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Abstract

The goal of this project was to complete a marketing study for the Hong Kong Maritime Museum (HKMM) at its future location at Pier 8. Observational data were collected at the pier and other museums, while museum marketing strategies were discovered through interviews. We estimated visitation rates and recommended ways to enhance accessibility, visibility, and attractiveness at Pier 8. Our findings suggest that the HKMM’s proposed business model for Pier 8 is viable and should help the museum be successful there.
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**Executive Summary**

The Hong Kong Maritime Museum (HKMM), presently in Stanley on the south side of Hong Kong Island, will be relocating to the Central Business District (CBD) on the island’s northern harbourfront. With its current lease expiring in 2012, the HKMM was presented with the opportunity to expand its facilities and audience by moving to a more visible and accessible location. Additionally, the harbourfront has been undergoing an extensive construction project, dubbed the New Central Harbourfront, to convert it into a cultural and recreational center for the people of Hong Kong. This new location, at Central Pier No. 8, would allow the museum to possibly quadruple annual visitation and tap into new market segments. However, sufficient data to definitively support these assertions have not been previously available. The uncertainty of the operational results at Central Pier No. 8 made the HKMM seek research from a baseline marketing study to maximize the use of its new location. The results of this marketing study would allow the HKMM to enhance its accessibility, visibility, and attractiveness both during and after the harbourfront construction. Our team completed this study and provided recommendations that were designed to draw new visitors to the HKMM and its bar and café.

The new market segments available at Pier No. 8 include passengers of the “Star” Ferry at the Central Ferry Piers (CFP) Complex, workers from the CBD, and locals engaging in recreational activities at the New Central Harbourfront. Furthermore, Pier No. 8 opens up the HKMM to a larger audience of tourists and school groups. To be successful, a museum must identify its target audiences and create a profile of their characteristics and museum-going behavior. Once these audiences are identified, it must then design its offerings to reach out to their needs and provide an exceptional “museum-going experience”. To ensure that the HKMM would continue to satisfy its mission of stimulating interest in Hong Kong and Southeast Asian
maritime history, we have identified these market segments so that the museum may address their needs after the relocation to Central Pier No. 8.

Once we created a visitor profile, we projected demographics and visitation estimates for the new location of the museum. We estimated these by surveying the market groups accessible to Central Pier No. 8. Our survey provided an estimate of how many people at the CFP were interested in visiting the museum. We defined a range of visitation projections based on visitor interest and identified the midpoint of it to be the most likely estimate. This estimate was then verified to be reasonable through interviews with development consultants and harbourfront business owners. We developed a separate visitation estimate for the bar and café by estimating the visitation to a nearby establishment with similar offerings. We then scaled all of the projected numbers from this study by the suggested visitation increases from the New Central Harbourfront developments to create a reasonable guess of what visitation might be after the construction is completed. We estimated that the HKMM would attract between 95,000 and 130,000 visitors annually at Central Pier No. 8 and that the bar and café would attract about 100,000. Additionally, we estimated that these numbers are likely to increase by around 50% once the New Central Harbourfront has been completed in 2015.

To identify how the HKMM can enhance its accessibility, attractiveness, and visibility, we completed extensive observational studies on other successful museums in Hong Kong including the Science Museum, the Space Museum, the Museum of Art, and the Museum of History. These museums were located in areas similar in many regards to Central Harbourfront, allowing us to identify methods they use to draw in their target audiences that were also applicable to the HKMM. These observational studies were supplemented by interviews with pertinent staff at other museums. Furthermore, we performed observational studies at Central
Pier No. 8 to identify how it could be enhanced to suit the needs of the HKMM. We then interviewed development consultants and members of the Development Bureau to gain insight on how the New Central Harbourfront construction might affect the visibility and accessibility of the museum. To analyze our findings for the accessibility, visibility, and attractiveness of Hong Kong museums and Pier No. 8, we took each team member’s observational studies and combined them to be representative of the entire group. All of the locations were scored on various ‘metrics’: attributes of accessibility, attractiveness, and visibility that were considered to be very important to ensure a museum’s success. These metrics were then weighted by Dr. Stephen Davies, Director of the HKMM, to identify those items that were most relevant for the museum. For the most relevant metrics, we selected the highest scoring museums to provide examples of how the HKMM can utilize Central Pier No. 8 to draw in visitors to the museum and bar and café while creating a pleasant museum-going experience.

By adjusting its offerings slightly to meet the needs of its target audiences at Central Pier No. 8, we believe that the HKMM will be more successful than ever and continue to fulfill its mission of stimulating interest in maritime history. We found that the new location is exceptionally accessible, more so than Stanley and the other museums that we studied. The accessibility of Pier No. 8 can be further improved by strategic placement of signage in the immediate grounds and surrounding areas of the CFP and nearby public transportation hubs. We determined that Pier No. 8 was not very visible because it was blocked by the CFP clock tower. However, if the HKMM were to brand itself with the CFP, visitors would associate the clock tower with the museum, making the museum very visible from both the Hong Kong Island and Kowloon sides. Central Pier No. 8 was also in a very aesthetically pleasing area, with great landscaping and lighting, and attractive building architecture. The museum could further
improve its external attractiveness by creating a stronger maritime presence through themed motifs, external exhibits, and events, while stylistically reaching out to its target audience of young and middle-aged adults.
1. Introduction

All museums face the common marketing challenge of attracting and retaining visitors. Museums continuously refresh content, drawing visitors who have the desire to experience new exhibits and offerings. Within their marketing strategy, museums develop an audience profile and gauge which exhibits, programs, and events will be successful. Current museum offerings are further evaluated, and those that create the best visitor experiences are maintained. Unfortunately, museums are often limited by myriad constraints, such as financial limitations or government regulations. This can result in limited content and a restricted ability to establish a presence in their communities. To be successful, museums must strive to maintain visitor attendance by satisfying their target audience’s needs. A museum’s primary purpose is to provide an enlightening and interactive experience that stimulates interest in its subject matter. As such, competition with other leisure activities requires museum managers to create refreshing offerings that result in a quality museum visit.

Museums with a highly accessible location are more likely to integrate with their communities and reach out to wider audiences to ensure fulfillment of the museum’s purpose. The Hong Kong Maritime Museum (HKMM), currently located in Stanley, is not easily accessible to many Hong Kong residents, schools, and other potential clientele. The museum is looking to expand its visitor base and gallery space, which is currently limiting its potential to further stimulate local interest in maritime history. At Stanley, the HKMM is only able to display about 25% of its gallery collection and attracts mostly Chinese adult tourists (Stephen Davies, personal communication, November 26, 2009). To overcome these limitations, the museum’s management has secured a new location at Central Pier No. 8 in the “Star” Ferry Piers
Located in the heart of Hong Kong’s New Central Harbourfront, Pier No. 8 will expose HKMM to a much larger and more diverse segment of the population and be more accessible to tourists from other countries. However, the HKMM has not yet collected any concrete data to confirm that increased visitation will result from this move to Pier 8, and it has yet to identify how it will take full advantage of the new location’s potential.

The new location at Central Pier No. 8 is highly accessible from various transportation hubs and other attractions, opening up new market segments to the HKMM that have not yet been previously profiled. Historically, many museums have faced very similar challenges, employing numerous methods to reach out to unexploited audiences. WPI Professor Jeffrey Forgeng (personal communication, November 30, 2009), a past curator at the Higgins Armory Museum in Worcester, Massachusetts, had noticed in his work that the museum failed to successfully reach out to single young adults. Consequently, the Higgins Armory Museum developed the Festival of Ale, a community-driven social event specifically targeted to this small but unexploited audience. Since the inception of this offering, visitation from adults in this market group has increased tremendously. Similarly, in an effort to satisfy the mothers of their young target audience, the Worcester EcoTarium developed a program (Prof. Dominic Golding, personal communication, November 24, 2009) where the mothers could congregate in a comfortable social atmosphere while the museum tended to their children. This program was successful and resulted in increased visitation as well as stimulating interest in ecology and environmental sciences among the children and their mothers. These offerings were initiatives employed to solve inadequate visitation by specific audiences by designing a quality experience for a profiled market segment.
The HKMM would like to develop a sustainable and increased visitor base but has not yet profiled or identified the audiences accessible from Central Pier No. 8. The relocation of the museum raises many unknowns including how to utilize the immediate and surrounding area of Pier No. 8 to enhance the HKMM’s visibility and accessibility. The museum needs to be visible and identifiable from the waterfront areas on both the Kowloon and Hong Kong Island sides, and highly accessible despite the New Central Harbourfront construction project. The HKMM must also address how it can be attractive to its target audiences by being stylistically appealing and by identifying events and other offerings that meet their needs.

A major goal of this project was to identify the newly available audiences at Central Pier No. 8 for HKMM. In addition to developing estimated visitation rates, we provided recommendations to enhance the HKMM’s accessibility, attractiveness, and visibility in an effort to help expand its visitor base and ensure success after the relocation. To achieve this, we observed other successful museums in Hong Kong and interviewed key museum staff to identify how they have marketed themselves and successfully utilized similar environments to Pier No. 8. We studied the new location to identify how the HKMM could exploit its physical environment and surveyed newly available audiences to predict visitation to the museum and its planned bar and café. Our research should help the HKMM develop a new marketing plan that can take advantage of the new location to achieve its mission of promoting and stimulating interest in Hong Kong and Southeast Asian maritime history.
2. Background

Museums are nonprofit organizations that promote a finer appreciation of the sciences, history, and cultural heritage. Our research required investigating museum’s role in society, their marketing techniques, and how these organizations can prepare for their relocation to a new area. In this chapter, we first explain some of the essential concepts to our analysis including the purpose museums have in society, along with the requirements these organizations must complete to successfully create a museum marketing system. We then provide a brief competitive profile of other Hong Kong museums. In addition, we detail information about the New Central Harbourfront construction period which will be present at the time the HKMM relocates to Pier No. 8. Furthermore, we also provide information about Pier No. 8, specifically plans for Pier No. 8 and adjacent areas. Finally, to provide context, we summarize key objectives the HKMM has set forth and that we must accomplish.

2.1 Museums in Society

According to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (2009) museums are defined as “centers for conservation, study, and reflection on heritage and culture” (Museums). Museums are broadly classified as nonprofit educational institutions. They serve society and its continuing development by acquiring, conserving, and researching exhibits and material evidence of human beings, their achievements, and their environment.

Museum scholar Stephen Weil (1995) alludes to an interesting phenomenon regarding museum audiences and museums’ purpose in society. This phenomenon is called Pierre Bordieu’s exclusion principle. Bordieu’s principle, briefly summarized, states that “the predisposition to visit museums in any regular way is a by-product of educational attainment, then it is only through a general increase in the level of the surrounding community that
museums will be able to attract and retain their desired new visitors” (Weil, 1995, p.78).

Bordieu believes the purpose of museums is to contribute toward the consecration of social order (Weil, 1995, p.77). Bordieu believed those who truly appreciate and learn from their “museum experiences” have a certain level of education. Thus, those who appreciate museums understand that these institutions offer society experiences, ideas, and satisfactions that cannot be found in other places (Kotler and Kotler, 1998, p.3).

Kotler and Kotler (1998, p.16) state that museums are valued primarily for the care and preservation of their rare collections as keepsakes for future generations. As the notion of museums changes and museums continue to reinvent themselves, it is important to understand their role in society. Museums find their niche in society as educational centers whose propensity for cultural diffusion drives the preservation of heritage and history. Currently, museums are evolving, “broadening their image, audience, programming and support. Like bandwidths in the digital and broadcasting worlds, museums can be thought of as ranged along a continuum, from ‘narrowband’ museums at one end to ‘broadband’ museums at the other” (p.xix). As museums change their place in society, their missions are modified to accurately encompass contemporary audience profiles. Formulating its mission is a complex task, but it is imperative for a museum to understand what it hopes to achieve in order to successfully fulfill its purpose.

Museums tend to have conflicting and sometimes competing purposes and goals. Establishing a harmony between these elements is difficult. An example of conflicting goals presents itself when a museum attempts to maximize visitor attendance. In an attempt to achieve this goal, they could hold blockbuster exhibitions. If successful in drawing large crowds, the “museum experience” might be unpleasant and unsatisfactory due to congested exhibition halls
and noisiness. Therefore, the museum’s goal of maximizing attendance was reached, but the museum’s goal of providing an optimal “museum experience” was not accomplished (Kotler and Kotler, 1998, p.29). Formulating a mission is problematic because the goal is to create a coherent mission and identity framed around the museum’s values and resources so the latter can be conveyed effectively. Kotler and Kotler (1998, p.29) mention that the mission of a museum, ultimately, determines the functions, roles, and purposes of its distinctive offerings and services.

Depending on the type of museum, the mission could be traditional, visitor oriented, instructive to the public, and community supported among other things. The most important element of a museum’s mission is the balance between its goals, vision, and purpose. A museum’s mission must be clear and concise; its priorities and emphases must be well articulated. Kotler and Kotler (1998, p. 34) believe that a museum’s mission is the foundation of the museum’s network and operations. As a result, museums should strive to offer a myriad of experiences to their visitors to ensure a quality “museum experience” and as a byproduct satisfy their audiences’ needs.

2.2 Museum Audience

As nonprofit business entities, museums serve large and diverse audiences; museum visitors, local or foreign, often have dissimilar interests, intentions, and expectations. Selecting, identifying, and grasping a museum’s audience is the equivalent of a company recognizing its customer base. Companies, throughout their life cycles, conduct extensive customer and marketing analysis that requires vast amounts of capital and man-hours. Michael Dell, founder of Dell Computers, was able to satisfy computer consumers by providing high levels of customer service at every step of the computer buying and servicing process (Koehn, 2004). For example, instead of utilizing the regular channels of distribution, Dell created his own sales team, driven
by customer satisfaction and highly trained technical computer knowledge; this sales team
provided optimum levels of service unseen in the computer industry. Therefore, the success of a
museum, if able to satisfy its audience like Dell, depends on explicitly comprehending and
satisfying its target audience. Museums differ from businesses in the sense that their purpose is
not to seek high levels of visitation (or profits), but stimulate interest in culture and history
throughout their local communities. To that extent, because museums offer intangible
experiences, their efforts to exploit their target audiences must be innovative, carefully modified,
and creative.

Museums must concentrate on understanding, in great detail, their target audience. This
process might include segmenting a target audience by demographics or other strata, in order to
profile characteristics and factors that influence museum-going behavior. Bordieu’s ideas are
important factors to consider when researching target audience. The Bordieu Principle (Weil,
1995, p.76) states that museums are agents of cultural diffusion and should aim to increase the
educational and cultural levels. For example, museums located in underprivileged areas should
have as a first priority not to attract wealthy individuals but rather educate its surrounding
community. Then these individuals can truly appreciate and learn from museums. This means
creating a profile which details a museum’s audience, their characteristics, their museum-going
behavior, and their expectations.

Dr. Carol Scott (2009), in a keynote speech to the International Congress of Maritime
Museums, posed the initiative of creating “a partnership with the public” (p.1). In terms of
museums, forming a partnership with the public implies understanding the museum’s audience
and satisfying their needs. Scott’s museum-public partnership is an innovative marketing
strategy. To implement it, two basic elements about a museum audience must be understood: (1)
audience characteristics; (2) audience attitudes and background (sometimes pre-existing) towards museums. Audiences can differ by demographics (age, gender, ethnicity and race, social class, and educational background). In addition, audiences have different visit frequencies and lengths, motivations, interests, and expectations (Kotler and Kotler, 1998, p.99). Gauging audience characteristics and attitudes requires specialized efforts such as marketing and psychological studies, which often yield data that can be used to build a profile of a specific target audience.

Kotler and Kotler (1998) add, that a challenge for “museum marketers is to develop an understanding of how people’s backgrounds and prior attitudes and perceptions influence their museum-going behavior” (p.115). Museum marketers must understand that factors such as ethnicity, race, and preconceived attitudes, all influence visitors’ attitudes towards museums. Kotler and Kotler argue that Europeans tend to enjoy art museums more than Americans do. Other such cultural and ethnic trends could be discovered through surveying museum visitors or by carrying out focus groups. Once a profile of visitors’ backgrounds and attitudes is available to museum staff, the next step is the construction of a unique visitor experience, which will in turn appeal to the museum’s target audience. The next section discusses the formulation of a museum marketing system, which is developed through key understanding of target audience, mission, goals, and objectives formulation.

2.3 A Brief Overview of Museum Marketing

Marketing is (Kotler and Kotler, 1998, p.59) a process in which consumers obtain what they need and want through the creation, offering, and exchange of products of value with others. Moreover, marketing research seeks to identify and satisfy consumers’ needs by matching consumers with organizations that can meet those needs. This marketing analysis and research encompasses two facets:
1. Systematic research to learn about the organization’s consumers, the organization’s ability to meet their needs, the larger environment in which both consumers and the organization interact, and the competitors who seek to meet the same consumer needs.

2. Experimentation, innovation, trial and error—a search to develop products and services that will succeed in the exchange process, within the framework of an organization’s objectives (p. 60).

In terms of museum marketing, Kotler and Kotler (1998) apply Strategic Marketing Planning System (SMPS), which revolves around the elements presented in figure 2.1. This network of marketing describes four steps that should be used when designing a marketing plan.
The first step is an analysis of the environments surrounding museums (internal, market, regulatory, competitive, and macro environments) (Kotler and Kotler, 1998). The second step is conducting an internal resource analysis, gauging the strengths and weaknesses of the museum.
and how it can appeal to its target audience. The third step is creating or developing a museum brand and reputation through the development of museum mission and goals. The fourth and final step is the marketing strategy formulation, which ties analysis and conclusions from the other steps. SMPS and the process of designing a museum marketing system create the foundation for a museum’s organizational shape, plans, programs, offerings, and services. In turn, a well designed marketing system helps retain museum visitation, which is the next step in satisfying a museum’s target audience.

### 2.4 Maintaining Visitation

Maintaining museum visitation rates often translates into refreshing museum offerings and the introduction of new exhibits. Retaining visitors creates a sustainable business environment in which museums produce capital to fund their operations. Moreover, visitor retention reveals an intricate challenge—attracting and satisfying audiences by providing quality visitor experiences. This challenge is multifaceted and requires an established audience profile, offerings portfolio, and the formulation of a marketing system. After an understanding of basic museum marketing is outlined, museum management must understand the concept of creating a sustainable business environment by maintaining visitors.

Museums compete in an industry with other forms of leisure activities, or alternatives to these activities. The most obvious alternative to a leisure activity is individuals or groups of people who decide to stay at home rather than go out. Kotler and Kotler (1998, p.39) mention this behavior involves activities such as watching television, listening to music, reading, using the computer, and playing video games. The second form of competitive behavior is going out, which is restricted to leisure alternatives of museums. These include such things as restaurants, cinemas, concert halls, theaters, professional sport events, theme parks, and shopping centers,
among other things. Dr. Carol (2009) provides a tool which depicts the values motivating a personal leisure choice (such as attending a museum). Below is Carol’s tool.

![Diagram of Values Motivating Personal and Leisure Choice](source: Carol, 2009, p. 13)

In her hypothetical study Carol (2009) delineates four elements that affect an individual’s leisure choices. The first element is “connection”, or as Carol describes, “the opportunity to bond with significant others and experience something together” (p.12). The second element is “personal identity” or “the sense of self” (ibid). The third element Dr. Carol coins as “learning” or the value of individuals “seeking knowledge and interested in self-development or seeking to share their learning with others” (ibid). “Entertainment” is the fourth element in Carol’s hypothesis, which refers to individuals seeking “fun in their leisure and expect the experience to provide enjoyment” (p.13). The results of Carol’s hypothesis are summarized below.

- **Personal identity** – This group of individuals in the market needs to feel cool and contemporary. Fifteen percent of the market.
• **Learning** – Personal interests and knowledge are important. This group of individuals seeks depth and something special. Approximately seventeen percent of the market.

• **Connection** – This group of individuals wants to share something personally worthwhile with others (friends or family). Estimated at thirty-six percent of the market.

• **Entertainment** – The group seeks pleasurable, fun, enjoyable, and hassle-free experiences. This group of individuals accounts for about thirty two percent of the market (p.14).

In order to appeal to their target audience, museum management and marketers must identify which one of Carol’s groups is prevalent in their audience, and construct specific and tailored marketing strategies framed around the audience. Consequently, museums must aim to maintain visitor and member satisfaction through rotating or periodic exhibits, events that provide the widest possible range of experiences. Moreover, if museum staff have a comprehensive understanding of the museum audience, then special events (often promoting social interaction) can be launched and customized to the needs, interest and satisfactions of visitors and members.

The implementation of methods to attract and retain a museum’s target audience is vital for its success. Professor Dominic Golding (personal communication, November 24, 2009) of Worcester Polytechnic Institute and former grant manager for the Worcester EcoTarium Museum, mentioned that when appealing to its target audience (school kids aged from 4 to 12 and family groups) the EcoTarium made sure to have immaculate rest room facilities and simple, interactive, and engaging exhibitions. However, there are obstacles that arise when constructing the museum experience. For example, museums must consider visitor demand, extending the length of museum visits and reducing the costs of museum-going. Extending the length of
museum visits could involve experiments such as providing “orientation and way-finding information” or “redesigning the spaces in [museum] halls and galleries to slow visitor’s passage and capture more attention” (Kotler and Kotler, 1998, p.44). Reducing costs of the museum experience can be solved through creative and persistent means. Professor Golding mentioned that the EcoTarium was able to reduce its entrance fee for school groups by gathering funds from local Worcester foundations. This is just one of many ways of reducing the costs of museum entry.

In summation, creating a thorough visitor profile of the museum’s target audience is vital to the success of any museum and the goals it sets for itself. Some museums spend their entire life time trying to define their visitor base and develop methods of attracting them without truly succeeding. An example of a museum which has successfully identified its visitor base is the Hong Kong Maritime Museum (HKMM).

2.5 Hong Kong Maritime Museum
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*Figure 2.3*

*Hong Kong Maritime Museum at the Murray House*

*(Source: Hong Kong Maritime Museum, 2009)*

The privately operated HKMM, currently located in Stanley on the south side of Hong Kong Island, has prospered for a number of years. Unfortunately it has outgrown the historic
Murray House in which it presently resides. It can only display about 25 percent of its exhibitions (Davies, 2009, p. 2). At its location in Stanley, museum director Dr. Stephen Davies (2009) estimates the yearly attendance ranges from 35,000 to 40,000 visitors. While the HKMM is a small museum when compared to the museums profiled in the subsequent sections, it is largely limited by its location and has still enjoyed relative success, according to Dr. Davies.

The HKMM (2009) mission states:

“The mission of the Hong Kong Maritime Museum is to stimulate public interest in the world of ships and the sea with particular reference to the South China coast and adjacent seas and to the growth of Hong Kong as a major port and international maritime centre, and in doing so highlight the major developments in and cross-fertilization between Chinese, Asian and western maritime traditions” (About Us).

For further information about the organizational structure, exhibits and other pertinent information about the Hong Kong Maritime Museum, refer to Appendix A.

2.5.1 Target Audience

The Hong Kong Maritime Museum currently considers its target audience to be, “Hong Kong Chinese males and females, with a median age of 27-32 (median moving upwards to probably mid-40s by 2030), earning HK$15,000-HK$20,000 a month, with senior secondary (high school) or bottom end tertiary (college) schooling, who are spontaneous walk-ins rather than museum devotees” (Stephen Davies, personal communication, November 26, 2009). This target is derived from 4 years of surveying visitors with a total of 1,200 respondents, about 1% of the total audience. These are displayed in Table 2.1.
Table 2.1

Visitor Analysis Based on a HKMM 4 Year Survey

(Source: Stephen Davies, personal communication, November 26, 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Visitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male/female</td>
<td>52%/48%</td>
<td>104,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>148,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liked the HKMM</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>190,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are occasional, come-upon-by-chance museum visitors</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>168,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend &gt; 30mins and &lt; 1hr in the HKMM</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>88,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 41 years of age</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>68,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 41 years of age</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>125,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-40 years of age</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>96,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary or higher education</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>176,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary or postgraduate education</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>116,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tncomes under HK$30,000 a month</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>104,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relocation to Pier No. 8 on Hong Kong Island will allow the HKMM to expand its audience to include, not just adults and older students, but younger children as well, and potentially new, unidentified market segments.

Currently, the Stanley location of HKMM (Stephen Davies, personal communication, November 26, 2009) does not have any dedicated outreach programs for younger children in part because of the lack of space inside the location. The current location encourages and receives visiting school groups, but from mostly affluent, international schools. The local public school system is very exam focused and “maritime history is not a significant element in the curriculum” (ibid). One problem is that the Stanley location of the HKMM is significantly far from the main residential areas of Hong Kong, particularly the schools in north Kowloon, North
Hong Kong Island, and the New Territories. The new location will be located near public transportation and inside the city’s Central Business District, thus making the Pier No. 8 location a more convenient day trip for Hong Kong schools. To appeal to school groups and groups with younger visitors, the HKMM currently (ibid) has an education pack for schools to use and plans to recruit a museum education assistant curator for the new location.

The current visitor composition, profiles, motivation, and satisfaction are displayed in Table 2.2 below. These data demonstrate that at the current location roughly 95% of visitors are Hong Kong residents or overseas visitors. The relocation site will allow easier access to the museum for locals of Hong Kong because the new location is within the central part of the city. The age range of the visitors, as well as the education range and income range may shift somewhat for the new location but will be assumed to remain consistent.
Table 2.2

HKMM Visitor and Visit Data

(Source: Stephen Davies, personal communication, November 26, 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visitor composition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;70% Hong Kong Residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;26% Overseas visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;4% Visitors from mainland China</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visitor Profiles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15% under 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45% 18-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35% 41-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% over 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-65% Are graduate or postgraduate educated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% Earn less than HK$12,000 a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% Earn HK$12,001 - HK$29,999 a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45% Earn more than HK$30,000 a month</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visitor Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97% Are either satisfied or have no complaints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;65% Like the Ancient Gallery most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;85% Express great satisfaction from the interactive and infotainment exhibits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% Think highly of HKMM staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once the HKMM has moved to the Central Pier No.8 location these data will change, school groups will be brought in, the location will be more convenient for locals, and the space will be bigger than the current location, allowing more groups and events to occur at the HKMM. Thriving museums in Hong Kong, such as those for history, science, space, and art are other examples of museums that have triumphed and attract large numbers of visitors annually. These institutions have done so by building competitive profiles of other museums in Southeast Asia. By building these competitive profiles, they can exploit the audiences which other museums have failed to attract. This allows them to develop different and distinctive methods of attracting these new audiences.
2.5.2 Hong Kong Museums’ Competitive Profiles

The competitive landscape of the museum industry is not only defined by museums that compete for similar patrons but rather museums or other leisure activities that are able to take a market share away from HKMM. The museums profiled below are the most successful and thus are museums whose marketing and advertising strategies must be investigated. In contrast to the HKMM, these museums are controlled and governed by the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, Leisure and Cultural Services Department, i.e. they are government supported entities. As a result, museums under the Leisure and Cultural Services Department umbrella enjoy political and financial support, while HKMM is privately funded and operated.

*Hong Kong Museum of History*
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*Figure 2.4*

*Hong Kong Museum of History Entrance*

*(Source: Hong Kong Museum of History, 2009)*

Established in 1975 with an estimated 17,500 square meters area, the Hong Kong Museum of History (2009) enjoys prominence among Hong Kong’s cultural organizations. It is
a “comprehensive state-of-the-art museum” located next to Hong Kong Science Museum, which “forms a museum complex of a harmonious appearance and color scheme” (About Museum).

The Hong Kong Museum of History’s (2009) mission aims to preserve and promote Hong Kong’s culture and history through collecting and conserving cultural objects native to Hong Kong. Furthermore, the museum advances public awareness and understanding of Hong Kong history and culture with the broader goal of strengthening social cohesion (Vision, Mission and Financials). The Hong Kong Museum of History (2009) has a significant visitor base, with 688,743 visitors between the 2008 and 2009 fiscal year (Vision, Mission, and Financials). Methods of attracting visitors utilized by the Hong Kong Museum of History may serve as models for the HKMM. The ultimate goal will be to determine the feasibility and appropriateness of such methods for the HKMM.

Hong Kong Space Museum

Figure 2.5

Hong Kong Space Museum

(Source: Hong Kong Space Museum, 2009)
Located strategically at the seaside of Tsim Sha Tsui in Kowloon, the Hong Kong Space Museum (2009) was established in October 1980 and includes the first planetarium in Hong Kong. Since its inception it has become a landmark in Hong Kong’s cultural landscape. The Hong Kong Space Museum aims to provide quality museum services and highly educational and entertaining programs and exhibitions. The museum’s broader goals are to stimulate Hong Kong community interest in astronomy and space science (Introduction to our Museum). The Hong Kong Space Museum enjoys a location which permits its patrons to engage in astronomical observation while at the same time visiting its exhibition halls and other facilities. This aspect makes this museum the third most popular museum in Hong Kong, with yearly attendance in 2008 totaling 594,131 visitors.

Through research of its website, we have discovered the technical prowess of the Hong Kong Space Museum marketing plan. Its home page is an attractive and tailored experience. It provides astronomical information, and information about special events and programs in the museum on a creative background of astronomical figures and celestial giants. Kotler and Kotler (1998) never delve in specifics about utilizing the internet as an effective tool for marketing. However, a quintessential example of a well constructed website, tailored to the museum’s target audience, is the Space Museum’s website.

2.6 The New Central Harbourfront Construction Period

The construction period will have direct effect on Central Pier No. 8 and thus the HKMM. The next section details the future items that encompass the New Central Harbourfront construction period. The Hong Kong Planning Department (2009, p.1) of the Town Planning Board for Hong Kong has completed an Urban Design Study for the Central Harbourfront. The Central Harbourfront, spanning 700m from Central to Wanchai, is being transformed into a
beautiful cultural center and waterfront attraction symbolic of Hong Kong. The vision of the Planning Department is to create a world-class showpiece at the heart of the city. The Central Harbourfront will include the new location of the HKMM, Central Pier No. 8.

Aedas Limited Planning Department (2008, p.1) sets three goals for the construction period. First, the construction should result in a harbourfront with more open space that can be enjoyed by the public. Second, the vibrancy of the waterfront should be enhanced by adding new uses and activities. Third, accessibility needs to be improved. With these three main goals in mind, construction should not hinder structures of significance or historical buildings that are presently on the Central Harbourfront. Additionally, all developments should focus on minimal building density and height.

