Systemic Racism Review Committee Legislation Review Summary

Serial Number/Title: Resolution 3002 A Resolution Expressing Support for the United States Department of Justice, Office of Justice Program, FY22 Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG). Introduced: 10/24/22 Public Hearing Date: N/A SRRC Review Date: 10/25/22 Presented By: Manager Drafted By: Finance Lead Staff Contact: <u>Ed</u> Mercer Department/Division: JPD Purpose of Legislation (background/summary of intent): The Juneau Police Department has been awarded \$37,362 in grant funding from the U.S. Department of Justice for training and equipment. This grant will provide funding for select staff to attend the Alaska Conference on Child Maltreatment and International Association of Chiefs of Police Technology Conference. Equipment funding provides for patrol vehicle vaults, explosive ordnance disposal hook and line kit, and uniform inventory software. No local match is required for this grant. Connection to existing legislation: Budget authority for this grant was appropriated via CBJ FY23 Budget Ordinance 2022-06(b). Connection to adopted planning documents: N/A Step One: What is the impact of the proposed legislation? YES NO Does the proposed legislation negatively impact or unduly advantage a particular a. 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: The Assembly's support of this grant ensures JPD can be awarded the funds. JPD intends to use these funds towards child maltreatment and police technology training, as well as equipment needs identified by the department. Increased training for Juneau's officers helps ensure the highest level of care and protection for Juneau's residents and visitors.

d. What quantitative and qualitative evidence of inequality exists?

ı	_	_	١-	: 1	٦
ı	J	ല	га	ш	S

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

Details:

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

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

Step Three: Who is affected by the Proposed Legislation?

_	11/ha	250	+ h a	impacted	ara	<i> </i> ~ '	١٦
а.	VVII()	are	1110	impacieo	Proun	١,	ır

\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 T	Fract/Block Groups	Minority	Census Tra	act/Block Gr	rouns	Minority	Census T	ract/Block (Frouns	Minority	Elementary Sch	ool Boundarie
		Pop.	Consus III	Joseph C.		Pop.		lucy Brook t		Pop.	Gastineau	Title 1
CT 1: Auk	ke Bay/Out the Road		CT 3: Meno	denhall Vall	ley Airpo	rt/ East Valley	CT 5: Dov	vntown			Harborview	Title 1
	BG1: Out the road	11.9%		BG1: N. of J	lennifer	42.5%		BG 1: High	lands	20.6%	Glacier Valley	Title 1
	BG2: Lena area	15.5%		BG 2: Glacie	er Valley	39.8%		BG2: DT/S	tarr Hill	24.8%	Mendenhall Riv	er
	BG3: Montanna Cree	k 14.5%		BG 3: Airpo	rt	40.8%		BG 3: Flats	/Village	30.8%	Riverbend	Title 1
	BG4: Fritz Cove area	10.1%		BG 4: Radcl	iffe	24.6%					Auke Bay	
CT 2: Me	ndenhall Valley with	n the Loop	CT 4: Salmo	on Creek/Le	emon Cre	ek					Lower Income F	ousing Areas
	BG1: Mendenhall Tal	α 27.8%		BG 1: DZ/Fr	eds	60.9%	CT 5: Dou	ıglas 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/McGin	r 33.7%		BG 3: Belard	di Costco	63.8%		BG 2: Wes	t Juneau	28.0%	Gruening Park A	rea
	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/V	ir 41.2%									Kodzhoff Area	
											Douglas Hwy Co	rridor

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	S:	

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?