

# Arizona Rural Development Council

P.O. Box 45439  
Phoenix, AZ 85064-5439  
(602) 254-7700



Michael Ortega, Chair  
Cochise County

Carla Roberts, Vice Chair  
AZ Community Foundation

Michael Proctor, Secretary  
University of Arizona

Wayne Fox, Treasurer  
Northern Arizona University

Richard Adams  
Bullhead Regional EDA

Jane Bristol  
City of Prescott

Debbie Broermann  
HUD, SONAP

Bill Bolin  
AZ Department of  
Commerce

Eddie Browning  
USDA, RD

Dave Castillo  
SRPMIC

Cathy Connolly  
Retired

Shawn Dralle  
RBC Capital Markets

Angie Harmon  
Freeport McMoran

Royce Jenkins  
Hopi Tribe

Fred Karnas  
AZ Department of Housing

Marty Laurel  
Blue Cross Blue Shield  
of Arizona

Sheldon Miller  
Graham Co. Chamber of  
Commerce

Lee Randall  
Apache Gold Casino Resort

Dr. Kathy Turner  
Northern Arizona United  
Way

Derrick Watchman  
JP Morgan Chase

**ADVISORY**

Rich Gaar  
SEAGO

Richard Kuczek  
WAEDD

Craig Ringer  
CAAG

Kenneth Sweet  
NACOG

September 23, 2008

We had a very successful second Annual Arizona Rural Policy Forum in Flagstaff at Northern Arizona University, July 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup>.

We have enclosed for your review the Final Report of the 2008 Arizona Rural Policy Forum prepared by Jeff Peterson and Megan Stalheim of the Arizona Rural Policy Institute at NAU. These "best practices" were gleaned from successful rural programs around the world and were the basis for our discussions at the 2008 Arizona Rural Policy Forum.

Drug abuse in rural Arizona was the main focus of this year's forum. The 2008 event also highlighted the current state of the three topics discussed during the 2007 forum: Affordable Housing, Workforce Training and Recruitment and Retention of Health Care Workers in Rural Arizona.

We are very conscious of our environment, therefore, we are providing this report to you electronically. If you would like for us to provide you with a hard copy or CD of the report we would be glad to do so, please contact Charlie Thompson at [charliethompson@cox.net](mailto:charliethompson@cox.net) or 602-828-9734. The final report is also posted at: <http://www.franke.nau.edu/RPI/>.

Sincerely,

Mike Ortega  
Chairman, Board of Directors

Charles P. Thompson  
Conference Chair

Enclosure: Final Report

# 2008 Arizona Rural Policy Forum

Final Report

## Drug Abuse in Rural Arizona

Prepared by

**The Arizona Rural Policy Institute**  
*A Unit of the Center for Business Outreach*

Jeff Peterson, Research Associate  
Megan Stalheim, Graduate Assistant

A Project of the  
**Arizona Rural Development Council**



This report was prepared by the Arizona Rural Policy Institute, Northern Arizona University, partially funded under award #07-66-05876 from the Economic Development Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce. The statements, findings, conclusions, and recommendations are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Economic Development Administration or the U.S. Department of Commerce.



## ***PARTNERS/SPONSORS***

We would like to give recognition to our Partners and Sponsor whose support is essential to the Forum

### ***President's Council***



**THE POWER TO MAKE IT HAPPEN<sup>SM</sup>**



### ***Corporate Rural Policy Forum***



### ***Event Sponsors: Rural Policy Forum***



## Table of Contents

|   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| Executive Summary .....                     | 4                                   |
| Featured Speakers and Topic Updates.....    | 6                                   |
| Common Risk Factors.....                    | 7                                   |
| Impact of Drug Abuse on Business .....      | 10                                  |
| What Can Be Done on a Community Level ..... | 12                                  |
| Effective Strategies for Rural Arizona..... | 15                                  |
| Conclusion.....                             | 19                                  |
| Appendix.....                               | 19                                  |
| Arizona Rural Development Council.....      | <b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| Panel Chairs & Recorders .....              | 20                                  |
| 2008 Forum Participants.....                | 20                                  |

## Executive Summary

The 2<sup>nd</sup> annual Rural Policy Forum was held July 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup>, 2008, at the W.A. Franke College of Business on the Northern Arizona University Campus.

