

NOTE: An Information Session will be held on Nov 29 at 6:30pm at Maseeh Hall, Flowers Dining Room.

This FAQ compilation has the following format:

Topic Heading

FAQ (Frequently Asked Questions)

1. Question? **Answer**
2. Question? **Answer**
3. Etc., Etc.

FMS (Frequently Made Suggestions)

1. Suggestion **Implementation**
2. Suggestion **Implementation**
3. Etc., Etc.

Abbreviations:

FFA=FSILG Facilities Assessment
 AILG=Association of Independent Living Groups at MIT
 DSL=MIT Division of Student Life
 MIT Facilities=MIT's Department of Facilities
 AILG Board=The AILG's Board of Directors
 AILG Facilities= The AILG's Facilities Sub-Committee
 FCI=FSILG Cooperative, Inc.
 SLI=Safety, Licensing, Inspections
 IRDF=Independent Residents Development Fund

FFA General

FAQ (Frequently Asked Questions)

- 1) What is the FSILG Facilities Assessment?

A professional report on the condition of AILG member buildings.

- 2) How can I use the information?

There are many uses for such a report. The most common use is to provide the owner a planning tool for critical building improvements.

- 3) How will MIT use the information?

MIT wants all undergraduates to have access to safe and well-maintained housing. In recent years, MIT has done the same assessment of its own properties in order to meet this goal. MIT wants to help the FSILGs have the same information it uses to make planning decisions. MIT wants to know what the future planning needs of AILG members are in order to help meet those needs.

- 4) Does each AILG House have to participate?

Each AILG House will be expected to have a professional report on the condition of its building. This report will be an important factor in the biennial AILG accreditation process

FMS (Frequently Made Suggestions)

1) Expectations regarding the assessment should be clear at the start. .

This report will not provide a complete path to solving the challenges that the assessment reveals, it will provide a start down that path. The report will have an Executive Summary and Guidelines for next steps in the Appendix (See Mock Pages 4 & 16).

FFA The ReportFAQ (Frequently Asked Questions)

1) What does the FAA Report look like?

A mock report for the fictional Alpha Beta Iota Fraternity was prepared based on the three pilot reports and input from the AILG Facilities Committee and other interested parties.

2) Are the reports compatible with MIT Facilities VFA Database?

Yes, the assessment will be formatted to comply with the construction industry's universally accepted "Uniformat" The specific items contained in the report must be hand-entered by MIT staff. (Mock Page 2, Pages 7-14)

3) Should the FSILGs be put into the MIT Facilities VFA Database?

This is an open question, will cost money and must be done by MIT Facilities.

FMS (Frequently Made Suggestions)

1) It is critical to provide Houses who have just done significant facilities assessments a useful product with this assessment (noting of past findings is fine). These Houses include TEP, SC, PBE, AP, CP, DKE, PBP, KS, ZP, WILG, ADP, SK, DTD, DPN06, LCA.

Executive summary should acknowledge this, but this concern is still being worked out with AILG/Facilities.

2) Finer grain HVAC and Electrical assessment needed.

Concern has been noted with Vendor.

3) Cost in dollars/Finer grain cost would be more useful to some Houses.

Yes, but the Vendor and MIT Facilities are concerned, based on experience with other clients, that specific dollar estimates will be mistaken for accurate price quotes based on detailed construction sets. More general ranges will be used (Mock Pages 5 & 15)

4) Expected life of system should be in table.

Yes, will be indicated. (Mock Page 5)

5) Report "Boilerplate" should include advice on how to proceed, current Code triggers (MAAB-Massachusetts Architectural Access Board/Mass. Building Code/Municipal Rainwater/Etc)

Yes, can be put into report.(Mock Page 3)

6) If a "Critical" item is "grandfathered" by the Code it should be so indicated on tables.

Yes, will be put into report.(Mock Page 10)

7) "Nothing noted on day of assessment"/"Functional"/"Adequate"/Other "Affirmative"

Declarations should be written in report on items which were inspected and deemed in working order.

Yes, will be so indicated in report.(Mock Pages 7-12, 14)

8) Up front Executive Summary needed in report.

Yes, will be put into report. (Mock Pages 4-5)

FFA CostFAQ (Frequently Asked Questions)

1) How much will it cost my House?

The assessment being offered by the AILG and MIT will cost \$7,500 per organization.

