



PASADENA ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Pre-Board Meeting

August 7, 2025, 3:00p.m.

Minutes

Members Present:

Rick Lord, President
Marilyn Wilkins, Vice President
Salvador Serrano, Jr., Treasurer
Ernesto Paredes, Secretary
Angela West
Efren Arjona
Elaine Domec

Members Absent:**Others Present:**

Jeff Moore, Brown & Hofmeister, LLP (via Zoom)
Karina Tomlinson, PEDC Manager
Julianne Echavarria, PEDC Marketing Manager
Dr. Jo Anne Estrada, Visit Pasadena Manager
Yolanda Vegas de Eaves, Sr. Office Assistant

Call to order:

The Pre-Board meeting for the August 7, 2025, Pasadena Economic Development Corporation was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Board President, Rick Lord.

Rick read through the agenda and asked if there were any questions and asked who will be presenting the item on the agenda. Karina Tomlinson, EDC Manager, responded that exhibit documents are part of the Board's packet and while there isn't a presentation, questions the Board may have can be answered by Public Works Department and herself. The architect cannot be present.

Pre-Board meeting adjourned at 3:01 p.m.

PASADENA ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Board Meeting

August 7, 2025, 3:01 p.m.

Minutes

Agenda Item One: Call to order

The Board meeting on August 7, 2025, for Pasadena Economic Development Corporation was called to order at 3:01 pm by Board President, Rick Lord.

Agenda Item Two: Invocation

Invocation given by: Elaine Domec, Board Member.

Agenda Item Three: Pledges

Pledges led by: Ernesto Paredes, Board Member.

Agenda Item Four: Public Comments

No comments made by any attendees.

Agenda Item Five: Board Actions – Resolutions

- a. **PEDC RESOLUTION 25-017** – Consideration to authorize Staff to negotiate and execute an agreement with Swart Architects for architectural and engineering services for the Pasadena Convention Center Expansion and Renovation Project (CIP #M029) in the amount not to exceed \$2,120,000.00 from the Convention Center Facility Improvements project account (M025).

R. Lord invited Robin Green, Public Works Director, to speak. He explained, this is an architectural contract that has, electrical, plumbing, and construction phase services. This is all wrapped up in one. There are additional services that allow for construction observation and travel allowances. *R. Lord asked about the travel allowance.* R. Green explained this is to cover expenses if someone comes from out of town. We had that in the previous contract, as well; it won't be close to \$10,000.00. These expenses are reimbursables and only pay them after they have done the work and have been reviewed by us. We won't be expending every penny, but we want to have enough money, so we don't have to come back to ask for more. Sarah Benavides, Senior Assistant Public Works Director, added that was for some of the subs they had for design for specific items like, food services designer and fire consultant. They were from out of town. K. Tomlinson added there are other things they may need as well such as printing, copies. Those are part of the reimbursables. *E. Paredes asked if this is common in these kinds of contracts.* R. Green responded, correct. *R. Lord asked if they are familiar with the project.* R. Green responded, they are. They worked on the first phase which is why we are using them. *A. West asked if this is the middleman spoken about during last meeting.* R. Green responded, part of that. S. Benavides responded that the middleman is the one we terminated the contract with. This company was the one doing the actual design. *R. Lord asked, what are we designing.* M. Wilkins had a question and wanted to read the part of the exhibit document that says: "We propose to use some of the same team utilized on the previous arena project as they are familiar with the site, the existing convention center, and provided excellent work". Obviously, a paid team that's their people or whomever else people. She's more interested in the team at the city,

