<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name - (Printed)</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
<th>Phone #</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rabbi Jan Salem</td>
<td>parking</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rabbijen@ruachhemagog.org">rabbijen@ruachhemagog.org</a></td>
<td>802-356-1668</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Wynne</td>
<td>planters+stuff</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sandywynne@cncast.net">sandywynne@cncast.net</a></td>
<td>802-231-0215</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devin Gestell</td>
<td>Hoover St. parking</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dvgastell@yahoo.com">dvgastell@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Bushor</td>
<td>Lutheran + Germain</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Sharon.Bushor@vtmednet.org">Sharon.Bushor@vtmednet.org</a></td>
<td>802-658-3604</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Murphy</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Patrick@Cavendish.org">Patrick@Cavendish.org</a></td>
<td>802-861-2370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note that this sign-in sheet and any information provided on it will be maintained as a public record and may be subject to disclosure under the Vermont Public Records Act.
Re: Resident Parking Management Plan Amendments

November 28, 2018

Public Works Commission
Cc: Chapin Spencer, Phillip Petersen

Chair Archambeau and members of the Commission,

Please accept the following comments for the public record. We write to thank DPW staff for their efforts to develop adjustments to the current parking ordinance for the administration of the Residential Parking Program, and to thank the Public Works Commission for their careful consideration of these proposals. On behalf of our nearly 1,000 members, we particularly appreciate the proposed clarification of traffic regulations for CarShare vehicles within residential parking zones, which duly recognizes the role that each CarShare vehicle plays in significantly reducing private vehicle ownership and managing neighborhood parking demand.

While we recognize that these ordinance changes to the administration of the RPP are a first step toward better parking management overall and balancing the needs of users of streets in particular neighborhoods, we feel it is important to also provide comment on the first proposed change instituting a fee structure for residential permits. We fully support the intent behind this change to charge vehicle owners for the private use of what is public space. Until the full costs of driving privately-owned vehicles (among these, parking costs) are assumed by drivers themselves and not the general public, cars will continue to contribute to the degradation of our urban and natural environments. However, we believe that the fairest and most effective way—both to discourage greater use of privately-owned vehicles and to compensate the public for their use of public space—seems to be a rate structure in which the parking permits for the 3rd or 4th vehicle associated with a given unit are charged at a geometrically higher rate than the 1st or even the 2nd. Because each additional vehicle contributes more than the last to the overall problem of congestion, the rates for each additional permit should reflect that disproportionate impact, with steeply increasing prices after the first permit. For example, the first permit for a unit might be $10, but the second $25, third $50, and fourth $100. To be clear, we are not recommending these specific numbers, but suggesting instead that a similar pricing structure might be more appropriate and effective in achieving the goals set for the RPP.
Dear Decision Makers-

I am writing this letter in the place of my absence at tonight’s meeting. I have a commitment at work that will be going late and apologize for not being there. Please do not take my absence as a symbol of not caring deeply about this topic.

I honestly don’t know what to say that hasn’t been said before and I am deeply saddened that this hasn’t been rectified yet. The parking and conditions on our street in the winter months is laughable at best and completely dangerous at worst. On many occasions over the last several winters mid-sized vehicles have had difficulty getting down our road (or haven’t been able to pass at all) due to lack of snow removal and the tight maneuvering from cars being unable to park as close to the curbs as they should. I have seen rescue vehicles have to park on Archibald and the first responders trudge their stretcher and all of their equipment down a road that is covered in snow because they cannot pass from the conditions on our street. The argument made often by the naysayers of changing the parking is that some rescue vehicles couldn’t make it down our street anyway due to power line placement. That argument is specifically directed at ladder trucks and not ambulances that can absolutely make the height restrictions. I dare say it is just as important for the men and women responding to medical emergencies get to our homes as it is for fire trucks. Beyond this- the ladder trucks could reach both ends of the street by simply traveling against the “one way” direction.

Some on our street will argue that moving parking will ruin the “esthetic” of our neighborhood. I dare say that the esthetic stands to suffer quite a bit more from the gorgeous hundred-year old houses burning to the ground or our neighbors suffering unduly in their homes BECAUSE PEOPLE WANT CONVENIENT PARKING. Our safety should be your only concern.

