

Pros, Cons, Desires, and Concerns about the FSILG Facilities Assessment Project - Responses from November 2017 AILG Plenary exercise

Pros

- Good to know what we need to do - roadmap going forward (never-ending renovation cycle)
- Taking care of our buildings is important
- Could create parity among FSILGs in terms of facilities
- Learn what you don't know
- Clean, useful, detailed assessment
- We can use data from assessment to encourage donations from chapter alumni
- Great! Helpful for capital planning and fundraising!

Cons

- High cost, low value
- MIT has access to the data
- Lack of transparency into vendor selection process
- "One size fits all" nature of costs/analysis
- MIT has access to data
- Report does not provide directly actionable information
- House could spend money on maintenance instead of report
- Cost
- Cost of \$7500 is expensive if repeated every few years
- Having information is not enough - needs to be an actionable plan
- It's mandatory

Desire

- Support from MIT in responding to deficiencies and repairs
- Customization: allow individual groups to target areas
- Get information on state of house and improvements, not just an overview of what's up to code
- 50% cost DSL; 25% IRDF; 25% house
- Help with donations
- Support from the MIT Alumni Association for fundraising
- MIT pays for 50% of upgrade costs
- Allow houses to customize reports to add value
- More than a report of what's up to code
- ADA [?]
- External facilities manager
- Support in implementation and continuing maintenance
- Coordinated project management - oversight; vendors to use for specific tasks
- Pride of ownership by residents
- Compete with the dorms

- FSILGs to be more appealing than dorms from a facilities perspective
- ALLG would respect the ability of each group to plan and budget in ways that work for them

Concern

- ALLG should bear higher portion of the cost, given that they will receive the majority of the value from MIT
- Value of these inspections over other options
- Doubtful usefulness
- Cost (high fee, especially given value)
- Lack of depth of inspections
- ARUP was the least capable of pilot vendors
- *Report may be used by municipal authorities as justification to shut down a house (x5)*
- Would grandfathered conditions be forced into compliance with current code?
- Will building code violations be identified and enforced?
- While a minimum quality should exist, that presumably is already satisfied by annual safety and health inspections
- From a legal perspective, assessed without a plan poses a liability if an “event” occurs
- *ALLG believes this will provide value for fundraising efforts but this is unlikely to be true for all groups (x3)*
- Sororities do not have as large alum donor base and are at a disadvantage in ability to cover expenses
- Small houses pay as much as large houses when their houses are less complex
- *Connection to Accreditation? What does this mean? (x3)*
- Could this be used against us during Accreditation?
- How will this impact Accreditation?
- Inspection may not reveal state of wiring and plumbing behind walls
- *Privacy of data from assessment - would data be used against us? (x5)*
- How will MIT use this information?
- How much of these reports does MIT get?
- The level of info MIT and the community needs for aggregate assessment and planning could be acquired much more cheaply by asking some basic questions about renovations history
- Does MIT want to tell us *how* to manage our properties?
- *Sets precedent of MIT DSL requiring FSILGs to spend lots of money with short notice (x2)*
- ALLG keeps coming up with new expensive mandatory things and imposing them on everyone
- *Report is not useful to a house which just completed major renovations (x3)*
- Upon any renovation project, a current assessment and estimate needs to be done, so no big benefit to doing one much earlier
- Can MIT work with an existing analysis?