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Executive Summary

On March 11-13, 2015, we conducted a site visit to assess the viability of the Institute of Texan Cultures (ITC) moving its operations and programs to a portion of the San Antonio Convention Center known as the River Building. The tasks included:

- Reviewing the capacity of the River Building to house ITC operations, exhibits, and programs under various scenarios.
- Reviewing the physical structure of the River Building to be adaptively reused as a museum.
- Reviewing the impact of ITC in the River Building in the context of the current plans for HemisFair Park.
- Reviewing the costs/benefits of ITC remaining in its current building.

For this study, we reviewed program plans for ITC, the University of Texas, San Antonio (UTSA), HemisFair Park Area Redevelopment Corporation (HPARC) documents, and conducted interviews with ITC staff, HPARC representatives, and Convention Center staff.

This report presents three options for ITC moving its operation into the River Building, each with varying square footage for program, and each with related cost estimates that detail construction costs, exhibition development costs, and transition costs. The report also analyzes the costs and impact of remaining in the current building.

Regardless of which path UTSA chooses to take regarding ITC, it is important to note that it is essential that a decision is made in the near term so as to benefit from potential negotiations from stakeholder parties. The expansion of the Convention Center is currently under construction, HemisFair Park proposals are ready to go to private developers, and interest in ITC as a potential partner is strong. Inaction at this point would be counterproductive.

Of all the options reviewed, remaining in the current building is the least attractive. A significant amount of maintenance has been deferred and total funds to bring the museum to Tier One status ($31,789M) would need to be raised. Completing this program would likely not increase visitation, revenue generated, raise the profile of the museum, or provide significant rebranding opportunities.

Moving ITC into the River Building is not only possible, but desirable. This move would place ITC closer to a growing, vibrant part of the city, dramatically increase attendance of tourists and convention delegates, and afford the opportunity to redesign the worn-out exhibits and rebrand the institution.

Of the options to move ITC to the River Building, the most attractive is Option 3. This uses the full River Building, a 30' extension into Civic Park, and a portion of the Bridge Hall (to be negotiated with the Convention Center). The available square footage is adequate for ITC programming.

Any option (including remaining in the current building) would require a fundraising effort. Developing a solid campaign approach is required in the near term.
Introduction

From its creation as a key part of HemisFair in 1968, the Institute of Texan Cultures (ITC) has served to showcase the diversity of people and families that call Texas home. Over the years, the Museum has developed into a respected institution that provides a wide array of programs for community members, tourists and university students and faculty. It develops and presents a large number of innovative and welcoming community-based programs to complement its exhibits that clearly support its exciting tagline, “Find Yourself Here!”

As a part of the University of Texas San Antonio (UTSA) the ITC is a direct link to communities in San Antonio, and throughout the State of Texas. It is positioned to engage community members in learning about themselves, and to provide an introduction to the University.

As put forth by the State of Texas, the University of Texas has developed a comprehensive plan to promote excellence in all areas and to achieve “Tier One Status.” As a part of this system and process, UTSA has developed, the UTSA 2020 Blueprint to align itself with the university’s strategic plan, and to provide a path to achieving its goals.

The University of Texas Work Plan identifies “Six Pillars” to serve as guides in this process:
- Educational Excellence
- Innovative Research and Discovery
- World Class Graduate Program
- Superior Infrastructure
- Superior Student Experience
- Strong Community Involvement

With its designation as a “Smithsonian Affiliate Organization” ITC has been recognized for its professional status and for the depth and importance of the services it provides for all of the communities it serves. Museums recognized as affiliates meet criteria established by the Smithsonian Institution and thereby form cultural partnerships with the Smithsonian and with other affiliates to “…maximize the cultural and educational benefits that both the Smithsonian and the affiliates can impart to the community.” This designation enables unique professional collaborations between and among the Smithsonian and other affiliates that include, borrowing objects, curriculum development; sharing specialized staff expertise, internships, study tours, etc.

It must be noted that for the ITC, the designation as a Smithsonian Affiliate also adds nationally recognized value to the University of Texas, and its students and faculty, as it moves toward achieving Tier One status under the “Strong Community Involvement Pillar.”

Specific steps as presented in the UTSA’s “Steps to Tier One” align perfectly with strategies, goals and steps:

- Develop UTSA’s infrastructure to support and expand public service efforts
- Expand lifelong learning opportunities
- Increase student engagement with the community
- Enhance quality-of-life through community engagement.
When placing them side-by-side, these goals and strategies appear to be in near-perfect alignment with *National Standards and Best Practices for U.S. Museums* as compiled and governed by the American Alliance of Museums (AAM).

Accreditation by the AAM is a comprehensive peer review process that encompasses formal, widely accepted standards and best practices for museums and provides the means for a museum to demonstrate that it is in compliance. Achieving the accreditation benchmark is increasingly sought after by policymakers, and funders as well as the museums, and their individual governing bodies. Becoming an AAM Accredited institution can be a point of pride for museums, and for communities they serve.

As it responds to the large museum community that it serves, the AAM has reviewed and revised some of the criteria for institutional accreditation to include a larger and more meaningful emphasis on community engagement and involvement. It identifies the importance of inclusiveness, diverse participation, and understanding both existing and potential audiences.

In the Spring of 2010, the ITC underwent an institutional assessment as part of the Museum Assessment Program (MAP) governed by the American Alliance of Museums. The process, which requires an in-depth self-assessment and identification of institutional strengths, weaknesses and opportunities, is often used to position a museum to undergo (the more in-depth) accreditation process.

Among the recommendations in that report were the need to update ITC exhibitions, focus on collections care and revisit and revise the museum’s mission statement to “correlate the museum’s growth and development with that of the University of Texas at San Antonio.” The report also recognized the value that the ITC added to UTSA’s plan to be recognized as a top tier institution. [A copy of the report is available from the ITC Director’s Office.]

