

Alameda County
Transportation Commission

ALAMEDA COUNTY CTC

GUARANTEED

**RIDE
HOME**



BAY AREA
AIR QUALITY



TRANSPORTATION
FUND FOR
CLEAN AIR

Program Evaluation 2010

FINAL

December 2011



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY PROGRAM UPDATE AND RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION

The Alameda County Transportation Commission (CTC) Guaranteed Ride Home (GRH) Program has been in operation since April 9, 1998. This report presents the results of the 2010 Program Evaluation and covers program operations during the 2010 calendar year including a comparison with previous years. The evaluation provides information about:

1. The effectiveness of the program's administration;
2. Statistics on employer and employee participation and rides taken;
3. The program's success in causing an increase in the use of alternative modes;
and
4. The status of Board recommendations made for 2010 and proposed recommendations for 2011.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Alameda County Guaranteed Ride Home (GRH) Program is administered by the Alameda County Transportation Commission (CTC). The Alameda CTC is a newly-formed countywide transportation agency, resulting from a merger of the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency (ACCMA) and the Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority (ACTIA).¹ Their mission is to plan, fund and deliver a broad spectrum of transportation projects and programs to enhance mobility throughout Alameda County.

The Alameda County GRH Program is funded with Transportation Funds for Clean Air (TFCA) from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The objective of the GRH Program is to maximize modal shift from driving alone to using commute

¹This merger was completed in 2010.

alternatives including transit, carpools, vanpools, bicycling and walking. The goal of changing travel modes is to reduce the number of vehicle trips, decrease traffic congestion, and improve air quality in Alameda County. The GRH Program meets these goals by providing incentives for Alameda County employees to travel to work using alternative modes rather than driving alone. The GRH Program provides a “guaranteed ride home” to any registered employee working for a participating employer in cases of emergency on days the employee has used an alternative mode of transportation to get to work.

Since June 2009, all businesses in Alameda County are eligible to participate in the GRH Program. Prior to that time, the GRH Program required an employer to have at least 75 employees to register with the program. Since it began in 1998, the GRH Program has grown into a smoothly operating program with 206 registered employers and 4,253 registered employees making a commitment to travel to work taking alternative modes to driving alone. This has resulted in a reduction of 3,330 drive alone trips per week. (See Figure ES-1 for highlights over the 12-year course of the Program.) Additionally, in 2010, 38% of participants stated they would not use an alternative travel mode or would use one less frequently without the GRH Program. Furthermore, 28% of participants stated that, with the program, they use alternative modes four or more times a week. The GRH Program provides incentives for commuters to travel using sustainable transportation modes as compared to driving alone.

GUARANTEED RIDE HOME PROGRAM EVALUATION | 2010 | FINAL
Alameda County Transportation Commission

Figure ES-1 Guaranteed Ride Home Program Historical Trends

Trend	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Program Participants													
Total Number of Employers	72	100	119	132	127	110	120	131	142	155	188	189	206
New Employers Registered	72	28	19	13	12	14	16	22	12	18	56	12	31
Total Number of Employees	880	1,674	2,265	2,759	2,664	2,785	3,268	3,638	4,107	4,437	4,327	4,249	4,253
New Employees Registered	880	794	591	494	525	710	543	603	550	514	722	406	414
Trip Statistics													
Total Number of Trips Taken	57	156	168	149	145	151	143	87	107	98	119	72	55
Total Number of Rental Car Trips	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8	10	18	9	18	18	23	13	17
Total Number of Taxi Trips	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	137	141	125	78	89	80	96	59	38
Average Trips per Month	6.3	13	14	12.3	12	12.4	11.8	6.8	8.9	8.2	9.9	6.0	4.6
Average Trip Distance (miles)	28.7	34.96	36.9	42.1	42.02	42.9	39.8	42.6	41.8	41.6	39.4	31.5	34.2
Average Trip Cost ²	\$54.51	\$65.25	\$70.45	\$84.02	\$88.18	\$93.64	\$80.92	\$87.78	\$89.48	\$86.13	\$90.49	\$69.47	\$54.85
Rental Car Savings	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$421	\$759	\$1,015	\$442	\$1,221	\$1,316	\$1,446	\$998	\$1,778
Number of potential trips per year	5,280	10,044	13,590	16,554	15,984	16,710	19,608	21,828	24,642	26,622	25,962	25,494	25,518
Percent of potential trips taken each year	1.08%	1.55%	1.24%	0.90%	0.91%	0.90%	0.73%	0.40%	0.43%	0.37%	0.46%	0.28%	0.22%

²A combined average of car rental and taxi costs.

GUARANTEED RIDE HOME PROGRAM EVALUATION | 2010 | FINAL
Alameda County Transportation Commission

Trend	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Survey Results													
Number of Surveys Collected	215	350	270	346	517	619	658	716	732	728	822	990	590
Survey Response Rate	N/A	21%	12%	13%	19%	22%	20%	20%	18%	16%	19%	23%	14%
Percent Who Would Not Use an Alternative Mode or Would Use Less Frequently without GRH	15%	16%	19%	19%	34%	41%	47%	46%	40%	41%	35%	35%	38%
Increase in the Percent of Those Using Alternative Modes Four or More Times a Week	N/A	10%	15%	8%	15%	17%	14%	21%	19%	18%	28%	28%	28%
Number of Single Occupancy Vehicle Trips Reduced per Week	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3,768	3,946	3,774	3,318	3,709	3,499	3,635	3,102	3,330

ANNUAL PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS

Registration of employers in the GRH Program in 2010 was affected by two opposing influences—the ACCMA Board’s decision to change the program requirements to allow all Alameda County businesses to enroll, regardless of size, and the downturn in the economy with businesses closing and employers leaving the county. Prior to 2009, employers were required to have at least 75 employees to enroll in the GRH Program. Figure ES-2 shows the new employers that registered along with those who left the program in 2010.

