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The Amador Hotel is a significant historic landmark in downtown Las Cruces and one of the oldest original buildings in the City. Built as a homestead for the Amador family in the 1870s, it became a rest stop for drovers and other travelers by 1878. Eight years later, a second story was added and the building evolved into a full-fledged hotel. Over the years the hotel served as a social gathering place for the community and gained a reputation from travelers as one of the best places to stay in the region.

After a century of serving the public, the building was sold to Citizens’ Bank in 1968. Under new ownership, the property was altered significantly to accommodate bank customers. The County of Doña Ana acquired the property in 1985 for administrative offices. In 2005, the County moved to a new facility and placed the Amador Hotel on the market.

A group of local citizens actively petitioned Dona Ana County and the City of Las Cruces advocating for the preservation and rehabilitation of the building. Eventually the County donated the building to the City with the stipulation that the building be considered for a history museum.

The Amador Museum Foundation. A private nonprofit 501(c)(3) was organized in 2006 with the goal of raising funds to preserve the Amador Hotel and create a museum of history for the citizenry. The Foundation, working closely with City staff and elected officials, set out to develop a plan for the building and to raise funds for its renovation as a history museum.

The Foundation successfully petitioned the New Mexico Legislature to fund the development of a plan to preserve the building, and to create an interpretive and operations plan for a history museum. In 2007, the Legislature authorized $62,900 to “plan, design, and renovate the Amador Hotel for city use”; and $114,000 in 2008 to “plan, design, renovate, and construct improvements to the Amador Museum.” These funds were used to undertake this adaptive reuse study. The architectural firm of Kells + Craig Architects, along with museum consultants Andrew Merriell and Associates and MK Communication, were engaged to provide expertise in architecture, historic building preservation, museum exhibits and programming, operations, financing and marketing.

Although originally envisioned as a history museum, the reuse plan for the Amador proposes a multi-use building comprising a small museum, events center, offices for non-profit organizations, restaurant, and small gift shop. This change has come about through interviews and visioning workshops with community members, Town Hall meetings, and meetings with the Amador Museum Foundation Board and City of Las Cruces staff and administrators.
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Work on The Historic Amador Hotel Reuse Plan started in December, 2008, and is the result of an intensive effort that included significant involvement by the Amador Museum Foundation, City of Las Cruces staff, potential stakeholders, and the community-at-large. The process used interviews, workshops, and Town Hall meetings to develop the reuse proposals which were incorporated into a draft plan that was presented to the Las Cruces City Council at a public working session in August of 2009. This final plan is the culmination of that effort and includes revisions and additions requested at the Council meeting and from subsequent review of the draft document by Councilors, Amador Museum Foundation Board members and city staff.

The scope of the study generally reflects that required by the original Request for Proposals (RFP), however certain items had to be deleted or reduced in scope during contract negotiations in order for the work to fall within the available funds. Items that were deleted included the services of a landscape architect and a civil engineer and a reduction in the number of trips to Las Cruces and the number of meetings proposed by the study team in its response to the RFP. Further, the change of direction in the planned use for the building during the study required rearranging and curtailing some of the original tasks in order that other tasks relating to the change in direction could be accomplished.

The study falls into three primary phases typically used by museum and interpretive planners in planning a new museum:

- Discovery Phase / Data Gathering
- Visioning & Preliminary Design
- Final Design Proposal and Documentation

The Discovery Phase seeks to determine what stakeholders and the community-at-large are looking for in the proposed museum and what level of community support exists for it. This phase also looks at other museum resources in the area and anticipated visitorship. This study also included detailed measurements, documentation and analysis of the existing building, and a historic preservation analysis. The Visioning Phase seeks to identify the “stories to be told” by the exhibits and generate preliminary design concepts, including funding and operational concepts. The Final Design Proposal and Documentation Phase develops the exhibit concept, building design, and the operations and funding plans into specific recommendations.

The interviews conducted by the museum and interpretive planning consultants with over 30 stakeholders at the beginning of the Discovery Phase in January, 2009 revealed that there was considerable affection for the Amador building as an important contributor to Las Cruces’ historic resources many of which were lost in the redevelopment of Downtown in the late 1960s and in the intervening years. There was also strong support and gratitude for the effort by members of the Amador Museum Foundation who fought to save the building from possible demolition and successfully negotiated transfer of its ownership from Dona Ana County to the City of Las Cruces following the County’s move to its new facility. There was much less support among those interviewed for reusing the building as a dedicated history museum, although most saw a need for some kind of museum exhibit to be included in any reuse plan. This reflects what is found nationally where history museums are typically the least-visited of all museums and the most difficult to sustain. What captured the imagination of those interviewed, and was confirmed by those who participated in visioning workshops and Town Hall meetings during the Visioning Phase, was the idea of The Amador “coming back to life” as a vibrant social venue in Downtown Las Cruces. It was seen by many as a possible catalyst project in Downtown’s revitalization and an opportunity to add more critical mass to the overall plans for the area’s redevelopment. Following an interim report on these findings, the study team met with representatives of the Amador Museum Foundation and city staff in April of 2009 to seek direction as to whether to proceed with the idea of a dedicated
Historic Hotel Reuse Plan

During two half-day workshops, the participants identified a range of possible uses in which an events center, hotel and restaurant/bar ranked highest. A small museum exhibit was also seen as an important component of any scheme. In addition, multiple uses that allowed for public access were favored. There was also a preference for including uses that could be potential revenue generators to offset the cost to the city of owning the facility. Following the workshops the study team developed conceptual designs for three options that included conceptual floor plans, site plans, and 3-dimensional renderings for:

- Option 1: Events center, offices (at second floor), and small museum exhibit
- Option 2: Boutique hotel, café, and small museum exhibit
- Option 3: Events center, offices (at second floor), restaurant/bar addition, and small museum exhibit.

Options 2 and 3 included a dining patio, which was a feature of the old Amador Hotel—before its conversion to a bank—that people remembered vividly in the visioning workshops. The proposals were presented at two Town Hall meetings in June of 2009, where a preference was indicated for Option 3 with a strong second choice preference for Option 2. The museum planning consultant also interviewed representatives of the business community and potential funders at this time and sought their reaction to the proposals. The proposals were favorably received and those interviewed were supportive of the idea of The Amador being developed and operated by a public/private partnership and linked to the revitalization of Downtown. Although raising funds in the current economy would be difficult, they felt that these components increased the chances of private funding support.

Following the Town Hall meetings, the consultant team was directed by the city project manager to develop a more detailed design proposal for Option 3, including development costs. The proposal is included in Section III, Design Proposal and Documentation, and includes the following components:

**Vision for the building and museum:** The plan includes proposed floor plans, elevations, a site plan, and 3-dimensional renderings of Option 3 along with concepts for the museum exhibit design. Historic preservation strategies are identified and a building code analysis is included. Building construction, structural considerations, mechanical, plumbing and electrical systems, site drainage, and site utilities are discussed. A preliminary project budget provides a range for construction cost and other project expenses such as furnishings and equipment, design fees, and contingencies. A range of costs is given to take into account unknown factors such as the extent of structural upgrades required at the historic structure—which cannot be known without additional selective demolition and investigation—more detailed design, and further consultation with building code officials.

**Operations plan and budget:** This section provides a market profile of the project including descriptions of comparable, mixed-use museum facilities in other parts of the United States, and proposes operating plans and a pro-forma for the museum portion of the facility. Since the original intent of the project was to develop the entire building into a museum, the study team includes a museum planner with experience in museum operations, management, and budgets. Regardless of the size of the museum, it still requires an operating plan and thus one is included in this section for the proposed small museum exhibit. The plan also includes some recommendations about operation of a museum gift shop. While some of the projected operating costs and revenues for the events center, offices, and restaurant are included, they fall outside the expertise of a museum.
planner. Additional research and recommendations should be provided by a consultant specializing in leasing and operations for these types of functions. This is recommended as a follow-up task in the last section of the plan.

**Analysis of funding sources and strategies:** This section provides a description of potential public and private funding sources including public and private grants and tax credits, with descriptions of their intent and how The Amador might qualify to receive funds from them.

The last section of the study includes recommendations for Phasing and Follow-up. The Mayor and City Council have requested that the consultants include recommendations to phase the construction, given the difficulty of raising the estimated $8-$11 million project budget at one time. The section includes both possible construction phasing and a list of tasks and their sequence that should be completed in order to move the project forward to a point where the first phase of construction can begin. A range of costs has been assigned to these phases and tasks.

The most important task to complete before moving forward with the first phase of construction is to undertake additional selective removal of the exterior stucco and interior finishes, in order to view currently concealed structural elements so that the nature and condition of the building structure can be fully understood. This information should then be used to perform a detailed structural evaluation by a professional structural engineer, which is required for the building code official to determine the extent to which the historic structure must be upgraded for its proposed new use. The structural engineer would then need to work with an architect experienced in historic preservation to develop feasible ways to make these upgrades which must be accepted by the building code official and by the State Historic Preservation Officer, who must make determinations about the acceptability of these upgrades for a State-Registered Historic Structure. Without performing these steps it is not possible to develop a realistic plan or budget for the project, or determine what portion of this budget must be expended in the first phase. Concurrent tasks should also include Phase 1 and 2 environmental surveys (to determine if hazardous materials exist in items to be selectively removed), a geotechnical survey to determine the nature and bearing capacity of the soil (required for the structural analysis), and a topographic survey and drainage analysis to be performed by a professional surveyor and civil engineer respectively so that existing drainage issues which are potentially harmful to the structure can be addressed in the first phase of construction.

In addition to construction related items, the Phasing and Follow-up section includes recommendations for additional market analysis and operating studies for the events, office and restaurant components, and fundraising and marketing studies to provide the Amador Museum Foundation and the city with strategies for funding and marketing the facility.

The Amador Museum Foundation is anxious to put the building back to use for small events on an interim basis as soon as possible so that the public can witness the process of its transformation and will be keenly anticipating the time when it can be rejuvenated as the social hub it once was. The preservation of The Amador provides an opportunity to engage and educate the community about its history and the place this unique building had in the development of Las Cruces. While any interim use will be dependent on the above structural analysis and approval by the Las Cruces Fire Department, the city as the owner, and the building code official, engaging the community in the entire process of preservation can only increase the chances of its success and the community’s support of the project. Finally, the project offers an opportunity to demonstrate how a historic preservation project can be an example of sustainable building through preservation of existing resources as well as through strategies for energy and water conservation and incorporation of renewable, non-toxic materials and systems in its renovation and expansion.
I. Discovery/Data Gathering
**DISCOVERY PHASE**

**PURPOSE**

The purpose of this phase was to:

- Seek input about community preferences for the interpretive plan for the museum and exhibits.
- Obtain insights into potential operations, management, marketing, and funding for the project.
- Research the building’s history and identify extant elements of historic significance.
- Measure and document the building and the site.
- Review building code and other requirements affecting the development of the project.

However, by the end of the exercise, the study revealed that devoting the whole Amador Hotel building to a historical museum is not in the best interests of the citizens of Las Cruces. Instead, the consultants found much more support for the idea of returning the Amador to its role as a central gathering place for residents; a few rooms would be devoted to the purpose of conveying the Amador’s colorful history, as well as its importance today. The following is a summary of the investigation.

**QUESTIONS**

The following are the specific questions the stakeholders were asked. The consultants sought to use the responses to define: the constituency and intended audience; the mission and main message of the proposed institution; the content and important stories to be conveyed in the exhibits; and the nature of the visitor experience.

1) Do you think it’s a good idea to turn the Amador Hotel into a history museum? What do you intend to accomplish by doing this? What do you think is the most important thing for the new museum to do? What’s the biggest mistake the makers of the new museum could make?

2) Who do you hope will benefit from this new museum? Do you think you personally will benefit?

3) What would you like to see in the new museum?

4) What do you hope visitors will learn from the new museum? What’s the most important takeaway message?

5) Tell me the most interesting story you know about the Amador Hotel, or the Las Cruces/Mesilla Valley area.

6) What kind of experience would you like visitors to have there? What kind of experience would you like to have there?
CONSTITUENCY/AUDIENCE

The constituency for the Amador Hotel project comprises everyone who cares about preserving the building—and that seems to encompass the majority of the community, or at least its long-term residents. However, the two constituent groups that stand out are the Amador Museum Foundation (AMF), the body that set this project in motion, and the City of Las Cruces, which now owns the building and operates the local museum system. AMF largely came together for the purpose of preserving the building. In addition, some if its members own artifacts for which a new history museum might provide a home. For the City of Las Cruces, however, the Amador Hotel has the distinct potential of overwhelming an already underfunded and overburdened museum system. Therefore it is important to define exactly the kind and scale of museum the community is looking for, in the hopes of striking a balance between the needs of these two main constituent groups.

Many of our interviewees named children as the hoped-for audience. However, demographic analyses of history museum visitation show that historical museums appeal mainly to older visitors, even if the museums offer discovery rooms and interactive experiences designed to appeal to children. As much as older people think history should interest children, there is no evidence that it generally does. And in its best years the Amador was not much of a children’s place.

People moving to the area from other parts of the country now make up the greater part of the recent growth of Las Cruces. Many of these are retirees. Some of our interviewees expressed doubt that a local history museum would appeal to these newcomers. However, some newcomers, particularly older ones, might see the Amador as a resource for becoming assimilated into the community. Other interviewees expressed hope that the Amador might be a tourist draw—but again, local history museums hardly ever serve an important role as tourist destinations in and of themselves. The consultant team’s opinion is that whatever happens with the Amador, its success will depend on service to a broad spectrum of the local community.

MESSAGE/MISSION

Although many different ideas for a main message for the Amador Museum were heard, several interviewees settled on the cultural/ethnic diversity message as the one most important takeaway messages of the Amador Museum. Everyone belongs. Everyone contributes. A good community embraces all its constituents. All members of the community have a right to pride in their heritage.

Las Cruces suffered terrible damage from the losses of St. Genevieve’s Church (what some considered the spiritual anchor of the community) and its main street (which was replaced by an ill-conceived pedestrian mall). The community has learned the hard way that tearing down old buildings typically does more harm than good. Almost everyone interviewed expressed a deep passion for preserving the Amador Hotel building. The building began life as a private residence, then became in turn a boarding house, a hotel, a bank, and a county office building. Now it is a temporary bus station. But the consensus among stakeholders is that its glory days were its hotel days. In the first two-thirds of the twentieth century the Amador was not just a hotel; it was the hotel, offering the best lodging, eating, and drinking in Las Cruces. More importantly, it was the city’s social anchor, the place where Las Crucens went to celebrate important events. It is the Consultants’ opinion that returning the hotel to that role in the community would be entirely appropriate—revitalizing the Amador as the linchpin between Las Cruces’ past and future.

Therefore, while most of the building would be devoted to hosting community events, a
small museum would serve as a means of telling Amador stories from the past. Such a museum would reinforce the need for preserving the building as a stage for experiences that will become fodder for stories in the future.

**CONTENT/STORY**

Other institutions in the area already cover many of the content areas stakeholders suggested for the Amador Museum. These include:

- Branigan Cultural Center - Las Cruces Local and Regional History
- New Mexico State University Museum Las Cruces - Local and Regional History
- New Mexico Farm & Ranch Museum - Las Cruces Agricultural & Ranching History
- Las Cruces Railroad Museum - Las Cruces Area Railroad History
- Bicentennial Log Cabin Museum - Las Cruces Pioneer History
- Gadsden Museum - La Mesilla Old West History
- Fort Selden State Monument Radium Springs - Early Military History
- White Sands Missile Range Museum WSMR - Past and Recent Military History
- New Mexico Museum of Space History Alamogordo - Space Exploration History

Planned museums:

- New Mexico State Veterans’ Museum - Las Cruces Military History (as part of NM Military history)
- J. Paul Taylor Historic House Museum - La Mesilla Local and Regional History

However, a museum focusing specifically on the life of the Amador Hotel building, its significance to the community, the family that built and operated it, and the people who passed through its doors would be a unique and fitting subject for the Amador Museum.

In addition, telling certain elements of the history of Las Cruces and New Mexico would put the history of the Amador in context. To avoid repeating the content of other museums, history would be told in an unusual way, using a kind of “tipping point” theme: Something specific happens, causing things generally to change. Soldiers come from elsewhere intending to fight, but end up staying to live. The railroad comes in, and Las Cruces grows in importance relative to surrounding towns. Prohibition wipes out a promising local winemaking industry, and agricultural lands end up in cotton and pecans instead. White Sands Missile Range replaces ranches and brings a different kind of resident and economy to the area. A murder case gets national publicity, exposes government corruption, sweeping political changes ensue, and New Mexico narrowly escapes a fate as the gambling capital of the United States. Urban renewal results in community devastation. And with luck, the rehabilitation of a historic building knits together a city’s past and its future.

**VISITOR EXPERIENCE**

The question of what kind of experience interviewees were looking for in a museum about the Amador proved the most difficult to answer. However, those who were able to articulate a vision kept coming back to the same themes: interactive, hands-on, technologically up-to-date, and media-rich. The aim of the museum, as a means of telling stories instead of just showcasing significant objects, is ideal for creating such a rich experience for visitors.

*Above: Bar at the Amador Hotel - NMSU Library, Archives and Special Collections #00040211*
**DISCOVERY PHASE**

In planning for developing, operating and managing the Amador History Museum, the consultants looked for insight into the potential operations and funding of the project. They sought answers to basic questions concerning public and private financial support, community goodwill, and the actual management of the institution. The questions we asked were these:

1) What do you consider to be the museum’s future role in the educational and cultural life of Las Cruces and the region? Will the museum have the support of the business community as well as the support of everyday citizens?

2) How is the museum idea perceived by the citizens of Las Cruces? What do they see as the public value of the museum? What do your friends see?

3) What do you consider the greatest challenge facing the museum? What hurdles does it have to overcome to garner grassroots support?

4) What do you think should be the most compelling reason for the people of Las Cruces to support the museum?

5) Recognizing that financial support is relative based on the future direction of the museum and its value to the public, what do city leaders and the Amador Museum Foundation Board have to do to get your support for the museum? What do you think they have to do to get the support of the local citizenry?

6) If you could tell the leaders of the City of Las Cruces and the Amador Museum Foundation Board one thing as they move forward in an effort to create a new history museum for Las Cruces, what would it be?

In 2007 an agreement was signed between the City of Las Cruces and the Amador Museum Foundation for the restoration of the Amador Hotel and the development of a museum of history. The Amador Museum Foundation agreed that the City of Las Cruces, through its Museum System, would administer the operations of a museum of history to be located in the Amador building.

The museum staff would be employees of the City of Las Cruces and report to the Director of Museums. The interpretation of the building, the acquisitions and management of collections would be the responsibility of the City of Las Cruces Museum System. The installation of permanent and temporary exhibits and the development of programming would be the responsibility of the museum staff.

The Amador Museum Foundation would:

1) Provide the funding for restoration and repair of all Amador property features, expansions, and renovation.

2) Provide funding for museum development, design, fabrication, installation and interpretive planning of exhibit components and project needs.

3) Be responsible for providing on an annual basis, assistance with operating expenses.

4) Establish, operate and staff a museum gift shop within the museum of history facility.

Several of the people interviewed on the feasibility of the project voiced the concern that it was unreasonable to expect the foundation to raise capital and operating funds to renovate the building and operate the museum. They understood that while the city would own the building and the collections and provide the staff, it would be up to the Amador Museum Foundation to provide the funds for ongoing museum operations through monies obtained from contributions and other means. People pointed to the foundation’s record of fund raising and were skeptical as to its ability to raise the monies needed to rehabilitate the building and create a viable history museum.

It was noted that if the foundation were to fail to meet its obligations, the city would then have the right and the opportunity to see how it might choose to use the building. In accordance with the agreement with Doña Ana County, if the city decides the building is unusable for its purposes, it will revert back to county ownership.
City officials noted that the Amador doesn’t necessarily have to be a history museum and that the agreement between the city and the foundation could be modified. “It’s not that we need to have a history museum. What we need to do is preserve the building, and use it for whatever functions are indicated by the consultants’ studies,” said one individual. According to others, the renovation of the building and its interior development must have a staff and financial support. At the time of the study, no resources were available for staff and budget for a proposed museum.

In the end, it was clear from the stakeholder interviews that the Amador needs to be preserved, but its function as a museum building was unclear. If funding for the preservation and rehabilitation of the Amador Hotel and for the development of a museum is not available, the history museum concept has little chance of moving forward.

**Funding the Institution**

Most people expressed the opinion that funding the project would be the biggest issue the foundation would have to face. Others said that if funding wasn’t the issue, then it would be whether the city could provide adequate support for the museum. While the museum was the priority of the foundation, city priorities involved the revitalization of Downtown Main Street, upgrading utilities for the people of Las Cruces, correcting drainage issues on the East Mesa, police and fire training, and the city’s museum system.

A member of the foundation expressed the hope that the foundation would be able to obtain government funding to do what he referred to as “fixed asset improvements.” “I’m hopeful that the plan the consultants come up with will give us direction and help us with the legislature. If that happens the foundation can help with the exhibits and with managing the museum. We don’t have the resources in Las Cruces to raise $5 million to $10 million, so we will need some government funding.”

It should be noted that the foundation did petition the legislature and did receive nearly $200,000 for the current museum study. However, the legislature has pulled back all capital outlay projects, and, according to some, could take years to accumulate enough money to do a significant project like the Amador. It was also stated that the city’s current budget could not sustain the Amador, and any support in the future would require commitment from and approval by the City Council.

Several of those interviewed were concerned as to whether the foundation would be able to sustain the museum, or that the museum would be able to sustain itself. The feeling among some stakeholders was that the foundation would not be able to raise all the money needed to sustain the museum on an annual basis, that it would need additional “ongoing revenue streams.” Most agreed that “It’s a good organization, but fundraising is not their strong point.”

Stakeholders spoke of the ability to raise “serious money” in Las Cruces, saying that Las Crucens give to the needs of the community. While money has been raised for a hospice, for children, and for the university, some questioned whether the city needs another museum recalling that “It took some time to finish the campaign for the Rio Grande Theater, but very little time for The First Step project.”

Responding to the question of whether the business community would be supportive of the Amador project, a couple of businessmen indicated that the business community is fighting building fatigue and very few are willing to step up at this time and make any type of commitment. “I’m not giving to a building, but I’ll give to a concept” said one individual, I’ll give to something like a cultural district where everything ties together and it’s all for the community, but I don’t hear that yet about the Amador.”

Finally there was a consensus among those interviewed that a window of opportunity exists with the current City Council to be more supportive of cultural affairs.

It must be pointed out that a good number
of city- and county-supported museums have a foundation or a friends group that provide added financial support for programming, exhibits, and even some staff. These foundations or friends groups are responsible for membership, annual giving, grants, major and planned gifts, corporate sponsorships, and earned income. While the Amador Museum Foundation agreement with the city goes beyond the essential support components of most foundations and friends groups, it is a beginning and one that will grow in importance, whatever emerges as the context and content of a new museum. Working in partnership with the city, there will be many supportive roles the foundation can play in the future of the cultural and educational aspects of the Amador.
HISTORIC STATUS
The Amador Hotel is listed on the New Mexico Register of Cultural Properties (#44, March 21, 1969). The listing was prior to the renovation and expansion by Citizens Bank. The New Mexico State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) has previously expressed doubts about the building's eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places due to the significant compromises to its integrity resulting from the 1974 additions. However, after presenting information gained from this study to the SHPO in June of 2009, the office has suggested that the building is worthy of further evaluation of National Register eligibility. Prior to preparing a National Register nomination, the SHPO recommends consultation with the Keeper of the National Register for eligibility guidance. The most likely criteria for a nomination would be A., association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or B., association with the lives of persons significant in our past. The existence of character-defining historic elements could also reinforce a register nomination.

METHOD OF STUDY
This analysis is intended as a preservation guide for the proposed renovation of the building for museum, or other public uses. It is not meant to serve as a detailed historic structure report nor as a preservation plan. Following the acceptance of the conceptual plan for the building’s renovation, and a review of the project by the SHPO’s office, a more detailed preservation analysis may be appropriate. Primary sources used for the compilation of this analysis are:

1) Field observations made by Steven Kells and Jonathan Craig during a one and one-half day visit to the building in January, 2009.
2) Sanborn insurance maps.
3) Historic photographs.
4) An oral history narrative provided by Martin Amador Campbell, Jr.
6) Drawings of renovations and additions for Citizens Bank, 1969, 1974 and undated (assumed to be 1974 or later) provided by Gerald Lundeen Architect.
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1870s A one floor courtyard structure is built on the northeast corner of Amador and Water Streets. As indicated by thickened walls which are now internal to the building, it may have been built in several phases.

1893 Sanborn By 1893, the second floor is added and the exterior patio is enclosed as a double height “Theatre”. A stage is located at the north end of the lobby where the stairway is now. A “gallery” extends all the way around the lobby with a “children’s gallery” located beneath the one along the south end of the east side. Exterior porches extend along the second floor on the south (Amador) and west (Water Street) sides. Exterior walls are painted or scored to resemble stone masonry construction, including quoins at the corners. The windows are tall (double-hung) units. The second floor roof line is considerably lower than at present and has a cornice.

1908 Sanborn The stage is no longer in the lobby. Heat is by means of stove and lighting is electric and oil.

Photo (dated 1910) The existing stairway is built at the north end of the lobby in place of the former stage. First floor rooms opening into the lobby have screen doors. First floor lobby walls have a picture rail and appear to be wallpapered.

HISTORY OF DEVELOPMENT AND MODIFICATIONS

This timeline is based on the following sources listed in descending order of emphasis: 1) Sanborn insurance maps, 2) historic photographs (some dated), 3) written narratives, and 4) field observations. In addition, drawings from the Citizens bank renovations and additions provided information about those modifications and portions of older structures demolished to accommodate them.

Above: c. 1890
NMSU Library, Archives and Special Collections #00040222

Below: Lobby, c.1910
NMSU Library, Archives and Special Collections #00040225

Sanborn Map, 1893

Sanborn Map, 1902
1913 Sanborn  The second floor porches are removed, except at the front entry. Photographs show a front entry porch (portico) with paired columns at each corner that were added after 1908. Wider windows with arched heads have been installed on the first floor, but the walls remain painted to resemble masonry. Heating and lighting remain as they were in 1908.

1921–1927 Sanborn maps  Second floor rooms (202A, 202B) have been added at the north end of the lobby behind the stairs. These are the two rooms with vigas and plaster coves.
By 1936 (dated photo) Hoods (roofs) are added over the doors on the east wing. Walls are no longer painted to resemble masonry. The parapet is raised, and a bell hung in an arch is added to the center of the south façade. An electric light or neon rooftop sign is added to the east end of the south façade.

Mid-Twentieth Century The underside of the lobby mezzanine is painted blue (as it still is above dropped ceilings). Rooms opening off of the first floor lobby still have screen doors.

1970 The building is renovated and expanded to become Citizens Bank. Carpeting is installed throughout over underlayment boards. Walls are furred out with gypsum board in many locations. New mechanical and electrical systems are installed throughout. Dropped lay-in ceilings are installed throughout the first floor, and in rooms 214A, 214B and 214C on the second floor. First floor lobby columns are furred out and capitals are added. Many interior doors are removed or replaced. A number of first floor door openings between the lobby and rooms on west side are widened. The one-floor east wing with outside guest room entries is demolished and is replaced with the current one-floor expansion that contains bank vaults and offices in two phases of construction.

BUILDING FEATURES

EXTERIOR WALL FINISHES
Investigations undertaken by the Cornerstones Community Partnership on the west wall revealed evidence of historic mud and lime plasters beneath the modern stucco finish. The finding of these plasters is consistent with historic photographs. The three-coat cement stucco was applied in 1970. One color coat of acrylic elastomeric stucco has been applied over the cement stucco. Although cement stucco, and acrylic (synthetic) stucco in particular, have the potential for trapping moisture within adobe walls, the investigation by Cornerstones found moisture levels within the west wall to be within acceptable ranges, despite the poor drainage along that side of the building.

INTERIOR WALLS AND CEILINGS
Above the existing lay-in ceilings on the first floor and in the three rooms in the south wing of the second floor much of the original wall finishes and ceilings remain intact. Wallpa-
per is visible in a number of locations, particularly where holes have been cut in the walls for mechanical equipment piping. In other areas (above the dropped ceiling and on the older ceilings) entire sections of wallpaper remain. The paper appears to have been applied directly to the earthen walls in most locations. Subsequently, gypsum plaster was applied on poultry netting over the wallpaper.

The first floor ceilings and those on the front wing of the second floor are fiberboard, either with battens, or they are laid in between wood framing to form coffers. (Except for rooms 121 and possibly 101, all of these ceilings remain intact on the first floor.) Fiberboard was in generally widespread use by the 1920s, but was less used after the mid-twentieth century. The presence of the gypsum wall plaster and fiberboard suggest that the last significant interior remodeling prior to that of the 1970s was during the early 20th Century. A ceiling with painted designs remains largely intact above the dropped ceiling in room 119. The ceiling was hand-painted by Corina Amador, grandmother of Martin Amador Campbell, Jr.

During the 1970 bank renovation, many walls, and particularly those in the lobby were furred out with gypsum board to accommodate wiring. On the second floor’s west side, all of the dividing walls between rooms (numbers 203 through 213) are of gypsum board with newer plain bases that abut the older bases on the exterior and mezzanine sides of the rooms, thus suggesting that the walls are either new or were completely re-sheathed. The ceilings in these rooms are also gypsum board. It is not possible to see above these ceilings to determine if earlier ceilings remain intact.

FLOORS

All interior rooms are carpeted – the only notable exception being room 203, which has a relatively new hardwood floor. At areas where the carpet can be lifted, either particle board or plywood underlayment is visible. The underlayment is generally attached with screws to the wood flooring below. The visible flooring is painted tongue and groove pine on wood subflooring. At an opening that was cut beneath the main stairway by Cornerstones an earlier wood floor is visible below the more recent painted pine floor.

WINDOWS

Late 19th Century photographs seem to indicate that the windows during the period were two over two double hung units. Based on historic photographic evidence, the first floor windows were widened and replaced with the existing arch-toped units by 1913. The existing second floor casement windows may have also been installed at the same time, although the opening sizes remained largely unchanged from the earlier windows. Curiously, on the west side of the second floor, each casement is

divided into eight equal panes, while those on the north and south elevations are comprised of a single large pane with four smaller panes above and below the single pane – a design that is very typical of the early 20th century.

DOORS
There is a wide variety of door types within the building. Many doors appear to have been removed or replaced during the time the building was used by the bank and by the county. On the second floor, all of the louvered doors opening out onto the mezzanine from the guest rooms are recent, while the original doors are missing. The 1970 renovation drawings indicate that the current paired glass-paneled doors into the first-floor offices on the west side of the lobby were installed to replace the solid panel doors and screens.

MISCELLANEOUS FEATURES
In addition to the features discussed above, the following character-defining features remain in whole or in part.

Portal—Dating from the mid-20th century, the Pueblo Revival style portal marks a shift in the hotel’s design towards the regional style that was becoming increasingly used in New Mexico, particularly with tourism related destinations. As pointed out in the Cornerstones report, there is considerable decay of the wood in the portal.

Stairway—Built during the first decade of the 20th Century, the stair replaced an earlier stage and is the focal point of the lobby. It appears to be of original construction, with the exception of the spherical finials on the newel posts, which were apparently added in 1970. Also, the paint has been stripped from the railings and newel posts.

Balcony (Mezzanine) Balustrade—The scroll-cut balustrade, dating from the late 19th century remains. However, during the 1970 renovation it was raised to the height of approximately 41” to comply with building code requirements (although this is 1” lower than required). Alternative means for meeting code compliance, if it were to be restored to its original height, are discussed in the code analysis following in this section.

Skylight (Monitor)—At the center of the lobby, a raised rooftop monitor once admitted light to the space as well as providing for passive ventilation of the building by allowing hot air to rise and exit the structure while pulling in cooler outside air. The feature has been removed but the outline of the monitor remains visible within the lobby. Recent beans have been added to reinforce the structure at this location.

Columns—The original wood columns that support the mezzanine and roof remain in place. However, on the first floor they were furred out with in wood trim with base and capital trim to further emphasize their size. The trim can be easily removed to restore the columns to their original appearance.