Since that report was completed, ITC has made progress toward achieving some of the internal institutional goals presented. In addition both the University of Texas system and the UTSA have developed and presented a Work Plan and a series of very specific goals and strategies to move each of the member universities toward Tier One Status.

Accreditation by the AAM would represent another nationally recognized accomplishment for the ITC and UTSA, and the people, families and communities they serve.
Museum Status: Recommendations

As the ITC and UTSA work to achieve the goals set forth in the University’s Strategic Plan, and to determine the future location for the museum, it is recommended that ITC:

- Review the previously completed MAP Assessment to identify key areas of strength and weakness
- Review the National Standards and Best Practices for U.S. Museums to determine the museum’s alignment/compliance
- Identify key points in the Accreditation process that directly further the UTSA’s Strategic Plan
- Meet with AAM Accreditation team members to discuss the feasibility of ITC undergoing the accreditation process
- Identify staff, faculty, and volunteers to assist in the evaluation necessary to complete the accreditation process

These actions would go a long way to raise the visibility of ITC among its museum peers as well as call attention to the outstanding work it is doing with the wide range of people and communities it serves within the University system, the State of Texas and the world. It aligns with the over-arching goal identified to become a Tier One Institution of first choice serving a diverse student population. And, as was stated, a key role in achieving this is to “Keep communication flowing.” and to “Listen to what people have to say.”
The following portions of this report* are organized as follows:

Current Status of ITC

Analysis of the River Building

Relocation of ITC to River Building: Options 1, 2, & 3

Cost Implications

Comparison of Options

Timeline, Transition, & Process

Conclusions

* Note: This report and the figures contained within it, is based on current information available as of March, 2015. Since the environment of ITC is a dynamic one, figures should be verified as part of the decision-making process.
Current Status of ITC

The museum currently operates in a building of approximately 188,000 sq. ft. built in 1968 on a site of 14 acres in the SE quadrant of Hemisfair Park. The museum provides a program of permanent and changing exhibitions and two significant festivals each year. The museums offers consistently high quality programs and sees large numbers of school tours. However, attendance has remained flat for the past 3 years. Overall, attendance of 126,403 annual visitors is low for an institution the size of ITC. Removing school groups and festival attendance further reduces attendance to 56,986 visitors annually. Further, non-school tour children make up only 1.5% of annual attendance, indicating families are not attending ITC or seeing it as a family destination. Less than 3% of visitors are college age, indicating it is not integral with UTSA programs. With only .074% attending as members, there are indications that, despite some feelings of support for the historic potential of the building, there is not strong ongoing community support. Membership support (including repeat visitation) also does not seem to be a significant factor.

This stagnant attendance is due to many factors, including:
- remote location of the museum
- inaccessibility from tourist destinations
- visual inaccessibility of the building
- poor parking provisions
### Current Status of ITC

#### Institute of Texan Cultures

**September 2013 - August 2014**

**General Admission FY14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FY 13</th>
<th>FY 14</th>
<th>FY 15</th>
<th>FY 16</th>
<th>FY 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adult</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Military</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College Student</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PT Field Trips</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>1,113</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>1,173</td>
<td>1,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Visits</strong></td>
<td>6,382</td>
<td>6,488</td>
<td>6,520</td>
<td>6,543</td>
<td>6,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Days</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**September 2013 - August 2014**

**Outreach Programs - Participants FY14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FY 13</th>
<th>FY 14</th>
<th>FY 15</th>
<th>FY 16</th>
<th>FY 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Field Trips (DFT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Projects (RP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media-Social &amp; Educational (MSE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Outreach (OC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Visits</strong></td>
<td>872</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Days</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Note:** The table provides a summary of the visits and days for different categories over the specified fiscal years, including general admission and outreach program participants.
Current Status of ITC

While the content and scholarship of the current exhibitions at ITC remains very high, there is room for revision and improvement. Some individual technological exhibit updates have been integrated, but most of the exhibits presented rely upon traditions and methods that are now outdated. There is no clear directional flow or continuity for visitors, which can result in a superficial (sampling) kind of visitor experience. And, while the major media presentation, which is designed to introduce the ITC to its visitors, uses engaging content, the 1970’s technology that is used to deliver its message is in urgent need of updating.

The ITC’s attendance numbers, which seem to be somewhat flat, appear to be highly dependent upon school groups and ITC’s special exhibitions, which are often developed to highlight specific communities. These exhibits and related programs, serve those communities well, but there is not much evidence that they are driving any additional attendance numbers to the museum.

It is also important to note that the building which houses the ITC has reached an age where significant repairs and system updating need to be addressed.

ITC now faces the challenge of either expending significant resources to upgrade and adapt the current site or moving to a new location in Hemisfair Park.

The following pages detail options for the future of the ITC.
Analysis of River Building

The Henry B. Gonzalez Convention Center was originally built in 1968 as part of the Hemisfair initiative and is now in the process of expanding to the east. Portions of the western side of the Convention Center are scheduled to be demolished to allow for the creation of a civic park and mixed use development. The expansion process will leave a portion of the building west of the River Walk known as the River Building.

"Construction of the park is expected to begin mid-2016 at the northwest corner of Hemisfair, on the site of the original portion of the Henry B. Gonzalez Convention Center. Hemisfair Park Area Redevelopment Corporation (HPARC) is responsible for expanding the park and improving its quality. The Hemisfair Master Plan, approved by City Council in February 2012, includes two urban parks with different characteristics on the western portion of Hemisfair. The first, at the southwest corner of the site, will be an active play and recreational environment for people of all ages and abilities. Called the Play Escape, this project is currently in design, with construction scheduled to begin in mid-2014. The second major Hemisfair project will be the civic park which will complement the Play Escape’s strong focus on play with a larger space for a broader range of activities."

