

Pennsylvania Opioid Misuse and Addiction Abatement Trust
Dispute Resolution Committee Public Meeting
March 13, 2026 | 12:15 PM | Virtual

MINUTES

DRC Member Attendees (7):

- Chair Tom VanKirk
- Tumar Alexander
- Commissioner Kevin Boozel
- Stuart Fisk
- Shea Madden
- Commissioner Robert Postal
- Senator Christine Tartaglione

Bedford County Representatives:

- Stephanie Clevenstine, Director of Planning, Bedford County Planning Department
- Karen Hendershot, Chief Public Defender, Bedford County Public Defender's Office
- Ben Naugle, Intensive Case Manager, Personal Solutions Inc.
- Bernard Smith, Director of Probation & Parole Services, Bedford County Probation Department

Luzerne County Representatives:

- Harry Skene, Chief Solicitor, Luzerne County
- Megan Stone, Division Head, Luzerne County Department of Human Services

Washington County Representatives

- Dr. John Tamiggi, Director, Washington County Department of Human Services
- Tiffany Milovac, Deputy Director, Washington County Department of Human Services

Other Attendees:

- Briana Anderson, Trust Administrator, CCAP
- Ashli Rudy, Trust Administrative Specialist, CCAP
- Jayson Wolfgang, Buchanan Ingersoll & Rooney
- Jordan Yeagley, Buchanan Ingersoll & Rooney
- Nathan McClellan, Representative of Senator Christine Tartaglione
- Other members of the public

Announcements by Chair Tom VanKirk

- This meeting of the Pennsylvania Opioid Misuse and Addiction Abatement Trust's ("Trust") Dispute Resolution Committee ("DRC") has been duly advertised as a public meeting in accordance with the Sunshine Act and is therefore open to members of the public as observers.
- Participation in this meeting is limited to representatives of Bedford County, Luzerne County, and Washington County, as beneficiaries under the Amended Trust Order, Trustees on the DRC, and those that the Trustees have invited in advance to take part.
- This meeting is being recorded, and the video will be available on the Trust's website along with the minutes from this meeting once approved by the DRC.
- An Executive Session was held today immediately prior to this public meeting for the purpose of receiving legal updates and legal advice.
- A quorum of Trustees on the DRC is present at this meeting.

Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes

Minutes from the public DRC meeting held on November 12, 2025, were circulated to Trustees in advance of this meeting. Chair Tom VanKirk indicated he would entertain a motion to approve the minutes. A motion to approve the minutes was made by Senator Christine Tartaglione and seconded by Stuart Fisk. With no further discussion, the motion was approved unanimously by the Trustees in attendance.

Appeal from Bedford County Concerning Program No. 3 – Establish a Problem Solving Court (Treatment Court Officer)

Before Bedford County's representatives began their presentation, Chair Tom VanKirk clarified that the instant appeal concerns only the portion of Bedford County Program No. 3 related to the Treatment Court Officer position. The remaining portion(s) of Program No. 3, which included funding for a treatment court coordinator and drug test kits, were approved by the Board at its December 4, 2025, public meeting.

Karen Hendershot, Chief Public Defender for the Bedford County Public Defender's Office, began the presentation by explaining that Bedford County is reducing the amount of opioid settlement funds ("OSF") allocated toward the Bedford County Treatment Court Officer's ("Bedford Co. Treatment Court Officer") salary from 90% to 80%. This request was based on a review of the percentage of treatment court participants diagnosed with opioid use disorder ("OUD").

Ms. Hendershot explained that Bedford County did not have a treatment court in place prior to receiving OSF. She noted that, through the use of those funds, the County was able to establish and implement a treatment court in 2024. Ms. Hendershot also shared that the Bedford County Treatment Court has served twenty participants to date, with its first participant graduating in November 2025. Ms. Hendershot further stated that she has been involved with the treatment court team since its inception.

Ms. Hendershot stated that treatment courts require probation officers in order to function and emphasized that the Bedford Co. Treatment Court Officer does not detain or arrest treatment court participants. Rather, Bedford County employs a specially trained probation officer instead of a social worker because the officer is able to safely conduct home and workplace visits.

Ms. Hendershot further explained that Ms. Couturiaux plays a significant role in the administration and operation of the treatment court program. Her responsibilities include assisting with the admission of voluntary participants into the program, assessing initial treatment needs, collaborating with SCA staff, facilitating participant access to treatment and supportive services, and communicating with treatment providers regarding participant engagement and provider concerns.

