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It is obvious that the principles, if not the sole problem, in Planning is the proper role of the Director.

1. What is the distinction between the function of the Bureau of Planning and OPD?

2. What should OPD be doing which it is not?

3. What should you be doing to make orchestrated community development work which you are not doing?

4. What changes are you suggesting on District Planning?

5. If you see yourself as the Chief Planner in charge of the Comprehensive Planning process, don't we need someone else to be the Director?

6. Are the responsibilities of the Zoning Section head so limited that he/she could also fill the self-proclaimed managerial void? Doesn't the Planning Bureau need a full-time administrator?

7. What are your internal personnel problems and what are you doing about them?

Edit. Comment: I don't understand a Bureau head submitting the kind of disjointed submittal that was made. Granting the capabilities of the section heads, why is it your problem to put it all together?

8. Why should I countenance your not going to Gary's meetings?

9. In light of the endless evidence of poor management in your Bureau and your unwillingness to accept Stout's authority, how can I assess the relative merits of the contending views?

10. If the Comprehensive Plan is top priority, how do the rest of the Bureau's responsibilities stack up and how are the resources to be allocated?
Maybe the superficiality of my contacts with both Gary and Ernie allows me the luxury of greater charity toward Gary, but I feel constrained to note Alan (particularly) and Doug's willingness to forgive Bonner's obvious transgressions but to be very hard on Gary. I consider some of Gary's complaints about the Mayor's Office and about the Planning Bureau to be legitimate!
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