2) What if my House can't afford it?

A payment plan will be arranged to for the needs of your specific house.

FMS (Frequently Made Suggestions)

1) The assessment should be free.

Your organization will be paying considerably less than the current cost of a professional assessment (about 1/3 of current cost).

FFA PrivacyFAQ (Frequently Asked Questions)

1) Who will see my House's report?

Various AILG associated entities (including MIT) will see the report on an as-needed basis. (See proposed Privacy Matrix).

2) Where will the report be kept?

In your organization's FCI SLI locker.

3) Who will control the releasing of the report?

Your organization will have control over the report.

4) Why does MIT see it?

MIT wants to know what the future planning needs of AILG members are in order to help meet those needs.

5) Why does the AILG Facilities Committee see it?

AILG Facilities wants to help member organizations maintain safe buildings.

6) Why does the AILG Accreditation Committee see it?

AILG Accreditation needs to know the condition of its member organization's buildings to accurately assess their safety.

7) Why does FCI see it?

FCI needs to anticipate member organization needs in order to help them correct critical concerns.

8) Why does the BSF see it?

Organization's municipal building inspections will be more successful if problems are identified and corrected before the inspector arrives.

9) Why does the IRDF see it?

The IRDF needs this information to provide loans and grants.

FMS (Frequently Made Suggestions)

None yet.

FFA ProcessFAQ (Frequently Asked Questions)

1) Who will be doing it?

A professional architectural/engineering firm.

2) What is the process like and how long will it take?

1-2 days of on-site assessment, a finished report takes about a month to complete. (See FSILG Facilities Assessment Guide)

3) History of Permits Research/BSF Summary/FCI Summary are all useful to Vendor. Who does this work?

The House, BSF and FCI.

4) Can assessments be done on weekends? This will allow greater Alumni participation.

It is unlikely that the Vendor will be able to work on weekends, but the BSF can moderate/facilitate a weekend meeting and report to the Vendor.

FMS (Frequently Made Suggestions)

1) Both Pre and Post Assessment expectations/followup by Vendor are needed.

Yes, will be put into procedure guide. (Guide B2, C2, E1, E2)

FFA FollowupFAQ (Frequently Asked Questions)

1) What happens when the report is delivered?

Your organization can begin to plan and prioritize critical building improvements.

FMS (Frequently Made Suggestions)

1) Post Assessment counseling should be in place with AILG before final reports are released.

Yes, AILG working on this feature.

2) Post Assessment meeting between Vendor and House should be expected.

The Vendor did not include a separate post assessment meeting in the assessment price, however the final draft report will be reviewed with Vendor before release and will serve most of the purpose of a post-assessment meeting. (Guide E2)

FAA Appendices**Appendix A**

This is a list of Pros, Cons, Desires, and Concerns from the November 8, 2017 AILG Plenary Meeting. **Any replies by Tom Stohlman are presented to inform and shown in bold italic.**

Pros

- Good to know what we need to do
- Roadmap going forward (never-ending renovation cycle)
- Good to get information about their building
- Information would be helpful for raising money
- Common baseline for all houses
- 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

- Utility of the report – would it be useful?
- Cost – expensive, could use money for maintenance

Payment plans will be worked out with any House with this type of budgetary challenge.

- Fear of Trust – No transparency into vendor selection, how data will be used

The Vendor was chosen by MIT Facilities staff, who have done this for every building on campus.

The AILG /MIT FSILG Assessment Committee has developed a Privacy Matrix in an open and collaborative manner over months of meetings with AILG Facilities, AILG Board, and AILG members.

- High cost, low value

A professional report on the condition of a 8-10,000 square foot dormitory residence is very difficult to obtain for less than \$7,500 dollars.

- MIT has access to the data

The data can only be shared on a need-to-know basis, with your organization's approval. (See Privacy Matrix).

- Lack of transparency into vendor selection process

The Vendor was chosen by MIT Facilities staff, who have done this for every building on campus.

- “One size fits all” nature of costs/analysis

Every report is unique to the individual building. The areas assessed are the same. The costs are general by design. Only detailed drawings and specifications can give accurate, actionable dollar figures.

- Report does not provide directly actionable information

The report does provide information on critical building systems, specific to the building. The report does not provide the detailed construction documents which may be needed to take action and address the concerns. For example, the report may indicate your building needs a new roof. Any construction documents needed to replace the roof and the name of a contractor to do the work are not included in the report.