The outcome of this project will result in a communal center of urban space for the people of Hong Kong. The waterfront of Central will be enjoyable, with open air promenade activities, shelters along the promenade, and a greener outlet for leisure. The result will be a "must-see" destination in terms of restaurants, commercial shops, entertainment, and cultural activity, for both the residents of Hong Kong and tourists (Aedas Limited Planning Department, 2008, p.2). It will be made more accessible by improving Central Ferry Piers (CFP), adding deck level pedestrian walkways, and an underground connection from MTR Central Station (Hong Kong Planning Department, 2008, p.13). In addition to this, effective north-south pedestrian linkages would be constructed to bring people to and from the waterfront, and present footbridges would be replaced with more extensive landscaped decks (Hong Kong Institute of Planners Public Affairs Committee, 2008, p. 2).
The developments of the New Central Harbourfront directly affect the success of the HKMM. The harbourfront will likely provide a great deal of tourism and local interest to this region of Hong Kong. Additionally, it will enable pedestrian traffic access to the museum from the Central Business District, park areas, hotels, and the Star Ferry, all of which are parts of the New Central Harbourfront plan (Planning Department, 2008, p. 17).

2.6.1 Plan for Central Pier No. 8 and Nearby Locations

Central Pier No. 8 lies at the heart of the Central Harbourfront and will therefore play a large role in the project's success. However, in terms of the Urban Design Study performed in 2007 and 2008 (Planning Department, 2008), the role of Central Pier No. 8 has been left largely undefined. The main attraction at Central Pier No. 8 will be the HKMM and thus will be responsible for most of the traffic in and out of that area. The pier is located in a region outside of one of the Planning Department's specified "Sites", however it is directly touching Sites 1 and 7 (See Fig. 6), and within close proximity of Site 8. Therefore, Central Pier No. 8 developments are directly related to the plans for these three bordering sites, which are vital in making Central Pier No. 8 accessible. Furthermore, visitor traffic to Central Pier No.8 is contingent on the attractiveness and success of these nearby locations.
The nearby Site 1 had plans for two possible outcomes. The first of these was to use it for hotel and office space, and the second strictly for office space. Public opinion has led to suggesting that the former be implemented. This plan would meet the need for offices and hotels in Central Business District, as well as add vitality for the New Central Harbourfront. According to the Hong Kong Planning Department (2008, p.12), Piers No. 4 and 6, located at Site 1, would be used for al fresco dining and other waterfront related uses. These attractions would allow a great deal of tourist activity as well as visitation from the business district to Pier No. 8, which is located directly to the east.

The adjacent Site 7 has plans to contain a large amount of public space, which has been defined by the Planning Department's "Urban Green" and "Urban Park" approaches. Ultimately,
public opinion has varied between the two approaches, and the Stage 2 study (Hong Kong Planning Department, 2008, p.18) has suggested a possible hybrid of the two concepts. The Stage 2 report suggests that Site 7 should be transformed to have more greenery, with better defined attraction nodes to enhance vibrancy. Also, because of Site 7’s location directly connecting many of the other sites, it has been suggested that the location should enhance pedestrian connectivity by providing such things as cycle tracks, jogging trails, or an automatic people mover. Site 7 will be transformed into an energetic park space, responsible for making the surrounding sites more accessible. As a result, the Hong Kong Planning Department (2008, p.18) believes much of the traffic to Pier No. 8 would be facilitated through Site 7.

The nearby Site No. 8 is of high maritime historical significance and will bring traffic to Pier No. 8. The Planning Department (2008, p.20) and the public generally believe that the historic Queen's Pier should be reassembled at Site No. 8, and memorial elements should be erected at its original site. This, the Hong Kong Planning Department notes, would involve the refurbishment of Piers No. 9 and 10, as well as the reconstruction of seawall caissons and ground stabilization works. The new Queen's Pier would be within direct proximity of Pier No. 8, and its historical significance would draw crowds, through available public transportation, to the historical attractions at Pier No. 8. Another benefit of Pier No. 8 and the Central District of Hong Kong is that it is convenient and easily accessible by means of public transportation.

2.6.2 Pier No. 8 Accessibility by Means of Public Transportation

According to the Transport Department of Hong Kong (2005) “over 11 million passenger daily journeys are made on a public transport system which includes two high capacity railways, trams, buses, minibuses, and ferries” (Introduction). Hong Kong is truly a modern metropolis that boasts a highly developed local transportation infrastructure. Hong Kong’s transportation
network encompasses three major modes of public transport: road, railway, and maritime transport. Transportation is an integral part of the HKMM relocation project because the new location will place the museum in highly trafficked crossroads, near the Star Ferry –Central Pier, the MTR Central and Hong Kong subway station stops, and the CityBus and Kowloon Motor Bus Central stop. This section outlines the different modes of transport closest to Pier No. 8, the new location of the HKMM, which are currently accessible to future museum patrons.

The Transport Department of Hong Kong (2008) estimates that approximately 54 million people utilize ferry maritime transportation yearly. Due to its heavy usage, its rates remain considerably inexpensive. The “Star” Ferry Company Ltd. is the primary leader in maritime ferry transport. Star Ferry Company Ltd provides ferry passenger services between Hong Kong Island and Kowloon Peninsula, crossing Victoria Harbour frequently. Star Ferry (2008) operates four major routes originating from four piers: Tsim Sha Tsui Pier, Wan Chai Pier, Hung Hom Pier, and Central Pier. Passengers disembarking from the Central Ferry Pier are approximately 95 meters away from Pier No.8. The fare for an adult from the farthest pier away from Central, the Hung Hom to Central Pier, ranges from $5 to $6 Hong Kong dollars.

The two leading bus companies in Hong Kong are Citybus Limited and Kowloon Motor Bus; both operate on Hong Kong Island and Kowloon. The Hong Kong Transport Department (2005) estimates that Citybus transports 571,000 passengers daily and Kowloon Motor Bus transports 2.70 million passengers a day. The companies’ urban fares (routes not including New Territories) range from $2.5 to $11.8 Hong Kong dollars. In relation to the HKMM relocation project, both bus companies have routes that travel to stops in the Central area of Hong Kong Island, near where Pier No. 8 is located.
Mass Transit Railway (MTR) Corporation Ltd. (2009) is the premier railway transportation provider in Hong Kong, with about “174.4 km of track and 82 stations” (Train Services). MTR estimates that on a weekday, an average of 3.7 million people travel to their destinations using the MTR railways. MTR travel is usually accessed by using an Octopus Card, an electronic smart card that deducts fares electronically according to the distance traveled.

There are two MTR stations located in the Central district of Hong Kong Island within walking distance of Pier No. 8.

The new location of the HKMM at Central Pier No. 8 is clearly advantageous in regards to accessibility as it is reachable by three different modes of public transportation. However, the HKMM staff maintains that there are certain unknown variables which must be addressed before the HKMM completes its relocation. These unknown variables and the inherent challenges they pose are detailed below.

2.7 Potential Challenges

It has been generally accepted by the Planning Department (2008, p. 17) that the HKMM will be the main attraction on the east side of the New Central Harbourfront. However, Dr. Stephen Davies was adamant that there have remained a number of issues that need to be addressed in order to ensure that the relocation will be a success. These include the following (Davies, 2009, p.2-3):

1) Projected visitor numbers need to be determined for the HKMM. It is expected that this number will greatly surpass the current annual visitor flow of 35,000-40,000 based on the fact that Pier No. 8 is closer to the heart of Hong Kong's business and touristic life. Projected numbers were divided into subcategories, including:

   o Projected visitor numbers for strictly museum entry.
o Projected visitor numbers for the intended bar and café.

o Projected visitor number differences during and after the New Central Harbourfront Construction period.

2) Methods of enhancing visitor accessibility need to be established. The museum location at Pier No. 8 will ideally be opened prior to the completion of the New Central Harbourfront construction period, and therefore the accessibility brought by the new developments cannot be fully realized during this time. These means have been identified in order to bring in visitors from the Central Business District as well as from tourism. Methods of improving accessibility also have been applicable to after the completion of the construction period.

3) Methods of enhancing the visibility of Pier No. 8 need to be identified. At the time of this study, Pier No. 8 was hidden from view from Central by the Central Ferry Piers Complex. Thus, signage and major features need to be used to make it visible from both Hong Kong Island and Kowloon sides of the harbour.

4) To be consistent with the Planning Department's vision for the New Central Harbourfront, the new location of the HKMM at Pier No. 8 also must be vibrant and attractive. Thus, methods of enhancing HKMM attractiveness need to be established.

The HKMM has faced several challenges in trying to revitalize its past operational and marketing techniques. It is imperative that the HKMM understands the new potential market segments available at Pier No. 8. Comprehending a museum’s target audience requires significant time and resources. The HKMM instructed us to conduct a small scale marketing study, aimed at highlighting the objectives stated above. This marketing study has resulted in recommendations to the HKMM, which have been constructed to enhance visibility, accessibility
and attractiveness of the Pier No. 8 location. We discuss how these objectives were accomplished in the next chapter.
3. Methodology

The goal of this project was to complete a baseline marketing study for the Hong Kong Maritime Museum (HKMM) that estimated visitation rates and provided recommendations to enhance the HKMM’s accessibility, attractiveness, and visibility for its future location at Central Pier No. 8. This chapter explains how we collected data to meet our objectives and the approach that we used to analyze our findings.

3.1 Division of Objectives

To assess the needs of the HKMM at its new location at Central Pier No. 8, we divided the methods for acquiring data and organized them based on the objectives for this project. These objectives are:

- Determine projected visitation rates for the new location
  - For visits to the museum
  - For visits to the planned bar and café

- Identify ways of enhancing accessibility to the new location
  - During the New Central Harbourfront construction period
  - After the New Central Harbourfront Construction period

- Identify ways of enhancing visibility on and off site for the new location
  - From the Kowloon side
  - From the Hong Kong Island side

- Identify ways of enhancing attractiveness of the new location

Each of these was addressed individually by our team. Each objective required different methods of data collection and analysis to be achieved. This research was then used to make
recommendations specific to each topic. The methods that we used to collect data for each objective are described below.

3.2 Projected Visitation for Central Pier No. 8

To ensure that the HKMM will continue to achieve its mission of stimulating public interest in Hong Kong maritime history, we projected a visitation rate for its new location at Pier No. 8. Estimated visitation is an essential element for creating a quality museum-going experience at the new location. However, estimating this for Pier No. 8 was the most complex problem our team addressed. This problem was complicated because the relocation opens up a number of different market segments. While the location in Stanley catered mostly to tourists, Central would expose the HKMM to many new groups of visitors. These included people working in the Central Business District (CBD), casual pedestrian and recreational traffic as a result of the New Central Harbourfront, traffic from the ferries, and a slew of native Hong Kong residents from various other sources. We established estimated visitation by directly surveying these market groups, interviewing various Central business owners, and interviewing development consultants for the harbourfront project. We separated projected visitation rates to the museum from projected visitation for the planned bar and café.

With the completion of the New Central Harbourfront construction project in 2015, the HKMM would be exposed to a great deal of casual pedestrian traffic from recreational activity. At the time of our study, this construction project was renovating the site directly adjacent to the Central Ferry Piers (CFP), which would eventually provide green park space for leisurely activity. Kotler and Kotler (1998, p.100) note that surveying is a common evaluation tool for gauging audience characteristics. To represent these types of people, we surveyed the pedestrian traffic at the Central Ferry Piers Complex that was already there from the CFP and other local
establishments. Many of these people were typically sitting on benches or leisurely strolling along the harbourfront promenade, reflecting both ferry passenger and recreational usage. To survey these people, we asked a simple question verbally, whether or not the person interviewed would visit a maritime museum if one were located at Central Pier No. 8. This proved to be much easier to execute than a written survey, which would require permission from authorities that we were not able to acquire. We collected a total of 330 survey responses at the CFP. Additionally, to eliminate possible error within our survey results from people who answered ‘yes’ but otherwise seemed entirely indifferent, we kept a second count of survey responses of people who we perceived to be enthusiastic to visit a maritime museum at Pier No. 8. These data were useful to us because they suggested a potential percentage of recreational and ferry traffic who might visit the HKMM. Furthermore, ferry traffic represents many of the market groups the HKMM will be exposed to, including CBD workers and tourists. This study was performed to be consistent with Kotler and Kotler’s suggestions for how to profile a museum’s target audience.

To formulate a projected visitation for the new location of the HKMM, we needed to acquire current average annual visitation to the Central Ferry Piers (CFP) and an estimated visitation increase for after the completion of the New Central Harbourfront construction period. To obtain the former, we interviewed Mr. Frankie Yick, Managing Director of the “Star” Ferry Company Limited, and Mr. Johnny Leung, the General Manager (See Appendix B: Interview Transcripts). To acquire the estimated visitation increase to the harbourfront after the completion of the construction period, we interviewed Mr. Paul Zimmerman, director of Designing Hong Kong, and Mr. Christian Fung, the Senior Administrative Officer of the Harbour Unit of the Development Bureau. Additionally, we used these interviews as
opportunities to acquire more information on how the construction phase might affect accessibility to Pier No. 8 (See section 3.3.2). From these interview results, we then estimated visitation to the HKMM by taking the percentage of our favorable survey responses from the overall annual pedestrian traffic through the CFP (See section 4.1.1 for this analysis). Furthermore, we scaled this number by the expected increase in visitation from the New Central Harbourfront to estimate visitation to the museum for after the completion of the construction period.

To estimate visitation for the planned bar and café at the HKMM, our team recorded the number of customers to Pier 7 Café and Bar. The target audience of this local establishment is directly comparable to the market that the HKMM bar and café wishes to attract. To do this, we used a handheld counter to tally patronage in two hour intervals during four main time periods: Wednesday 13:00, Wednesday 20:00, Saturday 13:00, and Saturday 20:00. By having data for these time periods, we then estimated weekly patronage for Pier 7 Café and Bar. With this, we assumed that the week days would result in similar visitation to Wednesday and that the weekend days would result in similar visitation to Saturday. We used these figures to project visitation for the HKMM bar and café based on the planned hours of operation, assuming the patronage would be very comparable. We did not account for seasonal variations in patronage but nonetheless provided a rough visitation estimate.

3.3 Accessibility Enhancement

To provide recommendations to enhance the accessibility to the new location of the HKMM, we conducted a two-part study. The first part evaluated the accessibility of the following sites: (1) Central Pier No. 8, (2) the Hong Kong Museum of Art, (3) the Hong Kong Museum of History, (4) the Hong Kong Science Museum, (5) the Hong Kong Space Museum,
and (6) the HKMM. We selected these museums due to their significant visitation while operating in different accessibility spectra. Additionally, we selected Pier No. 8 to identify how it could be improved and we selected the current location of the HKMM to have a point of reference for what the museum already did to improve its accessibility. We focused this evaluation on specific accessibility attributes that each site possessed. We collected data that focused on the immediate grounds and the surrounding area of each site to establish what worked well and what could be useful to the HKMM after the relocation. The second part of the accessibility study was interviewing museum staff and development consultants for the New Central Harbourfront project. By interviewing consultants to the harbourfront project, we gained an understanding of how the project and the construction phase will affect accessibility to Pier No. 8. By interviewing the staff of other successful museums in Hong Kong, we gauged what techniques these museums employed to address their accessibility concerns.

An observational study, as defined by our group, attempts to gauge the strengths and weaknesses of an institution within certain aspects of its operations. We further divided our observational studies into two correlated components: (1) observational reports, (2) observational metrics. These two were functions of each other; our observational reports provided detailed descriptions of particular metrics at each observed site. We gave the observational metrics a numerical value, one to ten, to indicate their level of effectiveness. To conduct each observational study, our team split up and individually visited Central Pier No. 8 and the five museums mentioned above. We collected data observationally using photography and documented reports of each of our experiences emulating different paths that visitors followed to arrive at each chosen site. These sites were studied to identify the accessibility strengths and
weaknesses at each and gauge how the strengths could be applied to exploit the maximum potential of the HKMM’s new location.

We began analysis began with compiling the observational reports, allowing us to build a final report for each of the locations. Each report included each team member’s summary of each metric, which was used to support the numerical grades that were assigned. We then took the six studies from each member’s individual reports and built a final description of that metric, encompassing feedback from all members of the team.

Next, we averaged the metrics and calculated final numerical grades that supported the report descriptions for each. These then became the final numerical grades, which were supplemented by the final report descriptions. This resulted in six final reports, one for each museum and location that we studied. Using these final compiled data, we drew conclusions with supporting evidence to suggest which location exemplified each metric the best. From each of these locations, we then extracted the items that were used effectively and could be utilized by the HKMM after relocating to Central Pier No. 8. Our recommendations were then built off of the items that we determined to be economically feasible.

The second part of the accessibility assessment was to conduct interviews with people who were involved with the development of the New Central Harbourfront to gauge how this project would affect accessibility to Central Pier No. 8. We interviewed Mr. Dick Groves, a commercial and retail real-estate development consultant. Additionally, we used the interviews with Mr. Paul Zimmerman and Mr. Christian Fung to provide further insight on this study as they were both involved with the New Central Harbourfront to some extent. We selected these people because of their involvement and expertise in the harbourfront project and the valuable insight that they could provide. These people were valuable to us because they provided
information on how the HKMM could enhance accessibility to Central Pier No. 8 both during and after the construction period.

Additionally, we interviewed museum staff from various institutions. The people that we interviewed for this study were Mr. Chan Ki-hung, curator of the Hong Kong Space Museum, Professor Dominic Golding, former Grant Manager for the Worcester EcoTarium, and Professor Jeffrey Forgeng, former curator of the Higgins Armory Museum in Worcester, MA. These people were valuable to our study because they helped us to understand how other successful museums make themselves accessible to their target audiences. With this understanding we extracted the methods that these museums used to enhance their accessibility that could be applied to the HKMM at its new location.

By coupling the observational studies with our interview results, we established a vivid display of the strengths and weaknesses of each site. Using our understandings of the Pier No. 8 location and of museum marketing, we then identified ways of enhancing accessibility to the new location of the HKMM (See section 4.2 for this analysis).

3.4 Visibility Enhancement

The HKMM, along with the Clock Tower Plaza, is expected to form the focal point of the New Central Harbourfront (Hong Kong Planning Department, 2009, p. 15). While the new facility is located very strategically, at the time of this study it was quite undeveloped and thus not very visible. Providing recommendations to enhance the visibility of the new location at Pier No. 8 required a two-pronged approach: (1) an assessment of the visibility of Pier No. 8, (2) an assessment of other means that could be utilized to enhance visibility to the new HKMM site.
To begin collecting data for this study, we conducted a preliminary assessment of what strategies the HKMM currently employs to enhance visibility so that there was no redundancy between what was already implemented and what our recommendations are. To do this, we interviewed Dr. Stephen Davies to identify what techniques the museum was used to reach out to its target audiences. Moreover, this interview was not performed to gain insight on what the museum can do differently, but rather so that our team was aware of what strategies are currently used to make the museum visible in Stanley. Additionally, each member of the team performed the same observational study that we carried out on other museums in Hong Kong on the current location of the HKMM in Stanley.

The second stage of data collection to achieve this objective was to identify new ways of enhancing visibility that were not in use at the Stanley premises, and how they could be applied to the opportunities presented by the Pier No. 8 location. We did this by studying how the leading museums in Hong Kong make themselves visible to the public. The Hong Kong Museum of Art, the Hong Kong Museum of History, the Hong Kong Science Museum, and the Hong Kong Space Museum were selected for this study. We selected these museums due to their sheer success, boasting impressive visitation in past years, suggesting that they efficiently make themselves visible to their target audiences. These museums were useful to our study because they share comparable locations to Central Pier No. 8 and therefore are likely to target some of the same audiences that will be available to the HKMM after the relocation. Our team performed an observational study on these museums using the same procedure as the observational study for accessibility. However, different metrics that specifically described visibility were used. We utilized metrics and an established ranking system to rate the visibility of these locations to perform a weighted analysis (See Appendix C: Observational Studies
Definitions and Associated Nomenclature). We documented the physical visibility of each museum’s facilities from different pedestrian routes, determined how difficult it was to find each location, and identified signage that made each museum distinguishable. Data were collected and documented through written observational reports and photography.

The next stage of this study focused on how these museums reach their target audiences. Outreach is arguably the most important attribute of visibility. Without it, the target audiences may not even be aware of a museum’s existence. Dr. Carol Scott (2009, p.18) suggests outreach is important as she adheres to the belief that museums should engage their communities and form a public partnership. We interviewed Mr. Chan Ki-hung, curator at the Hong Kong Space Museum, to identify the methods of outreach that the Space Museum utilized to enhance visibility to its target audiences. Additionally, we used the interviews with Professors Dominic Golding and Jeffrey Forgeng to gain additional insight on this subject. We focused our questions on what strategies these institutions employed in the past to reach their audiences as well as how successful these methods have been.

In addition, we each surveyed the Pier No. 8 location individually to focus on identifying areas where visibility could be enhanced. This was necessary to establish how our findings from other museums could be applied to the new location, and which of those were not applicable. Having identified the key routes to the museum from our accessibility study, we then surveyed those routes to see how the HKMM might enhance visibility of the museum along them. We conducted observational studies using the guidelines discussed in section 3.3. We collected data with the same methods utilized for the other Hong Kong museums, but employing a different metrics system to identify how visible the Pier No. 8 location is from various routes, angles, and perspectives. We complemented each metric with an extensive set of commentary that described
what was lacking and how the HKMM could take advantage of those routes to make the museum more visible after relocating to Pier No. 8.

As the HKMM would not be able to change the physical visibility of Pier No. 8, we focused our study on looking for areas where strategic signage could be utilized. Additionally, we looked for alternative ways to make Pier No. 8 visible as the location of the HKMM, such as through the placement of a maritime-themed centerpiece, cost-effective advertising, and increased local awareness. Data were then compared to our findings from other Hong Kong museums so that we could identify the methods of museum visibility enhancement that were consistently successful in the past.

3.5 Attractiveness Enhancement

Enhancing attractiveness of the new location deals with the HKMM’s immediate area, events, external exhibits, and other offerings, and how well these appeal to their target audiences. In the past, the primary audience of the HKMM was young adults, with median visitor age being between 27 and 32 (Davies, 2009). As such, to cater the museum’s attractiveness to this target group, our team needed to assess what their needs were. We believed that the bar and café would be an excellent start to appealing to them; however the HKMM needed to also be stylistically on target with this group. The content of the museum should also reflect their interests. Additionally, the museum seeks to attract the new audiences available at Pier No. 8 and reach out to tour and school groups (Davies, 2009). Professor Jeffrey Forgeng (personal communication, November 23, 2009) mentioned that the Higgins Armory Museum satisfied the needs of its target audience by utilizing its facilities to offer a comfortable social setting. Thus, by exploring the needs of the HKMM’s target audiences, we identified relevant offerings. Additionally, at a more basic level, the museum’s immediate area and facilities need to be
attractive to all audiences – they should be well landscaped and visually appealing, and exhibits should be identified with attractive banners and motifs. We explored the need for all of these items during the data collection to identify ways of enhancing the attractiveness of the HKMM after relocating to Central Pier No. 8.

For this study, we used the interviews with the curator of the Hong Kong Space Museum, Chan Hi-Kung, as well as Professors Dominic Golding and Jeffrey Forgeng, to collect ideas on how to make museums attractive. During these interviews, we asked questions regarding how these museums attract their target audiences. These museums also share similar market groups to those that will be available to the HKMM after relocating to Pier No. 8.

The next method of data collection that we used to identify items that would enhance attractiveness of the HKMM was an observational study (See section 3.3 for more information on the formulation of observational studies). During this study, our team identified techniques and approaches that other successful museums use to make their premises appealing and attractive. The museums selected for this study were the Hong Kong Museum of Art, the Hong Kong Museum of History, the Hong Kong Science Museum, and the Hong Kong Space Museum. During these studies, we identified the techniques that these museums employed to make their locations attractive and stylistically up-to-date. Style is a very broad term, ranging in everything from color and lighting choices to exhibit types and presentation methods. Our team documented what seemed to work with these locations and what types of external features they used that the HKMM could implement.

3.6 Conclusions

With relocating to Pier No.8, the HKMM was presented with the problem of determining how it could take advantage of its new location to expand the museum’s visitor base. Our team
bridged the marketing research gap that had been created by this problem and determined the projected visitation for the museum after the relocation. We not only focused on the museum itself, but also the planned bar and café, and how these new attractions would meet the needs of new market segments available in Central. To answer these questions, we surveyed these market segments, conducted observational reports on the new location and other successful museums, and interviewed staff of these successful museums. These data were collected and analyzed to achieve our project objectives.
4. Results and Analysis

The goal of our project was to complete a marketing study that would construct a visitor profile for the HKMM and provide recommendations to enhance the museum’s attractiveness, visibility, and accessibility, in an effort to help expand its visitor base at Central Pier No. 8. We performed observational studies at Pier No. 8 and four museums in Hong Kong, surveyed pedestrians at the Central Ferry Piers (CFP) Complex, and interviewed development consultants and pertinent museum staff to collect data for our project objectives. This chapter summarizes the data that were collected to achieve each research objective and provides the analysis necessary to be able to form our conclusions and recommendations.

4.1 Projected Visitation for Central Pier No. 8

We projected visitation for the HKMM for after the relocation to Central Pier No. 8. This exercise resulted in four different estimates: (1) visitation to the museum during the New Central Harbourfront construction period, (2) visitation to the museum after the construction period has been completed, (3) visitation to the Museum’s bar and café during the construction period, and (4) visitation to the bar and café after the construction period has been completed.

4.1.1 Museum Visitation

We determined that the most representative sample population that would encompass all of the market segments that the museum would be targeting was pedestrian traffic going in and out of the CFP. This included local residents, tourists, Central Business District (CBD) workers, and other groups. According to Mr. Frankie Yick and Mr. Johnny Leung of the “Star” Ferry Company (personal communication, February 1, 2010), only the traffic going through the Hung Hom and Tsim Sha Tsui piers at Central would directly affect visitation to the HKMM. The
following data for these piers of the CFP, as provided by the “Star” Ferry Company, are shown below in Table 4.1:

**Table 4.1**

“Star” Ferry Traffic for the Central Ferry Piers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual “Star” Ferry Passengers</strong> (for Hung Hom and Tsim Sha Tsui to Central Only)</td>
<td>2,482,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily “Star” Ferry Passengers</strong> (for Hung Hom to Central)</td>
<td>3,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily “Star” Ferry Passengers</strong> (for Tsim Sha Tsui to Central)</td>
<td>3,800*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peek Month</strong></td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peak Time</strong></td>
<td>Weekday afternoon, weekend evening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hong Kong Residents</strong></td>
<td>70%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tourists</strong></td>
<td>30%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These data were provided as approximations, not exact numbers

Furthermore, the demographics of the “Star” Ferry users are likely to be representative of visitors to the HKMM at Pier No. 8. These are:

- Nearly equally male-to-female ratio, with slightly more males From the following age groups, from most prevalent to least prevalent:
  - Adults, ages 25-34 (Most visitation from this age group)
  - Adults, ages 35-44 (Good visitation from this age group)
- Children and young adults, ages 12-24 (Less visitation than from previous age groups, but significant)
- Adults, ages 45-64 (Low visitation from this age group)
- Adults, ages 65+ (Nearly negligible visitation from this group)

- Within the following monthly income ranges, from most prevalent to least prevalent:
  - Between $15,000 - $30,000 HKD (Most visitation from this income range)
  - Between $9,000 - $15,000 HKD (Good visitation from this income range)
  - Below $9,000 HKD (Less visitation than from previous income ranges, but significant)
  - Above $30,000 HKD (Very low visitation from this income range)

- With the following level of education, from most prevalent to least prevalent:
  - Tertiary or higher education (Most visitation from this education group)
  - High school graduated (Good visitation from this education group)
  - High school, but not graduated (Less visitation than from previous education groups, but significant)
  - Primary or below (Very low visitation from this education group)

- Mostly Hong Kong citizens, with much fewer tourists. Tourists will likely be from the following nationalities, from most prevalent to least prevalent:
  - Mainland Chinese (Most visitation from this nationality)
  - Taiwanese (Far less but significant visitation from this nationality)
  - Australian (Less than previous nationalities)
  - American, Korean and Japanese (Roughly equal visitation from each, although significantly less than previous nationalities).
To arrive at a projected visitation for the HKMM at its new location, we estimated the percentage of the nearly 2.5 million people going through the CFP annually that intend to visit the museum. The results from our survey of pedestrian traffic at the CFP Complex are presented below in figure 4.1:

![Central Ferry Piers Survey Responses](image)

Figure 4.1

Survey Responses for Projected Visitation

The survey responses were broken down into two distinctive categories, (1) favorable responses, those that believed they would visit the HKMM if it were located at Pier No. 8, and (2) unfavorable responses, those that believed they would not visit the HKMM if it were located at Pier No. 8. We collected 39 favorable responses, which was 11.8% of the total population surveyed. However, based on our experiences surveying, many people seemed to be motivated by such things as impatience, indifference, and eagerness to please us. To address this problem, we kept a second count of people that seemed very motivated to visit a museum at Pier No. 8 and showed interest in maritime history. This totaled 17 people, which was 5.4% of the total responses.
Through our interviews, we acquired other guesses of visitation percentages to reaffirm the accuracy of our survey results. Mr. Yick and Mr. Leung (personal communication, February 1, 2010) both guessed that 4% of the ferry passengers would likely visit the HKMM. Dr. Stephen Davies (personal communication, February 1, 2010) guessed, rather conservatively, that 1% would visit. Taking these guesses into consideration, we chose the raw survey data of 11.8% as our most optimistic estimate, the more likely 5.4% as our mid-range estimate, and Dr. Davies’ guess of 1% as our conservative estimate.

Using the optimistic estimate, the mid-range estimate, and the conservative estimate, we calculated a range of visitation scenarios for the HKMM at Pier No. 8 based on the traffic going through the CFP from table 4.1. These calculated visitations are shown below in table 4.2. Color values are assigned to the estimates based on where they fit in generated spectrum of museum visitation. This spectrum can be seen below in figure 4.2.

