

**CITY OF VAUGHAN
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE (WORKING SESSION)
AGENDA**

This is an Electronic Meeting. The Council Chamber will not be open to the public. Public comments can be submitted by email to clerks@vaughan.ca. If you wish to speak to an item listed on the Agenda, please pre-register by contacting Access Vaughan at 905-832-2281 or clerks@vaughan.ca by noon on the last business day before the meeting.

Wednesday, November 4, 2020

9:30 a.m.

Council Chamber

2nd Floor, Vaughan City Hall

2141 Major Mackenzie Drive

Vaughan, Ontario

Pages

- 1. CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA**
- 2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**
- 3. COMMUNICATIONS**
- 4. DETERMINATION OF ITEMS REQUIRING SEPARATE DISCUSSION
INCLUDING MEMBERS RESOLUTION(S)**

Public Works

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. INTRODUCTION OF MULTI-RESIDENTIAL ORGANICS COLLECTION
Report of the Deputy City Manager, Public Works with respect to the above. | 3 |
| 2. SCHOOL CROSSING GUARD PROGRAM REVIEW
Report of the Deputy City Manager, Public Works with respect to the above. | 11 |

3. SCHOOL CROSSING GUARD POLICY
Report of the Deputy City Manager, Public Works with respect to the above.

5. ADOPTION OF ITEMS NOT REQUIRING SEPARATE DISCUSSION
6. CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS REQUIRING SEPARATE DISCUSSION
7. PRESENTATIONS
8. CONSIDERATION OF AD HOC COMMITTEE REPORTS
9. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS
10. NEW BUSINESS
11. ADJOURNMENT

ALL APPENDICES ARE AVAILABLE FROM THE CITY CLERK'S OFFICE
PLEASE NOTE THAT THIS MEETING WILL BE AUDIO RECORDED
AND VIDEO BROADCAST

www.vaughan.ca (Agendas, Minutes and Live Council Broadcast)

Committee of the Whole (Working Session) Report

DATE: Wednesday, November 04, 2020

WARD(S): ALL

**TITLE: INTRODUCTION OF MULTI-RESIDENTIAL ORGANICS
COLLECTION**

FROM:

Zoran Postic, Deputy City Manager, Public Works

ACTION: DECISION

Purpose

To request Council approval to provide green bin organics collection service in the multi-residential condominium sector.

Report Highlights

- To request Council approval to provide green bin organics collection service in the multi-residential condominium sector, to build on the City's commitment to environmental sustainability and waste reduction achievements, harmonize service levels for all citizens, and fulfill the new provincial policy directive on organics management.

Recommendations

1. That the City provide organics collection service for multi-residential buildings, to build on the City's commitment to environmental sustainability and waste reduction achievements, harmonize service levels for all citizens, and fulfill the new provincial policy directive on organics management.
2. That participation in the program be mandatory for multi-residential buildings receiving municipal waste collection.

3. That the program be initiated in phases, over a period of two years as generally outlined in this report, and that staff be given authority to initiate a change order to the waste collection contract to add this service.
4. That garbage collection frequency be offered weekly within two years of the organics program launch in each building.
5. That the City provide the initial complement of bins and carts necessary for waste collection and the in-home units for organics storage, to reduce barriers to participation.

Background

Provincial *Food and Organic Waste Policy Statement* aims to reduce food waste and recover food and organic waste as a resource through a circular economy model

Under the *Resource Recovery and Circular Economy Act*, 2016, the *Food and Organic Waste Policy Statement*, issued April 30, 2018, addresses food waste and resource recovery in the municipal, industrial and commercial sectors. A coordinated, Province-wide plan for organic waste materials intends to make diversion easier and more accessible for residents of Ontario, avoiding disposal of this valuable resource. Currently, the *Policy Statement* is open for public comment on the Environmental Registry until November 14, 2020, with proposed amendments focused on clarifying the categories of food and organic waste and providing new direction on the management of compostable products and packaging.

The complimentary *Food and Organic Waste Action Plan*, specifically calls out organics resource recovery in multi-unit residential buildings and commits to consult specifically on the barriers for this type of housing, referencing the single waste chutes typical of older buildings.

The Province has set a target of 50% organic waste diversion in the multi-residential sector by 2025

The Province's *Policy Statement* places the onus and direction for achieving this target on the owners of the multi-residential buildings and applies to buildings with more than six (6) units. The *Action Plan* reports that greenhouse gas emissions from the waste sector accounted for 8.6 megatonnes of carbon dioxide, or approximately 5% of Ontario's total greenhouse gas emissions from all sources. Efforts to address the issue of food and organic waste will impact this source of emissions and further the Province's Climate Change Action Plan targets, with a visionary goal of zero emissions from the waste sector.

Development and launch of an organics program will continue to support Council's commitment to the environment, and responsible waste management

Nearly 90 per cent of the City's citizens benefit from an organic waste diversion program implemented for all single-family homes, with the balance residing in multi-residential housing. Since the introduction of the green bin program in 2006, we have seen our waste diversion steadily improve, and citizens in Vaughan continue to divert two-thirds of their waste from landfill through recycling and organics collection.

With multi-residential housing forming a significant portion of growth, it is important to capture these users, form habits early and build on our waste diversion achievements

Organic waste collection in multi-residential buildings will bring solid waste service levels in line with single-family households and other York Region communities. Multi-residential housing represents a growing percentage of the City's housing mix and this sector will continue to impact our waste diversion and reduction achievements without the provision of a comprehensive waste diversion program. Environmental Services staff have heard from citizens that reside in these buildings, who are eager to responsibly divert organic material to composting, as they are coming from other communities or housing types that received this service.

Organic materials make up approximately 35% of the solid waste tonnage generated by the City's citizens

The City's Solid Waste services for garbage, organics, and recycling collected approximately 80,000 tonnes in 2019, excluding leaf and yard waste. Of that total, approximately 28,000 tonnes was food waste collected in the organics program. Based on results in our neighbouring communities of Richmond Hill and Markham and other large Canadian municipalities, multi-residential buildings can divert 25-30 per cent of waste to recycling and organics. Currently, the multi-residential sector in Vaughan is diverting approximately 10% of total waste through recycling alone. By introducing organics collection, we can expect to see similar diversion achievements over time as the program matures, and cascading benefits in recycling and textile waste diversion as residents learn about the importance and positive environmental impact of their participation.

Previous Reports/Authority

[NEW BUSINESS – POTENTIAL RETROFIT OF EXISTING MULTIRESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS WITH RESPECT TO SOLID WASTE STREAMS, DECEMBER 3, 2019](#)

[MULTI-RESIDENTIAL CONDOMINIUM WASTE COLLECTION SERVICE EXPANSION, MARCH 7, 2017](#)

Analysis and Options

An organics collection program is required to meet the waste diversion target in the provincial Policy Statement on Food and Organic Waste

Although the Policy Statement places the responsibility for addressing organic waste with the building owner, as the service provider to 89 multi-residential buildings in Vaughan, the onus will be on the City to provide organic collection service. The City's waste collection services are provided through a long-term service contract awarded through a competitive bidding process to Miller Waste Systems Inc. (Miller). At the time the contract was developed in 2016, organic waste collection in multi-residential buildings was not contemplated, and it was not included in the initial contract terms.

The City currently provides garbage and recycling collection to nearly ninety multi-residential buildings

The waste collection contract did include provisional pricing for service expansion of recycling and garbage collection to all multi-residential condominium buildings throughout Vaughan (approximately 6,500 additional dwelling units), and these buildings were added over the first two years of the contract, 2018 and 2019. All eligible multi-residential condominiums now receive front-end garbage collection, and a mix of front-end recycling or cart-based recycling collection, depending on space constraints and waste infrastructure. Table 2 outlines the proposed service levels and estimated waste collection costs for single-family homes and multi-residential buildings.

Table 1 – 2021 Budgeted Costs

	Solid Waste	Blue Box Recycling	Organics	Leaf and Yard Waste
Single Family Homes	\$2,230,000	\$3,370,000	\$3,330,000	\$1,160,000
Multi-residential Buildings	\$260,000	\$140,000	\$60,000	--
TOTAL	\$2,490,000	\$3,510,000	\$3,390,000	\$1,160,000

Multi-residential developments approved prior to 2016 have various dual- or single-stream infrastructure that can be adapted to accommodate organics collection through resident access to organics drop-off on-site

Building infrastructure varies across the multi-residential sector in Vaughan and will be served using two (2) separate collection methods. Among the current 89 multi-residential buildings receiving recycling and garbage collection in Vaughan, one third of units served either have an existing private organics program, or have new, three-stream waste infrastructure in the building, and will compose the first group to receive service. Older buildings without purpose-built organics infrastructure will be assessed on a case by case basis to determine the best approach to introduce this service. At this time, we anticipate approximately half of the total buildings served will be added to an organic cart program, and the remaining 19 per cent have been assessed as future front-end collection.

Table 2 – Multi-Residential Organics Infrastructure in Vaughan

Waste Infrastructure	Percentage of Units Served	Dwelling Units	Buildings
Service-ready infrastructure (Front-end bins or carts in place)	33%	4425	20
Proposed Cart service	48%	6571	54
Proposed Front-end service	19%	2503	15

Environmental Services staff will be focused on supporting the multi-residential sector to meet the organic waste diversion targets and employ best practices well-known throughout municipal waste collection service providers

Based on consultation with other communities that have launched similar programs, we anticipate challenges with behavior change, with some buildings participating more readily than others. Program implementation will involve personalized outreach based on building type and demographics to ensure program success, as well as on-going monitoring, targeted waste audits in collaboration with York Region, and annual touchpoints for all residents.

Garbage collection will be rationalized as the organics program is rolled out

Currently, garbage collection is provided twice per week for multi-residential buildings, and there have been no restrictions on the number of bins collected. With this

frequency, there is less incentive to divert waste to recycling and organics. As the organics program is adopted and buildings participate fully, the second weekly garbage collection will be suspended within two years of the program launch in a building. Based on the development planning review process since 2007, storage capacity for weekly garbage collection has been assessed as a general rule, so that any single missed collection would not impact citizens. Any new buildings brought onto our service will receive weekly garbage collection. This change brings the service level in line with other municipalities (Markham, Richmond Hill), and will result in negotiated cost savings over time, and in the next collection contract.

Financial Impact

Currently, all multi-residential buildings are responsible for the provision and upkeep of all waste containers. Staff recommend that all multi-residential buildings are provided with the initial required bins and carts necessary for waste collection, and that the City provide in-home units for organics storage to support program adoption.

The recommendations of this staff report have been included in the 2021 budget year and are projected to cost \$160K, including contracted collection costs, in-house bins and collection carts and front-end bins for 50% of buildings served. Bin costs in Year 1 are higher, as the majority of the bins will be metal, front-end bins, while Year 2 will be lower, as the majority will be plastic carts, which are less costly. Once the program has been normalized, the administration and oversight will be handled within the existing permanent staff complement in Environmental Services.

Table 3 – 2021 and 2022 Organics Program Costs

Year 1	
In-house organic containers (50% of total units)	\$20,000
Front end bins and carts	\$80,000
Collection service (hourly)	\$60,000
TOTAL	\$160,000
Year 2	
In-house organic containers (50% of total units)	\$20,000
Front end bins and carts	\$40,000
Collection service (hourly)	\$70,000
TOTAL	\$130,000

Broader Regional Impacts/Considerations

Due to our shared commitment to achieve the waste minimization goals set out in York Region's Integrated Waste Management Master Plan, all nine (9) local municipalities

have the responsibility of offering comparable waste diversion programming. By expanding organics collection, the City will meet the service levels offered by the most populous cities of Richmond Hill and Markham and will positively impact the overall system performance across the region. There are incremental costs related to organics processing, which would be supported by York Region. On a per tonne basis, it is estimated that these increased processing costs would be \$20-\$30K in 2021.

Conclusion

If approved, Environmental Services staff will collaborate with Miller Waste, York Region, condominium boards and property management firms to ensure that the separation, storage, collection and processing of organic waste from the multi-residential sector is successful and improves our integrated waste collection system for all citizens. To achieve this service level improvement, staff recommend that the program be initiated in phases over two years, starting with buildings that are already collecting organics under separate commercial contracts and those buildings with service-ready three-stream waste infrastructure. This will allow time for the City to provide individualized service to buildings that require more support, including presentations (on-line or in person), materials in specific languages, and repeat site visits to monitor participation.

For more information, please contact: James Steele, Director, Environmental Services, ext. 6116.

Prepared by

Kate Dykman, Manager, Solid Waste Management, ext. 6309

Approved by

Insert Digital Signature here
(DCM)

A blue digital signature of Zoran Postic, consisting of a stylized, cursive script.

Zoran Postic, Deputy City
Manager, Public Works

Reviewed by

A black ink signature of Jim Harnum, written in a cursive style.

Jim Harnum, City Manager

Committee of the Whole (Working Session) Report

DATE: Wednesday, November 04, 2020

WARD(S): ALL

TITLE: SCHOOL CROSSING GUARD PROGRAM REVIEW

FROM:

Zoran Postic, Deputy City Manager, Public Works

ACTION: FOR INFORMATION

Purpose

To provide the findings of the School Crossing Guard Program (SCGP) review.

Report Highlights

- The City has operated the SCGP for over 30 years to ensure safe travel for elementary school children. There has been consistent program growth over the last 10 years.
- A SCGP review has been completed which includes a scan of municipal best practices, an internal and external SCGP assessment, stakeholder engagement, and a staff engagement survey. The review is built on a framework of safety, program sustainability, and policy development.
- Key program review findings include: (1) The City compensates School Crossing Guards (SCGs) at the lower end of the pay scale in comparison to other municipalities; (2) the supervisor to staff ratio is significantly higher than other municipalities; and, (3) vacancies and shortages of standby SCGs have made it extremely difficult to maintain program deliverables.
- Legal Services, Risk Management and Human Resources have identified the need for periodic field inspections to ensure consistent oversight of staff and to be able to evaluate SCG requirements at warranted locations.
- SCG Policy and Procedures are outdated since 2011 and have been recommended to be updated in alignment with Provincial Guidelines.

Recommendations

1. That this report be received.

Background

School Crossing Guards are an important part of the City of Vaughan community. The City has operated the SCGP for more than 30 years, ensuring the safety of children is a top priority.

The SCGP was established over 30 years ago to provide assistance to elementary school children when crossing roads on their way to and from school. The SCGP (1) determines appropriate locations for SCGs; (2) hires, trains, implements and inspects SCGs; and, (3) works with local schools, YRDSB, YCDSB, York Region Public Health, York Region Police, parents/guardians, and the community to provide safer crossings. As the City's population grows, the SCGP evolves to manage the growing number of requests for SCGs. Today, the City has assigned crossing guards to assist children cross safely at 114 locations.

The most recent SCGP report was brought to Council on April 9, 2013. Council directed that the annual program review be deferred until the spring of 2015, and that staff promote children walking to and from school via the *Active Routes Are the Way to Go Program*, an initiative targeted at creating a safer and healthier mode choice for students, staff and families to travel to and from school, and to manage traffic congestion near schools. Due to staff and corporate changes over the past several years, the report was deferred. The Active Routes Are the Way to Go Program has also evolved to the *Active School Travel Program*.

The Highway Traffic Act (HTA) sets out the rules of the road in Ontario, including the operation of school crossings and the role of the SCG. With new crossing types such as pedestrian crossovers and roundabouts becoming more common as a form of intersection control, programs have been developed across the Province with respect to the implementation and standardization of school crossings. In 2017, the Ontario Traffic Council (OTC) developed a SCG Guide to enable uniformity in the implementation of SCGPs across the Province.

A SCG Program Review has been completed that includes a best practices program review of other municipalities, and a staff engagement survey.

Three studies were conducted to inform this review:

1. Exp Services Inc. (EXP) was retained as an independent consultant to review the City's SCGP and assess the existing warrants under the policy and perform an overall third-party review of the program's operations.
2. City staff conducted a Staff Engagement Survey.
3. City staff conducted a Market Survey of peer municipalities focused on compensation and administrative structure.

The SCGP review is built on the following framework:

- SAFETY:
 - Safety of children is a top priority; and,
 - Safety of staff and compliance to procedures.
- PROGRAM SUSTAINABILITY:
 - Managing growth year after year.
- POLICY DEVELOPMENT:
 - Enabling continuous program improvements and alignment with current legislation and best practices.

