



Legislation Text

File #: 2017-382, Version: 1

Report to Mayor and City Council

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Discussion

SUBJECT:

CONSIDER ADOPTING AN UPDATED POLICY/PROCEDURE NO. 1.2 - WARRANTS FOR ADULT CROSSING GUARD ASSIGNMENTS (CITY COUNCIL)

I. SUMMARY

The City Council requested that staff review Carson's Policy/Procedure No. 1.2 for school crossing guard assignments to reflect current standards. Staff has prepared an updated version, which has been reviewed and recommended by the City Council Budget Subcommittee. The City Council should review the revised policy.

II. RECOMMENDATION

ADOPT the updated Policy/Procedure No. 1.2 titled "Warrants for Adult Crossing Guard Assignments."

III. ALTERNATIVES

1. DO NOT ADOPT the updated Policy/Procedure No. 1.2 titled "Warrants for Adult Crossing Guard Assignments."
2. TAKE another action the City Council deems appropriate.

IV. BACKGROUND

The City of Carson's original Policy/Procedure No. 1.2, titled "Warrants for Adult Crossing Guard Assignments," was adopted on September 15, 1969. The Policy/Procedure was last updated on December 1, 2009 and is currently in effect (Exhibit No. 1). Staff has prepared a revised version of the Policy/Procedure to clarify the procedures for determining if a crossing guard is warranted at a particular location and to maintain consistency with current standards (Exhibit No. 2).

The Budget Subcommittee consisting of Mayor Pro Tem Davis-Holmes and Council Member Hicks worked with staff to review and revise the draft policy. The policy review was suggested by the City Council during the latest review of crossing guard assignments.

One of the issues discussed was the need to assign crossing guards at our middle schools. The Council also discussed the problem of changing school enrollments and developing a process to reassign guards based on enrollment changes. An additional area discussed was the need for school staff to work with City staff on exploring campus programs to mitigate the need for additional crossing guards first, prior to schools requesting guards. Lastly, staff was directed to reach out the Los Angeles Unified School District for guard funding. This effort is currently underway as a part of the FY2017-2018 budget process.

Proposed Revisions

In general, Policy/Procedure 1.2 presents guidelines and criteria that should be used to evaluate a location for a crossing guard assignment. For example, the guidelines state that at least 20 school children per hour must cross the street on the way to or from school to justify the need for a crossing guard, and that at least 300 vehicles per hour must be traveling on the street at an uncontrolled crossing location to justify using a crossing guard. The numerical values that are used to evaluate crossing guard assignments have not been revised. The revisions primarily add clarification to the process that should be used to evaluate requests for assigning new crossing guards or suspending existing crossing guard service. The suggested revisions to the document as summarized as follows:

Section I - Process for Evaluating Crossing Guards

The title was changed from "Purpose and Scope." Minor wording changes were made for clarification and to eliminate typos.

Section II - Evaluation Guidelines

The title was changed from "Procedures." The guidelines are the same as the previous version except that paragraphs 1, 4, and 6 state that the City Council has the authority to assign crossing guards if the pedestrian count is slightly lower than 20 per hour, assign crossing guards at middle schools if justified, and assign crossing guards at crossings that are shared with another jurisdiction.

Section III - Request for New Guards and Suspending Guard Service

This is a new section that instructs Carson staff to meet with school representatives to explore all options available to the school for pedestrian safety before consideration is given to assigning a crossing guard, to perform traffic/pedestrian studies in both the Fall and Spring semesters to reassess the assignment of an existing crossing guard, and to notify the school of any recommendations to add, retain, or eliminate crossing guards. It also states that the City Council may withdraw crossing guard assignments when conditions no longer satisfy the requirements.

Section IV - Additional Evaluation Guidelines If the Initial Evaluation Guidelines Are Met

This section is essentially unchanged from the previous version except for minor wording changes for clarification. Paragraph 3 is new as it states that at least 300 vehicles per hour should be turning through the crosswalk at a signalized intersection to warrant the

assignment of a crossing guard. This threshold is from the "California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices." The previous version just stated that the City Council would determine the need for a crossing guard at a signalized intersection, but without any quantifiable criteria.

Section V - Authority- This section shows the current date and City Manager.

V. FISCAL IMPACT

None.VI. EXHIBITS

1. Current Policy/Procedure No. 1.2 dated 12/1/2009. (pgs. 4-5)
2. Proposed Policy/Procedure No. 1.2. (pgs. 6-8)

Prepared by: Richard Garland, Traffic Engineer