

## Systemic Racism Review Committee Legislation Review Summary

Serial Number/Title: **Ordinance 2022-06(b)(L)** An Ordinance Appropriating \$187,442 to the Manager for the Design Phase of the Gate 5 Passenger Boarding Bridge Capital Improvement Project; Funding Provided by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Airport Improvement Program (AIP) Grant.

Introduced: 8/29/22 Public Hearing Date: 9/12/22 SRRC Review Date: 8/30/22

Presented By: Manager Drafted By: Finance

Department/Division: Airport Lead Staff Contact: Patty Wahto

Purpose of Legislation (background/summary of intent):

This ordinance would appropriate \$187,442 in Airport Improvement Program grant funding for the Gate 5 Passenger Boarding Bridge CIP. This funding would provide for the design phase of acquisition and installation of a new passenger boarding bridge. The local match requirement will be provided by previously appropriated 1% sales tax funds in the Gate 5 Passenger Boarding Bridge CIP.

Connection to existing legislation:

As a supplemental appropriation, this ordinance amends FY23 CBJ Budget Ordinance 2022-06.

Connection to adopted planning documents:

N/A

### 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: This project will replace the current 21-year old passenger boarding bridge at Gate 5. Installation of a new passenger boarding bridge ensures passenger's safety when loading onto or off a plane.

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: The Airport Board reviewed this request at the August 11, 2022 meeting. The Public Works and Facilities Committee reviewed this request at the June 6, 2022 meeting.

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

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

### 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:**

<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?