



# SYSTEMIC RACISM REVIEW COMMITTEE AGENDA

October 25, 2022 at 12:00 PM

Zoom Webinar

<https://juneau.zoom.us/j/92303909454> or: 1-253-215-8782 Webinar ID: 923 0390 9454

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

**B. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

We acknowledge that the City and Borough of Juneau is on Tlingit land, and wished to honor the people of this land, the Auk Kwaan and Taku Kwaan. For more than ten thousand years, Alaska Native people have been and continue to be integral to the well-being of our community. We are grateful to be in this place, a part of this community, and to honor the culture, traditions, and resilience of the Tlingit people. Gunalchéesh!

**C. ROLL CALL**

**D. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1. September 6, 2022 SRRC Minutes

**F. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

**G. CONSENT AGENDA**

2. Legislation for Review by SRRC

The following ordinances were up for introduction on the consent agenda at the October 24, 2022 Assembly Reorganization Meeting. The SRRC checklists associated with the ordinances are in this SRRC packet. Legislation and materials associated with the legislation are located in the Assembly packet (copy/paste link into preferred browser for access to the Assembly agenda page): <https://juneau-ak.municodemeetings.com/>

**Ordinance 2022-06(b)(U)** An Ordinance Appropriating \$500,000 to the Manager for the Aurora Harbor Improvements Capital Improvement Project; Funding Provided by Harbors Funds.

**Ordinance 2022-39** An Ordinance Amending Prohibited Acts within the Boat Harbor Related to Dogs and Other Domestic Animals.

**Ordinance 2022-43** An Ordinance Amending Boat Harbor Regulations Relating to Vessel Identification.

**Ordinance 2022-56** An Ordinance Amending the Land Use Code Regarding Alternative Residential Subdivision Requirements.

**Ordinance 2022-57** An Ordinance Amending the Land Use Code Regarding Planning Commission Meetings.

**Resolution 3002** A Resolution Expressing Support for the United State Department of Justice, Office of Justice Program, FY22 Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG).

The following ordinances were up for introduction on the consent agenda at the September 26, 2022 Special Assembly Meeting. The SRRC checklists associated with the ordinances are in this SRRC packet. Legislation and materials associated with the legislation are located in the Assembly packet (copy/paste link into preferred browser for access to the Assembly agenda page): <https://juneau-ak.municodemeetings.com/>

**Ordinance 2021-08(b)(am)(AU)** An Ordinance Appropriating \$7,127,047 to the Manager to Fund the City and Borough of Juneau and Bartlett Regional Hospital's Fiscal Year 2022 Public Employees' Retirement System (PERS) Contribution; Funding Provided by the Alaska Department of Administration.

**Ordinance 2021-08(b)(am)(AV)** An Ordinance Appropriating \$28,226,000 to and Deappropriating \$2,495,600 from the Manager for the City and Borough of Juneau's Fiscal Year 2022 Operating Costs; Funding Provided by Various Sources.

**Recommended Motions:**

*"I move to approve the consent agenda as presented and ask for unanimous consent"*

*"I move to approve the consent agenda as amended and ask for unanimous consent: [use this motion when items are pulled off consent for further discussion]"*

**H. AGENDA TOPICS**

3. Placeholder for legislation pulled for further discussion or to walk-through the SRRC checklist on particular legislation.

**Recommended Motions:**

*"I move to forward Ordinance xxxx-xx (or Resolution xxxx) to the full Assembly as presented and ask for unanimous consent" or "I move the SRRC recommend to the Assembly it {fill in the recommendation} prior to taking action on proposed legislation"*

**I. STAFF REPORTS**

**J. COMMITTEE MEMBER / LIAISON COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS**

**K. NEXT MEETING DATE**

Committee needs to determine a work session meeting date to discuss potential adjustments to original charge of the SRRC.

**Regular SRRC to review legislation:** Tuesday, November 22, 2022 @ Noon via Zoom Webinar

**L. ADJOURNMENT**

ADA accommodations available upon request: Please contact the Clerk's office 36 hours prior to any meeting so arrangements can be made for closed captioning or sign language interpreter services depending on the meeting format. The Clerk's office telephone number is 586-5278, TDD 586-5351, e-mail: city.clerk@juneau.org.



# SYSTEMIC RACISM REVIEW COMMITTEE WORKSESSION MINUTES

September 06, 2022 at 12:00 PM

Zoom Webinar

<https://juneau.zoom.us/j/92303909454> or 1-253-215-8782 Webinar ID: 923 0390 9454

## A. CALL TO ORDER

Acting Chair Lee called the Systemic Racism Review Committee to order at 12:08p.m.

## B. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We acknowledge that the City and Borough of Juneau is on Tlingit land, and wished to honor the people of this land, the Auk Kwaan and Taku Kwaan. For more than ten thousand years, Alaska Native people have been and continue to be integral to the well-being of our community. We are grateful to be in this place, a part of this community, and to honor the culture, traditions, and resilience of the Tlingit people.  
*Gunalchéesh!*

## B. ROLL CALL

**Present:** Acting Chair Grace Lee, Ephraim Froehlich, Gail Cheney and Ivan Nance

**Absent:** Kelli Patterson

**Staff/Other:** Robert Barr, Adam Gottschalk, Di Cathcart, Aquatics Board Chair Will Muldoon, Parks & Recreation Director George Schaaf

**Others in attendee mode:** Sherri Layne

## C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Agenda approved as presented.

## E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. August 30, 2022 SRRC Minutes

Minutes approved as presented.

## F. AGENDA TOPICS

### 2. Discussion on: Ordinance 2022-22 An Ordinance Amending the City and Borough of Juneau Code Related to the Aquatic Board of Directors.

Over the last two years, the Aquatics Board has had vacancies, which contributed to meetings being cancelled for lack of quorum. The Aquatics Board recommended changes to its membership requirements, so it can continue to provide effective oversight of the pool facilities. The Assembly Human Resources Committee reviewed this topic on August 1, 2022 and recommended the Assembly reduce the membership from nine to seven and allow up to three members to be from a local aquatic organization. Assemblymember Triem has also proposed an amendment to remove the current code requirement that inserts the Aquatics Board into the hiring process for the Aquatics Manager.

Robert Barr introduced George Schaaf (P&R Director) and Will Muldoon (Aquatics Board Chair) and highlighted the ethnicity and gender reports included in the packet that Granicus provides as part of the board management program. Mr. Schaaf gave an overview of the five Parks and Recreation board's currently in existence and noted the department is hoping to work on a consolidation of the five boards

into a manageable structure for both volunteer board members, board member recruitment and staff time.

Mr. Froehlich noted that part of the action that was under review in this ordinance was decreasing the number of seats from nine to seven and asked how does that protect for diversity vs. limiting it by decreasing board size. Mr. Schaaf responded that he didn't know if more seats would yield more diversity given the limited capacity of volunteers for our community size and thought one committee could provide better diversity than the current the structure.

