

Substance Misuse Prevention Oversight and Advisory Council December Meeting Minutes

Mtg. Facilitator: Melanie Sheehan
Mtg. Recorder: Nicole Rau Mitiguy
Mtg. Time Keeper: Nicole Rau Mitiguy
Where: Microsoft Teams meeting
Date: 7/20/2020
Start Time: 1:00 pm
End Time: 2:40 pm


Council Attendees

Mark those present with an "X"

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

Non-Council Attendees


Name		Organization		Name		Organization	
X	Cynthia Seivwright	VDH – Alcohol and Drug Abuse Programs		X	Rhonda Williams	VDH – Tobacco Control Program	
X	Lori Tatsapaugh Uerz	VDH – Alcohol and Drug Abuse Programs		X	Nicole Rau Mitiguy	VDH – Alcohol and Drug Abuse Programs	

#	Time Allotted (Optional)	Type of Topic	Agenda Item (Topic/Objective)	Notes
1	1:00-1:10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Inform <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discussion <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Decision	Welcome, Introductions, and June minute review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Melanie Sheehan: Thank you to this group that continues to prioritize substance use prevention despite the challenges and additional COVID work. June minutes were approved.
2	1:10-1:30	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Inform <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discussion <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Decision	Universal Afterschool Recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Though we are unsure what will be allowed for afterschool programming due to COVID or what action S.335 will have in the August session, the SMPC agreed to ensure that the SMPC recommendations regarding bill S. 335 are ready for review by the legislature. The recommendations are approved with the additional pieces to be added by Nicole Rau Mitiguy in consult with ADAP leadership and Auburn Watersong: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add reference to COVID regulations and the impact that could have, with links for resources on engagement in activities as related to COVID safety measures Add recommendation that all afterschool providers must complete a training on substance use prevention, noting that this would align with the Icelandic model to prevention as substance use prevention training is completed by individuals across sectors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further clarity given that a recommendation should be to ensure this training is allowed to be counted toward professional development to align requirements rather than adding an additional requirement The Substance Misuse Prevention Manager to coordinate with Auburn Watersong and ADAP's Prevention Unit to review current presentations available and ensure this is interwoven within the content. In addition to, or in alignment with the prevention training, a recommendation was made to ensure building resiliency and protective factors for youth to be a component of the required training as there is a connection between substance use and resiliency as seen in YRBS data as discussed in the follow slide deck: <div style="text-align: center;">  <p>YRBS Overview 2019 MS HS YRBS data for</p> </div> Decision that Substance Misuse Prevention Manager can make these modifications without additional SMPC approval. Kelly Dougherty will connect with VDH Policy team to identify the mechanism to provide SMPC recommendations to the legislation for their review Public Comment from: Lori Tatsapaugh Uerz

3	1:30-2:30	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Inform <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discussion <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Decision	SMPC Recommendations related to S. 54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The VT Legislature will come back for a special session on August 25th. S. 54 is not currently slated to be discussed in this special session, but it could be brought up if the legislature decides to do so. • The cannabis workgroup have met two times since our June meeting, with one of those meetings having all of the members present. • Workgroup has an active Google Doc with all of the resources informing the work of the workgroup • The workgroup reviewed the S. 54 bill and House amendment, in relation to the workgroup’s recommendation to compare what is written in the bill/amendment and what the workgroup would recommend. • From the language currently included in S. 54 the Cannabis Control Board would hold the responsibility of creating rules around packaging and advertising rather than the guidance or requirements being included in the bill itself • The workgroup believes that there is enough Vermont specific data to make recommendations for a Vermont specific threshold for roadway safety. The current bill does not include amendments to Title 23 Section 1201 a.3 But DLL feels amendments to this title could be made using 2012-2018 VT infraction data. • The THC limits included in this bill are high, per data and research completed in relation to THC potency levels. • It appears that the lens of S. 54’s approach leans more toward a business or agricultural approach rather than a public health or safety focus. • Workgroup was exploring if an “Opt In” approach for municipalities should be included regarding where cannabis could be sold, rather than the “opt out” approach currently included in the bill. The concern with “opt in” is that it creates an equity issue. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The SMPC agreed with the workgroup that this approach poses an equity issue as Vermont locations with more resources may be more likely to push against having retail cannabis, where underserved locations may not “opt out” which would add the burden on those communities to house these retailers. This leads to cannabis retail being more prevalent in marginalized communities, shifting social norms. ○ There is a sense that amending the bill to include “opt in” for municipalities is not a popular option among current legislators due to testimony heard to date. • Questions on oils as part of the recommendation – external or for vaping <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Could be for both <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If it came prepackaged with its own vaping device, would not follow those mg dose limits set in the bill as it relates to oils
---	-----------	--	---	---

