

Crossing Guard Program

The Crossing Guard Program is managed by the Special Operations Bureau of the Police Department. Twenty-seven crossing guard locations have been funded in the City’s budget to assist in guiding community members and students walking across streets, which are busy during peak travel times. Twenty-two of the 27 locations are staffed by City-employed crossing guards. The remaining five locations are covered by contract services through All City Management Services, Inc. (ACMS).

Table 1: Crossing Guard Locations

<p>LINCOLN ELEMENTARY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robinson & Vail • Rindge & Plant <p>MADISON ELEMENTARY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mackay & Nelson <p>BIRNEY ELEMENTARY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grant & Green • Aviation & Grant <p>ADAMS & WASHINGTON K-8th</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Felton & Grant • Felton & Ripley • Lilienthal & Ripley • 182nd & Inglewood • Lilienthal & Ralston • Inglewood & Ralston <p>TULITA ELEMENTARY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Palos Verdes & Prospect • Palos Verdes & Helberta • Helberta & Prospect 	<p>JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harkness & Morgan • Harkness & Carlson • Flagler & Morgan • Flagler & Havemeyer <p>BERYL HEIGHTS ELEMENTARY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beryl & Maria • Beryl & Prospect <p>ALTA VISTA ELEMENTARY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Camino Real & Prospect • Knob Hill & Julia • Julia & Serpentine • Knob Hill & Prospect <p>PARRAS MIDDLE SCHOOL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emerald & Lucia • Vincent & Lucia <p>ST. LAWRENCE MARTYR K-8TH</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prospect & Ave G
--	---

Funding Breakdown

Crossing guard staffing is split into morning and afternoon shifts of approximately two hours each, totaling 4 to 5 hours per day over the 180-day school year. The annual cost for a single City-employed Crossing Guard is approximately \$18,954. In FY 2025-26, the Police Department’s operating budget included \$212,600 for part-time personnel providing coverage at 12 crossing guard intersections. The City Council also approved

a one-time General Fund appropriation of \$340,000, which included \$201,842 for 10 additional part-time city employees and \$138,158 for contract services to staff 5 additional locations, bringing the total to 27 locations. For FY 2025-26, the ACMS contract rate is \$37.81 per hour, for a total estimated annual cost of \$138,158. This brought the total FY 2025-26 allocation for crossing guard services to \$552,600.

Table 2: Cost Calculation

	City part-time personnel	Contract services (ACMS)
# of crossing guard locations	22	5
Budget Allocation (FY 2025-26)	\$413,842	\$138,158
Cost per crossing guard location	\$18,954	\$27,631
Total Cost (FY 2025-26)	\$552,000	

Crossing Guard Location Assessment

On August 19, 2025, staff presented on the Crossing Guard Subcommittee (Subcommittee) assessment of the 27 crossing guard locations. The Subcommittee is comprised of two Councilmembers and representatives from the Police Department, Public Works (Traffic Engineering), and the City Manager’s Office. The Subcommittee utilized a data-driven approach to assess the City’s existing crossing guard locations. The assessment considered the following criteria:

- A. Combined bicycle and pedestrian volume
- B. Vehicular volumes
- C. Total number of formal and de facto lanes that enter the intersection
- D. If any approaching street has a speed limit above 25 mph
- E. If any approaching street has more than one through lane in each direction
- F. If the intersection is signalized or contains an uncontrolled crosswalk (no stop signs or signal)
- G. California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CAMUTCD) conditions, which outline standards that may warrant an adult crossing guard at intersections with higher vehicular volumes
- H. Engineering assessment in the context of local conditions

Vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian volumes were collected by the Police Department at each crossing guard location during a 90-minute window in the morning school drop-off period. By cross-referencing the Police Department's traffic analysis with the criteria listed above, 12 locations were identified as having the lowest need.

The Subcommittee also discussed alternative traffic safety measures and initiatives aimed at enhancing student safety, in particular, the AAA School Safety Patrol Program (AAA Program). This program was established in 1920 and is a nationally recognized initiative that promotes pedestrian safety and student leadership. Students, typically fifth to eighth graders, serve as patrollers and assist their classmates to safely navigate school zone crosswalks.

The intersections identified as possible candidates for the AAA Program exhibit similar characteristics, such as they are all-way stop-controlled, experience lower vehicular volumes, are relatively easy for younger pedestrians to cross, have lower speed limits, and contain fewer approach lanes that could conflict with pedestrian paths of travel. Based on these conditions, the need for an adult professional crossing guard at these locations is comparatively lower than at intersections with higher speeds, greater complexity, and/or heavier traffic volumes.

