

Opiod Settlement Advisory Committee

Date: 4/27/2026

Location and Time: Via Microsoft Teams 10:00 - noon

Present: Rick Hildebrant, Daniel Franklin, Eric Maguire, Jess Kirby, Deb Wright, Madeline Motta, Tim Tanner

Absent: Shawn Burke, Ruth Hardy, Monica Hutt, Thomas Davis, Matt Prouty, Stacy Sigmon, Amie Wunderlich

Meeting Facilitator and Note Taker: Rick Hildebrant, MD, Sarah Gregorek

Agenda Item	Discussion	Next Steps
Approve February 23, 2026, Minutes	Tim Tanner made a motion to approve the 2/23/2026 minutes, and Deb Wright seconded, the motion passed unanimously.	
People with Lived Experience Jessica Kirby	Jessica would like to propose to the committee to hear from some people with lived experience who have been participating in contingency management programming in Rutland and Chittenden County. Committee agreed to hear from people with lived experience	Jess will work with Sarah to coordinate this at the May meeting.
Status of H.660, An act relating to fiscal year 2027 Opioid Abatement Special Fund appropriations discussion Jessica Schifano	<p>Since we provided the last update to OSAC in late February, H. 660, the bill related to FY27 appropriations from the Opioid Abatement Special Fund, was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussed and passed by H. Appropriations – Key changes included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reverting four prevention projects (funding for Elevate Youth Services, Greater Falls Connections, Interaction: Friends of Change, and Winooski Partnership for Prevention) back to OASF from the Substance Misuse Prevention Special Fund (made it consistent with OSAC recommendations). ○ Adding requirements for the Department of Health to review all previously funded OASF appropriations and make recommendations about which appropriations could be funded in future years by the Substance Misuse Prevention Fund. 	

- The version of the bill passed by H. Appropriations was then passed by the House on March 20 and headed to the Senate.
- S. Health and Welfare began their consideration of the bill on April 1 and has met several times throughout the month to discuss and mark-up the bill.
- As part of the budget discussions, S. Appropriations also considered funding some priorities using OASF. S. Appropriations and S. Finance have voted out the FY27 budget bill and this will head to the Senate Floor for a vote this week. Following the vote in the Senate, there will be a conference committee to work out the differences between the House and the Senate versions of the bill.

What has the Senate changed in H. 660 and the FY27 budget related to OASF appropriations?

- Most appropriations have not changed, except:
 - The appropriation for new recovery residences, which was previously split between new recovery residences at level III or above (\$900,000) and new recovery residences in specific geographic locations (\$300,000) has now been combined into \$1.2M for new recovery residences at level III or above without any specified geographic locations (aligned with Administration recommendation)
 - Added \$287,000 for DPS Public Safety Enhancement Team (PSET) Community Convenings (aligned with Administration recommendation, OSAC did not recommend)
 - Added \$1,100,000 for Burlington overdose prevention center that would not be distributed until a location for the overdose prevention center has been procured, it is fit up for its intended use and is currently or will imminently become operational. Also includes legislative intent to continue to appropriate funds annually through at least FY28.
 - Added \$800,000 for recovery centers (not recommended by either OSAC or Administration)

- Added \$875,000 for DAIL HireAbility (moved from base to OASF – not recommended by OSAC, Administration recommended this in base funding)
- Four prevention projects now funded from the Substance Misuse Prevention Special Fund rather than OASF.
- Senate also added requirement for the Department of Health to report on:
 - Expenditures from OASF on a quarterly basis, identifying funds that remain unobligated or unspent with explanations as to why the funds have not been fully distributed.
 - The Department’s specific spending proposal from the Substance Misuse Prevention Special Fund.

In total, H. 660 and the FY27 budget would appropriate \$9,037,646 from OASF and revert \$1,452,287 back to OASF (net appropriations from OASF \$7,585,359). H. 660 would also appropriate \$640,631 from the Substance Misuse Prevention Special Fund.

As of February 11, 2026 – Estimated unappropriated balance of the OASF was approximately \$11.8M.

If H. 660 and FY27 budget passed as currently drafted – this would leave the balance of OASF at \$4,291,372.

Current draft of bill -

<https://legislature.vermont.gov/Documents/2026/Workgroups/Senate%20Health%20and%20Welfare/Bills/H.660/Drafts,%20Amendments,%20Legal%20Documents/H.660~Katie%20McLinn~Draft%205.1,%204-24-2026~4-24-2026.pdf>

Funding table (not completely current) -

<https://legislature.vermont.gov/Documents/2026/Workgroups/Senate%20Health%20and%20Welfare/Bills/H.660/Drafts,%20Amendments,%20Legal%20Documents/H.660~Katie%20McLinn~Draft%205.1,%204-24-2026~4-24-2026.pdf>

