

# Drugs: Legal, Illegal...Otherwise



*\*Reproduced with permission*

## 2005 Town Hall Findings & Recommendations



Moving Ideas into Action



***The Oklahoma Academy*** is a private, non-partisan membership organization that serves as Oklahoma’s “honest broker.” It develops recommendations on critical issues facing Oklahoma’s future and actively supports their implementation. Academy members understand that Oklahoma is sparsely populated with limited resources. They recognize that in order to improve and enhance education, business and our quality of life, we must collaboratively work together and develop a stronger, more progressive Oklahoma.

***Vision...***

***To be Oklahoma’s premiere citizen-based organization for public policy development***

Identifies areas of need and problems facing the State and its people

Sponsors and conducts research on critical issues facing the state

Develops an educated awareness on policies and programs designed to meet the needs of the people

Develops long range goals and agendas for action

Increases citizen awareness of the Academy and its policy recommendations

***Mission...***

***To develop and implement public policy designed to improve the quality of life for Oklahomans***

Utilizes a well-defined Town Hall ***process***

Focuses on maximizing ***Participation*** and establishing ***Partnerships***

Encourages collaborative and thoughtful ***Planning***

Produces ***Policy*** recommendations and supports their implementation

***Key to success...***

Held each fall, the ***Academy Town Hall*** conference is the centerpiece of the Academy’s program of work. It is the convening place for an invited group of participants who are culturally, geographically and politically representative of the state. Urban with rural, private with public, local and state leaders, concerned citizens of all cultures—They discuss the researched issue under focus, they share viewpoints, debate and collaboratively develop specific recommendations and action steps. Immediately after the Town Hall they, and other Academy members, begin the implementation work. Academy Town Hall recommendations are consistently incorporated into progressive legislation and community action.

***Join the Academy...***

Become one of a select group of Oklahomans willing to stay on the cutting edge of policy development and willing to take action at community and state levels. Join the Academy and help build a prosperous and progressive Oklahoma today and for future generations. Visit our website, [www.okacademy.org](http://www.okacademy.org), for more information regarding membership.

# The 2005 Oklahoma Academy Town Hall Drugs: Legal, Illegal...Otherwise

## Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	3
2005 Town Hall Participants.....	4
Preface.....	6
2005 Oklahoma Academy Town Hall Team.....	6
Executive Summary.....	7
2005 Town Hall Leading Recommendations.....	8
Findings.....	9
2005 Oklahoma Academy Board of Directors.....	22
2006 Oklahoma Academy Leadership.....	24
2005 Town Hall Sponsors.....	27

# 2005 Town Hall Participants

**Monte Akridge**  
Integris Health  
Edmond

**Thad Balkman**  
OK House of Representatives  
Norman

**Thomas Barber**  
USDA Rural Development  
Woodward

**Andrea Barkley**  
NSU  
Tahlequah

**Howard Barnett**  
TSF Capital, LLC  
Tulsa

**Craig Beers**  
Palmer Drug Abuse Program of  
Tulsa, Inc.  
Tulsa

**David Bell**  
PSO  
Tulsa

**Paul Beran**  
NOSU  
Alva

**Leslie Blair**  
OK Department of Commerce  
Oklahoma City

**Nancy Bolzle**  
Bolzle Consulting  
Tulsa

**David Braddock**  
OK House of Representatives  
Altus

**Ginger Brown**  
Cherokee Nation  
Tahlequah

**Susie Bullock**  
OU Health Sciences Center  
Oklahoma City

**Brant Cale**  
UCO  
Claremore

**Mary Jane Calvey**  
DEQ  
Oklahoma City

**Nancy Coats-Ashley**  
Oklahoma City

**Jack Coffey, DPh**  
OU College of Pharmacy  
Tulsa

**Doug Cox**  
OK House of Representatives  
Grove

**Michael Davis**  
SESU  
Cartwright

**Terry Detrick**  
Oklahoma Farmers Union  
Oklahoma City

**Barrett Dye**  
UCO  
Edmond

**Stephen Farmer**  
City of Tahlequah  
Tahlequah

**John Feaver**  
USAO  
Chickasha

**Will Focht**  
OSU Environmental Insititute  
Stillwater

**Becky Frank**  
Schnake, Turnbo, Frank  
Tulsa

**Robert Franklin**  
Sand Springs Public Schools  
Sand Springs

**Kay Goebel, Ph.D.**  
Kay Goebel, Ph.D.  
Oklahoma City

**Glenn Hayes**  
City of Guthrie  
Guthrie

**Nona Hessman**  
Kellyville Board of Education  
Kellyville

**Lee Hester**  
USAO  
Chickasha

**William Hoch**  
Crowe & Dunlevy  
Oklahoma City

**Kim Holland**  
Oklahoma Insurance Dept.  
Oklahoma City

**Jerome Holmes**  
Crowe & Dunlevy  
Oklahoma City

**Jenny Jackson**  
Cameron University  
Lawton

**Tena Kay Jolley**  
Chickasaw Nation  
Stratford

**Clark Jolley**  
Jolley & Jolley, P.C.  
Oklahoma City

**Gayle Jones**  
State Dept. of Education  
Oklahoma City

**Marilyn Kincade**  
Stepping Stones, Inc.  
Boley

**Regina Knell**  
Palmer  
Tulsa

**Craig Knutson**  
Oklahoma Insurance Dept.  
Oklahoma City

**Micah Kordsmeier**  
TU  
Tulsa

**Carlo La Monica**  
Cameron University  
Lawton

**Jared Lamb**  
UCO  
Edmond

**Michael Lapolla**  
OU  
Tulsa

**Jonathan Looper**  
TU  
Tulsa

**Greg Main**  
i2E  
Oklahoma City

**Neal McCaleb**  
Chickasaw Enterprises  
Ada

**Jeannie McDaniel**  
OK House of Representatives  
Tulsa

**Bill McKamey**  
PSO  
Tulsa

**Karen Metcalf**  
Hughes County Drug Court  
Holdenville

**Timothy Michaels - Johnson**  
TU  
Tulsa

**Charlotte New**  
Mental Health Assn. of  
Oklahoma County  
Oklahoma City

**Ron Peters**  
OK House of Representatives  
Tulsa

**Glenda Peters**  
USAO  
Chickasha

**Dan Plunket, MD**  
OU Health Sciences Center,  
Tulsa  
Tulsa

**Anita Poole**  
Kerr Center for Sustainable  
Agriculture  
Poteau

**Clay Pope**  
OK Assoc. of Conservation  
Districts  
Loyal

**Samonia Pope**  
Cookson Institute  
Oklahoma City

**Keith Reed**  
OU-Health Sciences Center  
McAlester

**Michael Rials**  
Dolese Bros. Co.  
Oklahoma City

**Larry Rice**  
TU  
Tulsa

**Ross Robinson**  
Norman Economic  
Development Coalition  
Norman

**John Robson**  
Saint Francis Health System  
Tulsa

**Andrew Scott**  
Edmond

**T.W. Shannon**  
Chickasaw Enterprises  
Ada

**Robert Stevens**  
Oklahoma Office of Personnel  
Management  
Oklahoma City

**Warren Thompson**  
Oklahoma Office of Personnel  
Management  
Oklahoma City

**Marilyn Thoms**  
Gateway to Prevention &  
Recovery  
Shawnee

**Miles Tolbert**  
Office of the Secretary of  
Environment  
Oklahoma City

**Ann Warn, MD, MBA**  
Oklahoma State Board of  
Health  
Lawton

**Renee Warning, SPHR**  
UCO  
Edmond

**Alba Weaver**  
City of Guthrie  
Guthrie

**Phil Woodward**  
Oklahoma Pharmacists  
Association  
Oklahoma City

**Jerry Young**  
Holdenville Police Department  
Holdenville

**George Young**  
Holy Temple  
Oklahoma City

**Waldo Zerger, Jr.**  
Edmond

# Preface

## Drugs: Legal, Illegal...Otherwise

The 2005 Town Hall considered the profound social, economic and personal health consequences of drugs of all forms: legal and illegal, harmful and helpful.