Previous Reports/Authority

Extract from Council Meeting Minutes of June 28, 2011 Meeting – Update to School Crossing Guard Policy and Procedure:

https://meetingarchives.vaughan.ca/extracts_2011/pdf/35ws0621ex-11.pdf

Extract from Council Meeting Minutes of June 25, 2007 Meeting – School Crossing Guard Compensation

https://meetingarchives.vaughan.ca/extracts_2007/pdf/32ws0612ex-07.pdf

Extract from Council Meeting Minutes of May 29, 2012 Meeting – Establishment of the School Crossing Guard Task Force

https://meetingarchives.vaughan.ca/council_2012/pdf/0529-12%20council%20minutes.pdf

Extract from Council Meeting Minutes of April 23, 2013 – Deferred School Crossing Guards Annual Review to Focus on Active Routes are the Way to Go Program

https://www.vaughan.ca/council/minutes_agendas/AgendaItems/CW0409_13_8.pdf

Provincial legislation, HTA Section 176 School Crossing Guards

[Ontario's Highway Traffic Act](#)

Analysis and Options

The SCGP was found to consistently perform key activities that are core to a successful program.

A comprehensive review was completed of the SCGP. This included a review of structure, staffing levels, SCG recruitment/ training/ compensation/ retention, stakeholder concerns, new location warrants, site inspections and reassessment.

Highlighted findings relate to an insufficient number of SCGs to protect identified crossing locations:

- SCG locations are frequently left without SCGs, due to a lack of standby guards. Parents and schools receive little advance notice. On average each SCG location was left unattended on more than 3 occasions during the 2017 and 2018 school years.
- Despite extensive recruiting activities, the City has been unable to recruit an enough SCGs resulting in warranted and/or new SCG locations not being assigned a guard.
- While other Ontario municipalities also report difficulty attracting SCGs, the vacancy rate of the municipalities surveyed is between 1.5% to 3% annually. In contrast, the daily absenteeism and vacancy rate at the City was 17% in 2019. The City of Vaughan was the only municipality surveyed to not have a standby roster of SCGs.

Identified potential drivers of the staff shortages were sub-standard compensation, a low supervision ratio, and a reluctance to remove SCGs from locations where they are not warranted. Employee recognition and events and the provision of added equipment could positively impact satisfaction. Municipalities surveyed indicated that a change to the compensation package had a direct positive impact on retention and recruitment percentages.

A SCGP Engagement Survey completed in 2020 found that 89% of the SCGs were pleased with their position, and that giving back to the community was their motivating factor in returning to the program.

A Risk Assessment of the SCGP was completed in June with support from Human Resources and Health and Safety. Recommendations implemented included:

- Extensive training on Health and Safety, Covid-19 precautions and PPE masks issued for SCGs.
- The placement of COVID 19 safety signage at school crosswalk locations.
- Collaborative communications and road safety messaging with stakeholders regarding safer school zone initiative in light of COVID 19.

- An updated robust recruitment plan was launched with the assistance of Corporate and Strategic Communications. As a result, the program started with thirteen (13) vacancies and now has one (1) vacancy for the start of the 2020/2021 school year.

The City of Vaughan SCGP was benchmarked against twelve other municipalities.

A benchmarking review was completed to understand how other municipalities operate their SCGP. Municipalities reviewed were Toronto, Mississauga, Brampton, Oakville, Guelph, Burlington, London, Ottawa, Markham, King, Richmond Hill and Niagara Falls.

The review found the following: (1) The City of Vaughan compensates School Crossing Guards (SCGs) at the lower end of the pay scale in comparison to other municipalities; (2) the supervisor to staff ratio is significantly higher than at other municipalities; and, (3) vacancies and shortages of standby SCGs have made it extremely difficult to maintain program deliverables.

The following are significant differences identified between the City's SCGP and those of other municipalities:

- The SCG hourly rate of pay was 17% less than comparable municipalities.
- The City did not have any standby SCGs on staff, whereas comparable municipalities maintained an average of 10% of their total complement of SCGs as standbys.
- The ratio of SCGs to supervision staff is much higher in Vaughan than other comparable municipalities (109:1 versus a range of 22:1 to 54:1).

As a result of the municipal scan (outlined in Attachment 1), Vaughan's SCGs compensation was reviewed and increased from the minimum wage to \$16.40 per hour in 2020 to more closely align with other municipalities, bringing Vaughan to the 50th percentile in wages.

In summary, several program challenges and opportunities were identified. These include:

- Constrained Administrative Capacity
 - The City has one supervisor administering the City's SCGP, addressing a wide range of administration duties and providing supervision to 114 SCG locations.
 - Limited capacity to respond to citizen enquiries, school administrations and SCGs; to perform field health and safety and program compliance inspections, recruitment, and administration of training sessions; and, to consistently update operating and training procedures and materials.

- Capacity to coordinate and liaison with OTC members for consistent program administration, operation and delivery is limited.
- Inconsistent Health and Safety field Inspections
 - Inconsistent completion of field inspections is a concern from a staff perspective considering that 85% of staff are over the age of 65 to start the 2020/2021 school year.
- Program Sustainability Risk
 - Consistent growth over the last 10 years with 2-3 SCG locations added per year drives recruiting pressures.
 - There is a strong interest in the SCGP from the public, and crossing studies are frequently requested, drawing further on supervisor capacity.
 - There are challenges filling SCG vacancies and a lack of standby coverage.
- Being able to build program support and resilience
 - The SCGP will benefit from engaging stakeholders to build greater awareness, to educate, to champion the program and to participate in the Active School Travel initiatives.
 - The SCGP will benefit from an increase in program capacity and flexibility to enable exploration of engagement strategies, and the implementation of new measures and initiatives to improve the overall performance and safety of the SCGP.

Stakeholders were engaged and were supportive of the new policy development and report recommendations.

Multiple internal stakeholders were engaged, and all were supportive of the new policy (Attachment 2), procedure (Attachment 3) and report recommendations. Comments and inputs received included:

- Legal and public reputational risk, as SCGs should be allocated based on a warrant process to limit program risk;
- Program growth be addressed with appropriate resourcing to sustain the program;
- Alignment with the new 2017 OTC SCG Guidelines to enable the ability to remove or allocate SCGs where required;
- Challenges with vacancies in past years has resulted in inadequate standby coverage and warranted locations left unguarded;
- There is notably high daily absenteeism (particularly during winter months);
- There is a need for inspections of staff, particularly considering staff demographics (85% over the age of 65);
- There is a significant administrative burden given a high staff to supervisor ratio;
- The program can benefit from substantial public awareness and communications initiatives;
- Measures to ensure program sustainability are required;

- Collaboration and partnerships with external stakeholders to build capacity to champion the SCGP are essential for the program to be successful; and
- There is a lack of development of a communication plan and matrix to address citizen concerns when removing or reallocating a SCG.

The SCG Program Review recommended a new operating policy and procedures, a refreshed recruitment plan, and health and safety provisions in alignment with best practices and the 2017 OTC SCG Guide.

To improve SCGP overall performance, maintain program sustainability, and reduce risk and liability, the following recommendations should be considered:

- That the SCG policy be updated to align to the 2017 OTC SCG Guide.
- Prioritization of essential warranted locations to improve operational efficiency and mitigate risk i.e. enable the ability to remove or reallocate SCGs.
- Resourcing the SCGP's administration through two (2) additional Program Coordinators to be able to meet program objectives, fulfill health and safety requirements, and minimize risk. Staff is recommending starting with the addition of one (1) Program Coordinator to enable manageable program expansion, and to allow for evaluation of the need for a second Program Coordinator.
- Engagement of stakeholders and building of capacity for education, outreach and communication.
- Support of safer school zone initiatives.
- Establish consistent administration, oversight and procedures to manage the SCGP, and maintain alignment with best practices across the Province.

Financial Impact

The total estimated cost for the SCGP Coordinator position is \$99,000. This will allow the SCGP to ensure the safety, efficiency and effectiveness of the program through the addition of administrative capacity to meet program objectives, fulfill health and safety requirements, and to administer the SCGP under the new SCG Policy and Procedure.

The SCGP Coordinator has been submitted in the 2021-2022 Draft Budget.

Any additional funding requirements to administer the SCGP will continue to be submitted through the City's budget deliberation process.

Relationship to Vaughan Vision 2020/ Strategic Plan

The SCGP Review is one of the nine strategic priority areas of the 2018-2022 Term of Council Service Excellence Strategic Map. The SCGP supports an Active, Safe and

Diverse Communities through the delivery of services that represent the City's commitment to the wellbeing of citizens, enriching of their lives, and maintenance of their safety.

Broader Regional Impacts/Considerations

The SCGP impacts overall road safety around schools. There are several Regional stakeholders that assist with championing the program and will benefit from the recommendations made in this report:

- Both YRDSB and YCDSB assist in obtaining information pertaining to new schools and their catchment areas to aid in identifying the most appropriate locations for a guarded school crosswalk.
- YRP aids the City in addressing safety concerns in school zones brought to their attention.
- York Region Public Health promotes walking and cycling as healthy methods for children to travel to school.

Conclusion

The City has operated the SCGP for over 30 years ensuring children's safety is a top priority. SCGs play an important role in road safety and the promotion of active travel to school. An external Program review, benchmarking study, and staff engagement survey identified challenges related to recruitment, inspections, high absenteeism, and supervision capacity. To improve the SCGP's overall performance, maintain program sustainability, and reduce risk and liability, it is recommended that the (1) SCG policy be updated to align with the 2017 OTC SCG Guide to provide a clear framework, in alignment with best practices across the Province when determining a SCG location, and the recommended activities associated with that implementation; (2) consistent administration be established, inclusive of oversight and procedures needed to manage the SCGP; and (3) capacity be added to enable stakeholder education, outreach and communication. To ensure the safety, efficiency and effectiveness of the program, it is further recommended that a Program Coordinator be added to the SCGP staffing complement to support the current supervisor to administer the SCGP under the updated Policy and procedure.

For more information, please contact Donald Eta, Director of Transportation and Fleet Management Services, Ext. 6141.

Attachments

1. City School Crossing Guard Market Survey
2. School Crossing Guard Program Policy 2020
3. School Crossing Guard Program Procedure 2020

Prepared by

Margie Chung, Manager of Traffic Engineering, Ext. 6173

Brenda Bisceglia, Supervisor, School Crossing Guard Program, Ext. 6144

In Consultation with

Rebecca Hall-McGuire, Legal Counsel, Municipal and Litigation

Robert Orrico, Manager, Occupational Health and Safety and Wellness

Frank Kraljevic, HR Specialist, Workplace Health and Safety

Lisa LaBelle, Human Resources Partner

Natasha Persad, Human Resources

Jennifer Ormston, Manager, Partner Communications and Engagement

Tricia Campbell, Risk Management Analyst

Marleen Hackman, Acting Supervisor (Animal Services) Bylaw and Compliance, Licensing and Permit Services

Approved by

Insert Digital Signature here
(DCM)



Zoran Postic,
Deputy City Manager, Public Works

Reviewed by



Jim Harnum, City Manager

Attachment 1
School Crossing Guard (SCG) Survey
February 2020

Table of Contents

Section 1: Overview	1
Section 2: Compensation Structure.....	1
2.1 Rate of Pay	1
2.2 Pay Structure	2
2.3 Minimum Wage Increase	2
2.4 Travelling Allowance	3
Section 3: Hours of Work.....	1
3.1 Maximum Hours per Week	3
3.2 Maximum shifts per day.....	4
3.3 Shift Times	4
Section 4: Incentives	5
4.1 Holiday & P.A. Day Pay	5
4.2 On-Call Pay	5
4.3 Equipment	6
4.4 Non-monetary benefits	7
4.5 Additional Bonuses.....	8
4.6 Lunch Service.....	8
4.7 Appreciation/Recognition Initiatives.....	9
4.8 Recruitment Methods	10
Section 5: Administrative Structure	12
5.1 Administrative Structure & Benefits.....	12
5.2 Reporting Structure	16
5.3 Health & Safety Inspections	16

Section 1: Overview

In Q1 of 2020, a market survey was sent to twelve municipalities across Ontario to determine where gaps and opportunities existed with the City of Vaughan's SCG Program, in order to improve upon current processes. More specifically, the department was seeking to perform an in-depth assessment on rate of pay, hours of work, incentives and the administrative structure of other municipalities SCG programs.

The following twelve municipalities were included in the survey: Brampton, Guelph, King City, Markham, Ottawa, Toronto, Burlington, Richmond Hill, Mississauga, Niagara, Oakville & London. Out of the twelve, nine provided a response to the survey. Those municipalities that did not provide a response had information pulled from publicly available documents where applicable (London, Mississauga).

The following chart outlines which municipalities provide in-house services, versus those that outsource the SCG Program to vendors.

In-House	Outsourced	Vendor
Richmond Hill, Oakville, King City, Burlington, Brampton, Mississauga, Niagara, Guelph	London	Stinson Security Services Limited
	Ottawa	Ottawa Safety Council
	Markham	Staffing Services
	Toronto	Carraway (Toronto, East York & Scarborough) ASP Inc (North York & Etobicoke)

Section 2: Compensation Structure

2.1 Rate of Pay

Municipality	Job Rate
Vaughan	\$14.00
Brampton	\$15.74
Guelph	\$15.00
King City	\$17.34
Markham	\$17.00
Ottawa	\$17.50
Toronto	\$15.68
Burlington	\$18.28
Richmond Hill	\$15.00
Mississauga	\$16.40
Niagara	\$18.12
Oakville	\$18.66
London	No response
Total Market Index Rate	\$17.00
Total Difference	-17.65%
Market Index Rate including only comparators (Brampton, Markham, Richmond Hill, Mississauga, Oakville)	\$16.40
Comparator Difference	-17.14%

2.2 Pay Structure

There is a split between municipalities who have pay structured in so that it includes ranges, versus one rate. The municipalities below offer a pay structure that supports a salary range:

Municipality	Range	Criteria
Markham	\$17.00 – \$18.50	Seniority
Ottawa	\$16.75 – \$17.50	Seniority
Burlington	\$14.63 – \$18.28	Seniority
Richmond Hill	\$14.00 – \$15.00	Seasons worked Year 1-3: \$14.00 Year 4: \$14.50 Year 5: \$15.00
Niagara	\$16.31 – \$18.12	6-month probation period
Oakville	\$15.34 – \$18.66	Rate increases for each year they return Step 1 \$15.54 Step 2 \$16.08 step 3 \$16.94 step 4 \$17.82 Step 5 \$18.66

Structuring pay in this manner may encourage retention, as it rewards those who have accrued tenure with the organization, however, in order for it to be successful, there would need to be a just-noticeable difference in incremental pay in so that it would act as a motivator, otherwise the department may run the risk of having an additional cost that would result in minimal to no impact.

2.3 Minimum Wage Increase

Vaughan, Guelph, Ottawa, Burlington & Richmond Hill have all increased wages as a result of the 2018 minimum wage increase (\$14.00), as these municipalities were paying below the mandated rate at the time of implementation. The increase in minimum wage did not have a negative impact on departments, with almost, if not all municipalities citing no cost effect on the operations of the program.

At the time of implementation, Brampton, King City, Toronto & Markham were paying above minimum wage, and were not required to make any adjustments to their current rates. However, Brampton, who had been compensating 30% above the minimum wage rate prior to the increase, did not adjust their rates further and is now experiencing recruitment & retention issues as a result of the compression. Toronto & Markham's SCG Program is outsourced, with vendors who have been compensating above the minimum wage since their services have been used. It is important to note however that although Markham is compensates at \$17.00/hour, this rate had been introduced five years ago when stations had been reduced to 30 minute shifts, in order to promote retention.

Mississauga, Oakville & London were unaccounted for as they did not respond to the survey.

2.4 Travelling Allowance

Typically, only spare guards will receive travelling allowances, with most municipalities basing rates on cents per kilometer. Assuming guards travel greater than 5 kilometers per day, Vaughan compensates 21.95% above the average.

Municipality	Travelling Allowance	Based Upon 5 km/day
Vaughan	\$6.00/day if >5km	\$6.00
Brampton	0.59/km	\$2.95
Guelph	0.52/km	\$2.60
King City	Does not offer – states location in posting	N/A
Markham	Rover guards paid based on circumstance and calculated based on cents per km driven.	N/A
Ottawa	No rate based on km - On-Call guards receive \$20/day to offset mileage and their shift rate. Regular back-up guards do not receive this	N/A
Toronto	Does not offer	N/A
Burlington	0.50/km	\$2.50
Richmond Hill	\$7.25/day if > 1.2 km	\$7.25
Mississauga	Up to 1.6 km home to crossing \$48.72/month 1.7 to 3.2 km home to crossing \$97.44/month 3.3 to 4.8 km home to crossing \$146.16/month 4.9 km+ home to crossing \$194.88/month	\$6.29
Niagara	\$10.00 flat rate/day worked	\$10.00
Oakville	0.57/km	\$2.85
London	N/A	N/A
	Average allowance per day	\$4.92
	Difference	21.95%

Section 3: Hours of Work

3.1 Maximum Hours per Week

The chart below outlines the maximum hours of week that guards are permitted to work.

