

Tennessee Opioid Abatement Council Quarterly Meeting	
Date	March 18, 2024
Time	9:00am-1:00 pm EDT
Location	Farragut Community Center

Council Members Present: Brian Buuck, Casey Cox, Charme Allen, Clay Jackson, Karen Pershing, Ken Moore, Lisa Tipton, Mike Flynn, Shayne Sexton, Stephanie Vanterpool, Stephen Loyd, Timothy Fournet, Thomas Farmer, Wayne Wykoff

Council Members Attending via Microsoft Teams: Armando Fontes

Staff Attending via Microsoft Teams: Matt Yancey, Matthew Parriott

Guests Attending in Person: Leann Hilliard, Kenny Johnston, Savannah Meade, Sara Bean, Shayla Wilson, Rebekah Bohannon, Alexa LeBouef, Paul Vickers, Lee Dilworth, Jeremy Kourvelas, Felicia Dellanini, Dan Spurlock, Deborah Hillin, Joshua Wright, Steven Ballard, Linda McLain, Cheryl Meadors, Pierce Gentry, Dean Graber.

Guest Attending via Microsoft Teams: Ben Harrington, Anna Gamino, Trish Burchette, Jodi Howard, Rebekah Provost-Emmons, Gwen Brown, Tracy Bacchus, Brittany Harleston, John Greenwood, Allie Cohn, Clark Flatt, Alanna McKissack, Peter Phillips, Adul Sawas, Heath Loyd, Colby Lane, Dianne Rease, Holly Kirby, Danielle Kohler, Amy Brown, Kris Kelley, Lyle Cooper, Jim Casey, Christian Tyree, Maggie Clark, Maranda Williams, Erin DeLullo, Trish Cunningham, Christi Granstaff, Richard Barber, Laura Durham, Greg Keeling, Paul Fuchcar, Tina Pettingill, Thomas Clinton, Mary Linden, Chloe Ligon, Liz Garza, Elizabeth Millsaps, Lisa Bell, Janet Brewer, Nancy Hooper, Lauren Lindback, April Clark, Brand Newland, Sascha Henderson, Alanna McKissack, Courtney Collier, Parul Patel, Mary Katsikas, Ken Trogdon, Patrick Schmidt, Brooke West, Lynsey Stubbs, Jonathan North, Melissa Fields, Lyle Cooper, Lyn Noland. Numerous other guests joined the meeting virtually using non-identifying connections.

Staff: Marie Williams, Mary Shelton, Sejal West, Elizabeth Rickman-Vaden, Ella Reding, David Sappington, Mark Carillo, Sam Boukli, Michael Stahl

Presenter	Topic	Discussion
S. Loyd	Welcome and Introductions	<p>S. Loyd opened the meeting, welcomed everyone, and reminded the Council of their why.</p> <p>He then asked for a moment of silence and displayed a slide show of pictures sent in by the public of loved ones that have been lost to opioid overdoses.</p> <p>S. Loyd then began Council business by having Council members and staff introduce themselves. Chair determined a quorum was present with 14 council members attending in person and 1 attending virtually via Microsoft Teams.</p>

M. Shelton	Approval of Minutes	M. Shelton conducted a roll call vote to approve minutes and all were approved.
M. Shelton	Conflict of Interest	M. Shelton presented the council's Conflict of Interest statement and explained that each council member and staff submitted a list of potential conflicts-of-interest.
M. Shelton	Fiscal Update	M. Shelton shared the Opioid Abatement Trust Fund balance, along with relevant information about any new or pending settlement funds.
M. Shelton	Community Grants Overview	<p>M. Shelton shared an overview of Tennessee's National Opioid Settlement Funds and how those funds are allocated, as determined by the State Legislature.</p> <p>M. Shelton then shared the specific statute T.C.A. 33-11-103(p) that stipulates the percentage of funds to be allocated via the community grant process.</p> <p>M. Shelton shared a summary of the Community Grants timeline, followed by an overview flowchart of the Community Grant application process and a screenshot of the Smart Simple application dashboard, showing 386 applications scored, 10 applications timed out, and 79 applications cancelled.</p> <p>M. Shelton then shared slides showing a breakdown of requested funding by strategy and by 1-, 2-, and 3-year requests.</p>
M. Shelton	Review of Scoring Process	<p>M. Shelton shared a flowchart of the review and scoring process for community grant applications.</p> <p>M. Shelton then shared the process of randomization in scoring assignment, and process of re-assigning any scorers with conflicts-of-interest as needed.</p> <p>M. Shelton recognized staff and council members involved in the scoring process.</p>
M. Shelton	Determining Eligible Applications	M. Shelton shared the percentage of funding allocated to each of the six (6) remediation strategies, as agreed upon by the Council previously.