Below is a breakdown of existing crossing guard locations, indicating which locations meet thresholds for recommending an adult professional crossing guard:

Table 3: Crossing Guard Locations

Locations that do <u>not</u> meet thresholds recommending an adult guard	Locations that meet thresholds recommending an adult guard
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emerald & Lucia (Parras Middle) • Flagler & Havemeyer (Jefferson Elementary) • Flagler & Morgan (Jefferson Elementary) • Harkness & Carlson (Jefferson Elementary) • Harkness & Morgan (Jefferson Elementary) • Julia & Serpentine (Alta Vista Elementary) • Julia & Knob Hill (Alta Vista Elementary) • Mackay & Nelson (Madison Elementary) • Ralston & Lilienthal (Washington Elementary and Adams Middle) • Rindge & Plant (Lincoln Elementary) • Robinson & Vail (Lincoln Elementary) • Vincent & Lucia (Parras Middle and Redondo Union High) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grant & Green (Birney Elementary) • Aviation & Green (Birney Elementary) • Felton & Grant (Washington Elementary and Adams Middle) • Felton & Ripley (Washington Elementary and Adams Middle) • Lilienthal & Ripley (Washington Elementary and Adams Middle) • 182nd & Inglewood (Washington Elementary and Adams Middle) • Inglewood & Ralston (Washington Elementary and Adams Middle) • Palos Verdes & Prospect (Tulita Elementary) • Palos Verdes & Helberta (Tulita Elementary) • Helberta & Prospect (Tulita Elementary) • Beryl & Maria (Beryl Heights Elementary) • Beryl & Prospect (Beryl Heights Elementary) • Camino Real & Prospect (Alta Vista Elementary) • Knob Hill & Prospect (Alta Vista Elementary) • Prospect & Ave G (St Lawrence)

Attachment A provides details on the statistics and characteristics of each existing crossing guard location.

Potential Additional Locations

Staff also evaluated three additional candidate locations identified through the City Council and public feedback. **Attachment A** also compares these three candidate locations with the City’s existing 27 crossing guard locations, and each is discussed in more detail below.

Aviation & Ford: During a 90-minute AM school peak period observation window, no student pedestrians were observed crossing this intersection, although 29 non-students did use it. A total of 33 students crossed on bikes or e-bikes, with approximately half traveling towards Mira Costa High School and the other half traveling towards Adams Middle School. This location is not an official school crossing under State standards, as it does not include yellow-painted crosswalks.

Artesia & North Redondo Beach Bikeway: This intersection is a signalized mixed-use path crossing with fewer potential conflict points than a conventional four-way intersection. This intersection experiences higher bike crossing volumes than existing crossing guard locations. Although it is not an official school crossing, this intersection serves a significant number of regional biking trips to nearby middle and high schools. Staff also notes that curb extensions have been requested to improve safety at this location and are pending funding availability.

Inglewood & Grant: While this intersection does not directly serve a nearby school, it is the only crossing available to students living east of the Metro-owned railroad tracks, near the South Bay Galleria. This intersection experiences fewer bicycle and pedestrian crossings than locations currently staffed with crossing guards and includes multiple approaching lanes. Staff notes that extensive safety improvements, such as curb extensions and protected bike lanes, are currently in design and funded for construction as part of the Metro MAT Redondo Beach Blvd Project.

Based on the cost calculations provided in Table 2, it would cost the City an additional \$27,631 per location, or \$82,893 to add all three potential additional locations.

Table 4: Cost Calculation with Additional Locations

	City part-time personnel	Contract services (ACMS)	Additional locations (ACMS)
# of crossing guard locations	22	5	3
Budget Allocation (FY 2025-26)	\$413,842	\$138,158	\$0
Cost per crossing guard location	\$18,954	\$27,631	\$27,631
Total Cost (est.)	\$413,842 + \$138,158 + \$82,893 = \$634,893		

Program Challenges and Considerations

Historically, the City has struggled to hire, retain, and consistently staff crossing guard positions due to a limited candidate pool. The challenges are further intensified by the part-time nature of the work, which typically offers only a few hours per day and split shifts that can be difficult for candidates. Additionally, the seasonal nature of the position and the requirement to work outdoors in varying weather conditions can further narrow the pool of interested candidates. In FY 2022-23, the City Council approved increasing the hourly pay range to \$20-25 in an effort to improve recruitment and reduce reliance on costly contract services.