A project of the Arizona Rural Development Council, the forum provided a priceless opportunity for community and business leaders to become informed, discuss important topics, and network with others from around the state.

Drug abuse in rural Arizona was the main focus of this year's Arizona Rural Policy Forum. The 2008 event also highlighted the current state of the three topics discussed during the 2007 forum: Affordable Housing, Workforce Training, and Recruitment and Retention of Health Care Workers in Rural Arizona.

After an intensive series of presentations and question-and-answer sessions, the participants separated into five breakout groups. Each group, guided by panel moderators, discussed both risk factors and the effects on businesses and communities. They then identified community assets for prevention and treatment, and some best practices from current efforts from around the state and country. The results of each topic have been grouped into six major categories.

### *Common Risk Factors*

- Perceived deficit in activities for children and youth in rural towns
- Depressed economy and lack of quality jobs
- Proximity to Mexico
- Barriers to effective law enforcement due to vast distances, lack of resources, and weak prosecution
- Lack of awareness of the consequences of drug abuse among potential users and parent
- Communities lack essential social fabric, resulting in gang activities and other social problems.

### *Impact of Drug Abuse on Business*

- Lack of applicants who successfully pass pre-employment drug screening
- Prohibitive costs of drug screening for small businesses
- Employee theft, high turnover, and absenteeism
- Poor workplace productivity and quality
- High safety risks in potentially hazardous occupations
- Drug problems with families have a ripple effect in the workplace

*What Can Be Done to Promote and Use Community Assets*

- Form strong public/private sector coalitions within communities
- Establish effective leadership for community-based prevention efforts – identify “champions” within each community
- Harness the energy of youth and students
- Use the highly effective statewide coordinating organizations (Partnership for a Drug-Free America, Arizona Methamphetamine Task Force, etc.)
- Encourage effective interaction of existing prevention, enforcement, and treatment organizations
- Continue effective local/regional/tribal/statewide prevention outreach and education activities (broadcast and print media, public presentations, etc.)

*Effective Strategies for Rural Arizona*

- Develop effective community and regional coalitions throughout rural Arizona, including private sector, government, education, and faith-based organizations
- Establish the “Willcox Model” as a statewide standard for community action, with due consideration of local cultural characteristics
- Limit access (statewide) to pseudoephedrine and ephedrine products
- Develop a “drug abuse factsheet” to effectively inform policymakers about the economic impact of drug abuse
- Provide incentives to establish effective regional treatment centers
- Provide resources for more comprehensive drug testing activities (public employers, businesses, schools, etc)

This final report will hopefully serve as a guiding document for those involved in the epidemic of drug use in rural Arizona, with a special emphasis on Methamphetamine.

## Featured Speakers and Topic Updates

The 2008 forum began on Thursday with a series of speakers addressing the current state of topics from the 2007 forum as well as 2008's central topic of the Impact of Drug Abuse on Rural Arizona.

An update and discussion of *Affordable Housing in Rural Arizona* was anchored by Fred Karnas, the director of The Arizona Department of Housing; Jean Richmond-Bowman from the Arizona Housing Commission; Helen Hudgens-Ferrel, Executive Director of Bothands; and Robert King of the Arizona Community Foundation.

The update and discussion of *Workforce Training* in the state was presented by Jody Ryan, Director of Workforce Development at the Arizona Department of Commerce, and Bill Bolin, Director of the Arizona Department of Commerce's Rural Development Office.

Joyce Hospodar, Senior Program Coordinator of the Rural Health Office at the University of Arizona's Mel and Enid Zuckerman College of Health provided the update and discussion on *the Recruitment and Retention of Health Care Workers*.

The 2008 Forum topic, *The Impact of Drugs on Arizona's Rural Economy*, was introduced and discussed at length by Leslie Bloom, CEO, and Colleen Pyra, Program Director, of the Arizona Affiliate of the Partnership for a Drug Free America. This discussion was continued on Friday morning with a presentation by Dr. Dawn Walker of Wilcox, who detailed the successful approach her community used to reduce methamphetamine abuse. Dr. Walker also provided the participants with valuable insight about the medical and social costs of methamphetamine along with prevention strategies.