		<p>M. Shelton then shared the approved 2024 and proposed 7-year budgets, highlighting the year 1 budget of \$81 million to be awarded in this cycle.</p> <p>M. Shelton shared the list of requirements that were incorporated into the selection process, as well as other factors that were taken into consideration during the process.</p> <p>M. Shelton shared the proposed methodology for selecting grantees, with applications grouped by remediation strategy, ranked by score, and then eligibility determined based on funds allocated for each strategy.</p> <p>M. Shelton further shared that OAC staff met individually with each council member to review the proposed package of grants to fund and solicit feedback.</p>
<p>M. Shelton</p>	<p>Review of Community Grant Applications</p>	<p>M. Shelton shared the workbook of applications, sorted by remediation strategy, and with applications proposed for funding highlighted.</p> <p>M. Shelton displayed a slide showing the six (6) remediation strategies, number of proposed grant awards, total number of passing scores for that strategy, total funding by dollar amount and percentage, and amount of capital funding for each strategy.</p> <p>She explained that each strategy is referred to as a ‘slate’ of applications to be reviewed, discussed, and voted on by the Council.</p> <p>M. Shelton explained that the proposed slates are suggested based on highest scores to arrive at a group of applications roughly equal to the dollar amount allocated to each strategy.</p> <p>M. Shelton then displayed an overview of the proposed application slates, with two options. This overview also showed unallocated funds from the research strategy, as the applications received for research did not reach the targeted funding amount.</p>

		<p>M. Shelton shared a slide showing proposed Community Grant awards by agency size, with a mix of small, medium, and large organizations included in the proposed funding. She then yielded the floor to chairperson S. Loyd.</p>
<p>S. Loyd</p>	<p>Recap of Attorney General's charge to the Council</p>	<p>S. Loyd expressed his appreciation of the work done by OAC staff in preparation for this meeting and asked for questions or concerns. There were no questions or comments.</p> <p>S. Loyd then recalled the July 8, 2022 meeting at the Tennessee Tower with then Attorney General Slattery. He shared the A.G.'s charge that the council's work will be setting the stage for addiction treatment and related matters in Tennessee for the next 2 to 3 decades, and shared personal reflections on this charge.</p> <p>S. Loyd emphasized that this will be a transparent process, that we have a remediation list and the council understands how these funds must be used.</p> <p>He shared that the council's work follows a 'begin with the end in mind' approach and shared that if all states use the funds appropriately, computer models predict it will take until the year 2046 for overdose death rates to return to a 1997 level.</p> <p>S. Loyd shared the A.G.'s comments that Tennessee is a fiscally responsible state that wants to spend money on things that work, and stressed the importance of measurement, accountability, and flexibility throughout this process.</p> <p>S. Loyd then again expressed his appreciation to the Council and Staff for the effort it took to review and score all the grant applications. He shared his excitement over the number of applications received addressing the Recovery Support strategy, while also sharing disappointment in the low number of Research applications received.</p>

		Commissioner M. Williams then commented that although a small number of research projects were proposed, many of the components have been researched and that may be something for council members to keep in mind moving forward.
M Shelton	Recap of Proposed Application Slates	<p>M. Shelton gave a quick recap that the \$81 million is stratified across the 6 strategies, defined percentages, and proposed funding amounts. She then displayed the slide again showing the proposed application slates.</p> <p>M. Shelton shared that she could go back and forth between the PowerPoint slides and the Excel spreadsheets as needed.</p>
S. Loyd	Break	S. Loyd again recognized the Opioid Abatement Council staff for the hard work involved in preparing this proposal and proposed a 10-minute break. Council agreed to a short break with a return after break to take up consideration of the proposed packages.
S. Loyd	Reconvene	<p>S. Loyd called the meeting back to order, and asked M. Shelton to address the conflict-of-interest issue, pointing out that the far-right column of each slate contained the names of council members who reported a conflict of interest with that applicant.</p> <p>He also asked council members to review the proposed slates and point out any conflicts that may not have been previously reported.</p>
M. Shelton	Conflicts of Interest	<p>M. Shelton displayed the Excel sheets for the proposed slates and asked council members to again review this.</p> <p>She then proposed a process whereby certain applications were excluded from the initial en bloc vote and then voted on separately, with specific council members abstaining from those individual votes based on their reported conflicts.</p> <p>M. Shelton asked S. Boukli (counsel) to share his thoughts on the process.</p>
S. Boukli	Clarification of process and options	S. Boukli restated and clarified the process proposed by M. Shelton, whereby applications with a conflict would be pulled out of the slate,