in the EDC, in the community or whoever team it is, that is providing specifications for this project. That is the problem we have now. It was not designed to start with, before we started building stuff. She wants to know who is in the mix to provide input. How it is going to be structured. How the board will receive reports on ongoing bases. What is the proposed cost. R. Green responded, those are very good questions, but he can't answer right now. M. Wilkins responded, we need to question before hiring someone to do it. R. Green responded, then don't hire them, it can wait. James Holt, Chief of Staff, added that right now this is an EDC project. The first step is actually to hire somebody that can do the design. Once you enter into contract with them you can have all discussions. He understands that during initial meetings, basically they were looking at this as square footage. Right now, they are saying you can afford this much square footage and what goes into it, is clearly an ongoing process. He encourages the EDC Board to host meetings or have stakeholders involved and ask what the community action is and what is they want. Some of those meetings should have happened before. Everybody is on the same page and agrees with the Board. There has to be a mechanism to report to the EDC Board on a project's progress. K. Tomlinson added that she will go as far as recommend the Board select or initiate a small subcommittee, so the Board would be heavily involved in the process. M. Wilkins asked whether a list of Stakeholders for this project was ever put down on paper. Do we have to go out in the community and ask who is interested in the Convention Center and ask them for their opinion? We don't have a list of people, we don't know anybody other than the major players like the school district, the rodeo, and the colleges. We don't even know who to ask. J. Holt responded that the people to ask to are the people who have been renting the grounds for twenty- thirty years: Pasadena Rodeo, Strawberry Festival, Economic Alliance, industry partners, Gun Show, Nutcracker Market to name some. All these events are the ones to ask, since they've been renting the facility for years and could share what they would like to see based on their experience. A lot of the industry folks wanted more expo-space, updated AV, so they can have conferences, cross training, among other events. The EDC could start with contacting the Convention Center for a list of people who rent the grounds, to ask them about their needs, and what we can do to improve the property. R. Lord responded, they had meetings. While we can still have them, they must be within a time frame. This project needs either move in a direction because of the bonds. He spoke with the chamber about planning something, but it will have to be by end of September. We need to have something and finalize the direction we want to go, whether it would be something with meeting rooms, or we want to do an Arena, or we want to expand it to where equipment can be stored there. There are a lot of variables. I think we had all those discussions. At these meetings we invite everyone. A lot of people show up and a lot of people don't say anything. Like today with public comments. We went through that process, but if we need to go through the same process again, I am okay with that. M. Wilkins asked who owns it, who invites people, who organizes it, who makes this happen in a structured. Otherwise, we are going to pay these people \$2M. R. Lord responded, it will be us. M. Wilkins responded there is no doubt on her mind this project will be over budget. She never saw what was designed, she does not know what it is other than three stories of an Arena. But from the standpoint that we don't know it ticks her off, number one, number two, she wants somebody to own this. If it is the EDC somebody needs to tell her that. Then, we will own this. We will work with the chamber, whomever else in the city and all of us can come together to make a list, and get this done. She does not think these architects are the ones who drive that boat. A. West added, she thinks M. Wilkins has some valid points. R. Lord added he thinks everybody is a little worried about how we have been looked upon in the media. We had open meetings. He thinks there is a breakdown in the communication and is committed to meet with everyone. Someone is going to have to show us the difference in price we've seen. It isn't good. None of us knew that. M. Wilkins added, this is taxpayer's dollars. We are the ones charged with the fiduciary responsibility to expend their