In 2010, 31 new employers enrolled in the program, bringing the number of registered employers to 206. Of the 31 new employers, 20 were in companies with less than 75 employees. Enrollment of new employers had peaked in 2008, when 56 new employers registered due to the program’s partnership with the Emeryville Transportation Management Association (TMA) and the Downtown Berkeley Association (DBA) as well as record high gas prices, leading to more commuters seeking alternative transportation modes.

The 2010 calendar year experienced a slight increase in the number of new registrants compared to 2009, with 414 new employees enrolling in the program (as shown in Figure ES-1). Enrollment continued to increase but not at the high levels in previous years due to hiring freezes and the increase in unemployment associated with the recent economic downturn. Total actively registered participants increased slightly in 2010; from 4,249 in 2009 to 4,253 in 2010.

A number of GRH employers have either gone out of business or decided not to participate in the program because their registered employees no longer work for the company or because of limited staff resources to administer the program. Participant losses were concentrated at employers that either went out of business or relocated to another county. Agilent Technologies Inc. closed their Pleasanton branch in 2010 and relocated to Santa Clara County. NUMMI in Fremont and Cholestech Corporation in Hayward both closed their doors on March 31, 2010. Robert Half International moved their office location on May 22, 2010 from Pleasanton to Bishop Ranch in Contra Costa County. After these businesses were shut down or relocated, 293 employees were removed from the database of actively registered employees in the program (268 employees from NUMMI, 21 employees from Robert Half International,

GUARANTEED RIDE HOME PROGRAM EVALUATION | 2010 | FINAL
Alameda County Transportation Commission

and 4 from Cholestech Corporation). In addition, three employers were removed from the database because no employer contact could be established.

See Figure ES-2 for a summary of new employers and participant losses in 2010.

Figure ES-2 New Employers and Participant Losses (2010)

Employer Name	City	# of Employees
New Employers - 2010		
Financial Benefits Credit Union	Alameda	6
Lockheed Martin	Alameda	7
Center for Accessible Technology	Berkeley	7
Experience in Software Inc.	Berkeley	10
Americans For Safe Access	Oakland	12
Elder Care Alliance	Alameda	15
Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund	Berkeley	20
State of California, Department of Fair Employment & Housing	Oakland	25
Avanguest North American Inc.	Pleasanton	25
Broadlane	Oakland	32
Wiss, Janney, Elstner Associates	Emeryville	40
Newfield Wireless, Inc.	Berkeley	40
First Solar	Oakland	50
Donahue Gallagher Woods LLP	Oakland	50
Hub-Data911	Alameda	50
The College Preparatory School	Oakland	50
Ironplanet, Inc.	Pleasanton	52
S & C Electric Company	Alameda	60
Ratcliff Architects	Emeryville	70
511 Rideshare Program	Oakland	75
Taylor Engineering	Alameda	80
Senela Center	Oakland	80
US Treasury - FMS	Emeryville	80
E&E Co. LTD	Fremont	85
Tri-City Health Center	Fremont	185
Doric Group of Companies	Alameda	200
Kaiser Permanente Union City	Union City	251

GUARANTEED RIDE HOME PROGRAM EVALUATION | 2010 | FINAL
Alameda County Transportation Commission

Employer Name	City	# of Employees
Workday	Pleasanton	400
Abbott Diabetes Care	Alameda	700
Carl Zeiss Meditec Inc.	Dublin	720
Lam Research Corporation	Fremont	1000
TOTAL		4,474 ³
Employers Who Left GRH Program - 2010		
	City	# of Employees
NUMMI	Fremont	-268
Cholestech Corporation	Hayward	-4
Robert Half International (moved to Contra Costa County)	Pleasanton	-21
Hunter Travel Managers	Pleasanton	-5
State Street California	Alameda	-3
Agilent Technologies Inc. (moved to Santa Clara County)	Pleasanton	-3
TOTAL		304 ⁴

Based on the fact that each registered participant may take up to six rides in a one-year period, the rate that guaranteed rides are taken is very low. Most program participants take a guaranteed ride home very infrequently or not at all. For example, for the year 2010, a total of 25,518 potential rides could have been taken based on a total enrollment of 4,253 employees and a maximum of six rides allowed per employee per year. However, only 55 rides were actually taken in 2010, which is approximately 0.22% of potential rides.

As shown in Figure ES-1, the total number of rides taken per year can fluctuate significantly. Despite the availability of the program to all employees in Alameda County, the number of rides taken declined in 2010. It is unknown why the number of rides taken in 2010 decreased by 24%. It could be attributed to the economic downturn and high rates of unemployment in 2009/10.

Of the 7,816 employees who have ever registered for the program at the end of 2010, 7,080 (91%) had never taken a ride. The vast majority of those who have used the program (80%) have only taken one or two rides. This demonstrates that participants

³ Total number employees from new employers in 2010; not the number of new employees enrolled in the GRH Program.

⁴ Number of employees who left the GRH Program due to inactive employer

see the GRH Program as an “insurance” policy and do not abuse the program or take more rides per year than they need. The program is available if and when an emergency or unscheduled overtime arises and provides participants with peace of mind knowing that even when they do not drive alone, they can get home under unexpected circumstances.

MAJOR FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION

The program evaluation consisted of an examination of the program’s administrative functions, statistics on employer and employee participation and use, data from the surveys of participating employees, and recommendations for program changes and enhancements. The following sections present the major findings from the evaluation.

