the house (see separate section, below).

**Bookstore**

Gamble House operates a bookstore in the Gamble House garage. According to Martin Weil, this provides the most complete collection of craftsman architecture and arts and crafts movement books and reproductions in southern California. The bookstore provides approximately 15% of the Gamble House annual income, operating on a 62% margin. There is one full-time employee and one part-time employee. Other staffing is performed by volunteers. Net profit for the past year was $180,000.

**Huntington Library**

In addition to the Gamble House and bookstore management, responsibilities of the governing management include maintenance and staffing of the Greene and Greene Exhibition at the nearby Huntington Library. This collection is made up of non-Gamble House Greene and Greene pieces.

**Gamble House Maintenance**

The City of Pasadena is only responsible for grounds (1.75 acres) maintenance. It provides work crews two times a month for this purpose. Volunteers maintain the various flower beds. Minor repairs are handled by USC staff, which has designated two of its maintenance staff to this task (to maintain repair history and continuity). Gamble House pays a flat $10,000/year for this service.
Tours

The house is considered one of Pasadena's three primary tourist attractions. The Mission Statement (attached) of the Gamble House Advisory Board states that the primary goal is to "inspire the public's appreciation and understanding of fine architecture..." and "maintaining an exemplary program of public access which interprets the architecture of the Gamble House in a relevant, educational and engaging way." Gamble House has been open to formal tours since 1970, with hours of operation from Thursday through Sunday, 12 noon to 4 pm. Tours leave every 15-20 minutes, and last about one hour. Fees are $4 per person; $3 for seniors and $2 per child. Groups tours are scheduled in the mornings, with the public tours in the afternoons. Last year 30,000 people toured the facility.

Tour groups are limited to 15 persons. No backpacks, tripods, video cameras, bulky camera equipment, or indoor photography are permitted. Flat shoes are required. Children must be accompanied by an adult. Any tour groups arriving by bus must have advance reservations. Large groups are limited to 45 people and are divided into smaller groups of 15, which begin their tours in three different areas of the house.

Other Uses

Monday through Wednesday are considered "work days". Meetings of several associated groups, special events, etc. are scheduled for these days. Some of the associated groups are: the Advisory Board; Board of Overseers; Docent Council; Friends of Gamble House; USC School of Architecture Dean's guests, etc. Several USC architectural/art courses include a tour of Gamble House.

Gamble House provides some areas for "event" use -- outdoor areas (tent and heaters permitted), basement (up to 80 for meals), and a third-floor meeting room. The dining room is limited to approximately 2 events per year for high level use). There are restrictions: no hard liquor, red wine, weddings or "parties". In addition, before a reception, lunch or dinner is scheduled, the participants must take the tour of the building - mandatory. Often, this tour is a part of the "event". The building is never "rented". Some exceptions are for income-producing events such as filming (exterior only) movies or commercials, which have contracts executed by the Director.

Groups may choose caterers from an approved list maintained by the Gamble House staff. A "warming kitchen" in the basement serves as a staging area for food service to the basement meeting room. Events outside may be staged outdoors, off the staff room (back porch). We saw two different caterers working at the same time the day we visited -- one out of the warming kitchen, the other outside the back door -- the weather was good.

Two of the bedrooms are available for overnight use by visiting USC lecturers.

Two of the bedrooms are used as offices.
Accessibility

The Gamble House itself is not disabled accessible, however terraces, and the bookstore are accessible. There is a video available that provides a secondary way of seeing the Gamble House interiors.

Scholars in Residence Program

Two fifth year USC architectural students are appointed through a competitive fellowship essay; faculty screening and staff interview to live in the Gamble House for their graduate year (August to August). One alternate is also named.

The students occupy second floor bedrooms; may use the main kitchen, and the laundry facilities at times when there are no tours or house events. Their furniture, but not soft goods, are provided for them. They are required to keep their own hall and rooms clean.

There are other duties and responsibilities for which they are responsible. One of the students must be on site every night. They may have guests, but are responsible for their behavior. The students may not have any alcohol, tobacco, or illegal drugs in the house. They are expected to turn on the alarm system each night; to operate the furnace when the weather warrants, and to assist in setting up for events. They are trained in earthquake preparedness.

Scholarship & Education Program

Randell Mackinson authored several books on the Gamble House as well as on the decorative arts. Ted Bosley has written a book, Gamble House, published by the Phaidon Press, London, as one of the books in its "Architecture in Detail" series. In addition, the American Bungalow magazine and other journals often publish articles on the Gamble House. The house is also mentioned in Arts and Crafts magazine, formerly printed by the Preservation Press, but recently purchased by John Wiley; and in Great Houses of Los Angeles and Great Spaces of Los Angeles. Bosley said that the publications help make the house known within the academic community.

As noted earlier, several USC classes include study and tours of Gamble House. Lectures to the community, or to professional groups are also part of the education (and publicity) program.

Docents/Volunteers

There are now 157 active docents and volunteers (bookstore, garden and Huntington Library exhibit). They have one room in the house as an office, with a copier and file cabinet. Mailings for the volunteers are handled by staff; there are no separate funds assigned.
Docent training occurs twice each year, in the spring and fall, and consists of 3 hours per week (Saturday mornings) for 16 weeks. Docents are trained by Ted Bosley, Randell Mackinson and others on the architecture of Greene and Greene (not the lifestyle of the Gambles), and on other nearby works of significant architecture — "Neighborhood Walk", and on the maintenance of the exhibit at the Huntington Library. Docents must commit to a two year contract of 120 hours per year (if not holding full-time jobs), or 60 hours per year (if working full time). A program of continuing education is currently being arranged to update docents as more information on the house becomes available.

Other activities by staff and docents include service within the Gamble House speakers bureau (on request) and publication of a newsletter.

There is a junior docent program for gifted 7th and 8th graders in the Pasadena schools. Students are trained to lead tours for elementary school groups during the spring months. This program is following the original junior docent program initiated by the Frank Lloyd Wright Home and Studio in Oak Park, Illinois.

Curatorial/Stewardship

Original house furnishings are either still in use or stored on-site. These have been restored, and represent the relevant historic period. Repairs are always the first choice in maintaining the property and contents, however the original interior wood finishes are no longer available, so repair is the rule, not the exception.

Annual Income & Expenses

Ted Bosley said that Income is produced at approximately the following percentages:

8% Friends of Gamble House (membership dues)
13% Endowment
18% Tour revenue
15% Bookstore net income
10% Unsolicited donations
15% Fund-raising residuals
? Docent council fund-raising events

Expenses:

40% Salaries/Benefits (35%) handled through USC payroll system
$10,000 to USC for minor maintenance

Insurance & Liability

Gamble House is covered through the USC policy, which also covers docents and volunteers.
Security

Bosley said that the best security is having the two full-time residents on site.

Tours of the Gamble House are given to fire department employees, and preferred entries (rather than breaking the historic glass or doors) are discussed. A lockbox is available for fire department entry in case of a fire.

As the Gamble House is on a street with other institutions, there is regular patrolling by the police. If the need arises, such as a rash of burglaries in the area, extra patrolling is requested. It was noted that exterior lighting is the best deterrent.

Recommendations

Must have a professional director on site, full-time.

Don't refer to the house as a museum, which connotes a "hermetically sealed" residence

Don't refer to social events as "parties".
RANCHO LOS ALAMITOS

Meeting with Pam Seager, Director

History/Development

Originally a Native American site, the land passed through several owners, with an adobe house being built about 1800. In 1878 the property was acquired by John Bixby. Bixby and his wife Susan, who improved the original house, added to it, and planted trees and gardens. Their son and his wife Florence occupied the house in 1906, and added to the gardens. In 1968, Bixby descendants gave the furnished house, gardens and barns to the City of Long Beach to develop as a regional historic and educational facility.

The ranch is described as an interpretive center, and has become a successful facility within the last few years. Director Seager bases this success on thorough planning through a series of consultants who have provided the following documents:

- Master Plan (Wallace Roberts & Todd)
- Interpretive Plan (Claudia Jurmain and Bill Wells)
- Historic Structures & Architecture (ARG)
- Landscape Restoration (Russell Beatty and Associates)
- Marketing Plan
- Capital Campaign Plan

The house and its contents serve as a house/museum, with no live-in residents. Public uses are limited to tours and planned educational events. The grounds are available for tours, and for special city and community sanctioned events free to the public (see Site Use Policy). The facility is not rented, although the Board of Trustees has said it is available for $50,000 per use to "non-hill" users. "Hill users" (those in the surrounding housing development), may rent the site for $25,000 per use. To date, no one has requested such a rental.

Governing Management

The city's efforts to manage the site were not successful, and in 1986, operations were handed over to a nonprofit organization, the Rancho Los Alamitos Foundation with seven board members serving during the first five years. Members now number 17. Meetings of the Board are not held on a regular basis, but when there is a need to meet. Day-to-day operations are carried out under the administration of Executive Director Pamela Seager. There are eleven full-time, and one part-time staff, consisting of an Administrative Assistant, Site Curator, Education Curator, Director of Development and an Associate and three full-time horticulturists and one part-time garden assistant. There is a buildings and maintenance staff member and two caretakers who live on-site.

4 Mission statement; Site Use Policy and list of Board of Trustees available.
The facility is still owned by the City of Long Beach which has contracted with the
foundation to operate the site for a total of twenty years, in 5 year renewable
increments. If the foundation fails in its obligations under the contract, it will be
dissolved, with the property remaining with the city, but with any foundation funds
being retained by the members of the Board. Any donations of furnishings will be
offered back to individual donors.

Maintenance

All maintenance is provided by the Foundation. There is one on-site maintenance
person, with other work contracted.

Tours

Los Alamitos is open to the public Wednesday through Sunday from 1 to 5. There is
no admission charge. Tours of the house are provided by volunteers. Garden tours
are self-guided. The farm office rooms to the rear of the house are used as staff offices
and as tour assembly areas.

Other Uses

Exhibition of animals in a farm setting. Special events include Native American
themes, and programs of special educational interest to children.

Accessibility

Portions of the house are disabled accessible; portions of the garden are undergoing
accessibility ramps or overlooks, but the entire site will not be totally accessible.

Docents/Volunteers

There is no staff volunteer coordinator. Volunteer hours are meticulously maintained,
as they are a record which the City of Long Beach can use when budgeting for their
expenditures at Los Alamitos for the coming year. Last year, 11,000 hours were
recorded. Volunteers are mostly drawn from Boy and Girl Scout troops; those who
are performing "public service"; and some who volunteer through visitor surveys. A
mailing list of visitors is maintained, and a newsletter announcing coming events is
sent to those on this list.

Curatorial/Stewardship

National Park Service and National Trust for Historic Preservation guidelines are
followed. The primary interpretive era of the ranch is considered to be 1900 - 1940.
The last active Bixby family period was 1952. Small valuables within the house have

5 Several flyers/brochures are available.
been removed for safekeeping, with inexpensive replacements substituted for authenticity. Other valuables are tied down with invisible plastic thread, or are placed where access is not easy.

The restoration of the gardens is probably more important than the maintenance of the house. Los Alamitos is currently restoring two areas of the gardens, provided by public grants.

**Annual Income/Expenditures**

The annual budget is approximately $750,000. The City of Long Beach supplies $303,000 annually (no other services provided). There is an endowment of $1.2 million, and plans are underway for a capital campaign to raise $7 million, and an additional $2.5 for the endowment.

Note: Current expenses include removing the "intervention improvements" made by the city during its operation and management.

**Insurance**

All insurance is carried by the foundation. Public liability (including the volunteers) causes the highest rates, and takes a large portion of the annual budget.

**Caretakers**

The on-site caretakers live in a separate (former farm-hand's) house on the site.

**Security**

Because the site is surrounded by a gated residential community, security has not been too much of a problem; however, the foundation has had a fence installed on the oceanside perimeter of the property to deter access from that direction.

**Miscellaneous Information**

Some remarks made by Director, Pam Seager not connected with facility operations were:

The approaches to an entry site are important, as they help establish a state of mind before one enters. She used as an example, the negative reactions to entering Los Alamitos through a manned/locked entry gate, and to the poor condition of the parking area.

It is important to establish what sort of place you will be operating. Is it to be a house museum, or is it to be a facility exhibiting architecture and character? In addition, is it to be an interpretive collection or a facsimile collection?

It is important to keep offices actually in the house to establish a living presence.
The Scholar-in-Residence Fellowship was designed with two distinct objectives: 1) to complement the undergraduate academic program with the experience of living in a significant example of American architecture, and 2) to provide, through daily occupancy, an essential measure of security for this National Landmark.

The Fellowship has been developed for the undergraduate scholar who recognizes the significance of historic architecture and the importance of its role in contemporary society. You have been chosen as this year's recipients of the Fellowship not only because you have demonstrated this understanding, but also because you have shown a particular enthusiasm for the unique potential offered by residence in The Gamble House. We hope that you will want to become a part of the community of the house and become actively involved in the programs of its volunteers and support group.

It is expected that you intend to complete your undergraduate degree in the same year as residence and that you will be able to create a workable balance between the responsibilities of The Gamble House and the academic programs of your degree. The second semester of residence is contingent upon enrollment in, or completion of, your undergraduate academic program. If for any reason you are unable to satisfy either of these expectations at any time during the year, you may be asked to relinquish your Fellowship so that an alternate Scholar-in-Residence can be selected.

PROVISIONS AND PRIVILEGES

Living Quarters
Students are each provided with a private, furnished bedroom and a shared, single bath. These quarters are never on tour and are for your exclusive, private use.

Studio Space
A basement studio, equipped with two drafting tables, book cases and flat files, is provided for exclusive use by students.

Kitchen Privileges
The main kitchen is available for your use, but is shared with staff and volunteers and is on public tour. You may use the kitchen at any time, even during public tour hours. Student have designated cupboard space
and a refrigerator to share. Dishes, flatware, and pots and pans are provided.

**Family Gathering**
Scholars-in-Residence may select one major holiday (e.g. Thanksgiving, Christmas or other) at which time they may have the special privilege of the use of the dining room for an “immediate family” gathering. Complete arrangements must be made at least one month in advance with the Director’s office.

**Laundry Facilities**
Laundry facilities, located in the basement warming kitchen, are shared with house staff and are available for student use during non-office hours. Laundry may not be done during special tours or events.

**Mail**
A specified location will be provided for students' mail. That location should be checked daily for mail, messages or communications from the office.

**Telephone Service**
Telephone jacks for one outside line are provided in each student's room and in the studio. Students are required to contact Pacific Bell to have this service connected and phone equipment installed. Payment of bills is the sole responsibility of the students. Until student phone service is activated, house phones are available for students' use. (Students are responsible for long-distance charges to the house phone).

**GENERAL CONDUCT AND HOUSE RULES**
Conduct of the Scholars-in-Residence, both in the house and away from it, reflects upon the image and reputation of The Gamble House, the Scholar-in-Residence Program, the University, and members of the Gamble family. You are responsible for conducting yourselves with courtesy and respect to others, and with an awareness of the privilege you have accepted.