In addition, Ms. Dakota Couturiaux, the current Bedford County Treatment Court Officer, assists participants with employment searches, identifying community service opportunities, locating Narcotics Anonymous (“NA”) and Alcoholics Anonymous (“AA”) meetings, addressing other needs such as housing, and reviewing participant journal entries. Ms. Hendershot noted that Ms. Couturiaux is often the first person to become aware that a participant has experienced, or may be at risk of, a recurrence of use. In those situations, she is able to promptly alert the treatment court team and assist the participant in accessing appropriate treatment and support services.

Ms. Hendershot stated that Ms. Couturiaux is trained in motivational interviewing, cognitive behavioral techniques, behavior coaching, and recurrence-of-use risk assessment, all of which are required qualifications for the position. She emphasized that Ms. Couturiaux’s primary responsibility is to build supportive relationships with participants, identify participant needs, and connect individuals with treatment and community resources.

Ms. Hendershot stated that Bedford County believes the position falls within Schedule B, Section B of Exhibit E. She argued that Ms. Couturiaux provides the services and supports outlined in those sections and that the position is a specialized, treatment-oriented role embedded within an evidence-based problem-solving court model.

Ms. Hendershot also explained that when a participant leaves the treatment court unsuccessfully, it occurs either voluntarily or only after all possible efforts to support the participant have been exhausted. She stated that the ultimate decision rests with the President Judge. She further

emphasized that Ms. Couturiaux has no authority to revoke a participant from the treatment court program and is not involved in the detention of individuals.

Shea Madden asked, given that the position appeared similar to a case management role, who was responsible for supervision within the treatment court program. Ms. Hendershot responded that Ms. Couturiaux is responsible for supervision in addition to the other duties previously outlined. She explained that by monitoring participant progress and following up regarding treatment participation, Ms. Couturiaux is able to identify absences or other concerns and bring those matters to the treatment court team for discussion.

Shea Madden asked whether the treatment court team collectively assesses individuals for entry into the Bedford County Treatment Court. Ben Naugle, Intensive Case Manager for Bedford County's SCA, Personal Solutions Inc., explained that he conducts the required drug and alcohol assessments, while the Treatment Court Coordinator interviews the individual and gathers additional information. He stated that the collected information is then presented to the treatment court team for discussion and review.

Shea Madden next asked who is responsible for sanctioning participants. Ms. Hendershot responded that sanctions are discussed by the full treatment court team and that Ms. Couturiaux typically informs the team when an issue has arisen. The team then discusses whether a sanction is appropriate and, if so, what sanction should be imposed, with the President Judge making the final determination.

Shea Madden then asked whether Ms. Couturiaux carries a firearm. Ms. Hendershot responded that she does carry a firearm because she enters the field to conduct visits and related duties. Shea Madden also asked whether Ms. Couturiaux has the authority to detain individuals. Ms. Hendershot stated that although Ms. Couturiaux technically possesses arrest authority, she has not historically detained participants.

Finally, Shea Madden asked how the SCA is utilized given Ms. Couturiaux performs duties similar to those of a case manager, which she stated can blur the distinction between treatment and law enforcement roles. Shea Madden also asked who represents law enforcement on the treatment court team. Ms. Hendershot responded that the team includes a member of the Bedford County District Attorney's Office, but no police officers serve on the treatment court team.

Stuart Fisk asked whether the position's job description specifically states that the Bedford Co. Treatment Court Officer may not act in a law enforcement or punitive capacity. Ms. Hendershot responded that it is a shared understanding among the treatment court team that the officer will not function in that manner, although she could not recall whether that limitation is expressly included in the applicable policy documents.

Commissioner Kevin Boozel asked what responsibilities comprise the remaining 20% of Ms. Couturiaux's position that is not funded through OSF. Ms. Hendershot responded that Ms. Couturiaux supervises a caseload of probationers with histories of OUD or other substance use disorders ("SUDs"). Commissioner Kevin Boozel then asked whether Ms. Couturiaux performs detentions involving individuals within that separate probation caseload. Ms. Hendershot confirmed that she does. He then asked whether any individual from that caseload had ever become a treatment court participant. Ms. Hendershot stated that she did not believe so. Bernard Smith, Director of Probation & Parole Services for the Bedford County Probation Department, added that he specifically instructs Ms. Couturiaux to remain mindful of that possibility, acknowledging that it could occur.