*Table 4.2*

*Annual Visitation Projections for the HKMM During the Construction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Ferry Traffic</th>
<th>Visitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservative Estimate</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Range Estimate</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimistic Estimate</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on this range that we generated from our survey and interview results, anything in the “yellow” area and warmer we found to be very unlikely. We estimated the most likely visitation for the HKMM at Central Pier No. 8 to be somewhere between 95,000 and 135,000 visitors annually. However, it must be noted that our estimate only reflects the traffic going through the “Star” Ferry piers that are within direct proximity of Pier No. 8. This ferry traffic is only approximately 10% of the annual ferry traffic through Central, and approximately 0.1% of the total public transportation in Hong Kong (Dr. Stephen Davies, personal communication, 2010). We were not able to establish adjustment factors for our survey data to estimate the visitation from other means of transportation, however these will only add to the visitation of the HKMM at Pier No. 8.

Mr. Christian Fung (personal communication, February 5, 2010), Senior Administrative Officer for the Harbour Unit of the Development Bureau, provided information from the New Central Harbourfront design studies that guessed visitation to the harbourfront would triple after the construction has completed. However, because Pier No. 8 is only directly visible and
accessible to about half of the geographical area that is included in the Planning Department’s study, we have consequently estimated that the HKMM would be affected by about half of this increase. As such, we have estimated that after the New Central Harbourfront is complete, the HKMM would see about 150% of its previous visitation. This increase would likely slowly be felt over the first three years that the HKMM is at Central Pier No. 8 as new sites and attractions of the harbourfront are opened and more means of making the area accessible are provided. By 2015, this increase could likely bring the museum’s visitation range to somewhere between 142,500 and 202,500 visitors annually.

4.1.2 Bar and Café Visitation

We projected visitation at the HKMM’s planned bar and café by measuring the weekly traffic to Pier 7 Café and Bar. Pier 7 Café and Bar is a nearby establishment whose target audiences are very similar to those that the HKMM would be attracting. The results from the four time periods during which we recorded visitation to Pier 7 Café and Bar are shown below.

Table 4.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Actual Time</th>
<th>Visitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekday Afternoon (V_{DA})</td>
<td>Jan 27, 2010</td>
<td>12:30 – 14:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday Evening (V_{DN})</td>
<td>Feb 10, 2010</td>
<td>20:00 – 22:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend Afternoon (V_{EA})</td>
<td>Feb 6, 2010</td>
<td>12:30 – 14:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend Evening (V_{EN})</td>
<td>Feb 6, 2010</td>
<td>20:00 – 22:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With these data, estimating visitation for the HKMM Bar and Café was simply a matter of roughly estimating the visitation to Pier 7. We used Equation 4.1 to calculate projected visitation annually for the bar and café from the results listed in table 4.3.
Equation 4.1

Bar and Café Projected Visitation

\[ P_B = 52 \times \left( (5 \times (V_{DA} + V_{DN})) + (2 \times (V_{EA} + V_{EN})) \right) \]

In equation 4.1, \( P_B \) is the projected visitation annually for the HKMM Bar and Café before the construction ends, \( V_{DA} \) is the measured visitation for Pier 7 Café and Bar during a weekday afternoon, \( V_{DN} \) is the measurement for a weekday evening, \( V_{EA} \) is the measurement for a weekend afternoon, and \( V_{EN} \) is the measurement for a weekend evening. We recorded each of these in two hour intervals. This equation was formulated by assuming visitation for a week is composed of four groupings of two hour time periods that draw similar visitation: (1) the five weekday afternoons (Monday-Friday), (2) the five weekday evenings (Sunday-Thursday), (3) the two weekend afternoons (Saturday and Sunday), and (4) the two weekend evenings (Friday and Saturday). These two hour periods represent the peak time periods for a café and bar on a waterfront based on our observations of Pier 7 and furthermore represent the vast majority of its weekly traffic. For the sake of a conservative estimate, we have not included the minimal visitation observed during other time periods. We then multiplied the weekly estimate by 52 to arrive at \( P_B \), the annual visitation estimate for the HKMM’s bar and café at Central Pier No. 8.

This resulted in our projected visitation of about 103,000 visitors annually during the construction phase. To calculate the projected visitation for the bar and café after the New Central Harbourfront project would be completed, we applied the same increase discussed for the museum in section 4.1.1. This assumes that after the construction, the bar and café would get about 150% of the visitation that it would currently get at Pier No. 8. This resulted in our projected visitation of 154,500 visitors annually for the bar and café by 2015. Similar to the
museum, this increase in patronage would be slowly realized during the first three years of operation as new areas of the harbourfront become completed and more accessible.

4.2 Accessibility Enhancement

We assessed Central Pier No. 8 to formulate recommendations for how accessibility can be improved to facilitate visitation to the HKMM. Through observational studies we evaluated techniques other museums in Hong Kong used to enhance their accessibility. Additionally, we interviewed development consultants and government officials to supplement the information found from our observational studies and provide insight on how accessibility can further be improved to Pier No. 8.

We selected five of the highest weighted metrics from our accessibility observational studies that were the most relevant for our project. During an interview, all of the metrics we used for our studies were weighted by Dr. Davies (personal communication, February 1, 2010) by how important he believes they are for the HKMM to be successful. In order of importance, the most relevant accessibility metrics are: (1) “Ease of Access to the Main Entrance”, (2) “Signage to the Main Entrance”, (3) “Ease of Access from the General Area”, (4) “Ease of Access of Navigation of Surrounding Area”, and (5) “Accessibility from Hotels and Other Attractions”. The data for all of observational studies can be found in Appendix E, Appendix F and Appendix G.

4.2.1 Ease of Access to Main the Entrance

The main entrance is the gateway for a visitor to an attraction. If the entrance is hidden or difficult to navigate to, visitors could become frustrated and abandon their attempts to find it by settling for an alternative leisure activity. This metric was very relevant to our project because
the HKMM could, within reason, control and improve the accessibility to its main entrance at Pier No. 8. Figure 4.3 below displays the average scores for each location we observed for the ease of access to the main entrance metric. On this meter, red represents ‘hotter’ locations, those which are more accessible and highly scored. On the contrary, blue represents ‘cooler’ locations, those that have scored poorly.

**Figure 4.3**

*Ease of Access to the Main Entrance Scale*

While performing our observational studies for the ease of access to the main entrance metric, we looked for the distance from public routes, the number of obstacles that hinder accessibility, how easily these obstacles can be circumvented (via a subway or overpass), and the ease of flow through the main entrance. Figure 4.4 shows two photos we took while performing our observational studies to display how easily accessible the entrance to Pier No. 8 is.
Based on our scoring for this metric in figure 4.3, the location that displayed the best example of accessibility to the main entrance was Pier No. 8, which was encouraging news for the HKMM. Figure 4.4A is a photo of the footbridge that allows pedestrians to bypass the construction between the Hong Kong MTR Station and the CFP. It was wide and easily accessible, rendering the experience of walking to Pier No. 8 efficient despite heavy pedestrian traffic when ferries arrive and depart. Figure 4.4B shows the main entrance to Pier No. 8, which was very wide and open as well. This allows for the possibility of a large museum entry way that could be easily accessed by large groups of visitors, such as with school and tour groups, as well as by people with handicaps.

While we scored Pier No. 8 the highest, we noticed some room for improvement. Many areas demonstrated ample signage pointing directly to the main entrance of Pier No. 8. However, all of these signs would need to be modified to include the museum, which could potentially be expensive for the HKMM. Regardless, we found the experience to be very
pleasant, with no difficulties finding the pier. The areas surrounding the entrance were not over-
crowded either, even during times of heavy ferry traffic.

The second best location that we evaluated was the Science and History Museum complex; their main entrances were clear of obstacles, had covered walkways, and avoided the only major obstacle in the vicinity, a road, with a well designed footbridge. Figure 4.5 shows a photo of this footbridge that we took during our observational studies.

![History and Science Museum Complex Footbridge](image)

Figure 4.5

History and Science Museum Complex Footbridge

This footbridge was even more extensive than the one used at Pier No. 8, as it had multiple entry points and was well lit and shielded from the weather. However, with the developments of the New Central Harbourfront, additional covered walkways and two more permanent foot bridges will be built that will lead to the CFP (Paul Zimmerman, personal communication, February 3, 2010), improving the overall ease of access to the main entrance of
Pier No. 8. From our studies, we found that the ease of access to the main entrance of Pier No. 8 was higher than any other museum surveyed and that it would only improve as new harbourfront developments are completed.

4.2.2 Signage to the Main Entrance and Ease of Access from the General Area

Dr. Davies (personal communication, February 1, 2010) emphasized the importance of signage, “If a visitor can’t find the place, they will throw their hands up in the air and go somewhere else!” Based on the weighting he selected for the “Signage to the Main Entrance” metric, this was one of the most important accessibility aspects on which we focused our observational studies. The results from the six locations that we rated for this metric can be seen below in figure 4.6A.

![Figure 4.6](image)

*Figure 4.6*

*Signage to the Main Entrance (A) and Ease of Access from the General Area (B) Scales*
As seen in figure 4.6A, Central Pier No. 8 scored the highest in the signage to the main entrance metric. This is likely because it is part of a public transportation hub, allowing it to enjoy the benefits of government assistance to improve accessibility. During our observational studies, we identified many signs that eventually helped to direct us to the main entrance of the pier. Figure 4.7a, an example of these signs that we found during our observational studies, was on the temporary footbridge leading to the CFP. However, we found that while many of the signs directed pedestrians to just the CFP, there were few references to Pier No. 8 specifically.

![Signage to Main Entrances of Pier No. 8 (A) and the Museum of Art (B)](image)

*Figure 4.7*

*Signage to Main Entrances of Pier No. 8 (A) and the Museum of Art (B)*

The Museum of Art scored second highest in this metric because it showed a considerable amount of directional signage, which can be seen above from our observational studies in figure 4.7B. The HKMM would be able to use similar methods as the Museum of Art to further improve the ease of access to its main entrance by suggesting the government adds signs that specifically point pedestrians to Pier No. 8. Through interviews with Mr. Christian Fung (personal communication, February 5, 2010) and Mr. Frankie Yick (personal communication, February 1, 2010) we found that the Development Bureau was interested in
helping to provide signage to the HKMM throughout the construction period, and that the “Star” Ferry Company is furthermore interested in ensuring the museum is accessible via signage.

As seen in figure 4.6B above, the sites that scored the highest for “Ease of Access from the General Area” were again Central Pier No. 8 and the Museum of Art. We scored the Museum of Art well because it used a combination of signage, great walkways, and lighting to enhance its accessibility. The wide and varied directional signs throughout the general area of this museum allow visitors to easily find the museum’s immediate grounds quickly while remaining sheltered from the sun and rain by covered walkways.

Similarly, we scored Pier No. 8 very well because the general area, specifically the grounds of the CFP, was very open and easily traversed. It was also shielded from the sun and rain, had a significant amount of directional signage, and was well lit at night. The photo in Figure 4.8, taken during our observational studies, shows how wide and accessible the general area outside of Pier No. 8 is.

![General Area Outside of Central Pier No. 8](image)

*Figure 4.8*

*General Area Outside of Central Pier No. 8*
We found that the HKMM could mimic the Museum of Art’s exceptional use of directional signage to further improve its ease of access from the general area. The physical accessibility to the CFP is also a priority for the government (Christian Fung, personal communication, February 5, 2009). Furthermore, in this interview, Mr. Fung suggested that it was a priority of the Development Bureau to ensure that the CFP are accessible throughout the construction phase and that a team would be investigating the placement of signs for the HKMM and other nearby attractions.

4.2.3 Ease of Navigation from the Surrounding Area and Hotels and Other Attractions

Many of the visitors coming to Pier No. 8 would use some form of public transportation within the vicinity of the CFP, making “Ease of Navigation from the Surrounding Area” very important. While ease of navigation was weighted highly by Dr. Davies as being vital to the museum’s success, the HKMM can do very little to further improve this metric beyond petitioning to the government for changes. Accessibility from nearby hotels and attractions would also be a great influence on a tourist’s decision to go to the HKMM from the surrounding locations. Consequently, while accessibility from “Hotels and Other Attractions” also had a high weighting, the museum would have very little control over it beyond adding signage. Figure 4.9 displays the results from our observational studies for these two metrics.
Based on our observational surveys, the locations that scored the highest for accessibility from hotels and other attractions were the Museum of Art, the Space Museum, and Pier No. 8 (See figure 4.9A). We scored the Museum of Art the highest because of its location; surrounding attractions and the availability of hotels in the Tsim Sha Tsui (TST) area make it fantastic for tourist accessibility.

Other areas in TST for shopping, restaurants, and recreational activity make it very attractive for local Hong Kong residents. After the completion of the New Central Harbourfront, Pier No. 8 will be exposed to many of the same attractions and offerings. According to Paul Zimmerman (personal communication, February 3, 2010), there are currently very few attractions to keep visitors at the CFP complex area despite heavy pedestrian traffic. However, the Development Bureau plans include a plethora of restaurants and hotels nearby Pier No. 8 as
part of the developments for the New Central Harbourfront (Christian Fung, personal communication, February 5, 2010).

The surrounding attractions of the Museum of Art include the Space Museum, Kowloon Park, TST shopping and dining, the Avenue of Stars, and the Hong Kong Cultural Centre. The Hong Kong Cultural Centre presents plays, concerts, and operas, all of which attract visitors interested in the arts. This creates a mutually beneficial relationship for both the museum and the centre. The location on Pier No. 8 would bring visitors who have a maritime interest, creating a similar mutually beneficial situation for the HKMM and the “Star” Ferry Company, Ltd. TST contains many hotels and attractions which cater to tourists from all walks of life such as from the Peninsula Hotel, one of the most renowned hotels in Hong Kong, to the local YMCA down the street, a common middle-class hotel and leisure activities center. Similarly, Pier No. 8 is near many high-end attractions and hotels in Central while still being very accessible to people coming from Kowloon. As such, we have determined from our observational studies that both locations, TST and Central Pier No. 8, share many similarities in terms of accessibility from hotels and other attractions.

Based on our observational studies for the “Ease of Navigation from Surrounding Areas” metric, the best location was Central Pier No. 8 (See figure 4.9B). The second best location was the Museum of Art, which was also surrounded by a multitude of transportation hubs. Both locations were well documented in many local directories, especially those located in the MTR Hong Kong station. Figure 4.10 is a map of Pier No. 8’s surrounding area with the results of our observational studies highlighted.
Figure 4.10

Accessibility Map for Central Pier No. 8

(Source Adapted from: Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront, 2009)

As seen in figure 4.10, the surrounding area of Pier No. 8 is accessible from many different major transportation hubs. Ferries from Discovery Bay, Tsim Sha Tsui, Hung Hom, Lamma Island, Lantau Island, Cheng Chau Island, and many other outlying islands make the CFP very accessible from all over Hong Kong. Directly in the south, Hong Kong and Central MTR Stations are very accessible by footbridges and pedestrian walkways. Additionally, two nearby bus terminals allow for this area to be accessed easily from many other areas of Hong
Kong. The bus stop nearest to Pier No. 8 provides an additional street lane dedicated to taxis at the front of the CFP. The accessibility from the surrounding area would continue to be improved with the addition of more walkways, better lighting, and more tourist attractions from the developments of the New Central Harbourfront (Paul Zimmerman, personal communication, February 3, 2010). From his perspective, even though accessibility is already great, it will only improve with time to further alleviate any possible accessibility issues that the construction may cause. All of these factors would improve the ease of access from the surrounding area of the CFP Complex.

4.3 Visibility Enhancement

We assessed the visibility of Central Pier No. 8 by evaluating the physical and marketing visibility of the premises. Through observational studies we evaluated techniques other organizations in Hong Kong implemented to enhance their visibility. Additionally, we interviewed museum staff and development professionals to supplement our observations and understand possible effects of the New Central Harbourfront construction on the visibility of Central Pier No. 8.

4.3.1 Centerpiece Visibility and Local Awareness

With the collaboration and input from Dr. Davies, we decided the most feasible visibility metrics for the HKMM to enhance were “Centerpiece Visibility” and “Local Awareness” (see Appendix D: Metric Definitions). Feasibility pertained to the capital, labor, and difficulty related to improving these visibility features. Thus, we felt that these visibility metrics must be addressed first to ensure the success of the HKMM at its Central Pier No. 8 location.

Centerpiece visibility and local awareness were two metrics that are related. For example, Paul Zimmerman (personal communication, February 3, 2010) told us that the HKMM
should create local awareness by branding itself with the CFP Clock Tower. Zimmerman noted that the goal of icon marketing should be that “when a local thinks about the Central Ferry Piers, they should associate it with the HKMM and vice versa”. Through our observational studies we identified centerpieces from our chosen sites that we found were efficient in enhancing the visibility of their locations. Figure 4.11 shows the scores for these sites.

![Centerpiece Visibility (A) and Local Awareness (B) Scales](image)

**Figure 4.11**

*Centerpiece Visibility (A) and Local Awareness (B) Scales*

The difference in the centerpiece visibility scores between the HKMM and the Hong Kong Space Museum was quite significant. Figure 4.12 displays the centerpieces of the HKMM and Hong Kong Space Museum. Although the HKMM was limited by financial and governmental constraints, it should aspire to design a more visible centerpiece at Central Pier No. 8.
The Hong Kong Space Museum’s dome was not only in theme with its content but also much larger and more visible than the HKMM’s centerpiece. Mr. Chan Ki-hung (personal communication, February 9, 2010), curator of the Hong Kong Space Museum, highlighted a mutually dependent relationship between centerpiece and local awareness. Mr. Chan commented, “It’s important to be visible day and night; this is why the Space Museum updated the dome to be more colorful and flashy”. Dr. Davies also noted that while the HKMM understands the importance of an attractive centerpiece, the capital and government requirements to produce one are excessive (personal communication, February 1, 2010). Despite these requirements, creating a new centerpiece at Central Pier No. 8 was be necessary. However, it would be beyond the financial means of the HKMM. As such, our focus then shifted from designing a new centerpiece for the museum to associating the HKMM centerpiece with the CFP Clock Tower.

Dr. Davies believed (personal communication, February 1, 2010) that these two metrics, together with “Public Transportation Advertising”, would ensure improved visibility for the HKMM at its future Central Pier No. 8 location. We coupled the public transportation
advertising metric with the “Surrounding Area Advertising” metric because each detailed different types of advertising. Together, these directly affect the marketing visibility of an organization.

4.3.2 Public Transport Advertising and Surrounding Area Advertising

While public transportation advertising and surrounding area advertising were given both very high weights, these metrics were only moderately relevant to the relocation because realistically an improvement in any of these requires significant capital. For example, Dr. Davies (personal communication, February 1, 2010) mentioned that advertising in CityBus on the Central to Stanley route was quoted at roughly HK $250,000 annually. Additionally, advertising through such things as billboards and large public promotions is not really feasible for the HKMM unless it receives aid from the government or other organizations. Figure 4.13 displays the scores of Hong Kong museums in terms of their marketing visibility. Notice that Central Pier No. 8 also received scores because the team observed significant advertising directing pedestrians towards Central Pier No. 8 in the CFP and the nearby IFC complex.
Dr. Davies (personal communication, February 1, 2010) mentioned that the budget of the HKMM is significantly less than government sponsored museums. As a result, the HKMM could not hope to advertise in both “Public Transport Advertising” and “Surrounding Area Advertising” categories because it would have to financially dedicate its entire budget to only one of these media. Mr. Chan Ki-hung (personal communication, February 9, 2010), however, mentioned that government museums actually have a small marketing budget. He argued that rather than allocating capital for public transport and surrounding area advertising, the Hong Kong Space Museum engages in “internet marketing” with a monthly newsletter. Another method of increasing visibility that Mr. Chan noted was publishing journal articles and making sure the building is well lit at night. We found that Pier No. 8 is already very well lit and that the
HKMM has published nearly 300 articles since its opening (Dr. Davies, personal communication, February 1, 2010). Ultimately, we understood that the HKMM must continue to seek means of free advertising, such as emailing an electronic newsletter to Hong Kong schools and the shipping community. This means of inexpensive advertising could increase the HKMM’s local awareness amongst people in Hong Kong.

The individuals we interviewed provided great depth of information about how the HKMM could economically advertise itself. Mr. Frankie Yick and Mr. Johnny Leung (personal communication, February 1, 2010) suggested creating a mutually beneficial relationship between their organization and the HKMM. This relationship would provide a perfect opportunity for the HKMM to advertise at a lower expense in different popular regions of Hong Kong such as Tsim Sha Tsui, Hung Hom, and Central. Figure 4.14 displays the locations of the “Star” Ferry piers in the Kowloon and Hong Kong Island areas where the HKMM could possibly display posters and other promotions.
To further analyze options for improving public transport and surrounding area advertising during the New Central Harbourfront construction period we interviewed Mr. Christian Fung. Mr. Fung, a Senior Administrative Officer for the Harbour Unit at the Development Bureau (personal communication, February 5, 2010) stated that the government would aspire to aid the HKMM by providing subsidized advertising. Figure 4.15 is a rendering of a map created to demonstrate how the CFP Complex’s visibility, which includes Central Pier No. 8, could be affected by the construction.
Displayed on Figure 4.15, the red circle indicates where construction might affect the visibility of Central Pier No. 8. The green areas indicate areas where the Development Bureau has indicated that visibility will remain very good (Christian Fung, personal communication, February 5, 2010), as there will be no high rise buildings or any large obstacles erected. In the red area and along the temporary pedestrian walkways, the government will potentially subsidize advertising to improve visibility of the HKMM during the New Central Harbourfront construction period. While the visibility of public transport and surrounding area advertising are
paramount to enhancing the marketing visibility of the HKMM, satisfying these features is complicated. The HKMM would have to petition the Hong Kong government to make any changes in advertising in the CFP complex. Furthermore, advertising in Hong Kong, Dr. Davies (personal communication, February 1, 2010) made clear, is dependent on large capital investments. Dr. Davies mentioned that the HKMM has attempted to advertise on buses that travel to Stanley without a noticeable visitation increase. As such, we felt that the public transport and surrounding area advertising visibility metrics were not very important due to both cost and expected impact.

4.3.3 Difficulty of Discovery

Although weighted highly by Dr. Davies, and important from a visibility perspective, the “Difficulty of Discovery” metric of our visibility observational studies was not very important for our recommendations as the HKMM can do very little to improve it. Although important to the success of the HKMM, we deemed this metric unfeasible to significantly change for Central Pier No. 8 because of budgetary and governmental constraints.

Regardless of the fact that the HKMM has no control over difficulty of discovery, this visibility metric conveyed an important element in our analysis. Enhancing physical visibility of Central Pier No. 8 would be a futile exercise in the sense that it would entail petitioning the government to change the assigned structures to sites adjacent to Central Pier No. 8. Even from only meters away, this Science and History Museum Complex could not be easily identified as museums within their general area. Figure 4.16 below is a quintessential example of how difficulty of discovery can be detrimental to museum’s success.
Difficulty of Discovery of the History and Science Museum Complex

As seen in figure 4.16, the pedestrian route from the Tsim Sha Tsui MTR station to the History and Science Museum complex was quite difficult to discover. We had to ask a policeman for directions to the museums to find them. With regards to the HKMM, to improve difficulty of discovery, the HKMM would have to engage in an aggressive marketing campaign directed towards erecting directional signage in the CFP complex and surrounding IFC complex. Because it lacks a substantial marketing budget (Dr. Davies, personal communication, February 1, 2010), the HKMM must concentrate on other means of improving its visibility. Moreover, the HKMM at Central Pier No. 8 will be visibly blocked by the CFP complex. Ultimately, improving a metric in the least feasible category would encompass accomplishing such things as: (1) investing in a large directional signage campaign, and (2) applying for government permits. Dr. Davies explained that the HKMM cannot overextend its budget nor squander efforts on permits which will not significantly increase visitation. However, after interviewing Mr. Yick and Mr. Leung we envisioned the opportunity of a strategic partnership between the “Star” Ferry
Company and the HKMM. This partnership would produce an inexpensive alternative to public transport and surrounding area advertising for the HKMM. Through possible “Star” Ferry and HKMM combination ticket packages, the museum would become more visible and allow potential patrons an inexpensive opportunity to visit from other parts of Hong Kong. Moreover, the “Star” Ferry operates out of locations in Kowloon and Hong Kong Island and as a result the HKMM could take advantage of this fact and advertise in different heavily pedestrian trafficked areas of Kowloon and Hong Kong Island.

### 4.4 Attractiveness Enhancement

Attractiveness of the HKMM in its future Central Pier No. 8 location is of paramount importance and must be addressed to increase its appeal to its target audience. During our observational studies, we focused on the aesthetic appeal of the Hong Kong Museums and Central Pier No. 8 and their immediate grounds.

#### 4.4.1 Centerpiece, Main Entrance, and Main Sign

Centerpiece, main entrance, and main sign attractiveness were metrics that Dr. Davies weighted highly as being vital to the success of a museum. Subsequently, we considered them to be very important for the success of the HKMM. Furthermore, as the HKMM can control them, we considered them highly relevant to enhancing attractiveness of the museum after the relocation. Figure 4.17 below displays our scores for the observational studies of centerpiece attractiveness for the selected sites.
From our observational studies, the highest scoring site for the centerpiece attractiveness metric was the Space Museum due to its iconic dome. The dome was observed to be well lit and elegant while being in theme with the museum’s content. The History and Science Museum complex, on the other hand, has a very mediocre and ultimately disappointing centerpiece. This simply consisted of a main sign and a well landscaped tree. However, for two of the largest museums in Hong Kong, we expected a much more impressive piece. Unfortunately, the lowest scoring centerpiece was the HKMM’s main sign at Stanley. While being somewhat attractive, it was small and poorly visible. Figure 4.18 below displays the centerpieces of each of the above mentioned museums.
According to Dick Groves (personal communication, January 19, 2010), a retail development consultant in Hong Kong, a centerpiece is without a doubt something that all businesses need in order to identify themselves. Mr. Groves alluded to an organization’s centerpiece as a means to alert potential patrons of its presence. Additionally, the centerpiece should be an element which a business or museum could brand itself through pamphlets or in advertising. Mr. Chan Ki-hung (personal communication, February 9, 2010), curator of the Hong Kong Space Museum, explained how the dome of the Space Museum has benefited the overall attractiveness of the premises. For example, in the past, the Hong Kong Space Museum

Figure 4.18

Centerpieces of the Space Museum (A) Science Museum (B), and the HKMM (C)
was approached by outside companies and asked to use the dome for advertising. Known as the “the bun” to Hong Kong locals, the Space Museum’s dome is considered a Hong Kong landmark.

Main entrance and main sign attractiveness were two metrics that we determined must be improved for Central Pier No. 8 after the HKMM relocates. A common trend throughout our observational studies of museums’ main entrances and main signs in Hong Kong were banners composed of exhibit information and relevant thematic material. Figure 4.19 displays the scores from our observational studies for the main entrance and main sign attractiveness metrics.

Figure 4.19

*Main Entrance (A) and Main Sign (B) Attractiveness Scales*

As can be seen from figure 4.19, the best main entrances at the sites we studied did not always have the best main signs, such as with the Science Museum. This can be seen in figure 4.20C, which demonstrates the Science Museum’s unattractive and poorly visible main sign but
modern and highly attractive main entrance. The entrance is in theme with the museum’s content and has many attractive banners and motifs.

Figure 4.20

Main Entrances and Signs for the Space (A), Art (B), and Science (C) Museums

The Space Museum had a very average main entrance and sign. Although the main sign of the Space Museum was highly visible, as seen in figure 4.20B from our observational studies, it was not particularly in theme with the museum’s content and consequently very plain and unattractive. Its main entrance, as seen from our observational studies in figure 4.20A, was not very pleasing at all, poorly lit, and had very few signs, motifs, or banners. Furthermore, this entrance had no landscaping and the coloring was very plain.
The main entrance and main sign of a museum were similar in purpose to a centerpiece. The main entrance and main sign need to draw people into a museum, particularly for spontaneous walk-in visits. Dr. Davies reaffirmed this by stating (personal communication, February 1, 2010) that “first impressions that people make are based off the main entrance, main sign, and the people working the front desk”. As such, it is very important for the HKMM to design an interesting and unique main entrance and sign that is in theme with maritime history and strategically placed at the CFP.

4.4.2 Exterior Exhibits

The attractiveness metric that we considered moderately influential was the “Attractiveness of Exterior Exhibits”. Often, the quality of exterior exhibits reflects upon a museum’s first impression. Figure 4.21 displays our ratings for the quality of the exterior exhibits of the museums that we studied through our observational reports.

![Figure 4.21](image)

*Attractiveness of Exterior Exhibits Scale*
From our observational studies, we determined that the Museum of Art exemplified the best exterior exhibits. Not only did it incorporate a number of different exhibits, it used sculptures that were theme with the museum’s contents. Moreover, the sculptures served to make the perimeter of the museum very visible and inviting. An example of one of these sculptures can be seen below in figure 4.22A. Figure 4.22B, on the contrary, shows a very poorly themed external exhibit outside of the Museum of History. As visitors, we could not discern how this was relevant to history in any way. Thus, we scored this museum very poorly for the attractiveness of its exterior exhibits.

![Figure 4.22](image)

*Figure 4.22*

*Exterior Exhibits for the Art (A) and History (B) Museums*

Mr. Chan (personal communication, February 9, 2010) further explained that exterior exhibits alert the public to the museum and its contents, which in-turn could result in higher
visitation. Furthermore, external museum offerings draw attention to the general and immediate area of the museum. This was also supported by Dick Groves (personal communication, January 19, 2010), who stated that modifying adjacent areas and filling them with exterior exhibits would help to make a museum highly attractive to its target audiences. Consequently, we considered exterior museum offerings to be another important factor that the HKMM could look into for Central Pier No. 8. To implement exterior offerings, the museum would need to acquire permission from the government to place exhibits in the general area of the CFP. However, from our interviews with the Development Bureau, we understood that the government was interested in maritime-themed items within that area, such as a large ship anchor.

4.4.3 Events

Museum events can be designed to target otherwise untapped market segments by creating attractive offerings that appeal to specific niche audiences. In the past, the HKMM has held an annual Family Day that is targeted at middle-aged couples with young children (Dr. Davies, personal communication, February 1, 2010). As the museum typically reached out to mostly adults, this event has made its offerings more attractive to children. This event has been very successful in the past for the HKMM and could be replicated and expanded upon at Pier No. 8 due to the increase in floor space.