Room Divider—Paired columns, connected by shelves, form a room divider between rooms 121 and 121A. When the dropped ceiling was installed in these rooms, the trim at the tops of the columns was replicated at the new ceiling height. However, the original trim remains in place above the dropped ceiling.
CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS ANALYSIS

FIRST FLOOR

- Hand Painted Coffered Ceiling
- Coffered Ceiling
- Ceiling Removed (Exposed Vigas)
- Fiber Board & Batten Ceiling
- Undocumented Ceiling
- Furred-Out Gypsum Board Walls
- Coffered Ceiling
- Coffered Fiber Board W/ Wallpaper
- Modern Reproduction "Tin" Ceiling
- Vigas Coffered Fiber Board W/ Battens

Legend:
- Gypsum Board Ceiling
- 1970 Addition
- Lay-In Ceiling
**FIELD WORK**

Existing conditions at the building have been analyzed and documented. This includes review of existing documentation and field measurements to generate plans, sections and elevations (undertaken with Autodesk’s REVIT modeling software), field analysis and discussions with city and county maintenance personnel. Analysis and documentation was undertaken by the staff of Kells + Craig Architects and by Ponce Engineering for the structural evaluation. The mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems were reviewed by Bridgers and Paxton Consulting Engineers.

**PREVIOUS DOCUMENTATION**

The architectural project team undertook measurement of the existing building over a period of two days in December 2008 with a further day follow-up concurrently with the stakeholder interviews in January 2009. The team obtained a copy of the conceptual floor plan prepared by the City of Las Cruces Facilities Department and several drawings from Gerald Lundeen, the architect for renovations in 1969 and 1974. The latter drawings included the original renovation after Citizen’s Bank purchased the building, the addition of the drive up bank and the addition of the lobby and offices to the east side of the building. Not all drawing sets have tables of contents and Mr. Lundeen was not sure that all the drawing sets were complete. In addition, there was a site plan for a separate building on the same site that was not constructed. The team also had a copy of the conditions analysis prepared by Cornerstones. This provided valuable information about construction of the original adobe building but did not include measured drawings.

**FIELD MEASUREMENT TECHNIQUES & RESULTS**

The original adobe building that occupies the west side of the site is extremely irregular in dimensions, both horizontally and vertically. Few walls are parallel to each other and they vary in thickness both along their length and their height. These irregularities have been evened out to some extent by the application of gypsum board on furring installed in renovations since the late 1960s but, where possible, the team tried to ascertain the dimensions of the original structure. Few of the columns in the central hall are plumb and the west exterior wall exhibits significant deformation, bowing out along its length and leaning out of plumb in its height. (See structural analysis). Much valuable information was gained from the drawings from Mr. Lundeen which in many cases appeared to fairly accurately reflect these inconsistent dimensions, as well as documenting some original construction that is no longer visible, or was demolished as part of the renovations. The drawings produced by the team reflect its best assumptions about the building based on the field measurements, the existing drawings and historic photographs. The measurement equipment included tape measures and a digital hand level and dimensions were checked by triangulation where possible, however the accuracy of the documentation is limited by the lack of a consistent datum. For detailed design, we would recommend that key elements of the building be documented by a professional surveyor, both horizontally and vertically using digital surveying equipment.

There are numerous level changes throughout the building on both the first and second
floors. These vary from steps, ranging in height from 1”-6” ramps that were created to connect dissimilar floor levels and floors that are simply out of level within a space. Most striking are the “balconies” on the second floor around the central hall, which slope several inches from the rooms they access towards the balcony railings. It is possible that these were exterior roofs at one time that were not leveled out when they became interior hallways to access second floor rooms. The slopes are not consistent and there is also a slope in the north-south direction, resulting in differential step heights into the west second floor rooms. These range from single steps of about 2” at the south end to two steps with a total rise of over one foot at the north. The floor level at the first floor north end of the building is below grade by about 9” and access to the north entrance (which is currently boarded up) is by means of a ramp within the “vestibule”, the north portion of which, adjacent to the door, is almost 7% slope without handrails. Slopes of over 5%
and 6" rise require handrails. The room on the first floor northeast corner (the former dining room) has an approximately 2% slope across it to the southwest corner. Other rooms have areas within them where there are slopes of 2% or more. 2% is the maximum cross-slope accessible to a wheelchair. See further discussion on accessibility issues on page 1.26 and in Section III for the proposed development.

Documentation of the more recent additions to the building was somewhat more straightforward than for the historic portions since they mostly matched the construction drawings, although some dimensions and construction did not. A significant difference exists at the lobby at the southeast corner where the stairs and balcony were reversed in an east-west direction and are of a different design.
BUILDING CONSTRUCTION & SYSTEMS

This section provides an overview of the entire building construction. See the previous chapter and the appendix for specific discussion of the building construction relating to historic preservation and the structural analysis respectively. The following descriptions are based on observations and measurement, where these were possible. Due to the extensive remodeling of the historic portions of the building, much of the original construction is not visible. In some cases assumptions have made about the continuity of structure but this will require confirmation. The general construction is illustrated in the building cross-sections following.

It is recommended that prior to development of any detailed remodeling plans further investigations be undertaken through selective, limited removal of finishes and contemporary construction in the historic portion to gather more precise information about both the building’s structure and historic finishes. Recommendations for selective demolition in follow-up contracts are included in Section IV of this plan.

HISTORIC BUILDING CONSTRUCTION

General: Based on field observation the team did not see any signs that there are significant structural problems or construction failures at the building, other than normal wear and tear. The most significant area is the west building wall which is bowing out and is out of plumb, as described above. There are no obvious significant structural cracks indicating failure or recent settlement but a realistic evaluation of this wall cannot be made without removal of the stucco to expose the adobe below it. One item of concern is that large amounts of dust (powdered dirt) continued to accumulate where Cornerstones cut away the interior plaster. This could indicate “dead” adobes, which would need to be replaced.

Foundations: The Cornerstones study included limited excavation at the west wall to determine if the adobe walls bear on footings. No footings of any kind were found and the wall appeared to bear directly on the sub-grade. No significant recent settling of the structure is evident (See also the structural report from Ponce Engineering.). The 1969 construction drawings for the original renovation for Citizens Bank include a detail for “Foundation at Ext. Walls” to be used at “damaged portions of west wall and partial north wall”. The detail shows underpinning of the existing adobe walls and states to “see plan”. The plan sheet in the set from Mr. Lundeen does not show these locations, but it is numbered Sheet 2, so this may have been on the missing Sheet 1. The detail also shows a tile apron at the exterior which is not evident. It appears doubtful that this detail was in fact installed and at best it would have been in limited locations.

Exterior Bearing Walls: Exterior adobe walls support the first and second floors and the roof. As stated in the Historic Preservation section, the original building was constructed in several phases from the 1870s to the late 1920s. More recent additions have replaced some of the historic additions on the east side. The original L-shaped, single story house that occupied the southwest corner of the site has approximately 32” thick adobe walls, including finishes, which probably account for 4”-6”
Historic Hotel Reuse Plan

I.20

of thickness. These were continued with the extension to the north. The second story walls are thinner (approximately 18-20", including plaster finishes) and offset with a shelf at the exterior at the west wall. It appears that the north exterior walls are somewhat thinner than the west and south walls. The east wall of the historic structure was at one time entirely exterior. This is now an exterior wall on the 2nd floor only. Portions of the first floor of this wall have been incrementally replaced either with cast-in-place concrete at the bank vaults or openings with lintels. It is also possible that previous openings were blocked up with concrete masonry units. While alterations to this wall are shown on the construction drawings for the 1970s additions the exact extent of the original adobe wall that remains is unclear. The adobe wall can be seen in a closet (off Room 104). Of some concern is the portion of the east wall of the lobby on the first floor at the men’s toilet (Room 130), and the hallway to the south of it, where the entire adobe wall appears to have been removed but is continuous at the upper floor. It is unclear what is supporting this, since the wall below it appears to be of 4" stud frame construction.

Interior Bearing Walls, Beams and Columns: Interior bearing walls are also adobe. As noted in the Cornerstones report, the parapets of the original single story structure (at the east walls of the west upstairs rooms) appear to have been “encapsulated” in the bead-board wainscot with the offset to the thinner adobe wall occurring above this. The offset is greater at the north end of the wall than the south (the change occurring at the Room 207). This wall supports the floor of the rooms and the balcony floor as well as the roof structure. Adobe interior walls also occur between rooms 121A and 122 (208 and 209 at 2nd floor) 124 and 101 (213 and 214A at 2nd floor) and each side of room 118. Some of these may have been exterior walls at one time.

The columns supporting the balconies are nominally 6 x 6 with one at the southeast corner of the central lobby which is 7 x 9. The reason for this is unclear, although it does carry more load than intermediate columns but no more than the corresponding column at the southwest corner, which is 6 x 6. The column spacing varies from 9'-6" to 10'-5". The beams between the columns are nominally 6" wide but it is not possible, without removal of the ceiling, to determine their depth. There are several bolts through the beams adjacent to the columns but it is unclear how this connection works. This may also be more evident once the ceiling is removed. The bolts appear to be of an old, square-head type but were likely added since the building’s original construction. The beam between the southeast and southwest columns appears to be larger than the others and to have received some reinforcing over time. There is a significant bow in this beam. At the edges of the “faux” skylight new beams have been inserted on beam hangers in an east-west direction. This appears to be the location of the removed roof monitor seen in historic photographs.

Interior Non-Bearing Walls: As stated in the Historic Preservation chapter, interior, non-bearing walls are predominantly wood-frame and plaster or gypsum board. It is not clear which walls (especially at the second floor rooms) are original or have been replaced in recent decades.

1st Floor Structure: The first floor is 2 x 8 joists at 24" o.c. with a board subfloor. This is tongue and grooved. It is not know if this has been covered with particle board or MDF as a subfloor for carpet in recent renovations.
As stated in the Historic Preservation chapter, there is an area at the north end of the lobby, under the stairs, where there appears to be a secondary floor structure below this. The wood joists in some cases appear to be resting on the subgrade. This would not be permissible under the current code, but may be allowed to remain given the building’s historic status. When this was viewed, the wood did not appear to be deteriorated, but further investigation will be required.

2nd Floor Structure: The 2nd floor structure is predominantly vigas at approximately 24" o.c. The average diameter of these appears to be about 8". The vigas carry a plank deck. Based on the step-up into the upper story rooms it appears that there is another structure above this, most-likely wood joists and a second wood deck that was constructed on top of the roof of the original single-story structure. If this secondary structure exists it is assumed that it bears on the vigas, although it is possible that it spans between the adobe walls also. The structure of the balconies is 2 x 8 nominal wood joists at 24" o.c., bearing on the adobe wall and a wood beam spanning between the columns.

Roof Structure: The roof framing was viewed above the ceilings in Rooms 214A and 214B and is composed of 2" (nominal) x 10" (actual) wood joists at 28" o.c. with wood plank decking. The deck appears nominally flat so a secondary structure above this must provide the roof slope. It is assumed that this structure extends over other areas of the roof, although these cannot be viewed due to hard ceilings. It is also assumed that the joists are supported by the columns and beams at the Lobby in addition to the interior adobe wall, although there is a significant space between the beam that is visible below the lobby ceiling at the column line and the underside of the main roof deck, which would require a cripple wall above this beam line or a secondary beam. The roof framing at the north end above Rooms 202A and 202B consists of vigas, with plaster coves between them. It is not known if there is a secondary structure above this or what the decking material is.

Exterior Finishes: See the Historic Preservation Chapter and the Cornerstones report for a discussion of the exterior stucco finish.

Interior Finishes: See the Historic Preservation Chapter and the Cornerstones report for a discussion of interior finishes.

Ceilings: See the Historic Preservation Chapter and the Cornerstones report for a discussion of ceiling finishes. The ceiling of the Lobby is modern gypsum board (with a rough texture finish) applied directly to the historic painted 2 x 8 joists with wood plank deck. This deck is not the current roof deck, but may
once have been since it is sloped. The slope is, however, the reverse of the roof slope over the east balcony and the slope from the east column line to the east wall of the west upstairs rooms does not match the roof slope. This creates a significant ceiling cavity (see "Roof Structure" above). The old ceiling structure, including the support joists, is thus supporting the current ceiling but it is unclear if any of the roof load is being transferred to this system.

Roof Covering and Drainage: Existing roofing consists of a built-up bituminous system with a granulated cap sheet. The age of the roof is not known but there are several areas of blistering (separation of plies) and the flashings are coming away in some locations. The flashing at the south end of the historic building has been patched with an additional ply of felt indicating a leak at one time at this location. A sagging in the deck was noted near the center of the high west roof. This may correspond to the location of the roof monitor that was removed and may account for the beams that have been added at this location. Pipe penetrations require new flashings. The cap sheet itself is scoured at the low roof on the east side but elsewhere is not significantly degraded. Repairs appear to be feasible for a short term fix. However, if a major renovation of the facility were to occur the complete roofing system should be replaced. Deterioration is most evident at areas with least drainage; above the lobby in the southeast corner; at the north end second-story roof and the east side one-story roof. There is good drainage on the higher roof over the historic structure; however, this drains to the lower roof via gutters and downspouts, exacerbating the drainage issues at this roof.

1960s–80s BUILDING ADDITIONS CONSTRUCTION

Foundations: The additions bear on continuous 12” deep by 24” wide reinforced concrete strip footings which likely met or exceeded the code at the time of construction.

Bearing Walls: Bearing walls are 8” reinforced concrete masonry units, except at the high lobby, where they are 12” wide. Again, they appear to have met or exceeded the code at the time of construction. Exterior walls are stucco directly on the masonry. Exterior walls are noted on the construction drawings as furred out with "Panelera Insulwall", which is a faced polystyrene insulation board product. The facing is gypsum board.

Interior Non-Bearing Walls: Interior walls are wood stud with gypsum board each side.

Roof Structure and Covering: The roof is a composite of 2-1/2” concrete on 26ga steel deck on steel bar joists. Roofing is as described above (under Historic Building), laid over tapered rigid insulation to provide drainage. Slope is about 1/8” per foot over most of the area but ponding is evident. The roof drains to leaderheads and downspouts, except at the high southeast lobby, which has a roof drain.

Ceilings: Ceilings are suspended acoustic tile with 6” fiberglass batt insulation laid on top, except at toilets where they are gypsum board.

STRUCTURAL EVALUATION

A preliminary structural evaluation was undertaken by Ruben Ponce, Ponce Engineering Inc. of El Paso. His report is included as an appendix. Although no significant structural problems were evident a detailed evaluation and analysis of the existing historic structure and the implications for the proposed reuse can only be made with selective removal of finishes to expose underlying load-bearing elements. This should be a priority follow-up task and is described in Section IV, of this plan.
BUILDING MECHANICAL, ELECTRICAL & PLUMBING SYSTEMS

HVAC/Plumbing: Information on the mechanical systems was gathered from the field visits by the architectural team and Patrick Watkins, P.E. of Bridgers and Paxton Consulting Engineers, the construction drawings for the additions, and discussions with both Pat Gomez, City of Las Cruces Facilities Manager, and Armando Cordero, Don Ana County Facilities Manager. The report from Mr. Watkins is included in the appendix of this report.

There are multiple HVAC systems operating in the building. The historic double-height lobby is heated and cooled by a 15-ton fan coil unit in the mechanical room (Room 215) on the second floor located at the southeast of the building and accessed from the east roof. Distribution is through large rectangular ducts in the dropped ceiling space under the south and west balconies at the lobby. This system would need to be completely removed if the lobby is to be returned to its historic appearance and an alternate system found that would not be visually intrusive. See further discussion in Section III.

The majority of spaces on the first floor and some of the south rooms on the second floor are heated and cooled through ducts connected to fan-coil units mounted above ceilings. There are 17 of these shown on the construction drawings. Heating and cooling for these is provided from a 2-pipe change-over system served by a central boiler and chiller in the mechanical room at the north end of the building (Room 115). During the study, a mechanical contractor was replacing the compressors, which are no longer working, and troubleshooting the entire system. The results of this were not available to the Amador study team at the time of this writing. The chiller discharges excess heat to an open ground source water loop through two wells located at the northeast corner of the building in the parking and drive areas (noted as a utility box, northwest of the electric utility box, on the survey in the Appendix). The loop apparently works well and, according to Armando Cordero, the wells were refurbished in 2002. The boiler is functioning satisfactorily. The heating system pumps were recently replaced. The rooms on the second floor at the north end of the building (Rooms 202A, 202B, 203, and 204) are heated and cooled by a package rooftop unit on the roof of Rooms 202A and 202B. Likewise, the second floor rooms at the south end of the building are cooled by a rooftop unit over this area. One room on the second floor west side of the building has a window A/C unit. The remaining rooms have floor-mounted, in-room fan-coil units, fed from the main heating and cooling loops.

Much of the plumbing was replaced in 1990 when the county owned the building. Upgrades were also made 8 years ago. Both Mr. Gomez and Mr. Cordero reported that there have been no recent problems with the plumbing. The building does not have an automatic fire sprinkler system.

Electrical: The electrical system was updated when the county occupied the building in the 1990s and the main service was updated in 2004 to 400 amp, 208 volt, 3-phase, along with an upgraded transformer by El Paso Electric. No problems have been reported with the electrical system. Lighting is primarily fluorescent with some incandescent can lights under the balconies and chandeliers in the main lobby.

The building is equipped with a fire alarm system which was being reprogrammed during the field visit in January 2009, so was not functional at that time. It is not known if this system meets the requirements of the code for a building undergoing significant renovations.

ENVIRONMENTAL HAZARDS

No surveys of hazardous materials, including asbestos-containing materials have been made available to the consultant team and it is not known if any exist. It is recommended that environmental studies be done prior to any detailed design.
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BUILDING CONSTRUCTION

EXISTING LONGITUDINAL SECTION

EXISTING CROSS SECTION

LEGEND

1) 2-story cement-plastered, acrylic finished (at exterior) adobe bearing wall w/ interior lime and cement plaster. 1st fl. adobe thickness approximately 28”; 2nd fl. adobe thickness approximately 20”.

2) Adobe wall (currently furred out both sides) assumed to be of similar dimensions to typical adobe bearing walls (Note 1).

3) Contemporary suspended acoustic ceiling

4) Concrete masonry unit wall

5) 12” thick CIP concrete vault wall/ceiling

6) MDF/particle bd. (currently carpeted) on wood plank on 2x8 wood framing at 24” o.c.

7) MDF/particle bd. on wd. plank on 2x wood framing (assumed) on wd. plank on 8” diam. load-bearing vigas @ 24” (approx.) o.c.

8) Balcony construction of MDF/particle bd. (assumed) on wd. plank on 2 x 8 @24: o.c. wood framing (originally exposed). (Floor slopes)

9) 6 x 6 (nom) wood columns @ approx. 10’ o.c. supporting balcony and roof structure

10) Built-up bituminous granulated cap roofing on wood plank deck on 2 x 10 (nom) wd. roof joists @ 24” o.c.

11) Wood plank ceiling on 2 x 4 (nom.) framing at 24” o.c. (originally exposed) with gypsum board ceiling under

12) Portions of adobe wall replaced with concrete vault wall and possibly CMU

13) Built-up bituminous cap sheet roof on rigid insulation on steel deck on steel bar joists

14) Built-up granulated cap-sheet roofing on wood plank deck on 2x framing (assumed) on structural vigas at 24” (approx.) o.c. with plaster infill ceiling finish between exposed vigas

15) Concrete slab on grade

16) Floor structure unknown

17) Suspended plaster coffered ceiling (original; recreated some rooms, and contemporary acoustic lay-in ceiling below, other rooms)

18) Vigas and latillas (entry hall only)

19) Built-up, granulated cap sheet roof on 2x wood joists (assumed)

20) Suspended gypsum board ceiling
SITE AND UTILITIES

Information on site utilities and site grading and drainage and conclusions about existing conditions and proposals for upgrades to accommodate new construction are based on existing available information, including the work completed by the NMSU students as part of the Cornerstones report. Information on existing utilities has been gathered from visual inspection, drawings from the 1970s additions and discussions with city and county facilities management and public works personnel. Since the submission of the draft report in August 2009, the city surveying section blue-staked utilities on the site. While these locations may not be entirely accurate they appear to be the most complete record that currently exists. Copies of both surveys are included in the Appendix.

A topographic survey was completed by the NMSU students. A topographic survey should be conducted by a registered professional surveyor for any future work on the project. No easements were identified on the city survey but these should be researched as well. The condition and capacities of all utilities should be evaluated with more detailed inspections, such as CCTV scanning of drain lines.

SEWER

The sewer line is shown on the 1969 drawings running partially along the west side of the building. There are connections to it shown from the west side of the building, presumably for fixtures at both the first and second floors that existed at that time but are no longer present. The sewer line for plumbing from the toilets on the east side of the building is shown on the construction drawings for the addition as running north, then west between the main building and the first drive-up aisle and then diagonally to meet the line on the west side of the building.

WATER

As shown on the recent survey and previous construction documents the water meter is at the west side of the building, about half way along its length and is fed from a main in Amador Avenue. The apparent routing of the main water service from this meter is under the floor of the historic structure where it runs to the mechanical room in the northeast corner.

SITE ELECTRICAL

A primary underground loop line feeds the existing transformer from Amador Avenue. This has been verified by El Paso Electric. On the survey a single line is shown about 10’ from the west wall of “My Brother’s Place”. These primaries run to an underground utility box (at the location of a previous transformer) and then west to the 3-phase transformer just south of the northeast corner of the Amador. A secondary line appears to run back east from this utility box to serve “My brother’s Place” which is consistent with information obtained from El Paso Electric that the transformer serves both properties. Another line is shown running towards the electrical service at the north wall of The Amador. This is likely the abandoned secondary from the previous transformer location. There is no evidence of a utility easement for these lines in information provided to the study team or independent research of county records. El Paso Electric also had no record of an easement.

COMMUNICATIONS

An underground telephone line is shown on the survey running from Bowman Avenue to the north and turning east, presumably to service “My Brother’s Place”. It is not known if this also serves The Amador.

There are two underground fiber optic lines shown on the survey approximately 17’-6” from the west wall of “My Brother’s Place”. One line turns west about 37’ from the Amador Avenue property line, presumably to serve The Amador. The other continues north traversing the entire site to Bowman Avenue.

GAS

There are several gas lines shown on the survey; one running along the west side of The Amador, which turns east at the north property line and then north across Bowman Avenue approximately half way along it; and a line that runs parallel to the east property line about 14’
from the west wall of “My Brother’s Place” to the existing meter at the east wall west wall of that property. This meter serves The Amador.

SITE TOPOGRAPHY, GRADING AND STORM DRAINAGE

The site slopes from north to south and from east to west at the north end. As noted in the Cornerstones report the paving to the east of the building has flat spots and the drainage problem is exacerbated by roof drainage from both the east addition to The Amador and from “My Brother’s Place” Restaurant. There are additional ponding areas at the north parking lot. Runoff that does not make its way to Amador Avenue via the east parking lot appears to pond at the northwest corner of the site before overflowing to Water Street through the driveway curb-cuts.

The floor level at the north end of the historic building is currently a 9”-12” below grade with the grade sloping up between the south and north end of the building. The floor level transition is accomplished with a non-code-complying ramp within the historic building at the north entry and steps at the 1970s addition. The Cornerstones report noted that the sidewalk slopes toward the building on the west side, which combined with the fact that the floor level is below grade poses a significant threat to the adobe wall and could result in flooding of the crawl space.

The topographic survey prepared by NMSU does not include spot elevations of floor levels at existing building entries. These will be required to evaluate accessibility to and from the building by people with disabilities.

The Cornerstones report provided recommendations for drainage. These are discussed in Section III along with additional discussion of drainage requirements for the proposed reuse plan.
APPLICABLE CODES

Renovations and additions for reuse of the Amador Hotel will be subject to the following Codes as adopted:

- 2006 New Mexico Commercial Building Code incorporating the 2006 International Building Code (IBC)
- 2006 New Mexico Existing Building Code incorporating the 2006 International Existing Building Code (IEBC)
- 2006 New Mexico Mechanical Code incorporating the 2006 Uniform Mechanical Code (UMC)
- 2006 New Mexico Plumbing Code incorporating the 2006 Uniform Plumbing Code (UPC)
- 2008 New Mexico Electrical Code incorporating the 2008 National Electrical Code (NEC)
- 2006 International Fire Code (IFC)
- 2006 New Mexico Historic Earthen Buildings Code (NMHEBC)

The existing building, if renovated, may also be subject to certain provisions of the International Energy Conservation Code (IECC) adopted by the 2006 New Mexico Energy Conservation Code, although the historic portion is exempted under the New Mexico Historic Earthen Building Code. The IBC incorporates ANSI 117.1, which provides design standards for people with disabilities and these standards generally meet or exceed those of the Americans with Disabilities Act Accessible Guidelines (ADAAG). Conflicts between these codes should be reconciled as part of the design phase. The City of Las Cruces 2001 Zoning Code regulates parking requirements.

The study team has conducted a preliminary review of the above codes to determine potential upgrades that would be required assuming different scenarios for reuse. This analysis is included in the appendix. The analysis includes a general review and a specific analysis for the development proposed in Section III. The currently adopted versions of codes were used, but the 2009 codes are currently under review for adoption by the State. It is anticipated, however, that it could be at least a year before they are adopted. The 2006 code was fully adopted in January, 2008, with mandatory use required July 1, 2008. It should be borne in mind that the 2009 code will likely be adopted by the time renovations start on the Amador Hotel building, which may change certain aspects of this analysis, although significant changes are not anticipated.
METHODOLOGIES

The New Mexico Historic Earthen Buildings Code exempts historic earthen buildings from being required to meet all the requirements of other adopted codes for alterations involving “changes necessary to return a historic earthen building to a documented or physically evidenced historic condition.” However, it also states that “Alterations that are not necessary to return a building to a documented historic condition or that involve more than 50 percent of the aggregate area of the building shall comply with the applicable provisions of the New Mexico Existing Building Code.” Even if no work was done on the second floor (other than possibly removing carpet) the area of alterations would exceed 50% of the floor area thus the alterations must comply with the NMEBC/IEBC. Further the structural provisions of the NMHEBC require the building to comply with those in the NMEBC/IEBC since the proposed new occupancy (assembly) of at least the first floor exceeds 299 and places the building in a higher seismic occupancy category.

The NMEBC/IEBC provides methodologies for assessing existing buildings to determine to what extent they must comply with the current codes, based on the extent of repairs, alterations, additions or changes of occupancy. The code has specific sections addressing historic buildings. There are three compliance methods:

- Prescriptive method
- Work area method and
- Performance method

Generally the prescriptive method is for minor repairs and alterations and cannot be used for changes of occupancy. The work area method is also prescriptive in nature but allows areas of the building to be considered separately depending on the extent of alterations occurring in them. The performance method is generally for more complex projects where formulae and tables are provided to “score” the building for various safety parameters for Fire Safety, Means of Egress and General Safety. The building must reach a certain score in each category to meet the code. However, this requires compliance with the requirements of the IBC for seismic and accessibility, which may be impractical for the Amador.

For the preliminary analysis the Amador building was evaluated using the Work Area Compliance Method. This was used because it was assumed the building would undergo a change of occupancy (as defined by the IBC).

The construction will most likely be considered a Level 3 Alteration because the work area will include more than 50% of the floor area. This requires additional compliance requirements over Levels 1 and 2, which are for more limited alterations.

The analysis is summarized in the “Summary Building Code Analysis” in the appendix, with specific building code section references.

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR REUSE AND RENOVATION

The IEBC divides occupancies by hazard from 1 to 4 or 5 for allowable areas, means of egress, and exposure of exterior walls, with 1 being the highest hazard. Analyses were done considering the existing occupancy as a hotel occupancy (R-1) and as a business occupancy (B). Classifying the existing occupancy as a hotel would reduce required upgrades since it is the same hazard category as the proposed A-3 assembly (such as for use as a museum/events center). Prior to determining the preferred use for the building as an events center, museum and restaurant, Kells+ Craig had a preliminary meeting with Chris Archuleta at the Construction Industries Division office in Albuquerque. The question of the building’s existing occupancy was discussed. Since a “B”, or business occupancy, is in a lower hazard occupancy than a museum/event center, or “A-3” occupancy, the IEBC requires certain upgrades to meet the requirements of the IBC. Classifying the existing occupancy of the building as a hotel (since the building was used as a hotel for the majority of
its existence) was discussed with Mr. Archuleta but he determined that the existing occupancy should be B, or business occupancy, this being the most recent occupancy for the building.

**OCCUPANCY/CONSTRUCTION TYPE AND ALLOWABLE AREA:**

If the existing occupancy is considered B, then the building will have to meet the current code for allowable heights and areas if the occupancy is changed. Currently it exceeds the allowable area for assembly use for Type V-B construction (that containing unprotected wood). However, installation of an automatic fire sprinkler system would allow the building to meet this requirement. Fire sprinklers will be relatively easy to incorporate into the recent additions. Although there are concealed spaces above most of the historic areas (including the high ceiling of the main lobby) in which sprinkler piping could be installed, careful consideration will need to be given to placement to avoid destruction of historic ceilings. Sidewall sprinklers frequently can be used at these areas.

**EGRESS AND LIFE SAFETY**

Regardless of the type of change of occupancy, a second exit stair or fire escape will be required from the second floor. Rebuilding the historic stair that was removed from the south end would theoretically accomplish the two goals of providing a second exit and restoring an historic element. Unfortunately the design of the historic stair would not meet current code and making it do so would not be possible at that location without affecting other historic elements. A second exit could be achieved with the addition of a fire escape from the east side roof, which is currently accessed from the east balcony or preferably a new stair could be built within, or in the location of, the southeast lobby that could be accessed from the east balcony.

Travel distances to exits are currently within code and would remain so for the proposed development described in Section III. If the building is equipped with an automatic fire sprinkler system, travel distances can be significantly increased. In addition, Paragraph 1003.12.1 of the IEBC allows historic buildings that cannot be made to conform to the construction requirements to be deemed in compliance if they are equipped with an automatic sprinkler system.

The existing balcony railing is about an inch lower than required by code. However, under the IEBC historic handrails do not need to meet the code. Lowering this railing to its original height would be desirable to restore the historic proportions of the lobby. The original height appears to be about 8” lower (32”-36”). The code official may not permit it to be lowered without providing a supplementary code-compliant guardrail. A supplementary railing could be attached to the face of the columns at 42” which would reduce its visibility from the first floor. An effective, unobtrusive way (possibly with structural glass) to ensure that the maximum opening of 4” between the new and existing railings should be found.

**STRUCTURAL LOADING**

A change in occupancy requires the building to be brought up to current seismic resistance requirements. Retrofitting unreinforced adobe without continuous foundations for seismic resistance, assuming it is even possible, would require significant alterations that would most likely affect the building’s historic character (see discussion in Section III). The IEBC, under Chapter 11, requires the following:

“A historic building undergoing repair, alteration, or change of occupancy shall be investigated and evaluated. If it is intended that the building meet the requirements of this chapter, a written report shall be prepared and filed with the code official by a registered design professional when such a report is necessary in the opinion of the code official. Such report shall be in accordance with Chapter 1 and shall identify each required safety feature that is in compliance with this chapter and where compliance with other chapters of these provisions would be damaging to the
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Contributing historic features. In high seismic zones, a structural evaluation describing, at minimum, a complete load path and other earthquake-resistant features shall be prepared. In addition, the report shall describe each feature that is not in compliance with these provisions and shall demonstrate how the intent of these provisions is complied with in providing an equivalent level of safety.

Given the construction of the Amador, the above report will most likely be required as part of a detailed design phase. In addition, a structural analysis will need to be performed by an engineer to demonstrate that the alterations do not impose an additional base shear of more than 10%. Until these reports are completed, it cannot be known with certainty if the change of occupancy would be granted by the building official, or the nature of the upgrades that would be required. Since this is a public building, any structural upgrades that would impact the historic character of the building will require review and approval by the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO).