(Hemisfair Civic Park Vision and Program Plan, 2013)
Analysis of River Building

The Civic Park area will provide a major entrance plaza at Alamo & Market streets and provide space and utilities for large events, a major connector between River Walk and Hemisfair, a natural amphitheater, and multi-story mixed use buildings enclosing the space. Currently, an RFQ has been issued for the development of the NW quadrant of the park area. An RFP will be issued in May for the development of the area to include ground level retail/restaurant, office space, and mixed income residential.

The River Building marks the eastern edge of the civic park and would be highly visible from the entry plaza. The main entrance to the museum would be on the west side of the building and incorporated into the development plans for the civic park.
The River Walk

The River Walk in San Antonio draws 7 million visitors annually with 1.3 million purchasing tickets for boat rides on the river.

While the River Walk and boat ride both extend to the convention center, there is no stop or ticket station at the location. The nearest stop is the Clearwater stop at RiverCenter mall lagoon.

The River Building is ideally located for a museum application and offers the potential for dramatically increasing attendance for a museum at that location. To take full advantage of the potential for increasing visitation, a river stop/ticket station would be located in the Grotto (adjacent to the Lonesome Dove space with an entrance to the museum at River Level. This would need approval of the City Council and to be incorporated into the river boat concessionnaire’s agreement.
Construction of the River Building

As originally constructed for the convention center, the River Building is a steel frame building with several clear span areas and support columns on 30’ centers. Concrete floor plates are generally clear and open. Ceilings are generally 12’ with 24’ ceilings in portions of Exhibit Hall B. HVAC units are placed on the roof and have recently been refurbished.
Size of the River Building and Program Requirements of ITC

While the structure of the River Building is sound, moving ITC into the structure would require a combination of new construction, significant renovation, and adaptive re-use to make it suitable as a top tier museum. Though the building has the gross square footage to accommodate the program, significant alteration of the interior would be required.

For example, since the western portion of the convention center will be demolished to clear the area for a civic park and mixed use development, any move of ITC into the River Building would require the construction of a new exterior wall (1,241 lineal feet) with a new entrance on the west side and a new entrance at the river level. Further, since the River Building served as a service core, connection two portions of the convention center, it has more service functions than would be necessary as a museum (e.g. restrooms, stairways, service corridors, etc).

The spaces are on three levels (River, Street, and Mezzanine) with each space designated by a corresponding code (R-1, R-2, S-1, S-2, M-1, etc).

Further, space studies are looking at gross square footage feasibility and are not intended to be architectural designs or functional schematic designs. Rather, they are tools to compare approaches to the required broad areas and related costs. Additional detailed comprehensive design and development would be required in all areas.

For the purpose of this study, space categories are as follows:

- Shell Space – Museum Ready. This space is ready for redesign, primarily as galleries and public areas, cleared of interior walls, but maintains basic HVAC, electrical

- New Construction. This space requires full architectural and engineering development and construction including new floor plates, structural support, HVAC, electrical

- New Exterior Wall. This requires full architectural and engineering development and construction

- Special Construction. This includes areas with special, high per square foot costs including elevators, kitchens, loading dock

- Back of House. This includes offices, production areas, collections storage areas, service areas.

Following are three options for moving ITC into the River Building with related square footage and cost by area type
Option 1: Full use of the River Building including Bridge Hall on two levels

River Level

Special construction includes Frieght elevator in existing stairwell.
Back of House is suitable for production shops, storage, maintenance.
New Entrance through Grotto/Lonesome Dove
Option 1: Street Level

New construction includes: New exterior wall and 30' extension into Civic Park (S-3); New Lobby (S-3); Demolition of restrooms (S-2)

Back of House (S-1) suitable for offices

Shell Spaces (S-5), (S-4) suitable for galleries
Option 1: Level 2 (Mezzanine)

Special Construction: vertical shaft for freight elevator
New construction (M-3) new floor plate at second level over Bridge Hall. New construction (M-1) enclosure of existing balcony. New construction (M-6) restrooms. New construction Add Alternate - extension of M-7 floor plate 30' to the west.
### Option 1: Square footage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Quantity1 UOM1</th>
<th>Quantity2 UOM2</th>
<th>Quantity3 UOM3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Back of House M-8</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>2nd Level</td>
<td>2,588 SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Back of House R-1</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>River</td>
<td>9,588 SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Back of House R-3</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>River</td>
<td>4,168 SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Back of House S-1</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>5,485 SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Back of House S-6</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>2,556 SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>New Construction M-1</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>2nd Level</td>
<td>1,352 SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>New Construction M-3</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>2nd Level</td>
<td>16,866 SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>New Construction M-6</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>2nd Level</td>
<td>1,981 SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Construction S-2</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>1,863 SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>New Construction S-3</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>16,983 SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>New Construction - Alternate Add</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>2nd Level</td>
<td>12,012 SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>New Exterior Wall</td>
<td>12' 0&quot;</td>
<td>Multi-Area Total</td>
<td>1,241 LF</td>
<td>14,887 SF</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>663 LF</td>
<td>7,950 SF</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Level</td>
<td>578 LF</td>
<td>6,937 SF</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Shell Space - Exhibit Ready M-2</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>2nd Level</td>
<td>6,652 SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Shell Space - Exhibit Ready M-4</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>2nd Level</td>
<td>11,651 SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Shell Space - Exhibit Ready M-7</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>2nd Level</td>
<td>20,734 SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Shell Space - Exhibit Ready S-4</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>24,054 SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Shell Space - Exhibit Ready S-5</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>20,112 SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Special Construction - Kitchen, Elevator, Loading</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>Multi-Area Total</td>
<td>3,853 SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>River</td>
<td>806 SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>2,375 SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Level</td>
<td>672 SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Option 1: Comparison of River Building with ITC space requirements