Municipality	Maximum Hours/Week
Vaughan	15
Brampton	20
Guelph	10
King City	10
Markham	15

Ottawa	20
Toronto	32
Burlington	10
Richmond Hill	15
Mississauga	17.5
Niagara	15
Oakville	15
London	No response
Average hours/week	16.25 hrs/week
Median	15 hrs/week

3.2 Maximum shifts per day

Most municipalities cover two (2) shifts per day, having one shift in the morning, and one shift in the afternoon. Toronto may have three (3) shifts per day, as they operate on a larger scale, with higher density of traffic during lunch time hours. Those municipalities that have '2-3' shifts indicates that some but not all locations provide lunch time service.

Municipality	Shifts/day
Vaughan	2-3
Brampton	2-3
Guelph	2
King City	2
Markham	2
Ottawa	2
Toronto	3
Burlington	2
Richmond Hill	2
Mississauga	2-3
Niagara	2-3
Oakville	2-4
London	No response

3.3 Shift Times

Generally, across municipalities, guards work an average of 30 to 45 minutes per shift, with start and end times varying. The City of Toronto has included an additional incentive - if guards work all 3 scheduled shifts within the day, they will then be compensated for a total of 6.5 hours. In addition, Toronto has included a 30-minute buffer time, increasing hours to 1.5 hrs/shift, which allows for better management and deployment of standby staff.

Municipality	Shifts/day	Total Max hrs/day
Vaughan	8:00 – 8:30AM, 3:10 – 3:45PM	1.05
Brampton	30 minutes before and after bell	1.15
Guelph	7:50 – 8:50 AM, 2:45-3:55PM	2.10
King City	8:10-9:10AM, 3:15-4:15PM	2

Markham	7:30-9:00AM, 3:00-4:00PM	3
Ottawa	7:30-9:25AM, 2:20-4:15PM	4
Toronto	8:00-8:30AM, 11:00-12:00PM, 2:30-3:30PM	4.5
Burlington	8:00 – 9:00AM, 3:00 – 4:00PM	2
Richmond Hill	7:25-8:10AM, 2:20-3:30PM	2
Mississauga	No response	No response
Niagara	7:55-9:10AM, 11:25 – 1:45PM, 2:40- 4:00PM	2.25
Oakville	Morning and afternoons shifts vary in times depending on school start time and some have lunch shifts	No response
London	No response	No response
Average # of hours worked/day		2.41

Section 4: Incentives

4.1 Holiday & P.A. Day Pay

Holiday pay is offered by five municipalities and for statutory holidays only. Four municipalities offer paid P.A. days; Vaughan & Brampton pay for all scheduled P.A. days and Richmond Hill pays a maximum of 6 days. Guelph appears to be implementing practices that are similar to ESA public holiday pay, indicating that they only compensate those guards who have worked the day before and the day after the P.A. day.

Municipality	Holiday Pay	P.A. Days
Vaughan	Statutory holidays	Yes all P.A. days
Brampton	Statutory holidays	Yes all P.A. days
Guelph	Statutory holidays	Those who work the day before and the day after
King City	No	No
Markham	Statutory holidays	No
Ottawa	Statutory holidays + 4% vacation pay	No
Toronto	Statutory holidays	No
Burlington	Statutory holidays & march break and Christmas break	Yes all PA days
Richmond Hill	No	Paid max 6 days
Mississauga	No response	No response
Niagara	Statutory holidays + 4% vacation pay	No
Oakville	No	Yes after 3 months probation
London	No response	No response

4.2 On-Call Pay

On-call pay is not common for all municipalities, however, could be used as incentive for stand-by guards if there are persisting issues with absenteeism.

Municipality	Shifts/day
Vaughan	No
Brampton	3.5 hrs/day – if they aren’t doing crossings, they are training new guards, delivering items to guards or attending school sessions
Guelph	Paid for morning & afternoon shift if able to work
King City	No
Markham	No
Ottawa	\$20/day
Toronto	Yes
Burlington	Yes
Richmond Hill	No
Mississauga	No response
Niagara	Rovers do not work, but they are guaranteed three hours of pay so long as they are available to work. They are required to checkin via phone at 7am, 10am and 2pm for any assignments.
Oakville	On-call pay is two hours per day
London	No response

4.3 Equipment

Municipality	Shifts/day
Vaughan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All guards receive: stop sign, cap, rain suit (coat, pants & hood), whistle & lanyard and safety vest All permanent full time guards receive: winter coat, winter hat, gloves After one month, all guards receive equipment
Brampton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All guards receive stop sign, rain coat, lanyard, vest, winter hat, gloves. After 3 months they receive a winter coat
Guelph	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stop sign, (& Flashing paddle for non traffic signal locations), ball cap, tongue, water resistant rain 6-in-one jacket with hood & rain pants , safety vest, winter hat, scoop and garden claw (for sand/salt)
King City	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stop sign, hi-vis safety vest for the summer, winter jacket with hood and orange hi vis - all items must be returned
Markham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All guards receive stop sign, safety vest and rain coat.
Ottawa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stop paddle, safety vest, summer hat, winter hat, fall/spring coats
Toronto	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All staff regardless of full-time, part-time, or standby status receive full uniform and

	equipment including winter items consisting of a Parka and toque
Burlington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All guards receive: stop sign, cap(summer and winter), rain suit lanyard (badge) safety vest & safety cuffs. Staff to supply pants, shoes & gloves All items must be returned before being replaced
Richmond Hill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety vest, stop sign & whistle
Mississauga	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stop paddle, safety vest, raincoat, summer hat, mittens/gloves, footwear allowance
Niagara	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stop Paddle, Safety Vest, Reflective armbands, hi-vis rain coat, rain pants, spring/summer ball cap, fall/winter toque, hi-vis short-sleeved uniform shirt, hi-vis long-sleeved uniform shirt, navy-blue cargo style uniform pants, six-in-one hi-vis coats, ID badge top paddle, safety vest, raincoat, reflective armband, summer hat, winter hat, 6 in coat, footwear allowance, uniform pants, uniform shirts
Oakville	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stop paddle, safety vest, raincoat, reflective armband, whistle, sunscreen, summer hat, winter hate, mittens/gloves
London	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No response

4.4 Non-monetary benefits

Banquets/luncheons at the expense of the organization are common amongst most municipalities. It gives the chance for the

Municipality	Non-monetary benefits
Vaughan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Banquet/luncheon for guards that is paid for by the City Service awards for long term employees Gift cards
Brampton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Banquet in June, Access to EAP program, Half price gym membership, Access to on line learning (Lynda.net)
Guelph	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All new staff are provided with peer to peer mentoring, Winter meeting with dinner included. Guard appreciation morning coffee and snacks. (Annually Ontario wide appreciation on the first Wed after March Break.)
King City	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
Markham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
Ottawa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discounts at various stores and memberships, Special appreciation nights at NHL games, Monthly coffee socials

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awards (i.e., Best Back-up Guard), • ACG appreciation day - mayoral proclamation, • Thank a Guard program, • Fave Crossing Guard contest, • End of year luncheon, • Tenure bonuses, • Attendance bonuses
Toronto	• Year-end Staff BBQ
Burlington	• Year-end banquet/Christmas luncheon
Richmond Hill	• Luncheon paid for by the City
Mississauga	No response
Niagara	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Year-end Appreciation • Years of Service Recognition event/dinner, • Pre-Winter break coffee/tea/hot choco/Timbits social hour; • full uniform, footwear allowance.
Oakville	None
London	No response

4.5 Additional Bonuses

Municipality	Non-monetary benefits
Markham	\$250 referral bonuses offered to guards who successfully refer a guard who reaches the 3 month probationary period.
Ottawa	Monthly perfect attendance draw - 4 Guards names picked, each get \$100 bonus

4.6 Lunch Service

Municipality	Non-monetary benefits
Vaughan	• provided at a limited # of crossings
Brampton	• provided if warranted by # of students
Guelph	• Guelph removed the only lunch service offered at the original first seven start up locations from 2004-2006 as of June 2018.
King City	• Does not provide
Markham	• Does not provide
Ottawa	• No lunch crossings
Toronto	• Does not provide
Burlington	• Does not provide
Richmond Hill	• Does not provide
Mississauga	• No response
Niagara	• provided at a limited # of crossings
Oakville	• Does not provide

London

4.7 Appreciation/Recognition Initiatives

Municipality	Non-monetary benefits
Vaughan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Christmas gift card of \$10 , • 15 Year Service Recognition Award at Annual Training - 2019 • New Guard Award, (2) Everyday Hero Award (7 guards received this award). • Total of 8 awards given at training in 2019.
Brampton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • perfect attendance award, • long service awards, • crossing guard of the year
Guelph	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Christmas card with \$5 dollar gift card. • Appreciation card (March) with a \$10 dollar gift card.
King City	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No
Markham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Christmas cards, • service recognition, • occasional performance/attendance-based bonuses.
Ottawa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • special appreciation nights at NHL games, monthly coffee socials, • awards (i.e., Best Back-up Guard), • ACG appreciation day - mayoral proclamation, • Thank a Guard program, • Fave Xing Guard contest, • end of year luncheon, • tenure bonuses, • attendance bonuses etc.
Toronto	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSA of the month - gift card is provided • Weekly employee spotlight - Gift card • Daily recognition of employees performing exceptionally well - Coffee gift card • Retirement card, chocolate and small gift handed out to staff who were city guards inherited by Carraway who retire this year.
Burlington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40, 45 year recognition award with gift.
Richmond Hill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service Awards to recognize service at 5 year intervals ie. 5, 10, 15 etc.
Mississauga	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No response
Niagara	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Years of service awards - Ten and 20 years. • Recognition of anyone retiring with 20 years+ service as a Guard (special award from the Mayor's office).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City has an Employee Recognition program in general and I have recommended Guards for this award several times and they have won.
Oakville	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gift cards (\$20) at Christmas Above and Beyond Gift cards Years of service award and a token
London	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No response

4.8 Recruitment Methods

Most municipalities cited issues with recruitment. This position may be difficult to recruit for due to:

- Weather conditions: must be available and willing to work in all forms of weather,
- Working conditions: must be able to move briskly & repeatedly, stand & hold a stop sign for an extended period of time, have good vision & hearing
- Cost burden of application: screening process requires VSC checks at the expense of the guard
- Need for work: some guards hours offered just aren't enough to keep interest

Outlined below are recruitment methods that municipalities have used.

Municipality	Recruitment Methods
Vaughan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All City Resources with the assistance of Corporate Communications and Recreation Local Newspapers Local Events /Attending local community centres Senior Clubs Local Schools Costi – Employment Agencies Printed Ads
Brampton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City Resources Workopolis School Newsletters, Attending community events Send letters to guards asking for guard
Guelph	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Newspaper Radio Social media School boards post ads on their webpage and the specific schools' webpages. One-month blitz on local medical buildings screens and internal city screens. A-Frame board - on location, rec centre, school hallway.
King City	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City website Social media Newspaper Roadside signs near the crossing location

Markham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advertisements in local newspapers, schools, school events, sandwich boards on street corners • referral bonus programs • summer on-foot house-to-house recruitment drives with flyer handouts.
Ottawa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Those mentioned by you • Facebook ads • door hangers/flyers • booths etc.
Toronto	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online job postings (indeed and other job sites) • Government and private employment agencies • Neighbourhood recruitment outreach (person to person) • Local schools • Print media including posters and post-cards • Direct Mail campaign <p>Recruitment is focused on Local initiatives. 90% of all staff work within the districts they live</p>
Burlington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All City resources. • Local Newspaper • Community/Senior Centres • Retirement Residences
Richmond Hill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All City resources. • Local Newspaper • Community/Senior Centres • Retirement Residences
Mississauga	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No response
Niagara	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crisis declaration sparked interest, brought about by a report that was going to Council to bump up pay. Story was picked up by local media. • Increased advertising by HR at Seniors' Rec Centre, • Social media • Local papers • full-uniform tends to draw interest (highly noticeable), • asking current guards to take applications for people they know who might be interested (these were given out at August Orientation meeting), • Job Fair 2020 (biggest impact)
Oakville	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advertise at schools and recreation Centres • Recruitment drives • Targeted pamphlets in certain areas of need as well

London	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No response
--------	---

Section 5: Administrative Structure

5.1 Administrative Structure & Benefits

Most SCG programs fall under the Transportation & Traffic division, allowing for alignment & compliance of policies and procedures, as guards are operating on public streets. Those municipalities that are outsourced tend to have a more streamlined process, as they do not have the added responsibility of communicating with other departments to maintain the program.

Municipality	Administrative Structure	Benefits
Vaughan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technical and administrative roles fall under one group. Resides within the Public Works Portfolio under the Transportation and Fleet Management Services Department. The SCG's report into the Supervisor of Crossing Guards & Administration, who receives administrative & clerical support from Operations Admin Assistants at times to help with the various admin tasks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alignment of the Crossing Guard Program with Transportation Services is ideal. The Supervisor works closely with traffic technical staff on studies/warrants, policy/procedures and communicating with the public and MMC. Operational constraints with having only one Supervisor oversee 114 outside staff. More time spent on administrative tasks and daily issues, than on health and safety requirements, metrics and on overall program development and direction. Downfall: still lacking support to have health and safety inspections completed.
Brampton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under Public Works, Traffic Services. There is one Supervisor, Crossing Guards, two Team Lead positions that are all full time. There is a senior rover to assist in the field 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alignment with Traffic Services provides for collaboration with Traffic Services regarding signal timing, pavement markings, etc. Complete our own warrant studies. Crossing Guard Supervisor and Team Lead are responsible for crossing guards, Brampton Safety Council, Peel Safe and Active Routes to School and other active transportation. We have 230 crossing guards. With the two full

		<p>time Team Lead positions this allows us to see all guard on site at least 4 times per year and focus on Health and Safety.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MTO has reviewed our policies and practices after a serious injury and they requested a quiz to be added when hiring. No downfall
Guelph	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The program is with Transportation Services team, which is part of the Infrastructure, Development & Enterprise Department. • Coordinator administers the day to day program needs, collects and analysis study data, advertising, interviews, payroll exceptions, public concerns and all training. • The Coordinator reports to a manager 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefit - Traffic Investigations supports the program.
King City	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crossing Guards (all are contract, none are FT) report to the Parks Supervisor under the Manager of Parks (part of Parks, Recreation & Culture Department). • Admin support via Parks division 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alignment with PRC is good - some overlap with EPW. • FT Parks Operators will handle coverage when contracted Crossing Guards are absent
Markham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our private operation is streamlined such that all activities of the program filter through the Assistant V.P. Of Operations. This includes phones, communication, payroll, office management and coordinating daily backup efforts with rovers and backups. • A Supervisor provides station-to-station attention, dealing with daily issues of roster adjustments, coordinating backups, auditing stations to ensure correct protocols and general liaison between guards and the office. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We don't see any downside to this structure. In the eyes of our company, we have developed a lean and productive system, utilizing over 30 years of Crossing Guard program administrative experience. Health and Safety inspections occur regularly, and we do not have the issue of having to communicate with other entities or departments to maintain the program effectively and efficiently. We feel that we have fine-tuned our process. We look upon ourselves as the crossing guard industry experts. There are no

		other companies that specialize in this field.
Ottawa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have a program Manager - 40% of time spent on the Guard program, a Coordinator (90% of time) that does all the scheduling, a Recruiter and HR Manager (70% each) and a Finance Coordinator (20%). • The City is split into five zones and we have a Team lead in each zone that goes around to do ped counts and site inspections 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No benefit/downside.
Toronto	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carraway Safety manages the school crossing guard program for 55-60% of the program on behalf of the City of Toronto's Transportation division 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outsourcing the School Crossing Guard program has been successful. • SCG are inspected
Burlington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCG program is under transportation department. • SCG report to supervisor of crossing guards. • Admin assistance provided by transportation admin associate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ideal - Assistant supervisor assists with completion of H & S items.
Richmond Hill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical and administrative roles falling under one group. The SCG Program resides within the Public Works Operations division. • The SCG's report into the Supervisor of Business & Technical Services, who receives administrative & clerical support from Operations Clerks at times to help with the various admin tasks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unable to comment on this section
Mississauga	No response	No response
Niagara	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCG program falls under the Transportation Services Department and specifically under the Traffic Engineering Division. • The School Crossing Guard Coordinator heads up the program. • This position used to be contracted out to a member of the Core of Commissionaires who are contracted to do Parking Enforcement, but was brought in-house as a non-union city position about six years ago. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It's convenient having the program under the Traffic Division for purposes of warrants, street signs and line painting operations; however, there is an extremely significant 'human' element to the program which might fit better elsewhere (in a less engineering-minded area). • It is difficult for one person to manage daily

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Coordinator reports to the Manager of Traffic Engineering. 	<p>operations of staff. All hiring aspects, in-house training, paperwork, out-fitting of uniform and equipment, HR related training is conducted by Coordinator, plus daily scheduling, check-in, timesheets, supervision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program has expanded over the past six years to incorporate road safety messaging, training and initiatives for staff, pedestrians (especially elementary students) and motorists. We have partnered with other stake holders to promote and encourage Active and Safe Travel for school. We have our own In-Class Road Safety Program which we offer free to local elementary schools' Primary Divisions. We have initiated a regional committee for all municipalities in Niagara region to work together and are heavily involved with the OTC's new provincial School Crossing Programs Committee. Difficulties to manage time between the numerous pedestrian safety programs and initiatives and daily operations of program.
Oakville	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Falls under the traffic section in the Roads and Works department. • There is a Supervisor, Traffic Operations. The Program Leader, Traffic Services reports to that Supervisor and is responsible for the coordination of the crossing guards. They 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a good place for the program to sit. • There is coordination with the Engineering and Construction Department that needs to happen as well but sitting in the

	have a senior coordinator and two other coordinators as well (all PT positions)	operational section of traffic is ideal.
London	No response	No response

5.2 Reporting Structure

Those municipalities that exhibit a higher supervisor to crossing guard ratio tend to have an administrative structure that allows for additional support in the daily operations of the program, and utilizes positions such as Coordinators to deal with administrative aspects of the program, such as scheduling, and Team Leads/Rovers to perform site visits and assist in the field, so that tasks & responsibilities are distributed in so that the Supervisor has the support they need to effectively manage the program.

