

Systemic Racism Review Committee Legislation Review Summary

Serial Number/Title: **Ordinance 2022-06(b)(Q)** An Ordinance Appropriating \$1,185,900 to the Manager for the Hospital CT/MRI Replacement Capital Improvement Project; Funding Provided by Hospital Funds.

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

Presented By: Manager Drafted By: Finance

Department/Division: Hospital/ENG Lead Staff Contact: Bob Tyk/Katie Koester

Purpose of Legislation (background/summary of intent):

This ordinance would appropriate \$1,185,900 of hospital funds for the replacement and installation of one MRI and two CT scanners at Bartlett Regional Hospital. The existing apparatus has reached end of useful life and upgrades to the HVAC, electrical, and magnetic shielding are required for installation of the new equipment. This funding will supplement the original project appropriation of \$2,300,000 in order to award the bid, which came in 65%-75% above the Architect's estimate.

Connection to existing legislation:

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

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: Replacement of the CT and MRI scanner machines will ensure the equipment is in good working order when needed, promoting the health and safety of patients.

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 Hospital Board reviewed this request at the August 23, 2022 meeting and the Hospital Finance Committee will review this request at the September 9, 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 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				Lower Income Housing Areas	
BG1: Mendenhall Taki	27.8%	BG 1: DZ/Freds	60.9%	CT 5: Douglas Island		Chinook/Coho	
BG2: Upper Riverside	23.1%	BG 2: Davis	45.0%	BG 1: North Douglas	15.9%	Cedar Park Area	
BG 3: Portage/McGinn	33.7%	BG 3: Belardi Costco	63.8%	BG 2: West Juneau	28.0%	Gruening Park Area	
BG 4: Long Run	19.6%	BG 4: Twin Lakes	25.9%	BG 3: Crow Hill/ DT D	27.6%	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?