Best Practices for Rail Transit Safety Education

A REVIEW OF OPERATION LIFESAVER’S TRANSIT GRANT PROGRAM
Statistics show that most fatalities on transit property are among members of the general public, not transit riders or employees.\(^1\) While engineering and enforcement actions are vital in reducing these incidents, public education is also an essential piece of the puzzle. Misinformation, lack of awareness, and distraction are unfortunately all too common and can lead to tragic results.

Operation Lifesaver, Inc. (OLI) is a national nonprofit rail safety education organization, with the mission of preventing collisions, injuries, and fatalities on and around railroad tracks and grade crossings, including rail transit. Many people are not aware that it can take a rail transit vehicle more than 600 feet (depending on the type of vehicle) to come to a stop once the operator applies the emergency brake. People believe they will always hear a train coming, though modern trains and transit vehicles can be quiet and hard to hear. Through national public education campaigns, OLI works to raise awareness about these and other facts so that people will be empowered to engage in safe behavior around tracks and trains.

With funding provided by the Federal Transit Administration, OLI offers Rail Transit Safety Education Grants to support activities that raise public awareness. The grants are available to transit agencies, local governments, and Operation Lifesaver state programs to support public education in any community served by rail transit, including light rail, streetcar, commuter rail, and heavy rail (subway). Grants can support a variety of public education and outreach activities, including posters, billboards, vehicle wraps, videos, radio ads, social media campaigns, classroom materials, flyers, and community events. All grant materials are approved by OLI to ensure consistency with OLI’s national safety messages.

OLI uses a competitive evaluation process to select applicants for grant awards. Applications must indicate the safety issue to be addressed as well as a target audience for the campaign. The rail transit line need not be in revenue service at the time of the grant award (since outreach to the public is important even in advance of opening day), but the transit project cannot be speculative.

Over the past three grant cycles, OLI awarded 27 Rail Transit Safety Education Grants to 25 different recipients, representing 16 states plus the District of Columbia, and all rail transit modes.\(^2\) (See Figure 1)

OLI anticipates making future grant awards as funding is available, and has prepared this report to assist future grantees in developing effective safety campaigns.

---


\(^2\) In prior grant cycles, grants were awarded to Operation Lifesaver state programs for use on rail transit safety activities within those states. Beginning in 2013, OLI began to make grants directly to transit agencies.
## Figure 1 Grant Recipients 2013–2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRANT RECIPIENT</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>MODE*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2013 Grant Cycle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>Streetcar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit</td>
<td>Sonoma &amp; Marin Counties, CA</td>
<td>Commuter rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain</td>
<td>San Mateo County, CA</td>
<td>Commuter rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SunRail / Florida Operation Lifesaver</td>
<td>Orlando, FL</td>
<td>Commuter rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>Light rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Regional Transportation District</td>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td>Light rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Metro</td>
<td>Austin, TX</td>
<td>Commuter rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TriMet</td>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
<td>Light rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2014 Grant Cycle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento Regional Transit District</td>
<td>Sacramento, CA</td>
<td>Light rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Atlanta</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>Streetcar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Metro Regional Transit District</td>
<td>Albuquerque, NM</td>
<td>Commuter rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metra / Illinois Operation Lifesaver</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>Commuter rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas Area Rapid Transit</td>
<td>Dallas, TX</td>
<td>Light rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey Transit</td>
<td>New Jersey (statewide)</td>
<td>Commuter and light rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-State Development Agency</td>
<td>St. Louis, MO</td>
<td>Light rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth Transportation Authority</td>
<td>Fort Worth, TX</td>
<td>Commuter rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority / Ohio Operation Lifesaver</td>
<td>Cleveland, OH</td>
<td>Light rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah Transit Authority</td>
<td>Salt Lake City, UT</td>
<td>Streetcar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Metro</td>
<td>Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td>Light rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2015 Grant Cycle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California Regional Rail Authority (Metrolink)</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>Commuter rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KC Streetcar Authority</td>
<td>Kansas City, MO</td>
<td>Streetcar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TriMet</td>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
<td>Light rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton Roads Transit</td>
<td>Norfolk, VA</td>
<td>Light rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit</td>
<td>Sonoma &amp; Marin Counties, CA</td>
<td>Commuter rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>Heavy rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Transit</td>
<td>Minneapolis, MN</td>
<td>Light rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Transit Authority of Harris County</td>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>Light rail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Refers to the mode that was the focus of the grant-funded safety campaign.
Survey Results

OLI sought information in the survey about transit agencies’ experiences both during and after the grant period. Questions focused on the use of grant-funded materials, plans for future safety campaigns, trends in safety incidents, and an assessment of the effectiveness of various public education tools. A complete list of survey questions can be found in Appendix A.