Municipality	Reporting Structure	Supervisor to Crossing Guard Ratio
Vaughan	Supervisor of Crossing Guards & Administration	0.0008
Brampton	Supervisor of Crossing Guards	0.0086
Guelph	Coordinator reports to the Manager, Transportation Engineering	0.02
King City	Parks Supervisor	0.25
Markham	Assistant V.P., Operations	Negligible: 2 supervisory staff operate the entire program, including all accounting, payroll and logistics.
Ottawa	Team Leads and Coordinator and all Guards report to the School Zone Safety Manager	0.006: two office staff that manage the Guards, and over 300 Guards. 5 team leads - but they are not supervisors, they just report issues to the Manager
Toronto	Operations Manager	0.02
Burlington	Supervisor of School Crossing Guards	0.0227
Richmond Hill	Supervisor of Business & Technical Services	0.025
Mississauga	Supervisor, Crossing Guards	0.02
Niagara	Manager, Traffic Engineering	0.016
Oakville	Supervisor of Traffic Operations	0.03
London	No response	0.03

5.3 Health & Safety Inspections

The completion of Health & Safety inspections varies from daily to annually, and is for the most part, dependent upon the department's capacity to complete inspections. Due to there being multiple crossing guard locations, there may be not enough time and/or resources to complete inspections as often as municipalities would like. As a result, departments tend to become reliant upon staff and/or the public to report any concerns/issues, so that they can be addressed in a timely manner. Some municipalities have in a sense 'outsourced' the inspection to the Joint Health & Safety Committee, who is familiar with OHS compliance procedures & protocol, and would be able to quickly spot when there is deviation from, while

the department focuses on the performance evaluation of guards. To be proactive, municipalities have also provided Health & Safety training prior to guards first day, so that they are aware of expectations and can help minimize and identify risk.

Municipality	Health & Safety Inspections
Vaughan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete inspection of each location twice a year • Current structure of the program, unable to complete all inspections. • Created a health and safety inspection, which all guards are aware of and provided with a copy of the inspection.
Brampton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed quarterly by the Health and Safety Committee • Crossing Guard Staff conduct on site evaluations 4 times per year at all crossings. • The guard and Team Lead, Senior Rover review the evaluation and review with the guard upon contract renewal
Guelph	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reliant upon staff to call in concerns for immediate follow up • Inspection report completed annually, while conducting an evaluation of staff
King City	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No formal health and safety inspections currently completed. • Crossing Guards are given health and safety orientation upon hiring. • JHSC members have job shadowed; inspections of these locations are conducted from a review standpoint (of use) vs. health and safety specific
Markham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed regularly • All guards are audited on a rotating basis, and coordinated by the office every few months
Ottawa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed twice quarterly by Team Leads
Toronto	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed in September at the beginning of the program • Health and Safety inspections are completed at least once a year. • Investigations conducted throughout the year as required
Burlington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed daily • All guards provided a checklist for H&S to submit for issues. • Assistant and supervisor make daily trips to field. Monthly safety talks were implemented in Jan 2020.
Richmond Hill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed during H&S orientation training • Audits occur on site to ensure rules & proper procedure are followed
Mississauga	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed 1 -4 times • Dependent upon departments capacity
Niagara	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed 3 times per year

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Handbook, they are to be carried out twice per year while Guards are present and then once in August before start of school year. • School Crossing Guard Coordinator is currently responsible for all site inspections. This is becoming extremely difficult to complete. • Attempting to move this responsibility to our JH&SC, which Coordinator currently sits on
Oakville	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed in the spring and fall • Carried out twice a year. All inspections are completed on schedule. Report is kept and forwarded to the Joint Health and Safety Committee
London	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No response

CORPORATE POLICY

POLICY TITLE: SCHOOL CROSSING GUARD PROGRAM

POLICY NO.: 19.C.04

Section:	Roads, Traffic & Operations		
Effective Date:	October 21, 2020	Date of Last Review:	June 1, 2011
Approval Authority: Council	Policy Owner: DCM, Public Works		

POLICY STATEMENT

The School Crossing Guard Program (SCGP) contributes to enhancing community well-being by encouraging children's active and safer school travel.

PURPOSE

The SCGP policy is intended to establish a framework for the administration, evaluation, approval, implementation, and removal/reallocation of School Crossing Guards (SCG) in accordance with the Ontario Traffic Council (OTC) SCG Guide, and in accordance with the *Highway Traffic Act*, in the operation of school crossings and active role of the SCG.

SCOPE

The SCGP was established to aid school aged children from five to 12 years of age when crossing roads on their way to and from school at a designated school crosswalk location. The City's SCGP policy and procedures assists staff to determine the most appropriate location for a SCG and where it is most needed.

LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

- 1. Highway Traffic Act (HTA) R.S.O. 1990, c.H.8:** Sets out the rules of the road in Ontario, including the operation of school crossings and the role of SCGs.
- 2. Occupational Health and Safety Act (OHSA):** Ontario's cornerstone legislation for workplace health and safety. It protects workers from health and safety hazards on the job. It sets out duties for all workplace parties and rights for workers. It establishes procedures for dealing with workplace hazards and provides for enforcement of the law where compliance has not been achieved voluntarily.

DEFINITIONS

1. **Controlled Crossing Location:** Locations with stop signs, a pedestrian crossover (PXO), intersection pedestrian signals (IPS), mid-block pedestrian signals (MPS) or full traffic control signals (TCS). At controlled crossings, vehicles must obey the respective HTA regulations for each type of control. A school crossing in the absence of stop signs, IPS, PXO, MPS or TCS is considered a controlled crossing only when the crossing is being supervised by a SCG.
1. **Eligible School:** A school is eligible for a SCG if elementary school children (age 5 to 12) attend, whether private or public.
2. **Exposure Index (EI):** A warrant methodology that examines the level of interaction and conflict between vehicular and student pedestrian volumes. The Exposure Index method generates a graph based on historical trends at existing SCG locations. The graph is then used as the threshold for future crossing locations where a SCG may be required. The EI methodology is suitable for controlled crossing facilities that have conflicting movements between vehicular and student volumes.
3. **Gap Study Method:** An objective process that: (i) uses site observations to establish the safe gap threshold for pedestrians to cross a roadway, and (ii) measures the available gaps along the roadway to determine if there are enough safe gaps. The Gap Study methodology is suitable for uncontrolled crossing facilities.
4. **Ontario Traffic Council (OTC):** Provides guidelines to address practices and procedures for SCG operations.
5. **School Crossing Guard (SCG):** A person 16 years or older who is directing the movement of persons (as defined in the HTA) across a highway (HTA term for any road) by creating necessary gaps in vehicular traffic to provide safe passage at a designated school crossing location.
6. **Uncontrolled Crossing Location:** Locations where pedestrians do not have the right-of-way and must wait for a safe gap in traffic prior to attempting to enter the roadway. Examples of uncontrolled locations are:
 - 6.1. Mid-block Crossings (in the absence of Mid-block Pedestrian Signal (MPS) or Pedestrian Crossover (PXO)).
 - 6.2. Designated School Crossing (in the absence of a SCG and without other forms of control such as Traffic Control Signal (TCS), Intersection Pedestrian Signal (IPS), Midblock Pedestrian Signal (MPS), Pedestrian Crossover (PXO), stop signs or Yield signs).
 - 6.3. Marked Crossing (at an intersection in the absence of Stop or Yield signs).

POLICY TITLE: SCHOOL CROSSING GUARD

POLICY NO.: 19.C.04

6.4. Roundabouts.

- 7. Warrant:** A consistent and uniform approach to the implementation of school crossing locations. It is used to determine where SCG's are needed, warrants are set by the OTC SCG Guide.
- 8. Warrant Analysis:** The process of verifying whether one or multiple SCGs are required for an intersection or location. The warrant analysis process is intended to be an unbiased and consistent evaluation method that is done without outside influence. There may be multiple ways to complete a SCG warrant depending on the type of intersection and location being assessed.

POLICY

To improve the SCGP performance and reduce risk and liability through:

- Consistent and uniform application of the OTC SCG Guide with established criteria for evaluating locations for SCGs;
- Development of processes for the assessment, deployment or reallocation of SCG's based on warrant and where most essential;
- Standardization of administrative practices; hiring, orientation, training and development, supervision and inspections in accordance with OHSA requirements and the OTC SCG Guide; and,
- A robust communication strategy to support the recruitment and retention of SCGs, as well education and outreach programs and materials that reinforce active and safe school travel.

1. Roles and Responsibilities

1.1. Deputy City Management, Public Works

The Deputy City Manager of Public Works and/or designate is authorized to administrate the SCGP in accordance with the SCG policy and procedures.

1.2. Supervisor of the SCGP and Traffic Services

The SCG Supervisor, with the support of the technical staff from Traffic Engineering Services will be responsible for the management, administration and promotion of the SCGP in accordance with the mandate given by City of Vaughan Council and HTA regulations; and, in accordance with the SCG policy and procedure, to ensure the active and safe travel of children to and

from school. The SCG Supervisor is also to be an active participant of the Traffic Management Stakeholder Advisory Committee (TMSAC).

1.3. Traffic Management Stakeholder Advisory Committee (TMSAC)

The TMSAC will promote active and safe travel for students and ensure consistent communication, application and awareness of the program. The Supervisor of the SCGP will be an active participant of the TMSAC.

2. Warrants and Annual Reviews

2.3. Warrants for SCG's must be administered in accordance with the criteria and guidelines set out in the OTC SCG Guide and the SCG procedures.

2.4. If the necessary traffic studies determine a warrant has been met, a SCG will be implemented based on the criteria and time requirements set out in the SCG procedures.

2.5. Existing SCG locations, currently warranted or not, will remain in place until such time as the locations are due to be reassessed.

2.6. Annual technical review of twenty-five (25) SCG locations will be studied to determine warrant of the SCG location for the subsequent school year. Locations will be pre-selected and may also be based on request.

2.7. SCG locations not meeting warrant will be subject to the SCG removal and/or reallocation process outlined in the SCG procedures.

1.1. Warrant criteria set out in the OTC SCG Guide and SCG procedures must be verified prior to the removal or reallocation of SCG's. Two traffic studies within the same school year on typical school days must be completed and meet warrant to proceed with the removal or reallocation of a SCG.

1.2. Removal or reallocation of a SCG will be implemented the next school year based on criteria outlined in the SCG procedure.

3. Communications

3.3. The SCG Supervisor and Traffic Engineering Services staff will ensure all applicable internal and external stakeholders; Mayor and Members of Council, citizens, school boards, school parent councils, senior leadership, etc. are advised via written communication and/or meetings on any intention to implement, not implement, remove or reallocate SCGs, as well as any changes impacting the SCGP, operating procedures and policies set out herein.

POLICY TITLE: SCHOOL CROSSING GUARD

POLICY NO.: 19.C.04

3.4. The Supervisor of the SCGP will meet with both YRDCSB and YRDSB School Boards annually to collaborate, discuss relevant initiatives and any issues or concerns pertaining to the SCGP.

3.5. The SCG Supervisor will work with Corporate and Strategic Communications to employ a comprehensive, multi-faceted approach to promote SCG recruitment as well as active and safe travel promotion SCGP material for the SCGP.

ADMINISTRATION

Administered by the Office of the City Clerk.

Review Schedule:	5 Years If other, specify here	Next Review Date:	October 21, 2025
Related Policy(ies):			
Related By-Law(s):			
Procedural Document:	PRC.16 – School Crossing Guard		

Revision History

Date:	Description:
Click or tap to enter a date.	
Click or tap to enter a date.	

CITY OF VAUGHAN

CORPORATE PROCEDURE**PROCEDURE TITLE: SCHOOL CROSSING GUARD PROGRAM****PROCEDURE NO.: PRC.16**

Section:	Roads, Traffic & Operations		
Effective Date:	October 21, 2020	Date of Last Review:	June 1, 2011
Policy Parent: 19.C.04 – School Crossing Guard		Procedure Owner: DCM, Public Works	

PROCEDURE STATEMENT

These procedures are to be followed when evaluating, implementing, approving, removing or reallocating a School Crossing Guard(s) (SCG) as per the School Crossing Guard policy.

PURPOSE

This procedure establishes a comprehensive approach with consistent standards in the evaluation, implementation, approval and removal/reallocation process of SCGs to support active and safer travel options for elementary students as they travel to and from school.

SCOPE

The School Crossing Guard Program (SCGP) was established to aid children between five to 12 years of age when crossing roads on their way to and from school at a designated school crosswalk location. The City's SCGP policy and procedures assist staff to determine the most appropriate location for a SCG and where it is most needed.

LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

- 1. Highway Traffic Act (HTA) R.S.O. 1990, c.H.8:** The HTA sets out the rules of the road in Ontario, including the operation of school crossings and the role of SCG's.
- 2. Occupational Health and Safety Act (OHSA):** Ontario's cornerstone legislation for workplace health and safety. It protects workers from health and safety hazards on the job. It sets out duties for all workplace parties and rights for workers. It establishes procedures for dealing with workplace hazards and

PROCEDURE TITLE: SCHOOL CROSSING GUARD

PROCEDURE NO.: PRC.16

provides for enforcement of the law where compliance has not been achieved voluntarily.

DEFINITIONS

- 1. Controlled Crossing Location:** Locations with stop or yield signs, a pedestrian crossover (PXO), intersection pedestrian signals (IPS), mid-block pedestrian signals (MPS) or full traffic control signals (TCS). At controlled crossings, vehicles must obey the respective HTA regulations for each type of control. A school crossing in the absence of stop signs, IPS, PXO, MPS or TCS is considered a controlled crossing only when the crossing is being supervised by a SCG.
- 2. Exposure Index (EI):** A warrant methodology that examines the level of interaction and conflict between vehicular and student pedestrian volumes. The Exposure Index method generates a graph based on historical trends at existing crossing guard locations. The graph is then used as the threshold for future crossing locations where a SCG may be required. The EI methodology is suitable for controlled crossing facilities that have conflicting movements between vehicular and student volumes.
- 3. Eligible School:** A school is eligible for a SCG if elementary school children (age 5 to 12) attend, whether private or public.
- 4. Gap Study Method:** An objective process that: (i) uses site observations to establish the safe gap threshold for pedestrians to cross a roadway, and (ii) measures the available gaps along the roadway to determine if there are enough safe gaps. The Gap Study methodology is suitable for uncontrolled crossing facilities.
- 5. Operating Procedures:** Established methods and guidelines set to be routinely followed by Crossing Guards, Supervisory Staff and Traffic Staff which include instructions on contract administration, reporting structure, payroll, health and safety requirements, warrant procedures, communication criteria for both internal and external stakeholders, and policy requirements. The aim is to achieve efficiency, and uniformity of performance, while reducing miscommunication and failure to comply with regulations or policy.
- 6. Ontario Traffic Council (OTC):** Provides guidelines to address practices and procedures for SCG operations.
- 7. Proponent:** A person who advocates a theory, proposal, or project or who puts forward a proposition or proposal; a person who argues in favor of something; an advocate.