The table to the left lists the 2006 IBC live- and dead-loading requirements for different occupancies. Changing from a business floor loading to assembly floor loading will increase superimposed loads more than 10%, which will require upgrading of the structure to current IBC standards (see structural report in appendix). While mixed occupancies without clear structural separations require the entire structure to be upgraded to current seismic design, live- and dead-loading for mixed occupancies follows the requirements for each occupancy, regardless of whether there is a structural separation. It would therefore be highly desirable to classify the new occupancy of the second floor as a Group “B” occupancy (business/office) to avoid upgrading required for increased live- or dead-loads that would be potentially destructive to the historic character of the building. Classifying the second floor as a separated use, Group B occupancy would require a two-hour fire separation between the 2nd floor rooms and the lobby, which would be potentially destructive to the historic character also. Installation of a fire sprinkler system reduces this requirement to a 1-hour separation, which is readily achievable under the IEBC with historic construction. This would provide another reason to install automatic sprinklers.

Given that the first floor construction is on joists, the existing first floor support system would need to be analyzed for its bearing capacity and upgraded as required for the additional loading imposed by an assembly occupancy. This may require installation of additional supports, such as doubled up joists and/or intermediate supports and girders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loading Requirements from 2006 International Building Code</th>
<th>Uniform Loads (psf)</th>
<th>Concentrated loads (lbs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assembly areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobbies</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movable seats</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stages and platforms</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balconies</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridors above first floor</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File and computer rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shall be designed for heavier loads based on anticipated occupancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobbies and first-floor corridors</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first floor existing joists, where observed at the southwest corner of the building, are not 18” or more from exposed earth, as required by section 2304 of the IBC. Most likely there are also girders that must be a minimum of 12” from exposed earth, however these could not be seen. The IEBC does not state whether joists less than 18” or girders less than 12” from exposed earth must be upgraded in existing buildings. However, if new members are added these must be of naturally durable or preservative-treated wood. Alternatives may include replacing the floor system with slab-on grade (and installing a historically appropriate, wood-plank finish) or encasing the existing joists in concrete as suggested in the structural engineer’s report. If the latter is chosen it should be confirmed with the code official as acceptable.

ACCESSIBILITY FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

As discussed on page I.16, the multiple floor levels on the second floor present a challenge to accessibility, even assuming an elevator could be installed. Accessibility is required to primary function spaces. Public access areas, would be considered primary function spaces. Elevator access could be provided in the southeast lobby and connected to the east balcony in the same way as for the egress stair. This is the solution proposed in Section III of this plan. Installing an elevator within the historic structure, or as an addition to it, may be difficult without impacting the historic integrity, although it could possibly be added to the north exterior wall, which has already been significantly compromised. While leveling out non-compliant slopes at the balconies may be achievable, providing wheelchair access to all the west 2nd floor rooms in a way that would not compromise the character of the spaces, does not seem feasible. The code does allow for relief if it is “technically infeasible” to “conform to the requirements to the maximum extent technically feasible”. Alternatively, using these spaces for non-primary functions, such as offices, would exempt them from the need to comply. Chris Archuleta, at CID, suggested that the Code Official could exempt the 2nd floor from the requirement for wheelchair access.

Appendix B to the IEBC allows alternative means for providing accessibility through “operational controls” provided that the Appendix is “specifically referenced in the adopting ordinance”. Unfortunately the New Mexico Building Code, which is the adopting ordinance, does not appear to specifically reference this Appendix. This is another item to be discussed with the Building Official. The Americans With Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG) does allow for alternative program accessibility that provides people with disabilities an equivalent experience or access to equivalent services in accessible areas. Other accessibility requirements, such as door widths and accessible entrances and exits, that would apply to the first floor rooms, if these were to be primary function areas, appear to be achievable.
INTERIM REPORT
FINDINGS & FEEDBACK

The findings from the discovery and data-gathering tasks (which have been expanded upon for this final report) were compiled into an interim report on March 30, 2009, which was submitted to the City of Las Cruces and the Amador Museum Foundation for review. An interim report at this phase was not originally anticipated but an interim approval was sought by the consultant team because information gathered at stakeholder interviews indicated that a change in the direction of the study was needed. Specifically, many interviewees indicated that they did not support the entire building being dedicated to a history museum, although this was seen as a necessary component of any reuse.

Following a meeting with city representatives and the Amador Museum Foundation on April 8, 2009, the consultant team was directed to organize visioning workshops to gather ideas about possible alternative or complementary uses for the building, after which design options could be developed for review.
THE VISIONING WORKSHOP

The Visioning Workshop was conducted April 22, 2009, by Andrew Merriell of Andrew Merriell & Associates assisted by Jonathan Craig of Kells + Craig Architects. The workshop began with a tour of the Amador building, then reconvened at the Rio Grande Theater for a morning session (on the theater stage) and afternoon session (in the theater boardroom). The purpose of the workshop was to explore options for uses for the Amador building, as the work of the Discovery Phase had indicated that a general history museum might not be the appropriate solution. The pages that follow summarize the sense of the workshop.

The workshops used index cards to ask participants to write their answers to various questions. The first workshop focused on Downtown development and community needs in general. The second workshop focused on the future of the Amador building.

WORKSHOP ISSUE: PROJECT SUCCESS/Failure

Initially, the consulting team wanted to know what the group felt were the characteristics of development projects that make for success or failure.

Q: “What has been the best development in downtown and what made it good?”

A: The Rio Grande Theater restoration and reopening of part of Main. (most common)

Other responses heard:

- Respecting the best of our history
- Anchoring the community and preserving its spirit
- Enjoying community support
- Making places where people want to be and feel safe
- Developments that are good for business

Q: “What has been the worst development in downtown and what made it bad?”

A: Main street mall, destruction of historic landmarks. (most common)

Other responses heard:

- Ignoring the historic fabric of the community
- Lack of understanding of how cities mature, failure to learn from the examples of others
- Destroying community anchors and landmarks
- Creating a sense of abandonment and despair

Tour by workshop participants of The Amador with boards displaying historic photographs
**WORKSHOP ISSUE: COMMUNITY NEEDS**

Next, we wanted to know what the workshop group felt were the most pressing needs in the downtown area.

**Q: “What does the downtown neighborhood need most?”**

**A: Most common answers:**

- A reinvigorated nightlife (dining, entertainment, music, clubs)
- Places where people want to be at all hours
- A thriving cultural center: museums, theaters, galleries, retail
- Places for families and children
- A critical mass of services and service-oriented businesses

**WORKSHOP ISSUE: VALUE INHERENT IN THE AMADOR FACILITY**

Next, we wanted to know what the workshop group felt was the principal value of the Amador building; the principal reasons it should be preserved.

**Q: “What is the Amador’s most valuable treasure?”**

**A: Most common answers:**

- The memories it holds of the people that lived, dined, and worked there
- The cultural bridge it built between the Hispanic and Anglo communities
- Its staying power through several different reinventions
- Its ability to link old and new
- Its heritage as a respected local business
- The history it represents

**WORKSHOP ISSUE: NATURE OF THE NEXT LIFE OF THE BUILDING**

Next, we wanted to know what the workshop group wanted for the next life of the Amador building.

**Q: “What should happen at the NEW Amador?”**

**A: We heard (most common answers):**

- Old memories restored and preserved, new memories made
- Locals gathering, enjoying the ambiance and each other’s company (learn, relax, meet, celebrate, grow)
- Visitors getting a sense of the history the building represents
- Visitors feeling a connection to the community, its past, present and future
- A source of community pride
Workshop Issue: Potential Roles for the Amador

We brainstormed potential roles for the building, and then asked the workshop participants to indicate their first, second, and third preferences among the roles on the brainstorming list.

A first preference was worth three points, a second preference was worth two points, and a third preference was worth one point.

Roles getting at least one vote and their scores:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A special events space that can be booked for weddings and other celebrations</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A themed boutique hotel, restaurant, and bar</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A “kaleidoscope” of several attraction types</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A general museum of Mesilla Valley history</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officing space for a number of cultural non-profit organizations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A “story museum” of local family history</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A living history museum</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A children’s museum</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A temporary exhibition space</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A media arts museum</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sense of the Workshop

The Amador needs to be more than a museum. For certain, it should be partly a museum, or at least contain exhibits and/or experiences that have as their focus the building itself, the history it has seen, and the people that have passed through its doors.

But its vitality will depend on it also serving a role as a special social event and gathering place. It will be important for it to offer amenities (food, drink, socializing) that will make people want to gather there and enjoy life with others.

If feasible and possible, it should retain some kind of identity as a lodging—a boutique hotel, bed and breakfast, or rooming house.
Following the visioning workshop, Kells + Craig Architects developed three conceptual design proposals for different combinations of uses based on the feedback obtained through the visioning workshops.

The urban design context for the options was studied for the ways in which the project could tie into surrounding development including the Downtown Revitalization Plan. The following pages include the context plans and design options as presented at the Town Hall meetings held June 2nd and 3rd, 2009.

1) **Option One** included a gallery space for a museum exhibition on the Amador Hotel and Amador family, event space with a patio area, a gift shop, and a service area including catering facilities. The second floor would be office space for local non-profits.

2) **Option Two** revolved around the development of a 19-room boutique hotel with a café and bar area, a patio available for dining, services areas, gallery space for a museum exhibition, and a gift shop. Hotel rooms would be on the first and second floors.

3) **Option Three** emphasized an event space and a café and bar with the necessary service areas, a patio for dining and receptions, gallery space for a museum exhibit, a gift shop, and office space for non-profits on the second floor.

For each option, the museum was intended to tell the story of the Amador Hotel and the Amador family without committing to a full-scale museum. Options 1 and 3 used rooms on the first floor not used for the exhibit as meeting/ancillary spaces for events in the main lobby. All options proposed demolition of the 2-story former bank lobby at the southeast corner to restore the south facade to its appearance when it was a hotel.
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Exhibits and Events

- 55 parking spaces
- Pedestrian Connection to Main Street
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Option 2

Hotel and Restaurant

- 19 Hotel Rooms (12 Historic, 7 New)
- East Side Dining Patio
- 48 parking spaces
- Establish 2-Way traffic on Water St.
- Restoration of Original Façade / Demolition of 2-story Bank Lobby
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Hotel and Café</th>
<th>Landscape/Patio Area</th>
<th>Café/Bar</th>
<th>Hotel Lobby/Reception</th>
<th>Hotel Rooms</th>
<th>Gift Shop</th>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Kitchen/Service Area</th>
<th>Ground Floor Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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TOWN HALL MEETINGS

DESIGN OPTIONS

In keeping with the City of Las Cruces practice of offering local citizens the opportunity to comment on significant city issues, two Town Hall Meetings (June 2 and June 3) were held to hear citizen’s opinions on the future role of the Amador Hotel. The consultants reported on the results of stakeholder interviews and visioning workshops previously mentioned, and presented three options for the future of the Amador, based on the opinions of those interviewed for the project and the Visioning Workshops.

rebuilt,” was the consensus of most participants. “We should think about how the Amador will serve the downtown of the future, and how it will fit into the city’s long-range plan.”

Others suggested that people were forgetting that downtown Las Cruces “doesn’t have a hotel.” “We’ve just scratched the surface of revitalization,” said one individual. Participants spoke of the courthouse and city hall occupants entertaining out-of-town guests and that “our hotels are on the outskirts of the city. We could make the Amador a landmark hotel for the city. We’re missing that element in downtown.”

Those who supported the concept of developing a restaurant and event center in the Amador emphasized how a café would “bring life to downtown.” Many people saw an after-hours restaurant as a top priority for downtown Las Cruces. One person offered the comment, “When I have people visit from out-of-town, we always go to La Posta for the historic atmosphere, why couldn’t we go to the Amador? How great would that be?” Said another, “I’d really like to see it as a hotel and restaurant, a high-end hotel and restaurant with nice artifacts from its heyday as part of the décor. We could have some of the artifacts from the Citizens Bank. It would be a living, working hotel, but part of its décor would be artifacts from the old hotel.”

People talked about the new Amador as the “perfect place for a wedding reception or rehearsal dinner,” a “place for corporate functions,” and for “family gatherings.” It won’t be “just any old event space,” it will be one of the most historic places in Las Cruces was the opinion of most participants.

In referring to the museum, the consultants talked about incorporating media and artifacts into the exhibition so that it becomes an experience, a happening that will add more excitement to the facility whether it’s a hotel, a restaurant, or an event venue. Whatever the reason that brings people to the Amador, their visit becomes more memorable and downtown becomes more of a destination.

WHAT WE HEARD AT THE TOWN MEETINGS

Approximately 40 people attended the Town Hall Meetings and participated in lively discussions on the future of the Amador. Attendees were split on whether the city should develop the Amador into a boutique hotel with a restaurant, or into an event space with a restaurant; both options would include a museum and gift shop. Many expressed the opinion that the city needed a “good hotel in downtown.” While they spoke of the recent renovation of the Alameda House as a lodging house, they saw the Amador as another ingredient in the revitalization of downtown.

Some felt that the timing was unfavorable to building a hotel, since the future of downtown was unclear, and suggested that maybe the Amador should be renovated in phases. Others encouraged participants to think of downtown in three to five years, which would be the downtown the Amador would serve. “Downtown Las Cruces is changing, it is being

Town Hall meeting
Some participants questioned what happened to the concept of a history museum saying, “This project started out as a museum. What changed? Why are we all of a sudden talking about hotels and restaurants? Why couldn’t it still be a museum?” According to the consultants, “We came here in January understanding we were going to create a history museum. It was the people we talked to who said ‘save the Amador, but it doesn’t necessarily have to be a history museum.’ We didn’t make that change, the people we talked to did that. We thought there would be universal excitement for a history museum, but that’s not what we heard in our interviews and workshops. We couldn’t just move forward if we didn’t hear that. The Amador Museum Foundation was very involved with this process. They set forth the idea for the history museum. So we worked with them on that basis.”

Members of the foundation board expressed concerns as to the viability of a city owned building being used for a hotel or an event center. They questioned whether the Amador would be in direct competition with the convention center and the Farm and Ranch Museum, and would the city “support the convention center or the Amador?” Having met with city officials about that very issue, the consultants responded that the city officials saw no conflict between the convention center and an event center at the Amador. To the contrary, they saw the Amador as an asset for the city, a part of the “meeting matrix.” Some people indicated that the city has more demand for meeting space then they have places to offer, even with the new convention center.

It is suggested that the city continue to own the Amador building and lease it to a concessionaire or, as a city owned building, it could be managed under the auspices of the convention center, and booked through the convention center. “If you’re looking for a special place with a historic feel, you have a perfect place in the Amador,” said a participant. “Its unique, it’s not going to challenge the convention center.”

Several of those attending the Town Hall meetings worked in the hotel, restaurant and tourist industry and commented on the options recommended by the consultants. The owner of a Las Cruces catering service said that there is a very viable market for a medium sized event facility in Las Cruces. “Although we have some fine venues in Las Cruces, we can use more. To have a facility with that style and historical character would be a huge asset. There are a lot of groups that would like to keep their meetings in the downtown area, and a new Amador would help ensure that.”

An architect remarked that, “The museum piece is important to this project. It celebrates the community and helps others understand what the building means to this city and its citizens.” Commenting on the other aspects of a new Amador, he reminded participants that the museum and event center alone would be operative only at certain times; the event center and restaurant would have more life; but that the hotel would have life 24/7. However, it was pointed out that while a boutique hotel would attract cultural tourism, it would need a public-private partnership to make it happen. In the end, the event center and restaurant appeared to be the most doable financially.

The cost of the project appeared to weigh on members of the foundation board as well. Some fully support the idea of a hotel and/or restaurant and event center, however others thought that from a financial point of view, “there’s no way you’re going to get a bank to finance a hotel at this time. The city owns the property, it won’t be owned by an entrepreneur who can finance it.” Some expressed the
idea that the same would be true for a restaurant saying, “There are restaurants downtown, some barely successful. The new federal building will help. There are no national hotels or restaurants downtown, they go out to where the people are.” Most people agreed that whatever the option the project would be difficult to finance. “The money has to come from the people in this room and the legislature,” said a local businessman.

The head of the Las Cruces Downtown Partnership pointed out how they look for the opportunity to “create catalytic projects,” and cited examples of new successes in downtown. People were reminded that over 4,000 people are employed downtown, and another 13,000 are either employed or live within five minutes of downtown. “They’re all looking for opportunities to shop and play and a place to bring visitors. Many go to Mesilla. We need more special places in downtown.”

Finally, a member of the foundation board reminded participants that, “We’ve been working on this project for four years. Some of us want a hotel, some are against a hotel, but we will reach a consensus. We’re asking the community to reach a consensus with us. We are hoping the community will support this. We haven’t heard from anyone who doesn’t support adaptive reuse of the building. Once we come to that consensus, we count on Las Cruces to get behind us and help us with this project. This is going to be challenging and we will need the full support of the city and the community.”

Index cards were distributed to participants at each Town Hall Meeting to rank their preferences for each option. The total numbers of first place votes for each option were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Total first place votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1: Events Center</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2: Hotel/Café</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3: Events Restaurant</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While Option 3 was the highest ranked overall, and was favored at the first meeting, Option 2 was favored at the second meeting.
LAS CRUCES BUSINESSMEN & WOMEN

The consultants interviewed several local businessmen and women as to the best way to preserve and rehabilitate the Amador Hotel, asking many of the same questions posed to civic leaders and foundation board members. There was one additional element to these conversations—they were able to share with the business leaders three potential scenarios for the new Amador. The following reflects their opinions about the future of the Amador Hotel and its impact on the future of downtown Las Cruces.

Interviewees spoke of the negative impact the loss of Saint Genevieve Church and urban renewal had on the citizens of Las Cruces. The preservation and eventual public use of the Amador Hotel—one of historic two buildings that survived the urban renewal of the sixties—is “vitaly important” to the community. Said one, “Our history has been so demolished not to save and renovate the Amador would be a crime.”

The courthouse and Amador Hotel are seen as the “last vestiges of the old downtown.” Urban renewal took basically most of the “heart of downtown—the retail space, the theaters, the businesses that drew people into downtown have been gone for sometime.” Bringing the Amador back means a lot to people in the community. The opportunity for adaptive reuse is “enormous,” and would be an essential part of the “catalytic projects that bring an 18/6 kind of life to downtown.”

When asked to consider the future use of the Amador building, people emphasized the importance of looking at the Amador based on what lies ahead for downtown. “The impact of the Amador needs to be planned for based on what downtown will be in two or three years when Las Cruces will be a much more energetic and vibrant city,” said a business owner. With the opening of Main Street and renewal of the Amador, people emphasized that downtown will become an active and vital place. Whether the Amador building becomes a hotel and restaurant or a restaurant and event center, it will be a significant anchor to a redeveloped downtown.

THE AMADOR OF THE FUTURE

As mentioned previously, the consultants shared with interviewees three different scenarios on the future role of the Amador in the life of the community. Two options—that of the hotel and restaurant, and the event space and restaurant—received equal support from business leaders. Following is a summary of their comments and reflections.

AMADOR MUSEUM

Everyone liked the idea of a small museum as an integral part of the Amador experience, commenting that the “museum exhibition celebrates the different parts of our history.” Some mentioned how the museum component retains a connection to the building and to the people who built and operated the hotel. They observed that the exhibition will probably see more people than if it stood alone. “You have recognized that in today’s market we probably don’t have enough to create a full-fledge museum, but we can and should provide an orientation to the Amador Hotel and the Amador and Campbell families” said one individual.

AMADOR EVENT CENTER

Everyone agreed on the importance of restoring the building for public use, as a “gathering place for the community.” Event places are tough to come by in Las Cruces was the consensus of those interviewed. “We have no good event spaces downtown. There is a real need for more intimate spaces for “weddings, family gatherings, and small corporate events.”

Most people agreed that an Amador Event Center would be a good use of the building. While there are other event spaces in downtown Las Cruces, such as the Rio Grande Theater, Branigan Cultural Center, the Black Box Theater, and the Placita now under construction, “there is still the need for small, intimate event and meeting spaces.” “It’s the type of space that if you wanted to do this right now to raise a little money you could be catering smaller events,” said a business owner.
AMADOR HOTEL
Combining the idea of a hotel with the idea to have downtown “alive 18 hours a day,” has been at the top of the Downtown Partnership’s business recruitment list for some time. According to its representatives, “We need restaurants that are open in the evening, establishments that are available to the public beyond 8 to 5.” They consider a boutique hotel an essential ingredient to the revitalization of downtown.

According to others, the combination of a small boutique hotel in the Amador building, one that celebrates its heritage, has a restaurant and patio that plays to Las Cruces’ weather, along with an area for events is a “terrific idea.” “We have no hotels downtown. If the Amador housed a hotel, tourists would stay there because it’s historical. We need small boutique hotels downtown, and we need more than one.”

From a business standpoint, those in favor of a hotel and restaurant felt that it would bring in more tourism, more high-dollar tourism, because it’s not going to be cheap to “stay in one of those rooms. It’s going to be like the La Fonda in Santa Fe, which is a high dollar, high-end historical hotel,” said a business leader.

While some business leaders celebrated the idea of a boutique hotel, others were concerned as to the viability of the hotel as a business venture. “Whatever direction the project takes it has to have a very stable financial footing,” according to some, “because if it doesn’t provide for ongoing income then another group will be saying in 10 to 20 years ‘what do we do with the old Amador Hotel?’”

Observed another, “How high-end of a hotel would it be, and would it be right for Las Cruces? It would seem to me that it would have to be a pretty high-end hotel to make money.”

RESTAURANT
The events and restaurant option looked to be the most viable. Businesswomen emphasized the importance of having “the right restaurant with right pricing and the right menu.” All agreed that price-points need to be carefully considered no matter the restaurant and event space.

OFFICE SPACE
Office space for non-profits was considered a good use of the rooms on the second floor. What was a concern to some was whether the non-profits would need office space or program space. If the primary purpose of the agency was to care for children and families and was in need of program space then it was determine accessibility would be an issue.

COMMUNITY SUPPORT
When business leaders were asked how best to fund the renovation of the Amador, they responded saying that the Amador is like downtown and downtown is for everybody, its not just for people in the neighborhoods or within the business community. The new Amador should be for everybody for all Las Cruces and the whole community should support it.

The redevelopment of downtown and the renovation of the Amador will bring tourists to the city, and will bring local citizens back to downtown. With a vibrant downtown the city will add to its income. It is believed that cultural and heritage tourism travelers, and regular tourists will stay longer and spend more, if downtown is a lively and livable place.

Several businessmen expressed the opinion that the redevelopment of downtown and the renovation of the Amador are jumping off points in bringing more investment to downtown.

The character of downtown will change. There will be more young professionals, more lawyers, and more investments. Some interviewees remarked that they are talking to their business colleagues encouraging them to buy property and invest in downtown believing the opportunity is now. “There is a lot of excitement regarding the growth of this city, and a hotel and a couple of good quality restaurants will bring more people here,” said a business owner.

PUBLIC/PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP
Business leaders were encouraged with the concept that the Amador would remain a property of the city, but managed through a public/private partnership. Having the private
investor not have to buy the property, but able to work with the city to restore the building is a "huge plus." Said one individual "public/private partnership has an incredible history in downtown revitalization. You don't want the public to manage the Amador because the public doesn't run projects like this very well. The private sector doesn't want to buy the property because they can't afford the purchase cost in this environment."

"I think the renovation of the Amador Hotel would be a developer's dream," remarked another business owner. "The hotel, the cafe, even the public spaces could be leased out." This should be a public/private partnership, including a partnership with the foundation who would operate the museum and gift shop. If the city owns the property and leases it to a developer, the city saves the building and people know it's safe. That will speak volumes to the citizens.

From these and other comments, it was clear that the business community would support the redevelopment of the Amador. They recognized the importance of the Amador not as competition, but as an enhancement to downtown development. "I think the business community would be very happy to see the city put it out for somebody to run as a business," commented one individual.

PRIVATE SUPPORT
When asked if the Amador was something the neighborhoods could get behind, people pointed to the Mesquite District as being supportive of downtown revitalization. The Alameda Depot District was said to be a little harder to organize, but the new Alameda District initiative would certainly help. As in the past, the two neighborhoods would come together to support the Amador. "This was the place residents from these two neighborhoods came together to meet, to eat, and to visit. It can happen again."

When asked if the Amador was something the business leaders would support financially, the question was answered this way: "The list of supporters is shorter in this economy. There's been some great fund raising going on in Las Cruces. Hospice just finished a $6 million campaign, but that was for hospice and they had the right people on the committee. There was a campaign for the art center, but finding the people who can write a check for $100,000 is getting smaller. There have been two or three campaigns in the last two or three years. "You combine the amount given in those campaigns with the uncertainty of the economy, and whether you are a wealthy person or not you still retreat a bit," said one individual.

On the other hand, there were those who were sure that many people will "write checks for this project that would not write the same check for say the university project or for that matter for downtown revitalization." Everyone agreed that the economy would certainly need to improve for many people to give at a substantial level, but with "the concepts that have developed, people can start seeing that the restoration of the Amador will give life back to this hotel and it will excite people."

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FINAL DESIGN PROPOSAL
Following the Town Hall Meetings, the consultant team met with members of the Amador Museum Foundation to determine what development option should be pursued in more detail. The foundation requested that the results of the Town Hall Meeting be put to the foundation board which would make a decision on which option to pursue. This was supported by the city project manager. On June 17, 2009, the AMF board voted to request that the city direct the consultant team to pursue Option 3, for an events center and restaurant, for further development. This was reported by Mr. Jamie Fletcher, AMF Board Chairman, to Tomas Mendez, City of Las Cruces project manager, on June 19.
OVERVIEW
The reuse plan proposes that the Amador Hotel be restored as a primary cultural and social gathering venue for Las Cruces. It will serve both civic and educational functions, as well as a meeting place for private groups and individuals seeking to recapture the informal ambiance for which the hotel was once famous. The proposal is based on the conceptual plan for Option 3, developed for the Town Hall Meetings in June 2009. Those attending the visioning workshops and Town Hall Meetings considered the addition of a restaurant and bar as essential to the success of the project for three key reasons. It will:

- bring patrons to the Amador on a routine basis and provide activity both during the day and in the evenings,
- provide food service capabilities for social events that take place in the historic hotel building, and
- provide a steady revenue stream to the facility.

In working out the floor plan in more detail, certain aspects of the conceptual design were changed. For instance, it was determined that the kitchen would need to be bigger than shown in the concept drawing and that it would be more cost-effective to construct it as part of the new construction, rather than in the remodeled 1970’s additions. To the extent feasible, both the interior and exterior of the hotel will be restored to its appearance in the mid-20th century, prior to its renovation by Citizens Bank. This will include the removal of the drive-up window, the drive up booth and lanes and the two level “lobby” extension on the southeast corner (see demolition plans following). In order to provide the food service capacity and service areas required by modern hospitality facilities, the plan proposes to extend the building to the east into what is now the bus loading area. To differentiate the 4,200 square foot addition from the historic hotel, the addition’s stucco color and texture will contrast with that of the hotel. The Amador Avenue elevation will recall the massing of the guest room wing that previously occupied the site. The existing one-floor eastern addition will remain but will be extensively renovated and largely obscured by the new addition.

It is proposed that the hotel’s second floor be made available for lease by non-profit agencies. Use by cultural, historic, and preservation related organizations would be particularly appropriate. Within Las Cruces, there is an expressed need for non-profit organization offices. While the city has no need for office space at this time they would be available if the need arises and some could be used by the management entity for the events center.

CONTEXT AND SITE DEVELOPMENT
Located adjacent to the downtown core, the Amador Hotel is well-sited to contribute to both the developing cultural milieu that includes the Rio Grande Theater, the Branigan Cultural Center, the Natural History, Art and Railroad Museums, as well as adding a new restaurant to the underserved downtown core. The Amador’s original front entry faced south onto Amador Avenue. To address this condition, the plan proposes to preserve the south hotel portico entry as the formal “front” entry, while providing access to both the public events area and to the restaurant from the north. However, existing parking and foot traffic sources are largely to the north. (The pedestrian links to the site are shown in the plans presented to the Town Hall meetings, included in Section II of this report.) After further research to better determine the north elevation’s historic appearance, the rear entry to the historic hotel would be reconstructed. The restaurant’s entry would be developed as a separate and distinctly contemporary element. Although the restaurant’s primary entry would be from the north, a secondary entry would open onto Amador Avenue.

Forty-five parking spaces can be accommodated on site. The parking requirement under the City Zoning Ordinance would be approximately 92 spaces. However, the City Zoning Administrator, Jim White, confirmed that because the property
is located so close to the downtown overlay dis-
trict (where off-street parking is not required)
and since the city owns most of the public lots
in that area, a valid argument can be made for
accommodating any parking that will not fit on-
site at surrounding public parking areas.

Currently service access for deliveries to My
Brother’s Place Restaurant is through the drive
to the east of the Amador, on the Amador lot.
There appears to be no easement for this and
there is insufficient space on the restaurant
property for access. In addition, roof drainage
from the restaurant discharges on the Amador
property. The proposed design provides a
service alley to maintain this access and allow
for drainage. This alley would be wide enough
for a pick-up truck but deliveries from larger
trucks would need to be off-loaded at Amador
Avenue or the parking lot and hand-trucked to
the service doors. Service access to the new re-

taurant would likewise be from the parking lot.

BUILDING DESIGN

HISTORIC BUILDING—FIRST FLOOR
6,389 GROSS SF

The first floor of the original Amador Hotel will
provide the primary experiences to connect
the community to the history of this fascinating
building. This will be accomplished by provid-
ing a “living room” events space for Las Cruces,
and through interpretive exhibits.

Events Space
2,000 net sf historic hotel lobby with seating
capacity for approximately 200 for meetings
and 140 for dining
1,000 net sf in 4 meeting rooms at north-
west side of historic hotel lobby
242 net sf serving area for catering

The events space will serve the City of Las
Cruces as a venue for receptions and ceremo-
nies. Additionally, the space will be available
for rental to the public for receptions, wed-
dings, meetings and other social events. The
historic hotel lobby will be restored to as close
to its mid-20th century appearance as feasible.

This will include restoration of the columns, and
underside of the balcony, and of the ceiling
and light monitor. To the extent feasible, the
decor will recall the original furnishings and
character of the space. The four rooms adjoin-
ing the north side of the lobby will be available
for hosting smaller groups. Among these rooms
is the hotel’s dining room with its hand-painted
ceiling, which will be restored. A serving area
will be available for caterers and direct con-
nection to the restaurant / bar addition.

Interpretive Exhibit Area
1,172 net sf (See detailed description fol-
lowing this section)

The five rooms opening off of the southwest
corner of the lobby will be developed as exhib-
its to interpret the hotel’s history. The primary
entry to these spaces will be through the hotel’s
historic main entry, so as to recreate the expe-
rience of entering the hotel as a guest would
have. In addition to visiting the five rooms, visi-
tors will be able to visit the lobby. And con-
versely, visitors to the exhibit area will enter the
restored lobby as part of their visit experience.

Gift Shop
400 net sf at north end of lobby (partially
new addition)

A small gift shop is located between the north
entries into the historic hotel and the new res-

taurant / bar in a space that was previously ren-
ovated to contain the bank’s drive-up window.
The shop is also accessible from the hotel lobby.
This particular location is proposed to maximize
the shop’s exposure to visitors to both the res-
taurant and to the events center. A new addition
projects the shop out under the new covered
portal that forms the restaurant entry. A wrap-
around glazed storefront will provide maximum
exposure to the shop and its merchandise.

HISTORIC BUILDING—SECOND
FLOOR 5,235 GROSS SF

Due to accessibility and floor load limitations,
the second floor, unlike the first floor, cannot
be used as an assembly occupancy. It is thus
proposed that it be used to house offices for
non-profit agencies.
Non-Profit Offices
2,811 net sf on 2nd floor of historic hotel building (excluding balcony)

   16 spaces ranging in size from 130 to 150sf. Spaces could be combined depending on impact to historic fabric.

   Some spaces could be used for non-assembly support functions for events

The majority of the rooms were originally small guest rooms without baths. They are ideally sized to serve one or two workers, and could be leased individually or in various combinations to non-profits. Pending a determination on the historic significance of the dividing walls between offices it may be possible to cut openings between adjoining offices, or to possibly remove some walls. Because of steps at the doors from the balcony, only a portion of the offices are accessible to people with disabilities. It is therefore proposed that an area in the accessible portion be set aside for meetings and as a work area for those with disabilities.