River Building including Bridge Hall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area: Option 1</th>
<th>NSF</th>
<th>GSF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Areas: Gallery Lobby, Theaters</td>
<td>84,584</td>
<td>134,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back of House: Offices, security, prod.</td>
<td>15,366</td>
<td>24,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>15,366</td>
<td>24,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Construction</td>
<td>2,428</td>
<td>3,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Wall</td>
<td>2,428</td>
<td>3,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>102,378</strong></td>
<td><strong>162,498</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grossing Factor:</strong> 37%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area*</th>
<th>Min. NSF*</th>
<th>Min. GSF*</th>
<th>Max. NSF*</th>
<th>Max. GSF*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Area: Galleries, Lobby, Theaters</td>
<td>53,770</td>
<td>85,495</td>
<td>60,470</td>
<td>96,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back of House: Offices, security, prod.</td>
<td>25,305</td>
<td>40,236</td>
<td>26,875</td>
<td>42,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage, Loading dock,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>79,075</strong></td>
<td><strong>125,731</strong></td>
<td><strong>87,345</strong></td>
<td><strong>138,881</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Estimates according to MGA Report, 2012
Grossing Factor: 37%

Conclusions:
- This area exceeds the needs of ITC
- Portions of Public Areas would need to be converted to Back of House.

Note: Net assignable or Net Square Feet (NSF) is the total of all functional spaces within the building. Gross Square Feet (GSF) is the total area of the building including all the Net Square Feet plus space required for wall thickness and structure, vertical and horizontal circulation, and mechanical areas.
Option 2: River Building without Bridge Hall

River Level

Special construction includes Freight elevator in existing stairwell.
Back of House is suitable for production shops, storage, maintenance.
New Entrance through Grotto/Lonesome Dove
Option 2: Street Level without Bridge Hall

New construction includes: New exterior wall and 30' extension into Civic Park (S-3); New Lobby (S-3); Demolition of restrooms (S-2)

Back of House (S-1) suitable for offices

Shell Spaces (S-5), suitable for galleries
Option 2: Level 2 (Mezzanine) without Bridge Hall

Special Construction: vertical shaft for freight elevator
New construction (M-1) enclosure of existing balcony. New construction (M-6) restrooms. New construction Add Alternate - extension of M-7 floor plate 30' to the west.
Option 2: Comparison of River Building without Bridge Hall with ITC space requirements

**River Building without Bridge Hall**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area: Option 2</th>
<th>NSF</th>
<th>GSF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Areas: Galleries, Lobby, Theaters</td>
<td>58,805</td>
<td>93,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Construction</td>
<td>2,428</td>
<td>3,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Wall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>76,599</td>
<td>121,578</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grossing Factor: 37%

**ITC Space Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area*</th>
<th>Min. NSF*</th>
<th>Min. GSF*</th>
<th>Max. NSF*</th>
<th>Max. GSF*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Area: Galleries, Lobby, Theaters</td>
<td>53,770</td>
<td>85,495</td>
<td>60,470</td>
<td>96,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back of House: Offices, security, prod. Storage, Loading dock</td>
<td>25,305</td>
<td>40,236</td>
<td>26,875</td>
<td>42,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>79,075</td>
<td>125,731</td>
<td>87,345</td>
<td>138,881</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Estimates according to MGA Report, 2012
Grossing Factor: 37%

**Conclusions:**
- This nearly matches ITC’s space requirements at the minimum level
- Portions of Public Areas would need to be converted to Back of House.
Option 3: Street Level - include a portion of Bridge Hall as theater

River Level and Level 2 (Mezzanine) remain the same as Option 2.

Develop a 60' x 60' portion of the Bridge Hall into a multimedia theater. The theater could be used collaboratively by ITC and the Convention Center. The theater could be used after hours by the Convention Center independently. It would also provide an area for access to ITC directly from the Convention Center into the Lobby of ITC.
Option 3: Comparison of River Building without Bridge Hall with ITC space requirements

River Building with multi-media theater in a portion of Bridge Hall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area: Option 3</th>
<th>NSF</th>
<th>GSF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Areas</td>
<td>58,805</td>
<td>93,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-media Theater</td>
<td>2,268</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back of House</td>
<td>15,366</td>
<td>24,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Construction</td>
<td>2,428</td>
<td>3,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Wall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78,867</td>
<td>125,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grossing Factor: 37%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ITC Space Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area*</th>
<th>Min. NSF*</th>
<th>Min. GSF*</th>
<th>Max. NSF*</th>
<th>Max. GSF*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Area: Galleries, Lobby, Theaters</td>
<td>53,770</td>
<td>85,495</td>
<td>60,470</td>
<td>96,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back of House: Offices, security, prod.</td>
<td>25,305</td>
<td>40,236</td>
<td>26,875</td>
<td>42,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage, Loading dock,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79,075</td>
<td>125,731</td>
<td>87,345</td>
<td>138,881</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Estimates according to MGA Report, 2012
Grossing Factor: 37%
Cost Estimations for Options 1, 2, & 3

### Institute of Texan Cultures

**Budget Pricing**

#### Option 1 - Full use of River Building Inclosing Bridge Hall on two levels *See attached Assumptions & Qualifications*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>$/SF</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Back of House</td>
<td>24,365</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2,316,575</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Construction</td>
<td>3,853</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>963,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell Space - Exhibit Ready</td>
<td>83,203</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>11,448,420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>31,045</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>14,641,875</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rework Exterior Wall</td>
<td>14,087</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>932,229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add AR - New Construction</td>
<td>12,012</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>4,504,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Escalation Cost: 15% = 5,245,176

Total SF: 162,498 Cost/SF: $247

$ = 40,213,014

#### Option 2 - River Building without Bridge Hall *See attached Assumptions & Qualifications*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>$/SF</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Back of House</td>
<td>24,365</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2,316,575</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Construction</td>
<td>3,853</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>963,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell Space - Exhibit Ready</td>
<td>83,203</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>11,448,420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell Space - Deduct area at bridge hall</td>
<td>12,012</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>4,504,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>31,045</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>14,641,875</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Shell Space - Option 2: 68,261 $240 = 8,954,820