Mr. Nance wondered if a special interest gets implanted in these boards would the special interest consider what is in the best interest of the whole community. He stated it seemed the less specialized a group the more likely to get a better mix of people with the interest in the community as a whole. Mr. Nance said he liked the idea of cutting back on the number of boards and instead look at a larger committee since recruiting is a huge deal and marketing is key.

Ms. Cheney liked the idea of a smaller, stable board and focusing on the diversity piece and better utilization of technology for people to be able to meet.

Chair Lee noted that looking at the ordinance, the Aquatics Board started as a seven member board and then became a nine member board and asked why that happened. Mr. Muldoon responded that originally there were two non-voting members when it was a seven member board and increased that to nine members with the two non-voting seats becoming voting seats. As we've had members term out we've ended up where we are now with two vacancies. He added that the not meeting quorum is the current main issue.

Ms. Cheney asked when staff was expecting to review and make possible changes to board structure. Mr. Muldoon said there have been vacancy issue through the pandemic which has made it hard to meet quorum. The ordinance has gone through some rewrites and the hope is to have this legislation move forward within the next month, as well as the larger discussion regarding board consolidation.

Mr. Barr noted that specific changes to the Aquatics Board will happen at the next Assembly meeting. The larger discussion around board consolidation will go to the Assembly Human Resources Committee sometime this fall. All those changes would come back before the SRRC.

Mr. Barr, one of the things the Assembly is looking for is recommendations of how the SRRC should evolve, a work session for the committee to discuss how the SRRC should or could evolve and the charge of the committee; as Chair Lee stated, the tool was created by the committee and can be used as the committee likes.

Committee members began to discuss the role of the SRRC in reviewing legislation and using the toolkit the committee created and the possibility of expanding the role of the committee – how to get more diversity on CBJ boards/committees. Discussion was had on what is currently within the ability of the committee and how best to get information from the SRRC to the Assembly – through motion, through the SRRC Assembly Liaison or through a summary included in the Manager's Report of what action the SRRC recommends regarding specific legislation.

**MOTION:** by Mr. Froehlich that the SRRC makes a recommendation to the Assembly that the current action pertaining to the aquatics board is not flagged by this committee but has raised larger issues which the SRRC believe merit review by the City and potentially the Systemic Racism Review Committee as well. **Hearing no objection, motion passed.**

**G. STAFF REPORTS**

3. CBJ Board/Committee demographic charts on ethnicity and gender. Since those two questions on the board application are optional these charts only reflect applicants or board members who answered the two questions.

**H. COMMITTEE MEMBER / LIAISON COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS**

**I. NEXT MEETING DATE**

Tuesday, September 13, 2022 at Noon via Zoom Webinar

**J. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the committee, meeting adjourned at 1:09 p.m.

# Systemic Racism Review Committee Legislation Review Summary

Serial Number/Title: **Ordinance 2022-06(b)(U)** - An Ordinance Appropriating \$500,000 to the Manager for the Aurora Harbor Improvements Capital Improvement Project; Funding Provided by Harbors Funds.

Introduced: 10/24/22 Public Hearing Date: 11/21/22 SRRC Review Date: 10/25/22

Presented By: Manager Drafted By: Finance

Department/Division: Harbors Lead Staff Contact: Carl Uchtyl

Purpose of Legislation (background/summary of intent):

Docks and Harbors has been awarded a \$2 million matching harbor facility grant from the Alaska Department of Transportation (ADOT), restricted solely to project construction. This ordinance would appropriate \$500,000 of Harbors fund balance to the Aurora Harbor Improvements CIP, increasing the total project balance sufficiently to leverage the full value of the ADOT 50/50 matching grant while ensuring adequate funds are available to award the project bid, estimated to exceed \$4 million.

Connection to existing legislation:

As a supplemental appropriation, this ordinance amends CBJ FY23 Budget Ordinance 2022-06(b).

Connection to adopted planning documents:

This project was #13 on CBJ's FY23 Legislative Priority List.

## Step One: What is the impact of the proposed legislation?

- a. Does the proposed legislation negatively impact or unduly advantage a particular racial/ethnic group or otherwise perpetuate systemic racism?

*If No, review is completed. If yes, go on to the next question:*

YES	NO

- b. Does the legislation work to mitigate and/or eliminate structural racism  
*If Yes, review is completed. If No, or Undetermined, continue through the remaining steps.*

--	--

## Step Two: How does the legislation perpetuate systemic racism?

- What are potential unintended consequences?
- What benefits may result?
- What is the potential long term impact of the proposed legislation?

Details: This ordinance appropriates local matching funds in order to leverage state funding for harbor improvements. These improvements are necessary for continued safe usage of the harbor by residents and visitors.

d. What quantitative and qualitative evidence of inequality exists?

Details:

e. What steps has the department or legislation sponsor taken to notify those impacted of the proposed changes?

f. Have key stakeholders who could be potentially impacted by the proposed legislation been engaged?

Details: The Docks and Harbors Board approved this request at the September 29, 2022 meeting.

g. Has public input been received?

h. If public comment has been received, what is the substance of that comment?

Details: Public comment will be held on this ordinance on November 21, 2022.

### Step Three: Who is affected by the Proposed Legislation?

a. Who are the impacted group(s)?

☐ White ☐ Black or African American ☐ American Indian or Alaska Native  
☐ Asian ☐ Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander ☐ Two or more races ☐ Other

b. Are there impacts on specific geographic areas?

Race Considerations - Total Community is 69.7% White Only - 30.3% Minority						Economic Considerations	
Census Tract/Block Groups	Minority Pop.		Census Tract/Block Groups	Minority Pop.		Census Tract/Block Groups	Minority Pop.
CT 1: Auke Bay/Out the Road			CT 3: Mendenhall Valley Airport/ East Valley			CT 5: Downtown	
BG1: Out the road	11.9%		BG1: N. of Jennifer	42.5%		BG 1: Highlands	20.6%
BG2: Lena area	15.5%		BG 2: Glacier Valley	39.8%		BG2: DT/Starr Hill	24.8%
BG3: Montanna Creek	14.5%		BG 3: Airport	40.8%		BG 3: Flats/Village	30.8%
BG4: Fritz Cove area	10.1%		BG 4: Radcliffe	24.6%			
CT 2: Mendenhall Valley withn the Loop			CT 4: Salmon Creek/Lemon Creek				
BG1: Mendenhall Taki	27.8%		BG 1: DZ/Freds	60.9%		CT 5: Douglas Island	
BG2: Upper Riverside	23.1%		BG 2: Davis	45.0%		BG 1: North Douglas	15.9%
BG 3: Portage/McGinnr	33.7%		BG 3: Belardi Costco	63.8%		BG 2: West Juneau	28.0%
BG 4: Long Run	19.6%		BG 4: Twin Lakes	25.9%		BG 3: Crow Hill/ DT D	27.6%
BG 5: Glacierwood/Vir	41.2%						
						<b>Elementary School Boundaries</b>	
						Gastineau	Title 1
						Harborview	Title 1
						Glacier Valley	Title 1
						Mendenhall River	
						Riverbend	Title 1
						Auke Bay	
						<b>Lower Income Housing Areas</b>	
						Chinook/Coho	
						Cedar Park Area	
						Gruening Park Area	
						Switzer Area	
						Kodzhoff Area	
						Douglas Hwy Corridor	

c. Is there a benefit to a specific census block district/neighborhood/school zone?  
 If Yes, does it come at the detriment of another?

