

SYSTEMIC RACISM REVIEW COMMITTEE THE CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU, ALASKA

May 18, 2021 12:00 PM

Zoom Webinar

Work Session - No Public Testimony Taken During the Meeting

<https://juneau.zoom.us/j/92303909454> or: 1-253-215-8782 Webinar ID: 923 0390 9454

AGENDA

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. 2021-05-11 SRRC Work Session Minutes-Draft

V. AGENDA TOPICS

A. Continued Work on Draft Criteria Created During Saturday 5/8/2021 Work Session

VI. STAFF REPORTS

A. Updated Calendar of Possible SRRC Meeting Dates

VII. COMMITTEE MEMBER / LIAISON COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

VIII. NEXT MEETING DATE

A. June 1, 2021 12:00pm SRRC Work Session

IX. ADJOURNMENT

ADA accommodations available upon request: Please contact the Clerk's office 36 hours prior to any meeting so arrangements can be made for closed captioning or sign language interpreter services depending on the meeting format. The Clerk's office telephone number is 586-5278, TDD 586-5351, e-mail: city.clerk@juneau.org

SYSTEMIC RACISM REVIEW COMMITTEE

May 11, 2021 12:00 PM

Zoom Webinar

MINUTES

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Worl called the Systemic Racism Review Committee Work Session to order at 12:02pm.

II. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Chair Lisa Worl, Carla Casulucan, Kelli Patterson, Dominic Branson, David Russell-Jensen, Grace Lee (joined at 12:10), Gail Dabaluz (joined at 12:14pm)

Members Absent: none

Assemblymembers & Staff Present: SRRC Assembly Liaison Christine Woll, CBJ Attorney Rob Palmer, Deputy City Manager Mila Cosgrove, Deputy Municipal Clerk Di Cathcart

Other Attendees: Assemblymembers Loren Jones and Maria Gladziszewski, Municipal Clerk Beth McEwen

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Agenda approved as presented.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes approved as presented.

A. 2021-04-27 SRRC Work Session Minutes-Draft

V. AGENDA TOPICS

A. Review/Finalize Draft Criteria Created During Saturday 5/8/2021 Work Session

Chair Worl thanked the committee member who were able to attend the Saturday work session and for all their work. Chair Worl opened the agenda topic on draft criteria up for committee discussion.

Ms. Patterson apologized for not being able to attend; appreciated everyone's work and thought the draft was a good draft of a working document.

Chair Worl thanked Ms. Cosgrove for walking the committee through the demographics during the Saturday session. Chair Worl, put the question to the committee of what types of criteria did members want regarding demographics that the committee could formulate and put it into a checklist type format when reviewing legislation and refine it to reflect Juneau's needs.

Assemblymember Woll, stated it was great to see this progress and wondered if the committee had been able to test this draft against any of the ordinances yet or if that for a future meeting.

David Russell-Jensen, asked about having departments come up with their own criteria.

Chair Worl, noted that by the time the committee is reviewing legislation it will have been through at least one committee and would differ to Mr. Palmer for his thoughts.

Mr. Palmer, Chair Worl said it quite well, the committee doesn't have the authority to request that departments do something; however the committee may be able to use the criteria they come up with to help the departments when crafting legislation in the future by knowing what the committee would be looking for. Mr. Palmer noted that an hour meeting with an average of six ordinances to review only gives the committee 6-10 minutes per ordinance for review.

Chair Worl, since in our second meeting we assigned members to listen into various other committee meeting, we can report back to the SRRC what is getting worked on as we move forward and the departments will become aware of what SRRC is working on. In order to make the best use of time for these one hour meetings, Chair Worl recommended the committee do some pre-work and come to our next meeting prepared with specific questions so we can get the review criteria finalized. Once the criteria is in final form the committee could practice for a session or two on reviewing the examples of legislation Mr. Palmer provided the committee with. This would adjustments to be made to the review criteria as needed.

Ms. Dabaluz, concurred with Chair Worl that the committee do a practice run with Mr. Palmer and also recommended getting the committees meetings scheduled out for the future.

Mr. Russell-Jensen, asked about the process for adding additional comments to the draft criteria and how to bring those back to the committee.

Chair Worl, requested that members go through the criteria section by section independently then work as a group to review and edit the document.

Mr. Branson, noted that Ms. Cosgrove had mentioned being able to put together a racial equity spreadsheet and wondered if that was still possible. Ms. Dabaluz, concurred with Mr. Branson and also requested creating a flow chart if that seemed like a useful tool.

Mr. Russell-Jensen, suggested working independently to make edits to the draft and then meet next week to work through everyone's edits prior to sending it to staff for finalizing.