CONTINUED USE OF GRANT MATERIALS

According to the survey, the impact of the Rail Transit Safety Education Grants has continued far beyond the term of the initial grant. Ninety-three percent of survey respondents (all but one) indicated that they are still using the materials funded by the OLI grant, even several years after the grant concluded. (See Figure 2) In some cases, the grant funded printed ads for use on vehicles or at stations, which have been left in place. In others, the grant funded digital ads, videos, or slide presentations which have continued to be disseminated online or at outreach events. The one agency that has not continued using materials funded by the grant reported that its grant funds were used primarily for education materials that were distributed to the public during the grant period.

FIGURE 2 HAS YOUR AGENCY USED THE MATERIALS FUNDED BY THE OLI GRANT SINCE YOU SUBMITTED YOUR FINAL GRANT REPORT?

TRENDS IN SAFETY INCIDENTS

The survey also asked grantees about trends in safety incidents since the expiration of the grant. Respondents reported trends in both trespassing and grade crossing incidents. While the results are intriguing, they cannot be used to draw a definitive conclusion about the impact of the public awareness campaigns. Since the earliest grants were completed no more than three years ago, most grantees have only one or two years of safety data following the conclusion of their grants. A longer period of analysis would be needed to distinguish long-term trends from yearly variations in the data.
SMART received two grants during the past three grant cycles. With the first grant, SMART carried out a rail safety education campaign focused on public schools within the new system’s service area. Schools within two miles of the right-of-way received Kid Scoop News, a classroom newspaper with safety information, several times throughout the school year, featuring “Crissy Crossbuck,” the campaign mascot. SMART also ran radio PSAs and kiosk ads. All materials were available in English and Spanish. With the second grant, SMART placed rail safety ads in Marin and Sonoma County movie theaters, taking advantage of the opportunity to deliver rail safety messaging during the releases of new Star Wars, James Bond and Hunger Games movies. SMART’s pre-movie ad ran in local theaters beginning in December 2015 for a three-month period.

Moreover, the survey did not require respondents to use a common definition of “incident,” nor did it require them to exclude suicides, so the data is not necessarily comparable among agencies. In addition, the data does not capture “near misses,” which is also an important indicator of the impact of public education campaigns. The data is not necessarily comparable with National Transit Database reporting, as the survey asked for information specifically related to the transit line on which the grant-funded campaign focused, rather than the system as a whole.

Among the agencies responding to the trespass question, 7 respondents reported a decrease, while 5 reported that the number had stayed the same. Regarding crossing incidents, 5 respondents reported a decrease, 7 reported that the number had stayed the same, and 2 reported an increase. (See Figure 3.) One of the agencies reporting an increase is in the first year of revenue service, and has experienced two crossing incidents, one of which was a suicide.

**FIGURE 3 TRENDS AS REPORTED BY SURVEY RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TREPASS INCIDENTS</th>
<th>CROSSING INCIDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INCREASED</td>
<td>DECREASED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note that “Incidents” was not a defined term in the survey, and that the period for comparison was 1–3 years. Not all respondents provided an answer to these questions.

Despite its limitations, the data is encouraging and worthy of additional study. Overall the vast majority of respondents reported that safety incidents have either stayed the same or decreased following conclusion of the grant.

**EFFECTIVENESS OF GRANT ACTIVITIES**

Grant recipients were asked to report on the effectiveness of their grant-funded activities by specifically identifying the most and least effective elements of their campaigns. Because not all campaigns included the same elements, the responses to these questions are not directly comparable. However, respondents were also asked to explain their choices, and the answers to that open-ended question provide insight into the utility of the various activities. The pros and cons of each type of public education activity, based on the responses to the open-ended questions, are summarized below and in Figure 4.

**Radio ads**

Only a few grantees produced radio ads. Two agencies reported that radio ads were the most effective element of their campaign. They noted that radio reaches a broad audience at relatively low cost. One agency commented that having high-profile people provide the voice-over, such as the governor, university football coaches, or well-known sports announcers, contributed to the effectiveness of their radio ads.

3 The other three respondents reported either that trespass prevention was not part of their campaign or that they did not have data.
MBTA's project was designed to raise awareness of safety issues at grade crossings and rights-of-way along the Green Line light rail system, particularly among college students. Campaign elements included a YouTube video promoting the “Eyes up, phone down” safety message; safety events for students at Northeastern University and Boston University; radio PSAs on college radio stations and print ads in student newspapers; and a Twitter outreach campaign.

One grantee reported that radio ads were the least effective element of their campaign. This agency observed that radio ads are difficult to target toward people who come into contact with the transit system. This is particularly relevant for small transit agencies in a relatively large region.