Following Dr. Walker's presentation and the ensuing question and answer session, the participants separated into five discussion groups. The groups approached the discussion by first identifying risk factors and ill effects. They then discussed community assets and defined what they saw as best practices in the fight against drug abuse.

## **Challenges and Solutions - *Economic Impact of Drug Abuse in Rural Arizona***

### Common Risk Factors

The five groups deliberated on the risk factors contributing to drug abuse in rural areas of Arizona. Group members identified the following common risk factors:

- Perceived deficit in activities for children and youth in rural towns
- Depressed economy and lack of quality jobs
- Proximity to Mexico
- Barriers to effective law enforcement, due to vast distances, lack of resources, and weak prosecution
- Lack of awareness of the consequences of drug abuse among potential users and parents
- Communities lack essential social fabric, resulting in gang activities and other social problems

### **Perceived Deficit in Activities for Youth**

Group members suggested that youth in their area perceive a lack of activities in which to participate, and may engage in drug use as an escape from boredom. Those who live in remote areas and lack transportation could be particularly susceptible to this problem.

Cultural tolerance of drug use and the cultural norm of instant gratification were listed as possible causes for young people's preference of drug use over other activities. In addition, youth may be attracted to the "cool factors" of specific drugs, such as weight loss, increased energy, street credit, and fitting in with other users.

### **Economic Depression**

Group participants suggested that the high rate of unemployment or underemployment found in some areas can lead to boredom and depression, which may in turn lead to drug abuse. Lack of legitimate economic opportunity also encourages participation in the lucrative trade of drug dealing. Parents who choose to stay in legitimate low wage jobs to support their family may need to

work several jobs, leaving their children unsupervised and more likely to experiment with drugs.

Poor and sparsely populated communities are attractive to dealers and meth lab operators since rent is inexpensive, law enforcement is lax, and demand for the drug is high. Dealers and bootleggers who work with impoverished users are known for cut-throat business practices such as raising prices for addicts and accepting bartered items in lieu of cash when the addict's money runs out. These practices encourage a cycle of poverty and unemployment among drug users.

### **Proximity to Mexican Border**

Recent law enforcement efforts and increased restrictions on the sale of meth components within Arizona have encouraged a shift of drug production to Mexico. Several communities located near the U.S./Mexican border have noted an increase in drugs smuggled into their communities. In addition, the legal age for alcohol consumption in Mexico is 18, which draws underage drinkers from Arizona border towns.

### **Ineffective Law Enforcement**

Many barriers to effective law enforcement exist in Arizona communities, including vast distances, weak prosecution, and lack of resources. In vast, understaffed law enforcement zones, officers may be unable to execute adequate surveillance. Arrests cannot be made without proof of drug use or possession, which may be difficult or impossible. Finally, law enforcement efforts often lack the necessary funding to effectively stifle drug use and production.

### **Lack of Public Awareness**

Ignorance and misperception are barriers to drug abuse prevention efforts in communities. Lack of public awareness also hinders the detection and eradication of drug abuse. In sparsely populated rural areas, drug users may be able to keep their activities concealed from other residents and law enforcement officers fairly easily. Residents who are under the mistaken impression that drug abuse is only a problem in metropolitan areas may be less likely to detect drug-related activities in their family or neighborhood. Youth may harbor misconceptions about drugs being able to help them lose weight or fit into a social circle, and remain uneducated about drugs' long-term negative consequences.

## **Lack of Social Fabric in Communities**

Individuals in contemporary society often experience a lower level of connection to others in their family and community. When family and community fail to provide individuals with social acceptance and stability, gangs and drug cliques become attractive alternatives. Decreasing levels of connectedness and accountability in communities also make drug abuse easier to hide and perpetuate. As a result, family and community activities are seen as unappealing, while drugs provide instant gratification. Whereas community residents used to know their neighbors and were aware of the activities of youth in the neighborhood, that is often not the case today. Decreased social cohesiveness in communities also makes anti-drug efforts more difficult to carry out, since the entire community must be involved in order to successfully eradicate drug abuse.

## **Other**

Methamphetamine is particularly attractive to some youth because it is relatively inexpensive and easier to obtain than alcohol. It also provides an income for enterprising youth. Lighter legal penalties for youth compared to adult offenders may also serve to embolden young drug abusers.