money. We already spent a lot of money we didn't realize we were spending. We would potentially be on the hook for a bunch more without our knowledge. Now, we have to be involved. The clock continues to tick and, yes, the bonds are out there accruing interest. Somehow this needs to be on a fast track. She is not convinced that hiring these people solves the problem. There is an awful of expertise in this city. She thinks that a lot of people are thinking okay, "X" million dollars is worth by sitting in committees and coming up with a real vision. Putting it on paper and tell the architects, this is what we want. What is it going to cost? Put a price tag on everything. We will figure out what we can afford now and what we put off for the future. In terms of facility structure. Jeff Moore, attorney for the EDC, asked to intervene. He wanted to respond to a couple of points made. The city will own the Convention Center, but the PEDC is the funding mechanism for that city owned project. The other issue is, it appears that it was going to a higher cost that we anticipated. Our original contract was for \$44M and change, which was all we ever saw. For the contractors to change that price we would have a change order that would come to the Board and go to city council. We saw a revision of \$135M change order, which was never submitted to the EDC. It was a big change of more than 200%. M. Wilkins asked, with respect to our potential actions here, obviously the proposal on the table is one of them. Is it within of the purview of the EDC to say we will expend the \$50M and \$42M in bond funds. If the rest of the world wants to do something outside of that then we can put the ball in the city's court and ask them to come with \$85M plus interest, if that is what they want to build. Can we even do that? J. Moore responded, the EDC is committed to the \$49.5M in bonds. He understands there is cost associated with that bond issuance. If somebody wants to do more, it will have to go to city council for approval. If it is going to be for the EDC to make more expenditures, it will need the EDC's approval. Right now, you have those bonds proceeds for the Convention Center Renovation Project. M. Wilkins responded that what she's saying is: if what gets envisioned is determined to be outside the budget of the EDC, can the city choose to fund some portion of this on their own, or not? J. Moore responded, yes sure. If the city wants to take on some expenditures, he thinks they could. M. Wilkins responded that the other thing we could do is have this open forum meetings come up with another vision. We can get another price range from the architect and say okay we will commit "X" amount of additional dollars. If we decide to do that and then check off some things on the list that we won't pay for at this point but could be incorporated in the building at some future point when there is more money that somebody wants to add. Is that doable? J. Moore responded, sure, as a Board you can decide. You can have public hearings take action, have council approval, publish notice in the newspaper, you have to have all the procedures. But, yes, you can add more money to it. E. Paredes asked J. Moore, what needs to be done right now? What is the issue at hand, what we need to do? J. Moore responded, to engage architectural engineering services. If you want to see that contract, it can be the motion to authorize staff that to negotiate and bring back that contract. Or if you want them to, or as presented on the agenda, authorize staff to negotiate and execute the contract. you can do that too. It could not exceed the \$2,120,000.00. amount that is listed on the agenda. The issue is as R. Lord alluded to, we are subject to time and that is for consideration. R. Lord added, this will slow down the process, and more likely Hensel Phelps will probably leave the job. They are there to build. They aren't there to sit. They will probably leave the project. We will have to start from scratch. Get a general contractor and figure out where we are with everything, I see another waste in motion. M. Wilkins responded that we are jumping out of a frying pan with Way-Tech and potentially getting into another frying pan with another firm that is going to do the same thing. They are just going to go back and reenvision whatever it is they should envision, to start with somewhat budget. We can be in the same situation in a month from now, or two months. It goes back to who is going to control this. Who is going to keep us informed of what is going on. Which is what didn't happen. R. Lord responded that there was a lot of things added,