Chair Tom VanKirk then asked Bedford County, once more, whether it might be possible for the position to instead be filled by a case manager or social worker. Ms. Hendershot responded that the role also involves enforcing compliance and addressing responsibilities that would fall outside the typical scope of a case manager or social worker. Shea Madden responded that this distinction is precisely why treatment court programs should include both a case manager from the SCA and a probation officer serving in clearly separate and distinct roles.

Stuart Fisk asked what the treatment court team's practice is when discussing a participant's potential involuntary removal from the program. Ms. Hendershot explained that the team is typically notified of an issue via email. Team members then provide concerns, questions, and input through email communication until the next team meeting. At that meeting, the issue is discussed collectively, and each team member provides a recommendation. After the team reaches a consensus, the President Judge makes the final decision.

The Trustees of the DRC had no further questions, thus concluding Bedford County's presentation. Chair Tom VanKirk then presented the following resolution:

RESOLVED, that, the Dispute Resolution Committee of the Pennsylvania Opioid Misuse and Addiction Abatement Trust hereby affirms the decision of the Board of Trustees that Bedford County Program No. 3 (Establish a Problem Solving Court – Treatment Court Officer) is not compliant with Exhibit E. A “yes” vote would maintain the current denial by the Trust, whereas a “no” vote would reverse the decision by the Trust that the program is not compliant with Exhibit E.

Senator Christine Tartaglione made the motion as presented. Tumar Alexander seconded the motion. With no further discussion, the Trustees of the DRC then voted as follows:

Yeses (6)

- Tumar Alexander
- Commissioner Kevin Boozel

- Stuart Fisk
- Shea Madden
- Commissioner Robert Postal
- Senator Christine Tartaglione

The outcome of the vote was thus to maintain the current denial by the Trust.

Appeal from Luzerne County Concerning Program No. 13 – Dress For Success

Harry Skene, Luzerne County Chief Solicitor, began the presentation by describing the services provided through Dress for Success, including warm handoff and recovery support services for women reentering the community. Specifically, the program provides assistance with housing, transportation, job placement and training, and childcare. Mr. Skene reported that more than 200 women with OUD have received appropriate work attire, interview training, and job placement assistance through the program. In addition, 228 currently incarcerated individuals were assisted through workforce development and employment certification programs and received dignity bags containing essential supplies upon release. Mr. Skene also noted that the woman who operates the program is a CRS.

Chair Tom VanKirk asked what the \$83,950 allocated to the program specifically supports. Megan Stone, Division Head of the Luzerne County Department of Human Services, explained that the funds support material, preparation, and partial personnel costs associated with the Set for Success program and Project Clean Break. She stated that Project Clean Break provides women who are currently incarcerated with basic life and professional skills training. The funding also supports costs associated with obtaining a CRS certification, including training and materials.

Chair Tom VanKirk asked whether the entire allocation was directed toward individuals with OUD. Ms. Stone confirmed that it was.

Stuart Fisk stated that the information submitted as part of Luzerne County’s appeal materials was helpful and noted that it would have been beneficial if the same information had been included in the initial report.

The Trustees of the DRC had no further questions, thus concluding Bedford County’s presentation. Chair Tom VanKirk then presented the following resolution:

RESOLVED, that, the Dispute Resolution Committee of the Pennsylvania Opioid Misuse and Addiction Abatement Trust hereby affirms the decision of the Board of Trustees that Luzerne County Program No. 13 (Dress For Success) is not compliant with Exhibit E. A “yes” vote would maintain the current denial by the Trust, whereas a “no” vote would reverse the decision by the Trust that the program is not compliant with Exhibit E.

Commissioner Kevin Boozel made the motion as presented. Senator Christine Tartaglione seconded the motion. With no further discussion, the Trustees of the DRC then voted as follows:

Nos (6)

- Tumar Alexander
- Commissioner Kevin Boozel
- Stuart Fisk
- Shea Madden
- Commissioner Robert Postal
- Senator Christine Tartaglione

The outcome of the vote was thus to reverse the current denial by the Trust.

Appeal from Washington County Concerning Program Nos. 40, 41, 42, 49, 53, 55, and 58

Dr. John Tamiggi, Director of the Washington County Department of Human Services, began the presentation by stating that approval of the Washington County programs under appeal would directly support the intended purposes of OSF by helping to mitigate the ongoing and future harms caused by the opioid epidemic within the community. Dr. Tamiggi then stated that he would like to address each program individually.