MIT and the AILG will help any organization which needs advice on additional consultants and contractors to address the concerns noted in the Report.

- Cost of \$7500 is expensive if repeated every few years.

It will not be repeated every few years, but your organization will be expected to keep the report current.

- It's mandatory.

Each AILG House will be expected to have a professional report on the condition of its building. This report will be an important factor in the biennial AILG accreditation process. \$7,500 is a very low cost for a similar professional report. Payment plans will be worked out with any House with a budgetary challenge.

Desires

- Help with fundraising
- Particular items to include in the report.

See Mock report, based on three pilot reports done this summer using the construction industry's Uniformat designations.

- Coordination of maintenance and support.

AILG working on this feature for post assessment needs. We intend to have it in place before the reports are released.

- Make residents enjoy their house.
- Respect groups to plan and budget themselves.
- Support from MIT in responding to deficiencies and repairs

This is one of the stated reasons MIT wants this FSILG Assessment.

- Customization: allow individual groups to target areas

Noted.

• Get information on state of house and improvements, not just an overview of what's up to code

See Mock Report.

- 50% cost DSL; 25% IRDF; 25% house

\$7,500 is a very low cost for a similar professional report. Payment plans will be worked out with any House with a budgetary challenge.

- Help with donations

This is one of the stated reasons MIT wants this FSILG Assessment.

- Support from the MIT Alumni Association for fundraising

This is one of the stated reasons MIT wants this FSILG Assessment.

- MIT pays for 50% of upgrade costs

Beyond the scope of this assessment initiative, but noted.

- ADA [?]

ADA concerns are noted in the report.

- External facilities manager

AILG working on this feature for post assessment needs. This is in the process of being created and will be in place before the reports are released.

- Support in implementation and continuing maintenance

AILG working on this feature for post assessment needs. This is in the process of being created and will be in place before the reports are released.

- Coordinated project management - oversight; vendors to use for specific tasks

AILG working on this feature for post assessment needs. This is in the process of being created and will be in place before the reports are released.

- Pride of ownership by residents
- Compete with the dorms
- FSILGs to be more appealing than dorms from a facilities perspective
- AILG would respect the ability of each group to plan and budget in ways that work for them.

Concerns

- Financial – cost (\$7500); value for \$; precedent set by MIT to require large financial outlay and determine value.

\$7,500 is a very low cost for a similar professional report. Payment plans will be worked out with any House with a budgetary challenge.

- Accreditation – How does this fit into the process? If there are facility issues, will the chapter receive accreditation with reservations?

The Organizations Facility Assessment will be reviewed in the same manner many organizational attributes are reviewed. If your organization has facilities issues, you will be asked how you are addressing them. You will get help to address them. Accreditation with reservations has traditionally been a last resort for any critical organizational issue (including the condition of your building).

- Differences between different groups – recently renovated chapters, smaller communities, and chapters without a large alumni base.

Each report will be specific to your building.

- Privacy concerns. Will the information be used against houses?
See privacy matrix. The report is intended to help, not hurt Houses.
- Does MIT recognize that managing is part of the learning process?
Yes, I believe so.
- If they are planning to relocate to West Village, why should they do it?
The West Village will not be complete for many years.
- What is follow-up process?

The House decides how to address any concerns, but the AILG is committed to assisting with post assessment needs such as prioritizing concerns, selecting consultants for detailed construction documents, selecting contractors to perform the work, and reviewing work as it progresses.

- “Just call it mandatory”
- AILG should bear higher portion of the cost, given that they will receive the majority of the value from MIT.

\$7,500 is a very low cost for a similar professional report. Payment plans will be worked out with any House with a budgetary challenge.

- Value of these inspections over other options
\$7,500 is a very low cost for a similar professional report.
- Doubtful usefulness.

You cannot plan for critical building improvements without assessing your building's condition.

- Cost (high fee, especially given value)
\$7,500 is a very low cost for a similar professional report.
- Lack of depth of inspections

MIT has used the same building assessment method for all of its buildings.

See Mock Report.

- ARUP was the least capable of pilot vendors
All the Vendors showed themselves capable of doing the building assessments well.

