



Colorado Opioid Abatement Council (COAC)

Assistance Committee

Meeting #23

August 12th, 2025
3:00pm – 4:00pm

Appointees: Josh Blum, Terry Hofmeister, KC Hume, Racquel Garcia

DOL Staff: Jamie Feld, Christian Dykson, Natalie Sandoval

Guests:

Welcome and Introductions

ORU staff opened the meeting, welcomed attendees, and acknowledged the presence of committee members.

ORU staff presented minutes from the June 2024, November 2024, and April 2025 meetings for approval:

June 2024 Minutes:

Motioned by Josh Blum.

Seconded by KC Hume.

Unanimously approved.

November 2024 Minutes:

Motioned by Josh Blum.

Seconded by KC Hume.

Unanimously approved.

April 2025 Minutes:

Motioned by Josh Blum.

Seconded by KC Hume.

Unanimously approved.

FAQ Development

ORU staff initiated discussion regarding the creation of a formal FAQ resource to consolidate guidance on commonly recurring questions submitted to the assistance committee. Two specific scenarios were presented for review:

Crimestoppers Tip Line:

A prior inquiry about funding Crimestoppers tip lines was recapped. The committee had previously determined that such expenses were not allowable under opioid settlement funding guidelines. The tip lines and associated payouts for drug-related tips were deemed misaligned with eligible use cases, particularly as they did not qualify as centralized call centers. This item would be included in the FAQ document for future reference and consistency.

Lakewood Probation Inquiry:

A request from Lakewood Probation posed two key questions:

1. **Mentorship Programs for High-Risk Youth:**
Lakewood Probation inquired whether funds could be used to support mentorships for juveniles identified as high risk due to trauma, substance use, or other justice-involved factors. Committee members agreed on the general benefit of mentorship but emphasized the need for clear ties to SUD/ODU-related programming. Questions were raised about the qualifications of mentors, whether they were trained or volunteers, and how the mentorship was structured or reimbursed.
2. **Urinalysis Testing (UA):**
The request also asked whether UA testing for probation-involved youth could be funded. Committee members discussed how UA testing is generally inexpensive but context-dependent. If used for adherence monitoring within a treatment or recovery pathway—such as probation compliance or referral to evidence-based care—funding might be permissible under Exhibit E. Committee members stressed the difference between screening and punitive use. ORU staff agreed to request additional details from Lakewood Probation to clarify intent and implementation.

Committee members proposed that responses to such inquiries should be recorded systematically in the forthcoming FAQ document being drafted by ORU staff.

Community Inquiry

Dr. Chelsea Shore-Miller submitted an inquiry regarding the purchase of spectrometers by public health departments to support regional harm reduction efforts. ORU staff referenced North Carolina’s approval precedent and clarified that spectrometers used for drug checking—not enforcement—could fall under “harm reduction” in Exhibit E. Dr. Blum highlighted that overdose prevention, even through data-informed harm reduction tools, aligns with Exhibit E’s flexibility language. The committee indicated general support, pending documentation of non-punitive usage.

Biometric Monitoring in Jails

The second inquiry addressed use of funds to support biometric monitoring devices in jails. These devices were intended to detect vital sign changes and identify overdoses or medical crises in individuals experiencing withdrawal. Sheriff Hume confirmed the successful implementation of such technology during his previous tenure. While committee members agreed the use aligned with opioid abatement goals, they cautioned against long-term dependence on these funds, recommending other funding sources be pursued. ORU staff reiterated that prior approvals had included a similar caution and that seed funding might be an acceptable pathway.

Region 10 Recovery Housing Grant and Complaint

A formal complaint had been submitted regarding Region 10's \$1.2 million award to Monarch Recovery Homes for the purchase of a women's sober living residence. The complaint alleged that gifting public funds to a for-profit entity violated the MOU. ORU staff provided detailed context, noting the award was contingent on a 15-year recovery use requirement and a scholarship component benefiting Region 10 residents. ORU staff also emphasized that other for-profit treatment centers had received similar funding in the past.

Committee members discussed the issue at length. Questions were raised about potential Medicaid billing, property ownership, continuity of care, and lease terms. Dr. Shore-Miller clarified that the program had operated for nearly a decade under a lease agreement and would be disrupted if the purchase did not go through. The homeowner had extended lease terms pending the grant decision but intended to sell the property only to Monarch.

Raquel Garcia and other members highlighted the need for transparency and accountability, particularly with recovery housing certification and Medicaid billing. However, consensus emerged that the program's longevity and community commitment warranted cautious support.

The committee concluded that no action from COAC was required at this time and that the complaint did not indicate a breach of the MOU. Region 10 was advised to continue its normal course of business, and ORU staff would proceed with a response to the complainant indicating no findings of misuse.

Indirect Costs

Due to the extensive nature of prior discussions, the topic of indirect costs was not addressed during the meeting. This item was deferred to the next session, scheduled for September 9, 2025.

Capital Assets

The broader issue of capital assets, including infrastructure purchases and down payments on recovery housing, was introduced. ORU staff explained that recent inquiries—such as one from Region 3—necessitated clearer guidance on eligible capital asset use across regional allocations. Given time constraints, it was agreed this topic would be addressed in the next scheduled meeting, with supporting documentation shared in advance for review.

2025 Conference Speakers

ORU staff briefly mentioned upcoming conference planning efforts and expressed interest in including assistance committee members as potential speakers. Further discussion would occur via email, and feedback was welcomed regarding topic areas and presentation formats.

Public Comment

ORU staff opened the floor for public comment. No public comments were made.

Adjourn