

CHAPTER 7

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

While the Station Area Plan provides a comprehensive development framework as well as policies to carry out the vision and the framework, effective implementation may require a range of measures. These can include amendments to general plans of both cities to incorporate policies of the Area Plan, zoning and other implementation tools to help attain specific urban design concepts.

This chapter provides an overall implementation strategy for the Station Area Plan that includes potential regulatory changes, as well as an evaluation of tools and strategies available for funding new facilities.

MAJOR PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS

Substantial public improvements—streets, bike-ways, parks, pedestrian amenities, and landscaping, for example—are necessary to transform the Station Planning Area into a vibrant community. These require close coordination among governmental entities in the affected jurisdictions to ensure project feasibility and attainment of consistent standards and quality in the built environment.

Public improvements necessary for the full realization of the Station Area Plan and a vibrant community should include the following major elements:

- Regional transit infrastructure (Santa Clara Station) implemented by VTA, Caltrain, and BART (includes BART parking);

- APM system connecting the SJIA with the Station and VTA’s Metro/Airport light rail system;
- New surface streets;
- Widened sidewalks and streetscape improvements to link the Station with downtown Santa Clara and Santa Clara University;
- A potential new underpass linking Coleman Avenue and El Camino Real;
- Consideration of streetscape improvements, including utility undergrounding, landscaping, and wayfinding/signage along:
 - Brokaw Road and Benton Street,
 - Coleman Avenue,
 - Campbell Avenue/El Camino Real intersection, and
 - El Camino Real/State Route 82 (coordinated with Caltrans);
- Pedestrian bridges and overpasses; such as:
 - BART Station pedestrian overcrossing from Railroad Avenue to BART plaza off of Brokaw Road;
 - Caltrain inter-platform pedestrian underpass from western platform to central platform;
 - Potential extension of Caltrain underpass to eastern side of the rail corridor and BART plaza;
 - Newhall Street pedestrian bridge across the rail corridor to the south; and
 - Open spaces and landscape buffer/bike-way connections along the west side of tracks.

POTENTIAL IMPLEMENTING STRATEGIES

One effective vehicle for implementation of some of the infrastructure components of the Station Area Plan could be a Joint Powers Authority (JPA), authorized under Section 6500 of the State Government Code. Facilitating coordination between cities, the JPA could have oversight for construction and on-going maintenance of public facilities.

A JPA must be authorized by the governing bodies of the participating entities, which would define their discretion and powers. The law provides considerable flexibility in how JPAs operate; it may exercise any authority common to the contracting parties.

A JPA could cover physical improvements, or focus on certain critical interagency components—such as the open space areas and the east-west underpass.

Another possible method of implementation is a Memorandum of Understanding between the two cities to align and implement common objectives, with each entity controlling entitlements in its own jurisdiction. This may be a more flexible approach given the potential complexity of future development proposals in the two jurisdictions.

Policy-makers should also be aware of the potential use of financing options associated with the adoption of an Infrastructure Finance District (IFD). Developer fees are another potential source of revenue, as development sites in the Station Plan Area will be major beneficiaries of proximity to publicly-financed transportation infrastructure. Existing fee structures could be reevaluated within this overall context and fees specific to certain Planning Area-wide improvements could be adopted by each city.

7.1 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENTS

The Station Area Plan may need to be reflected in the General Plan of each city in order to be fully implemented. This incorporation might be through reference or direct changes where appropriate, to a General Plan itself through revisions such as:

- The Land Use diagrams in each of the two general plans.
- The land use classifications, densities/intensities, and land use policies in the Land Use elements.
- The roadway and bikeway standards in the Transportation elements.

General Plans amendments could also help integrate the Station Planning Area into each city with policies for surrounding areas.

SAN JOSÉ GENERAL PLAN

The City of San José should consider amendments to its General Plan to further implement the Station Area Plan. Specifically, the City should consider the following:

- Modifications to the Land Use Transportation Diagram to reflect the land uses and transportation improvements shown on Figure 2-8: Land Use Structure, Figure 3-2: Internal Street Network, and Figure 4-5: Street Typologies; and
- Modification of the General Plan text as necessary for Figure 4-4: Building Heights.

