

# Crossing Guard Proposal Presentation



**SPRINGFIELD CITY COUNCIL  
&  
SPRINGFIELD SCHOOL BOARD  
JOINT MEETING**

**SEPTEMBER 24, 2014**

# Background & Context



## City Ordinance

- ❑ City Ordinance (Sec. 66-71) authorizes, but does not mandate, a school crossing guard program
- ❑ The City previously entered into formal agreements with the Missouri Highway and Transportation Commission (MHTC) for each crossing location on the state highway system
  - ❑ The City does not have any agreements in place with the MHTC as there are currently no crossing locations on the state highway system

## State Law

- ❑ There are no State Statutes that require cities or schools to provide this service

## Other Research

- ❑ Researched other Missouri Cities/School Districts
- ❑ There was no consistent model (some City, some School)

# The Current Process



- ❑ Currently, there are a total of 34 crossing guard locations, as determined by the School Crossing Protection Committee (27 are within the City limits; 7 locations are outside City limits)
- ❑ School crossing guard locations are staffed twice each day for one-hour in the morning, and a half-hour in the afternoon
- ❑ The City currently hires, trains, manages, and funds the program for the 27 crossing locations inside the City limits
- ❑ The School District currently hires, trains, and manages the program for the 7 crossing guard locations outside the City limits
  - ❑ Six of these positions have been reimbursed to the district by Greene County for many years. Greene County stopped funding this program in the fall of 2013
  - ❑ The seventh location is funded through reimbursement from the City of Battlefield

## The Current Process (Continued)



- ❑ The City program is managed by the Springfield Police Department Traffic Unit, assisted by a paid coordinator, and staffed with City employees
  
- ❑ When school crossing guards within the City do not show up for their post or call-in sick, one of the City's three non-sworn Traffic Safety Officers will fill-in, if available, and provide this service
  - ❑ If the City's Traffic Safety Officers are unable to fill the post, the City notifies the School Police Office and they staff it, or they contact the local school to do so
  
- ❑ A similar process is used for the crossing vacancies outside the City
  - ❑ When substitutes are needed, that request and placement is managed through the School Police Office

# Crossing Locations



- ❑ There are 34 crossing guard locations:
  - ❑ 27 are inside the City limits
  - ❑ 7 are outside the City limits, including one in the City of Battlefield (Wilson Creek)
  
- ❑ Of the 34 crossing guard locations:
  - ❑ 14 crossing locations are at the edge of school district property
  - ❑ 20 crossing locations are not connected to the school district property:
    - ❑ 4 are less than two blocks away
    - ❑ 16 are two or more blocks away

# Improvements are Needed in the Current Process



The current process is not working well, and changes are needed for primarily two reasons:

## 1) Increase the effectiveness of the program for the safety of students

- ❑ Crossing locations sometimes go unstaffed
  - ❑ Historically, the absentee rate is about 10% of the time, or 475 morning and afternoon shifts over the course of the school year
  - ❑ We are not always aware of no-shows until after the fact

## 2) Utilize resources appropriately

- ❑ Maintain City traffic safety officers and School police for their primary roles and responsibilities
- ❑ Strain on administrative staff (HR, Finance, Legal, Police)
  - ❑ Difficult to recruit and retain employees to work part-time with one shift in the morning and one in the afternoon
- ❑ Reduce duplication of efforts: single program for the entire school district

# Where are we now?



- ❑ The City Council and the School Board met November 19, 2013 in a joint session to review this issue
  - ❑ As a result of that meeting, the City and SPS staff have been investigating the possibility of utilizing a third-party vendor for the crossing guard services
  
- ❑ The City's Purchasing staff assisted in the preparation of the Request for Proposal (RFP)
  - ❑ The RFP was jointly approved by City and SPS staff
  
- ❑ The RFP was written to allow either party to host the contract
  
- ❑ The joint committee reviewed the five initial proposals that were received as a result of the RFP process and unanimously identified three finalists to interview

# RFP process status



- ❑ The SPS/City committee jointly evaluated the three presentations and unanimously recommended the top firm
  - ❑ Short List Evaluators:
    - ❑ Scott Wendt-SPS
    - ❑ Eric Boxberger-SPS
    - ❑ Greg Hall-SPS
    - ❑ Justin Herrell-SPS
    - ❑ Ben King-City
    - ❑ Paul Williams-City
    - ❑ Collin Quigley-City
    - ❑ Greg Burris-City

# Moving Forward



- ❑ Awaiting School Board and City Council approval to award bid
  - ❑ The bid has been extended for an additional 90 days and is good until November 18, 2014

## Implementation Process with contractor

- ❑ Award the bid & sign the contract:
  - ❑ Contractor will order required equipment (hand-held stop signs, plastic whistles, reflective safety vests, high-visibility rain gear, cap with logo) all provided to employee at no cost
  - ❑ Post signs at each crossing location announcing that they are hiring for that location
  - ❑ Attempt to contact all current guards and bring them under company employment
  - ❑ Train employees

# Proposal Details



## Vendor Proposal: Details from the recommended bidder:

## City's Proposal: To split-fund the 27 locations inside the City limits:

\$167,620 for all 34 crossing locations  
(34 x 2 hours per day x 170 days x \$14.50 per hour)

\$9,860 for the crossing guard supervisor  
(680 hours x \$14.50 per hour)

\$177,480 Total for all 34 crossing locations

\$133,110 for the 27 locations inside the City limits  
(27 x 2 hours per day x 170 days x \$14.50 per hour)

\$7,790 for the crossing guard supervisor inside City limits  
 $\$9,860 \times .79$   
(27/34)

\$140,900 Total for 27 locations inside the City limits

Shared equally between the City and SPS =  
\$70,450 each annually

# City's Proposal



- ❑ A third-party vendor be utilized for the entire school crossing guard program
- ❑ An IGA be entered into between the City and the School District
  - ❑ The City and SPS would split-fund the cost of a third-party vendor for the 27 crossing locations inside the City limits
    - ❑ Each would fund \$70,450 annually
  - ❑ After three years, the City and SPS would re-evaluate the program

## Contracting Options with third-party vendor



- ❑ Contract covers all 34 locations (inside and outside the City) and SPS holds the contract
  - ❑ If there is a single agreement on the use of a third-party vendor for all 34 crossing locations, the School District would need to enter into the agreement with the vendor since the City cannot legally enter into a contract to perform services outside the City limits
- ❑ Contract covers all 34 locations (inside and outside the City) and the contract is held jointly
  - ❑ Requires a joint hold-harmless agreement
  - ❑ IGA would need to carve out the funding portion for inside the City limits, since the City cannot legally enter into a contract to perform services outside the City limits
- ❑ Contract covers only the 27 locations inside the City, and the City holds the contract
  - ❑ SPS continues to fund and run a separate program for the seven locations outside the City limits

Discussion/Questions?