Mr. Palmer advised the committee they are free to send comments to the clerk and the clerk would include those comments in the next meeting packet; the committee could then discuss as a group during the meeting. Chair Worl, agreed and requested staff to send out a word version of the draft criteria for committee members to review and send their edits and comments to the City Clerk for inclusion in an upcoming meeting packet. Chair Worl also asked members to think about what type of information they might need to do the work the committee is tasked with.

VI. NEXT MEETING DATE

The committee discussed availability of members during Noon on Tuesdays for May and June. Ms. Cosgrove will check with the Mayor and Deputy Mayor on when they would like to schedule a joint meeting with the full Assembly and the Systemic Racism Review Committee (SRRC) to review the final matrix prior to the SRRC beginning official review of legislation in Mid-June.

MOTION: by Mr. Russell-Jensen to set the next meeting dates of the committee for Tuesdays at 12:00pm on May 18, June 1 & June 15. ***Hearing no objection, motion passed.***

The combined training between the Systemic Racism Review Committee and the Juneau Human Rights Commission will take place via Zoom webinar on Saturday, June 19, 2021 from 9:00am - 2:30pm with a lunch break. The trainer will send out reflective questions to members to use when

watching the videos. Staff is waiting for final confirmation on streaming links for the videos and will report back to the committee if it appears the links wouldn't be available with enough time for review prior to the training; at which time the committee could decide to reschedule the training to a later date.

A. Tentative Date/Time: Tuesday, May 25, 2021 at Noon

VII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the committee, meeting adjourned at 12:51pm.

Meeting Notes – Brainstorm space/Agreement capture

Process and input

Policy Impact

Accountability

Evaluation

Puget Sound Review combined with three basic questions:

1. Are there racial/ethnic groups potentially affected by the proposed legislation? (PS 1.2):
 - a. Who benefits from and/or who is harmed by the proposed legislation? (PS 4.1)
NOTE: This is a threshold question. If the answer is no, then no further review is needed.
If the answer is yes, then sections 2 & 3 may apply.
2. If so, what is the impact?
 - a. Is the legislation neutral in its impact?
 - b. Does the legislation work to address and or eliminate structural racism? (PS 5.3)
 - c. Does the legislation perpetuate structural racism? If so, how?
3. What are the potential solutions?
 - a. Are the community conditions and/or agency racial inequities clearly documented? If not, what is your plan for assessing the community conditions? (PS 3.1)
 - b. Are there goals and measures for eliminating racial inequity, if so what are they? (PS 3.2)
 - c. Is there any additional information that could be added to strengthen the legislation or the legislation or regulations cross-referenced with this legislation? (PS 5.4)
 - d. Does the legislation make provisions for accountability? If so, what are they? (PS 5.2)
 - e. What are the overall goals and outcomes? What are the specific strategies for decreasing racial inequity? How do the specific strategies work to decrease racial inequity? (PS 6.1)
 - f. How will strategies be adjusted regularly to keep pace with changing community needs and racial demographics? (PS 6.2)
 - g. Is there any additional information that could be added to strengthen the legislation or legislation or regulations cross-referenced with this policy? (PS 6.3)

King County Racial Equity Toolkit Review – like the checklist format – we could adapt and create a workflow

Step 1 – Set Outcomes

1a – What does your department define as the most important racially equitable community outcomes related to this issue?

1b – Which Assembly Committee is the proposed legislation being assigned to?

1c – Are there impacts on: Contracting Equity, Workforce Equity, Immigrant and Refugee Access to services, Inclusive outreach and public engagement (These will likely need to be revised as we go through legislative review).

Step 2: (adapt geography to match our area)

2 a – Are there impacts on geographic areas? Yes or No. If yes, have a check list of geographic areas in the community.

2 b - What are the racial demographics of those living in the area or impacted by the issue?

2 c –How has public process been cared for? Who has been at the table?

2 d – don't include

2 e – don't include

Step 3: Determine Benefit and/or Burden

How will the proposed legislation sustain, increase or decrease systemic racism? What are potential unintended consequences? What benefits may result? Or is there no impact? What quantitative and qualitative evidence of inequality exists?

Step 4. How will you address the impacts (including unintended consequences) on systemic racism? 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? _____

Step 5: Evaluate. Raise Racial Awareness. Be Accountable

Don't include. Already addressed earlier

Step 6.

We are already charged with reporting back.

Racial Equity Impact Assessment Guide

Moved into the Step checklist

Meeting Notes – Brainstorm space/Agreement capture

Process and input

Policy Impact

Accountability

Evaluation

Puget Sound Review combined with three basic questions:

1. Are there racial/ethnic groups potentially affected by the proposed legislation? (PS 1.2):

a. Who benefits from and/or who is harmed by the proposed legislation? (PS 4.1)

NOTE: This is a threshold question. If the answer is no, then no further review is needed.

