

MEETING NOTES

Statewide Substance Use Response Working Group Prevention Subcommittee Meeting

June 4, 2025
3:00 p.m.

Zoom Meeting ID: 825 0031 7472

Call in audio: 1 253-205-0468

No Physical Public Location

Members Present via Zoom or Telephone

Chair Jessica Johnson, Vice Chair Eric Schoen, Debi Nadler, Angela Nickels

Attorney General's Office Staff

Joseph Peter Ostunio, Esq.; Dr. Terry Kerns; and Ashley Tackett

Social Entrepreneurs, Inc. (SEI) Support Team

Kim Hopkinson, PhD; Laura Hale; and Mary O'Leary

Members of the Public via Zoom

Amy Lucas, D. Davidson, James Dardis, Linda Anderson, Noelle Hardt, Sabrina Schnur, Tamika Shauntee Rosales, Trey Abney

1. Call to Order and Roll Call to Establish Quorum

Chair Johnson called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m. Kim Hopkinson then led the roll call.

2. Public Comment (*Discussion Only*)

Kim Hopkinson read public comment guidance, and Chair Johnson asked for public comment.

Seeing or hearing no public comment, Chair Johnson moved to agenda item #3.

3. Review and Approve Minutes from May 7, 2025, Prevention Subcommittee Meeting (*For Possible Action*)

Chair Johnson asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the May 7, 2025, Prevention Subcommittee meeting.

- Vice Chair Schoen made a motion to approve the minutes.
- Ms. Debi Nadler seconded the motion.
- The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Johnson moved to agenda item #4.

4. Presentation from Boys and Girls Club of Nevada Alliance: Fund for Resilient Nevada SMART Moves Tween & Teen Initiative (*For Discussion Only*)

Chair Johnson introduced this agenda item, welcoming Ms. Noelle Hardt and Ms. Tamika Shauntee-Rosales to present on the Boys and Girls Club of Nevada Fund for Resilient Nevada SMART Moves Tween & Teen Initiative.

Ms. Hardt thanked the subcommittee for the opportunity to present and noted that she and Ms. Shauntee-Rosales were familiar with the Prevention Subcommittee's work, having observed meetings in the past. She emphasized the alignment between the subcommittee's prevention priorities and the Club's work. Ms. Hardt explained that they were 15 months into their grant from the Fund for a Resilient Nevada and had applied for it in early spring the previous year to support what they call the Smart Moves Tween and Teen Initiative. She outlined the agenda for

the presentation, stating they would provide a high-level overview of the initiative, including the statewide reach, the design, the impact to date, and time for questions.

Ms. Hardt moved on, describing the Nevada Alliance of Boys & Girls Clubs as comprising eight member organizations with a long-standing presence in the state, dating back to 1959. “Our oldest club here in Southern Nevada is from 1959, so we have a deep history—66-year history in the state of Nevada—and certainly have grown with the times.” She shared that the organization has grown from one clubhouse in the basement of a casino to 97 club sites, which include traditional community-based centers, school-based sites, and early learning sites serving children ages 0 to 5. Over the past five years, their reach has expanded significantly, with a growing presence in rural Nevada, as well as suburban and urban areas, and on military bases like Nellis and Fallon.

Ms. Hardt continued, noting that the Clubs serve 37,000 youth annually and employ 1,100 staff. Two-thirds of the youth served qualify for free and reduced lunch, and a majority are under the age of 12. Teens make up about 20% of the population served, though Ms. Hardt noted attendance among older teens can decline due to increased independence and competing obligations.

Ms. Hardt then moved to introduce the Smart Moves Initiative as an evidence-informed prevention program developed with Allstate and Kohl’s Cares. It features a peer-led model in which youth leaders deliver curriculum alongside staff, parents, and community members. The program focuses on developing resilience skills through discussion, role-playing, media analysis, and education about substance use. It emphasizes delaying the age of first use, promoting abstinence, and rewarding responsible behavior with food and incentives. The program is evaluated through pre- and post-tests and delivered with fidelity.

Ms. Hardt explained the three core goals of the program: first, to reach approximately 2,900 Boys and Girls Club members ages 10 to 15; second, to train 75 staff mentors in opioid use prevention, including administering Naloxone; and third, to engage more than 300 families in 14 community events that combine education with social engagement.

