Introduction

• The Ground Access Study which the Authority has been conducting is nearing completion.

• Study has identified two high priority projects where immediate opportunities exist:
  – North Hollywood to Pasadena connectivity
  – Metrolink Schedule Improvements
There were 3 Fundamental Objectives for the Study:

- Improve transit services along Antelope Valley Line Corridor to Santa Clarita & Palmdale
- Reduce traffic impacts on Hollywood Way
- Promote east/west connectivity
Study “Framework”

• The Authority’s objective was to:
  – *Serve as “catalyst” for ground access improvements*
  – *Direct certain grant funding toward tangible improvements*
Successes

• As a catalyst, even before completion, the Study has enjoyed unique success:
  – planned new Metrolink Station
  – add’l bus routes now serve RITC
  – future pedestrian bridge connection to Empire Station

• In terms of funding tangible improvements:
  – Authority Resolutions 448 & 457 reallocated nearly $2.6M of STURAA Grant funding to Metro toward construction of new station and Transit Center
Closing Opportunity

- The main body of the Study is near complete and is well under budget
- Focus on the two high priority projects
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• The main body of the Study is near complete and is well under budget

• Focus on the two high priority projects
  – Working with Metro & Metrolink regarding Metrolink Schedule improvements; i.e. increase frequency
Closing Opportunity

• The main body of the Study is near complete and is well under budget

• Focus on the two high priority projects
  – Working with Metro & Metrolink regarding Metrolink Schedule improvements; i.e. increase frequency
  – Working with Metro & City of Burbank regarding establishment of East/West bus connectivity linking Gold Line Station in Pasadena to Red Line Station in North Hollywood
TERMINAL BUILDING RELOCATION UPDATE
earthquake because it does not meet seismic standards. Additionally, the runway is too close to parts of the terminal. Parts of the building are as close as 250 feet from the center of the runway, well below the federal design safety standard of 750 feet.
An upgrade for Burbank Airport

Plans call for a much larger terminal while keeping the same number of gates.

RONG-GONG LIN II

Officials generally agree that the Burbank Bob Hope Airport passenger terminal is cramped, outdated and obsolete. Opened 63 years ago, the terminal is so close to the runway that it does not meet federal design safety standards. The terminal also doesn’t meet seismic standards and could be so heavily damaged in a major earthquake that it could go out of service.

Airport officials have long sought a new terminal since aerospace giant Lockheed Corp. sold it in 1978. But the effort has been stalled for various reasons over the years. Most recently, a renewed flight between the Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport Authority and the Burbank City Council has halted progress on designing a new terminal.

Both sides have come a long way to agree on major issues. But they still disagree over how much more influence Burbank’s representatives should have on

BURBANK AIRPORT was built in the 1930s and the terminal is too close to the runway for modern U.S. safety standards.

A new terminal at Burbank Bob Hope Airport

Airport officials have dreamed of a modern passenger terminal since Lockheed Corp. sold the facility in 1978. A dispute between the Burbank City Council and the Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport Authority has stalled plans, but the two sides have agreed on many issues. Here’s what a new terminal could look like.

What has happened since then?

Both sides have since agreed that a replacement terminal should be kept to

14 gates.
What would a new airport look like?

As currently envisioned, the new airport building would be north of the current terminal, partly on vacant land and partly on a long-term parking lot, Economy Lot A. The new terminal would be bigger — an increase of about 69% — but would keep the same number of gates, 14, and the same number of parking spaces, 6,631. Parking structures would be built close to the new terminal and the old terminal would be demolished.
Other questions raised and answered in Times’ article are:

1. Why does it need to be bigger?
2. Will it still be possible to board from front and rear?
3. Has runway proximity been a problem before?
4. What is the status of the airport design?
5. Haven’t Airport & City been feuding for a long time?
What has happened since then?

Both sides have since agreed that a replacement terminal should be kept to 14 gates.

But here’s the crux of the argument: Burbank wants to essentially have veto power of major decisions to which it is strongly opposed. The authority is governed by a commission of nine people, with three representatives each from Burbank, Glendale and Pasadena, so Glendale and Pasadena representatives can easily outvote Burbank representatives.
What has happened since then?

Burbank wants a different voting structure for certain hot-button issues, such as increasing the number of gates. Burbank wants to change the rules so that two of the three representatives from each city need to approve such major changes. The city calls it “consensus voting.”
What has happened since then?

The airport authority’s president and vice president, Pasadena Councilman Steve Madison and former Glendale Councilman Frank Quintero, proposed a deal: They would support Burbank’s veto power if Burbank agrees to the new airport terminal at the proposed site and the terminal is actually built there. The deal would need approval from Burbank voters.
What was Burbank’s response?

Burbank says that it wants the supermajority rules in place even if the new terminal ends up being built elsewhere. For the Burbank City Council, “that’s important because we see those as long-term protections for the citizens of this city,” City Atty. Amy Albano said. “An expansion of gates, or things that could change noise rules ... all of that goes to the well-being of our citizens.”
Where else could the terminal be built? One alternative could be to build it on the southwest corner of the airport, along Empire Avenue. But it’s not as favorable a location because it’s small, it’s already used by corporate, FedEx and UPS jets and it would be farther from a possible site of a California High-Speed Rail station. Because the land is already owned by the airport and not recently acquired, it may be possible for the airport authority to build on the southwest corner without needing Burbank’s support.