**TV ads**
No grantee selected TV ads as either the most or least effective campaign element.

**Videos**
One grantee reported that their safety video was the most effective element of their campaign (which, besides the video, included brochures and other printed materials). In that grantee’s case, the target audience was middle-school students. The grantee reported that the video was effective in keeping children interested in the presentation and could be paused at strategic moments to engage the students in discussion.

**Social media**
Two grantees reported that social media was the most effective element of their campaign. Reasons for selecting social media as most effective included the number of actual transit riders that can be reached, and the ability to disseminate safety videos to the public in a way that would directly engage them in a conversation about safety.

Two grantees reported that social media was least effective. They noted two issues. First, even social media requires outreach to generate interest; this transit agency did not get the response on social media they had hoped for, which they attribute to insufficient outreach to accompany the campaign. Second, if social media is not appropriately targeted, the message may miss the intended audience. One transit agency, which runs buses as well as a relatively small rail line within a large region, reported that most of its social media followers do not live in the downtown area and rarely come into contact with its trains.

**Vehicle ads**
Two grantees reported that vehicle ads were the most effective elements of their campaigns. These two grantees run very different rail systems: one is a large commuter rail operator, while the other has a single streetcar line. Still, both agencies noted that their vehicle ads reached their target audience, i.e. the people who come into direct contact with the rail lines, including both riders and non-riders.

One grantee reported that vehicle ads were least effective. The agency noted that the size of their ads limited their visibility, and next time they would opt for a larger venue, such as billboards.

**Station/platform ads**
Two respondents chose station/platform ads as most effective. One transit agency which found station/platform ads effective had identified transit users as the target audience for its campaign. Ads at stations and on platforms directly reached that target group. The other agency that found these ads effective placed safety messages directly on the ground at light rail platforms as well as along the tracks and at downtown intersections. These ads were very noticeable to pedestrians and called their attention to the fact that they were approaching tracks or trains.

One grantee chose station/platform ads as least effective. This agency noted that stations are oversaturated with advertisements, and that people no longer pay attention to the same safety messages they have been seeing for many years. This agency runs a commuter rail system that has been in operation for decades.
The City of Atlanta’s “Be Streetcar Smart” pedestrian and bicycle safety campaign launched when Atlanta Streetcar operations began in December 2014. The “pancake people” graphics were used in station posters, safety postcards, and on the project’s website. Atlanta city staff also made a number of presentations to local community groups.

Billboards
One respondent selected billboards as its most effective campaign element. This agency runs commuter rail in a large, heavily congested region, and noted that with the volume of traffic in the area, drivers could not help but see a billboard sooner or later.

One respondent identified billboards as its least effective element. This agency is also a commuter rail operator in a large, heavily congested region, but found that the size and location of their billboards did not effectively reach their target audience.

Community Events
Two respondents reported that community events were the most effective element of their campaign, and none selected community events as least effective. Community events were seen as effective because they allow transit agencies to reach people in the community who do not regularly ride rail transit, and also because the public responded positively to having personal contact with transit agency staff.

Brochures
No respondents selected brochures as the most effective element, and two respondents selected them as the least effective element of their campaign. These respondents observed that people who received the brochures (attendees at community events and school children) mostly threw them away.

Classroom Materials
One respondent reported that classroom materials were the most effective element of their campaign, but noted that their OLI grant only funded classroom materials, so it was the only element of their campaign. They did feel that the materials were effective, due to having a comprehensive outreach plan that involved going into each school and demonstrating the materials, not merely dropping them off.

One respondent found classroom materials to be the least effective campaign element, due to school district rules limiting what could be provided to students.

Other
Two respondents chose “other” as the most effective element of their campaigns. One transit agency produced movie theater ads, which were shown ahead of several blockbusters and exposed thousands of people to safety messages. The other respondent who chose “other” reported that they were unable to choose a “most effective” element because it was the blend of multiple activities that created an effective campaign overall.

Six respondents chose “other” as the least effective element of their campaign, but five of them explained that they had selected that option only because they could not identify any particular element that was not effective. The sixth respondent that chose “other” noted that with educational items that are distributed to the public, such as key chain fobs, it is very difficult to track effectiveness.
Valley Metro conducted a campaign in partnership with the Phoenix Police Transit Enforcement Unit to discourage red light violations and unsafe pedestrian activities in its light rail corridor. The campaign featured images of people dressed as guardian angels advising the public not to engage in dangerous behavior. The campaign included station and vehicle ads, radio ads, a dedicated microsite, and social media outreach, as well as a press event to kick off the campaign.