1970S ADDITIONS REMODEL & NEW ADDITIONS

REMODEL: 3,300 GROSS SF
NEW CONSTRUCTION: 5,270 GROSS SF
PATIO: 1,388 GROSS SF

A well-remembered destination of the Amador Hotel was its patio, bar and restaurant. To recapture this feature, the proposed bar and restaurant addition will wrap around an exterior dining patio. A portion of the bar and restaurant will be in the remodeled 1970’s additions. The remainder of this area will be devoted to service spaces and vertical circulation.

Bar and Restaurant
5256 net sf including storage and toilet; excluding patio

   Dining—1,360 net sf with approximately 85 seats

   Lobby/Waiter—690 net sf

   Patio dining—1,250 net sf (not included in gross area above) - approximately 75 seats

Bar—1,940 net sf including bar service with approximately 100 seats

Kitchen—1,266 net sf at the northeast corner including dishwashing, storage and service spaces

The facility is designed so that from the primary north entry, patrons can directly enter either the bar or dining areas, and so that either the bar or restaurant can be open when the other is closed. A waiting and reception area is included here. A secondary entry is placed on Amador Avenue in anticipation of increased foot traffic from the south and west at a future date. The walls facing onto the patio would be mostly glazed in the new construction with some new openings being cut in the east wall of the 1970’s addition. Bar services would back up to the old vault which could provide some storage and support space for the bar.

The kitchen includes typical support functions such as dishwashing, dry storage, walk-in freezer and staff toilet, in addition to the food prep, cooking and serving areas. However, detailed planning of the kitchen should be worked out with the restaurant operator.

Support spaces
2,120 gross sf, mostly remodel

   New exit stair and elevator from 2nd floor with new elevator lobby

   New unisex toilet on second floor

   Chair and table storage for events space

   Storage for bar/restaurant

   Reconfigured men’s and women’s toilets plus new unisex toilet

   Mechanical (existing) and janitor

The design includes a small hydraulic passenger elevator and a new exit stair from the second floor. These are accessed from a new entry lobby from Amador Avenue in the location of part of the existing southeast bank lobby, which is to be demolished. This lobby also accesses the main historic lobby and includes access to the bar. The latter is not a required exit and could be locked if necessary. At the second floor a new unisex toilet has been included.
A new opening will need to be cut through the wall at the second floor to access the balcony area.

The main toilets for the facility are shared by all functions and have been relocated to back up to the mechanical room and the small vault. This allows for more efficient circulation to and within the bar and restaurant. The old, small bank vault will become a serving area for catering to the events space. The portion of the larger vault, not used for the stair/elevator core, will be used for chair storage and storage for the bar.
SECOND FLOOR PLAN
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SOUTH ELEVATION

EAST ELEVATION

NORTH ELEVATION

SECTION THROUGH RESTAURANT LOOKING WEST
RESTAURANT PATIO

VIEW TO NORTHEAST FROM AMADOR AVENUE
EXHIBIT CONCEPTS & INTERPRETIVE PLAN

Visitors move through a stimulating and multifaceted exhibition to gain an understanding of the colorful history of the Amador building. The exhibition seeks to portray the dramatic and personal stories of the owners, guests and visitors of this old hotel. It is dynamic and interactive, fitting for a building with such a complex story that weaves together the lives of past and present Las Cruces residents.

EXHIBIT SPACE PLAN USE
Visitors enter the welcome area (room 102), either through the south exterior entrance, or by passing through the lobby and passing through an interior door. They are directed to enter the orientation room (room 103) by entering a door on the right.
Thompson, George W. Photograph. Shaw, Fred. New Mexico’s Slaphappy Hostelry.” Holiday, November 1946, p. 65.
ORIENTATION

The orientation room is furnished with period parlor furniture for seating. Opposite the entrance door, on large-format screens mounted on the opposite wall, a 7-10 minute introductory video is projected. The start of the video triggers the window blinds and door to close, dimming the room and creating a movie theater-like atmosphere. As the film progresses, casework lighting is programmed to come on at key moments. Some cases embedded behind a large wall mural are not visible until their lighting comes on. Visitors will be able to open the doors at any time to exit the room if necessary. The video contains historic photographs and film clips, as well as music and narration, preparing viewers for the exhibits in the next rooms. Once the video presentation is over, the door and window blinds automatically open again, signaling visitors to pass into the other rooms of the exhibit, as well as allowing new visitors to enter the orientation room.
Period recreations of parlor-style seating
THE AMADORS, THE CAMPBELLS & THEIR HOTEL

After the video presentation, visitors pass back through the welcome area and enter room 125, which is devoted to distinct but related themes: The Amadors, the Campbells, and Their Hotel; The Evolution of the Amador Building; and The Evolution of the City. Visitors learn about the Amadors and Campbells by viewing some of their personal effects, as well as photographs of the families, the hotel register, and, ideally, artifacts from the Citizen’s Bank collection. Many of the items from this collection are currently on exhibit in the bank lobby, and include furniture and decorative items once used in the hotel. The evolution of the Amador building is depicted through a series of interactive three-dimensional models showing different phases of the building throughout its history. The models include people in period costume, as well as carriages and cars from the eras depicted. The models are augmented with an audio-video presentation that includes projected period photographs, lighting, and music, giving viewers a complete sense of the different periods. Different eras in the evolution of the city are depicted on the walls behind corresponding period models of the Amador. These depictions include audio and video material, as well as old city maps featuring the location of the Amador building.
Next, visitors pass through a doorway into room 124, which features an exciting exhibit about the ghosts of Amador past called “If Walls Could Talk.” The room is a complete reproduction of an early-1950s-era Amador hotel room, just a few years after some of the Amador’s most dramatic scenes played out. Visitors can sit on the reproduction bed, open the closet door, and move freely about the room. Sound clips of conversations between Amador “ghosts” with accompanying lighting, similar to a radio drama, plays automatically upon entry. The visitor hears the voices of famous Las Cruces characters like Billy the Kid and Cricket Coogler, as well as sound effects like knocks on the door and screeching tires, all heard through many small, directed speakers, which ensure the experience is atmospheric and dramatic but not chaotic or confusing.

The Amadors, The Campbells & Their Hotel

1930s Hotel Room NMSU Library, Archives and Special Collections # 00041350
1946 Amador Hotel Room
Thompson, George W. Photograph. Shaw, Fred. New Mexico’s Slaphappy Hostelry.” *Holiday* November 1946, p. 62.
MEMORY BANK

After experiencing the drama of some of the Amador’s most famous stories, visitors move into the lobby to enter room 123, which portrays the experiences of the everyday people who were the lifeblood of the Amador in its heyday, and will continue to be after this restoration. The main feature of this room is the Memory Bank, a nod to the building’s history as a bank. The Memory Bank is an ongoing oral history project that consists of two parts: one section of the room contains a digital recording station, where anyone with a story to tell about the Amador can make an appointment to record their tale on video with the help of a facilitator; another section of the room will contain two kiosks with seating and a touch screen, in which visitors can select one- or two-minute previously recorded stories to watch on the screen. When the Amador is rented for weddings, anniversaries, or other special events, revelers can rent this space to record their tidings for their own family histories. The room will be decorated from floor to ceiling with framed photographs solicited from the community of events at the Amador.

ARCHITECTURAL ARCHAEOLOGY

Each of the three rooms, 123, 124, and 125, contain a small area illustrating an aspect of Architectural Archeology. For example, one room shows the many layers on the walls, with an explanation of the history of the changes made to the building. Similar exhibits show changes made to the floors and ceilings over the years. Restoration to the rooms includes removal of carpeting to expose the existing pine plank floor, as well as removal of the new drop ceilings and restoration of the original plaster ceilings. After passing through the final room of the exhibit, visitors enter the lobby, a grand gathering space ideal for weddings, celebrations, and conferences.
Framed photos of events taken at Amador Hotel
**RECOMMENDED PRESERVATION TREATMENT**

The Amador was listed on the New Mexico Register of Cultural Properties in 1969 because of its significance as a hotel. The building had been used continuously as a hotel since at least 1878. At the time of its listing, the building reflected a series of gradual modifications and additions dating onwards from the late 19th century. Through historic photographs and Sanborn maps the evolution of the building is largely documented. These previous changes, as they existed at the time of the 1960s renovation, reflected an eclectic range of styles and influences that collectively defined the building.

Concurrent with, or shortly after the building’s listing on the New Mexico Register of Cultural Properties, it underwent a major renovation into a bank, and was subsequently converted into a county office building. The alterations not only changed the historic use of the building, but also removed some historic features and fabric. The most significant loss was perhaps the rooms on the east side of the lobby and the wing that extended to the east. Fortunately, as is so often the case with “modernizations”, many of the alterations were simply added on top of existing fabric which remains in part, or in whole, behind the furred out walls and dropped ceilings. Hidden features include the underside of the second floor mezzanine around the lobby, coffered ceilings in most first floor rooms, including the hand-painted ceiling in the dining room, wallpapers, and wood floors.

The late 1960s and early 1970s alterations were unsympathetic to the historic character of the building, and by imposing a “Santa Fe Style,” they sought to create a false sense of history. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standard for Rehabilitation number four states that most buildings change over time and that changes that have acquired historic significance are to be retained and preserved. However, it is the opinion of this study that these alterations are not historically significant, and are unlikely to be considered so within the foreseeable future. The recommended preservation approach is therefore to remove as many of the bank and county office building alterations as feasible to uncover all surviving building fabric. (The covered drive-through bank lanes and the southeast bank lobby will be removed, but the remainder of the addition on the east side, which contains two vaults will be retained.)

The remaining fabric will then serve as a basis for the repair, and if necessary, restoration of lost fabric. To the extent feasible, the building will be returned to its appearance during the mid-20th century.

It has been suggested that the building be restored to an earlier period, such as New Mexico statehood in 1912. The restoration of the building to a period prior to the mid-20th Century would by necessity require the removal of features that in their own right have become significant to the building’s history. Among these features are possibly some windows, the existing portal, the hand-painted dining room ceiling and murals, the room names, and the blue paint on the underside of the mezzanine. Restoration would also likely require the reconstruction of missing features for which there is incomplete documentation. There would be a high chance that such a restoration would result in the coexistence of features that never actually existed at the same time, while simultaneously removing added features that have become significant to the building’s history as a hotel.

In summary, the justification for the proposed treatment is:

1) It removes non-contributing features,
2) It returns much, but not all, of the building to its appearance at the end of the period in which it was a hotel,
3) In addition to retaining remaining historic fabric, it exposes historic fabric that had been concealed by the alterations, and
4) Where necessary, the design of replaced or replicated historic features will be based on historic photographs, or physical evidence (Secretary of the Interior’s Standard for Rehabilitation Number Six).
STRATEGIES FOR PRESERVING CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES

The following strategies are recommended for the adaptive reuse of the remaining original portion of the Amador Hotel—the two-story structure to the west of the lobby’s east wall. The intent of these strategies is to preserve the surviving historic fabric, and where feasible and desirable, restore missing or damaged historic features. Most of the eastern addition built by Citizens Bank will remain, but will be changed as necessary to meet current needs.

It is recommended that, prior to completing a detailed design for the building, sufficient interior alterations made since 1970 be removed to facilitate the further investigation and documentation of the surviving historic fabric. The extent of surviving materials and the feasibility for their retention should be major factors in developing the final adaptive use plan.

EXTERIOR WALLS

- Remove the 1970 Portland cement stucco and lath to further investigate the wall’s structural condition and historic finishes.
- Repair any structural problems within the adobe walls and refinish the walls with a finish more appropriate to the building’s early to mid 20th Century appearance.

DOORS AND WINDOWS

- Retain all existing exterior doors and windows and repair as required.

INTERIOR WALLS AND FINISHES

- Remove furred-out walls, such as those in the lobby.
- Retain all existing interior adobe walls.
- Minimize the cutting of new connecting doorways between rooms, except where walls are deemed to be non-historic/non-contributing (see discussion page I.11). Where new openings are necessary, detail in such a manner as to allow them to read as contemporary alterations.

- Further investigate frame partitions to determine their age, materials, and significance prior to proposing their removal or alteration.
- After removing the lay-in ceilings throughout the building, further investigate the surviving plasters and wallpaper.
- Retain and restore existing historic ceilings where feasible.
- Remove carpeting and repair painted pine floors, leaving exposed if feasible.

FIRST FLOOR LOBBY AND SECOND FLOOR MEZZANINE

- Retain as the building’s single primary space.
- Remove covers and capitals from first floor columns
- Remove dropped ceilings and expose underside of mezzanine.
- Reconstruct skylight (monitor).
- Retain stairway as principal access to second floor.
- Retain second floor railing, and consider options for lowering to original height.

MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS

- Where feasible, install systems within walls, attics, or under floors or in other concealed spaces to be as inconspicuous as possible. Construction of some new vertical chases may be required, but these should be in locations where they will not impact character-defining historic elements, such as in closets or service spaces. Where concealment is not possible, express the systems as a contemporary addition to the building.
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CODES & CONSTRUCTION

BUILDING CODE REQUIREMENTS
A preliminary building code analysis has been performed for the proposed design (see appendix and Section I.). An analysis of all provisions of the applicable codes was not in the scope of this study and has not been completed. This should be completed as part of follow-up detailed design work. The analysis has focused on significant provisions of the code that are likely to affect the design and floor plan. The assumptions for the code analysis are as follows:

OCCUPANCY GROUPS
Existing occupancy is B (business). A change of occupancy is required. New occupancies are as follows:

- Events/Meeting/Museum – A-3
- Offices (2nd floor historic building) – B
- Restaurant / Bar – A-2

CONSTRUCTION TYPE
V-B (unprotected wood), with automatic fire sprinklers for allowable area.

ALLOWABLE AREAS AND SEPARATIONS
The design is within the allowable area for a sprinklered building with the above occupancies and construction type. The design assumes separated uses for different occupancies, in order that the second floor can be classified as “B” occupancy for structural loading purposes. Separation between the lobby, A-3, and the offices is required to be 1-hour for a sprinklered building. No fire separation is required between the restaurant (A-2) and the lobby. Per 1105.10 the IEBC, separation from the lobby need not be provided if the office walls are wood lath and plaster and the building is sprinklered. Some lath and plaster is evident but the extent should be confirmed with further selective demolition. The wood wainscot will need to be approved by the building official, but since it is clearly part of the historic fabric would most likely be accepted.

OCCUPANT LOAD AND EXITING
Initial analysis indicates that the design meets egress requirements for:

- Number of exits (3 required; 4 provided)
- Maximum distance to exits (250 feet allowed; 112 feet provided)
- Width of exits (112 inches required; 238 inches provided)

A preliminary occupant load/exiting plan has been completed that indicates that all spaces have the required number of exits (see Appendix). When the final plan is developed detailed occupant loads, exits, exit widths and travel distances will need to be recalculated to ensure compliance or seek appropriate approvals if compliance is not possible without affecting the historic character of the building. Some of the doors to the proposed meeting rooms at the west side of the first floor have the required total width but are pairs of doors, so each leaf does not meet the minimum width requirement. Some of the doors at the offices on the second floor are just below the minimum clear width of 32”. The IEBC allows for less than the required width in historic buildings when “...in the opinion of the code official, there is sufficient width and height for a person to pass through the opening or traverse the exit and that the capacity of the exit system is adequate for the occupant load, or where other operational controls to limit occupancy are approved by the code.”

Some or all of the doors to the first floor rooms and second floor offices may be replaced where they are not original (the original first floor doors do not appear to have been pairs.) Where doors are replaced every effort should be made to achieve the required exit width, unless this would require significant changes to historic frames and trim.

STRUCTURAL
As described in Section I, seismic upgrades and reinforcement for increased gravity loads are required with the proposed change of occupancy (per Level 3 Alterations, where the work area is more than 50% of the building and where gravity loads are increased more than 5%).
Prior to final design, the architect shall provide a written preservation report to the building official describing safety features, a structural seismic load path description, and any instances where preservation dictates non-compliance with the building code. Specific treatment of the historic building with regard to structural reinforcement to comply with the code must be defined. Of particular importance is to get a determination about the extent of work needed to meet current seismic design requirements. The report shall be a written narrative containing the following items:

1) Parapet bracing and wall anchoring system
2) Diaphragm repair/bolstering
3) Reductions in strength of existing structural components
4) Added live and dead loads
5) Increased seismic forces
6) Increased snow or wind loads
7) Anticipated operational controls
8) An analysis of the structural system, illustrating its adequacy and its conformance with codes that existed at the time of the original construction.

The final code plan cannot be determined without detailed calculations and discussions with both the building official (Construction Industries Division) and the State Historic Preservation Officer. This should be included in a follow-up design contract that includes the services of a structural engineer with specific experience in the application of the NMEBC/IEBC and the NMBC/IBC to historic structures and the New Mexico Historic Earthen Building Code (although the latter for the most part may not apply given the extent of alterations and the proposed building occupant load, as discussed in Section I and the Appendix).

Structural issues and their potential resolutions include the following:

**Foundations:** Since the historic building appears to have no footings, except possibly at the portions of the east wall where the bank vaults were constructed, it does not meet the seismic requirements of the IBC (or the basic structural provisions of the code). Work required to underpin all the bearing walls would not only be prohibitively expensive but would likely threaten the integrity and stability of the adobe walls. Alternative solutions should be investigated by the structural engineer and relief from the requirement to underpin the footings should be sought from the building official, based on the fact that the NM Earthen Building Code would permit the existing construction to remain if it qualified to be covered under the code. Column footings should be investigated and upgraded with underpinning, if necessary. It is not known what footings exist, but it is almost certain that there must be some kind of column footings. These could be underpinned or replaced using temporary bracing without jeopardizing the structure.

**Seismic reinforcing of walls:** If seismic reinforcing of the bearing walls is required it could be achieved by installing plywood-sheathed, wood stud framing at the interior of exterior walls. (The plywood could then be covered with plaster or gypsum board). This has been approved elsewhere in the state. Effective methods would be required to tie the framing in with the floor and roof framing. There are several disadvantages to this from a historic preservation standpoint such as covering up historic plasters, modifying historic window trim and details and changing the historic coffered ceiling at the first floor west and south rooms. However, it may be less invasive than other options such as steel framing. Any solution must be approved by the State Historic Preservation Officer in conjunction with the code official.

**First floor reinforcing for gravity loads:**
As discussed in Section I, the first floor framing will most likely require reinforcement or replacement. Given that the lobby space will be used for assemblies, leaving the structure in place with operational controls (at the discretion of the code official per IEBC 1106) would not be practical for an events space. Options would include installing intermediate or “sister” joists of treated lumber or complete replacement of the floor structure with wood frame or...
Historic Hotel Reuse Plan

III.26

a slab-on-grade. The latter would be expensive and potentially damaging to the historic fabric during installation, but also could be used as part of the seismic retrofit in lieu of underpinning. This should be investigated by the structural engineer.

Balcony loading: Since the balcony cannot be separated from the lower level assembly occupancy (without affecting the historic character) it would normally be considered part of that occupancy and would need to be reinforced to withstand the increased load (from 80psf for corridors above the first floor for business occupancies to 100psf for assembly occupancy lobbies). Approval should be sought from the building official for this to remain classified as a business occupancy with operational controls so that it is not used as part of the lobby and to provide relief from it having to be separated from the lobby with a wall. If the balcony remains as business occupancy it should be able to be left in its current structural condition without upgrades. However, the entire structure should be examined once the dropped ceilings and other contemporary finishes have been removed to ensure there are not dangerous conditions. Some reinforcing of the junctions at beams and columns may be required but this will need to be done in a concealed manner.

Stability of existing adobe walls: The west exterior wall has significant deformations along its length and height. It bows out in the middle and appears to be leaning out also. There is no significant cracking to indicate that this is a structural problem or due to recent events. However a full assessment cannot be made before the exterior stucco is removed. Another area that should be investigated is the east wall of the lobby north of northernmost bank vault where there is no visible support for the second story adobe wall between the north wall of the vault and the northeast corner of the lobby over the opening to the corridor and the men’s toilet. Again there is no evidence of structural failure, however, in order to complete an analysis of the building’s ability to withstand existing and new loads, this condition must be uncovered to determine how the structure works at this point. Likewise, along the length of this wall the original adobe appears to have been been intermittently replaced where the concrete bank vaults were inserted and the 1970s addition constructed. While this may have provided a more solid bearing for the second floor adobe it may also have weakened it by interrupting its continuity. This entire wall should be reviewed when the furred-out gypsum board finishes are removed.

ACCESSIBILITY FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES:

At least one accessible entrance will be provided to the historic building (at the new vestibule in the southeast corner). Other entrances are not required to be accessible but will be evaluated. All entrances and exits in the new addition and remodeled areas will be made accessible. Accessibility (door widths) to first floor rooms in the historic building will be provided where feasible. Where not feasible alternate program accessibility may be required, by providing equivalent facilities/experience in an accessible space. Accessibility is to be provided to the second floor of the historic structure with the addition of an elevator, but due to numerous level changes within the floor, only portions of this area may be able to be made accessible without compromising the historic fabric. A CID official has indicated that an exception could be made to providing wheelchair access to the second floor, given the building’s historic status. All toilet rooms will be accessible as will all areas of the new addition and remodeled area.

CONSTRUCTION

It is anticipated that in addition to removal of non-historic finishes in the old hotel areas, and demolition of the 1970s southeast bank lobby and drive up bank, the 1970s additions at the east side will be gutted to the bearing walls and roof structure. Construction of additions is anticipated to be from concrete masonry units or steel stud frame with stucco finish, and steel bar joist and steel deck.
The design and construction of the interior décor of the bar and restaurant areas and detailed kitchen and equipment layout will be coordinated with, or undertaken by, the restaurant operator with the approval of the city.

Other features of the project should include:

- Reroofing of all renovated areas with the addition of insulation where possible
- A plan to minimize possible impacts on the historic structure of new construction and renovations so as not to weaken it or damage historic fabric
- Incorporation of energy-saving features wherever possible, such as, high performance glazing, shading of windows (either interior or exterior), , increased day-lighting, "smart" switching of lighting systems, high-efficiency mechanical systems and natural ventilation
- Incorporation of water-saving features including possible rain-water harvesting
- Use of non-toxic materials of low-embedded energy, or rapidly renewable natural resources.

**UTILITIES**

Specific requirements for utility services for the proposed development may include:

**SEWER**

The 4" diameter of the line, shown on the drawings should be of adequate capacity for the new plumbing requirements but its size and condition should be evaluated with a CCTV scan.

**WATER**

The routing of the main water service under the floor of the historic structure poses a danger to the structure from potential leaks. It is recommended the water meter be relocated to the north, clear of the building and that the line be rerouted to the mechanical room along the north side of the building. The line size and meter size will need to be determined but the meter is not anticipated to be greater than 2".

**FIRE LINE**

A new fire line will need to be run to service the building's new automatic sprinkler system. It is anticipated that this will come from Water Street but a water availability statement will need to be issued by the city to determine this. The location of the fire riser will need to be determined. It should preferably be in the existing mechanical room if there is sufficient space. An additional fire hydrant may be required. The location and feed for this should be determined once fire flow requirements are calculated and available flows known.

**SITE ELECTRICAL**

The restaurant addition as currently designed will require relocation of the electrical transformer. Once specific requirements for the restaurant are known a plan may be able to be developed that could avoid relocation, but for budgeting purposes the assumption is made that it will be relocated. The most likely location would be to the north of the new kitchen addition, which would allow reconnection to the services for "My Brother's Place" and would involve a limited amount of secondary line from the existing utility box. Upsizing of the transformer may be required also. The proposed east building wall of the new addition is approximately 14' from the west wall of "My Brother's Place". This may be too close to the underground primaries and the plan may need to be adjusted to provide additional space.

The 3-phase, 208 volt service is appropriate for the new construction but the service size will likely need upsizing to at least 600 amps to accommodate the increased loads from the kitchen. The proposed design leaves the existing service entry and panels on the north wall of the building. A new panel would be required for the kitchen. If the transformer is replaced, a transformer-mounted meter should be considered. Separate metering for the restaurant should also be evaluated, although this may be of limited use given that some areas of the building are shared between the events center and the restaurant.
COMMUNICATIONS

Telephone service demands will need to be evaluated for the new uses before a determination on the adequacy of the current service can be evaluated. Given the previous use of the building as an office building, it is possible that the existing feed to the building may be adequate for the anticipated uses.

The two underground fiber optic lines shown on the survey will need to be relocated to accommodate the restaurant/kitchen addition—possibly into the proposed new "alley".

GAS

The existing underground feed from the gas meter to The Amador will need to be rerouted to feed the kitchen and the remainder of the building, including the main boiler. Upsizing of the meter is anticipated and relocating it to the north end of the new addition may be advisable to avoid having to run the boiler feed over the restaurant roof. Separate metering for the restaurant should also be considered.

STORM DRAINAGE

Civil engineering services were deleted from the scope of this reuse study during contract negotiations in order to allow the remainder of the work to be completed within the available funds. Some preliminary drainage calculations were made by NMSU students as part of the Cornerstones report but a full drainage analysis and drainage plan will be required as part of future detailed design phases. These will be required to comply with City of Las Cruces hydrology requirements and stamped by a professional engineer. If the development of the project is undertaken in phases the appropriate phase for a drainage plan to be prepared will need to be confirmed with the city.

Based on discussions with city staff, storm water must be detained on-site with controlled release to the acequia (piped underground at Water Street) or the city storm drainage system. This would require regrading of the parking area to an on-site pond or an underground detention system. Incorporating underground collection cisterns could provide water harvesting for landscaping.

ENVIRONMENTAL SYSTEMS

HVAC

It is anticipated that most of the HVAC system in the historic building will need to be replaced because of its age and in order to conceal it above the original historic ceilings. The central chiller, boiler and ground source heat disposal
system require more detailed study and the results of recent repairs before they can be evaluated for reuse. Specifically, the entering and leaving temperatures for the underground loop should be measured. Due to its age, it should be anticipated that some, if not all of the existing system will require replacement.

For all spaces except the main lobby, new, more compact and energy efficient Variable Refrigerant Flow fan coil systems with roof-mounted condensers could be installed, with ventilation by means of operable windows. Condensing units can be combined to reduce the number of rooftop items and penetrations. The fan coil units and refrigerant lines for these systems are small and should be easily concealed in the space above the historic ceilings. The central lobby space will require a new air handler mounted on the roof of the 1970s additions or in the new mechanical room that is part of the new stair core. Routing of ducts to the space will require further study. Side discharge, wall-mounted grilles at the east wall are anticipated. Cutting through the concrete vaults will be a major expense, so alternative locations should be explored. Routing return air ducts will also be a challenge.

PLUMBING

The proposed design moves the main plumbing stacks for the toilets in order to configure the plan to accommodate the required number of fixtures. This will require cutting the slab and installing new piping. This can be tied into the existing service line. In historic areas fire suppression lines will be run in ceiling spaces and walls where feasible. Sidewall heads will be used where possible in areas without ceiling spaces (such as under the balconies.) Where exposing the lines is unavoidable these shall be located in inconspicuous locations where possible but exposed as clearly identifiable contemporary additions where not.

ELECTRICAL

All existing electrical conduits that are within the historic structure in areas to be exposed shall be relocated above historic ceilings or within walls. Replicated historic lighting fixtures may be added in the historic areas especially in the lobby where photographs of these exist and in some of the exhibit rooms. New power will need to be run to the exhibit areas along with data lines to a central server location for exhibit programming. Power and data should also be run to meeting rooms for audio-visual presentation equipment. New power and lighting will be run to all restaurant, bar and kitchen areas as required. Lighting in these areas should be clearly contemporary so as not to be confused with the historic areas. The fire alarm system will need to be upgraded or replaced to cover the entire facility and tie into the sprinkler system.
CONSTRUCTION BUDGET

Resolution No. 07-326 requires that the Amador Museum Foundation raise capital funds for the renovation of the building for a museum and that it assist the city with operating it. The city is to provide staff for operations and on-going building maintenance with the foundation assisting with operating funds for exhibit maintenance etc. Since in the proposed scheme the museum occupies only part of the project, it is possible that the resolution would need to be renegotiated, depending upon the mutual responsibilities of each entity for operations, capital funds, and the allocation of revenues from the leased functions—the events spaces, the restaurant/bar and the offices. The project budget has been developed assuming that development costs may be split between the Amador Museum Foundation and the City of Las Cruces, although no recommendation on the proportion from each entity is being recommended. The other contributor to the capital improvements will be the restaurant operator, who would be responsible for tenant finish costs (including HVAC and electrical distribution within the restaurant/bar areas) and equipment (such as kitchen equipment, furnishings etc.). An assumption is being made for these costs based on a typical split for commercial property development but the exact proportions would be negotiated.

CONSTRUCTION COSTS

A combination of the following techniques has been used to assess the likely construction costs for the project:

- Quantity take-offs for some elements in renovated areas and site work
- Order of magnitude allowances for some elements where not enough detail is known
- Costs per square foot of floor area for new construction and renovated areas.

Unit costs are derived from a number of sources, including R. S. Means Building Construction Cost Data, 2009 edition, estimates from recent projects completed by Kells+Craig Architects, City of Albuquerque “Engineer’s Unit Price List for Contract Items 2009” and bid results for recent projects. The construction budget has been developed as a range and includes a number of contingencies. The range is what can reasonably be anticipated but could be wider if significantly different conditions are encountered when more detailed design and investigation are undertaken. The range is necessary for the following reasons:

- Renovation costs cannot be accurately determined due to unknown conditions of the historic structure under the existing wall and ceiling finishes.
- The extent of structural upgrades for code compliance cannot be determined without detailed structural analysis and design, and negotiations with code officials and the SHPO.
- Utility extension and upgrade costs cannot be accurately estimated until there is more information about the condition of existing utilities, and the utility loads imposed by the development.
- A site topographic survey prepared by a professional surveyor is required along with a site grading and drainage plan.
- Geo-technical test results are not available and no hazardous materials assessment has been done. The results of all of these could significantly affect the cost of the project.
- Construction costs have varied widely in the last 5 years, rising steeply from 2004 to 2007 and declining sharply at the end of 2008 through 2009. Since the schedule of development is not known and the long-term trend in construction costs is uncertain, prices have generally been based on those prior to the recent decline and assume an average of 3.5% escalation per year. An escalation amount has been included for three years.

A more detailed spreadsheet of costs is included in the appendix.
OTHER PROJECT COSTS

Project costs include those typically outside of the construction contract, such as the museum exhibit cost, furnishings, construction contingency (for unknown conditions and changes during construction) and soft costs, such as professional fees and surveys. A detailed explanation of exhibit costs follows this section.