electrical, acoustics and such. M. Wilkins responded that's wonderful, but nobody told us. R. Lord continued, he hopes to work with Robin or whoever else to see a monthly spreadsheet, or he could go out to visit the site any time. R. Green responded, we are civil engineers, our part is done, paving and drainage. What goes forward is up to you. You can use anybody you want. R. Lord added that is up to the administration to work with us and keep us informed. R. Green asked to continue. We can't review their work, because I not an architect. This person comes out and says, okay I have done \$75K of work as an architect, I can't review that. You need a licensed architect that's qualified to do that. He is present because of Pasadena Blvd. He has a day job. When I got here, we were doing \$10M jobs, then up to \$35M. Now we are up to \$100M a year worth of work, with the same amount of people I had before actually half the people. M. Wilkins responded that she is not fussing at him. She is fussing at the fact that we are sitting here in the situation that we are in, without having had the appropriate communication. This is in our laps. She wants to know if the EDC hires anybody that we are not getting ourselves back into the same situation we were just got ourselves out of. At this time, James Holt, Chief of Staff, introduced himself. He stated, this was a design-build project. No body brought to you a design. This is what you are buying, here is what it is, everybody agrees, square footage, here is your picture. Design-build they just change it as they go. By the time the new administration came in there was no final price, no final design. This proposal is, let's get an architect, let's do a new design with input from everybody and you know exactly what you are building, upfront. It will be a wise business decision, to keep Swart Architects because they were involved since the beginning and are familiar with the project. But this time it won't be a design-build. This is going to be the difference between what you had before versus what is proposed now. S. Benavides added that the previous contractor went astray because that was what they were directed to do. They had to all these big changes. At this point, you will be in control over the direction it will go with the design. They know how much money is available, they know what the original design was supposed to be and that is what we are going back to. What was originally approved by the Board. Anything above that will have to come to you by whatever group is working with the design through the EDC. R. Lord added, the way the process should work is that we should reviewed the plans or send them to council. We may want to make a Taj Mahal. Who knows, but we didn't have the opportunity to review it. There might be some things that the board members feel very strongly about out there. There might be a price increase or a price decrease. E. Arjona added, he understands Marilyn's concerns. But if we don't learn from what we just learned, then, whose fault is it? If we put ourselves in the same situation, it is our own fault. We have an opportunity right now to correct the situation and to be proactive in the sense of keeping an eye on the choices being made and be part of the design, so we don't make those mistakes in the future. We control the amount of money that is being spent. A. West asked who will bring that information to the Board. E. Arjona responded that somebody is going to have to. K. Tomlinson responded, the EDC staff. Efren added that Board will have to come to the meetings and to discuss that. We took on the responsibility in this room to make those decisions. If we just decide to come once a month and go yeah, yeah, then we don't need to be here. Send me an email, and tell me, hey this is what we are looking at. We have an opportunity to make sure we don't make that mistake that was made earlier. M. Wilkins responded that one of the things they didn't do was to get a marketing study. There was a group response to her that "yes" there was a marketing study. M. Wilkins asked if that guided the design of the previous proposal. J. Holt responded that he cannot speak to that, but he read over it. There are some cautions in it, some stipulations. If you are going to be successful, we recommend doing these things. It was done by the EDC: He is surprised the Board hasn't seen it. M. Wilkins responded that she does not remember seen the marketing studies. E. Paredes responded they were done before EDC existence it could have be done in different administrations. R. Green added, there are at least

three of them that he's aware of. *M. Wilkins added that R. Lord is right, there is a time clock ticking. How do we fast-track getting the right people in the room to include the chamber. They have all kinds of fillers with their membership. How do we get in a room, review what that market study says, look at the existing design that Way-Tech put together, see how it matches, see where economic scales can be gain. Also find out whether or not the stakeholders that are going to use the building agree with the final design concept. Then, we get with our accounting people and say okay, how much money do we have? Is there any way for us to take existing dollars that haven't been allocated? Can we choose to re-allocate them to this Convention Center project, to make it a better vision than just one-story building with meeting rooms?* J. Holt responded that the way you take some of that time back, is to use people familiar with the project. As recommended, stay with the same architect, the same contractor minus Way-Tech. They are familiar with what's underground. All the civil work is done. Try to build something that will fit with the same framework. The EDC is into a year and half into the three-year bond. They are going to extend the three-year bond into a five-year window, but you do have timeclock that is ticking. *E. Paredes asked, if they will keep the momentum instead of stopping.* J. Holt responded, if you get rid of the contractor that's out there, there is a move out cost. If you select another one there is a procurement process. There is a moving in cost. Just trying to look at it, we may not agree how we got here but now we have to work together, to make something great for the city. We are trying to make the best decisions and how the city can support the EDC. There is no doubt that the grounds can be updated. But you are correct, you are going to have so much money to work with. M. Wilkins asked if there are elements of the design that regardless of what gets built, will have to get done? Are most of the basic things completed? So, now we only need to have design decisions. R. Lord responded that there is a design, and it is for an Arena. He thinks that some of those numbers were shared with the Board. S. Benavides added that the only thing that has been permitted for construction were the piers and the foundation. The foundation has not been completed because of the six inches discrepancy that were caught before the poured anything. So that has been on hold. When we met with the architect, that was part of our conversation. It is trying to use what was already structurally on the ground. We thought by using the same design team, which is the structural engineer they had as well, that will save time and money. *M. Wilkins responded, so therefore they can go and pour foundation stay working, spend money that is going to have to be spent anyway, keep the project moving forward while we have different discussions.* S. Benavides responded, the sitework continues to go on right now. The building won't get touched not even the foundation until the Board has approved the design. When you add to a foundation that is going to fail at some point. It is better if they don't continue the foundation until the Board approves the design. *R. Lord added, that is the reason to expedite meeting with some groups, scheduled a couple of meetings and invite people. Council Woman Pat Van Houte added, what she is hearing from the Board is not an objection to a contractor, it is an objection to them starting to design without you and the stakeholders being part of going back as well and say, this is what we are going to need.* M. Wilkins responded, absolutely. *We are going to build something that is going to make money when is built.* Council Woman Pat Van Houte added, you don't mind having this contractor, but you want somebody to take the time to check the stakeholders before they put another design together. The Arena isn't the same, we got back. Well, we know that cost too much. They have to start, and we need to backup to get the right plans. So how do you get these people now, to get the information that is needed to get the right plan before you actually take other physical action. *R. Lord responded that you have to have a contractor in place and a designer. I think there is a way to have the stakeholders meeting. We have a conceptual design that was agreed upon by council and the EDC in the beginning.* Council Woman Pat Van Houte responded, what she recently found out is the design she was shown, would never fit the budget she was shown.