Group members also cited societal factors that contribute to drug abuse, such as parents who are not very involved in their children's development and the rise of gang culture in rural areas and on Native American reservations. Cultural factors noted include a society which values privacy over connectedness and immediate gratification over hard work with long-term rewards.

## Impact of Drug Abuse on Business

The five groups deliberated on the impact of drug abuse on business in their communities. Group members identified the following key impacts:

- Lack of applicants who successfully pass pre-employment drug screening
- Prohibitive costs of drug screening for small businesses
- Employee theft, high turnover, and absenteeism
- Poor workplace productivity and quality
- High safety risks in potentially hazardous occupations
- Drug problems within families have a ripple effect in the workplace

### **Lack of applicants who successfully pass pre-employment drug screening**

Several businesses reported finding very low percentages of applicants who pass a drug test. When businesses are unable to find drug-free applicants, they are forced to lower their standards or recruit labor from other pools, such as recent high school graduates or workers from more distant communities. This may result in a lower-skilled workforce or additional transportation costs for the employer. Some businesses have even been forced to shut down due to a lack of available drug-free employees.

### **Prohibitive costs of drug screening for small businesses**

Small businesses in particular suffer from the increased drug screening and insurance costs caused by increased drug abuse, since their expense per employee is much higher than that of a large business. Discussion participants noted that small businesses are often unable to afford drug screening, and may only become aware of drug abuse among employees through decreased work performance or legal charges brought against the employee. As a result, small businesses face great problems with employee retention due to drug abuse.

### **Employee theft, high turnover, and absenteeism**

When businesses are forced to hire employees without performing a pre-employment drug screening or when employees develop drug abuse problems after their hire, employers observe higher instances of employee theft, turnover, and absenteeism. Even drug users who are productive workers when they are

present might go on “benders” and miss work for an entire week or more when the company needs them most.

### **Poor workplace productivity and quality**

Employees who abuse drugs are routinely less productive at work. They often come to work under the influence of drugs, physically exhausted, emotionally disturbed, or lacking motivation. The quality of their performance as well as the volume of work they are able to accomplish suffers measurably.

### **High safety risks in potentially hazardous occupations**

Employees working under the influence of drugs put themselves and others under great risk of physical injury or death when operating heavy machinery.

### **Drug problems within families have a ripple effect in the workplace**

Employees who have drug problems in their families are often less productive at work due to stress and increased absenteeism. They often need to leave work suddenly or miss work in order to deal with the problems of their drug abusing family member(s). Youth with drug-abusing parents who often miss work are more likely to abuse drugs themselves and copy their parents’ poor work habits.

### **Other**

Even though youth are the primary focus of many methamphetamine prevention efforts, the average age for meth users is 32. Since the average user is in prime child-rearing years, the quality of parenting and domestic work may suffer as drastically as the quality of work which takes place outside of the home. When meth users fail at their jobs as parents, children are removed from the household and sent to adoption agencies. This process is quite costly for the county. In Pima County, 700 children are currently available for adoption, and drug use is the primary reason they have been removed from their homes.

## What Can Be Done on a Community Level

Participants were asked to identify what can be done on a community level to promote community assets (families, faith based, schools, programs) to deter drug abuse in rural communities?

- Form strong public/private sector coalitions within communities
- Establish effective leadership for community-based prevention efforts— identify “champions” within each community
- Harness the energy of youth and students
- Use the highly effective statewide coordinating organizations (Partnership for a Drug Free America, Arizona Methamphetamine Task Force, etc.)
- Encourage effective interaction of existing prevention/ enforcement/ treatment organizations
- Continue and increase effective local/regional/tribal/statewide prevention outreach and education activities (i.e., broadcast and print media, public presentations)

### **Form strong public/private sector coalitions within communities**

*“Looking only to government may not be the best solution.”*

Most groups noted that the skills of both private and public entities are necessary to successfully address the issue. The assets of the community exist both within and outside the government. As mentioned repeatedly during the forum’s presentations and discussions as well as the background report, drug abuse is a financial drain on private firms through such issues as employee turnover and theft. Businesses should be cooperative if they realize that their best interest lies in the eradication of this problem. The public and private sectors have different skill sets; using every approach possible is the surest way to solve the problem. It will be necessary to define the common interests of the sectors.