### FIGURE 4 SUMMARY OF RESPONSES: EFFECTIVENESS OF CAMPAIGN ELEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC EDUCATION ACTIVITY</th>
<th>PROS</th>
<th>CONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RADIO ADS</td>
<td>Reaches wide audience at low cost</td>
<td>Hard to target toward people in the transit system’s specific service area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV ADS</td>
<td>No information</td>
<td>No information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIDEOS</td>
<td>Engaging for students/children</td>
<td>No information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL MEDIA</td>
<td>Can reach a large number of riders</td>
<td>May not be easily targeted to people in the rail line’s service area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can directly engage the public in a conversation, e.g. by sharing dramatic “close call” videos</td>
<td>May not generate response on its own; other outreach may be required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE ADS</td>
<td>Directly reaches both riders and non-riders who are near rail lines</td>
<td>Can be difficult to see if the ad is not large enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATION/PLATFORM ADS</td>
<td>Effective in reaching transit riders</td>
<td>Stations can be oversaturated with ads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILLEBOARDS</td>
<td>Extensive exposure to drivers when placed on heavily traveled roads</td>
<td>Size and location matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY EVENTS</td>
<td>Can expose people who do not regularly ride transit to safety messages</td>
<td>Reaches fewer people than other types of ads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People respond well to personal contact with transit agency staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASSROOM MATERIALS</td>
<td>Demonstrations can be engaging for students</td>
<td>Some school districts have rules limiting what can be provided to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>Movie theater ads can reach a wide audience when timed to open with major blockbusters</td>
<td>It can be difficult to track effectiveness of items distributed to the public such as keychains</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NJ TRANSIT
NEW JERSEY

NJ Transit wrapped four of its bi-level commuter rail trains with the “See Tracks? Think Train!” message. With those trains operating systemwide, more than 13 million impressions were generated over the 5-month project period. NJ Transit also used station blitzes, distributed “See Tracks? Think Train!” merchandise, and carried out a social media outreach campaign.

FUTURE CAMPAIGNS

OLI sought to determine the extent to which past grantees are continuing to put resources into safety campaigns. Fewer than half the respondents (6 out of 15) indicated that they are currently running or planning a new rail safety campaign. (See Figure 5).

FIGURE 5 ARE YOU CURRENTLY RUNNING OR PLANNING A NEW RAIL SAFETY CAMPAIGN?

The survey asked those respondents who are not planning a new campaign to indicate which of the following would help convince them to run one: grant funding, ready-made materials, technical assistance, or “other.” Respondents could select more than one choice. As shown in Figure 6, grant funding was by far the most likely to help convince a transit agency to engage in another safety campaign, showing that there is still great demand for OLI’s Rail Transit Safety Education Grants. The agencies that selected “other” noted that they needed more time or internal capacity in order to take on another safety campaign.

FIGURE 6 IF YOU ARE NOT CURRENTLY PLANNING A NEW SAFETY CAMPAIGN, WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING WOULD HELP CONVINCE YOU TO RUN ONE? (SELECT ALL THAT APPLY.)
Best Practices and Lessons Learned

The survey solicited comments from grant recipients on lessons learned from their grant experience and best practices to share with peer agencies embarking on public awareness campaigns. The following recommendations were derived from responses to these questions.

1. MATCH THE APPROACH TO THE TARGET AUDIENCE.

While this may seem intuitive, several grantees found that their approach was not as well-matched to their target audience as they had intended. There were various reasons for this. For example:

- Small systems in large regions found that using regional distribution methods such as radio ads and social media did not reach the subset of people who actually come into contact with the rail system. On the other hand, large regional rail systems found those tools to be quite effective, since their target audience was regionwide.

- Newly opened rail lines found that people were generally receptive to basic safety messaging. Older systems found that their riders and even the general public tended to tune out messages they had heard before.

When determining an approach to a safety campaign, an important question to ask is whether the target audience is the whole region or a subset, such as downtown residents, regular transit riders, or drivers. Another factor to consider is whether there are new populations who will be exposed to rail, such as recent immigrants or residents near a new extension, or if the target audience is already familiar with (and perhaps complacent about) the rail system. Once these questions are answered, transit agencies should consider how well potential campaign elements would reach that specific audience. A broad-based social media campaign, for example, may not be the best approach for dealing with the problem of trespassers along a specific section of track, nor would placing ads at stations be the best way to get safety messages to drivers.