Except in your private living quarters, you are asked to be fully dressed when in the house, since staff, volunteers or important visitors may come in at unexpected times. Bare feet are not allowed in the house outside your living area, not just for appearances, but because natural oils and moisture on your skin can damage the floors and rugs.
Overnight guests are allowed only on rare occasions, and not as a matter of course. The tour-area bedrooms of the house are never to be used without prior approval of the Director.

GENERAL RESPONSIBILITIES
Specific responsibilities of the Scholars-in-Residence are as follows:

Security
a. Security of the house and garage, their contents, and the safety of property and persons at night and on weekends. This includes protection of furniture, rugs, walls, etc. from abnormal use.

b. Nightly residence. You must plan to be here every night. Special requests to be excused from this responsibility must be arranged through the office prior to any absence.

c. Final nightly check of all window and door locks, appropriate security lights, all gas appliance controls and operation, and air systems.

Housekeeping
a. Immediate clean-up of dishes after meals. Kitchen must be "tour-ready" after clean-up.

b. Tour-ready house at all times. While the housekeeper maintains the house in a tour-ready state, students are responsible for maintaining that state at night and non-touring days.

c. Weekend disposal of trash from the kitchen and cold room to the service-area containers outside the kitchen.

d. Regular cleaning of own bedroom, bath and studio. Staff housekeeper is not responsible for students' private living areas or studio.

e. Frequent laundering of linens and clothing. Airing of private living quarters shall be done evenings and weekends.

Physical Plant
a. Monitoring of all physical plant systems and immediate reporting of any unusual circumstance. Checking of all structure's and ground's drainage systems in inclement weather.

b. Notification to the office of inoperative grounds lights.
Office Responsibility
a. Check-in with staff office and front desk before leaving and when returning to the house during office hours. This is important, as we often have messages for the resident students.

b. Daily courier service between The Gamble House and various University campus offices Monday through Friday during the academic year.

Special Events
a. Setups for various special events. This generally involves the arrangement of tables and chairs in various areas of the house. You will be notified of the following week's events by the prior Friday. Students are responsible for sharing these responsibilities, and each is responsible that the total setup is complete and not left to staff or volunteers.

b. Availability to secure house at the close of special events, as notified by the Staff. Every effort will be made to give students ample notice of such events so they may make appropriate plans. Students are asked to escort volunteers (Docents) to their cars at the end of an evening event.

Fire Systems and Unusual Circumstances
a. Familiarity with fire detection system and other safety devices and emergency equipment and procedures.

b. Notification of Director or appropriate persons or authorities of any extraordinary condition.

HOUSE POLICIES
The Gamble House is an irreplaceable example of internationally-significant architecture and contains valuable examples of important decorative arts. While your judgement is of foremost importance in preserving the house and creating a safe environment, the following policies have been developed to guide your decisions about the use of the house. Willful disregard of any of the following policies is grounds for termination of the Fellowship:

a. There is NO SMOKING in The Gamble House or on any porch or terrace area under the eaves of the house. Smokers must smoke outside the house well away from overhangs, and must make use of the ceramic pots provided for extinguishing cigarettes.
Page five/Scholar-in-Residence Privileges and Responsibilities (cont'd)

b. **No candles or incense** may be lighted in any part of the house. The only exception to this will be candles on the dining room table for a family gathering (see above).

c. **No person or persons unknown to you should be allowed by you to enter the house.** You may tour friends and acquaintances as your schedule allows, but you will not respond to requests from the general public to tour the house.

d. **No abuse of alcohol is permitted in The Gamble House.** Report any abuse of alcohol to the Director immediately. Do not allow an obviously intoxicated person to drive a car or other vehicle away from The Gamble House.

e. **Illegal drug use will not be tolerated** in The Gamble House or on its property. Report any such incident to the Director immediately.

f. **No small-heeled shoes** (spike heels) are to be worn in the house. Slippers are in Mr. Gamble Den for guests who are not wearing flat, broad-heeled shoes.

g. **Neither students nor their guests are permitted to use or move furniture or other objects in the tour areas of the house without permission from the Director.** No object which is the property of The Gamble House shall be removed from the house or its grounds.

h. **Counter tops and table tops in the kitchen must have protective covers** in place at all times except during public touring hours.

i. **Food and drink must be confined to the kitchen, breakfast room, gallery, studio, private quarters, terraces or gardens.** No cooking or coffee making device shall be operated in any area other than the kitchens. Barbecues may be used if kept well away from the house and terraces.

j. **Food, radios, clothing, debris, etc... should be removed from touring areas and kept in appropriate places when not in use.**

k. **Access to the roof areas of the house is strictly forbidden.** Rose Bowl fireworks on July fourth, for example, may be viewed from inside the third floor of the house, but under no circumstances may students or their guests be allowed on the roof at any time.
EMERGENCY PROCEDURE
In an emergency, call 911 immediately. Follow up as the situation allows by calling the Director or other staff member immediately, night or day.

FIRE DETECTION AND ALARM SYSTEM
The Gamble House has a sophisticated fire detection system in virtually every area of the house, including porches, which combines smoke and heat detection with an automatic alarm and notification device.

If the system is activated, fire department units will be dispatched to the house automatically. If this occurs when you are home, even if you suspect it is a false alarm, be sure you and others are safely out of the house being careful not to put yourself in danger. Leave the front door open as you exit so that fire personnel do not need to break in to enter the house.

Staff will familiarize you with the operation of the fire system shortly after you have moved in.

August, 1993
THE GAMBLE HOUSE, USC

Mission Statement

The mission of The Gamble House, USC is to inspire the public's appreciation and understanding of fine architecture through the example of The Gamble House, the most complete and best-preserved work of American Arts and Crafts architects Charles and Henry Greene. This will be realized by:

• conserving The Gamble House, its furnishings, and collection according to nationally-recognized standards of historic preservation and archival conservancy,

• maintaining an exemplary program of public access which interprets the architecture of The Gamble House in a relevant, educational and engaging way,

• maintaining strong academic and administrative ties with the University of Southern California School of Architecture, and

• pursuing a mutually supportive relationship with the City of Pasadena in the interest of meeting our mission and adhering to the 1966 Gamble family gift agreement.

5/4/95
Hanna House Board of Governors

Agenda
July 27, 1995
8:30 - 10:00 am
Hobby House at the Hanna House

I. Review of Minutes - June 22, 1995 Meeting; Please see Attachment

Please review the Minutes from the Meeting of June 22, 1995 and raise any comments or concerns.

II. Announcements

- House below - addition should not be a problem
- FEMA submission sent mid-July - request additional
  FKO (200 used)
  also sent to SIND

III. Fundraising

- Art file - will design brochure -
- Hanna House will need to pay for printing -
  8 page brochure - color photo image area
  ~500 - $8,000, printing
  ~$4,500, design

Dining room - never had any FLW furniture - P. Hanna built - original to house.
Bedrooms/bath - built in bed
Study - opt for maintaining as it was.
Living room - built ins - etc.
FLW furniture - reproductions

Kitchen - limited
Caterers use storeroom off garage -
DATE: July 24, 1995

TO: Hanna House Board of Governors

FROM: Laura Jones

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

Dear Colleagues:

Enclosed please find the agenda for the meeting of July 27, with attachments. Please review the minutes of our last meeting of June 22, 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

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

Marlene Bumbera
Gerhard Casper
John Paul Hanna
Warren Jacobsen
Mark Jones
Academic Secretary
Minutes of Meeting - June 22, 1995
Hobby House at the Hanna House

Members Present: Marilyn Fogel
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman

Tim Portwood
Jack Rakove
Paul Turner, Chair

Members Absent: James Gibbons

Mark Jones

Others Present: Marlene Bumbera
John Hanna

Warren Jacobsen
Laura Jones

Chair, Paul Turner, opened the meeting

1. **Review of Minutes, May 25, 1995**

   The minutes of the meeting of May 25, 1995 were approved following corrections.

2. **Reports**

   a. **FEMA Status**

      Warren Jacobsen reported that a meeting had been held with Craig Comartin, Jean Barnes, Tom Ferrier, Laura Jones and himself to finalize the funding submittal to FEMA. It is expected that it will be completed in a week or two, and it is hoped that a determination will be made during the summer as to the amount of funding we will receive. He said that FEMA has depleted their pre-planning fund designation, so must identify their source of funds. Tim Portwood inquired if FEMA would still be obligated to pay us if our renovation begins before we receive their funding. Jacobsen said that it is a statutory obligation that they must pay, not a donation. Laura Jones added that we will have already given them the plans, so there would be no surprises.

   b. **Video**

      Jacobsen said that the contract with Kristine Hanna is going forward for a video. The first part will be a history of the House and family, with the second portion, a record of the actual restoration.
c. Provost Office/Future Scheduling

Laura Jones said that Jack Rakove, Maggie Kimball and she had met with Provost Office representatives to discuss types of events and frequency of events for Hanna House on the completion of the reconstruction. She said that would prefer unlimited and unrestricted use of the facilities, but are not willing to offer any estimates of how often events would occur. Jones said that it will be important to continue the dialogue, and that we will need to impress them as to the need for use guidelines. At this point, they feel we are being too protective of Hanna House.

Several members commented: Rakove said that the more dependent that we are on the Provost's office for funds, the more they will expect. Paul Turner said that he could understand that point of view, but that an annual average of events should be agreeable. Rosemary Hornby said that we need to reinforce the Board's "prudent stewardship" as it relates to Hanna House. She said that this House is more valuable than either the Lake House or the Buck Estate, and should be treated as a University resource. She said that the University's record, in the case of the Buck Estate, was not good, as the gardens were allowed to deteriorate. Marilyn Vogel said that this issue reduces to an assessment of whether the Hanna House is a "facility" or a "work of art".

Further discussion ensued regarding the best approach to solve the apparent differences in evaluation and use for the Hanna House. David Neuman said that we had contacted the Provost's Office to handle future scheduling as an administrative saving, and that it would be inappropriate to raise jurisdiction at this point. At this point in time, the Provost's Office only schedule events, they have no management policy. When our management plans are better defined, management that responds to neighborhood concerns, whether we will need a County Use Permit, etc., we will be in a better position to reach an accommodation.

It was decided to arrange for a tour of the House for John Ford, the Provost and the President, with Marilyn Fogel as Docent.

d. Potential Addition to 745 Frenchman's Road

Laura Jones said that the Planning Office has received information that the neighbors on the South are planning a second-story addition to their house. David Neuman explained that the University does not review residential projects for aesthetics, but that the Faculty/Staff Housing Office does review for setbacks. Santa Clara County has
jurisdiction, but they do not review for aesthetics either. If a neighbor has an objection to a project, it must be made personally, or through the SCRL.

A letter will be sent from the Board to the Housing Office, asking them to keep us apprised of this project.

e. Fundraising

Tim Portwood reported that he had received comments on the proposed brochure text from Laura Jones and Paul Turner. He said that the Development Office writer needs help, as he does not have the understanding of the project or the enthusiasm of the Board members. He asked that members write some sentences to assist.

David Neuman suggested that a restoration brochure be devised with quotes by Paul Turner perhaps from Richard Joncas' PhD dissertation, John Paul Hanna, and Marilyn Fogel on public access giving different perspectives of the House. He thought that President Casper might provide a quote. Maggie Kimball commented that there should be "short, snappy text".

Laura Jones said that the book of photos being assembled for review by potential major donors is nearing completion, with only text and captions still needed.

Maggie Kimball said that she is meeting next week with an editor of the Stanford Magazine regarding an article in the Fall issue. David Neuman said this would be a good time for it, as the Fall issue will feature campus architecture and planning.

Tim Portwood said that on July 6th, he and John Ford will be meeting with former Provost Jim Rosse in Orange County, to elicit help with former Provosts and fundraising leads. He said that the involvement of the Board is vital, and that any potential donor names be given to him as soon as possible. He said that a potential donor (Board of Trustee member) will be approached soon to see if a half million dollar challenge or matching grant can be worked out.

f. Miscellaneous

It was pointed out that there is a slot on the Board of Governors for the Director of Operations and Maintenance. Since that post has now been filled, we should make arrangements to add Chris Christofferson to the Board. Laura Jones is to arrange a meeting with him, Bruce Wiggins, Warren Jacobsen and herself to give him background on the House and on Board activities.
3. **Fact-Finding Tour to Los Angeles**

John Hanna said that after the visits to Gamble House and Rancho Los Alamitos, that we might give more thought to tours. He said that Falling Water has 120,000 visitors a year, and Gamble House had 30,000 visitors last year. With a tour charge, this is a great source of income. He said that we should explore the emphasis on tours and book sales.

Laura Jones said that the Gamble House is self-sufficient, and that we received a lot of good suggestions.

Jack Rakove said he came away from the tour with the certainty that we need to define our purpose and fundamental mission.

Following several more comments from participants, it was decided that there is too much information to pursue at this meeting. It was decided to extend the July 27th meeting by an hour, and to place a discussion of what was learned on the trip at the head of the agenda. It was also determined to ask Martin Weil to attend this meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 10:10 am.

Minutes prepared by M. Bumbera
HAMMA HOUSE Board of Governors

Meeting Notes - June 12, 1995 - Visits to Gamble House (Pasadena) and Rancho Los Alamitos (Long Beach)

Attending: Marlene Bumbera Mark Jones
            Marilyn Fogel Warren Jacobsen
            John Paul Hanna Jack Rakove
            Rosemary Hornby Martin Weil
            Laura Jones

GAMBLE HOUSE

History/Development

Gamble House, built by the Gamble Family, was the summer home of Mr & Mrs Gamble and family (Proctor and Gamble). The house was constructed in 1909, with Greene and Greene (Charles and Henry) Architects. This house is considered to be the epitome of Greene and Greene's Craftsman style design. The family gave their house to the City of Pasadena in 1966, specifying that it should be under the direction of "A University with a School of Architecture". U/C. accepted this charge, and is the principal operator.

The first Director/Curator was Randal Mackinson, who spent a great deal of time in laying the groundwork and operating principles for the success and scope of today's operation. He began with one staff member, one volunteer secretary; a scholar in residence, and 7 or 8 volunteer Docents. His initial annual budget was $5,000. It took about five years before Gamble House "broke even".

Governing Management

Management of the house is achieved through a three-party agreement, an "Advisory Board" made up of: City of Pasadena (2 votes); University of Southern California (2 votes), and members of the Gamble family (3 votes). A unique portion of the agreement dictates that the three Gamble family votes must be given precedence in any disputed action. In practice, there have only been unanimous votes by the Advisory Board. Making recommendations on day-to-day operations, is a 12 member Board of

1 Agreement between Gamble Heirs, City of Pasadena and University of Southern California available.
Overseers, made up of primarily of members from various support organizations. The Docent Council of the Gamble House\(^2\), Friends of the Gamble House.\(^3\)

The City of Pasadena owns the house and the furniture. U/C holds the endowments under its tax free 501-3c foundation, and the Gamble House endowments are a part of their investment pool, returning a level 5.5% per year. Actual income/expenditures appear as a line item on the School of Architecture budget.

