Systemic Racism Review Committee
Legislation Review Summary

Serial Number/Title: **Ordinance 2023-10** An Ordinance Amending the Official Zoning Map of the City and Borough to Change the Zoning of Tidelands Addition to the City of Juneau, Block 68, Lot 8 Fractions, Lots 9, 10, 11, 12 Fraction, 12A, 13, and 14 Fraction; Tidelands Addition to the City of Juneau, Block 74, Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9; Tidelands Addition to the City of Juneau, Block 75, Lot A; Juneau Subport Lot A, and USS 3566, Lot 3 Fraction and 2A Fraction; from Mixed Use 2 (MU2) to Mixed Use (MU).

Introduced: 2/27/2023 Public Hearing Date: 3/20/2023 SRRC Review Date: 2/28/2023

Presented By: City Manager Drafted By: Law

Department/Division: Community Development/Planning Lead Staff Contact: Irene Gallion, Sr. Planner

Purpose of Legislation (background/summary of intent):

This ordinance is one of two proposing rezone in the Aak'w Kwan District. The two ordinances are intentionally separate so either case may proceed on its own merits.

This ordinance would rezone 6.6 acres in the Aak'w Kwan District MU2 to MU. This project proposes a westward extension of less-restrictive MU zoning to encompass Centennial Hall, the Juneau Arts and Culture Center, Zach Gordon Youth Center, the proposed location of the new City Hall, and the Four Points Sheraton. This area includes the 5.7 acres in the original application from the City and Borough of Juneau and a staff-proposed expansion of 0.9 acres. CDD held a public meeting on December 6, 2022, and one member of the public attended.

CDD Staff Report for AME22-08 Rezone – Planning Commission Meeting on Feb. 14, 2023

A 15-minute video summarizing the project can be viewed on the CBJ YouTube Channel: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oEAFc3lKX8Y

Connection to existing legislation:

Pages six and seven of the staff report details of how MU zoning would modify development standards. In summary, the proposed zoning has zero setbacks from the lot line, no limit on lot coverage, and no limit on height (for a caveat to height standards, see the box below). There is no limit to density under the proposed zoning.

Connection to adopted planning documents:

Pages 10 and 11 of the staff report provide analysis of plan conformity.

While MU has no height restrictions, future CDD and Commission decisions would be moderated through the Willoughby District Land Use Plan. Height limitations in the plan preserve natural light along Village Street, and water views from Calhoun Avenue and Distin Street.

The proposed rezone reduces zoning setbacks, facilitating canopies over sidewalks and improving pedestrian experience.

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: a) Proposed development of CBJ lands could be more intense than discussed in public forums so far. Develop-ability of land, coupled with value, could pressure Zach Gordon to move.
b) CBJ and private land owners would be able to more highly utilize lands they own or control.
c) Increased mixed use development in the Aak'w Kwan District.

d. What quantitative and qualitative evidence of inequality exists?

Details: If rezone of this land is approved and rezone of predominantly native land to the north is NOT approved, the reasons should be examined.

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: CDD conducted a public meeting on December 6, 2022 (staff report, **Attachment G**). One member of the public attended. The attendee's concern was to protect the view from his residence on Dixon Avenue. The attendee was comfortable with the limitations of the Willoughby District Land Use Plan.

CDD conducted a public comment period between December 12, 2022 and January 12, 2023 (staff report, **Attachment I**). Public notice was mailed to property owners within 500 feet of the proposed rezone. A public notice sign was also posted on-site two weeks prior to the scheduled hearing (staff report, **Attachment J).** Property owners within the rezone area received a letter advising them of the rezone and providing public meeting materials (staff report, **Attachment K**).

An e mail was sent to Marriot Franchise group regarding the possibility of rezoning their Four Corners property (staff report, **Attachment L**). Staff sent Marriott the letter to property owners, discussed above.

No public comments were received for analysis in the staff report.

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

Details: One member of the public attended the public meeting. The attendee's concern was to protect the view from his residence on Dixon Street. The attendee was comfortable with the limitations of the Willoughby District Land Use Plan.

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							
BG1: Mendenhall Taku	27.8%		BG 1: DZ/Freds	60.9%		CT 5: Douglas Island			**Lower Income Housing Areas**	
BG2: Upper Riverside	23.1%		BG 2: Davis	45.0%		BG 1: North Douglas	15.9%		Chinook/Coho	
BG 3: Portage/McGinn	33.7%		BG 3: Belardi Costco	63.8%		BG 2: West Juneau	28.0%		Cedar Park Area	
BG 4: Long Run	19.6%		BG 4: Twin Lakes	25.9%		BG 3: Crow Hill/ DT D	27.6%		Gruening Park Area	
BG 5:Glacierwood/Vir	41.2%								Switzer Area	
									Kodzhoff Area	
									Douglas Hwy Corridor	

YES	NO

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?

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?