At this point, Ms. Hardt handed the presentation over to Ms. Shauntee-Rosales. Ms. Shauntee-Rosales described that they were well on their way to meeting their first goal of reaching 2,900 youth members. She broke down the numbers by clubhouse and noted that the data had already become outdated due to continued progress. They are getting close to meeting the goal, with 2,176 youth reached at the time the presentation was created. She also clarified that the Boys & Girls Club of North Lake Tahoe only participated in the family engagement component, so no youth numbers were reported for that site.

Turning to the second goal, Ms. Shauntee-Rosales noted that staff training “was hit out of the park.” Truckee Meadows, for example, exceeded its goal by training 150 staff instead of its goal of 32. Even smaller clubs like Colorado River and Elko surpassed their targets. In total, 271 staff were trained—well beyond the goal of 75. The training covered recognizing and responding to opioid overdoses and administering Naloxone.

The second goal also had a Narcan-readiness component, which aimed for 10 clubhouses to be equipped with Naloxone. This was also significantly surpassed. “[The] goal was 10. We have 27, and potentially there might be one or two more,” Ms. Shauntee-Rosales added, referencing additional sites that added capacity the following month.

On the third goal around family and community engagement, Ms. Shauntee-Rosales reported that the goal of reaching 320 families through 14 events was also greatly exceeded. “We ended up doing 724 families, and counting,” she said. Events included activities like barbecue nights, movie nights, and cookie decorating parties, where families could receive prevention information in an accessible and engaging environment.

Ms. Shauntee-Rosales then discussed program outcomes. Among youth, 73% demonstrated increased knowledge about opioid misuse and community resources based on pre- and post-test results, and 91% showed improved resilience to peer and media pressure. Some variation in data was due to attendance inconsistencies. “Some of these were administered in the morning... and then some of those children were absent,” Ms. Shauntee-Rosales explained. Additional cohorts are expected to complete testing, potentially improving data coverage.

The staff and club impact data mirrored earlier findings: 271 staff were trained—361% of the original goal—and 27 sites were Narcan-ready, 270% of the target. Regarding family engagement, Ms. Shauntee-Rosales remarked that they served 724 families—226% of the goal. She also noted that “Southern Nevada Health District comes out and helps a lot,” along with numerous other partners including first responders, fire departments, and hospitals across the state.

Ms. Shauntee-Rosales then discussed pending expansion requests. These include lowering the program’s age range to include 8- and 9-year-olds, which would expand access to approximately 2,900 more youth. They also requested transportation funding to meet youth and families where they are and remove participation barriers.

Ms. Shauntee-Rosales went on to explain that they also would like to do more community outreach. One example of successful outreach is the partnership with Equipo Charter School in Las Vegas, where club staff deliver Smart Moves to 685 students onsite. “Our staff goes out to them... some of them weren’t even members of the club,” she noted. Ms. Shauntee-Rosales emphasized the desire to replicate this model across more sites.

Ms. Shauntee-Rosales also mentioned a proposal to add community partnership specialists to deepen collaboration with family service and education providers. “The sooner we could do it, the better we could do it,” she said, “and the further reach we can use to get to it, the better it is for everyone in our society and state.”

At the conclusion of the presentation, Chair Johnson thanked Ms. Hardt and Ms. Shauntee-Rosales, opening the floor for questions from subcommittee members.

Ms. Nadler expressed strong support for the initiative and asked what kind of testing was used to measure youth impact. Ms. Shauntee-Rosales explained that the tests are surveys containing both written and interactive questions. “They’re asked specific questions like, ‘What do you do if you’re presented with this?’” Ms. Hardt added that the questions align with the Smart Moves program modules and measure knowledge and confidence regarding opioid safety. “Do they recognize more media pressures? Do they recognize the actual physical appearance of an opioid?” she said.

Ms. Nadler then asked whether Smart Moves could be brought into all middle schools. Ms. Hardt explained that the Smart Moves program is proprietary to Boys & Girls Clubs of America, which allows for flexibility and adaptation. “It’s not boilerplate. It’s not dated. It’s very fluid,” she said. They have even added modules on vaping and fentanyl as those issues gained relevance. Ms.

Hardt noted the key distinction between delivering this content in clubs versus schools: “When they come into a clubhouse, they can choose... and those that are choosing to come into the room and connect as peers... is really encouraging.”