Gamble House has a $1 million endowment, raised from a campaign in 1984. This year they will kick off a campaign to raise an additional $3.75 million by the year 2000. A restoration fund campaign is anticipated, as the exterior needs major restoration work.

The second Gamble House Director/Curator/Title Director is Ted Bosley. He is a full-time position, and he also is responsible for publicity and community outreach activities. He reports to the Dean of Architecture at U/C. He has a staff of six, consisting of an Administrative/Financial Administrator (House Manager) - a full-time position who keeps the calendar and arranges group tours; an Administrative Assistant - full time; Bookstore Manager - full-time; Assistant Bookstore Manager - part-time, weekends). Housekeeper (full-time, experienced in handling valuable objects, plus having had additional training); In addition there are two U/C graduate architectural students living in the house (see separate section, below).

**Bookstore**

Gamble House operates a Bookstore in the Gamble House garage. This is, according to Martin Weil, provides the most complete craftsman architecture and arts and crafts movement collection of books/reproductions in southern California. The bookstore provides approximately 15% of the Gamble House annual income; operates on a 62% margin. There is one full-time employee and one part-time employee. Other staffing is performed by volunteers. Net profit for the past year was $180,000.

**Huntington Library**

In addition to the Gamble House and Bookstore management, responsibilities of the governing management include maintenance and staffing of the Green and Green Exhibition at the nearby Huntington Museum. This collection is made up of non Gamble House Green and Green pieces.

---

\(^2\) Bylaws and Policies documents available.

\(^3\) Bylaws available.
Gamble House Maintenance

The City of Pasadena is only responsible for grounds (1.75 acres) maintenance. They provide work crews two times a month for this purpose. Volunteers maintain the various flowering beds. Minor repairs are handled by U/C staff, who have designated two of their maintenance staff to this task (to maintain repair history and continuity). Gamble House pays a flat $10,000/year for this service.

Tours

The house is considered one of Pasadena’s three primary tourist attractions. The Mission Statement (attached) of the Gamble House Advisory Board states that the primary mission is to “inspire the public’s appreciation and understanding of fine architecture...” and “maintaining an exemplary program of public access which interprets the architecture of the Gamble House in a relevant, educational and engaging way.” Gamble House is open to formal tours from Thursday through Sunday from 12 noon to 4 pm. The tour takes about one hour. Fees are $4 per person; $3 for seniors, $2 per child. Special groups tour in the mornings, with the building open to the public in the afternoons. Last year 30,000 toured the facility.

Tour groups are limited to 15 persons. No backpacks or cameras are permitted. Flat shoes are required. Children must be carried. Any tour groups arriving by bus must have advance reservations, and are broken into 15 person groups, who start their tour at three different portions of the house.

Other Uses

Monday through Wednesday are considered “work days”. Meetings of several associated groups; special events, etc. are scheduled for these days. Some of the associated groups are: the Advisory Board; Board of Overseers; Docent Council; Friends of Gamble House; U/C School of Architecture Dean’s events, etc. Several U/C architectural/art courses include a tour of Gamble House.

Gamble House provides some areas for “event” use — outdoor areas, basement (up to 80 for meals), with dining room use limited to approximately 2 events per year for high level use). There are restrictions: no alcohol, red wine, weddings or “parties”. In addition, before a reception, lunch or dinner is scheduled, the participants must take the tour of the building - mandatory. Often, this tour is a part of the “event”. The building is never “rented”, exceptions are for income-producing events such as filming (exterior only) movies, commercials, which have contracts executed by the Director.
A list of approved caterers is maintained by the Gamble House staff. A "warming kitchen" in the basement serves as a staging area for food service to the basement meeting room. Events outside may be staged outdoors, off of the staff room (back porch). We saw two different caterers working at the same time the day we visited — one out of the warming kitchen, the other outside the back door — the weather was good.

Two of the bedrooms are available for overnight use by visiting U/C lecturers.

Two of the bedrooms are used as offices.

Accessibility

The Gamble House is not disabled accessible, however events held outdoors, and the Bookstore are accessible. There is a video available that provides a secondary way of seeing the Gamble House interiors.

Scholars in Residence Program

Two fifth year U/C Architectural students are appointed through a competitive Fellowship Essay; faculty screening and staff interview to live in the Gamble House for their graduate year (August to August). One alternate is also named.

The students occupy second floor bedrooms; may use the main kitchen, and the laundry facilities at times when there are no tours or house events. Their furniture, but not soft goods, are provided for them. They are required to keep their own hall and rooms clean.

There are other duties and responsibilities for which they are responsible. One of the students must be on site every night. They may have guests, but are responsible for their behavior. The students may not have any hard liquor or red wine in the house. They are expected to turn on the alarm system each night, and to operate the furnace when the weather warrants, and to assist in setting-up for events.

Scholarship & Education Program

Randal Mackinson authored several books on the Gamble House as well as on the decorative arts. Ted Bosley has published a book, Gamble House, published by the Phidon Press, London, as one of the books in its "Architecture in Detail" series. In addition, the "American Bungalow" magazine and other journals often publish articles on the Gamble House. The house is also mentioned in "Arts and Crafts" magazine, formerly
printed by the Preservation Press, but recently purchased by John Wiley; and in *Great Houses of Los Angeles* and *Great Spaces of Los Angeles*.

As noted earlier, several USC classes include study and tours of Gamble House. Lectures to the community, or to professional groups are also part of the education (and publicity) program.

**Docents/Volunteers**

There are now 157 docents and volunteers (bookstore, garden and Huntington Library exhibit) active. They have one room in the house as an office, with a copier and file cabinet. Mailings for the volunteers are handled by staff, there are no separate funds assigned.

Docent Training occurs twice each year, in the spring and fall, and consists of 3 hours per week (Saturday mornings) for 16 weeks. Docents are trained by Ted Bosley, Randal Mackinson and others on the architecture of Green and Green, not lifestyle of the Gambles, on other nearby works of significant architecture — "Neighborhood Walk", and on the maintenance of the exhibit at the Huntington Library. Docents must commit to a two year contract of 120 hours per year (if not holding full-time jobs), or 60 hours per year (if working full time). A program of continuing education is currently being set-up to update docents as more information on the house becomes available.

Other activities by staff and docents includes service within the Gamble House speakers bureau (on request) and publication of a newsletter.

There is a Junior Docent program for gifted 7th and 8th graders in the Pasadena schools. Students are trained to lead tours of other school groups during the spring months. This program is following the original junior docent program initiated by the Frank Lloyd Wright Studio in Oak Park, Illinois.

**Curatorial Stewardship**

Original house furnishings were either still in use or stored on-site. These have been restored, and are the relevant historic period represented. Repairs are always the first choice in maintaining the property and contents, however the original interior wood finishes are no longer available, so repair is the rule, not the exception.
Annual Income & Expenses

Ted Bosley said that Income is produced at approximately the following percentages:

- 8% Friends of Hanna House
- 13% Endowment
- 18% Tour revenue
- 15% Bookstore net income
- 10% Unsolicited donations
- 15% Fund-raising residuals

Expenses:

- 40% Salaries/Benefits (35%) handled through U/C payroll system
- $10,000 to U/C for minor maintenance

Insurance & Liability

Gamble House is covered through the U/C policy, which also covers docents and volunteers.

Security

Tours of the Gamble House are given to fire department employees, and preferred entries (rather than breaking the historic glass or doors) are discussed. A lockbox is available for fire department entry in case of a fire.

As the Gamble House is on a street with other institutions, there is regular patrolling by the police. If the need arises, such as a rash of burglaries in the area, extra patrolling is requested. It was noted that exterior lighting is the best deterrent.
History/Development

Originally a Native American Indian site, the land passed through several owners, with an adobe house being built about 1800. In 1878 the property was acquired by John Bixby. Bixby and his wife, Susan, who improved the original house; added to it, and planted trees and gardens. Their son and his wife, Florence occupied the house in 1906, and added to the gardens. In 1968, Bixby descendants gave the furnished house, gardens and barns to the City of Long Beach to develop as a regional historic and educational facility.

The ranch is described as an interpretive center, and has become a successful facility within the last few years. Director, Pamela J. Jeager bases this success on thorough planning through a series of consultants who have provided the following documents:

- Master Plan (Wallace Roberts & Todd)
- Interpretive Plan (Claudia Jurmain and Bill Wells)
- Historic Structures & Architecture (ARG)
- Landscape Restoration (Russell Beatty and Associates)
- Marketing Plan
- Capital Campaign Plan

The house and its contents serve as a house/museum, with no live-in residents or public uses other than tours. The grounds are available for tours, and for special city and community sanctioned events free to the public. (see Site Use Policy). The facility is not rented, although the Board of Trustees has said it is available for $50,000 per use to "non-hill" users. "Hill users" (those in the surrounding housing development), may rent the site for $25,000 per use. To date, no one has requested such a rental.

Governing Management

The city’s efforts to manage the site were not successful, and in 1986, operations were handed over to a nonprofit organization, the Rancho Los Alamitos Foundation, with seven Board members serving the board during the first five years. Members now number 17. Meetings of the Board are not held on a regular basis, but when there is a need to meet. Day-to-day operations are carried out under the administration of Executive Director Pamela Jeager. There are eleven full-time, and one part-time staff, consisting of an Administrative Assistant, Site Curator; Education Curator; Director of Development and an Associate and Three full time horticulturists and one part time

---

4 Mission statement; Site Use Policy and list of Board of Trustees available.
garden assistant. There is a buildings and maintenance staff member and two live on-site caretakers.

The facility is still owned by the City of Long Beach who have contracted with the Foundation to operate the site for a total of twenty years, in 5 year renewable increments. If the Foundation fails in its obligations under the contract, it will be dissolved, with the property remaining with the City, but with any Foundation funds being retained by the members of the Board. Any donations of furnishings will be offered back to individual donors.

Maintenance

All maintenance is provided by the Foundation. There is one on-site maintenance person, with other work contracted.

Tours

Los Alamitos is open to the public Wednesday through Sunday from 1 to 5. There is no admission charge. Tours of the house are provided by volunteers. Garden tours are self-led. The farm office rooms to the rear of the house are used as staff offices and as tour assembly areas.

Other Uses

Exhibition of animals in a farm setting. Special events include Native American themes, and programs of special educational interest to children.

Accessibility

The house is disabled accessible; portions of the garden are undergoing accessibility ramps or overlooks, but the entire site will not be totally accessible.

Docents/Volunteers

There is no staff volunteer coordinator. Volunteer hours are meticulously maintained, as they are a record which the City of Long Beach can use when budgeting for their expenditures at Los Alamitos for the coming year. Last year, 11,000 hours were recorded. Volunteers are mostly drawn from Boy and Girl Scout troops; those who are performing "public service", and some who volunteer through visitor surveys. A mail list of visitors is maintained, and a newsletter announcing coming events is sent to this list.

---

5 Several flyers/brochures are available.
Cutatorial/Stewardship

National Park Service and Nation Trust for Historic Preservation guidelines are followed. The primary interpretive era of the ranch is considered to be 1900 - 1940. The last active Bixby family period was 1952. Small valuables within the house have been removed for safekeeping, with inexpensive replacements substituted for authenticity. Other valuables are tied down with invisible plastic thread, or are placed where access is not easy.

The restoration of the gardens is probably more important than the maintenance of the house. Los Alamitos is currently restoring two areas of the gardens, provided by public grants.

Annual Income/Expenditures

The annual budget is approximately $750,000. The City of Long Beach supplies $303,000 annually (no other services provided). There is an endowment of $1.2 million, and plans are underway for a capital campaign to raise $7 million, and an additional 2.5 for the endowment.

Note: Current expenses include removing the "intervention improvements" made by the City during their operation and management).

Insurance

Insurance is carried by the Foundation. Public liability (including the volunteers) causes the highest rates, and takes a large portion of the annual budget.

Caretakers

The on-site caretakers live in a separate former farm-hand's house on the site.

Security

Because the site is surrounded by a gated residential community, security has not been too much of a problem, however the Foundation has had a fence installed on the oceanside perimeter of the property to deter access from direction.
Miscellaneous Information

Some remarks made by Director, Pam Seager not connected with facility operations were:

The approaches to an entry site are important, as they help establish a state of mind before one enters. She used as an example, the negative reactions to entering Los Alamitos through a manned/locked entry gate, and to the poor condition of the parking area.

It is important to establish what sort of place you will be operating. Is it to be a house museum, or is it to be a facility exhibiting architecture and character. In addition, is it to be an interpretive collection or a facsimile collection?

It is important to keep offices in the house to establish a living presence.
THE GAMBLE HOUSE, USC

Mission Statement

The mission of The Gamble House, USC is to inspire the public's appreciation and understanding of fine architecture through the example of The Gamble House, the most complete and best-preserved work of American Arts and Crafts architects Charles and Henry Greene. This will be realized by:

• conserving The Gamble House, its furnishings, and collection according to nationally-recognized standards of historic preservation and archival conservancy,

• maintaining an exemplary program of public access which interprets the architecture of The Gamble House in a relevant, educational and engaging way,

• maintaining strong academic and administrative ties with the University of Southern California School of Architecture, and

• pursuing a mutually supportive relationship with the City of Pasadena in the interest of meeting our mission and adhering to the 1966 Gamble family gift agreement.

5/4/95
Hanna House Board of Governors
Agenda
June 22, 1995
8:30 - 10:00 am
Hobby House at the Hanna House

1. Review of Minutes - May 25, 1995 Meeting  Please see Attachment

Please review the Minutes from the Meeting of May 25, 1995 and raise any comments or concerns.

2. Reports  Report to FEMA

   - 30-60 days afterwards we may get feedback.

3. Fundraising

4. Report on L.A. trip

   Video - history of the house - first
   ...Hanna
   ...then restoration

   Provost & use of house
   - issue of oversight of house-use, supervision of use.
   Resident? role of resident?
Stanford University
Manna House Board of Governors

Minutes of Meeting - May 25, 1995
Mobby House at the Manna House

Members Present: Marilyn Fogel
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood
Jack Rakove
Paul Turner, Chair

Members Absent: James Gibbons
David Neuman

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

Chair, Paul Turner, opened the meeting.

1. Review of Minutes, April 27, 1995

The minutes of the meeting of March 30, 1995 were approved following a correction.

2. Reports

a. Fundraising

Tim Portwood reported that a meeting was held with Development Office Vice President, John Ford, Jim Gibbons, Mark Jones and David Neuman. Several potential donors have been identified, but specific names will not be revealed at this time. Portwood also said that Laura Jones is working on a draft brochure, and a Development Office staff member is working on text for an inexpensive information brochure. He said that such a
brochure will be used a variety of ways — to leave with individuals, or as a
mailing piece.

Laura Jones said that in addition to a brochure, a collection of before
and after photos with accompanying captions are being prepared for
use with major donors. She also said that a video estimate has been
received from Kristine Hanna with a schedule of tasks. Warren
Jacobsen said that the proposed $16,000 budget has been included in
the project, and that production of the video will go forward unless he is
directed otherwise.

