

## Opioid Settlement Advisory Committee

*Date:* 9/15/2025

*Location and Time:* Via Microsoft Teams 10 – noon

*Present:* Kelly Dougherty, Shawn Burke, Daniel Franklin, Jess Kirby, Deb Wright, Ruth Hardy, Monica Hutt, Eric Maguire, Madeline Motta, Matt Prouty, Stacey Sigmon, Tim Tanner

*Absent:* Kristen Atwood, Liz McLoughlin

*Meeting Facilitator and Note Taker:* Kelly Dougherty, Sarah Gregorek

Agenda Item	Discussion	Next Steps
Advisory Committee New Member	Kelly introduced Tim Tanner, MD. He is appointed by the Blueprint for Health (replaces Heather Stein, MD)	
Proposed OSAC Operating Policies and Procedures – Kelly Dougherty	<p>The Committee received the proposed OSAC Operating Policies and Procedures on 9/10/25 and this version includes all the revisions that were made last month in executive session. The ACLU has accepted all the Committee’s proposed revisions. If Committee members wish to review and discuss the marked-up version from last month’s meeting, it can be reviewed in executive session.</p> <p>Motion: Daniel Franklin made a motion to approve the OSAC Operating Policies and Procedures as written, Chief Burke seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.</p>	
Projects With Legislative Intent to Continue Funding Annually – Kelly Dougherty	<p>Currently, there are four projects with legislative intent to continue funding annually:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outreach and engagement staff (as long as Opioid Abatement Special Fund (OASF funding is available)</li> <li>• Recovery residences (as long as OASF funding is available)</li> <li>• Syringe service programs (SSP) (as long as OASF funding is available)</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Burlington overdose prevention center (OPC) (through FY28)</li> </ul> <p>Questions for Discussion – Should OSAC review funding requests for projects with legislative intent to continue funding annually and make recommendations on these projects before considering any other funding requests? Or should OSAC review all funding requests together without prioritizing projects with legislative intent to continue funding annually?</p> <p>Motion: Senator Hardy made a motion that the projects that have been designated by the legislature for continued funding do not need to reapply. The committee will consider any change in their status and make recommendations to the Governor and Legislature accordingly and review all FY2027 funding proposals at the same time. Deb Wright seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.</p>	
State of Vermont Funding Application Presentation –Shayla Livingston	<p>Shayla reviewed the projects with legislative intent:</p> <p>Recovery Residences have \$1.4M  Outreach and Engagement need \$455,494.13 this year  SSP has carry forward money for this year but will need new funding in the future.  Treatment Satellite Services (MDU), DOC didn't use \$440,000 so it's going back into the OSAC fund  Reengagement beds – legislature gave VDH base funding so we can revert \$1M back into the OSAC fund  Overdose Prevention Center – no new funding due to carry forward but in the future, it will need new funding</p> <p>Request from the State for FY2027 a full list of projects:  Continued funding: Peer Recovery, DOC \$1.25M  Opioid Recovery Employment, DAIL \$875,000  Emergency Shelters, DCF \$800,000</p>	

	<p>Recovery residences, VTAAR \$1.4M Outreach and engagement services, Preferred Provider Network, \$455,500</p> <p>Senator Hardy asked that the state proposals follow the same process as the community proposals and hold off on this presentation due to inequity. Typically, the committee only invites presentations from applicants who make it through the first round of voting and that hasn't happened yet.</p> <p>Jess Kirby wants the State to wait.</p> <p>Judge Motta suggested the committee take a vote on when to hear the State proposals.</p> <p>Motion: Jess Kirby made a motion that the committee hear the state's proposals after the committee scores them with the other proposals. They will be invited provided their proposals make it through the first round. Ruth Hardy seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.</p>	
Ongoing Funding Pressures – Kelly Dougherty	<p>To date, many appropriations from the Opiate Abatement Special Fund (OASF) have been awarded to projects that have been identified as priorities for continued funding and for projects that have identified need for continued funding. The Statute also requires OSAC to “give priority consideration to services requiring funding on an ongoing basis.”</p> <p>This includes projects with specific legislative intent to continue funding annually (outreach and engagement, recovery residences, SSPs, OPC) and projects that have been recommended by OSAC with identified needs for continued funding (DAIL HireAbility, contingency management and many FY26 grantees).</p> <p>Each year, there will be less money available in OASF for appropriations (see previous budget presentation from VDH).</p>	

	<p>Taking into account the appropriations that have been made, there will not be sufficient funds in the OASF in future years to cover all these existing continuing obligations.</p> <p>While some of these pressures have been alleviated for FY27 given the carryforward available on some projects (SSPs, OPC, outreach and engagement, contingency management), these projects will likely need additional resources in FY28 and beyond, which could account for a large portion of the OASF money available in future years.</p> <p>If OSAC chooses to recommend funding for new projects, especially those with continued funding needs, previously recommended projects with continued funding needs may not be able to be funded.</p> <p>Over time, projects with continued funding needs that are unable to be supported with funds available in OASF would need to find other funding sources or the work would no longer be supported.</p> <p>Questions for Discussion: How should OSAC account for the ongoing pressure from projects with continued funding needs in its current and future year recommendation processes? Should OSAC change its process to first set aside funds for previously recommended projects with continued funding needs before considering new projects that will contribute to future year funding pressures? Should OSAC continue to consider each application on an annual basis without respect to continued funding needs or pressures?</p> <p>This was decided in agenda item #3 and the motion addressed these questions.</p>	
Funding Requests Without Applications – Kelly Dougherty	Last year, OSAC received funding requests from entities that had not completed the application process. OSAC made a determination that requests outside of	

	<p>the formal application and review process would not be considered but did not vote on it.</p> <p>Discussion: Should OSAC consider any funding requests where requesters did not apply through the formal process?</p> <p>Motion: Senator Hardy made a motion that OSAC will not consider any funding requests made outside of the formal application and review process, except the programs designated by the legislature for ongoing funding. Jess Kirby seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.</p>	
Decriminalization caused major rises in crime in both Oregon and Washington state article – Deb Wright	<p>Deb wanted to share the articles with the committee, she feels that the decriminalization of drug crimes has gotten worse and sees it first hand with a family member. Lack of criminal enforcement has been a problem in her community. Many people are discharged from treatment, and they land back into the community committing crimes.</p> <p>Daniel Franklin – Vermont sends mix messages re: substances like allowing alcohol “to go” and marijuana being legalized but we have mounting pressures with lots of other substances. 75% of people in recovery are there for alcohol use disorder. Vermont promotes substances (like craft beer) to make money.</p>	
Public Comment	<p>Kathryn Mullens – from Recovery.com. and they applied for funding. It would be helpful to know how much funding we can apply for, \$6M versus \$1M? Can the committee clarify?</p> <p>Kelly Dougherty - \$6M is available for FY 27 which includes ongoing projects. The committee will need to decide if the legislative intended project will continue to be funded.</p> <p>Ed Baker People on the front lines are not being listened to, front line people are the people using drugs and are close to death. We should have active users participate in the</p>	

	meetings. Look at data saving lives for people most at risk and if a program shows they are having an impact on that, we should continue to fund those programs.	
Next Meeting	October 6, 2025, 11 a.m.	