Our state has been a leader in implementing innovative programs dealing with drug courts, meth labs and re-use of prescription medicine. But necessity is the mother of invention and two of these programs arose out of desperate conditions.

This Town Hall does not limit its examination to that of drug abuse. We think it vital to consider policies to make prescription drugs more affordable, used more when helpful and used less when not. We recognize we are not merely consumers of drugs and that businesses in our state are becoming producers of biologics and other new medicines. Our future economic prosperity will benefit by being a global competitor in the field of biotechnology.

We want our children to be taught to live healthy and meaningful lives, free of dependence on drugs. When our citizens are trapped in the grip of drugs we want them to receive the right mix of treatment and punishment; if we do that, they can return to being healthy contributors to our society and we will expend our precious resources only for that purpose.

To these aspirations, we commit this Town Hall Findings Report.

## 2005 Town Hall Team

*Town Hall Chairman*  
Howard Barnett

*Research Co-Chair*  
Mike Lapolla

*Research Co-Chair*  
Craig Knutson

*Town Hall Report Co-Chair,  
Implementation Chair*  
Doug Branch

*Town Hall Report Co-Chair*  
Terry Kordeliski

*Town Hall Training Chair*  
Marc Edwards

*Panel Leaders:*  
Claudean Harrison  
Steve Kreidler  
Karen Langdon  
Matthew Weaver

*Panel Recorders:*  
Adam Childers  
Joyel Haave  
Jennifer Kirkpatrick  
Jennifer Miller  
Bonner Gonzalez

# 2005 Town Hall Executive Summary

## **Introduction**

As a major part of our mission, the Oklahoma Academy for State Goals organizes an annual Town Hall Conference devoted to collaborative, creative and engaging discussion on an issue critical to the development and progression of the State. The 2005 Town Hall Conference focused on “**Drugs: Legal, Illegal...Otherwise.**” Attendance was by invitation and limited to 140 attendees. Invitations were issued to nominees to assure that the participants approximated the socio-demographic composition of Oklahoma. The Town Hall was held at the National Center for Employee Development in Norman, Oklahoma Sunday evening October 23 through Wednesday noon October 26.

## **This Town Hall...**

This Town Hall presented researched information and articles of perspective covering legal drugs, illegal drugs, and current and future drug research. The Town Hall recognized that “drugs” has both a positive and negative tone. And that governments, businesses, and educational institutions are increasingly dealing with issues related to both. It is also recognized that these “drugs” are causing a myriad of debates concerning their use, abuse and social costs. Miracle drugs cure – at a price. Illegal drugs destroy – at a price. Legal drugs – pharmaceuticals – are an emerging force in the health care arsenal of therapies; businesses cope with the costs of health care and prescription drug benefits as much as they do with absenteeism caused by the use of illegal drugs.

The Academy decided it is time to take a serious look at both and determine the public policies that advance the positive outcomes of legal drugs and minimize the negative consequences of the abuse of illegal (and legal) drugs.

## **Panel Discussions...**

The Town Hall required participants to deliberate and discuss the presented issues over a two and one-half day session. The group of 94 was subdivided into four Panels (groups). Each group independently discussed and addressed a standard discussion outline covering the following areas: Prescription Drugs, Re-Use of Prescription Medicine, Research and Development, Importing Medicine, Social and Legal Sanctions, Methamphetamine, Alcohol, Alternatives to Incarceration, and Best Practices.

An experienced Academy Board member facilitated each Panel discussion and the proceedings of each group were recorded and synthesized by attorney recorders. At the end of the discussion sessions, the recorders for each group crafted the consensus of all groups. The final document representing that consensus was presented to the entire group, and the closing half-day plenary session was spent debating and resolving differences.

## **Findings and Recommendations...**

The Findings and Recommendations represent the active consensus of the thought and discussions of the entire group of 94 participants. The Findings reveal many important attitudes, concepts and ideas to consider regarding measures that we can and should take. They also share the collective thoughts and ideas to improve Oklahoma’s situation with legal drugs, illegal drugs and the future.

The Town Hall participants have identified five priority recommendations for immediate implementation. They follow on the next page.

# 2005 Town Hall Leading Recommendations

## Drugs: Legal, Illegal...Otherwise

- **The Academy Town Hall recommends that public school districts employ and engage qualified public school counselors at the elementary, middle school and high school levels to work with students and families in the areas of mental health and substance abuse concerns as well as the academic and career counseling areas.** Counselor expertise in academic, career, mental health and social concerns must be utilized effectively in our schools at all levels. Counselors should not be involved with duties that could be adequately and appropriately handled by secretaries and administrative assistants.
- **The Academy Town Hall recommends that the Oklahoma Academy for State Goals convene a knowledgeable and skilled group of people to determine the criteria and information necessary for a statewide public education campaign designed to generate a greater awareness of the significant impact methamphetamines and all meth-related derivatives have in Oklahoma.** The campaign should encompass multimedia, advertising and public relations components utilizing explicit graphics and meth user testimonials to convey the seriousness of the issue.
- **The Academy Town Hall recommends that responsibility be imposed on business owners (in addition to the actual sellers) for sale of alcohol to minors through a three-strike program, which provides for graduated punishment.** First strike – a program of mandatory training; second strike – monetary penalties; and third strike – suspension and possible revocation of licenses.
- **The Academy Town Hall recommends mandatory drug testing for initial criminal arrest to identify those with drug problems and get them into treatment and supervision as early as possible.** People with an identified drug problem and arrested for a non-violent offense would be routed into an Expanded Drug Court System.
- **The Academy Town Hall recommends that an inventory be taken of all drug and mental health programs, both government and nonprofit, available within the State of Oklahoma.** The inventory should be dispersed to appropriate agencies, nonprofits, the public, the legislature and the Governor's office. Collaboration by all agency and nonprofit programs should be encouraged to prevent duplication of services and All programs should be encouraged to update their information annually.

## **Findings**

### **THE BIG PICTURE**

The Town Hall began with a consideration of the “big picture”: a proposition that is less about legal and illegal drugs, and more about the problems associated with helpful drugs and harmful drugs (recognizing that legal drugs could still be harmful).

Helpful Drugs. Town Hall resource materials point out that, based on National Institutes of Health treatment guidelines, the number of people being untreated for many diseases – such as hypertension, asthma and cholesterol – is quite large. The Town Hall considered this condition against the positive economic impact of pharmaceutical use by patients in increasing the labor supply through greater productivity, i.e., less sick time, greater worker longevity and reduced use of medical services. The under-use of medications has been identified as a cause of tens of thousands of heart attacks, strokes, deaths and hospitalizations. The compulsion to reduce the overall cost of prescription drugs and the economic cost of under-use of helpful drugs is therefore a contradiction.