- 8. School Crossing Guard (SCG):** A person sixteen (16) years or older who is directing the movement of persons (as defined in the HTA) across a highway (HTA term for any road) by creating necessary gaps in vehicular traffic to provide safe passage at a designated school crossing location.
- 9. School Peak Periods:** The timeframes in the morning, mid-day and afternoon during which most students arrive at and depart from school.
- 10. School Zone:** A roadway section with a lower speed limit near a school. The periods during which the lower speed limits are in effect are at the discretion of each municipality.
- 11. Stakeholders:** Representatives from the various divisions (internal and external partners), including City Council, Human Resources, Legal Services, Public Works, York Region Catholic and York Region Public-School Boards, York Regional Police, Public Health, The Regional Municipality of York, School Parent Council, and concerned parents and citizens of Vaughan.
- 12. Traffic Control Devices:** Any sign, signal, marking or device placed upon, over or adjacent to a roadway by a public authority or official having jurisdiction, for regulating, warning, guiding or informing road users.
- 13. Uncontrolled Crossing Location:** Locations where pedestrians do not have the right-of-way and must wait for a safe gap in traffic prior to attempting to enter the roadway. Examples of uncontrolled locations are:
- 13.1. Mid-block crossings (in the absence of MPS or PXO);
 - 13.2. Designated school crossing (in the absence of a SCG and without other forms of control such as Traffic Control Signal (TCS), Intersection Pedestrian Signal (IPS), Midblock Pedestrian Signal (MPS), Pedestrian Crossover (PXO), stop signs or Yield signs);
 - 13.3. Marked crossing (at an intersection in the absence of stop or yield signs); and,
 - 13.4. Roundabouts.
- 14. Warrant:** A consistent and uniform approach to the implementation of school crossing locations. It is used to determine where SCGs are needed, warrants are set by the OTC SCG Guide.
- 15. Warrant Analysis:** The process of verifying whether one or multiple crossing guards are required for an intersection or location. The warrant analysis process is intended to be an unbiased and consistent evaluation method that is done without outside influence. There may be multiple ways to complete a SCG warrant depending on the type of intersection and location being assessed.

PROCEDURE TITLE: SCHOOL CROSSING GUARD

PROCEDURE NO.: PRC.16

PROCEDURE

1. Roles and Responsibilities

1.1. Supervisor of the SCGP

The SCG Supervisor will be responsible for the management, administration and promotion of the SCGP in accordance with the mandate given by City of Vaughan Council and HTA regulations, in accordance with the SCG policy and procedure to ensure the active and safer travel of children to and from school. Activities include:

- 1.1.1. Determining the strategic direction of the SCGP;
- 1.1.2. Approval of assignment, relocation, or removal of crosswalk locations and guards based on policy, warrant procedures and communication with all relevant stakeholders;
- 1.1.3. Monitoring the operating budget for the SCGP;
- 1.1.4. Establishing and tracking Key Performance Indicators;
- 1.1.5. Working closely with internal and external stakeholders to improve and enhance the SCGP;
- 1.1.6. Performance Management of SCGs;
- 1.1.7. Ensuring compliance with Health and Safety regulations;
- 1.1.8. Recruiting, training and managing the operational performance of SCGs; and,
- 1.1.9. Responding to inquiries raised by the public, schools, City Councillors, internal departments, and SCGs.

1.2. Staff Support

Staff support will provide daily supervision and coordination of the delivery of services in accordance with the Ontario HTA and the SCG policy and procedures. Staff activities include:

- 1.2.1. Managing crossing guards on a day to day basis;
- 1.2.2. Ensuring coverage of crosswalk locations;
- 1.2.3. Addressing general inquiries related to the SCGP;
- 1.2.4. Conducting field inspections to ensure safe and efficient services City-wide and ensure OTC guidelines are adhered to;
- 1.2.5. Ordering Personal Protective Equipment;
- 1.2.6. Assisting with training and development of training material;
- 1.2.7. Processing Payroll;
- 1.2.8. Assisting with developing and administering outreach programs; and,
- 1.2.9. Day-to-day communication with all stakeholders.

PROCEDURE TITLE: SCHOOL CROSSING GUARD

PROCEDURE NO.: PRC.16

1.3. School Crossing Guard (SCG)

The role of the SCG is to direct and supervise the movement of persons (as defined in the HTA) across a roadway by creating necessary gaps in vehicular traffic to provide safe passage at a designated school crossing location.

1.4. Traffic Engineering Services

The SCGP is supported by technical staff from Traffic Engineering Services. Traffic Engineering Services staff SCGP activities will include:

- 1.4.1. Receiving, assessing and replying to requests for SCGs;
- 1.4.2. Conducting the required traffic engineering screening (s4) to assess each potential new location to determine whether minimum criteria are met;
- 1.4.3. Conducting the required traffic engineering studies (s5-8) to assess each potential new location to determine whether warrants are met;
- 1.4.4. Determining the optimum layout of new SCG locations and arrange for pavement marking and traffic signage;
- 1.4.5. Conducting annual reviews of select SCG locations; and,
- 1.4.6. Prioritizing warranted SCG locations based on specified traffic engineering criteria.

2. Primary List of Stakeholders

Internal	External
Public Works	Schools
Mayor, Members of Council	Schools Boards: York Region Catholic District School Board and York Region District School Board Private Schools
By-Law and Compliance	York Regional Police
Human Resources	Ontario Traffic Council (OTC)
Corporate and Strategic Communications	OTC Crossing Guard Committee
Legal Services	Public Health
Risk Management	Regional Municipality of York

3. Intake Process for New School Crossing Guard Request

All requests for SCG must be directed to the SCG Supervisor or Traffic Engineering Services in writing or through a digital application process. The SCG Supervisor will forward all requests to Traffic Engineering Services.

PROCEDURE TITLE: SCHOOL CROSSING GUARD

PROCEDURE NO.: PRC.16

3.1. Upon receipt of a SCG request, the Traffic Engineering Services will provide an acknowledgement response within two business days (48 hours).

3.2. Members of Council may also submit a request for an inspection and traffic study to be performed.

4. Location Screening Process for New School Crossing Guard

Locations must meet the following criteria prior to further assessment for a SCG:

4.1. A minimum of 40 assisted and unassisted children crossing combined AM and PM review periods (elementary school children); and,

4.2. A speed limit of less than or equal to 50km/h on roadways approaching the crossing at uncontrolled crossing locations.

4.3. The result of the traffic engineering study will identify if a SCG can be accommodated at the proposed location which meets the screening criteria.

4.4. SCGs should be assigned at locations within the proximity of the subject school being served.

4.5. SCGs will no longer be placed fronting driveway aprons abutting residential properties.

4.6. SCGs will no longer be placed at uncontrolled locations. If an SCG is requested at an uncontrolled location a suitable controlled location should be identified as an alternative, if possible. If not possible, the SCG request at the uncontrolled location can be considered together with a requirement for traffic control for when the SCG is not present.

5. Traffic Engineering Study to Assess Potential SCG Location

If the criteria outlined in s.4 of the procedures are met, traffic staff will communicate with the proponent of the request and any other stakeholder advising of the criteria required to implement a SCG. Traffic staff will proceed to undertake a field analysis at the requested location.

5.1. During the school year (September to June), Traffic Engineering Services staff will analyze all SCG requests within 60 days of receipt by the proponent. The timing of the traffic studies is dictated by weather, the ability to collect data (staff resources) and a fixed time frame associated with the school calendar.

5.2. Traffic Engineering Services will update the proponent on the timing for the studies.

5.3. To accommodate the data collection, assessment and review of requested sites will take place in the fall and spring months during a regular school day during the morning and afternoon school peak times.

6. SCG Warrant Method Determination

The 2017 OTC SCG Guide provides guidelines for how to implement SCGs where needed. The purpose of the warrant is to utilize a consistent and uniform approach when dealing evaluating student safety.

Two methods are used to conduct the warrant analysis:

6.1. Gap Study Method: warrant methodology suitable for uncontrolled crossing facilities; or,

6.2. Exposure Index (EI) Method: warrant methodology suitable for controlled crossing facilities that have conflicting movements between vehicular and student volumes.

All warrants conducted account for total assisted (with an adult) and unassisted elementary school children volumes.

7. Gap Study Warrant Method

The Gap Study method is used to assess uncontrolled crossing locations. Marked crosswalks having no other form of traffic control – such as a stop sign – may give pedestrians the incorrect impression that vehicles must stop for them, even when an SCG is not present. Resultantly, when this method is applied, it must be used in conjunction with an assessment for suitable traffic control must also be performed.

The Gap Study method follows this process:

7.1. Identify the most suitable location for a potential SCG location given spacing between existing controlled crossings and available sightlines to/ from the crossing.

7.2. Conduct traffic engineering studies to determine warrants for traffic control, such as Pedestrian Crossovers, Intersection Pedestrian Signals, Midblock Pedestrian Signals and/or All-Way Stops, based on other City procedures.

7.3. Calculate the safe gap time using the OTC formula including perception reaction time, crossing time based on road width and group factor time based on observed group size.

PROCEDURE TITLE: SCHOOL CROSSING GUARD

PROCEDURE NO.: PRC.16

- 7.4. Conduct a field gap study on a normal school day, as per OTC guidelines. Record the number and duration of observed gaps in each five-minute period.
- 7.5. Compare the observed gaps in fifty per cent (50%) of five-minute periods to the threshold of four gaps.
- 7.6. If the Gap Study threshold is met and an appropriate form of traffic control is warranted, then an SCG should be installed.
- 7.7. All potential locations should be inspected using OTC guidelines and the collision history reviewed.

8. EI Warrant Method

The EI is used to evaluate the level of conflict at controlled crossings. The EI method can also be used as a prioritization tool for comparison between different SCG locations. It is recommended for roadways with a speed limit less than 60 km/h. The EI method follows this process:

- 8.1. Establish the leg (side) of the intersection that would be most suitable for an SCG.
- 8.2. Identify the conflicting vehicular movements for the leg (side) of the intersection being studied.
- 8.3. Count the conflicting vehicular volumes and student crossing volumes during the school peak hours.
- 8.4. Input the conflicting vehicular volume and student crossing volume to the table of the EI template.
- 8.5. If the conflict is greater than the threshold, then an SCG is warranted.
- 8.6. Signalized intersections are evaluated with the EI method and a SCG may be needed if the warrant conflict exceeds the threshold (EI = 5,000).
- 8.7. All-way stop-controlled intersections are evaluated with the EI method and a SCG may be warranted if the warrant conflict exceeds the threshold (EI = 19,000).
- 8.8. SCG, at minor street stop-controlled intersections, may be needed if the conflict exceeds the threshold established by the warrant.

8.9. Pedestrian crossings parallel to the major street, SCG warrant is best evaluated with the EI method with the following threshold (EI =10,000).

8.10. Pedestrian crossings at an unprotected major street, SCG warrant can be evaluated with either the EI or the Gap Study method. SCG may be needed if the warrant conflict exceeds the threshold.

8.11. All potential locations should be inspected using OTC guidelines and the collision history reviewed.

9. Approval of New SCG Locations

After completion of the warrant study, the SCG Supervisor will advise the proponent and any other stakeholders of the outcome of the study.

9.1. If the warrant is met, a SCG will be placed at the identified location pending installation of signage and pavement markings and recruitment for the position. Communication via email and/or meeting request will be sent to the proponent (if applicable), Member(s) of Council and any other stakeholders outlining the results of the study, and the timing for implementation of the SCG at the identified location.

9.2. If the warrant is not met, communication via email and/or meeting request will be sent to the proponent, Member(s) of Council and any other stakeholders outlining the results of the study and the decision to not implement a SCG.

10. Signage and Pavement Markings Installation

Sites warranting SCGs will have the necessary signage, pavement markings and SCGs implemented for the first day of school of the following September (subject to weather, budget approval and staffing resources).

11. Prioritization of SCG Locations Meeting Criteria

A prioritization process at warranted locations ensures fairness and transparency and it also ensures that SCGs are installed and maintained at essential locations.

Locations may be prioritized for implementation in consideration of the following:

- 11.1. Type of traffic control for the crossing location;
- 11.2. Collision history;
- 11.3. Vehicular speed (speed limit vs operating speed);
- 11.4. Number of children crossing;
- 11.5. Number of travel lanes;
- 11.6. Vehicular volume; and,

- 11.7. Minimum sight distance is below 65 meters.

12.Request for Second Crossing (“L”) At A SCG Location

A single SCG may assist children at a second crossing at a single location, forming an “L” shape, at the discretion of the SCG Supervisor in consultation with Traffic Engineering Services. The second crossing at the location should be screened to ensure that:

- 12.1. No more than one lane of travel in each direction if the second crossing location is uncontrolled;
- 12.2. A speed limit of less than or equal to 50km/h on roadways approaching the second crossing at uncontrolled crossing locations; and,
- 12.3. The second crossing does not front driveway aprons abutting residential properties.

The total number of children and total volume of vehicles must allow for a safe second crossing by a single SCG, as determined by the SCG Supervisor. No minimum number of elementary school children using the second crossing in the “L” is required.

13.Lunch Time Period

SCGs are not provided in the lunch time period at new locations. Existing locations will be assessed under the new policy and procedures. If the number of students crossing during the lunch time period at existing locations has been observed to be below ten assisted and unassisted children, it will be reassessed.

- 13.1. Two studies should be conducted on non-consecutive normal school days.
- 13.2. If a threshold of ten assisted or unassisted elementary school children crossing in total over the lunch period is not met, the lunch time period SCG is not warranted.
- 13.3. The removal of the lunch time period SCG will occur at the start of the next school year.

14.Removal or Reallocation of A SCG

To increase the overall sustainability of the program and to enable resources to be reallocated to higher risk warranted locations, SCG locations will be periodically reviewed to determine whether crossings are warranted.

- 14.1. A technical review of twenty-five (25) pre-selected SCG locations in the field are to be conducted each year to determine if the crossing location for the subsequent school year continues to meet warrant. Locations will be pre-selected and may also be based on request.
- 14.2. Both the location screening and OTC warrant (either Gap Study or EI, as appropriate) will be conducted as per sections 5 to 8. Required traffic counts will be performed on two non-consecutive regular school days to determine reallocation or removal of a SCG.
- 14.3. If warrants are not met at a reassessed location, the SCG Supervisor and Traffic Engineering staff will determine if other traffic safety measures would be appropriate.
- 14.4. The local Ward and Regional Councilor will be made aware via written communication and/ or meeting of the intent to perform the two necessary studies to reallocate or remove a SCG from a specified location.
- 14.5. Recommended changes with respect to the relocation or removal of a SCG will be made through a Communication to the Mayor and Member(s) of Council along with a scheduled meeting with the impacted Local Ward Councilor and Regional Councilors. The affected school, school board, parent council (if applicable) and trustee will also be notified in writing of any changes.
- 14.6. Appropriate communication channels and tools for local community engagement will be applied on a case by case basis with each SCG location identified for removal or reallocation, and the process will be communicated to all internal and external stakeholders.
- 14.7. Removal or reallocation of a SCG will only occur at the start of the following school year.
- 14.8. When a school closes and the SCG is only servicing at that school, the SCG will be removed without re-evaluation.
- 14.9. All pavement markings and signage will be removed at the location where the SCG is removed.
- 14.10. SCG reallocation will be prioritized based on warrant and where there is an essential need, as described in s.11.