New Construction: 30,045

New Const. - Deduct are at bridge hall | 12,012 | 875  | 4,504,500  |

Total New Construction - Option 2: 22,323 $375 = 8,371,875

Rework Exterior Wall: 14,087

Add AR - New Construction: 12,012

Escalation Cost: 15% = 3,900,636

Total SF: 120,538 Cost/SF: $236

$ = 20,904,876

#### Option 3 - Include a portion of Bridge Hall as Theater *See attached Assumptions & Qualifications*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>$/SF</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Back of House</td>
<td>24,365</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2,316,575</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Construction</td>
<td>3,853</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>963,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell Space - Exhibit Ready</td>
<td>83,203</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>11,448,420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shell Space - Deduct area at bridge hall: 68,261 $240 = 8,954,820

New Construction: 30,045

New Const. - Deduct are at bridge hall | 12,012 | 875  | 4,504,500  |

Total New Construction - Option 3: 25,025 $375 = 9,721,875

Rework Exterior Wall: 14,087

Add AR - New Construction: 12,012

Escalation Cost: 15% = 4,109,116

Total SF: 130,118 Cost/SF: $232

$ = 31,457,348

---

**Institute of Texan Cultures Assumptions and Qualifications**

March 24, 2015

1. Assume no LEED requirements
2. Cost includes a 15% allowance for price escalation for 1½ years
3. Assume chilled water system loop has capacity for additional tonnage equivalent for new space
4. Existing air handling units are to be re-used
5. Assume all ductwork to be new
6. Does not include any landscape or site work outside of building
7. No CPS or SAWs charges
8. No new utility work
Program Impact for Moving ITC to the River Building

Although moving a museum can seem a daunting proposition it is an opportunity that few institutions can take advantage of due to a lack of truly workable options. This is not the case for UTSA and the ITC.

It appears that many funding pathways exist that could allow the ITC to take advantage of the rebuilding of the Convention Center that would include downsizing the existing square footage by approximately 30%, and shrinking the operating costs through various efficiencies — i.e. — air handling, communications and lighting upgrades to modern standards.

Refreshed and updated exhibitions would draw more visitors and increase revenue from admissions and rental and a variety of other sources, (see Vendor Recommendations), and obviously allow the addition of new programs.

Relocating all ITC functions under one roof would continue to ensure that the “cross pollination” between exhibits, programs, research and education would continue to thrive and enrich the reputation of UTSA and the lives of those reached by ITC.

Benefits to UTSA for relocation

The stated vision of ITC is, “The Institute of Texan Cultures gives voice to the experiences of people from across the globe who call Texas home, providing insight into the past, present and future.”

The ITC must continue to deliver a Mission that is the foundation of the Museum.

The relocation of the ITC would greatly enhance the ability of the Institution to deliver this mission and function more efficiently by:

- Increasing attendance by potentially 100%
- Exposing the ITC to a broader audience by becoming attractive to convention visitors who would not normally be drawn to the existing site.
- Further increasing the public awareness of ITC as a unique and influential asset of the University and potentially functioning as a recruiting or orientation tool.
- Generate greater revenue through increased museum shop and emarket sales and café or food service consequently unburdening the Institute and University budget.
- Further unburdening the University budget by eliminating the need to address deferred maintenance and exhibition retrofit costs.
- Becoming part of the economic development tour of San Antonio
- Integrate ITC with Hemisfair activities
- Becoming the cultural anchor of Hemisfair
- Providing the opportunity for rebranding ITC and re-launching it in the public eye
- Giving the convention center a unique profile among national convention centers
- Providing a unusual event space, steps from the nexus of downtown
- Becoming a link between area neighborhoods and downtown
Program Impact for Moving ITC to the River Building

Without question, moving ITC to the River Building would dramatically increase attendance. It would:

- Move the museum to a highly visible location
- Move the museum within walking distance of tourist attractions to participate more fully in the tourist market
- Allow the museum to benefit from activities in the civic park
- Allow the museum to benefit from 1.2 million tourists who go on the River boat tour
- Allow the museum to collaborate with the Convention Center to include attendance at ITC for 750,000 convention delegates as part of a convention package.
- Move the museum within walking distance of major hotels.
- Draw visitors from adjacent mixed-use residential units planned as part of Hemisfair Park redevelopment.
- Provide increased accessibility for UTSA students, staff and faculty

Further, collaborations with civic uses of Hemisfair Park would place ITC at the hub of activity, provide cross-marketing opportunities and develop new audiences with the influx of new residents.

Transitioning

As negotiations with all of the participants progresses, the ITC must research and develop a meaningful Transition Plan. Relocating the museum is an enormous task which requires thoughtful planning and execution. It is important to use the time to build community-wide excitement and to capitalize on the opportunity to both introduce and reacquaint everyone with the ITC.

The complexity and array of real estate and financing agreements that will need to be in place in order for the move to occur, and be successful, makes the logistics of programming in temporary space(s) and storing and maintaining the museum’s collection all the more important. Every effort must be made to share this process with the public in order to maintain the museum’s credibility and connections with the communities it currently serves.

It is recommended that a Comprehensive Plan for the ITC Transition be in place, and ready to go, concurrent with the public announcement of the decision to move ahead with the relocation of the museum. A very significant portion of this plan should include a comprehensive marketing component to explain the move, the broadening of the ITC’s base of support, and the benefit to existing supporters, visitors and communities. This emphasis on marketing also provides an excellent opportunity to reawaken and grow community pride and support for the ITC and what it means to The University, San Antonio and to Texas.