Details:

YES	NO

d. Is there a benefit to an individual, group of individuals, or business/organization?  
 If yes, does that come at a detriment of others?

Details:


**Step Four: What solutions could remedy the legislation's implications in perpetuating systemic racism? Check all that apply:**

<input type="checkbox"/>	Recommend additional public input be gathered (Neighborhood/census block meetings, assembly/ committee meetings)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Recommend that the legislation move forward with accountability measures (sunset provisions, 6 mo./annual review of impacts/implications for system racism.) to monitor impact.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Propose revised language to strengthen the legislation or the legislation or regulations cross-referenced within the proposed legislation.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Recommend the proposed legislation not move forward.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other: (explain)

**Step Five: Further Feedback to the Assembly on systemic racism implications**

The SRRC will forward to the Assembly any additional questions that arose during the legislation review that the committee feels may be important for the Assembly to consider.

If a systemic racism implication is identified, the SRRC will provide a written report to the Assembly that includes consideration of the provisions below:

What are the indicators and progress benchmarks?  
 Program strategies?  
 Policy Strategies?  
 Partnership Strategies?

# Systemic Racism Review Committee Legislation Review Summary

Serial Number/Title: **Ordinance 2022-39** An Ordinance Amending Prohibited Acts within the Boat Harbor Related to Dogs and Other Domestic Animals.

Introduced: 9/26/22 Public Hearing Date: 10/24/22 SRRC Review Date: 10/25/2022

Presented By: Carl Uchtyl, Port Director Drafted By: Carl Uchtyl

Department/Division: Docks & Harbors Lead Staff Contact: Carl Uchtyl

Purpose of Legislation (background/summary of intent):

Docks & Harbors wishes to amend CBJC 85.25.090 language to allow dogs (and other domestic animals) access on harbor floats. Currently only dogs with harbor patrons, owning their vessels (and their guests), are allowed on harbor floats.

Connection to existing legislation:

This expands the ordinance to allow any pedestrian to walk their dog (or domestic animal) without violation on harbor floats, regardless of vessel ownership. The legislation also provides an administrative change describing how one must curb their dog (or domestic animal). The Docks & Harbors Board held a public hearing on this proposed change at an August 25<sup>th</sup> Special Board meeting with no comments received.

Connection to adopted planning documents:

None.

\*\*\*\*\*BELOW IS FOR SRRC MEMBERS TO COMPLETE\*\*\*\*\*

## Step One: What is the impact of the proposed legislation?

- a. Does the proposed legislation negatively impact or unduly advantage a particular racial/ethnic group or otherwise perpetuate systemic racism?

*If No, review is completed. If yes, go on to the next question:*

YES	NO

- b. Does the legislation work to mitigate and/or eliminate structural racism  
*If Yes, review is completed. If No, or Undetermined, continue through the remaining steps.*

--	--

## Step Two: How does the legislation perpetuate systemic racism?

- What are potential unintended consequences?
- What benefits may result?
- What is the potential long term impact of the proposed legislation?

Details:

d. What quantitative and qualitative evidence of inequality exists?

Details:

e. What steps has the department or legislation sponsor taken to notify those impacted of the proposed changes?

f. Have key stakeholders who could be potentially impacted by the proposed legislation been engaged?

Details:

g. Has public input been received?

h. If public comment has been received, what is the substance of that comment?

Details:

### Step Three: Who is affected by the Proposed Legislation?

a. Who are the impacted group(s)?

- ☐ White ☐ Black or African American ☐ American Indian or Alaska Native  
☐ Asian ☐ Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander ☐ Two or more races ☐ Other

b. Are there impacts on specific geographic areas?

Race Considerations - Total Community is 69.7% White Only - 30.3% Minority						Economic Considerations	
Census Tract/Block Groups	Minority Pop.	Census Tract/Block Groups	Minority Pop.	Census Tract/Block Groups	Minority Pop.	Elementary School Boundaries	
CT 1: Auke Bay/Out the Road		CT 3: Mendenhall Valley Airport/ East Valley		CT 5: Downtown		Gastineau	Title 1
BG1: Out the road	11.9%	BG1: N. of Jennifer	42.5%	BG 1: Highlands	20.6%	Harborview	Title 1
BG2: Lena area	15.5%	BG 2: Glacier Valley	39.8%	BG2: DT/Starr Hill	24.8%	Glacier Valley	Title 1
BG3: Montanna Creek	14.5%	BG 3: Airport	40.8%	BG 3: Flats/Village	30.8%	Mendenhall River	
BG4: Fritz Cove area	10.1%	BG 4: Radcliffe	24.6%			Riverbend	Title 1
						Auke Bay	
CT 2: Mendenhall Valley withn the Loop		CT 4: Salmon Creek/Lemon Creek		CT 5: Douglas Island		Lower Income Housing Areas	
BG1: Mendenhall Taki	27.8%	BG 1: DZ/Freds	60.9%	BG 1: North Douglas	15.9%	Chinook/Coho	
BG2: Upper Riverside	23.1%	BG 2: Davis	45.0%	BG 2: West Juneau	28.0%	Cedar Park Area	
BG 3: Portage/McGinnr	33.7%	BG 3: Belardi Costco	63.8%	BG 3: Crow Hill/ DT C	27.6%	Gruening Park Area	
BG 4: Long Run	19.6%	BG 4: Twin Lakes	25.9%			Switzer Area	
BG 5: Glacierwood/Vir	41.2%					Kodzhoff Area	
						Douglas Hwy Corridor	

c. Is there a benefit to a specific census block district/neighborhood/school zone?  
 If Yes, does it come at the detriment of another?

Details:

YES	NO

d. Is there a benefit to an individual, group of individuals, or business/organization?  
 If yes, does that come at a detriment of others?

Details:


**Step Four: What solutions could remedy the legislation's implications in perpetuating systemic racism? Check all that apply:**

<input type="checkbox"/>	Recommend additional public input be gathered (Neighborhood/census block meetings, assembly/ committee meetings)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Recommend that the legislation move forward with accountability measures (sunset provisions, 6 mo./annual review of impacts/implications for system racism.) to monitor impact.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Propose revised language to strengthen the legislation or the legislation or regulations cross-referenced within the proposed legislation.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Recommend the proposed legislation not move forward.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other: (explain)

**Step Five: Further Feedback to the Assembly on systemic racism implications**

The SRRC will forward to the Assembly any additional questions that arose during the legislation review that the committee feels may be important for the Assembly to consider.

If a systemic racism implication is identified, the SRRC will provide a written report to the Assembly that includes consideration of the provisions below:

What are the indicators and progress benchmarks?

Program strategies?

Policy Strategies?

Partnership Strategies?