If the answer is yes, then sections 2 & 3 may apply.

-Not only who is potentially harmed by the potential legislation, but what race or ethnic group in the city benefits the least from the proposed legislation.

-Have the racial/ethnic groups that are most affected by this legislation been active participants in the discussion of this legislation? Have they been made aware of how this will positively and negatively be affected by this policy? What concerns did the racial/ethnic groups have with the legislation?

-How do we determine who represents these racial/ethnic groups, who speaks on behalf of the racial/ethnic groups?

***I AM NOT SURE WHERE THIS SHOULD FALL, but I believe that it is important to know the historical context of the proposed legislation. Why was the legislation proposed? Was a racial/ethnic group experiencing inequity prior to the proposed legislation?**

2. If so, what is the impact?

-How is a racial/ethnic group benefitting or being harmed by the proposed legislation?

-Are there any unintended consequences that the committee or members from the affected group are aware of?

-What is the long-term impact of the proposed legislation.

a. Is the legislation neutral in its impact?

-Does this legislation create barriers that might prevent people of a certain race/ethnicity from fully benefitting from the policy as written?

b. Does the legislation work to address and/or eliminate structural racism? (PS 5.3)

-If so, how?

c. Does the legislation perpetuate structural racism? If so, how?

-Does the legislation perpetuate structural racism for one group while reducing/eliminating structural racism for another?

-Will the legislation be monitored to ensure that it does not increase the negative impact on certain racial/ethnic groups?

3. What are the potential solutions?

a. Are the community conditions and/or agency racial inequities clearly documented? If not, what is your plan for assessing the community conditions? (PS 3.1)

b. Are there goals and measures for eliminating racial inequity, if so what are they? (PS 3.2)

- c. Is there any additional information that could be added to strengthen the legislation or is the legislation or regulations cross-referenced with this legislation? (PS 5.4)
- d. Does the legislation make provisions for accountability? If so, what are they? (PS 5.2)
- e. What are the overall goals and outcomes? What are the specific strategies for decreasing racial inequity? How do the specific strategies work to decrease racial inequity? (PS 6.1)
- f. How will strategies be adjusted regularly to keep pace with changing community needs and racial demographics? (PS 6.2)
- ~~g. Is there any additional information that could be added to strengthen the legislation or legislation or regulations cross-referenced with this policy? (PS 6.3)~~

King County Racial Equity Toolkit Review – like the checklist format – we could adapt and create a workflow

Step 1 – Set Outcomes

1a – What does your department define as the most important racially equitable community outcomes related to this issue?

-Did your department review the legislation to ensure that it had a racially equitable community outcome?

1b – Which Assembly Committee is the proposed legislation being assigned to?

- In what way areas does the proposed legislation affect the community.

1c – Are there impacts on: Contracting Equity, Workforce Equity, Immigrant and Refugee Access to services, Inclusive outreach and public engagement (These will likely need to be revised as we go through legislative review).

Step 2: (adapt geography to match our area)

2 a – Are there impacts on geographic areas? Yes or No. If yes, have a check list of geographic areas in the community.

-Is the impact on that area positive or negative?

-Does the legislation negatively impact one geographic neighborhood, while positively impacting another group?

2 b - What are the racial demographics of those living in the area or impacted by the issue?

2 c –How has public process been cared for? Who has been at the table? Was the impacted racial/ethnic group invited to the discussion?

***I believe that 2d & 2e should be addressed in the historical context of the bill proposed legislation as I discussed above.**

2 d – don't include

2 e – don't include

Step 3: Determine Benefit and/or Burden

How will the proposed legislation sustain, increase or decrease systemic racism? What are potential unintended consequences, **and who do they affect?** What benefits may result **and who benefits?** **Does it harm certain racial/ethnic groups over others?** Or is there no impact? What quantitative and qualitative evidence of inequality exists?

-Is the burden on the racial/ ethnic group going to heighten over time?

Step 4. How will you address the impacts (including unintended consequences) on systemic racism?

The SRRC will provide a written report to the Assembly that includes consideration of the provisions below: What are the indicators and progress benchmarks?

-What provisions can be changed or added to ensure positive impacts on systemic racism?

Program Strategies? _____

Policy Strategies? _____

Partnership Strategies? _____

Step 5: Evaluate. Raise Racial Awareness. Be Accountable

Don't include. Already addressed earlier

Step 6.

We are already charged with reporting back.

Racial Equity Impact Assessment Guide

Moved into the Step checklist

Legislative Review Criteria

- 1) Who could be affected by the proposed legislation?
 - a. Who benefits from and/or who is harmed by the proposed legislation?
 - b. Does the census block group affected by the proposed legislation have a significant (>50%?) non-white population?