The City is responsible for staffing 22 crossing-guard locations. Although 24 crossing guards are currently employed, five serve exclusively as alternates and therefore cannot be assigned to a consistent post. As a result, the City has experienced ongoing challenges in fully staffing all 22 locations. From the start of the 2025-2026 school year in August through today, approximately 500 crossing-guard vacancies have occurred. These vacancies are typically filled by Municipal Services Officers, diverting them from their primary responsibilities, including parking enforcement and street-sweeping support.

In addition to hiring difficulties, the City has also encountered challenges with its contracted crossing guard services. In August 2025, staff presented a proposed one-year agreement with ACMS as part of a broader discussion regarding the contractor's request to modify the City's standard indemnity language. Following that discussion, the City Council directed staff to reject the contractor's proposed changes and require ACMS to accept the City's Standard Indemnity Provision. ACMS ultimately agreed to the City's indemnity requirements, however the contractor indicated that its concerns with the indemnity provision would likely continue in future negotiations, which may affect the City's ability to secure a new contract after the current agreement expires on June 30, 2026.

Attachments:

- A. Statistics and Characteristics of Crossing Guard Locations

Crossing Guard Location	School	90 min AM Data by RBPD				Intersection Conditions					Assessment
		# Bikes	# Peds	Total Bike/Ped ¹	# Vehicles ²	Total # Of Lanes Approaching ²	Speed Limit >25?	Signalized Intersection?	Multilane Street Approach?	Meets Suggested CAMUTCD Adult Guard Thresholds ³ ?	
Flagler/Havemeyer	Jefferson	57	74	131	586	4					Yes
Flagler/Morgan	Jefferson	49	65	114	742	4					Yes
Harkness/Carlson	Jefferson	14	102	116	490	2					Yes
Harkness/Morgan	Jefferson	19	129	148	557	3					Yes
Julia/Serpentine	Alta Vista	8	136	144	398	3					Yes
Prospect/Camino Real	Alta Vista	18	46	64	3190	12	X	X	X	X	No
Julia/Knob Hill	Alta Vista	3	132	135	734	3					Yes
Prospect/Knob Hill	Alta Vista	18	69	87	2233	10	X	X	X	X	No
Rindge/Plant	Lincoln	16	233	249	261	3					Yes
Robinson/Vail	Lincoln	24	92	116	470	4					Yes
Mackay/Nelson	Madison	8	129	137	111	3					Yes
PVB/Helberta	Tulita	10	55	65	2275	8	X		X	X	No
Prospect/Helberta	Tulita	5	194	199	1947	7	X		X	X	No
Prospect/PV Blvd.	Tulita	7	49	56	2794	13	X	X	X	X	No
Prospect/Ave G	St. Lawrence (Pvt.)	10	97	107	1255	5	X		X	X	No
Emerald/Lucia	Parras MS	63	92	155	761	6	X				Yes
Vincent/Lucia	Parras MS	69	68	137	1003	4				X	Yes
Beryl/Prospect	Beryl Hgts	13	37	50	3519	11	X	X	X	X	No
Beryl/Maria	Beryl Hgts	33	191	224	1364	8	X	X		X	No
Grant/Aviation	Birney	27	35	62	2316	9	X	X	X	X	No
Grant/Green	Birney	21	169	190	1742	8	X	X		X	No
Inglewood/182 nd	Washington/Adams	10	39	49	3093	7	X	X	X	X	No
Grant/Felton	Washington/Adams	174	128	302	1892	8	X	X		X	No
Inglewood/Ralston	Washington/Adams	14	26	40	2827	7	X	X	X	X	No
Ralston/Lilienthal	Washington/Adams	50	133	183	597	7					Yes
Ripley/Felton	Washington/Adams	217	664	881	589	4	X				No
Ripley/Lilienthal	Washington/Adams	37	324	361	665	4	X				No
Additional Intersection Evaluation (No Guard Currently)											
Aviation/Ford	N/A	47	29*	76	2509	6	X	X	X	N/A	No
Artesia/NRBB	N/A	92	38	130	2000	4	X	X	X	N/A	No
Inglewood/Grant	N/A	18	38	56	2960	13	X	X	X	N/A	No

¹Darker green bars show relatively higher bike/ped volumes.

²Darker red bars show relatively higher vehicular volumes or higher number of approach lanes (formal or defacto).

³California MUTCD (CAMUTCD), which governs public street design, provides guidance thresholds for when an adult crossing guard could be deployed.

⁴Intersection Conditions, volumes, and other factors were used to determine location feasibility to vacate and/or introduce the AAA School Safety Patrol Program.

* Please note that all 29 pedestrians at Aviation/Ford were adults. No students were identified crossing during AM school peak period.