

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

May 11, 2021 12:00 PM

Zoom Webinar

Work Session - No Public Testimony Taken During this 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. 2021-04-27 SRRC Work Session Minutes-Draft

V. AGENDA TOPICS

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

VI. NEXT MEETING DATE

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

VII. 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

April 27, 2021 12:00 PM

Zoom Webinar

MINUTES

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Worl called the Systemic Racism Review Committee Work Session to order at 12:01pm

II. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Chair Lisa Worl, Grace Lee, Kelli Patterson, Gail Dabaluz, Carla Casulucan and David Russell-Jensen

Members Absent: Dominic Branson

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

Other Attendees: Assemblymember Loren Jones, City Manager Rorie Watt, Municipal Clerk Beth McEwen, Beth Weigel, Ibn Bailey

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Agenda approved as presented.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes approved as presented

A. 2021-04-13 SRRRC Work Session Minutes-Draft

V. AGENDA TOPICS

A. Continued Work Outlining Legislation Review Criteria & Process

Included in the packet:

- Policy Guide Example from Chair Worl
 - Puget Sound Education Service District-Racial Equity Tool: Policy Review Guide
- Examples of Type of CBJ Legislation that SRRRC would be reviewing [Code/Non-Code Ordinances, Resolutions] from City Attorney Rob Palmer
 - Ord2019-06(AD)
 - Ord2019-06(E)
 - Ord2019-06(N)
 - Ord2019-06(Q)
 - Ord2020-02(b)
 - Resolution 2882
 - Resolution 2898
 - Resolution 2923

Mr. Russell-Jensen, liked the Puget Sound policy review guide and that it starts with agreements. First Alaskans Institute has a good first agreements and wondered if the Assembly was familiar with that. He also liked the example questions and wondered if it was possible for the SRRC to meet with the developers of this criteria and how they went about implementing and coming up with these.

Assemblymember Woll, noted that the Assembly used the First Alaskans Institute agreement during its November retreat and racial equity training and didn't necessarily talk a lot about how we might use them in the future but the Assembly did agree to use them.

Ms. Dabaluz, appreciated having these tools and liked how they considered internal and external resources and how they might look at racial equity. She also raised the question of if the committee needs to add a legal component.

Chair Worl, felt it was good to not start with a blank slate so having the references is a good beginning.

Ms. Casulucan, echoed Mr. Russell-Jensen's comments regarding the Puget Sound and First Alaskans Institutes agreements and liked the idea of using Southeast Traditional Values. She noted the committee is a diverse group and mindset and creating our own agreements is important.

Ms. Lee, agreed with Ms. Casulucan and felt the committee needs to get started with the brainstorming process. She liked the PSED outline; it's important to start with the questions such as: 'who does this impact' and that will help develop our criteria.

Ms. Patterson, noted that as the committee looks at these particular guidelines, they deal with inequality and the committee is dealing with systemic racism. It is important to look at how we can incorporate these two together; while they are similar they are not exactly the same thing.

Chair Worl, agreed with Ms. Patterson and noted an hour long meeting goes by very quickly and asked the committee to consider having a longer session to get this outline done. Chair Worl suggested that now that the committee has these various examples, committee members can review them and come to the meeting prepared to select ones that should be included and start to format which questions and which areas to include in the agreements.

Mr. Russell-Jensen recommended having a full day work session or two 4 hour sessions and other committee members agreed.

Committee members requested getting to walk through and get an overview of each type of legislation that Mr. Palmer gave the committee as example legislation. Ms. Dabaluz and Ms. Lee suggested waiting until the committee had set some criteria before reviewing legislation examples.

Ms. Patterson said she would defer to Mr. Palmer and what was his intention was in providing the legislation, if he gave these simply as examples for the committee as to what we will be reviewing.

Mr. Palmer, noted to Ms. Patterson's question, it's a little bit of both, these are the types of documents the committee would typically review and have been included to show some of the challenges you may run into.

Chair Worl told the committee to take the time to read through the legislation examples as the committee gets ready to go into a longer session for developing the committee's scope and practice going through the examples.

Ms. Cosgrove suggested that as the committee reads through the ordinances they look at what information they may need to have from staff so we can better anticipate what the committee's questions might be.

Chair Worl noted that one metric won't work as a one size fits all for ordinance review so the committee will probably need to come up with multiple metrics.

B. Discussion on Trainings & Setting Possible Saturday Dates

Chair Worl recommended selecting a Saturday for the training with time to watch the videos prior to the joint training with Juneau Human Rights Commission (JHRC) and the Systemic Racism Review Committee. The facilitator, Mary Fertakis is not available on May 8 and 22 and June 12, all other Saturday's in May and June would work for Ms. Fertakis. Evaluating our roles between the SRRC and the JHRC were suggested training goals with the facilitator.

Chair Worl also recommended holding a Saturday work session of the SRRC to come up with a legislative review draft plan. If Saturday, May 8 worked, the committee could hold a morning session from 10am-Noon, break for lunch, than resume from 1pm-3pm. If the PBS video series is available prior to the May 8 work session it would be good for the committee to watch them ahead of the work session.

Ms. Lee noted that she is not available on May 15 and suggested the Clerk's Office send out a Doodle Poll to the SRRC members and the JHRC members to check Saturday availability for the training with Ms. Fertakis.

The Clerk's Office will create and send out a Doodle Poll to both the SRRC and the JHRC with dates in May and June and report back with date(s) work for the majority of members. Staff will order the streaming PBS video series and share with the committees once available.

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Setting Future Meeting Dates for SRRC

Committee discussed future dates when discussing setting dates for upcoming training sessions.

VII. STAFF REPORTS

A. Juneau Census Demographics on Race

Discussion on this topic was postponed until a future work session. The Manager's Office is compiling additional data.

VIII. COMMITTEE MEMBER / LIAISON COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

IX. NEXT MEETING DATE

Longer work session scheduled for Saturday, May 8, 2021 from 10am-Noon with a break for lunch then beginning again at 1pm and running until 3pm if needed.

Regular work session scheduled for Tuesday, May 11, 2021 at 12:00pm.

X. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the committee, meeting adjourned at 1:01pm.

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