

From: [Ann Krier](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: Comment for City Council Meeting
Date: Tuesday, November 12, 2024 2:01:50 PM

Dear Council Members for the City of Salem,

As a citizen of the City of Salem, I am extremely disturbed and concerned about Julie Hoy's repeated ethics violations during her term serving in City leadership. Julie Hoy's efforts to push forward a contract with a local tire, as well as not recusing herself from a vote related to a land use decision that would directly benefit a campaign donor, call into question Mayor Hoy's commitment to ethics in her role. In a time when the legitimacy of government decisions often seems to be called into question, Mayor Hoy's lack of regard for basic ethic rules is extremely troubling. Please hold all elected city officials to high standards of ethics, as this is the only way to keep public trust in local government.

Sincerely,
Ann Krier
530 Wormwood St. SE
Salem, OR 97306

From: [Jill Day](#)
To: [citycouncil](#)
Subject: Censures
Date: Tuesday, November 12, 2024 10:38:21 AM

Regarding the topic of censuring the two councilors, didn't they disclose their potential conflicts of interests at the time they voted, and isn't it a fact that the outcome wasn't changed as a result of their votes?

Do we have better things to waste time on than this? I think so.

From: [Rep Mannix](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#); [Chris Hoy](#); [Julie Hoy](#)
Subject: Comment regarding Censorship of Councilor Hoy and Gwynn
Date: Tuesday, November 12, 2024 11:55:41 AM
Attachments: [Salem City Council 11-12-24.docx](#)

Please find attached my comments regarding the motion to publicly censure Councilors Hoy and Gwynn.

Sincerely,

Kevin L. Mannix



Representative Kevin L. Mannix

Oregon House of Representatives
House District 21
(O) (503) 986-1421
900 Court Street, Office 384 | Salem OR, 97301
www.oregonlegislature.gov/mannix

Please note that all emails sent to and from this email address are shared among Representative Mannix and his staff and may be subject to disclosure under Oregon public records laws.

KEVIN L. MANNIX
STATE REPRESENTATIVE
DISTRICT 21



HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

November 12, 2024

Salem City Council
555 Liberty St. SE
Salem, Oregon 97302

Via email: cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net

Dear Mayor Hoy and Salem City Councilors:

It is my understanding that Mayor Chris Hoy is set to make a motion at the Salem City Council Meeting this evening to publicly censure councilors Julie Hoy and Deanna Gwynn for failing to recuse themselves in a land use hearing involving a developer who made donations to each of their campaigns.

Both parties declared their potential conflict of interest before voting on the matter. Their declarations are public record which sufficiently satisfies their responsibilities under the city charter along with their responsibility to uphold principles of transparency and accountability. In fact, to not vote would be abandoning their duty to their constituents. Councilors are elected to represent a particular city ward. It is important that every city ward has representation.

I urge you to vote against this motion to censure.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Kevin L. Mannix".

Kevin L. Mannix
State Representative, HD 21

cc:
Mayor Hoy
Mayor-Elect Julie Hoy

From: [Sarah Van Woy](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#); [citycouncil](#)
Subject: Public Comments Regarding Censure
Date: Tuesday, November 12, 2024 12:13:54 PM
Attachments: [Public Censure Public Comments 11-12-24.docx](#)

Good Afternoon,

I apologize, I cannot find which agenda item is the mayor's motion to publicly censure two councilors, otherwise I would have listed it in my document. The Statesman Journal noted the motion would be a topic this evening, but I can't find it on the agenda posted on the city's website.

I also apologize for such a late statement, and I appreciate the council for reading my thoughts when they are able.

Very Respectfully,
Sarah Van Woy
Ward 2

Good Evening City Council,

I apologize that I cannot present these comments in person as I have to work this evening, but I'm grateful for your time and consideration of my written statement.

I'm concerned about the public censure motion. Some of my reservations may be due to my misinterpreting city charter and/or meeting rules, so please do clarify anything below that may be getting wrong. I'm still a learner in this field.

At the October 14th meeting, Councilors Hoy and Gwyn disclosed their applicable campaign contributions, and immediately afterwards the presentation and deliberations (seemingly?) proceeded without issue. I didn't sense any underlying tension or unease in the room, and in fact, it felt like a fairly lighthearted session to me. The councilors all seemed very comfortable in the room with many even laughing and joking amongst themselves. If the decision of Councilors Hoy and Gwyn was a source of major unease for the other councilors, why did no one speak up about it at the time? I've seen councilors call each other out in the moment for actions or issues that caused them disquiet on many previous occasions. Is there not an opportunity for other council members to comment in the moment on these disclosures and potential conflicts of interest?

I may be overly sensitive about this scenario given my line of work, but this has the feel of someone making the wrong call on scene, and only during the after-action report does the rest of the team speak up to explain why the call went so terribly wrong. Unquestionably, the onus is on the team leader to make the right decision in the moment, but what responsibility does the rest of the team have voice their concerns right away when they see something wrong? Instead of waiting until after the fact to explain why a catastrophic error was made, we train our providers to speak up immediately if they see something wrong. I understand these are very different circumstances and that there are no lives at stake in the council chamber, but I'm left with the same feeling, nonetheless.

Additionally, it is my understanding that the general consensus of council was that this appeal was a practical and reasonable request that had the citizens' interests at heart. If the consensus of the board was that awarding this appeal would solely benefit the developers' profit margins or even more concerningly, come at the expense of the citizens' interests and taxpayer dollars, then I feel most reasonable people would perceive bias and impropriety in the councilors' decisions. Yet as far as I could tell, all parties involved (the developers, the city councilors, and the residents who live in that area) were motivated by a desire to be both environmentally conscious and fiscally responsible.

From my own perspective, I left the meeting extremely encouraged by our motivation to support local developers who are braving the inflation, supply chain stagnation, and overregulation of this industry in order to make even a dent in our critical housing shortage. The charter states that, when money is involved, a councilor shouldn't vote on the issue if a reasonable person would perceive bias or impropriety from that vote. For my part, I didn't perceive either.

My final concern is that this motion feels like a distraction from bigger issues at hand. We cannot spend our precious few hours together each month focused on highlighting our disagreements. We need to be working together, to communicate, to OVER-communicate, both in the moment and when we go home. Every single one of you has said or done something during these meetings that has frustrated me to no end. And every single one of you has said or done something during these meetings that brought me hope, joy, gratitude, inspiration, and the realization that you knew way more about something than I did. Each of you are doing your best to help this city. PLEASE don't become distracted from that.

Thank you all for your time and for your service to our city.

Sarah
Ward 2