15. Crossing Guards at Newly Built Schools

- 15.1. A SCG will be proactively assigned at all newly built schools for a period of one year.
- 15.2. The SCG Supervisor and Traffic Engineering Services must be advised in writing of any new school by the appropriate York Region School Boards.
- 15.3. Once confirmation of a new school opening is received, the SCG Supervisor will respond according to the SCG implementation schedule.
- 15.4. Traffic Engineering Services staff will request from the School Board the catchment area of the registered children for the subject school. For new school sites, the forecast of students and vehicular traffic volumes will be analyzed as part of the overall assessment process.
- 15.5. The student volumes will be estimated based on the maximum school enrollment as well as the catchment area of each school.
- 15.6. Traffic Engineering Services staff will determine an appropriate location for a temporary SCG based on the information. The temporary guard location will be in place for a one-year term.
- 15.7. The SCG location will be assessed after the first year is completed.
- 15.8. Following a warrant study, recommendations with respect to implementing, reallocating or removal of a SCG will be communicated to the local Ward and Regional Councillor and a meeting will be facilitated with the proponent and all relevant stakeholders.

16. Training and Education

- 16.1. Once the proper sites for the crossings are chosen, guards must be hired and educated in their duties including:
 - 16.1.1. Basic traffic law;
 - 16.1.2. School zone signage, especially crosswalk signs;
 - 16.1.3. Hand traffic signals;
 - 16.1.4. Proper crossing procedures, and ways to teach them to children;
 - 16.1.5. Emergency procedures;
 - 16.1.6. How to time crossings with gaps in traffic to minimize disruption to the flow of vehicles
 - 16.1.7. What to do in case of an accident; and,
 - 16.1.8. Personal safety and user safety.

- 16.2. SCGs will also be provided appropriate equipment such as stop sign, whistle, uniform including Personal Protective Vest, raincoat, jacket, hats, gloves and various types of sun protection.

17. SCG Site Inspections

- 17.1. Inspections are to be conducted during the morning, midday, and afternoon school peak periods (30-40 minutes before the applicable school bell times), on a typical school day.
- 17.2. Inspections at each SCG location will be performed for health and safety and administration matters at each SCG location a minimum of one time each year. Inspections will include:
- 17.2.1. Observation of the arrival and departure times of the SCG at their locations, the wearing of proper attire, appropriate use of equipment, adherence to procedures, and assessment of hazards; and,
- 17.2.2. A subjective overview of the crosswalk location as being “busy” or “not busy” regarding both vehicular movement and pedestrian traffic. This information will serve to inform technical field staff of crosswalk locations that may require prioritization for assessment in the following year.

18. Communication

- 18.1. The SCG Supervisor and Traffic Engineering Services Staff will ensure all applicable internal and external stakeholders, Mayor and Member(s) of Council, citizens, school boards, school parent councils, senior leadership, etc. are advised via written communication and/or meetings of any intention to implement, not implement, remove or reallocate SCGs, as well as any changes impacting the SCGP, operating procedures and policies set out herein.
- 18.2. The Supervisor of the SCGP will meet with both the York Region District Catholic School Board and York Region District School Board annually to discuss SCG initiatives and issues pertaining to the SCGP.
- 18.3. The SCG Supervisor will work with Corporate and Strategic Communications to employ a comprehensive, multi-faceted approach to promote SCG recruitment as well as active and safe travel promotion material for the SCGP.
- 18.3.1. Communications may include email, memorandums, social media, billboards, pamphlets, drop communication to local catchment area, participation at City-run public events, Councilor E-Newsletters, etc.

PROCEDURE TITLE: SCHOOL CROSSING GUARD

PROCEDURE NO.: PRC.16

ADMINISTRATION			
<i>Administered by the Office of the City Clerk.</i>			
Review Schedule:	SELECT If other, specify here	Next Review Date:	Click or tap to enter a date.
Related Procedure(s):			
Related By-Law(s):			
Supporting Documentation:			
Revision History			
Date:	Description:		
Click or tap to enter a date.			
Click or tap to enter a date.			
Click or tap to enter a date.			

Committee of the Whole (Working Session) Report

DATE: Wednesday, November 04, 2020

WARD(S): ALL

TITLE: SCHOOL CROSSING GUARD POLICY

FROM:

Zoran Postic, Deputy City Manager, Public Works

ACTION: DECISION

Purpose

To present the updated School Crossing Guard (SCG) Policy and Procedures to better align with the 2017 Ontario Traffic Council (OTC) SCG Guide and seek approval to implement the updated SCG Policy and Procedures on an interim basis while evaluating the implications of the new warrant methodology.

Report Highlights

- The SCG policy governs the School Crossing Guard Program (SCGP) for one hundred and fourteen (114) crossing locations and was last updated June 2011.
- The updated SCG policy employs warrants for new SCG locations from the 2017 OTC SCG guide which reflect the latest best practices and promotes uniformity across municipalities.
- Highlights of the proposed policy include:
 - Utilization of the Exposure Index (EI) warrant which measures risk to children based on conflicting traffic movements and traffic controls at each location;
 - A new threshold of forty (40) assisted and unassisted elementary school children (i.e. students walking alone and/or with a parent/guardian), from fifty (50) unassisted elementary school children (student walking alone);
 - New schools will continue to be assigned a SCG temporarily for one (1) year;
 - Existing SCG locations remain in place until reassessed with a new warrant; and,
 - Annual SCG location reassessments.
- Staff seek authorization to administer the proposed Policy and Procedures on an interim basis for up to two (2) years to allow for the development of the EI at existing school crossing locations and evaluate the implications of the new warrant methodology.

Recommendations

1. That Council approve the updated School Crossing Guard Policy as outlined in Attachment 1 on an interim basis for up to two (2) years;
2. That Council repeal the 2011 SCG Policy and Procedure;
3. That Council approve the School Crossing Guard Procedures as outlined in Attachment 2 on an interim basis for up to two (2) years;
4. That staff be authorized to administer the updated School Crossing Guard Policy and Procedures on an interim basis for up to two (2) years; and
5. That the City Clerk forward a copy of this report to the Region of York, York Regional Police, York Region Public District School Board and York Region Catholic District School Board.

Background

The Ontario Highway Traffic Act (HTA) assigns the responsibility for establishing and maintaining School Crossings to municipal government. The City's School Crossing Guard Program (SCGP) serves to promote active and safer travel for school aged children to and from school.

The Highway Traffic Act (HTA) is the legislative authority providing the rules of the road and the role of SCGs at school crossings. The City established the SCGP over thirty (30) years ago to assist children to safely cross roadways while walking to elementary schools. As of today, the City has assigned SCGs to assist children at one hundred and fourteen (114) locations.

The guidelines/Criteria for placement of a SCG were last updated in June 2011. The 2011 Guidelines/Criteria for placement of SCG include:

- a minimum of fifty (50) unassisted (student walking alone) elementary school children crossing in total over the school peak periods;
- one (1) of ten (10) other criteria related to daily or peak hourly volume of vehicles, traffic control type, insufficient sight distance or excessive operating speeds; and
- new SCG locations are currently permitted at uncontrolled intersections and mid-block crossings.

The 2011 Policy and Procedure is shown in the Previous Report/Authority section. The requirement of a minimum of fifty (50) unassisted elementary school children crossing was established in 2004.

The Ontario Traffic Council (OTC) has updated the School Crossing Guard Guide in 2017 to enable uniformity in the operation of School Crossing Guard Programs across the province.

The City of Vaughan and fourteen (14) other municipalities in Ontario participated in a project led by the Ontario Traffic Council (OTC) to update the OTC's School Crossing Guard Guide (SCGG) in 2017. The updated SCGG is to promote uniformity in the operation of School Crossing Guard Program and the implementation of SCGs across the Province.

The current City SCG policy and procedure approved in 2011 does not include the recent OTC SCG guide.

Previous Reports/Authority

Extract from Council Meeting Minutes of June 28, 2011 – Update to School Crossing Guard Policy and Procedures:

https://meetingarchives.vaughan.ca/extracts_2011/pdf/35ws0621ex-11.pdf

Extract from Council Meeting Minutes of May 29, 2012 Meeting – Establishment of the School Crossing Guard Task Force:

https://meetingarchives.vaughan.ca/council_2012/pdf/0529-12%20council%20minutes.pdf

Extract from Council Meeting Minutes of April 23, 2013 – Deferred School Crossing Guards Annual Review to Focus on Active Routes are the Way to Go Program:

https://www.vaughan.ca/council/minutes_agendas/AgendaItems/CW0409_13_8.pdf

Provincial legislation, HTA Section 176 School Crossing Guards:

[Ontario's Highway Traffic Act](#)

[Vaughan School Crossing Guard Policy and Procedure June 2011:](#)

https://www.vaughan.ca/services/residential/transportation/traffic/school_crossing_guards/Documents/School%20Crossing%20Policy%20Procedure%20June%202011.pdf

Analysis and Options

The updated policy is consistent with industry best practices and aligns with the 2017 OTC SCG guide that includes warrants based on pedestrian exposure to risk and incorporates made-in-Vaughan indices.

The 2017 OTC School Crossing Guard Guide is based on updated industry practices. It provides criteria for two additional traffic control types: new Ontario Pedestrian Crossovers (PXOs) and roundabouts. The 2017 OTC Guide also recommends the use of an Exposure Index (EI) warrant. The EI quantifies the level of interaction and potential

conflict between vehicular and child pedestrian movements at a given crossing. It provides an empirically based value which can be used to objectively determine if a SCG is warranted at a location.

The updated policy includes the use of EI warrants, which reflect exposure to risk. Staff is establishing the EI thresholds consistent with City of Vaughan context. A benchmarking study found that over sixty percent (60%) of all surveyed municipalities were already using warrants based on the new OTC SCG guide.

Aligning the updated policy with the 2017 OTC SCG Guide provides a clear framework to assess potential locations.

The updated policy determines whether a location may be warranted using a count of all elementary school children crossing at a location, whether assisted by an adult or unassisted. This recognizes that parents may be walking with their children prior to an SCG being provided.

The screening threshold for warranting a SCG will be reduced from fifty (50) unassisted children to forty (40) unassisted and assisted children (i.e. with a parent/guardian) crossing with the SCG in total (daily). This new threshold reduction may increase the number of warranted SCG locations across the City as well as promote and enhance the community's active travel by providing a SCG in observed lower demand locations. Sightlines must be adequate for the conditions of crossing location.

The policy and related procedures provide details in determining a SCG location and specify some physical locations where it is inadvisable to place SCGs, including at uncontrolled locations. Marked crosswalks may give pedestrians the incorrect impression that vehicles must stop for them, even when an SCG is not present. The new Pedestrian Crossovers introduced in Ontario in 2016 provide more options for controlled crossings and will be considered together with SCG requests at uncontrolled locations. Adequate sightlines must also be present to and from the crossing. The screening criteria for uncontrolled crossings specifies that there should be no more than one lane of travel in each direction at the crossing location, and that the speed limit be less than or equal to 50km/h on the roadway approaching the crossing.

SCGs are also not to be considered at locations abutting residential driveway aprons or where the posted speed limit is above 50 km/h.

The procedures now specify that a single guard may cross two legs of an intersection (an "L") if the minimum screening criteria, such as speed limits (less than or equal to 50 km/h), at controlled intersection, and with adequate sightlines, at two lanes roadway are met. This allows a SCG to assist children with more crossings when they can do this

safely, even if the minimum number of children to warrant the second crossing are not present.

Finally, the updated policy includes the same process currently used for new schools in Vaughan: a SCG is provided temporarily for one (1) year, as the location is assessed to determine whether warrants are met.

The updated policy includes a process for school crossing guard removal /reallocation, with a communication plan.

As neighbourhood demographics and travel habits change, the number of elementary school children using each route to school may also increase or decrease. The 2017 OTC SCG guide recommend regular reassessment of school crossing locations.

The current policy specifies that there will be an annual review of twenty-five (25) SCG locations to determine whether fifty (50) unassisted school children are crossing daily, with removal of the SCG at locations where this does not occur. However, the effort to review and communicate proposed removals is significant and recommendations to remove SCGs have been highly sensitive for citizens in the past. As a result, SCGs are maintained at locations that do not meet the criteria, even where the City has been unable to attract new SCGs for warranted locations with much greater numbers. The reassessment process in the updated policy has been designed to maximize student safety throughout the City and align with the 2017 OTC SCG guide. All existing school crossing guard locations will remain in the program until reassessed under the new warrant methodology.

Consistent with the 2011 SCG Policy and Procedure, twenty-five (25) SCG locations will be reviewed annually, selected based on known lower numbers of students crossing. The reassessment criteria will change to correspond to the new warrant screening criteria. The threshold for removal will be reduced from fifty (50) unassisted children to forty (40) unassisted and assisted children, (i.e. with a parent/guardian) crossing with the SCG in total (daily). Each reviewed location will be studied twice on normal, non-consecutive, school days. If an SCG location fails to meet the threshold, the SCG Supervisor and Traffic Engineering staff will also assess if other traffic safety measures would be appropriate. If a school crossing location is to be removed/reallocated, appropriate stakeholders will be notified and the guard will be removed/reallocated from the crossing at the start of the following school year.

A preliminary review of the existing SCG locations found that close to eighty percent (80%) of current SCG locations will meet the new threshold of forty (40) unassisted and assisted children (i.e. with a parent/guardian) crossing, as opposed to only fifty percent (50%) meeting the current threshold of fifty (50) unassisted children crossing. Staff is

establishing the EI thresholds and will use them to evaluate and assess the implications of the new warrant criteria in the updated SCG Policy and Procedures.

All existing SCG locations will remain in place until such time as the locations are due to be studied under the new warrant and policy. There will be no blanket application of the new warrants.

If the warrant of ten (10) assisted / unassisted crossings is not met during lunch time periods based on two studies, they will be removed at the beginning of the next school year. Any removal or reallocation of SCGs will be communicated to all stakeholders based on the criteria of the updated policy and procedures. All existing SCG locations will remain in place until such time as the locations are assessed under the new warrant in the updated policy.

The updated policy requires extensive communications in advance of SCG removal/ reallocation and other changes.

The current policy does not address SCGP communication, except for annual meetings with both School Boards. However, communication is essential for community engagement and to safely implement changes.

The updated policy specifies communication with all applicable internal and external stakeholders, Mayor and Members of Council, citizens, School Boards, school parent councils, senior leadership, etc. via written communication and/or meetings. They must be informed of any intention to implement, not implement, remove or reallocate SCGs, as well as any changes impacting the SCGP, operating procedures and policies.

The updated policy is proposed to be administered on an interim basis for up to two (2) years to evaluate the staffing and financial impacts of the new warrant.

To apply the proposed new warrant methodology, staff must perform studies at SCG crossing locations and use the data collected to develop EI Thresholds. The studies will require several months to complete and review, as will subsequent evaluation of current crossings against the developed EIs to determine if a SCG is warranted.

Application of the new warrant is likely to result in a change in the required number of school crossing guards. Administering the interim Policy for two (2) years will allow staff to develop the referenced relevant EI thresholds, assess which SCG locations meet warrant and require a SCG, and evaluate the financial implications should there be a change in the number of warranted locations. Staff will then consider if adjustments are required to the Policy and Procedures, and report back with a final document for Council consideration.

During the time that the interim Policy is in effect, all existing SCG locations will remain in place. Newly requested locations will be evaluated using the new warrant methodology with currently developed sample EI Thresholds.

The updated policy and procedure enable program sustainability and provide a framework for continuous program improvements to meet the City's rapid growth.

Finally, the School Crossing Guard Procedures have been revised to align with the updated Policy's directives regarding warrants and reassessment. Procedures related to SCG training and inspections have been added to maximize public and staff safety.

The updated policy and procedures enable program sustainability and provide a framework for continuous program improvements to manage the City's rapid growth.

Financial Impact

There is no financial impact as a result of this report. Any additional funding requirements to administer the SCGP will continue to be submitted through the City's budget deliberation process.

Relationship to Vaughan Vision 2020/ Strategic Plan

The SCGP aligns with the Term of Council Service Excellence Strategic Map to ensure Active, Safe and Diverse Communities, supporting and promoting the City's commitment to the wellbeing of citizens, enriching their lives and maintaining safety.

Broader Regional Impacts/Considerations

The SCG Program impacts overall road and school safety and there are several Regional stakeholders that assist with championing the program who will benefit from the recommendations made in this report:

- Both YRDSB and YCDSB assist in obtaining information pertaining to new schools and their catchment areas to aid in identifying the most appropriate location for a school crosswalk.
- York Regional Police (YRP) aid the City in addressing safety concerns in school zones brought to their attention.
- York Region Public Health promotes walking and cycling as healthy methods for children to travel to school.

