

SYSTEMIC RACISM REVIEW COMMITTEE THE CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU, ALASKA

April 5, 2022 12:00 PM

Zoom Webinar

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

AGENDA

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

III. ROLL CALL

IV. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. 2022-03-01 SRRC Minutes-Draft

B. 2022-03-15 SRRC Minutes-Draft

VI. AGENDA TOPICS

A. Budget Process Discussion

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Legislation Introduced at April 4, 2022 Regular Assembly Meeting

The following ordinances were up for introduction and the CIP resolution were on the consent agenda at the April 4, 2022 Regular Assembly Meeting. The SRRC checklists associated with the ordinances and resolution 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.org/assembly/assembly-minutes-and-agendas>

Ordinance 2022-23 An Ordinance Temporarily Closing Auke Lake for the 2022 IRONMAN Alaska Triathlon and Providing a Penalty.

Ordinance 2021-08(b)(am)(AE) An Ordinance Appropriating \$3,000,000 to the Manager for the August Brown Pool Capital Improvement Project; Funding Provided by General Funds.

Ordinance 2021-08(b)(am)(AF) An Ordinance Appropriating \$5,000,000 to the Manager for the Affordable Housing Fund; Funding Provided by General Funds.

Ordinance 2021-08(b)(am)(AG) An Ordinance Appropriating \$1,500,000 to the Manager for the Information Technology Infrastructure Upgrades Capital Improvement Project; Funding Provided by General Funds.

Ordinance 2021-08(b)(am)(AH) An Ordinance Appropriating \$500,000 to the Manager for the Juneau Police Department Radio System Replacement Capital Improvement Project; Funding Provided by General Funds.

Ordinance 2021-08(b)(am)(AI) An Ordinance Appropriating \$1,000,000 to the Manager as Local Match for the Lemon Creek Multimodal Path Capital Improvement Project; Funding Provided by General Funds.

Ordinance 2021-08(b)(am)(AJ) An Ordinance Appropriating \$6,300,000 to the Manager for the New City Hall Capital Improvement Project; Funding Provided by General Funds.

Ordinance 2021-08(b)(am)(AK) An Ordinance Appropriating \$250,000 to the Manager for the North Douglas Crossing Capital Improvement Project; Funding Provided by General Funds.

Ordinance 2021-08(b)(am)(AL) An Ordinance Appropriating \$1,300,000 to the Manager as a Grant to United Human Services of SE Alaska to Construct the Southeast Community Services Center; Funding Provided by General Funds.

Ordinance 2021-08(b)(am)(AN) An Ordinance Appropriating \$300,000 to the Manager to Replace Lost Revenue in the Downtown Parking Fund; Funding Provided by General Funds.

Ordinance 2022-06 An Ordinance Appropriating Funds from the Treasury for FY23 City and Borough Operations.

Ordinance 2022-07 An Ordinance Appropriating Funds from the Treasury for FY23 School District Operations.

Ordinance 2022-08 An Ordinance Establishing the Rate of Levy for Property Taxes for Calendar Year 2022 Based Upon the Proposed Budget for Fiscal Year 2023.

Resolution 2976 A Resolution Adopting the City and Borough Capital Improvement Program for Fiscal Years 2023 through 2028, and Establishing the Capital Improvement Project Priorities for Fiscal Year 2023.

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]

VIII. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

A. Legislation Pulled from Consent Agenda for Discussion

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"

"I move the SRRC recommend to the Assembly it *{fill in the recommendation}* prior to taking action on proposed legislation"

IX. STAFF REPORTS

X. COMMITTEE MEMBER / LIAISON COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

XI. NEXT MEETING DATE

XII. 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

March 1, 2022 12:00 PM

Zoom Webinar

MINUTES

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Worl called the Systemic Racism Review Committee to order at 12:02 p.m.

II. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

III. ROLL CALL

Welcome new members – Gail Cheney and Ivan Nance

Present: Chair Lisa Worl, Gail Cheney, Ivan Nance, Carla Casulucan, Kelli Patterson, Gail Cheney and Ivan Nance

Absent: Grace Lee, Dominic Branson

Staff/Other: Robert Palmer, Di Cathcart, Adam Gottschalk and Assembly Liaison Christine Woll

Other Attendees: Sherri Layne

IV. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Agenda approved as presented.

V. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

None

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Legislation Introduced at February 28, 2022 Regular Assembly Meeting

The following ordinances and resolutions were up for introduction on the February 28, 2022 Regular Assembly Meeting. The SRRC checklists associated with each ordinance and resolution are in this SRRC packet. Ordinances and material associated with the ordinances are located in the

Assembly packet (copy/paste link into preferred browser for access to the Assembly agenda page): <https://juneau.org/assembly/assembly-minutes-and-agendas>

- **Ordinance 2022-14** An Ordinance Authorizing the Manager to Convey Lot 9, Block 13, Juneau Townsite to Franklin Foods LLC.
- **Ordinance 2021-09(A)** An Ordinance Appropriating \$10,000 from the Treasury for FY22 School District Operations.
- **Ordinance 2021-09(B)** An Ordinance Appropriating and Deappropriating Funds from the Treasury for FY22 School District Operations.
- **Ordinance 2021-08(b)(am)(AA)** An Ordinance Transferring \$120,000 from CIP U76-121 Collection System Pump Station Upgrades and CIP W75-061 Douglas Highway Water - David to I St. to CIP R72-157 Spruce Lane Reconstruction.
- **Ordinance 2021-08(b)(am)(AB)** An Ordinance Appropriating \$5,500,000 to the Manager as Funding for City and Borough of Juneau and Juneau School District Deferred Maintenance Capital Improvement Projects; Funding Provided by General Funds.
- **Ordinance 2021-08(b)(am)(AC)** An Ordinance Appropriating \$75,000 to the Manager as Funding for Eaglecrest's Fiscal Year 2022 Pay Plan Adjustment; Funding Provided by Eaglecrest Revenue.
- **Resolution 2974** A Resolution Re-establishing the Juneau Local Emergency Planning Committee.
- **Resolution 2976** A Resolution Repealing and Reestablishing the Assembly Rules of Procedure.

Mr. Palmer read the six ordinances and two resolutions into the record. Chair Worl walked the new members through the committee process regarding the consent agenda and making a motion to pull an item for further discussion.

Mr. Vance asked if there was an example where a piece of legislation stood out enough that you would pull off of the consent agenda and take it through the process. Chair Worl responded that the committee did that recently regarding a rezone ordinance where the committee walked through the entire SRRC legislative tool and made specific recommendations to the Assembly. Chair Worl noted that sometimes members request to pull an ordinance off the consent agenda for further questions prior to moving it forward to the Assembly.

Chair Worl reminded committee members that if there is legislation they would like pulled for further discussion to let city staff know, prior to the meeting, so the proper staff is available at the meeting to answer questions relating to the pulled legislation.

Ms. Cheney had a question regarding the funding provided to the school district for use of Treadwell Arena per Ordinance 2021-09(A). Chair Worl outlined the school district budget process.

Mr. Palmer walked the committee through the changes to Resolution 2974 with the addition of the Alaska Native Tribal Representative seat and a Healthcare system seat.

Ms. Cheney asked how Eaglecrest fits into the CBJ budget. Mr. Palmer noted that Eaglecrest is one of the city's enterprise boards and it receives roughly an annual 30% subsidy over the last decade and is roughly 70% self-funded.

Chair Worl recommended new members review the recordings and minutes from the foundational trainings staff provided to the committee prior to the committee beginning to review legislation. Assemblymember Woll said she would be happy to meet with new members to answer any questions they may have.

Chair Worl commented she was glad to see there are some deferred maintenance school district projects getting the attention needed so we have safe schools for our children.

MOTION: by Ms. Patterson to approve the consent agenda as presented, *hearing no objection, motion passed.*

VII. STAFF REPORTS

Mr. Palmer reiterated the offer to meet with new members to answer questions.

VIII. COMMITTEE MEMBER / LIAISON COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Ms. Cheney stated it has been an interesting process to watch and asked if there are additional roles the committee may take on. Mr. Palmer noted the organic legislation that created the SRRC was very narrow in its scope with its current role to review legislation. Timing is a little tricky with the SRRC meeting the day after the Assembly meeting to review the legislation introduced prior to the legislation being up for public hearing at the next Assembly meeting.

Assemblymember Woll said while the Assembly direction to the committee

was narrow and discussion has happened around expanding the committees charge; the Assembly wants to see the committee go through a full cycle prior to making any changes to the current charge. The SRRC will submit an annual report to the Assembly, which is a good way to highlight any additional needs or requests of the committee.

Chair Worl thanked Mr. Nance and Ms. Cheney for joining the committee. As the new members get more familiar with process and explained how committee members agreed to listen in to other Assembly Committees to report to the SRRC any potential legislation making its way to the SRRC and once the new members felt familiar with the process, could choose an Assembly Standing Committee they would track and report back on.

