

OPIOID SETTLEMENT PROCEEDS GRANTS PROGRAM APPEALS BOARD
Meeting Minutes
October 21, 2025, 2:00 PM
City Hall, 1st Floor, Lynwood Roberts Room

Appeals Board Meeting Attendance	
Present	Madelaine Zarou - Chair
Present	Antonio Nichols - Member
Present	Robert Waremburg - Member

Quorum Present: Yes

City of Jacksonville Staff:

- Ashley Smith, Assistant General Counsel - Office of General Counsel, City of Jacksonville
- Laura Viafora Ray, Program Coordinator - Opioid Abatement - Jacksonville Fire and Rescue Department

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 2:01 PM by Madelaine A. Zarou, Chair.

II. Welcome and Introductions

Staff members introduced themselves, and Appeals Board members introduced themselves:

- Madelaine A. Zarou, Manager of Opioid Abatement, Jacksonville Fire & Rescue Department
- Antonio Nichols, Chair, Opioid and Substance Use Disorder (OSUD) Grants Committee
- Robert Waremburg, Senior Manager of Procurement, Procurement Division - Office of Administrative Services

III. Public Comment

Ms. Zarou opened the floor to public comment.

There was no public comment.

IV. Community Rehabilitation Center, Inc. Appeal #1

Ms. Viafora Ray provided an overview of the purpose of the meeting, summarized as follows:

- Per Chapter 84, Sec. 304 (c), the Manager of Opioid Abatement is responsible for deeming agencies eligible or ineligible to apply for an Opioid Settlement Proceeds Grant (OSPG) award. From July 2, 2025, to July 11, 2025, the Office of Opioid Abatement (OOA) conducted Eligibility Reviews and Ms. Zarou, in their capacity as Manager, sent notifications of eligibility or ineligibility to apply for an OSPG award for the FY 2025-2026 cycle based on the requirements outlined in Sections 84.304 and 84.305.
- One agency, Community Rehabilitation Center, Inc., did not receive their notifications of ineligibility due to a combination of human and technology error. On October 7th, the Office of Opioid Abatement became aware that the agency did not receive these notifications, and as a result, did not have an opportunity to appeal. The Office of Opioid Abatement promptly reached out to the Office of General Counsel, and it was determined that the notifications of ineligibility should be issued again to give the agency an opportunity to appeal. On October 9th, the notifications of ineligibility were submitted, and notices of appeal were submitted by the agency on October 16th.

Ms. Viafora Ray then provided the basic information regarding the appeal, summarized as follows:

- Requesting Agency: Community Rehabilitation Center, Inc.
- Program Name: Lifestreams Treatment Program
- Funded Category: Treatment
- Request Amount: \$500,000.00
- Notice of Appeal Date Submitted: October 16, 2025
- Program was deemed ineligible due to the agency's failure to submit the following in the form and manner prescribed:
 - Copies of the requesting agency's fiscal balance sheets for the last two fiscal years of the requesting agency
- Per Sec. 84.304(c), "...a requesting agency shall include the following eligibility documents listed in subsections (1)—(5) below, as applicable (collectively, the "Eligibility Documents"), in its Opioid Settlement Proceeds Grant application submittal. If a requesting agency fails to include the Eligibility Documents in the form and manner prescribed below, the requesting agency shall be ineligible to apply for an Opioid Settlement Proceeds Grant and such requesting agency's application shall not be reviewed and evaluated by the OSUD Grants Committee."
 - (3) a. "Copies of the requesting agency's fiscal balance sheets and statements of income and expenses for the last two fiscal years of the requesting agency"

- The Notice of Appeal cited the following appealable matter per Sec. 84.309(c)(3):
 - “A minor irregularity in the application contents or requirements which (i) is not prohibited under Section 84.305; (ii) adversely impacts a requesting agency's eligibility or application score and ranking; and (iii) will not result in an unfair competitive advantage to the requesting agency if such irregularity is waived.”
- Documents included in member handouts: meeting agenda, notification of ineligibility, fiscal balance sheets submitted with the initial application that are not aligned with the agency's fiscal year, a copy of Chapter 84 with relevant sections highlighted and tagged with post its, and a copy of the notice of the appeal and the documentation that was submitted with the notice of appeal by the agency.

Ms. Zarou then invited a representative of Community Rehabilitation Center to present their appeal.

Patricia Sampson, Director of Quality Assurance and Compliance, presented their appeal. Leeann Krieg (title not provided) was also in attendance representing the agency.

Ms. Zarou made statements addressing whether the appeal met the criteria as described in Sec. 84.309(c)(3) and opened the floor to discussion. The members discussed and asked questions for clarity from the Office of General Counsel, the agency representatives, and Ms. Viafora Ray.

Ms. Zarou made a motion to deny the appeal. Robert Waremburg seconded the motion to deny the appeal.

Ms. Zarou opened the floor to further discussion. Antonio Nichols expressed disapproval in denying the appeal.

The motion to deny the appeal passed with two ‘ayes’ (Ms. Zarou and Mr. Waremburg) and one ‘nay’ (Mr. Nichols).

V. Community Rehabilitation Center, Inc. Appeal #2

Ms. Viafora Ray provided basic information regarding the appeal, summarized as follows:

- Requesting Agency: Community Rehabilitation Center, Inc.
- Program Name: Lifestreams Recovery Support Program
- Funded Category: Recovery Support
- Request Amount: \$500,000.00

- Notice of Appeal Date Submitted: October 16, 2025
- Program was deemed ineligible due to the agency's failure to submit the following in the form and manner prescribed (the same reason as the previous appeal):
 - Copies of the requesting agency's fiscal balance sheets for the last two fiscal years of the requesting agency

Ms. Zarou then invited a representative of Community Rehabilitation Center to summarize their appeal. They had nothing further to present, as the circumstances were the same as with the first appeal.

Ms. Zarou made a motion to deny the appeal. Mr. Waremburg seconded the motion to deny the appeal.

Ms. Zarou opened the floor to further discussion. Mr. Nichols expressed disapproval in denying the appeal.

The motion to deny the appeal passed with two 'ayes' (Ms. Zarou and Mr. Waremburg) and one 'nay' (Mr. Nichols).

VI. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by Ms. Zarou at 2:47 PM.

Meeting recording available upon request. Email opioidabatement@coj.net.