The Town Hall examined factors which inhibit people from receiving the helpful drugs they need or want. Among the factors identified were:

- Lack of resources to pay for drugs. Poverty or lack of prescription drug insurance coverage were the principal forces at work.
- Affordability. While generic drugs in America are among the cheapest in the world, the prices for brand-name, patented drugs have been labeled as “intolerably high”.
- Gaps in the delivery of health care. Aside from the lack of prescription drug insurance, the large population of Oklahomans without health and medical insurance coverage leads to undiagnosed/untreated conditions.
- Lack of awareness or education about illnesses and their treatment. Fear of adverse side effects, often fueled by advertising disclaimers, can discourage people from taking the medication they need. Patient confusion, incomplete description of symptoms by patients to healthcare providers and the unwillingness to use drugs as directed are other factors.
- Regulatory oversight or fear of civil or criminal liability can discourage physicians from prescribing certain drugs. For example, in the field of pain management, where abuses of painkillers has resulted in high-profile cases, doctors are under-prescribing to avoid suspicion or leaving the field altogether because there is no accepted definition of what prescription practices are legitimate. Patient advocacy groups have surfaced in reaction.
- Intangible factors, such as cultural and religious bias, also play a part. Drugs can develop stigmas (Ritalin, for example).
- Managed care bureaucracy can inhibit the appropriate use of needed medications.

Harmful Drugs. The question of why people use harmful drugs has plagued society for ages. Illegal drugs are not reserved merely for the back alleys and flophouses; they pervade all levels of society and have enormous destructive impact.

Curiosity, experimentation and pleasure-seeking are natural human tendencies that lead to illegal drug use. Peer pressure in social groups where drug use is accepted is a common entry point and the desire to escape life’s problems is a powerful cause. Social factors such as income play an important role, where people in lower economic classes and those from weak family support structures have a greater tendency for abuse of highly addictive drugs.

Illegal drug use is not limited to the recreational or thrill-seeking user; performance enhancing drugs (steroids for athletes; amphetamines for students) are also a concern.

Education as to the evils of use of illicit and harmful legal drugs is necessary, but hasn't eliminated the problem: alcohol and nicotine addictions persist in the face of several decades of educational programs. Genetic predispositions to addiction (e.g., alcoholism) require self-awareness to avoid succumbing to the disease.

Drugs may not be illegal or obviously harmful, yet have that effect. Culturally, we believe in medicating ourselves; the desire to feel better immediately is powerful and the belief that pills make this happen is ingrained. More constructive ways of coping or treatment may be better, but not as expedient. The prevalence of pharmaceutical advertising contributes to this perception. Drugs can also be used as a coping mechanism for dealing with life's problems. Painkillers, while intended as helpful, can be harmful because they can be very addictive.

A number of prescription medications have become available for purchase without a prescription and the easy availability of these nonprescription medications can lead to misuse. Prior to Oklahoma's innovative methamphetamine law which restricted sales of pseudophedrine to behind-the-counter sales, the supply of meth was enabled by a low cost of entry into manufacturing. The unrestricted use of herbals, homeopathics and dietary supplements can be risky and prevent patients from seeking legitimate medical help.

Some Surprises. Town Hall participants learned a great deal from the Town Hall background document:

- Many were encouraged by how quickly and inexpensively the government intervened in the problem of methamphetamine labs via the restrictions on pseudophedrine purchases. This was countered by the surprising continued use of meth despite the constriction of supply.
- The tendency of Oklahoma in drug matters to incarcerate rather than treat individuals where the issue is primarily a disease was noted. The economic impact of incarceration versus treatment was emphasized and that so little money is spent on prevention versus punishment. The success of drug courts was of interest.
- The high incidence of crimes committed by persons under the influence of drugs and the failure of emergency room physicians to recognize symptoms of addiction. The connection of mental health to the commission of crimes was also mentioned.
- The number of prescribed drugs taken by most people. The role of advertising and prevalence of non-innovative "me-too" drugs were cited by some.
- That the leadership in pharmaceutical research and development was situated in Europe 50 years ago, but due to the high cost of drug development, and the high profitability available to American drug companies, Europe has ceded that role to the U.S. It was noted that minor changes in patents by drug companies can extend the lives and profitability of drugs that otherwise should go generic. The amount of time and money to patent and launch a new drug was also of interest. Many were surprised by the amount of tax dollars and university research devoted to drug development.
- Decriminalizing certain drugs may not be as revolutionary a concept as once believed.
- There is no current tracking system for individuals and their prescription drugs and medical history.

Areas for Oklahoma Leadership. Oklahoma's methamphetamine law restricting access to pseudophedrine was followed by 37 other states and federal legislation is pending. Oklahoma is the first state in the nation to allow the responsible and transparent transfers of unused prescription

medicine from nursing homes to charity clinics. Oklahoma provides the most drug court funding per capita than any other state.

There are other areas where Oklahoma can take the lead as well:

- More treatment programs should be pursued. The emphasis should be on treatment versus incarceration for cases stemming from drug addiction. A comprehensive study should be conducted to determine the cost/benefit of various policies that address the issues of drug abuse and treatment options versus incarceration. Drug courts should be adopted statewide.
- Immediate access to community-based substance abuse treatment services is the single most effective means to address addiction. Availability of these treatment services early in the disease process, prior to any criminal justice system involvement, is critical in improving outcomes and reducing costs to the state.
- Greater funding should be made for education programs to intervene with youths at risk for drug addiction and abuse.
- An open and honest discussion of the merits and harms of decriminalization of certain drugs.
- A voucher program should be considered as an alternative to “sampling” of medicines.
- Partnerships with tribal governments in all aspects of health care for Oklahoma citizens.

## **PRESCRIPTION DRUGS**

The increasing costs of prescription drugs is well documented. Higher drug costs (through higher prices and increased prevalence of usage), higher insurance premiums, higher taxes and the resulting reduction of government services in other areas pose a number of policy issues that government, private industry and consumers must address.

As a philosophical matter, the Town Hall is incapable of consensus as to whether government has a moral responsibility to ensure that everyone has access to affordable prescription drugs. While government has had an historical role as a provider of health care for its citizens having the least, and while that role may have profound moral footing, the Town Hall could not conclude that there was a moral imperative to subsidize the cost of all prescription drugs for all citizens.

The allocation of scarce resources in a democratic, capitalist country is necessarily a political matter. Thus, providing greater benefits to help citizens purchase prescription drugs is a political, rather than moral, question. Justifications exist for improving the affordability and access to prescription drugs, but the extent of that benefit is dependent upon political will and economic realities. The extension of Medicare benefits to prescription drugs is an indicator of a degree of government acceptance of responsibility, but that does not mean that government has assumed the responsibility to open those benefits to everyone.

Oklahoma’s state government has a role to play in providing assistance in the purchase of prescription drugs. A healthier populace would reduce overall state healthcare expenditures and promote greater worker productivity, which would be realized in a higher state tax base. The state should continue innovative programs such as “Rx for Oklahoma”, “Smart”, “Insure OK Card” and assistance with insurance coverage premiums. However, these programs must be coordinated with federal programs so that Oklahoma is not at a competitive disadvantage to our neighboring states. The state could offer more advantageous purchasing power to make insurance coverage more affordable to small businesses offering prescription drug benefits to employees.