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Concern over the impact this could have on youth in particular, specifically as it relates to EVALI ● Evidence based practice and lessons learned through work on prevention of tobacco use that was shared to inform the work around cannabis prevention included the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Designated smoking areas for state parks and beaches <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is still a lot of visibility and exposure within these designated areas ○ Restricting use around municipal buildings, especially popular public access buildings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerns about exposure when entering and existing buildings with individuals using outside of the building. There is a need to ensure there is enough space away from these buildings to truly protect individuals entering and exiting the building from exposure ○ Price floor – this is a weakness for tobacco, there is a suggestion to establish this for cannabis (and perhaps frame in a way that includes tobacco and cannabis) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ VDH’s Tobacco Control Program can share a webinar on the policy approach for a tobacco price floor for the workgroup to review and inform this potential consideration (https://countertobacco.org/policy/raising-tobacco-prices-through-non-tax-approaches/) ○ Currently there are no restriction on flavors for tobacco in Vermont <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Neighbors in New England are very active in this policy work ▪ There was a call to action from a Council member to try and align policies and messaging between tobacco and cannabis highlighting that the more there is parody between this work, the easier it will be to shift culture and attitudes. ● Open invitation for folks to join the workgroup that would be interested <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chris Herrick will be joining the workgroup <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Chris has sat through quite a few hours of testimony ● In addition to having a roadway test, there was a request to include the recommendation of also expanding Drug Recognition Experts known as DREs in the state. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ DREs are law enforcement officers who are specifically trained to identify when folks are under the influence of drugs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Currently there are only a few DREs trained. It takes a significant amount of time for a DRE to arrive on scene if called by another officer.
--	--	--	--	---

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The legislature believes all law enforcement officers should be trained, however to accomplish this it would take an extreme amount of time and resources and would not meet the immediate need if S. 54 was passed. • An additional point for consideration is the impact S. 54 would have on environment health because of the impact that commercial cannabis would have on the environment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Question on if the council should include some language around environmental health for this set of recommendations ▪ One thought is that because environmental health is a public health issue, we should include this lens in our set of recommendations • The current language on the Cannabis Review Board’s membership is focused on a business or agricultural approach. Public health and youth sectors are either not included or minimal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ From the literature, the best practice is to not include a cannabis industry representation or vested interest ○ The workgroup will likely propose a recommendation to expand the current membership to take a more public health view and framework noting that including a member of public health could also increase the perception of risk from consumers as public health inclusion might indicate a health impact. ○ Council member agreed with the need for someone with an epidemiology background should be included on the Cannabis Review Board to be able to discuss of link between protective factors and substance use. In the current bill, the SMPC has budgetary oversight of the percentage of the excise tax which could help direct where the investments will be, such as in prevention and messaging campaigns. ○ In this light, there was general agreement that a SMPC member should be included on the oversight board. • There are many times where there is a rub between economic development and public health <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ An ask from Melanie Sheehan -- is there experience within this group for navigating this rub? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Rand report on cannabis has many pages on multiple economic models ▪ This report is still available, with additional new journal articles around how public health sector should be included in the board ▪ The LA County RAM (Retail Access to Marijuana) Marijuana Policy Decision Matrix was cross referenced into the recommendations presented today. • Are there lessons learned from other states on this issue?
--	--	--	--	--

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Opportunity to do this in a proactive way ○ The RPP Marijuana Conference, canceled because of COVID-19, was going to look at lessons learned from other states <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This would have brought in experts from CO and CA to reintroduce the issue and what other states are working with, including RAM group ▪ ADAP is exploring if there is a way that this can be done this in person, or potentially have some webinars to bring this information in to the state ▪ Does ADAP have contacts with the states to bring information in on who is included on the Control Board? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lori Tatsapaugh Uerz, Vermont’s representative on the National Prevention Network is willing to ask other National Prevention Network representatives about contacts to inform the workgroup <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Melanie Sheehan to provide language to Lori for this request • The workgroup will provide the full council draft recommendations in early August for discussion during the August SMPC meeting on August 24th • An additional topic for consideration is CBD age restriction for sales: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No current age of sale restriction for CBD <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ For states that have a tax and regulate system for cannabis have a 21-age restriction ▪ Some CBD companies include language on CBD product labels that should they are not be used for folks under 21 ▪ Question on if this should be considered for this Council’s recommendations on S.54 ▪ Initial feeling is that it could be too much, especially since this bill is focused on THC especially as CBD is too widely sold, so is not practical to include in this bill ▪ Potential for this to be a separate topic for this Council to review separate from this work. <div style="text-align: center;">  <p>Cannabis Workgroup July 20 report out.pdf</p> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Comment from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Rhonda Williams
--	--	--	--	--

				○ Lori Tatsapaugh Uerz
4	2:30-2:40	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Inform <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discussion <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Decision	Next Steps and Reminders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next SMPC meeting is on August 24th from 1:00-3:00 using Microsoft Teams

Action Item Log			
#	Action Item	Due Date	Staff Responsible
1	Review Prevention 101 Training(s) to ensure resiliency is discussed in training	8/24/2020	Nicole Rau Mitiguy (NRM), Auburn Watersong with ADAP
2	Make edits to Universal Afterschool Recommendations and send final version to SMPC	8/24/2020	NRM
3	Identify mechanism to provide legislature SMPC recommendations with the VDH Policy team	8/24/2020	Kelly Dougherty
4	Language provided to Lori Tatsapaugh Uerz to share with the NPNs to identify stakeholders from legalized states to inform the SMPC's cannabis workgroup's recommendation related to industry representation on Cannabis Control Board	8/1/2020	Melanie Sheehan
5	After the initial drafting of recommendations, send drafted recommendations for bill S. 54 for consideration by the SMPC during the August 24 th meeting.	8/12/2020	Cannabis Workgroup