Some municipalities in the Region already use the 2017 OTC SCG warrants modified to their requirements. The Ontario Traffic Council School Crossing Guard Committee creates standard practices and procedures based on up-to-date industry guidance. Use

of tailored OTC SCG Guide warrants enables all municipalities in the Region to improve consistency.

Conclusion

Safety for elementary school children is the SCG program's top priority. SCGs play an important role in road safety and the promotion of active and safer travel to school. The new SCG policy seeks to improve road safety using warrants for new locations that include evaluation of a crossing child's exposure to conflicts with vehicles. It aligns warrants with the latest standard guidelines for Ontario – as well as with most benchmarked municipalities – while using “made-in-Vaughan” thresholds. It provides greater clarity in the process for new requests, reassessments and communication, and an improved framework for the SCGP. It is recommended that Council approve the updated SCG Policy and Procedures on an interim basis to enable staff to evaluate the implications of the new warrant methodology on the number of crossing guard locations, and report back within two (2) years.

For more information, please contact Donald Eta, Director Transportation and Fleet Management Services ext. 6141

Attachments

1. School Crossing Guard Policy 2020
2. School Crossing Guard Procedures 2020

Prepared by:

Margie Chung, Manager Traffic Services, Ext. 6173

Brenda Bisceglia, Supervisor, School Crossing Guard Program, Ext. 6144

In Consultation with:

Rebecca Hall-McGuire, Legal Counsel, Municipal and Litigation

Robert Orrico, Manager, Occupational Health and Safety and Wellness

Frank Kraljevic, HR Specialist, Workplace Health and Safety

Lisa LaBelle, Human Resources Partner

Jennifer Ormston, Manager, Partner Communications and Engagement

Tricia Campbell, Risk Management Analyst

Marleen Hackman, Acting Supervisor (Animal Services) Bylaw and Compliance, Licensing and Permit Services

Approved by

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'Zoran Postic', with a stylized, cursive script.

Zoran Postic,
Deputy City Manager, Public Works

Reviewed by

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'Jim Harnum', with a stylized, cursive script.

Jim Harnum, City Manager

CORPORATE POLICY

POLICY TITLE: SCHOOL CROSSING GUARD PROGRAM

POLICY NO.: 19.C.04

Section:	Roads, Traffic & Operations		
Effective Date:	October 21, 2020	Date of Last Review:	June 1, 2011
Approval Authority: Council	Policy Owner: DCM, Public Works		

POLICY STATEMENT

The School Crossing Guard Program (SCGP) contributes to enhancing community well-being by encouraging children's active and safer school travel.

PURPOSE

The SCGP policy is intended to establish a framework for the administration, evaluation, approval, implementation, and removal/reallocation of School Crossing Guards (SCG) in accordance with the Ontario Traffic Council (OTC) SCG Guide, and in accordance with the *Highway Traffic Act*, in the operation of school crossings and active role of the SCG.

SCOPE

The SCGP was established to aid school aged children from five to 12 years of age when crossing roads on their way to and from school at a designated school crosswalk location. The City's SCGP policy and procedures assists staff to determine the most appropriate location for a SCG and where it is most needed.

LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

- 1. Highway Traffic Act (HTA) R.S.O. 1990, c.H.8:** Sets out the rules of the road in Ontario, including the operation of school crossings and the role of SCGs.
- 2. Occupational Health and Safety Act (OHSA):** Ontario's cornerstone legislation for workplace health and safety. It protects workers from health and safety hazards on the job. It sets out duties for all workplace parties and rights for workers. It establishes procedures for dealing with workplace hazards and provides for enforcement of the law where compliance has not been achieved voluntarily.

DEFINITIONS

1. **Controlled Crossing Location:** Locations with stop signs, a pedestrian crossover (PXO), intersection pedestrian signals (IPS), mid-block pedestrian signals (MPS) or full traffic control signals (TCS). At controlled crossings, vehicles must obey the respective HTA regulations for each type of control. A school crossing in the absence of stop signs, IPS, PXO, MPS or TCS is considered a controlled crossing only when the crossing is being supervised by a SCG.
1. **Eligible School:** A school is eligible for a SCG if elementary school children (age 5 to 12) attend, whether private or public.
2. **Exposure Index (EI):** A warrant methodology that examines the level of interaction and conflict between vehicular and student pedestrian volumes. The Exposure Index method generates a graph based on historical trends at existing SCG locations. The graph is then used as the threshold for future crossing locations where a SCG may be required. The EI methodology is suitable for controlled crossing facilities that have conflicting movements between vehicular and student volumes.
3. **Gap Study Method:** An objective process that: (i) uses site observations to establish the safe gap threshold for pedestrians to cross a roadway, and (ii) measures the available gaps along the roadway to determine if there are enough safe gaps. The Gap Study methodology is suitable for uncontrolled crossing facilities.
4. **Ontario Traffic Council (OTC):** Provides guidelines to address practices and procedures for SCG operations.
5. **School Crossing Guard (SCG):** A person 16 years or older who is directing the movement of persons (as defined in the HTA) across a highway (HTA term for any road) by creating necessary gaps in vehicular traffic to provide safe passage at a designated school crossing location.
6. **Uncontrolled Crossing Location:** Locations where pedestrians do not have the right-of-way and must wait for a safe gap in traffic prior to attempting to enter the roadway. Examples of uncontrolled locations are:
 - 6.1. Mid-block Crossings (in the absence of Mid-block Pedestrian Signal (MPS) or Pedestrian Crossover (PXO)).
 - 6.2. Designated School Crossing (in the absence of a SCG and without other forms of control such as Traffic Control Signal (TCS), Intersection Pedestrian Signal (IPS), Midblock Pedestrian Signal (MPS), Pedestrian Crossover (PXO), stop signs or Yield signs).
 - 6.3. Marked Crossing (at an intersection in the absence of Stop or Yield signs).

POLICY TITLE: SCHOOL CROSSING GUARD

POLICY NO.: 19.C.04

6.4. Roundabouts.

- 7. Warrant:** A consistent and uniform approach to the implementation of school crossing locations. It is used to determine where SCG's are needed, warrants are set by the OTC SCG Guide.
- 8. Warrant Analysis:** The process of verifying whether one or multiple SCGs are required for an intersection or location. The warrant analysis process is intended to be an unbiased and consistent evaluation method that is done without outside influence. There may be multiple ways to complete a SCG warrant depending on the type of intersection and location being assessed.

POLICY

To improve the SCGP performance and reduce risk and liability through:

- Consistent and uniform application of the OTC SCG Guide with established criteria for evaluating locations for SCGs;
- Development of processes for the assessment, deployment or reallocation of SCG's based on warrant and where most essential;
- Standardization of administrative practices; hiring, orientation, training and development, supervision and inspections in accordance with OHSA requirements and the OTC SCG Guide; and,
- A robust communication strategy to support the recruitment and retention of SCGs, as well education and outreach programs and materials that reinforce active and safe school travel.

1. Roles and Responsibilities

1.1. Deputy City Management, Public Works

The Deputy City Manager of Public Works and/or designate is authorized to administrate the SCGP in accordance with the SCG policy and procedures.

1.2. Supervisor of the SCGP and Traffic Services

The SCG Supervisor, with the support of the technical staff from Traffic Engineering Services will be responsible for the management, administration and promotion of the SCGP in accordance with the mandate given by City of Vaughan Council and HTA regulations; and, in accordance with the SCG policy and procedure, to ensure the active and safe travel of children to and

from school. The SCG Supervisor is also to be an active participant of the Traffic Management Stakeholder Advisory Committee (TMSAC).

1.3. Traffic Management Stakeholder Advisory Committee (TMSAC)

The TMSAC will promote active and safe travel for students and ensure consistent communication, application and awareness of the program. The Supervisor of the SCGP will be an active participant of the TMSAC.

2. Warrants and Annual Reviews

2.3. Warrants for SCG's must be administered in accordance with the criteria and guidelines set out in the OTC SCG Guide and the SCG procedures.

2.4. If the necessary traffic studies determine a warrant has been met, a SCG will be implemented based on the criteria and time requirements set out in the SCG procedures.

2.5. Existing SCG locations, currently warranted or not, will remain in place until such time as the locations are due to be reassessed.

2.6. Annual technical review of twenty-five (25) SCG locations will be studied to determine warrant of the SCG location for the subsequent school year. Locations will be pre-selected and may also be based on request.

2.7. SCG locations not meeting warrant will be subject to the SCG removal and/or reallocation process outlined in the SCG procedures.

1.1. Warrant criteria set out in the OTC SCG Guide and SCG procedures must be verified prior to the removal or reallocation of SCG's. Two traffic studies within the same school year on typical school days must be completed and meet warrant to proceed with the removal or reallocation of a SCG.

1.2. Removal or reallocation of a SCG will be implemented the next school year based on criteria outlined in the SCG procedure.

3. Communications

3.3. The SCG Supervisor and Traffic Engineering Services staff will ensure all applicable internal and external stakeholders; Mayor and Members of Council, citizens, school boards, school parent councils, senior leadership, etc. are advised via written communication and/or meetings on any intention to implement, not implement, remove or reallocate SCGs, as well as any changes impacting the SCGP, operating procedures and policies set out herein.

POLICY TITLE: SCHOOL CROSSING GUARD

POLICY NO.: 19.C.04

3.4. The Supervisor of the SCGP will meet with both YRDCSB and YRDSB School Boards annually to collaborate, discuss relevant initiatives and any issues or concerns pertaining to the SCGP.

3.5. The SCG Supervisor will work with Corporate and Strategic Communications to employ a comprehensive, multi-faceted approach to promote SCG recruitment as well as active and safe travel promotion SCGP material for the SCGP.

ADMINISTRATION

Administered by the Office of the City Clerk.

Review Schedule:	5 Years If other, specify here	Next Review Date:	October 21, 2025
Related Policy(ies):			
Related By-Law(s):			
Procedural Document:	PRC.16 – School Crossing Guard		

Revision History

Date:	Description:
Click or tap to enter a date.	
Click or tap to enter a date.	

CITY OF VAUGHAN

CORPORATE PROCEDURE**PROCEDURE TITLE: SCHOOL CROSSING GUARD PROGRAM****PROCEDURE NO.: PRC.16**

Section:	Roads, Traffic & Operations		
Effective Date:	October 21, 2020	Date of Last Review:	June 1, 2011
Policy Parent: 19.C.04 – School Crossing Guard		Procedure Owner: DCM, Public Works	

PROCEDURE STATEMENT

These procedures are to be followed when evaluating, implementing, approving, removing or reallocating a School Crossing Guard(s) (SCG) as per the School Crossing Guard policy.

PURPOSE

This procedure establishes a comprehensive approach with consistent standards in the evaluation, implementation, approval and removal/reallocation process of SCGs to support active and safer travel options for elementary students as they travel to and from school.

SCOPE

The School Crossing Guard Program (SCGP) was established to aid children between five to 12 years of age when crossing roads on their way to and from school at a designated school crosswalk location. The City's SCGP policy and procedures assist staff to determine the most appropriate location for a SCG and where it is most needed.

LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

- 1. Highway Traffic Act (HTA) R.S.O. 1990, c.H.8:** The HTA sets out the rules of the road in Ontario, including the operation of school crossings and the role of SCG's.
- 2. Occupational Health and Safety Act (OHSA):** Ontario's cornerstone legislation for workplace health and safety. It protects workers from health and safety hazards on the job. It sets out duties for all workplace parties and rights for workers. It establishes procedures for dealing with workplace hazards and

PROCEDURE TITLE: SCHOOL CROSSING GUARD

PROCEDURE NO.: PRC.16

provides for enforcement of the law where compliance has not been achieved voluntarily.

DEFINITIONS

- 1. Controlled Crossing Location:** Locations with stop or yield signs, a pedestrian crossover (PXO), intersection pedestrian signals (IPS), mid-block pedestrian signals (MPS) or full traffic control signals (TCS). At controlled crossings, vehicles must obey the respective HTA regulations for each type of control. A school crossing in the absence of stop signs, IPS, PXO, MPS or TCS is considered a controlled crossing only when the crossing is being supervised by a SCG.
- 2. Exposure Index (EI):** A warrant methodology that examines the level of interaction and conflict between vehicular and student pedestrian volumes. The Exposure Index method generates a graph based on historical trends at existing crossing guard locations. The graph is then used as the threshold for future crossing locations where a SCG may be required. The EI methodology is suitable for controlled crossing facilities that have conflicting movements between vehicular and student volumes.
- 3. Eligible School:** A school is eligible for a SCG if elementary school children (age 5 to 12) attend, whether private or public.
- 4. Gap Study Method:** An objective process that: (i) uses site observations to establish the safe gap threshold for pedestrians to cross a roadway, and (ii) measures the available gaps along the roadway to determine if there are enough safe gaps. The Gap Study methodology is suitable for uncontrolled crossing facilities.
- 5. Operating Procedures:** Established methods and guidelines set to be routinely followed by Crossing Guards, Supervisory Staff and Traffic Staff which include instructions on contract administration, reporting structure, payroll, health and safety requirements, warrant procedures, communication criteria for both internal and external stakeholders, and policy requirements. The aim is to achieve efficiency, and uniformity of performance, while reducing miscommunication and failure to comply with regulations or policy.
- 6. Ontario Traffic Council (OTC):** Provides guidelines to address practices and procedures for SCG operations.
- 7. Proponent:** A person who advocates a theory, proposal, or project or who puts forward a proposition or proposal; a person who argues in favor of something; an advocate.

PROCEDURE TITLE: SCHOOL CROSSING GUARD

PROCEDURE NO.: PRC.16

- 8. School Crossing Guard (SCG):** A person sixteen (16) years or older who is directing the movement of persons (as defined in the HTA) across a highway (HTA term for any road) by creating necessary gaps in vehicular traffic to provide safe passage at a designated school crossing location.
- 9. School Peak Periods:** The timeframes in the morning, mid-day and afternoon during which most students arrive at and depart from school.
- 10. School Zone:** A roadway section with a lower speed limit near a school. The periods during which the lower speed limits are in effect are at the discretion of each municipality.
- 11. Stakeholders:** Representatives from the various divisions (internal and external partners), including City Council, Human Resources, Legal Services, Public Works, York Region Catholic and York Region Public-School Boards, York Regional Police, Public Health, The Regional Municipality of York, School Parent Council, and concerned parents and citizens of Vaughan.
- 12. Traffic Control Devices:** Any sign, signal, marking or device placed upon, over or adjacent to a roadway by a public authority or official having jurisdiction, for regulating, warning, guiding or informing road users.
- 13. Uncontrolled Crossing Location:** Locations where pedestrians do not have the right-of-way and must wait for a safe gap in traffic prior to attempting to enter the roadway. Examples of uncontrolled locations are:
- 13.1. Mid-block crossings (in the absence of MPS or PXO);
 - 13.2. Designated school crossing (in the absence of a SCG and without other forms of control such as Traffic Control Signal (TCS), Intersection Pedestrian Signal (IPS), Midblock Pedestrian Signal (MPS), Pedestrian Crossover (PXO), stop signs or Yield signs);
 - 13.3. Marked crossing (at an intersection in the absence of stop or yield signs); and,
 - 13.4. Roundabouts.
- 14. Warrant:** A consistent and uniform approach to the implementation of school crossing locations. It is used to determine where SCGs are needed, warrants are set by the OTC SCG Guide.
- 15. Warrant Analysis:** The process of verifying whether one or multiple crossing guards are required for an intersection or location. The warrant analysis process is intended to be an unbiased and consistent evaluation method that is done without outside influence. There may be multiple ways to complete a SCG warrant depending on the type of intersection and location being assessed.

PROCEDURE TITLE: SCHOOL CROSSING GUARD

PROCEDURE NO.: PRC.16

PROCEDURE

1. Roles and Responsibilities

1.1. Supervisor of the SCGP

The SCG Supervisor will be responsible for the management, administration and promotion of the SCGP in accordance with the mandate given by City of Vaughan Council and HTA regulations, in accordance with the SCG policy and procedure to ensure the active and safer travel of children to and from school. Activities include:

- 1.1.1. Determining the strategic direction of the SCGP;
- 1.1.2. Approval of assignment, relocation, or removal of crosswalk locations and guards based on policy, warrant procedures and communication with all relevant stakeholders;
- 1.1.3. Monitoring the operating budget for the SCGP;
- 1.1.4. Establishing and tracking Key Performance Indicators;
- 1.1.5. Working closely with internal and external stakeholders to improve and enhance the SCGP;
- 1.1.6. Performance Management of SCGs;
- 1.1.7. Ensuring compliance with Health and Safety regulations;
- 1.1.8. Recruiting, training and managing the operational performance of SCGs; and,
- 1.1.9. Responding to inquiries raised by the public, schools, City Councillors, internal departments, and SCGs.