		<p>the full council would then vote on the slate, and then the specific applications with a conflict would be voted on separately with the conflicting member(s) abstaining as appropriate.</p>
S. Loyd	Support for proposed process	<p>S. Loyd voiced his support for the process proposed by M. Shelton and S. Boukli for addressing conflicts of interest and asked for any objections. Council members all concurred.</p>
S. Loyd	Acknowledgment of public support	<p>S. Loyd shared that the pictures he displayed earlier came from a Facebook group, and since the meeting convened additional pictures had been added to the post, with over 200 families sharing photos to the group.</p> <p>M. Shelton stated that she had presented the needed information and turned the meeting back over to the chairperson to proceed with discussion and voting on proposed slates.</p> <p>S. Loyd then asked for open discussion, and suggested the Council come to a consensus for one motion to proceed rather than multiple individual motions at this time.</p>
S. Vanterpool	Conflicts of Interest	<p>S. Vanterpool suggested that the council vote by strategy/slate. She also commented that conflicts of interest were addressed previously via assignment of scorers, and questioned if it was necessary to further address this by separating those applications.</p> <p>S. Loyd asked for an opinion from counsel.</p> <p>S. Boukli shared his recommendation that the council proceed with the process as discussed earlier, separating apps with conflicts and voting on them separately with the conflicted council member(s) abstaining.</p> <p>S. Loyd concurred with S. Boukli's recommendation and asked for input from Commissioner and Deputy Director. Both agreed with S. Boukli and there were no objections to proceeding as discussed previously.</p> <p>S. Loyd suggested the council move forward with consideration of the proposed slates and yielded the floor to M. Shelton.</p>

<p>M. Shelton</p>	<p>Discussion of Education and Training Slate of Applications & Motion</p>	<p>M. Shelton displayed the spreadsheet tab showing the Education and Training strategy slate of applications and asked the council to share if they wanted to start with a different strategy. There being no objection the council began deliberation on the proposed slate.</p> <p>S. Loyd commented that one of the proposed applicants is Tennessee Medical Foundation and shared that he is a member of this organization as a participant but is not part of their organizational hierarchy and therefore feels that there is no conflict.</p> <p>S. Loyd asked for discussion or a motion and shared that his experience with grants is that once they are scored it is generally a matter of moving down the list and seeing how many can be funded.</p> <p>S. Sexton asked for clarification on the omission of one specific application, from TN Oncology, that was skipped over.</p> <p>S. West explained the funding parameters for the strategy of Education and Training, stating that the allocated budget for this strategy is 10%, or \$8.1 million. She shared that due to the first-year cost of this project funding it would significantly exceed the budgeted amount.</p> <p>Therefore, the next application was funded instead, as its year 1 amount fit within the budget parameters.</p> <p>S. Loyd confirmed that this answered S. Sexton’s question.</p> <p>K. Moore made a motion to approve the Education and Training slate as displayed.</p> <p>C. Jackson asked to amend the motion to approve by excluding the two applications that had listed conflicts of interest, so that those applications could be voted on separately with the conflicted members abstaining.</p>
--------------------------	---	--