It must be noted that this transition time also provides the perfect opportunity for the ITC to rebrand itself. While there are costs associated with a comprehensive rebranding campaign, the investment in ITC at this critical point in its institutional history would be invaluable as the museum re-emerges and re-introduces itself to San Antonio and to the world!
Program Impact for Moving ITC to the River Building

Further Considerations

Critical areas requiring research and specific plans of action to maintain ITC visibility include:

- Identification of the approximate amount of time the current ITC will be closed
- Creating specific programs and/or events to help to maintain public (and brand) visibility
- Identification of museum quality storage space for the ITC collections prior to relocation
- The Identification of appropriate community spaces to host special ITC programs
- The development of a coordinated press plan to release information to the public on a regular basis in order to maintain anticipation and excitement about the new ITC.

The largest impact to be dealt with may be the “Back 40”. There are several ideas that should be on the table when discussions about moving to the convention center begin in earnest. They include: moving the early and rural structures to a location outside the city limits; moving all or some to a portion of the refurbished Hemisfair park; scrapping the program as too expensive for the numbers served.

With exposure to larger, more diverse audiences that come with relocating to an active convention center that attracts a global audience, the positive exposure to both formal and informal education programs will raise the status of ITC and the UTSA.

Historic Preservation Issues – There is no hard data to support an opinion that the public considers the building a historic treasure. Though there has been important work of the SA Conservation Society and the Texas Historical Commission on analyzing the status of buildings throughout the park, no consensus is clear regarding ITC. Never the less, since this is a sensitive community issue, a carefully thought out plan and clear communications will be required.

Vendor Recommendations – It is highly recommended that ITC seek out professional services specific to museums in two areas, food service and retail. Vendors with museum experience in these areas can offer products and services identified for ITC’s audience and tied to the themes of the collection and programs. An example of well respected vendors in each area would be Arthur M. Manask & Associates for food service and museum store consultant Shelley Stephens.
Program Impact for Moving ITC to the River Building

Total Project Cost Estimate for moving ITC to the River Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Retrofit Costs</th>
<th>$40,213,016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soft Costs (15%)*</td>
<td>$6,031,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exhibition Dev. &amp; Prod.</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transition costs</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$57,244,968</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Retrofit Costs</th>
<th>$29,904,876</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soft Costs (15%)*</td>
<td>$4,485,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exhibition Dev. &amp; Prod.</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transition costs</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$45,399,607</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Retrofit Costs</th>
<th>$31,457,376</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soft Costs (15%)*</td>
<td>$4,718,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exhibition Dev. &amp; Prod.</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transition costs</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$47,175,982</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Soft costs include architectural development and design of west facade wall, new north entrance, architectural design of all refit space, and related engineering.
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Florence P. Mayne, J.D.
Executive Director, Real Estate Office
The University of Texas System
201 West 7th Street, Suite 410
Austin, Texas 78701

RE: U.T. San Antonio; Appraisal of
approximately 14,706-acre site and
improvements in San Antonio,
Bexar County, Texas.

Dear Ms. Mayne:

In accordance with your request, we have made an inspection and appraisal of The University of Texas at San Antonio Institute of Texan Cultures, including 14,706-acre site and improvements at 801 East Cesar E. Chavez Boulevard, City of San Antonio, Bexar County, Texas.

The purpose of this appraisal was to estimate the market value of the fee simple interest of the subject property, in "as is" condition, as of November 15, 2012. Attached to this letter is an outline of the data gathered during the course of our investigation and of the reasoning used in arriving at the estimate of market value.

The value estimate herein contained and this Self-Contained Appraisal Report have been prepared in compliance with the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP) as promulgated by the Appraisal Standards Board of The Appraisal Foundation and published by the Appraisal Institute and adopted by its Board of Directors and the Real Estate Appraisal Guidelines of The University of Texas System.

The undersigned have made a personal inspection of the subject property, as well as, the comparable sales used in this appraisal.

The subject property is appraised as having no environmental hazards. No environmental site assessment was provided to the appraisers. Please see the attached "Contingent and Limiting Conditions".

The Institute of Texan Cultures building is appraised as being in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. No study of the subject property pertaining to the Americans with Disabilities Act was provided to the appraisers. Please see the attached "Contingent and Limiting Conditions".

No furniture, fixtures, or equipment are included in the value estimate contained herein.

Based upon our inspection and appraisal, it is our opinion that the market value of the fee simple interest of The University of Texas at San Antonio Institute of Texan Cultures, consisting of the 14,706-acre site and improvements at 801 East Cesar E. Chavez Boulevard, City of San Antonio, Bexar County, Texas, in "as is" condition, as of November 15, 2012, was:

THIRTY MILLION SIX HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS
($30,600,000.00)

The value estimate reported above is based upon an exposure time of approximately one year or less.

Respectfully submitted,

NOBLE & ASSOCIATES, INC.

BY:

CHARLES H. NOBLE, JR.
MAI, CRE, SREA, ASA, CPM
CHAIRMAN
STATE CERTIFIED GENERAL REAL
ESTATE APRAISER #TX-1220789-G

CHARLES H. NOBLE III
MAI, CRE, RM
PRESIDENT
STATE CERTIFIED GENERAL REAL
ESTATE APRAISER #TX-1320734-G
Comparison of Options: Staying in current location

One of the options available to ITC is to stay in the current location and continue to serve the community at existing levels. This position of status-quo does little to advance the Mission or impact the community, State, or region. In some respects, it could insure a declining future for the institution.

The existing infrastructure and physical plant have decades of deferred maintenance and the exhibitions are worn and dated. Bringing the building and the exhibits into the 21st Century should be a priority if ITC is to remain in the current location.

If this were accomplished an aggressive marketing campaign would be needed to bring up attendance and use by the public and businesses.

An exhibit Master Plan, that goes into detail beyond the current schematic design generated by West Office, is needed.

The original building was designed in the Brutalist Modern style popular in the mid 1960’s to accommodate World’s Fair sized crowds, supposedly one million visitors per month for six months. The current visitation of one hundred and fifty thousand per year is an adequate number but at times the vast space appears to be underutilized and the cost of operations for so few visitors is higher than necessary.