Program Administration

Program Operating Principles

- The use limitation of six rides per year continues to be appropriate. Very few program participants have reached the limit since the program’s inception. The highest number of trips taken in 2010 by a single participant was three.
- The rental car demonstration program was successfully implemented in October 2002 in the Tri-Valley area (Dublin, Livermore and Pleasanton), and countywide in April 2004 to reduce program costs by encouraging use of rental cars with a fixed rate regardless of the number of miles traveled. A new policy went into effect in 2006 requiring participants to use a rental car for any non-emergency trip over 50 miles⁵. Rental car use accounted for 31% of all 2010 rides. The program realized an estimated savings of approximately \$1,700 on ride costs in 2010. Despite the low number of rides taken in 2010, the program had the largest cost savings in rides since the majority of trips over 20 miles were taken by a rental car instead of by taxi. Rental car savings increased from \$998 in 2009 to \$1,778 in 2010.

Marketing and Promotions

- Approximately 20% of program resources are dedicated to marketing and promotion. This time is spent marketing both to employers and their employees in the form of making calls, distributing flyers, giving presentations and attending events. The program has sought to leverage these resources by relying on

⁵ The requirement to use rental cars for non-emergency trips over 50 miles also takes into consideration that for those who do shift work, the rental car companies close at 6:00 p.m.

participating employers to promote the GRH Program internally, and by seeking co-marketing opportunities with local transit agencies and with organizations that promote commute alternatives such as MTC and local business districts like the Hacienda Business Park.

- In 2009, the program eliminated the eligibility requirement that only employers with 75 or more employees could participate. All Alameda County employers and employees are now eligible for the program. Marketing materials and the website have been updated to reflect this new requirement. The Program Administrator also sent press releases to the Chambers of Commerce and attended transportation fairs to inform employers about the new program changes in 2010. Furthermore, program staff continued to form partnerships with Transportation Management Agencies (TMAs) and business associations to more effectively market the program to all employers regardless of size. This change in eligibility requirement resulted in the enrollment of 20 new employers with less than 75 employees in 2010.
- To help increase countywide awareness about the GRH Program, GRH staff developed a Marketing Plan in 2010 that had three focus areas: Companies, Communities and Creative Outlets (see Appendix B). As part of this initiative, staff reached out to various businesses (identified through the East Bay Economic Development Alliance), various Alameda County city and county staff, as well as other advocacy and non-profit groups that are supportive of alternative modes of transportation.
- GRH has ramped up its efforts for co-marketing with other agencies and groups with similar missions and goals. GRH staff has had correspondence with individuals from AC Transit and Alameda CTC bicycle and pedestrian program. Co-marketing efforts not only expand the reach of GRH marketing efforts in a cost-effective manner, it helps present GRH as a complimentary service to alternative modes of transportation.
- Although the GRH program has been marketed throughout Alameda County, 85% of registered employers are located in North and East County. In order to encourage increased participation in South and Central Alameda County, the GRH Program focused marketing efforts on employers in these areas in 2010. In 2010,

the Program Administrator sent letters to the Chamber of Commerce of Newark, San Leandro, Union City, Hayward, and Fremont and has been in contact with city staff from Union City and San Leandro. The Program Administrator also attended a Clean Commute Transportation Fair in San Leandro on April 19, 2010. Despite the targeted marketing efforts, Union City was the only city in South or Central Alameda County to increase GRH enrollment in 2010. Registered businesses in Union City increased from two to three in 2010 (50% increase). Although no new employers in San Leandro enrolled in the GRH program in 2010, several have enrolled in 2011 as a result of increased marketing efforts. This increase will be reported in the 2011 annual report. Overall, there was a decrease in registered businesses in South and Central Alameda County in 2010, likely due to the downturn in the economy.

- The availability of the marketing materials in electronic format via the internet or email continues to be a useful and inexpensive tool for promoting the program.
- The website is updated to include changes in the program, such as the rental car program, new eligibility requirements, online registration, and to clarify the program, as necessary, such as providing a clear description of the instant enrollment program.

Employer and Employee Participation

Employer and Employee Registrations

- A total of 31 new businesses and 414 employees registered for the program in 2010. Twenty of the newly registered businesses in 2010 had fewer than 75 employees.
- Despite the enrollment activity, the total number of registered participants in the program increased by only 1% since the previous year. According to employer contacts, this is due to the downturn in the economy and company downsizing.
- Even with following the ACCMA Board's direction to focus a new marketing effort on south and central Alameda County in 2010, north and east Alameda County continue to be the areas with the most employers enrolled in the program. These areas account for over 85% of all registered businesses. This can be attributed to the large concentration of employers in Downtown Oakland and our partnerships

with the Hacienda Business Park in Pleasanton, the Emeryville Transportation Management Association (TMA) in Emeryville, and the Downtown Berkeley Association (DBA) in Berkeley.

Rides Taken

- From the program's inception in 1998 through 2010, a total of 1,516 rides (1,379 taxi rides and 137 rental car rides) have been taken. A total of 55 rides were taken during the 2010 calendar year for an average of approximately 5 rides per month. 2010 had the lowest number of rides taken since the program inception in 1998. This could be due to the economy and job losses.
- Ninety-one percent of the employees enrolled have never taken a trip. This demonstrates the "insurance" nature of the program and shows that participants do not abuse the program. Of the employees who have taken a trip since the program inception (1998), 80% have taken only one or two rides.
- The two most common reasons to take a guaranteed ride home in 2010 were "personal illness" (33% of rides) and "unscheduled overtime" (16% of trips).
- Those who carpool or vanpool are more likely to use a guaranteed ride home trip than those who use other alternative commute modes. Sixty-one percent of guaranteed rides home were used by car- and vanpoolers.
- The average trip distance increased by 9% in 2010 compared to 2009. The average trip distance for all trips in 2010 was 34.2 miles.
- The average taxi trip distance declined 27% to 20.1 miles and the average rental car trip distance increased 25% to approximately 65.9 miles. Since car rental trips are a flat fee, their increase in mileage helped to contribute towards cost savings for the program.
- The average taxi trip cost decreased 23% in 2010; from \$71.44 in 2009 to \$55.01 in 2010 due to shorter taxi trip distances. When factoring in rental car trips, the average trip cost was \$54.85. This large decrease in cost was due to an increase in rental car usage for longer trips. Friendly Cab, serving Oakland, Berkeley, and Emeryville, provides a majority of the GRH rides.