# Systemic Racism Review Committee Legislation Review Summary

Serial Number/Title: **Ordinance 2022-43** An Ordinance Amending Boat Harbor Regulations Relating to Vessel Identification.

Introduced: 9/26/22 Public Hearing Date: 10/24/22 SRRC Review Date: 10/25/2022

Presented By: Carl Uchtyl, Port Director Drafted By: Carl Uchtyl

Department/Division: Docks & Harbors Lead Staff Contact: Carl Uchtyl

Purpose of Legislation (background/summary of intent):

Docks & Harbors wishes to amend CBJC 85.25.020 language to oblige all vessels to display identification required by federal or state law.

Connection to existing legislation:

This expands the ordinance requiring all vessels in the Juneau harbor system to display registration or name on the vessel. The Docks & Harbors Board held a public hearing on this proposed change at an August 25<sup>th</sup> Special Board meeting with no comments received.

Connection to adopted planning documents:

None.

\*\*\*\*\*BELOW IS FOR SRRC MEMBERS TO COMPLETE\*\*\*\*\*

## Step One: What is the impact of the proposed legislation?

- a. Does the proposed legislation negatively impact or unduly advantage a particular racial/ethnic group or otherwise perpetuate systemic racism?

*If No, review is completed. If yes, go on to the next question:*

YES	NO

- b. Does the legislation work to mitigate and/or eliminate structural racism  
*If Yes, review is completed. If No, or Undetermined, continue through the remaining steps.*

--	--

## Step Two: How does the legislation perpetuate systemic racism?

- What are potential unintended consequences?
- What benefits may result?
- What is the potential long term impact of the proposed legislation?

Details:

- What quantitative and qualitative evidence of inequality exists?

Details:

- e. What steps has the department or legislation sponsor taken to notify those impacted of the proposed changes?
- f. Have key stakeholders who could be potentially impacted by the proposed legislation been engaged?

Details:

- g. Has public input been received?
- h. If public comment has been received, what is the substance of that comment?

Details:

### Step Three: Who is affected by the Proposed Legislation?

- a. Who are the impacted group(s)?

- ☐ White ☐ Black or African American ☐ American Indian or Alaska Native  
☐ Asian ☐ Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander ☐ Two or more races ☐ Other

- b. Are there impacts on specific geographic areas?

Race Considerations - Total Community is 69.7% White Only - 30.3% Minority						Economic Considerations	
Census Tract/Block Groups	Minority Pop.		Census Tract/Block Groups	Minority Pop.		Census Tract/Block Groups	Minority Pop.
CT 1: Auke Bay/Out the Road			CT 3: Mendenhall Valley Airport/ East Valley			CT 5: Downtown	
BG1: Out the road	11.9%		BG1: N. of Jennifer	42.5%		BG 1: Highlands	20.6%
BG2: Lena area	15.5%		BG 2: Glacier Valley	39.8%		BG2: DT/Starr Hill	24.8%
BG3: Montanna Creek	14.5%		BG 3: Airport	40.8%		BG 3: Flats/Village	30.8%
BG4: Fritz Cove area	10.1%		BG 4: Raddcliffe	24.6%			
CT 2: Mendenhall Valley withn the Loop			CT 4: Salmon Creek/Lemon Creek				
BG1: Mendenhall Taki	27.8%		BG 1: DZ/Freds	60.9%		CT 5: Douglas Island	
BG2: Upper Riverside	23.1%		BG 2: Davis	45.0%		BG 1: North Douglas	15.9%
BG 3: Portage/McGinr	33.7%		BG 3: Belardi Costco	63.8%		BG 2: West Juneau	28.0%
BG 4: Long Run	19.6%		BG 4: Twin Lakes	25.9%		BG 3: Crow Hill/ DT C	27.6%
BG 5: Glacierwood/Vir	41.2%						
						<b>Elementary School Boundaries</b>	
						Gastineau	Title 1
						Harborview	Title 1
						Glacier Valley	Title 1
						Mendenhall River	
						Riverbend	Title 1
						Auke Bay	
						<b>Lower Income Housing Areas</b>	
						Chinook/Coho	
						Cedar Park Area	
						Gruening Park Area	
						Switzer Area	
						Kodzhoff Area	
						Douglas Hwy Corridor	

- c. Is there a benefit to a specific census block district/neighborhood/school zone?  
If Yes, does it come at the detriment of another?

Details:

YES	NO

- d. Is there a benefit to an individual, group of individuals, or business/organization?  
If yes, does that come at a detriment of others?

Details:


### Step Four: What solutions could remedy the legislation's implications in perpetuating systemic racism? Check all that apply:

	Recommend additional public input be gathered (Neighborhood/census block meetings, assembly/ committee meetings)
	Recommend that the legislation move forward with accountability measures (sunset provisions, 6 mo./annual review of impacts/implications for system racism.) to monitor impact.
	Propose revised language to strengthen the legislation or the legislation or regulations cross-referenced within the proposed legislation.
	Recommend the proposed legislation not move forward.
	Other: (explain)

#### **Step Five: Further Feedback to the Assembly on systemic racism implications**

The SRRC will forward to the Assembly any additional questions that arose during the legislation review that the committee feels may be important for the Assembly to consider.

If a systemic racism implication is identified, the SRRC will provide a written report to the Assembly that includes consideration of the provisions below:

What are the indicators and progress benchmarks?

Program strategies?

Policy Strategies?

Partnership Strategies?

# Systemic Racism Review Committee Legislation Review Summary

Serial Number/Title: **Ordinance 2022-56** An Ordinance Amending the Land Use Code Regarding Alternative Residential Subdivision Requirements.

Introduced: 10/24/2022 Public Hearing Date: \_\_\_\_\_ SRRC Review Date: 10/25/2022

Presented By: Jill Maclean, Director Drafted By: Law Dept.

Department/Division: Community Development Lead Staff Contact: Jill Maclean, Director

Purpose of Legislation (background/summary of intent):

A property owner is currently seeking approval from the Planning Commission for 440 units of housing using the Alternative Residential Subdivision code. However, during the application review, staff and the Planning Commission identified a code inconsistency with the definition of unit-lot. This ordinance would amend the unit-lot definition to be consistent with the other Alternative Residential Subdivision standards.

Connection to existing legislation:

The Assembly created the Alternative Residential Subdivision standards in 2019. (Ord 2018-41). The purpose of the Alternative Residential Subdivision is to create flexibility in the regulation and use of land to promote and encourage different types of housing options. CBJC 49.15.900.

Connection to adopted planning documents:

The ARS ordinance and this revision, support the goal of providing housing in Juneau. This goal is strongly supported in the Comprehensive Plan, the Housing Action Plan, and the Juneau Economic Development Plan.

\*\*\*\*\*BELOW IS FOR SRRC MEMBERS TO COMPLETE\*\*\*\*\*

## Step One: What is the impact of the proposed legislation?

- a. Does the proposed legislation negatively impact or unduly advantage a particular racial/ethnic group or otherwise perpetuate systemic racism?