Ms. Nadler suggested distributing flyers in middle schools to recruit students to join the clubs. Ms. Hardt affirmed that a middle school outreach initiative is currently being developed.

Chair Johnson then asked the presenters about the evidence-informed nature of the curriculum and whether there were plans to elevate it to an evidence-based program. Ms. Hardt confirmed that Boys & Girls Clubs of America are working with a university partner in Georgia to meet that goal. She also discussed related programs including Smart Girls and Passport to Manhood, which focus on gender-specific issues such as body image, dating violence, and emotional regulation. “It’s a continuum of curricula,” she said.

Chair Johnson asked whether the Clubs collaborate with statewide prevention coalitions like Join Together Northern Nevada and PACT. Ms. Hardt explained that each club has its own set of regional partners and that joining the Fund for a Resilient Nevada opened the door to more relationships and training opportunities. “We love to host meetings,” she added, inviting groups to use Club facilities.

Chair Johnson asked whether the Club’s work aligns with the subcommittee’s recommendations. Hardt affirmed this, saying, “It’s in our DNA to talk about primary prevention.” She emphasized the need to reach youth before they move into treatment or law enforcement systems and praised the committee’s focus on universal prevention. “We have a hand on your back,” she said. “We’re your partner.”

Chair Johnson closed the session by thanking the presenters again for their presentation. Hearing no other questions or discussion, Chair Johnson moved to agenda item #5.

5. Review Progress on Prior SURG Prevention Subcommittee Recommendations (*For Discussion Only*)

Chair Johnson introduced the agenda item as a review of progress on the prior SURG Prevention Subcommittee recommendations and their formal submission. She asked Kim Hopkinson whether there were additional slides to accompany the discussion. Kim Hopkinson replied that there were no more slides and that the next section of the presentation would focus on a document that had been shared with the group and posted to the website—an Excel spreadsheet summarizing the impact of current SURG recommendations.

Chair Johnson briefly recapped that the spreadsheet was prepared by Ms. Laura Hale from SEI, who had spent significant time compiling the status of each recommendation. Chair Johnson invited feedback on the document and noted that Ms. Hale was present on the call in case any clarification or updates were needed, especially given that the document had been created while the legislative session was still ongoing.

Vice Chair Schoen was the first to respond, stating that he had reviewed the document and found it very helpful overall. He highlighted a key success that occurred during the recently concluded legislative session: the bill to formally recognize Certified Prevention Specialists passed. Vice Chair Schoen expressed cautious optimism, noting that while outcomes aren’t guaranteed, he hoped the certification would gain legitimacy and value similar to that of Community Health Workers (CHWs) and peer support professionals. “I would hope... that they are recognized, basically valued components of the workforce that we need to develop the kinds of supports that

previous presenters just provided.” He urged that certified prevention specialists be intentionally included in strategic planning and implementation, especially in discussions about what constitutes effective prevention.

Chair Johnson thanked Vice Chair Schoen for highlighting the bill’s passage, affirming its alignment with past and current recommendations from the subcommittee. She then asked whether the bill had already been signed or was still awaiting the governor’s signature. Vice Chair Schoen responded that to his knowledge, it was expected to be signed if it hadn’t been already, and he was not aware of anything indicating otherwise.

Chair Johnson confirmed that this development could potentially influence how the subcommittee might want to revisit or revise related recommendations around certified peers and CHWs once the legislative session outcomes were finalized. Vice Chair Schoen agreed and noted that many people were still processing the final actions taken in the last days of the session. He added that as he reviewed the spreadsheet, it appeared to him that the group had made more measurable progress on harm reduction recommendations than on those related to prevention. He emphasized that this wasn’t necessarily due to a difference in effort, but the disparity was nonetheless striking.

Chair Johnson asked Vice Chair Schoen if he had thoughts on why that might be the case. Vice Chair Schoen deferred momentarily, suggesting that Ms. Nadler might also have insights, as she had raised a related concern earlier.