On an interim basis, the City could establish a development policy to encourage implementation of the Station Area Plan in the context of any interim development proposals.

SANTA CLARA GENERAL PLAN

Santa Clara should consider amendments to its General Plan in the context of the comprehensive update over the next two years. Like San José, on an interim basis, the City could establish a development policy to encourage implementation of the Station Area Plan in the context of any interim development proposals.

Additionally, the General Plan Housing Element, which needs to be updated by mid 2009 in accordance with State laws, should reflect the new housing units planned for the Station Area Plan. These new units would comprise a significant portion of the ABAG Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) for 2007-2014.

7.2 ZONING AMENDMENTS

Consistent with any General Plan amendments, both San José and Santa Clara should also revise the zoning regulations to implement the Plan provisions. This may include changes to use regulations and development, as well as design standard and review procedures. Other strategies to accomplish the Station Area Plan objectives are also available for the two cities.

Until such time as General Plan and/or zoning changes are approved by the responsible jurisdictions, existing regulations would take precedence over the Station Area Plan. Adoption of the Station Area Plan would not constitute a General Plan or Zoning Code amendment. Those actions require distinct subsequent approvals by the legislative bodies for each city.

SAN JOSÉ

A vast majority of land in the San José portion of the Planning Area has a Planned Development (PD) zone designation. According to the Zoning Ordinance, PD districts are "...combined with an alternatives base zoning district or districts," and PD Districts "... shall be individually designed to meet the needs of the territory so zoned."

With the exception of the BART maintenance facility, all land east of the rail corridor has an A(PD) [Agriculture (Planned Development)] designation and is included in the FMC Planned Development (PD) District. The sites west of the rail corridor have either A(PD) designation, with

the planned developments allowing residential uses of densities ranging from 13.6 to 25.6 hu/ac depending on the zone, or Light or Heavy Industrial designations.

FMC PD District

Zoning implementation for San José may include the following:

- Rezoning the heavy and light industrial sites to the west of the rail corridor as either mixed use, or PD if master plans for some sites are prepared (a majority of sites with industrial designations have current active residential development projects).
- Ensuring that the PD zoning for new development incorporates policies outlined in the Station Area Plan, including transitions in scale and heights adjacent to existing neighborhoods and the provision of open space.
- Reviewing and amending PD regulations for the FMC PD District east of the rail corridor for consistency with the Station Area Plan, including streets, land use, urban design, and development intensities.

The Station Area Plan incorporates the current FMC PD objectives and entitlements into the mixed-use designation for the FMC site area as well as the PD urban design guidelines. Adopted in 2003 by the City of San José, the FMC PD District allows "the development of up to three (3) million square feet of office/R&D development." In addition, an undetermined amount of hotel, retail, and commercial uses may be constructed, but in no case would total development of the site

exceed the traffic performance criteria that are equivalent to the traffic that would result from three (3) million square feet of office/R&D development. New development could also include parking, landscaping, public streets, internal private streets, and necessary new infrastructure.”¹

SANTA CLARA

The City of Santa Clara is undertaking a comprehensive update of its zoning regulations in conjunction with its General Plan Update. The zoning strategy for the City may include the following components:

- A reference to the Station Area Plan District to create the urban environment called for in the Plan. For purposes of design review, the Station Area Plan design guidelines could be used.
- Subdistricts. Subdistricts within this overlay district could correspond to the Station Area Plan land use classifications.
- Land Use Regulations. This could show permitted and conditionally permitted uses within each subdistrict, as well as use development standards (such as driveways and curb-cuts).
- Development and Design Regulations and Standards. This could include standards for building scale, building form, setbacks, pedestrian orientation, vehicle parking and accommodation, as well as other standards (i.e., lot coverage, height, etc.).
- Overlay Districts. Certain regulations could in-

clude provisions that vary by location within the Station Planning Area, and be regulated through overlay districts. Potential maps could include a land use overlay showing the subdistricts, building floor area ratios, setback/street-wall overlays, building heights, differentiated parking requirements (if any), street typology, etc.

The City could, instead, choose to apply a Planned Development—Master Community zoning district (PD-MC) designation to all or a portion of the Planning Area and require subsequent development proposals to conform to the master plan.

¹ Language from FMC Coleman PD Rezoning Draft EIR, April 2003, City of San José.

