## Systemic Racism Review Committee Legislation Review Summary

Serial Number/Title: **Ordinance 2022-06(b)(V)** An Ordinance Transferring \$200,000 from CIP W75-061 Douglas Highway Water - David to I St. to CIP R72-141 Hospital Drive Improvements.

Introduc	ced: <u>11/21/22</u> Public Hearing Date: <u>12/12/22</u> S	SRRC Review Date: 11/22/22	
Present	ed By: Manager Dra	fted By: <u>Finance</u>	
Departn	nent/Division: Water/ENG	Lead Staff Contact: John Bohar	1
Purpose	of Legislation (background/summary of intent):		
and the allow t will con	quest would provide \$200,000 in funding to remedy e proposed Bartlett Regional Hospital Emergency De he waterline to be upgraded and relocated away fro nnect the new water systems completed from other project is complete and in the process of being close	epartment (ED) Addition. The funding om the proposed ED Addition. This recent projects. The Douglas High	ng will work
Connect	ion to existing legislation:		
As a su	pplemental appropriation, this ordinance amends F	Y23 CBJ Budget Ordinance 2022-06	(b).
Connect	ion to adopted planning documents:		
Capital	Improvement Plan		
Step On	e: What is the impact of the proposed legislation?	_	
a.	Does the proposed legislation negatively impact or racial/ethnic group or otherwise perpetuate system If No, review is completed. If yes, go on to the next	unduly advantage a particular iic racism?	YES NO
b.	Does the legislation work to mitigate and/or eliminal of Yes, review is completed. If No, or Undetermined, remaining steps.		
Step Tw	o: How does the legislation perpetuate systemic ra	acism?	
	<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 present of the present</li></ul>	roposed legislation?	
Details	:		

I:\Clerks Office\Advisory Boards\Systemic Racism Review Committee-SRRC\2022-11-22 SRRC Meeting\SRRC Tool\_2022-06(b)(V).docx

d. What quantitative and qualitative evidence of inequality exists?

5	
Details:	
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 reviewed this request at the November 7, 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 December 12, 2022.

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

a.	Who	are	the	impacted	ground	(5)	١.
a.	V V I I U	aic	uic	IIIIpacteu	group	0	, :

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

b. Are there impacts on specific geographic areas?

Race Considerations - Total Community is 69.7% White Only - 30.3% Minority							Economic Considerations				
Census 1	Fract/Block Groups	Minority	Census Trac	t/Block Groups	Minority	Census T	Fract/Block G	Frouns	Minority	Flementary Sci	nool Boundarie
CCIIJUJ I	Тиссу Біоск Стоирз	Pop.	Census muc	Ly Diock Groups	Pop.	CCIISUS I	Tucky Block C	Jioups	Pop.	Gastineau	Title 1
CT 1: Aul	ke Bay/Out the Road		CT 3: Mendenhall Valley Airport/ East Valley		CT 5: Downtown			·	Harborview	Title 1	
	BG1: Out the road	11.9%	В	G1: N. of Jennifer	42.5%		BG 1: High	lands	20.6%	Glacier Valley	Title 1
	BG2: Lena area	15.5%	В	G 2: Glacier Valley	\$ 39.8%		BG2: DT/S	tarr Hill	24.8%	Mendenhall Ri	ver
	BG3: Montanna Cree	ek 14.5%	В	G 3: Airport	40.8%		BG 3: Flats	/Village	30.8%	Riverbend	Title 1
	BG4: Fritz Cove area	10.1%	В	G 4: Radcliffe	24.6%					Auke Bay	
CT 2: Me	ndenhall Valley with	in the Loop	CT 4: Salmo	n Creek/Lemon Cre	eek					Lower Income	Housing Areas
	BG1: Mendenhall Ta	ıkı 27.8%	В	G 1: DZ/Freds	60.9%	CT 5: Dou	uglas Island			Chinook/Coho	
	BG2: Upper Riversid	e 23.1%	В	G 2: Davis	45.0%		BG 1: Nort	h Douglas	15.9%	Cedar Park Are	a
	BG 3: Portage/McGi	nr 33.7%	В	G 3: Belardi Costco	63.8%		BG 2: Wes	t Juneau	28.0%	Gruening Park	Area
	BG 4: Long Run	19.6%	В	G 4: Twin Lakes	25.9%		BG 3: Crov	v Hill/ DT D	27.6%	Switzer Area	
	BG 5:Glacierwood/V	/ir 41.2%								Kodzhoff Area	
										Douglas Hwy C	orridor

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?