- The cost of a rental car trip is \$55.00. It is estimated that the use of rental cars in 2010 saved \$1,778 in trip costs. Nearly one out of three trips taken was with a rental car.

Employee Commute Patterns

- The most common trip-origin cities are Oakland, Pleasanton, and Fremont. The most common trip-destination cities are Oakland, Manteca, and Modesto.
- The most common trip destination county is Alameda County, followed by Contra Costa County and San Joaquin County.

Employee Survey

The 2010 survey was distributed and completed primarily online. GRH staff attempted to contact all employer representatives (some were non-responsive despite repeated attempts) to request their assistance with the distribution of the survey. When employers were not available to distribute the survey, GRH staff contacted employees directly with the survey. Of the 4,253 employees currently enrolled in the program, 590 completed the survey, a 14% response rate – similar to previous years, but lower than 2009. Of the surveys, 98.6% were completed online. Survey respondents represent 105 (out of 206) different participating employers. The results of the survey follow.

Use of Alternative Modes

The Guaranteed Ride Home Program continues to be successful in encouraging the use of alternative modes. According to 2010 survey responses:

- When asked how important GRH was in their decision to stop driving alone, 63% of respondents who used to drive alone said that it was at least somewhat important.
- Ninety percent of respondents stated that they think that the GRH Program encourages people to use alternative modes more often. Only 55% of respondents, however, stated that the program encourages them personally to use alternative modes more often.
- If the GRH Program were not available, the majority (64%) reported that they would continue to use an alternative mode at the same frequency that they currently do.

- Survey results suggest that the program may have helped encourage participants to try alternative modes and now that they are in the habit of using alternative modes, they would continue using them even if the program became unavailable.
- The survey asked respondents how they traveled to work at present and before they registered for the GRH Program. Both before and after the program, the most common modes were driving alone, BART and bus. Drive alone rides, however, declined by nearly 50% after registering with the GRH Program, while alternative mode use increased.
- Using these survey findings, we were able to extrapolate the impact of the program on travel behavior of all participants. The program reduces an estimated 3,330 single-occupancy vehicle (SOV) trips per week.⁶

Other Commute Characteristics

- Commute distances of program participants are generally 50 miles or less (90%).
- Most program participants travel to work during the peak commute hours of 7-9 AM in the mornings (64%) and 4-6 PM in the evenings (75%).

Customer Service Ratings

The annual evaluation survey includes two questions to evaluate participant's level of satisfaction with the customer service provided in the program. Additional information on service satisfaction is collected in the survey that participants return after they have taken a ride.

- The administrative functions of the GRH Program continue to receive very high ratings for the quality of customer service, consistent with previous years' evaluations.
- In 2010, 31% of respondents rated Clarity of Information as Excellent and 44% as Good. These numbers were very similar to 2009 results.

⁶Using the data gathered on the frequency of alternative mode use, an estimate can be generated for the total number of drive-alone trips replaced by alternative mode trips for those enrolled in the Guaranteed Ride Home Program. Figure 4-8 in Chapter 4 shows the percentage of respondents for each frequency category before and after joining the program. The total number of people in each category is then extrapolated based on the total 2010 program enrollment of 4,253 people. The number of roundtrips per week is calculated using the frequency and number of people in each category. Based on this analysis, approximately 3,330 drive-alone roundtrips or 6,660 drive-alone one-way trips per week were replaced by alternative mode trips by those who joined the program.

- Passengers were very positive in their evaluation of the transportation services provided through GRH with 90% of users rating the services as “excellent” or “good”.

Program Value

This year’s survey asked participants how much they value the GRH Program compared to other transportation benefits they receive.

- Sixty-three percent reported that the program was as valuable as or more valuable than other transportation benefits they receive at work. Thirteen percent reported that they receive no other transportation benefits at work. Participants may value the program highly partly because it is a free commuter benefit offered by the County during an economic downturn.

Employer Survey

In addition to employee participants, employer representatives are also surveyed annually. Of the 206 employers currently enrolled in the program, 63 surveys were completed, resulting in a 31% response rate. New questions were added to the employer survey this year asking how much employers would be willing to pay towards the program and their attitudes toward Transportation Demand Management (TDM) benefits. The results are summarized under “Program Value,” below.

Use of Alternative Modes

- The survey asked the employer representatives how important the program is in encouraging employees to use alternative commute modes more often. A large majority (87%) reported that they feel participation in the program at least somewhat encourages more alternative mode use.⁷
- The survey asked respondents if their companies offered additional commuter benefits to employees. Most employers (84%) reported that they provide other transportation subsidy programs besides the GRH Program. The most popular benefits were bicycle parking and Commuter Checks.

⁷ Employers were asked for their opinion regarding if the GRH Program encourages employees to use alternative commute modes more often. Employers did not take a poll or individual survey of their registered employees.