Sincerely,

Amanda Young, 14 Germain Street
ROBERT N. FORD
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of the business segment as they can; expand the job as they expand their ability (no rigid job specs, please).
—If helpful, organize self-contained work units, or mini-
groups, of mutually supporting workers, so that a final
product or service emerges from the group. (Some jobs
cannot be improved except by inclusion in a larger
grouping of jobs.)
—Give employees lots of feedback as to how they are
doing.
—Give them access to staff support for information and
expertise so that they can perform more effectively
within their own segment (e.g., the industrial engineer,
cost accountant, methods and practices people, com-
puter experts).
—Give them access to the boss for knowledge and support
also.

There is very little more to be said about what’s at the
heart of the matter, the human psychology of the situ-
ation. But now that we’ve said it, how do we do it, how do
we put our words into action?

Translating the Model into Jobs

Now we must call upon managers, industrial engineers,
equipment designers, anyone who has a finger in the job
pie, and ask for their diagnostic help and understanding
as we translate the model into good jobs.* There are four
aspects to be considered, regardless of whether we are
reexaming an existing job or laying out a new work flow
prior to slicing it into jobs.

THE MODULE OF WORK

The first consideration is the module of work someone is
to perform. The questions we must answer are these:

Where does the work begin and end as a whole? What is
the product or service? Can one person perform the whole
task? Can employees acquire and maintain the necessary
knowledge and skill for the task? Will they be able to meet
reasonable, objective performance standards, for we are
going to have them? Will they be able to meet the equally
important, nonobjective standards, such as maintaining
good product appearance or maintaining a gracious man-
ner and desirable appearance in dealing with customers?

Although the work may flow through half a dozen steps
or stages, the employee must have as functionally com-
plete a module as possible. If six steps are involved, half a
dozzen people could be lined up, each to perform one-sixth
of the work before passing it on to the next person. All
this would be done in the name of efficiency, so that train-
ing time will be minimized, and workers can develop great
skill, the ability to knock the work out very fast. More
likely, what they will develop is great boredom and great
indifference.

Evidence is now reasonably strong that such a six-step
arrangement will create at least these problems: Work
may have to be logged in and out in an effort to keep track
of its progress, thus creating more jobs. A coordinator
may have to be appointed. Since no one person is responsi-
bale for the work or service from beginning to end, except
the boss, the number of errors will surely rise, leading to
the need for quality control jobs. Approximately the first
20 percent of the time spent at each stage after the first
will be on checking out the situation as received. This
front-end load of work can be eliminated each time we
figure out a way of letting the same person who per-
formed the first step perform the next step, and the next
after that, right up to some limit of practicality. And if
one person can perform all six steps, then we free a coor-
dinator and have reduced or eliminated the need for log-
ging work and for extra quality control. Functional com-
pleteness is a marvelous goal in design jobs; in this case
the work becomes the job. We may have to settle for far

*My particular thanks go to my former colleague, Malcolm B. Gillette, Director,
Human Performance Systems, AT&T, New York City, and his current staff for
some of the ideas in this reformulation of an earlier model.
less, but we must minimize the number of jobs in the lineup, and we must make each slice as meaningful as possible.

**CONSISTENCY IN THE WORK SITUATION**

Now that the work flow and the least number of jobs or slices across that work flow have been determined, more questions must be asked. How can we make this a consistent situation for the worker?

Can the worker forecast the load, the work volume that will hit? How about deadlines—can they be set meaningfully, not arbitrarily? Can we set the work input so that a worker gets it consistently from a certain group of customers or clients? Can the worker have an area, a piece of “turf”? Must this worker provide a special technology consistently? Can it be made interesting and challenging?

If a worker has a functionally complete module of work, and if it comes from a certain place and goes out to a certain place consistently, we are well on our way toward building a very good job.

**CONTROL**

The third important ingredient is power to act, or control. If the worker is going to be held responsible for the product or service, and that is one of our goals, can he or she take action if something starts to go wrong?

What can we let workers do, on their own, on this job? Can they schedule the work, in and out, to meet the deadlines, for example? Can they make estimates and requests for parts, supplies, inventory, or must this be done by the boss? What if workers feel that too much stock is lying around, in the way? If time requirements, deadlines, costs, budgets, qualities, and quantities are being met, can employees work on their own? Can employees call for help, scrounge, get it any way they can, if deadline problems or other problems loom ahead? Can workers go directly to workers at previous stages if problems are emerging, or must they go to the boss, who will go to another boss, to resolve the problem? If someone above actually needs to know what progress is being made, can a Xerox copy of the information be sent to that person while the work goes right ahead, without waiting for consent? Can workers be given small budgets for their jobs, or the right to ask for services directly within certain boundaries, so that work can go right ahead or start faster after a problem occurs?