Ms. Nadler then spoke, affirming that she too had noticed the imbalance. She mentioned reviewing many of the bills awaiting the governor’s signature—at least 121 by her count—and observed that very few, if any, addressed prevention directly. She remarked, “It just seems like we’ve done this every year, and the prevention part has always been knocked to the back of the table.” Ms. Nadler praised the earlier presenters from the Boys and Girls Club for emphasizing primary prevention, and questioned why this essential area is often deprioritized. “Our overdose rates are up. Why is nobody talking about this in our state? Everybody else is down. Why are our overdoses up?” she asked.

Vice Chair Schoen acknowledged Ms. Nadler’s concerns and transitioned back to the initial question posed by Chair Johnson. He offered a hypothesis: the prevention recommendations may have been more “challenging to the status quo.” He reminded the group that the committee had intentionally proposed bold, specific goals, such as doubling the base prevention budget from \$12 million to \$24 million, and including line items like a \$2 per capita index or 15% set-aside for tobacco control. “We were very specific on how we wanted these indexed,” he said, adding, “I think it made people uncomfortable that maybe we were that direct.” In contrast, the harm reduction goals may have been more digestible or familiar to decision-makers, which could explain their higher adoption rate.

Chair Johnson agreed with this assessment and referenced a recent recommendation from the SEI team: the importance of having a bill sponsor. She suggested that many of the prevention-related items were structured as bill draft requests (BDRs), and therefore required more legislative strategy to move forward. Chair Johnson proposed that the subcommittee work more closely with legislative appointees to refine and make prevention recommendations more actionable for future sessions—particularly for the 2025 Annual Report.

Ms. Nadler added that the current recommendations may have been too broad. “We need specifics,” she argued. “There’s no breakdown... we need to focus on specific programming or specific mental health services.”

Chair Johnson responded that the committee’s role is to make “broader brushstrokes,” aggregating priorities from across the state. But she agreed that working with subject matter experts, such as the Nevada Tobacco Control and Smoke-Free Coalition, would help in translating broader goals into more precise and actionable policy. She encouraged members to re-submit refined or updated recommendations through the SEI SurveyMonkey so that the committee could workshop them in upcoming meetings.

Following up on Vice Chair Schoen’s earlier point, Chair Johnson floated the idea of inviting the sponsor or legislative lead behind the certified prevention specialist bill to a future meeting to help the subcommittee better understand how to frame prevention-related recommendations. Vice Chair Schoen supported the idea and reflected on his experience serving on the committee. “It’s interesting what you think it’s going to be... and what it actually is,” he said, admitting that he initially thought the group would make recommendations that others would then carry forward. Instead, he found the subcommittee also had to build a level of legislative and political sophistication to move recommendations forward. He acknowledged that Chair Johnson’s earlier points underscored the need for improved framing and communication to make recommendations more appealing and actionable.

Chair Johnson responded that perhaps once Senator Doñate rejoined the committee, his legislative insight could assist in reframing key items. Vice Chair Schoen then reemphasized the committee’s original—and in his view, still valid—recommendation to significantly increase the prevention budget. “That seems to me a pretty straightforward recommendation,” he said, even while acknowledging the financial constraints facing the state.

Chair Johnson then recalled that during the October SURG meeting, she had learned that some of their recommendations may have arrived at key decision-makers’ desks too late in the budget cycle. She suggested that timing and process are areas where the committee can improve. Turning to Dr. Terry Kerns, who chairs the Response Subcommittee, Chair Johnson invited additional thoughts.

Dr. Kerns first thanked the group for the opportunity to speak. She reported that the Northern Regional Policy Board had sponsored the certified prevention specialist bill and noted that they would be discussing it further at a meeting the following day. She offered to send details to Kim Hopkinson to share with the group. Dr. Kerns confirmed that the bill had passed both the Assembly and Senate and was now awaiting the Governor’s signature.

Dr. Kerns also provided an update on AB19, originally sponsored by the Attorney General’s Office to expand SURG membership. During its passage, amendments were made to increase representation from multilingual households and to revise the timeline for the SURG Annual Report. If signed, the new law would change the recommendation deadline to August each year, aligning with the state’s budget development and legislative planning timeline. “The purpose is to make the recommendations more actionable and aligned with timelines for departmental budgets and legislative deadlines,” she explained. Therefore, the 2025 Annual Report will be approved in January 2026 and will encompass the process for developing recommendations. Then in August 2026, the next Annual Report will be due with those recommendations. Annual Reports will be released in August from that point forward.