If both 1)a. and 1)b. make little impact, further review may not be needed.

- 2) If there are impacts to communities, what is the impact?
 - a. What steps has the department or legislation sponsor taken to notify those impacted of the proposed changes? (qualitative)
 - b. Has public input been received? (Y/N)
 - c. How could the legislation perpetuate systemic racism? How? (qualitative)
- 3) What solutions could remedy the legislation's implications in perpetuating systemic racism?
 - a. Recommendation for additional public input (neighborhood/census block meetings, assembly/committee meetings)
 - b. Recommendation for CBJ to develop systemic racism mitigation plan (document how the department/CBJ has reached out to impacted community, what input was received, how CBJ/department is taking input into consideration/amending legislation)
 - c. Recommendation for legislation to move forward with accountability measures (sunset provisions, 6 mo./annual review of impacts/implications for systemic racism)

Puget Sound Review combined with three basic questions:

1. Are there racial/ethnic groups potentially affected by the proposed legislation? (PS 1.2):
 - a. Who benefits from and/or who is harmed by the proposed legislation? (PS 4.1)
NOTE: This is a threshold question. If the answer is no, then no further review is needed. If the answer is yes, then sections 2 & 3 may apply.
2. If so, what is the impact?
 - a. Is the legislation neutral in its impact?
 - b. Does the legislation work to address and or eliminate structural racism? (PS 5.3)
 - c. Does the legislation perpetuate structural racism? If so, how?
3. What are the potential solutions?

EDITS, David Russell-Jensen

- a. Are the community conditions and/or agency racial inequities clearly documented? If not, what is your plan for assessing the community conditions? (PS 3.1)
- b. Are there goals and measures for eliminating racial inequity, if so what are they? (PS 3.2)
- c. Is there any additional information that could be added to strengthen the legislation or the legislation or regulations cross-referenced with this legislation? (PS 5.4)
- d. Does the legislation make provisions for accountability? If so, what are they? (PS 5.2)
- e. What are the overall goals and outcomes? What are the specific strategies for decreasing racial inequity? How do the specific strategies work to decrease racial inequity? (PS 6.1)
- f. How will strategies be adjusted regularly to keep pace with changing community needs and racial demographics? (PS 6.2)
- g. Is there any additional information that could be added to strengthen the legislation or legislation or regulations cross-referenced with this policy? (PS 6.3)

King County Racial Equity Toolkit Review – like the checklist format – we could adapt and create a workflow

Step 1 – Set Outcomes

- 1a – What does your department define as the most important racially equitable community outcomes related to this issue?
- 1b – Which Assembly Committee is the proposed legislation being assigned to?
- 1c – Are there impacts on: Contracting Equity, Workforce Equity, Immigrant and Refugee Access to services, Inclusive outreach and public engagement (These will likely need to be revised as we go through legislative review).

Step 2: (adapt geography to match our area)

- 2 a – Are there impacts on geographic areas? Yes or No. If yes, have a check list of geographic areas in the community.
- 2 b - What are the racial demographics of those living in the area or impacted by the issue?
- 2 c –How has public process been cared for? Who has been at the table?
- 2 d – don't include
- 2 e – don't include

Step 3: Determine Benefit and/or Burden

How will the proposed legislation sustain, increase or decrease systemic racism? What are potential unintended consequences? What benefits may result? Or is there no impact? What quantitative and qualitative evidence of inequality exists?

Step 4. How will you address the impacts (including unintended consequences) on systemic racism? 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? _____

EDITS, David Russell-Jensen

Step 5: Evaluate. Raise Racial Awareness. Be Accountable
Don't include. Already addressed earlier

Step 6.
We are already charged with reporting back.

Racial Equity Impact Assessment Guide

Moved into the Step checklist

UPDATED: Possible Meeting Dates for SRRC following Regular Assembly Meetings
[Tuesdays at Noon unless otherwise noted]

Date	Quorum (Y/N)	Notes
11-May	Y	work session, set future work session dates of 5/18, 6/1 & 6/15
18-May		work session
1-Jun		work session
15-Jun		work session/meeting if ready to review legislation
19-Jun		Joint Training Session w/ SRRC & JHRC 9am-2:30pm
13-Jul		
3-Aug		
24-Aug		
14-Sep		9/13 Last Regular Assembly Mtg prior to Municipal Election
26-Oct		10/25 Assembly Reorganization Mtg, 1st Mtg after Municipal Election
23-Nov		
30-Nov		
14-Dec		
Need to Schedule a joint meeting of the SRRC & the Assembly prior to beginning to review legislation in June		
Need to Schedule a joint meeting of the SRRC & the Assembly prior to 12/31/2021 as a 6 month check-in		