CITY OF LAS CRUCES / AMADOR FOUNDATION COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SITE WORK</td>
<td>$327,202</td>
<td>$376,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISTORIC STRUCTURE RENOVATION &amp; RESTORATION</td>
<td>$1,064,935</td>
<td>$2,002,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970s ADDITION RENOVATIONS (stair/elevator support areas)</td>
<td>$877,875</td>
<td>$953,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESTAURANT/BAR/ ADDITION (shell only)</td>
<td>$715,830</td>
<td>$855,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building (Shell only - Tenant Improv. by op)</td>
<td>$675,000</td>
<td>$787,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patio</td>
<td>$40,830</td>
<td>$68,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Construction</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,985,843</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,187,680</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency for scope change</td>
<td>$298,584</td>
<td>$418,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Conditions</td>
<td>$262,754</td>
<td>$368,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;P</td>
<td>$212,831</td>
<td>$298,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>$75,200</td>
<td>$105,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,835,213</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,378,930</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMGRT</td>
<td>$285,244</td>
<td>$400,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Construction</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,120,457</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,776,988</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contingency (for Change Orders etc)</td>
<td>$618,069</td>
<td>$866,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FURNISHINGS &amp; EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>$706,800</td>
<td>$887,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibits</td>
<td>$646,800</td>
<td>$787,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events Furnishings/Equipment</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Escalation 3.5% for 3 years</strong></td>
<td><strong>$571,759</strong></td>
<td><strong>$791,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Construction, FF&amp;E, and Escalation</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,017,085</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,324,337</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEES, HAZARDOUS MATERIALS, MISC. EXPENSES</td>
<td>$1,048,545</td>
<td>$1,450,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional A/E fees (including Survey, soils tests)</td>
<td>$722,050</td>
<td>$998,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit Design Fees</td>
<td>$253,546</td>
<td>$253,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous materials survey</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials Removal Allowance</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Expansion/development fees</td>
<td>$13,449</td>
<td>$13,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing/reproduction/reimbursable expenses</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CITY OF LAS CRUCES/AMF PROJECT COST</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,065,630</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,774,752</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESTAURANT OPERATOR COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FINISH-OUT OF RESTAURANT</td>
<td>$669,714</td>
<td>$830,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Conditions</td>
<td>$38,172</td>
<td>$49,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;P</td>
<td>$30,919</td>
<td>$40,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>$10,925</td>
<td>$14,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$70,016</strong></td>
<td><strong>$104,469</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMGRT</td>
<td>$61,712</td>
<td>$77,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Construction Restaurant Operator</strong></td>
<td><strong>$698,895</strong></td>
<td><strong>$909,148</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTINGENCY, FEES AND ESCALATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contingency (for Change Orders etc)</td>
<td>$104,834</td>
<td>$136,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escalation</td>
<td>$84,392</td>
<td>$109,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional fees</td>
<td>$71,050</td>
<td>$92,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL RESTAURANT OPERATOR PROJECT COSTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$959,170</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,247,724</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL PROJECT COST RANGE (INCLUDING EXHIBITS): $8,000,000 - $11,000,000**
EXHIBIT BUDGET

There is no typical exhibition cost. Exhibit and multimedia production costs vary widely, from around $200 per square foot for a simple display of labeled objects in cases to more than $1,000 per square foot for an exhibit rich in high-quality expensive exhibitory such as dioramas, immersion environments, interactive media, and audiovisual and electronic media. As per the vision outlined in this report, which is high in multimedia and low in artifacts, and because of the scale of the project, we feel an appropriate budget for production costs would be $550 per square foot for the five exhibition rooms in the Amador Hotel.

For projects of this scale we expect that the design team members will spend about 1/4 of their time on the Amador Project in Phase I. We multiply these hours by estimated hourly rates to determine fees. Part of the work for this first phase will be to establish a firm exhibit and multimedia production budget. The fees for Phase I for a project of this scale usually amount to approximately 7% of the production budget.

For the Design Development and Contract Documents phases (Phase II), fees are often calculated as a percentage of the exhibit and media production budget. The fee for this size project is typically 18% of the exhibit and multimedia production budget. It includes all subcontractor fees, but not reimbursable expenses.

For the Construction Administration Phase (Phase III), fees are often calculated as a percentage of the exhibit and multimedia production budget. This fee is usually 10% of the exhibit production budget. It includes all subcontractor fees, but not reimbursable expenses.

For reimbursable expenses, such as for copies, travel and overhead, we recommend a not-to-exceed budget: 10%-12% of the total fee.

PRODUCTION BUDGET = $646,800

Production includes exhibit and graphic fabrication as well as multimedia production.

- Welcome Room = 175 square feet (sf)
- Orientation Room = 305 sf
- Amadors, Campbells & Their Hotel = 246 sf
- If Walls Could Talk = 225 sf
- The Memory Bank = 225 sf

Total Square Feet = 1176 sf

1176 square feet X $550 = $646,800

EXHIBIT DESIGN FEES = $253,546

Design fees include work to conceive the initial design of the exhibition, to create fundraising renderings, to draw schematic floorplans of exhibit elements in CAD, to create graphic design layouts, to research content and write exhibit text, to detail exhibits for production, and to supervise fabrication and multimedia production.

Fees = 35%($646,800) = $226,380
Expenses = 12%(226,380) = $27,166

See page III.31 for A/E design fees for the building.

TOTAL EXHIBIT BUDGET = $900,346
MARKET PROFILE
This section of the report reviews and analyzes the market profile for The Amador, looks at attendance figures of New Mexico history museums, and suggests successful models of historic hotels, restaurants and event centers, although no one entity is precisely the same as what is being proposed for The Amador. Operating challenges facing the Amador, and a projected operations budget are also a major portion of this section.

INTRODUCTION
In the 1960s Downtown Las Cruces was subjected to the trend of the time when retailers and other businesses began to move to the suburbs, leaving many downtowns without the products and services that brought people into the heart of the city. Like many other cities, the city fathers of Las Cruces, in an effort to create a downtown mall, closed off city streets and made the surrounding streets one-way encircling the mall.

While the Downtown Mall attracted a considerable number of residents and tourists on Wednesday and Saturday mornings for the produce and arts and crafts markets, or special event weekends such as the Whole Enchilada Fiesta weekend, much of what took place in downtown happened between the hours of 8 am and 5 pm six days a week. It was the lack of business and the changing times that caused The Amador to close, be sold to a local bank, and then later to the county for offices.

In 2006, the city undertook serious revitalization efforts when it formed the Las Cruces Metropolitan Redevelopment Area (MRA). In the ensuing years, the Rio Grande Theater has been renovated to a state-of-the-art performing arts center; the new Federal courthouse is under construction; a new city hall is almost complete; development of a cultural corridor is taking shape; a Bed & Breakfast recently opened; and development of condos and restaurants promises to turn downtown into a more lively and dynamic area. When Main Street reopens, the mall effect will no longer be a factor in the success of Downtown Las Cruces. The shops and activity on Main Street will return; Main Street will be more accessible, and additional changes will take place. Integral to this development will be The Amador.

MARKET PROFILE OF THE AMADOR
Primary and Secondary Resident Market
The Primary Resident Market Area for this study is considered to be within the city limits of Las Cruces. The population is estimated at 91,294 in 2007, while more recent figures have the population for 2008 at 91,865. It should be noted that approximately 13,000 people reside within a four-minute drive of Downtown Las Cruces, and 4,000 people are employed by businesses within the same drive time.

The Secondary Market Area for this study is considered to be Doña Ana County residents living beyond the city limits of Las Cruces, comprising a population of 109,738. The total Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) records the population to be 194,181 in 2007. The Bureau of Business & Economic Research (BBER/UNM) at the University of New Mexico projects Las Cruces population to be 237,241 by 2015.
AGE PROFILE
The Amador is expected to appeal to residents and tourists for its historical significance and amenities. It is believed that the museum will have a particular allure for families, grandparents, and middle-age boomers whose families and relatives visited or were in some way impacted by the former Amador Hotel and the people who oversaw its operation. The following information and chart are meant to give readers a sense of potential attendance and local interest in the new Amador.

AGE PROFILE OF PRIMARY AND SECONDARY MARKET 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Level</th>
<th>Est. Pop. (Percentage)</th>
<th>Primary Market/Las Cruces City Total: 91,294</th>
<th>Est. Pop. (Percentage)</th>
<th>Secondary Market/Doña Ana County Total: 194,181</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14</td>
<td>6,512</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>14,780</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>7,594</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>16,725</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>10,560</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>18,956</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 34</td>
<td>13,897</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>27,592</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 44</td>
<td>11,296</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>23,835</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 54</td>
<td>10,341</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>23,412</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 64</td>
<td>7,051</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>16,740</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 - 74</td>
<td>5,728</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>11,660</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 - 84</td>
<td>4,547</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8,297</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: 2008 American Community Survey. Ages 1-9 and 85 + are not included.
HOUSEHOLDS AND HOUSEHOLD INCOME

An analysis of households and household income will be another factor in examining the primary and secondary market area as people begin to study local support for The Amador. Reviewing the size of households and their financial make-up can indicate the number of people who will visit the proposed museum, and enjoy the restaurant and event center. In 2008, the number of households in the overall Primary Resident Market reached 35,209, with 68,164 households in all of Doña Ana County. The following chart identifies the percentage of households in the primary and secondary markets, the type of family household, and the income level of residents.

People with disposable incomes are associated with museum visitation and with extended leisure time and activities. However, due to the uniqueness of The Amador, attendance at the museum may go beyond that of a history or general museum and fall into the category of attraction, drawing a cross section of ages, incomes, and educational backgrounds.

ESTIMATED HOUSEHOLD INCOME OF RESIDENTS IN PRIMARY/SECONDARY MARKET 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Primary Market/Las Cruces City</th>
<th>Secondary Market/Doña Ana Co</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Households 35,208</td>
<td>Total Households 68,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Families</td>
<td>Non-family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21,436</td>
<td>13,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 - $14,999</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 - $24,999</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 - $34,999</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $74,999</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 - $149,000</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 or more</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$43,813</td>
<td>$22,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Size</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Family Size</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: 2008 American Community Survey
III. POTENTIAL IMPLICATIONS OF RESIDENT MARKET

The population and household income of the Primary and Secondary Resident Market Areas need to be studied further to determine if there is a substantial local market capable of supporting activities at The Amador. One additional indicator is the educational attainment level of residents. The percentage of high school graduates in the primary market of Las Cruces is 81.6%, those with a college degree or higher is 29.8%. Percentage of high school graduates in all of Doña Ana County is 74.2%, those with a bachelor’s degree or higher is 24.6%.

LAS CRUCES TOURIST MARKET

While the residents of Las Cruces and Doña Ana County will have an enormous impact on the success of The Amador, it will be visitors and tourists to the area that could equally influence its success. It has been said that the vision for Downtown Las Cruces is that it “functions” as a regional center. Not only will customers be employees of downtown businesses and residents of adjacent neighborhoods, but residents throughout the Mesilla Valley and tourists will add to those that regularly patronize the restaurant, event center and museum.

VISITOR MARKET OVERVIEW FOR SOUTHWEST NEW MEXICO

Tourism is a major component of the New Mexico economy. An estimated 11.5 million people visited New Mexico during FY 2007 of which 6.4 million were leisure visitors and 1.4 million were on a business trip, according to BBER/UNM. The top three visitor destinations were Albuquerque (4.7M), Santa Fe (1.4M), and Doña Ana County (1.2M). The top five states of origin were New Mexico, Texas, Colorado, Arizona and California. The average travel party spent $1,192 during their visit. It should be noted that of the 7.8 million visitors, who spent the night in New Mexico, 6.4 million drove to their destination.

Other characteristics of New Mexico visitors include:

- The average overnight traveler spent 5.3 nights in New Mexico.
- The average head of household is 47.6 years of age.
- The median household income is $56,667.
- Sixty-six percent are married.

Further studies by Research & Polling for the Las Cruces Convention and Visitors Bureau indicate that a majority of the people (61%) they interviewed were returning visitors, and half (51%) said that Las Cruces was their only destination for their trip. One-third (32%) visited the state six or more times in the past five years. On average, repeat visitors made approximately ten trips to Las Cruces in the past five years, according to Research & Polling. Many people (56%) were visiting family and friends and listed Old Mesilla as their top activity while in the area.

With a 14.9 percent growth in population projected by BBER/UNM, a strengthening economy, a strong promotional campaign before, during and after the opening of The Amador, excellent amenities and southwest hospitality, the Amador should find success among tourists.
MUSEUMS/FOR-PROFIT PARTNERSHIPS

The proposed Amador facility—museum, event space, restaurant and non-profit office space—is outside the norm of a regular museum facility and is unique to most for-profit hotels and restaurants. The following facilities, while not fully corresponding to the proposed space for The Amador, provide the city and foundation with information on a few successful venues.

GAYLORD BUILDING
Lockport, IL

More than 150 years ago, the Gaylord Building in Lockport, Illinois played a major role in the creation of the Illinois & Michigan Canal, the final link in America’s great waterway system of the 19th century. One of the oldest industrial buildings in the I&M Canal National Heritage Corridor, the Gaylord Building is a model of adaptive reuse. Visitors to the Building can explore exhibits on the history of the canal, enjoy a meal in the Public Landing Restaurant, and take a relaxing stroll along the scenic canal trail, or linger in nearby antique shops. The Canal Corridor Association manages the Gaylord Building, a National Trust Historic Site.

Facilities
Exhibit Galleries
The Gaylord Building features a range of exhibits on the history of the canal: the people who built it, the towns that prospered along it, and the landscape that was shaped by it. On the ground floor is the permanent exhibit Illinois Passage: Connecting the Continent, which examines the impact of the Canal on the development of northeastern Illinois. Blending artifacts, historic photos and an engaging interpretive text, the exhibit provides visitors with an introduction to the role the I&M Canal played in shaping Illinois’ destiny.

Restaurant
Public Landing Restaurant features regional American cooking. The banquet facility can accommodate up to 150 guests and is available for private and corporate events.

Friends of the Gaylord Building is the membership organization and provides financial and volunteer support. Individual membership is $35; family membership is $50 annually.

Museum Attendance: 50,000

GADSBY’S TAVERN
Alexandria, VA

Gadsby’s Tavern Museum consists of two buildings, a ca. 1785 tavern and the 1792 City Hotel. The buildings are named for Englishman John Gadsby who operated them from 1796 to 1808. His establishments were at the center of political, business, and social life in early Alexandria. The tavern was also the setting for theatrical and musical performances. The goal of the Tavern today is to play a dynamic role in the social, economic, and educational life of Alexandria.

Facilities
Museum
The Gadsby’s Tavern Museum houses artifacts, decorative arts and furnishings of the 18th and early 19th century. Staff and volunteers offer tavern tours to 18th century Balls.

Tavern and Event Space
The Tavern provided 18th century travelers with rest, food, drink and the latest news. It was a place to make business deals and to hold political discussions. Today its semi-private and private dining rooms, courtyard and adjacent ballrooms are available for receptions, corporate functions, family gatherings, and other special occasions.

The Ballroom (22x38) seats 72 guests for dinner and 100 for a standing reception.

The Assembly Room seats 40 guests for dinner and 80 for a standing reception.

Museum Store
The museum store carries items produced exclusively for the museum that feature Gadsby’s Tavern and historic Alexandria as well as a large selection of colonial literature.

Gadsby’s Tavern Museum Society is an all-volunteer non-profit organization supporting the Gadsby’s Tavern Museum. Individual membership is $20; family membership is $30 annually.

Museum Attendance: 24,500
FRAUNCES TAVERN
New York City, NY
The Tavern was built in 1719 as a residence for the merchant Stephan Delancey and his family. In 1762, the home was purchased by tavern-keeper Samuel Fraunces, who turned it into one of the most popular taverns of the day. Best known as the site where Washington gave his farewell address to the officers of the Continental Army in 1783, the tavern also played a significant role in pre-Revolutionary activities. When New York was the nation’s first capital, the tavern housed the offices of the Departments of War, Treasury and Foreign Affairs.

Facilities
Museum
Fraunces Tavern Museum’s collection is comprised of artifacts, paintings, drawings and documents related to the colonial, revolutionary, and early federal periods of American history. The Sons of the Revolution in the State of New York have collected objects relating to the Revolutionary period since their founding in 1876. They purchased and restored Fraunces Tavern in 1904 and opened it as a museum in 1907.

Restaurant and Event Space
There are five dining rooms and a lounge within the Tavern. The Tavern Museum offers a dramatic and historical setting ideal for cocktail receptions, business meetings, and various special events.

Sons of the Revolution is the membership organization of the Fraunces Tavern Museum. Membership is $40 annually.

Museum Attendance: 17,500

MISSION INN
Riverside, CA
The history of the Mission Inn, a National Historic Landmark Hotel, encompasses more than a century of California life. It began as a modest 12-room adobe boarding house and now fills an entire block in downtown Riverside. Throughout the site, visitors are able to view paintings, sculpture and furnishings from the Mission Inn collections. In the late 1800s wealthy easterners and Europeans flocked to Riverside in search of a warmer winter climate and to invest in the area’s profitable citrus industry. By the 1890s Riverside was the richest city per capita in the United States.

Facilities
Museum
Located in the Mission Inn, the museum features permanent exhibits from the Mission Inn collection, as well as frequent temporary exhibits. The collections include stained glass, architecture, textiles, furniture, decorative arts, and paintings. The Mission Inn Foundation was incorporated in 1976 to assist in the preservation and restoration of the Inn. Today its has the unique role of operating a non-profit museum within an operating for-profit hotel.

Restaurant and Event Space
The restaurant and event spaces are similar in nature to that of a for-profit hotel and resort.

Museum Store
The Mission Inn Foundation operates the museum Store with all proceeds going to support the educational activities of the Mission Inn Foundation.

Mission Inn Foundation is the membership organization of the museum. Individual membership is $25; family membership is $40 annually.

Museum Attendance: 45,500
BOULDER CITY/HOOVER DAM MUSEUM

Boulder City, NV
Boulder City/Hoover Dam Museum is located in the Historic Boulder Dam Hotel and operated by the Boulder Dam Museum and Historical Association. The museum tells the story of the Boulder Canyon Project and of those who helped to build Hoover Dam and Boulder City.

Facilities
Museum
The museum’s three-dimensional, interactive displays and exhibits describe the great social and economic forces surrounding the Depression and the thousands of unemployed citizens who move to the Nevada desert seeking employment with the Boulder Canyon Project. Photographs, artifacts, oral histories, and the sounds of Hoover Dam construction provide a sense of the complexity, danger, and immense scale of the construction project, as well as a picture of ordinary life in an extraordinary time and place.

Restaurant and Event Space
The Boulder Dam Hotel is a boutique-style hotel located in the historic district of Boulder City, minutes from Las Vegas. The historic building has been recently remodeled and has preserved the classic architecture style of the 1920s and 30s. The hotel features on-site dining, a museum, shopping, catering, and event space for individual dining to family gatherings and corporate events.

Historical Association membership is $20 annually.

Museum Attendance: 16,000

OPERATING CHALLENGES
The success of most museums and for-profit businesses is reflected in the understanding of their markets and the products and services they offer those markets. Numerous other factors including market size, location, quality of the consumer experience, marketing, and price will affect customer support.

TARGET AUDIENCES
The variety of Amador amenities will attract a diversity of audiences—families, young professionals, school groups, tourists, group tours, history buffs, and the like. Capturing their awareness will be important for the Museum, for the Event Center, and for Downtown Las Cruces. Due to the uniqueness of The Amador and the museum’s subject matter, it will be important for each to reach out to demographic groups not typically associated with museum-going activities, but which would be attracted to The Amador.

Not only will promotion draw people to The Amador, but also the experience they have viewing the exhibition, the variety of merchandise in the gift shop, the quality of restaurant fare, and the amenities of the Event Center. While economic and visitor studies are not available for the profiled facilities listed previously, what information is available indicates that visitation patterns differ considerably among the profiled venues.

Implications for The Amador
An important base of support for any museum, attraction, or restaurant is the local population. An aggressive marketing campaign, a quality visitor experience, and competitive pricing will determine the number of customers and visitors to The Amador. It is expected that during the first year of operation, The Amador will be visited at a high rate due to local excitement about the project, an aggressive local and regional promotional campaign, and an active marketing partnerships with Downtown Las Cruces. The ability of the Las Cruces Convention and Visitors Bureau to include The Amador on “suggested tours” of Las Cruces, participation in the group tour and sports
markets will be important. Once the Museum, Event Center, and restaurant are open to the public, Las Cruces will have an exciting, unique, even iconic destination to add to the list of things for visitors to do and see while in the area.

**ADMISSION AND MEMBERSHIP**

Museums that charge admission set the price to maximize revenue and count on admission fees to support the budget. It is assumed that there will be no admission fee for the Amador Museum, since other city museums do not charge for admission. The costs for renting the Event Center and leasing office space will help support the Museum’s budget. However, the foundation will need to be entrepreneurial and devise additional ways to underwrite the costs associated with running the Museum. The restaurant owner will handle restaurant costs and income.

**Implications for the Amador Museum Foundation**

Offering residents and visitors the opportunity to purchase memberships will be a good strategy to add to the museum’s revenue and a way for the community to support the organization. Membership in the Friends of the Amador should be studied before any commitment is made to move ahead with a Friends organization. The price of individual memberships should be reflective of museum memberships in New Mexico.

As the foundation considers membership in the museum, board members might want to consider an enhanced membership package that would afford high-end level members unique benefits. In cooperation with the Event Center and/or the restaurant, individual/family members and business members who contribute at a high-end level would have one time complimentary use of the Event Center, or receive a complimentary dinner at the restaurant, or one time complimentary use of a conference room. These are merely suggestions. These or other ideas would need to be worked out in partnership with the Event Center, restaurant, etc.

**EXHIBITION AND GIFT SHOP**

**Exhibits, Focus and Visitor Product**

Exhibits at the profiled museums are diverse in size, collection, exhibitions, programming, events, interactivity, and visitor experience. Each venue has put great emphasis on their particular story, and tells their story through collections, memorabilia, advertising, and merchandising items.

**Gift Shop**

Gift shops perform very well at specialty museums as they carry a variety of merchandise specific to the theme of the museum, and merchandise that appeals to visitors of all ages. Lower priced items can sell well among schoolchildren, with the more unusual items selling best among adults. The gift shops at the Taverns do well, while the others break even.

**MARKETING**

Marketing can have a significant impact on museum attendance, funding, and membership sales. At non-profit organizations however, marketing funds are often scarce. Small museums rely on the cross-promotion activities of their local visitors bureau, state tourism agencies, and free or donated advertising. Most make use of numerous modes of marketing including brochures, the Internet, the media, and other advertising channels. In the age of social marketing, some museums have My Space and Facebook sites and invite visitors to their sites for comment and for sharing information.

**Implications for The Amador Museum**

The Amador Museum should not be a hard sell to local residents and tourists; however it will require collaborative marketing efforts with the Convention and Visitors Bureau and Downtown Las Cruces. Skillful use of the area’s tourism marketing budget as well as an emphasis on collaborative promotion and publicity will be necessary for implementation of a successful marketing effort.

The museum is within a day’s trip of 1.2 million visitors, and many early visitors will be regional day-trippers. Other museum attendees will be visiting friends and relatives in the area. Travel-
ers passing through the area will be important visitor prospects, and marketing to them must be ubiquitous at key tourist information sites, on the web, and through highway signage. Key factors in the museum’s success will be the development and implementation of a strong marketing campaign prior to opening, and cross-promotional opportunities with Downtown Las Cruces, the CVB, Event Center and restaurant.

OPERATIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

A multi-purpose, joint-use facility inherently has the potential for scheduling and administrative control conflicts. The plan addresses these concerns by providing separate lockable entries for each of its primary uses - the events space, the interpretive exhibit area, the offices, the restaurant, and the gift shop. These entrances will allow any one of the spaces to be accessible when the other is closed. Likewise, interior circulation allows any one of them access to toilets and other required common spaces. Possible conflicts with private or restricted events in the main lobby can be addressed by establishing time slots in which events can be scheduled outside of the regular exhibit and office hours. There may be occasions where museum patrons will need to access toilets, for instance, through the outside entrance to the restaurant, rather than through the lobby. Office tenants and visitors would have access to the new toilet to be constructed at the second floor as part of the elevator/stair addition. This addition also allows for access from the exterior without passing through the first floor lobby.

GOVERNANCE, FUNDING, AND THE OPERATIONAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF LAS CRUCES AND THE AMADOR MUSEUM FOUNDATION

The management and operations of the new Amador building are based on information available at this time to the Kells + Craig project team. However, as further planning of the project is considered, operations listed below will need to be refined and budgets confirmed. Based on the current agreement (City of Las Cruces Resolution # 07-326,) between the city and the foundation, the consultants are suggesting two options under which the Amador building might operate under a public/private partnership.

1) The 2007 agreement between the city and the foundation continues as originally written, and the foundation remains responsible for the rehabilitation of the Amador Hotel and planning and implementation of an exhibition on the history of The Amador. The Amador Museum staff is employed by the city, as is the Amador Event Center staff. A separate lease agreement is contracted with a café/restaurant operator/developer. The city is responsible for all leases, including second floor offices, and remains the fiscal agent for the foundation.

Ongoing Foundation expenses would include a percentage of operating expenses for the museum facility, gift shop merchandise, additional fund raising and marketing activities, and the gift shop manager salary.

Foundation sources of revenue for ongoing operations would include museum donations, membership fees, and gift shop sales.

2) The 2007 agreement is revised and assigns both the city and the foundation equal responsibility for the rehabilitation of the Amador, with the foundation taking the lead as fundraiser, since, as a 501(c)3 entity, it can apply for federal funds beyond that of the city. The Amador Museum staff is employed by the foundation, and the city and foundation come to an agreement on Event Center management. A lease agreement is contracted with a café/restaurant operator/developer, agreed to by the city and the foundation. The city is responsible for all leases, including second floor offices, and remains the fiscal agent for the foundation. The city and foundation agree to specific rules and regulations for lessees.

Ongoing foundation expenses would include a percentage of operating expenses for the museum facility, gift shop merchandise, additional fund raising and marketing activities, and site manager and gift shop manager salaries.
**Foundations sources of revenue** for ongoing operations would include a percentage of lease income, museum donations, membership fees, and gift shop sales.

Actual annual income for the city will be determined by the level of rent per square foot charged to the restaurant and to those renting office space. Other sources of income will be determined by the cost of event space rental. It is assumed that admission to the museum is free. Annual expenses to the city should be offset by revenue from the leases.

At the October board meeting of the foundation, members recommended the foundation and city pursue Option 2.

**Ongoing Sources of Funding**

It is rare for museums to be self-sustaining through earned revenue. While detailed budgets are not available for the profiled facilities, generally non-earned and contributed revenues comprise up to 50% percent of total revenue. The museums profiled are funded through a number of key sources, including earned revenues such as admission, gift shop sales, and memberships. Unearned revenue sources include contributions from individuals, foundations, and companies.

**Budget**

Budget expenditures are a function of the size of the facility, number of employees, exhibits and programs offered, and level of funding. Typically, personnel costs are the highest expense category, often comprising more than 60 percent of operating costs. Since the museums profiled are fully operating museums, their operating budgets were not researched. Once the exhibition is complete and installed, costs for operating the exhibition will involve maintenance, periodic exhibition updating, and maintenance of the media and interactivity devices.

**Employment**

Employment is a function of museum size, programs, exhibits, marketing efforts, and auxiliary activities. Museums with static exhibits usually have fewer employees. Those with public programming and interpretive focus employ more staff. The consultants expect that the museum will require a site manager and a gift shop manager full-time, and an exhibit technician and a volunteer coordinator part-time.

As mentioned above, personnel salaries and benefits are usually the most expensive budget item. Museums have had much success minimizing personnel costs by relying on volunteers, where appropriate. Small museums are particularly dependent on a strong core of volunteers for the help they provide staffing the information desk, programming activities, operations, gift shop, and, in some cases, maintenance. The money saved through the help of volunteers can be a determining factor in the financial health of a museum. The final scope of the exhibition and of programming will help determine the personnel positions and the number of volunteers needed to run a successful museum.

**Capital Investment**

Launching the museum with adequate capital investment is necessary to it becoming a visitor destination. Proper capital investment includes not only construction and exhibit costs, but also funds for organization development, opening marketing and operating, and operating reserve funds.
# Attendance at New Mexico History Museums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Admission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alamogordo</td>
<td>35,234</td>
<td>Alamogordo History Museum</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Mexico Museum of Space History</td>
<td>106,864</td>
<td>Paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>505,578</td>
<td>Albuquerque Museum</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>Paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM Museum of Natural History &amp; Science</td>
<td>246,974</td>
<td>Paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deming</td>
<td>14,116</td>
<td>Luna Mimbres Museum</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>Paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Cruces</td>
<td>91,294</td>
<td>NM Farm &amp; Ranch Heritage Museum</td>
<td>30,000 est.</td>
<td>Paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Branigan Cultural Center</td>
<td>79,000 est.</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamos</td>
<td>11,090</td>
<td>Los Alamos Historical Museum</td>
<td>34,700</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bradbury Science Museum</td>
<td>89,327</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roswell</td>
<td>46,280</td>
<td>Roswell Museum and Art Center</td>
<td>31,299</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truth or Consequences</td>
<td>7,289</td>
<td>Geronimo Springs Museum</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>Paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
<td>65,163</td>
<td>New Mexico History Museum</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>Paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Museum of International Folk Art</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>Paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver City</td>
<td>10,545</td>
<td>Silver City Museum</td>
<td>15,987</td>
<td>Paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso, Texas</td>
<td>592,627</td>
<td>El Paso Museum of History</td>
<td>36,500</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>El Paso Museum of Art</td>
<td>100,000 est.</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PROJECTED MUSEUM OPERATIONS**

This section provides an analysis of operating factors and economic potential of The Amador. Operating assumptions listed here are based on the market potential identified for the project and research on operations and development that would be associated with the museum at The Amador. Operating assumptions for management of the event center and the restaurant are beyond the scope of work contracted under this study and will need further evaluation by a consultant with expertise in event management and restaurant operations. This analysis will require refinement as the project moves forward and ownership, corporate partnerships, and facility amenities are determined.

**OPERATING AND REVENUE ASSUMPTIONS**

Operating assumptions for The Amador Museum used in this analysis are typical for small museums nationally.

a. The consultant’s are working under the assumption that Resolution No. 07-326 remains intact and the Amador Museum Foundation is responsible for “providing funding for the restoration and repair of all Amador property features, expansions, and renovations . . . “ and the “city will administer operations . . . and be responsible for operating expenses, routine maintenance” utilities and minor operations.

b. The proposed square footage of the galleries, gift shop, and museum office space is approximately 4,000 sq. ft.

c. The museum is expected to develop an excellent reputation with a strong staff and/or volunteer organization, and have a broad base of community support.

d. The museum will develop and implement an aggressive marketing program to achieve and maintain attendance and continually attract new visitors. The museum will be free, similar to other city museums.

e. There will be marked directions from local roads to The Amador and parking will be available for visitors.

f. The museum’s infrastructure—exhibits, mechanical equipment and support systems—will be well maintained to minimize insurance risks and unexpected repair and maintenance expenditures. The exhibits will receive ongoing maintenance to ensure excellent condition. Maintained exhibits are essential to customer satisfaction and repeat local visitation.

g. At this time it is unknown as to the days and hours when the museum will be open to the public.

h. The museum will be part of a multi-use facility. Traffic patterns and operating procedures that allow access to the museum during daytime events has yet to be resolved.

**FINANCIAL PRO FORMA**

This section of the report assesses the financial feasibility of the museum, and provides information for the development and planning process. As project planning moves forward, project timing, operations and financial projections will need to be refined. The financial pro forma analysis is based on 2008 prices. Current economic conditions, actual revenues and expenses for 2012 would more than likely increase, and are not projected in this analysis.

**OPERATING REVENUES**

A financial plan needs to be developed to ensure fiscal stability for the museum. It is assumed that the museum foundation will derive its earned revenues mainly from memberships, gift shop sales, and facility use. It will continue to seek community support and contributions. The museum will be free to visitors, similar to the other museums operated by the City of Las Cruces.

Following is a review of the revenue potential of the museum. projections are based on
the museum being open to the public from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m., 300 days a year, with an average weekly attendance of 300 visitors or 15,600 annually. The consultants also allowed for potentially higher visitation during the peak travel seasons bringing annual visitation to 20,800.

MEMBERSHIPS
Memberships can be an important revenue source, specifically if there is an admissions charge. The Amador Museum Foundation should consider memberships and determine a few choice benefits for membership. One suggestion would be to offer one free Event Center rental annually for a high-end membership. It is suggested that 1% to 2% of the museum’s attendance will be members in the first year. Based on an annual attendance of 15,600 visitors, it is estimated there will be a minimum of 90 individual memberships at $35 per membership, and 60 family memberships at $45 per membership. In addition, the foundation is encouraged to offer business memberships at a minimum of $500 annually. The actual number of memberships will depend on membership development efforts and the community’s response. The following membership revenue table is based on an average and an optimal number of memberships for a history museum in a city the size of Las Cruces:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Est. Number of Memberships</th>
<th>Average Membership Fee</th>
<th>Membership Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vis-à-vis attendance of 15,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% or 150</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$3,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% or 300</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associations &amp; Business (15)</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Memberships/Income</td>
<td></td>
<td>165 / $13,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>315 / $19,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RETAIL REVENUES
Retail/gift shop sales are an important revenue source of major visitor attractions and museums. Based on Museum Store Association research, visitor spending at a 400 sq.ft. gift shop is estimated to be $2.50 per visitor. Depending on the types of merchandise for sale, the amount of mark up, and using the number of 15,600 visitors annually, the museum could realize up to $39,000 in gross sales. See the Summary Pro Forma Assumptions Table for a breakdown of revenue options.