Jessica Ramirez, Communications Director for the Mayor's Office, added the current design would not work with the amount of money you are trying to agree upon. We are all in the same page, based on everyone's comments. At his point what councilwoman Pat Van Houte is saying is absolutely correct. What the EDC has in place right now there is no way it will fit within that budget. So, you as a group have to come together and say okay, let's move forward with this company so we can streamline some of those meetings and see, what can we do, what do we need to do and what is going to be the best for our community within our budget. We are completely supportive of that, we will be transparent, and we will have those meetings with you.

M. Wilkins asked what if a vision is different than the original. J. Ramirez responded, it will have to be. *M. Wilkins continued, so therefore there will be a cost involved with that if it is over and above of what is budgeted.* J. Ramirez responded, not necessarily, the foundation is there. The foundation is already there, if you scrap the original design and what is going to fit there is smaller it will fit within a smaller budget. J. Holt added, the difference is that you are going to be more in control or the design. He asked R. Green if he said is going to take several months? R. Green responded, yes. S. Benavides added, the estimate states three to four months. Council Woman Pat Van Houte added, that if the EDC would have the architect in the meetings now with the stake holders, they will understand things that somebody else listening in the meetings won't understand. J. Moore wanted to add to Marilyn's comment. What the EDC previously approved is \$49.5M. If it goes one nickel over that or one penny, it will have go to the Board for approval. *M. Wilkins responded, she doesn't disagree with that at all. However, her other point is we have design "A" which was the original design and design "B" which is where we are now. What if the stakeholder's input is in the middle and then some? We have to meet the needs of the community and that hasn't been defined to this board in a cohesive way. If we can come out of this room and say, oh my goodness we need \$135M, then let's go find them. That is one thing, that isn't there. If instead of \$50M is \$72M, and over the next fifty years it was worthy for the City of Pasadena. We just don't have the answer to that question.* E. Paredes asked, how do we set the meetings with the stakeholders. J. Holt added, the Chamber of Commerce can help with that, the Convention Center staff, as well, since they know who rents the ground. *E. Paredes added, we can invite people from different industries and business areas. We need to stay within our timeline, as well, and make them aware of that. They are the ones that when the decision is made, they will turn around and say we had no idea what you guys were doing. If we go to the meetings and they show up or not, it was presented. Whoever attended, that is what we rely on.* J. Holt added that this time the dream must fit the budget. *E. Arjona agreed, we had this idea, it was exciting, but it wasn't realistic. I will vote for this, so we keep track, and in the process reach out to the vendors and different event organizers and start getting ideas of what works. This is an opportunity to fix it and do it right, because if we don't vote and we stall, it is going to create a bigger budget down the road.* C. Womack added, the Chamber has been very involved in this project from the onset. She spoke of concerns for this reason, transparency and accountability for what the design-build was. We previously requested these workshops, and as partners with the EDC we want to see this project succeed and within budget. You may remember that in February I was asked to do that, right after the state of the city, to bring all the stakeholders to that meeting. They offered a lot of input to which they were told, thanks, but this is just to say you were included. Those ideas could not be incorporated because it wasn't the design that was on the table. So, it won't be a hard thing to host these workshops and bring the stakeholders to the table. In reference to Marilyn's comments, there isn't a project manager in terms of the Board trying to understand who is going to be the point person and obviously without an EDC Director on staff. Who is going to lead the vision? Is that the EDC Team? Karina has been the manager supporting the project, or R. Lord? She knows there has been a lot of pieces to this. The industry partners, the vendors, all have ideas. You need an architect who is going to take those ideas and put them within the