*If No, review is completed. If yes, go on to the next question:*

YES	NO

- b. Does the legislation work to mitigate and/or eliminate structural racism  
*If Yes, review is completed. If No, or Undetermined, continue through the remaining steps.*

--	--

## Step Two: How does the legislation perpetuate systemic racism?

- What are potential unintended consequences?
- What benefits may result?

c. What is the potential long term impact of the proposed legislation?

Details:

d. What quantitative and qualitative evidence of inequality exists?

Details:

e. What steps has the department or legislation sponsor taken to notify those impacted of the proposed changes?

f. Have key stakeholders who could be potentially impacted by the proposed legislation been engaged?

Details:

g. Has public input been received?

h. If public comment has been received, what is the substance of that comment?

Details:

### Step Three: Who is affected by the Proposed Legislation?

a. Who are the impacted group(s)?

- ☐ White ☐ Black or African American ☐ American Indian or Alaska Native  
☐ Asian ☐ Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander ☐ Two or more races ☐ Other

b. Are there impacts on specific geographic areas?

Race Considerations - Total Community is 69.7% White Only - 30.3% Minority						Economic Considerations	
Census Tract/Block Groups	Minority Pop.	Census Tract/Block Groups	Minority Pop.	Census Tract/Block Groups	Minority Pop.	Elementary School Boundaries	
CT 1: Auke Bay/Out the Road		CT 3: Mendenhall Valley Airport/ East Valley		CT 5: Downtown		Gastineau	Title 1
BG1: Out the road	11.9%	BG1: N. of Jennifer	42.5%	BG 1: Highlands	20.6%	Harborview	Title 1
BG2: Lena area	15.5%	BG 2: Glacier Valley	39.8%	BG2: DT/Starr Hill	24.8%	Glacier Valley	Title 1
BG3: Montanna Creek	14.5%	BG 3: Airport	40.8%	BG 3: Flats/Village	30.8%	Mendenhall River	
BG4: Fritz Cove area	10.1%	BG 4: Radcliffe	24.6%			Riverbend	Title 1
						Auke Bay	
CT 2: Mendenhall Valley withn the Loop		CT 4: Salmon Creek/Lemon Creek		CT 5: Douglas Island		Lower Income Housing Areas	
BG1: Mendenhall Taki	27.8%	BG 1: DZ/Freds	60.9%	BG 1: North Douglas	15.9%	Chinook/Coho	
BG2: Upper Riverside	23.1%	BG 2: Davis	45.0%	BG 2: West Juneau	28.0%	Cedar Park Area	
BG 3: Portage/McGinr	33.7%	BG 3: Belardi Costco	63.8%	BG 3: Crow Hill/ DT D	27.6%	Gruening Park Area	
BG 4: Long Run	19.6%	BG 4: Twin Lakes	25.9%			Switzer Area	
BG 5: Glacierwood/Vir	41.2%					Kodzhoff Area	
						Douglas Hwy Corridor	

c. Is there a benefit to a specific census block district/neighborhood/school zone?  
 If Yes, does it come at the detriment of another?

Details:

d. Is there a benefit to an individual, group of individuals, or business/organization?  
 If yes, does that come at a detriment of others?

**Step Four: What solutions could remedy the legislation's implications in perpetuating systemic racism? Check all that apply:**

<input type="checkbox"/>	Recommend additional public input be gathered (Neighborhood/census block meetings, assembly/ committee meetings)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Recommend that the legislation move forward with accountability measures (sunset provisions, 6 mo./annual review of impacts/implications for system racism.) to monitor impact.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Propose revised language to strengthen the legislation or the legislation or regulations cross-referenced within the proposed legislation.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Recommend the proposed legislation not move forward.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other: (explain)

**Step Five: Further Feedback to the Assembly on systemic racism implications**

The SRRRC will forward to the Assembly any additional questions that arose during the legislation review that the committee feels may be important for the Assembly to consider.

If a systemic racism implication is identified, the SRRRC will provide a written report to the Assembly that includes consideration of the provisions below:

What are the indicators and progress benchmarks?  
 Program strategies?  
 Policy Strategies?  
 Partnership Strategies?

# Systemic Racism Review Committee Legislation Review Summary

Serial Number/Title: **Ordinance 2022-57** An Ordinance Amending the Land Use Code Regarding Planning Commission Meetings

Introduced: 10/24/2022 Public Hearing Date: \_\_\_\_\_ SRRC Review Date: 10/25/2022

Presented By: Jill Maclean, Director Drafted By: CBJ Law

Department/Division: Community Development Lead Staff Contact: Jill Maclean, Director

Purpose of Legislation (background/summary of intent):

CDD and CBJ as a whole have been experiencing a number of staffing capacity challenges. We have managed to fill two positions (Planner II and one of two Administrative Assistant positions), and we need to focus on their onboarding and training in order to ensure their success. We continue to recruit and train up the other vacant positions in the department. The Administrative Officer, and the other Administrative Assistant position are vacant. Currently, CDD has one Administrative Assistant to staff the entire dept. including, Building / Compliance, Planning / Zoning, and Permit / Admin (Permit Center).

Connection to existing legislation:

The Planning Commission currently is required to meet twice a month; we are asking for a reduction to one required meeting per month due to staffing capacity reductions. This will alleviate a heavy workload that cannot be reasonably completed by one staff person.

Connection to adopted planning documents:

The Comprehensive Plan and the Land Use Code provide the Planning Commission with certain powers and duties. Reducing the number of monthly meetings will not prevent the continuation of these duties, nor does it change their regulatory power.

\*\*\*\*\*BELOW IS FOR SRRC MEMBERS TO COMPLETE\*\*\*\*\*

## Step One: What is the impact of the proposed legislation?

- a. Does the proposed legislation negatively impact or unduly advantage a particular racial/ethnic group or otherwise perpetuate systemic racism?

*If No, review is completed. If yes, go on to the next question:*

YES	NO

- b. Does the legislation work to mitigate and/or eliminate structural racism  
*If Yes, review is completed. If No, or Undetermined, continue through the remaining steps.*

--	--

## Step Two: How does the legislation perpetuate systemic racism?

- a. What are potential unintended consequences?
- b. What benefits may result?
- c. What is the potential long term impact of the proposed legislation?

Details:

- d. What quantitative and qualitative evidence of inequality exists?

Details:

- e. What steps has the department or legislation sponsor taken to notify those impacted of the proposed changes?
- f. Have key stakeholders who could be potentially impacted by the proposed legislation been engaged?

Details:

- g. Has public input been received?
- h. If public comment has been received, what is the substance of that comment?

Details:

### Step Three: Who is affected by the Proposed Legislation?

- a. Who are the impacted group(s)?

- ☐ White
 ☐ Black or African American
 ☐ American Indian or Alaska Native
 ☐ Asian
 ☐ Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
 ☐ Two or more races
 ☐ Other

- b. Are there impacts on specific geographic areas?

