Study Date: June 2, 2022

SCHOOL CROSSING ANALYSIS City of Madison Department of Transportation Traffic Engineering Division

School Van Hise Elementary						
Crossing Location Segoe + Richland					DO!	NTO
Elementary School Children Crossing Segoe W Leg						NTS
1) Number of elementary students crossing	number	points	number	points	a.m. 3	p.m. 4
a.m. peak hour (8:00 to 8:45)13	1 - 5 6 - 9	1 2	25 - 29 30 - 34	6 100		
p.m. peak hour (2:40 to 3:55)15	10 - 14 15 - 19	3 4	35 - 39 40 - 49	15 20		
School Schedule 8:20am – 3:17pm (Monday release at 1:45pm)	20 - 24	5	50 - 74 75 - 99	30 35		
2) Gap Availability					32	32
crossing distance = <u>88</u> feet	% safe gap time 80 +	points 0	% safe <u>gap time</u> 45 - 49	points 20		
minimum safe crossing time = <u>29</u> seconds	70 - 79 60 - 69 55 - 59	4 8 12	40 - 44 30 - 39 20 - 29	24 28 32		
% safe crossing time = 20 % a.m.	50 - 54	16	0 - 20	36		
	tiı		vd; crossing I on crossing ce.			
3) Motor Vehicle Speed	mph	<u>points</u>	<u>mph</u>	<u>points</u>	4	4
95th paraentile anged = 22 mph am	< = 20 21 - 25	0 1	36 - 40 41 - 45	7 11		
85th percentile speed = 32 mph a.m.	26 - 30	2	41 - 45 46 +	15		
32 mph p.m.	31 - 35	4				
4) Sight Distance :			ign stopping		5	5
available sight distance: <u>350</u> feet <u>West</u>	bound		<u>h %ile speed</u> <= 25 mph	<u>feet</u> 155		
250 feetEast	bound		26 - 30 mph 31 - 35 mph	200 250		
			36 - 40 mph 41 - 45 mph	305 360		
			46 + mph	425		
ratio: available sight distance / design stopping distance	e		<u>ratio</u>	points		
<u>1.4</u> feet <u>Wes</u>	st bou	nd	2.1 + 1.5 - 2.0	0 1		
1 feet West	bound	t	1.0 - 1.5	5 15		
5) Safety History - Previous Five Years			< 1.0	15	0	0
a) Number of reported crashes at study location involvin	g		<u>crashes</u>	points		
elementary school children going to or coming from school. 0 0 1 8						
0 reported crashes	i		each add'l	20		
b) Reported crashed not involving children going to or c						
of types and/or at times that could conflict with schoo	I crossing a	t this locat		<u>points</u>	0	0
reported crashes. Type: _				0 - 5		
reported crashes. Type: _				0 - 5		
reported crashes. Type: _				0 - 5		
6) Other Factors Foreign traffic route.				<u>points</u> 0 to +5	5	5
For each approach in excess of four.				+5 5 to +10	Ü	
For complex signal or crossing design. For simple signal or crossing design.				5 to -10		
Safer crossing one block out of the way. Large percentage of grades K and 1 students (over 40%).				-10 0 to +5		
An intersection of two arterial streets where total weekday						
traffic approach volume exceeds 25,000 vehicles. Children crossing multiple crosswalks at an intersection.				+4 0 to +10		
Stopped buses and/or other obstructions. Volume of turning traffic not reflected in gap availability.				0 to +5 0 to +5		
Observations of the percent and types of trucks during the tim	nes when stu	dents are u	sing the crossin			
			TOTAL HAZAF	RD RATING	49	50
						Ī

Interpretation of Hazard Rating

Using the hazard rating as a guide, the following measures are appropriate:

- 1. **Mark as a school crossing** when the hazard rating is <u>greater than 20 points</u> at a crossing used by <u>at least 25 elementary school students</u> during the peak crossing hour. The Traffic Engineer is authorized to mark such a crossing with appropriate warning signs and special crosswalk markings.
- 2. **Install flashing beacons** if any one of the following conditions is met:
- a. The 85th percentile speed is in excess of 40 mph measured at existing school crossing signs which have been in place at least 30 days.
- b. The street crossed is a U.S. or State Trunk Highway on which a significant percentage of "foreign" drivers can be expected.
 - c. The ratio of sight distance to safe stopping distance is less than 1.5.
- d. The hazard rating is greater than 30 at an unguarded location where at least 25 elementary students cross and the available safe crossing gaps are less than 50 percent.
- 3. **Recommend the assignment of an adult school crossing guard** when the hazard rating is greater than 40 points at a crossing used by at least 25 elementary school students during the peak crossing hour.

If the <u>school has only grades K through 2</u>, recommend the assignment of an adult school crossing guard in the hazard rating is <u>greater than 30 points</u> at a crossing used by <u>at least 15 elementary school students</u> during the peak crossing hour.

4. **Recommend the discontinuance of adult school crossing guard protection** at a crossing where the hazard rating <u>falls below 30 points</u> or if the number of elementary school students crossing during the peak hour in <u>less than 15</u>.

At the intersection of two arterial streets where the total weekday entering traffic volume exceed 25,000 vehicles, the total number of students crossing at the intersection will be used to compare to the minimum of 15 students required to retain an adult school crossing guard.

Remarks/Recommendations

- RRFB added in Summer 2020
- Spring 2019 U-turns at Segoe/Richland were prohibited after Crossing Guard study
 - o U-turns decreased from 40 cars in Dec 2019 to 3 cars in June 2021 during Crossing Guard study
 - o Observed in 2022 AM: 4 U-turns, PM: 3 U-turns.
- AM: All elementary school students crossed with adults.
- PM: 2 elementary school students crossed alone, 13 crossed with an adult.

Assignment of Adult School Crossing Guard is not recommended since this location does not meet the criteria for minimum number of elementary students.

by Gretchen M. Aviles Pineiro Date June 10, 2022