realm of the design. There are a lot of folks that can weigh in that. We thought they should be part of that process from the beginning. This is where we are right now. We are here to help make it successful. We aren't here to manage the project. We understand this is an EDC lead initiative. We are going to bring stakeholders together, as we had with the strategic plan, and every time we have been asked. It is just a matter of defining who the project lead is, what is the Board's engagement in the project, working cohesively. *R. Lord added that they have a basic idea how we get that on paper. He knows what people want and do not want to envision. We understand the budget aspect. How quickly would be the turnaround time on this?* C. Womack responded, there are feasibility studies, and she was not sure that has been shared with the Board. She had to do public information requests and track some of that information herself. We've seen some of it and haven't shared it widely because it is not our place necessarily. She thinks there are some components that the Board may consider understanding and ask for a presentation from the folks who did those studies. J. Holt added, there are some cautions in the proposal that was being built on whether or not it can be feasible and the success of it. The stakeholders also understand the circumstances and have all said we are ready to come to the table and have these conversations and to help make it successful. C. Womack added, it is not a blank slate. It is not a white board of how we dream. The Board has some parameters the foundation, the steel, the things that are there, and work within, to then build from. She understands that Swart Architects has an idea of an expanded Convention Center space with potential meeting rooms that have an operating AV, which is something all the local stakeholders has asked for. That can give us some options to say, this is what we can do within the budget. To Marilyn's point, if we want to expand, we can look at that, but this isn't a design build they aren't going to design without coming back to the Board. *M. Wilkins said that she would like to see if we could have a workshop. Have the original plan be outlined for what it was going to contain, that's the \$49.5M to the \$135M. What elements were added for different things and do we have any feedback from the stakeholders so far that support any or all of those things. If there are some things that can get checked off the list, other ones that are desirable but aren't in our budget, and then it becomes a conversation.* C. Womack responded that from her understanding, the design was never presented to the stakeholders initially. The design that was shared in February you can't build. From a standpoint of an Arena concept of an entertainment venue concert driven focus, she does not think that is on the table within the \$50M budget. C. Womack asked Karina for clarification on this. K. Tomlinson believes that what M. Wilkins wants to see is how it went from point A to Z and maybe having that conversation prior to having the stakeholder meetings. J. Ramirez added that she does not disagree. She wishes that previously, the Board would have been up to speed and have everything on the table with more transparency. She does not think the Board is going to be able to go back in time and get that information because some of those decisions that were made, were made by a few. The Board was given information, but her understanding is that probably wasn't all the information. It wasn't as transparent as it should be. She does not think the Board can go back and pinpoint where these decisions came from. There are some things that we have been trying to find out, as well and we have not been able to. She thinks that the best thing is to move forward because the old design is not going to fit within the budget. *M. Wilkins added that there was a vision in place that had to do with this major entertainment venue, and someone thought that was financially fit, not necessarily cost prohibited and the cost would justify itself over time.* J. Ramirez responded, those people aren't here to speak to that point anymore. *E. Paredes added, we need to regroup and invite the stakeholders. Get us a new starting point and let's move forward. When we meet with the stakeholders, we will hear about, but we don't want to get down to what we should, we would or whatever. Let's regroup, get a new starting point, let's move forward for the benefit of all. A lot of times we sit here with our backs to you all and your machine is going one-hundred miles an*