Race Considerations - Total Community is 69.7% White Only - 30.3% Minority						Economic Considerations	
Census Tract/Block Groups	Minority Pop.	Census Tract/Block Groups	Minority Pop.	Census Tract/Block Groups	Minority Pop.	Elementary School Boundaries	
CT 1: Auke Bay/Out the Road		CT 3: Mendenhall Valley Airport/ East Valley		CT 5: Downtown		Gastineau	Title 1
BG1: Out the road	11.9%	BG1: N. of Jennifer	42.5%	BG 1: Highlands	20.6%	Harborview	Title 1
BG2: Lena area	15.5%	BG 2: Glacier Valley S	39.8%	BG2: DT/Starr Hill	24.8%	Glacier Valley	Title 1
BG3: Montanna Creek	14.5%	BG 3: Airport	40.8%	BG 3: Flats/Village	30.8%	Mendenhall River	
BG4: Fritz Cove area	10.1%	BG 4: Radcliffe	24.6%			Riverbend	Title 1
						Auke Bay	
CT 2: Mendenhall Valley withn the Loop		CT 4: Salmon Creek/Lemon Creek		CT 5: Douglas Island		Lower Income Housing Areas	
BG1: Mendenhall Taki	27.8%	BG 1: DZ/Freds	60.9%	BG 1: North Douglas	15.9%	Chinook/Coho	
BG2: Upper Riverside	23.1%	BG 2: Davis	45.0%	BG 2: West Juneau	28.0%	Cedar Park Area	
BG 3: Portage/McGinnr	33.7%	BG 3: Belardi Costco	63.8%	BG 3: Crow Hill/ DT D	27.6%	Gruening Park Area	
BG 4: Long Run	19.6%	BG 4: Twin Lakes	25.9%			Switzer Area	
BG 5:Glacierwood/Vir	41.2%					Kodzhoff Area	
						Douglas Hwy Corridor	

- c. Is there a benefit to a specific census block district/neighborhood/school zone?  
If Yes, does it come at the detriment of another?

Details:

YES	NO

- d. Is there a benefit to an individual, group of individuals, or business/organization?  
If yes, does that come at a detriment of others?

Details:

Section G, Item 2.

**Step Four: What solutions could remedy the legislation's implications in perpetuating systemic racism? Check all that apply:**

<input type="checkbox"/>	Recommend additional public input be gathered (Neighborhood/census block meetings, assembly/ committee meetings)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Recommend that the legislation move forward with accountability measures (sunset provisions, 6 mo./annual review of impacts/implications for system racism.) to monitor impact.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Propose revised language to strengthen the legislation or the legislation or regulations cross-referenced within the proposed legislation.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Recommend the proposed legislation not move forward.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other: (explain)

**Step Five: Further Feedback to the Assembly on systemic racism implications**

The SRRC will forward to the Assembly any additional questions that arose during the legislation review that the committee feels may be important for the Assembly to consider.

If a systemic racism implication is identified, the SRRC will provide a written report to the Assembly that includes consideration of the provisions below:

What are the indicators and progress benchmarks?  
Program strategies?  
Policy Strategies?  
Partnership Strategies?

# Systemic Racism Review Committee Legislation Review Summary

Serial Number/Title: **Resolution 3002** A Resolution Expressing Support for the United States Department of Justice, Office of Justice Program, FY22 Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG).

Introduced: 10/24/22 Public Hearing Date: N/A SRRC Review Date: 10/25/22

Presented By: Manager Drafted By: Finance

Department/Division: JPD Lead Staff Contact: Ed Mercer

Purpose of Legislation (background/summary of intent):

The Juneau Police Department has been awarded \$37,362 in grant funding from the U.S. Department of Justice for training and equipment. This grant will provide funding for select staff to attend the Alaska Conference on Child Maltreatment and International Association of Chiefs of Police Technology Conference. Equipment funding provides for patrol vehicle vaults, explosive ordnance disposal hook and line kit, and uniform inventory software.

No local match is required for this grant.

Connection to existing legislation:

Budget authority for this grant was appropriated via CBJ FY23 Budget Ordinance 2022-06(b).

Connection to adopted planning documents:

N/A

## Step One: What is the impact of the proposed legislation?

- a. Does the proposed legislation negatively impact or unduly advantage a particular racial/ethnic group or otherwise perpetuate systemic racism?

*If No, review is completed. If yes, go on to the next question:*

YES	NO

- b. Does the legislation work to mitigate and/or eliminate structural racism  
*If Yes, review is completed. If No, or Undetermined, continue through the remaining steps.*

--	--

## Step Two: How does the legislation perpetuate systemic racism?

- What are potential unintended consequences?
- What benefits may result?
- What is the potential long term impact of the proposed legislation?

Details: The Assembly's support of this grant ensures JPD can be awarded the funds. JPD intends use these funds towards child maltreatment and police technology training, as well as equipment needs identified by the department. Increased training for Juneau's officers helps ensure the highest level of care and protection for Juneau's residents and visitors.

d. What quantitative and qualitative evidence of inequality exists?

Details:

- e. What steps has the department or legislation sponsor taken to notify those impacted of the proposed changes?
- f. Have key stakeholders who could be potentially impacted by the proposed legislation been engaged?

Details:

- g. Has public input been received?
- h. If public comment has been received, what is the substance of that comment?

Details: No public testimony will be received on this resolution since it was on the Assembly's consent agenda for approval, however a 30-day public comment period commenced on October 3<sup>rd</sup>, through which the public has an opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed use of the grant funds.

### Step Three: Who is affected by the Proposed Legislation?

a. Who are the impacted group(s)?

- ☐ White ☐ Black or African American ☐ American Indian or Alaska Native  
☐ Asian ☐ Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander ☐ Two or more races ☐ Other

b. Are there impacts on specific geographic areas?

Race Considerations - Total Community is 69.7% White Only - 30.3% Minority						Economic Considerations	
Census Tract/Block Groups	Minority Pop.	Census Tract/Block Groups	Minority Pop.	Census Tract/Block Groups	Minority Pop.	Elementary School Boundaries	
CT 1: Auke Bay/Out the Road		CT 3: Mendenhall Valley Airport/ East Valley		CT 5: Downtown		Gastineau	Title 1
BG1: Out the road	11.9%	BG1: N. of Jennifer	42.5%	BG 1: Highlands	20.6%	Harborview	Title 1
BG2: Lena area	15.5%	BG 2: Glacier Valley	39.8%	BG2: DT/Starr Hill	24.8%	Glacier Valley	Title 1
BG3: Montanna Creek	14.5%	BG 3: Airport	40.8%	BG 3: Flats/Village	30.8%	Mendenhall River	
BG4: Fritz Cove area	10.1%	BG 4: Raddcliffe	24.6%			Riverbend	Title 1
						Auke Bay	
CT 2: Mendenhall Valley within the Loop		CT 4: Salmon Creek/Lemon Creek				Lower Income Housing Areas	
BG1: Mendenhall Taki	27.8%	BG 1: DZ/Freds	60.9%	CT 5: Douglas Island		Chinook/Coho	
BG2: Upper Riverside	23.1%	BG 2: Davis	45.0%	BG 1: North Douglas	15.9%	Cedar Park Area	
BG 3: Portage/McGinr	33.7%	BG 3: Belardi Costco	63.8%	BG 2: West Juneau	28.0%	Gruening Park Area	
BG 4: Long Run	19.6%	BG 4: Twin Lakes	25.9%	BG 3: Crow Hill/ DT C	27.6%	Switzer Area	
BG 5: Glacierwood/Vir	41.2%					Kodzhoff Area	
						Douglas Hwy Corridor	

c. Is there a benefit to a specific census block district/neighborhood/school zone?  
 If Yes, does it come at the detriment of another?