**FEEDBACK**

The fourth and final ingredient is useful feedback from the work, an ingredient that is only too frequently missing.

Where, or what, is the feedback? Do employees know themselves when things are going wrong, or have we mistakenly set it up so that employees find out from the supervisor rather than from a dial, a red light, a printout, an irate customer/client? Is the feedback as fast and direct as we can possibly make it? Is it individualized, the employee's own feedback, or is it merely the average for a group—a form of feedback that is second best. (As an example, offer to keep score for four golfers. At the end of the round, tell them you have only their average score to offer.) Is the feedback work-related, or is it secondary (failure to be cooperative, to give to the United Fund, to park properly in the employee lot, etc.)? Is it consistent? Are other employees measured in the same way? Is it reliable information?

The concept of feedback is borrowed from electrical engineering, where means are set up so that a mechanism senses when it is beginning to malfunction and can take steps internally to reduce the error back toward some zero point. If my analogy is way off, I hope electrical engineers will forgive me. The point is that the work situation should be self-adjusting rather than boss-adjusting. We've had the latter quite long enough. When employees are asked, "How do you know whether or not you are doing a good job?" they very frequently answer: "I don't
know, actually, how well I’m doing,” or “No news is good news,” or “Did I get the work out on time?” The third of these replies is the only desirable one, and it doesn’t go far enough. How about the quality, for example?

Employees have every right to have a copy of the checklist used by the boss when he or she evaluates performance, to know how they are being judged. As Odiorne, exponent of Management by Objectives, has wisely pointed out, it isn’t cheating to know how the boss is judging you. An ideal feedback arrangement goes well beyond that. Ideally, the employee should be able to tell the boss how well he or she, the employee, is doing, for the employee has exactly the same information as the boss, and the employee has it earlier.

So much for the model, the ingredients that make for a good job: a functionally complete module, work in a consistent situation, with reasonable and necessary power to act and keep things under control, plus plenty of feedback. Some writers add “variety” to the requirements. As I see it, jobs designed with these four ingredients will tend to be quite varied, the very opposite of monotonous. I would not add items to a job merely for purposes of variety; the items should belong to the job naturally.

We need not concern ourselves here with the question, Will this job engage a person’s attention forever? It probably won’t. Later chapters of this book go into this issue: the problem of self-renewal.

This prescription for a good job, calling for four ingredients, assumes that two other important requirements will be met—but they are not part of the job. First, we assume that the training department will be able to cooperate, to supply the necessary knowledge and skill—but no more than that—so that the employee can get started. No useless knowledge, no “cold storage” training should occur in this ideal training effort. Just get the beginners started, and supply only what the work situation itself cannot supply in an efficient and timely way. If the training jobs are built properly, their feedback will answer the ques-

tion: “Did my trainees succeed when they went onto the job?” We can think of training as the front end of the job.

And there is a back end, too: Does the whole work environment support the workers in their effort to be useful? Do practices and procedures sustain them? Are the measurement plan and the standards just right? How about light, heat, ventilation, the cafeteria, and the other factors in the surrounding environment, do they sustain or annoy? Pay plans, holidays, benefits, and similar items, do they also sustain the employees in their feeling that this is not only a reasonably good job, but it’s a good organization to work for?

**Lethal Information Loops: A Violation of the Model**

Managers cannot escape having a model for laying out work and job assignments. They have to believe something about how to get work done. It is easy to accept the model offered here while retaining parts of an older model, and the two may be in open conflict. The following example is intended to help managers make a decision as to which way to go.

Now that computer printouts are so readily available, and in an effort to stay on top of their jobs, the top bosses may easily make the mistake of asking to see the results of a work unit’s operations before the members of the unit themselves see it. This may happen accidentally, simply because the boss is located at headquarters, near the computer, and the work unit is out in the field, where reports arrive a day or two later. This situation is lethal in the sense that the field people learn to worry about the report in the interim between its coming off the computer and their seeing it. If it’s bad, they may get a stormy call from the big boss while lacking the information the boss has.

These anxieties can lead not only to poor performance but to self-defeating efforts. In a situation I observed, the general manager chided a division manager reporting to