Businesses and insurers also have a role to play. Greater insurance coverage by companies is desirable and the state should offer incentives for companies to provide prescription drug benefits. Businesses

which assume a larger role will contribute to a greater overall health of their employees as a whole that should aid in productivity of their workforce. In addition, businesses should consider offering wellness/preventative programs in order to drive down the cost of prescription drugs and the need for healthcare services. Even though increased prescription drug benefits provided by employers is a desirable thing, it must fit within an overall cost structure that does not damage the competitiveness of Oklahoma companies.

A number of specific policy proposals can be made that will result in cost-savings to consumers and the state. The proposals that should be considered include:

- “RPh Oklahoma”, a proposal of the University of Oklahoma College of Pharmacy, aims to optimize health benefits, ensure the appropriate use of medications and devices and improve cost-effectiveness. Through a targeted and professional review of multiple medication regimens, patients can receive an assessment of their drug therapy to maximize their prescription drug benefits and achieve the most effective use of all drugs prescribed to the patient.
- Oklahoma Bureau of Narcotics to set up a computerized system of tracking all prescriptions of controlled substances. This system would immediately alert the pharmacist of the point of sale as to the number of doses of controlled substance the patient has recently obtained. The system would aid OBN in tracking the narcotic-prescribing habits of physicians as well as tracking narcotic abusing patients.
- “E-Prescribing” which allows physicians to transmit prescriptions via the Internet to pharmacies; allows integration between pharmacists and physicians.
- Elimination of sample drugs in favor of vouchers. It is common in a physician’s office for a patient to be offered free “starter” samples of prescription drugs when the patient begins on a new medication. Under a voucher program, in lieu of a physical sample, the physician gives a patient a voucher for a designated quantity of medication. The voucher for a trial supply is accompanied by a prescription and can be redeemed at any retail pharmacy. Undesirable effects result from sampling, including drug diversion (where samples are not used by the intended patients), no labeling, use of expired samples and improper influence on the physician’s prescription judgment. Pharmaceutical company resistance may be encountered due to potential lost sales of sampled drugs, but drug companies could benefit from reduced costs of sampling. Caution must be exercised in the implementation in rural counties where vouchers may add a barrier to residents who must travel to obtain samples, although mailing samples to rural patients may be an answer.
- Use of tobacco fund proceeds to fund a prescription drug benefit.
- Launch an awareness campaign on wellness and preventative programs.
- Establish buying pools to achieve economics of scale for small businesses in the purchase of health insurance for employees.
- Encourage businesses to offer healthcare plans at cost to presently non-eligible employees.

## **OKLAHOMA’S BIOTECH INDUSTRY**

The Town Hall considered not only issues around the use of drugs, but also the importance of drug discovery and manufacturing to our state. Oklahoma is rapidly becoming a significant participant in the expanding field of biotechnology. Biotechnology has been identified as a major field of economic growth for many states and Oklahoma must be competitive with those states.

For this industry to prosper in Oklahoma, there must be significantly more state expenditures in university, institutional and corporate research. The most broadly supported strategy for funding research is the research endowment called for by EDGE. Funding mechanisms include use of rainy day funds over several years, a statewide referendum for a temporary sales tax increase dedicated to fund the EDGE endowment (similar to MAPS in Oklahoma City, or Vision 2025 in Tulsa) or the sale and lease-back of state-owned assets (i.e., Grand River Dam Authority, Turnpike Authority, etc.) Organizations such as OCAST and i2e must become funded at the highest justifiable level.

Oklahoma's biotech companies require more venture capital than that currently offered in Oklahoma and must reach out to venture capital firms in California and Massachusetts, where there is not a great urgency to invest in Oklahoma. To solve this problem, Oklahoma should consider increasing the available venture capital funds by requiring that state pension funds adopt a category for venture capital for .5% of total pension funds. This is a prior Academy recommendation.

The Greater Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce has launched a strategic bioscience plan for the "Oklahoma Biotech Corridor", basically the area from Ardmore up I-35 through Norman, Oklahoma City to Stillwater. The plan represents four fundamental strategies that will be needed to take the region's bioscience cluster to the next level:

- Build the region's bioscience Research and Development base and encourage commercialization of bioscience discoveries;
- Develop and attract bioscience talent to the region;
- Grow a critical mass of bioscience companies by creating an environment in which such firms can start, grow and prosper;
- Build a bioscience image and market the region.

Efforts should be made to extend the Biotech Corridor Regional Plan as a statewide initiative.

One impediment to the growth and competitiveness of Oklahoma's biotech industry is "brain drain." A large number of the best and brightest students in Oklahoma leave Oklahoma either to attend college or to take a job after obtaining their degree. Creating high paying research positions through investment in the biotech industry and expanding state-funded internship programs with these new companies will help keep those "best and brightest" in Oklahoma. Additional issues that must be addressed in order to keep Oklahoma's best and brightest and attract outside researchers businesses to move to Oklahoma are quality of life issues. These issues include improved K-12 education, expanded social and cultural opportunity, increased tolerance and easier direct flights to the coasts.

Other impediments mentioned were:

- Oklahoma's tax structure that penalizes capital investment;
- The poor self-image of Oklahomans (lack of knowledge of opportunities in Oklahoma);
- The politics of allocating any research endowment or venture capital funds.

One proposal is the creation of the Department of Applied High-end Research in Oklahoma, which would recruit 25-50 selected biotech researchers at nationally competitive salaries and establish top-end facilities, with the goal of attracting an additional \$50 to 100 million of National Institutes of Health funding per year. The labs must become self-sufficient through grants and/or private sector funding within 2-3 years. A rule of thumb is that two to four new biotech companies emerge each year for every \$100 million of NIH funding.

## IMPORTING MEDICINE

The re-importation of prescription drugs is not a preferred long-term plan for more favorable prescription pricing. There are also concerns whether a minimum quality standard could be enforced, which raises safety concerns. In addition to safety and standards concerns, the Town Hall questions the economic effects of drug re-importation on the U.S., its pharmaceutical industry, and other countries' drug-price control regimes. The causes of high drug prices, including regulatory costs and international price controls, must be addressed in ways that drug re-importation does not.

Among the factors considered in the reluctance to adopt any re-importation plan were:

- The effect price controls have had in Europe's continued diminishment as a developer of new medicines.
- The importation of drugs is actually an importation of price controls, which we lack the political willpower to do directly.
- Importation may become moot through the independent decisions of the countries exporting the drugs. (Canada has already commenced steps to restrict exports.)
- Importation further exacerbates the motive of drug manufacturers to "make-up" lost profits in the United States.
- The effect of adoption may result in a miniscule reduction in need of affordable prescriptions and is purely a short-term solution.

A considerable, yet minority, view of the Town Hall was that the choice of purchasing re-imported drugs is a personal one and the government should not legislate to protect citizens from themselves. This view believes that re-importation should be allowed to see if price reductions are actually realized. Additional safety controls such as legal mechanisms to redress injury and ensure manufacturer and supplier liability to consumers, limiting to re-importing rather than importing foreign drugs, tight regulation of shipping and handling; and strict FDA oversight. This view also held that allowing re-importation would provide the state with additional leverage in negotiating prices with drug manufacturers.