hour, and then go, go, and done. This is more about the community. So, we open the doors for the stakeholders. There are rules that we have to obey also. We can't have all the board members attending. Jeff will have to clarify that for us, so we don't get in trouble. But right now, we need to move forward. We heard your feedback. You have done a lot of homework already compared to us. If we come up with a decision, it is going to be from all of us. Even if it cost more or less. The building will exist and there will be people that may not be happy but within those stakeholders that were involved, we take a motion. J. Ramirez responded, speaking to the point of the stakeholders, she thinks there has been miscommunication or misinformation about as to what it is they actually wanted or what came to fruition. She recently attended a meeting with one of the stakeholders and she was under the impression and was told that all this people knew and agreed upon the current design the way it is. They told her no; they were not consulted. E. Paredes responded that's why we are going regroup for a new starting point. S. Benavides added, this contract is going to start with step one of design development, as is there isn't design of the building just yet. The only thing that the EDC is locked into is the foundation and the piers, which they already have been directed to work with. So, we are not redeveloping all of that, which will be a larger expense. The EDC has complete control, since is not a design-build. You will have an approved design with a cost estimate for construction before any construction would start on the building. A. West asked, what is before them today. Are they just voting on the architect? After that, they move to the next step, and the Board is given the word from everyone that they will be kept on the loop. That is basically what we need to do today. K. Tomlinson recommended that one or two of the Board members to be part of this committee that way you are in those direct conversations with any stakeholders. We have a list of stakeholders. We can ask the Convention Center for one as well. To reach out so we can hear from them. We can have you meet with the Strawberry festival the Rodeo, industry partners, Chamber members. She recommends at al least two of them be a part of those conversations on the EDC's funded project, so the Board would know were those details are. E. Paredes asked J. Moore for attendance clarification. J. Moore stated that it can be up to three, four is Quorum. Two or three, the latter is the maximum. R. Lord stated there is a time crunch, and a time frame is needed. This is going to cost us a lot of money. That is the reality of it. S. Benavides suggested, go ahead and have the stakeholder meetings. Have feedback. Look at the originally approved design, because it gives you a starting point. Then, the Board approves moving forward with this architect. But you don't give up the notice to proceed, to start working on the design until you have all the stakeholders' meetings and you are comfortable with giving the architect direction. A. West asked if that goes to City Council for approval. S. Benavides ask if she refers to the design itself. A. West responded, yes. S. Benavides responded, no. R. Lord added, he thinks that it will be good to have the City Council's input on it. But, as far as the stakeholders why would we have a bunch of different meetings. He is not understanding that. S. Benavides responded that it will be a matter of what the Board decides if you want the stakeholder's input in your design as you move forward. She does not know if the Board is going to have all the stakeholders meet with the architect. That may slow down the project and does not know how the Board wants to do that. R. Lord responded, we are not going to have the stakeholder meet with the architect. S. Benavides responded, correct. But how many people the Board wants to have at the stakeholders' meetings that is completely up to you. R. Lord responded, he thinks we ought to have the stakeholder meetings. We are on a pathway, if people don't know by now what they want, I don't know when they will. C. Womack spoke of a recent meeting with all twenty-five stake holders, Convention Center, Rodeo, all of those together. She recommends the architect be present as well, because they are the ones who need to collect that data and present a design. It would be helpful for them to be present in this discussion to understand. It isn't hard to pull all the stakeholders together. She thinks that does not require a lot of study. They are intricately involved in this space. At this time, is a matter