7.3 PHASING STRATEGY

The major timing parameters for the Station Area Plan are: the construction of the BART maintenance facility, which is to start in 2009; the BART Station, which is projected to be on-line in 2016; and the APM, which is anticipated to be funded in 2018. Cost factors suggest that the east-west underpass connecting Coleman Avenue to El Camino Real will need to be constructed at an early date, ahead of the BART maintenance facility. Preliminary estimates of the costs of these improvements have not been established at this time. To fund these improvements, a combination of public and private funding sources, mechanisms and/or strategies will likely be needed. Policy 3-P-3 addresses the need for joint financing between the cities of Santa Clara and San José.

The Station Area Plan provides a projected net addition of 2,250 dwelling units; 2.9 million square feet of office space; 0.6 million square feet of commercial space; and 1,970 hotel rooms to existing development in the Planning Area. The private development that would occur in the Planning Area as a result of the public investment in transit infrastructure could provide a revenue base from which to fund public improvements through impact fees, special districts, and potential taxing strategies. These mechanisms could be a prerequisite to further development in the Planning Area.

7.4 FUNDING STRATEGIES

This section evaluates potential approaches to funding capital costs. An explanation of the overall process and funding sources and potential facilities that could benefit by each approach is summarized in Table 7-1. Capital improvements proposed for the Station Area Plan and the various funding approaches that could be tapped for implementation are identified.

These strategies are offered as a menu of choices that the cities and other agencies can select from.

MUNICIPAL IMPACT FEES

The municipalities collect a variety of impact fees from new development that could be used to fund capital improvements in the Planning Area. These typically include park fees from residential developments, drainage fees, sewer fees, water connection fees, and traffic mitigation fees. Municipalities could decide to allocate a portion of development impact fees generated within the Planning Area to fund capital investment in public facilities. For instance, park fees from residential development could fund open space development in the Planning Area. Since park fees are collected only from residential development by law, the City of San José will not be collecting any park fees for parks in the Plan as there is no residential development planned in San José.

Schools are funded based on requirements of Education Code Section 17620, subject to the limitations set forth in Chapter 4.9 (commencing with Section 65995) of the Government Code, which

provide no other method of mitigation other than the assessment of development fees for schools construction (current maximum is \$2.97 per square foot for residential and \$0.47 per square foot for commercial/industrial development).²

To encourage development in the Planning Area, fees on development could be reduced through the Statewide Community Infrastructure Program (SCIP), which utilizes 1913/15 Act bonds. SCIP could be used for commercial and residential projects; fees can either be funded directly prior to obtaining a building permit, or subsequently reimbursed.

DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

Developer contributions are payments made in addition to normal impact fees as part of the development approval process for specific projects; these most often apply to larger developments with significant associated impacts. Examples of contributions include: dedications of right-of-way for streets and utilities; and provision of open space, parks or landscape improvements. Since large-scale development is anticipated in the Planning Area, potential revenue from this source could be appreciable.

Where developers provide parks as part of their developments, they could be exempted from park impact fees at the discretion of each city.

² Source: Report of the Executive Officer, State Allocation Board Meeting, January 30, 2008.

SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS

Community Facilities District

The 1982 Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act enables cities, counties, special districts, and school districts to establish Community Facility Districts (CFDs) and to levy special taxes to fund a wide variety of facilities and services. This mechanism could have significant applicability for funding Station Planning Area improvements on a tax-exempt basis.

A CFD is created by a sponsoring local government agency upon petition by property owners or the city council. The proposed district will include all properties that will benefit from the improvements to be constructed or the services to be provided. A CFD cannot be formed without a two-thirds majority vote of residents living within the proposed boundaries. Or, if there are fewer than 12 residents, the vote is instead conducted of current landowners, with each acre of ownership counting as one vote. In many cases, that may be a single owner or developer.

A special district may not be feasible to implement on the FMC property, since entitlements for development already include a package of impact fees for installation of project-wide infrastructure.