Chair Johnson expressed appreciation for Dr. Kerns' insights and noted that other subcommittees had faced similar timing issues. She asked Ms. Nadler if she had additional thoughts to share. Ms. Nadler recalled the proposed marijuana recommendation and asked whether the committee would address that topic. Chair Johnson assured her that the recommendation would be discussed under the next agenda item and that Kim Hopkinson had updates on speakers for the next meeting.

Before transitioning, Chair Johnson opened the floor for any last comments. Vice Chair Schoen thanked Dr. Kerns, saying it was "affirming to hear that... [people] understood that a shift in those dates would help us get recommendations out in a timely fashion to have the kind of impact that we want." Dr. Kerns acknowledged the credit and named Senator Doñate as one of the key individuals behind the amendment.

Chair Johnson closed the item by reiterating that any recommendations subcommittee members wanted to retain or revise for 2025 should be submitted through the SEI SurveyMonkey survey, even if in draft form. This would allow staff to track interest and begin planning for speakers and workshopping sessions. She reminded members that only a few meetings remained before the next report cycle and noted that the Attorney General's Office would be providing updated guidance if AB19 was signed into law.

Dr. Kerns added that the Response Subcommittee had begun considering whether the updated timeline might necessitate a change in the cadence of meetings and that a survey would be distributed to gather feedback. Chair Johnson confirmed that SEI would send out the survey and encouraged members to respond.

With no further questions or discussion, Chair Johnson closed agenda item #6 and moved on to agenda item #7.

6. Discuss Proposed 2025 Prevention Subcommittee Recommendations *(Discussion Only)*

Chair Johnson introduced the agenda item, which focused on reviewing and discussing proposed recommendations for the 2025 Prevention Subcommittee. Chair Johnson opened the item by acknowledging the earlier overview of AB19, provided by Dr. Kerns, and the related forthcoming survey which could potentially impact the timeline for developing and submitting recommendations. Despite these changes, Chair Johnson encouraged the committee to begin thinking about which recommendations they would like to retain, sunset, modify, or move forward based on either recent progress or changes in statewide needs.

Chair Johnson then turned to Kim Hopkinson to ask whether there were any additional details about the recommendations process that should be highlighted based on the current slide. Kim Hopkinson clarified that the slide had been slightly updated from previous versions to reflect the altered timeline resulting from AB19. Previously, the slide included a firm deadline by which members were asked to submit recommendations. However, due to the possible shift in the report submission schedule tied to AB19, the instructions had been made more flexible and general.

Kim Hopkinson also emphasized that if a member was planning to elevate an existing strategy for continued discussion, they should still complete the survey to the extent possible, particularly any sections that capture changing circumstances or context. However, she clarified that if prior information remained the same, members could simply note that there had been no change. Because some fields in the survey are required, members would still need to input responses such

as “has not changed” to allow the submission to go through. She reminded the group that existing recommendations from prior years are documented in previous annual reports and encouraged members to reference those documents when determining what information to update or reuse in the current submission.

Chair Johnson thanked her and asked the group if there were any immediate questions for the SEI team about the survey submission process. Seeing no hands raised or participants coming off mute, she moved to the next slide. She noted that the committee had received two recommendations so far, one of which was related to cannabis, submitted by Ms. Nadler. Chair Johnson shared that the SEI team had been working with the recommended presenter, Dr. Lev, to identify a time and date when she could attend a future meeting to speak on the topic. Kim Hopkinson noted that she had reached out to Dr. Lev multiple times and was still waiting to hear back, but hoped to receive a response soon. Chair Johnson noted that if the subcommittee moved forward with its tobacco recommendation, the Nevada Tobacco Control and Smoke-Free Coalition subject matter experts had also expressed willingness to present, including on overlapping areas related to cannabis. She hoped their participation would help provide broader context for the cannabis-related recommendation.

Kim Hopkinson confirmed that the coalition representatives had already committed to attending the August meeting, assuming the current meeting cadence remained unchanged. Chair Johnson thanked her for that confirmation and opened the floor for further discussion.

