

**Campbell**

Yes. And even more so. "It appears that the current attitude is only tell people what we have to. Attitude needs to be that we'll tell people everything, unless we can't. Everything ought to be available." Would be in favor of broadcasting council meetings on the Web. Wants to put everything before the public and have town hall meetings. Commends the police training academy as a great idea that lets residents see what the city does. When the mayor said the volunteer group firing is not a public issue, that was wrong. It is. Everything the city does is a public matter. No, wouldn't have a meeting that goes against what he knows the law is. Would work within the framework of rules he is given and figure out a way to get it done.



**Will you follow the letter and spirit of the Open Door Law? What if an attorney, elected official or anyone else makes a recommendation or request that goes against what you know the law is?**

**Henderson**

"I believe I have and I will continue to do that." Very rarely asks for an executive session. "If I believed that it didn't fit, I'd say no." Has been fortunate to have been served by two city attorneys who are both very strict about the Open Door Law. Trusts their guidance.

**Campbell**

Is not sure if there any issues with that now. But the idea of being public servants applies to everyone. Each department should have a mechanism for handling complaints and to making sure they are all handled properly. City employees need to call people back and make sure issues are handled and keep records on it, just like any business would. If the city can't solve the issue the way the resident wants, then the department head and the mayor should get involved and explain why or what they are doing to take care of it.



**What would you do to improve customer service for Greenwood residents who contact the city building with questions or concerns?**

**Henderson**

"We need to continue to instruct our people who work for the city that they are an employee of citizens. If somebody calls and wants help, it is our job to help them, not to pass them off." Hoops and hurdles are in place for a reason, but help people through them.

**Campbell**

Revitalization is a top priority and economic development is the focus, not just beautification. Needs more restaurants, retail and residential to create somewhat of a night life. Restaurants and retail and residential will get people there in the evening. If people think we don't take care of our past, they can figure that we won't take care of our future and present. A minimal amount of taxpayer money should be involved. Favors a public-private partnership, but the city sets the plan. Infrastructure is the thing the city gets involved in. Parking lots are the city's expense. Would work with private developers on new buildings.



**Is revitalization of downtown Greenwood a top priority? Why? Should taxpayer dollars be used? What do you propose be done?**

**Henderson**

Grew up in downtown Greenwood and is saddened that it is not vibrant place it once was. "The reality is, millions of dollars are spent every year trying to revitalize downtown communities. And nobody has found that crystal ball." Economic development commission is studying it, and he supports that. A new city employee, a landscape architect, has ideas and designs for beautifying and they are redoing a downtown parking lot. Last year, put out pots of flowers. "We have to do those things to make it as attractive as we can." Doesn't know how to address public misperception that there is no parking. Fire codes don't allow for shops downstairs and apartments upstairs. City does not have a high level of responsibility. City should keep streets clean and curbs painted. Could also abate taxes on buildings downtown and help business owners get permits and cut through red tape. "And then if the public doesn't visit them, there's just nothing we can do about that."

**Campbell**

"Yes, I think we need more police officers." The city should hire the three officers that the budget already allows for. "From what I understand, they are not able to do preventive work they would like to do." The irony is that he understands that Henderson was a good police chief. But that department has deteriorated now. He gets the sense that there is a morale problem. Officers can't do the job they would like to do, and part of that is due to lack of manpower, part of it is due to management. The city needs a long-term goal to add a couple of police officers per year until it reaches what would be an acceptable ratio of residents to officers. Has heard the city needs 60 to 65 officers. Doesn't know that for sure, but finding out would be top priority. Would work to come up with a plan for hiring police, what their role is, and what the department is going to do beyond just increasing the numbers.



**What is your assessment of the Greenwood Police Department? Are city police adequately supervised and are they preventing and solving crime? Should the city create positions for additional police officers?**

**Henderson**

Is much more pleased today and department is more productive. Supervision is always an issue, and it is difficult to get supervisors to realize they are supervisors and not someone's buddy. Department had been at an all-time high when he left it, but it slid. Will let the chief ask for more manpower. Department has funding for 58 full-time officers. At times, merit commission hasn't had a list of applicants to fill openings from.

**Campbell**

If the mayor gets too involved, appointees become puppets. That's why he thinks the park board excuse was that the guidelines weren't in place. Wants better training for appointees. Parks department mishandled advisory groups. "And even if they should have been dismissed, the manner in which they went about it, I think, was mishandled." "At that point the mayor was wrong to say it wasn't a public matter." It becomes difficult for the mayor to make them do something different. If groups are doing something wrong, the mayor ought to be able to step in and correct it. It is a very hard call and the city has to have a mayor you can trust and a mayor who exhibits good leadership qualities. Some things are judgment calls. The mayor has to do what he thinks is right. Dismissing the boards was symptomatic of a much larger problem. There are better ways to handle conflict than sweeping it under a rug. Believes in dealing with those things up front, face to face and with compromises.