FACILITY RENTALS & SPECIAL EVENTS
Management of the Event Center and allocation of rental fees is yet to be determined. To better understand the potential income from renting event space at The Amador, the consultants suggest a partnership be developed with an event management company and that the foundation receive a percentage of all rental fees. A full facility-use pricing fee would need to be established. See the Summary Pro Forma Assumptions Table for initial rental fee suggestions.

CONTRIBUTED REVENUE
In addition to earned revenues, most museums require contributed revenues. Nationwide, virtually all not-for-profit museums receive a substantial share of total operating revenues from contributed sources. The amount of revenues museums receive can vary widely based on their particular circumstances and the aggres-
siveness of the organization. These can include grants from foundations and government for outreach, educational programs, exhibitions, and other museum activities.

Private philanthropic funding is often given for special projects and educational programming. Sometimes “gifts-in-kind” provide essential operating input for an organization. Occasionally, the Friends organizations will sponsor specific staff salaries such as positions in education or marketing. City and county museums receive free building maintenance and repairs, ground maintenance, utilities, property insurance, etc. In the case of The Amador, it is assumed that the city will provide maintenance services and utilities.

### SUMMARY PRO FORMA REVENUE ASSUMPTIONS
(Does not include Restaurant / Bar)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Based on Number of Visitors</th>
<th>Average Annual Income</th>
<th>Optimal Annual Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assumption: Museum open to public 300 days/year</td>
<td>No admission fee</td>
<td>No admission fee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gift Shop income based on attendance and square footage</th>
<th>400 sq. ft.</th>
<th>400 sq. ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Retail Sales $2.50/per capita</td>
<td>$39,000</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic Hotel Lobby $800/3hr</td>
<td>36/yr = $28,800</td>
<td>54/yr = $43,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Rooms $100/hr</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average $400/week/40 weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership: Individual and Family</th>
<th>1% of attendance</th>
<th>2% of attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Membership Income</td>
<td>$5,850</td>
<td>$11,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Memberships</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Business Member Income</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office Leases</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Offices @ $500/mo</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Offices @ $500/mo</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Average Gross Revenue based on attendance and square footage | $127,150 | $190,400 |
OPERATING PROFILE
It is assumed that The Amador Museum will to be owned by the City of Las Cruces. The museum will require from one to two full time paid staff members, two part time paid staff, and several volunteers depending on the size of the facility and the public programming available to the community. The Site Manager would oversee operations and maintain the fiscal health of the organization. See Personnel Positions and Salaries table for a complete list of potential personnel.

When final decisions are made as to the size and operations of the facility, expenses should reflect a tightly managed project with a “bottom line” orientation. Expenses should be compared to other local museum operations. However, for the purpose of this report, expenses should be regarded as a guide for planning only and a means of testing the reasonableness of the museum’s operating plan.

PERSONNEL EXPENSES
The following table estimates the staffing requirements for The museum based on facility size and attendance potential. The personnel salaries listed are comparable to museum-level salaries published by the Mountain-Plains Museum Association. Benefits, payroll taxes, health insurance, other insurance, disability and retirement plans are summarized as 28% of employee salaries. It should be noted that these are not recommended salary levels, but rather, they are representative of industry standards.

The personnel positions listed below assume that custodial services, building and ground maintenance, and security will be provided by the City of Las Cruces; general marketing, marketing to the leisure travel market, and to the motor coach industry will be provided by the Las Cruces Convention and Visitors Bureau and Downtown Las Cruces.

NON-PERSONNEL OPERATING EXPENSES
The following items need to be considered as the museum moves forward. These items have not been budgeted due to the uncertainty of the commitment and involvement of the City of Las Cruces and the Las Cruces Convention and Visitors Bureau.

Administration
Professional and outside services include consulting fees, tax preparation and auditing, legal fees, and temporary office services. Office supplies, custodial and building maintenance supplies, tele-

---

**SUGGESTED PERSONNEL POSITIONS AND SALARIES (museum only)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions Based on 4,000 Sq. Ft. Facility</th>
<th>Level of Employment</th>
<th>Annual Salaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Manager/Development and Communications Director</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum Store Manager/Bookkeeper</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Coordinator/Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>PTE</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit Technician</td>
<td>PTE</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptionists/Museum Store Assistants/Cashiers</td>
<td>10-14 Volunteers</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefits (28%) of Salaries</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Salaries and Benefits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$155,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
phone, postage and shipping, equipment rental, travel, dues and subscriptions, insurance, and other costs will need to be estimated.

**Gift Shop**
A gift shop is assumed to be set-up and operated by The Amador Museum Foundation and include diverse merchandise reflecting the visitor’s experiences. Shop operating supplies, utilities and other administrative expenses should be included within the overall museum operating cost line items. Cost of goods sold is assumed at 52 percent of retail sales, based on typical industry results.

**Marketing**
Depending on who is responsible for marketing the museum, advertising, printing and publications will include the design, production and distribution expenses for advertising and other printed matter including office stationary and letterhead, press release packages, educational kits, tour guides and others. When estimating advertising, printing and publication, costs should be measured based on projected annual total attendance.

**Utilities and insurance**
It is assumed that the City of Las Cruces will cover the utilities, insurance costs, and the materials and supplies for building and ground maintenance needed to run The Amador. Ideally, utilities for the restaurant would be metered separately and billed directly to the operator, but this may not be feasible given the shared support spaces. Utility costs were based on a range of $1.55–$2.10 /sf /yr for the museum, events spaces, and offices and $3.56 /sf /yr for the restaurant.

**CAPITAL RESERVES**
A capital reserves fund should be in place to cover major non-recurring expenses for mechanical, electrical and plumbing repairs and maintenance contracts. These costs are expected to be less during the early years of operation due to new construction and extended warranty periods. Capital reserves may also contribute to future changing exhibits and minor building improvements. This reserve can also double as an operating expense contingency fund in emergencies. Contributions to this fund are usually made from surplus net operating income, but can also be funded through other sources including private and corporate sponsorship of new exhibits and programs.

**SUMMARY PRO FORMA EXPENSE ASSUMPTIONS**
(Includes Restaurant / Bar)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space</th>
<th>Net Floor Area</th>
<th>Utility Costs</th>
<th>Janitorial</th>
<th>Annual Maintenance</th>
<th>Annual Building Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event Space</td>
<td>6,289</td>
<td>$11,703</td>
<td>$5,072</td>
<td>$20,729.91</td>
<td>$37,504.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>$2,758</td>
<td>$968</td>
<td>$4,829.54</td>
<td>$8,554.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gift Shop</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>$868</td>
<td>$335</td>
<td>$1,294.57</td>
<td>$2,497.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Support</td>
<td>1,203</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Circulation</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant/Bar</td>
<td>5,567</td>
<td>$18,663</td>
<td>$4,489</td>
<td>$15,532.09</td>
<td>$38,684.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>2,925</td>
<td>$5,844</td>
<td>$2,359</td>
<td>$9,681.40</td>
<td>$17,884.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,364</strong></td>
<td><strong>$39,836</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14,809</strong></td>
<td><strong>$52,067.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>$106,712.95</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total area less shared area</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,396</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Pro-rated cost included in other categories
FUNDING THE PROJECT

Based on the public’s recommendation that the future Amador be home to a museum, an event space, a restaurant and gift shop, the consultants researched public and private funding in three categories:

a. Historic preservation for the renovation of the Amador building.
b. Community development.
c. Planning and implementation of a museum quality history exhibition.

Public and private sources of revenue were reviewed for support of ongoing operation and maintenance of the Amador Museum, the Amador Museum Foundation gift shop, and the Amador Event Center. Government granting agencies, private and corporate foundations, government loans, tax credits, and other financial resources were researched for funding opportunities, as were New Mexico foundations supportive of historic preservation, community development, and museum projects. Individuals representing federal, state and city government interests in preservation and rehabilitation of historic properties, community development, and museum projects were contacted.

Based on this research, the consultants concluded that renovation of the Amador Hotel into a small museum, event center, restaurant, and offices for non-profit groups would require development and implementation of a comprehensive financial plan and funding from a variety of sources. The financial plan for the new Amador would include strategies for the following:

a. Creation and implementation of a capital campaign similar to one for a major non-profit institution.
b. Funding through federal, state and local grants, tax incentives, and loans.
c. Funding from the private sector including foundations, corporations, and individuals.
d. Sound business investment opportunities for potential developers.
e. On-going revenue-generating income.
f. On-going communication with local, state and federal legislators, community leaders, foundation and corporate donors, and the media to raise the project’s public profile.
g. Development of a Friends of the Amador organization whose purpose will be to help sustain and expand the foundation’s financial and volunteer support of the museum.

The financial plan would call for city and foundation efforts to secure funding directly from the state legislature, which the city has indicated would need to be part of the annual city ICIP request. The foundation would pursue grants in which the city is not eligible. The foundation and a specially created fund raising committee would solicit private funds. A professional fund raising consultant would manage the overall funding campaign.

A position statement would be developed to demonstrate how the renovation of The Amador strengthens the activities of downtown redevelopment and creates a new destination for tourists to and residents of Las Cruces and Doña Ana County. The plan would include a detailed timetable, target amount of funding sought from government appropriations, grants, tax credits, business investments, and individual donations. The plan would include a donor recognition program to publicly thank contributors.

It should be noted that a substantial portion of public funding for the Metropolitan Redevelopment Area Plan and the MainStreet initiative has been the result of the efforts of city council, local senators and representatives working on behalf of the projects. The Amador project needs the same kind of energetic and enthusiastic government support.

A list of potential federal and state sources for capital support, and foundation, corporate, and individual support for the museum exhibition and programming follows.
SOURCES OF FUNDING: HISTORIC PRESERVATION
CITY OF LAS CRUCES, STATE OF NEW MEXICO

1. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM (CIP)

Purpose
The City of Las Cruces Capital Improvements Program (CIP) is meant to help enhance the physical and cultural development of the city in implementing the Las Cruces Comprehensive Plan. Through a multi-year schedule of public physical improvements including utilities, public works, facilities and parks, CIP administrators approve capital expenditures for acquiring, constructing, upgrading, and rehabilitating the city’s built environment.

Funding the Amador Project
City appropriation for the Amador project could be part of the CIP Facilities program in which the museum is a general listing funded at $800,000 in FY10. Any funding for the Amador would need to be prioritized against the museum of Nature and Science, Brangan Cultural Center, and the Museum of Art, each of which requests capital maintenance funding annually. While CIP monies have been approved for other Las Cruces projects up to the year 2012, it is important that the city consider including the Amador project in the next set of funding considerations.

2. METROPOLITAN REDEVELOPMENT PLAN (MRA)

Purpose
The Metropolitan Redevelopment Plan provides tax incentives to encourage redevelopment through the use of public taxation tools. These tools often take the form of tax credits or tax deferrals. By crediting or deferring taxes to be paid on property, income, or sales, governments create incentives for businesses to act on redevelopment opportunities. MRA projects can include land acquisition, demolition, zoning, traffic controls, recreational and community facilities, housing, commercial and industrial facilities, and public transportation.

The authority afforded a city under the Metropolitan Redevelopment Code is wide-reaching, but mainly consist of the ability to use city-owned property or acquire property by purchase, renovation or replacement, which is then leased or sold as new or remodeled property to a qualified developer in response to a request for proposals issued by the city. The city may issue tax-exempt revenue bonds and/or may employ tax increment financing to help fund the redevelopment project.

Funding the Amador Project
The Amador lies within the southern boundaries of the Metropolitan Redevelopment Area at South Water St. and West Amador Ave. and is eligible for MRA funds and tax credits or tax deferrals. Among the tools available to the Amador project and that have been initiated by the Las Cruces Metropolitan Redevelopment Area plan are:

- Public/private partnerships
- Revision of zoning regulations
- Improved services and infrastructure
- Business Improvement District (BID)
- Arts and Entertainment District
- Funding and financial incentives
- Tax Increment Financing (TIF)
- Revenue bond financing
- State/Federal funding opportunities

3. TAX INCREMENT FINANCING (TIF)

Purpose
Tax Increment Financing is created through local government tax assessments. The incremental difference in tax is used to finance built environment improvements within a particular district. New Mexico’s tax increment financing is enabled through the Metropolitan Redevelopment Code, Enterprise Zone Act, and the Urban Development Law. The City of Las Cruces uses its TIF funds specifically to fund public infrastructure and parking facilities.
Funding the Amador Project
As mentioned previously, the Amador project will require a variety of funding sources and the city's TIF funds should be considered one of these sources when it comes to parking facilities.

4. NEW MEXICO MAINSTREET PROGRAM

Purpose
The New Mexico MainStreet Program is affiliated with the National Trust Main Street Center, a division of the National Trust for Historic Preservation. In New Mexico, it is a program of the state's Economic Development Department. New Mexico MainStreet works with affiliated downtown organizations to create economically viable business environments, while preserving local and cultural resources. Currently, New Mexico MainStreet is supporting the development of the La Placita Plan—the conversion of a downtown alleyway into an attractive and vibrant outdoor pavilion-style space featuring gardenscapes, public art and spaces for relaxation. Support for La Placita is part of a MainStreet Special Appropriations Funds for FY 2009.

Funding the Amador Project
The rehabilitation of the Amador will help strengthen and improve Downtown Las Cruces and the new economic assets that are developing and coming online every month as part of the city's Metropolitan Redevelopment Area Plan. Tying the preservation and renovation of the Amador Hotel to the city's plan and New Mexico’s MainStreet program is critical. The city may want to consider MainStreet funds for the Amador Hotel project similar to the funds appropriated for the historic Clovis Hotel, in Clovis, NM, which received $300,000 in 2009. MainStreet funds for the Amador project, added to other state and federal funding, can be vital to the ongoing revitalization efforts of Downtown Las Cruces, its partnerships, population growth, and business recruitment.

5. PUBLIC/PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP

Purpose
The Amador Hotel project offers a number of opportunities for partnerships between various entities beyond the city and Amador Museum Foundation including management of the Amador Event Center, restaurateurs, students and faculty of New Mexico State University, and members of the non-profit community. Partnerships have the highest potential for redevelopment opportunities and the city can provide incentives through public financing such as the New Mexico Community Development Loan Fund, Small Business Administration, and other agencies.

Sources of Funding:

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

6. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANTS (CDBG)
www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/communitydevelopment/programs/entitlement/index.cfm

Purpose
Community Development Block Grants help communities carry out a wide range of community development activities directed toward revitalizing neighborhoods, economic development, and providing improved community facilities and services. They can be used for funding historic preservation, renovation of public facilities, economic development incentives, and development of micro enterprises. Among the projects eligible for funding are: acquisition of real property, rehabilitation of residential and non-residential structures, construction of public facilities and improvements, assistance to businesses to carry out economic development; and job creation/retention activities.
Funding the Amador Project
Las Cruces is an entitlement city and is eligible for CDBG funds. However, while a portion of Las Cruces funds are available for building improvements the amount is relatively small and generally limited to accessibility improvements. Packaging CDBG funds with preservation monies could be a viable opportunity for the Amador project.

Note: Section 108, the loan guarantee provision of the CDBG program, allows communities to transform a small portion of their CDBG funds into federally guaranteed loans. This provides a source of financing for activities such as: property acquisition, rehabilitation of publicly owned property, housing rehabilitation, economic development activities, and acquisition, construction, reconstruction, or installation of public facilities.

7. PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE (EDA)
www.eda.gov/AboutEDA/Programs.xml

Purpose
Public Works and Economic Development Assistance programs help communities revitalize, expand, and upgrade their physical infrastructure to attract new industry, encourage business expansion, diversify local economies, and support the generation or retention of jobs and investments. The rehabilitation of historic buildings is an eligible activity.

Funding the Amador Project
The city has used various EDA grants for development of the Industrial Park and is in good standing with EDA. The city has no current grants in progress and EDA should be looked at as a potential source of funding for rehabilitating the Amador.

8. COMMUNITY RENEWAL INITIATIVE & URBAN EMPOWERMENT ZONES
www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/economicdevelopment/programs/rc/index.cfm

Purpose
Community Renewal Initiative and Urban Empowerment Zones assist designated communities in realizing their revitalization strategies. The Initiative helps spur private investment in communities that have experienced economic decline by providing tax incentives, grants, loans, and technical assistance. The program provides performance-oriented, flexible Federal grant funding so communities can design local solutions that empower residents to participate in the revitalization of their neighborhoods.

Funding the Amador Project
The city’s Local Economic Development Act (LCEDA) mirrors that of the state and allows for incentives to be provided to “a business that is the developer of a metropolitan redevelopment project.” Applications for a LCEDA grants go to the state with the city as the pass-through entity.

9. TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT FUNDING
www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/te/index.htm

Purpose
Transportation Enhancement Funding is available to states through the Federal Highway Administration. In New Mexico it is available through the NMDOT Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21), and is a source of funding for the purchase of easements on historic properties, rehabilitation of historic buildings, landscaping in historic areas, archeological planning and research, and scenic or historic highway programs.

Funding the Amador Project
According to the Federal Financial Assistance for Historic Preservation website, Transportation Assistance Funding for historical and archeological projects makes transportation enhancement funding one of the largest pools of federal money for historic preservation. TEA-21 could be a perfect opportunity for the Amador, especially since it carries the designation as one of New Mexico’s Most Endangered Buildings.
**TAX CREDITS: HISTORIC PRESERVATION**

Tax credit equity investment can be an extremely valuable part of a historic rehabilitation financing plan. It helps fundraising by leveraging additional revenue for the project.

10. NATIONAL TRUST COMMUNITY INVESTMENT CORPORATION (NTCIC)

www.ntcicfunds.com/funds/ntcif.html

**Purpose**

The National Trust Community Investment Corporation is the for-profit subsidiary of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and the leading source of federal and state Rehabilitation Tax Credit and New Markets Tax Credit. NTCIC's guiding principle is that the rehabilitation of historic properties can stimulate economic development and protect a community’s unique sense of place. By providing equity to the rehabilitation of landmark commercial properties, NTCIC helps revitalize downtowns and business districts nationwide.

11. NEW MARKETS TAX CREDITS (NMTC)

www.ntcicfunds.com/funds/ntcif.html

**Purpose**

The New Markets Tax Credit (NMTC) is a 39 percent credit on an equity investment to a Community Development Entity (CDE), and is claimed over a 7-year compliance period (5 percent over the first 3 years and 6 percent over the last 4 years). The CDE must then make a Qualified Equity Investment or loan to a Qualified Business in a Qualified Low-Income Community (LICs). Most commercial and mixed-use real estate development projects located in LICs are Qualified Businesses.

Unlike the federal Rehabilitation Tax Credits, the annual dollar volume of New Markets Tax Credits allocated by the U.S. government is capped. That means that CDIs must compete against each other to receive an allocation of New Markets Credits during each annual funding round. Once a CDE wins an allocation, it partners with an investor who is attracted by the tax benefits offered by the New Markets Tax Credit. In order to claim the credit, the investor must make an equity investment in a CDE.

**SOURCES OF FUNDING: EXHIBITION PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION**

**FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS**

Historic properties, particularly the historic built environment, can benefit from federal funding programs that support projects in the arts, humanities, and museum development. Las Cruces is not a Certified Local Government for historic preservation funding and thus not eligible for most funding through the National Parks Service. The Amador Museum Foundation, being a 501 c 3 organization, is eligible for historic preservation funds and could apply for the following grants.

12. SAVE AMERICA’S TREASURES

www.nps.gov/history/hps/treasures

**Purpose**

Since its creation in 1999, Save America’s Treasures program has provided $265 million for preservation of historic properties and cultural artifacts. Historic properties receiving funds must be nationally significant and be threatened, endangered, or otherwise demonstrate an urgent preservation need. The Amador Hotel is listed on the New Mexico Heritage Preservation Alliance 2007 Most Endangered List, and can demonstrate a need.

Funded by the Federal Historic Preservation Fund and administered by the National Park Service (NPS) in partnership with the National Endowment for the Arts, SAT grants require a dollar-for-dollar non-Federal match. The maximum grant is $1 million and the minimum is $250,000 for historic property projects, and $50,000 for cultural artifact projects. In FY 2008, the program was funded at $25 million.
There are 35 sites, including 20 cities, in New Mexico that have benefited from Save America’s Treasures grants for local preservation efforts. These sites have attracted gifts from corporations, foundations, and individuals to support community projects. Grantees must match the federal award with private funding, which is helped by an Official Project designation from Save America’s Treasures. SAT at the National Trust provides designees guidance on obtaining funds through Congressional earmarks when available. Traditionally, half of the Save America’s Treasures funds have typically been awarded through Congressional appropriations. One recent New Mexico success story is the Murray Hotel in Silver City.

**13. WE THE PEOPLE: INTERPRETING AMERICA’S HISTORIC PLACES**

www.neh.gov/grants/guidelines/IAHP_Planning.html

**Purpose**

We The People: Interpreting America’s Historic Places, a grant of the National Endowment for the Humanities helps organizations interpret a single historic site or house, a series of sites, an entire neighborhood, a town or community, or a larger geographical region. They are designed to help institutions and organizations secure long-term improvements in and support for humanities activities focused on exploring significant themes and events in American history. Grants can be used to support construction and renovation, acquisition of materials and equipment.

**Funding the Amador Project**

NEH offers two categories of grants for Interpreting America’s Historic Places—Planning and Implementation Grants. The grants can provide support for the Amador Museum Foundation, working in partnership with NMSU, representatives from different neighborhoods, and other interest groups, in planning and implementing an exhibition on the history of the Amador Hotel and the Amador and Campbell families.

**14. PRESERVATION GRANTS FOR STABILIZING HUMANITIES COLLECTIONS**

www.neh.gov/grants/guidelines/stabilization.html

**Purpose**

These grants help museums, libraries, archives, and historical organizations preserve their humanities collections through support for improved housing and storage, environmental conditions, security, lighting, and fire protection. Renovation costs required to rehouse and install climate control, security, lighting, and fire protection systems are eligible. These grants cannot be used for capital improvements of buildings or structures.

**Funding the Amador Project**

There will be need for artifacts for the Amador exhibition and this grant will provide needed funds for the stabilization and care of collections.

**15. MCCUNE CHARITABLE FOUNDATION**

www.nmmccune.org

**Purpose**

The mission of the McCune Foundation is to memorialize the benefactors through grants that enrich the cultural life, health, education, environment, and spiritual life of the citizens of New Mexico. The foundation supports philanthropic programs that are responsive, flexible, and may be proven effective at aiding the people of New Mexico to reach their full human and spiritual potential. Primary areas of interest include the arts, education, youth, health, social services and environment.

**Funding the Amador Project**

The McCune Foundation funds projects in community development, education, historic preservation/historical societies, and museums. Foundation support includes annual campaigns, building and renovation, program development and technical assistance.
Phasing & Follow-Up Tasks
PHASING & FOLLOW-UP TASKS

ONGOING USE OF THE AMADOR

The intent of this study is to identify how The Amador can be reused and how preservation of the building can be a part of that reuse. The assessment undertaken by Cornerstones Community Partnerships was beneficial as a first step in understanding the construction and condition of the historic structure, but was by nature limited in scope. Likewise, the current study is limited since it does not include undertaking any additional demolition work. Conclusions about required structural repairs and upgrades for building code compliance, as well as for renovations required to restore both existing and lost historic elements, are based on selective demolition from the Cornerstones study and by what can be viewed above lay-in ceilings and behind other non-contributing finishes without requiring further demolition.

The implementation of the plan is dependent upon developing a more detailed understanding of the building’s structure and condition. This cannot be accomplished without more widespread selective removal of non-historic elements. At the same time, there is a strong desire by the Amador Museum Foundation to start using the building—even in a limited way—so that public awareness of the Amador project can be raised, which will help in both the funding and in generating community support which will be essential to move the project forward. It may also be in the City of Las Cruces’ interest to have the building used and to draw upon the resources of the foundation’s volunteers for management and upkeep to prevent the building from becoming a liability. However, the city will need to determine safe interim uses for the building based on a more detailed structural analysis, once more of the structure can be viewed. In addition, meshing the desire to keep using the building while selective demolition is in progress—before any significant funds are available for a full restoration—will be challenging. The proposed implementation steps described in this section are based on keeping the building open for public use, in at least a limited way, for as long as possible prior to the point at which sufficient funds are available for a full renovation and, ultimately, expansion for the proposed restaurant component. This use will be contingent on the city determining that any use is safe. One of the possibilities in this interim period would be to use the building as a teaching tool about historic construction methods. It would be similar to an archaeological “dig” that is open to the public. Suitable safety measures should be put in place to protect users from injury, while allowing them to view the exploratory work as it proceeds. Opportunities exist for graphic displays that explain historic construction and show the building in historic photographs. If the building is to be used for other interim uses, potential conflicts between these uses and the ongoing exploratory work will need to be resolved.

There are a few cautionary factors to be borne in mind for any interim use of the building:

- Until a major renovation is planned, life safety and building use are primarily the jurisdiction of the Las Cruces Fire Department, unless an unsafe structural condition is identified. It is strongly recommended that members of the foundation and city staff meet with the fire department to review interim use plans and to establish an on-going dialog so that the fire department can be confident that there will not be unacceptable life safety conditions, while allowing the foundation reasonable use of the building.

- The city and the foundation should establish interim operating procedures that will limit possible liability claims against the city and the foundation. While this can be done to a degree by the foundation providing the city with insurance for the foundation’s operations, no one wants to endanger the community or risk losing possible community support as a result.

- The foundation has requested that the study team provide safe loading capacities for the existing second floor structure. The building is currently classified as a “B” or business occupancy. Design loading requirements from the 2006 IBC for offices and corridors above the first floor
(such as the balconies) are listed on page 1.30 of this report. The code does not require structural upgrades if the building does not undergo a change of occupancy and if it met the code at the time it was built (and is not identified to be dangerous). There was likely no code in force at the time of the construction of the original building, but the project was presumably permitted by the building code authority under the code in force at the time it was converted from a hotel to a bank—a lower hazard occupancy—in the late 1960s and early 1970s. It must be assumed, therefore, that it met the code at that time. The study team’s structural engineer did not identify dangerous conditions, based on what can be viewed. He did identify some settlement of the balconies and deformations in the west exterior wall, but neither of these conditions appear to be recent or progressive.

However, a complete assessment of conditions defined by the code to be dangerous cannot be made without further study once structural members and their bearing conditions are revealed. While portions of the structure of the balcony and the second floor can be seen above dropped ceilings, the entirety cannot, and the bearing conditions of the wood framing on the adobe are only partially exposed to view. Furthermore, the structural condition of the adobe bearing walls cannot be fully understood without the removal of the exterior stucco and interior plaster at interior adobe bearing walls. Additional exploratory excavation is also required at the base of bearing walls to confirm the Cornerstones finding that there appear to be no foundations.

Pending a more detailed structural investigation, the study team recommends that the second floor not be used except for viewing by limited numbers of people under supervision and for on-going exploratory work of existing conditions. Under no circumstances should the second floor be used for assembly purposes. This is not only due to the potential structural overloading but also the life safety threat posed by the story only having one exit (down the main stairway). Likewise, the loading on the first floor should be limited until the full bearing conditions supporting it are revealed. The calculated live load bearing capacity for the size and spacing of the floor joists observed (under the portion of floor removed at the southwest corner room) is less than 40 pounds per square foot, which is less than live load capacities required for offices (50 psf) and assembly uses (100 psf). This assumes that they span the width of the room without intermediate supports. Further investigation may reveal that there are more intermediate support, which would increase their bearing capacity.

**FOLLOW-UP TASKS AND PLAN IMPLEMENTATION**

The following suggests phasing options for implementation of the reuse plan. These phases may need to be revised or split further based upon the findings of further investigative work and/or the availability of funding. The first phase specifically could be split into a number of separate tasks as funding is available.

The costs are “order-of-magnitude amounts” for planning purposes.

**Phase 1—Follow-up investigation and analysis**

1) Engage an environmental engineer/hazardous materials testing agency to conduct Phase 1 and Phase 2 environmental site assessments including identification of asbestos-containing materials and lead paint in the building. Work should be done in collaboration with the architect so that significant locations to investigate are highlighted, based on likely renovation work.

   Cost: $7,500

2) Engage a geotechnical engineer to provide soils tests to permit the structural engineer to determine the seismic design category for reinforcements to the existing structure and to determine structural requirements for the restaurant addition. The engineer is to work with the A/E team to review appropriate boring locations and quantities based on the proposed development.

   Cost: $2,000
3) Engage a professional surveyor to prepare a site topographic survey and to identify/locate existing easements. The surveyor should also undertake surveying within the building, record floor levels at each exit door related to exterior grades and also provide levels at all changes in level at the interior of the building so that all existing floor levels and transitions can be evaluated for accessibility, relationship to exterior entries, and required accessibility upgrades.

Cost: $6,000

4) Engage an architectural/engineering team for the following:

a. Work with the contractor (see below) to identify locations and materials to be selectively demolished.

b. After reviewing the results of selective demolition, undertake detailed structural code analysis and load path analysis for seismic, wind, dead- and live-loading for current and anticipated uses including a determination of current safe loading of the existing building for interim use. The work is to be conducted by a registered structural engineer.

c. Meet with the building code official to review initial structural findings and requirements of the New Mexico Existing Building Code and confirm requirements for the preservation report required by Section 1101.2.

d. Undertake a detailed code analysis for the proposed events center, museum, and restaurant and write a draft preservation report. Meet with the building code official to review the preservation report and discuss options for code compliance. The work is to be performed by a registered architect in conjunction with a structural engineer.

e. Undertake site drainage analysis and propose design solutions to improve drainage at the west side of the building to be accomplished as part of the first phase of construction.

The work is to be performed by a registered professional civil engineer in coordination with the architect and with approval of the City of Las Cruces Public Works Department. This may require preparation of a master site drainage plan to accommodate the future fully built-out development of the project.

a. Develop solutions for structural up-grades required for the proposed development plan, change of occupancy, and/or any corrective measures required for interim use, based upon findings and code official requirements.

b. Review proposed structural solutions and other modifications to meet code requirements, incorporate them into a preservation report, and meet with the building code official and the State Historic Preservation Officer to review. The work is to be performed by a registered architect with assistance from a structural engineer. Obtain preliminary written approval of the preservation report from the building code official and the SHPO.

c. Develop updated recommendations for all future phases based on the findings of investigations and discussions with code officials, including budget updates.

d. Develop detailed proposals for the first phase of construction including cost estimates by a professional cost estimator with assistance from the first phase general contractor. This would be approximately equivalent to the design development phase in a typical architect’s scope of basic services.

Cost range: $40,000-$50,000
5) Engage a general contractor/construction manager-at-risk or in-house city crews to undertake selective removal of non-contributing finishes to reveal historic fabric, as required by the A/E team to determine existing structural conditions. The work is to include but not necessarily be limited to the following tasks:

   a. Removal of portions of exterior stucco at floor/roof joist bearings and at the bowed area of the west wall. Removal of all exterior stucco may be required to determine the entire extent of adobe and other repairs.

   b. Remove carpet throughout the facility.

   c. Removal of additional area(s) of the first floor MDF/plywood subfloor and original floor decking for access to the crawl space to inspect the floor support structure including joists, girders, bearing conditions, and foundations for columns. This will also allow confirmation of the existence of "utility tunnels", mentioned by Martin Amador Campbell Jr., and their possible use for new work.

   d. Removal of all dropped ceilings under the balcony to allow for the inspection of the condition and extent of required repairs to the original wood joists and deck. Suspension grids could remain until future construction phases for support of lights etc.

   e. Removal of a section of the floor decking in the upstairs rooms to reveal the floor structure. (There appears to be a secondary floor structure above the vigas and decking that are visible above the first-floor ceiling.)

   f. Removal of additional areas of gypsum board ceiling at the upper lobby to reveal the condition of historic wood deck and joists. Removal of a portion of wood deck to determine the nature of the attic space and roof structure including the roof deck above the lobby. This could be done where the historic roof monitor was removed and the deck was patched during the 1969 renovation. The condition of the roof deck above this area could also be reviewed where it is "spongy".

   g. Removal of portions of furred-out gypsum board walls at each wall of the lobby to review the condition and integrity of the adobe. A specific area of interest is the north end of the east wall between the old bank vault and the toilets.

   h. Removal of portion of gypsum board fascia below the balcony railing to determine feasibility of restoring the original balcony edge detail and lowering the balcony railing.

   i. Removal of all column surrounds.

   j. Removal of portions of dropped gypsum board ceilings at second floor rooms to determine the structure of the roof system at this area.

   k. Assist the design team with development of construction budgets for phased construction.