2. BALANCE GOALS WITH RESOURCES.

In general, grantees reported that they got the best response from highly targeted interventions, such as large colorful signs at crossings and intersections or direct one-on-one interaction with the public. Several survey respondents indicated a desire to do more of these types of interventions. However, these activities can be resource-intensive, either in terms of cost for placement of signs or staff time at events. On the other hand, social media has a broad reach at low cost, though it is not always easy to target to the desired audience. (Newly available geo-fencing technology has begun to address this issue by targeting digital advertising to people in specific physical locations, such as within a certain radius of a rail station.)

The balance between low-cost, far-reaching media and direct, location-based outreach is something each transit agency must determine for itself. Agencies should be aware of the costs and benefits of each approach, and select the mix that best matches their desired outcomes. Agencies should also be aware of time limitations when developing a campaign schedule, including whether the ad space they are interested in using is available at the time they need it. Agencies should develop a detailed plan at the outset of their campaigns that clearly states goals and sets appropriate expectations for what can be accomplished within available resources.
3. MAKE IT ENGAGING.

Consumers today are saturated with messages everywhere they look, in both physical and virtual locations. To avoid being overwhelmed, people are learning to tune out or ignore unwanted advertising. In order to capture people’s attention, safety messages must be interesting, fun, and different. Videos and face-to-face outreach are the most engaging, but can also be costly. Some grantees have successfully developed creative print and social media ads, but other grantees struggled to make their safety messages stand out among all the stimuli in the modern world. Several grantees recommended that campaigns include more than one message and have a variety of different graphics or images. These grantees found that people eventually begin to ignore signs or ads that provide the same information over and over, but they do notice when things change.

4. WORK WITH PARTNERS TO EXPAND YOUR REACH.

Several grantees recommended that transit agencies leverage the capacity of local partners to help get safety messages out to the public. Local businesses, schools, places of worship, and other transit providers in the area can all help, such as by displaying signs or hosting presentations. Building these relationships at the outset of the campaign is helpful in establishing shared expectations for the roles and responsibilities of each party. For example, some school districts may have rules about material that is provided to their students, which is important for transit agencies to understand before designing materials for classroom use.

5. DON’T PUT ALL YOUR EGGS IN ONE BASKET.

A few grant recipients used their funding primarily for a single activity, but found that there was a downside to that approach: if the festival is rained out, if the location of the signs is not ideal, the campaign will not reach its full potential. One respondent that focused heavily on social media noted that next time, they thought they could reach their target audience better through printed ads and signs. Another respondent that focused mainly on print materials said that next time, they thought they should do more digital advertising.

In most cases, successful safety campaigns rely on more than one element. Many survey respondents commented on the importance of a blended approach that includes a variety of educational strategies, as well as enforcement of safety rules. Having some flexibility in the campaign allows for better response to unanticipated issues or emerging “hot spots” of unsafe behavior. One survey respondent noted that they had planned a single weekend safety campaign which was canceled due to weather issues. Instead, they redistributed resources to give the campaign visibility across all of their outreach events. They believe this approach allowed them to reach more members of the public than they could have in a single weekend.

Overall, the survey respondents emphasized that a well-planned safety campaign can provide great return on investment. Compared with physical infrastructure investments, public education campaigns are relatively low cost, and the benefits of raising public awareness about safety can be high. OLI hopes that the experiences and insights provided by past Rail Transit Safety Education grantees can help peer agencies make their safety campaigns even more effective. OLI looks forward to continuing to partner with transit agencies on this important mission.

---

5 For example, Metro Transit in Minneapolis found that a variety of elements were required to run an effective safety campaign. See “Reducing Light Rail Pedestrian Collisions,” Mass Transit Magazine, September 15, 2017, available at http://www.masstransitmag.com/article/12349498/reducing-pedestrian-collisions.
Survey Questions

Operation Lifesaver, Inc. (OLI) is conducting a survey of recipients of Rail Transit Safety Education Grants to assess the impact of the program and identify best practices to help us develop a new grant program in 2018. Please answer the following questions as they relate to the grant your agency received from OLI. OLI will not publicly report your responses in a way that would identify your agency.

1. PLEASE PROVIDE YOUR NAME, TITLE, AGENCY NAME, AND EMAIL ADDRESS.

2. HAS YOUR AGENCY USED THE MATERIALS FUNDED BY THE OLI GRANT SINCE YOU SUBMITTED YOUR FINAL GRANT REPORT?
   - Yes, campaign has been running continuously.
   - Yes, we have used them occasionally.
   - No.
   Please provide details about how you have used the materials.

3. SINCE YOUR OLI GRANT CONCLUDED, HAVE TRESPASSING INCIDENTS ON THE TRANSIT MODE(S) COVERED BY THE GRANT:
   - Increased
   - Decreased
   - Stayed the same
   Please provide details and/or supporting data, e.g., the percentage of the increase or decrease.