IX. NEXT MEETING DATE

X. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the committee, meeting adjourned at 12:49 p.m.

SYSTEMIC RACISM REVIEW COMMITTEE

March 15, 2022 12:00 PM

Zoom Webinar

MINUTES

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Worl called the Systemic Racism Review Committee to order at 12:01 p.m.

II. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

III. ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Lisa Worl, Gail Cheney, Ivan Nance, Carla Casulucan, Kelli Patterson and Dominic Branson

Absent: Grace Lee

Staff/Other: Robert Palmer, Di Cathcart and Assemblymember Liaison Christine Woll

Other Attendees: Sherri Layne, Adrien Speegle, Dan Bleidorn, Katie Koester, Beth McEwen

IV. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Agenda approved as presented.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. 2022-02-15 Systemic Racism Review Committee Minutes-Draft

Minutes approved as presented.

VI. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

None

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Legislation Introduced at March 14, 2022 Regular Assembly Meeting

The following ordinance was up for introduction and the resolutions were on the consent agenda at the March 14, 2022 Regular Assembly Meeting. The SRRC checklists associated with the ordinance and each resolution are in this SRRC packet. Legislation and material associated with that legislation are located in the Assembly packet (copy/paste link into preferred browser for access to the Assembly agenda page):

<https://juneau.org/assembly/assembly-minutes-and-agendas>

Ordinance 2021-08(b)(am)(AD) An Ordinance Appropriating \$2,400,000 to the Manager for the Purchase of the Family Practice Building at 10301 Glacier Highway; Funding Provided by Hospital Funds.

Resolution 2981 A Resolution Supporting the People of Ukraine and Suspending the Juneau Sister City Relationship with Vladivostok, Russia.

Mr. Palmer read the ordinance and resolution into the record.

Assemblymember Woll gave a brief overview of the discussion had at the Assembly Human Resources Committee regarding Resolution 2981 and sits in committee until questions that arose around potential unintended consequences if resolution passed are resolved.

MOTION: by Ms. Casulacan to pull the resolution from the consent agenda for further discussion. ***Hearing no objection, motion passed.***

MOTION: by Ms. Patterson to approve the consent agenda as amended, ***hearing no objection, motion passed.***

Ms. Casulacan noted that looking at the SRRC toolkit and going through the questions it would be a yes to question one. Ms. Cheney stated it would be hard to judge what the benefits would be to passing the resolution without more background information. Ms. Patterson echoed Ms. Cheney's comments and asked what it would mean for the sister city relationship.

Mr. Nance stated he thought this resolution was out of SRRC's purview as a committee.

Chair Worl, while this resolution may be a political gesture, it is important to think about the systemic racism implications within our community when making a statement in support of or opposition to an event. Chair Worl trusts that Assemblymembers will have thoughtful discussion around that and what other communities we have sister city relationships with that we may do something in a similar situation.

Chair Worl stated that, like the Assembly, the SRRC would like more information around the impact or unintended consequences of the resolution. Chair Worl recommended the HRC use the SRRC toolkit as a guide to help answer the questions that arise around this resolution.

Assemblymember Woll, thanked committee members for the thoughtful discussion; if there is something the committee wants to pass on to the Assembly or to say that may be outside the scope of work of the committee, it is easier if the body makes a formal recommendation to pass on to the Assembly.

Mr. Branson agreed with Chair Worl and appreciated the language in the summary of content on the toolkit; and noted the resolution puts the blame on Putin and not the people of Vladivostok.

SRRC RECOMMENDATION TO THE ASSEMBLY: while the SRRC feels Resolution 2981 is generally outside of its purview, being political in nature, the committee recommends the Assembly use the SRRC toolkit as a guide, specifically the first two questions, as this or similar legislation is discussed and adopted.

VIII. STAFF REPORTS

None

IX. COMMITTEE MEMBER / LIAISON COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Ms. Cheney commented that the material in the packet assumes that we have the background information related to legislation being reviewed and requested that staff add a bit more of the “where is this coming from” information. Chair Worl recommended reviewing the foundational training material provided to the committee by staff and that as a committee we have committed to following the various Assembly Standing Committees and report to the SRRC any legislation or topics that will end up before the SRRC for review. Chair Worl outlined the school district’s legislative and budget review process.