Details:

YES	NO

- d. Is there a benefit to an individual, group of individuals, or business/organization?  
If yes, does that come at a detriment of others?

Details:


**Step Four: What solutions could remedy the legislation's implications in perpetuating systemic racism? Check all that apply:**

<input type="checkbox"/>	Recommend additional public input be gathered (Neighborhood/census block meetings, assembly/ committee meetings)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Recommend that the legislation move forward with accountability measures (sunset provisions, 6 mo./annual review of impacts/implications for system racism.) to monitor impact.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Propose revised language to strengthen the legislation or the legislation or regulations cross-referenced within the proposed legislation.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Recommend the proposed legislation not move forward.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other: (explain)

**Step Five: Further Feedback to the Assembly on systemic racism implications**

The SRRRC will forward to the Assembly any additional questions that arose during the legislation review that the committee feels may be important for the Assembly to consider.

If a systemic racism implication is identified, the SRRRC will provide a written report to the Assembly that includes consideration of the provisions below:

What are the indicators and progress benchmarks?  
Program strategies?  
Policy Strategies?  
Partnership Strategies?

# Systemic Racism Review Committee Legislation Review Summary

Serial Number/Title: **Ordinance 2021-08(b)(am)(AU)** An Ordinance Appropriating \$7,127,047 to the Manager to Fund the City and Borough of Juneau and Bartlett Regional Hospital's Fiscal Year 2022 Public Employees' Retirement System (PERS) Contribution; Funding Provided by the Alaska Department of Administration.

Introduced: 9/26/22 Public Hearing Date: 10/24/22 SRRC Review Date: 10/25/22

Presented By: Manager Drafted By: Finance

Department/Division: CBJ/BRH Lead Staff Contact: Jeff Rogers

Purpose of Legislation (background/summary of intent):

This ordinance would appropriate \$7,127,047 for the State of Alaska's FY2022 8.11% PERS benefit rate paid on-behalf of the CBJ and BRH, distributed as follows:

City and Borough of Juneau	\$3,498,144
Bartlett Regional Hospital	\$3,628,903

Funding is provided by the Alaska Department of Administration, authorized by passage of HB69 during the 2021 legislative session.

Connection to existing legislation:

As a supplemental appropriation, this ordinance amends CBJ FY22 Budget Ordinance 2021-08(b)(am).

Connection to adopted planning documents:

N/A

## Step One: What is the impact of the proposed legislation?

- a. Does the proposed legislation negatively impact or unduly advantage a particular racial/ethnic group or otherwise perpetuate systemic racism?

*If No, review is completed. If yes, go on to the next question:*

YES	NO

- b. Does the legislation work to mitigate and/or eliminate structural racism  
*If Yes, review is completed. If No, or Undetermined, continue through the remaining steps.*

--	--

## Step Two: How does the legislation perpetuate systemic racism?

- What are potential unintended consequences?
- What benefits may result?

c. What is the potential long term impact of the proposed legislation?

Details: This is a housekeeping ordinance to properly account for these on-behalf contributions to the state-managed retirement fund and has no impact on the CBJ or BRH's finances.

d. What quantitative and qualitative evidence of inequality exists?

Details:

e. What steps has the department or legislation sponsor taken to notify those impacted of the proposed changes?

f. Have key stakeholders who could be potentially impacted by the proposed legislation been engaged?

Details: N/A

g. Has public input been received?

h. If public comment has been received, what is the substance of that comment?

Details: Public comment on this ordinance will be held on October 24, 2022.

### Step Three: Who is affected by the Proposed Legislation?

a. Who are the impacted group(s)?

☐ White ☐ Black or African American ☐ American Indian or Alaska Native  
☐ Asian ☐ Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander ☐ Two or more races ☐ Other

b. Are there impacts on specific geographic areas?

Race Considerations - Total Community is 69.7% White Only - 30.3% Minority						Economic Considerations	
Census Tract/Block Groups	Minority Pop.	Census Tract/Block Groups	Minority Pop.	Census Tract/Block Groups	Minority Pop.	Elementary School Boundaries	
CT 1: Auke Bay/Out the Road		CT 3: Mendenhall Valley Airport/ East Valley		CT 5: Downtown		Gastineau	Title 1
BG1: Out the road	11.9%	BG1: N. of Jennifer	42.5%	BG 1: Highlands	20.6%	Harborview	Title 1
BG2: Lena area	15.5%	BG 2: Glacier Valley	39.8%	BG2: DT/Starr Hill	24.8%	Glacier Valley	Title 1
BG3: Montanna Creek	14.5%	BG 3: Airport	40.8%	BG 3: Flats/Village	30.8%	Mendenhall River	
BG4: Fritz Cove area	10.1%	BG 4: Radcliffe	24.6%			Riverbend	Title 1
						Auke Bay	
CT 2: Mendenhall Valley with the Loop		CT 4: Salmon Creek/Lemon Creek		CT 5: Douglas Island		Lower Income Housing Areas	
BG1: Mendenhall Taki	27.8%	BG 1: DZ/Freds	60.9%	BG 1: North Douglas	15.9%	Chinook/Coho	
BG2: Upper Riverside	23.1%	BG 2: Davis	45.0%	BG 2: West Juneau	28.0%	Cedar Park Area	
BG 3: Portage/McGinr	33.7%	BG 3: Belardi Costco	63.8%	BG 3: Crow Hill/ DT D	27.6%	Gruening Park Area	
BG 4: Long Run	19.6%	BG 4: Twin Lakes	25.9%			Switzer Area	
BG 5: Glacierwood/Vir	41.2%					Kodzhoff Area	
						Douglas Hwy Corridor	

c. Is there a benefit to a specific census block district/neighborhood/school zone?  
 If Yes, does it come at the detriment of another?

Details:

d. Is there a benefit to an individual, group of individuals, or business/organization?

YES	NO

--	--

If yes, does that come at a detriment of others?

Details:

**Step Four: What solutions could remedy the legislation's implications in perpetuating systemic racism? Check all that apply:**

<input type="checkbox"/>	Recommend additional public input be gathered (Neighborhood/census block meetings, assembly/ committee meetings)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Recommend that the legislation move forward with accountability measures (sunset provisions, 6 mo./annual review of impacts/implications for system racism.) to monitor impact.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Propose revised language to strengthen the legislation or the legislation or regulations cross-referenced within the proposed legislation.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Recommend the proposed legislation not move forward.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other: (explain)

**Step Five: Further Feedback to the Assembly on systemic racism implications**

The SRRC will forward to the Assembly any additional questions that arose during the legislation review that the committee feels may be important for the Assembly to consider.