Chair Tom VanKirk responded that this approach was acceptable and asked for clarification regarding whether Washington County had withdrawn Program No. 46, (North Strabane Township Resource Officer). Dr. Tamiggi confirmed that Program No. 46 had been withdrawn.

Program No. 40 – Jeff Hancher Enterprises – Success Readiness Framework

Dr. Tamiggi stated that Washington County believes Program No. 40 aligns with Schedule B, Section B, Subsection 8 of Exhibit E because it provides structured employment training and educational services to individuals in treatment and recovery from OUD and co-occurring conditions in Washington County. He further explained that the program operationalizes evidence-based recovery supports by integrating workforce readiness education, life skills development, and individualized coaching within recovery residences and community settings. He stated that the program specifically targets unemployment and economic instability, which are significant drivers of recurrence of use and overdose risk.

Dr. Tamiggi shared that the program was implemented at three Resurrection Power licensed recovery houses in Washington County in 2025. Tiffany Milovac, Deputy Director of the Washington County Department of Human Services, stated that if the program is approved, the County plans to expand the services to additional recovery houses in Washington County.

Commissioner Kevin Boozel stated that the program was initially denied because the original

submission lacked sufficient information demonstrating its connection to OUD. However, he noted that the information provided in Washington County's appeal materials appeared to adequately establish that connection.

Commissioner Robert Postal asked whether support services are provided to recovery house residents individually or in a group setting. Ms. Milovac responded that services are provided in both capacities. Commissioner Postal then asked about Mr. Hancher's qualifications. Dr. Tamiggi explained that Mr. Hancher has a background in leadership and training focused on helping individuals develop pathways to success.

Chair Tom VanKirk asked how the County determined, based on the request for proposal ("RFP") response submitted by Mr. Hancher, that the services would specifically target individuals with OUD. Dr. Tamiggi and Ms. Milovac explained that they met with Mr. Hancher, during which he described his initiative to work with individuals with OUD residing in recovery housing. Ms. Milovac added that she subsequently connected him with local recovery houses.

Commissioner Robert Postal asked how the County determined that a \$45,000 award was appropriate for providing services to residents in three recovery houses. Ms. Milovac responded that the County believed three houses represented an appropriate scope for the program's first year, given the number of residents in each location. She stated that if future recovery houses served fewer residents, the number of participating houses could be expanded. However, she explained that the County intentionally selected Resurrection Power recovery houses for the pilot program because they are well-established and stable within the County.

The Trustees of the DRC had no further questions regarding Program No. 40.

Program No. 41 – L.O.Y.A.L. After School Programming

Ms. Milovac stated that Washington County believes Program No. 41 aligns with Schedule B, Section G, Subsection 9 of Exhibit E because it provides structured substance use prevention education through a daily youth podcast addressing vaping and nicotine addiction, underage alcohol use, illicit drugs, including fentanyl, peer pressure, healthy decision-making, coping strategies, and stories of resilience and recovery. She explained that the program incorporates clear educational components focused on prevention of substance use.

Ms. Milovac shared that participant eligibility is determined through risk-based referrals from Washington County school districts, which identify at-risk and underprivileged youth who would benefit from targeted prevention support. She further explained that the program reflects an evidence-informed framework grounded in the Health Belief Model, promoting protective factors such as risk awareness, self-efficacy, and behavioral change through academic support and structured physical activities. Ms. Milovac stated that research supports physical activity and mentorship as protective factors that enhance resilience, provide positive role models, foster a

sense of belonging, and reduce the likelihood of substance misuse.

Commissioner Kevin Boozel stated that he did not recall Schedule B, Section G, Subsection 9 being identified as the applicable Exhibit E category in Washington County's initial report for Program No. 41. Dr. Tamiggi confirmed that this represented a change from the original submission.

Shea Madden asked for clarification regarding the evidence base supporting the program. Ms. Milovac responded that the program is grounded in the Health Belief Model and explained that one component includes educational outreach through podcasts and videos, while another component involves participation in organized physical activities.

Commissioner Robert Postal asked about the background of Avery Turner, founder of L.O.Y.A.L. Dr. Tamiggi stated that Mr. Turner is a Washington County native who has worked extensively with at-risk youth and that the County is confident in both his background and the efforts being carried out through the program. Ms. Milovac added that Mr. Turner comes from a disadvantaged background himself, which allows him to connect effectively with participating youth.

