Substance Misuse Prevention Oversight and Advisory Council November Meeting Minutes

Mtg. Facilitator: Nicole Rau Mitiguy  
Mtg. Recorder: Nicole Rau Mitiguy  
Mtg. Time Keeper: Nicole Rau Mitiguy  
Where: Microsoft Teams meeting

Date: 11/16/2020  
Start Time: 1:00 pm  
End Time: 3:00 pm

### Council Attendees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization and Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization and Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Dougherty</td>
<td>Health Department, Co-Chair</td>
<td>Peter Espenshade</td>
<td>Recovery Vermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Sheehan</td>
<td>Mt. Ascutney Hospital and Health Center, Co-Chair</td>
<td>Skylar Dryden</td>
<td>Youth Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel French</td>
<td>Agency of Education, Executive Committee Member</td>
<td>Courtney Farrell</td>
<td>Lund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Herrick</td>
<td>Dept. of Public Safety, Executive Committee Member</td>
<td>Clay Gilbert</td>
<td>Rutland Mental Health, Evergreen Recovery Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Allaire</td>
<td>City of Rutland</td>
<td>Cindy Hayford</td>
<td>Deerfield Valley Community Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Brewer</td>
<td>Northwestern Medical Center</td>
<td>Roger Marcoux</td>
<td>Lamoille County Sherriff Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Brookes</td>
<td>Upstream Social Marketing</td>
<td>Maryann Morris</td>
<td>The Collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses Delane</td>
<td>Youth Representative</td>
<td>Christina Nolan</td>
<td>U.S. Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberley Diemond</td>
<td>Big Brother Big Sister</td>
<td>Eileen Peltier</td>
<td>Downstreet Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Searles, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Retired, Dept. of Health</td>
<td>Daisy Berbeco</td>
<td>Vermont Department of Mental Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Von Sitas</td>
<td>Regional Treatment Court</td>
<td>Auburn Watersong</td>
<td>Agency of Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyler Genest</td>
<td>Dept. of Liquor and Lottery</td>
<td>Erica Gibson</td>
<td>University of Vermont Medical Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Time Allocated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Time Allotted (Optional)</th>
<th>Type of Topic</th>
<th>Agenda Item (Topic/Objective)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:00-1:10</td>
<td>☒ Inform ☒ Discussion ☒ Decision</td>
<td>Welcome, Introductions, and October minute review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  * Meeting for December will be moved to December 14<sup>th</sup> from December 21<sup>st</sup>.  
  * Edits needed to October minutes  
    - Let’s Grow Vermont needs to be changed to Let’s grow Kids  
    - Clarification on the impact marketing with tobacco on children’s engagement in use |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2 1:10-1:25</td>
<td>Inform, Discussion</td>
<td>• October minutes with identified edits passed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|  | SMPC Workplan | • There have been multiple versions of the logic model  
|  |  | • Thank you to Amy Brewer, Auburn Waterson, Maryann Morris, Stephen Von Sitas and Cindy Hayford for significant edits on this logic model  
|  |  | • This logic model reflects the language in Act 82 and demonstrates the work that the SMPC can do on behalf of prevention in Vermont.  
|  |  | • The bulk of activities were put under the following:  
|  |  | o Reviewing  
|  |  | o Recommending  
|  |  | o Developing  
|  |  | o Advising  
|  |  | • These have been reflected in the performance measures that are included in the SMPC 2021 Annual Report.  
|  |  | • The logic model has a slight language tweak from Act 82 which references “prevention programming”  
|  |  | o The work of prevention is larger than programs and includes environmental strategies, policy work, and communication campaigns  
|  |  | o The language in the logic model has been adjusted to prevention initiatives or environmental strategies  
|  |  | o Environment strategies look at where families work, live, and play and work on promoting health  
|  |  | ▪ This is language from the prevention field. If SMPC Members need additional information on this, a future meeting agenda item can be going into depth on environmental strategies as related to substance use prevention.  
|  |  | • The Prevention Inventory was a launching point to start this reviewing process. From this initial review process the SMPC will be able to make recommendations.  
|  |  | • Many themes came up in the logic model development process.  
|  |  | o Subcommittee work is necessary to move work forward as this Council is as large as it is.  
|  |  | ▪ The SMPC has had success in subcommittee work through the Cannabis Workgroup and the workgroup for the 2021 Annual Report  
|  |  | ▪ Subcommittee work could become more systematized for the SMPC moving forward  
|  |  | o Funding was a theme, and language around this in annual report  
|  |  | o Elevating the work of inequality  
|  |  | o Question on the intention from Act 82 “Review existing youth programming… to determine a foundation of connection and support of all VT children and youth” as this was difficult to include as an outcome.  
|  |  | o What are the timeframes (short-term and long-term) for the SMPC and this work  
|  |  | o Evaluation is not explicit throughout the language, such as how would evaluation inform our work around recommendations.  
|  |  | o Lack of Chief Prevention Officer and how this work gets distributed across VDH and the SMPC.  