of sharing this information that Karina has to help build trust with the stakeholders as part of this process. Hosting a meeting that shares the reality of where we are, the funding parameters, the ability with the architects to build, and to ask their input on what can make that successful. The stakeholders are willing to come again. They know there is a situation, and we are starting over with the building. She thinks this is an easy step to take. *R. Lord asked K. Tomlinson if a meeting can be put together within two to three weeks.* K. Tomlinson responded, sure. M. Wilkins asked if the original \$49.5M budget makes this \$2M cost design allocation to be exceeded. She is sure that the design-build had design cost, and all kinds of things where this would fit. K. Tomlinson responded, that is going to be funded separately, not from the \$49.5M because is all tied up to the design-build agreement. This available funding in the M025 account. This account is specific to the Convention Center and has to do with facility improvements. *M. Wilkins asked if we are spending money that was originally earmarked for something else.* K. Tomlinson responded, no. It was earmarked for any improvements at the Convention Center property, not just the building but the property. *M. Wilkins asked but anticipated potential needs for cash.* K. Tomlinson responded, yes, associated to that area. M. Wilkins asked R. Lord if he is ready for a motion. He responded, yes.

Marilyn Wilkins made a motion, seconded by Ernesto Paredes that PEDC Resolution 25-017 be passed, approved and adopted. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUS.

Agenda Item Six: Comments by Board Members.

Marilyn Wilkins – She thinks it was helpful from the representative of the communications department to clarify the desires of the stakeholders, primarily communicated today, are in line with the original design. Salvador Serrano, Jr. – He feels the Board is in a situation from which they need to move from, keep going and take our losses for what they are. It is a lesson learned. He also wants to say, at the end of the day this is an EDC project and all of us on the Board need to take responsibility for not asking questions enough and that includes himself as well. Because, at the end of the day, when the media talks about us, it is going to be on us, this board. It is more than coming here monthly. He thinks they need to communicate with the mayor's office, and the EDC's office. So, it is not only on the EDC's staff, but we are also on the Board. He is on other Boards and expects a transparent answer, and they give it to him, but he also goes to ask for those answers. He thinks the stakeholder meetings are a great idea, he thinks Marilyn is 100% correct. We want the Convention Center to be for years to come. I don't want to be like Marie Antionette sixty years from now, that my head gets cut off because I voted for this. Because y'all will be in Brenham or Canyon Lake on retirement and I will be down the street. With that being said let's keep on going.

Angela West – Excited about moving forward and continue to pray for our mayor.

Ealine Domec - She thinks that they have learned from they have been through so far. They can move forward, and everything is going to go a lot smoother.

Ernesto Paredes – He very much said enough, he appreciates everybody being here. We will get it going. We are going to be challenged as we go. We just got a challenge with our mayor unexpectedly but at the same time everybody is pulling in. He was told the police officers, and the ambulance did a good job. He thanked everyone.

Efren Arjona - He thanked everyone for attending and their patience. He told Karina she has a big responsibility right now. So, thank you so much. Lesson learned. We have to move forward and hopefully the mayor gets better soon. Whatever is needed, reach out to him. He is not good at attending galas and these lunches. But if he is needed to do some work, for the city, he is willing to do anything needing to be done.

Rick Lord – He acknowledged J. Holt did CPR. R. Lord thinks he did very well and thanked him. He hopes they can have a line of communication, as well. J. Holt responded they hope to keep the communication

back and forth. R. Lord added, there is a little frustration on the Board. They are being seen like they did something wrong. They aren't happy about that. He shares everybody's opinion. They need to do a more diligent job. He looks forward to that. Anything he needs to do, let him know. J. Holt responded, yes. R. Lord added, we need to be in a time frame with the staff to get that meeting set up. J. Echavarria responded, yes, absolutely. He asked S. Benavides if there is anything else from the contractors to add to the time frame. S. Benavides added, they are finishing up the sitework they were already permitted to do. The area to the west of the building they are going to hold up on work until we have 100% footprint on the building itself. They are going to secure the site. Where they have the piers in, they are going to clean that up. They are going to grade everything so when they are complete with the sitework and between that and the building the site will be a safe area.

Agenda Item Seven: Adjournment

Board President, Rick Lord called for a motion to adjourn the August 7, 2025, meeting at 4:03 pm. Salvador Serrano, Jr. moved, seconded by Ernesto Paredes. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUS.