BURBANK UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Measure ABC SCHOOL FACILITIES OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting Held on
March 4, 2026

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting of the Measure ABC Bond School Facilities Oversight Committee was called to order by Vice Chairperson Diana Abasta at 5:07 p.m. Committee Members present: Diana Abasta, Matt Benson, Ari Altman, Preston Joseph, Diana Simon and Jason Clark.

Kirsten Morris was absent.

Alternate Members present: Julie Grair and Victor Taraceha

Also present: Board Member Kelsey Olsen, Interim Assistant Superintendent of Business Services Dr. Jason Hasty, Sr. Administrative Assistant to Director of Facilities Crystal Cozakos, Project Manager Robin Rickman, Project Manager Malihe Shokouhi, Director of Elementary Education Dr. Rebecca Harris, and Assistant Superintendent of Educational Services Peter Knapik.

Vice Chairperson Ms. Abasta invited Preston Joseph to lead in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF February 4, 2026 – It was moved by Jason Clark and seconded by Preston Joseph that the minutes of February 4, 2026 be approved, as amended to edit phrase “72-hour notice” on second page and to note Victor Taraceha arriving at 6:15 PM. Motion carried 6-0 with no abstentions.

3. REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE COMMITTEE –

Jeff Vanderborght, community member, expressed his concerns regarding the previous board approval of the Measure ABC Financial and Performance Audit that did not include the corrections this committee requested due to timing error, per Mr. Hasty. Mr. Vanderborght mentioned he was told that the audit language would be corrected and returned to the board in the consent agenda at the next meeting. Also noted, that bond audits are not either filed or submitted with the state and questioned what the purpose of the audit is if it doesn’t get recorded or filed. Corrected performance audit to be taken to the board tomorrow night, March 5, 2026. Mr. Vanderborght reviewed the language that was revised and noted the code section focuses on the number of members and the makeup of the committee and not the appointment or 60-day time limit. While the District has acknowledged its failure to appoint the committee as required by law in a timely matter, the audit seems to imply the appointment was made in accordance with state laws and specifically an education code; Mr. Vanderborght expresses the concern of accuracy. He also noted the audit did not identify any personnel expenses for Measure ABC projects despite staff working on projects and questioned who paid for their salaries. Lastly, Mr. Vanderborght inquired if the items going to the March 5 board meeting are all for Measure ABC or Measure S as there is still $1.7 million available from Measure S that needs to be spent.

Committee provided comments to speaker. Ms. Abasta noted the SFOC is a very active probing committee; language is important and needs to be accurate. With the information Mr. Vanderborght presented, the public can review report and refer to the specific page being referenced. Also suggested was to review the interim report for fund 21 that lists object codes that explain in terms what each item line is, such as project managers.

4. DISCUSSION OF SFOC MEETING CALENDAR/TIMES – Ms. Cozakos briefed over the poll that was sent out to committee members to keep the meeting time at 5:00 PM or move the meetings to 5:30 or 6:00 PM to make sure it works with everybody's schedule and to ensure quorum is met. The majority said anytime or 5:30 PM. It was moved by Jason Clark and seconded by Ari Altman to move the meetings to 5:30 PM. Motion carried 6-0 with no abstentions.

5. FORMATION OF BYLAWS REVIEW COMMITTEE – Ms. Cozakos reviewed the discussion of frequency of the calendaring; as of right now, meetings are scheduled monthly through June. Typically, these types of committees only have to meet quarterly. Ms. Cozakos explained with Measure S committee met three times: in November to report on a summer update, January to present the bond audit, and then in May to present the annual report; will

need to meet quorum for these meetings. Bylaws state meetings are to be monthly; Ms. Morris suggested a sub committee to review bylaws in previous meeting.

Kirsten Morris arrived at 5:20 AM

Mr. Hasty reviewed that by law, there's a statute requirement for the committee to meet once per year; the bylaws, as it currently stands, state meetings are monthly. Bylaws would need to be amended with a motion; best practice is quarterly. Ms. Abasta expressed wanting to make sure documentation that goes to the Board of Education, who meets twice a month, is also communicated to the public. Discussion of forming a bylaw review committee followed; to consist of 3 people willing to serve and meet once or twice to briefly discuss recommendations to change the bylaws; sub-committee would submit note minutes to main committee; committee would make motion of recommendations and then decide as a whole to revise the bylaws to meet quarterly. Sub-Committee volunteer discussion followed. It was moved by Preston Joseph and seconded by Jason Clark to create a committee to review bylaws with the following members: Kirsten Morris, Jason Clark, and Preston Joseph. Motion carried 7-0 with no abstentions.

6. SFOC UPDATE POWERPOINT PRESENTATION – FACILITIES UPDATE – Ms. Rickman reviewed the Facilities presentation with project status updates highlighted in purple to illustrate movement on those particular projects. Roofing projects are slated to go for board approval at the March 5 meeting to award the contractor and the purchase of the materials by the owner. The girls' softball field for Burbank High School is anticipated to start in April; John Burroughs High school has started with design meeting scheduled in upcoming weeks. A proposal from the engineers for the Dead and Hard of Hearing Project has been requested; will take to the board once reviewed; can't be started until tech infrastructure is completed.

Engineers proposal for a full site assessment of all 22 campuses will determine the conditions of all HVACs, chillers, heat pumps and so forth on the campuses and will go to the board for approval on March 5; will be about 20 days of walks with engineers and facility staff to start in March. Questions regarding the two (2) separate units purchased from Sigler for Burbank High School Library and Room 1210 followed. Ms. Rickman explained the two air conditioning units at Burbank High School were in need of repair for quite a while; will be funded by the bond program as part of the overall upgrade; will be ordered and delivered to the site, then facility staff will install units; will be tracked in the assessment to not be replaced again; full assessment report from the engineer will be received in July or August that will breakdown unit description and costs; all criteria is in purchase order/quote that will be attached to board item being presented at the March 5 meeting; like for like unit replacements. Mr. Taraceha requested board reports be provided to committee for review; District staff will try but not all things will be presented in a timely manner in order to keep projects moving; the committee is to look at expenditures to determine the District is making allowable expenditures, not an approval process, but District is providing additional information to keep the committee informed.

Five (5) schools don't have secure entrances; choosing architects from list of approved architects and to design the secure entries; proposal for Edison will go for board approval March 5; rest of schools are still in process and will tentatively go to the board next meeting; Emerson, Bret Harte, Roosevelt, and Washington will be in process between 2026 and 2028. Ms. Shokouhi explained upon entering these schools, the entrance leads to a hallway rather than a secure office so that anyone can go in and walk around which presents several unsafe scenarios; also ties in ADA as some schools, like Jefferson, have steps going to front but not a ramp; Edison has been started first with architect, while the other schools are still in process with DSA which could take 18 months-2 years; work to be done during summer but if possible, can be done during school year as well; each site has different needs, scope is not the same but the main idea is for them to have secure entrances which includes an accessible path to the entrance; principals are involved in design meetings; any current repairs would not come from bond funds, only permanent fixes. Committee would like to be invited to design meeting to listen in; architects need to present to committee and board if requested.

Jefferson ADA is still in the survey process which will be completed March 14; design can be presented to committee afterwards. All eleven (11) elementary schools have playgrounds for ages 5-12 but with TK coming in, the play equipment is not safe and is too advanced for little kids, 4 years old. Representative of Little Tikes has surveyed the equipment at these sites to put together a report that will determine which parts need to be changed in order to make the playground safe for four years old; will also look at the older kid's play equipment to update to be compliant with current equipment safety codes; report will include analysis of each site's equipment to determine what is essential or potential to change. Ms. Simons questioned if ADA was taken into consideration when designing playgrounds and mentioned swings are beneficial for overall child development, proprioceptive senses, specifically with kids with autism or sensory developmental issues; no other site, aside from Emerson, has a swing; conversations during walkthroughs have considered ADA such as the oddly set

curbs that create a tripping hazard; at this point, new equipment like swings are not being added to most sites unless determined it should be required; special play equipment can be discussed; site level admin are included in walkthroughs and are providing feedback on needs; discussion on adaptable equipment followed; while the equipment is accessible, the District does not have specific wheelchair bound equipment; can be an option if space permits. Ms. Simon expressed the importance of accessibility on the playgrounds for the children to not only have fun but also for socialization skills. Ms. Morris questioned if the surveys for the playgrounds also include the pavement and turf; Ms. Shokouhi confirmed that is included and will be pour in place surfacing; path of travel will also be considered as well in order to pass DSA requirements; PTA parents are included in conversations about design with admin and site staff.

The Adult School Landscape Improvement Project is currently programming, with design being started at the end of March; contractor was awarded in February. Burbank High School is the main focus for site work at this time; the first project is the concession stand as the site currently does not have one in their sports area; working with architect to submit proposal; concession stand will be near the football area, accessible by the baseball team and others that the athletic department deems necessary in the sports area. Also, being discussed is the storage building for the pool project that currently has no place to store equipment; new equipment for the pool project is being bought and needs a place to be stored; this project was bid back in 2024, but was not awarded as the District didn't have money to fund; project has been DSA approved but is still in discussion as a potential project. Concession stand will be ADA accessible to be approved by DSA. Security Cameras, Access Control, and Fire Alarm Upgrade are in programming status and haven't moved forward yet and won't be starting until the wintertime after IT finishes the infrastructure as it will need the Wi-Fi network. Most Fire Alarms are up to date using Silent Night Fahrenheit which is the standard for the District, only a few are not but are still in good condition; will work with engineer for proposal to convert the last ones. Mr. Taraceha suggested the possibility of working with a contractor to do design work instead of engineers and then going out to bid; is an option but all projects will still have to go through DSA. While previous fire alarm work was covered through Measure S, it was clarified that Measure ABC projects will not be mixed in with Measure S.