Mr. Chan (personal communication, February 9, 2010) stated that the Space Museum successfully holds a “Sidewalk Astronomy” event annually. For this event, the Space Museum placed telescopes on the sidewalks and invited pedestrians to look into the sky. This pulled people off of the street into the event and encouraged walk-ins, a visitor group that the Space Museum had not previously successfully exploited.
From our observational studies of the CFP, we have found the area to be ideal for events involving historical Chinese vessels tied up at Pier No. 8, on the side opposite side from the Hung Hom Ferry docking area. In an interview with Mr. Laurent Genna (personal communication, February 22, 2010), owner of SpySea, Limited, we learned that some boat owners would be very interested in a partnership with the HKMM to provide, for example, a Chinese Junk for some form of annual event. Mr. Genna’s vessel, the Huan (See figure 4.23), would be iconic for such events as an annual holiday dinner on the Lunar New Year or for historic harbour tours. Such a partnership would be mutually beneficial for both parties, giving the boat greater public exposure for its owner, and making Pier No. 8 more visible and distinguishable from across the harbour.

Figure 4.23
The Huan
(Source: SpySea, Limited, 2010)
4.4.4 Building Attractiveness

We considered the “Building Attractiveness” metric to be less important to our project, although it was considered important by Dr. Davies. According to Dr. Davies (personal communication, February 1, 2010), the Hong Kong SAR government mandated that no exterior modifications could be made to the outside appearance of Central Pier No.8. As a result of this restriction, the HKMM would not be able to improve the exterior building attractiveness after the relocation, which could otherwise have been an important marketing tool.

Dick Groves (personal communication, January 19, 2010) stated that the first element that appeals to pedestrians is building attractiveness. Figure 4.24 displays all of the scores from our observational studies pertaining specifically to the building attractiveness metric.

![Building Attractiveness Scale](image)

*Figure 4.24

*Building Attractiveness Scale*

We scored the Space Museum’s building as the most attractive site during our observational studies. This was because of its distinguishable dome and the fact that this
structure is related thematically to its content (see figure 4.25A). Furthermore, the Space Museum created an inviting environment through extensive landscaping and attractive lighting. Mr. Chan informed us (personal communication, February 9, 2010) that the Space Museum had a blank piece of land to work with when first designing its facilities. He stated that they strived to create an attractive building because they felt the museum would benefit from a unique appearance.

![Figure 4.25](image)

**Figure 4.25**

*Building Attractiveness for the Space (A) and Science (B) Museums, and Pier No. 8 (C)*

Central Pier No. 8’s building, as seen in figure 4.25C, is not as overwhelmingly attractive as the Space Museum but still very aesthetically pleasing. With its use of Palladian-style
columns, the architecture of the pier is still quite attractive – much like the Murray House in Stanley. Unlike these sites, the Museum of History’s building is unattractive with out-of-theme architecture and coloring. This is depicted in figure 4.25B. The building is not only mundane with its pastel colors and uncreative architecture, but it is also a mirror image of the Science Museum, making them indistinguishable from each other. Furthermore, we noticed exposed piping and other unsightly attributes that make the museum complex at this site significantly unattractive.

4.4.5 Bar and Café

From our observational studies within the CFP, and our studies at Pier 7 Café and Bar, we found that to be competitive, the HKMM bar and café would need to be able to distinguish itself from its competitors and be more attractive than them. We noticed that there were two gaps that other establishments with similar offerings at the CFP did not take advantage of: (1) similar establishments at Piers No. 1 through 7 failed to take full advantage of the fantastic view of Victoria Harbour available from the piers and (2) there were no “grab-and-go” cafés at the piers for people on their way to and from work, who might otherwise stop at a place like Pacific Coffee or Starbucks. If the HKMM could fill both of these gaps, making a convenient and scenic café-experience with a great environment, it would likely attract these same people in the evenings at its bar.

Furthermore, none of the establishments at the piers have free wireless internet access, which would be an inexpensive and attractive offering. Dr. Davies (personal communication, January 20, 2010) also mentioned that there are no jazz cafés within the city. If the HKMM could fill a thematic gap that is not otherwise available in Hong Kong, it would reach out to significantly larger audiences. Consequently, having a theme would make the bar and café more
attractive for tourists, improving the likelihood that the HKMM could be listed in tour books. The HKMM could also explore such themes for the bar and café as country-western, folk, or blues. These themes could be possibly changing, attracting different visitors on different days of the week.

4.5 Conclusions

We determined projected visitation for both the museum and its planned bar and café, identifying the differences between before and after the New Central Harbourfront construction period. Ultimately, the analysis of our interviews and observational studies helped us to complete a marketing study that would provide recommendations to enhance the museum’s attractiveness, visibility, and accessibility, in an effort to help expand the museum's visitor base after it is relocated. These results and analyses have provided the foundation for building our conclusions and recommendations for the HKMM.
5. Conclusions and Recommendations

The goal of this project was to complete a baseline marketing study for the Hong Kong Maritime Museum (HKMM) that estimated visitation rates and provided recommendations to enhance the HKMM’s accessibility, visibility, and attractiveness at its future location at Central Pier No. 8. This chapter provides recommendations to maximize the HKMM’s potential in the following aspects: (1) main entrance and main sign, (2) museum offerings, (3) centerpiece, and (4) signage. These recommendations highlight several scenarios (idealistic, realistic, and optimistic) due to uncertainty regarding the HKMM’s potential budget and Hong Kong governmental restrictions. With these recommendations, we believe the HKMM would be able to attract between 95,000 and 135,000 visitors annually at Pier No. 8, and about 100,000 visitors annually at its planned bar and café, with further visitation increases envisioned after the completion of the New Central Harbourfront. Furthermore, our suggestions are meant to emphasize areas improvement that if addressed successfully would help promote the HKMM’s mission of stimulating interest in Chinese and Southeast Asian maritime history.

5.1 Main Entrance and Main Sign Recommendations

Our recommendations to enhance attractiveness aim to differentiate the HKMM from any other museum in Hong Kong. Thus, these suggestions focus on creating a “wow” factor by differentiating the museum, main entrance, and main design. Ultimately we aspire to enhance visitors’ museum-going experience and continue fulfilling the HKMM’s mission.

- Replicate and adapt the bow of an Asian vessel into the main entrance of the HKMM. As a more practical alternative we recommend the incorporation of propellers, cleats,
portholes, small anchors, and similarly themed maritime ideas into the main entrance of the HKMM.

- Because the CFP Clock Tower is a Hong Kong landmark, we recommend the HKMM petition the Hong Kong government and inquire about placing a weathervane on top of the Clock Tower. Figure 5.2 is a rendering of what the weathervane could look like.

![Image of Central Ferry Piers Clock Tower with HKMM weathervane]

Figure 5.1

Central Ferry Piers Clock Tower with HKMM weathervane

- Redesign the sign of Pier No.8 to include the HKMM. However, the HKMM is not the sole business on Pier No. 8. We recommend putting both the icon from the HKMM and the Star Ferry into the circles that make up the “8”. Figure 5.2 is an example of the proposed Pier 8 sign.
5.2 Museum Offerings Recommendations

Creating a strategic portfolio of museum offerings is vital when constructing a museum marketing plan. Typically museum offerings encompass exterior exhibits, special exhibitions and events, and other attractions museums hold to reach their target audience. After analyzing past HKMM offerings we decided to create a list of recommendations that we felt could be successful in satisfying the HKMM’s target audience. At Pier No.8 the HKMM would have the opportunity to focus on the following museum offerings: (1) exterior exhibits and events, (2) ticket packages, and (3) a HKMM bar and café with unique themes.
5.2.1 Exterior Exhibits and Events

Exterior exhibitions and events are a vital means of attracting different market segments. In Hong Kong, however, it is important to note that the HKMM will be bound by strict governmental regulations and financial limitations. With the help of Dr. Davies, we drafted a list that we feel would be successful in satisfying the new market segments available to the HKMM at Pier No. 8.

We recommend the following:

- Acquire a water cannon and its mounting system from a fire rescue vessel. The HKMM would need to ensure that it meets the necessary government safety regulations and harbour safety requirements. However, with given permission, it could be fired on special occasions to attract further attention to the HKMM.

- Schedule a marine vessel docking event at Pier No. 8 that would allow HKMM patrons to board and explore the vessel. Due to the cost of continuing this as a regular event, we recommend making it an occasional event instead of a regular event.
  - An example of a vessel docking event is scheduling a special Lunar New Year tour of Victoria Harbour whose main attraction is the fireworks. The vessel for this event would preferably be a “Chinese Junk” which could pick up patrons at Pier No. 8.

- Add a plaque to each “Star” Ferry miniature boat model that gives the exhibit more depth by providing an explanation of its historical importance and origin. Also include the HKMM name on the explanation.
• Create an overnight event that targets primary school students and community groups. We recommend that the HKMM consult with Hong Kong schools about such field trips and gauge feasibility and attendance numbers.

5.2.2 Ticket Packages

If the HKKM were successful in forging a strategic partnership with the “Star” Ferry Company it could offer a ticket package that includes the “Star” Ferry harbour tour and museum entrance tickets. As the “Star” Ferry is already a popular tourist attraction, the HKMM’s visibility would only increase from such a relationship and could allow the HKMM to emerge as an increasingly visible and well known Hong Kong museum.

We would like to recommend the following:

• Pursue talks with “Star” Ferry Company management seeking the creation of package tickets.

5.2.3 Bar and Café

The bar and café is a perfect venue for HKMM to attract potential visitors. Furthermore, this bar and café would increase the visibility of the HKMM by having different operational hours from the museum galleries.

We would like to recommend the following:

• Given the beautiful Victoria Harbour view, the HKMM bar and café should incorporate the harbour into its layout. There are few restaurants located as close to Victoria Harbour as the HKMM bar and café. We recommend that the HKMM bar and café organize its layout and maximize customer seating to incorporate the view of Victoria Harbour.
• Hong Kong has a technologically savvy culture. Thus, we recommend the HKMM bar and café provide free wireless internet access to paying customers.

• Hong Kong locals, especially at the CBD, seek unique, fast, and convenient experiences. Thus, we recommend that the HKMM bar and café provide fast and convenient services.

• To distinguish separate the HKMM bar and café from similar establishments in CBD, we recommend the integration of a unique theme. As such, HKMM bar and café could be a jazz-themed or other special themed-lounge that holds musical performances at night.

5.3 Centerpiece Recommendations

Successful centerpieces spark interest in pedestrians. Ultimately, these pedestrians would at least appreciate the organization that is responsible for such a centerpiece. Although the result may not always be to draw in more visitors, at the very least the pedestrians would become aware of the existence of the HKMM.

We recommend the following:

• Build three nautically themed centerpieces that would work in conjunction as one. Each should be positioned to cover a different entry direction. As an practical alternative, we recommend having at least one main centerpiece in the “close approach” to the CFP complex coming from the CBD in such a location where it is visible from other routes as well. Figure 5.3 is a rendering of a possible centerpiece.
Figure 5.3

Anchor Centerpiece for the HKMM

(Source: Aphoenix Anchors Away, 2010)

5.4 Signage Recommendations

A pattern we found in our data collection was the constant need for directional and promotional signage. As a result, we decided to group our recommendations for the enhancement of accessibility and visibility to encompass the broad theme of signage. There are two overarching goals within our signage recommendations. First, to make sure pedestrians in the Central Piers and adjacent areas are directed towards the CFP Complex and Pier No. 8. The second goal is to provide a cheaper advertising alternative for the HKMM to promote itself at locations in Hong Kong Island and Kowloon.
5.4.1 Directional Signage

We would like to recommend the following:

- Ideally, all signs and directories in the Central Piers that include Pier No. 8 should include the HKMM. Strict governmental regulation impedes significant changes on Pier No. 8. Therefore, the HKMM should petition the Hong Kong government to at least include its name on signage and directories present at the CFP complex.
- Petition to be included in exit directories, exit directional signs, and attraction directory maps, specifically in the Hong Kong MTR Station
- During the New Central Harbourfront construction, pedestrian routes leading towards the Central harbourfront that include signage directing pedestrians should add an HKMM directional sign.
- Petition to be included in new directional signage and directories after the New Central Harbourfront construction is completed.
- Request to paint a blue directional line emanating from the HKMM entrance at Pier No. 8. Furthermore, this line would extend to Pier No. 10 and Pier No. 5. Due to governmental regulations and the fact the HKMM is not the only business in the CFP complex, the HKMM should aspire to petition the Hong Kong government to paint the blue line. More realistically, the blue line would extend from Pier No. 6 and Pier No. 9 and emanate from the HKMM entrance at Pier No. 8.

5.4.2 Promotional Signage

We would like to recommend the following:

- The HKMM should have a presence (i.e. pamphlets) in hotels and other attractions in the CBD, however, budgetary constraints would limit the number of pamphlets the HKMM
could distribute. As a practical alternative, we recommend the HKMM should aspire to choose major hotels in the CBD (Mandarin Oriental, Conrad, etc.) and contact these establishments to inform the Hotel tourism personnel about the HKMM.

- Hold open discussions with the “Star” Ferry Company and inquire about the placement of small posters and other promotional advertisements in the “Star” Ferry locations in Hong Kong Island and Kowloon.

- Given unlimited human resources the HKMM should engage in “free” internet advertising such as publishing an E-newsletter and distributing it electronically to tour companies, the Hong Kong shipping community, and Hong Kong schools. However, the HKMM has a limited personnel budget and an E-newsletter would require significant human resources. Thus, the HKMM should aspire to at least continue its current free advertisings, such as publishing articles in scholarly journals, continue updating its website, and invite tour companies (local and international) to visit their new location.

5.5 Overall Conclusions

One area that could be explored further in our research was identifying how the HKMM could reach out to the needs of school groups. Unfortunately, because of the disconnect between the current Hong Kong school curriculum and maritime history, there is no simple way to reach out to the needs of schools without pursuing an aggressive campaign to design museum educational services that stimulate students’ interest in learning. This was beyond the scope of our project.

Furthermore, due to a language barrier, we were unable to acquire qualitative survey responses from the HKMM’s current primary visitor demographic of Chinese tourists. Without time constraints, we would have further pursued direct surveying of Chinese locals and tourists.
to identify what would attract them to the HKMM and interviewed school officials to understand how the museum’s educational offerings could be modified to be more cohesive with the school curriculum. With the new educational reform coming in, a new curriculum with more flexibility is a possibility.

With relocation, the Hong Kong Maritime Museum must adjust its marketing plan to reach out to its target audiences in an entirely different environment. Central Pier No. 8 is more accessible to new market segments and offers significantly more gallery space. Therefore, it is an ideal location for the HKMM to continue fulfilling its mission. However, to continue stimulating interest in maritime history, the museum must constantly be reaching out to visitors while providing an exciting and interactive museum experience. With this project, we profiled the HKMM’s new audiences at Central Harbourfront and identified how the museum could enhance the pier’s accessibility, visibility, and attractiveness to meet its needs. Furthermore, we identified how the HKMM could enhance these facets of the pier both during and after the New Central Harbourfront development project, highlighting how construction might affect the museum and its planned bar and café’s success. Finally, we believe our recommendations can be used by the HKMM to reach its desired audiences.
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Appendix A: Sponsor Description

Hong Kong, known as one of the "Four Asian Tigers", has long stood as an international trading hub. Ranked as 3rd in the world in ease of doing business, Hong Kong has enjoyed much financial wealth because of its advantageous geographic position (Doing Business, 2009), with a highly developed and technologically-driven society. The Hong Kong Maritime Museum (HKMM) celebrates Hong Kong’s commercial culture in an atmosphere of admiration and praise towards Chinese maritime history. Dr. Stephen Davies, the HKMM museum director states, “The museum is operated by the Hong Kong Maritime Museum Ltd, funded and overseen by the Hong Kong Maritime Museum Trust." (Davies, 2009, p. 1) The Hong Kong Maritime Museum is a nonprofit educational institution that is funded by Hong Kong’s international shipping community. The museum lists COSCO (H.K.) Shipping Co., Ltd, IMC Group of Companies, and Hutchinson Port Holdings as its most prevalent donors.

The Hong Kong Maritime Museum has a very sturdy organizational structure built of quality employees which is displayed in figure A.1 below. The Hong Kong Maritime Museum has twelve trustees with one chair, Mr. CC Tung. Under the trustees is the board of directors with its four members and its chairman, Mr. Anthony Harding. Directly under this board sits the Museum Director, who is our direct contact at the museum Dr. Stephen Davies. Dr. Stephen Davies oversees everything that goes on at the museum on a day to day basis as well as all external museum affairs. Dr. Davies oversees the museum curator, Ms. Catalina Chor who also holds the position of executive manager. Ms. Chor supervises the rest of the staff at the museum, who are divided into two divisions, the curatorial staff and the operational staff. The curatorial staff is made up of three employees, Ms. Moody Tang, the assistant curator, Ms. Dorothy Kwong, the assistant curator of public relations, and Ms. Elisa Pang, the museum's assistant
curator of design. The operational museum staff, also managed by Ms. Catalina Chor, is made up of the executive secretary, Ms. Jesse Chan, the accounts supervisor, Ms. Louisa Leung and, the shop adviser, Ms. Kendi Tong. Ms. Kendi Tong manages a shop assistant; Ms. Josephine Chow who also works as the receptionist for the museum. The frontline of the Hong Kong Maritime Museum is made up of the receptionist, the museum technician, Mr. Simon Ho and, the museum attendant, Mr. Raymond Law (Hong Kong Maritime Museum Business Pack, 2009, p.7).

**Figure A.1**

*HKMM Organization Chart*

*(Source: Hong Kong Maritime Museum Business Pack, 2009)*
Currently the HKMM is working on a relocation project to move their museum to a new location with the goal of achieving greater visibility and accessibility to new market segments and develop a more unique and attractive museum grounds with a maritime theme. Presently, the HKMM is located in Stanley Plaza at the historic Murray House. The museum is filled with exciting, innovative, interactive semi-permanent exhibitions, and dynamic displays. The HKMM also holds educational events, and a museum shop for guests. The museum's goal is to display the contributions of Chinese, Asian, and Western maritime influences across history, with details on the development of boats, ships, maritime exploration, trade, and naval warfare. The HKMM focuses on the Southern Chinese influences; however, it also displays global trends and comprehensively recounts the growth and development of Hong Kong as a major world port and top maritime center (Hong Kong Maritime Museum, 2009). The mission of the Hong Kong Maritime Museum (2009) is best worded on their website:

*The mission of the Hong Kong Maritime Museum is to stimulate public interest in the world of ships and the sea with particular reference to the South China coast and adjacent seas and to the growth of Hong Kong as a major port and international maritime centre, and in doing so highlight the major developments in and cross-fertilization between Chinese, Asian and western maritime traditions* (About Us).

The Interactive Qualifying Project Team will be working directly with the museum staff to help develop the necessary research and data for the museum to make its move to its new location and positive and productive as possible.
Appendix B: Interview Transcripts

For many of our objectives, we used interviews with museum staff, development consultants, and other pertinent officials to supplement the results from our survey and observational studies. The following are the transcripts from these interviews:

B.1 Professor Jeffrey Forgeng

Professor, Worcester Polytechnic Institute (Curator, Higgins Armory Museum)

Salisbury Labs

Ben Goldberg - Secretary
Eric Nadeau - Chair

November 24, 2009

(1) *What was your role at the Higgins Armory?*

I was a curator, or a person who has expertise in the museums’ collection and their background stories, for the Higgins Armory, a museum in Worcester, MA.

(2) *What methods has the Higgins Armory used to make its premises both visible and attractive??*

The Higgins Armory promotes building relationships in the community. We used to advertise through small advertisement firms directed towards small local companies. Other means of promotion also came through non profits that have grassroots campaigns and can get the word out.

(3) *What methods has the Higgins Armory used to enhance its accessibility to visitors?*

Certain groups that needed help with regards to accessibility were the school groups, library programs, and volunteer groups with demonstrations at the conventions in the area.
(4) Has the Higgins Armory gone through any major periods of renovation or relocation, and if so, how and why did it affect changes in visitor traffic and demographic and how did you reach out to these new demographics?

There are other museums which have moved. Look up the Royal Armory which moved to Leeds. It ended up being somewhat of a failure for that museum.

(5) Does the Higgins Armory use any other means to bring in visitors (e.g. a café, bar, store, or specific events), and if so, what are they and how successful are they?

Means of bringing visitors is varied. Mostly the Higgins Armory utilized three main techniques: (1) functions, (2) collections, and (3) uniqueness.

Functions: Examples are company dinners, and weddings. In layman terms, space at the Armory could be rented for various functions.

Collections: Museums typically have main collection and have extended collection for enthusiasts which is not labeled or described in detail.

Marketing Space: Marketing premises as unique and providing unique experience to bring functions different from the Marot Function Hall.

(6) Has the Higgins Armory done anything to attract visitors to its location (e.g. improve greenery, add benches/walkways, increase signage), and how successful have these efforts been?

The Armory has a signature piece which is visible from the outside of the building. I recommend museums utilizing a modern signature piece. The museum staff should integrate it into the community to make surrounding area more appealing.

(7) What other methods does the Higgins Armory use to expand its visitor base, and how successful have these methods been?
Higgins Armory Demographics: (1) families with children under 12, (2) school groups, and (3) 20-30 year olds. The museums’ demographics are made up of mostly local visitors. Data was gathered through analysis of basic demographic data, ages, and zip codes which were collected from our visitors.

Advertising Functions:

1. Festival of Ale: Estimated 20 – 30 people. Designed to have a community feeling clashing with a celebration.
2. Themed Overnight Parties: Kids under the age of 12 would host their birthday celebrations themed around movies
3. Holiday Events: Designing events for Holidays with customized holiday feels

(8) How does your organization gauge its successfullness?

Success was mostly determined by visitor number, which could be broken by several categories. For example: (1) school groups, (2) general visitation, (3) overnight parties, and (4) birthday party functions. The overall annual visitation was roughly 40,000 – 60,000 for the museum.

Additional Questions:

(9) What types of Museum Business Plans exist?

Museums often have different business plans. There is no real set business plan where you pick it up one day, build a collection, and then open a museum. But there are some basic plans which most museums fall into in one way or another. They are Mergers where non-profit museums come together or a museum joins with another institution or university. In 1980 the MFA and Art Museum tried to acquire the Higgins Armory. Sometimes museums will just receive funding from a university. Others work in a consortium where they share not only their offerings and exhibits, but also their staff. This works well because workers can move as needed
between the museums and there only needs to be one I.T. department between the museums in the consortium.

(10) Anything further to add on the Higgins Armory or other museums which may help us for our project?

The Higgins armory is planning a move soon. The Higgins Armory will be moving to the Auditorium.

I would suggest looking into the Royal Armory Museum as I mentioned earlier. It moved from the Tower of London to Leeds where it went from a high traffic area to a less traveled area. They purpose built a space with great performance; however, the visitor count reflected their new location, not their shiny new museum.

(11) Is there a good way to measure foot traffic or any ideas for how to survey the foot traffic to see if they would visit a museum? What sort of questions should we ask?

I would ask if they worked nearby, what brings them to the area, are they in a rush or not, and if they were to find the museum if they would visit it. Try to collect data on where they are coming from as well and then compare it to the museum’s current data.

Look into extensive advertising via vacation packages, pamphlets and, Billboard campaigns. The Higgins Armory has done the billboard campaigns and found them to be very useful and successful.

I would also suggest building relationships with all of its neighbors and with local companies. Make good with the big local players and offer a corporate membership. Offer for them to use the planned bar/café as a meeting area or place for the corporation’s events.
B.2 Professor Dominic Golding

Professor, Worcester Polytechnic Institute (Grant Manager, Worcester EcoTarium)

IGSD Office

Eric Nadeau - Chair

Byron Rodriguez - Secretary

November 15, 2009

(1) What has your role in the EcoTarium been?

Grant Manager.

(2) What methods has the EcoTarium used to make its premises both visible and attractive?

We have used a multi pronged strategy. It's important to know the key audiences, identify them and know where they live. Do an internal assessment of who you are and where you want to take the museum. The EcoTarium is geared towards kids under the age of 13. So trying to market to tourists in Worcester, for example, is just stupid. A marketing study will show the typical demographics that you want to appeal. It will highlight, by "zip code", these groups. Outreach to schools within these groups. You might want to do direct mail to these folks, or advertisements in newspapers that affect these groups specifically. The tradeoff - how much you are going to pay for this marketing vs. how much you will actually gain back. Key indices of people in the community are more likely to go to museums. You have to know the subset demographics of your areas and who you are appealing to. Not so much how to do tourists, I'm not as experienced with that. Unfortunately, it's not too easy to get your hands on the marketing study of a museum.
(3) What methods has the EcoTarium used to enhance its accessibility to visitors?

Market to schools - we do field trips to the EcoTarium all the time. Do outreach in a number of ways. Word of mouth, school programs, develop contacts with a number of schools. Provide money to subsidize visits, such as for busing. Demonstrate the educational value, how this visit connects with the current curriculum. You contact location foundations that provide busing, offer to give X amount of overhead. We would also target schools that are under served, such as with high percentages of minorities or pre-schools and moms with young kids that aren't in school. We did a program that gave coffee to the moms while the kids could see the museum. They could gather and socialize, and Starbucks provided the coffee. It was very popular and attractive to them. As far as a café, it could maybe be opened during a peak period of the year, but it may not be able to be supported. You need a lot of visitors to do that, it is certainly attractive, but difficult to maintain unless visitation is very high. Also, bathrooms should be geared for kids and their mothers! They should be clean, well lit, and have changing tables.

(4) Has the EcoTarium gone through any major periods of renovation or relocation, and if so, how and why did it affect changes in visitor traffic and origins and how did you reach out to new customer bases?

It has existed since 1865, and most recently moved to the line of Shrewsbury by Plantation Street. It's on the site of Harrington Farm, which was donated by a major philanthropic family in Worcester. They donated 40 acres for it in 1970, however it has suffered because it is not in downtown Worcester. It has indoor and outdoor facilities, a pond for skating, an outdoor train that kids love, a planetarium, and the only polar bear in the region. In the 90's it renamed itself to the EcoTarium. It changed its style a lot, with subtle graphics, motifs, etc. It might have appealed to a very sophisticated audience; however what they should have been
targeting was kids. However, it just rebranded itself again, now more vibrant and geared much more towards people of younger ages. You have to know who you are, know who your audience is, and brand yourself accordingly. For example, we now use bright colors instead of earth tones.

We got our current building in the late 90's... 95-97 or so. It was designed by the famous architect Darrell Stone. When it was built, they ran out of money, so only half of it was completed and they just walled it off. The best renovation they did was making it into a three story glass window letting in tons of light. They spent tons of money on this, not on exhibits but on the building. It was far more than they should have spent. And, of course, visitation went up at first due to the publicity, and then went back down again. Now they are building exhibits, which is what people go for. And now numbers are steadily going up. However, many people were offended by the change of name... they were attached to the "Worcester" in it.

(5) What other methods does the EcoTarium use to expand its visitor base, and how successful have these methods been?

Know your core market - your bread and butter. For the EcoTarium, this is school groups and families with children under the age of 12. We are at around 30,000 visits from school groups annually. It is important to keep your budget even too, 1/3 from people who come in the door, 1/3 from endowment, and 1/3 from grants and contracts. When this goes askew bad things happen. For example, the New England Aquarium was very dependent on people who come in through the door, and they ran into a lot of issues. They are now evening that out. You have to do different things to appeal to different groups though. For example, we did a beer brewing evening, and adults loved it, they got to get away from the children. We also did a planetarium stargazing show for young couples on Valentine’s Day. The hardest group to get is kids over 12, teenagers. They just don't go to museums. We had a program called Task, where minority
interns came in and got paid to work on the floor. We also had a “Women in Science”
conference, where we brought in 150 school girls aged 12 to 14 to spend a day. This was in
collaboration with U. Mass Medical; they came in to do various workshops. Other foundations
funded teenagers coming in to work.

Recently, numbers of old folks coming in has also increased. We're really not sure why
that has been happening. The planetarium was also redone to make it more snazzy, making it
completely digital. This would appeal to younger audiences, as it is more attractive

(6) Does the EcoTarium use any other means to bring in visitors (e.g. a café, bar, store, or
specific events), and if so, what are they and how successful are they?

The EcoTarium is not in the right place. There is not enough foot traffic in the area to
warrant a bar. In the past, we have done a jazz series with WICN during the summer. On good
nights, they would get 3,000 people. It was geared towards adult audiences; they set up a big
tent. A bar or café could be done if we were in a more downtown location, but we have done all
sorts of other special events.

(7) Has the EcoTarium done anything to attract visitors to its location (e.g. improve greenery,
add benches/walkways, increase signage), and how successful have these efforts been?

We've tried to spruce up the outside; this is one thing that used to be very unattractive.
We have also done surveys to make it more attractive. Initial impressions are important, the
front staff is very important too. Coupons work amazingly well. Memberships are also great for
revisits. They are great in the winter, they let kids run around with an educational value, and you
usually need to only go back twice or so to repay cost. They are also great when grouped with
other museums. It's also really great getting institutional passes to libraries, which is a great way
to get the word out and make money. Target grandparents, they will buy membership for their
grandchildren. You should look at past conference procedures for stuff like this, ASTC.org, and
the AIM for museum marketing strategies. You can also try the library at the Worcester Art
Museum. You could try contacting Honey Hess there, or whoever their current marketing person
is. For the EcoTarium, you can try Jennifer Glick, the Director of Marketing and Development,
or Steve Pitcher, the President. Just call 929-2700 and ask for Jennifer.

(8) How does your organization gauge its successfulness?

Money - which can come from visitation and other various sources, the store, etc? You
need to evaluate if the program is "really working". You can also measure success by
endowment, look at how much money you are receiving each year from membership, the GATE
program, and other sources. Set yourself targets at the beginning of the year and see how much
you will actually end up getting from each thing. Visitation is the key.

(9) Are there any other resources that you could provide our group with for our study?

Definitely talk to Jennifer or Steve from the EcoTarium. You should also look at the
Association of American Museums, VSA.org - the Visitor Studies Association, and ASTC.org.
You should be able to find a lot of resources, consultants who do marketing studies, etc. See
who would be willing to talk to you.
B.3 Mr. Dick Groves

Owner, Retail Development Consultants

Starbucks, Alexandra House

Ben Goldberg

Byron Rodriguez - Secretary

Eric Nadeau - Chair

January 19, 2010

(1) To your knowledge, how might the construction period affect accessibility to and from the Central Ferry Piers?

It will destroy the accessibility of Pier No. 8. The construction will render most avenues of access impassable or very hard to use.

