

Meeting Minutes

Attendance:

Council members: Chair-Ann Pylkas, MD, Co-Chair Representative Dave Baker, Willie Pearl-Evans, Toni Napier, Senator Mark Koran, Senator Chris Eaton, Becky Graham (proxy for Sarah Grosshuesch), Representative Erin Koegel, John Sutherland, MD, Peter Carlson, Nicole Anderson, Katrina Howard, Kathy Nevins, Judge Korey Wahwassuck, Jolene Rebertus, Halena Gazelka, MD, Gertrude Matemba-Mutasa, Darin Prescott, MD, Dana Farley

Absent Council Members: Wendy Burt, Shelly Elkington, Easter Muturi

DHS Staff: Boyd Brown, Dwayne Green, April Beachem, Sam Nord, Elyse Bailey, Chelsea Magadance, Helen Ghebre, Amanda Calmbacher, Angie Hirsch, Sarah Rinn,

MMB Staff: Kris Van Amber, Weston Merrick, Anna Solmeyer

Public: Kelly Endres, Juliana Milhofer, Nikki Vilendrer, Mark Foresman

Agenda

- **How to Participate**

KV (MMB) - explained how to participate using WebEx features.

- **Welcome**

KV (MMB) - Goal of meeting today is to approve the RFP. Will be using “levels of agreement”. Went over agenda.

- **Council member Introductions**

Roll call (see attendance)

- **Public Comment**

No public comment

- **Timeline**

- **BB (DHS)** – gave update on timeline which was shared via WebEx and was sent to all council members with meeting invite.

- Added responder’s conference on 5/8/20. Would be good if a few council members attend this.
- Added next full council meeting 5/15/20. This will be a proposal reviewer training for council members and any community reviewers.

- **Question – KE** - can RFP occur without legislation? **Answer – BB** – Yes, legislation is separate from RFP process. **DB & EK** – Correct, no legislative approval is needed for the RFP and appropriation is separate.

- **Question – DP & DB** - can a link to the RFP be sent to council after it is posted for ease of forwarding? – **Answer – BB** - Yes DHS will forward to council members.

- **Comment – KV** - Council members need to let DHS know if they have community reviewers in mind for proposal reviews.

- **Draft RFP overview**

Meeting Minutes

- **Scope of work**
 - **Comment – AP** - explained she used the grid from Feb. meeting to revise this section.
 - **Question – KN** - Why was #4 deleted? **Answer – AP and BB** - not deleted still there, will add the # back.
 - **Question – KH** - What about adding best practices under each category – **Answer – DG** – will add current best practices **Comment - WP** please make sure it addresses culturally specific element in best practices
 - **Question – HG** - What does practice based mean? Would rather have it say evidence based. **Answer – DG** - Was to bring balance to evidence and practice based – takes evidence based and incorporates cultural specific
 - **Comment – JS** - John – concern about “cultural base” and not individual differences and cultural variation
 - **Comment – JS** - practice based should still be able to show data that it is working.
 - **Comment – AP** - practice based is a compromise – need to add a definition
 - **Comment – EK** - Make sure the language isn’t being limited make sure it doesn’t mean has to be culturally specific – **BB** to keep it open make sure they define the target population they want to serve and why.
 - **Comment – BB** - shared language regarding practice based does council -like this language? **Decision – Council** - Yes listed as a footnote with definition.
 - **Question - DG** - Do we still need it in each category then? **Decision – Council** - give right below scope of work so covers all categories
 - **Question – DG** – does Scope meet what council had in mind?
 - #1 – No questions or concerns from council members
 - #2
 - **Comment-AP** - one call needs to be explained better – was used just for example – **Decision – council** - was to leave one call in as an example, Development of programs that increase access to specialty care for community providers (i.e. One-Call), same with ECHOs. Important to keep.
 - #3 – No questions or concerns from council members
 - #4 – No questions or concerns from council members
- **Question - KN** – Does facility need to provide all of the medication listed? **Answer - BB** – this is SAMHSA language and is just examples doesn’t have to be all just at least one. **AP** – say “access to” need to make sure participants have access to MAT – clean up language just don’t list them.
- **Impact evaluation components- Weston Merrick**