Mr. Palmer stated that staff continues to strive to get as much information to the committee as possible and have staff on-hand to answer questions during SRRC meetings; especially if committee members can let us know ahead of time when they know they will be requesting to pull legislation for further discussion. Due to the timing of SRRC meetings, it has been a bit of a

struggle to have school district staff available to answer questions.

Assemblymember Woll empathized with Ms. Cheney stating she found relying on staff as her best tool; noting that this committee and the process is new and still an experiment; the more questions committee members ask will help staff and the Assembly make good decisions.

Ms. Cheney would like to encourage a broad spectrum of citizen engagement and to include public input into the SRRC and Assembly agendas. Chair Worl one hundred percent agreed on the need for more public participation and appreciated all of the committee discussion.

Chair Worl brought up the idea of having a work session to allow for deeper discussions as CBJ moves into the budget cycle in April.

X. NEXT MEETING DATE

XI. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the committee, meeting adjourned at 12:53 p.m.

Systemic Racism Review Committee Legislation Review Summary

Serial Number/Title: Ordinance 2021-08(b)(am)(AE) An Ordinance Appropriating \$3,000,000 to the Manager for the August Brown Pool Capital Improvement Project; Funding Provided by General Funds.

Introduced: 4/4/22 Public Hearing Date: 4/25/22 SRRC Review Date: 4/5/22

Presented By: Manager Drafted By: Finance

Department/Division: Parks & Rec/Engineering Lead Staff Contact: Katie Koester

Purpose of Legislation (background/summary of intent):

Delaying renovation of Augustus Brown Pool has substantially increased costs due to inflation, supply chain issues, and limited competition in the pool specialty trade. This ordinance would provide \$3,000,000 of general funds to progress project work. The intent is to complete renovations contemplated in the 2017 sales tax renewal.

Connection to existing legislation:

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

Connection to adopted planning documents:

Capital Improvement Plan

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
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- 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.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------

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: Performing this work extends the pool's useful life and continues providing an affordable recreational opportunity for constituents in the downtown and Douglas area. Furthermore, extending the pool's useful life ensures students at the Juneau Douglas High School continue to have a facility in

proximity to the school to perform competitive aquatic sports, which promotes health and wellness of student participants.

d. What quantitative and qualitative evidence of inequality exists?

Details: N/A

- 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 Assembly Finance Committee reviewed this request at the March 12, 2022 meeting. The Public Works and Facilities Committee will review this request at the April 11, 2022 meeting. The Aquatics Board is in support of funding the renovations supported by the voters in the 2017 sales tax renewal.

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

Details: Public hearing on this ordinance will be held on 4/25/22.

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 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:

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 2021-08(b)(am)(AF) An Ordinance Appropriating \$5,000,000 to the Manager for the Affordable Housing Fund; Funding Provided by General Funds.

Introduced: 4/4/22 Public Hearing Date: 4/25/22 SRRC Review Date: 4/5/22

Presented By: Manager Drafted By: Finance

Department/Division: Assembly / Affordable Housing Lead Staff Contact: Rorie Watt/Robert Barr

Purpose of Legislation (background/summary of intent):

This ordinance would appropriate \$5,000,000 of general funds to the Affordable Housing Fund. Assuring adequate and affordable housing for all Juneau residents is highest ranking on the Assembly's goals for 2022. Appropriating these funds will ensure continued robust and sustainable use of the Affordable Housing Fund.

Connection to existing legislation:

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

Connection to adopted planning documents:

Assembly 2022 Goals

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
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- 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.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------

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: This appropriation will help fund projects that promote affordable housing in Juneau. Greater availability of affordable housing can lead to fewer evictions, a healthier and wealthier population, increased local purchasing power, and better opportunities for investing in the future through the

reduction of childhood poverty. Furthermore, affordable housing projects create jobs in the community, both in the construction phase and ultimately through long-term societal growth.

d. What quantitative and qualitative evidence of inequality exists?

Details: N/A

- 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 Assembly Finance Committee reviewed this request at the March 12, 2022 meeting. The Public Works and Facilities Committee will review this request at the April 11, 2022 meeting.

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

Details: Public hearing on this ordinance will be held on 4/25/22.

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?

YES	NO

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)(AG) An Ordinance Appropriating \$1,500,000 to the Manager for the Information Technology Infrastructure Upgrades Capital Improvement Project; Funding Provided by General Funds.