Program impact – The various education programs for students, families, tourists and educators is adequate but not at a level of use that furthers the Mission or enhances the status of UTSA. Although the quality of the education programs meets the needs of those served, the volume versus the potential is out of balance.

For example, the Folk Festival and Asian Festival are popular regional events. Unfortunately, attendance at those events total less than 20,000 at a cost to ITC of $500,000 annually or a cost to ITC of $25.00 per person. The structure of the events allows for a modest amount of this expense to be recovered.
Comparison of Options: Cost of Remaining in current building

The costs detailed below are estimates of deferred maintenance backlog costs. Additional costs for remaining would include exhibition masterplanning, redesign, and installation, transition costs during refit of the building, and marketing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building No.</th>
<th>Building Name</th>
<th>GSF</th>
<th>Yr. Built</th>
<th>2014 Backlog</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0750</td>
<td>Institute of Texan Cultures</td>
<td>182,247</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>$14,126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These numbers reflect construction costs only. For total project costs, add 50% for soft costs*:

Total Project Costs: $14,126,000 + 50% = $21,189,000

The cost figures are derived from a predictive model and NOT generated from field observation untilizing any historical or internal UTSA source. The condition of the subsystems has not been validated by any field assessment via third party professional consultants. The cost figures do not consider any unforeseen conditions and typical remodel costs of an older building (e.g. asbestos abatement)

Note: All information on this page (including soft cost %) was provided by:
The University of Texas, San Antonio
Facilities Planning and Development

Note: * Soft costs for deferred maintenance would include: architectural design and engineering on a per project basis. Since it is likely that individual projects would be treated as separate contracts, total soft costs would be higher. It is also not clear what conditions may be encountered (e.g. asbestos abatement) in the current building.
Comparison of Options: Staying in current location

Funding for the museum comes primarily from three sources: biennial legislative appropriations; exhibit floor and special event admissions; grants, contributions, and other locally generated funds such as the rental of the museum's facilities, retail sales from the Museum Store, and royalties from the sale of museum publications. New sources of funding are limited. If the ITC chooses to ignore the maintenance and exhibit needs the building value decreases, operational costs for temporary fixes rise and the visitor experience declines.

Total Project Cost Estimate for remaining in current location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Maintenance</td>
<td>$14,126,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Costs (50%)</td>
<td>7,063,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition Dev. &amp; Prod.</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition costs</td>
<td>600,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$31,789,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: It is likely that system improvements will require the vacating of portions of the building, closing them to the public and may require relocating collections, offices, and production capacity.
**Timeline and Process**

UTSA and the development of Hemisfair (HPARC & the City of San Antonio are moving on two different timelines. The development of Hemisfair is rapidly moving forward with the issue of an RFP for the development of the NW quadrant of the park due out in May. UTSA has not yet committed to either the option of staying in the current building or moving to the River Building. This difference in timing puts the pieces of the project out of sync and does not offer the optimum decision environment, nor the most cost effective solutions. Further, the lack of decision clarity hampers the ability of ITC to negotiate favorable terms and may create the impression of an uncooperative partner.

It is incumbent on UTSA to institute a clear decision making process in the near term. The decision diagram to the right suggests and approach to this process.

Two pieces are critical to the decision making process:

1. UTSA must secure a professional real estate appraisal of the current 14 acres of property. The Noble & Associates estimate in this report is only an initial appraisal. A second appraisal should be obtained.

2. ITC must establish a community based Steering Committee with a recognized community spokesperson. The spokesperson/chair could come from government (current or former) or business, but must be seen as an advocate for San Antonio. The Steering Committee would be composed of representatives of significant members of the community, UTSA, & the business/cultural community.
Timeline and Process

ITC is at a crossroads in its history. It must decide whether it should move to the River Building or stay in its current location.

As it sets out on the path to achieving Tier One Status, UTSA stands to gain by being able to showcase its truly unique community based asset, the ITC.

As a community-based institution, the ITC is poised to reconnect, redefine and celebrate its role in serving the citizens of San Antonio, Texas and the world.

With each of the solutions, there are many concerns and issues to weigh. It is certain, however, that this is a very important opportunity for both the ITC and the UTSA, and that a decision must be made quickly to assure a positive outcome.

Should ITC decide to remain in its current location, a plan for the next two years must include:

- Development and implementation of an exhibit master plan
- Design and installation of revitalized exhibits
- Creation of a master schedule to resolve deferred maintenance
- Development of a comprehensive marketing campaign
- Strategies for integration with Hemisfair Park

Should ITC decide to move to the River Building, a plan must include:

- Strategies for linking to Hemisfair development
- Strategies for linking with the Convention Center
- The development of a re-branding campaign
- A plan for the relocation that accounts for storing and moving the museum's collections, developing and presenting temporary programs and/or exhibits during the construction, and appropriate staffing
- Strategies for keeping ITC "real" and in the public eye during a transition
- The development of an exhibition master plan for the new facility

As it faces these important decisions, the ITC and the UTSA must recognize what a truly wonderful opportunity they are faced with. Forty-seven years after it was celebrated by its first visitors, ITC stands poised to reinvent and present itself to new generations of children and families from all over the world!
Conclusions

The following is an initial analysis of options available to ITC. The report is presented at a time when many elements are in motion and the landscape and options for ITC can change rapidly. At the same time, the development of the convention center expansion; the release of the Phase I RFQ for the development of the NW corner of Hemisfair Park and plans for the further development of the entire area are all moving forward very rapidly. These developments allow ITC to negotiate from a position of strength and that opportunity should be acknowledged.

Additionally, there is growing commercial interest in the development of the Park area and there may be a critical mass of potential buyers, should ITC want to sell its property.

For all of these reasons, it is critical that ITC resolve the issue of moving to a new facility or not in the near term.