Commissioner Robert Postal then asked whether Mr. Turner is the only paid staff member involved in the program. Ms. Milovac responded that Mr. Turner also utilizes volunteers to support program activities.

Chair Tom VanKirk asked how Washington County determined from Mr. Turner's RFP submission that the program was intended to prevent OUD among youth. Dr. Tamiggi responded that he and Ms. Milovac met with Mr. Turner and, through those discussions, came to understand that the program was specifically designed to address the needs of at-risk youth through prevention-focused services.

Chair Tom VanKirk then asked why this information had not been included in the original report submitted to the Trust. Ms. Milovac explained that the September 2025 reporting cycle was the first reporting cycle in which she and Dr. Tamiggi were directly involved. She stated that the process has been a learning experience and that they only recently came to fully understand the Trust's reporting expectations through conversations with Trust Administrator Brie Anderson.

The Trustees of the DRC had no further questions regarding Program No. 41.

Program No. 42 – Leadership Development LLC – 911 Training

Dr. Tamiggi stated that Washington County believes Program No. 42 aligns with Schedule B, Section I, Subsection 2; Schedule B, Section C, Subsection 9; and Schedule B, Section H, Subsections 1, 3, and 8 of Exhibit E because it delivers structured wellness education and practical support strategies for first responders who experience repeated exposure to opioid-related trauma. He explained that the program incorporates mental health resources, stress management

techniques, professional referrals, peer and managerial support systems, flexible scheduling for therapy, and wellness index self-assessment tools. Dr. Tamiggi stated that these components are intended to proactively mitigate trauma by normalizing help-seeking behavior and reinforcing that professional support is available. He further noted that the program addresses secondary trauma, burnout, and cumulative stress experienced by first responders. In addition, Dr. Tamiggi stated that the program increases awareness of and access to naloxone and provides training and education related to overdose response, naloxone, and Vivitrol, which he stated are consistent with harm reduction objectives.

Commissioner Kevin Boozel asked how Washington County came to fund the program. Dr. Tamiggi responded that the County's 9-1-1 call center submitted a response to their RFP. Ms. Milovac added that the head of the center had requested support after staff reported significant struggles with burnout and high turnover rates, and the County determined that this type of support aligned with those identified needs.

Chair Tom VanKirk suggested that Washington County consider utilizing the Trust's Technical Advisory Group to obtain advisory guidance on proposed uses of OSF in the future, which could potentially help avoid matters proceeding to a DRC meeting. Ms. Milovac stated that the County appreciated the recommendation.

The Trustees of the DRC had no further questions regarding Program No. 42.

Program No. 49 – Regola Consulting – Grant Management

Ms. Milovac stated that Washington County believes Program No. 49 is consistent with Schedule B, Section J, Subsection 3 of Exhibit E because it supports planning, coordination, and infrastructure development aimed at strengthening the County's cross-system capacity to prevent and address opioid misuse and overdose.

She explained that, through strategic planning, grant development, and interagency coordination, Regola Consulting has assisted the Washington County Department of Human Services in securing and leveraging opioid abatement funding streams. This work includes developing competitive funding applications and supporting planning efforts related to the County's reacquisition of the SCA designation. According to Ms. Milovac, these efforts strengthen the County's infrastructure for coordinated service delivery and enhance partnerships across the justice, behavioral health, and community systems.

Commissioner Robert Postal asked whether Regola Consulting was being used to identify additional funding opportunities to support opioid abatement programming. Dr. Tamiggi responded that it was. Senator Christine Tartaglione and Commissioner Postal expressed concern about how funding a consultant to pursue additional revenue sources fit within the scope of Exhibit E.

In response, Dr. Tamiggi stated that the work involves planning, coordinating, and aligning internal and external partnerships, as well as leading the County's strategic efforts to reacquire SCA status.

The Trustees of the DRC had no further questions regarding Program No. 49.

Program No. 53 – Shekinah Youth Ranch of the Mon Valley – Youth Prevention Program

Dr. Tamiggi stated that Washington County believes Program No. 53 is consistent with Schedule B, Section G, Subsection 9 because it provides a structured youth prevention initiative grounded in Social Cognitive Theory. Through the Trail of Grace scholarship program, the initiative utilizes mentoring relationships, positive role modeling, leadership development, and faith-based programming to strengthen protective factors associated with reducing the risk of substance misuse.