Program Management

- The survey asked respondents how long they have managed the program for their company. In 2010, 77% of respondents have been with GRH for one or more years, compared to 74% in 2009 and only 57% in 2008. When GRH staff contacted the employer representatives this year, GRH staff did not encounter a large number of employers who had experienced employer representative turnover.
- When asked about the workload that GRH presents, all employers reported that their workload was “manageable” or the program is “not much work”.
- One of the important features of the program is the instant enrollment voucher which allows persons not registered in the program to become instantly enrolled and receive a guaranteed ride home in case of emergencies. Eighty-two percent of employer representatives stated that they have never issued an instant enrollment voucher, a lower number than 2009 when 91% of respondents stated that they had not issued an instant enrollment voucher. This shows an increase in employer awareness about the instant enrollment vouchers.

Customer Service Ratings

The survey includes two questions to evaluate the employer representatives’ level of satisfaction with the customer service provided in the program in 2010.

- “Clarity of information” provided by program staff received very high ratings, with 81% of respondents stating that information was “excellent” or “good”. This is a slight decrease from 2009 when 88% of employers stated that clarity of information was either excellent or good. The decrease in perceived clarity of information in 2010 could be attributed to the changes in program eligibility requirements to allow all Alameda County employees to register in the program and new online registration.

Rental Car Awareness

Starting in 2007, the annual survey started asking employer representatives about their awareness of the rental car requirement for rides over 50 miles.

- Over three fourths (79%) of employer representatives stated that they were aware of the requirement. In 2007, less than half of employer representatives knew about the rental car requirement, in 2008, 69% of employers knew about the

requirement, and in 2009, 72% of employers knew about the requirement. This shows that the marketing outreach for the rental car requirement has worked to increase its awareness.

Program Value

The employer survey asked questions specifically about the perceived value of the GRH program compared to other transportation benefits offered at their workplace.

- Sixty percent of respondents stated that they thought that their employees value the GRH Program as much as or more than other transportation benefits offered by their employer. A quarter of respondents stated that their employer does not offer any other transportation benefits.

Transportation Demand Management (TDM)

Employer representatives were asked if they were interested in offering Transportation Demand Management (TDM) benefits to their employees. A follow up question also specifically asked about willingness to pay to participate in a comprehensive TDM program.

- The majority of employer representatives (77%) stated they would be interested in offering their employees additional TDM benefits. Most employers reported that they provide some type of commuter benefits in addition to GRH. The most popular programs were bicycle parking and Commuter Checks.
- Employer representatives were asked to rank the top three TDM benefits that they would be interested in offering their employees, other than the GRH Program. As their first choice, the majority of employer representatives would like to offer their employees free or discounted transit passes (30%) or Commuter Checks (25%). As their second choice, the majority of employers listed telecommuting/flextime (22%) and again Commuter Checks (19%) and free or discounted transit passes (19%). As their third choice, employers would like to offer preferential carpool/vanpool parking (19%) and telecommuting (19%). Twenty-three percent of participants stated they are not interested in offering TDM benefits to their employee.
- Respondents were asked a set of questions that focused on their company's willingness to pay to participate in the GRH Program if it were incorporated into a

countywide TDM Program. Sixty-five percent of respondents stated that their continued participation would be “very unlikely” or “unlikely” if the program charged an annual fee to be part of a TDM Program. Thirty-five percent of employers thought that their participation would either be “very likely” or “likely.” This is a five percent increase in willingness to pay from last year, when 30% stated that their participation would either be “very likely” or “likely.” This could be a sign that employers may be warming up to the idea of financially contributing to be a part of a comprehensive TDM program.

- Employers were asked if their company paid a fee, would they be more likely to pay a flat annual fee or per registered employer to be part of a countywide TDM program. Twenty percent stated they would rather pay a fee per registered employee and only 3% said they would rather pay a flat annual fee. Larger employers may be more willing to pay a set annual fee, while smaller employers were more willing to pay per registered employee, since it is probable that larger companies would use more trips on an annual basis as compared to smaller ones. Last year, 13% of employers said they would be willing to pay a flat annual fee and 17% said they would be willing to pay a fee per registered employee.
- The lack of willingness to pay an annual fee was mostly attributed by employer representatives to the current state of the economy.

Program Savings

The Guaranteed Ride Home Program’s goal is to reduce single occupancy vehicle commute trips through encouraging alternative transportation use. Based on the annual employee survey results, the program eliminated approximately 3,330 single-occupancy vehicle roundtrips per week or 1,332 one-way trips per weekday. Based on the average reported commute distance by GRH participants and the number of registered participants, the GRH Program eliminates approximately 9.2 million vehicle miles from roadways annually.⁸ It is estimated that the program saved participants approximately \$1.2 million annually on fuel expenses in 2010.⁹

⁸ Based on 1,332 reported reduced weekday one-way trips by participants from the annual survey, 250 days in a work year, and the average reported commute distance of 27.6 miles

⁹ Based on the calculated number of annual miles reduced, the annual US vehicle fuel economy reported by the US Bureau of Transportation Statistics (22.6 MPG), and the average Bay Area fuel price per gallon reported by MTC in 2010 (\$3.09)

Figure ES-3 Estimated Program Savings and Highlights in 2010

Category	2010 Savings
Program Enrollment at end of program year	4,253
Drive Alone Roundtrips Reduced per Week	3,330
Drive Alone One-Way Trips Reduced per Week	6,660
Drive Alone Roundtrips Reduced per Weekday	666
Drive Alone One-Way Trips Reduced per Weekday	1,332
Total drive-alone roundtrips reduced per Year	173,160
Total drive-alone one-way trips reduced per Year	346,320
Guaranteed Ride Home rides taken in 2010	55
Average commute distance of GRH participants in 2010	27.6
Average miles saved per workday	36,763
Annual miles saved per work year (250 days)	9,190,800
Average US vehicle fuel economy (MPG)	22.6
Average gallons of gas saved per workday	1,626.7
Annual gallons of gas saved per work year (250 days)	406,670
Average gas price in 2010	\$3.09
Average dollars not spent on gas per workday	\$5,027
Annual dollars not spent on gas per work year (250 days)	\$1,256,626

PROGRAM UPDATE AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Alameda County Transportation Commission (CTC) has been successful in bringing about a modal shift from driving alone to using alternative transportation modes to travel to work. Data from this year’s participant survey indicate that the program is continuing to reduce the number of drive-alone trips made within the county by eliminating one of the significant barriers to alternative mode use – namely, the fear of being unable to return home in the event of an emergency.

