



SYSTEMATIC RACISM REVIEW COMMITTEE WORKSESSION MINUTES

August 12, 2025 at 12:00 PM

Zoom Webinar

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

A. CALL TO ORDER - Chair Froehlich called the SRRC meeting to order via Zoom at 12:06 p.m.

B. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT - Read by Chair Froehlich

We would like to acknowledge that the City and Borough of Juneau is on Tlingit land and wish to honor the indigenous people of this land. For more than ten thousand years, Alaska Native people have been and continue to be integral to the well-being of our community. We are grateful to be in this place, a part of this community, and to honor the culture, traditions, and resilience of the Tlingit people. *Gunalchéesh!*

C. ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Ephraim Froehlich, Ivan Nance, AnaVera Morato, and Jennifer Pemberton

Absent: Kelli Patterson

Staff/Other: Municipal Clerk Breckan Hendricks, Deputy Municipal Clerk Andi Hirsh, City Attorney Emily Wright, Assistant City Attorney Sherri Layne, and Chief of Police Derek Bos

D. APPROVAL OF AGENDA - Agenda approved as presented.

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - Minutes approved as presented.

1. **2025-07-29 SRRC Meeting Minutes - Draft**

F. PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Phil Moser, a valley resident, stated there would be less need for the ordinance if there were more reliable funding for homelessness services at the state and federal levels. He expressed that Ordinance 2025-28 authorizes police intervention in situations, even when such intervention is not requested by the public. Mr. Moser noted that the ordinance would increase police contact with vulnerable populations, noting the recent violent incidents involving the Juneau Police Department and residents. He stated that this ordinance is a red flag and if it were adopted, a civilian taking a video of police around a scene of a crime would be criminalized, and it would also criminalize protesting.

G. LEGISLATION PULLED FOR DISCUSSION

2. Ordinance 2025-28 An Ordinance Amending CBJC 42.20.090, Disorderly Conduct

Ordinance 2025-28 *An Ordinance Amending [CBJC 42.20.090](#), Disorderly Conduct* was pulled from the July 29, 2025, SRRC meeting for continued discussion prior to moving any recommendations forward to the Assembly for action at its August 18, 2025, Regular Assembly Meeting.

Chair Froehlich said it was decided at the last meeting to hold more time for discussion.

Mr. Nance stressed that the ordinance needs to be more thoroughly discussed and analyzed, not just by the SRRC, but by the city as a whole.

Ms. Pemberton recalled that the ordinance was proposed to the Assembly due to encampment issues around the Glory Hall and Teal Street, as staff came to the city to try and solve the problem. She further recalled that, at the July 14 COW meeting, Chief Bos said the ordinance would be used more downtown on individuals rather than for encampments like on Teal Street. She said that this will have an outsized impact on SRRC, which seeks to take away opportunities for discrimination and racism; this feels like an invitation for increased instances of that in enforcement.

Chair Froehlich relayed that the Teal Street safety zone was shot down because the City Attorney said it would've been unconstitutional since it would be targeting a specific population. He said it is appalling that there's no effort toward solving the root issues of homelessness but to rather criminalize the symptoms instead.

Mr. Nance shared that users of the bus system have a problem with being accosted by the homeless users of the system. He said there has got to be a balance between their right to exist and the bus user's right to go un-harassed.

Chair Froehlich responded that harassment is already illegal. He said this change would target the existence of people just sitting or standing. He said the issue of people being harassed on the bus system could be solved by offering resources to those in need.

Ms. Morato noted that the section on whether that person was asked to move was struck. She said this seemed to be a call to quicker action without the permission of the property owner.

Ms. Pemberton said the code as it stood, directs that a person cannot sit or lie on a public street in such a manner as to interfere with the free passage of pedestrians or vehicle traffic, and that adding standing, walking, and camping to that list would change the intent of what the code would be used to enforce. She asked Attorney Layne about the struck language in Section A5 "after being requested to move in order to create room for another person to pass." She

inquired, if this language is struck from the code, how are people asked about compliance before enforcement is engaged.

Chief Bos said the intent is still to ask people who are blocking the sidewalk to move, not to immediately arrest them. He explained that they are trying to find a way to take that burden off the public to ask a person to move and put it on someone from the city.

Ms. Pemberton highlighted that this amendment would make it, so nobody is asked to move. She said that, since the language would be stricken from policy, it would therefore be an unwritten code.

Chief Bos clarified that an addition is being made to the amendment that would insert language to require a request, as well as better detail as to who is responsible to make that request.

Attorney Wright confirmed that an amendment is being crafted, but if this is something that is important to the committee, then it should put that in the committee's recommendation and statement, because there is no guarantee that an assembly member would propose the amendment.

Chair Froehlich said there has been much discussion on intent, but intent doesn't really matter, it's the letter of the law that does. He suggested that the SRRC shouldn't be considering intent, it is the impact of the laws that should be discussed. He reflected that homelessness has been criminalized in the last decade across the country, and those laws don't come paired with initiatives to provide permanent housing. He stressed that, even without striking the move request language, the changes would have impacts that are racist and against certain people.

Ms. Pemberton added that these changes would go further than criminalizing the homeless, it would criminalize everyone. She said she tried to compare this ordinance to the SRRC's legislation checklist, and she found it frustrating and insufficient. She recommended that the committee craft a strongly worded note to the Assembly, and that a committee member testify at the meeting.

Mr. Nance said there must be a list of problem customers who the police interact with on a regular basis. He asked what tools they need to handle the situations that come up.