A clear consensus exists that if re-importation is allowed, it should be available to all consumers.

If implemented, the characteristics of an effective public policy on re-importation of prescription drugs are:

- Ensuring consumer safety;
- Accountability of manufacturers and suppliers;
- Relatively simple regulatory scheme;
- Ensuring quality of prescription drugs; and
- Education regarding risk.

The Town Hall felt that additional information was required to have a credible assessment of the governor's re-importation proposals. Additional information that is necessary includes:

- From what countries could Oklahoma import?
- Who is liable for faulty drugs (either due to manufacturing or shipping problems)?
- Will insurance pay for imported drugs?
- Restricted to US manufactured drugs or FDA approved labs elsewhere?
- Statistical verification for cost savings
- Can the State negotiate with pharmaceutical companies?

Greater study is required to assess all of these factors. The agency possessing the greatest expertise necessary to make a credible analysis and produce a report is the Pharmacy Board.

### **RE-USE OF PRESCRIPTION MEDICINE**

Oklahoma is the first state in the nation to allow the responsible and transparent transfers of unused prescription medicine from nursing homes to charity clinics. The program has been implemented in only one county of the state – Tulsa – where it has been very successful, distributing an estimated \$1 million of drugs to needy patients. The pilot program is limited in terms of drugs allowed and placement of unused drugs.

This program should be expanded to other Oklahoma communities. To do so would require an examination of aspects of the Tulsa program and whether those aspects are feasible statewide (i.e., use of volunteers, logistics for less urban areas). Proper professional oversight and management (conducted perhaps by the State Department of Health, county health departments or the Oklahoma Health Care Authority) would be required on a statewide basis. Additional issues for statewide implementation would be liability for volunteer physicians and pharmacists, the absence of charity clinics and pharmacies in rural areas and the need for screening of participants. Periodic evaluations and audits would be required to monitor safety and effectiveness. The program must be flexible to meet the needs of all areas; one size does not fit all.

To expand the program beyond Tulsa, an effective promotional campaign is necessary. Media coverage can help spread awareness of the benefits of this program. This campaign should be directed at participating pharmacies and doctors, as well as the general public. The legislature should consider appropriating seed dollars to launch this awareness campaign. If effective, it should be self-funding as Medicaid benefits are received by this program.

Efforts could be made to increase the program's effectiveness in rural areas. As a way to increase supply of recycled medicines for rural areas, the program could be extended to prisons and hospitals. A process should be adopted, along with guidelines and requirements, for recognition or certification of charity pharmacies. A regional approach could be implemented to enhance effectiveness in rural areas. Mobile facilities are also an option for more effective distribution.

Beyond the Tulsa recycling program, other options are available. A deposit fee could be offered for the recycling of drug containers. A centralized bank or a regional distribution pharmacy could be established for participating communities.

### **SOCIAL AND LEGAL SANCTIONS**

In our society, certain substances are legal (aspirin), some are controlled (antibiotics) and some are illegal (cocaine). Some (alcohol) are legal, but their abuse is illegal. In other words, substances maybe “medicalized,” “legalized” or “decriminalized”.

Decriminalization / Legalization. The Town Hall was presented with “conservative” and “libertarian” positions that legalizing or decriminalizing drugs would reduce problems rather than create them. Opposing perspectives from physicians and religious leaders were presented that forecast more problems than ever. A country (Portugal) was profiled that is experimenting with decriminalization with mixed results.

No consensus surfaced at the Town Hall for decriminalization of drugs. The rationales given for this were:

- The expansion of “gateway” drugs;
- Expected reduction in workforce productivity;
- Concerns of unrestricted drug abuse and higher instances of addiction;
- Reduced opportunities to identify abusers of drugs;
- A “slippery slope” effect that leads to greater drug liberalization;
- Elimination of the punitive “hammer” function of the drug court; and
- Education and treatment are preferable options to decriminalization.

That decriminalization was not endorsed does not mean that reform of drug offenses was not favored. Penalties for certain drug offenses should be examined to determine their appropriateness, viewed from societal as well as economic interests. Too many people, particularly women, are in prison for drug offenses that are not a genuine threat to society. Economic justifications exist for reform, primarily the high cost of prosecuting and jailing offenders. These expenditures would be better spent on education and treatment of drug users.

Drug courts are an effective tool, in that they not only provide treatment for those with substance abuse problems, but also provide tools and resources for living a functional life.

Consideration should be given to mandatory counseling and other non-incarceration methods to address drug offenses, especially for those who are arrested for possession or use of drugs, versus those engaged in active and substantial distribution. One approach that was discussed was reducing the crime for possession of marijuana from a felony to a misdemeanor. Some cities in Oklahoma have made possession of a small amount of marijuana (less than one ounce) a ticket offense.

Several education and treatment programs were considered:

- Expansion of community-based substance abuse treatment services;
- Programs such as “PAC” which seeks out those who need treatment for abuse;
- Increasing the number of juvenile drug courts;
- Encouraging faith-based counseling programs;
- Pre-marital counseling;
- Parenting classes for women receiving DHS benefits;
- Monitoring of prescription histories;
- Parent talking points;
- Partnerships between the schools and families for education on whole person health discussion.

Emphasis should be on intervening in the drug use among adolescents. By arresting the problem at younger ages, the chances of curbing overall drug use in the population is greatly improved.

Medicalization. In contrast with decriminalization or legalization, the concept of medicalization, where otherwise illegal drugs may be used for medicinal purposes if prescribed by a physician, can be appropriate. So long as proper safeguards are in place, such as a valid prescription of drugs which have undergone clinical trials to evaluate safety and efficacy, then medicalization of a drug could be a positive thing for patients. A valid prescription requires a legitimate doctor-patient relationship, which in turn requires a valid medical examination, diagnosis and conclusion that the drugs prescribed are for a legitimate medical purpose. Medicalization is considered a humane approach (especially for people with terminal illnesses) that on balance is beneficial to society. In fact, several forms of opiates and amphetamines have already been medicalized and are in use by the medical community.

Proponents of adding marijuana to the list of drugs with legitimate medical applications make claims for its efficacy in the treatment of several diseases and conditions including cancer, multiple sclerosis and AIDS. If extremely addictive substances such as morphine can be prescribed for patients, then marijuana should be, if, based on clinical trials, it is proven to have beneficial medical properties superior to that of other options, such as marinol.

Although there was a general consensus in favor of medicalization, this view was not universal among all Town Hall participants. Some disputed the medicinal intent of use of the drugs and, even if proper intentions could be attributed to their use, believed that as an illegal drug should not be available, even for medical purposes.

Even if a drug is medicalized, caution must be observed. For example, OxyContin is a highly addictive pain medication which is quickly growing in use among adolescents in Oklahoma. In recent months, there have been numerous reports of OxyContin diversion and abuse in several states. Some of these reported cases have been associated with serious consequences including death.

Although we live in a democratic society and people have the right to choose what medications they use to treat their medical conditions, there still must be parameters to control and protect society.

The raising of public consciousness regarding issues surrounding medicalized drugs should be encouraged. This can be done through individual research, seeking information from medical experts and through public service campaigns.

A View of the Future. The Town Hall is hopeful that Oklahoma has a future in which the abuse of drugs is not a pervasive problem. In this world, we are focused on having a safe and healthy place to live. The key to achieving this goal is continued education, treatment and prevention. Education must begin at an early age and must not be dependent solely on government initiative, but must engage business, churches, schools, charitable organizations. But in the end this goal is realized only as citizens accept personal responsibility for their safe and healthy lives.