Introduced: 4/4/22 Public Hearing Date: 4/25/22 SRRC Review Date: 4/5/22

Presented By: Manager Drafted By: Finance

Department/Division: IT/ENG Lead Staff Contact: Rorie Watt/Robert Barr

Purpose of Legislation (background/summary of intent):

This ordinance would appropriate \$1,500,000 of general funds for information technology needs at CBJ, including cyber security and system modernization upgrades that do not fit in the traditional operating budget framework.

Connection to existing legislation:

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

Connection to adopted planning documents:

Capital Improvement Plan

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
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- 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.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------

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: Staying apace with cyber security standards protects CBJ, its employees, and the residents of Juneau. Keeping up with system modernization promotes operational efficiency, as modernized IT systems deliver better performance and better experiences for internal and external customers.

d. What quantitative and qualitative evidence of inequality exists?

Details: N/A

- 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 Assembly Finance Committee reviewed this request at the March 12, 2022 meeting. The Public Works and Facilities Committee will review this request at the April 11, 2022 meeting.

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

Details: Public hearing on this ordinance will be held on 4/25/22.

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				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/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 D	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?

Systemic Racism Review Committee Legislation Review Summary

Serial Number/Title: Ordinance 2021-08(b)(am)(AH) An Ordinance Appropriating \$500,000 to the Manager for the Juneau Police Department Radio System Replacement Capital Improvement Project; Funding Provided by General Funds.

Introduced: 4/4/22 Public Hearing Date: 4/25/22 SRRC Review Date: 4/5/22

Presented By: Manager Drafted By: Finance

Department/Division: JPD/ENG Lead Staff Contact: Rorie Watt/Robert Barr

Purpose of Legislation (background/summary of intent):

The Juneau Police Department owns and maintains a system of radios that is at the end of its useful life. A consultant report estimated new system costs in excess of \$12 million. This ordinance would appropriate \$500,000 for an updated consultant cost estimate and first stages of design and planning for the project.

Connection to existing legislation:

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

Connection to adopted planning documents:

Capital Improvement Plan

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
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- 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.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------

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: Maintaining operable police radios ensures the health and safety of both police officers and Juneau residents and visitors.

d. What quantitative and qualitative evidence of inequality exists?

Details: N/A

- 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 Assembly Finance Committee reviewed this request at the March 12, 2022 meeting. The Public Works and Facilities Committee will review this request at the April 11, 2022 meeting.

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

Details: Public hearing on this ordinance will be held on 4/25/22.

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				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/McGinnr	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 D	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?

Systemic Racism Review Committee Legislation Review Summary

Serial Number/Title: Ordinance 2021-08(b)(am)(AI) An Ordinance Appropriating \$1,000,000 to the Manager as Local Match for the Lemon Creek Multimodal Path Capital Improvement Project; Funding Provided by General Funds.

Introduced: 4/4/22 Public Hearing Date: 4/25/22 SRRC Review Date: 4/5/22

Presented By: Manager Drafted By: Finance

Department/Division: Engineering Lead Staff Contact: Katie Koester

Purpose of Legislation (background/summary of intent):

This ordinance would appropriate \$1,000,000 of general funds as local match for the Lemon Creek Multimodal Path capital improvement project. This project is ranked highest on CBJ's FY23 Legislative Priority List, and may be a good candidate for grant funding that is likely to require a local match.

Connection to existing legislation:

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

Connection to adopted planning documents:

FY23 Legislative Priority List
Capital Improvement Plan

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
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- 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.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------

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: Funding the Lemon Creek multimodal path project will promote the health and safety of Juneau residents who use the path, as it provides a means of transportation (walking, biking, etc.) that is not adjacent to the road. Use of this path is accessible to everyone.

d. What quantitative and qualitative evidence of inequality exists?

Details: N/A

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 Assembly Finance Committee reviewed this request at the March 12, 2022 meeting. The Public Works and Facilities Committee will review this request at the April 11, 2022 meeting.

g. Has public input been received?

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

Details: Public hearing on this ordinance will be held on 4/25/22.

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 2021-08(b)(am)(AJ) An Ordinance Appropriating \$6,300,000 to the Manager for the New City Hall Capital Improvement Project; Funding Provided by General Funds.

Introduced: 4/4/22 Public Hearing Date: 4/25/22 SRRC Review Date: 4/5/22

Presented By: Manager Drafted By: Finance

Department/Division: Engineering/Manager Office Lead Staff Contact: Katie Koester

Purpose of Legislation (background/summary of intent):

This ordinance would appropriate \$6,300,000 of general funds as initial funding for the New City Hall capital improvement project. Although the Assembly has not made final decisions on replacing or renovating the current city hall, appropriating these funds now will ensure funding is available to move the project forward once final decisions have been made. This project is ranked #4 on CBJ's FY23 Legislative Priority List.