Summary of 2010 Evaluation Report Recommendations

Last year, the CMA Board made recommendations (shown in Figure ES-3) for the 2010 GRH Program. The recommendations for the 2010 GRH Program and their outcomes are presented below. A more detailed description of the 2010 recommendation outcomes is presented in Chapter 6.

Figure ES-4 Summary of 2010 Evaluation Report Recommendations

Recommendation	Outcome/Status
1. Continue operations and marketing, including maintaining website and conducting employee and employer surveys	GRH staff continually markets the program and updates the website. The employee and employer surveys for the 2010 program evaluation were completed in March 2011. Results are included in Chapters 4 and 5 of this report.
2. Continue monitoring and marketing the 50+ mile car rental requirement	GRH staff continued monitoring and marketing the requirement to take non-emergency rides greater than 50 miles with rental cars. Marketing was focused on informing new employers and employees about the requirement. This included continuing to telephone and e-mail participants who use the program and live over 50 miles from their workplace to remind them of the program requirement and attach reminders to all vouchers about the requirement. In 2010, 17 of the 55 trips taken were by rental car. This represents 31% of all trips taken in 2010. Both the employee and the employer surveys included information and questions about the rental car requirement. As a result of these efforts, rental car requirement awareness among employer representatives increased from 49% in 2007, to 69% in 2008, to 72% in 2009, to 79% in 2010.

GUARANTEED RIDE HOME PROGRAM EVALUATION | 2010 | FINAL
 Alameda County Transportation Commission

Recommendation	Outcome/Status
<p>3. Continue to focus on registering businesses in South and Central Alameda County.</p>	<p>By working with Chambers of Commerce, business associations and city staff in South and Central County cities, the GRH Program attempted to increase awareness and participation in these areas. GRH staff conducted targeted outreach to several cities and businesses that fall in this area. The Program Administrator worked with the City of San Leandro Office of Business Development to contact all businesses near the Links Shuttle route. Every employer was sent a personalized letter and GRH brochure to encourage them to enroll in the program. Since the mailing, several new employers in San Leandro have signed up for the GRH program in 2011, which will be shown in the 2011 report. GRH staff also established a point of contact in cities that are currently not enrolled in the program (such as Newark and Union City). Despite the targeted marketing efforts, Union City was the only city in South or Central Alameda County to increase GRH enrollment in 2010. Registered businesses in Union City increased from two to three in 2010 (50% increase). Overall, there was a decrease in registered businesses in South and Central Alameda County, likely due to the downturn in the economy. For example, the closing of Nummi resulted in a decrease of 268 employees registered in the program. As described in Chapter 3, South and Central County are more suburban than other parts of Alameda County and most businesses have extensive free parking available for employees. Thus it is more challenging to convince businesses in South and Central County to register for the GRH Program.</p>
<p>4. Continue to market the reduced minimum employee per employer requirement.</p>	<p>Based on the results of the comprehensive program evaluation (Eisen/Letunic, 2009), which found that the GRH Program was the only one of 12 nationwide programs that had a minimum number of employees per employer requirement, the CMA Board recommended eliminating the employer size requirement and opening the program to any employer in the county, regardless of size. In 2010, 20 out of the 31 new employers who registered had 75 or fewer employees. In 2009, 6 out of the 12 new employers who registered had fewer than 75 employees. With increased marketing efforts in 2010, the number of new employers, especially smaller employers, grew substantially. As with most programmatic changes, even with marketing, there is often a lag time between initiating a new program change and its increased use. GRH staff worked with Chambers of Commerce and created press releases to advertise the change in the program and continue to form partnerships with business associations throughout the county to more effectively market the program to all employers regardless of size. The GRH website was also updated to reflect this programmatic change.</p>

GUARANTEED RIDE HOME PROGRAM EVALUATION | 2010 | FINAL
 Alameda County Transportation Commission

Recommendation	Outcome/Status
<p>5. Implement new program-wide marketing strategies.</p>	<p>To help increase countywide awareness about the GRH Program, GRH staff developed a Marketing Plan in 2010 that had three focus areas: Companies, Communities and Creative Outlets (see Appendix B). As part of this initiative, staff reached out to various businesses (identified through the East Bay Economic Development Alliance), various Alameda County city staff, as well as other advocacy and non-profit groups that are supportive of alternative modes of transportation.</p> <p>GRH staff reached out to Chambers of Commerce in Alameda County cities and requested to have our marketing text added to their e-blasts. Some of the various chambers produce print newsletters. After investigating the cost-effectiveness of print media ads, it was decided that GRH would not pursue print ads at this time. In addition, staff reached out to several departments of education as a way to reach out to educational staff in Alameda County schools and higher education institutions.</p> <p>With regard to other creative marketing efforts, GRH has ramped up its efforts for co-marketing with other agencies and groups with similar missions and goals. GRH staff has had correspondence with individuals from AC Transit and Alameda CTC. Co-marketing efforts not only expand the reach of GRH marketing efforts in a cost-effective manner, it helps present GRH as a complimentary service to encouraging alternative modes of transportation. In addition to these activities, GRH staff attended several marketing fairs and promoted GRH’s mission to numerous individuals in the cities of Berkeley, San Leandro, Emeryville, Oakland and Pleasanton.</p>
<p>6. Create a new GRH database with information stored on-line instead of in Access Database.</p>	<p>This recommendation was made to help reduce the administrative time associated with running the GRH Program and to make it easier for employers and employees to enroll in the program. In 2010 the database was updated to interface the online registration form with an online database. Once an employee or employer fills out the registration form online, it is automatically entered into the GRH database in real time – eliminating the need for GRH staff to re-enter the same information. This change not only saves staff time, but it also allowed new registrants to be enrolled in the system more easily and efficiently. An automatic e-mail is sent to each new applicant when they register, directing them to the liability waiver form. Time saved from data entry can then be spent on marketing and customer service.</p> <p>The database update was completed in two phases. The first phase of the update allowed the database to be synced up with the website and also included e-mail authentication and an electronic signature for the liability waiver. This facilitates the ease of registration and reduces paper waste.</p> <p>The second phase of the project allowed online registration for employers, similar to the new employee registration. Employers can also log-in and access a list of the employees from their company who are enrolled in the GRH program. This allows the employer representative the ability to update employee contact information and indicate which employees have left the company. It also provides valuable information to employers about the commute behavior of their employees.</p>