I am distressed citizen because the government and other government entities have not integrated modern development ideas with the actual plans of development of the [Hong Kong Island] harbourfront. They have great potential to make a world class harbourfront similar to those found in Sydney Australia and Baltimore, Maryland. However, the government is too bureaucratic to get anything done and any plan or concept through.

The government is just too rigid, and single-minded in certain facets of commerce and Hong Kong development. Progress within the government ranks is very narrow-minded because employees from same companies attain government positions and vice versa, limiting the flow of new perspectives and ideas. In addition, new people are also hindered from progressing vertically and shedding new perspective or light on anything.

(2) To your knowledge, how might the areas surrounding the New Central Harbourfront be utilized to enhance the accessibility to and from the Piers during and after the construction
period? (e.g. For during extremely hot and humid Hong Kong Summers when potential visitors might not be compelled to walk along the waterfront promenade).

The government has no plan and has not paid attention. Government needs to take action because Hong Kong is competing with Shanghai, Tokyo and other cities. Thus, Hong Kong needs to build modern harbour to control and retain prominence and as a result maintain status as financial center.

The government is working separately on three areas of the harbourfront, which are not integrated to maximize potential. These areas should be built one at a time, with businesses, shops and other attractions dispersed equally amongst them. “Instead they [Hong Kong government] are putting all of their eggs in one basket”. Furthermore, there is no schedule for construction and the concepts of the development project continue to change. The Central Harbourfront development should be broken up instead of being considered one huge project.

The ideas I propose are the following: Maritime Center the following elements: (1) static ships, (2) marine police cigarette boats formations, they should dock during the day, and (3) gimmick model, example in Vegas.

Use Hong Kong’s city hardware and shipping industry and utilize these elements in exhibits. For example, use containers as foundation for museum structure.

Quarter Deck Restaurant with harbourfront views. There are only three water front restaurants and this could be a major attraction.

Change the name of Hong Kong Maritime Museum to Hong Kong maritime centre. The word museum is not an attractive element that draws people, especially in this part of the world it has a negative connotation. Look at the Hong Kong Infrastructure and Planning Museum; it was located in Central and close to the harbourfront.
One way of bringing in support from Hong Kong community is allowing architectural students or civil engineers use the development of Pier No. 8 and adjacent construction areas as examples. For example, the “Eco-Box” was an observatory set up for students and developer to come and watch the construction.

(3) Have there been any studies done for projected visitation for the New Central Harbourfront areas, specifically:

a. Tourist traffic

b. Pedestrian traffic from the Central Business District

c. Visitation for the planned recreational areas

d. Estimates for possible increases/decreases in ferry use

And if so, is it possible for us to get acquire this data?

From a developers perspective the museum will NOT go from 35,000 – 40,000 to 500,000. There is nothing in the plans that will get people to go down there [Central Ferry Piers]. The museum visitation may even drop. Talk to Central Piers Ferry retailers who have had trouble staying above water with their finances because of their location on the ferry pier. The HKMM is placed on the wrong side for a large segment of the pedestrian traffic. Also, the little planning they have will send a lot of the traffic, not across the front of the museum but directly past it in a fashion which would not show the museum’s location very well unless further design were to take the museum’s projected location into account.

The chaos around the development project has produced too many unknowns, and as a result no way of projecting number for any of the above. Where is the Hong Kong Maritime Museum currently? What draws tourists to current location? I do not think visitation would
increase. If anything, because of the lack of a gimmick it might decrease. I have spoken to retailers in the Ferry Piers and they have mentioned that their finances have decreased.

Again, I have benchmarked prominent harbourfronts, such as Sidney and Baltimore to indicate process of modernization.

Either way, some ways you guys can project numbers is by going to retailers and businesses in the CFP complex and evaluating their historical data, then extrapolating those numbers for museums.

ALWAYS, ask yourselves one question: What would make/cause visitation to rise?
(1) What methods has the HKMM used to make its premises visible to its target audiences (ie through outreach, etc)?

We’ve advertised in the nearest we can find to local free sheets – like Hong Kong Dollar Saver, Art Map. We haven’t advertised otherwise because we simple couldn’t afford it. These things were free. We looked at buses, but couldn’t afford it. For three years, until the deal got too expensive, we advertised on three minibuses that went from Stanley to Central. Cost us $40,000 a year, and we were beginning to feel the pinch. We couldn’t see from our surveys that it was having a significant effect on our visitation. We did get street banners on the railings of streets, but it’s a lottery system, you apply for the lottery and they put it up for three weeks. We have street banners now and then in Stanley, but those too are lottery, and if government declares an overriding need they get them. We do use the lamp posts as well around the museum and bus stop in Stanley Plaza. We have lobbied with the Highways Department to get the finger ways, and we are on tourist maps as well. We tried to get into the major guide books, but this all has to do with when they publish the latest addition. We did get an acknowledgement from Rough Guide, they’d obviously gone to print first, because we weren’t in their most recent. We are on the website of Lonely Planet, but not yet their guide. We get most visits by word of mouth. About 80% are spontaneous walk-ins, they have no idea that we were even here. This being
said, advertising is not targeting our audiences. We would do much better if we did target advertising via email, mailings, etc, but we can’t afford that. Instead, we rely on news articles; we have gotten nearly 300 since starting. We still have come across people who have not known about the museum despite reading all of the media we have been in. I think by being a bloody good museum, we find that people who like the museum go and talk to their friends. We find that that 60% of visitors say they came because they have heard about us from family and friends in our surveys. Unless we have half a million dollars to squander on advertising, I think we would be wasting our time. All of these we plan to continue doing after the relocation.

(2) What methods has the HKMM used to make its premises attractive and meet the needs of its target audiences?

Well we try very much – I mean the major attraction we go for is the approach and the shop. The approach used to be a boring corridor; we’ve now got those banners. But they are still rather boring. We are not allowed to do anything though, because it’s still a historic building. We tried to make the shop attractive by putting on thematic exhibits. The common area between the two galleries is butt numbingly boring, so we’ve tried to put some colorful exhibits in here. We also try to train Raymond and Simon, against their inner selves, to be more welcoming to visitors. I don’t think they really like doing that. The Young Ambassadors are much better than them. These are students who come from time to time on the weekends. They are here to meet, be friendly, and welcome tourists. Allows them to practice their English/Mandarin, and only cost us lunch and bus money, so it’s a good deal for us.

(3) What methods has the HKMM used to enhance its accessibility to visitors?

In particular, we are disabled oriented. Wheel chairs can get to the ramps. However, Hong Kong in general is not very good with disability, it’s seen in a medieval way as sort of an
evil eye, and the average member of the population is not that sensitive to their needs. In terms of easy to find, our biggest problem in signage. That signage is ruled in Hong Kong by all these different government and quasi-government satrapies that just past the gavel. They all want to say no. We are what they call a “private museum”. The Danish, very smartly, use the word “independent”. Because we are not a government museum, they say we are indistinguishable in regulatory terms from a fish and chip shop or a café. If we do it for you, we have to do it for Gino’s Gelato, McDonalds, Wild fire; because they are just the same as you. This is because there was no such thing as a private museum in Hong Kong until we broke the mold. It has taken altogether about 8 years

(4) What events has the HKMM held in the past to attract new audiences? Have they been successful? Why/ Why not?

Well, we have held 9 of our mini-themed exhibitions so far, starting back a year after we opened. It’s very hard to tell if they are successful. We only get about 3% responses from our questionnaires to see if they actually came to see the exhibition. We can’t get the people who run the Arts pages on the news papers to show us, they say “You’re not culture, you’re a maritime museum”. You need to chivy them every day, and in fact I have to chivy my staff too – that’s just part of how the people in Hong Kong are. Hong Kong is not very productive, if you look at the productivity figures. The government sits and churns paperwork all day, but their throughput is actually abysmal. This has set a mark for much of everyday Hong Kong. I’m a very tough boss, I don’t pay people to be idle, I don’t pay myself to be idle.

These small exhibitions require a lot of work, and we are whipping through them quite quickly. We’ve had a couple of people who hire space at venues, because you can’t have people bringing food and drink into the galleries. A couple of years ago, on the French National Day,
there was a visiting French bagpipe band. We got a hold of them, and with another band, they put on a concert, these two bands playing together. This was tremendous; we had 500-600 people. If something big like that happens, we try to grab it. We had a concert with the academy of performing arts. Probably the most successful tour was when a Swedish vessel replica visited that cost $80M. We got it to anchor in Stanley bay, and we arranged for a boat to ferry people out to visit. That was a great success. A second one like that, was the first ever Chinese junk to circumnavigate the Pacific, we got down here. People came to look at it, and it had a little exhibition. Every year we have a family day with cooperation with the local district board in Aberdeen; with a competition such as “build your fantasy boat”. We play games all day, give out balloons, and work all day, which is much more than the government museums do. There is a maritime exhibition put on in the convention exhibition center put on every two years, we always have two booths there where we take stuff out of the shop, have videos, and sell things. We usually do good business, especially from international visitors. It basically all comes down to any way we can for free, or close to free, show our stuff in public. We did run a traveling exhibition around four venues in the New Territories. It was reasonably successful; we managed to get through about 6,000 pamphlets. We did the same with an exhibition we put on in late 2007 with respect to the growth of Hong Kong as a maritime center. It’s very expensive though, we need to have sponsors. The idea of travelling around schools is great, but it’s money and staff. And in my opinion, the only one who can go around and talk maritime history with enthusiasm is me, and I can’t speak Cantonese.

(5) What other methods does the HKMM use to expand its visitor base, and how successful have these methods been?
I can’t think of anything else we have done. And I don’t think most of this even made a blip in the curve.

(6) Has the museum ever tried to distribute brochures or pamphlets in local establishments?

We have regular pamphlet drops in about 30 hotels all over Hong Kong. Sometimes we give them to the concierge, and if someone asks them, they can get one.

(7) Before the museum opened, did you ever do any studies to try and project visitation to it?

As far as I know, nothing of the kind was done because almost nothing was done. There was no attempt to cost the museum properly.

(8) What would be some things you would do to make the new HKMM more attractive for its initial opening and for the duration?

For the opening, getting one of the popular canto bands or stars would be worth more than a bazillion dollars for marketing and advertising.

As for the duration, changing the name to avoid the usage of “museum” in the title which is a boring word and has some educational connotations which is not the type of message we are trying to send.
B.5 Mr. Frankie Yick and Mr. Johnny Leung

Managing Director and General Manager, the “Star” Ferry Company, Ltd.

Wheelock House

Byron Rodriguez - Chair

Ben Goldberg - Secretary

February 1, 2010

(1) We wanted to verify the numbers that are posted on your website about the Star Ferry Attendance?

Mr. Yick -> The numbers posted on the website are: (1) Annual total number of passengers = 23 million, (2) Number of daily passengers carried equals 62,971. The numbers on the website were conducted by students and we found they were more prone to ask Chinese tourists and locals rather than foreigners and thus these data are skewed. The ratio they determined was around 20 to 80 percent of tourists to locals. The more realistic numbers point towards ~30% - 40% / ~70% - 80%.

Mr. Leung -> However, our ferry lines that will directly affect the HKMM at Pier No. 8 are TST to Central and Huang Hom to Central. Their passenger numbers are:

• 3,800 daily from TST to Central

• 3,000 daily from Huang Hom to Central

Mr. Yick -> You would be interested to know that “Star” Ferry has experienced a drop in patronage in the last two years. Firstly because of the development on Central harbour Hong Kong locals do not like walking 300 meters towards then new Central Ferry Piers complex. Secondly, the recession exposed transportation industry and with the renovation and expansion of MTR, there was an 18% drop in patronage.
(2) **What are the demographics of your passengers?**

Mr. Yick -> The demographics broken down in general by two groups: foreigners and local Hong Kong inhabitants.

- Local Hong Kong Inhabitants: (2008) 70% and (2009) 60%
- Tourists: (2008) 30% and (2009) 40%

Mr. Leung -> Surveys are conducted annually although are outsourced to Universities who are primarily Cantonese speakers and were prone to ask HK locals and Chinese tourists. Furthermore, as you can see in the pie charts, demographics are broken down. In addition, the peak season for ferry patronage is December. The peak time for weekly peak is in the afternoon.

(3) **In addition to general passenger traffic from the ferries, in your opinion, what is the number of pedestrians that pass through the central ferry piers complex?**

Mr. Yick -> You might be better asking the tourism board, we simply survey our ferries not pedestrian traffic. The development bureau might have statistics on these numbers.

(4) **As a manager, how successful are the businesses that reside and advertise in the Star Ferry Piers?**

Mr. Yick -> Truly, advertising is dependent on promotional and development of actual advertisements. Thus, our recommendation would be to emphasize the need for innovative and creative advertisements.

However, we wanted to make it clear that “Star” Ferry is avid supporter. We were wondering why Dr. Davies had not presented the application to the Town Planning board. You see, the GPA is the government entity that oversees the development. The plans still state that Pier No. 8 location is set aside for a restaurant.
(5) As a businessman, in your opinion, how do you think the HKMM will fare at the Star Ferry Complex?

Mr. Yick -> The biggest challenge the HKMM will face is drawing people there presumably the development adjacent to Pier No. 8 will still be undergoing. Again, I feel advertisement and promotion are integral part of attracting people. Much emphasis and resources must be placed in marketing.

Mr. Leung -> We [The “Star” Ferry] feel that the new location is perfect. As far as maritime museums go, the Victoria Harbour location would only be beneficial because its location is convenient. Convenient in the sense that visitors do not have to go out of their way to come across the museum, as they presumably did in Stanley location.

Mr. Yick -> Like I mentioned before, Hong Kong people do not like to walk. And the extra 300 meter walk to Central Ferry Piers must be attractive to get people to want to go there. Thus, making the walk more pleasant should be another element to improve upon. I also wanted to add that, the first few years visitation will be affected by construction in the adjacent area.

Mr. Leung -> One idea that we had as ignorant Hong Kong museum supporters is to get historic vessels to birth at the dock for limited amount of time.

(6) In your opinion how do you feel the construction around Pier No.8 will affect the HKMM?

We did not ask this question because Mr. Yick had previously explained in other answers.

(7) Given the location and proximity to the Star Ferry’s, would it be possible to work out some sort of package for a harbour tour and a HKMM entrance ticket?

Mr. Yick and Mr. Leung -> Any possibility of combined packages which are mutually beneficial would be considered.
(8) Do you think it would be possible to build some sort of recognizable structure in the rotary? A Centerpiece? Either there or just outside of Pier No.8?

Mr. Yick -> Well, the land or building (CFP) is actually owned by the government. Thus, Development Bureau and Town Planning Board must approve of anything built and the process is exhaustive, time-consuming, and expensive.

(9) The HKMM has hypothesized that they will be able to attract 1% of CFP annual patrons. In your opinion, is this hypothesis correct?

Mr. Yick -> To be honest, without exact figures, the 1% hypothesis seems extremely conservative. Let’s see, if 3,000 passengers daily from Central to Huang Hom and 3,800 and TST to Central. That equals ~6,800 daily passengers which would be possible to target. My estimate would be that roughly 3% of those passengers could be potential visitors to the HKMM 3% of 6,800 = 204. This is my semi-conservative estimation. On weekends due to higher tourist activeness that number might be closer to 300.
B.6 Mr. Paul Zimmerman

Director, Designing Hong Kong

Designing Hong Kong Main Office, Caroline Centre

Eric Nadeau - Chair

John Depot - Secretary

February 3, 2010

(1) Do the final plans for the New Central Harbourfront reflect the results of the Designing Hong Kong Central Waterfront Design Contest?

Yes and no, but not enough. Did we have an impact? Yes. Are we satisfied with that? Yes and no. We haven’t been able to impact any of the road designs, which is a significant issue.

(2) What do the current plans for the New Central Harbourfront include for accessibility to the Central Piers Complex?

There is a footbridge that currently runs from IFC to Pier 7. In the future, this will be gone, and the adjacent areas will be pedestrian accessible. The fence that blocks off past Pier 9 right now will be moved up very soon, as well. The roofs of the piers are going to be connected with a deck structure and tower property to the IFC. So ultimately what you are going to have is the under pass under Central, then you will have deck access. There is a coffee shop in IFC with a big massive window, that will be taken away and there will be a footbridge there over to the piers area, or through exchange square or they can take the street level and walk through the parks. In terms of accessibility in the future, it’s going to be very good. Before then, you are going to have to use the temporary footbridge.
(3) Do you know what the general time frame is for the New Central Harbourfront developments?

I don’t know, I haven’t seen the latest timeline for this work. What needs to be done first and what has been holding it up is this underpass road. This entire reclamation needs to be done for this road tunnel that is going across the Central area of the Harbourfront. That is why this reclamation was agreed to. If you look up the Central-Wan Chai bypass update on the Leisure Cult website, you should be able to find the latest documents on that. There are also various “development packages” for the land in this area. When they are going to sell them, I don’t know. You still have pretty good access from the ferries, and indirect access from the bus terminals (three nearby) and two MTR stations.

The accessibility is there, the question is how many people have a reason to stay in this area. This will go up as these properties are finished. The accessibility would never be a problem though, because they are not going to block it. The visibility of the clock tower here, your highest point, is the visibility of your museum – not the pier. Your logo for the maritime museum is the Central Ferry Pier logo. So in terms of branding of where you are, you are in the Central Ferry Piers. That’s your marker, and that visibility of the marker will be quite strong, especially from IFC. Branding wise – go for the highest point – the building. “The maritime museum in central ferry piers”.

(4) You mentioned that the Design Contest did not have as much of an impact on the final plans as you would like. Is that because you are not satisfied with the government’s plan?

Our problem is that we wanted more street level access. They are taking this primary pedestrian street level access and are moving it up to the deck. We’ve asked them for pedestrian crossings, but we’ll have to see what the final outcome is.
(5) What do you think the major attraction will be in the New Central Harbourfront area that will draw people in that are not already there now?

Well right now, there is no reason to stay. You arrive with your transport, and there is no reason to hang about, so you leave. This will change as these properties are completed.

(6) Do you think that the Hong Kong Maritime Museum will find success, in terms of increased visitation, after being relocated to Pier No. 8?

I think the museum will do very well. Whether a place is going to be busy depends on the reasons for people to be there, and there are a lot. There are people for transport, there will be people on top of the deck and at IFC, and you are going to have people who are working there, coming down for dinner and lunch. When all is said and done, there are going to be lots of people there, from bars and restaurants, offices, the promenade, etc. So there are lots of reasons for people to be there, and therefore, more people will go to the HKMM. So this is going to be a great location, I think this will maybe even have more visitors than West Kowloon Cultural District. I think this is going to definitely be a very busy area.

(7) Do you have any information, or suggestions, of how to determine how visitation to this area and the HKMM will increase after the Harbourfront is completed?

Well, no studies have been done. You should be able to get traffic for the ferries. Also, for all of the new developments, the “Star” Ferry is going to be a convenient way to cross the harbour. A portion of people will find that the ferry will be the best way to go, so increases should be seen there. You should also look at the Gross Floor Area of nearby properties. I don’t have a clue how you’d get a percentage. Also look at tourists though, you may be able to talk to the Hong Kong Tourist Board to see, for example, how many people visit Bauhinia Square in front of the Convention Center. You can make the assumption that if the tour buses stop there,
they may stop at the Central Harbourfront after the project, so take a percentage of how many
would visit the HKMM.

What you could do is take Ocean Park visitors, would you be able to get as many as
them? It may be aiming very high, but why not? There are not that many things for tourists do
in Hong Kong. Does the HKMM hit the same needs of visitors who go to Ocean Park? Then
you can look at the Science museum, etc.. I definitely would have taken my kids there, it’s
extremely interesting. It’s just very far away, but once it’s in Central it’s very easy to go there.
Look at Ocean Park figures, and take a percentage of that – you can make some assumptions.
It’s a matter of “who would go why”. You’re a visitor, so where do you go in Hong Kong,
beyond shopping?

Just keep in mind; you are never going to be perfect. Make a hypothesis, using numbers
from various directions, and make a bandwidth. You will find a range of numbers that start to
converge around a certain area. “It’s going to be less than this number, and certainly more than
this number”. Try to interview the other museums, and get a feeling for their visitor profiles.
But because Ocean Park has both a mix of residents and tours, this may be a good option. You
would have to go and ask the tour operators, would you put the HKMM on your tour, and if not,
why not? You can also look at other cities, and see what percentages of people who go to their
maritime museum go to their science museum. Then apply that to the figures of the Hong Kong
Science Museum, etc. You just have to take different rationales, look at those numbers, see
where they are, and formulate your bandwidth. If they are all 100% over a certain level and all
100% of a certain level, then you can pick an exact area. I would do comparables, in Hong Kong
and in other cities.
(8) *Do you have anything you could add to improve visibility to the museum while at Central Pier No. 8?*

Ultimately, we hope the HKMM can get an extension to the basin to the East, close to the Convention Center. If it can get that basin, the museum could park vessels there. If the HKMM can get some moored ship as part of an extension to the waterfront, as a nice walking distance away, and people can get tickets to visit and see the ships, why not? And the museum should definitely brand itself with the Piers; he will not get any more visibility.
B.7 Mr. Christian Fung

Senior Administrative Officer of the Harbour Unit of the Development Bureau

Development Bureau Office

Ben Goldberg - Chair

Byron Rodriguez - Secretary

John Depot - Secretary

February 5, 2010

(1) What has your involvement been in the New Central Harbourfront development project?

I am from the harbour unit of the development, my role is to do harbourfront enhancement, and this includes area all around Victoria Harbour. Central is area we devote a lot of effort, the government has named this CBD one of the most important areas in next 10 and or 15 years. CEED, Architecture department and us will be working on it. Our involvement is more of a monitoring role. To make sure no problems or disputes come up. Central Harbourfront Development includes lots of places, from Central to Wan Chai.

(2) From your knowledge of the development project, do you believe the HKMM will find success being relocated to Central Pier No 8? (In terms of visitation) How do you feel this will be affected by the construction?

Presently from this unit’s point of view, it will be better. Firstly, the New Central Harbourfront (NCHF) is intended to be vibrant with a lot of green places and a lot of activities. Propose this event; if more people come to Central then more people come to Central Ferry Piers. The main goal of the project is to get more people to go to this area. Not just for museums, but also for the new fine dining, walking etc. From this unit point of view it would be a beneficial move. As a Hong Kong citizen, right now it is in Stanley in Hong Kong “drive for
forty minutes? That’s a long time.” Convenience is a big deal in Hong Kong and it will be much easier to go there at the piers than to Stanley.

(3) How do you think the construction will affect visibility of the Star Ferry Piers Complex, and what do you think the HKMM might be able to take advantage of to overcome any potential visibility problems? (ie through signage, etc)

For your reference to the document, Site 1 and Site 2, there exist building height limitations, and total gross for the area. This may be changed, but plans are to have one six story building and two four story buildings. We are not worried about affecting visibility. I have spoken to Frank Wong, who has plans to promote the HKMM so people can still find HKMM at its new location. They say they are now planning for a special signage system. They are currently inviting people to design this signage system, but details are limited right now. This is what is going to be done.

In my opinion, Hong Kong people are very smart and will find a means to get there and will recommended friends to go so it will not be a large issue.

(4) In your opinion, how do you think visitation will increase to the Central Piers area as a result of the New Central Harbourfront development project? (Have there been any studies done to project visitation or is there any other data that we can extrapolate a visitation estimate from? Or, at the very least, do you have a personal 'guesstimate' of how visitation might increase?)

As I said, at the NCHF there will be a lot of activities and facilities, a promenade is being built and will total in at over 16 hectares of promenade. Families and business people can go and visit the restaurants, night life, fine dining, museums and other galleries which are being planned. Apart from this site, site five will be a commercial development area, so people working
Saturday morning can go to HKMM in afternoon. We are trying to draw different people to this area and provide different activities for them.

We are pretty sure we can draw a lot people. According to their proposal they think attendance is three times increased. This is their research; the government does not have any research at this time. I will give you a person’s name, subject officer from Home Affairs Bureau, Bureau for Recreation, Sports and Museums. Helen Kwan, she is subject officer and may be able to give you more information, projected number of attendance.

(5) How might the construction affect accessibility to the piers area, and how might this be overcome?

During construction period accessibility problems will be present. We will not do construction in one go but in phases, so in effect the interference will be minimized. We will construct in phases and we will leave access and will build accessibility footbridges and walkways as needed, (walking time to museum will be increased). This is in general, government must be fair to all people, commercial and non-commercial sectors, in general we will provide a space for all Central Piers.

Signage – Just like other museums, LCSD always promotes signage, posters, sometimes even provide big advertisement boxes. This is part of the LCSD’s job.

(6) Are there any other people that you would suggest we interview, or that you could refer us to, to acquire more information on these matters?

Mr. Helen Kwan, Home Affairs Culture, and Office Phone Number: 2594 5627, email: hhykwan@hab.gov.hk

Mr. Eric Lam, Project Manager 1/Development Opportunities Office, Office Phone Number: 2186 8915 and email: doo@devb.gov.hk
(7) You spoke of other museums or exhibitions being installed on the piers in the future. What museums or galleries were in mind and will they keep with the maritime theme?

Right now there is no plan, but WKCD it is about 43 hectares; and they aim to become a large cultural district. Most of cultural facilities will be moved into that area but the plans are for galleries. We will coordinate other cultural experiences to include other facilities in Central in our site in the future.

(8) We find that museums have a centerpiece. We were wondering if the development bureau is in favor in a centerpiece in close proximity to the museum or not?

Right now HKMM haven’t approached us for this kind of thinking. If they approach us for the idea, it can be explored further. I have been to Macao. There is a yacht in front which somewhat acts as a centerpiece. We can explore this but must wait for HKMM to start this action.

(9) The HKMM would like to have more exterior exhibits at its new location. Do you think that the government or Star Ferry would have an issue with exterior exhibits being on the pier?

If they allow and they think it is good. The government might not have a lot of comments but depends on safety issues. It is Star Ferry’s issue and will be in their agreement.
(1) What methods has the Hong Kong Space Museum used in the past to reach out to its target audience by making its premises visible?

The most important factor is definitely location. As for the HKMM moving, I think it is a good move because their location now is remote. They are moving into a traditional tourist area. They are at a great advantage moving to there.

As for the advertising to be visible, the space museum and museums in general tend to have a small marking budget. Thus, we focus on other forms. For example, the space museum participates in internet marketing, the space museum releases a quarterly news letter, we participate in school advertising and community centers.

Another great form of advertising is during solar events such as lunar and solar eclipses. This way we can publish writings or have coverage providing the information in the news about the solar event. It is free advertising for the space museum. Furthermore, publishing articles in the newspapers and magazines is good advertising too.

For visibility, it is important to be visible at day and night, this is why the space museum has upgraded the dome lighting to be more colorful and flashy.
(2) What methods has the Hong Kong Space Museum used in the past to enhance its accessibility to visitors?

The accessibility aspect of museums is something that most museums do not have a budget for. The space museum is no exception. The best way to improve accessibility would be to convince or impress the local government or public transport companies with the museum so they want to advertise or support the museum.

Sometimes museums try to make deals, for example, the government of Hong Kong wanted to increase the visitation of the Costal Defense Museum. They developed a free bus to take visitors to the museum, but it was still unsuccessful.

(3) What methods has the Hong Kong Space Museum used in the past to make it attractive to its visitors and reach out to the needs of its target audiences?

The Space Museum has added the artistic statue, the crab like one. We call it “The General”. In the tunnel going under the road right outside we have some posts which we advertise off of. We changed the color of the lights from something rather bland to some very vibrant color changing LEDs and spotlights.

To reach out further, we have some external activities. Sidewalk Astronomy is an event where we place telescopes on the sidewalk and have people come and look at space through them. International Museum Day is a government operation we participate in. We put tents up with themed exhibits, performances, giveaways and purchasable items. During this an example would be the Tea Museum serving different types of tea.
(4) Has the Hong Kong Space Museum gone through any major periods of renovation or relocation, and if so, how and why did it affect changes in visitor traffic and demographic and how did you reach out to these new visitors?

The museum opened in 1980. It was renovated 10 years later in 1990 and there are plans for a 2011 renovation again. Full museum renovations are expensive and sometimes certain parts are renovated, for example in 2009, the Space Museum’s Theater was renovated.

The renovations bring in new visitors and bring back old ones. For example, the space museum theater renovations raised the theater visitation from 46% full on average to 96% full for a few months after it was renovated. Of course the numbers eventually drop again.

Another new visitor attraction attempt is renovating or changing up some regular programs and bring in new some temporary exhibitions. This is to keep the visitors coming back and attract new visitors on a regular basis.

(5) Does the Hong Kong Space Museum use any other means to bring in visitors (e.g. a café, bar, store, or specific events), and if so, what are they and how successful are they?

Bringing and keeping the visitor population coming back is a big problem and there is no easy solution. Most museums have a gift shop, but that is not very useful or successful. A lot of people will look but not buy anything. Personally I think the HKMM’s is too expensive. Sales records have shown us that the cheaper items are usually the items that sell. Moreover, most the visitors are either stumbling upon the museum or are there or the general theme, not specific ideas or exhibits, they are not specific and want to learn more general things.

Another way to bring up visitation is to bring in exhibits which conform into the school curriculum. This makes it easier to promote to schools. Most museums have a large percentage of their visitation coming from school groups, for example, the science museum gets about 30-
40% of their visitation there. The space museum however, does not. Only about 10% come from school groups. So advertising or bringing in the exhibits to fit the curriculum is not necessary and has little impact. We are an established museum and people come to visit the space museum because they want to, not because of some other reason for the most part. That and tourists. We are right in the middle of TST and we get three to four times the visitors of the history and art museum’s yet we about 1/10th the size. Our visitation is similar to the science museums but we have little for school groups while almost half of their visitation is from school groups.

There is some synergy between the Art and Space museums, for example if they have a temporary exhibit about a certain place or artifact or culture, we tend to get some exhibits from the same line. We each refer each other to one another when visitors ask, however, we do not have ticket rebates for each other or any sort of combination ticket for both museums, yet the Art and Space are right next to each other. It just gets too complicated with the government, especially when you are talking about reducing the price or discounts. There just is not a lot of overlapping to truly warrant it either.

Example: About five to ten years ago the art museum had some exhibits on Egypt and the space museum had a theater movie on Egypt.

(6) Has the Hong Kong Space Museum done anything to attract visitors to its location (e.g. improve greenery, add benches/walkways, increase signage), and how successful have these efforts been?