Mr. Hasty reviewed the draft Request for Proposal (RFP) for a Program Management Service; professional services does not have to be formal bid; would have regular newsletters, content for the website, Gantt charts, and overall coordination of the programming, as well as working with KeyAnalytics on the accounting. Program Managers will bring a skill set to coordinate projects and bundle cohesively while aligning priorities; having a third party to be held accountable and has specific expertise that relates directly with the bond is better practice. This draft is not going to the board yet; will amend as needed based on feedback; invite only RFP where 3-5 firms would be requested to submit proposals for a bond program manager with the scope; 10 days to respond; staff will score proposals and interview; would then bring selected firm to board to award the contract; SFOC committee members can be part of the evaluation portion; referrals would be based on experience with selected firms but pool can be opened up to more firms for fair and accurate price. This will be a significant cost; in-house staff like clerical and project manager would not need hourly rates which will reduce rates. A request for the selected firm to do a presentation for the SFOC committee can be added to the RFP. Typical contract for a program management is a 3-5-year contract; the selected firm would be doing the subcontracting, coordination, job walks, presenting at the meetings, monthly board presentations and newsletters; estimated about 20% for soft costs, rates will be negotiated; Measure S had similar contract with a one-person management with in-house staff members; will include language of expectations including what services the District will be providing. Committee is on board with hiring team to assist the current project managers but recommends District to be cautious of the price. Ms. Cozakos provided background information on Measure S. Program Management started in 2013 and stayed until 2018 for the majority of the duration of Measure S but was eliminated due to high cost as bond was dwindling; most supporting staff was in-house which included a clerical staff member and an account analyst; Program manager had a separate accounting company like KeyAnalytics; Director of Facilities assisted as a project manager and took over after contractor separated. No motion for committee as it is informational; next step is to review list to invite for RFP submittal; will involve committee in scoring or having entities present to committee; will include language regarding deliverables and closed-out documents as well as Facilities Master Plan and tailor proposals to specific priorities.

Ms. Abasta questioned the recent rains and if there were any leaks from the new roofs; Ms. Rickman explained the contractors are under warranty for five years for labor; Facilities department is to call the inspector to look at any roof leaks that have shown up in the last couple of months; most recent leaks have been considered stucco related and not roof related.

7. REVIEW OF BUDGET STATUS – Dr. Hasty introduced Tarana Alam from KeyAnalytics; briefed on future expenditures for legal fees from attorney at AALRR who is vetting contracts; invoices for general fund will be charged separately from bond work. Ms. Alam reviewed the procedure of KeyAnalytics which works directly with

the District's financial records and transfers the data into a proprietary software to analyze the data; date reflected on the report is the date that the software is reconciled with the District's financials; report will include broad summary of the program as a whole; full amount of bond is not available all at once and is issued in increments in order to remain below the $60 per 100,000 pledge that the District made to the community. First series was issues in May 2025; each series is issued 2-3 years from the previous one; typically, about 10-12 years to issue entire amount depending on the District's assessed value and how quickly funds are needed for projects; funds are deposited in Los Angeles County Treasurer and earns interest that is also added to the bond fund. Ms. Alam highlighted the expenditures of Fund 21.3 for Measure ABC Bond; encumbrances reflect the contractual financial obligations recorded from purchase orders; expenditures reflect the balance that has been paid so far; future reports will not see repeat expenditure details but will have cumulative history for each site. Committee reiterated the cautiousness for soft costs vs hard costs like newspaper advertising, consultant costs, bidding software; budget report will be presented quarterly.

Measure S balance was briefly reviewed; Measure S is coded by 21.3 and Measure ABC is 21.0; Ms. Cozakos stated the $1.7 million left from Measure S is already encumbered and is to be expended by the end of this year; won't be split funding any projects bonds as Measure S fund has been accounted for and is wrapping up expenditures.

Annual Report will be presented at June meeting; KeyAnalytics will provide financials; Ms. Cozakos will provide template for annual report newsletter that is separated by 3 parts: Chairperson statement, facilities update, and financials of expenditures and encumbrances.

8. COMMITTEE COMMENTS – Mr. Benson highlighted the comments from Mr. Vanderborght regarding staff working on projects that were allocated within that budget and the remaining $1.7 million to Measure S is still allocated to be used. Committee members showed appreciation for staff and information being provided.

9. ALTERNATE COMMENTS – Echoed previous committee comments with appreciation and thanks to the staff.

10. NEXT MEETING – The next meeting will be held Monday, April 13, 2026, 5:30 p.m. in the Board Room of the District Administration Office.

    Next agenda will include the presentation of the report with bylaws, changes, recommendations as well as scheduling an April site visit.

11. ADJOURNMENT – Ms. Abasta adjourned the meeting at 6:59 p.m.