GUARANTEED RIDE HOME PROGRAM EVALUATION | 2010 | FINAL
Alameda County Transportation Commission

Recommendation	Outcome/Status
7. Continue to investigate implementing a regional GRH Program with MTC and all nine counties in the region.	In 2009 and 2010, the ACCMA Board recommended that the ACCMA work with MTC to investigate initiating a regionwide GRH program. This has the potential of reducing total indirect costs--such as administration, marketing and overhead--across the merged programs. CMA staff presented this concept to MTC and the Bay Area counties at the Regional Rideshare Committee in 2009 to discuss the regions' interest in this option. At that time, the counties were receptive to the concept of joint efficiencies while expressing concerns about how this could be accomplished while maintaining the current, well established programs with their different eligibility requirements and funding. As part of the current update to the Countywide Transportation Plan, Alameda CTC is reviewing options to enhance our Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program to be responsive to Climate Action legislation (SB 375 and AB 32). The Countywide Transportation Plan will be adopted in 2012 with a draft available fall 2011. The updated Plan will include a range of TDM alternatives, including Alameda CTC's current GRH Program and bicycle and pedestrian programs, and other TDM options that could be undertaken at a countywide or regional level. The Board will review these options as part of the Countywide Transportation Plan.
8. Continue research/planning to expand the GRH Program in Alameda County into a comprehensive TDM Program.	Unlike other GRH programs throughout the Bay Area and the U.S., the ACCMA GRH Program was the only one that does not include other transportation demand management (TDM) programs. However, since merging ACCMA with ACTIA as Alameda CTC, the new agency also has bicycle and pedestrian TDM programs and has been-co-marketing them with the GRH program. Including the GRH program as part of an even more comprehensive TDM program would result in further economies of scale for marketing and administration. As part of the Climate Action efforts the CMA is pursuing to address greenhouse gas emissions requirements through AB 32 and SB 375,) the CMA is including a range of TDM alternatives in the update of the Countywide Transportation Plan (see above). The GRH Program, whether in Alameda County or regionwide, is being considered as part of these efforts. Additional TDM measures to be considered could include: ridematching, financial incentives for carpooling and vanpooling, discounted transit passes, personalized transit itineraries, subsidized bicycle parking racks and lockers, bicycle commuting maps and promotions and other marketing strategies.
9. Investigate alternative funding sources for the GRH Program.	The GRH program has been funded by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) funds since 1998. To diversify program funding and address the Alameda CTC Board's concerns about having employers contribute towards the cost of the program to reduce congestion and air emissions, the Alameda CTC Board recommended investigating methods of introducing employer contributions into the program. For the past two years, as part of the GRH annual employer survey, employers were asked if their company would be willing to pay if the GRH program were part of a countywide TDM program. In 2010, 35% of employers stated that their participation would either be "very likely" or "likely" to continue if they contributed towards the program. This is a five percent increase in willingness to pay from the previous year, when 30% stated that their participation would either be "very likely" or "likely." Although this is an increase, the majority of employers would still not be willing to pay for the GRH program now, even if it were part of a countywide TDM program. This response may be attributed to the timing coinciding with layoffs and a downturn in the economy. The update to the Countywide Transportation Plan, which is in process, includes sections on alternative financing and on TDM alternatives. The Alameda CTC will be reviewing the draft Plan update fall 2011 and the final in 2012.

2011 RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of this evaluation report and the comprehensive program evaluation completed in February 2009 (Eisen/Letunic), Alameda CTC staff recommends the following course of action for 2011:

Recommendations for 2011

1. Continue operations and marketing, including maintaining website, monitoring car rental requirement, and conducting employee and employer surveys.

Operations of the GRH program should continue in 2011 including database maintenance, general marketing, monitoring the car rental requirement, and maintaining the website. GRH staff should continue monitoring and marketing the requirement to take non-emergency rides greater than 50 miles with rental cars. Marketing should be focused on informing new employers and employees about the requirement. This effort should include continuing to telephone and e-mail participants who used the program for non-emergency rides and live over 50 miles from their workplace to remind the participant of the program requirement and attach reminders to all vouchers about the requirement.

Employee and employer surveys should be completed annually as part of the annual program evaluation report. The surveys for the 2011 evaluation should be scheduled for late January/early February 2012.

2. Continue to market the availability of the program to all employers countywide.

In February 2009, the CMA Board recommended eliminating the employer size requirement and opening the program to any employer in the county, regardless of size. The recommendation was based on the results of the comprehensive program evaluation which found that of 12 GRH programs nationwide, only the Alameda County GRH program had a minimum number of employees per employer requirement. Eliminating the minimum number of employees per employer requirement enabled 20 new businesses to register in the GRH Program in 2010. Since this change was introduced in 2009, it is necessary to continue to increase program awareness among smaller businesses in Alameda County in

order to further encourage mode shifts from driving alone to alternative forms of transportation.