**Should the mayor get involved in decisions made by his appointees on various boards or commissions? Should the mayor have gotten involved when the parks board fired its volunteer groups? Why or why not? Do you agree with the park board's action?**

**Henderson**

No, doesn't think the mayor should get involved. It is his job to appoint people to those boards to make the right decisions, but that doesn't mean he will always agree with those decisions. "But if I'm going to make all those decisions, I don't need those boards." He was not consulted about the park board's decision and had a concern about it after it happened. "But I understand why they did it. They told me why they did it, and I accepted that."

**Campbell**

The question is not should we release this to the public. "Everything should be public unless there is a good reason not to make it public." The mayor can't be afraid of public input or disagreement among advisory boards. "The only reason to be afraid is if you have a pre-set agenda." Would listen to what people say and take the best out of the discussions and work toward a common goal. Doesn't have the attitude that if someone disagrees, they are wrong. Must have a public servant attitude. Once someone is appointed to a board, they are part of city government. This problem was long in the making. "The mayor saying this isn't a public issue just shows where the problem comes from. If he has that attitude, no wonder his boards do."



**One park board member indicated that leaks of information about trails is part of what led to friction between the trails advisory board and the park board and the trails board's eventual firing. Later, the mayor said the board's dissolution was not a public issue. Should all information about what government is doing be public? If yes, what would you do to change this attitude?**

**Henderson**

The park board created that committee and the committee worked for the park board, not the public. It was a park board issue to deal with a committee they created; the public didn't create that committee. Law says public creates the park board. It wasn't something the city would put out for the public to vote on. All information should be public to the extent that it can be as the law allows.

**Campbell**

Has a hard time with the concept of a large regional park. Survey says residents prefer small neighborhood parks. Parks department says those are too expensive, so we're not going to do them. Sees a possible need for a new swimming pool, because the city should have a pool. Doesn't know if in favor of the huge aquatic park. Some people say that the residents said in the survey that they want it and are willing to pay for it, but not all agree with that. The survey is being interpreted in different ways. "But it seems to me that the parks department is looking for a regional attraction. That's the argument I've heard. If that's what they want to do, I'm not sure that's something that the citizens want, and therefore, I don't know that I'd be in favor of it." The new pool is trying to be sold as something that will attract people from all over. "I see that as creating a tourist attraction, not as serving the citizens." "If it could be proven to me that the citizens wanted it, I would go along with it. But I don't believe that is what they've shown."



**The park board has been planning development of a 72-acre park to include softball fields, trails, a dog park and a pool. A similar pool in Kokomo cost \$6.5 million. Do you support the plan? Why or why not? What kind of pool should be built? How much money should be spent?**

**Henderson**

Can't say how much money should be spent. Doesn't know. Supports a major park in Greenwood. Says the city needs a new pool. The aquatic idea came into play because the park board did research and said it would draw people and pay for itself, so he said fine, go ahead. Current pool is crowded and extremely inefficient. "I'm not sure that we shouldn't take a look at going back and building a new pool that could be added onto. I think the park board needs to come forward and say to the city council and to the public what they believe we want." Park board should come forward with some different plans. Show the pool at different levels and what it would cost. Wants the park board to have three or four options, from the top facility and costs on down to half that. Thinks what happens sometimes, competing forces started butting heads. People wanted money added for certain things in previous proposal. "Before you know, everything was in the pie and the mountain was pretty high."

**Campbell**

Trails. The survey shows they are No. 1. Trails are something that everybody can use, are available to more of the public than a pool and are available for a longer period of time during the year. Trails enhance the city on multiple levels by providing exercise and connections to areas.



**What's more important: Trails or a new pool?**

**Henderson**

Can't put one over the other. Personally, will use trails, but youngsters and teens will use pool. "I believe they are equally important." Can build trails for less money, but trails won't generate revenue like a pool might. Parks department survey shows they are pretty equally. Both are important for a quality of life, but at what level can we pay for them?

**Campbell**

No, it was not handled properly. The mayor's main responsibility is leadership and this is an example of his failed leadership. The mayor never found out what the lingerie shop would include before he called a news conference, proposed an ordinance and pushed it through. Henderson got the ordinance that he wanted that didn't stop what he wanted to stop. Those who were in favor of the shop were mad at the mayor. Those opposed to the shop are unhappy with the mayor because he didn't do his homework and the shop went in anyway. The whole situation was a fiasco. It goes to leadership and doing your homework and knowing what you're talking about. If the mayor was truly as passionate about closing it as he appeared to be, "passion without knowledge gets you in trouble." The mayor didn't talk to the owner, had no communication, and the situation was mishandled.



**Did the city handle the proposed lingerie shop properly? Were any missteps made in how that was handled by city government?**

**Henderson**

No mistakes.