• Under the development of the media campaign and host two public meetings component of the logic model. In developing a media campaign there is a client side and an agency side. Typically, the client would identify the problem, the audience, and tentatively a solution, identify barriers and motivation, developing the evaluation plan. The agency side completes primary research if needed, creates the creative platform, and completes the production. What is the SMPC’s role for developing a media campaign?
  o The SMPC could act as a stakeholder group for VDH’s communication. The Substance Misuse Prevention Manager can connect with the divisions of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Programs (ADAP), Health Promotion and Disease Prevention (HPDP) and Maternal and Child Health (MCH) communication staff to utilize the SMPC as a stakeholder group for their communication campaigns.
  o There is no identified timeline for these activities in Act 82, so it can take multiple years to accomplish this activity.
  o SMPC agreed to modify the language in the logic model to “Assist with the development of a media campaign”

• The next steps for a workplan will be based primarily in the decisions that are made by the SMPC around the logic model and annual report performance measures.
  o The Substance Misuse Prevention Manager will support each workgroup in developing a workplan that addresses reviewing, recommending, and advising, with specific goals or products for each workgroup. It may be helpful to work the workplan backwards from the 2022 SMPC Annual Report

• What steps do SMPC members think should be included in the workplan to move this logic model into action?
  o Breaking out the tasks
  o Identifying partners
  o Identifying timelines

• Potential workgroup topics:
  o Feedback from previous VTERB experience is that workgroups are helpful for a deeper dive into a topic or a challenge to understand and translate for the larger group.
  o Community based and school-based programs are difficult to separate, and in VTERB these two pieces were together as one workgroup.
  o Support for inequities being its own workgroup.
  o The SMPC is assuming the responsibilities of VTERB, OCC, and VADAC and therefore the experience that members have from these previous councils will be valuable for the SMPC as it continues to build from the previous work of these councils.
  o VTERB also had a media committee, and it might be helpful to include for the SMPC given our logic model related to assisting with the development of a media campaign.
  o Should the SMPC have standing subcommittees with additional subcommittees happening ad hoc as needed?
As we look at our workgroup, we want to ensure we are not overcommitting ourselves with a relatively small group.

- Given the SMPC’s small numbers, the Council may need to prioritize some subcommittees given our current legislative situation, such as cannabis given the new cannabis law.

- Part of this work is developing our strategic plan while we are already

- The Intervention, Treatment, and Recovery Committee uses a model where there are four priority topics and five cross-cutting themes that are addressed for each of the priority topics. This could be a model that the SMPC looks to replicate as they take a look at the structure of their workgroups.

- In our meeting evaluations we have seen the need to identify and clarify the best practices of prevention, which could be another workgroup to examine the best practices of prevention and ensure the SMPC has a mutual understanding of those practices.
  - Additional meeting evaluations have asked how opioid overdose prevention works into the larger prevention work in the state, so potential for that to be explored in this committee as well.

- Health equity could be a cross cutting theme along with evaluation

- Having a workplan would allow the SMPC to be more deliberative in this process. Nicole, Kelly, and Melanie to meet to discuss and work on this before our next meeting to spend time discussing that during our time together in December.