## **METHAMPHETAMINES**

“Meth” has become the poster-child for drug abuse in Heartland states. Oklahoma is the first state in the nation to restrict the access to pseudophedrine, the key ingredient for making “meth.” The pioneering legislative initiative has been replicated by at least 37 other states. The U.S. Congress based federal legislation on the Oklahoma law.

The Oklahoma law has been quite successful in attacking the manufacture of methamphetamines. But as successful as that law has been, it has simply disrupted and moved the manufacture of methamphetamines to other regions. The Oklahoma law was intended to reduce supply, not demand.

To address the problem of demand for methamphetamines in Oklahoma, there must be a comprehensive education campaign on the dangers of the drug. This campaign should start in schools at very young ages. The campaign would inform people of all ages about the physical and mental effects of methamphetamines, ice and other derivatives, as well as the collateral consequences of methamphetamine use (e.g., felony conviction reduces career opportunity). The program should be creative, graphic, detailed and intense. It should explain why methamphetamines are bad rather than generally saying “meth will kill you” or “drugs are bad.” One effective poster showed the progression in appearance of a methamphetamine user.

The education of the public should extend past childhood through teens and continue with adults. Awareness must be raised as to the ingredients used in the manufacturing of methamphetamines, ice and other derivatives to help the public understand its disastrous impact on the human body. One panel suggested a large scale campaign including a state-sponsored one-hour TV program along with posters, TV commercials, training video and participation by the Attorney General's office.

Partnerships with community and faith based organizations could provide additional resources and opportunities to educate the public on the negative effects of methamphetamines.

The state should increase funding for use and or existing treatment facilities / programs, particularly community-based treatment services, to assist addicts in recovering. The state should also develop and fund an education program on recognizing the signs of methamphetamine use and how to intervene with a meth user. This program would be mandatory for front line personnel such as school teachers, school nurses, school counselors, physicians and dentists. Further, the per capita number of school counselors should also be increased. One panel recommended a comprehensive program including:

- State-wide drug summit to educate teachers and other school personnel how to identify and report kids affected by methamphetamines.
- Annual training for school personnel and day care providers.

On the supply side several potential policy options were proposed, including:

- To increase financial penalties for vendors violating Oklahoma's existing laws governing the sale of pseudophedrine;
- Defining methamphetamine as a schedule 1 drug;
- Compacting with neighboring states to adopt similar restrictions on pseudophedrine;
- Encouraging the federal government to better control the trafficking of methamphetamines from foreign countries;
- Encourage drug manufacturers to use alternatives to pseudophedrine;
- Expand the restrictions on pseudophedrine to other meth ingredients;
- Aggressively work to interrupt supply lines through law enforcement; and
- Increase severity of penalties for manufacturing or distributing methamphetamines.

Any viable solution to the methamphetamine problem is going to require collaboration of multiple agencies/entities, including the Department of Health, Department of Mental Health, Attorney General, public schools and law enforcement.

Other policy options suggested or discussed by individual panels include:

- Continue and expand treatment programs that allow meth users to seek assistance without fear of criminal implications;
- "De-felonizing" certain drug related activities to curtail the collateral consequences of methamphetamine use (i.e., employment difficulties because of felony conviction);
- Increased use of drug courts and mental health courts;
- Drug testing in schools;
- Encourage drug testing for hiring and employment purposes by providing incentives for business owners. This would include support for treatment for employees and legal protection for businesses who terminate employees for drug abuse; and
- Expansion of community-based substance abuse treatment centers.

## ALCOHOL

Alcohol is the most problematic of products in that it is legally and socially sanctioned, but its abuse is life-threatening and many times, deadly. It was prohibited nationally at one time and Oklahoma had banned it for a period of time in its recent history.

In considering policy matters relating to alcohol, the Town Hall considered the perspectives of a former legislator, health officials, Native Americans, educators and the ideas of a nearby state, New Mexico.

Policies were considered to address alcohol-related problems. Among the policies discussed were:

- The evidence is that there is more trouble today with 18-21 drinking than ever before. There should be graduated penalties for purveyors of alcohol who violate laws prohibiting sales to underage children, ranging from minor penalties to loss of license and possible criminal penalties for willful violators. Accountability should be greater for retailers. A “three-strikes policy could be adopted for retailers which sell to minors, beginning with mandatory remedial training at strike one, intermediate penalties at strike two, then suspension of license after strike three. Fines paid should be earmarked for education and treatment programs.
- Increase state taxes on alcoholic beverages. Underage drinkers especially are moderated to a great degree by cost. Higher taxes will not cure all ills, but would have positive economic and social effects.
- Enforce and penalize with greater severity adult providers of alcohol to minors, including parents.
- Stricter measures for existing alcohol laws.
- Embrace anti-alcohol groups (MADD, SADD, etc.) to reinforce education campaign.
- Incorporate latest technology to curtail the use of fake IDs.
- Attack binge drinking. Adopt a “Two then you’re through” campaign. Impose restrictions on happy hours. Oklahoma colleges and universities are toughening campus alcohol rules, the most publicized of which is the University of Oklahoma’s recent ban of alcohol on campus residence halls or in sorority or fraternity houses after the death of a student last year from binge drinking.

While alcohol abuse is not limited to any age group, children should be considered a protected class deserving of greater vigilance and oversight to prevent mistakes that can have lifelong effects. Among those policies discussed above that affect children peculiarly are those directed at sales of alcohol to minors, greater penalties for providing alcohol to minors and college binge drinking policies. Oklahoma has made progress in addressing these issues, but tougher provisions can be adopted.

Drug and alcohol abuse in the workplace must receive greater attention. Loss of productivity due to drug and alcohol abuse is a growing concern. Alcoholics and problem drinkers are absent from work four to eight times more than average while drug users are reportedly absent an average of five days per month. The National Council on Compensation Insurance reports that thirty eight to fifty percent of all workers’ compensation claims are related to substance abuse. Under Oklahoma law, drug testing is permitted any time an employee has sustained a work-related injury or the employer has suffered property greater than \$500.

Policies should be considered to educate employers as to drug and alcohol testing and treatment programs. Incentives should be considered for making it possible for small businesses to adopt such programs.

## ALTERNATIVES TO INCARCERATION

Substance abuse, including both alcohol and illicit drugs, causes over \$1.4 billion of expense in Oklahoma each year. The majority of these costs are related to safety and security issues (prisons, jails, prosecutions, etc.), and the contribution of substance abuse to domestic violence/sexual assault and resulting child abuse and neglect. These costs are cash costs. These expenses are purchasing services, employing people and buying products. They are dollars not spent for schools, roads, bridges or the Oklahoma family. Some may be the “costs of doing business in a free society” – many are not.

Despite such significant advances as our drug courts, Oklahoma is still using its resources inefficiently by using incarceration as the primary technique to combat substance abuse.

To more efficiently allocate its resources in dealing with substance abuse, Oklahoma should shift more resources from high cost (low effectiveness) incarceration to lower cost (higher effectiveness) prevention / treatment programs. The most efficient use of resources appears to be the expanded use of drug courts and other substance abuse treatment programs, particularly community-based services. Although Oklahoma leads the nation in per capita drug court funding, the program could and should be expanded. The increase in funding should mean more drug courts and better funding for existing drug courts. These drug courts not only provide treatment at a fraction of the cost of incarceration, but also equip participants with the tools and resources to function in the real world after the program ends.

