

Bill 72 Comments

Cheryl Haughney, 1231 W. Walnut St.

I am not in favor of changing this rule.

- An elected official should fulfill the term of the elected office and complete the fiduciary obligation created by running for and being elected to that position
- Should an elected official want or need to resign that position for any reason including in order to run for another elected position, they should wait the year after resignation as required.
- To change this rule to advance the political career of an elected official is a disservice to the constituency. Further, it speaks to the fact that the elected individuals wanting to change the rule for personal gain clearly don't have the needs of the constituency at heart.
- I find it preposterous that someone thinks they are such a great gift to a Mayoral race that they would want to change the ruling in order to run.

To say that I am disappointed, is an understatement at best.

Nicholas Butterfield, 223 S 13th St

My reading of this bill is that it is presented expressly to prevent Leonard Lightner, Community & Economic Development, from running for mayor. It specifically excludes officials already elected from having to resign.

Thus Josh, CeCe and Julio can all run without the need to resign, but Leonard would be required to resign. It also means that City employees could not run for Treasurer, City Council, Controller unless they resigned.

If such is the case, then I oppose the bill. It is a self-serving device by city Council Members.

Hasshan Batts, 8th St.

This statement relates to Bill 72 which amends the Ethics Code by adding arguably unconstitutional restrictions on city employees who wish to run for office.

It is understood that on 10/1/2020, the City Solicitor's Office sent a written response to questions from Ray O'Connell, Mayor of Allentown and Members of City Council regarding

elected officials running for office. After reading the solicitor's response it is clear to me that the current language in the code of ethics allows for elected officials to run for office. The solicitor writes:

"In the absence of such clarifying language, the Solicitor's Office reads this language to mean that appointed officials and employees are able to run for office, but they are not able to take an active role in the campaign of others who are running for city office."

It is my opinion, after reading all available public documents on this matter, that there is no reason or circumstance for City Council to seek change in this language. Changing the current language denying city employees to run for office is arguably unconstitutional and it builds a system of oppression. Requiring a city employee to quit their job before announcing their candidacy is an issue of equity. Those who have historically been privileged enough to quit their job will not be affected by this. Those who work for the city and can't afford to quit their jobs to run for office will be oppressed by this.

Bill 72 will permanently change language in the Code of Ethics that will affect generations of already underprivileged and historically disadvantaged groups of people such those of African, Latino and Native descent.

It is your duty as elected officials to safeguard any citizen's right to run for office. Employees and city officials MUST have the constitutionally given right to run for office on their own time and guided by a Code of Ethics that seeks to avoid corruption and does not seek to create a system that will deny equitable access to running for elected office.

I ASK THAT YOU VOID BILL 72 NOW TO PRESERVE AN EQUITABLE CITY.

Justan Parker Fields, 315 W Linden St

My statement is in regards to Bill 72.

And here I thought the "Cell Phone Bill" couldn't be topped.

We're not dealing with house rules of Monopoly where Council can change the verbiage to further restrict city employees who wish to run for office.

It is understood that on 10/1/2020, the City Solicitor's Office sent a written response to questions from Ray O'Connel, Mayor of Allentown and Members of City Council regarding elected officials running for office. After reading the solicitor's response it is clear to me that the current language in the code of ethics allows for elected officials to run for office. The solicitor writes:

"In the absence of such clarifying language, the Solicitor's Office reads this language to mean that appointed officials and employees are able to run for office, but they are not able to take an active role in the campaign of others who are running for city office."

It is my opinion, after reading all available public documents on this matter, that there is no reason or circumstance for City Council to seek change in this language. Changing the current language denying city employees to run for office is arguably unconstitutional and it builds a system of oppression. Requiring a city employee to quit their job before announcing their candidacy is an issue of equity. Those who have historically been privileged enough to quit their job will not be affected by this. Those who work for the city and can't afford to quit their jobs to run for office will be oppressed by this.

Bill 72 will permanently change language in the Code of Ethics that will affect generations of already underprivileged and historically disadvantaged groups of people such those of African, Latino and Native descent.

It is your duty as elected officials to safeguard any citizen's right to run for office. Employees and city officials MUST have the constitutionally given right to run for office on their own time and guided by a Code of Ethics that seeks to avoid corruption and does not seek to create a system that will deny equitable access to running for elected office.

I ASK THAT YOU VOID BILL 72 NOW TO PRESERVE AN EQUITABLE CITY.

Stop treating individuals as 501c3 non profits.

My name is Nadia Alicia, I am an Allentown resident. This statement relates to Bill 72 which amends the Ethics Code by adding arguably unconstitutional restrictions on city employees who wish to run for office.

It is understood that on 10/1/2020, the City Solicitor's Office sent a written response to questions from Ray O'Connel, Mayor of Allentown and Members of City Council regarding elected officials running for office. After reading the solicitor's response it is clear to me that the current language in the code of ethics allows for elected officials to run for office. The solicitor writes:

"In the absence of such clarifying language, the Solicitor's Office reads this language to mean that appointed officials and employees are able to run for office, but they are not able to take an active role in the campaign of others who are running for city office."

It is my opinion, after reading all available public documents on this matter, that there is no reason or circumstance for City Council to seek change in this language. Changing the current language denying city employees to run for office is arguably unconstitutional and it builds a system of oppression. Requiring a city employee to quit their job before announcing their candidacy is an issue of equity. Those who have historically been privileged enough to quit their job will not be affected by this. Those who work for the city and can't afford to quit their jobs to run for office will be oppressed by this.