Maggie Kimball noted that while the video is a good idea, there are some
things not included in it, and that for historic and educational purposes it
might be expanded after the restoration and put on sale in the museum.

Jacobsen said that this will be a recording of what happens during the
restoration. Kimball said that the research and philosophy as discussed
during the interview will make it work.

The expenditure of $16,000 for the film was approved.

b. Fact-Finding Tour to Los Angeles

Jacobsen stated that the visit to the Los Angeles area has been
scheduled for Monday, June 12th, and that two houses will be visited — the
Gamble House in Pasadena and Rancho Los Alamitos in Long Beach.
Martin Veil has informed him that both are good examples for
information regarding management, and that arrangements have been
made for us to get full details from the facility operators. Veil will
prepare questions prior to our meetings with the operators, and these will
be distributed to Board members during the next week for review and
additions.

Individuals may leave from either San Francisco Airport (at 6 am) or from
San Jose to Burbank at 6:55 am, and return on a 5pm flight to either SF or
San Jose. Members were asked to inform Warren in the next two or three
days so that final arrangements for the trip can be made.

c. Repairs

Jacobsen said that the house is being lightly cleaned to remove dust,
bugs, cobwebs and mildew. The garage area and sheds are also being
vacuumed, and trash removed. Hobby House is to be cleaned next, along with the downstairs apartment. It is expected that the apartment carpet can be saved if it is cleaned soon.

3. **Hanna House Project Budget**

Jacobsen distributed a project budget for the period ending May 16, 1995. The total for expected expenditures is $1,158,000. Furnishings are estimated to be an additional $100,000.

Steve Farneth stated that a meeting will be held with FEMA in a week or two. FEMA re-initiated the meeting with Jean Barnes. It is hoped that a settlement of $500,000 to $600,000 will be the outcome. Portman said that if this is finalized, it will result in a fund-raising goal of $1,000,000.


A discussion regarding Section 4.0, the period for furnishings ensued. Fogel said that the program document suggested that the living room be furnished in 1937 style, with the remainder of the house in 1962 style. She said that there was a 1950 remodel of the entry, living room and dining room, but that these renovations should not be restored to an earlier date.

Paul Turner said that it would probably be advantageous to retain some flexibility in these areas. John Paul Hanna said that his parents would have favored a flexible approach, and that they would probably prefer that the dining room be used over the play room. Turner suggested that there should be flexibility as to the date of furnishings — perhaps on a case-by-case basis. Hanna noted that if the furnishings style reverted to 1937, there would be no play room. Kimball said that if the house is to be used, assigning specific time periods might inhibit such uses. Rosemary Hornby said that it might be better not to have separate rooms represent different periods.

Farneth said that the time to make decisions such as this is during the program phase, not during the remodel. Laura Jones said that the remodeling of built-ins would be a part of the FEMA 106 review process, but that the furnishing themselves are not included, that the furnishings decisions are up to the Board. It was agreed that the program needs to be re-written to clarify these decisions, following future discussions for each room.
It was noted that there will be some modifications to the house that will not be in historic context, to meet codes, such as spark arrestors and dampers on the chimneys, although there are alternative ways to handle this — including restricting use of the fireplaces.

Laura Jones stated that to be responsible stewards, the Board should not make any changes from the time of the Hanna’s residency, but could revise changes that were made while the house was under Provostial care, such as the skylight in the bathroom. She said that there should be some guidelines written as to these principles.

Fogel stated that there are some areas that may need to be modified for safety reasons, for example the steps from the dining room to the Terrace. Farneth said another area is from the dining room to the living room, and that these issues need to be discussed further, especially if it involves the installation of hand rails. He continued that the State Historic Building Code allows a lot of flexibility, and that there may be alternative solutions.

Jack Rakove said that in response to limited accessibility, those who book any of the rooms should inform the users of that fact. It was noted that Mobby Mouse would not be a part of house tours, but that photos would be available inside Hanna House itself.

Fogel suggested that information be collected on all modifications to the buildings from the various departments and have them in one place for complete documentation. It was suggested that Bruce Wiggins’ files be culled for anything that has been done to the house by Operations and Maintenance.

Regarding the extent of use for the house, a re-evaluation with more flexibility as to the number of events has been proposed by the Provost’s Office, for example there will probably be a need for more than two events during summer months, with very few during the winter. Farneth said that initial guidelines will be modified, and that instructions for a re-evaluation of use every six months be inserted into the program document.

There being no further business or announcements, the meeting was adjourned.

Minutes prepared by M. Bumbera
Hanna House
Stanford University
Programming Document
SU Project Number 6110
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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 recommendation to the President to discontinue the use of the Hanna House as the sole 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, faculty retreats, dinners and cultural events, and very 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 with Paul and Jean Hanna in 1935. 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." Further, 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 security, electrical and water services continue to be in use 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 recommendation, subsequently accepted by the Stanford University President, 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 in 1994 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 seismic strengthening 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 delineated 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 in April 1995.

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," to be submitted later for FEMA negotiations.

Participants in the charette included the following:

Representatives of the Hanna House Board of Governors:
- Paul Turner (Chair, Art Department)
- James Gibbons (Dean, School of Engineering)
- Rosemary Hornby (Stanford Historical Society)
- Maggie Kimball (Campus Archivist)
- David Neuman, FAIA (University Architect)
- Tim Portwood (Office of Development)
- John Paul Hanna (ex officio member)
- Darrell Carey (Substitute for Marilyn Fogel)
- Laura Jones (Secretary), (Campus Archeologist)

Other Representatives of Stanford University:
- Mark Jones, AIA, Director, Facilities Project Management
- Warren Jacobsen, Project Manager
- Tiffany Gravlee, Assistant to University Architect
- Marlene Bumbera, Architectural Associate
Marilyn Banwell, Provost’s Office
Ann Fletcher, Provost’s Office

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, Associate AIA
- Laura Jones, phd.

Facilities Project Management is represented by:
- Warren Jacobsen, AIA, 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 The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation Projects

- 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 University functions:

- Promote scholarship and teaching concerning architecture and art.
- Host scholarly functions.
- Host small scale University meetings or entertainment functions.
- Promote appreciation of the house as a work of art through public tours.
- Host distinguished visitors to the University for short periods of time.
- Provide facilities for a live-in graduate student.
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 Hannas' 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 landscape fabric of the site, evaluation of the 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 code and zoning 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 original 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; this capacity 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 may result in both zoning and building code impacts. Since the current zoning of the property is for single-family residential uses, the proposed uses could require a conditional use permit from Santa Clara County. This process, if mandated, 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 able to 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 these county code 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 support 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’ spatial configuration that will occur is the construction of a bathroom that is accessible for the disabled within the existing 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 estimated capacity for each type of use recommended for the site. These are to be considered as initial guidelines for the use of the site. They should be evaluated and adjusted based on actual experience after using the house for a period of time.

<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>10</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Small Group Seminar</td>
<td>Hobby House</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Two per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dining Room</td>
<td>20 (Alternative)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>10 (Alternative)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dinner</td>
<td>Dining Room</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>One per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cultural Events</td>
<td>Living Room or Dining Room</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>One per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terraces</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>One per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dinner, Cocktails or Cultural Event</td>
<td>Terraces</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>One per month</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>
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 Hannas' 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 may 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 main 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
- Remove exterior storm window at Living Room
- 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
- Remove powder room skylight
- Restore original powder room floor
- Restore chimney caps
- Remove panel at end of master bath tub
- Remove doors on kitchen cabinets
- Restore bookshelves in Library
- 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 Hanna House and site were designated as a National Historic Landmark in 1989. National Historic Landmarks consist of those properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places which are considered to be of national significance.

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.
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 may have implications related to the zoning of the property, resulting in a change in 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 the garage and two cars in the carport 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; parking for events with more than 30 participants will require parking off site.

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 a 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 coordinator.

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 per original plans. 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 may 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 fewer.

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. Santa Clara County Codes
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.

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 low level of proposed use, most elements of the Hannas' 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.
4.08 Period Room Furnishing Plan

The issue of the presentation and furnishing of each area of the house will require considerably more research and discussion. After this initial work is completed, an interpretation plan for the house should be developed, setting forth in detail the furnishings and their relationship to the development of the house. It is intended that this interpretation plan will be a flexible one. However, in no event will portions of the house constructed or altered by the Hannas be remodeled back to an earlier period.

The period room settings for the residence may 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 may be 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 furnishing plan will be developed in conjunction with the proposed University functions.

The Hobby House will be furnished with new furniture that is appropriate to the character of the Hanna House and the proposed new uses 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 House 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, entry, and owner’s bedroom.

Cable television outlets are located in the kitchen and TV room.

The fountain pump and wiring are 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 proposed strengthening concept will result in less demolition and reconstruction work than the 1991 scheme. The resulting project will have no visible changes. However, there will still be considerable impacts to the existing fabric of the building. 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 relatively minimal impact on the existing appearance of the building since all work will be concealed inside the original elements.

A summary of the proposed strengthening work is shown below. The extent and details of the structural repairs and strengthening project are detailed in the structural report as described in 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superstructure</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, chords and collectors are needed to complete the load path, the diaphragm requires strengthening, and the flitch plates may need supplementing/repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chimney repair and strengthening (See S-4 for details at main/library)</td>
<td>Repoint cracks and replace damaged brick; add center coring to improve the bending capacity of the chimneys and add concrete fill in openings to reduce stress concentrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Realigned damaged wood elements</td>
<td>Realign displaced and bowed walls and realign damaged doors, cabinets and windows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strengthened straight wall (See S-5)</td>
<td>Reduces diaphragm rotation, limits wall drift and improves stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Strengthened hexagon (See S-6)</td>
<td>Reduces diaphragm rotation, limits wall drift and improves stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</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>8</td>
<td>Improved high roof vertical framing</td>
<td>Increases redundancy and improves load path</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substructure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Rebuild Parking Area Wall</td>
<td>Repair and strengthening of partially collapsed wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rebuild/repair planter boxes</td>
<td>Repoint cracks and rebuild damaged and bowed areas as necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Repoint retaining walls</td>
<td>Repoint cracks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>New veneer ties at retaining walls</td>
<td>Reduces the risk of veneer delamination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</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>14</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>15</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>16</td>
<td>Recast and/or releveled damaged pavers</td>
<td>Repair of damaged floor and terrace step areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</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>18</td>
<td>New foundation work at bedroom chimney</td>
<td>Provides necessary overturning resistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Foundation work at library chimney</td>
<td>Provides necessary overturning resistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</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>
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 when 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 when 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>Tasks</th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>1996</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford Project Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schematic Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford Project Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer &amp; Seiz. Crit. Reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford Project Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford Project Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Application(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidding &amp; Negotiation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 Months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Stanford Review Period
- Peer &/or Seismic Criteria Reviews
- Project Meetings
- Miscellaneous Activity
- Architect and Engineer Activity
7.00 Project Budget
## Hanna House
### Cost Estimate Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seismic Strengthening and Repair *</td>
<td>$458,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5% General Conditions</td>
<td>$52,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5% Contractor Fee</td>
<td>$43,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% Contingency</td>
<td>$110,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$665,510</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements and Conservation **</td>
<td>$351,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5% General Conditions</td>
<td>$40,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5% Contractor Fee</td>
<td>$33,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% Contingency</td>
<td>$85,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$510,138</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape @ Pool ***</td>
<td>$26,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5% General Conditions</td>
<td>$3,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5% Contractor Fee</td>
<td>$2,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% Contingency</td>
<td>$6,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$38,123</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,213,771</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes Phase One Retaining Wall Repair @ $30,388.

** Includes $80,000 allowance for Hobby House. Does not include budget for restoration furnishings. Includes budget for landscape maintenance.

*** Pool area only per concept design.

May 10, 1995
8.00 Appendices
Appendix A
Structural Report

See accompanying report:

Seismic Repair and Strengthening Concept Study
Hanna House, Stanford University
by Rutherford & Chekene
Appendix B
Disabled Access Sketches
Appendix C
Detailed Cost Estimate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>GENERAL DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ORDER #</th>
<th>SPECIFIC DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>TOTAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1001</td>
<td>GEN. REQUIREMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R = ROOF WORK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>H = HEXAGON</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>REINFORCEMENT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>RM = RETAINING WALL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WORK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C = CHIMNEY WORK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>FN = BLOG FOUNDATION</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WORK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ST = STRAIGHT WALL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>HVR = IMPROV. CONSERV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>LOC P = POOL AREA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td>FINISH PROTECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>FINISH PROTECTION</td>
<td>650.00 SF</td>
<td>ALL LANDSCAPE PROTECTION</td>
<td>24,375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>FINISH PROTECTION</td>
<td>1.00 ALL</td>
<td>LANDSCAPE PROTECTION</td>
<td>12,000.00 ALL</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td>SCAFFOLDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SCAFFOLDING</td>
<td>1000.00 SF</td>
<td>ALL ALLOW</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>CRANE/ HOISTING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>HOISTING</td>
<td>1.00 ALL</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>2,000.00 ALL</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>SALVAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>BUDGET FOR SALVAGE</td>
<td>38.00 LF</td>
<td>R/R BUILT-INS</td>
<td>75.00 LF</td>
<td>2,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>SOFT DEMOLITION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SOFT DEMO BUDGET</td>
<td>7400.00 SF</td>
<td>R STRIP ROOF</td>
<td>11,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SOFT DEMO BUDGET</td>
<td>7400.00 SF</td>
<td>R ROOF SHEATHING</td>
<td>14,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SOFT DEMO BUDGET</td>
<td>315.00 SF</td>
<td>H STRIP INT FINISH</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300</td>
<td>HARD DEMOLITION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>HARD DEMO BUDGET</td>
<td>30.00 LF</td>
<td>RW SAWCUT ASPHALT</td>
<td>360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>HARD DEMO BUDGET</td>
<td>200.00 SF</td>
<td>RW DEMO ASPHALT</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>HARD DEMO BUDGET</td>
<td>75.00 SF</td>
<td>C EXT SLAB MBR FPL</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>HARD DEMO BUDGET</td>
<td>125.00 SF</td>
<td>FN SLAB DEMO</td>
<td>3,768</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>HARD DEMO BUDGET</td>
<td>174.00 SF</td>
<td>ST DEMO SLAB</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>HARD DEMO BUDGET</td>
<td>2.00 CY</td>
<td>H DEMO HEX SLAB</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>HARD DEMO BUDGET</td>
<td>60.00 LF</td>
<td>H SAWCUT HEX SLAB</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>HARD DEMO BUDGET</td>
<td>600.00 SF</td>
<td>DEMO POOL</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>HARD DEMO BUDGET</td>
<td>200.00 SF</td>
<td>DEMO STEPS/WALK</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>HARD DEMO BUDGET</td>
<td>100.00 SF</td>
<td>DEMO WALL</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>HARD DEMO BUDGET</td>
<td>750.00 SF</td>
<td>DEMO DECK</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>HARD DEMO BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>DEMO POOL EQUIP</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>HARD DEMO BUDGET</td>
<td>165.00 LF</td>
<td>DEMO FENCE</td>
<td>660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2330</td>
<td>STRUCTURAL SHORING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>STRUCTURAL SHORING</td>
<td>36.00 LF</td>
<td>ROOF AT EXIT WALL</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>STRUCTURAL SHORING</td>
<td>58.00 LF</td>
<td>ROOF AT EXIT WALL</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>STRUCTURAL SHORING</td>
<td>3.00 EA</td>
<td>H HEX ROOF</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2420</td>
<td>EARTH SHORING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>EARTH SHORING</td>
<td>80.00 SF</td>
<td>RW EARTH SHORE</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>EARTH SHORING</td>
<td>60.00 SF</td>
<td>FN AT LIV RM EXCAV</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2430</td>
<td>ROCK ANCHORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ROCK ANCHOR BUDGET</td>
<td>4.00 EA</td>
<td>RW TIEBACKS</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ROCK ANCHOR BUDGET</td>
<td>40.00 LF</td>
<td>C MBR FPL ROCK ANCHORS</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EXCAVATION BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2450</td>
<td>UNDERPINNING BUDGET</td>
<td>5.00 CY</td>
<td>UNDERPIN FIREPLACE PIT</td>
<td>1,100.00 CY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2513</td>
<td>EXCAVATION BUDGET</td>
<td>26.00 CY</td>
<td>RM EXCAV</td>
<td>40.00 CY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXCAVATION BUDGET</td>
<td>26.00 CY</td>
<td>RM CMP BACKFILL</td>
<td>40.00 CY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXCAVATION BUDGET</td>
<td>2.00 CY</td>
<td>RM TOPSOIL FILL</td>
<td>50.00 CY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXCAVATION BUDGET</td>
<td>5.00 CY</td>
<td>C EXT MER FPL</td>
<td>100.00 CY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXCAVATION BUDGET</td>
<td>140.00 CY</td>
<td>FN EXT WALL</td>
<td>70.00 CY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXCAVATION BUDGET</td>
<td>110.00 CY</td>
<td>FN BACKFILL</td>
<td>60.00 CY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXCAVATION BUDGET</td>
<td>6.00 CY</td>
<td>H AT REX</td>
<td>120.00 CY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LANDSCAPING BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LANDSCAPING BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>EXT MAINT</td>
<td>25,000.00 LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LANDSCAPING BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>EXT MAINT</td>
<td>4,000.00 LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LANDSCAPING BUDGET</td>
<td>400.00 SF</td>
<td>R/R PLANTS &amp; PLNTRS</td>
<td>10.00 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LANDSCAPING BUDGET</td>
<td>400.00 SF</td>
<td>R/R PLNTR IRREG</td>
<td>5.00 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LANDSCAPING BUDGET</td>
<td>400.00 SF</td>
<td>R/R PLNTR IRREG</td>
<td>2.50 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LANDSCAPING BUDGET</td>
<td>4,000 SF</td>
<td>R/R PLNTR IRREG</td>
<td>2.50 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LANDSCAPING BUDGET</td>
<td>4,000 SF</td>
<td>R/R PLNTR IRREG</td>
<td>2.50 SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ASPHALT PAVING BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASPHALT BUDGET</td>
<td>200.00 SF</td>
<td>RM ASPHALT</td>
<td>6.00 SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LANDSCAPING BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LANDSCAPING BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>EXT LIGHTING</td>
<td>10,000.00 LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LANDSCAPING BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>EXT MAINT</td>
<td>25,000.00 LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LANDSCAPING BUDGET</td>
<td>400.00 SF</td>
<td>R/R PLANTS &amp; PLNTRS</td>
<td>10.00 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LANDSCAPING BUDGET</td>
<td>400.00 SF</td>
<td>R/R PLNTR IRREG</td>
<td>5.00 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LANDSCAPING BUDGET</td>
<td>400.00 SF</td>
<td>R/R PLNTR IRREG</td>
<td>2.50 SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CONCRETE PLACE/FIN. BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONCRETE PLACE/FIN. BUDGET</td>
<td>17.00 LF</td>
<td>RM CAP BEAM</td>
<td>150.00 LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONCRETE PLACE/FIN. BUDGET</td>
<td>17.00 LF</td>
<td>RM CAP BEAM &amp; WALL BASE</td>
<td>150.00 LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONCRETE PLACE/FIN. BUDGET</td>
<td>5.00 CY</td>
<td>C CAP ROCK ANCHORS</td>
<td>275.00 CY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONCRETE PLACE/FIN. BUDGET</td>
<td>50.00 SF</td>
<td>C REPL SLAB PAVING</td>
<td>10.00 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONCRETE PLACE/FIN. BUDGET</td>
<td>12.00 SF</td>
<td>FN TF/G/WALL/PLASTERS</td>
<td>350.00 CY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONCRETE PLACE/FIN. BUDGET</td>
<td>50.00 CY</td>
<td>FN GRAGE BEAMS</td>
<td>275.00 CY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONCRETE PLACE/FIN. BUDGET</td>
<td>12.00 SF</td>
<td>FN BASE SLAB</td>
<td>2.50 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONCRETE PLACE/FIN. BUDGET</td>
<td>12.00 SF</td>
<td>FN FINISH SLAB</td>
<td>6.00 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONCRETE PLACE/FIN. BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>FN REPAIR PLANTER BOX</td>
<td>3,500.00 LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONCRETE PLACE/FIN. BUDGET</td>
<td>17.00 LF</td>
<td>ST REPLACE FIN SLAB</td>
<td>3.50 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONCRETE PLACE/FIN. BUDGET</td>
<td>17.00 LF</td>
<td>H HEX FIN/SLAB</td>
<td>125.00 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONCRETE PLACE/FIN. BUDGET</td>
<td>54.00 SF</td>
<td>R/R BOWED GARAGE WALL</td>
<td>10.00 SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CONC. PATCHING/REPAIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONCRETE PATCHING/REPAIR BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 ALL</td>
<td>FLOOR REPAIRS</td>
<td>10,000.00 ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONCRETE PATCHING/REPAIR BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 ALL</td>
<td>CONC DECK DRAINAGE</td>
<td>10,000.00 ALL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EPOXY BOLTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BOLT &amp; DOWEL BUDGET</td>
<td>17.00 EA</td>
<td>RM DOWELS</td>
<td>25.00 EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BOLT &amp; DOWEL BUDGET</td>
<td>360.00 LF</td>
<td>C CENTER CORE CHIMNEYS</td>
<td>120.00 LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>ORDER</td>
<td>SPECIFIC DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3920</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EPOXY BOLTS (CONT.) DOLT &amp; DOWEL BUDGET</td>
<td>2.00 EA</td>
<td>C TO EXIST FTG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4200</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>BRICK MASONRY BUDGET</td>
<td>60.00 SF</td>
<td>RW REMOVE BRICK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>BRICK MASONRY BUDGET</td>
<td>65.00 SF</td>
<td>RW CLEAN BRICK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>MASONRY BUDGET</td>
<td>65.00 SF</td>
<td>RW DOVETAIL ANCHORS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>MASONRY BUDGET</td>
<td>85.00 SF</td>
<td>RW REINSTALL BRICK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>MASONRY BUDGET</td>
<td>110.00 EA</td>
<td>RW SPIRAL TIES/IVIENEER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>MASONRY BUDGET</td>
<td>25.00 EA</td>
<td>RW CROUT CONE HOLES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>MASONRY BUDGET</td>
<td>2.00 EA</td>
<td>C INFILL FLUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>MASONRY BUDGET</td>
<td>300.00 EA</td>
<td>VENEER TIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>MASONRY BUDGET</td>
<td>2200.00 SF</td>
<td>PRESSURE WASH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5500</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS METAL</td>
<td>108.00 LF</td>
<td>H CUSTOM 3X3X1/4 ANGLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS METAL</td>
<td>54.00 LF</td>
<td>H 3X1/4 PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS METAL</td>
<td>130.00 LF</td>
<td>H 2X3 ANGLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS METAL</td>
<td>18.00 SF</td>
<td>H HEADER PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6130</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>WALL FRAMING/PLY BUDGET</td>
<td>42.00 EA</td>
<td>ST TOP ANGLE PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>WALL FRAMING/PLY BUDGET</td>
<td>504.00 EA</td>
<td>ST PLY SHEATHING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>WALL FRAMING/PLY BUDGET</td>
<td>85.00 EA</td>
<td>ST ROOF BLOCKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>WALL FRAMING/PLY BUDGET</td>
<td>2740.00 EA</td>
<td>ST PLY SCREWS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>WALL FRAMING/PLY BUDGET</td>
<td>1764.00 EA</td>
<td>ST STUD SCREWS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>WALL FRAMING/PLY BUDGET</td>
<td>99.00 EA</td>
<td>ST NAILED 10 EA PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>WALL FRAMING/PLY BUDGET</td>
<td>42.00 EA</td>
<td>ST SHEAR TABS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>WALL FRAMING/PLY BUDGET</td>
<td>16.00 EA</td>
<td>ST HD STRAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>WALL FRAMING/PLY BUDGET</td>
<td>215.00 EA</td>
<td>H HEX SHEATHING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>WALL FRAMING/PLY BUDGET</td>
<td>5.00 EA</td>
<td>H HEX PLY DIAPHRAGMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>WALL FRAMING/PLY BUDGET</td>
<td>16.00 EA</td>
<td>H HEX HD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>WALL FRAMING/PLY BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 ALL</td>
<td>MISC FOUND CONDITIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6230</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ROOF FRAMING/PLY BUDGET</td>
<td>82.00 EA</td>
<td>R BEARING SLIP JOINT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ROOF FRAMING/PLY BUDGET</td>
<td>105.00 EA</td>
<td>R ROOF/CHIMNEY TIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ROOF FRAMING/PLY BUDGET</td>
<td>7400.00 EA</td>
<td>R ROOF PLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ROOF FRAMING/PLY BUDGET</td>
<td>7400.00 EA</td>
<td>EDGE BLOCK PLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6550</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>SIMPSON HARDWARE</td>
<td>555.00 LF</td>
<td>R COLLECTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6600</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EXT. FINISH CARPENTRY</td>
<td>36.00 LF</td>
<td>F/N R/R EXT WALL SYSTEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EXT. FINISH CARPENTRY</td>
<td>522.00 SF</td>
<td>ST R/R EXT SIDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EXT. FINISH CARPENTRY</td>
<td>2100.00 EA</td>
<td>EXT SIDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EXT. FINISH CARPENTRY</td>
<td>1.00 EA</td>
<td>EXT DOORS/WINDOWS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EXT. FINISH CARPENTRY</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>INT DOORS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EXT. FINISH CARPENTRY</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>INT TRIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EXT. FINISH CARPENTRY</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>INT SIDING/TRIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EXT. FINISH CARPENTRY</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>INT CLOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EXT. FINISH CARPENTRY</td>
<td>1200.00 SF</td>
<td>LOW ROOF SUFFIT REPAIRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EXT. FINISH CARPENTRY</td>
<td>510.00 LF</td>
<td>1/2 FASCIA REPLACEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7200</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>BATT INSULATION</td>
<td>6200.00 SF</td>
<td>R19 ROOF INS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7500</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ROOFING BUDGET</td>
<td>7400.00 SF</td>
<td>R NEW BUR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Page 3*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ORDER QUANTITY</th>
<th>SPECIFIC DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>TOTAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7600</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>SHEET METAL BUDGET</td>
<td>980.00 LF</td>
<td>R PERIMETER</td>
<td>13.00 LF</td>
<td>12,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>SHEET METAL BUDGET</td>
<td>650.00 LF</td>
<td>R TRELLIS</td>
<td>22.00 LF</td>
<td>14,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>SHEET METAL BUDGET</td>
<td>140.00 LF</td>
<td>R CHIMNEYS</td>
<td>22.00 LF</td>
<td>3,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>SHEET METAL BUDGET</td>
<td>650.00 SF</td>
<td>PLANTER LINERS</td>
<td>12.50 SF</td>
<td>8,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9700</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>FINISH HARDWARE BUDGET</td>
<td>2.00 PR</td>
<td>ELEC DOOR OPERATORS</td>
<td>4,000.00 PR</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8800</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>GLAZING BUDGET</td>
<td>110.00 SF</td>
<td>R TRELLIS GLASS</td>
<td>20.00 SF</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>GLAZING BUDGET</td>
<td>22.00 EA</td>
<td>R TRELLIS FRAME REPAIRS</td>
<td>350.00 EA</td>
<td>9,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9250</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>DAYWALL BUDGET</td>
<td>135.00 SF</td>
<td>ONE HEX INTERIOR</td>
<td>5.00 SF</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9900</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>INTERIOR PAINTING BUDGET</td>
<td>2800.00 SF</td>
<td>WOOD FINISH/REFINISH</td>
<td>5.00 SF</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11460</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>UNIT KITCHENS BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>KITCHEN</td>
<td>7,500.00 LS</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12005</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>GEN.CONTRACTOR’S ALLOWANCE</td>
<td>1600.00 SF</td>
<td>HOBBY HOUSE UPGRADE</td>
<td>50.00 SF</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14250</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>HANDICAP LIFTS BUDGET</td>
<td>30.00 SF</td>
<td>DEMO BRICK WALL</td>
<td>10.00 SF</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>HANDICAP LIFT BUDGET</td>
<td>5.00 CY</td>
<td>REMOVE PLANTER FILL</td>
<td>50.00 CY</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>HANDICAP LIFT BUDGET</td>
<td>35.00 SF</td>
<td>NEW SLAB</td>
<td>6.00 SF</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>HANDICAP LIFT BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 EA</td>
<td>LIFT</td>
<td>11,000.00 EA</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>HANDICAP LIFT BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 EA</td>
<td>LIFT ENCLOSURE</td>
<td>1,200.00 EA</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>HANDICAP LIFT BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 EA</td>
<td>PROTECTION BOLLARD</td>
<td>120.00 EA</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>HANDICAP LIFT BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>POWER TO LIFT</td>
<td>500.00 LS</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16400</td>
<td>ELECTRIC DISTRIBUTION</td>
<td>2.00 EA</td>
<td>FN RELO DUCTS</td>
<td>750.00 EA</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ELECTRICAL BUDGET</td>
<td>9.00 EA</td>
<td>FN RELO CONDUITS</td>
<td>300.00 EA</td>
<td>2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ELECTRICAL BUDGET</td>
<td>12.00 EA</td>
<td>FN ELEC RELS</td>
<td>300.00 EA</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ELECTRICAL BUDGET</td>
<td>10.00 EA</td>
<td>ST ELEC RELS</td>
<td>300.00 EA</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ELECTRICAL BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>R ELEC CABLES</td>
<td>2,500.00 LS</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ELECTRICAL BUDGET</td>
<td>4.00 EA</td>
<td>R RELO ELEC</td>
<td>300.00 EA</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ELECTRICAL BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>MISC ELEC UPGRADE</td>
<td>25,000.00 LS</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ELECTRICAL BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>TELEPHONES</td>
<td>7,500.00 LS</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ELECTRICAL BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>CATV</td>
<td>1,500.00 LS</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ELECTRICAL BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>SECURITY</td>
<td>15,000.00 LS</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 20100 CONTRACTOR’S FEE | 10 | CONTRACTOR’S FEE | 0 |
| 10 | CONTRACTOR’S FEE | 0 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION ITEM</th>
<th>ITEM DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ORDER QUANTITY</th>
<th>SPECIFIC DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>TOTAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20100</td>
<td>CONTRACTOR'S FEE (CONT.)</td>
<td>10 CONTRACTOR'S FEE</td>
<td>IMP &amp; CONSERV WORK</td>
<td>0 $</td>
<td>0 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20400</td>
<td>G.C. CONTINGENCY</td>
<td>10 GEN CONTRACTOR'S CONTINGENCY</td>
<td>STRUCTURAL WORK</td>
<td>0 $</td>
<td>0 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 GEN CONTRACTOR'S CONTINGENCY</td>
<td>POUL WORK</td>
<td>0 $</td>
<td>0 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 GEN CONTRACTOR'S CONTINGENCY</td>
<td>IMP &amp; CONSERV WORK</td>
<td>0 $</td>
<td>0 $</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRAND TOTALS

836,004+
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ORDER</th>
<th>SPECIFIC</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1001</td>
<td>GEN. REQUIREMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td>R = ROOF WORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H = HEXAGON REINFORCEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RM = RETAINING WALL WORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C = CHIMNEY WORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FN = BLOG FOUNDATION WORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST = STRAIGHT WALL WORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOC LAC = IMPROV.KONSERV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOC P = POOL AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT SIZE IN SQUARE FEET</td>
<td></td>
<td>GEN. REQUIREMENTS BY %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GEN. REQUIREMENTS BY %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GEN. REQUIREMENTS BY %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td>FINISH PROTECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td>FINISH PROTECTION BUDGET</td>
<td>6500.00 SF</td>
<td>24,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00 ALL LANDSCAPE PROTECTION</td>
<td>3.75 SF</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36,375*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>SCAFFOLDING</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCAFFOLDING BUDGET</td>
<td>1000.00 SF</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>CRANE+HOISTING</td>
<td></td>
<td>HOISTING BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 ALL ALLOW</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>SALVAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td>BUDGET FOR SALVAGE</td>
<td>38.00 LF</td>
<td>2,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,850*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>SOFT DEMOLITION</td>
<td></td>
<td>SOFT DEMO BUDGET</td>
<td>7400.00 SF</td>
<td>11,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R STRIP ROOF</td>
<td>1.50 SF</td>
<td>14,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300</td>
<td>HARD DEMOLITION</td>
<td></td>
<td>HARD DEMO BUDGET</td>
<td>30.00 LF</td>
<td>26,058*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RN SANCUT ASPHALT</td>
<td>12.00 LF</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RN DEMO ASPHALT</td>
<td>2.00 SF</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C EXT SLAB MBR FPL</td>
<td>10.00 SF</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FN SLAB DEMO</td>
<td>3.00 SF</td>
<td>3,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST DEMO SLAB</td>
<td>10.00 SF</td>
<td>1,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H DEMO HEX SLAB</td>
<td>300.00 CY</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H SANCUT HEX SLAB</td>
<td>26.00 LF</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,218*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2330</td>
<td>STRUCTURAL SHORING</td>
<td></td>
<td>STRUCTURAL SHORING BUDGET</td>
<td>96.00 LF</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ROOF AT EXT WALL</td>
<td>50.00 LF</td>
<td>2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2330*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,900*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2420</td>
<td>EARTH SHORING</td>
<td></td>
<td>EARTH SHORING BUDGET</td>
<td>60.00 SF</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FN AT LIV RM EXCAV</td>
<td>20.00 SF</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2420*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,800*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2430</td>
<td>ROCK ANCHORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>ROCK ANCHOR BUDGET</td>
<td>40.00 LF</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C MBR FPL ROCK ANCHORS</td>
<td>100.00 LF</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2430*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,800*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2450</td>
<td>UNDERPINNING</td>
<td></td>
<td>UNDERPINNING BUDGET</td>
<td>5.00 CY</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2450*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,500*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2515</td>
<td>EXCAVATION</td>
<td></td>
<td>EXCAVATION BUDGET</td>
<td>26.00 CY</td>
<td>1,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RW EXCAV</td>
<td>40.00 CY</td>
<td>1,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RN TOPSOIL FILL</td>
<td>50.00 CY</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RN COLP BACKFILL</td>
<td>40.00 CY</td>
<td>1,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FN BACKFILL</td>
<td>60.00 CY</td>
<td>6,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FN GRADE BEAMS</td>
<td>70.00 CY</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FN EXT WALL</td>
<td>70.00 CY</td>
<td>9,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C EXT MBR FPL</td>
<td>100.00 CY</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H AT HEX</td>
<td>120.00 CY</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2515*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21,200*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2540</td>
<td>BASE COURSE</td>
<td></td>
<td>ROCK,SAND+GRAVEL BUDGET</td>
<td>160.00 SF</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RW MIRADRAIN</td>
<td>4.00 SF</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RW GRAIN ROCK</td>
<td>80.00 CY</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RW LARGE ROCK</td>
<td>80.00 SF</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BASE PHASE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ORDER</th>
<th>SPECIFIC DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROCK, SAND+GRAVEL BUDGET</td>
<td>1255.00 SF</td>
<td>FN BASECOURSE</td>
<td>2.00 SF</td>
<td>2,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCK, SAND+GRAVEL BUDGET</td>
<td>200.00 SF</td>
<td>RN ASPHALT BASECOURSE</td>
<td>2.00 SF</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCK, SAND+GRAVEL BUDGET</td>
<td>25.00 LF</td>
<td>RN PVC DRAIN</td>
<td>5.00 LF</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,017</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2540 | ASPHALT PAVING | 200.00 SF | RN ASPHALT | 6.00 SF | 1,200 |
| 2550 | **Total** | **1,200** |

| 2630 | LANDSCAPING | 400.00 SF | R/R PLANT IRKIG | 2.50 SF | 1,000 |
| 2650 | **Total** | **1,000** |

| 3030 | POURED IN PLACE CONCRETE | 150.00 LF | RN CAP BEAM | 17.00 LF | 2,550 |
| 3040 | **Total** | **2,550** |

| 3860 | CONCRETE PATCHING/REPAIR | 30.00 EA | C TO EXIST FTG | 20.00 EA | 600 |
| 3880 | **Total** | **600** |

| 4200 | ARCHITECTURAL MASONRY | 120.00 CF | C CENTER CORE CHIMNEYS | 12.00 LF | 43,200 |
| 4220 | **Total** | **43,200** |

| 5500 | MISCELLANEOUS METAL | 5.00 LF | H 3X1/4 PL | 14.00 LF | 1,225 |
| 5550 | **Total** | **1,225** |

| 6130 | WALL FRAMING | 6.50 SF | ST PLY SHEATHING | 5.00 SF | 3,275 |
| 6150 | **Total** | **3,275** |

<p>| 6230 | ROOF FRAMING | 1.00 SF | EDGE BLOCK PLY | 7400.00 SF | 7,400 |
| 6250 | <strong>Total</strong> | <strong>7,400</strong> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>GENERAL DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ORDER QUANTITY</th>
<th>SPECIFIC DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>TOTAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6550</td>
<td>SIMPSON HARDWARE</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPSON CONNECTOR</td>
<td>555.00</td>
<td>2,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BUDGET</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>2,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6600</td>
<td>EXT.FINISH CARPENTRY</td>
<td></td>
<td>FN R/R EXH WALL</td>
<td>94.00</td>
<td>19,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6600</td>
<td>EXT.FINISH CARPENTRY</td>
<td></td>
<td>FN R/R EXT SIDING</td>
<td>522.00</td>
<td>13,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6600</td>
<td>EXT.FINISH CARPENTRY</td>
<td></td>
<td>LOW ROOF Soffit</td>
<td>1200.00</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6600</td>
<td>BATT INSULATION</td>
<td></td>
<td>INSULATION BUDGET</td>
<td>6200.00</td>
<td>4,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7500</td>
<td>ROOFING</td>
<td></td>
<td>ROOFING BUDGET</td>
<td>7400.00</td>
<td>29,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7600</td>
<td>FLASHING/SHEET METAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>SHEET METAL BUDGET</td>
<td>998.00</td>
<td>12,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7700</td>
<td>FINISH HARDWARE</td>
<td></td>
<td>FINISH HARDWARE BUDGET</td>
<td>2.00 PR</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8000</td>
<td>GLAZING</td>
<td></td>
<td>GLAZING BUDGET</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>7,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9250</td>
<td>DRYWALL CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRYWALL BUDGET</td>
<td>135.00</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>HVAC SYSTEMS</td>
<td></td>
<td>HVAC BUDGET</td>
<td>2.00 EA</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16400</td>
<td>ELECTRIC DISTRIBUT'N</td>
<td></td>
<td>ELECTRICAL BUDGET</td>
<td>9.00 EA</td>
<td>2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30100</td>
<td>CONTRACTOR'S FEE</td>
<td></td>
<td>IMP &amp; CONSERV WORK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION WORK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50400</td>
<td>G.C. CONTINGENCY</td>
<td></td>
<td>GEN,CONTRACTOR'S CONTINGENCY</td>
<td>.15%</td>
<td>458,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3860</td>
<td>CONCRETE PATCHING/REPAIR</td>
<td></td>
<td>CONCRETE PATCHING/REPAIR BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 ALL</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4200</td>
<td>DRICK MASONRY</td>
<td></td>
<td>MASONRY BUDGET</td>
<td>2200.00</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6600</td>
<td>EXT.FINISH CARPENTRY</td>
<td></td>
<td>EXT.FINISH CARPENTRY BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6600</td>
<td>EXT.FINISH CARPENTRY</td>
<td></td>
<td>EXT.FINISH CARPENTRY BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6600</td>
<td>EXT.FINISH CARPENTRY</td>
<td></td>
<td>EXT.FINISH CARPENTRY BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6600</td>
<td>EXT.FINISH CARPENTRY</td>
<td></td>
<td>EXT.FINISH CARPENTRY BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6600</td>
<td>EXT.FINISH CARPENTRY</td>
<td></td>
<td>510.00 LF 1/2 Fascia Replacement</td>
<td>20.00 LF</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6600</td>
<td>EXT.FINISH CARPENTRY</td>
<td></td>
<td>EXT.FINISH CARPENTRY BUDGET</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>131,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>GENERAL DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>QUANTITY</td>
<td>SPECIFIC DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>UNIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14C</td>
<td>INTERIOR PAINTING</td>
<td>PAINT/WALL COVERING BUDGET</td>
<td>2000.00 SF</td>
<td>WOOD FINISH/REFINISH</td>
<td>5.00 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11460</td>
<td>UNIT KITCHENS</td>
<td>UNIT KITCHEN BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>KITCHEN</td>
<td>7,500.00 LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13005</td>
<td>G.C.'S ALLOWANCES</td>
<td>GEN. CONTRACTOR'S ALLOWANCE</td>
<td>1600.00 SF</td>
<td>HUBBY HOUSE UPGRADE</td>
<td>50.00 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14250</td>
<td>HANDICAP LIFTS</td>
<td>HANDICAP LIFT BUDGET</td>
<td>35.00 SF</td>
<td>NEW SLAB</td>
<td>6.00 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14250</td>
<td>HANDICAP LIFTS</td>
<td>HANDICAP LIFT BUDGET</td>
<td>5.00 CT</td>
<td>REMOVE PLANTER FILL</td>
<td>50.00 CY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14250</td>
<td>HANDICAP LIFTS</td>
<td>HANDICAP LIFT BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 EA</td>
<td>PROTECTOR BOLLARD</td>
<td>120.00 EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14250</td>
<td>HANDICAP LIFTS</td>
<td>HANDICAP LIFT BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 EA</td>
<td>LIFT ENCLOSURE</td>
<td>1,200.00 EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14250</td>
<td>HANDICAP LIFTS</td>
<td>HANDICAP LIFT BUDGET</td>
<td>30.00 SF</td>
<td>DEMO BRICK WALL</td>
<td>10.00 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14250</td>
<td>HANDICAP LIFTS</td>
<td>HANDICAP LIFT BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>POWER TO LIFT</td>
<td>500.00 LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15400</td>
<td>PLUMBING</td>
<td>PLUMBING BUDGET</td>
<td>48.00 SF</td>
<td>NEW TILE FLOOR/BASE</td>
<td>15.00 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15400</td>
<td>PLUMBING</td>
<td>PLUMBING BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>TOILET ACCESS</td>
<td>400.00 LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15400</td>
<td>PLUMBING</td>
<td>PLUMBING BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 EA</td>
<td>REMODEL WALLS</td>
<td>500.00 LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15400</td>
<td>PLUMBING</td>
<td>PLUMBING BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 EA</td>
<td>PLUMB REMODEL/TOILET</td>
<td>3,000.00 EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15400</td>
<td>PLUMBING</td>
<td>PLUMBING BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 EA</td>
<td>NEW CUSTOM DOOR</td>
<td>1,500.00 EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15400</td>
<td>PLUMBING</td>
<td>PLUMBING BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>DEMOLITION</td>
<td>300.00 LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15400</td>
<td>PLUMBING</td>
<td>PLUMBING BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>CLOSET REMODEL</td>
<td>800.00 LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16400</td>
<td>ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION</td>
<td>ELECTRICAL BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>MISC ELEC UPGRADE</td>
<td>1,500.00 LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16400</td>
<td>ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION</td>
<td>ELECTRICAL BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>CATV</td>
<td>7,500.00 LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16400</td>
<td>ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION</td>
<td>ELECTRICAL BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>TELEPHONE</td>
<td>15,000.00 LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300</td>
<td>HARD DEMOLITION</td>
<td>HARD DEMO BUDGET</td>
<td>600.00 SF</td>
<td>DEMO POOL</td>
<td>10.00 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300</td>
<td>HARD DEMOLITION</td>
<td>HARD DEMO BUDGET</td>
<td>155.00 LF</td>
<td>DEMO FIREPLACE</td>
<td>4.00 LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300</td>
<td>HARD DEMOLITION</td>
<td>HARD DEMO BUDGET</td>
<td>200.00 SF</td>
<td>DEMO STEPS/WALK</td>
<td>1.50 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300</td>
<td>HARD DEMOLITION</td>
<td>HARD DEMO BUDGET</td>
<td>100.00 SF</td>
<td>DEMO WALL</td>
<td>3.00 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300</td>
<td>HARD DEMOLITION</td>
<td>HARD DEMO BUDGET</td>
<td>750.00 SF</td>
<td>DEMO DECK</td>
<td>1.50 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300</td>
<td>HARD DEMOLITION</td>
<td>HARD DEMO BUDGET</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>DEMO POOL EQUIP</td>
<td>500.00 LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2630</td>
<td>LANDSCAPING</td>
<td>LANDSCAPING BUDGET</td>
<td>5.00 EA</td>
<td>FRUIT TREES</td>
<td>400.00 EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2630</td>
<td>LANDSCAPING</td>
<td>LANDSCAPING BUDGET</td>
<td>60.00 LF</td>
<td>HEDGE</td>
<td>25.00 LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2630</td>
<td>LANDSCAPING</td>
<td>LANDSCAPING BUDGET</td>
<td>25.00 EA</td>
<td>SHRUBS</td>
<td>90.00 EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2630</td>
<td>LANDSCAPING</td>
<td>LANDSCAPING BUDGET</td>
<td>1500.00 SF</td>
<td>IRRIGATION</td>
<td>2.00 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2630</td>
<td>LANDSCAPING</td>
<td>LANDSCAPING BUDGET</td>
<td>150.00 SF</td>
<td>GROUNDCOVER</td>
<td>4.00 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2630</td>
<td>LANDSCAPING</td>
<td>LANDSCAPING BUDGET</td>
<td>100.00 LF</td>
<td>FILL AT POOL</td>
<td>30.00 LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2630</td>
<td>LANDSCAPING</td>
<td>LANDSCAPING BUDGET</td>
<td>1500.00 SF</td>
<td>GRADING</td>
<td>1.00 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2630</td>
<td>LANDSCAPING</td>
<td>LANDSCAPING BUDGET</td>
<td>900.00 SF</td>
<td>STRIP VEGETATION</td>
<td>7.75 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2630</td>
<td>LANDSCAPING</td>
<td>LANDSCAPING BUDGET</td>
<td>30.00 LF</td>
<td>RASPBERRY</td>
<td>60.00 LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2630</td>
<td>LANDSCAPING</td>
<td>LANDSCAPING BUDGET</td>
<td>10.00 LF</td>
<td>BARK MULCH</td>
<td>50.00 LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2630</td>
<td>LANDSCAPING</td>
<td>LANDSCAPING BUDGET</td>
<td>100.00 SF</td>
<td>D.G. ACCESS PATH</td>
<td>6.00 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2630</td>
<td>LANDSCAPING</td>
<td>LANDSCAPING BUDGET</td>
<td>4.00 EA</td>
<td>RR TIE STEPS</td>
<td>50.00 EA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUMULATIVE TOTAL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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It was noted that there will be some modifications to the house that will not be in historic context, to meet codes, such as spark arrestors and dampers on the chimneys, although there are alternative ways to handle this -- including restricting use of the fireplaces.

Laura Jones stated that to be responsible stewards, the Board should not make any changes from the time of the Manno’s residency, but could revise changes that were made while the house was under Provostial care, such as the skylight in the bathroom. She said that there should be some guidelines written as to these principles.

Fogel stated that there are some areas that may need to be modified for safety reasons, for example the steps from the dining room to the Terrace. Farneth said another area is from the dining room to the living room, and that these issues need to be discussed further, especially if it involves the installation of hand rails. He continued that the State Historic Building Code allows a lot of flexibility, and that there may be alternative solutions.

Jack Rakove said that in response to limited accessibility, those who book any of the rooms should inform the users of that fact. It was noted that Mobby House would not be a part of house tours, but that photos would be available inside Manno House itself.

Fogel suggested that information be collected on all modifications to the buildings from the various departments and have them in one place for complete documentation. It was suggested that Bruce Wiggins’ files be culled for anything that has been done to the house by Operations and Maintenance.

Regarding the extent of use for the house, a re-evaluation with more flexibility as to the number of events has been proposed by the Provost’s Office, for example there will probably be a need for more than two events during summer months, with very few during the winter. Farneth said that initial guidelines will be modified, and that instructions for a re-evaluation of use every six months be inserted into the program document.

There being no further business or announcements, the meeting was adjourned.

Minutes prepared by M. Bumbera
Manna House Board of Governors
Agenda
June 22, 1995
8:30 - 10:00 am
Hobby House at the Manna House

1. **Review of Minutes - May 25, 1995 Meeting** Please see Attachment

Please review the Minutes from the Meeting of May 25, 1995 and raise any comments or concerns.

2. **Reports**

3. **Fundraising**

4. **Report on L.A. trip**
Stanford University
Manna House Board of Governors

Minutes of Meeting - May 25, 1995
Hobby House at the Manna House

Members Present: Marilyn Fogel
Rosemary Romby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood
Jack Rakove
Paul Turner, Chair

Members Absent: James Gibbons
David Neuman

Others Present: Marlene Bummera
Steve Farneth
John Paul Hanna
Warren Jacobsen
Laura Jones

Chair, Paul Turner, opened the meeting.

1. Review of Minutes, April 27, 1995

The minutes of the meeting of March 30, 1995 were approved following a correction.

2. Reports

a. Fundraising

Tim Portwood reported that a meeting was held with Development Office Vice President, John Ford, Jim Gibbons, Mark Jones and David Neuman. Several potential donors have been identified, but specific names will not be revealed at this time. Portman also said that Laura Jones is working on a draft brochure, and a Development Office staff member is working on text for an inexpensive information brochure. He said that such a
brochure will be used a variety of ways -- to leave with individuals, or as a mailing piece.

Laura Jones said that in addition to a brochure, a collection of before and after photos with accompanying captions are being prepared for use with major donors. She also said that a video estimate has been received from Christine Hanna with a schedule of tasks. Warren Jacobsen said that the proposed $16,000 budget has been included in the project, and that production of the video will go forward unless he is directed otherwise.

Maggie Kimball noted that while the video is a good idea, there are some things not included in it, and that for historic and educational purposes it might be expanded after the restoration and put on sale in the museum.

Jacobsen said that this will be a recording of what happens during the restoration. Kimball said that the research and philosophy as discussed during the interview will make it work.

The expenditure of $16,000 for the film was approved.

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

Jacobsen stated that the visit to the Los Angeles area has been scheduled for Monday, June 12th, and that two houses will be visited -- the Gamble House in Pasadena and Rancho Los Alamitos in Long Beach. Martin Weil has informed him that both are good examples for information regarding management, and that arrangements have been made for us to get full details from the facility operators. Weil will prepare questions prior to our meetings with the operators, and these will be distributed to Board members during the next week for review and additions.

Individuals may leave from either San Francisco Airport (at 6 am) or from San Jose to Burbank at 6:55 am, and return on a 5pm flight to either SF or San Jose. Members were asked to inform Warren in the next two or three days so that final arrangements for the trip can be made.

c. **Repairs**

Jacobsen said that the house is being lightly cleaned to remove dust, bugs, cobwebs and mildew. The garage area and sheds are also being
vacuumed, and trash removed. Hobby House is to be cleaned next, along with the downstairs apartment. It is expected that the apartment carpet can be saved if it is cleaned soon.

3. Manna House Project Budget

Jacobsen distributed a project budget for the period ending May 16, 1995. The total for expected expenditures is $1,158,000. Furnishings are estimated to be an additional $100,000.

Steve Farneth stated that a meeting will be held with FEMA in a week or two. FEMA re-initiated the meeting with Jean Barnes. It is hoped that a settlement of $500,000 to $600,000 will be the outcome. Portman said that if this is finalized, it will result in a fund-raising goal of $1,000,000.

4. Review of Draft Programming Document

A discussion regarding section 4.0, the period for furnishings ensued. Fogel said that the program document suggested that the living room be furnished in 1937 style, with the remainder of the house in 1962 style. She said that there was a 1950 remodel of the entry, living room and dining room, but that these renovations should not be restored to an earlier date.

Paul Turner said that it would probably be advantageous to retain some flexibility in these areas. John Paul Hanna said that his parents would have favored a flexible approach, and that they would probably prefer that the dining room be used over the play room. Turner suggested that there should be flexibility as to the date of furnishings -- perhaps on a case-by-case basis. Farneth noted that if the furnishings style reverted to 1937, there would be no play room. Kimbali said that if the house is to be used, assigning specific time periods might inhibit such uses. Rosemary Hornby said that it might be better not to have separate rooms represent different periods.

Farneth said that the time to make decisions such as this is during the program phase, not during the remodel. Laura Jones said that the remodeling of built-ins would be a part of the FEMA 106 review process, but that the furnishings themselves are not included. that the furnishings decisions are up to the Board. It was agreed that the program needs to be re-written to clarify these decisions, following future discussions for each room.
Hanna House - Laura, Paul, MK
5.30.95

Relations with Museum -
- stronger relationship with Museum
- issues: furniture - care and exhibition - unk of space
- decent led tours

Dr. Chani should not be in House - Martin Weil
## Projects

**Project Name:** Hanna House  
**Phase:** Concepts - Program

### Project Cost and Time Summary

**ENR (SF BLDG) Index:** 0  
**ENR Date:** N/A

### Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>$/Sq.Ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1,153,303</td>
<td>60.34%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment In Contract (1A1 to 1A2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Work (1A1 to 1A3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Rise (to: N/A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BASIC CONSTRUCTION BUDGET**  
1,153,303 60.34% 0

### Other Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>$/Sq.Ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equipment &amp; Furnishings (Not In Contract)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>5.23%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>284,700</td>
<td>14.90%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Costs</td>
<td>165,500</td>
<td>8.66%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activation</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1 To 5) SUBTOTAL  
1,734,353 90.74% 0

### Project Contingency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>15.0% of Const Budget</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>$/Sq.Ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Plant Improvements Pro Rata</td>
<td>177,023</td>
<td>9.26%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL WITHOUT FINANCING**  
1,911,376 100.00% 0

### Construction Financing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>$/Sq.Ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL PLUS FINANCING**  
1,911,376

---

*GPI Campus Pro Rata is 5.16% for Auxiliaries & Service Centers (See PD-22)*

---

Prepared By: Warren Jacobsen  
Reviewed By:  
Approved By:  

Date: 16-May-95

---

FEMA

5/25/95

---

CATS-Hanna: 5/25/95
### 3. PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>Prime Consultant Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prime Consultant:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Basic Fee - ARG</td>
<td>125,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program &amp; Concepts - ARG</td>
<td>42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Measured Drawings of Existing Conditions - ARG/R&amp;C</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Initial Study - ARG</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime Consultant Total</td>
<td>201,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B. Landscape Architect
- 0.00% x 0 = 0

#### C. Acoustic
- Audio-Visual
- Communicat

#### D. Film Documentary
- 18,000

#### E. Construction/Cost Consultant

#### F. Shelving Consultant
- Lab Consultant

#### G. Asbestos Consultant
- Surveillance

#### H. Survey
- 10,000

#### I. Soil Engineering:
- Design
- Construct
- 0

#### J. Materials Testing

#### K. Initial Structural Analysis - Rutherford & Chekene
- 10,700

#### L. North Retaining Wall Design - Rutherford & Chekene
- 9,500

#### M. Minimal Structural Concept - Rutherford & Chekene
- 35,000

#### N. Extra Prints, Reproduction Costs

#### O. Campus Model

**TOTAL FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES**: 284,700

### 4. ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Management Fee</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. PM 0 Hrs@$95</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ENGR 0 Hrs@$95</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. CM 0 Hrs@$95</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Stu 0 Hrs@$30</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. GIP 0 Hrs@$66</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. FP 0 Hrs@$73</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. UA 0 Hrs@$95</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. JrPrMGr 0 Hrs@$70</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL FOR ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS**: 185,500

### 5. ACTIVATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>2 TSO's @ $</th>
<th>1000 /TSO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moving Expense (New Occupants)</strong></td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IR Charges</strong></td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Keys &amp; Locks</strong></td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial Cleaning and Window Washing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operations &amp; Maintenance Startup (See PD-12)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dedication Ceremonies (if project-funded)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Activation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for Activation</strong></td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Project Name:

**Hanna House**

### Project Information:
- **Project Number:** 6110
- **Date:** 16-May-95

### Construction Costs:

#### 1A. BASIC CONSTRUCTION (PRIME CONSULTANT'S SCOPE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>$/Sq.Ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Seismic Strengthening Repair</td>
<td>458,426</td>
<td>39.75%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Improvements and Conservation</td>
<td>351,400</td>
<td>30.47%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Landscape and Pool Area</td>
<td>26,260</td>
<td>2.28%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. General &amp; Special Conditions</td>
<td>96,150</td>
<td>8.34%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Contractor's Markup</td>
<td>71,067</td>
<td>6.16%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Design Contingency</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>13.01%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL**

#### 1A1 To 1A14: **1,153,303** (100.00%)

### Calculations:

**GRAND TOTAL** (line 17 above) = 1,153,303

---

* Use checklists for Equipment in Contract (pg. 6) and Site Work (pg. 7).
## Project Cost and Time Summary (Back-up Sheet)

**Project Name:** Hanna House  
**Proj #:** 6110  
**Date:** 16-May-95

### Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>$/S.Q.FT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Asbestos Abatement</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Force Account</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Work Orders</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Traffic Barricades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Fire Alarm Connections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Signs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Other (Including Work Orders)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Site Clearance (if outside architect's scope):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Investigation</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. On-Site Utilities (if outside architect's scope):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Steam/Condensate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Chilled Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Communication Ducts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Alternate Power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Domestic Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Fire Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Sanitary Sewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Storm Sewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Gas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Tunnel Location &amp; Geology investigation</td>
<td>19,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total On-Site Utilities</strong></td>
<td>19,750</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FOR OTHER CONSTRUCTION</strong></td>
<td>26,850</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

CATS-Hanna: 5/25/95
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name:</th>
<th>Hanna House</th>
<th>Proj #:</th>
<th>6110</th>
<th>Date: 16-May-95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. **EQUIPMENT & FURNISHINGS (NOT IN CONTRACT)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Interior Furnishing (Budget)</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL FOR EQUIPMENT AND FURNISHINGS (Not in Contract)** $100,000

**NOTE:** Estimates should include the costs as applicable of taxes, shipping, and cost rise to purchase date, plus installation costs and any contingency deemed necessary.
Gamb: House
p2 (see beside)

Limitations -
- groups using house encouraged to tour the house - encourage respect for the house -
- no weddings / receptions

Food kept outside during nice months
basement can seat 80 people

Lounge is not used; dining room only occasionally

Bedrooms - 2 used as offices

Voluntary lecturer can be offered opportunity to spend night
- 3 bedrooms used as

Staff of 6 -
1. Full-time director 50-60 hrs.
   *imp to have full-time site director
2. Financial Admin / House admin - keeps calendar, schedule, full-time
3. Admin assit - full-time
4. Bookstore - full-time manager $250,000. yr operating
5. Cafe manager part-time
6. Full-time housekeeper - came from Norton Simon Museum
   - housekeeper received additional training
   - maintains list of problems
   *consistency w/ maintenance people from USC

Board - facilities head at USC on board

groundskeeping - City of Pasadena
Gamble House
p. 3.