Chief Bos answered that JPD does not keep a list of problem individuals. He added that the officers know people well through daily interactions, not just on a criminal level but while being out and about on foot.

Mr. Nance sought confirmation that officers have a good awareness of the context of who the people are. Chief Bos responded that's correct.

Chair Froehlich asked Ms. Pemberton to reiterate her recommendation. Ms. Pemberton recommended that the SRRC forego using the SRRC legislation checklist and craft a written note to the Assembly, and that an SRRC member should be designated to read the note before the Assembly.

Chair Froehlich asked if the SRRC wanted to testify on this ordinance, how it would make that request. Ms. Hendricks said that a member could sign up to testify since it is under public hearing.

Chair Froehlich asked for clarification on whether being added under public testimony is the only pathway, or if there is a way a member could speak in the lead up to ordinance discussion. Ms. Hendricks responded that what she suggested would be the best way since the public testimony would happen before ordinance discussion happens.

Chair Froehlich asked if the SRRC's formal comments would be limited to the same amount of time public testimony would be. Ms. Hendricks answered that it would be up to the Mayor to extend the member's comments.

Chair Froehlich said he sees this as an empowered committee wishing to have input in a public space. Ms. Hendricks reiterated that testimony through public comment would be the best way. She doesn't have another way to add the SRRC to the agenda in a separate way.

Attorney Wright added that she agrees with Ms. Hendricks but said that everything is available by the Mayor or the Manager's Office to recommend an amendment. She said it would be appropriate, if the SRRC wished to be addressed, to put in the written recommendation a request to address the Assembly. She said it would still be up to the Assembly, so the SRRC should still sign up for public testimony, but there is no harm in asking.

Chair Froehlich asked how the committee should make that ask. Attorney Wright recommended that the invited testimony request be included at the start of the written statement to the Assembly.

Chair Froehlich stated that the letter would state "The Systemic Racism Review Committee raises grave concerns about the proposed ordinance 2025-28 and requests that a representative of the committee be accepted as invited testimony ahead of consideration of the ordinance." He suggested that the next language be a summary of what the committee believes this ordinance does. He continued, "This proposal seeks to expand the city's disorderly conduct code to include all existence in public as illegal activities, including standing and walking in public spaces."

Mr. Nance said someone might think the language comes off as sarcastic.

Ms. Morato said language about the potential long-term impacts could be added.

Chair Froehlich agreed with Ms. Morato. He responded to Mr. Nance that he compared this correctly to what is happening in D.C. and across the country. He said this law is an expansion of police powers to arrest an unkempt-looking person for blocking a public space without any notice.

Ms. Pemberton said she does not know if it would give them power to arrest the person, but they could fine them, and that could escalate to an arrest. Chair Froehlich asked if that was true, and that if disorderly conduct was an arrestable offense, it would be unlawful to do these things. He further asked if a person could be arrested for sitting, lying, standing, walking, or camping on any public street. Attorney Wright answered that he was correct. At the bottom of the ordinance at the end of page three, it directs which acts are a misdemeanor, or an infraction. The one that is a fine only, is urination and defecation; everything else is arrestable.

Chair Froehlich asked Ms. Pemberton to read what she had written. Ms. Pemberton stated, "The SRRC strongly recommends that the Assembly reject Ordinance 2025-28, amending the Disorderly Conduct Code. This ordinance was presented at the Committee of the Whole meeting on July 14 as a tool to help address the encampment issues at Teal Street, but the proposed amended language in Ordinance 2025-28 goes well beyond that." She said she was going to continue by talking about expansion of police powers and more opportunities for discrimination. She said she also has a note to request that the SRRC representative speak as invited testimony. She said the two big points are: adding verbs to the list is the expansion that the SRRC doesn't want to see, and taking away the notice is bad.

Chair Froehlich stressed that this is a massive expansion of police powers and authority to criminalize certain human activity that is not illegal, dangerous, or harmful. He said the phrase "criminalizing existence" should be included. He thanked Mr. Moser for his remarks during public testimony. He said that, if the powers are expanded, they are going to see people be brutally assaulted for not being as well off as others. He said this is about the law, not intent, and that it cannot be guaranteed that the same intent would be placed upon this law by future enforcers.

Ms. Pemberton said that "removing notice is bad" is her current placeholder. Chair Froehlich offered that removal of reasonable notice requirements before a non-violent act becomes an arrestable offense sounds dangerous and unconstitutional. Ms. Pemberton asked Attorney Wright about the committee proposing its own amendment to the Assembly. She said the committee's recommendation is to reject the ordinance entirely, but maybe as a contingency, the committee could suggest that it be amended. Chair Froehlich suggested that there would

need to be police notice of vacating a space, and if the notice is not complied with, then there would be enforcement.

Ms. Pemberton said the letter will suggest that the ordinance needs to be clarified or rewritten. Chair Froehlich suggested that the committee approve the notes Ms. Pemberton has taken and vote to allow a representative to speak at the August 18 Assembly meeting. He said he would be testifying as a community member, so it would be better if someone else testified on behalf of SRRC. Ms. Pemberton said she would do it.

MOTION by Mr. Nance that the SRRC endorses the comments drafted by Ms. Pemberton and authorizes her to take them to the Assembly. ***There being no objection, the motion was adopted by unanimous consent.***

H. STAFF REPORT/COMMITTEE MEMBER / LIAISON COMMENTS & QUESTIONS - None

I. NEXT MEETING DATE - August 19, 2025 at Noon via Zoom

J. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to come before the committee, meeting adjourned at 1:02 p.m.