      Cost range: $50,000-$100,000

6) Undertake repairs and upgrades required for interim use of the building if it is determined they are required and the city and foundation decide this is something that is cost-effective to do prior to a major renovation for reuse.

      Cost: To be determined

7) Engage a retail marketing/leasing consultant to:

   a. Review demands for meeting space of the type to be offered by The Amador.

   b. Estimate projected revenues from meeting spaces based on estimated demand.

   c. Propose additional amenities that could be provided that may affect the building design.
d. Evaluate demand and format for the proposed restaurant.

e. Develop a plan for engaging a tenant/operator for the proposed restaurant including lease rates/term, build-out responsibilities, and process for engagement (RFP/RFQ, or through commercial leasing agents).

   Cost: $15,000-$20,000

8) Engage a fund raising firm or an independent fund raiser to assist the Amador Museum Foundation, and either work in partnership with board members as they raise funds for the project or prepare the foundation board to solicit funds for building renovation and exhibit development. The fund raising firm should provide the following tools and resources to set up and implement a capital campaign:

   a. Pre-campaign preparation: Whether funds are appropriated through federal, state and/or city means, or through solicitation of the local community, preparation for the pre-campaign should:

      • Ready foundation board members for the campaign
      • Finish a feasibility study
      • Create the case for support
      • Establish a preliminary campaign timetable, campaign policies, and dollar goal
      • Determine the campaign structure and leadership
      • Identify preliminary donors and potential contributions
      • Determine the budget for the campaign

   b. Other pre-campaign activities include:

      • Writing grant proposals
      • Creating a communications plan and other campaign materials—brochure, web page, solicitation materials, etc.
      • Training volunteers

   c. Implementation of Capital Campaign (Quiet Phase): Once the pre-campaign work is underway, the fund raising professional would work with the foundation to create the details for federal and state grants.

   d. Other implementation activities would include:

      • Development of the fund raising committee and solicitation of individuals, foundations, and corporations for lead gifts, and people able to move the campaign forward and secure local and state support
      • Establishment of goals for board-giving and solicitation

   e. Implementation of public phase: The goal of this phase of the campaign will be to broaden the solicitation reach to mid- and lower levels of giving. This would also include:

      • Events, direct mail, web-based solicitations, and a variety of other activities
      • Development of a communications plan and promotional materials
      • Establishment of a membership program
      • Creation of a donor recognition and benefits program

   Cost range: $60,000-$80,000
1) Engage a museum store consultant. A museum store consultant would be invaluable to the Amador Museum Foundation in helping to create guidelines and best practices as the foundation seeks to fulfill its goal of maximizing earned income, while enhancing and amplifying the mission of the foundation. This can be done at any time prior to the detailed design of the second phase of construction, when the gift shop would be constructed.

Ensure museum store consultant expertise. The Museum Store Association compiles a financial, operations, and salary survey called the MSA Retail Industry Report. Within the survey is a subgroup entitled, "History Museums Earning Less Than $500,000 in Gross Sales." A good museum store consultant will have access to the material and be able to offer benchmark information on inventory management, stock turn, margin of mark-up, gross margin return on investment, capture rate, and bottom-line margins. An experienced consultant will be invaluable in managing inventory, receiving, pricing, the storage and displaying of merchandise, and creating good retail ambiance for visitor comfort.

The consultant would develop a plan and provide recommendations for the following:

a. Quality of Operations: The quality of the products to be sold must be first rate. Sales personnel need to be well versed in the history of The Amador and well informed on the products they are selling. A daily restocking of shelves would ensure that items are readily available for customers.

By the very nature of the museum and the content of the exhibition, the store must contain a mixture of merchandise on The Amador, Las Cruces, and the region, with a variety of price points. Customers should find opportunities to purchase "must have" Amador Hotel related items. There would also be educational merchandise for children, culturally oriented products, as well as low cost souvenirs.

b. Branding and Product Development: Branding and product development for The Amador Museum will require sensitivity to the history of the hotel, the Amador and Campbell families, and local residents. Museum store product development should be different than product development for the event center and the restaurant, and the foundation will need to maintain a quality branded retail product program. The museum store manager and/or the site manager will need to be experienced in searching out the right market for products, negotiating price, reviewing and approving product prototypes if appropriate, and planning visual merchandising and display of products.

The foundation will want to consider a "suite" of special products in certain categories, such as:

• Low cost items like mugs, key-chains, magnets, post cards, guidebooks to the exhibition, and branded apparel such as T-shirts, baseball caps, and sweatshirts. Some of these items are considered impulse merchandise, which visitors would pick up as they enter the register area to check out.

• High-end items would include another category of branded apparel such as scarves, household linens, decorative art pieces, jewelry, and the iconic Amador Hotel poster framed.

• Books on the history of the region, its people, and places are always good merchandise for a museum store, as are DVDs. The store could also sell small books on the story of the Amador Hotel and/or the Amador family. Other DVDs could include travelogues and folk music CDs in both English and Spanish.

Cost: $20,000-$30,000
11) Develop an ongoing educational program for tours of investigation and project development (after the city and foundation determine it is safe to do so and in consultation with the structural engineer). The program could include participation of local schools, NMSU students and faculty, and the general public. Develop partnerships with local businesses and newspaper(s) for sponsorship and publicity.

Cost: Primarily volunteer effort

12) Revisit and amend the agreement between the city and the foundation to reflect new proposed uses.

**TOTAL PROJECT COST RANGE PHASE 1: $175,000-$280,000**

**Phase 2—First phase of construction: Exterior repair and restoration**

The intent of this phase would be to stabilize the exterior of the historic structure to prevent deterioration of major elements such as the exterior walls and the roof. A secondary intent would be to improve the appearance of the building so that there is obvious progress to the public. It should be expected that there may be some duplicative effort in future phases when these repaired items will need to be penetrated or partially removed to accommodate new systems and upgrades—such as the construction of the new stair and elevator. The scope of this phase is based on the assumption that it will be viewed by the building code official as repair and stabilization and will not “trigger” major interior structural or life-safety upgrades, such as those required for improved seismic resistance. It is also based on the assumption that any future seismic reinforcing would be accomplished on the inside of the building. If structural reinforcements are required at the exterior of the building for the proposed change of occupancy, then these will have to be completed in this phase. Repair of the roof structure and reinforcement of parapets are also in this phase.

1) Engage an A/E team to complete full construction documents, administer bidding, and provide construction period services for Phase 2 work and to update preliminary proposals for Phase 3 to establish a budget.

Cost range: $35,000-$60,000

2) Engage a contractor/construction manager (preferably same as for Phase 1 or selected through qualifications-based proposals based on experience in historic building restoration).

See construction cost range below

3) Engage a hazardous materials abatement contractor to remove/encapsulate hazardous materials identified in the environmental study in work area.

Cost range: $5,000-$50,000

**Scope of Construction Work:** Demolish drive-up bank.

1. Remove the concrete sidewalk and excavate along the west and north sides of the building to lower the grade below finish floor and to install an underground trench/slot drain system. Install a new sidewalk with slope leading away from the building and to the drainage system.

2. Reconfigure the north entry to accommodate the new grade, including removal (or partial removal) of the interior ramp at Room 118 (the Billy-the-Kid Room).

3. Remove the remainder of the stucco at the historic building—if not already removed—and repair the adobe.

4. Recondition/recreate historic exterior windows and doors. Include energy upgrades to windows such as weather-seals and the application of nano-ceramic film to reduce heat gain—assuming that windows cannot be modified to accept insulated glazing.
5. Replace stucco with historic lime plaster or other appropriate system as determined from the investigation.

6. Remove the roofing at the historic structure (and possibly east additions, since these accept drainage from the historic structure) and repair/reinforce the roof structure and parapets as required for proposed change of occupancy and install new roof covering.

   Cost range: $420,000-$750,000

**TOTAL PROJECT COST RANGE PHASE 2:** $460,000-$860,000

**Phase 3—Second phase of construction: Interior repair and renovation and major infrastructure upgrades**

The intent of this phase would be to complete the interior renovation of the historic building and undertake any structural upgrades required by code for the proposed change of occupancy. The project would also upgrade utilities and mechanical and electrical services and distribution systems. The building would need to be closed during renovations except for occasional tours as part of the public education program.

1) Engage an A/E team to undertake full design and construction documents and provide bidding and construction period services, including approval by the State Historic Preservation Officer.

   Cost range: $335,000-480,000

2) Engage a contractor/construction manager (preferably the same as for Phase 2 or selected through qualifications-based proposals based on experience in historic building restoration).

   Cost range: See below.

3) Engage a hazardous materials abatement contractor to remove/encapsulate hazardous materials identified in the environmental study in work area.

   Cost range: $15,000-50,000

5) If the foundation handles the event center or leases the offices, set up partnership or sub-contracting agreements.

**Scope of Construction Work**

1. Demolish the 1970s bank lobby at southeast corner.
2. Remove all non-historic finishes not required to be retained.
3. Remove all mechanical and electrical systems in areas where historic finishes are to be exposed and elsewhere as required.
4. Perform structural reinforcement of floors and walls to meet building code requirements, including seismic upgrades.
5. Restore walls, floors, ceilings, balcony railings, and interior doors of the historic building.
6. Install new mechanical/electrical systems.
7. Install an automatic fire sprinkler system.
8. Demolish and rebuild existing toilets with the required fixture count for full build-out.
9. Construct a new entry vestibule and vertical circulation addition (stair, elevator, mechanical room and toilet) at the south end of the 1970 addition.
10. Construct the gift shop addition.
11. Relocate the utilities along the east side of the site clear of final build-out (fiber optic, gas and possibly electric) and upgrade capacities as required. Relocate the electrical transformer.

Cost range: $2,800,000-4,500,000

**TOTAL PROJECT COST RANGE PHASE 3: $3,200,000-$5,000,000**

Note: The wide range of project costs in this phase reflects the unknown extent of structural upgrading required at the historic structure.

Phase 4—Museum exhibit design and installation
Design of the museum exhibit should begin concurrently with Phase 3 so that the infrastructure (mechanical and electrical) can be installed as part of that phase. Installation of the exhibit should happen after Phase 3 is complete.

1) Engage a museum exhibit designer.

2) Engage a museum exhibit fabricator through competitive proposals to the exhibit.

**TOTAL PROJECT COST RANGE PHASE 4: $1,000,000**

Phase 5—Third phase of construction: Restaurant shell and site work
This phase would construct the addition as a shell for the restaurant, bar and kitchen, including renovation of the remainder of the 1970s addition and completion of the site drainage, parking lot, landscaping, site furnishings, site lighting, and pedestrian connection to the crosswalk to Downtown at Bowman.

1) Engage an A/E team to undertake full design and construction documents and provide bidding and construction period services.

   Cost range: $145,000-$180,000

1) Select a contractor by competitive bid for construction.

   Cost range: $2,000,000-$2,500,000 (including design fees)

**TOTAL PROJECT COST RANGE PHASE 5: $2,145,000-$2,680,000**

Phase 6—Fourth phase of construction: Tenant build-out of restaurant and bar
This would be the final phase of construction for the project and would be completed by the operator, or in collaboration with the operator.

**TOTAL PROJECT COST RANGE PHASE 6: $1,000,000-$1,200,000**
Phase 1—Follow-up investigation and analysis

Phase 2—First phase of construction: Exterior repair/restoration and roofing; Demolition of drive-up bank; drainage at west side

Phase 3—Second phase of construction: Interior repair and renovation and major infrastructure upgrades
Phase 4—Museum exhibit design and installation
Phase 5—Third phase of construction: Restaurant shell and site work
Phase 6—Fourth phase of construction: Tenant build-out of restaurant and bar
November 18, 2009

Jonathan Craig, AIA
Kells + Craig Architects, Inc., AIA
400 Gold SW, Suite 880
Albuquerque, NM 87102

RE:  Visual review of existing Building
     Amador Hotel Re-Use Study
     Las Cruces, NM

Dear Mr. Craig,

This office, as per your request, provided a visual review of the referenced project to inspect and determine the structural integrity of the original adobe building. This two story building constructed with adobe walls and wood framing members for the ground first floor joists, second floor joists and the roof rafters, was built in 1887. Plus, a one story building addition has been added, to include a drive-up/walk-in tellers building and canopy. The one story addition was built in the 1970’s and the other additions in the 1980’s, as informed. The original adobe building structure is listed in the historic register.

Based on the initial review and visual inspection, it appears that the original adobe building was a one story building only and then a second story, with the similar construction materials, was probably added shortly after the completion of the original one story adobe building. The wood roof rafters and vigas of the original one story building were left in place when the second story was added. Since then, all the materials for the construction of the one story additions, on the east end and north end sides, have been constructed on a concrete floor slab with perimeter masonry walls and steel bar roof joists.

As informed, the occupancy for this building will be changed from its previous use as a hotel to the proposed use as a museum. The proposed floor live load occupancy will be increased from the 40 psf, to depending on the use and occupancy of the new building floor areas, from 50 psf (office) to 100 psf (assembly). More than likely, the proposed floor live load should be 100 psf. The second floor wood joist framing members were designed for the 40 psf live load capacity also, since the second floor rooms were originally designed for motel/hotel occupancy use. The balcony/corridor and lobby areas were probably the only floor areas that were designed for the live load of 100 psf, but based on the visual review and noted discrepancies it does not appear that this may have been the case. The floor live load tables that I have go back to 1928 only and the live loads for hotel rooms and corridors are 40 psf and 80 psf respectively. Fortunately, the roof live load of 20 psf has not changed, at least for the past 81 years and therefore should not
have a roof live load problem at this time, but the only problem appears to be the aesthetics (wear & tear) of the roofing materials.

The plans drawn for the renovations of the building in 1969 noted that the existing first floor wood framing members (original building) were to be removed and the floor areas replaced with a 4" concrete slab reinforced with welded wire mesh. As evident, this was not accomplished at that time. Therefore, on the first floor, once the wood floor members are removed and replaced with a concrete floor slab, would be the only floor area that can safely accommodate the proposed 100 psf live load. Apparently, plans of the original building were not available and a more thorough review of the adobe building and framing systems will be required.

The wood floor decking and wood framing members of the first floor, of the adobe building, have areas with a very noticeable uneven floor levels (settlement and/or heaving), particularly at the front of the stairs, south end, and some movement in the floor areas of all the rooms is very evident. In most of the floor areas, the wood floor framing members do not have the adequate clearance (18") from the ground and the wood joists members supported by the perimeter walls are in direct contact with the soil subgrade in most cases. Plus, the balcony/walkway of the second floor has areas that have an excessive slope towards the handrail perimeter area. Based on this review, it appears that these floor level problems are not recent and have probably been occurring for many years.

Following is a list of discrepancies noted and comments:

**Roof**
1. The rolled roofing of the upper roof area has several bubbles, spongy areas were noted and a sagging deck area was noted near the center west area. The west side roof area has a high slope and drains towards the east onto the lower roof.
2. The valley roof conditions are not adequately lapped or placed.
3. The high roof at the southeast area has one roof drain only and several bubbles were noted.
4. The lower flat roof rolled roofing also has a few spongy areas
5. The top of the parapets of the high roof have cracks in the roof flashing. The south end flashing at the parapet has a large area that is damaged and is allowing rainwater to enter.
6. The pipe and vent penetrations do not have adequate flashing or sealant and the sealant has become dry and has cracked.

**Exterior**
1. The stucco surfaces have several areas that are damaged with the stucco cracked, broken and with small sections of stucco missing and obviously in a dire need of repair.
2. The stucco also gave a hollow sound, indicating that the stucco has separated and come loose and is not in direct contact with the adobe wall surface.
3. Wall areas of the stucco surfaces are bulging out, again indicating that the stucco is not adequately attached or the attachments to the adobe have corroded, broken and come loose.
Interior

1. The wood joist floor framing members of the first floor do not have the adequate ground clearance of 18", as per the current code. Plus the wood joists supported by the exterior adobe stem walls are less than 8" from the exposed soil and in some areas, are in contact with the soil.

2. The entire first floor wood framing is not level, in particular the long lobby center area that has as much as 8" of out of level at the support columns.

3. The wood floor decking, on the first and second floors, have several areas that have a spongy and squeaky effects.

4. The first floor stair landing area has settled approximately 3" and the south end lobby columns have also settled approximately 6". Each column supporting the balcony has a progressive settlement towards the south, but more pronounced at the south end.

5. Obviously, this floor and column settlement movements, which are very evident, have also transmitted into the second floor and roof framing members.

6. The south ends of the balconies have a very pronounced dip in the balcony floor area with the east side having a lower elevation.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on the uneven floors of the entire first floor area, it appears that attempts have not been or perhaps have never been made to level or to replace these wood floor framing members in the past or even during the past additions. In order to obtain the proposed 100 psf live load capacity for the first floor, the existing wood floor framing members should be removed in their entirety and a new 4" concrete slab reinforced with fiber should be placed. All the lobby columns should also be raised, at that time, to level the second floor balcony.

As an alternate, the void space under the first floor wood framing can be filled with a two sack concrete flowable fill mix to the bottom of the wood decking. But before this is done, all the floor decking should be reattached to the wood joists with screws spaced at 8". Granted this will not level the floor, but will only increase the floor live load capacity.

The live load of the second floor can be increased by “doubling up” on the wood floor joists members and support beams. The wood columns, if required, can also be “beefed up” to increase their load capacity. The existing member sizes will have to be reviewed and the new members designed to obtain the appropriate loading conditions. Obviously, this fix to the second floor will be costly and may not warrant it, since the second floor rooms are small and the building does not have an elevator to access the second floor. However, these changes will have to be approved by the State Historic Official.

The seismic design for the Type V construction of this adobe building is Seismic Design 1, with
an Occupancy Category & Importance Factor II. The Basic Wind Speed is 85 mph with a 3-second gust of 100 mph. It appears that most if not all of these design requirements have already been met.

This two story adobe building structure has been in use and occupied since 1887. And it appears that the only structural problem that the building system has endured has been a foundation movement issue. This adobe building has a historical significance and by all means this building should be preserved and restored. The mere fact that the building is still standing is a testimony that the foundation system and walls are still sound. However, due to the deterioration of the stucco cladding, the stucco on the entire exterior face of the adobe walls should be removed and replaced with a new, historically appropriate system.

The analysis and recommendations are based on previous experience and on the limited visual inspection of the building. All repairs or new construction should be monitored and inspected by a Professional Engineer to insure the owner that proper construction methods and procedures are accomplished.

If there are any questions or further information required, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

Ruben Ponce, Jr., P.E., SECB
New Mexico #9302
Historic Amador Hotel
Existing Mechanical Systems Evaluation

Prepared For Kells and Craig
May 18th 2009

By Patrick H Watkins, PE
Bridgers and Paxton Consulting Engineers
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INTRODUCTION

The historic Amador Hotel was built in 1866 as a residence and has undergone several renovations and changes in use since that time. For over a century it was used as a community gathering place and a hotel. After that it was used as a bank and an office. Now the building is up for preservation and re-use. The building is approximately 13,000 square feet and could be adapted to a few different uses.

The construction of the building is adobe with exterior walls over thirty inches thick in some places. The windows are in poor condition and many are covered with a retro fitted storm window on the exterior. The building is currently served by a two pipe fan coil system with a water cooled chiller providing chilled water and a boiler providing heating water. Natural ventilation is relied upon for outside air.

The purpose of this evaluation is to report on the condition, capability and flexibility of the existing mechanical systems for consideration in moving forward with a building re-use plan.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Amador Hotel presents many challenges for re-use. A few steps were taken to determine the condition, capability and flexibility of the existing HVAC systems. First all available documentation was gathered and reviewed to gain familiarity with the building and understand the existing HVAC installation. Next a site visit was conducted to evaluate the accuracy of the existing documents and evaluate the condition of the existing equipment. Finally a careful review of all the information was done to determine the viability of the existing mechanical systems for re-use.

The existing mechanical systems are relatively limited in terms of both capacity and flexibility. Replacing the fan coils and changing the system to a four pipe fan coil system and should be considered. There is some question whether the existing plant has the capacity to operate the building comfortably. The occupancy, lighting, ventilation and envelope will have to be considered carefully to ensure good operation if the current plant remains in use.
EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing building is primarily served by a two pipe, changeover fan coil system. Most of the rooms on the first floor have a dedicated, above ceiling fan coil for heating and cooling. On the second level, most of the original hotel rooms are served by floor mounted fan coils dedicated to each room. The main lobby is open to above and is served by a large fan coil located in a mechanical room on the first floor roof. Air is ducted from the fan coil into the lobby with high sidewall grilles. Some of the other spaces in the building are served by small, air to air direct expansion split systems. Mechanical ventilation is not provided. It is possible to illustrate compliance for the natural ventilation path per, ASHRAE 62.1-2004, for almost all of the perimeter rooms, but many of the interior spaces do not have code compliant ventilation.

A two pipe, changeover fan coil system is characterized by the fact that the system must be changed over from summer operation to winter operation manually. That fact has two important ramifications: First, the system must be changed over manually from heating water to chilled water on a seasonal basis which can lead to poor comfort during shoulder seasons. Second, the system is not capable of simultaneous heating and cooling despite the zone control discreet fan coils offers. For example, if you are entering cooling season, but mornings are still cold, a system changed over to cooling could not accommodate the heating loads. Furthermore, if the east exposure called for cooling in the morning sun, but the west still called for heating, one of these zones could not be satisfied. The building is oriented such that there are large east and west exposures potentially exacerbating the comfort issues the mechanical system presents.

The plant that serves this system is located in a mechanical room on site. Chilled water is provided by a water cooled chiller that is currently under maintenance to replace the two 12.5 ton compressors. The chiller rejects heat to an open ground source water loop located on the site. The drawings reflect a well on the northeast side of the building where water is taken from the ground and another well southeast of the building to return the condenser water. There does not appear to be a heat exchanger to decouple the ground loop from the condensing loop of the chiller. As a result the chiller is exposed to contaminants from the ground loop. It appears the pumping is constant volume primary pumping on the chilled water side and constant volume pumping on the condenser side. PVC pipe appears to be the material used for the condenser water loop.

The boiler is also located in the same mechanical room on site and appears to have adequate combustion air. The heated water is conveyed to the system by constant volume primary pumping. The boiler appears to be twenty years old.

The piping is routed through the ceiling space around the first level Lobby area in a soffit and serves the second level floor mounted fan coils from below. The system was
down for maintenance on the day of the site visit so there was no opportunity to verify the functionality of the existing equipment.

The condition of the rest rooms was acceptable, but new fixtures could be installed. Code required exhaust appeared to be installed in both restrooms.

A new electrical service has been installed and appeared more than adequate for the building.
HISTORIC AMADOR HOTEL RE-USE
MECHANICAL SYSTEM EVALUATION

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR RE-USE

The Amador Hotel has largely been used as a gathering place and hotel for the majority of the time it has been occupied. The building could potentially be used as a museum or as a hotel. Either use presents some mechanical challenges that would need to be resolved. The HVAC system does not allow for a great deal of flexibility concerning occupancy and delivering ventilation to some of the interior spaces will be required.

The mechanical system currently serving the building is limited in terms of satisfying the heating and cooling loads. While the building loads may have been taken by the existing system, adding internal loads such as lighting and people may overwhelm the existing systems. Envelope building modifications such as incorporating high performance glazing would help reduce the loads on the system. Other envelope modifications could be considered to help diminish the loads on the HVAC system.

One recommendation to consider is installing the piping necessary to operate the system without changeover. Much of the existing piping and insulation that was visible appeared to be in poor condition. Furthermore, the routing of the mains is through an existing soffit that was added during a renovation. It is the desire of the team to restore the aesthetic of the building to the way it was originally built. Should removing the soffit be considered, a new path will have to be determined for both the fan coil piping and the supply air to the lobby space. Replacing the existing piping with a four pipe system would make sense for both restoring some of the aesthetic features as well as gaining the performance and reliability a new four pipe distribution system offers (See sketch below). A four pipe system would allow some fan coils to satisfy cooling loads while others were meeting the heating loads. Operating the system as a four pipe fan coil system would also require some mechanical controls to be installed.

Most of the fan coils appear to be at least ten to fifteen years old and should be considered for replacement. If the existing plant systems are to be re-used, verification of the operation of both the boiler and the chiller should be considered. In particular, the open condensing water loop serving the condenser side of the chiller should be evaluated. Volumetric flow and temperature of the water from the supply well should be measured as well.

If the existing system is to be re-used a dedicated ventilation system should be designed to provide code required ventilation to the interior and high occupancy spaces. Since the lobby may be used as an assembly area, maintaining a higher rate of ventilation will be required.
Another approach for re-use of the building would be to remove the existing fan coils system and install a Variable Refrigerant Volume (VRF) system. Similar to fan coil systems, VRF systems have fan coil terminals for each space to be controlled, but the fluid conveyed to these terminals is refrigerant. Since refrigerant is the heat transfer medium, pipe sizes are smaller making a retrofit much easier. The system is capable of two different zones simultaneously heating and cooling. The original HVAC equipment would not be re-used and VRF systems have a relatively low first cost and offer good performance and good operating efficiency. In this scenario natural ventilation would still be the strategy for the perimeter spaces and a dedicated ventilation system would need to be designed to accommodate the interior spaces. Installing a new VRF system
would bring all the spaces together to be served by a common HVAC system which would reduce the points of maintenance while adding reliability and performance.
SUMMARY BUILDING CODE ANALYSIS

In accordance with the New Mexico Commercial Building Code and the New Mexico Existing Building Code and the New Mexico Historic Earthen Building Code the following will need to occur in order to proceed with the project as planned:

NEW MEXICO HISTORIC EARTHEN BUILDING CODE
- The anticipated alterations exceed 50% of the aggregate area or the building. Therefore the alterations shall comply with applicable provisions of the NMEBC/IEBC.
- Historic building portions of the project will not be required to meet the New Mexico Energy Conservation Code. More recent additions may be required to meet the NMECC. New construction will be required to meet the NMECC.

NEW MEXICO EXISTING BUILDING CODE/INTERNATIONAL EXISTING BUILDING CODE

Method of Analysis
- The prescriptive method may not be used because the method does not allow for a change of occupancy unless the change is to a lower risk group.
- The performance method requires complete compliance with 2006 IBC chapter 16 (structural) and chapter 11 (accessibility) which is infeasible for this project.
- The work area method is therefore the only reasonable method of analysis.

Classification of Work
- Determine the classification of alteration work per Chapter 4, IEBC. The Work Area (construction other than repair) in the building is expected to exceed 50% and the work will therefore be classified as an alteration Level 3. Level 3 alterations shall meet all requirements of Levels 1 and 2 Alterations in addition to those for Level.

Procedural
- Architect shall provide a written preservation report to the design official describing safety features, structural seismic load path description, and any instances where preservation dictates non-compliance with other chapters of this code.
- Meet with code official to get a ruling on existing hallways and doors for workability for egress
- Meet with accessibility panel and code official to come up with alternatives to full access

Architectural
- Addition of another women’s restroom with 2 toilets and one sink.
- Addition of another men’s restroom with 1 toilet and one sink.
- Addition of a unisex restroom

Structural
- Investigate alterations to structure and new loads and analyze per IEBC and IBC
- Determine seismic design category and wind and snow loads
Egress
• Addition of a second stairway or fire escape from the second level (enclosure is not required for two levels only)
• Addition of panic hardware required on all exit doors
• Widening of egress paths to required width
• Renovation of corridors to have solid core wood doors or approved equivalent, must be continuous to exit, must not have openings/grilles in the walls.

Fire Safety
• Addition of a fire sprinkler system (desirable for reducing need to comply with other requirements)
• Automatic fire detection and fire alarm system shall be provided
IEBC 2006 REQUIREMENTS

PROCEDURAL
Chapter 4—Classification of Work
• Alteration level 3 since Work Area exceeds 50%

Chapter 9—Change of Occupancy Applies
• Changing from occupancy Group B (business) to Group A-3 (museum / events center). Existing office portion of the building will remain as offices (Group B). May need to be classified as separated use (seed discussion below).
• Certificate of Occupancy required
• Means of Egress Hazard for events / museum portions changes from level 4 to level 3 - higher hazard. Must comply with requirements of Chapter 10, IBC except;
  1. Stairways shall be enclosed in compliance with the applicable provisions of Section 803.1.
  2. Existing stairways including handrails and guards complying with the requirements of Chapter 8 shall be permitted for continued use subject to approval of the code official.
  3. Any stairway replacing an existing stairway within a space where the pitch or slope cannot be reduced because of existing construction shall not be required to comply with the maximum riser height and minimum tread depth requirements.
  4. Existing corridor walls constructed of wood lath and plaster in good condition or ½-inch thick (12.7 mm) gypsum wallboard shall be permitted.
  5. Existing corridor doorways, transoms, and other corridor openings shall comply with the requirements in Sections 705.5.1, 705.5.2, and 705.5.3.
  6. Existing dead-end corridors shall comply with the requirements in Section 705.6.
  7. An existing operable window with clear opening area no less than 4 square feet (0.38 m²) and with minimum opening height and width of 22 inches (559 mm) and 20 inches (508 mm), respectively, shall be accepted as an emergency escape and rescue opening.
• Means of Egress Hazard for office portion remaining at level 4. Existing elements of the means of egress shall comply with the requirements of Section 805 for the new occupancy classification. Newly constructed or configured means of egress shall comply with the requirements of Chapter 10 of the International Building Code.
• Exposure of Exterior Walls Hazard for all portions remains at level 3. Existing exterior walls, including openings, shall be accepted.
• Heights and Areas Hazard for events / museum portion changes from level 4 to level 2 – higher hazard. Must comply with Chapter 5, IBC
• Heights and Areas Hazard for office portion remaining at level 4. The height and area of the existing building shall be deemed acceptable (if a separated use from assembly areas).
• Building Importance Classification for events / museum portion changes from level II to level III (IBC 1604) – higher importance.

1101—Historic Buildings: General
• Architect shall provide a written preservation report to the design official describing safety features, structural seismic load path description, and any instances where preservation dictates non-compliance with other chapters of this code.
• Historic buildings need not comply with IBC 2006 1612—Flood hazard
• A special exception to the code exists for historic buildings converted into museums if they are less than 3,000 SF (probably does not apply, due to total size of building even though the museum portion may be less than 3000 sf)

ARCHITECTURAL
1103—Historic Buildings: Fire Safety
• Historic guardrails do not have to meet the requirements of the code for height or openings. Guard rails may remain as is with repair of broken segments (provided they do not compromise accessibility).
• Historic stairway railings. Grand stairways shall be accepted without complying with the handrail and guard requirements. Existing handrails and guards at all stairs shall be permitted to remain, provided they are not structurally dangerous.
• If re-roofing, new roof must meet 2006 IBC.
• If more than one roof, both must be removed prior to re-roofing.
• Per paragraph 1003.12.1 General. Every historical building that cannot be made to conform to the construction requirements specified in the International Building Code for the occupancy or use and that constitutes a distinct fire hazard shall be deemed to be in compliance if provided with an approved automatic fire-extinguishing system.

STRUCTURAL
Change of occupancy
A change of occupancy to a historic earthen building shall be allowed to comply with the provisions of this section for repairs and alterations subject to the conditions listed below. A change of occupancy not meeting these conditions shall comply with the New Mexico Existing Building Code.

1. The calculated occupant load of the new use does not exceed 299.
2. The change of occupancy does not result in the building being placed in a higher seismic, wind, or occupancy category based upon Table 1604.5 of the 2006 New Mexico Commercial Building Code.
3. The change of occupancy does not result in an increase of more than 5 percent in uniform or concentrated loads based on Tables 1607.1 of the 2006 New Mexico Commercial Building Code.

Exception: The code official is authorized to accept existing floors and approve operational controls that limit the live loads on such floors.

