



MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 13, 2026

TO: Mayor and City Council

FROM: Brenda Harvey-Williams, Assistant City Manager

SUBJECT: 710 Vision Plan Clarifying Questions and Responses

On March 30, 2026, staff, consultants and members of the Reconnecting Communities 710 Advisory Group presented the draft *Reconnecting Communities 710 Vision Plan* to the City Council. Attached are responses to questions that Councilmembers and others have subsequently submitted to staff related to the *Plan*. Staff will present this information, as well as respond to further questions at the April 13 Council meeting.

710 Vision Plan

Clarifying Questions

The Relinquishment

1. *Part of the agreement for relinquishment was that the property retains and promotes a transportation purpose.*

- ◇ *Does that essentially mean that it takes regional traffic?*
 - **Not in the same sense as the 20th Century freeway plan intended. We have the ability to regulate access, speeds, and, to some degree, mode choice, in how we design the overall mobility system. Some regional trips are appropriate, such as those accessing Huntington Hospital and some of our other world-class medical facilities to the southeast of the Stub.**

- ◇ *What criteria will Caltrans apply in determining whether to sign off on Pasadena plan?*
 - **Caltrans and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) have already “signed off” on the relinquishment. Any future finding for “transportation purpose” will be benchmarked to a 21st Century context, which is about moving people – via walking, biking, transit, auto, etc.**

- ◇ *How will that be measured?*
 - **Any future finding for “transportation purpose” will be benchmarked to a 21st Century context, which is about moving people – via walking, transit, auto, etc.**

The Vision Plan

General Overview

2. *Is the Vision Plan the overall entitlement framework for the 710 Stub?*

- ◇ **The Vision Plan provided the City with the opportunity to gain a detailed understanding of a variety of elements that will comprise not only entitlement, but ownership of 50 acres of land as an asset that was a freeway and now can reconnect neighborhoods, embody equity, provide housing and employment opportunities, be a crucible for sustainability and resilience, and economic return.**

Parking

3. *The vision plan states it is assumed that up to 1 million square feet of underground parking garages.*
 - ◇ *How many spaces do 1 million square feet equal?*
 - **A total of up to 2,800 spaces (350 sf/space). It is most likely that this number will be adjusted by phase as added multi-modal transportation options are brought forward through the City's entitlement process.**
 - ◇ *What are the expectations of parking needs?*
 - **See above. The total amount of parking will likely adjust downward as additional mobility options are realized and as each phase of future development is brought forward. The specific needs and amounts, per phase, will be developed as part of the City process.**

Street Grid Concepts

4. *How important is it to add new east-west streets?*
 - ◇ **As this effort and opportunity is focused on “Reconnecting Pasadena”, both adding back east-west access (perhaps streets, but potentially non-auto access connections are possible as well) AND modifying remaining wide bridges for multi-modal and safe access is critical. These east-west corridors help to maximize connectivity east-to-west, connecting people to key destinations and activities.**

Mobility and Access

5. *What do you think will happen to the current through traffic?*
 - ◇ **By designing complete streets with a focus on both multi-modal access and safety, overall speeds and perceived efficiency of this route as an effective “through route” will be diminished and seek alternative routes in higher capacity/speed corridors (i.e., SR-2, I-5, I-605, etc.).**
6. *The Vision plan relies on a 30 – 35% trip reduction, so what is the contingency if those reductions are not true?*
 - ◇ **The Vision plan assessed overall trip generation from potential development within the 710 Stub and reasonably assigned a goal of 30 – 35% trip reduction due to a variety of factors (co-location of housing and employment; complete street designs; etc.). As the City engages in more detailed analysis as part of the entitlement effort, total trips (project trips and background trips) will be evaluated, and the trip reduction goal(s) can be linked to the phases of development to as to enhance the ability to achieve the reduction goal.**

Options

7. *What are the benefits of the “Boulevards and Paseos” option?*

- ◇ **The *Boulevards & Paseos* option has a number of benefits, including but not limited to:**
 - **Maximizes connectivity north-south, and east-west, for pedestrians and vehicles;**
 - **Allows traffic to be diffused/reduced by having three complete street north-south options (St. John, New Blvd, Pasadena Avenue); and**
 - **Creates a more walkable environment – narrower streets – enhancing safety and vehicle trip reduction.**

The City Process

8. *Given that engineering studies were not deemed appropriate at the Vision Plan level, what is the plan, timeline, and costs of conducting them going forward?*