Connection to existing legislation:

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

Connection to adopted planning documents:

FY23 Legislative Priority List
Capital Improvement Plan

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
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- 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.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------

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: Replacing or renovating the current city hall ensures employees and residents have a safe and healthy place to work and seek public services. Renovating or replacing city hall will create jobs in the

community and has the potential to save CBJ annual costs from leasing buildings downtown for employees who do not currently have offices in city hall.

d. What quantitative and qualitative evidence of inequality exists?

Details: N/A

- 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 Assembly Finance Committee reviewed this request at the March 12, 2022 meeting. The Public Works and Facilities Committee will review this request at the April 11, 2022 meeting.

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

Details: Public hearing on this ordinance will be held on 4/25/22.
CBJ's Engineering and Public Works Department conducted a survey of more than 1300 people relating to the new City Hall concept. The results of this survey can be reviewed [here](#).

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/McGinn	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:

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 2021-08(b)(am)(AK) An Ordinance Appropriating \$250,000 to the Manager for the North Douglas Crossing Capital Improvement Project; Funding Provided by General Funds.

Introduced: 4/4/22 Public Hearing Date: 4/25/22 SRRC Review Date: 4/5/22

Presented By: Manager Drafted By: Finance

Department/Division: Engineering/Manager's Office Lead Staff Contact: Katie Koester

Purpose of Legislation (background/summary of intent):

This ordinance would appropriate \$250,000 of general funds towards the planning stage of the North Douglas Crossing capital improvement project. This project is ranked #2 on CBJ's FY23 Legislative Priority List.

Connection to existing legislation:

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

Connection to adopted planning documents:

FY23 Legislative Priority List
Capital Improvement Plan
Comprehensive Plan

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
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- 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.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------

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: A second crossing to Douglas Island would have positive impacts on Juneau's economy through the creation of jobs and potential expanded growth of West Douglas. Benefits also include

reduction of greenhouse gases through provision of a more direct route across the channel between Douglas and the Valley. A second crossing also ensures the safety of Douglas residents by providing an alternate means of accessing the mainland if the current Douglas bridge were to close, as well as means for providing quicker access for emergency services.

d. What quantitative and qualitative evidence of inequality exists?

Details: N/A

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 Assembly Finance Committee reviewed this request at the March 12, 2022 meeting. The Public Works and Facilities Committee will review this request at the April 11, 2022 meeting.

g. Has public input been received?

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

Details: Public hearing on this ordinance will be held on 4/25/22. The McDowell Group conducted a public survey on a second crossing on CBJ's behalf in 2018. The results of this survey can be reviewed [here](#).

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 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 D	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?

YES	NO

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?

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 2021-08(b)(am)(AL) An Ordinance Appropriating \$1,300,000 to the Manager as a Grant to United Human Services of SE Alaska to Construct the Southeast Community Services Center; Funding Provided by General Funds.

Introduced: 4/4/22 Public Hearing Date: 4/25/22 SRRC Review Date: 4/5/22

Presented By: Manager Drafted By: Finance

Department/Division: Mayor & Assembly Lead Staff Contact: Rorie Watt/Robert Barr

Purpose of Legislation (background/summary of intent):

The Assembly appropriated \$1,100,000 to United Human Service of SE Alaska in October 2020 to support construction of the Southeast Community Services Center. Since this time, the project has experienced significant cost escalation due to inflation, supply chain issues, and other economic factors. This ordinance would appropriate an additional \$1,300,000 to help address these issues and ensure completion of project construction.

Connection to existing legislation:

As a supplemental appropriation, this ordinance amends FY22 CBJ 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
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- 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.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------

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: Completion of the Southeast Community Services Center promotes the health and wellness of Juneau's more vulnerable populations by providing social services and resources in one centralized

location. This location is also in close proximity to other social service facilities, such as the new Glory Hall.

d. What quantitative and qualitative evidence of inequality exists?

Details: N/A

- 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 Assembly Finance Committee reviewed this request at the March 12, 2022 meeting. The Public Works and Facilities Committee will review this request at the April 11, 2022 meeting.

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

Details: Public hearing on this ordinance will be held on 4/25/22.

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?

YES	NO

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)(AN) An Ordinance Appropriating \$300,000 to the Manager to Replace Lost Revenue in the Downtown Parking Fund; Funding Provided by General Funds.