- Report may be used by municipal authorities as justification to shut down a house (x5)
Municipal authorities are not allowed to see the report (See Privacy Matrix).
- Would grandfathered conditions be forced into compliance with current code?

Complex question, but generally no.

- Will building code violations be identified and enforced?

If you are in violation of the building code, it is in your interest to correct the condition before it has to be enforced. Municipal authorities are not allowed to see the report.

- While a minimum quality should exist, that presumably is already satisfied by annual safety and health inspections

Municipal inspections are not as detailed as this building assessment.

- From a legal perspective, assessed without a plan poses a liability if an “event” occurs
I'm not a lawyer, can't comment. As an architect, no assessment is a liability in planning your building improvements, and ignorance of potential problems is no excuse if an “event” occurs.

- AILG believes this will provide value for fundraising efforts but this is unlikely to be true for all groups (x3)

Agreed, absolute statements are likely to be false.

- Sororities do not have as large alum donor base and are at a disadvantage in ability to cover expenses

AILG and MIT are committed to help whatever your specific situation.

- Small houses pay as much as large houses when their houses are less complex

Payment plans will be worked out with any House with a budgetary challenge.

- Connection to Accreditation? What does this mean? (x3)

The Organizations Facility Assessment will be reviewed in the same manner many organizational attributes are reviewed. If your organization has facilities issues, you will be asked how you are addressing them. You will get help to address them. Accreditation with reservations has traditionally been a last resort for any critical organizational issue (including the condition of your building).

- Could this be used against us during Accreditation? How will this impact Accreditation?

See above

- Inspection may not reveal state of wiring and plumbing behind walls

Nor is it intended to.

- Privacy of data from assessment - would data be used against us? (x5)

See Privacy Matrix.

- How will MIT use this information?

MIT wants all undergraduates to have access to safe and well-maintained housing. In recent years, MIT has done the same assessment of its own properties in order to meet this goal. MIT wants to help the FSILGs have the same information it uses to make planning decisions. MIT wants to know what the future planning needs of AILG members are in order to help meet those needs.

- How much of these reports does MIT get?

See Privacy Matrix.

- 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

That is part of the assessment process (See Guide Questionnaire)

- Does MIT want to tell us how to manage our properties?

No, MIT and the AILG want to help you manage your properties.

- Sets precedent of MIT DSL requiring FSILGs to spend lots of money with short notice (x2)

Payment plans will be worked out with any House with a budgetary challenge.

- AILG keeps coming up with new expensive mandatory things and imposing them on everyone

You are part of the AILG and have a say in what the AILG comes up with.

- Report is not useful to a house which just completed major renovations (x3)

A professional report is needed in any case, with a minimum standard of assessment (See Mock Report).

- Upon any renovation project, a current assessment and estimate needs to be done, so no big benefit to doing one much earlier

You cannot plan for critical building improvements without assessing your building's condition. No current benefit if assessment is pushed to an unspecified future date.

- Can MIT work with an existing analysis?

Each AILG House will be expected to have a professional report on the condition of its building. This report will be an important factor in the biennial AILG accreditation process. The report should meet a minimum standard. (see Mock Report). So, maybe?

Appendix B FSILG Assessment Meetings with AILG

March 2, 2017 Board

MIT Vice President for Student Life Suzy Nelson presented the idea of undertaking a comprehensive facilities assessment of all FSILGs funded through MIT. Suzy noted that she had presided over a similar review at Cornell. The information would be useful to both students and alums by helping to guide short-term and long-term renovations. The information would be accessible to the non-expert, and would include assessment of the building envelope, plumbing, electrical, roof, windows, safety and fire. Steve Baker and Scott Klemm noted that studies had been done in the past and they were not entirely pleased with the results.

Suggestions from alums:

- Desire a high quality report – readable and usable
 - Prefer to have one company to do all the assessments
 - Would like value-added cost estimates
 - Need someone with the knowledge of historical buildings
 - Want to involve alums and undergrads in process
 - Use specialists to look at particular systems
 - Recommend that Tom Stohlman be the alumni liaison
- The committee discussed goals for the assessment:
- Accessible
 - Integrated with leadership
 - Tom Stohlman as facilitator
- Peter Cummings said that he would start to work with MIT facilities. He would interface with Tom to identify vendors and develop a project team. Next steps will be to develop a system and process, and identify funding.
- A Motion was made by Alice Leung, seconded by Akil Middleton: That the AILG endorses the principle of the facilities assessment and the formation of a working group. The Motion passed unanimously.