The program prioritizes underserved and at-risk youth in Washington County, including those experiencing economic hardship, family instability, trauma exposure, foster or kinship care placement, or limited access to structured developmental opportunities. Within the camp environment, youth participate in activities designed to build self-efficacy, emotional resilience, decision-making skills, and positive peer relationships. Dr. Tamiggi explained that these protective factors are widely recognized in prevention research as reducing vulnerability to substance misuse. By providing early intervention through mentorship, structured programming, and community belonging during critical developmental stages, the program aligns with evidence-based prevention frameworks referenced by the CDC, NIH, and SAMHSA, and directly supports upstream strategies aimed at preventing the initiation of substance misuse.

Dr. Tamiggi reported that eligible youth are identified through a risk- and needs-based selection process prioritizing underserved and at-risk youth. Eligibility criteria initially focused on household income but later expanded to include additional risk factors such as family instability, foster care placement, trauma exposure, limited access to positive adult role models, and lack of structured summer programming. Local schools, churches, and community leaders refer youth to the program, and scholarship decisions are made through individualized review to ensure participation opportunities are directed to those most in need.

Commissioner Robert Postal asked for clarification regarding the total amount awarded. Ms. Milovac explained that the organization initially requested \$150,000, but Washington County ultimately awarded \$25,000, which the County determined was sufficient to operate the program.

Stuart Fisk then asked whether the \$25,000 award was specifically intended to support the evidence-based substance use prevention practices referenced earlier in the presentation. Ms. Milovac confirmed that it was.

Commissioner Kevin Boozel questioned whether the County intended to continue funding the program if it were approved. Ms. Milovac responded that it did.

Chair Tom VanKirk questioned what type of education was being provided to youth to help prevent substance use. Ms. Milovac responded that the program operated as a summer camp where youth participated in hands-on activities and learned life skills that they otherwise may not have had access to without the scholarship.

The Trustees of the DRC had no further questions regarding Program No. 53.

Program No. 55 – The Hill Group – Washington Co. OUD Services Assessment

Ms. Milovac stated that Washington County believes Program No. 55 is consistent with Schedule B, Section J, Subsections 1, 3, and 4, as well as Schedule B, Section L, Subsection 1 because the program provided a system-level assessment of how the County's drug and alcohol services operate. The assessment identified coordination gaps, barriers to access, reentry challenges, and populations most affected by OUD through structured engagement with providers, partners, and stakeholders across prevention, treatment, recovery, healthcare, courts, and law enforcement systems.

She explained that the project highlighted key trends and compared local practices to state and national best practices. According to Ms. Milovac, the findings provide a strategic foundation for data-driven decision-making, helping ensure that OSF are used effectively to address system gaps, strengthen coordination, and reduce opioid-related harms across Washington County.

Shea Madden asked whether the study had been completed and whether a copy of the study had been submitted. Ms. Milovac responded that the study was complete, but only the outline of the plan had been provided in Washington County's appeal materials.

Ms. Milovac further stated that, through the assessment, the County identified initiatives for potential OSF investment, including increasing the number of licensed recovery homes.

Commissioner Kevin Boozel asked whether this was a one-time commitment, and Stuart Fisk asked whether \$58,500 represented the total cost of the project. Ms. Milovac responded yes to both questions.

Stuart Fisk asked whether the goal of the study was to facilitate bringing the SCA into the Washington County Department of Human Services. Dr. Tamiggi clarified that this was an outcome of the study, rather than its primary goal. Commissioner Kevin Boozel then asked whether the process of reacquiring SCA status was currently underway, and Ms. Milovac responded that it was.

The Trustees of the DRC had no further questions regarding Program No. 53.

Program No. 58 – Washington STEAMworks

Dr. Tamiggi stated that Washington County believes Program No. 58 is consistent with Schedule B, Section G, Subsection 9 of Exhibit E because it utilizes evidence-based Social Problem-Solving theory to structure STEM programming for students in grades pre-K through 8, with planned expansion to adult learners. The program is designed to foster cognitive, problem-solving, and prosocial skills that reduce high-risk behaviors, including substance use.