Introduced: 4/4/22 Public Hearing Date: 4/25/22 SRRC Review Date: 4/5/22

Presented By: Manager Drafted By: Finance

Department/Division: Parks & Rec Lead Staff Contact: George Schaaf

Purpose of Legislation (background/summary of intent):

The Downtown Parking Fund has experienced a significant reduction in revenue as a result of decreased permit sales to tourism companies and employees downtown who largely transitioned to working from home during the pandemic. This ordinance would appropriate \$300,000 of general funds to replace lost revenue in the Downtown Parking Fund and prevent the fund from going negative at the end of FY22. Permit fee increases are also being considered and more information will be presented at the Public Works & Facilities Committee on April 11, 2022.

Connection to existing legislation:

As a supplemental appropriation, this ordinance amends FY22 CBJ 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
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- 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.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------

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: This appropriation ensures that the Downtown Parking Fund is made mostly whole again after adverse financial impacts from the COVID-19 pandemic significantly eroded existing fund balance.

d. What quantitative and qualitative evidence of inequality exists?

Details: N/A

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 hearing on this ordinance will be held on 4/25/22.

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.		Elementary School Boundaries	
CT 1: Auke Bay/Out the Road			CT 3: Mendenhall Valley Airport/ East Valley			Gastineau	Title 1
BG1: Out the road	11.9%		BG1: N. of Jennifer	42.5%		Harborview	Title 1
BG2: Lena area	15.5%		BG 2: Glacier Valley	39.8%		Glacier Valley	Title 1
BG3: Montanna Creek	14.5%		BG 3: Airport	40.8%		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			Lower Income Housing Areas	
BG1: Mendenhall Taki	27.8%		BG 1: DZ/Freds	60.9%		Chinook/Coho	
BG2: Upper Riverside	23.1%		BG 2: Davis	45.0%		Cedar Park Area	
BG 3: Portage/McGinn	33.7%		BG 3: Belardi Costco	63.8%		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 2022-06 An Ordinance Appropriating Funds from the Treasury for FY23 City and Borough Operations.

Introduced: 4/4/22 Public Hearing Date: 4/25/22, 6/13/22 SRRC Review Date: 4/5/22

Presented By: Manager Drafted By: Finance

Department/Division: City-Wide Lead Staff Contact: Jeff Rogers

Purpose of Legislation (background/summary of intent):

This ordinance appropriates \$430,907,100 in expenditure authority for the City and Borough of Juneau's FY23 operating budget, excluding the School District. This ordinance appropriates all transfers between funds that support operations, debt service and capital projects as well as the associated expenditures within the funds themselves.

This ordinance also recognizes \$423,752,800 of forecast revenue and transfers-in and decreases fund balances, across all funds, by \$7,154,300. The forecast revenue and draw from fund balance are sufficient to fund the budgeted expenditures. Budgeted expenditures and revenues will be reviewed in detail with the Finance Committee during the budget process in April and May.

The Charter requires that a public hearing be held on the FY23 operating budget by May 1, 2022, and the ordinance be adopted by June 15, 2022.

Connection to existing legislation:

N/A

Connection to adopted planning documents:

The FY23 Manager's Proposed Budget Book accompanies this ordinance.

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: This ordinance provides appropriation authority for CBJ's operations in FY23.

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

Details: N/A

- 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 Assembly Finance Committee will review the FY23 budget during the months of April and May.

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

Details: Public hearing on this ordinance will be held on 4/25/22 and again on 6/13/22 prior to adoption.

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 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 D	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?

YES	NO

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?

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 2022-07 An Ordinance Appropriating Funds from the Treasury for FY23 School District Operations.

Introduced: 4/4/22 Public Hearing Date: 4/25/22, 6/13/22 SRRC Review Date: 4/5/22

Presented By: Manager Drafted By: Finance

Department/Division: School District Lead Staff Contact: Dr. Bridget Weiss

Purpose of Legislation (background/summary of intent):

This ordinance will appropriate to the School District an FY23 operating budget of \$86,659,000. This is an overall decrease in the budget of \$5,737,600 from the FY22 Amended Budget. The FY23 school budget is supported with a combination of funding sources including CBJ local funding of \$30,608,500 and state and federal funding of \$51,389,400. The local funding consists of \$28,491,200 for general operations and \$2,117,300 for programs and activities not subject to the state funding cap.