If a systemic racism implication is identified, the SRRC will provide a written report to the Assembly that includes consideration of the provisions below:

What are the indicators and progress benchmarks?

Program strategies?

Policy Strategies?

Partnership Strategies?

## Systemic Racism Review Committee Legislation Review Summary

Section G, Item 2.

Serial Number/Title: **Ordinance 2021-08(b)(am)(AV)** An Ordinance Appropriating \$28,226,000 to and Deappropriating \$2,495,600 from the Manager for the City and Borough of Juneau's Fiscal Year 2022 Operating Costs; Funding Provided by Various Sources.

Introduced: 9/26/22 Public Hearing Date: 10/24/22 SRRC Review Date: 10/25/22

Presented By: Manager Drafted By: Finance

Department/Division: Various Lead Staff Contact: Jeff Rogers

Purpose of Legislation (background/summary of intent):

This ordinance appropriates \$28,226,000 and deappropriates \$2,495,600 for the City and Borough of Juneau's FY2022 operating costs. The following departments and funds require supplemental budget authority in FY2022:

**Airport:** this ordinance appropriates \$383,000 of Federal CARES Act funding for required repairs and maintenance upgrades at the Airport.

**Docks:** \$335,000 of Docks funds provides for extraordinary costs associated with hiring seasonal part-time limited staff required to meet unfunded, new Coast Guard security regulations pertaining to dual identification verification.

**Hospital:** \$2,000 of supplemental authority is needed to support increased labors costs due to staffing shortages and inflationary pressure on materials and commodities; funding provided by Hospital funds.

**Risk Management:** this ordinance appropriates \$1,452,000 of Risk Management funds for health and property insurance claims that exceeded budget estimates.

**Pandemic Response Fund:** this ordinance provides budget authority to transfer federal ARPA funds for the replacement of lost State Marine Passenger Fee revenue and the Local Government Lost Revenue Relief Grant to the General Fund. This ordinance also appropriates nearly \$1 million for CBJ's FY2022 COVID-related costs, funded by FEMA revenue.

This ordinance appropriates the remaining authority of \$7,123,300 and deappropriates \$2,495,600 for housekeeping items, including aligning budget to actual transfers, the liquidation of the Waste Management and Library Minor Contribution funds, and the repayment of a refunded bond with bond proceeds.

Connection to existing legislation:

As a supplemental appropriation, this ordinance amends CBJ FY22 Budget Ordinance 2021-08(b)(am).

Connection to adopted planning documents:

N/A

I:\Clerks Office\Advisory Boards\Systemic Racism Review Committee-SRRC\2022-10-25 SRRC Meeting\SRRC Tool\_2021-08(b)(am)(AV).docx

**Step One: What is the impact of the proposed legislation?**

- a. Does the proposed legislation negatively impact or unduly advantage a particular racial/ethnic group or otherwise perpetuate systemic racism?

YES	NO

*If No, review is completed. If yes, go on to the next question:*

- b. Does the legislation work to mitigate and/or eliminate structural racism  
*If Yes, review is completed. If No, or Undetermined, continue through the remaining steps.*

--	--

**Step Two: How does the legislation perpetuate systemic racism?**

- a. What are potential unintended consequences?  
b. What benefits may result?  
c. What is the potential long term impact of the proposed legislation?

Details:

- d. What quantitative and qualitative evidence of inequality exists?

Details:

- e. What steps has the department or legislation sponsor taken to notify those impacted of the proposed changes?  
f. Have key stakeholders who could be potentially impacted by the proposed legislation been engaged?

Details:

- g. Has public input been received?  
h. If public comment has been received, what is the substance of that comment?

Details: Public comment on this ordinance will be held on October 24, 2022.

**Step Three: Who is affected by the Proposed Legislation?**

- a. Who are the impacted group(s)?

☐ White ☐ Black or African American ☐ American Indian or Alaska Native  
☐ Asian ☐ Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander ☐ Two or more races ☐ Other

- b. Are there impacts on specific geographic areas?

Race Considerations - Total Community is 69.7% White Only - 30.3% Minority												Economic Considerations				
Census Tract/Block Groups				Minority Pop.	Census Tract/Block Groups				Minority Pop.	Census Tract/Block Groups				Minority Pop.	Elementary School Boundaries	
CT 1: Auke Bay/Out the Road					CT 3: Mendenhall Valley Airport/ East Valley					CT 5: Downtown					Gastineau Harborview	Title 1
BG1: Out the road				11.9%	BG1: N. of Jennifer				42.5%	BG 1: Highlands				20.6%	Glacier Valley	Title 1
BG2: Lena area				15.5%	BG 2: Glacier Valley S				39.8%	BG2: DT/Starr Hill				24.8%	Mendenhall River	
BG3: Montanna Creek				14.5%	BG 3: Airport				40.8%	BG 3: Flats/Village				30.8%	Riverbend	Title 1
BG4: Fritz Cove area				10.1%	BG 4: Radcliffe				24.6%						Auke Bay	
CT 2: Mendenhall Valley withn the Loop					CT 4: Salmon Creek/Lemon Creek					CT 5: Douglas Island					Lower Income Housing Areas	
BG1: Mendenhall Taki				27.8%	BG 1: DZ/Freds				60.9%	BG 1: North Douglas				15.9%	Chinook/Coho	
BG2: Upper Riverside				23.1%	BG 2: Davis				45.0%	BG 2: West Juneau				28.0%	Cedar Park Area	
BG 3: Portage/McGinn				33.7%	BG 3: Belardi Costco				63.8%	BG 2: West Juneau				28.0%	Gruening Park Area	
BG 4: Long Run				19.6%	BG 4: Twin Lakes				25.9%	BG 3: Crow Hill/ DT C				27.6%	Switzer Area	
BG 5:Glacierwood/Vir				41.2%											Kodzhoff Area	
														Douglas Hwy Corridor		

c. Is there a benefit to a specific census block district/neighborhood/school zone?  
If Yes, does it come at the detriment of another?

Details:

YES	NO

d. Is there a benefit to an individual, group of individuals, or business/organization?  
If yes, does that come at a detriment of others?

Details:


**Step Four: What solutions could remedy the legislation’s implications in perpetuating systemic racism? Check all that apply:**

<input type="checkbox"/>	Recommend additional public input be gathered (Neighborhood/census block meetings, assembly/ committee meetings)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Recommend that the legislation move forward with accountability measures (sunset provisions, 6 mo./annual review of impacts/implications for system racism.) to monitor impact.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Propose revised language to strengthen the legislation or the legislation or regulations cross-referenced within the proposed legislation.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Recommend the proposed legislation not move forward.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other: (explain)

**Step Five: Further Feedback to the Assembly on systemic racism implications**

The SRRC will forward to the Assembly any additional questions that arose during the legislation review that the committee feels may be important for the Assembly to consider.

If a systemic racism implication is identified, the SRRC will provide a written report to the Assembly that includes consideration of the provisions below:

- What are the indicators and progress benchmarks?
- Program strategies?
- Policy Strategies?
- Partnership Strategies?