

Systemic Racism Review Committee Legislation Review Summary

Serial Number/Title: Ordinance 2022-22 An Ordinance Amending the City and Borough of Juneau Code Related to the Aquatic Board of Directors.

Introduced: 8/29 Public Hearing Date: 9/12 SRRC Review Date: 8/30

Presented By: R. Palmer Drafted By: R. Palmer

Department/Division: Manager/P&R Lead Staff Contact: R. Barr

Purpose of Legislation (background/summary of intent):

At a recent meeting, the Aquatics Board requested two changes – reduction of the number of seats from 9 to 7 and elimination of the provision that limits the number of seats able to be held by members of formal aquatics organizations (e.g. Glacier Swim Club). The Assembly Human Resources Committee reviewed this request and approved the seat reduction and increased, but did not eliminate, the represented organization seats from two to three. A staff memo and aquatics board memo on this topic were provided to the Assembly HRC and both are included in the SRRC packet for this item.

Connection to existing legislation:

--

Connection to adopted planning documents:

--

*****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/McGinnr	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%					Kodzhooff 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:

- 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:

YES	NO

Step Four: What solutions could remedy the legislation's implications in perpetuating systemic racism? Check all that apply:

<input type="checkbox"/>	Recommend additional public input be gathered (Neighborhood/census block meetings, assembly/ committee meetings)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Recommend that the legislation move forward with accountability measures (sunset provisions, 6 mo./annual review of impacts/implications for system racism.) to monitor impact.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Propose revised language to strengthen the legislation or the legislation or regulations cross-referenced within the proposed legislation.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Recommend the proposed legislation not move forward.
<input type="checkbox"/>	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?