- Is there any requests or needs from VDH around tobacco control that this Council would assume from VTERB?
  - Yes, as this Council replaces VADAC and VTERB there are needs from VDH that this Council can help support.
  - If it is helpful for VDH to provide more information on this in a future meeting.
  - These needs can be embedded within our workplans as the Council develops them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>1:25-2:10</th>
<th>Inform</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SMPC Annual Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Council previously decided to keep the recommendations generalized in a way that if any legislation would come up for alcohol, cannabis, or tobacco the recommendations would applicable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alcohol:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Suggestion to include an increase on alcohol sales tax, which has not been done in a number of years. This could be an important source of funding for prevention services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Across Substance Recommendations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Suggestion to start the recommendation section with parity across substances.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Suggestion to include the revenue of all substances to fund prevention work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Suggestion to examine if there needs to be a tax increase for all substances at a regular interval.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Act 82 does have language around any new tax for any substance would go to substance use prevention services, however, a designated fund was not created for this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- It was noted that tobacco had a specific fund and the legislature regularly used the funding in that fund for other priorities.
- A call out to ensure the prevention fund can address all substances and allow for flexibility in how they are used.
- A call for subcommittee work around funding to ensure that while the state utilizes tax revenue, that it doesn’t become dependent upon it and has a sustainable way to fund this work; if use goes down, so will the tax revenue.
  - A suggestion to include the restriction of flavors in this section
  - A suggestion to point out the disconnect between the language in Act 82 around taxation being put toward prevention services, but the Council not seeing that happen, specifically within the new vaping tax
    - This was one of the Governor’s concern in his letter to the Senate regarding cannabis
  - An acknowledgment that there are statutory parity as well as regulatory parity. While the SMPC likely is a proponent of parity across both, the Council should be mindful of the recommendations to include in their reports to the legislature, as the legislature only oversees the statutory components, and other boards or agencies oversee the regulatory components of those statutes.
    - It could be subcommittee work to examine this detail for future SMPC annual reports.
  - A suggestion to include local control over whether approving or denying licenses to sell products are granted. There is currently local control for alcohol licenses, and was included in S. 54.

- **Cannabis:**
  - This section includes the call out that a supplemental report specific to the excise tax will be submitted to the legislature later in the legislative session.
  - Suggestion to include language around the make-up of the Cannabis Control Board to ensure a public health perspective is included
    - In January the nominating committee will be appointed. The Cannabis Control Board will be nominated by May 2021.
    - It might be important to include this language in the Annual Report and the additional report to come out at a later date in the legislative session.
  - Suggestion to include language in addition to the 12 member board, to expand the number to ensure the key sectors who were not included as described in the previous S. 54 Recommendations.

- **Tobacco recommendations were developed in part with the Tobacco Control Program in the division of Health Promotion and Disease Prevention. This models the work from CDC on tobacco prevention.**
  - Suggestion to move the PACE study recommendation to the next steps section, as it is a “how” rather than a legislative recommendation
  - Based on conversations with the Tobacco Coalition, it is very likely that our recommendations in this report will reflect their policy priorities as well.
Local control does have some nuances, as local control for density may protect some communities and put others at risks. Local control for licenses allows for communities to say no, but local control for density is an area that would need to be discussed further for the Council.

- Public Comment: Mariah Sanderson

| 5 | 2:55-3:00 | ☐ Inform  
☐ Discussion  
☐ Decision | Adjourned |
|---|---|---|---|

- Next SMPC meeting is on December 14th from 1:00-3:00 using Microsoft Teams
- The SMPC will receive instructions on how to vote and move forward with the Annual Report given the timeline for this work.

**Action Item Log**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Staff Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rebecca Brookes will add a report on the SharePoint on how advertising for young children on substances increases their likelihood of engaging in substance use.</td>
<td>11/16/2020</td>
<td>SMPC Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Meet to discuss workplan creation.</td>
<td>12/14/2020</td>
<td>Kelly Dougherty, Melanie Sheehan, and Nicole Rau Mitiguy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Review SMPC Annual Reports and provide edits.</td>
<td>11/30/2020</td>
<td>SMPC Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Submit SMPC Annual Report to VDH Policy</td>
<td>12/1/2020</td>
<td>Nicole Rau Mitiguy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Vote on the annual report recommendations.</td>
<td>11/30/2020</td>
<td>SMPC Members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minutes approved on 12/14/2020.