This is another area which seems like it would be important but visitors of museums are visiting for what is on the inside of the museum, its exhibits, so a nice exterior is always a plus, but it is not as important as one would think.
The space museum has its little lawn with the Oak Tree out front, but that is really the only modifiable land on the immediate grounds.

Our activities and advertising do go on the outside of the museum and we take advantage of that, we use the exterior walls to hang banners and posters outside.

(7) Has the Hong Kong Space Museum done any studies to determine how projects it has pursued might reflect changes in visitor base, and if so, can you describe these?

The projects do not really change the visitor base. The visitor base changes on a much larger scale and that is really the only way it will truly change. For example, the opening of China mainland has brought a flood mainland Chinese into the museum, but that is a factor which the museum has no control over. The museum can make concessions or add helpful things to make it easier and more attractive for these new populations to visit. For example, the Space museum has added multiple languages to its displays to make it easier for mainlanders and other countries visitors to take advantage of the museum’s displays. They have also added more exhibits on the mainland space program. However, a museum must be careful, because adding something the new visitors can get at home from museums, might not be in the museums best interest. The new visitors may want to hear about Hong Kong’s space exploration programs verse their own homelands. (Emphasis on mainland verse Hong Kong for mainlanders)

(8) Are there any studies that have been done, or anyone else that you could refer us to, that might be able to provide more information on these matters?

The museum and the government do conduct studies and surveys:

1. Visitors Survey: Government department study

2. Internal Museum Survey: Asks questions about what would interest the public pertaining to the renovations. Asks what the visitors would want to see at the
museum, what the museum should pursue in the form of suggestions, and what the visitor’s expectations are.

3. Survey Activities: Ask questions and build a survey for the topics in the museum, how the presentations were perceived and received by the visitors, and how the speakers or activities were perceived and received.

(9) Was the centerpiece, your dome at the space museum, original or was it added later on?
Also was its purpose to act like a centerpiece?

The dome was original. Space Museum was a blank construction site so they played with the architecture to build a centerpiece into the building and we ended up with the dome.

(10) How has the advertising been handled at the Space Museum?

We have had requests for adding the dome to the light show for the harbour but we have no done anything about it yet and do not really plan on it because it is pretty much blocked by the Art Museum from a harbour point of view. Advertising companies had contacted us about using the dome for advertising but we have denied the companies. We felt that it would damage the image of the museum.

(11) In your professional opinion, do you feel the construction will greatly affect visitation for the HKMM at Pier No.8 during the New Central Harbourfront construction?

I do not think the construction will be much of an issue, people will come for the exhibitions and programs not the building or environment. As for the walk-in percentage of visitors, that might fall but it will be hard to tell because the Central Ferry Piers Complex will still be operating. The museum must strive to create a friendly and inviting environment however, too much could also cause issues. This is hard to talk about because it is hard to say anything about the construction and the environment piece is unique to every museum.
(12) Did you do any in-house surveys and if so how did they fare?

We have done some surveys in the past but the government does have a service that comes in and does their own surveys on a much larger scale than the museum itself could put on. We have done smaller surveys for both users and non-users. We have done some exit polling which worked very well. We have also done some random polling of visitors. We tend to get 8 out of 10 filled out in a way which will actually help the museum and represents good data.

(13) How do you feel the word “Museum” is perceived by the people in Hong Kong? Have you ever changed the Space Museum’s name and would if you have not so far?

The Space Museum is already famous in Hong Kong and gets plenty of visitors a year so a name change is neither necessary nor would it bring any foreseeable benefits. The word “Museum” is old fashion but I do not think it needs to be changed. The Space Museum is already established with its 30 year history here and is already one of the most popular museums in Hong Kong so there is just no benefit to changing the name.

(14) How do you feel about using “Center” in the name for a Museum?

Center doesn’t have a real meaning in Hong Kong compared to other countries. People do not associate center with something interesting or fun. This may stem from a lack of knowing the culture. For example, people associate certain key words with “center” and “museum”. Museum is associated with school and learning and education, all of which are important in Hong Kong. “Center” is associated with nothing and people do not really know what its meaning is.
(15) Is there anyone you know of that you could put us in contact with that could help us further with our study?

Chan Shing Wai, the chairman of the curator association. You can contact him at 2734-2107.
Appendix C: Definitions of an Observational Study and Associated Nomenclature

In our project we mentioned three facets which draw visitors to leisure activities. These leisure activities we were speaking about were defined as any activity that is done in one’s free time. This means that leisure activities also directly compete with staying in during one’s free time and relaxing at home. The three facets which draw patrons to leisure activities were the activity’s accessibility, visibility, and attractiveness. For a leisure activity to be chosen among a list of possible activities, the activity one chooses had to stand out via their accessibility, visibility, and/or attractiveness. All the facets need to be well developed for the leisure activity to bring in patrons.

C.1 Definitions and Explanations of Accessibility, Visibility, and Attractiveness

What did we mean by attractiveness? Attractiveness of an activity was broken down into seven attributes which we later talk about as metrics. These metrics look at how attractive the grounds of the leisure activity were. For example, we looked at a metric known as Exterior Exhibits and Events. This metric specifically looked at the exterior offerings and events that the institution under observation offered. All in all, attractiveness measured the exteriors décor and utilization for its strengths and weaknesses at each site in our study. This was important because a leisure activity must have attractive grounds and offerings or people will not spend their free time visiting. Thus, companies must take these into account when designing their business plan, their activities, and how and who to market the activities towards.

What is accessibility and why is it important? Accessibility is the gauge of how easy it is to get from a patrons home or work to their desired leisure activity. This is also built of three sections, the accessibility of the immediate ground of the leisure activity, the ease of reaching the general area of the leisure activity, and finally, the ease of navigation of the surrounding area.
The first section, accessibility of the immediate grounds, looks at the ease of using the entrances into the leisure activities premises and its accommodations for handicapped or challenged patrons. The second facet of accessibility deals with the accessibility of the general location of the leisure activity. This looks at how efficiently the forms of transportation available to the patrons transport them to the leisure activity’s immediate grounds. Finally, the last section of accessibility looks, once again, at the ease of navigation of the leisure activity’s surrounding area. The surrounding area is hard to judge and the museums have no control over it but if the surrounding area has other leisure activities or accommodations, it will be better for that leisure activity in question and will lead to a higher chance of being found. Accessibility is another large factor to be considered by leisure activity companies.

What is visibility and how does it affect a leisure activity? Visibility was broken down into two main facets for our project, the physical visibility of the leisure activity’s location and the leisure activity’s marketing. First, the location of a leisure activity must be visible so people can, find it and/or stumble upon it through curiosity or while on an exploratory adventure if they are tourists. A visible physical location is good for people to see it, recognize it, and know where the leisure activity is so they can visit in the future and recommend it to others. The second part of visibility is the marketing visibility of the leisure activity. A leisure activity must advertise and make its theme visible to its possible patrons so they can come and participate in the leisure activity. Leisure activities often advertise in local hotels, shops, and in public transportation hubs. If the activity is unknown, it will not have any visitors and it will not even be considered. Thus, visibility is a very important facet of the leisure activity’s design because it makes the leisure activity known to its possible patrons.
Accessibility, visibility, and attractiveness as defined above were the definitions used in our study. They help in our efforts to help the Hong Kong Maritime Museum improve those specific facets pertaining to its relocation to the Central Ferry Pier Complex, Pier No.8. Improving those facets for the HKMM could potential raise the visitation for the HKMM exponentially. It is our hope that our recommendations based on our findings will help the museum to improve those facets of its location and in doing so increase its visitation from its old location in Stanley, Hong Kong.

C.2 Definition of Immediate Grounds

The Immediate Grounds was defined as the grounds of the museum, plus about fifteen yards outwards from the museum’s exterior walls. Of course, there was leeway within this definition for the distance off the exterior walls. The immediate grounds could be extended up to five extra yards or retracted up to five yards based on the site.

C.3 Definition of General Area

The general area was defined as the area extending from where the immediate grounds ended up to about one hundred yards out or the first major obstruction. An example of an obstruction would be a road larger than two lanes or a waterfront. The general area was also be defined as the entire park in some cases, if the museum was located within the park. It is better defined as the grounds extended out until the grounds change in use, change in a significant way, or something provided a boundary such as an obstacle or building. For example, the general area of the Hong Kong Space Museum would include the Art Museum, the Cultural Center, the Avenue of Stars, and the Clock Tower, but not the Peninsula Hotel because that is across a major street which is an example of a boundary or a formidable obstruction.
C.4 Definition of Surrounding Area

The surrounding area for our study was defined as the area beyond the general area. Once those grounds change and open up dramatically, then one knows they are in the surrounding area and have left the immediate grounds and the general area of the attraction. This area, as far as the institution is concerned, is no man’s land. They have absolutely no control over the surrounding area.

C.5 Definition of an Observational Study

An observational study is an onsite visual study which is used to gauge the strengths and weaknesses of an institution through a visual inspection of the premises and its attributes. We conducted the observational studies as individuals, each team member visiting all of the six sites for their own visual inspection, and then compiled our data into six group observational study metrics and reports, one for each site. The basic idea is to visit the actual location or institution which is being studied along with other locations and institutions which share a common theme, for example museums, and then observe the point of interest looking at specific attributes and record what one finds.

To help structure and focus our study, we divided the attributes we wished to observe into three main facets, accessibility, visibility, and attractiveness and constructed metrics to assess these attributes. A grading system was developed to assess the metrics within each facet we wanted to observe. The metrics were graded gauging their strengths and weaknesses through two components, the observational study metrics, which was the given a numerical grade, and the observational study reports which defined why that grade was given.
C.6 Definition of an Observational Study Metric

The observational metrics were broken into three facets, attractiveness, accessibility and, visibility. Within each facet there were specific attributes that looked at and graded. We called these attributes metrics. Each metric was graded on a 1-10 scale, 1 being the lowest possible grade and 10 being the highest possible grade. All the metrics are defined in appendix g and each is labeled with a basic outline grading system which relates what a 1 would mean for that metric as well as a 5 and a 10 grade. Each member of our team went to the six different sites we chose to do studies on and graded them accordingly based on the facet and metrics they were assigned to grade each visit. Each member visited all the sites at least three times looking at a minimum of one metric per visit, grading them while onsite. The explanations for the given grades are in the observational study reports which follow the observational study metrics. Once all the observational study metrics were completed individually, they were all compiled into one metrics spread sheet and then data was pulled from the metrics and an analysis was conducted. A final average grade was attached to each metric, at which point a final average for each metric could be computed. Then a final average was assigned to each facet. Finally, an overall final grade was comprised of the averages of the three facet’s averages of each site.

C.7 Definition of an Observational Study Report

The observational study reports are made up of an two parts, the individual reports and the final reports. Each individual report holds an explanation for each metric’s grade that team member assigned. This is not the explanation of what the metric is, rather it is the explanation of why it was assigned said numerical grade. A report is completed for each site visited and it is comprised of each metric’s grade explained in three or four sentences with cited reasons and examples to support the chosen grade. The second part is completed once all the observational
study reports are completed individually. An average for each metric at each site is computed and then the explanations are compiled into one explanation for each metric. Thus, there are six final observational reports, one for each site, which show and average for each metric at that site and an explanation that reflects all the team members’ points of view on the metrics.
Appendix D: Descriptions of Observational Study Metrics

During our research, we studied Pier No. 8 and other successful museums in Hong Kong through observational studies. These focused on documenting our experiences at these locations and scoring ‘metrics’ that describe various qualities of a successful museum in terms of accessibility, visibility, and attractiveness. This appendix describes all of the metrics that we rated these sites for.

D.1 Accessibility

Accessibility metrics focused on the qualities of a location that made it easy and efficient to locate and go to. The following are the metrics that describe accessibility:

D.1.1 Immediate Grounds

1. **Ease of Access of Main Entrance** was defined as how easy it was to get from the immediate grounds to the main entrance of the museum. The factors we took into account included: distance from pedestrian routes such as sidewalks, any obstacles which include roads or hills, how evident the solutions like escalators were to such obstacles, as well as the flow through the main entrance and signs to the main entrance.
   i. 1 – Long distance to entrance or obstacles without solutions, entrance is cluttered
   ii. 5 – Medium distance to entrance and/or obstacles with minimal solutions and/or a easy to use entrance
   iii. 10 – Short distance to entrance and if any obstacles, many solutions and very easily accessed main entrance

2. **Signage for Main Entrance** was gauged by looking at the signs pointing towards the main entrance within the immediate grounds. The factors that were considered were the number of signs, how many different routes were covered, clarity of the signs which was
gauged by assessing how accurate the directions were and, how ease they were to see and follow.

i. 1 – No signs or sign that are not clear, not accurate, nor visible

ii. 5 – Some signs and/or vague with only a generally accurate heading and/or only slightly visible

iii. 10 – Many signs which are very clear, giving a very accurate heading and, very visible

3. **Ease of Access of Alternative Entrances** was the ability of the visitor to get from the immediate grounds to the alternative entrances of the museum.

   i. 1 – No alternate entrance or there is a long distance to be traveled and/or many obstacles with no solutions and, the flow is limited

   ii. 5 – Medium distance from traveled route and/or few obstacles with solutions and/or good ease of flow

   iii. 10 – Short distance from traveled route and little to no obstacles with multiple solutions and great ease of flow

4. **Signage to Alternative Entrances** was gauged by looking at signage pointing towards the main entrance found in the immediate grounds. The factors that were considered were the number of signs, how many different routes were covered, clarity of the signs which was gauged by how accurate their directions were and, how ease they were to see and follow.

   i. 1 – No signage or only within a limited distance with unclear signage that was not very visible
ii. 5 – Only a few signs within a moderate proximity to the alternative entrance that were somewhat visible, however, the signs only conveyed a general heading

iii. 10 – Many signs that clearly point the visitor in an accurate direction towards the alternative entrance via many clearly visible signs

5. **Walkways** on the immediate grounds were rated based on the following factors, walkway obstructions, directness to destination, walkway signage and, the clarity of the signage.

   i. 1 – Many obstructions, very indirect and, no signs

   ii. 5 – Few obstructions and/or winding walkway with few signs and/or unclear signs

   iii. 10 – No obstructions on a direct walkway with many clear signs

6. **Directory Station** was rated through two main facets. If there was a directory, which there may not be, and secondly, how clear the directory was if there was a directory present on the immediate grounds.

   i. 1 – No directory

   ii. 5 – One directory and unclear

   iii. 10 – More than one directory which is very clear

7. **Handicap Accessibility** is mandatory based on building code; however this does not mean that it is built to be the most useable access point. We looked at their handicap access and then graded it on the proximity to the main entrance and how easy it was to use.

   i. 1 – No handicap accessibility (only possible if the building is Grandfathered)

   ii. 5 – Distant handicap access which was not well identified
iii. 10 – One or more handicap access point which were in close proximity to the main entrance

8. **Main Entrance Lighting** was judged on how visible the museum was at night.
   i. 1 – No lighting
   ii. 5 – Minimal lighting or too much lighting
   iii. 10 – An aesthetically pleasing amount of lighting which properly lights the immediate grounds but does not overdo it

9. **Walkway Lighting** graded the lighting of the walkways since some of the museums are open at night, if the walkways are not lit; there will be no way to access the museums at night.
   i. 1 – No lighting
   ii. 5 – Minimal lighting or too much light and lighting is not attractive
   iii. 10 – An aesthetically pleasing amount of lighting which properly lights the immediate grounds but does not overdo it

**D.1.2 General Area**

1. **Walkways** in the general area were rated based on the following factors, walkway obstructions, directness to destination, walkway signage and, the clarity of the signage.
   i. 1 – Indirect or obstructed walkways with no signage
   ii. 5 – Indirect walkways with minimal signage and signs give a general heading
   iii. 10 – Direct walkways, many clear signs with direct and accurate headings

2. **Major Obstacle Solutions** include, but were not limited to, roads, train tracks, monorails, water obstructions, and construction zones. This metric gauged how effectively these obstacles were bypassed. For example, if there was a highway without
an overpass for pedestrians, that represents an obstacle that did not have a solution. That would represent a lower grade than if there was an overpass for pedestrians provided.

i. 1 – Multiple obstacles with no solutions

ii. 5 – Multiple obstacles with few solutions

iii. 10 – No obstacles or obstacles with multiple easy to use solutions

3. **Number of Directory Signs** was measured by looking at not only the overall number of directories, but also where they were located. The more centrally they were located, the more points were assigned, as well as the more directories there were, the more points were awarded. However, pointlessly located directories amounted to a reduction in points.

i. 1 – No directories

ii. 5 – Only one directory, that may or may not have been well located

iii. 10 – More than one directory all of which were centrally

4. **Directory Clarity** was similar to sign clarity. The directory clarity value was assigned based on how easy it was to use the directory. It also took into account the detail level of the directory.

i. 1 – No directories

ii. 5 – One unclear and confusing directory

iii. 10 – More than one directory which was very clear and detailed

5. **Directional Signage** looked at the number and frequency of the signs indicating the direction to the museum.

i. 1 – No directional signage

ii. 5 – Few directional signage
iii. 10 – Many directional signs

6. **Directional Signage Clarity** looked at how clearly defined the direction one was supposed to travel to reach the museum was conveyed.

   i. 1 – No directional signage
   
   ii. 5 – Unclear signage (points to general vicinity of attraction)
   
   iii. 10 – Very clear signage (leads the visitor from sign to destination)

7. **Ease of Access of General Area** was an overall score based on all the metrics listed above. This overall score gave a good indicator of just how accessible the location was.

   i. 1 – Not accessible
   
   ii. 5 – Somewhat accessible
   
   iii. 10 – Very accessible

8. **Public Transportation Signage** was based on how well the signage to the public transportation options was in the general area.

   i. 1 – None
   
   ii. 5 – A few signs around to the public transport options
   
   iii. 10 – Many very good signs to the public transport options around.

**D.1.3 Surrounding Area**

1. **Public Transportation Options** was a grade of how many transportation options were present within a close, moderate, or distant distance. A good grade required multiple options within a close distance while a poor grade was awarded to locations with one of only a few modes of public transport all of which were far away.

   i. 1 – No transportation options within walking distance
   
   ii. 5 – Few transportation options within walking distance
iii. 10 – Many transportation options within walking distance

2. **Signage for Museum in Public Transportation Hubs** was a grade of how visible and advertised the signs for the museum were in the public transportation hubs located around each museum.
   
i. 1 – No signs in any transportation Hubs
   
   ii. 5 – Few, unclear signs in some transportation hubs
   
   iii. 10 – Many, clear signs in many transportation hubs

3. **Accessibility from Hotels and Other Attractions** assessed how many other attractions and hotels were in the surrounding area and how easy it was to get from them to the HKMM. We looked at this because it was a good judge of how visited this location was for tourism, a large market for museums. Hotels were counted as well as other attractions which would include leisure activity locations, museums, malls, and other attractions for large groups of people.
   
i. 1 – No attractions in surrounding area
   
   ii. 5 – Few attractions in surrounding area
   
   iii. 10 – Many attractions in surrounding area

4. **Major Obstacles Solutions** were graded on how well the obstacles could be conquered by pedestrians. Pedestrian overpasses or subways for train tracks and impassable roads, and bridges for water obstacles or large distances across many obstacles were the solutions we studied mainly. The more obstacles with solutions, the higher the grade.
   
i. 1 – No solutions
   
   ii. 5 – Few, ineffective or hard to find solutions
   
   iii. 10 – Many, effective and easy to find solutions
5. **Ease of Navigation of Surrounding Area** assessed exactly how hard it was to navigate the surrounding area of the museum in question. It took into account all of the metrics listed above and some attributes for which metrics were not made.

   i. 1 – Not navigable
   ii. 5 – Difficult to navigate
   iii. 10 – Easy to navigate

6. **Signage for Attraction in surrounding area** was similar to signage for attraction in public transportation hubs, as it shared the same idea; except it deals with the surrounding area rather than just the public transportation hubs. This metric excluded the signs within the public transportation hubs as they were already accounted for.

   i. 1 – No signs at all in the surrounding area for the attraction.
   ii. 5 – A few hard to see or not very visible signs for the attraction.
   iii. 10 – Many very visible signs for the attraction.

**D.2 Attractiveness**

Attractiveness metrics focused on the qualities of a location that made it aesthetically pleasing and able to meet the needs of its target audiences. The following are the metrics that describe attractiveness:

**D.2.1 Aesthetic Appeal**

1. **The Centerpiece** was a grade comprised of whether or not there was a signature or centerpiece on the immediate grounds and how applicable the piece was to the theme of the museum. Also, this metric took into account how recognizable the centerpiece was. The better the centerpiece fit with the museum’s theme the higher the score.

   i. 1 – No centerpiece
ii. 5 – One centerpiece, far from attraction, hidden and not representative of attraction

iii. 10 – Multiple centerpieces, close to attraction, visible and representative of attraction

2. **Main Entrance** metric assessed how attractive and effective the main entrance was. This metric looked at the overall layout, the landscaping around the main entrance, the sign’s attractiveness and location at the main entrance and, anything else that stands out around the entrance. It also included how easy the flow of people through the main entrance was.

   i. 1 – No landscaping with an unattractive main entrance and an undifferentiated and unattractive location that does not stand out nor flow well for foot traffic

   ii. 5 – Some landscaping with a somewhat attractive main entrance and an ok location that is visibly differentiated with okay foot traffic flow attributes

   iii. 10 – Well executed landscaping, an attractive main entrance, great location that is unique and has great foot traffic flow attributes

3. **Main Sign** metric gauged how visually appealing the sign was for each location and how recognizable the sign was.

   i. 1 – No main sign

   ii. 5 – Reasonable attractive, somewhat recognizable but may be hard to read.

   iii. 10 – Very attractive, very recognizable, very visible and, very clear

4. **Exterior Exhibits and Events** If there are exterior exhibits and/or events, this metric will assess them. We will factor into our grade, how well the exhibits or events are executed, how appealing they are and, how effective they are. This metric will be applied to all the
museums unless the specific site does not have exterior exhibits or events at which point, the will be noted in all of our data.

i. 1 – No exterior exhibits or events

ii. 5 – One exterior exhibit or one event in a year, not well executed, unappealing and not very effective

iii. 10 – Multiple exterior exhibits and events across the year, well executed, very appealing and very effective

5. **Building Attractiveness** was how attractive the actual building housing the museum was. We assessed interesting the building was, how different it was from the surrounding buildings and how recognizable it was. These factors gave us a grade for this metric.

   i. 1 – Not attractive at all, blends in with surroundings

   ii. 5 – Fairly attractive exterior, similar to surroundings, vaguely recognizable

   iii. 10 – Very attractive exterior, distinguishable from surroundings, very recognizable

6. **Immediate Grounds Attractiveness** was an overall grade of the immediate grounds made up from all the metrics which apply from above. It took into account metrics such as building attractiveness, and other attributes of the immediate grounds such as landscaping.

   i. 1 – Not attractive

   ii. 5 – Fairly attractive

   iii. 10 – Very attractive

7. **General Area Attractiveness** This is an overall average grade of the general area made up from all the metrics which apply.
i. 1 – Not attractive  
ii. 5 – Fairly attractive  
iii. 10 – Very attractive

**D.3 Visibility**

Visibility metrics focused on the qualities of a location that made it distinguishable and identifiable, both physically and through marketing. The following are the metrics that describe visibility:

**D.3.1 Physical Visibility**

1. **Observable Distance** was based on the distance from which the attraction location can be observed and recognized.
   
i. 1 – The attraction location was only visible or recognizable within the immediate area  
ii. 5 – The attraction location was visible or recognizable within the general area  
iii. 10 – The attraction location was visible and recognizable from most locations in the general area

2. **Multiple Route Observe-ability** was based on the visibility of the attraction from multiple routs that led to the attraction.
   
i. 1 – Not visible  
ii. 5 – Somewhat visible  
iii. 10 – Very visible

3. **Difficulty of Discovery** was based on the ability of potential patrons to stumble upon the attraction during an adventure or while participating in tourist activities. Factors taken
into account were the visibility from pedestrian routes, recognition as an attraction and visible signs.

i.  1 - The attractions building is hidden with a single dedicated route to the entrance

ii.  5- The attraction is partially visible from pedestrian routes and is located along routes to other attractions or transportation hubs

iii. 10-The attraction is on a well used pedestrian route, very well advertised and, near or between transportation hubs (utilizes location)

4. **Recognize-ability** was based on the ability of potential patrons to identify the attraction based on an icon that represents the attraction and was used in most forms of advertisement for that attraction or institution. An example, the iconic symbol of the MTR is instantly recognizable.

i.  1 - The attraction blends in with local area, no significant signage

ii.  5- The attraction is slightly different from surrounding area, partial signage

iii. 10- The attraction is very different from surrounding area and heavy signage

5. **Centerpiece Visibility** applied to any “centerpiece” around the attraction that attracted attention from potential patrons. This metric measured the visibility of the centerpiece, how easy it was to recognize and, how easily it could be associate with the museum or institution the centerpiece was supposed to be associated with.

i.  1 - No highlighted centerpiece or one that did not reflect the attraction and was hidden or not very recognizable

ii.  5- One centerpiece that may not have reflected the attraction and was not overly visible
iii. 10- One very recognizable centerpiece that reflected the attraction very well and was very visible

D.3.2 Marketing Visibility

1. **Available Advertising Amenities** measured the utilization and amount of potential advertising locations.
   
i. 1- Low number of advertising amenities with little to no utilization of the potential advertising locations
   
ii. 5- Moderate number of advertising amenities and moderate utilization of potential advertising locations
   
iii. 10- Heavy advertising amenities available with close to full utilization of potential advertising locations

2. **Immediate Grounds Advertising** applied to signs and exhibit advertisements within the immediate area of the attraction. This graded the advertising amenities within the immediate grounds on their number and how well they were utilized.
   
i. 1- No advertising
   
ii. 5- Some advertising, some exhibit information provided
   
iii. 10- Lots of advertising, lots of exhibit information provided

3. **General Area Advertising** applied the signs and exhibit advertisements within the general area of the attraction. This metric graded the general area on its overall number of advertisements and the utilization of such advertisement amenities.
   
i. 1- No advertisements
   
ii. 5- Some advertisements with moderate utilization
   
iii. 10- Lots of advertisements with highly utilization
4. **Surrounding Area Advertising** applied to the signs and exhibit advertisements within the surrounding area of the attraction. This metric graded the surrounding area on its overall number of advertisements and the utilization of such advertisement amenities. This included signs in local transportation hubs, other attractions and, hotels.
   i. 1 - No advertisements
   ii. 5 - Some advertisements but not highly visible
   iii. 10 - Lots of advertisements and highly visible

5. **Public Transport Hub Advertising** graded specifically the advertising in transportation hubs such as MTR stations, Star Ferry terminals and bus stations.
   i. 1 – No mention of attraction at any local hubs
   ii. 5 – Some advertisements or not clear advertisements
   iii. 10 – Lots of advertisement, very clear and includes directions to attraction

6. **Local Establishment Advertising** applied specifically to advertisements for an attraction that were located within a local establishment, such as posters, fliers and pamphlets in local hotels, restaurants or other attractions.
   i. 1 – No advertisements
   ii. 5 – Few advertisements, not very visible
   iii. 10 – Lots of advertisements, very visible, suggested by establishment

7. **Local Awareness** tried to gauge the people living in Hong Kong, Kowloon or the new territories, knowledge of the attraction, its location and exhibits as well as their interest and recommendations.
   i. 1 – Unknown or not recommended
   ii. 5 – Somewhat known, somewhat recommended
   iii. 10 – Well known, highly recommended
Appendix E: Observational Survey Metric Scores

This appendix presents the raw data recorded from our observational studies at (1) Pier No. 8, (2) the Hong Kong Museum of History, (3) the Hong Kong Museum of Art, (4) the Hong Kong Science Museum, (5) the Hong Kong Space Museum, and (6) the HKMM. The process for scoring these sites is discussed in Chapter 3.

E.1 Accessibility

Table E. 1

Accessibility Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Pier No. 8</th>
<th>HKMM</th>
<th>History M</th>
<th>Art M</th>
<th>Science M</th>
<th>Space M</th>
<th>HKMM/M</th>
<th>AVG.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immediate Grounds:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Access of Main Entrance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage to Main Entrance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Access of Alt. Entrance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage to Alt. Entrance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkways</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directory Station</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicap Accessibility</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Entrance Lighting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkway Lighting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Area:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkways</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Obstacle Solutions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directory Sign #</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directory Clarity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directional Signage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directional Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transport Signage</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Access</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surrounding Area:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transport Options</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>8.125</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage for Attraction in Hub</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage for Attraction in SA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels and other Attractions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Obstacle Solutions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Navigation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### E.2 Attractiveness

**Table E.2**

**Attractiveness Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Weight:</th>
<th>Pier No. 8:</th>
<th>AVG</th>
<th>History Mt:</th>
<th>AVG</th>
<th>Art Mt:</th>
<th>AVG</th>
<th>Science Mt:</th>
<th>AVG</th>
<th>Space Mt:</th>
<th>AVG</th>
<th>HKMM:</th>
<th>AVG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aesthetic Appeal:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Center Piece</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Entrance</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Exhibits and Events</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Sign</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Attractiveness</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Grounds Attractiveness</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Area Attractiveness</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E.3 Visibility

**Table E. 3**

**Visibility Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Weight:</th>
<th>Pier No. 8:</th>
<th>AVG</th>
<th>History Mt:</th>
<th>AVG</th>
<th>Art Mt:</th>
<th>AVG</th>
<th>Science Mt:</th>
<th>AVG</th>
<th>Space Mt:</th>
<th>AVG</th>
<th>HKMM:</th>
<th>AVG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Visibility:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Observable Distance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Route Observability</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty of Discovery (Ease = Better)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizability</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center Piece Visibility</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marketing Visibility:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Available Advertising Amenities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Grounds Advertising</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Area Advertising</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding Area Advertising</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transport Hub Advertising</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Establishment Advertising</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Awareness</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### E.4 Totals Site Scores

**Table E. 4**

Cumulative Site Scores from Observational Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Attractiveness</th>
<th>Visibility</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Accessibility%</th>
<th>Attractiveness%</th>
<th>Visibility%</th>
<th>Overall%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pier No. 8</td>
<td>1236.5</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>638.75</td>
<td>2199.25</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>578.25</td>
<td>1923.25</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>1222.25</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>671.5</td>
<td>2335.75</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>940.5</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>1880.5</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
<td>1175.875</td>
<td>415.75</td>
<td>663.25</td>
<td>2254.875</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HKMM</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>406.5</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>2076.5</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: Observational Survey Reports

F.1 Hong Kong Museum of Art

F.1.1 Accessibility

Immediate Grounds

Ease of Access of Main Entrance: (7.5) The Art Museums main entrance is one of the best. It has a large opening with wide stairs and a covered escalator right next to the stairs leading to the main entrance. It is very easy to access the main entrance.