State statute requires the Assembly to determine the total amount of local educational funding support to be provided and provide notification of the support to the School Board within 30 days of the School District's budget submission. The district's budget was submitted April 1, 2022. To meet this timing provision, it is necessary for the Assembly to determine the amount of funding and provide notice in the month of April. This amount cannot subsequently be reduced, unless the amount exceeds the State funding cap, but it can be increased. If the Assembly does not set the amount and furnish the School Board with notice within 30 days, the amount requested by the School District is automatically approved. By Charter, the Assembly is required to appropriate the School District's budget no later than May 31, 2022.

On April 25, 2022, a meeting is scheduled for the Assembly to state, by motion, the amount of local funding to be provided to the School District.

Connection to existing legislation:

N/A

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?

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

Details: This ordinance provides appropriation authority for the School District's operations in FY23.

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

Details: N/A

- 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 Assembly Finance Committee will review the School District's FY23 budget during the months of April and May.

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

Details: Public hearing on this ordinance will be held on 4/25/22 and again on 6/13/22 prior to adoption.

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					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 D	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?

Systemic Racism Review Committee Legislation Review Summary

Serial Number/Title: Ordinance 2022-08 An Ordinance Establishing the Rate of Levy for Property Taxes for Calendar Year 2022 Based Upon the Proposed Budget for Fiscal Year 2023.

Introduced: 4/4/22 Public Hearing Date: 4/25/22, 6/13/22 SRRC Review Date: 4/5/22

Presented By: Manager Drafted By: Finance

Department/Division: Finance Lead Staff Contact: Jeff Rogers

Purpose of Legislation (background/summary of intent):

This ordinance establishes the mill rates for property taxes for 2022, which funds a significant portion of the City and Borough of Juneau's FY23 operating budget. The Charter requires the Assembly to adopt, by ordinance, the tax levies necessary to fund the budget before June 15.

The mill levies presented in this ordinance support the Manager's FY23 Proposed Budget that will be reviewed by the Assembly Finance Committee (AFC). As part of the budget review process, the AFC reviews, amends and recommends to the Assembly the final mill levies.

For FY23, the operating mill rate is set to increase by 0.10 mills for a total proposed mill levy of 10.66, the components of which are:

Operating Mill Rate by Service Area	Millage	Change from FY22 Adopted
Roaded Service Area	2.45	-
Fire Service Area	0.31	-
Areawide	6.70	0.10
Operating Total	9.46	0.10
Debt Service	1.20	-
Total	10.66	0.10

Connection to existing legislation:

This ordinance impacts the revenue projections in draft Ordinance 2022-06 (CBJ FY23 budget).

Connection to adopted planning documents:

N/A

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

YES	NO
-----	----

- 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:

- 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: This legislation establishes the mill rate for only one year. During this year, property owners in Juneau pay property taxes based on the adopted mill rate by the Assembly.

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

Details: N/A

- 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 Assembly Finance Committee will review the FY23 budget during the months of April and May.

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

Details: Public hearing on this ordinance will be held on 4/25/22 and again on 6/13/22 prior to adoption.

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					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 D	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?

Systemic Racism Review Committee Legislation Review Summary

Serial Number/Title: Resolution 2975 A Resolution Adopting the City and Borough Capital Improvement Program for Fiscal Years 2023 through 2028, and Establishing the Capital Improvement Project Priorities for Fiscal Year 2023.

Introduced: 4/4/22 Public Hearing Date: 4/25/22, 6/13/22 SRRC Review Date: 4/5/22

Presented By: Manager Drafted By: Engineering

Department/Division: Engineering Lead Staff Contact: John Bohan/Katie Koester

Purpose of Legislation (background/summary of intent):

This resolution would adopt the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for Fiscal Years 2023 through 2028, as required by Charter Section 9.4, and lists the capital projects that will be initially appropriated by ordinance in FY23.

Connection to existing legislation:

N/A

Connection to adopted planning documents:

Capital Improvement Plan

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: Identifying and completing priority capital projects promotes economic growth in Juneau through the creation of jobs, and helps develop public spaces that provide a variety of community benefits, including safe transportation, recreational opportunities, and infrastructure maintenance and development.

d. What quantitative and qualitative evidence of inequality exists?

Details: N/A

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 Public Works and Facilities Committee reviewed the preliminary CIP at its March 7, 2022 meeting and forwarded the plan to the Assembly. The Planning Commission will review the preliminary CIP at its April 12, 2022 meeting.

g. Has public input been received?

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

Details: Public hearing on this ordinance will be held on 4/25/22 and again on 6/13/22 prior to adoption.

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 within 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?

YES	NO

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?