4. SINCE YOUR OLI GRANT CONCLUDED, HAVE GRADE CROSSING INCIDENTS ON THE TRANSIT MODE(S) COVERED BY THE GRANT:
   - Increased
   - Decreased
   - Stayed the same
   Please provide details and/or supporting data, e.g., the percentage of the increase or decrease.

5. WHAT ELEMENT OF YOUR OLI-FUNDED SAFETY CAMPAIGN DID YOU FEEL WAS MOST EFFECTIVE?
   - Radio ads
   - TV ads
   - Videos
   - Social media
   - Vehicle ads
   - Station/platform ads
   - Billboards
   - Community events
   - Brochures
   - Classroom materials
   - Other (please specify)

6. WHAT MADE THAT CAMPAIGN ELEMENT SO EFFECTIVE?

7. WHAT ELEMENT OF YOUR OLI-FUNDED SAFETY CAMPAIGN DID YOU FEEL WAS LEAST EFFECTIVE?
   - Radio ads
   - TV ads
   - Videos
   - Social media
   - Vehicle ads
   - Station/platform ads
   - Billboards
   - Community events
   - Brochures
   - Classroom materials
   - Other (please specify)

8. WHAT LIMITED THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THAT CAMPAIGN ELEMENT?

9. WHAT ASPECT OF YOUR OLI-FUNDED SAFETY CAMPAIGN, IF ANY, WOULD YOU DO DIFFERENTLY IN THE FUTURE?

10. ARE YOU CURRENTLY RUNNING OR PLANNING A NEW RAIL SAFETY CAMPAIGN?
   - Yes
   - No
   If yes, please describe campaign.

11. IF YOU ARE NOT CURRENTLY PLANNING A NEW SAFETY CAMPAIGN, WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING WOULD HELP CONVINCE YOU TO RUN ONE?
    (SELECT ALL THAT APPLY)
    - Grant funding
    - Ready-made materials
    - Technical assistance
    - Other (please specify)

12. PLEASE SHARE ANY BEST PRACTICES OR LESSONS LEARNED FOR RAIL TRANSIT SAFETY CAMPAIGNS BASED ON YOUR AGENCY’S EXPERIENCE.

Thank you for your participation. We appreciate your response. If you provided an email address at the beginning of the survey, you will receive a $25 Amazon gift card at that address within a few weeks (one per agency).
TRIMET, PORTLAND, OR

TriMet received two grants during the past three grant cycles. With the first grant, the agency’s campaign targeted millennial males, and included train bulkhead, bus, and shelter ads; restroom ads; online ads; and TV and radio spots. With the second grant, TriMet conducted a safety campaign surrounding the MAX Orange Line, specifically targeted toward an area where there had been observed risky cyclist behavior among both males and females. The campaign used TV, digital, and radio ads and social media, as well as bench, shelter, and vehicle ads, using the tag lines “Pause Your Play” and “Stay Alert, Stay Alive,” and showing an image of a person using an electronic device next to a TriMet light rail vehicle.

MBTA, BOSTON, MA

MBTA’s project was designed to raise awareness of safety issues at grade crossings and rights-of-way along the Green Line light rail system, particularly among college students. Campaign elements included a YouTube video promoting the “Eyes up, phone down” safety message; safety events for students at Northeastern University and Boston University; radio PSAs on college radio stations and print ads in student newspapers; and a Twitter outreach campaign.

FLORIDA OPERATION LIFESAVER / SUNRAIL, ORLANDO, FL

Florida OL and SunRail received a joint grant focused on educating first responders. SunRail worked with Florida DOT to develop a 2-part video series focusing on trespass enforcement and grade crossing safety. In addition, a handout was created featuring key messaging from the videos. The materials were incorporated into incident response training with SunRail.

DISTRICT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, WASHINGTON, DC

A streetcar safety education curriculum was designed for DC children who go to school within ½-mile of the new DC Streetcar. An educator toolkit was prepared with lesson plans for age groups from pre-K through 12th grade, and was distributed to the ten schools near the streetcar route. Safety education materials were presented by classroom teachers, DDOT safety officials, and OL volunteers at school assemblies, and included take-home messages for parents.

SMART, SONOMA AND MARIN COUNTIES, CA

SMART received two grants during the past three grant cycles. With the first grant, SMART carried out a rail safety education campaign focused on public schools within the new system’s service area. Schools within two miles of the right-of-way received Kid Scoop News, a classroom newspaper with safety information, several times throughout the school year, featuring “Crissy Crossbuck,” the campaign mascot. SMART also ran radio PSAs and kiosk ads. All materials were available in English and Spanish. With the second grant, SMART placed rail safety ads in Marin and Sonoma County movie theaters, taking advantage of the opportunity to deliver rail safety messaging during the releases of new Star Wars, James Bond and Hunger Games movies. SMART’s pre-movie ad ran in local theaters beginning in December 2015 for a three-month period.