Below each of the four options are evaluated for strengths and weaknesses of approach:

1. Move to the River Building under Option 1.

The advantages of the River Building are outlined elsewhere in this document. The main advantage is moving the institution to a very high profile position and the likely doubling of attendance. This option would allocate 162,498 gross square feet to ITC on three levels. This allocation exceeds the maximum space and program needs of ITC by 15% in both public and back-of-house areas according to the Goodwin Report.

Additionally, the Convention Center may not be interested in allocating the Bridge Hall to ITC. Currently, it uses the Bridge Hall in its calculation of total available space and releasing that area to ITC may lower the capability of the City to attract conventions.

This option provides for an additional 30' extension into the Civic Park area to provide for a new entrance, lobby space, and additional gallery space. This extension would need to be negotiated with the City and HPARC, but there are indications this may not prove difficult.

Any option to move to the River Building will incur costs beyond the finishing of the new space. New exhibitions must be developed, designed and installed; collections must be moved; staff/programs must be housed during the transition; and revenue may be interrupted for a period of time.

Total Costs for Option 1 are higher as the listing below indicates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total costs*</td>
<td>$57,244,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less sale of current property++</td>
<td>-$30,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds to be raised</td>
<td>$26,644,968</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes Capital costs; soft costs; exhibition design & installation, collections move, and staff transition
++ Based on 2012 property assessment by Noble & Assoc., Inc.
Because of the high total cost, this may not be a desirable option. It puts heavy reliance on UTSA developing a robust capital campaign and designating ITC as a priority and full agreement of the City and HPARC for the additional space.

2. Move to the River Building under Option 2

This option would allocate 121,578 gross square feet to ITC on three levels. Currently, this is the preferred option of the City and Convention Center. However, this only meets the minimum space requirements for ITC. Further, some portion of designated public space would need to be reallocated to back-of-house to accommodate ITC needs. This would further shrink the public space. This option provides for an additional 30’ extension into the Civic Park area to provide for a new entrance, lobby space, and additional gallery space. This extension would need to be negotiated with the City and HPARC, but there are indications this may not prove difficult.

Costs for Option 2 are the lowest as indicated by the chart below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total costs*</th>
<th>$45,339,607</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less sale of current property++</td>
<td>- $30,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds to be raised</td>
<td>$14,739,607</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a less desirable option because the total square footage may not fully meet ITC’s needs.

3. Move to the River Building under Option 3

This option would allocate 125,178 gross square feet to ITC on three levels. The additional square footage over Option 2 is located in a portion of the Bridge Hall. Since this is a transition space between the ITC and Convention Center, it is a logical place to put a state of the art media presentation theater. This theater could be used to present an orientation to Texas experience for ITC visitors AND used equally by the Convention Center as an orientation to Texas experience for convention delegates. The theater could have additional after hours uses for the Convention Center so they may be able to include the space in their total square footage calculations.

This position would need to be negotiated with the City and the Convention Center. This option provides for an additional 30’ extension into the Civic Park area to provide for a new entrance, lobby space, and additional gallery space. This extension would need to be negotiated with the City and HPARC, but there are indications this may not prove difficult.

Costs for Option 3 are mid-range as indicated by the chart below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total costs*</th>
<th>$47,175,982</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less sale of current property++</td>
<td>- $30,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds to be raised</td>
<td>$16,575,982</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This may be the most desirable option. It gives ITC adequate space at a reduced cost from Option 1. Never the less, it puts heavy reliance on UTSA developing a robust capital campaign and designating ITC as a priority and full agreement of the City and HPARC for the additional space.
4. Staying in the current building

This may be the least desirable option. Given the significant need to address deferred maintenance; the need for redeveloped exhibitions; and other program needs. This option presents the opportunity to spend significant funds with little return.

It is not anticipated that ITC would increase its visitor-ship or generate additional revenues.

Summary of costs

| Total costs*       | $31,789,000 |

Little additional value is seen in return for this investment.
**Fundraising & Support Group**

The ITC could greatly benefit from the creation of a non-profit, fundraising-focused support group that can tentatively be called “The Friends of Texas Cultures”, (Friends).

This group of diverse citizens from all walks of life would initially be brought together by the non-staff spokesperson for the project. At first a group of three or four people would be selected as the officers of record, working in concert with ITC staff and UTSA to form the charitable 501c (3) through the State Attorney General’s office and to post the proper public notices. The Friends would further work closely with the ITC and UTSA to create the by-laws and establish the strategies and tactics to fulfill their mission of fundraising to fill the capital delta between revenue generated through real estate development and the refurbishment/re-purposing of the ITC.

Money raised should flow through the Friends Group with special care being given to ensure that there was no conflict with UTSA annual or capital campaigns. Funds could be earmarked for specific components of the project, (such as capital expenditures or exhibitions), but it would be most useful if funds were “unrestricted” and could be directed where they were most needed to support the chosen option.

The Strategic Fundraising Plan, coordinated with the three entities, would need to raise a delta amount of $14M - $32M depending on the choice of the option 1, 2 or 3. Although these include Capital, Soft, Exhibition and Transition costs it does not include the “cost of raising money”. A campaign that could span several years is not an inexpensive endeavor, especially considering it is recommended that it be a statewide effort.

Funds from individuals, public and private foundations, corporations and governmental sources should be sought out but a feasibility study should be undertaken first to determine the potential for success and to identify a lead donor and gift and to prevent any conflict with the UTSA.
This report is a collaborative effort based on interviews with UTSA personnel, museum staff, Hemisfair Park Area Redevelopment Corporation and other public sources. It is intended to aid UTSA and ITC in developing decisions regarding future sites and planning for ITC. While every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of figures presented, they are estimates based on information available at the time of this report and may vary in future discussions.

We thank UTSA and ITC for the opportunity to develop this paper and would look forward to future discussions.
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