606—Alterations Level 1: Structural
• If increasing dead load 5%, affected roof and floor structural components must meet 2006 IBC requirements for dead load.
• If re-roofing, parapet bracing and wall anchors must be installed if seismic category D, E, or F. See chapter 506.1.1 for details.

• If re-roofing, roof diaphragm must be inspected and connections repaired

707—Alterations Level 2: Structural
• Structural strength of existing systems may not be reduced below levels permissible to the 2006 IBC

• If snow drift loads are increased more than 5%, affected structural components must meet 2006 IBC

807—Alterations Level 3: Structural
• If alterations increase seismic shear more than 10%, the engineer must prepare an evaluation and analysis of the altered structure to establish its adequacy — this report to be submitted to building official.

• If alterations to structure affect more than 30% of the building, then analysis must demonstrate compliance with IBC 2006 for wind loading and IEBC 506.1.1 reduced seismic forces—see chapter for details. (Probably not applicable)

• If alterations to structure do not affect more than 30%, then demonstrate that it would have met code when built.

907—Change of Occupancy: Structural
• If gravity load is increased more than 5% due to new occupancy/programming, structure must comply with IBC 2006 (see exception in 1106, below).

• Where the importance factor from table 1604 is increased, the building must comply with snow and wind load requirements of IBC 2006.

• Where the occupancy hazard group is increased, the building must comply with the seismic requirements of the IBC for the new seismic use group.

1106—Historic Buildings: Structural
• Code official may accept non-conforming floors and approve operational controls that limit the live load.

Appendix A—Guidelines for the Seismic Retrofit of Existing Buildings
Chapter A1—Seismic Strengthening Provisions for Unreinforced Masonry Bearing Wall Buildings

• Covers burned clay, concrete or sand-lime brick; hollow clay or concrete block; plain concrete; and hollow clay tile. Does not specifically include un-burned mud (adobe). Building Official could allow some provisions of this appendix to apply (such as testing procedures) but it is unlikely that adobe would conform.

• Does not apply to Occupancy Category III buildings in Seismic Design Category C, D, or E. The Seismic Design Category can only be determined once the existing soils conditions are know.

Structural Action Items:
The following will need to be done as part of any renovation design of the facility but are beyond the scope of this study.

– Consult with Building Official to determine if any of the provisions of the NM Historic Earthen Building Code can apply to reduce the amount of code-required alterations.
- Determine seismic design category when geotechnical boring test results are available.
- Determine wind and snow loads.
- Review IEBC sections listed here.
- Write narrative describing:
  - Parapet bracing and wall anchoring system
  - Diaphragm repair/bolstering
  - Reductions in strength of existing structural components
  - Added live and dead loads
  - Increased seismic forces
  - Increased snow or wind loads
  - Anticipated operational controls
  - An analysis of the structural system, illustrating its adequacy and its conformance with codes that existed at the time of the original construction.

EGRESS

705
- Rooms with occupant load greater than 50 shall have 2 exits
- Panic hardware required on all exit doors
- Corridors must be designated and must have solid core wood doors or approved equivalent, must be continuous to exit, must not have openings/grilles in the walls.
- Stairs shall have 2006 IBC compliant handrails on at least one side

912
- Operable windows can serve as emergency escape and rescue.
- Existing stairs need not be enclosed because building is only 2 floors
- Means of egress shall comply with 2006 IBC, except that corridor construction need only be ½” gypsum or plaster and lath with doors and openings meeting 705.

1103
- Main doors may swing inward if other exits can handle the occupant load
- Alternative exit signage OK if approved by AHJ.

1105
- If official thinks that corridors and doors are workable, then minimum widths and heights need not apply

ACCESSIBILITY

605
- Thresholds must be ¾” max.
- New stairs shall be connected with accessible routes.

912
- Provide at least one accessible entrance
• Provide accessible route to primary function space
• Provide code compliant accessible signage
• Provide accessible parking and route to entrance
• Provide accessible passenger loading zone, where loading zones are provided
• Any of above requirements that are technically infeasible shall conform to the requirements to the maximum extent technically feasible.

APPENDIX B–101
(may not apply since it is not specifically referenced in the adopting ordinance—NM Building Code—to be confirmed with building official)

• Where the state historic preservation officer or Advisory Council on Historic Preservation determines that compliance with the requirements for accessible routes, ramps, entrances, or toilet facilities would threaten or destroy the historic significance of the building or facility, the alternative requirements of Section 1005 for that element are permitted.

FIRE SAFETY
703
• Interior finishes must comply with 2006 IBC

704/804
• Sprinkler system must be added, if it would be required for new construction
• Automatic fire detection and fire alarm system shall be provided

912
• If occupancies are separated per 2006 IBC, then the office portion of the building need not comply with Chapter 8 requirements.
• Must comply with chapter 5 IBC 2006 for height and area limits
• ½'' gypsum board or plaster can serve as a 1 hr. area separation
• Vertical shafts shall be protected in accordance with IBC 2006

1103
• Historic finishes may remain, whether or not they meet combustibility requirements
• Stairway enclosure only need be solid walls with tight-fitting doors – no rating is required
• Lath and plaster can be substituted for 1 hr. construction throughout
• General Note: “Every historical building that cannot be made to conform to the construction requirements specified in the IBC for the occupancy or use and that constitutes a distinct fire hazard shall be deemed to be in compliance if provided with an approved automatic fire-extinguishing system.”

1105
• Historic buildings may exceed allowable area by 20%
• Alternative accessibility and fire safety solutions are OK if approved by AHJ.
• Existing historic transoms may remain in corridors
MECHANICAL

709
- All habitable rooms shall be provided with mechanical or natural ventilation.
  Mechanical ventilation shall be at least 5cfm/pp of outdoor air and at least 15
cfm/pp of ventilation.

710/910
- The building shall comply with the intent of the IPC for fixture quantity
  requirements.

808
- New construction shall comply with energy conservation requirements.

909
- The building shall comply with the intent of the IMC for ventilation requirements.

ELECTRICAL

708
- Exit lighting and signage must comply with 2006 IBC
- All new electric work shall meet 2006 IBC requirements
- Clearances shall be provided for electrical service equipment in accordance
  with 2006 IBC

A specific analysis based on a change from B occupancy to A-3 occupancy follows.
CODE ANALYSIS SUMMARY CHART

Applicable Codes: 2006 New Mexico and International Codes, The Las Cruces Zoning Code 2001

Property Description
Physical Address = 303 Water Street
Parcel Information Map Code = 4-007-135-221-293
Parcel ID = 02-06033
Zip Code = 88004-9002
Lot = PC 123
Block = 12
Subdivision = Original Townsite
Acres = 1.24
R_T_S = 2E 23S 18

IEBC Analysis
• "Work Area Method" of analysis used
• Architect shall provide a written preservation report to the design official describing safety features, structural seismic load path description, and any instances where preservation dictates non-compliance with other chapters of this code.
• Architect shall meet with code official to get a ruling on existing hallways and doors for workability for egress
• Architect shall meet with accessibility panel and code official to come up with alternatives to full access
• Means of Egress Hazard group is changing from 4 (offices) to 3 (events), so the building must comply with the seismic requirements of the IBC for the new seismic use group.
• Exposure of Exterior Walls Hazard for all portions remains at level 3
• Heights and Areas Hazard for event area changing from level 4 to level 2, so these areas must comply with the heights and areas requirements of the IBC for the new occupancy group and construction type
• Heights and Areas Hazard for office portion remaining at level 4

Design Occupant Load - Based on IBC Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Occupant Load</th>
<th>Based on IBC Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-2:</td>
<td>306 occupants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-3:</td>
<td>401 occupants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B:</td>
<td>39 occupants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>746</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Occupancy Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupancy Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Occupancy: B for Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Mixed Use Occupancy: A-3 Museum Exhibit Space, A-3 Event Space, A-2 Restaurant and Bar, and B - Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated Uses: Group A-3 and A-2 require a 1 hr. separation from occupancy group B in a sprinklered building. Is achievable with historic materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Separated Uses: Allowable if building is sprinklered and most stringent use is used to calculate allowable area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Importance Classification - III (per IBC table 1604.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Building Construction Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Construction Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Area and Height Limitations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area and Height Limitations</th>
<th>503</th>
<th>Frontage Increase</th>
<th>Automatic Sprinkler Increase</th>
<th>Historic Building Increase</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Area per Floor(sq. ft.)</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td><strong>25,200</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Height</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2 Story</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No separation required between A-3 and B occupancies, since A-3 (most stringent) is used to calculate allowable area
Smoke separation at mechanical rooms w/ equipment over 400,000 btu/hr
Smoke separation at storage areas over 100 sqft.
### Code Analysis Summary Chart (Cont’d)

#### Actual Enclosed Building Area (for Selected Design Option)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Within Limit?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Floor Existing (after selective demolition)</td>
<td>10,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Floor New Construction</td>
<td>4,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Floor Total</td>
<td>14,496 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Floor Existing</td>
<td>6,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Floor New Construction</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Floor Total</td>
<td>6,800 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20,716</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Interior Finishes

Class C finishes allowed in rooms, Class B required in corridors and exit access; historic finishes may remain.

#### Egress Requirements (Sprinklered Building)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
<th>Passes?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corridor Requirement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(IEBC allows existing plaster or drywall and properly fitting doors in lieu of rated materials)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egress Exit Width</td>
<td>112 inches</td>
<td>238 inches</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exits = (3), min.</td>
<td>3 (min.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Exit Distance</td>
<td>250 feet</td>
<td>112 feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Plumbing Fixtures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Passes?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male: Toilets (50% urinals)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavatories</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urinals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female: Toilets</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavatories</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unisex Toilet and Shower Room</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavatories</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Fountains</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Sinks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Parking Calculations

*Zoning Administrator indicated that since the site is adjacent to the Downtown Overlay District and since the City owns many nearby lots, parking will probably not be required to comply with these requirements.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>92</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking required by zoning ordinance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Detailed Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1226 sqft of patio area (1 per 100 SF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94 dining seats (1 per 5 seats)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 sqft of bar area (1/200 SF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197 max occ. for event space (1 per 5 occupants)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410 sf gift shop (1 per 350 SF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500 sf office space (1 per 450 SF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970 sf museum (1 per 600 SF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 space per 1000 gross square feet of floor area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### On-Site Parking Proposed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Passes?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>43 spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off-Site Parking Required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix A.27

### BUDGET ESTIMATE DETAIL

#### CITY OF LAS CRUCES / AMADOR FOUNDATION COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Paving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb and Gutter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot Grading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regrading at west side</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Paving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Striping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete walks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb and Gutter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move transformer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 ls</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer upgrades</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 ls</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water line reroute</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150 if</td>
<td></td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Fire Line</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200 if</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Fire Hydrant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 ea</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas line reroute/upgrade</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76 if</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$1,140</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$1,140</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$1,140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000 sf</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site furnishings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 ls</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumpster enclosure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 ea</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb cuts/Drive Pads</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 ea</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West side of Building</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 ls</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking lot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 ls</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patios/east side</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 ls</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Lighting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 ls</td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### HISTORIC STRUCTURE RENOVATION AND RESTORATION (See detailed back-up)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolish Drive-up Bank Building Canopy and columns incl.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 ls</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,966</td>
<td>$7,966</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$7,966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw-cut 1970 lobby CMU walls</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>360 in.ft</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$1,697</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$1,697</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw-cut 1970's bank lobby walls (12 °CMU)</td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td>1,920 sf</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$2,535</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$2,535</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolish miscell 1970's walls (8 °CMU)</td>
<td>1,133</td>
<td>1,133 sf</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$1,335</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$1,335</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw-cut vault walls</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>70.00 sf</td>
<td></td>
<td>$71</td>
<td>$495</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw-cut vault ceiling, floor-at elev</td>
<td>104.00</td>
<td>104.00 if</td>
<td></td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>$16,672</td>
<td>$136</td>
<td>$16,672</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete vault demo removal</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>18.00 cy</td>
<td></td>
<td>$295</td>
<td>$5,304</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$5,304</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove bank lobby roof structure</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00 ls</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,357</td>
<td>$2,357</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,357</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove Faux Sair/Landing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 ls</td>
<td></td>
<td>$589</td>
<td>$589</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$589</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove Carpet</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td>2,500.00 sf</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$295</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove Lay-In Ceilings</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>2600 sf</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$1,992</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$1,992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove Gyp Board Ceilings</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600 sf</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$1,061</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$1,061</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove gyp bd/frame walls</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>2200 sf</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$5,990</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$5,990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove plumbing fixtures</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9 sf</td>
<td></td>
<td>$59</td>
<td>$530</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$530</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw-cut slabs for new toilets/entry/gift shop</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>208 cy</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$699</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$699</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal/dump fees</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15 cy</td>
<td></td>
<td>$108</td>
<td>$1,627</td>
<td>$92</td>
<td>$1,627</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet areas</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>627 sf</td>
<td></td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$188,100</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$188,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant areas</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1593 $</td>
<td></td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>$199,125</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$238,950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other areas</td>
<td>1261</td>
<td>1261 $</td>
<td></td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$252,200</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$283,725</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gift Shop</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>154 $</td>
<td></td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$30,800</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$34,650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$144,000</td>
<td>$144,000</td>
<td>$144,000</td>
<td>$144,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stair/Elevator core</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$144,000</td>
<td>$144,000</td>
<td>$144,000</td>
<td>$144,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESTAURANT/BAR/ ADDITION (SHELL ONLY), Building (Shell only - Tenant Improv. by operator)</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>4500 sf</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$675,000</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$787,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1361</td>
<td>1361 sf</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$40,830</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$68,050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Construction</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,985,843</td>
<td>$4,187,673</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency for scope change</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$298,584</td>
<td>$418,768</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Conditions</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$262,754</td>
<td>$368,516</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;P</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,200</td>
<td>$105,469</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,835,212</td>
<td>$5,378,930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMGRT</td>
<td>7.4375%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$285,244</td>
<td>$400,509</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,120,456</td>
<td>$5,778,988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contingency (for Change Orders etc)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$618,068</td>
<td>$866,848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings/Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$706,800</td>
<td>$887,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibits</td>
<td>1 ls</td>
<td>ls</td>
<td>$646,800</td>
<td>$646,800</td>
<td>$787,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events Furnishings/Equipment</td>
<td>1 ls</td>
<td>ls</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal FFE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$571,759</td>
<td>$791,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escalation</td>
<td>3 years @ 3.5% /year=</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,017,084</td>
<td>$8,324,336</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEES, HAZARDOUS MATERIALS, MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,048,545</td>
<td>$1,450,415</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional A/E fees (including survey, soils tests)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$722,050</td>
<td>$998,920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit Design Fees</td>
<td>1 ls</td>
<td>ls</td>
<td>$253,546</td>
<td>$253,546</td>
<td>$253,546</td>
<td>$253,546</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous materials survey</td>
<td>1 ls</td>
<td>ls</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials Removal Allowance</td>
<td>1 ls</td>
<td>ls</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Expansion/development fees</td>
<td>1 ls</td>
<td>ls</td>
<td>$13,449</td>
<td>$13,449</td>
<td>$13,449</td>
<td>$13,449</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing/reproduction/reimbursible expenses</td>
<td>1 ls</td>
<td>ls</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PROJECT COST (Excluding Costs by Restaurant Operator)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,065,629</td>
<td>$9,774,752</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESTAURANT OPERATOR COSTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$669,714</td>
<td>$830,394</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish Out of Restaurant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$423,850</td>
<td>$515,550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish-out New Construction</td>
<td>4238</td>
<td>4238 sf</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$317,850</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$423,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance-out renovation</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1593 sf</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$159,300</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>$199,125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen Equipment</td>
<td>1 ls</td>
<td>ls</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant Furnishings</td>
<td>5% of restaurant cost</td>
<td></td>
<td>$67,564</td>
<td>$82,469</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Conditions</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$38,172</td>
<td>$49,834</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;P</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,019</td>
<td>$40,366</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,925</td>
<td>$14,262</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$80,016</td>
<td>$104,462</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMGRT</td>
<td>7.4375%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$61,712</td>
<td>$77,299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$698,895</td>
<td>$909,148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contingency (for Change Orders etc)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$104,834</td>
<td>$136,372</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escalation</td>
<td>3 years @ 3.5% /year=</td>
<td></td>
<td>$84,392</td>
<td>$109,780</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional fees</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$71,050</td>
<td>$92,424</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL COSTS TO RESTAURANT OPERATOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$959,170</td>
<td>$1,247,724</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PROJECT COSTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,024,799</td>
<td>$11,022,476</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## HISTORIC BUILDING BUDGET ESTIMATE DETAIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HISTORIC STRUCTURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2000 Demolition (Exterior)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove stucco at historic structure</td>
<td>7312</td>
<td>7312</td>
<td>sf</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>36,560</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
<td>51,184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repair/Replace roof deck</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>sf</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>3,306</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>22,040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove roofing @ Historic Structure</td>
<td>5510</td>
<td>5510</td>
<td>sf</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>8,265</td>
<td>$5.50</td>
<td>30,305</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disposal/Dump fees (incl interior work)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>lb</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2000 Demolition (Interior)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demolish Drive-up Bank Building Canopy and columns incl disposal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>lb</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove Carpet</td>
<td>9,823.00</td>
<td>9,823.00</td>
<td>sf</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>982</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove Plywood/MDF @ Lobby floor</td>
<td>2,153.00</td>
<td>2,153.00</td>
<td>sf</td>
<td>$0.52</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>$0.52</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove fur-outs at walls - Lobby</td>
<td>1803</td>
<td>1803</td>
<td>sf</td>
<td>$1.05</td>
<td>1,925</td>
<td>$1.20</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rooms 203-213</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>2520</td>
<td>sf</td>
<td>$1.05</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>$1.20</td>
<td>1,204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove Lay-in Ceilings</td>
<td>2606</td>
<td>2606</td>
<td>sf</td>
<td>$0.65</td>
<td>1,694</td>
<td>$0.65</td>
<td>1,694</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove Lay-in Ceilings - West rooms</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>sf</td>
<td>$0.65</td>
<td>1,385</td>
<td>$0.65</td>
<td>1,385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove Gypsum Board Ceilings - Upper lobby</td>
<td>2151</td>
<td>2151</td>
<td>sf</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>3,227</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>3,227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rooms 203-213</td>
<td>399.25</td>
<td>1597</td>
<td>sf</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>1,996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove Ductwork/conduit etc at lobby</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>lb</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove Fan Coils/Conduit etc. at West/north/south rooms</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>lb</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove Gypsum Board fascia at lobby balcony</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>sf</td>
<td>$1.05</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>$1.20</td>
<td>845</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove non-historic doors</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cut new openings in adobe walls</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>4,160</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove column covers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cut new return air penetrations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove concrete slabs and excavate</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>sf</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>2,273</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>3,030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cut hole for skylight incl. reframe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>lb</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>03000 Concrete</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miscell underpinning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>04000 Masonry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repair Adobe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>lb</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>05000 Metals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miscell reinforcing beams etc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>06000 Wood and Plastics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repair damaged joists at lobby ceiling/balcony</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>lb</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repair/New wood plank floor at lobby</td>
<td>430.6</td>
<td>2153</td>
<td>sf</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>2,153</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
<td>15,071</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repair/Replace wood plank floor at remainder of 1st floor</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>2525</td>
<td>sf</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>2,525</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
<td>17,675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repair/Repair wood plank floor at 2nd floor offices</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>2970</td>
<td>sf</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>2,970</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
<td>20,790</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repair/level wood plank floor at balcony</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>2970</td>
<td>sf</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>3,564</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>44,550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Replace/repair Wall Base</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>lf</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower balcony railings</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>sections</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>28,500</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>42,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repair/replace false beams at 1st floor rooms</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>lf</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repair vigas/deck at entry porch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>lb</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structural reinforcing/replacement of first floor</td>
<td>9,823.00</td>
<td>9,823.00</td>
<td>sf</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>49,115</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>98,230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconstruct molding a balcony fascia</td>
<td>326.00</td>
<td>32600</td>
<td>sf</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>16,300</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>32,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>07000 Thermal and Moisture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2&quot; polysio roof insulation</td>
<td>5510</td>
<td>5510</td>
<td>sf</td>
<td>$1.30</td>
<td>7,163</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>8,265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New roofing membrane</td>
<td>5510</td>
<td>5510</td>
<td>sf</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>22,040</td>
<td>$5.50</td>
<td>30,305</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New metal Coping</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>if</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Additional Cost</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doors and Windows</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recondition historic windows</td>
<td>30 ea $1,200.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior storm windows</td>
<td>30 ea $150.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace interior panel doors at first floor</td>
<td>6 ea $2,500.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replica screen doors</td>
<td>5 ea $500.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replica exterior doors</td>
<td>2 ea $3,500.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New doors at second floor</td>
<td>16 ea $400.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>$700.00</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstructed skylight complete</td>
<td>1 ls $8,000.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ls</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36,203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45,570</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finishes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New exterior stucco</td>
<td>812 sy $52.00</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>sy</td>
<td>42,247</td>
<td>$70.00</td>
<td>56,840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New interior plaster (at exterior walls and interior adobe)</td>
<td>368 1471 sy $42.50</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>sy</td>
<td>15,625</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>73,528</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint prep</td>
<td>40000 40000 sf $0.60</td>
<td>40000</td>
<td>sf</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint wood soffits at Lobby/balcony</td>
<td>3611 3611 sf $1.50</td>
<td>3611</td>
<td>sf</td>
<td>5,417</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>10,833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint windows</td>
<td>30 30 ea $100.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint walls</td>
<td>18380 18380 ea $0.65</td>
<td>18380</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>11,947</td>
<td>$0.80</td>
<td>14,704</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint ceilings 1st &amp; 2nd fl rooms</td>
<td>5500 5500 ea $0.70</td>
<td>5500</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>3,850</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>5,225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint interior doors</td>
<td>26 26 ea $55.00</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>$70.00</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint Balcony Railings</td>
<td>650 650 sf $2.40</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>sf</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint columns, fascia, beams, stair</td>
<td>1 1 ls $1,500.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ls</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New wallpaper</td>
<td>600 4,000 sf $4.50</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>sf</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore old wallpaper</td>
<td>1 1 ls $2,500.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ls</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish and paint floors</td>
<td>7700 7700 sf $1.40</td>
<td>7700</td>
<td>sf</td>
<td>10,780</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>15,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous, patching and wall infill</td>
<td>1 1 ls $5,000.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ls</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131,555</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>254,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specialties</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replica neon Sign</td>
<td>1 1 ls $50,000.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ls</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mechanical</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVAC</td>
<td>7900 7900 sf $40.00</td>
<td>7900</td>
<td>sf</td>
<td>316,000</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>474,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Protection</td>
<td>7900 7900 sf $2.00</td>
<td>7900</td>
<td>sf</td>
<td>15,800</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>31,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>505,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electrical</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>7900 7900 sf $25.00</td>
<td>7900</td>
<td>sf</td>
<td>197,500</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>276,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>276,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPLICATION FOR REGISTRATION
NEW MEXICO STATE REGISTER OF CULTURAL PROPERTIES
STATE PLANNING OFFICE, SANTA FE

1. Name of Property:
   Amador Building (formerly Amador Hotel)

2. Location of Property:
   N.E. corner of Amador and Water Streets

3. Nature of Property:
   Building(s) (X) District or Area ( ) Object ( ) Other ( )
   Description and present condition.
   Good condition. Building remodelled 1969-1970

4. Owner, name and address:
   Citizens Bank of Las Cruces, Albert Armijo, President

5. Present use of Property:
   Bank

6. Has property been:
   a. listed in a municipal or other register? Yes (X) No ( )
   b. plaqued or otherwise designated as worthy of preservation? Yes (X) No ( )
   c. recorded in the Historic American Buildings Survey? Yes ( ) No ( )
   If any of above questions are answered "Yes", give details.
   Designated worthy of preservation by Dona Ana County Historical Society, 1969.

7. Name and address of organization or individual submitting this application:
   Dona Ana County Historical Society and others
8. Tell why property is important. List documentary sources, etc.
Structure originally built for hotel by Martin Amador in 1850. Remodeled in 1969-70 for use as commercial bank. The patio (of recent date) on the east side of the building was removed. New doors installed and vaults and other bank equipment built in. The structural integrity of the building is intact, and a great deal of the historic character of the building is intact.

Continuation of registration recommended and approved.

9. Names and addresses of persons preparing this application material:

(a) Inventory data by: George H. Ewing Date: 6/1/72
(b) Recent photograph by:
(c) Recent map by:

______________________________________________________________________________
DATE BELOW FOR PLANNING OFFICE USE

Date Form A received: __________ Initial application complete ( )
incomplete ( )

Action of Review Committee and date: ____________________________________________

Date applicant advised of Committee action:

Nominated to National Register: Yes ( ) Date: __________________ No ( )
Amador Building
Amador and Water Streets

Martin Amador owned a freight line operating between the City of Chihuahua and Santa Fe and his use of Las Cruces as a rest stop was one of the events that led to the development of the town. Sometime about 1850, he had an adobe building with three-foot thick walls erected as a place for his drivers to stay, safe from Apaches. After the county court house in Dona Ana was flooded out, Don Martin, who had become probate judge, had the courthouse moved to his building in Las Cruces. From 1852 to 1855 it was the Dona Ana County Courthouse, which it was again later, in 1882 to 1883, after the county offices were moved back from Mesilla. The building also served as post office and jail, and the large central room was sometimes used as a theatre.

But the building is best known as the Amador Hotel, which served travelers for over one hundred years. Freighters, cavalry officers, lawmen, cowboys, miners, and merchants used the rooms that originally had names such as "Wild Rose Bud", and later were called by women's names such as "Juanita," and "Mercedes." One of the most famous guests to stay at the hotel was Mexico’s great statesman and president, Benito Juarez, for whom the city El Paso del Norte changed its name in the 1880's.
THE LOUIS E. FREUDENTHAL HOME

This home of Rio Grande Pueblo architecture was designed by O. H. Thorman and built with baciadobe walls in 1934. Upon the architect's advice, stucco was not applied to the outer walls for two years and as a result no cracks have ever appeared. The house is approached through a low walled court sheltered between two wings with the doorway and fenestration in perfect proportion and placement.

Ingenious and efficient use of space gives ample room for reception rooms in one wing, with a family room and workshops and bedrooms in the other. From the tiled entry hall short flights of steps lead down to the basement and up to the corridor which continues to a railed balcony above the back patio. Flooring, vigas on the first level, hand wrought bannisters, hardware and lighting fixtures are all in harmony. Of special interest are the Tudor brass chandelier in the dining room which is an exact reproduction of one in the palace of William of Orange in The Hague, and the bell dated 1630 which is used at the front door.

The rooms are open to a charming patio walled by a small apartment, garages, and workrooms entered in a manner that preserves the shaded, fruitful privacy. The furnishings include family antiques and treasures acquired by the widely traveled Freudenthals. Especially notable are a needlepoint tapestry made by Amalia Freudenthal, Mr. Louis's mother, and a Steinway piano sent to Las Cruces on one of the first trains to arrive in the valley.

Beauty has followed function perfectly in the Freudenthal house so carefully planned to adhere to regional architecture.

BUILDINGS DESIGNATED AS WORTHY OF PRESERVATION

During this period of rapid movement, rapid expansion, and forward thrust, a reflective pause is needed to assess the present in terms of lasting values of the past. Buildings which have endured the passage of time and have been a part of the historic panorama in the Mesilla Valley are a part of those lasting values. The Dona Ana County Historical Society brings attention to two structures deemed of importance to the community and designates them worthy of preservation. One is the Amador Hotel, owned by Mr. and Mrs. Martin Amador Campbell. The other is a home, the residence of Mr. and Mrs. J. Paul Taylor, located on the west side of the Plaza in La Mesilla.

THE AMADOR HOTEL

In 1850, Don Martin Amador established a boarding house in Las Cruces, primarily to serve freighters and passengers on his freight lines between Chihuahua, Mexico, and Santa Fe. As decades passed, the Amador family became hosts, not only to travelers, but to Mesilla Valley residents who came to the Amador Hotel for bailes (social dances), theatrical performances, social and political gatherings. Once, while a new courthouse was being built, Don Martin, a Probate Judge of the Territory of New Mexico, held court at the Amador. He used another room as jail. For men of the 7th Cavalry, stationed at Fort Selden and Fort Fillmore, Don Martin's hotel provided the only nearby entertainment center. Later, people came to the Amador to see the first electric light in Las Cruces and to note how the Amador family continually modernized the building without destroying its basic charm. Today, Martin Amador Campbell, grandson of Don Martin, retains ownership of the hotel, which is still open for business. He preserves there countless relics of historic value, and he sees that the building itself is saved as a historic landmark.

The Amador Hotel is of Mexican Colonial design—rare in that it is of two stories. In the days of Don Martin Amador, the five-foot thick adobe walls were laid on the ground, without foundations. When Frank Campbell married Don Martin's youngest daughter, Corina, Campbell gave her as a wedding gift a foundation for the hotel. To lay the foundation, workers dug a hole eight to ten feet long near
Mrs. Campbell now mourns the loss of a large print of "Custer's Last Stand" which recently disappeared from a wall. Not so valuable as many other objects in the Amador, it was still of sentimental value to the family that once played host to Custer's 7th Cavalry.

The Amador family has acted not simply as business people providing hotel service, but as guardians of a historic building and its contents. Present day Las Cruces should recognize that the Amador Hotel is a unique record of New Mexico's history. They should also join Mr. and Mrs. Martin Amador Campbell in seeing that the hotel is preserved for future generations.

The J. Paul Taylor Home

Coins, musket balls, and a dragoon's button confirm tradition that a house existed on the site of the J. Paul Taylor home as far back as La Mesilla's history goes. The earliest records show that Rafaela Barela built a house there in the early 1850's and that her son, Sheriff Mariano Barela operated a store in the room to the east of the living quarters. Later, occupants include Charles Reynolds; Father Jean Grande, the French priest who held catechism classes in the front rooms for many years; Mrs. Alidits who found sanctuary in the old house during the Mexican Revolution; and now Paul and Mary Daniels Taylor.

Built flush with the sidewalk, the house is entered through a zaguan that continues beside the reception rooms to the dining room. One can move on through the kitchen to additional bedrooms or move to another zaguan which connects another bedroom wing. Walled by the store building which is part of the property, the zaguan opens to a secluded patio and offers entry to the rooms that surround it. From its door on the Mesilla plaza the Taylor house extends through a dozen rooms, beside an apartment for Mrs. Daniels, which was the original barn. Through workshops and storage space--the original carriage house--to the Callejon Arroyo behind. Seven of the main rooms have fireplaces identical in measurements with those that were built at Fort Fillmore.

Some remodeling of the ancient structure was done by earlier owners who operated the store and lived in the adjacent quarters, but the present restoration is the work of the Taylors who did much...
PLAT SHOWING LOCATION OF UTILITIES AS PER BLUE-STAKES
IN THE FORMER AMADOR HOTEL PROPERTY
IN BLOCK 26 OF THE
IN BLOCK 26 OF THE DOWNTOWN URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT N.M.R.-4
LOCATED IN SECTION 18, T.33S., R.32E., N.M.P.M. OF THE U.S.R.S. SURVEYS
AS PART OF BLOCK 12, OF THE ORIGINAL TOWNSITE OF LAS CRUCES, AS FILED SEPTEMBER 15, 1853 IN
PLAT RECORD 6, PAGE 1, DONA ANA COUNTY RECORDS ALSO PART OF BLOCK 26 OF THE
DOWNTOWN URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT N.M.R.-4 AS FILED NOVEMBER 27, 1973 IN
PLAT RECORD 11, PAGES 74-82, DONA ANA COUNTY RECORDS. ALSO INTENDED TO BE EXHIBIT "A" OF
WARRANTY DEED FILED JUNE 6, 1986 IN DEED RECORD 305, PAGES 256-260
IN THE RECORDS OF DONA ANA COUNTY
CITY OF LAS CRUCES, DONA ANA COUNTY, NEW MEXICO

NOTE 11-12-2009
LOCATION OF UTILITIES IS APPROXIMATE ONLY
EXACT LOCATION SHOULD BE DETERMINED BY
ON-SITE ESCAVATION PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.