



# City of Milwaukee

200 E. Wells Street  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin  
53202

## Meeting Minutes

### MKE COMMUNITY IMPACT COMMITTEE

**AMANDA AVALOS, CHAIR**  
*Anita Johnson, Vice-Chair*

*Nik Kovac, Bill Christianson, Steve Mahan, Jordan Schettle,  
Brook Stanley, Tammy Rivera, Jamaal Napoleon, Christlyn  
Frederick-Stanley, and Ashley Harrell*

*Staff Assistant, Chris Lee, 414-286-2232; Fax: 414-286-3456,  
clee@milwaukee.gov  
Legislative Liaison, Beka Bein, 414-286-3789,  
Beka.Bein@milwaukee.gov*

---

Tuesday, May 12, 2026

5:00 PM

Room 301-A, City Hall

---

This is a virtual meeting via GoToMeeting. Should you wish to join this meeting from your phone, tablet, or computer you may go to <https://meet.goto.com/495272501>. You can also dial in using your phone United States: +1 (408) 650-3123 and Access Code: 495-272-501.

1. **Call to order.**

*The meeting was called to order at 5:03 p.m.*

*Vice-chair Johnson presiding over the meeting.*

2. **Roll call.**

**Present** 10 - Mahan, Kovac, Christianson, Stanley, Rivera, Napoleon, Frederick-Stanley, Harrell, Johnson, Schettle

**Excused** 1 - Avalos

**Also present:**

*Beka Bein, Legislative Reference Bureau*

3. **Review and approval of the previous meeting minutes from April 14, 2026.**

*Meeting minutes from April 14, 2026 were approved without objection.*

4. **Public comments and/or announcements.**

*There were no public comments and announcements.*

5. Discussion on defining non-police safety solutions.

*Member Stanley commented. She proposed that the committee adopt a broad definition grounded in a biopsychosocial model, which would encompass social support, nutrition, mental health treatment, and other factors that contribute to community well-being. She asked whether any members felt the definition should be more narrowly tailored to traditional public safety concepts.*

*Member Rivera responded by emphasizing that the committee's prior understanding was that this work must go beyond policing. She added a specific proposal that the committee should not fund activities that effectively serve as public relations or auxiliary work for law enforcement, noting that the city already has community relations funding and Community Development Block Grant funding that support police collaboration. As examples of activities to exclude, she cited National Night Out events, crime and safety meetings, and target team meetings. She argued that using these new funds for such purposes would duplicate existing efforts and further center law enforcement.*

*Member Stanley agreed with this limitation and suggested that the rulebook could include language stating that law enforcement cannot be one of the primary collaborators on a grant, which would allow for some connection or information sharing without making police the focus.*

*Member Christianson stated that he favored the most expansive definition possible and that the literature on participatory budgeting supports allowing residents broad latitude to propose ideas. In his view, the committee should define public safety broadly and then allow residents, through the voting process, to determine whether a particular proposal fits the criteria.*

*Members discussed terminology. The committee had previously used the phrases "non-police safety solutions," "public safety," and "non-police public safety" interchangeably, and members noted that words matter for community understanding.*

*Member Rivera proposed calling the initiative "community-led public safety" and defining within the materials that this means non-policing solutions, using the broad examples member Stanley had offered.*

*Member Mahan concurred, stating that adding "community-led" clearly defines the category and removes confusion.*

*Member Stanley noted that the original proclamation and some announcements already refer specifically to "non-police public safety," suggesting the committee could combine those terms.*

*Member Rivera offered a compromise name "community-led public safety participatory budget initiative" with the word "non-policing" in parentheses.*

*Member Napoleon suggested an alternative, "community-led non-police safety solutions," recalling that the initial briefing had used that language. He cautioned that making the definition too narrow could create unnecessary questions from applicants, but he supported leading with "community-led" and placing the non-policing element in the definition rather than making it the entire focus. He also noted that "public safety"*

*alone could fall into too many buckets.*

*Member Frederick-Stanley recommended that "non-policing" should be treated as part of the definition and not included in the formal name, arguing that centering "community led" in the title tells the whole story and prevents a flood of inappropriate applications.*

*Member Stanley then suggested "community safety solutions" as a potentially more marketable and quickly understood title for outreach purposes, with the fuller definition provided in documentation.*

*Member Christianson proposed a practical next step to move the conversation forward, suggesting that one or two members draft a few definition options for the committee to consider.*

*Members Harrell and Rivera volunteered to work together to develop two or three naming and definition options that incorporate the various suggestions heard. The draft language would return for discussion and a vote at the next meeting.*

**6. Review of research on best practices, use cases, rulebooks, existing and/or past community budgeting program efforts.**

*Member Rivera said that staff had previously distributed a memo summarizing models from Eau Claire, Chicago, and Seattle, and had also emailed rulebooks from these cities as well as those from Boston, Evanston, King County, New York City, and Philadelphia. Rulebooks from the African-American Roundtable and the Participatory Budgeting Project handbook was also emailed out.*