Bill 72 will permanently change language in the Code of Ethics that will affect generations of already underprivileged and historically disadvantaged groups of people such as those of African, Latino, and Native descent.

It is your duty as elected officials to safeguard any citizen's right to run for office. Employees and city officials MUST have the constitutionally given right to run for office on their own time and guided by a Code of Ethics that seeks to avoid corruption and does not seek to create a system that will deny equitable access to running for elected office.

I ASK THAT YOU VOID BILL 72 NOW TO PRESERVE AN EQUITABLE CITY.

Yamelisa Taveras, 1329 Hamilton St

Dear Mayor members of Council,

Amending the Ethics code for the benefit of the few is a violation of the ethical code within itself.

Bill 72 is a blatant act of oppression. Many city employees work hard to earn their way, and now are being expected to quit their jobs before being able to make a change in their city and serve their community. That is a privilege not everyone has, and those that don't should not be punished.

This attacks the ability of the individuals that may be most qualified for elected office positions. Whether it is because of their work as a City Employees or an Appointed position of leadership, removing the ability for run for office during their unpaid time is a violation of their constitutional rights.

It seems quite suspicious that this Bill is once again up for discussion as we approach the upcoming election. We have a large number of individuals announcing their candidacy for the Mayoral race, it appears convenient to get the most eligible knocked out from the race on an "ethical violation" that did not exist previously.

Our city is no longer turning a blind eye to the facade put forth by the current and past government officials. We will no longer stand by and blindly trust the campaigns and platforms presented by politicians. We are here to hold each of you accountable for how you vote and how each of those votes may attack our rights and affect us each day.

We have not only a Mayor, but also council members that first entered their positions as appointed or city employees, we see you and we are calling you out for now being willing to burn a bridge you once crossed to get where you are.

VOID BILL 72 NOW!

By moving forward with such actions you are risking the trust of the city and our votes will reflect this.

Charlotte Moyer, 1129 East Emmaus Avenue

This statement relates to Bill 72 which amends the Ethics Code by adding arguably unconstitutional restrictions on city employees who wish to run for office.

It is understood that on 10/1/2020, the City Solicitor's Office sent a written response to questions from Ray O'Connel, Mayor of Allentown and Members of City Council regarding elected officials running for office. After reading the solicitor's response it is clear to me that the current language in the code of ethics allows for elected officials to run for office. The solicitor writes:

"In the absence of such clarifying language, the Solicitor's Office reads this language to mean that appointed officials and employees are able to run for office, but they are not able to take an active role in the campaign of others who are running for city office."

It is my opinion, after reading all available public documents on this matter, that there is no reason or circumstance for City Council to seek change in this language. Changing the current language denying city employees to run for office is arguably unconstitutional and it builds a system of oppression. Requiring a city employee to quit their job before announcing their candidacy is an issue of equity. Those who have historically been privileged enough to quit their job will not be affected by this. Those who work for the city and can't afford to quit their jobs to run for office will be oppressed by this.

Bill 72 will permanently change language in the Code of Ethics that will affect generations of already underprivileged and historically disadvantaged groups of people such those of African, Latino and Native descent.

It is your duty as elected officials to safeguard any citizen's right to run for office. Employees and city officials MUST have the constitutionally given right to run for office on their own time and guided by a Code of Ethics that seeks to avoid corruption and does not seek to create a system that will deny equitable access to running for elected office.

I ASK THAT YOU VOID BILL 72 NOW TO PRESERVE AN EQUITABLE CITY.

Loretta Wagner

Dear Michael without a doubt I am opposed to any changes that are so self serving. Such elected officials have no regard for the people who have elected them. It seems to me that these same council people are again looking to create disruption then positivity in an already difficult economic and health climate. .

Follow up with C. Haughney's email

I am not in favor. To capriciously change our governing Rules would not serve the citizens of Allentown. Merrily J. Starkey

My name is Enid Santiago my address is 1243 S. Jefferson St. Allentown,PA 18103. This statement relates to Bill 72 which amends the Ethics Code by adding arguably unconstitutional restrictions on city employees who wish to run for office.

It is understood that on 10/1/2020, the City Solicitor's Office sent a written response to questions from Ray O'Connel, Mayor of Allentown and Members of City Council regarding elected officials running for office. After reading the solicitor's response it is clear to me that the current language in the code of ethics allows for elected officials to run for office. The solicitor writes:

"In the absence of such clarifying language, the Solicitor's Office reads this language to mean that appointed officials and employees are able to run for office, but they are not able to take an active role in the campaign of others who are running for city office."

It is my opinion, after reading all available public documents on this matter, that there is no reason or circumstance for City Council to seek change in this language. Changing the current language denying city employees to run for office is arguably unconstitutional and it builds a system of oppression. Requiring a city employee to quit their job before announcing their candidacy is an issue of equity. Those who have historically been privileged enough to quit their job will not be affected by this. Those who work for the city and can't afford to quit their jobs to run for office will be oppressed by this.

Bill 72 will permanently change language in the Code of Ethics that will affect generations of already underprivileged and historically disadvantaged groups of people such those of African, Latino and Native descent.

It is your duty as elected officials to safeguard any citizen's right to run for office. Employees and city officials MUST have the constitutionally given right to run for office on their own time and guided by a Code of Ethics that seeks to avoid corruption.