	60~Nolan%20Langweil~2026%20Senate%20Opioid%20Fund%20Proposals~4-21-2026.pdf	
<p>Discussion about annual process, obligations for the year, and OSAC process guidelines – Lauren and Dr. Hildebrant</p>	<p>Lauren shared the OSAC guidelines, policy and procedures. https://www.healthvermont.gov/sites/default/files/document/dsu-osac-operating-policies-procedures-F...</p> <p>Requires the committee each calendar year to review the process for collecting and reviewing proposals. H. 660 includes changes to OSAC Powers and Duties, with some additional changes made in the Senate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires OSAC to consult with the Health Equity Advisory Commission in making recommendations • Requires ongoing funding proposals considered by OSAC to include a sustainability plan from the applicant. • Suspends new funding proposals for FY28, except where legislative intent in statute that a previous proposal intended for annual funding (outreach and engagement, recovery residence, SSPs, and OPC). Instead, OSAC is required to review the outcomes of programs and initiatives previously funded to assess effectiveness and long-term sustainability. If funds are available after making FY28 recommendations, OSAC is required to identify specific areas of focus and make funding recommendations within those areas based on needs assessments and statewide data rather than requesting new proposals. <p>VDH put together a draft schedule to hear about previously funded proposals starting in May. During these meetings the committee will receive information regarding implementation of program timeline; performance metrics that they are tracking; and their sustainability plan.</p> <p>Have committee discussion on who should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receive similar amount of funding ongoing, and if there is a recommendation for how long. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No longer receive OSAC funds because they need to find a different sustainable source, but committee likes the program. • Committee recommends no longer state funding this program because it appears: not necessary, not effective, not sustainable etc. 	
<p>OSAC Dashboard Anne Van Donsel</p>	<p>The Division of Substance Use Disorder created a dashboard for the OSAC projects that are under our purview using a power app. They looked at each of the activities that was funded by the committee through FY 2025 and chose one performance measure. Activities that are funded in FY 2026 are not included because they need more time to get the data. Anne reviewed a few of the activities and we will include a document with the minutes that show the current status of the activities they are tracking. The committee should review the document to determine if it's helpful information,</p>	<p>Review Dashboard saved with the Minutes</p>
<p>Overdose Prevention Center Update Discussion Theresa Vezina</p>	<p>This update covers project progress, financial spenddown, and key milestones. Funding & Spenddown Overview</p> <p>The total award for the City's Overdose Prevention Center (OPC) Contract – YTD Expenses Snapshot (Q3 FY26):</p> <p>Total YTD Actual Spent: \$328,519.60 Total Award: \$2,200,000 Remaining Unspent: \$1,871,480.40</p> <p>Spending aligns with major deliverables including Service Assessment completion, implementation of staffing, and siting exploration.</p> <p>Key Milestones Completed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staffing Vermonters for Criminal Justice Reform (VCJR) OPC Director, Implementation Manager, OPC consultant, and financial consultants, legal services all to support organizational capacity building related to building better financial systems, policies and procedures. • Service Assessment completed; public report released this week. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive community engagement across all required sectors that informed the Service • Assessment and are the building blocks for ongoing partnerships and collaborative work to effectively integrate the OPC services into the larger treatment and recovery framework. • Preliminary results shared with NPAs and DSU providers. • Planning for a public presentation event planned for early June to share the final Service Assessment Findings Report. Working with Brown University and PIRE on this. • VCJR and a commercial broker completed a comprehensive real estate analysis and site acquisition plan. • A potential site was explored but eliminated after due diligence. • VCJR working closely with Project Weber Renew out of RI receiving extensive technical assistance support for implementation. Bi-weekly meetings. • VCJR and the City weekly meetings focused on deliverables, compliance, strategy and reporting. • Clarifying the Siting Process - no site has been selected and none has fallen through, a site did not meet the initial requirements to move it forward to the required steps for proposing a location. Early site reviews are normal feasibility work and are not commitments. The City will only bring forward a site to City Council, Zoning & Ordinance and public comment after it has been determined that it meets baseline required parameters and feasibility. <p>What We Are Learning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Siting remains complex and requires careful analysis. • Criteria include public health data, safety, ADA access, zoning, transportation, feasibility, and merchant impacts. • Only sites meeting all criteria advance to the next steps. <p>If a Site Meets All Parameters: Public engagement begins, including:</p>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Engaging City Council & Zoning – Public Comment – Listening sessions – Merchant outreach – Door-to-door engagement <p>When a potential location is identified this will also trigger the start of a robust Neighborhood Impact Study done in collaboration with PIRE as part of the baseline and ongoing evaluation work required of this project.</p> <p>Next Steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Release final Service Assessment Online May 2026 • Hold June 2026 community presentation to share the Service Assessment findings report & launch additional community engagement opportunities • Continue siting explorations while remaining nimble. • VCJR continues advancing policy and procedure development and hiring new staff. • City recruiting/hiring Grant Manager. • May visits to OPC sites in Montreal Mobile and fixed sites, Kingston, Toronto, RI, and NYC. • Goal: Stand up OPC in 2026 and begin consumption services in FY27. 	
<p>Status of FY 2026 Funding Projects Shayla Livingston</p>	<p>The FY 2026 funding is out the door except there are two programs that haven't been executed: one is Washington County Mental Health Recovery Coaching because they need to determine if it will work with their CCBHC model that they've implemented and the other is the Champlain Housing Trust, they were directly appropriated OSAC funding for wound care and preventive health and they asked for the funding to be routed a different way so that is being reviewed by legal.</p> <p>Everything else has been executed but the grants were rolled out slower because things needed to be in place before the grants could be finalized. We moved positions around and have figured out a way to get the grants out the door faster. The grantees will be seeing funding sooner in the next cycle.</p>	

	For the grants that just started, you should consider how you want to address those since they don't have any metrics; maybe look at process measures.	
Public Comment	<p>Ed Baker</p> <p>Saw Dr. Hildebrant's interview on WCAX on Sunday and thought it was genuine and engaging. Ed appreciated that he emphasized VDH's priority on morbidity and mortality on Substance Use in Vermont. Keep it on the front burner.</p> <p>Thanked Theresa for the good work but she didn't mention the considerable stigma on the OPC and the effect on obtaining a site location. Dr. Hildebrant could use his voice to do something about that and speak out on saving more lives.</p> <p>Suggested OSAC have an educational researcher platform for this committee and get some experts in to present and to hear from people with lived experience.</p> <p>Who has read the ACLU allegations against Mark Levine, MD to uncover what happened in this committee? You need to look at what went out to undermine the OPC funding.</p>	
Next Meeting	May 22, 2026, 1 – 3 p.m.	