1.2. Staff Support

Staff support will provide daily supervision and coordination of the delivery of services in accordance with the Ontario HTA and the SCG policy and procedures. Staff activities include:

- 1.2.1. Managing crossing guards on a day to day basis;
- 1.2.2. Ensuring coverage of crosswalk locations;
- 1.2.3. Addressing general inquiries related to the SCGP;
- 1.2.4. Conducting field inspections to ensure safe and efficient services City-wide and ensure OTC guidelines are adhered to;
- 1.2.5. Ordering Personal Protective Equipment;
- 1.2.6. Assisting with training and development of training material;
- 1.2.7. Processing Payroll;
- 1.2.8. Assisting with developing and administering outreach programs; and,
- 1.2.9. Day-to-day communication with all stakeholders.

PROCEDURE TITLE: SCHOOL CROSSING GUARD**PROCEDURE NO.: PRC.16****1.3. School Crossing Guard (SCG)**

The role of the SCG is to direct and supervise the movement of persons (as defined in the HTA) across a roadway by creating necessary gaps in vehicular traffic to provide safe passage at a designated school crossing location.

1.4. Traffic Engineering Services

The SCGP is supported by technical staff from Traffic Engineering Services. Traffic Engineering Services staff SCGP activities will include:

- 1.4.1. Receiving, assessing and replying to requests for SCGs;
- 1.4.2. Conducting the required traffic engineering screening (s4) to assess each potential new location to determine whether minimum criteria are met;
- 1.4.3. Conducting the required traffic engineering studies (s5-8) to assess each potential new location to determine whether warrants are met;
- 1.4.4. Determining the optimum layout of new SCG locations and arrange for pavement marking and traffic signage;
- 1.4.5. Conducting annual reviews of select SCG locations; and,
- 1.4.6. Prioritizing warranted SCG locations based on specified traffic engineering criteria.

2. Primary List of Stakeholders

Internal	External
Public Works	Schools
Mayor, Members of Council	Schools Boards: York Region Catholic District School Board and York Region District School Board Private Schools
By-Law and Compliance	York Regional Police
Human Resources	Ontario Traffic Council (OTC)
Corporate and Strategic Communications	OTC Crossing Guard Committee
Legal Services	Public Health
Risk Management	Regional Municipality of York

3. Intake Process for New School Crossing Guard Request

All requests for SCG must be directed to the SCG Supervisor or Traffic Engineering Services in writing or through a digital application process. The SCG Supervisor will forward all requests to Traffic Engineering Services.

PROCEDURE TITLE: SCHOOL CROSSING GUARD

PROCEDURE NO.: PRC.16

3.1. Upon receipt of a SCG request, the Traffic Engineering Services will provide an acknowledgement response within two business days (48 hours).

3.2. Members of Council may also submit a request for an inspection and traffic study to be performed.

4. Location Screening Process for New School Crossing Guard

Locations must meet the following criteria prior to further assessment for a SCG:

4.1. A minimum of 40 assisted and unassisted children crossing combined AM and PM review periods (elementary school children); and,

4.2. A speed limit of less than or equal to 50km/h on roadways approaching the crossing at uncontrolled crossing locations.

4.3. The result of the traffic engineering study will identify if a SCG can be accommodated at the proposed location which meets the screening criteria.

4.4. SCGs should be assigned at locations within the proximity of the subject school being served.

4.5. SCGs will no longer be placed fronting driveway aprons abutting residential properties.

4.6. SCGs will no longer be placed at uncontrolled locations. If an SCG is requested at an uncontrolled location a suitable controlled location should be identified as an alternative, if possible. If not possible, the SCG request at the uncontrolled location can be considered together with a requirement for traffic control for when the SCG is not present.

5. Traffic Engineering Study to Assess Potential SCG Location

If the criteria outlined in s.4 of the procedures are met, traffic staff will communicate with the proponent of the request and any other stakeholder advising of the criteria required to implement a SCG. Traffic staff will proceed to undertake a field analysis at the requested location.

5.1. During the school year (September to June), Traffic Engineering Services staff will analyze all SCG requests within 60 days of receipt by the proponent. The timing of the traffic studies is dictated by weather, the ability to collect data (staff resources) and a fixed time frame associated with the school calendar.

5.2. Traffic Engineering Services will update the proponent on the timing for the studies.

5.3. To accommodate the data collection, assessment and review of requested sites will take place in the fall and spring months during a regular school day during the morning and afternoon school peak times.

6. SCG Warrant Method Determination

The 2017 OTC SCG Guide provides guidelines for how to implement SCGs where needed. The purpose of the warrant is to utilize a consistent and uniform approach when dealing evaluating student safety.

Two methods are used to conduct the warrant analysis:

6.1. Gap Study Method: warrant methodology suitable for uncontrolled crossing facilities; or,

6.2. Exposure Index (EI) Method: warrant methodology suitable for controlled crossing facilities that have conflicting movements between vehicular and student volumes.

All warrants conducted account for total assisted (with an adult) and unassisted elementary school children volumes.

7. Gap Study Warrant Method

The Gap Study method is used to assess uncontrolled crossing locations. Marked crosswalks having no other form of traffic control – such as a stop sign – may give pedestrians the incorrect impression that vehicles must stop for them, even when an SCG is not present. Resultantly, when this method is applied, it must be used in conjunction with an assessment for suitable traffic control must also be performed.

The Gap Study method follows this process:

7.1. Identify the most suitable location for a potential SCG location given spacing between existing controlled crossings and available sightlines to/ from the crossing.

7.2. Conduct traffic engineering studies to determine warrants for traffic control, such as Pedestrian Crossovers, Intersection Pedestrian Signals, Midblock Pedestrian Signals and/or All-Way Stops, based on other City procedures.

7.3. Calculate the safe gap time using the OTC formula including perception reaction time, crossing time based on road width and group factor time based on observed group size.

PROCEDURE TITLE: SCHOOL CROSSING GUARD

PROCEDURE NO.: PRC.16

- 7.4. Conduct a field gap study on a normal school day, as per OTC guidelines. Record the number and duration of observed gaps in each five-minute period.
- 7.5. Compare the observed gaps in fifty per cent (50%) of five-minute periods to the threshold of four gaps.
- 7.6. If the Gap Study threshold is met and an appropriate form of traffic control is warranted, then an SCG should be installed.
- 7.7. All potential locations should be inspected using OTC guidelines and the collision history reviewed.

8. EI Warrant Method

The EI is used to evaluate the level of conflict at controlled crossings. The EI method can also be used as a prioritization tool for comparison between different SCG locations. It is recommended for roadways with a speed limit less than 60 km/h. The EI method follows this process:

- 8.1. Establish the leg (side) of the intersection that would be most suitable for an SCG.
- 8.2. Identify the conflicting vehicular movements for the leg (side) of the intersection being studied.
- 8.3. Count the conflicting vehicular volumes and student crossing volumes during the school peak hours.
- 8.4. Input the conflicting vehicular volume and student crossing volume to the table of the EI template.
- 8.5. If the conflict is greater than the threshold, then an SCG is warranted.
- 8.6. Signalized intersections are evaluated with the EI method and a SCG may be needed if the warrant conflict exceeds the threshold (EI = 5,000).
- 8.7. All-way stop-controlled intersections are evaluated with the EI method and a SCG may be warranted if the warrant conflict exceeds the threshold (EI = 19,000).
- 8.8. SCG, at minor street stop-controlled intersections, may be needed if the conflict exceeds the threshold established by the warrant.

8.9. Pedestrian crossings parallel to the major street, SCG warrant is best evaluated with the EI method with the following threshold (EI =10,000).

8.10. Pedestrian crossings at an unprotected major street, SCG warrant can be evaluated with either the EI or the Gap Study method. SCG may be needed if the warrant conflict exceeds the threshold.

8.11. All potential locations should be inspected using OTC guidelines and the collision history reviewed.

9. Approval of New SCG Locations

After completion of the warrant study, the SCG Supervisor will advise the proponent and any other stakeholders of the outcome of the study.

9.1. If the warrant is met, a SCG will be placed at the identified location pending installation of signage and pavement markings and recruitment for the position. Communication via email and/or meeting request will be sent to the proponent (if applicable), Member(s) of Council and any other stakeholders outlining the results of the study, and the timing for implementation of the SCG at the identified location.

9.2. If the warrant is not met, communication via email and/or meeting request will be sent to the proponent, Member(s) of Council and any other stakeholders outlining the results of the study and the decision to not implement a SCG.

10. Signage and Pavement Markings Installation

Sites warranting SCGs will have the necessary signage, pavement markings and SCGs implemented for the first day of school of the following September (subject to weather, budget approval and staffing resources).

11. Prioritization of SCG Locations Meeting Criteria

A prioritization process at warranted locations ensures fairness and transparency and it also ensures that SCGs are installed and maintained at essential locations.

Locations may be prioritized for implementation in consideration of the following:

- 11.1. Type of traffic control for the crossing location;
- 11.2. Collision history;
- 11.3. Vehicular speed (speed limit vs operating speed);
- 11.4. Number of children crossing;
- 11.5. Number of travel lanes;
- 11.6. Vehicular volume; and,

- 11.7. Minimum sight distance is below 65 meters.

12. Request for Second Crossing (“L”) At A SCG Location

A single SCG may assist children at a second crossing at a single location, forming an “L” shape, at the discretion of the SCG Supervisor in consultation with Traffic Engineering Services. The second crossing at the location should be screened to ensure that:

- 12.1. No more than one lane of travel in each direction if the second crossing location is uncontrolled;
- 12.2. A speed limit of less than or equal to 50km/h on roadways approaching the second crossing at uncontrolled crossing locations; and,
- 12.3. The second crossing does not front driveway aprons abutting residential properties.

The total number of children and total volume of vehicles must allow for a safe second crossing by a single SCG, as determined by the SCG Supervisor. No minimum number of elementary school children using the second crossing in the “L” is required.

13. Lunch Time Period

SCGs are not provided in the lunch time period at new locations. Existing locations will be assessed under the new policy and procedures. If the number of students crossing during the lunch time period at existing locations has been observed to be below ten assisted and unassisted children, it will be reassessed.

- 13.1. Two studies should be conducted on non-consecutive normal school days.
- 13.2. If a threshold of ten assisted or unassisted elementary school children crossing in total over the lunch period is not met, the lunch time period SCG is not warranted.
- 13.3. The removal of the lunch time period SCG will occur at the start of the next school year.

14. Removal or Reallocation of A SCG

To increase the overall sustainability of the program and to enable resources to be reallocated to higher risk warranted locations, SCG locations will be periodically reviewed to determine whether crossings are warranted.

PROCEDURE TITLE: SCHOOL CROSSING GUARD

PROCEDURE NO.: PRC.16

- 14.1. A technical review of twenty-five (25) pre-selected SCG locations in the field are to be conducted each year to determine if the crossing location for the subsequent school year continues to meet warrant. Locations will be pre-selected and may also be based on request.
- 14.2. Both the location screening and OTC warrant (either Gap Study or EI, as appropriate) will be conducted as per sections 5 to 8. Required traffic counts will be performed on two non-consecutive regular school days to determine reallocation or removal of a SCG.
- 14.3. If warrants are not met at a reassessed location, the SCG Supervisor and Traffic Engineering staff will determine if other traffic safety measures would be appropriate.
- 14.4. The local Ward and Regional Councilor will be made aware via written communication and/ or meeting of the intent to perform the two necessary studies to reallocate or remove a SCG from a specified location.
- 14.5. Recommended changes with respect to the relocation or removal of a SCG will be made through a Communication to the Mayor and Member(s) of Council along with a scheduled meeting with the impacted Local Ward Councilor and Regional Councilors. The affected school, school board, parent council (if applicable) and trustee will also be notified in writing of any changes.
- 14.6. Appropriate communication channels and tools for local community engagement will be applied on a case by case basis with each SCG location identified for removal or reallocation, and the process will be communicated to all internal and external stakeholders.
- 14.7. Removal or reallocation of a SCG will only occur at the start of the following school year.
- 14.8. When a school closes and the SCG is only servicing at that school, the SCG will be removed without re-evaluation.
- 14.9. All pavement markings and signage will be removed at the location where the SCG is removed.
- 14.10. SCG reallocation will be prioritized based on warrant and where there is an essential need, as described in s.11.

15. Crossing Guards at Newly Built Schools

- 15.1. A SCG will be proactively assigned at all newly built schools for a period of one year.
- 15.2. The SCG Supervisor and Traffic Engineering Services must be advised in writing of any new school by the appropriate York Region School Boards.
- 15.3. Once confirmation of a new school opening is received, the SCG Supervisor will respond according to the SCG implementation schedule.
- 15.4. Traffic Engineering Services staff will request from the School Board the catchment area of the registered children for the subject school. For new school sites, the forecast of students and vehicular traffic volumes will be analyzed as part of the overall assessment process.
- 15.5. The student volumes will be estimated based on the maximum school enrollment as well as the catchment area of each school.
- 15.6. Traffic Engineering Services staff will determine an appropriate location for a temporary SCG based on the information. The temporary guard location will be in place for a one-year term.
- 15.7. The SCG location will be assessed after the first year is completed.
- 15.8. Following a warrant study, recommendations with respect to implementing, reallocating or removal of a SCG will be communicated to the local Ward and Regional Councillor and a meeting will be facilitated with the proponent and all relevant stakeholders.

16. Training and Education

- 16.1. Once the proper sites for the crossings are chosen, guards must be hired and educated in their duties including:
 - 16.1.1. Basic traffic law;
 - 16.1.2. School zone signage, especially crosswalk signs;
 - 16.1.3. Hand traffic signals;
 - 16.1.4. Proper crossing procedures, and ways to teach them to children;
 - 16.1.5. Emergency procedures;
 - 16.1.6. How to time crossings with gaps in traffic to minimize disruption to the flow of vehicles
 - 16.1.7. What to do in case of an accident; and,
 - 16.1.8. Personal safety and user safety.

PROCEDURE TITLE: SCHOOL CROSSING GUARD

PROCEDURE NO.: PRC.16

- 16.2. SCGs will also be provided appropriate equipment such as stop sign, whistle, uniform including Personal Protective Vest, raincoat, jacket, hats, gloves and various types of sun protection.

17. SCG Site Inspections

- 17.1. Inspections are to be conducted during the morning, midday, and afternoon school peak periods (30-40 minutes before the applicable school bell times), on a typical school day.
- 17.2. Inspections at each SCG location will be performed for health and safety and administration matters at each SCG location a minimum of one time each year. Inspections will include:
- 17.2.1. Observation of the arrival and departure times of the SCG at their locations, the wearing of proper attire, appropriate use of equipment, adherence to procedures, and assessment of hazards; and,
- 17.2.2. A subjective overview of the crosswalk location as being “busy” or “not busy” regarding both vehicular movement and pedestrian traffic. This information will serve to inform technical field staff of crosswalk locations that may require prioritization for assessment in the following year.

18. Communication

- 18.1. The SCG Supervisor and Traffic Engineering Services Staff will ensure all applicable internal and external stakeholders, Mayor and Member(s) of Council, citizens, school boards, school parent councils, senior leadership, etc. are advised via written communication and/or meetings of any intention to implement, not implement, remove or reallocate SCGs, as well as any changes impacting the SCGP, operating procedures and policies set out herein.
- 18.2. The Supervisor of the SCGP will meet with both the York Region District Catholic School Board and York Region District School Board annually to discuss SCG initiatives and issues pertaining to the SCGP.
- 18.3. The SCG Supervisor will work with Corporate and Strategic Communications to employ a comprehensive, multi-faceted approach to promote SCG recruitment as well as active and safe travel promotion material for the SCGP.
- 18.3.1. Communications may include email, memorandums, social media, billboards, pamphlets, drop communication to local catchment area, participation at City-run public events, Councilor E-Newsletters, etc.

PROCEDURE TITLE: SCHOOL CROSSING GUARD

PROCEDURE NO.: PRC.16

ADMINISTRATION			
<i>Administered by the Office of the City Clerk.</i>			
Review Schedule:	SELECT If other, specify here	Next Review Date:	Click or tap to enter a date.
Related Procedure(s):			
Related By-Law(s):			
Supporting Documentation:			
Revision History			
Date:	Description:		
Click or tap to enter a date.			
Click or tap to enter a date.			
Click or tap to enter a date.			