Systemic Racism Review Committee Legislation Review Summary

Serial Number/Title: **Ordinance 2022-06(b)(O)** An Ordinance Appropriating \$2,400,000 to the Manager for the Purchase of the Family Practice Building at 10301 Glacier Highway; Funding Provided by Hospital Funds.

Introdu	ced: <u>8/29/22</u> Public Hearing Date:	<u>9/12/22 </u>	C Review Date:	8/30/22	
Present	red By: Manager	_ Drafted By:	Finance/Law		
Departi	ment/Division: <u>Hospital</u>	_ Lead Staff Cor	ntact: <u>Rob Pa</u>	almer	
Purpose	e of Legislation (background/summary o	f intent):			
ensure currer medic	tt Regional Hospital desires to acquire the the hospital has space to expand into a atly houses multiple established medical al care for people that live in the Mende le easy access to specialty care practition	s the demand for med practices, and it would nhall Valley. The hospi	ical care increase I provide conveni tal would like to	es. This propo ient access t	erty
Connec	tion to existing legislation:				
As a si	upplemental appropriation, this ordinand	ce amends FY23 CBJ Bu	idget Ordinance	2022-06(b).	
Connec	tion to adopted planning documents:				
Bartle	tt Regional Hospital Facilities Master Pla	n			
Step Or	ne: What is the impact of the proposed	legislation?			
				YES	NO
a.	Does the proposed legislation negativel racial/ethnic group or otherwise perpet			lar	
	If No, review is completed. If yes, go on	to the next question:			
b.	Does the legislation work to mitigate ar	nd/or eliminate structu	ral racism		
	If Yes, review is completed. If No, or Un remaining steps.	determined, continue t	hrough the		

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: Easier access to medical care for Juneau's community, as well as specialty care practitioners being located closer to patients' homes.

d. What quantitative and qualitative evidence of inequality exists?

Deta	•	I
LIPTA	ш	ıc.
DCta	ш	IJ.

- 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: This request was reviewed by the Lands, Housing and Economic Development Committee at the March 7, 2022 meeting. This request was reviewed by the Hospital Board at the February 22, 2022 meeting. The Hospital Board recommended the purchase of the building at the August 23, 2022 meeting.

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

Details: Public hearing on this ordinance will be held on September 12, 2022.

Step Three: Who is affected by the Proposed Legislation?

a.	Who	are	the	impacted	ground	(5)	17
u.	***	uic	UIIC	IIIIpactca	SICUPI		, .

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

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	Census Tr	ract/Block Groups	Minority	Census Tract/	Block Groups	Minority	Elementary School	Roundarie
census	Tructy Block Groups	Pop.	CCIISUS 11	lacty block Groups	Pop.	census macy	Siock Groups	Pop.	Gastineau	Title 1
CT 1: Au	ke Bay/Out the Road		CT 3: Men	ndenhall Valley Airpo		CT 5: Downtov	vn		Harborview	Title 1
	BG1: Out the road	11.9%		BG1: N. of Jennifer	42.5%	BG	1: Highlands	20.6%	Glacier Valley	Title 1
	BG2: Lena area	15.5%		BG 2: Glacier Valley	5 39.8%	BG2	: DT/Starr Hill	24.8%	Mendenhall River	
	BG3: Montanna Creel	k 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	non Creek/Lemon Cr	eek				Lower Income House	sing Areas
	BG1: Mendenhall Tak	27.8%		BG 1: DZ/Freds	60.9%	CT 5: Douglas	sland		Chinook/Coho	
	BG2: Upper Riverside	23.1%		BG 2: Davis	45.0%	BG	1: North Douglas	15.9%	Cedar Park Area	
	BG 3: Portage/McGini	r 33.7%		BG 3: Belardi Costco	63.8%	BG	2: West Juneau	28.0%	Gruening Park Area	9
	BG 4: Long Run	19.6%		BG 4: Twin Lakes	25.9%	BG	3: Crow Hill/ DT	C 27.6%	Switzer Area	
	BG 5:Glacierwood/Vi	r 41.2%							Kodzhoff Area	
									Douglas Hwy Corric	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?