		<p>S. Loyd restated the amended motion to approve the slate with the exclusion of lines 13 and 17, to be voted on separately. He then asked for a second, which was offered by W. Wykoff.</p> <p>S. Loyd asked for any further discussion, and there being none asked that the council proceed with a roll call vote.</p>
M. Shelton	Roll Call Votes & Motions	<p>M. Shelton conducted roll call vote and the motion carried, with S. Loyd abstaining.</p> <p>S. Loyd then asked to vote on the line 13 application and noted that Dr. Jackson is the conflicted member.</p> <p>T. Fournet made a motion to accept the application on line 13, with second from K. Pershing. S. Loyd asked for discussion and there was none.</p> <p>M. Shelton conducted roll call vote and the motion carried, with C. Jackson and S. Loyd abstaining.</p> <p>S. Loyd then asked for a motion to approve the application on line 17, with B. Buuck and T. Fournet recused. Motion to accept was made by M. Flynn and seconded by S. Vanterpool. S. Loyd asked for discussion and there was none.</p> <p>M. Shelton conducted roll call vote and the motion carried, with B. Buuck, T. Fournet, and S. Loyd abstaining.</p> <p>S. Loyd thanked the council and expressed congratulations to the recipients.</p>
M. Shelton	Discussion of Harm Reduction Slate	<p>M. Shelton displayed the Harm Reduction slate of applications and explained that there are 2 options for the council to consider, Option 1 and Option 2.</p> <p>S. Loyd started the discussion by pointing out that option 1 contains the Meharry Rise project, and by opting to not fund that project a larger slate of projects can be funded as displayed in</p>

	<p>Option 2 which includes some small and medium sized applicants. He then asked for comment from K. Moore.</p> <p>K. Moore shared that Tennessee is #2 in the country in overdose deaths, and he agreed that this is a category where we 'need to spread some more money out.</p> <p>He stated he would like to see an option where the Meharry project is funded at \$5 million (rather than \$7.5mil) which would free up some additional money to fund some additional projects. He also stated that the Research category has some unallocated funds that could be used to fund the Meharry project at a lower rate. He then asked for some discussion on this topic.</p> <p>S. Loyd stated he would be happy to entertain a motion but would like to hear more discussion from the council members first.</p> <p>C. Jackson commented that Dr. Moore's proposal could be worthy of consideration, and asked for clarification on how much unallocated funding is available.</p> <p>S. Loyd clarified the question and asked how much money is allocated for research.</p> <p>M. Shelton asked for explanation from S. West and asked to display the research slate.</p> <p>S. West explained that one of the Research applications was duplicative of services that will be provided by our vendor SAS. She then asked to display the summary sheet and clarified that only 2 of the strategies have a second option. Harm Reduction and Research. The displayed slide showed option 2 for research with \$3.297 million in unallocated funds.</p> <p>K. Moore commented (inaudible)</p> <p>C. Jackson commented that the council engaged in lengthy discussions about the Rise project as it</p>
--	---

	<p>had been considered for expedited review, and that there had been a couple of iterations to consider on that application. He then asked if it would be feasible to award a lower amount than requested for this project.</p> <p>M. Shelton shared that she did ask Dr. Cooper (Meharry) about lower funding amounts and said this is feasible but will lower the amount of Narcan the project can provide.</p> <p>S. Loyd commented that the council staff had thought of this back in November-December, of reducing the amount.</p> <p>He said every other part of this project would be in place, so it does come down to the amount of Narcan that can be purchased and distributed.</p> <p>He then apologized for using the term 'Narcan' and said it should be referred to as 'overdose reversal drugs' due to there being multiple brand names of this on the market. He said the Rise project happened to be for Narcan.</p> <p>C. Jackson commented that the cleanest way to consider this money is to decide if we want to reallocate funds, the council should stop the current discussion, go to the Research slate, vote on those options, see how much money is left over, and then vote to reallocate it to Harm Reduction.</p> <p>The council could then come back to the Harm Reduction slate, see what the math is, and decide.</p> <p>K. Moore interjected that Commissioner Williams had pointed out that there is a significant amount of research in every application, and there will be more and more opportunities for research that will follow.</p> <p>He stated that we are just in year one and trying to get money out the door so we can be creative moving forward on research wherever the data points us. He shared that he has no problem</p>
--	---