April 6, 2017 Board

Progress Report

April 12, 2017 Plenary

MIT Vice President for Student Life Suzy Nelson presented the idea of undertaking a comprehensive facilities assessment of all FSILGs. She is looking for guidance and support from the FSILG community. MIT is planning major facilities projects: a new dorm on the West Garage site and the New House renovations; then MIT will be cycling through dorm renovations. The goal of the assessment is to determine the needs for each building and to create a road map, timeline, and cost estimate in a user-friendly format.

Peter Cummings and Bob Ferrara will be taking the lead on the project. The last time an overall assessment was done was in 1998, and a facilities assessment is called for in the AILG Strategic Plan. Peter Cummings noted that they are in the process of figuring out how best to conduct the assessment. They received feedback from organizations at the March AILG Board meeting. They will be working with the MIT Facilities Department and will be looking for firms that can understand our houses. Bob Ferrara stated that they are looking for some houses to participate in a pilot program over the summer. He noted that Tom Stohlman, as AILG building safety facilitator, has been involved in the process, and will continue to be a point

person for the AILG. Financing for the assessments has not been finalized. Bob suggested that a shared model with funding from MIT, the IRDF and individual organizations, similar to the model that was used for IT improvements could be implemented.

Questions/concerns raised:

- How to close the circle about funding improvements after houses get results? Bob is talking to the MIT Alumni Association about this.
- Concern about ongoing maintenance costs for improvements and how to meet ADA requirements.
- Concern about how much the shared cost would be. Bob noted that he realizes that many houses cannot handle a large expense. Steve Baker estimates in the range of \$10-20,000 per house for the total assessment.
- Suggestion that the final report not be too corporate, more like for a home assessment.
- Suzy Nelson asked whether in general people were favorable of the facilities assessment? The consensus was overwhelmingly positive. Bob noted that the IRDF would play an important part in financing.

•
May 4, 2017 Board
Progress Report

May 31, 2017 Annual Meeting
Progress Report

July 18, 2017 Board
Progress Report

August 4, 2017 Board Retreat

Bob Ferrara led a discussion of the planned FSILG Facilities Assessment project. Discussed whether participation in the program should be optional or mandatory; it was agreed that participation should be mandatory, with a compliance alternative process for those organizations that can demonstrate they have completed a substantially similar evaluation on their own. Also discussed how this program should interface with the Accreditation Program.

August 30, 2017 Board
Progress Report

September 20, 2017 Plenary
Progress Report

October 5, 2017 Board

Bob reported on recent activities on the planned Facilities Assessment program. Bob noted that the expectation is that all organizations will participate in the program; there is no provision for an opt-out. Tom Stohlman noted that the Facilities Committee had provided an extensive amount of input on the program. He presented a written summary of the program and encouraged attendees to provide further suggestions to improve the process. Bob reported that member organizations may take up to 3 years to pay, although DSL hopes that most will pay immediately. The cost per organization is about one-third of the anticipated cost; the IRDF and DSL are paying the other two-thirds. Tom noted that the resulting data will be entered into the Department of Facilities' internal database so that progress toward completion can be tracked. Bob will consolidate all of the written information and post it to the AILG website for member organizations to review. It was noted that once the reports are complete, member organizations will need help to interpreting the findings of the assessments.

November 2, 2017 Board
(Draft as of 11/14/2017)

Bob reported on the planned Facilities Assessment program. Bob noted that the MIT General Counsel's office had slightly delayed the project while reviewing the draft contract; the contract is expected to be finalized soon. The plan is still to get the program going in the fall, but it will likely extend well into the spring. Bob also noted that at least one vendor has agreed to produce cost estimates as part of its scope of service. Tom Stohlman reviewed a written assessment guide prepared by the Facilities Committee that will be provided to each organization to help prepare them for the assessment process. A community-wide meeting has been scheduled for 29 November to introduce the winning vendor and provide more information. The parties discussed whether and how to encourage or require all member organizations to participate. It was noted that some organizations may not find as much value in this assessment as others. It was agreed that improved communication would help achieve buy-in among the membership; the 29 November meeting will help this process.

November 8 Plenary
(See Appendix A)