Signage to Main Entrance: (7.75) In the immediate area of the art museum there are a few directional signs to entrance but the main entrance is quite obvious and does not need many signs. Coming from behind the museum there are the few signs leading to the main entrance. They are along the harbourfront and the promenade.

Ease of Access of Alt. Entrance: (7.75) The alternative entrance is adjacent to the main entrance, on the ground floor however.

Signage to Alt. Entrance: (4.5) The alternate entrance is advertised at the stairs and escalator to the main entrance. There is a sign directing those who cannot use the stairs or escalator.

Walkways: (8) The walkways are very clear, wide open, yet direct. Along the side of the Art museum some of the walkways wind through a garden area which is quite pretty.

Directory Station: (8) There are two directory stations on the immediate grounds which display a full diagram of the general area of the museum and all the attractions to visit there. It is in bland color but with a limited key.

Handicap Accessibility: (7.5) Handicapped users would use the alternate entrance right below the main entrance.
Main Entrance Lighting: (7) The main entrance and main sign both have multiple spot lights projecting copious amounts of light on them when the museum is open at night. When it is not open, only the sign has light on it.

Walkway Lighting: (8.25) The paths are well lit with multiple light poles along their length in short distances from each other. Everything of interest is well lit including exterior exhibits, the main entrance, the main sign, and all the walkways and directory stations.

General Area

Walkways: (8.5) The walkways are abundant, wide, clear of obstacles, and well lit. They lead to every point of interest, and some even venture through gardens and courtyards for a very nice touch of nature within Tsim Sha Tsui (TST).

Major Obstacle Solutions: (8.5) A major road cuts off the tip of Kowloon peninsula, where the museums are located. The solution is a subway located in the courtyard which brings you out onto Nathan Road or to an MTR Station. The subways have multiple entrances and are very well labeled and lit.

Directory Sign #: (7.25) In the general area there are two main directory stations. They have a diagram of the general area and limited labeling in very dull color.

Directory Clarity: (7) The directories are clear in their diagram but they fail to give the directory location on the diagram; however, the area itself is very recognizable from any vantage point so it is very easy to navigate by recognition.

Directional Signage: (8) Directional signage is posted around the building, along the waterfront and in neighboring complexes.

Directional Clarity: (8.5) Signs point visitors around the outside of the building towards the main entrance, signs in neighboring complex point towards the main entrance.
Public Transport Signage: (8.25) There are many signs in the MTR station as well as the ferry terminal that advertise the location of the museums.

Ease of Access: (8.25) The museum itself is not overly easy to access from the TST side because of the major road; this is resolved by using a subway to cross under to the side of the street with the museum complex. Coming from the ferry terminal signs point towards the museum and eventually the main entrance as one gets closer to the museum.

Surrounding Area

Public Transport Options: (8.125) The museum is located next to the star ferry terminal. It is only a short walk from the TST MTR and there is a bus stop in front of the Space museum which can be used to visit the Art Museum directly behind the Space Museum.

Signage for Attraction in Hub: (7.25) The signs in the public transportation hubs have lists which did include the museum, its location and exit to take as well as the walking distance from that exit. It was also included on the exit signs from the different exits of the MTR.

Signage for Attraction in Surrounding Area: (7.5) The attraction was included in a list of local attractions at the hubs as well as on maps of the area around the terminal.

Hotels and other Attractions: (9.75) The Art Museum is located on the tip of Kowloon peninsula, TST, an area dedicated to tourism. There are many restaurants, hotels, stores and malls in the area which all attract tourists which make up a large percentage of visitors. The museum is located directly across the street from one of the best hotels in Kowloon and the world, The Peninsula Hotel.

Major Obstacle Solutions: (8) The major road has an underpass, the underpass is not difficult to find and is well marked with signs.
Ease of Navigation: (8.25) If a visitor is going to the museum, they can follow the exit signs from the MTR, walk along the water from the ferry terminals or walk towards the harbourfront and would be able to see the museum. If a visitor is on the north side of the major road, finding the underpass and the museum would not be difficult.

F.1.2 Attractiveness

Aesthetic Appeal

Center Piece: (8.25) The Art Museum’s centerpiece is located next to its main entrance which is below the deck where the museum’s café and book store are. It is a wall mural of their current main attraction. The Art Museum’s centerpiece alerts its visitors to the museum’s theme, but it changes often and; thus, is not as recognizable as other museums centerpieces.

Landscaping: (8.375) The landscaping of the Art Museum is shared with the Space Museum, and it is done extremely well. The general area landscaping is also fantastic. The Art Museum has less actual landscaped area than the Space Museum. The Space Museum has a fountain construction around the base of its iconic dome and a courtyard-like area directly outside of its main entrance. The only greenery for the Art Museum is located on the side shared by the Space Museum and the MTR which opens into their shared garden-like area.

Main Entrance: (7.25) The main entrance is elegant, large and, well defined. It is impossible to mistake it for anything but a main entrance, however, it lacks a flashy sign or something that truly screams to passer-by to come and visit.

Exterior Exhibits: (9) The Art museum has many exterior exhibits. They span multiple genres of art which shows the museum’s versatility and allows them to draw in more people who are interested in different types of art. They are scattered about their immediate grounds as well.
Main Sign: (7) The main sign is big and visible from afar, but it is dull and unattractive. It was probably limited by the government which seemed to enforce a theme for the entire area. So it accomplishes what a main sign should, large, visible, and it displays what the establishment is, however, it is lacking a show factor.

Building Attractiveness: (8) The Art museum is limited by the theme of the surrounding area which is persistent across all structures in the area of the Cultural Center. Its neighboring buildings share the same décor, the Space Museum, which has the unique dome, and Cultural Center. Thus, overall attractiveness of the building alone is not as high as it could be. However, all the structures around the Art Museum have been integrated into the structure in a modern artistic manner of some sort. For example, the shape of the stair cases is unobtrusive and disguised in a way to fit the museum’s art theme. Another attractive attribute of the Art Museum is its light show at night. It has a part in the harbour light show.

Immediate Grounds Attractiveness: (8.25) The immediate grounds of the Art Museum are attractive. There are sculptures, some greenery, sitting areas, and a harbour promenade. The shaded walkways wind through a garden on one side of the Art Museum. The entire grounds are home to numerous photo-worthy sculptures and views of the harbour. During the night the entire building and its immediate grounds are lit up with flashing and color changing lights.

General Area Attractiveness: (9.25) Similar to the immediate grounds, the general area is also very attractive. All the buildings in the general area share a similar theme in their exterior décor. Also, most of them take part in the harbour light show at night. The Cultural Center, Space Museum, and Clock Tower are all in general area and add to its overall attractiveness. There are harbour viewing decks, promenades, the Avenue of Stars, and a nearby mall housing a MTR station. All in all, the entire area is very nicely landscaped and the walkways are elegant.
Another nice factor is that the general area is somewhat separate from the hustle and bustle of TST which is right across the street from the Space Museum.

F.1.3 Visibility

Physical Visibility

Observable Distance: (9) The Art Museum is one of the most observable museums from afar, it is tall, and from the harbour it is well lit and extremely recognizable at day and night. If it was not for the luxury hotels, the museum would have a perfect score. It is tall and visible from over 3 blocks away coming down Nathan road.

Observable from Multiple Routes: (8.25) From TST MTR and Nathan road once one has gotten past the luxury hotels then one can clearly see the museum but from the other side of the avenue of stars the museum is blocked by an office building and from the far side coming from the ferry terminal, the Hong Kong Cultural Centre blocks it from view.

Difficulty of Discovery: (9) It was extremely easy to find as its building is directly adjacent to the subway exit.

Recognizable: (9) The building does not have a distinguishable feature which you could look for if you did not know where it was like the space museum’s dome. But once you have seen it once it is hard to forget.

Centerpiece Visibility: (8) The huge mural in front of the art museum is very visible but not overwhelmingly attractive. Thus, the score is above average but not perfect. It is dynamic and changes based on the current main attraction at the museum which also does not help how recognizable it is.
Marketing Visibility

Available Advertising Amenities: (8.25) The design of the Art Museum definitely utilizes huge murals or posters all over its exterior walls. Its premise’s have street posts and space for advertising amenities.

Immediate Grounds Advertising: (8.5) From the immediate grounds one can see most of the advertisements of the art museum. From the promenade, on the harbour side of the museum there is another set of advertisements which are all very visible. Thus, the score reflects that from the two major routes to the museum, the advertisements are extremely visible.

General Area Advertising: (7.5) This score is lower because once you get farther from the art museum there is less signage and very few advertisements for the museum itself in the general area. They are all condensed into the immediate grounds.

Public Transport Hub Advertising: (9) Apart from directional signage there are no distinguishable advertisements for the art museum in the underground mall or MTR station. They are limited to directional signage and a worthy mention on the maps for tourists.

Local Establishment Advertising: (3.25) The nearby luxury hotels and restaurants did not have specific flyers or pamphlets for the Art Museum.

Local Awareness: (6.75) Even though it is partly blocked by the Space Museum, locals know the Art Museum because it is well lit at night and a very attractive leisure activity, the Avenue of Stars promenade is right next door. It also takes part in the harbour night show.
F.2 Hong Kong Museum of History

F.2.1 Accessibility

Immediate Grounds

Ease of Access of Main Entrance: (8) The main entrance is one floor above the ground level, to reach it from the ground level there are two escalators, two large flights of stairs. From the MTR and bus hub the visitor must take an overpass that is at level with the main entrance.

Signage to Main Entrance: (7.5) There are many directional signs on the immediate grounds, for example at the bottom of stairs, top of escalators all pointing to the main entrances to both the history and science museum.

Ease of Access of Alt. Entrance: (7.75) The alternate entrance is located at ground level next to the covered walkway and the escalator of the History Museum. This entrance is located next to a bus stop where the entrance is highly visible to the visitors arriving at the bus stop.

Signage to Alt. Entrance: (4.25) The alternate entrance has its own sign above the entrance and is landscaped to attract a visitor’s attention. Signs near the bus stop as well as at the covered walkways point towards the museum and museum entrances.

Walkways: (8.25) There are a lot of wide, clear, well landscaped walkways leading directly to the museum’s main and alternant entrances.

Directory Station: (3.25) There was no directory station for the History or Science Museum on its premises’. There was some basic advertisement booths with some small maps though.

Handicap Accessibility: (6.5) Alternate entrance on ground level that leads to an elevator for disabled visitors. Escalators are available where there are stairs allowing visitors with problems walking to avoid the stairs.
Main Entrance Lighting: (7.25) The main entrance, main sign, walkways, and immediate grounds are all adequately lit at night.

Walkway Lighting: (7.5) The main entrance, main sign, walkways, and immediate grounds are all adequately lit at night.

General Area

Walkways: (7.75) As you approach the immediate grounds sidewalks are available, clear of obstructions, well lit and landscaped. When a visitor reaches the one major obstacle, a road, an overpass is available with covered walkways.

Major Obstacle Solutions: (8) There is only one major obstacle, a road, which is defeated by using a covered overpass which is accessible via stairs, an escalator and, a ramp. The overpass includes directional signs to the museum.

Directory Sign #: (4.25) Until the overpass there are no signs pointing towards the museum, on the overpass there are multiple signs directing visitors.

Directory Clarity: (5) The directories do not exist in any real fashion and the small signs in the advertising booths are hard to read because they are so small.

Directional Signage: (4.25) There is a limited number of directional signs. There are a few located on an overpass leading to the museum. From the MTR station the provided signs are inadequate at best.

Directional Clarity: (5.25) The signs display the symbol and name of the museum with the sign pointed in the general direction of the museum. The signs are adequate at conveying the direction the museum is in.
Public Transport Signage: (6.25) There are many signs which name the attraction, sighs that include the location, they also include the MTR line as well as its location on a map of the area surrounding area.

Ease of Access: (7.25) There are very direct routs using sidewalks from transportation hubs to the attraction however, the signage in close proximity to the MTR stations is limited and could easily be overlooked.

**Surrounding Area**

Public Transport Options: (8.25) Within the surrounding area there are MTR stations, bus hubs, and, bus stops.

Signage for Attraction in Hub: (5.25) Many signs including the museum among a list of attractions in the MTR stations but not the museum’s specific location. There were only a few signs that included the location of attraction in relation to the terminal. They were also hard to find coming out of the MTR station.

Signage for Attraction in SA: (5.25) The attraction was included in a list of attractions and a few posters displaying their feature exhibit.

Hotels and other Attractions: (7.25) The museum is located near HKPU and relatively close to Hong Kong coliseum. Day trips for tourists may include the museum and then the coliseum for a concert. Students at HKPU may be enticed into visiting the museum. However, there are very few hotels in the area of the museum. They are further down by the Art and Space Museums.

Major Obstacle Solutions: (7.5) The one main road has an overpass in the general area, no other major obstacles plague the area for pedestrians.
Ease of Navigation: (5) Once an obscure sign near the MTR station is found, and arrow points towards the museum. After that sign, the signage becomes sparse and inadequate until the overpass is reached.

F.2.2 Attractiveness

Aesthetic Appeal

Center Piece: (7) The centerpiece of the Science Museum is shared with the History Museum. Our team identified it as the large tree in the driveway with the signs for both the Science and History Museum’s wrapped around it. It was nothing special and did not really compare to the Dome of the Space Museum.

Landscaping: (8) The landscaping right outside the main entrance and around the courtyard area was very well executed. Beyond those two areas, it was limited. The street side of the History Museum was nicely landscaped, but that was because the sidewalk was wide and it was feasible. The street side of the Science Museum was not so wide and therefore, was limited. The back side of the entire building was actually nicely landscaped as well. All in all, nothing truly stood out from either museum but they were still landscaped beautifully.

Main Entrance: (7.25) The main entrance of the History Museum was very similar to the Science Museums. They are not unattractive, but not overly attractive. They were made up of one protrusion from the building. Then the title was displayed upon the cross member and the legs were advertising space for the feature exhibits inside each museum. The History Museum is superior to the Science Museums because it is more clear and easier to see than the Space Museum’s.

Exterior Exhibits: (4) The exterior exhibits at this museum were lacking with a connection to the actual museum content. There were some flags located on some upper decks surrounding the
courtyard, but they were more for advertising than permanent exhibits such as the sculptures at the Art Museum. The few exterior exhibits on the ground were not really related or explained in a way which would tie them to either museum.

**Main Sign: (7.75)** The main sign was displayed on a protrusion from the building, silver lettering on white background. It was not unattractive, but it certainly could have been done better. It was definitely more attractive than the signs for the Art and Space Museum, but it is obvious that limitations had been set by the government for elements of their design as well. It was easier to read than the Science Museum’s as well.

**Building Attractiveness: (7.25)** The building itself of the History museum is rather plain. It does not have any distinguishing features like the Space or Art Museums do. It does not share a unique shape or have any defining architecture. It seems like it tried to be modern, but it did not succeed. There seems that there was a lot of unrealized potential for both the Science and History Museums.

**Immediate Grounds Attractiveness: (8.25)** The Science Museum and the History Museum share a courtyard, centerpiece and their immediate grounds. The sidewalks surrounding the complex are also shared. Nothing was overly beautiful, everything was subdued. Even the flowers, while vibrant by themselves, were unimpressive when combined with the other flowers chosen. One’s feelings towards the immediate grounds are described as indifferent. There is no “wow factor” like with the dome of the Space Museum. Nothing draws one in or peaks one’s curiosity.

**General Area Attractiveness: (7.25)** Once again, there is just no “wow” factor as with the general area of the Art and Space Museums. Whereas they are separated into their own little area, the History and Science Museums are separated because their entrances are in the center of their complex rather than on the exterior and they have a inner courtyard, but they are just dropped
into a commercial zone in TST while the Art and Space Museums have their own little area which is separated from the rest of TST.

**F.2.3 Visibility**

**Physical Visibility**

*Observable Distance:* (5.5) This was completely blocked by landscaping and other buildings. It was perhaps one of the hardest buildings to see from a distance.

*Observable Multiple Routes:* (6) When leaving the TST MTR station the museum is impossible to see. From other directions such as hotels and HKPU it was blocked by buildings; thus, it had a low score.

*Difficulty of Discovery:* (5.25) From TST MTR station it was extremely difficult to find the museum and we actually got lost until we asked a police officer. After the station there are very few signs. If you take bus to the Hong Kong Science Museum stop it is very easy; however, from most popular means of transportation, MTR it was very hard.

*Recognizable:* (6.75) The building itself is not very different from others in the area. The fact that the History Museum is right next door and is very similar in construction does not help it in the metric. From afar the first time one wouldn’t be able to tell which building is which museum.

*Centerpiece Visibility:* (6.25) It has the same centerpiece as the history museum and thus the scores are similar, the center piece is extremely well maintained and taken out of context is very appealing.

**Marketing Visibility**

*Available Advertising Amenities:* (7.75) The amenities available for advertising were plenty with everything from lampposts to entire walls, and footbridge advertisements. However, some of
these structures were only observable from certain routes, thus the amenities score was only a little above average.

*Immediate Grounds Advertising:* (7.75) The team found the immediate grounds advertising: (lamp posters) to be interesting and creative but small and unimpressive.

*General Area Advertising:* (7.5) The advertising in the general area was low, only MTR had signage and advertisements. However, closer to museum more posters could be seen.

*Public Transport Hub Advertising:* (6.5) There were some signs in the MTR station for the museums. However, along the actual street route to the museum there were none and the MTR signs were useless for directions; thus, the score is low.

*Local Establishment Advertising:* (4.25) Hotels and restaurants did not have specific flyers with regards to History museums. No advertisements could be found.

*Local Awareness:* (6) Hotels and restaurants and other businesses knew what direction the museum was thus the score reflects this. However, knowledge on the specific exhibits of museum was very little.

**F.3 Hong Kong Maritime Museum**

**F.3.1 Accessibility**

*Immediate Grounds*

*Ease of Access of Main Entrance:* (6.75) The main entrance of the HKMM is hidden within Murray house, there are little to no obstacles to enter the bottom level of the Murray house. The entrance is open via many entrances into the Murray House, yet a visitor must recognize that the museum is on the ground floor of the Murray House before they will find the entrance to the museum.
Signage to Main Entrance: (7) Posters advertising the museum stand outside of the main entrance to the Murray House and the Maritime Museum yet there is no visible signage on the outside of Murray house except on the centerpiece located adjacent to the building.

Ease of Access of Alt. Entrance: (6.5) There are two entrances to the museum, separated by a set of escalators; the accessibility of the alternate entrance is equivalent to the accessibility of the main entrance except for its being further away from visitor routes.

Signage to Alt. Entrance: (4.75) All signage pertaining to the main entrance includes the alternate entrance because of their proximity. No signage is specifically for the alternative entrance.

Walkways: (8.5) There are very wide and clear walkways leading along the waterfront past the Murray House. The covered area inside the Murray House that leads to the main entrance is wide and clear with multiple signs posted.

Directory Station: (6) One directory station lies near the museum to guide visitors throughout Stanly; the Murray House is included on this directory.

Handicap Accessibility: (8.25) The HKMM main entrance lies on the ground floor with only a few steps to enter the Murray House; a ramp is provided for handicapped patrons.

Main Entrance Lighting: (8.25) The main entrance is inside the Murray House. The inside is well lit, but the museum is not open at night. They do however keep their main sign lit. It is a back lit sign. All the adjacent walkways have significant lighting from lamp posts.

Walkway Lighting: (8) The walkways contain streetlights along the waterfront and in front of the Murray house.
General Area

Walkways: (8.5) The walkways in the general area are smooth and clear of obstacles. Stanley is a dedicated tourist area designed to allow the free movement of visitors. Sign posts are periodic and any obstacles such as steps or stairs are circumvented using ramps, escalators and, lifts.

Major Obstacle Solutions: (8.75) There are no immediate obstacles within Stanley that require a solution other than the Stanley bus station, which is located at the top of a large hill. The solution to this is a lift and escalators that will take patrons to the ground level.

Directory Sign number: (7.75) A few directory signs exist in Stanley, they are spread out and visible to tourists.

Directory Clarity: (7.25) The directories are diagrams of the area. They indicate attractions in the area.

Directional Signage: (7.25) A few directional sign post are placed around Stanley that include the HKMM and the Murray house.

Directional Clarity: (7) The directional signs are pointed in the general direction of the Murray house.

Public Transport Signage: (7.25) At the bus stops there are directory stations that include the Murray house.

Ease of Access: (7.75) The overall the ability to find the HKMM specifically is pretty easy. The entire promenade ends with the Murray House which is where the HKMM is found. Assuming a visitor does not associate the Murray house with HKMM, it could be somewhat difficult; however, most signs indicate that the HKMM is inside the Murray House and extensive advertisements for the Museum are on the Murray House’s exterior.
Surrounding Area

Public Transport Options: (5.5) In the area of Stanley the only transportation options are those of bus or cab. The MTR does not extend to Stanley, nor do ferries travel from Kowloon or Hong Kong to the Stanley location.

Signage for Attraction in Hub: (7.25) The Murray house is included on directional stations located at most bus stops in the surrounding area.

Signage for Attraction in SA: (5.25) There is very little signage visible from outside the general area of the HKMM.

Hotels and other Attractions: (7) Stanly is a tourist attraction boasting restaurants, beaches and a renowned street market. There are also hotels in the area catering to tourists.

Major Obstacle Solutions: (7.25) In the area of Stanley there are no major obstacles other than the overall hilliness of the area. This is resolved by using stairs, escalators and, lifts. All the destinations have dedicated walkways.

Ease of Navigation (7) The Murray house is extremely visible once a visitor has arrived at the waterfront. Before that a visitor must make their way through winding streets, markets and through shopping complexes to reach the waterfront.

F.3.2 Attractiveness

Aesthetic Appeal

Centerpiece: (5.5) The centerpiece for the HKMM is their sign which is displayed outside of the Murray House. It is elegant but it is small. It is not hard to see, but it does not scream the way a centerpiece should. It was not the strongest centerpiece we saw, mostly because it had a limited ability to convey the theme of the museum.
**Landscaping:** (7.75) The landscaping about the HKMM is very nice. The Murray House, which houses the HKMM, is well maintained, beautiful in its construction, and its landscaping. Flower gardens line the front where pedestrians enter, trees and flowers litter the area. Overall, it is very pretty to be there. However, compared to some other landscaping, it is only minor in its size and therefore the HKMM scored lower than some of the other museums.

**Main Entrance:** (7.25) The main entrance of the HKMM is hidden within the Murray House’s bottom floor. It is extremely easy to get to but the entrance itself is disjointed. There is the ticket window on one side and then some double glass doors leading into the museum exhibition across from the ticket window on the other. The entrance itself is in a hallway which has nothing to do specifically with the HKMM and therefore the main entrance scored low because of its setup. There is no true dedicated entrance to the museum from the exterior of the building, thus the score was not as high as the other museums with a dedicated exterior main entrance.

**Exterior Exhibits:** (6.75) The exterior exhibits for the HKMM were limited at the time we observed, however, the director of the museum, Doctor Davies had enlightened the team to the fact that they often do have more exterior exhibits and interactive pieces outside of their main exhibit area, but they are collapsible and because we visited during a time of the year were attendance is lower, they did not have anything setup outside like they would if it were peak tourist season.

**Main Sign:** (6.75) The main sign of the HKMM is small and also acts as their centerpiece. It is elegant but should be bigger. It does fit the size of the current museum nicely though. All in all, it is not overly visible however.

**Building Attractiveness:** (8.5) The Murray House is a highly attractive building. Its exterior is old and pretty while the interior is beautifully decorated. The floors are marble and well
maintained; the stone is also well maintained. All in all, it was one of the most attractive buildings, not because of the museum, but because the building itself was very well executed and maintained.

*Immediate Grounds Attractiveness:* (8.75) The immediate grounds of the Murray House is also very attractive. The entire area itself is very well executed in its design and décor. The Murray House has its own pier which also adds to its attractiveness.

*General Area Attractiveness:* (9) The general area of the Murray House is very attractive. The entire area itself is very well executed in its design and décor. It includes a wooden promenade to view the bay from, small boutiques, restaurants and shops all of which are very elegant. The general area was very attractive and thus scored well.

**F.3.3 Visibility**

**Physical Visibility**

*Observable Distance:* (8.5) From afar the Murray House is extremely recognizable and has no real obstacles within a couple hundred meters. Once one is in the water front promenade the Murray House is extremely observable. However from the housing projects the Murray house is blocked by Stanley Plaza and other housing projects. One cannot see it until they are on the water front.

*Observable from Multiple Routes:* (7) From the main water front it is extremely visible but from Stanley Plaza and the housing projects (a puzzle themselves) it is harder to see it.

*Difficulty of Discovery:* (5.8) If one was not looking for it, it is extremely hard to discover, especially getting to Stanley which is very far away from main parts of Hong Kong Island.
Recognizable: (8.8) If you know you are looking for the Murray House and have looked at the building already then it is extremely recognizable, especially in contrast to other buildings in the Stanley waterfront. The Murray house itself really stands out.

Centerpiece Visibility: (6) The centerpiece is rather small to the point where a visitor might miss it. Its design however, is very appealing but does not really alert the visitor to the museum’s theme.

Marketing Visibility

Available Advertising Amenities: (4.5) Because of tight government restrictions for private businesses the HKMM is very limited in its advertising amenities. Also because of the HKMM’s limited budget, purchasing advertising space from the government is not really feasible in any sustainable or effective way; thus, the score was low.

Immediate Grounds Advertising: (6.3) Advertising is limited to some street posts and directional signs with the museum’s name. These are colorful but not enough. Limited by government, it took 18 months to get those light posts. It is not an easy system to navigate and get things done in. The new location is much more supported by the government so advertising will become easier and subsidized by the government.

General Area Advertising: (6.5) Advertising in the general area is very limited; there is some directional signage but very little promotional advertising in the general area.

Public Transport Hub Advertising: (5) From the bus station there is really no advertisements to the Hong Kong Maritime Museum until you get to the Stanley water front.

Local Establishment Advertising: (5.5) Restaurants and hotels did not have pamphlets but they did know about the museum, its theme, and its location.
Local Awareness: (5.5) In Stanley most locals would tell you that there is a Hong Kong Maritime Museum. Outside of Stanley, most would not be able to tell you where it was located though.

F.4 Central Pier No. 8

F.4.1 Accessibility

Immediate Grounds

Ease of Access of Main Entrance: (9) The current main entrance to Pier No.8 is a wide clear walkway leading on the grounds which will become the new home of HKMM in 2012. The section that currently connects Pier No.8, Pier No.7 and a footbridge is large and inviting with open walkways on both sides of the shops and escalators or lifts to move from ground level to the second floor. There are also spiral stair cases on both sides of Pier No.8.

Signage to Main Entrance: (8) The signs leading to Pier No.8 within the immediate grounds are numerous, yet most point to the Hong Hum station rather than to Pier No.8.

Ease of Access of Alt. Entrance: (8.75) The alternate entrance for Pier No.8 is the ground floor entrance that is used for Hong Hum Star ferry. The alternate entrance contains a lift and is at ground level.

Signage to Alt. Entrance: (8) Most signage in the CFP complex points to the Hong Hum station entrance rather than to Pier No.8. However, there is a lot of space and signs that could easily be added to for the museum.

Walkways: (9.25) The walkways throughout the CFP complex are wide, clear and direct. There is a lot of directional signage which is posted at every turn to guide visitors to their destinations.

Directory Station: (5) There are only very randomly places directory stations which are not overly helpful.
Handicap Accessibility: (8) The footbridge leads directly to the level holding the future location of the HKMM, for visitors arriving at ground level there are multiple escalators and lifts available.

Main Entrance Lighting: (8.25) The location of the future main entrance is exceptionally well lit using overhead lighting. The CFP complex lost points because our group believes that the area is excessively lit taking away from the visitor experience.

Walkway Lighting: (7.75) The CFP complex is very well lit; but, it has been graded down because it is the belief of the group that the CFP complex is overly lit.

General Area

Walkways: (7.5) The walkways are clear, direct and contain some directional signage leading to the CFP complex and Pier No.8.

Major Obstacle Solutions: (7.75) Major obstacles include a main road and the current construction. These obstacles are solved using a raised footbridge leading from CBD to the clock tower complex.

Directory Sign Number: (6.25) There are only a few directory signs within the general area.

Directory Clarity: (9) There are some directory stations which very clearly define the visitors’ current location relative to the CFP complex.

Directional Signage: (8.75) They are numerous, clear directional signs which present along paths leading towards the CFP complex.

Directional Clarity: (9) The signs are very clear and lead visitors along a path that contains many more directional signs.

Public Transport Signage: (9) In local public transportation hubs the CFP complex is included in all directory and directional signage.
Ease of Access: (8.25) The CFP complex is a hub of public transportation. The area has been designed to allow patrons of the Star Ferry to easily access the CFP complex.

Surrounding Area

Public Transport Options: (9) Within the surrounding area of CFP complex there are numerous public transportation options. Honk Kong and Central MTR stations are within short walking distance, Exchange Square bus terminal as well. Pier No.8 itself is part of the CFP complex, a widely used transportation option.

Signage for Attraction in Hub: (7.25) In all hubs signage is visible that indicates the CFP complex, but none indicate Pier No.8 specifically (not surprising because of the lack of any special attraction such as the HKMM).

Signage for Attraction in SA: (6.5) Directional signage exists to the CFP complex but again not to Pier No.8 specifically.

Hotels and other Attractions: (7.5) The Central Business District is not as large of a tourist attraction as TST. The area contains a few hotels and major shopping and dining attractions but not many other museum type attractions which may or may not work to their advantage.

Major Obstacle Solutions: (8) Major obstacles include the construction and roads, both are circumvented by using a series of interconnected elevated footbridges.

Ease of Navigation: (7.75) The surrounding area is very crowded and to a visitor it may be hard to navigate a way to the footbridges and from there to the CFP complex where Pier No.8 and the future HKMM will be.