In order to reduce recidivism of incarcerated drug users, Oklahoma should divert more funds to provide them with greater educational opportunities (high school GED, college credits and/or career tech). Particularly, efforts should be made to coordinate between Department of Corrections (“DOC”) and State education system to ensure adolescents and young adults who are incarcerated have the opportunity to complete their common education course of study after release.

DOC, in partnership with the Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services and other state agencies, should develop and provide (to all persons incarcerated for drug possession or use) treatment during incarceration. The treatment programs should continue as part of any probationary term.

One of the most disturbing problems of incarcerating persons for drug use or possession is the difficulty of re-integrating into society. “Wraparound” and other evidence-based re-entry programs should be implemented that provide post-incarceration assistance in battling substance abuse and overcoming barriers to retaking a productive role in society. Halfway houses would further aid in the reintegration process.

Additional changes discussed were:

- Establishing more facilities operated like the Bill Johnson Correctional Facility, which is a multi-phase drug offender work camp program designed to break the cycle of drug abuse. This facility utilizes a military boot camp model combined with intensive drug treatment and a labor intensive work program to effect change by instilling personal responsibility and strong work ethics.
- Eliminate mandatory minimum sentencing for offenses of drug use and possession.
- State sponsored education program for judges and District Attorneys to ensure they understand the issues of recovery and treatment of substance abuse and mental illness.
- GPS technology for house arrest.

- Drug testing upon arrest for non-violent crimes with positive testers placed in community-based treatment/supervision programs that offer different levels of care to include outpatient, intensive outpatient, Alcoholics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous, and residential treatment centers in accordance with best practices.
- Utilization and integration of faith based resources in rehabilitating prison inmates and working with troubled youths and their family.
- Mentoring and providing educational and emotional support to children of incarcerated persons to break this dysfunctional and destructive cycle.
- Expand parental responsibility for juvenile actions.

## **BEST PRACTICES**

Several policies and/or practices would reduce the negative impacts of illegal drugs and alcohol on the workplace and school. Drug testing in the workplace should be encouraged as it appears to increase morale, decrease workplace accidents, reduce drug use and significantly increase worker productivity. A successful testing policy has education and rehabilitation as cornerstones, rather than going directly to “no tolerance.” One panel suggests drug testing be mandatory for employees who hold Class A commercial drivers licenses or who operate heavy machinery.

Oklahoma should implement a comprehensive state-wide “healthy living skills” program. The program would include courses taught as part of common education curriculum and would educate students on the dangers of alcohol and drug abuse. One panel suggested that courses should cover all areas of health, life skills and drug and alcohol abuse prevention. The course should be integrated into the 1<sup>st</sup> through 12<sup>th</sup> grades. The program should include parenting classes focused on teaching parents coping skills, developmental and child care issues, and drug and alcohol abuse prevention. Involvement of parents is integral to avoiding drug and alcohol abuse in children.

Other suggestions were:

- Require students and parents to sign contracts to uphold educational standards and promote accountability.
- Mandatory covenants between school and parents.

State-sponsored public service announcements that promote the abstention from drugs and alcohol would be beneficial. The ads should focus on hard facts related to drug and alcohol abuse rather than emotional aspects.

The state should encourage local communities and faith based organizations to assist in educating the public and influencing positive lifestyle changes. Immediate access to community-based substance abuse treatment services would complement school and workplace programs.

Additional proposals that were mentioned include:

- Vesting the ABLE Commission with the power to regulate 3.2 beer.
- Encourage school boards to implement policies with remedial measures for students who violate the respective policies, rather than “no tolerance.”
- Mandate insurance coverage for drug and alcohol abuse treatment.

# 2005 Board of Directors

Monte Akridge  
INTEGRIS Health

Howard Barnett, Jr.  
TSF Capital, LLC

Sharon Bell  
Rogers & Bell

Randy Beutler  
Beutler Ranch

Roger Blais  
TU

Douglas Branch  
Biotech Law Associates, P.C.

Larry Briggs  
First National Bank and Trust  
Co.

Robert Butkin  
TU

Gene Callahan  
Tulsa Technology Center

Jim Campos  
State Farm

Glenn Coffee  
OK State Senate

Michael Cooper  
SBC

Terry Detrick  
Oklahoma Farmers Union

Ford Drummond

Marc Edwards  
Phillips, McFall, McCaffrey,  
McVay & Murrah

Margaret Erling  
Erling & Associates

Edmund Farrell

John Feaver  
USAO

George Foster  
NSU, College of Optometry

Linda Gibbs  
O. R. Burton, Inc.

Kay Goebel  
Kay Goebel, Ph.D.

Jay Paul Gumm  
OK State Senate

Shirley Hammer  
Hammer Construction, Inc.

Claudean Harrison  
Harrison Investments, Inc.

Glenn D. Hayes  
City of Guthrie

Jason Hitch  
Hitch Enterprises

Kim Holland  
Oklahoma Insurance Dept.

Jerome Holmes, Esq.  
Crowe & Dunlevy

Anne Holzberlein  
The University of Central  
Oklahoma Foundation

Mary Jenkins  
SBC

John Johnson  
Bluestem Resources Group

David Johnson  
Boesche McDermott, LLP

Craig Knutson  
Oklahoma Insurance Dept.

Terry Kordeliski  
Riggs, Abney, Neal & Turpen

Steve Kreidler  
UCO

Karen Langdon  
Legal Aid of Oklahoma

Michael Lapolla  
OU

Ryan Leonard  
Ryan Leonard, P.L.L.C.

David Littlefield  
Littlefield, Inc.

Greg Main  
i2E

Mark Malone  
McAfee & Taft

Steve Mason  
Cardinal Engineering

Neal McCaleb  
McCaleb Consulting

Bill McKamey  
PSO

Kathleen Miller  
Oklahoma Dept. of Commerce

Danny Morgan  
OK House of Representatives

Sarah Mussett  
OK Department of Career and  
Technology Education

Jess Nelson  
City of Guymon

Jim Norton  
Downtown Tulsa Unlimited,  
Inc.

Susan Paddock  
OK State Senate

Ron Peters  
OK House of Representatives

Roy Peters, Jr.  
Okla. Alliance for Mfg.  
Excellence, Inc.

Anita Poole  
Kerr Center for Sustainable  
Agriculture, Inc.

Samonia Pope  
Cookson Institute

Tom Price, Jr.  
Chesapeake Energy  
Corporation

Ryan Rex  
Rex Public Relations

Larry Rice  
TU

Sandra Robinett  
AT&T

Claudia San Pedro  
Office of State Finance

Tom Seth Smith  
Rural Enterprises, Inc.

Lloyd Snow  
Sand Springs Public Schools

David Stewart  
Cherokee Nation Enterprises

Sheri Stickle  
SSTI

Jim Strate  
Autry Technology Center

Wes Stucky  
Ardmore Economic  
Development Authority

Valerie Thompson  
Urban League of Greater OKC

Steve Turnbo  
Schnake, Turnbo, Frank, Inc.