- ◇ **It was determined that, as a high-level overview of both development potential and other policy and operational aspects inherent in ownership of this property, the more detailed initial engineering work would be performed commensurate with the entitlement process. As this will be a multi-year effort, staff will begin immediately with identifying the engineering scope for entitlements, upon authorization by the Council to proceed with the planning process.**
- ◇ **As engineering will be a multi-year and ongoing process throughout the development of the 710 Stub, staff also intends to develop an overall estimated scope, by phase, and estimate cost in order to pursue funding from multiple sources.**

9. *What are your thoughts on phasing?*

- ◇ *Did you give it any thought that we could potentially have acres of dirt sitting for years while we work on phase 1?*
 - **All projects unfold over time. It would be important to identify early phases that are least impactful, can be supported by current infrastructure and complement existing neighborhoods (e.g., the westside of Pasadena Avenue; creating a linear park as a buffer along St. John; etc.)**
 - **Individual phases should also be designed to feel complete and not have repeated construction elements interrupting the new environments/”special places” created.**

10. *What is the timeline and gameplan for modifying the existing freeway-to-freeway interchange to begin to modify regional through trips and determine their future path with a modified connection to the freeways from the 710 Stub?*

- ◇ **Due to our strong partnership with Caltrans and the California Transportation Agency, which oversees Caltrans, our local District 7 partners have already submitted a budget request for state funding to begin this very work now (FY 26-27). This is a critical piece in the transition of freeway-to-freeway to local-to-freeway/freeway-to-local access, with the likely outcome being both modification of existing connections (to ensure**

not pushing Pasadena-destined trips to other routes that could become more impacted) and some connection elimination. Staff will continue to update the Council on the status of this budget request and commencement of this important work.

11. *Has the staff studied what is a wide range of models for governance, including the structures from base closure authorities and other similar major land use conversion and development projects?*

- ◇ Yes. Staff is compiling a series of relevant models for governance, including base closure examples (e.g., The Presidio in San Francisco), and successful and effective models from other similarly sized land use conversion and development projects (e.g., Denver Union Station; Battery Park City; Seattle Waterfront). We also anticipate that the Urban Land Institute Technical Advisory Panel report (see below) will further address some of these models and examples based upon whom the group interviewed in their two day process.

Economics

12. *When will we see the total infrastructure cost including water, sewer, power, etc.?*

- ◇ Once a specific plan is developed and detailed, overall cost analysis can begin in parallel and track with the various phases of development.

13. *Have we looked at and confirmed off-site upgrades needs?*

- ◇ Once a specific plan is selected and detailed, overall cost analysis can begin in parallel for any off-site upgrades and track with each phase of development.

14. *What funding sources are available to the city to pay for infrastructure?*

- ◇ A multiplicity of public and private funding sources will be evaluated and needed to fund the basic horizontal development of the site (i.e., infrastructure, public facilities). The City has already contracted with Kosmont Associates, who have been working to develop an Enhanced Infrastructure Finance District (EIFD), and will be evaluating and recommending other initial and long-term funding options and opportunities for the City in the coming months. Their initial work has been presented to the City Council's ED Tech committee.









Urban Land Institute Technical Advisory Panel (ULI TAP)

15. *When will we see the recommendations and ideas generated from the ULI TAP that took place several weeks ago?*

- ◇ The ULI TAP was an extremely valuable process, bringing together public and private practitioners who have extensive experience in a variety of disciplines that are relevant to what the City needs to consider for the 710 Stub (e.g., organization/governance; implementation; etc.). ULI Los Angeles, who organized and oversaw this process, have informed staff that they will deliver the final report to the City on April 20, 2026.

Other Questions

16. How many housing units were within the relinquishment area in 1950, 1960 and 1970?

Building Counts in the 710 Relinquishment Area		
Building Type		Count
	Residential	
	Buildings	56
	Units	64
	Commercial	18
	Institutional	6
	Industrial	14
	Total Buildings (Known)	94
	Total Buildings (incl. vacant/unknown)	107

17. Have we identified any families who were directly impacted by the acquisition of the relinquishment area (not any other location outside of the relinquishment area) and are there school records from the neighborhood elementary school to determine how many people resided in the relinquishment area?

- ◇ **Research conducted by historical consultants Allegra Consulting and located families directly impacted by the acquisition of the relinquishment area. Several of these families stories are included in the *Amplify* documentary and written report. Historical consultant Architectural Resources Group tried to locate school records from Garfield Elementary but were told by PUSD that those records no longer exist.**