*Member Rivera stated that while the narrative summaries were helpful, she found the volume overwhelming and requested a more visual tool. She asked staff to create a comparison matrix that would display all the models side by side, showing elements such as whether they used a steering committee, the range of budgets, voting ages and processes, and other key parameters. She described this as a kind of meta-analysis that would help visual learners see patterns quickly.*

*Member Stanley offered to support this effort in an advisory capacity, noting that her background is in participatory research and that she is comfortable synthesizing large guideline documents.*

*Member Rivera said that staff should retain primary responsibility for the work and that members' support should not supplant staff duties.*

*Ms. Bein commented. She only focused on the three cities of Eau Claire, Chicago, and Seattle as not to overwhelm the committee. She can produce the matrix and deliver the visual summary by May 26, 2026, in time for members to review before the next meeting. She welcomed Brook Stanley's advisory input.*

*Member Napoleon added that the African-American Roundtable's one-page layout was an excellent model for future public-facing literature. He described it as short, sweet, and understandable, and suggested the committee use it as an example when developing its own outreach materials.*

**7. Discussion on developing community budgeting program methodology, parameters, criteria, rulebook, and timeline.**

*Members confirmed with staff that the committee's deadline to submit a methodology to the Common Council had been extended to November 1, 2026. Given the amount of work remaining, members discussed the need to increase the frequency of meetings and to set clear deliverables for each session.*

*Members discussed that the matrix would allow the committee to come to the next meeting with informed opinions, rather than starting discussions from zero. There was need to draft a timeline immediately, working backward from the November deadline, so the committee could stay on track.*

*Members Frederick-Stanley and Harrell volunteered to work together to create the draft timeline.*

*Member Stanley suggested that once members receive the best-practices summary, each person could identify areas where their personal expertise aligns with the work needed, noting her own background in survey research as an example.*

**8. Discussion on developing public outreach strategy, public facing website, and survey.**

*Member Rivera discussed a model from her service on the Community Collaborative Committee's first season. That model centered on stipending community-based organizations that already have trusted relationships in neighborhoods. Organizations received tiered stipends based on how many residents they engaged, such as 10, 25, or 50 participants, and were required to submit the collected input back to the committee. This was supplemented by an online portal for those who preferred virtual participation, which addressed barriers like childcare and transportation in the post-pandemic environment. She contrasted this with the CCC's second season, which used police-led community hubs and which she felt was less successful.*

*Member Harrell supported the CBO model, stating that using trusted messengers makes outreach more intentional and meaningful than relying solely on the city to announce the program.*

*Members referenced an email attachment from Mr. Kuta regarding website capabilities.*

*Member Napoleon noted that staff appeared willing to build the website, brochures, and surveys if the committee provided the content and messaging. He suggested the committee should focus on crafting that messaging and consider how to pursue and budget for it.*

*Member Rivera said that while the committee should accept all staff support available, the outreach itself must remain community-led and centered, not merely a marketing campaign.*

*Members discussed budget timing and implementation.*

*Members raised concerns about ensuring the timeline includes not only outreach but also the administrative work of distributing stipends, reviewing applications, hiring a project manager to carry the work forward after the committee dissolves, and holding*

*the city accountable for implementation.*

*Member Kovac responded to questions about the funding source. He explained that the dollars were levy funds originally allocated in the 2024 budget, though he said he would verify the exact year, and that such funds are subject to a three-year carryover rule. He noted the funds had already been carried over twice and that the committee should aim to have them spent or at least encumbered in 2026.*

*Member Christianson added that if the funds were appropriated in the 2025 budget, they could theoretically be carried into 2027, and he referenced an April 2, 2025 resolution directing the expansion of resources.*

*Members expressed concern that a November recommendation would make full expenditure by December 31 infeasible.*

*Member Kovac stated that having the funds allocated or encumbered by November would likely satisfy the requirement, but he committed to confirming the details with the Comptroller.*

*Vice-Chair Johnson asked that members Kovac and Christianson report back before the next meeting so the timeline could reflect accurate funding constraints.*

**9. Next meeting date and time.**

*Vice-Chair Johnson said that the next meeting was set for Monday, June 9, 2026, at 5:00 p.m. in Room 301-A, with virtual access available, and encouraged in-person attendance, if possible.*

**10. Items for future agendas.**

*Next meeting agenda items to prioritize reviewing the best-practices matrix, reviewing the draft timeline, and voting on the name and definition language. Discussion of detailed outreach plans and budget administration would be deferred unless time allowed.*

*Member Schettle also proposed adding a discussion about forming workgroups, arguing that with roughly ten members, assigning small groups to focus on specific areas would help the committee meet its November deadline with proper due diligence. He offered to draft potential workgroups for consideration.*

**11. Adjournment.**

*Meeting adjourned at 6:01 p.m.*

*Chris Lee, Staff Assistant  
Council Records Section  
City Clerk's Office*

**Meeting materials for this meeting and past meetings can be found within the following file:**

[251987](#)

Communication relating to the activities of the MKE Community Impact

Committee.

Sponsors: THE CHAIR