



Colorado Opioid Abatement Council (COAC)

Administrative Committee

Meeting #28

May 6th, 2025
2:00pm – 3:00pm

Appointees: Aaron Miltenberger, David Frank, Nancy Rodgers, Lori Laske

DOL Staff: Jamie Feld, Jack Patterson

Guests:

Welcome and Introductions

Vice Chair Dave Frank welcomed all committee members and began with the first agenda item of approving meeting minutes.

Lori Laske moved to approve the March 2025 meeting minutes.

Aaron Miltenberger seconded

Unanimously approved

Conflict of Interest Policy

ORU staff introduced the revised Conflict of Interest Policy, noting that the original version had been adopted by COAC in early 2023 and could be reviewed. The revised draft reflected updates based on internal legal review.

ORU staff highlighted several key changes:

- Addition of language in executive summary to explain general intent of policy that members should not vote on funding decisions that impact their regions, governments, or organizations.
- Inclusion of “partner” in addition to “spouse” in definition of “family”
- Clarifying that family member’s interests is considered a financial interest of a COAC member
- Clarifying that policy is solely applicable to COAC members
- Requiring disclosures to be made to all other COAC members and the COAC administrator (i.e. the ORU)
- Removing requirement to leave room when there is a conflict of interest (members are still expected to recuse and not influence the discussion, but not required to leave the room). Since our meetings are virtual, it’s a bit tricky to leave and rejoin the meeting without disrupting the meeting.

The Committee engaged in detailed discussion around nuances in the policy language, particularly concerning the interpretation of an “official act, including not only votes and decisions, but also recommendations” or “any.....other action, including inaction, which involves the use of discretionary authority” and how discretionary authority is defined. Members expressed a shared desire for clearer guidance and the use of illustrative examples in future resources. ORU staff proposed developing a supplemental training to accompany the policy, providing real-world scenarios to support consistent understanding by bringing in an expert to provide an overview to the Council of expectations at a future full COAC meeting.

Dave Frank moved to recommend the conflict of interest policy for full COAC approval

Nancy Rodgers seconded

Unanimously approved

Local Government Allocation Policy

ORU staff presented a new policy to codify existing operational practices related to the local government share of opioid settlement funds. The policy aimed to streamline reporting expectations, clarify annual decision timelines, and formalize exemptions from reporting when certain criteria are met.

The policy confirmed that a local government’s decision to redirect funds to a regional body would carry over by default unless changed in writing. ORU staff explained that this provision was designed to reduce administrative burden and prevent confusion across fiscal years. Additional clarification was provided regarding intra-county allocation changes, such as instances when one local government fully redirects its share to another within the same county. In such cases, if no other opioid funds were held or expended during the reporting period, that entity may be exempted from annual expenditure reporting.

Committee members expressed strong support for the policy. Lori Laske noted that local jurisdictions often found their role in the funding structure unclear, and she appreciated the clarification this policy would bring.

Dave Frank moved to recommend the adoption of the Local Government Allocation Policy.

Nancy Rodgers seconded

Unanimously approved

Interest Memo

ORU staff reviewed a drafted memo created to communicate COAC’s determination that interest earned on opioid settlement funds must be treated as opioid settlement funds and used solely for approved purposes.

The memo outlined three key expectations for local governments and regions: to account for interest in financial records, to ensure all earned interest is used for approved purposes, and to report interest amounts annually. Committee members discussed the implications of reporting timing, investment fluctuations, and fiscal agent practices. ORU staff clarified that interest should be reported as accrued through December 31 of each calendar year.

The committee expressed support for the memo's content and acknowledged its alignment with COAC's original intent.

Supplantation Guidance

ORU staff provided a draft version of guidance on supplantation, developed in coordination with the Assistance Committee. The guidance emphasizes that opioid settlement funds must be used to supplement, maintain, or expand programming—not to replace existing funding sources.

The committee reviewed a proposed definition of supplantation and accompanying rationale adapted from national best practices. The guidance included specific examples of both supplantation and non-supplantation scenarios, which the committee agreed were critical to ensuring clarity. Members engaged in a thoughtful discussion about the nuances involved—particularly in cases where programs are at risk due to expiring grants or declining local budgets.

ORU Staff shared that internal legal review is ongoing and noted that this was intended to be guidance, not a binding policy, and emphasized its use as a preventive tool for local governments navigating funding decisions. The Committee expressed general support and encouraged continued refinement.

Statewide Data System

ORU staff updated the Committee on efforts to develop a statewide data system. The initiative was in response to requests from regions for more accessible and actionable data tools. The data system will build on existing dashboards and include features to track not only expenditures but also program reach, effectiveness, and short and long-term outcomes.

A working group composed of regional and local partners had been convened and was meeting regularly to shape the system's vision. Key goals included promoting learning, supporting technical assistance, and fostering data-informed decision-making. Committee members voiced support for including both quantitative and qualitative data, including personal impact stories. ORU staff indicated that the RFP process for the system would be launched in the coming months and that stakeholder feedback would continue to guide development.

Public Comment

No public comments were made.

Adjourn