He explained that by providing hands-on, student-driven learning experiences in a supportive, low-stakes environment, the program strengthens resilience, emotional regulation, and decision-making skills while also building technical and soft skills associated with long-term academic and personal success. The program uses a risk-based, evidence-informed selection process to ensure that resources are targeted to youth most vulnerable to substance misuse, including students in pre-K through 8 from underserved or higher-risk communities in Washington County.

Dr. Tamiggi further noted that the program relies on demographic, socioeconomic, and school-based data to identify populations facing individual and environmental risk factors such as limited problem-solving skills, low engagement in structured activities, social or academic challenges, and exposure to high-risk peer or home environments. He added that NIH-published research from 2016 indicates that participation in structured STEM and extracurricular activities can reduce the likelihood of opioid use and other risky behaviors.

Commissioner Kevin Boozel asked whether the program had been operating prior to receiving OSF and whether the \$45,000 represented the full operating cost. Dr. Tamiggi responded yes to both questions. Ms. Milovac clarified that the program is operated through a local community center serving four schools within the district.

Commissioner Robert Postal asked how at-risk youth were identified. Dr. Tamiggi explained that the organization uses school data to identify populations facing individual and environmental risk factors. Ms. Milovac added that the program primarily serves youth from Washington City proper, identified as a disadvantaged area.

Stuart Fisk noted that, upon review of the appeal materials, Washington STEAMworks cited a 1966 study in support of its evidence base in their RFP response, which found no significant relationship between substance use disorders and readiness to learn in first grade, first-grade reasoning and math scores, or mother's education. He stated that, based on this, there appeared to be no evidence supporting the organization's claims and emphasized the importance of ensuring that the evidence base is relevant and appropriately aligned with program outcomes.

The Trustees of the DRC had no further questions regarding Program No. 58, thus concluding Washington County's presentation. At 2:31 PM, the members of the DRC went into Executive Session to seek the advice of legal counsel.

The DRC returned from Executive Session at 2:54 PM, with a quorum of Trustees still present.

Chair Tom VanKirk asked which of the programs had received OSF expenditures and which programs had OSF committed to them. Ms. Milovac responded that all programs had already received OSF.

The Trustees of the DRC had no further questions. Chair Tom VanKirk indicated that each Washington County program would be voted on individually, and then presented the following resolution:

RESOLVED, that, the Dispute Resolution Committee of the Pennsylvania Opioid Misuse and Addiction Abatement Trust hereby affirms the decision of the Board of Trustees that Washington County Program No. 40 (Jeff Hancher Enterprises – Success Readiness Framework) is not compliant with Exhibit E. A “yes” vote would maintain the current denial by the Trust, whereas a “no” vote would reverse the decision by the Trust that the program is not compliant with Exhibit E.

Commissioner Kevin Boozel made the motion as presented. Senator Christine Tartaglione seconded the motion. With no further discussion, the Trustees of the DRC then voted as follows:

Nos (6)

- Tumar Alexander
- Commissioner Kevin Boozel
- Stuart Fisk
- Shea Madden
- Commissioner Robert Postal
- Senator Christine Tartaglione

The outcome of the vote was thus to reverse the current denial by the Trust.

Chair Tom VanKirk then presented the following resolution:

RESOLVED, that, the Dispute Resolution Committee of the Pennsylvania Opioid Misuse and Addiction Abatement Trust hereby affirms the decision of the Board of Trustees that Washington County Program No. 41 (L.O.Y.A.L. After School Programming) is not compliant with Exhibit E. A “yes” vote would maintain the current denial by the Trust, whereas a “no” vote would reverse the decision by the Trust that the program is not compliant with Exhibit E.

Stuart Fisk made the motion as presented. Commissioner Robert Postal seconded the motion. With no further discussion, the Trustees of the DRC then voted as follows:

Yeses (4)

- Tumar Alexander
- Stuart Fisk
- Shea Madden
- Senator Christine Tartaglione

Nos (2)

- Commissioner Kevin Boozel
- Commissioner Robert Postal

The outcome of the vote was thus to maintain the current denial by the Trust.

Chair Tom VanKirk then presented the following resolution:

RESOLVED, that, the Dispute Resolution Committee of the Pennsylvania Opioid Misuse and Addiction Abatement Trust hereby affirms the decision of the Board of Trustees that Washington County Program No. 42 (Leadership Development LLC – 911 Training) is not compliant with Exhibit E. A “yes” vote would maintain the current denial by the Trust, whereas a “no” vote would reverse the decision by the Trust that the program is not compliant with Exhibit E.