3. Implement new program-wide marketing strategies, including co-marketing and social media marketing.

GRH staff should continue to work with Chambers of Commerce and create press releases to advertise the program to all employers in Alameda County and continue to form partnerships with TMAs and business associations to more effectively market the program to all employers regardless of size or location. In addition to partnership and press releases, new marketing strategies such as co-marketing and social media marketing, can be used to reach out to new potential employers throughout Alameda County.

A co-marketing strategy can be used to work with other agencies and groups who have similar missions and goals, such as AC Transit and Alameda CTC bicycle and pedestrian program. Co-marketing efforts will not only expand the reach of GRH marketing efforts in a cost-effective manner, it will help present GRH as a complimentary service to alternative modes of transportation, which is very effective in offering a packing of alternative modes of travel. Co-marketing involves co-promoting organizational missions at marketing events and in press releases.

A second strategy is to use social media tools to help the GRH Program stay in touch with businesses and reach out to new users. Social media tools, such as Facebook and Twitter, are commonly used by other programs and services in Alameda County, including Safe Routes to School Alameda County, Oakland Broadway Shuttle, BART, and Alameda Harbor Bay Ferry. In addition, many large and small employers use social media to make announcements to their employees and to announce community events, such as Transportation and Health Fairs. Social media tools would help marketing and co-marketing efforts become more effective, allowing GRH to promote events in Alameda County and stay in communication with major employers and other program partners.

4. Rebrand the GRH Logo and Website to be consistent with the Alameda CTC.

The Alameda CTC was formed in 2010 as a result of a merger of the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency (ACCMA) and the Alameda County

Transportation Improvement Authority (ACTIA). The GRH Program was previously administered by the Alameda County CMA. All of the printed program materials, logo, and website contain the words “Alameda County CMA Guaranteed Ride Home.” Since all program materials have to be updated to reflect the new organizational change, it is recommended that GRH rebrand the logo and website to be more consistent with the look and feel of the Alameda CTC website. A consistent look and feel will better integrate the GRH Program with Alameda CTC and will show users that GRH is part of a larger countywide transportation agency.

5. Promote the GRH Program to School Districts by working with Alameda County Safe Routes to School (SR2S) Program.

The Alameda County Safe Routes to Schools (SR2S) provider, TransForm, has worked with over 150 schools in the county and has recently started to promote SchoolPool (a 511.org resource) to local schools. The GRH Program compliments these programs and can be used to encourage teachers and staff to use alternative forms of transportation to commute to work (transit, carpool, vanpool, bike, or walk). In 2011, efforts should be made to coordinate outreach activities to promote awareness of the GRH Program to teachers and staff through the SR2S Program. Since Transform has already established contacts in schools throughout the county, GRH Staff can work with Transform to contact an employer representative for each school.

6. Continue research/planning to expand the GRH Program in Alameda County into a comprehensive TDM Program as part of the Alameda Countywide Transportation Plan Update.

Including the GRH program as part of a comprehensive TDM program would result in economies of scale for marketing and administration. A comprehensive TDM package that includes the GRH program is being included in the update of the Countywide Transportation Plan. These efforts are part of Alameda CTC’s goals to contribute towards reducing greenhouse gas emissions in compliance with state legislation (AB 32 and SB 375).

The GRH Program, whether in Alameda County or regionwide, is being considered as part of these efforts. TDM measures could include: ridematching, financial incentives for carpooling and vanpooling, discounted transit passes, personalized

transit itineraries, subsidized bicycle parking racks and lockers, bicycle commuting maps and promotions and other marketing strategies.

Continuation of this discussion is timely and coincides with the upcoming updates of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Countywide Transportation Plan (CWTP). The Alameda CTC is updating the Countywide Transportation Plan with a discussion of a range of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) alternatives, including the GRH Program, which could be undertaken at a countywide or regional level.

7. Continue to investigate alternative ways to fund the program, such as employer and employee contributions.

To continue investigating funding options for the GRH Program to supplement TFCA grants, which have solely funded the program since its inception, it is worthwhile for the Alameda CTC to continue investigating supplemental funding options for the GRH Program alone, or as part of a comprehensive TDM program (see number 6, above).

A comprehensive memo that investigates options for employer contributions into the GRH program was submitted to the CMA early 2010 (see Appendix C of Annual Program Evaluation). The memo analyzed several strategies that could be used to introduce employer contributions for the GRH program over time and investigated other funding options for the program. The results from the 2010 survey also show that employers may be more willing to pay for GRH when it is incorporated into a countywide TDM Program.

Based on the results of the memo, the following next steps are recommended:

To continue investigating employer contributions to the program, do the following:

- 1) Further investigate a per-trip basis employer fee for those enrolled in the GRH program by adding questions to the 2011 GRH survey
- 2) Establish goals for employer fees, such as:
 - a) maintaining program participation
 - b) establishing funding equity

c) improving administration efficiency

- 3) Establish goals for revenues from employer contributions
- 4) Defer any implementation until economic conditions improve
- 5) Consider conducting additional education and outreach efforts to inform employers about the value of a TDM benefits program.

Investigate other options to supplement funding of the program, such as:

- 1) Include GRH as part of a Countywide TDM Plan
- 2) Lobby for legislation to enable commuter benefits (Commuter Checks) to be used for the GRH Program or other TDM benefits
- 3) Include GRH and other TDM programs as part of an Alameda County updated Expenditure Plan
- 4) Work with jurisdictions to pass employer commuter benefits mandates