Meeting Minutes

- Weston walked through PP shared via WebEx and sent to council members with meeting invite
 - **Comment - DB** – suggestion how are we making impacts in communities of color can we focus on those areas for the impact evaluations? **WM** – Yes MMB will take that into consideration
 - **Question - EK** – Worried about oversight issues – how will the council know they are getting good oversight – **Answer – WM**- MMB and DHS will work together to assure this happens
 - **Comment - KH** – PMP utilization – don't list – concern of legality – **DB**- concerned about taking it out. **KH**-will bring to board of pharmacy to reword
 - **Question – DB** – how will viable candidates be chosen? **Answer - WM** - MMB will identify viable candidates from proposals and advise the committee. **BB** – not part of scoring process – this will happen after council decides what proposals to award –
 - **Question – BB** - are the appropriation agencies eligible for the impact eval? **Answer – WM**- yes
- **Priority to score/proposal scoring**
 - **DG** – explained each component in the scoring grid
 - Council agreed to:
 - 1 = 5, 2=5, 3=20, 4=20, 5=20, 6=15, 7=5, 8=10
- **Attachment A- Proposal requirements form**
 - **DG** – explained each area of Attachment A that was shared in WebEx and also in PP that was sent to all council members with meeting invite.
 - **Comment - AP** – She doesn't need to know who responsible. **Response – BB and DG** need to tie back to budget and need to know if they have the correct staff etc. **Response - JS** – thinks it is important to leave this here. **Response - DP** – doesn't think it is necessary to have roles, need to simplify – **Response - JR** – explained how the role responsibilities help when reviewing proposals
 - **Comment – AP** – need to simplify – **Response - JP** – want to make it simplistic but not so simplistic that it loses value of what it is meant to do, accountability **Response - Dana** – agrees with JR and JP all four sections of tasks and deliverables are necessary
 - **Comment - KE** – wants this to be open to smaller less sophisticated, she thinks tasks and deliverables is a barrier **Response - BB** – responders conference will address this document gives technical assistance – Also can withhold rating the form if you think they didn't understand how to complete and ask questions during interview process
 - **Comment - EK** – take out examples or simplify examples
- Conclusion – council- simplify examples then it will be good
- **Logic model**

April 10, 2020 OPIOID EPIDEMIC RESPONSE ADVISORY COUNCIL

Meeting Minutes

- **Comment - AP** – take it out, too complicated, it is a barrier, why do we need this? **Answer - WM** – it's a process step to help them understand how everything is related **AK** – adds layer of accountability
- **Questions - AK** – can we offer technical assistance – **Answer – MW** - yes
- **Question - KV** – Is there something that can make this easier? **Answer - BB** – yes we would include this in bidders conference **WM** – is happy to provide technical assistance on this
- **Comment - KE** – concerned about organizations who don't normally write grants this is too intimidating – need simple definition
- **Comment - JS** – Use a different word or descriptor to make less intimidating. The value of this is great. **WM** – will work with DHS to make this more simple
- **Conclusion – Council**
 - Keep but simplify – just use second paragraph with link
- **Evaluation**
 - Will incorporate target population and potential barriers to tasks and deliverables and take out 2 and 3 in #7 **KN**- why does target population need to be a column
 - **BB** - Just add to target population section
- **Budget**
 - No comments
- **DB** – motions that the council approves the draft RFP for release **AP** – second
- All council members present are in agreement
- **Appropriation review and approval**
 - **DB** – asked if anyone has comments or questions on the language that was sent out to council members
 - **KN** – why isn't amounts 50/50 for RFP and appropriation?
 - **BB** – may have overestimated amount available in year one
 - **DB** – Better to leave it the way it is
 - **EK** – explained how awarded appropriation to African American – **BB** – explained differences between organizations –
 - **PC** – can they apply for RFP also – **DB** – yes if they so choose
 - **EK** – how to award funds to African American Organizations? **WP** – motion – **AP** second to divide equally – council agreed no nay or abstain
 - **EK** – will bring for final legislative approval – council agrees
 - **DB – EK** – DHS should wait to inform organizations of appropriations
- **Next Steps and Meeting Wrap**
 - Meeting Agenda items for May 15
 - Panel process – training and preparation for review
 - Additional panelist candidates – who else do you want to be on the panel?

April 10, 2020 OPIOID EPIDEMIC RESPONSE ADVISORY COUNCIL

Meeting Minutes

- Send suggestions to Boyd – council will vet