Site 1 3/4 ac.

Director / Curator function -
- to make accessible to public - programs & tours
- serves as curator of scene & scene - exhibition - at the
  Huntington (ft agreement w/ USC & Huntington)

Director - current.

Arthistory UCB / MBA (advertising background)

Org began as 1st staff + volunteers plus $5000. budget (Scholarism
residency program begun in early)
charging for tours helped put house on operating leen
$450,000 lyc - operating budget of $800,000/yr.
(incl. conservation)

operation of house pays for director's salary

Salaries - $175,000,000

Governing Institution -
- city of Pasadena is where "bud stops" 3

Board of Overseers - 3 each / yr. - Gamble family, city, university
(12 total)
- voting members (7) - Advisory Board
+ others who can vote to advise Advisory Board

- Friends of Gamble House
- Joint Council.
Gamble House

- History statement -
  Dir. reports to Dean, School of Architecture.

- University compensation governs salary program of staff.

Prospects of use of house as teaching tool:

Friends of Gamble House has its own board.

Budget:

- $450,000 - annual
- expenditures
- $55,000 - $1M endowment payout
  - pays for annual operation
  - no restoration fund per se

Friends of Gamble House - do fund raising - $375,000 operating costs 1994-95.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8% Friends contribution</td>
<td>Salaries/benefits 55% - 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13% Endowment income</td>
<td>Cost of goods sold 45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18% Tour revenue</td>
<td>Conservation 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% bookstore (net)</td>
<td>Overhead fee to USC - $10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% Unsolicited donation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% Residual from fundraisers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Decent Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gamble

0.5

Tours limited to 15

Endowment - investment resides w/ USC

q'ty go to USC - house is part of USC

-endowment payout static

fund run through School of Arch.

Docent Council -

contribute time -

solicited word of mouth plus some publicity

16 weeks - docent training course (Sat, am) (20-25 ea yr)
docent pool - (~160)
current director

Training includes -

-emeritus director

- review of collection at Huntington
special speakers

-in depth house tour (session on "art of being a docent")

-training in interpretation

- neighborhood tour

- Arts & Crafts movement

Training manual - evolutionary doc.

docents asked to sign 2yr contract to give tours

-rent is 120 hrs yr

-others, 160 hrs/yr.

Continuing education for trained docents - "retraining"

-study sessions - organizing education

-speakers bureau - trained for outreach activities

Friends of Gamble house organize events to which docents are invited
- no photography in house
- no video

Site conservation:
- Secret interiors standards followed.
- To leave intact historic fabric of house - to repair not to replace.

Fabrics:
- Application of UV filters to windows.
- Upholstery has been replaced.
- Rugs ongoing / some replaced w/ replicas.

Conservation policy - Kitchen:
- Original w/ some electrical upgrades.

Scholarship/Publication Program:
- 2 pub. by Randall Macnair.
- Good fundraising tool.

Magazine articles:
- New pub. from John Wiley & Sons on Arts & Arch.

Film: $5K/day
- Photoshoot less - $1000 for afternoon eg.
Capital projects responsibility of University -
  eg. roof replacement
  house is most often an exception to University policy.

Free sheet -
  exceptions - the dean or the mayor

Events - Th F S
  MTW - work carried on at home.
  (USC can use on MT.)

See junior decent program - public school program
  relating Gamble House to student's own home.

Insured through University - w/ deductible - includes coverage of volunteers
  - University self-insured

Security -
  - fire dept. given tours -
  - lock box outside for entry
  - entry suggested to fire dept.
  - light good deterrant -

Cost incurred by decent covered by house - family minimal -
HANNA HOUSE MEETING
JUNE 12, 1995

Purpose
History of the site and development as a museum.

Site Program
Major activities
- principally - touring
  - Fri-Sun 12-4pm (15-20min)
  - tours (30,000/yr)
  - special group tours & public tours

Limitations to use of site
- house/attic decided to groups interested in architecture & history of
  - orientation of house
  - lead tours
  - meeting space on first floor

Personnel
Directors
- meeting space on first floor

Staff duties
- visual accessibility - through video
- wheelchair accessible

Salaries
- approved list of caterers
- through orientation of house
- invited to caterers
- warming kitchen available

Governmental Institution
Relationship between Site Director and the institution that owns the site.

Board of Trustees
- School of Architecture
- students live in several quarters year round. 5th year class
- fellowship - "scholars in residence" - only architecture
- students expected to help w/ set-up for events

Budgets
Expenditures
- maintenance of student space upkeep
- also overnight guests students are asked to

Salary scale
- use judgment
- No smoking/drinking students asked to

Maintenance
- No hard alcohol, no red wine served in house
- Duties & responsibilities - detailed

Conservation
- furnishings supplied (student furnishings, etc.)
- Students trained in heating, plumbing, electrical systems
Income
Institution funding

Tours
Fundraising
Bookstore

Fundraising

Tours
Schedules
Group number limitation

Docents
Training
Quality Control

Schedules
Docent Council

Volunteer Programs

Support Groups

Site Conservation
Policies

Procedures
Daily, weekly, monthly and annual schedules
Personnel
HANNA HOUSE BOARD OF GOVERNORS MEETING
JUNE 12, 1995

SCHEDULE

7:55 a.m.  Arrive Burbank Airport

9:00 a.m.  Gamble House meeting with Ted Bosley, Director

12:00 noon  Leave for Rancho Los Alzmitos

1:00 p.m.  Lunch and meeting with Pam Seager, Executive Director

4:00 p.m.  Leave for LAX

5:00 p.m.  Flight to San Jose
HANNA HOUSE BOARD OF
GOVERNORS MEETING
JUNE 12, 1995

SCHEDULE

7:55 a.m.    Arrive Burbank Airport
9:00 a.m.    Gamble House meeting with Ted Bosley, Director
12:00 noon  Leave for Rancho Los Alamitos
1:00 p.m.    Lunch and meeting with Pam Seager, Executive Director
4:00 p.m.    Leave for LAX
5:00 p.m.    Flight to San Jose
HANNA HOUSE MEETING
JUNE 12, 1995

Purpose
History of the site and development as a museum.

Site Program
Major activities

Limitations to use of site
- no rental of site
- unless $50k donated

Personnel
Directors
Curator
Staff duties
Salaries

Governing Institution
Relationship between Site Director and the institution that owns the site.

Board of Trustees

Budgets
Expenditures
Salary scale
Maintenance
Conservation

Entry sequence -
Public/private management -
(welcome
- use of site
- audience -
- who are we serving? what can we do with site?
- interpretive plan
- capital campaign feasibility study
- educational value
- mailing lists

Any literature development - carefully consider:
- Marketing plan -
- Development Plan -
- Issue of "publication"

$750,000 - total budget excluding capital
Income
Institution funding

Tours

Fundraising — Writing towards 3.4M endowment.

Financial Controls

Fundraising

Tours
Schedules
Group number limitation
Reservations

Docents
Training —
Quality Control
Scheduling
Docent Council

Volunteer Programs
Amecora program —

Support Groups

Site Conservation
Policies

Procedures
Daily, weekly, monthly and annual schedules

Personnel
Policy
Capital Improvement
Personnel
Rental and site use —

Curatorial & Stewardship

Security — antiquated system — master plan includes elaborate security system

Insurance & Liability —
Worker's Comp on volunteers —

Ways of dealing with artifacts so as to deter theft or use of items that are not as available,
TO:Chris Christofferson
Marilyn Fogel
James Gibbons
Rosemary Hornby
Maggie Kimball
David Neuman
Tim Portwood
Jack Rakove
Paul Turner, Chair

FROM: Laura Jones

AGENDA

Wednesday, September 24, 1997 - 8:30-10:00 a.m.
Hobby House at the Hanna House

1. Approval of Minutes, Meeting of August 27, 1997
   (Attachment)

2. Reports
   • Fundraising
   • Project Schedule

3. Documentation Proposal

4. Landscape Plan

5. Film Committee

Phase III - $500,000.
   Hobby House
   Landscaping
   Furniture/Finishes
   Other funding possibilities

Subcommittee: Phase III - Paul, Marilyn, Tim, Laura
The meeting was opened by Chairman, Paul Turner.

1. **Review of Minutes**

   The Minutes of July 30, 1997 were approved with minor corrections.

2. **Reports**

   a. **Fundraising**

   Tim Portwood stated that he has been working with his colleagues regarding strategies to raise the final half million necessary for Phase 3 of the project. He reported that Stanford will officially close earthquake repair fundraising efforts on December 31st. He also said that the various aspects of Phase 3 should be prioritized -- agendized for discussion by the Board.

   Information sheets with details as to the various aspects of the Phase 3 renovations (landscape, furniture) are being prepared. He sais these will help in fundraising efforts.

   Relative to a groundbreaking event, Tim said that in his opinion it would be better to defer a celebratory event until the project is completed. He said that if individual donors need a special tour or other consideration,
that perhaps an event could be planned at the time of the fall Board of Trustees meeting.

Tim suggested that another letter from Paul Turner could be sent to the donor list in the fall, giving contractor information, etc. He also suggested that we begin thinking about an event for the fall, 1998 with the completed reconstruction to coincide with a symposium and a display, perhaps at the Museum.

b. Contractor Selection

Greg Gehlen reported that the committee had interviewed four firms (one firm withdrew from the original five), and had visited reconstruction work of each of these four firms. Rudolph and Sletten, Inc. were the successful project bidders. Greg then introduced Ken Brickwedel who has been assigned by Rudolph and Sletten to the project. Brickwedel stated that Terry Barnum, who worked as the construction superintendent on the retaining wall, has been hired by Rudolph and Sletten to be construction superintendent for the Hanna House restoration project. Ken will attend Board of Governor meetings when appropriate to do so to inform the Board of construction progress.

Gehlen said that the next step is to select sub-contractors specialists in repointing brick, repainting wood, etc. Selection of the sub-contractors, and a final project budget will be completed during September.

c. Project Schedule

Greg Gehlen reported that drawings were submitted to the ASA in Santa Clara County last week for the change in use. He said that the City of Palo Alto has endorsed the project.

Ken Brickwedel said that construction will begin the end of October, with a construction period of six months scheduled. Gehlen said that there may be heavy rain this year (El Niño) which could extend this six-months schedule.

3. Neighborhood Meeting

David Neuman said that the meeting with approximately twenty neighbors went well, and that there seemed to be general support for the project. He said that the comments made were constructive, and that the change in use was not an issue. The neighbors are looking forward to having an active house. Neuman also said that it would be important for the contractor to establish good relations with the immediate neighbors to keep them informed on construction events.
4. **Security During Construction**

David Neuman reported that at the neighborhood meeting, several people mentioned that there are a lot of visitors to the house. Neuman said we have been fortunate that these visitors have been more curious than souvenir hunting, which may not be the case once construction has begun and the house is more open. He said that we should proceed to have the Hobby House apartment prepared for occupancy, and bring in a student resident as soon as possible. Laura Jones said that we will need to find out if the contractor’s insurance will permit having a student on-site. She also mentioned the need to have data and communication lines installed; bathroom upgraded, and furnishings. It was suggested that Housing and Dining Services be contacted for the furnishings, and perhaps for the expenses involved in making the apartment habitable.

John Hanna said that since the house has many entry points, will there be enough fencing to keep the area secure. Brickwedel stated that it may be necessary to use a security service in the evenings. He said that construction equipment needs to be secure, too.

5. **Garden Art Objects**

Paul Turner mentioned that there are many art objects still in the garden area. Laura Jones said that all small objects have been moved to the carport storage room, and that all of these pieces have all been photographed, catalogued and mapped. The larger pieces now need to be wrapped and stored, which needs to be coordinated with the contractor.

The Imperial Hotel Urn will need to be moved before construction begins. Laura Jones will follow-up with the Museum and ask them again for a written proposal for this art object.

6. **Photo Documentation Proposal**

Laura Jones presented background information to the written proposal which was attached to today’s agenda. She said that Bradford Bosch has volunteered to do photo-documentation during construction for no fee. We would pay only for processing of still photos and video. A discussion ensued regarding archival-quality qualifications of Bosch versus the type of media (film versus video) and any overlap between what Bosch could provide and what Skywalker Ranch (Lucas Films) and Kristine Hanna are already doing.

It was the decision of the Board to separate out still archival photographs from the other filming, and that we obtain a proposal from the Architectural Resources Group for this documentation.

It was also pointed out that we will need an overall policy relative to filming the house. Stanford University does have a policy, and it was requested that we get
a copy of this from Terry Shepard to assist in preparation of a specific filming policy for the Hanna House.

7. Film Review

Paul Turner said that several Board members had reviewed the rough-cut of the film prepared by Kristine Hanna, and that he had responded with a memo to Kristine.

Marilyn Fogel stated that the film was not what she had expected, so she reviewed minutes of the proposal from 1994 and 1995, where it was stated that the film would “shoot the house as being restored”. A video produced by Steelcase for the Mayer-May House was cited as the prototype of the film expected.

Discussion brought up several points: It has taken two and a half years to get the reconstruction project underway, and the Board has not given the film project enough time and direction. The original funding has been expended. The purpose(s) for the film have been somewhat changed. We now have three different types of films to consider: 1) The Paul Turner lecture on the Hanna House, 2) film prepared by Kristine Hanna, and 3) a new proposal needed for filming during reconstruction. What we probably need is one half-hour film, or two films of different lengths.

On a motion by David Neuman, seconded by Tim Portwood, unanimously carried, Paul Turner, Maggie Kimball, Marilyn Fogel and Laura Jones were appointed to a committee to:

- clarify the audience;
- compare what has been completed with the Hanna film and what is needed to add to it;
- acquire a new proposal from Kristina Hanna;
- assure that Stanford University will own the film.

It was suggested that the committee prepare one or more possible film outlines; meet with Kristine – perhaps go to the Skywalker Ranch to meet with her there, and discuss alternative proposals with her.

On a motion by David Neuman, seconded by Tim Portwood and unanimously carried, Greg Gehlen was instructed to obtain a written proposal from The Architectural Resources Group for still archival photos to be taken during construction. Greg Gehlen and Maggie Kimball are to review this proposal.
8. **Landscape**

Greg Gehlen stated that the list of costs is still being developed, with priorities. He will present this document at the September meeting.

Greg stated that the arborist has re-evaluated the on-site trees. The oaks are in good shape, but the Monterey Cypress in the carport is dying, and could cause damage to the house. Greg was instructed to have Herb Fong attend the next meeting with his assessment, and have our Landscape Architect, Cheryl Barton, recommend an alternative replacement tree. It was also requested that John Hanna be asked what he knows of the tree.

9. **Other**

Laura Jones inquired as to day of the week for meetings during the coming year. Paul Turner said that his teaching schedule allows for meetings on either Wednesday or Thursday mornings. It was noted that Chris Christofferson has staff meetings on Wednesday mornings. It was decided to hold meetings on Thursday mornings during the 1997-98 year.

The meeting adjourned at 10:20 am.

Minutes prepared by M. Bumbera