	<p>moving to the Research slate to try and find more money for Harm Reduction.</p> <p>S. Loyd thanked Dr. Moore for his comments and recognized Commissioner Williams.</p> <p>Commissioner M. Williams asked if there is a breakdown between West, Middle, and East.</p> <p>M. Shelton directed attention to column F in the spreadsheet.</p> <p>Commissioner Williams asked that the council look for an equitable distribution of funds across Grand Divisions when taking the final vote.</p> <p>S. Loyd clarified that as they move through the different strategies this will be the final vote. He stated that during his pre-meeting session with staff he could see the mix between small cap, medium cap, large cap, East, Middle, and West to make sure that we try to be equitable across the state. He also pointed out that several grants are statewide and therefore should include all 3 Grand Divisions.</p> <p>He also noted that there are columns in the displayed spreadsheet that give this information.</p> <p>Commissioner Williams asked that the council take all these factors into consideration when voting.</p> <p>S. Loyd thanked the Commissioner for her input and shared that this was part of the consideration when looking at the slates.</p> <p>He also reminded the council that discussions were had with Meharry staff about reducing the amount of funding for the Rise project.</p> <p>He pointed out that by going with Option 2 for Harm Reduction is gives a much broader allocation of funds between small, medium, and large organizations and across the grand divisions.</p>
--	--

		<p>S. Loyd reminded the council that early on, when deciding on the various percentages per strategy, the council wanted the flexibility to move money. He shared that he would like to see funding go to things that are needed, and looking at the Harm Reduction slate... He then commented that he does not like the term 'Harm Reduction' because it has negative connotations and sees them as survival programs, and it's about keeping people alive until we can get them the help they need.</p> <p>S. Loyd stated it is important as the public watches the work of the council, that 'we're here after the tornado hit, and we've got our arms out and we're going to help the people in our community' and harm reduction is a quick way to do that 'while the cavalry arrives.' He then recognized T. Farmer.</p> <p>T. Farmer (inaudible); T. Farmer stated that he is good with reallocating the funds, but not to just one program.</p> <p>S. Loyd pointed out that this is a fair point, and he had not thought of many of these points. He stated that in looking at the grants, it is score, it is distribution, and it is the size of the organization that were deemed important from the very start.</p> <p>S. Loyd then asked to look at the other slates to see what the distribution of funds looks like regarding organization size and geographical distribution. He asked the council members to take their own notes on this.</p> <p>(inaudible)</p> <p>S. Loyd asked if the council member would like to state this in the form of a motion.</p> <p>(inaudible)</p>
<p>S. Loyd</p>	<p>Motion and Vote</p>	<p>S. Loyd stated we have a motion on the floor that the council retains the ability to reallocate funds that are unspent in other categories.</p>

		<p>T. Fournet seconded the motion.</p> <p>M. Shelton conducted a roll call vote and the motion passed with none abstaining.</p> <p>S. Loyd thanked the council and shared his belief that this is a good way forward. He then asked to view the next tab in the presentation workbook.</p>
<p>S. Loyd</p>	<p>Discussion of Other Slates and Unallocated Funds</p>	<p>S. Loyd stated that the next tab is Primary Prevention.</p> <p>S. Vanterpool (inaudible)</p> <p>S. Loyd commented that there appears to be a good mix in this slate between small, medium, large and East, Middle, and West divisions.</p> <p>S. West then displayed the unallocated funds recommendations showing 2 options. She pointed out that based solely on scores the first option has 5 applications, all from Recovery Support. She stated they also added an option from the treatment slate, since this strategy had the largest percentage of funding.</p> <p>C. Jackson asked for clarification.</p> <p>S. Loyd stated that these are the highest scoring applications that are currently unfunded, regardless of funding, but they happen to fall into the 2 biggest categories of Recovery Support and Treatment. He clarified this is based on score alone.</p> <p>M. Shelton asked to display the Harm Reduction slate again and clarified that the Meharry Rise project had a final score of 88.72.</p> <p>C. Jackson (inaudible) asked to include the Rise project as another option for unallocated funds, due to it having the higher score.</p> <p>S. Loyd clarified that there are six strategies, and M. Shelton stated that the council has so far voted on one slate, Education and Training.</p>

