



Task Force on Holistic and Effective Responses to Illicit Drug Use

Date: 01.08.2025

Open meeting law in-person location, staffing, and task force members in attendance:

Task Force members in attendance: Kurt DeVine, Ryan Kelly, Barry Edwards, Lauren Graber, Shane Myre, Dziwe Ntaba, Bradley Ray, Donovan Sather, Bill Ward, Donald Lannoye, Alex Kraak, Jillian Dease

Absent: Chris Bates, Phil Baebenroth

Design team: Office of Addiction and Recovery, Management Analysis and Development (MAD): Jennifer Blanchard, Cat Rohde, Jose Phipps, Stephanie Klein, Abra Pollock, Ari Edelman-McHenry, Anne Siegler, Chas Anderson

Other: Sonya Mydels, Ashley Anderson (MDH), Andrew George

Agenda items

Welcome and roll call

- Members and guests were welcomed
 - Noted it was a working meeting without planned public comment, though public could observe and submit comments to the Office of Addiction and Recovery. Contact information was provided.
- Co-Chairs provided opening thoughts.
 - Impressed with the work done to date and how the recommendations will be able to improve people's lives and experiences with improved resources.
 - Indicated that prioritization will be different for everyone based on their personal perspectives.
- **Roll call and introductions:** Roll call was taken
- **Review of agenda:** Agenda and objectives for the meeting were reviewed.
 - Note – a new meeting invite will be sent before the February meeting.
- **Approve of minutes:** Meeting notes for November and December were approved.

Voting results

- All recommendations from latest voting activity were passed, including:
 - Harm reduction

- Crosscutting
- Data collection
- Revised rec. 61 (“Pass the Model School Response to Drugs and Drug-related Incidents Act.”)
- Combined 4+29 recommendation
- Revised rec. 102 (Steve’s law)
- Revised rec. 105 (Naloxone – carrying, confiscation)
- 116 recommendations have been approved and will be included in the legislative report
- This group will need to select 20 to prioritize in the report
 - **Will you want those listed as top 20, or do you want to prioritize within those 20?**
 - Decision: not prioritizing within the top 20.

Prioritization

- Facilitator explained the prioritization activity.
 - Each member will have 29 votes to use. This reflects 25% of the recommendations
 - Place the sticky notes in Mural (with your initials) on the edge of the recommendations you wish to prioritize
 - Each member can allocate a maximum of 2 votes to a recommendation
- Mural -
 - <https://app.mural.co/t/stateofminnesota6573/m/stateofminnesota6573/1728398833847/8045ce2c03eef08a93f51c700339e341c2d1ef6c>
- Facilitator noted we have 12 TF members in meeting, super-majority will be 9.
- Member – what % of TF members are participating?
- Facilitator - 12 of 14
- Member – will that be indicated in the report?
- Facilitator – we will be talking more about the report later, but we made sure that all TF members have participated in at least one round of voting, and we reviewed to make sure it was not one person’s perspective on recommendations that were not passing.
- Member – I am holding on to four votes until I see where people of different backgrounds are voting.
- Member – I am doing the same thing and seeing where people are most interested in the non-medical recommendations.
- **Initial Tally of Votes – Round 1**
 - Super-majority
 1. 7 (9)
 2. 8 (9) – reached SM before second round of voting
 3. 10 (10) – combined with #15
 4. 11 (9)
 5. 20 (11)
 6. 36 (9) – reached SM before second round of voting
 7. 48 (10)
 8. 102 (9)
 9. 103 (10)
 10. 107 (9) – reached SM before second round of voting
 11. 130 (9)

- Recommendations with 8 votes – 45, 50
- Recommendations with 7 votes – 4, 5, 47, 80, 109, 110
- Recommendations with 6 votes – 3, 14, 15, 58, 77, 90, 121

Round 2: TF members were given four additional votes and asked to vote on the 15 recommendations (above) that have 6 to 8 votes.

- This is a fresh vote, the previous votes do not carry over. Of the 15 recommendations being voted on, only those that received a super majority of 9 new votes will move into the top 20
- Member – I feel strongly about #47, but I am the only one voting on it.
- Member – I didn't vote on #47 because the TF on substance use during pregnancy is promoting that issue
- Member – agree on #47
- Facilitator – do the TF members want a reference in the report to add Kurt's language about the recommendations of the substance use and pregnancy task force
 - Task Force agreed to include a reference to the recommendations of this other task force
- **Tally after Round 2 (voting on the 15 recommendations that had 6-8 votes in Round 1)**
 - Additional recommendations that reached super-majority
 - 12. #4 (9)
 - 13. #45 (9)
 - 14. #109 (10)

Round 3: TF members were given another four votes and asked to vote on the 11 remaining recommendations that have 6 – 8 votes.

- **Tally after Round 3 (voting on the 11 remaining recommendations that had 6-8 votes in Round 1)**
 - Additional recommendations that reached super-majority
 - 15. #5 (9)
 - 16. #50 (9)
 - 17. #77 (9)
- Facilitator – a roll call vote to include the additional five recommendations that have some votes has been called.
- Member - #10 is very similar to one we have that is not super-majority, regarding OTP. Should those two be combined?
- Facilitator – we have to recognize that this group did not write the recommendations, and there is redundancy
- The group decided on one additional vote in place of spending time prioritizing among the prioritized.
 - Roll call vote – Aye's have the decision to do one more vote

Round 4: TF members were given another four votes and asked to vote on the 9 remaining recommendations that have 6 – 8 votes.

- **Tally after Round 4 (voting on the 9 remaining recommendations that had 6-8 votes in Round 1)**
 - Additional recommendations that reached super-majority
 - 18. #110

- Member - we're split on 3 and 58, can we just vote to include both?
 - Bill – agreed
 - Verbal vote agreed to include 3 and 58
 - 19. #3
 - 20. #58
- Member – recommends combining the two recommendations regarding OTP (#10 and #15)
 - Verbal vote agreed to combine #10 and #15

Report update

Facilitator provided a brief update on the January report, including that prioritized recommendations will be put in the body to the report.

Next meeting and adjourn

- The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, February 12 and will be a fully virtual meeting.
- The February meeting will focus on:
 - Status of report
 - Presentation from Rise Research: policing recommendations
 - Discussion: policing recommendations
 - Discussion: Task Force goals for future meetings
 - What do you hope to achieve between now and June?
 - Member – my understanding of policymaking for the current 2025 leg session is that he doesn't believe final decisions have been made and hopes that there is still room inform policy for the current session. What is the lifecycle of the report?
 - Facilitator – the report is legislatively mandated and will go to the legislative library. The recommendations live on and get referenced. This group will have an opportunity to track what is being decided for the current leg session.
 - Co-chair – do we want to change our strategy or processes as we go through the Rise research policing recommendations?
 - Member – any chance this TF will be extended beyond June? Will we need to file a report on policing recs by June?
 - Facilitator – any member can bring that forward. The State will not be bringing it forward.
 - Facilitator – Budget would factor in the decision to extend the TF beyond June
 - Co-chair – it would be ideal to complete in June.
 - Member – will there be another opportunity to review the report before it is submitted?
 - Facilitator – review, but not revise.
 - Facilitator – The chairs were given an opportunity to give comments. Once it is started in the routing process, it can not be shared.
 - Facilitator - The status of the report is fairly basic. It articulates that this is based off of the work of rise research.
- The Task Force adjourned at 12:00 p.m.