Landscape and Lighting District

The formation of a Landscape and Lighting District may be used by local government agencies to pay for financing the costs and expenses of elements such as landscaping and lighting public areas. The District is based on the concept of benefit assessment, which is not subject to Proposition

13 limitations. Approved uses include installation and maintenance of landscaping, public art, fountains, general lighting, traffic lights, recreational and playground courts and equipment, and public restrooms. In addition, the Act allows the acquisition of land for parks and open spaces, plus the construction of community centers, municipal auditoriums, or halls.

With formation of a Landscape and Lighting Districts pursuant to the 1972 Act, each lot or parcel in the District is assessed proportionately for improvements and services that are determined to be a special benefit.

In order to approve the District, a majority vote of affected property owners is required through an assessment balloting procedure.

Business Improvement District (BID)

Business or property owners within a defined geographic area may agree to assess themselves annual fees to fund activities and programs to enhance the business environment. Fees can be applied toward a wide range of activities that include marketing and promotion, security, streetscape improvements, and special events. Once established, the annual BID fees are mandatory for business/properties located within the BID.

In a business-based BID (BBID), fees are assessed to businesses, with the amount of the fees varying by location, type and size of business. With a property-based BID (PBID), assessments may vary by location, size of lot/building, and linear footage. Generally, this mechanism is most frequently used in existing commercial retail

districts and has marginal applicability in funding infrastructure due both to the limited revenue base and the short-term nature of the BID structure, which makes issuance of debt infeasible.

INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCE DISTRICT (IFD)

This is a method of finance based upon use of tax increment financing. Cities and counties can form the District to fund region-wide infrastructure. There is no blight test necessary to establish an IFD. Additionally, an IFD cannot be part of a redevelopment project area. Unlike a redevelopment project area, participation by the taxing jurisdictions is voluntary, except with respect to school districts, which cannot participate. An IFD may be used to fund region-serving infrastructure and may apply to funding some capital improvements in the Planning Area if deemed appropriate.

CITIES' CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

The CIP is typically a discretionary component of a city's General Fund. The municipalities could decide to direct portions of CIP expenditures to the Planning Area.

JOINT DEVELOPMENT

Public/private partnerships, in which developers join forces with municipalities to achieve development is an option, particularly in respect to strategies to implement parking development. Achieving joint development may draw upon a mix of implementation approaches and funding

sources such as the use of Mello-Roos/CFD, leveraged by city impact fees. Within the Station Area Plan, there may be opportunities for joint development on lands adjacent to the BART parking structure, where parking infrastructure could possibly be shared by public and private interests.

CDBG FUNDS

Some or all of the cities' annual allotment of Community Development Block Grant funds from the Federal Government could be capitalized into a Section 108 loan, to increase the immediate ability to fund improvements. Needs of the Planning Area must be weighed against other needs of the municipalities in the allocation of these typically scarce funds by each city.

GRANTS AND LOANS

- *SAFETEA-LU (Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act—A Legacy for Users)* provides a variety of funding options for smaller, neighborhood-based projects relating to streetscape improvements and bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Programs include the Surface Transportation Program (STP); Congestion Management Air Quality (CMAQ) funds; Transportation Enhancements (TE); State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)/Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP); and the Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA), which is available to cities and counties with Caltrans-approved bicycle plans.
- *State Proposition 1B (Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006)* will make available \$20 billion in funding for local governments; the \$2 billion allocated for local streets and road improvements appear potentially applicable to projects in the Station Plan Area. The League of California Cities is drafting legislation with the California State Association of Counties for allocation of the revenue.
- *State Proposition 1C (Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act of 2006)* allocates \$1.35 billion to fund three new programs aimed at increasing development projects in existing urban areas and near public transportation. The programs provide loans and grants for a wide variety of projects, such as parks, water, sewerage, transportation and housing.
- *State Proposition 1E (Disaster Preparedness and Flood Prevention Bond Act of 2006)* allocates \$4.1 billion for various categories of flood control and storm water management projects that could be applicable to remediation of hazardous environmental conditions in the Station Plan area.
- *State Proposition 84 (The Safe Drinking Water, Water Quality and Supply, Flood Control, River and Coastal Protection Bond of 2006)* allocates \$5.4 billion for a variety of measures; including floodplain mapping, flood control and prevention projects, and parks and nature education facilities. Lead agencies are the Department of Water Resources and the Department of Parks and Recreation.