	<p>S. Loyd summarized that there are 5 categories left to consider, so he asked to move forward with looking at the other categories. He stated that while the score is one factor to consider, they also need to consider the mix between East, Middle, and West and small, medium, and large organizations.</p> <p>S. Loyd then asked to display the next category, and stated the next category is Primary Prevention. He stated that the high score is an 87. S. Loyd then recognized T. Farmer</p> <p>T. Farmer stated that since they would be moving funds allocated to research to another category, they will need to adjust the percentages.</p> <p>S. Loyd confirmed this was correct, stating that according to the math, whatever is removed from Research will need to be reallocated and the resulting percentages updated to reflect this. He commented that this was what was talked about at the very start, that the council wanted the ability to reallocate as needed. He then asked to scroll down a bit on the displayed slate to see the applications below the cut-off, then asked for any additional discussion.</p> <p>S. Loyd asked to see the next category, which is Recovery Support and was the biggest category.</p> <p>K. Moore stated that he is on the board of one of the proposed organizations and as such will need to be added as a conflict of interest on that application.</p> <p>M. Shelton clarified which application Dr. Moore referenced, and his name was added as a COI for that application.</p> <p>S. Loyd commented that there are so many organizations across the state that it can be challenging to identify all the potential COIs.</p>
--	--

	<p>S. Loyd pointed out that the first 4 unfunded applications in this category were the ones proposed to fund with the unallocated research dollars. He stated that this makes sense due to it being the largest category. He then asked for any discussion on the slate of Recovery Support.</p> <p>S. Loyd asked to look at the Treatment slate.</p> <p>C. Jackson commented that if the council votes by slate the only option is what to do with Harm Reduction.</p> <p>S. Loyd clarified that they could go with a reduced amount for the Meharry Rise project or go with the option that eliminates that project.</p> <p>C. Allen (inaudible)</p> <p>S. Loyd responded that they are just looking through all the slates to get a general feel for what they have in all the categories, and that Research is the last one to look at.</p> <p>S. Vanterpool clarified that the council could vote on the proposed slates, and then decide what to do with the unallocated funds.</p> <p>S. Loyd concurred and asked to display the Research slate. He pointed out that there are 2 options for the Research slate.</p> <p>M. Shelton clarified that they have looked at the scope of services under the SAS contract, and there is a duplication between the U of M research proposal and the services contracted with SAS, hence the second option that eliminates the U of M proposal.</p> <p>S. Loyd stated if they look at Dr. Moore's motion and Dr. Jackson's addendum to it they would need to decide and vote on the Research slate so they know how much unallocated funds they will have when they go back to address Harm Reduction, or other categories.</p>
--	--

		<p>C. Jackson (inaudible)</p> <p>S. Loyd stated an opinion that they need to decide and vote on the Research category, and then move forward as Dr. Jackson has described.</p>
S. Loyd	<p>Discussion and Vote on Research Slate & Motion</p>	<p>K. Moore made a motion to approve option 2 on the Research slate.</p> <p>M. Flynn seconded the motion.</p> <p>S. Loyd asked for any discussion. Being none, he asked to proceed with a roll call vote.</p> <p>M. Shelton conducted roll call vote on the Research slate, option 2, and the motion carried with S. Loyd abstaining.</p> <p>S. Loyd summarized that this leaves them with \$3.297 million in unallocated funds.</p> <p>S. Loyd thanked the council for their votes and asked to return to the Harm Reduction slate.</p>
S. Loyd	<p>Discussion and Vote on Harm Reduction Slate & Motion</p>	<p>S. Loyd stated that the Harm Reduction slate is now displayed, and they have 2 options to choose from.</p> <p>M. Shelton pointed out that choosing option 2 would include 2 additional applications from Meharry on lines 44 and 45.</p> <p>A motion was made by T. Farmer to approve option 2 and was seconded by C. Cox.</p> <p>K. Moore expressed his continued support for the Rise project, stating that it would get Naloxone into areas that are underserved at this time.</p> <p>S. Vanterpool (inaudible)</p> <p>S. Loyd asked for any further discussion.</p> <p>T. Farmer pointed out that there are projects included in option 2 that would also likely include Naloxone distribution.</p> <p>C. Jackson pointed out that they just voted to have \$3.2 million unallocated, and that in</p>