CALTRAIN, SAN MATEO, CA

San Mateo County and Caltrain partnered with California Operation Lifesaver to produce pocket guides for local law enforcement officers that detail all state rail-related violations. The pocket guides were distributed to law enforcement agencies in the service area. Additionally, Caltrain developed a safety brochure, “Don’t Shortcut Life,” for distribution to passengers and the general public. Caltrain also produced videos, radio ads, print ads, in-person presentations, and online advertising.
RTD, DENVER, CO

RTD developed a pedestrian-safety campaign with input from a University of Denver public attitude survey, and carried out the project through a combination of community awareness events, RTD employee training, and safety posters and messages displayed throughout the system. RTD developed train wrap ads using the “See Tracks? Think Train!” message customized for its light rail vehicles. The wraps included the message “It can take up to two football fields to stop this RTD train.”

CITY OF ATLANTA, GA

The City of Atlanta’s “Be Streetcar Smart” pedestrian and bicycle safety campaign launched when Atlanta Streetcar operations began in December 2014. The “pancake people” graphics were used in station posters, safety postcards, and on the project’s website. Atlanta city staff also made a number of presentations to local community groups.

CAPITAL METRO, AUSTIN, TX

CapMetro worked with middle school students to make a safety video for a middle school audience, prepared a presentation guide to accompany the video, and published an online version of the video and presentation for use in schools. CapMetro staff also presented the video at several middle schools.

ILLINOIS OPERATION LIFESAVER / METRA

Illinois Operation Lifesaver and Metra conducted a regional outreach campaign to support the national OL “See Tracks? Think Train!” public awareness campaign. Project elements included Metra train banners, ads on freight trains, highway billboards, digital signage in Metra station interiors, and Metra ticket pouches.

SACRAMENTO REGIONAL TRANSIT DISTRICT, SACRAMENTO, CA

SacRT’s campaign included bus and railcar ads using OLI graphics modified to show SacRT rolling stock; social media outreach on Facebook and Twitter; a five-day enhanced safety enforcement campaign by SacRT police; and development of safety brochures, including materials in English, Spanish, and Hmong. The transit agency launched the campaign with a news conference featuring the agency’s general manager as well as OL’s California State Coordinator. The ads were also launched that week, and 20,000 safety postcards were mailed out. SacRT staff made community presentations as well.

VALLEY METRO, PHOENIX, AZ

Valley Metro conducted a campaign in partnership with the Phoenix Police Transit Enforcement Unit to discourage red light violations and unsafe pedestrian activities in its light rail corridor. The campaign featured images of people dressed as guardian angels advising the public not to engage in dangerous behavior. The campaign included station and vehicle ads, radio ads, a dedicated microsite, and social media outreach, as well as a press event to kick off the campaign.
RIO METRO RTD, ALBUQUERQUE, NM

Rio Metro RTD ran a series of radio and television PSAs featuring the Rail Runner commuter rail system and utilizing the “See Tracks? Think Train!” national safety campaign message. The PSA messages are: Heads Up, Look Twice, Stand Back, and Stay Off Tracks. The transit agency also placed ads on RailRunner trains and in platform kiosks.

DART, DALLAS, TX

DART’s safety campaign targeted the homeless population in Dallas and surrounding areas. The campaign kicked off with a news conference and continued with presentations and materials distributed to homeless individuals and families. DART also partnered with a local organization to include the “See Tracks? Think Train!” message in their Homeless Directory, which reaches social service agencies, non-profit organizations, police departments, the homeless, faith-based institutions, hospitals, and a host of others. In addition, DART promoted the “See Tracks? Think Train!” campaign through local and national print, online, and social media, resulting in 769,311 impressions.

NJ TRANSIT, NEW JERSEY

NJ Transit wrapped four of its bi-level commuter rail trains with the “See Tracks? Think Train!” message. With those trains operating systemwide, more than 13 million impressions were generated over the 5-month project period. NJ Transit also used station blitzes, distributed “See Tracks? Think Train!” merchandise, and carried out a social media outreach campaign.

UTAH TRANSIT AUTHORITY, SALT LAKE CITY, UT

Utah Transit Authority conducted a public education and outreach campaign in communities along the Sugar House Streetcar line, and where the new streetcar extension will be built. The campaign focused on direct outreach through safety presentations and giveaways at community centers, boys and girls clubs, and station blitzes.