Table 7-1: Potential Station Area Plan Infrastructure Financing Sources

Project Components	Lead Entity(ies)	Summary of Possible Major Funding Sources							Issues/ Recommendations
		Impact Fees	Developer Contributions ¹	Special Assessments/ Districts	CIP	Joint Development	Tax Increment/ Redev. or IFD	Other Grants & Loans (SAFETEA, etc.)	
Public Infrastructure/Improvements									
1. Major Streets	Possible JPA/Cities	✓	✓	✓ (Mello-Roos/ CFD)	✓		✓	✓	May consider special assessments on properties that benefit from the new streets, for both construction and maintenance.
2. Potential East-West Underpass	Possible JPA/Cities	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	Significant costs may require use of multiple sources.
3. Streetscape Improvements, including utility undergrounding, wayfinding/signage, and landscaping along: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brokaw Road & Benton Street • Campbell Avenue/El Camino Real intersection • Coleman Avenue • El Camino Real 	Possible JPA/Cities	✓	✓	✓ (Mello-Roos/ CFD, LLD ²)	✓	✓	✓	✓	May consider allocating some of the costs to private developments which benefit from these improvements for both construction and maintenance.
4. Pedestrian Bridges & Overpasses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BART pedestrian overcrossing • Extension of Caltrain pedestrian undercrossing • Newhall bridge to the south 	Possible JPA/Cities	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	Significant costs will likely require participation from multiple entities.
5. Parks—including landscape buffer/bikeway connection along west side of tracks	Possible JPA/Cities/ Developers	✓ Park Fees	✓	✓ (Mello-Roos/ CFD, L&LD ²)	✓	✓	✓	✓	May consider special assessments on properties that benefit and user fees for construction and maintenance.

Table 7-1: Potential Station Area Plan Infrastructure Financing Sources

Project Components	Lead Entity(ies)	Summary of Possible Major Funding Sources							Issues/ Recommendations
		Impact Fees	Developer Contributions ¹	Special Assessments/ Districts	CIP	Joint Development	Tax Increment/ Redev. or IFD	Other Grants & Loans (SAFETEA, etc.)	
6. Schools	Possible JPA/Cities/ School Districts	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	Coordinate with SCUSD & SJUSD to determine facility requirements and possible joint use of some recreation and meeting facilities.
7. Public Safety	Possible JPA/Cities/ Affected Districts	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	Coordinate siting, building and equipment needs with affected Districts.
Parking									
1. Shared Parking	Possible JPA/Cities/ Developers	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	Development regulations
2. Reduced Minimum Parking Requirements	Possible JPA/Cities/ Developers	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	Development regulations
3. Centralized Parking Facilities	Possible JPA/Cities	✓	✓	✓ (Parking)		✓	✓	✓ (Parking Revenue)	Could involve parking in-lieu fees.
4. Shuttle Service	Possible JPA/Cities/ Businesses	✓	✓	✓ (BID ³)				✓	JPA/Cities may initiate with business association operating once stabilized.
5. Maintenance/Public Facilities	Possible JPA/Cities		✓	✓ (Mello-Roos/ CFD, LLD ²)		✓			

¹ Includes possible land dedications.

² LLD: Landscaping and Lighting District

³ BID: Business Improvement District

- *The California Infrastructure and Economic Development Bank (CIEDB)* provides low-cost financing to public agencies for a wide variety of infrastructure projects. Infrastructure State Revolving Fund (ISRF) Program funding is available in amounts ranging from \$250,000 to \$10,000,000, with loan terms of up to 30 years. Eligible projects include city streets, drainage, flood control, and environmental mitigation.

PARKING DISTRICT AND IN-LIEU FEE

Local governments may propose a Special District formation to finance parking-related activities, including acquisition of land for parking facilities, construction of parking lots and garages, issuance of bonds, and funding of operating costs. The majority of affected property owners must vote in favor of the District formation. The District actually has two aspects: creation of new parking, and management of parking. Creation of a Parking District might allow the public entities to better determine present and future parking resources, including use of in-lieu fees to fund parking in the Planning Area.

A possible approach to funding is imposition of an in-lieu fee; whereby developers pay the fee instead of providing on-site parking, thereby reducing the cost of development and potentially increasing substantially the efficient use of development sites. Fees are set in various ways; the most widely used approach is a uniform fee per space, generally at a cost that is less than the cost of developing the parking.