Tumar Alexander made the motion as presented. Commissioner Robert Postal seconded the motion. With no further discussion, the Trustees of the DRC then voted as follows:

Yeses (6)

- Tumar Alexander
- Commissioner Kevin Boozel
- Stuart Fisk
- Shea Madden
- Commissioner Robert Postal
- Senator Christine Tartaglione

The outcome of the vote was thus to maintain the current denial by the Trust.

Chair Tom VanKirk then presented the following resolution:

RESOLVED, that, the Dispute Resolution Committee of the Pennsylvania Opioid Misuse and Addiction Abatement Trust hereby affirms the decision of the Board of Trustees that Washington County Program No. 49 (Regola Consulting – Grant Management) is not compliant with Exhibit E. A “yes” vote would maintain the

current denial by the Trust, whereas a “no” vote would reverse the decision by the Trust that the program is not compliant with Exhibit E.

Shea Madden made the motion as presented. Commissioner Kevin Boozel seconded the motion. With no further discussion, the Trustees of the DRC then voted as follows:

Yeses (6)

- Tumar Alexander
- Commissioner Kevin Boozel
- Stuart Fisk
- Shea Madden
- Commissioner Robert Postal
- Senator Christine Tartaglione

The outcome of the vote was thus to maintain the current denial by the Trust.

Chair Tom VanKirk then presented the following resolution:

RESOLVED, that, the Dispute Resolution Committee of the Pennsylvania Opioid Misuse and Addiction Abatement Trust hereby affirms the decision of the Board of Trustees that Washington County Program No. 53 (Shekinah Youth Ranch of the Mon Valley – Youth Prevention Program) is not compliant with Exhibit E. A “yes” vote would maintain the current denial by the Trust, whereas a “no” vote would reverse the decision by the Trust that the program is not compliant with Exhibit E.

Commissioner Kevin Boozel made the motion as presented. Senator Christine Tartaglione seconded the motion. With no further discussion, the Trustees of the DRC then voted as follows:

Yeses (2)

- Tumar Alexander
- Senator Christine Tartaglione

Nos (4)

- Commissioner Kevin Boozel
- Stuart Fisk
- Shea Madden
- Commissioner Robert Postal

The outcome of the vote was thus to reverse the current denial by the Trust.

Chair Tom VanKirk then presented the following resolution:

RESOLVED, that, the Dispute Resolution Committee of the Pennsylvania Opioid Misuse and Addiction Abatement Trust hereby affirms the decision of the Board of Trustees that Washington County Program No. 55 (The Hill Group – Washington Co. OUD Services Assessment) is not compliant with Exhibit E. A “yes” vote would maintain the current denial by the Trust, whereas a “no” vote would reverse the decision by the Trust that the program is not compliant with Exhibit E.

Commissioner Robert Postal made the motion as presented. Senator Christine Tartaglione seconded the motion. With no further discussion, the Trustees of the DRC then voted as follows:

Yeses (5)

- Tumar Alexander
- Commissioner Kevin Boozel
- Stuart Fisk
- Shea Madden
- Senator Christine Tartaglione

Nos (1)

- Commissioner Robert Postal

The outcome of the vote was thus to maintain the current denial by the Trust.

Chair Tom VanKirk then presented the following resolution:

RESOLVED, that, the Dispute Resolution Committee of the Pennsylvania Opioid Misuse and Addiction Abatement Trust hereby affirms the decision of the Board of Trustees that Washington County Program No. 58 (Washington STEAMworks) is not compliant with Exhibit E. A “yes” vote would maintain the current denial by the Trust, whereas a “no” vote would reverse the decision by the Trust that the program is not compliant with Exhibit E.

Stuart Fisk made the motion as presented. Tumar Alexander seconded the motion. With no further discussion, the Trustees of the DRC then voted as follows:

Yeses (1)

- Senator Christine Tartaglione

Nos (5)

- Tumar Alexander
- Commissioner Kevin Boozel
- Stuart Fisk
- Shea Madden
- Commissioner Robert Postal

The outcome of the vote was thus to reverse the current denial by the Trust.

Chair Tom VanKirk reiterated that the information Washington County submitted in its appeal materials and presented during the meeting was helpful and encouraged the County to provide similar information in its initial reports to the Trust.

Chair Tom VanKirk thanked everyone for attending. With no new business to address, the meeting was adjourned at 3:06 PM.