	<p>discussions with Meharry regarding the Rise project they provided options for reduced funding amounts.</p> <p>He then commented that he preferred spreading the money out rather than devoting almost the entire 10% to one program. He stated he would support funding the Rise project at a reduced rate if that still allowed for an equitable distribution among the other applicants.</p> <p>He stated he would opt to vote on the option that excludes the Rise project, and then come back and discuss/vote on how to spend the unallocated funds.</p> <p>C. Jackson also put forth the idea to remove app 57 from option 2 (at 1.697 million) and move the moneys into the unallocated fund bringing the total to close to 5 million which could be used to fund the Meharry Rise Project.</p> <p>S. Loyd thanked Dr. Jackson for his comments and recognized Dr. Fournet.</p> <p>T. Fournet stated his preference to go ahead and vote on the Harm Reduction slate and then go back and vote on the unallocated funds afterward.</p> <p>S. Loyd commented that Tennessee has the second highest overdose rate in the nation, and a broad statewide effort, such as proposed in the Rise project, would be very worthwhile.</p> <p>He also commented that the Rise project has a media component, and that it does no good to have opioid reversal drugs available if the people don't know that they are there. He reiterated that Rise was one of the highest scoring projects, with almost immediate statewide impact, so the council can come back and try to fund it with the unallocated dollars at whatever level they choose.</p>
--	--

		<p>He also pointed out that they can fund several other projects with the unallocated funds, and not fund Rise based on the discussions that have taken place.</p> <p>S. Loyd reminded C. Jackson there is currently a motion on the floor to vote on Option 2 for Harm Reduction and what he would be asking is to add an amendment to the motion on the floor.</p> <p>S. West confirmed the 1.7 million discussed earlier would be split up over three years and the Meharry Rise Project was a one-year grant. So, the actual yearly amount would be \$566,566.00.</p> <p>S. Loyd “Which would put this at 3.7 million rather than 5 million.”</p> <p>C. Jackson commented on the two other Meharry applications under the Harm Reduction Strategy and was interested in their total funding request.</p> <p>M. Shelton answered with 1.8 million and 2.1 million total funding for three years.</p> <p>S. Loyd reminds the council there is still a motion on the floor to vote for option 2 in Harm Reduction. This vote will not affect the unallocated funding (3.297 million) which is separate. The voting will proceed without the 2 conflicts of interest.</p> <p>M. Williams reminded the council the state substance abuse and mental health also funds Narcan distribution across the state.</p> <p>S. Loyd thanked M. Williams for the reminder of the state funding, then called for a roll call vote.</p>
M. Shelton	Voting on Option 2 Harm Reduction	M. Shelton called for a roll call vote for Option 2 Harm Reduction.
S. Loyd	Option 2 Harm Reduction & Motion	S. Loyd stated Option 2 carries except for the two conflicts of interest. Which will be voted on with the two conflicts removed from the Harm Reduction package. Voting proceeds.

		<p>S. Loyd confirms the motion carries and congratulates the awardees for Option 2 Harm Reduction.</p>
S. Loyd	<p>Voting/Discussion on Primary Prevention Discussion & Motion</p>	<p>S. Loyd recognizes the COI's (conflicts of interest) on the Primary Prevention Strategy as the council prepares to vote with a motion on the floor to accept the current strategy except for the COI's lines 7,8,12,16,18,19,25 and 29. Motion has been made and second.</p> <p>C. Cox reported he has an additional conflict which is added to the line up to read, lines 7,8,12,16,17,18,19,25,29 and 31. Motion and a second to carry roll call vote.</p> <p>M. Shelton calls a roll call vote.</p> <p>S. Loyd stated that the motion carries and proceeds to continue roll call vote for remaining conflict of interest applications.</p> <p>Voting concludes with all votes and motion carries for Primary Prevention and congratulations to all awardees of Primary Prevention Strategy.</p>
S. Loyd	<p>Voting/Discussion on Recovery Support Strategy & Motion</p>	<p>S. Loyd began the next strategy, Recovery Support, by calling out his COI's, line 11,14,19. Discussion continued with the remaining COI's 8,11,12,14,19,20,27 and 28. Motion carries on the floor to have a roll call vote.</p> <p>M. Shelton begins roll call vote on all items except for lines 8,11,12,14,19,20,27 and 28.</p> <p>S. Loyd the motion carries. A motion is made for continued roll call votes with the remaining conflict of interest line items until all have been covered.</p> <p>Motion carries, and congratulations to all Recovery Support awardees.</p> <p>S. Vanderpool makes a point regarding Primary Prevention and an error on the spreadsheet. Clarification needs to be made regarding an item listed as one-year award when it is a three-year award.</p>