BI-STATE DEVELOPMENT AGENCY (METRO), ST. LOUIS, MO

Metro developed ads for its platforms, rail car interiors, and bus interiors and exteriors using the “See Tracks? Think Train!” messaging. Metro noted a 38% decrease in trespasser occurrences as reported by Metrolink operators in February–April 2015 (when the campaign was running) compared to the same period the year before.

FORT WORTH TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY, FORT WORTH, TX

The T’s safety campaign used “See Tracks? Think Train!” messages for an online banner ad, seen on thousands of national and local websites based on the users’ online behavior. The ad buy targeted adults ages 18–34 in the Dallas/Fort Worth area who had shown an interest in transportation by searching and/or reading articles on transportation. Over the course of the campaign, the ads received 7,559,991 total impressions, with an average of 1,511,998 impressions per month.
OHIO OPERATION LIFESAVER / GCRTA, CLEVELAND, OH
GCRTA used the “See Tracks? Think Train!” campaign to develop materials for distribution to the public at summer festivals and community events.

METROLINK, LOS ANGELES, CA
Metrolink ran a bilingual, targeted, and coordinated campaign that included a series of print, social media, and broadcast public service announcements to raise awareness and to improve pedestrian, bicyclist, and driver behavior around rail property.

KC STREETCAR, KANSAS CITY, MO
KC Streetcar partnered with a bicycle advocacy organization to deliver education to bike riders in the city about safely riding near the streetcar. The educational materials included a bicycle safety video, a slide presentation for use at bicycle safety training classes, a safety flyer, and a rack card targeted toward pedestrians and bicyclists.

HAMPTON ROADS TRANSIT, NORFOLK, VA
HRT conducted an awareness campaign to educate and promote safety in the Downtown Norfolk corridor. The campaign was targeted toward pedestrians around the Tide light rail, and made use of sidewalk clings and a billboard using the “See Tracks? Think Train!” messaging. HRT also participated in numerous community events.

MARTA, ATLANTA, GA
Due to an increase in people accessing the transit system through improper wayside entries, MARTA’s Rail Safety Passenger Education Initiative educated MARTA riders on how to safely access the platforms and board the trains. MARTA produced a 3-minute video, which is available online and is also being shown on MARTA’s “Transit TV” in rail stations and on buses, as well as collateral materials.

METRO TRANSIT, MINNEAPOLIS, MN
Metro Transit’s safety campaign was targeted to motorists and pedestrians around the Green and Blue light rail lines. The campaign made use of billboards, bus ads, platform kiosks, vehicle interior cards, bus wraps, and platform clings, using elements of both “See Tracks? Think Train!” and Metro Transit’s existing safety campaign, “Safety is a shared responsibility.”

METROPOLITAN TRANSIT AUTHORITY OF HARRIS COUNTY, HOUSTON, TX
The transit authority delivered safety messages to motorists and pedestrians by handing out “See Tracks? Think Train!” materials (including car sun shades and air fresheners), using backpack billboards (people walking around key locations, at high-traffic times of day, with safety messages printed on their backpacks), and social media. They also used posters and pedicab (bicycle cab) ads.
¿BARRERAS ABAJO? ¡SOLO ESPERA!
NUNCA CRUCE SI LAS BARRERAS ESTÁN ABAJO.

GATES DOWN? JUST WAIT!
NEVER CROSS IF THE GATES ARE DOWN.

VSCAR TRAIN
average of 1.5 tons
average of 50 tons

RideMETRO.org  OLI.org

IT'S NO CONTEST

SYSTEM ENFORCEMENT

PLEASURES OF TRAVEL

EJECTION authorized for violation of system rules. (Train crew's authority)

PUBLIC UTILITIES CODE SECTIONS

7656 PUC
Passenger not displaying fare media on request may be ejected. (Train crew's authority)

VEHICLE CODE SECTIONS

21113 (a) CVC
Parking permit violations for transit police enforcement. (This section also grants authority for enforcement of all CVC violations on Transit System properties and Parking Lots.)

21461 (a) CVC
Failure to obey signs or signals.

21461.5 CVC
Pedestrian failure to obey official signs or signals.

21752 (c) CVC
Passing another vehicle within 100 feet of a railroad grade crossing.

22451 (a) (1) CVC
Vehicle/pedestrian ignoring warning lights or sounds and proceeding through a railroad crossing.

22451 (b) CVC
Vehicle/pedestrian going under or around a closed railroad crossing gate or arm.

22521 CVC
Parking within 7 1/2 feet of a railroad track.

22526 (c) CVC
Vehicle stopping on the railroad grade crossing.

425 THIRD STREET SW
SUITE 915
WASHINGTON, D.C.
20024
(703) 739-0308

WWW.OLI.ORG