7.5 PARKING STRATEGIES

Resolution of parking issues is a critical component in the creation of a pedestrian-friendly, walkable community. The ideal solutions typically require a mix of carrots and sticks to create a proper balance of parking to ensure that parking resources are not excessive but are yet sufficient to ensure the economic feasibility and sustainability of development. Examples of parking strategies which have been used successfully to achieve such a balance in other urban communities—and which may be applicable to the Santa Clara Station Planning Area—include the following:

SHARED PARKING

Uses that operate at different peak times, such as office and entertainment, can be clustered so that the number of parking spaces required by each use can be reduced and/or shared for a more efficient use. The clustering of uses also encourages drivers to park only once to access different facilities in the area.

Pros:

- More efficient use of scarce land resource;
- Reduces development costs with fewer land and space requirements;
- Reduces short-distance driving between facilities;
- Reduces land area allocated for parking;
- Increases tax revenue from substitute land use; and
- Allows for higher and best use of land for business, residential, or open space.

Cons:

- Possible parking conflicts, i.e., if the uses are not compatible (such as between residential and industrial uses) and/or if the parking demand peaks at the same time;
- Difficult to monitor over long-term, i.e., with changes in use;
- Requires recorded easements to ensure parking does not disappear or become unavailable;
- May create insufficient parking; and
- Spillover parking to adjacent land uses.

REDUCED MINIMUM PARKING REQUIREMENTS

Given the proximity of development sites to multiple transit modes, standard parking requirements in the Station Area could be reduced somewhat to take transit ridership into account. Parking requirements could potentially be met through a combination of on-site parking, off-street spaces, in-lieu fees, and shared parking arrangements. This approach has been adopted by a number of cities to support transit-oriented developments.

Pros:

- More efficient use of scarce land resource;
- Reduces development costs with fewer space requirements;
- Creates incentive to use public transit; and
- Increases tax revenues from substitute land use.

Cons:

- Underparked uses could potentially create parking overflows into the surrounding neighborhoods and/or adjacent lots (such as use of transit lots by non-transit riders that are not part of shared parking agreements or parameters);
- May be more difficult to market for some uses, i.e., grocery stores;
- May increase circling of cars looking for the more limited number of spaces—resulting in more environmental and congestion issues;
- May create insufficient parking;
- Spillover parking to adjacent land uses; and
- May pose difficulties for private financing of development

DEVELOPMENT OF CENTRALIZED PARKING FACILITIES

The municipalities could assist in the development of a public and/or a private centralized parking facility to serve the community's parking needs and/or for shared parking use at a large, centrally-located site in the Station Planning Area. The facility could be funded through the use of a range of financing mechanisms, such as through private fund sources like in-lieu parking fees, assessment districts, and public funding such as federal, state and local capital improvement programs, parking revenue bonds, and certificates of participation. Given the significant costs of constructing a centralized parking facility, a combination of both public and private funds will likely be needed for implementation.

Pros:

- More efficient use of scarce land resource;
- More efficient management and operation;
- May reduce costs for individual projects;
- Reduces short-distance driving between facilities; and
- Allows revenue sharing from parking fees.

Cons:

- Requires availability of large, centralized site;
- Not the highest and best use of the underlying land;
- The use of potential funding sources is also problematic:
 - Private funding sources (exactions, in-lieu parking fees) would constitute an additional cost/cost burden to the developer – which may impact project feasibility; and
 - Federal, State and local programs, are often constrained and highly competitive; and
- Maintenance and operations cost of parking facilities.

SHUTTLE SERVICE

The municipalities could assist in the development of a shuttle loop between the Santa Clara Station and various destination points in the area to maximize parking resources and improve overall accessibility. This service could be funded using the financing mechanisms identified above.

Pros:

- May reduce costs for smaller developments;
- Reduces short-distance driving between facilities;
- Reduces circling of cars for limited parking spaces—less adverse environmental impacts; and
- Encourages transit ridership.

Cons:

- Typically, not self-supporting—requires long-term subsidies. Public funds alone are usually unavailable or highly competitive; and
- Requires active participation by benefiting businesses.