

Systemic Racism Review Committee Legislation Review Summary

Serial Number/Title: **Ordinance 2022-39** An Ordinance Amending Prohibited Acts within the Boat Harbor Related to Dogs and Other Domestic Animals.

Introduced: 9/26/22 Public Hearing Date: 10/24/22 SRRC Review Date: 10/25/2022

Presented By: Carl Uchtyl, Port Director Drafted By: Carl Uchtyl

Department/Division: Docks & Harbors Lead Staff Contact: Carl Uchtyl

Purpose of Legislation (background/summary of intent):

Docks & Harbors wishes to amend CBJC 85.25.090 language to allow dogs (and other domestic animals) access on harbor floats. Currently only dogs with harbor patrons, owning their vessels (and their guests), are allowed on harbor floats.

Connection to existing legislation:

This expands the ordinance to allow any pedestrian to walk their dog (or domestic animal) without violation on harbor floats, regardless of vessel ownership. The legislation also provides an administrative change describing how one must curb their dog (or domestic animal). The Docks & Harbors Board held a public hearing on this proposed change at an August 25th Special Board meeting with no comments received.

Connection to adopted planning documents:

None.

*****BELOW IS FOR SRRC MEMBERS TO COMPLETE*****

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?

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

Details:

- 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:

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

Details:

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 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:

☐	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?