F.4.2 Attractiveness

Aesthetic Appeal

Center Piece: (N/A) There was no centerpiece to grade.
Landscaping: (8) The landscaping around Pier No8 was limited and in controlled of the government. The areas that were landscaped were very nice and well maintained though. Thus, it scored well but the HKMM will have little to no control over the exterior landscaping.

Main Entrance: (8.25) The main entrance of Pier No.8 at this time is shared with Pier No.7’s main entrance. It is very nice and accessible from multiple points. All in all, it is attractive but other museums with more dedicated entrances have more potential to be attractive than the shared entrance at this time.

Exterior Exhibits: (4.5) Exterior exhibits are limited at Pier No.8. There are some exhibits from the Star Ferry within the CFP complex in-between Pier No.7 to Pier No.8 but other than that, all the additional exterior exhibits the HKMM would add would have to be allowed by the government and that is the main reason there are no exterior exhibits besides those in CFP complex.

Main Sign: (7.5) The main sign once again is something that is controlled by the government and it is bland. It is very visible though and not unattractive; however, its full potential has not been recognized.

Building Attractiveness: (7.25) The CFP complex is not the most attractive building complex from the land side; however, from the harbour it is extremely attractive. Unfortunately, a portion of the people will not see its overall attractiveness as a structure until they are on another pier or they are on the harbour. The government certainly did not sacrifice form for function at the CFP complex. Specifically, Pier No.8 is one of the more bland piers in the complex and thus it did not score as highly as some of the other museums.
Immediate Grounds Attractiveness: (7.25) The immediate grounds of Pier No.8 are not the most attractive immediate grounds we have seen in the study. The grounds are bland at best and do not house much for attractive exhibits or anything that really stands out.

General Area Attractiveness: (7.5) The general area, the CFP complex is more attractive as a whole than Pier No.8 alone because it encompasses more of the area which has certain facets which stand out more than Pier No.8’s alone, for example, it has more sitting areas, promenades and views areas including some greenery which Pier No.8 is seriously lacking. Thus, it scored slightly better, but not by much.

F.4.3 Visibility

Physical Visibility

Observable Distance: (6.3) Pier No.8 is very visible from the Kowloon side and water front however, from Hong Kong Island side it is obstructed by construction and mostly the IFC complex. Thus, from Central District it is not very visible. Even the Ferry Piers Complex (clock tower and shops) block actual structure of Pier No.8.

Observable from Multiple Route: (7.3) Similar to its observable distance Pier No.8 from any other route than crossing Victoria Harbour, is not extremely visible because Central Ferry Piers complex and the construction on another side block the view of the actual premises. Thus, the scores are very similar, note that this score is higher than the one before because in relevance to different routes because Pier No.9 and 10 are outside of the actual Central Ferry Piers complex, visitors can deduct that Pier No.8 is next to Pier No.9.

Difficulty of Discovery: (7) Because it is inside CFP complex it is a little harder to discover Pier No.8. However, there is ample signage within the actual CFP complex. Furthermore, from the
Central MTR station the difficulty of discovery is relatively high (which equals a low score) because there is lack of directional signage after leaving the station.

*Recognizable:* (8.3) CFP is very recognizable because of its Clock Tower and shops. Thus, Pier No.8 for that matter falls well within the recognizable category. Pier No.8 has lots of signage from multiple routes, the fact it is within CFP helps Pier No.8 increase it recognizable.

*Centerpiece Visibility:* (NA)

**Marketing Visibility**

*Available Advertising Amenities:* (9) Pier No.8 demonstrated massive amounts of advertisements varying from street posts, to wall posters along the footbridge, to painted floor murals. Thus, the score is high because there are many different means of advertising within CFP complex.

*Immediate Grounds Advertising:* (8.8) This score reflects the fact that CFP complex advertising amenities are well taken advantage of.

*General Area Advertising:* (7.8) The Central Business District has the footbridge from Hong Kong MTR station, IFC complex and CFP complex which have advertisements along them. However, the Central MTR station did not have advertising space and currently the advertisements were related to Central Piers, not specifically Pier No.8. However, IFC had advertisements only in the direction of footbridge leading to Central Piers thus the score is not as high as it could be.

*Public Transport Hub Advertising:* (8) As it was stated below Central MTR station has few advertisements if any. However, Hong Kong Station the main Central Pier station has plenty of advertisements; thus, the score was within above average range.
Local Establishment Advertising: (8) All the establishments in the area knew about the CFP complex and the piers inside. The establishments had several advertisements of the Hong Hum (Pier No.8) thus the score is fairly good.

Local Awareness: (7) We asked several people if they knew Pier No.8 but the problem with Central Piers is that there is a lot of tourist traffic and they did not seem to know where Pier No. 8 was specifically located; thus, the score was average.

F.5 Hong Kong Science Museum

F.5.1 Accessibility

Immediate Grounds

Ease of Access of Main Entrance: (8) The main entrance is one floor above the ground level, to reach it from the ground level there are two escalators and two large flights of stars. From the MTR and bus stop the visitor must take an overpass walkway that is at level with the main entrance.

Signage to Main Entrance: (7.5) There are many directional signs on the immediate grounds, bottom of stairs, top of escalators all pointing to the main entrances to both the History and Science Museums.

Ease of Access of Alt. Entrance: (5.25) The alternate entrance is located at ground level next to the covered walkway and the escalator. It is hard to see however.

Signage to Alt. Entrance: (2.75) Two 8 ½ by 11 print out directional signs near escalator are the only signs leading to the alternative entrance. They also say that it handicap accessible. The signs are hard to read and see.

Walkways: (8.25) There are a lot of wide, clear, well landscaped walkways leading directly to the museum’s main and alternant entrances.
**Directory Station:** (1.75) There was no directory station for the History or Science Museum on its premises’. There was some basic advertisement booths with some small maps though.

**Handicap Accessibility:** (6.5) There is an alternate entrance on ground level that leads to an elevator for disabled visitors. Escalators are available next to the stairs allowing visitors with problems walking to avoid the stairs.

**Main Entrance Lighting:** (7.25) The main entrance, main sign, walkways, and immediate grounds are all adequately lit at night.

**Walkway Lighting:** (7.5) The main entrance, main sign, walkways, and immediate grounds are all adequately lit at night.

**General Area**

**Walkways:** (7.75) As you approach the immediate grounds sidewalks are available, clear of obstructions, well lit and landscaped. When a visitor reaches the major obstacle such as an impassable road, a covered overpass is available.

**Major Obstacle Solutions:** (8) One major obstacle, a road, is crossed using a covered overpass which is accessible via stairs, escalator and, a ramp. The overpass includes directional signs to the museum.

**Directory Sign number:** (3.5) There is a limited number of signs until the overpass where the signs become more frequent.

**Directory Clarity:** (4.75) The directories do not exist in any real fashion and the small signs in the advertising booths are hard to read because they are so small.

**Directional Signage:** (4.5) There is a limited number of directional signs. There are a few located on an overpass leading to the museum. From the MTR station the provided signs are inadequate at best.
**Directional Clarity:** (5) The signs display the symbol and name of the museum with the sign pointed in the general direction of the museum. The signs are adequate at conveying the direction the museum is in.

**Public Transport Signage:** (6.25) There are many signs which name the attraction, signs that include the location, they also include the MTR line as well as its location on a map of the area surrounding area.

**Ease of Access:** (6.75) There are very direct routs using sidewalks from transportation hubs to the attraction however, the signage in close proximity to the MTR stations is limited and could easily be overlooked.

**Surrounding Area**

**Public Transport Options:** (8.25) Within the surrounding area there are MTR stations, bus hubs, and, bus stops.

**Signage for Attraction in Public Transport Hubs:** (5.25) Many signs in the public transport hubs include the museum on a list of attractions along the MTR lines, there are no museum specific advertisements or directional signs aside from the directions found on the directory stations within the stations.

**Signage for Attraction in Surrounding Area:** (5.25) The attraction was included in a list of attractions and on a few posters for the Science Museum’s current featured exhibit.

**Hotels and other Attractions:** (7.25) The museum is located near HKPU and relatively close to Hong Kong coliseum. Day trips for tourists may include the museum and then the coliseum for a concert. Students at HKPU may be enticed into visiting the museum. However, there are very few hotels in the area of the museum. They are further down by the Art and Space Museums.
**Major Obstacle Solutions:** (7.5) The one main road has an overpass in the general area, no other major obstacles plague the area for pedestrians.

**Ease of Navigation:** (5) Once an obscure sign near the MTR station is found, and arrow points towards the museum. After that sign, the signage becomes sparse and inadequate until the overpass is reached.

**F.5.2 Attractiveness**

**Aesthetic Appeal**

**Centerpiece:** (7) The centerpiece of the Science Museum is shared with the History Museum. Our team identified it as the large tree in the driveway with the signs for both the Science and History Museum’s wrapped around it. It was nothing special and did not really compare to the Dome of the Space Museum.

**Landscaping:** (8) The landscaping right outside the main entrance and around the courtyard area was very well executed. Beyond those two areas, it was limited. The street side of the History Museum was nicely landscaped, but that was because the sidewalk was wide and it was feasible. The street side of the Science Museum was not so wide and therefore, was limited. The back side of the entire building was actually nicely landscaped as well. All in all, nothing truly stood out from either museum but they were still landscaped beautifully.

**Main Entrance:** (7.5) The main entrance of the Science Museum was very similar to the History Museums. They are not unattractive, but not overly attractive. The entrance was made up of one protrusion from the building, lined with sheets of mirrored metal. Then the name was displayed upon the cross member with the legs acting as advertising space for the feature exhibits inside each museum.
*Exterior Exhibits:* (4.25) The exterior exhibits at this museum were lacking with a connection to the actual museum content. There were some flags located on some upper decks surrounding the courtyard, but they were more for advertising than permanent exhibits such as the sculptures at the Art Museum. The few exterior exhibits on the ground were not really related or explained in a way which would tie them to either museum.

*Main Sign:* (7.25) The main sign was displayed on a protrusion from the building, red lettering on mirrored silver backed cross member. It wasn’t unattractive, but it certainly could have been done better.

*Building Attractiveness:* (6.75) The building itself of the Science Museum is rather plain. It does not have any distinguishing features like the Space or Art Museums do. It does not share a unique shape or have any defining architecture.

*Immediate Grounds Attractiveness:* (8.25) The Science Museum and the History Museum share a courtyard, centerpiece and their immediate grounds. The sidewalks surrounding the complex are also shared. Nothing was overly beautiful, everything was subdued. Even the flowers, while vibrant by themselves, were unimpressive when combined with the other flowers chosen. One’s feelings towards the immediate grounds are described as indifferent. There is no “wow factor” like with the dome of the Space Museum. Nothing draws one in or peaks one’s curiosity.

*General Area Attractiveness:* (7.25) Once again, there is just no “wow” factor as with the general area of the Art and Space Museums. Whereas they are separated into their own little area, the History and Science Museums are separated because their entrances are in the center of their complex rather than on the exterior and they have a inner courtyard, but they are just dropped into a commercial zone in TST while the Art and Space Museums have their own little area which is separated from the rest of TST.
F.5.3 Visibility

Physical Visibility

Observable Distance: (5.5) Much like the History Museum, the Science Museum was not easily observable from a distance. Its landscaping worked against it with all the trees blocking its view from afar.

Observable from Multiple Routes: (6) From multiple routes, the museum seemed a bit more observable however; a busy highway and tall buildings adjacent to it still significantly blocked its view. It is far less visible than the Art or Space Museums.

Difficulty of Discovery: (5.25) With the lack of directional signage and a small observable distance, the Science museum was difficult to discover without good directions. The team got lost on my way there from the MTR the first time we were looking for the museum.

Recognizable: (6.75) The building itself is not very different from others in the area. The fact that the History Museum is right next door and is very similar in construction does not help it in the metric. From afar the first time one wouldn’t be able to tell which building is which museum.

Centerpiece Visibility: (6.25) It has the same centerpiece as the history museum and thus the scores are similar, the center piece is extremely well maintained and taken out of context is very appealing.

Marketing Visibility

Available Advertising Amenities: (7.5) The amenities for advertising are ample as the entire complex spans about four or more blocks in length. There are walls, street posts and ample open space but advertisement is underutilized.
Immediate Grounds Advertising: (7.75) There is some posters and wall murals but they are not impressive thus the score is a little above average.

General Area Advertising: (7.5) There are only a few actual advertisements in the general area except for a special exhibit.

Public Transport Hub Advertising: (6.5) There were some signs in the MTR station for the museums. However, along the actual street route to the museum there were none and the MTR signs were useless for directions; thus, the score is low.

Local Establishment Advertising: (4.25) Hotels and restaurants surveyed in the area had not direct advertisings for the museum; they did however provide good directions.

Local Awareness: (6) The concierges at multiple hotels were knowledgeable of the existence of the Science Museum. When asked about museums in general, they all did suggest the Science Museum as one to visit, as it was interesting and close in proximity.
F.6 Hong Kong Space Museum

F.6.1 Accessibility

Immediate Grounds

Ease of Access of Main Entrance: (7.5) The main entrance faces the main road. It is on ground level and is handicapped accessible which is in contrast to the other museums who have stairs or escalators leading to their main entrances and have to have an alternative entrance for their handicapped patrons.

Signage to Main Entrance: (5.25) There is only minimal directional signs to main entrance.

Ease of Access of Alt. Entrance: (7) The alternate entrance is at ground level, but it is on the rear of the building and not very well marked.

Signage to Alt. Entrance: (3.75) The only sign to the alternate entrance is above the alternate entrance.

Walkways: (8) The walkways are very clear, wide open, yet direct. Along the side of the Art museum some of the walkways wind through a garden area which is quite pretty.

Directory Station: (8) There are two directory stations on the immediate grounds which display a full diagram of the general area of the museum and all the attractions to visit there. It is in bland color but with a limited key.

Handicap Accessibility: (8.25) Gentle ramp to main entrance which is close to ground level, ramp is integrated into large clear walkway leading to ticketing counter.

Main Entrance Lighting: (7) The main entrance and main sign both have multiple spot lights projecting copious amounts of light on them when the museum is open at night. When it is not open, only the sign has light on it.
Walkway Lighting: (8.25) The paths are well lit with multiple light poles along their length in short distances from each other. Everything of interest is well lit including exterior exhibits, the main entrance, the main sign, and all the walkways and directory stations.

General Area

Walkways: (8.5) The walkways are abundant, wide, clear of obstacles, and well lit. They lead to every point of interest, and some even venture through gardens and courtyards for a very nice touch of nature within Tsim Sha Tsui (TST).

Major Obstacle Solutions: (8.5) A major road cuts off the tip of Kowloon peninsula, where the museums are located. The solution is a subway located in the courtyard which brings you out onto Nathan Road or to an MTR Station. The subways have multiple entrances and are very well labeled and lit.

Directory Sign Number: (7.25) In the general area there are two main directory stations. They have a diagram of the general area and limited labeling in very dull color.

Directory Clarity: (7) The directories are clear in their diagram but they fail to give the directory location on the diagram; however, the area itself is very recognizable from any vantage point so it is very easy to navigate by recognition.

Directional Signage: (8) Directional signage is posted around the building, along the waterfront and in neighboring complexes.

Directional Clarity: (8.5) Signs point visitors around the outside of the building towards the main entrance, signs in neighboring complex point towards the main entrance.

Public Transport Signage: (8.25) There are many signs in the MTR station as well as the ferry terminal that advertise the location of the museums.
Ease of Access: (8.25) The museum itself is not overly easy to access from the TST side because of the major road; this is resolved by using a subway to cross under to the side of the street with the museum complex. Coming from the ferry terminal signs point towards the museum and eventually the main entrance as one gets closer to the museum.

Surrounding Area

Public Transport Options: (8.125) The museum is located next to the star ferry terminal. It is only a short walk from the TST MTR and there is a bus stop in front of the Space museum which can be used to visit the Art Museum directly behind the Space Museum.

Signage for Attraction in Hub: (7.25) The signs in the public transportation hubs have lists which did include the museum, its location and exit to take as well as the walking distance from that exit. It was also included on the exit signs from the different exits of the MTR.

Signage for Attraction in Surrounding Area: (7.5) The attraction was included in a list of local attractions at the hubs as well as on maps of the area around the terminal.

Hotels and other Attractions: (9.75) The Space Museum is located on the tip of Kowloon peninsula, TST, an area dedicated to tourism. There are many restaurants, hotels, stores and malls in the area which all attract tourists which make up a large percentage of visitors. The museum is located directly across the street from one of the best hotels in Kowloon and the world, The Peninsula Hotel.

Major Obstacle Solutions: (8) The major road has an underpass, the underpass is not difficult to find and is well marked with signs.

Ease of Navigation: (8.25) If a visitor is going to the museum, they can follow the exit signs from the MTR, walk along the water from the ferry terminals or walk towards the harbourfront
and would be able to see the museum. If a visitor is on the north side of the major road, finding the underpass and the museum would not be difficult.

**F.6.2 Attractiveness**

**Aesthetic Appeal**

*Center Piece: (8.75)* The Space Museum’s centerpiece is integrated into the actual building itself. Its center piece is its white dome. It is iconic, visible, and recognizable. It is everything a centerpiece should be. It alerts visitors to the space theme of the museum. It is well maintained and at night it is lit up with multiple spot lights flashing different colors across the dome. It is very beautiful at night.

*Landscaping: (8.5)* The landscaping of the Space Museum is partly shared with the Art Museum but also has separate areas which belong solely to the Space Museum. All of the landscaping is done extremely well. The Space Museum has a fountain construction around the base of its iconic dome. A front court yard which is entered via the MTR station and from the underpass defeating the street obstacle is beautiful with its flower gardens and sitting areas.

*Main Entrance: (7.75)* The main entrance is integrated and hard to see from anywhere but the street side of the museum. The front of the building funnels visitors into its main entrance, but it is cave-like and unattractive. There is good landscaping out front, but it sometimes can interfere with viewing the main sign from certain angles as the shrubbery can block some of the sign if it is not constantly maintained.

*Exterior Exhibits: (4.5)* There were some exterior exhibits, the dome itself is a drawing factor that could be considered and exterior exhibit. It does a good job but the Space Museum is significantly lacking in this metric if one were to not include the dome. Considering the sheer
number of the exterior exhibits of the Art Museum which is right next door, one would expect to see more of a showing from the Space Museum.

**Main Sign:** (6.5) The main sign is under the same design requirements as the Art Museum’s. So it is bland at best. It was low to the ground, at eye level with the side walk so it is great for passer-bys but it is blocked partly by the construction for people traveling on the road or across the street. Furthermore the sign has some shrubbery in front of it which, if not maintained, could easily begin to block it from view. The sign is somewhat unnoticeable until one is already right on top of it where as you can see the main sign for the Art Museum as soon as one exits the MTR station.

**Building Attractiveness:** (8.75) The building is unique in structure and shape, and its dome is very iconic and recognizable, however, the actual building material and décor is the same, and probably required to be by the government, as the rest of the buildings in its general area. From a far they meld together. The dome pushes it above the Art Museum in the building attractiveness metric.

**Immediate Grounds Attractiveness:** (8.5) The immediate grounds of the Space Museum are attractive. There is the dome, some greenery, sitting areas, and a harbour promenades just on the other side of the Art Museum. The shaded walkways wind through a garden on one side of the Art Museum leading into the sitting area and garden of the Space Museum. During the night the dome is lit up with flashing and color changing spot lights flashing all over the dome. All in all, the grounds are very attractive.

**General Area Attractiveness:** (9) Similar to the immediate grounds, the general area is also very attractive. All the buildings in the general area share a similar theme in their exterior décor. Also, most of them take part in the harbour light show at night. The Cultural Center, Art
Museum, and Clock Tower are all in general area and add to its overall attractiveness. The actual grounds are very nice, including very nice harbour viewing decks, promenades, the Avenue of Stars, and a nearby mall housing an MTR station. All in all, the entire area is very nicely landscaped and the walkways are elegant. Another nice factor is that the general area is somewhat spate from the hustle and bustle of the city which is right on the other side of the small fence right outside the entrance of the Space Museum.

F.6.3 Visibility

**Physical Visibility**

*Observable Distance:* (9) The Space Museum is one of the most observable museums from afar, it is tall, and from the harbour it is well lit and extremely recognizable at day and night. If it was not for the luxury hotels, the museum would have a perfect score. It is tall and visible from over 1.5 blocks away coming down Nathan road.

*Observable from Multiple Routes:* (8.25) From TST MTR and Nathan road once one has gotten past the luxury hotels then one can clearly see the museum but from the other side of the avenue of stars the museum is blocked by an office building and from the far side coming from the ferry terminal, the Hong Kong Cultural Centre blocks it from view.

*Difficulty of Discovery:* (9) It was extremely easy to find as its building is directly adjacent to the subway exit.

*Recognizable:* (9) The Space Museum has the iconic dome which is extremely recognizable. The people of Hong Kong have given it the nickname of “The Bun”. It is unique, memorable, and extremely recognizable.
Centerpiece Visibility: (8) The Space Museum has its iconic dome which acts as its centerpiece. It is very visible from any direction except from the harbour because it is blocked by the Art Museum.

Marketing Visibility

Available Advertising Amenities: (8.25) The design of the Space Museum definitely utilizes huge murals or posters all over its exterior walls. Its premise’s have street posts and space for advertising amenities.

Immediate Grounds Advertising: (8.5) From the immediate grounds one can see most of the advertisements of the Space Museum. They are not as high in number compared to the Art Museum, but the Space Museum has its iconic dome which acts as its own advertisement.

General Area Advertising: (7.5) This score is lower because once you get farther from the Space Museum there is less signage and very few advertisements for the museum itself in the general area. They are all condensed into the immediate grounds.

Public Transport Hub Advertising: (9) Apart from directional signage there are no distinguishable advertisements for the Space Museum in the underground mall or MTR station. They are limited to directional signage and a worthy mention on the maps for tourists.

Local Establishment Advertising: (3.25) The nearby luxury hotels and restaurants did not have specific flyers or pamphlets for the Space Museum.

Local Awareness: (6.75) Locals know the Art Museum because of its iconic dome centerpiece. It is flanked by a very attractive leisure activity, the Avenue of Stars promenade is right next door.
## Appendix G: Observational Study Data

### G.1 Accessibility

#### Table G.1

**Accessibility Metric data (Pier No. 8, History, Art)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Weight: Pier No. &amp;</th>
<th>Ben</th>
<th>Byron</th>
<th>Eric</th>
<th>John</th>
<th>AVG</th>
<th>Score: History M</th>
<th>Ben</th>
<th>Byron</th>
<th>Eric</th>
<th>John</th>
<th>AVG</th>
<th>Score: Art M</th>
<th>Ben</th>
<th>Byron</th>
<th>Eric</th>
<th>John</th>
<th>AVG</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Immediate Grounds:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Ease of Access of Main Entrance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage to Main Entrance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>69.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Access of Alt. Entrance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage to Alt. Entrance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkways</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>64.75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>61.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directory Station</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicap Accessibility</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>48.75</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>56.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Entrance Lighting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkway Lighting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Walkways</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>38.75</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Obstacle Solutions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directory Sign #</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>29.75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>50.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directory Clarity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directional Signage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>21.25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directional Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>26.25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transport Signage</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>57.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Access</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding Area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Public Transport Options</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.125</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage for Attraction in Hub</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage for Attraction in SA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels and other Attractions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>60.75</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Obstacle Solutions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Navigation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>29.75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>57.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Total:</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183.5</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>146.25</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>186.5</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>180.375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1236.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1222.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table G.2

**Accessibility Metric data (Science, Space, HKMM)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Immediate Grounds:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Ease of Access of Main Entrance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage to Main Entrance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>47.25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Access of Alt. Entrance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>26.25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage to Alt. Entrance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkways</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>54.25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicap Accessibility</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Entrance Lighting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkway Lighting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Walkways</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>38.75</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Obstacle Solutions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directory Sign #</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>26.25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>47.25</td>
<td>47.25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>54.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directory Clarity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>50.75</td>
<td>50.75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>50.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directional Signage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>33.75</td>
<td>33.75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>36.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directional Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transport Signage</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>57.75</td>
<td>57.75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>50.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Access</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding Area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Public Transport Options</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage for Attraction in Hub</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage for Attraction in SA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels and other Attractions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>60.75</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>87.75</td>
<td>87.75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Obstacle Solutions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>38.75</td>
<td>38.75</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>36.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Navigation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>29.75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Total:</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>138.25</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>173.25</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>162.75</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>162.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score:</td>
<td>940.5</td>
<td>1175.875</td>
<td>162.75</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>940.5</td>
<td>1175.875</td>
<td>162.75</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>1175.875</td>
<td>162.75</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### G.2 Attractiveness

#### Table G.3

Attractiveness Metric data (Pier No. 8, History, Art)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Pier No. 8:</th>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>History M:</th>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>Art M:</th>
<th>Score:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Byron</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>AVG:</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center Piece</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Entrance</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Exhibits</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Sign</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Attractiveness</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Grounds Attractiveness</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Area Attractiveness</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score:</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>442</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table G.4

**Attractiveness Metric data (Science, Space, HKMM)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Science M.</th>
<th>Ben</th>
<th>Byron</th>
<th>Eric</th>
<th>John</th>
<th>AVG.</th>
<th>Space M.</th>
<th>Ben</th>
<th>Byron</th>
<th>Eric</th>
<th>John</th>
<th>AVG.</th>
<th>HKM M.</th>
<th>Ben</th>
<th>Byron</th>
<th>Eric</th>
<th>John</th>
<th>AVG.</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attractiveness:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Aesthetic Appeal:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Center Piece</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5 6 6 6</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10 10 8 9</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5 6 5 6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Entrance</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7 8 8 7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7 7 8 6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7 7 8 7</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Exhibits</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4 6 6 6</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>29.75</td>
<td>5 4 5 1</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>26.25</td>
<td>6 7 6 8</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>47.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Sign</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6 6 8 7</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>47.25</td>
<td>5 7 8 6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>6 7 8 6</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>47.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Attractiveness</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5 8 8 6</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9 9 10 7</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9 8 9 8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Grounds Attractiveness</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8 9 9 7</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>9 9 9 7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>9 8 10 8</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Area Attractiveness</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6 7 7 7</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10 9 9 10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>9 9 10 8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Total:</td>
<td>41 50 52 41</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Score:</td>
<td></td>
<td>357</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>415.75</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>53.25</td>
<td>51 52 56 51</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>406.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G.3 Visibility

Table G.5

Visibility Metric data (Pier No. 8, History, Art)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visibility:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Physical Visibility:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Observable Distance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7 6 5 6 6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5 6 5 4 5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9 9 9 9 9</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Difficulty of Discovery (Ease = Better)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9 9 10 5 8.25</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>6 4 5 6 5.25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9 9 9 9 9</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Recognizability</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9 8 7 8 8</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5 7 7 6 6.25</td>
<td>56.25</td>
<td>9 8 8 8 8.25</td>
<td>74.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Center Piece Visibility</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>N/A N/A N/A N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 8 6 7 6.25</td>
<td>56.25</td>
<td>6 10 8 8 8</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Marketing Visibility:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Available Advertising Amenities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9 9 8 10 9</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7 9 8 7 7.75</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>8 9 9 8 8.5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Immediate Grounds Advertising</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9 9 7 10 8.75</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>8 7 8 8 7.75</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>8 9 9 8 8.5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>General Area Advertising</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7 7 8 9 7.75</td>
<td>54.25</td>
<td>6 8 9 7 7.5</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>6 8 8 7 7.25</td>
<td>50.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Surounding Area Advertising</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6 7 8 7 7</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7 8 6 5 6.5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6 6 7 6 6.25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Public Transport Hub Advertising</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7 8 8 9 8</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7 7 9 6 7.25</td>
<td>65.25</td>
<td>5 7 5 5 5.5</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Local Establishment Advertising</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9 9 6 8 8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3 4 4 3 3.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2 3 4 1 2.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Local Awareness</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8 9 8 9 8.5</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>6 8 7 7 7</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8 7 7 7 7.25</td>
<td>65.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Totals:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>88 81 87</td>
<td>85.75</td>
<td>70 82 79 73</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Score:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>638.75</td>
<td>578.25</td>
<td>671.5</td>
<td>88.25</td>
<td>85 93 91 84</td>
<td>671.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table G.6

Visibility Metric data (Science, Space, HKMM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Visibility:</th>
<th>Physical Visibility:</th>
<th>Marketing Visibility:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obsorable Distance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Route Observability</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty of Discovery (Ease = Better)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizability</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center Piece Visibility</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Visibility:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Advertising Amenities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Grounds Advertising</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Area Advertising</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding Area Advertising</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transport Hub Advertising</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Establishment Advertising</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Awareness</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score:</td>
<td>583</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H: Central Pier No. 8 Photography Results

This appendix presents our findings from Central Pier No. 8 from our observational studies in the form of photography. For each metric we studied, a picture example has been provided below.

H.1 Accessibility Metrics

Immediate Grounds:

Figure H.1

Central Pier No. 8 – Accessibility – Immediate Grounds
Key (From left to right):
Ease of Access of Main Entrance, Signage to Main Entrance, Ease of Access of Alternate Entrance, Signage to Alternate Entrance, Walkways, Directory Station, Handicap Accessibility, Main Entrance Lighting, and Walkway Lighting

General Area:

Figure H.2

Pier No. 8 – Accessibility – General Area
Key (From left to right):

Walkways, Major Obstacle Solutions, Directory Sign Number, Directory Clarity, Directional Signage, Directional Clarity, Public Transport Signage, and Ease of Access

Surrounding Area:

*Figure H.3*

*Pier No. 8-Accessibility-Surrounding Area*

Key (From left to right):

Public Transport Options, Signage for Attraction in Hub, Signage for Attraction in the Surrounding Area, Accessibility from Hotels and other Attractions, Major Obstacle Solutions, and Ease of Navigation
H.3 Attractiveness

Aesthetic Appeal:

Figure H.4

Pier No. 8-Attractiveness-Aesthetic Appeal

Key (From left to right):

Center Piece, Main Entrance, Exterior Exhibits and Events, Main Sign, Building Attractiveness, Immediate Grounds, and General Area
H.3 Visibility

Physical Visibility:

Figure H.5

Pier No. 8-Visibility-Physical Visibility

Key (From left to right):

Observable Distance, Observable from Multiple Routes, Difficulty of Discovery, Easily Recognizable, and Center Piece Visibility
Marketing Visibility:

Figure H.6

Pier No. 8 - Visibility-Marketing Visibility

Key: (From left to right)