Ms. Nadler asked if Kim Hopkinson was not able to get in touch with Dr. Lev, would she like her to send information on another subject matter expert. Ms. Nadler also inquired whether she should submit this alternative speaker recommendation via the survey or another method. Kim Hopkinson let Ms. Nadler know that she could email her the name of the alternate speaker directly, especially since the cannabis recommendation had already been submitted through the survey once. Ms. Nadler thanked her and then asked a clarifying question about the use of the SurveyMonkey form, wondering whether members should use it now to express their ideas or wait until they were fully ready.

Chair Johnson asked whether her forthcoming recommendation would include new wording changes or whether it constituted an entirely new recommendation. Ms. Nadler confirmed that it was new and not directly about marijuana but instead focused on Kratom, a substance currently legal in Nevada but illegal in six other states. “I want to talk about making it illegal in our state,” she said. Kim Hopkinson responded that for a new recommendation like that, it would be best to complete the full survey form to ensure all relevant context was captured for subcommittee review. “It has places to collect a lot of supplementary information that we want to share with the subcommittee,” she explained. Ms. Nadler acknowledged the instruction and agreed to complete the survey. Kim Hopkinson reiterated that Ms. Nadler could continue emailing speaker suggestions but encouraged completing the survey to fully outline the rationale for the Kratom-related recommendation.

Chair Johnson thanked Ms. Nadler for continuing to think proactively about the subcommittee’s work and contributing to its evolving list of recommendations. She then introduced the second received recommendation, which related to Naloxone distribution and access. Chair Johnson reminded the committee that a presentation on this topic had been delivered at the previous meeting and that she planned to submit some amendments to the existing recommendation based on insights from that presentation. Specifically, she mentioned guidance from Mr. Josh Luftig,

the presenter, who clarified that some policy changes in California had made standing orders unnecessary now that Naloxone is available over the counter. Chair Johnson stated that she wanted to ensure that the recommendation being considered by the committee reflected the most current best practices and policy environment.

Chair Johnson informed the group that once the speakers finalized their presentation slides, SEI would post them to the SURG website and she would submit updated text for the Naloxone recommendation. She asked the subcommittee for any further feedback or comments on that item before finalizing it for submission. No members unmuted or raised their hand.

Chair Johnson then acknowledged that while only two recommendations had been submitted so far, she anticipated additional proposals surfacing in the weeks leading up to the next meeting.

With no further comments, Chair Johnson transitioned the group to agenda item #7.

7. Discuss Report Out for July 9, 2025, SURG Meeting (*For Possible Action*)

As the meeting moved into agenda item #7, Chair Johnson introduced its topic of preparing for the upcoming SURG meeting scheduled for July 9, 2025. She explained that she has typically served as the reporting representative for the Prevention Subcommittee at these larger statewide SURG meetings and described it as an honor to represent the group in that role.

However, Chair Johnson informed the subcommittee that she would be traveling at the time of the July meeting and was uncertain about the quality and reliability of her internet access during the trip. Acknowledging that “hotel wi-fi can be a little dicey,” she wanted to ensure that the subcommittee’s voice would still be represented effectively and without any technical disruption.

Turning to Vice Chair Schoen, Chair Johnson asked whether he would be available to step in and deliver the update in her absence. In response, Schoen gave her a thumbs up, which she acknowledged aloud. Chair Johnson thanked Vice Chair Schoen in advance for stepping in.

Vice Chair Schoen confirmed his availability with a verbal affirmation, and Chair Johnson reiterated her appreciation. Therefore, Vice Chair Schoen will be providing the subcommittee report out at the full SURG July 9th.

Chair Johnson then opened the floor for any additional discussion on this item. Hearing no further comments or questions, Chair Johnson moved onto agenda item #8.

8. Public Comment (*Discussion Only*)

Chair Johnson opened the floor for public comment, asking Kim Hopkinson to read the public comment guidance. Once completed, Chair Johnson called for public comment.

Seeing and hearing no additional public comment, Chair Johnson moved to agenda item #9.

9. Adjournment

Chair Johnson thanked subcommittee members, presenters, and others in attendance and adjourned the meeting at 4:18 p.m.

Meeting Chat Log:

Kim Hopkinson (she/her) 3:04 PM

Please do not utilize chat for anything other than technical issues because the content is not necessarily available to the general public, which is a requirement of the open meeting law.

Kim Hopkinson (she/her) 4:18 PM

Please do not utilize chat for anything other than technical issues because the content is not necessarily available to the general public, which is a requirement of the open meeting law.