

# **Current Status of Marin County Crossing Guard Program**

**Presentation to the  
Citizen Oversight Committee**

**November 7, 2016**



# Presentation Overview

- ❑ Program History
- ❑ Funding Sources
- ❑ Location Selection
- ❑ Evaluations



# Program History

- ❑ Approved as part of Strategy 4.2 of the Measure A Expenditure Plan
- ❑ Guards first deployed for the 2006/2007 School Year
- ❑ Initial program paid for 54 guards
- ❑ Number of guards increased to 63 for the 08/09 Year
- ❑ Measure A funded 76 guards in 2014/2015 School Year
- ❑ 10 of the 76 guards now paid for by Measure B
- ❑ 4 additional guards this year as part of new guard policy
- ❑ Program funds 8 additional guards on a reimbursed basis

# Funding Sources

## Ongoing Funding from Measures A and B

- ❑ Measure A existing reserves and future revenues
- ❑ Measure B is fixed amount of \$150,000

## One Time Funding

- ❑ OBAG Safe Routes Funding \$200,000
- ❑ Measure B Unallocated Funds this year



# Location Selection

- ❑ Intersection locations are recommended by School Districts, City and Town Public Works Departments, and Police Departments.
- ❑ Public Works Director determines which locations to forward to TAM.
- ❑ TAM hires consultant to conduct counts and to analyze data.
- ❑ Score assigned to each location.
- ❑ Ranked list approved by TAM Board.
- ❑ Public Works Directors can swap between locations on the list within their jurisdiction.

# Location Selection Criteria

- ❑ Criteria based on the California Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CMUTCD).
- ❑ Ranking system recommended by TAM TAC, MPWA and TAM Staff - Approved by TAM Board in 2009.
- ❑ Selection criteria intended to be measurable and objective.
- ❑ Pedestrians ages 5 to 13 counted for scoring.
- ❑ Crosswalks (not intersections) scored individually.
- ❑ Highest scoring crosswalk is the score for that intersection.
- ❑ Possible for one intersection to have multiple, high-scoring crosswalks, including non-adjacent crosswalks.

# Location Selection Criteria (Cont.)

- ❑ One guard is assumed to be able to service two adjacent crosswalks.
- ❑ TAM TAC recommended only one guard per intersection.
- ❑ Pedestrian and vehicle counts for all locations are conducted within as short a timeframe as possible, during fair weather, and as coordinated with school schedules, i.e. on regular days, etc.
- ❑ New policy regarding new locations and considering changed conditions adopted by TAM Board in December 2011.

**TAM Crossing Guard Location Evaluation Criteria  
 For Ranking Locations that do not meet MUTCD Qualifying Criteria**

Index	Criteria	Scoring	Maximum Score	Weight	Maximum Weighted Score
1	Actual vehicular volume crossing guarded crosswalk as percent of qualifying volume (use highest hourly volume a.m. or p.m.)	One point, rounded to the nearest whole number, for each ten percentage points of maximum hourly volume (a.m. or p.m.) to qualifying volume up to a maximum of 20 points.	20	2	40
2	Actual school-aged pedestrian volume as percent of qualifying volume (use highest hourly volume a.m. or p.m.)	One point, rounded to the nearest whole number, for each ten percentage points of maximum hourly volume (a.m. or p.m.) to qualifying volume up to a maximum of 20 points.	20	5	100
3	Intersection Skew Angle	Maximum skew from 0 to 5 degrees = 0 Maximum skew from 6 to 15 degrees = 1 point Maximum skew from 16 to 25 degrees = 2 points Maximum skew from 26 to 35 degrees = 3 points Maximum skew from 36 to 45 degrees = 4 points Maximum skew greater than 45 degrees = 5 points	5	1	5
4	Stopping Sight Distance at Intersection	Stopping sight distance not impaired = 0 Stopping sight distance slightly impaired = 1 point Stopping sight distance significantly impaired = 2 points	2	10	20
5	Location of intersection on a horizontal curve with posted warning or speed reduction sign(s)	No = 0 Yes = 1 point	1	5	5
6	Posted speed limit (highest on any approach to pedestrian crossing)	Posted Speed Limit 25 mph or less = 0 Posted Speed Limit 30 mph = 1 point Posted Speed Limit 35 mph = 2 points Posted Speed Limit 40 mph = 3 points Posted Speed Limit 45 mph = 4 points Posted Speed Limit 50 mph or greater = 5 points	5	2	10
7	Other factors	Use cumulative score (i.e. total for all factors below - 4 max.) Ped-Vehicular accident history documented = 1 point Multiple ingress-egress within 50 feet of crosswalk = 1 point Crossing more than 4 lanes total (i.e. both directions) = 1 point Other factor documented/concurred by Public Works = 1 point ea.	4	5	20
				<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>

# Evaluation/Assessment

- ❑ Evaluation/ Assessment conducted in 2009 and 2012
- ❑ Required by Strategic Plan every three years
- ❑ Updated Assessment occurring right now
- ❑ Assessment via on-line questionnaire

# Evaluation (Cont.)

The assessments have four primary objectives:

- ❑ To determine the level of awareness of the Measure A Crossing Guard Program;
- ❑ To determine the typical travel modes to and from school and the frequency at which students cross at a location where a crossing guard is on duty;
- ❑ To determine whether or not the presence of crossing guards influences travel choices for students that walk or ride a bicycle to and from school on most school days; and
- ❑ To determine whether or not the communities served by the Crossing Guard Program consider the expenditure of Measure A funds a good investment.

# Evaluation (Cont.)

The responses to the previous surveys indicate the following:

- ❑ Results show that 96% of the respondents indicated that crossing guards are a good way to spend Measure A funds.
- ❑ Almost all of the respondents are aware of the crossing guards but only one in seven knows that Measure A provides funding for the crossing guards.
- ❑ Approximately one-third of the respondents walk or ride their bicycle on most schools days (almost one-half are driven to school in a car).
- ❑ More than six in ten reported that they use a crosswalk where a crossing guard is on duty on most school days.

# Evaluation (Cont.)

- ❑ Significant majority of the students that walk or ride their bicycle on most school days regularly use a crosswalk where a crossing guard is on duty and feel more comfortable knowing the crossing guards are at certain locations.
- ❑ One-third of the students that walk or ride their bicycle on most school days reported they changed from being driven to school in a car to walking or bicycling, in part, due to the presence of the crossing guards.
- ❑ An overwhelming majority of respondents indicated they believe the Crossing Guard Program is a valuable investment of Measure A funds.

# Current Needs

- ❑ The Program will not be able to maintain the current level
- ❑ Costs are increasing much faster than Revenue
- ❑ New list in 2018 may need substantial reductions
- ❑ Feedback from users, schools, and police have indicated that the next 30 sites on the list are well deserving of a crossing guard
- ❑ Current cost of a funded location is \$16,000 annually and rising
- ❑ TAM's liability increases if sites are skipped on the approved list

# Potential Solution - Volunteers

- ❑ Volunteer Program would allow for program expansion and for sites to be bypassed if not interested in participating
- ❑ TAM is willing to manage guards under current contractor. This includes background check, training, equipment, supervision, discipline, and liability insurance
- ❑ Annual cost of a volunteer position would be \$4,000 to \$4,500 depending on total volunteers required
- ❑ TAM's current policy is not to discontinue service except at winter and summer breaks

# Questions?