David Walters  
Walters Power International

Matthew Weaver  
OK Department of Commerce

Alba Weaver  
City of Guthrie

Susan Winchester  
OK House of Representatives

# 2006 Academy Leadership

<b>Board of Directors</b>	<i>At Large:</i> John Feaver USAO	Sylvia Burgess Nancy Coats-Ashley
<b>Executive Committee</b>		
<b>Chairman</b> Howard Barnett	Glenn D. Hayes City of Guthrie	Glenn Coffee OK State Senate
<b>Vice Chairman</b> Larry Rice	Kim Holland Oklahoma Insurance Dept.	Markham Collins TU College of Business
<b>Immediate Past Chairman</b> Bill McKamey	Steve Kreidler UCO	Terry Detrick Oklahoma Farmers Union
<b>Treasurer</b> Larry Briggs	Karen Langdon Legal Aid of Oklahoma	Ford Drummond Drummond Ranch <i>NE Region Contact</i>
<b>Forum Sponsor Coordinator</b> Kay Goebel	Ryan Leonard Ryan Leonard Law Firm	Marc Edwards Phillips McFall <i>Town Hall Training Chair</i>
<b>Development Chair</b> Margaret Erling	Jim Norton Downtown Tulsa Unlimited	Malinda Berry Fischer Thamas N. Berry & Co.
<b>Policy Implementation Chair</b> Doug Branch	Susan Paddack OK State Senate	Will Focht OSU Environmental Institute
<b>Research Committee Co-Chair</b> Mike Lapolla	Tom Price Chesapeake Energy Corp.	George Foster NSU College of Optometry
<b>Research Committee</b> Mickey Hepner	Claudia San Pedro Office of State Finance	Linda Gibbs O.R. Burton
<b>Marketing Committee</b> Ryan Rex	Alba Weaver City of Guthrie	John Griffin Griffing Food Company
<b>Town Hall Planning Committee Chair</b> Greg Main	<b>Board</b> Monte Akridge INTEGRIS Health	Jay Paul Gumm OK State Senate
<b>Regional Liaison Co-Chair</b> Claudean Harrison	Dewayne Andrews OU College of Medicine	Anne Holzberlein UCO
<b>Regional Liaison Co-Chair</b> Steve Turnbo	Thad Balkman OK House of Representatives	Mary Jenkins AT&T
<b>Tulsa Region Contact</b> Michael Cooper	Keith Ballard OK School Boards Assoc.	Craig Knutson Oklahoma Insurance Dept. <i>Research Committee Co-Chair</i>
<b>NW Region Contact</b> Pepper DeVaughn	Roger Blais TU	Terry Kordeliski Riggs Abney <i>Town Hall Training Vice Chair</i>
<b>OKC Region Contact</b> Jerome Holmes	David Braddock OK House of Representatives	

Dave Lopez Downtown OKC	Sheri Stickley SSTI	Gene Callahan Tulsa Technology Center <i>Strategic Planning Committee Co-Chair</i>
Mark Malone McAfee & Taft	Wes Stucky Ardmore Economic Development Authority	Michael Cawley The Noble Foundation
Ed Martin Ackerman McQueen	Chuck Thompson Republic Bank & Trust	Tom Clark Tulsair Beechcraft, Inc.
Neal McCaleb McCaleb Consulting	Valerie Thompson Urban League of Greater OKC	Terry Cline OK Department of Mental Health
Kathleen Miller Oklahoma Dept. of Commerce	Miles Tolbert Secretary of Environment	Jim Clinton Southern Growth Policies Board
Danny Morgan OK House of Representatives	Dylan Waddle Devon Energy Corporation	Mike Crutcher OK State Department of Health
Sarah Mussett OK Dept. of Career & Technology Education	David Walters Walters Power International	Chuck Dehart Williams
Ron Peters OK House of Representatives	Matthew Weaver Oklahoma Dept. of Commerce	Susan Ellerbach World Publishing Company
Roy Peters OK Alliance for Manufacturing Excellence	Susan Wnchester OK House of Representatives <i>SW Region Contact</i>	Ken Fergeson NBanC
Anita Poole Kerr Center for Sustainable Agriculture <i>SE Region Contact</i>	Phyllis Worley ONG	Joseph Ferretti OU Health Sciences Center
Clay Pope OK Assoc. of Conservation Districts <i>Policy Committee</i>	Waldo Zerger	Sandy Garrett State of Oklahoma
Samonia Pope Cookson Institute	<b>Advisory Council</b>	Sue Hale The Oklahoman
Sandra Robinette AT&T	Michael Anderson Presbyterian Health Foundation	Enoch Kelly Haney Seminole Nation
Darryl Schmidt BancFirst	Bill Anoatubby Chickasaw Nation	Russ Harrison Harrison Gypsum Co.
Lloyd Snow Sand Springs Public Schools	Jari Askins OK House of Representatives	Hans Helmerich Helmerich & Payne, Inc.
David Stewart Cherokee Nation Enterprises	David Bialis Cox Communications	Steven Hendrickson BOEING
	David Boren OU	Clifford Hudson Sonic Corp.
	Robert Butkin The University of Tulsa	
	Don Cain AT&T	

Glen Johnson  
SSOSU

David Ketelsleger  
McAfee & Taft

Joe Kinzer, Jr.  
Northern Oklahoma College

Bill LaFortune  
City of Tulsa

Ken Levit  
OU-Tulsa

David Littlefield  
Littlefield, Inc.

Edna Manning  
Oklahoma School of Science &  
Math

Tom McCasland, Jr.  
McCasland Foundation

Thomas McKeon  
Tulsa Community College  
*Strategic Planning Committee  
Co-Chair*

Scott Meacham  
State of Oklahoma

Mary Melon  
The Journal Record

Saundra Naifeh  
Oklahoma Assoc. of  
Optometric Physicians

Ken Neal  
World Publishing Company

Larry Nichols  
Devon Energy Corp.

Greg Pyle  
Choctaw Nation

H.E. Gene Rainbolt  
BancFirst

Paul Renfrow  
O.G.& E.

Paul Risser  
Oklahoma State Regents for  
Higher Education

Susan Savage  
State of Oklahoma

David Schmidly  
OSU

Chad Smith  
Cherokee Nation

Ross Swimmer

James Tolbert III  
First Oklahoma Corporation

Gary Trennepohl  
OSU-Tulsa

Michael Turpen  
Chapel, Riggs, Abney, et al

Steadman Upham  
TU

Roger Webb  
UCO

Joe Wiley  
RSU

Larry Williams  
NSU

**Honorary Council**

Joe Bob Drake  
Drake Farms

Frederick Drummond  
Drummond Ranch

Jean Gumerson

Charles Hollar

Alexander Holmes  
OU

Ed Long

Melvin Moran  
Moran Oil Enterprises

George Singer  
Singer Bros., LLC

Larkin Warner  
OSU

Clyde Wheeler, Jr.  
Clear Creek Ranch

2005



# Town Hall Sponsors



*\*Given in recognition & honor of Julian K. Fite*



Harrison Investments, Inc.

Moran Oil Enterprises

Oklahoma Dept. of Career & Technology Ed.

Oklahoma Assoc. of Optometric Physicians

The Zarrow Families Foundation



*Moving Ideas into Action*

120 E. Sheridan, Ste. 200  
Oklahoma City, OK 73104

Phone: 405.232.5828

Fax: 236.5268

[www.okacademy.org](http://www.okacademy.org)