		<p>S. Loyd announced a 10-minute break while the correction is made to the spreadsheet.</p>
S. Loyd	Voting/Discussion Regarding Treatment Strategy & Motion	<p>S. Loyd addresses the council after the break to review and vote on Treatment Strategy.</p> <p>The conflicts-of-interest are all identified. Discussion continued with ensuring the Spreadsheet is accurate with relation to the 1-, 2-, 3-year budgets and to put it on record to correct them going forward.</p> <p>It was noted that the overall budget would not be affected.</p> <p>S. Loyd continued with ensuring all conflicts-of-interest are covered with the council members.</p> <p>C. Jackson made a motion to fund the entire Treatment Strategy except for line items 7,9,11,12,17,18,19,27,32 and 36 (COI's).</p> <p>K. Moore second the motion.</p> <p>S. Loyd asks for discussion and there is none, so a roll call vote is asked for.</p> <p>M. Shelton calls for a roll call vote.</p> <p>S. Loyd announces the motion carries and proceeds to continue roll call vote until all conflict of interest are addressed.</p> <p>S. Loyd announces the motion carries and congratulations to all the awardees.</p>
S. Loyd	Unallocated Fund Recommendations/Discussion & Motions	<p>S. Loyd opened the floor for discussion on the use for unallocated funds of 3.297 million left over from the Research Strategy. Discussion continued with the need to include the Meharry Rise Project to the spreadsheet with the other high score candidates.</p> <p>S. Loyd confirmed the Meharry Rise Project should be placed in a category of its own in the Harm Reduction strategy due to the Spread sheet being divided by Strategy.</p>

	<p>Discussion continues with where the best use for the \$3.297 million in unallocated funds.</p> <p>S. Vanderpool made the point with Meharry Rise that the council vote is based on the score and not by how many applications they have submitted.</p> <p>S. Loyd continued discussion with the council deciding where to place the unallocated funding.</p> <p>S. Vanderpool recommended the council also add an application that was left out of Education/Training due to the dollar asking amount being too high to fit within the confines of the percentages allotted to the Strategies.</p> <p>S. Loyd thanked the council for their due diligence for accuracy within the proceedings.</p> <p>Also, the council was reminded that there is still a motion on the floor to fund the highest score on the unallocated fund spread sheet.</p> <p>M. Shelton proceeds with the roll call vote to accept the motion to give the unallocated money to the highest score.</p> <p>S. Loyd reported the motion failed to fund the highest score. He proposed to the council to fund the applicants in the unallocated spread sheet that are in Recovery Support strategy.</p> <p>T. Farmer made a motion to fund the five Recovery Support applications with the 3.297million unallocated funds.</p> <p>S. Loyd calls for a roll call vote to fund the 5 Recovery Support applications with the unallocated funds of 3.297 million.</p> <p>M. Shelton takes the roll call vote.</p> <p>S. Loyd stated the motion carries and congratulations to the additional “grantees.” He then called on the council to go back and ensure there was no conflict of interest on the</p>
--	--

		<p>previous strategy that needed corrections on their 1-, 2-, 3-year funding. Then asked if there were any conflicts on any of the projects before voting commences.</p> <p>C. Jackson makes a motion to proceed with the vote and has a second by T. Fournet.</p> <p>S. Loyd motion carries, thank you all.</p> <p>Then called for a 10-minute lunch break and then to come back and finish with M. Shelton’s slide presentation.</p>
M. Shelton	Closing Power Point Presentation	<p>M. Shelton closed out the council meeting by reviewing the “Next Steps” power point presentation. In brief the Opioid Abatement Council Office is targeting July 2024 for the first payments to the Grantees.</p> <p>There are requests for outside vendors to meet with the Executive Director. Also, the Executive Director is requesting approval to engage with the Hoover Institute to develop a Memorandum of Understanding for research.</p> <p>S. Loyd thanked the council again for their quick response and efforts to move the funding where it is most needed.</p> <p>S. Loyd then opened the floor for public comment, with the council hearing testimony from those in attendance who have lost loved ones to opiate addiction.</p> <p>Those in attendance thanked the council and shared heart felt loses of loved ones.</p>
S. Loyd	Adjournment	<p>There being no further business, S. Loyd recognized a motion and second to adjourn.</p> <p>There being no objections or discussion, the meeting was adjourned.</p>