# Systemic Racism Review Committee Legislation Review Summary

Serial Number/Title: **Ordinance 2022-06(b)(AA)** An Ordinance Appropriating \$3,164,401 to the Manager for the Power Upgrades for Electric Buses Capital Improvement Project; Grant Funding Provided by the Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities.

Introduc	uced: <u>12/12/2022</u> Public Hearing Date: <u>1/9/2023</u> SRRC Review Date: <u>12/13</u>	/2022
Presente	ted By: Manager Drafted By: Finance	
Departm	ment/Division: Capital Transit Lead Staff Contact: Denise Koch	
Purpose	e of Legislation (background/summary of intent):	
funding of Tran	ordinance would appropriate \$3,164,401 to the Power Upgrades for Electric Buses CIP. Going is comprised of Federal Transit Administration funds passed through the Alaska Depainsportation and Public Facilities. The local match requirement of \$558,425 is being metously appropriated funds in the Power Upgrades for Electric Buses CIP.	rtment
Connect	ction to existing legislation:	
Connect	ction to adopted planning documents:	
<u>Capital</u>	al Improvement Plan	
Step On	ne: What is the impact of the proposed legislation?	
ı	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
	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	wo: How does the legislation perpetuate systemic racism?	
ŀ	<ul><li>a. What are potential unintended consequences?</li><li>b. What benefits may result?</li><li>c. What is the potential long term impact of the proposed legislation?</li></ul>	
Details	ls:	

I:\Clerks Office\Advisory Boards\Systemic Racism Review Committee-SRRC\2022-12-13 SRRC Meeting\SRRC Tool\_2022-06(b)(AA).docx

d. What quantitative and qualitative evidence of inequality exists?

Details:
----------

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

Details: The Public Works and Facilities Committee will review this request at the December 19, 2022 meeting.

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

Details: Public comment on this ordinance will be held on January 9, 2023.

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

a.	W/ho	are the	impacted	ground	(<)	1
a.	VVIIO	are the	IIIIpacteu	group	<b>,</b> > <i>l</i>	, :

$\square$ White $\square$ Black or African American	☐ American Indian or Alaska Native
☐ Asian ☐ Native Hawaiian or Pacific Is	slander $\Box$ Two or more races $\Box$ Other

b. Are there impacts on specific geographic areas?

Race Considerations - Total Community is 69.7% White Only - 30.3% Minority						Economic Considerations					
Census 1	Tract/Block Groups	Minority	Census Tra	act/Block Groups	Minority	Census Tra	ct/Block (	Groups	Minority	Elementary School	Boundarie
		Pop.		· .	Pop.			·	Pop.	Gastineau	Title 1
CT 1: Au	ike Bay/Out the Road		CT 3: Mendenhall Valley Airport/ East Valley		CT 5: Dowr	ntown			Harborview	Title 1	
	BG1: Out the road	11.9%		BG1: N. of Jennifer	42.5%		BG 1: High	lands	20.6%	Glacier Valley	Title 1
	BG2: Lena area	15.5%		BG 2: Glacier Valley	5 39.8%		BG2: DT/S	tarr Hill	24.8%	Mendenhall River	
	BG3: Montanna Creek	14.5%		BG 3: Airport	40.8%		BG 3: Flats	/Village	30.8%	Riverbend	Title 1
	BG4: Fritz Cove area	10.1%		BG 4: Radcliffe	24.6%					Auke Bay	
CT 2: Me	endenhall Valley withn	the Loop	CT 4: Salm	on Creek/Lemon Cr	eek					Lower Income Hou	sing Areas
	BG1: Mendenhall Tak	27.8%		BG 1: DZ/Freds	60.9%	CT 5: Doug	las Island			Chinook/Coho	
	BG2: Upper Riverside	23.1%		BG 2: Davis	45.0%		BG 1: Nort	h Douglas	15.9%	Cedar Park Area	
	BG 3: Portage/McGini	33.7%		BG 3: Belardi Costco	63.8%		BG 2: Wes	t Juneau	28.0%	Gruening Park Are	a
	BG 4: Long Run	19.6%		BG 4: Twin Lakes	25.9%		BG 3: Crov	v Hill/ DT D	27.6%	Switzer Area	
	BG 5:Glacierwood/Vii	r 41.2%								Kodzhoff Area	
										Douglas Hwy Corri	dor

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:

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

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

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

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

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