The motivations and assets of the private sector will vary. For-profit businesses require a competent, drug-free workforce and have financial power over their employees. Nonprofits, churches, and educational institutions exist to better the community and provide essential services and outreach. As one attendee stated

in the post-forum questionnaire, “Are we relying solely on government to solve our problems? That is a recipe for disaster.”

### **Establish effective leadership for community-based prevention efforts— identify “champions” within each community**

Leadership is essential when bringing together the mix of service providers necessary to enact such extensive social action. Finding the right leadership within the community is necessary, and these people must be groomed to address the long-term problem. Leadership needs to be identified, and existing assets need to be outlined and involved. It has been repeated that leadership needs to be identified by those involved. From the identified leadership locals must appoint “champions” who direct and mobilize the assets available and lead a strong task force to tackle the issue.

The leader of each coalition depends on the community. It is important to accurately identify where the leadership lies. Leaders may be anywhere, from government to the business community to youth leadership. Picking the right person for the job is essential.

### **Harness the energy of youth and students**

Youth summits were mentioned by several groups. A number of outgoing questionnaires lamented the lack of a youth voice in the forum’s drug discussions. Young people are not only a significant portion of the users in many areas, they are also an essential part of the community and can provide insight into many of the factors that contribute to drug use.

Student and youth leaders are needed in order to bring up the issues of this significant portion of stakeholders. The unique insights they have into the problem may hold the key to solving the issue for young people.

### **Use the highly effective statewide coordinating organizations (i.e., Partnership for a Drug Free America, Arizona Methamphetamine Task Force, etc.)**

Arizona is fortunate to have a number of talented statewide coordinating agencies. Participants discussed the need for outside experts to work directly with local systems and leadership in promoting the development of a sustainable, culturally appropriate plan for individual communities. Teams of experts can help provide direction and support to local leaders. These locals can then mobilize their assets, address relevant barriers and take action in consideration of the local culture and resources. Direction from such experts will ensure that

interventions are rooted in evidence-based practice and that locally crafted responses apply patterns that have proven successful.

Local drug-abuse coalitions should use the services and knowledge of such groups as the Partnership for a Drug-Free America and the Arizona Methamphetamine Task Force.

### **Effective interaction of existing prevention/enforcement/treatment organizations**

The existing groups should work together to create new strategies and emulate proven best practices. Simply enforcing the rules and policies already in place would lead to reductions in incidences of drug use. There is a general consensus that there are many rural community assets available to deter drug abuse.

Every community has its unique mix of organizations already in place. Even very small communities use state and county law enforcement resources. Many are home to additional prevention and treatment organizations. Panel recommendations advocate the effective use of these currently available resources, both alone and in collaboration with each other.

In terms of mobilizing these various entities, acknowledging the problem and assessing how each views it must come first. The chosen leadership must bear in mind the different viewpoints.

Assets need to be identified and utilized, including medical facilities, schools, townspeople, churches, community groups, law enforcement, stay at home parents, social services, and young people.

### **Continue and increase effective local/regional/tribal/statewide prevention outreach and education activities (i.e., broadcast and print media, public presentations)**

Education has proven effective in reducing meth use. The Montana Meth Project and successors such as the Arizona Meth Project and the National Indian Country Meth Initiative have worked to drastically reduce the number of people who use the drug. These projects use highly visible media to deliver messages about drug abuse. Most groups agreed that the use of such projects should continue and be more widespread. The people reached by these messages become educated about the consequences of drug use, the risks of addiction, and the effects of drug use on others. The effective continued use of a successful and proven program is something everyone can agree on.

## **Other**

The groups mentioned other community assets that didn't necessarily fit in the six major categories above. Reports stressed the fact that tailoring efforts to individual communities is essential. No two places will be identical, and what works in one place will not work exactly the same in another.

Treatment should be both accessible and affordable for those who need it. This is especially important for those arrested and convicted, as the motivation to quit the drug will be high. Therefore, rehabilitation programs should be more widespread and available wherever the drug problem is found.

Drug testing is often repeated as a necessary approach. Where testing is appropriate is often debated. Some believe testing should be applied to students, teachers, and all government workers. A group even recommended the testing of certain private employees.

One group was concerned that local governments might not always be trusted to tackle problems like this. Because they often have competing obligations they may mishandle their duties. In this case other community assets might be more appropriate managers of drug policy. School districts and community centers were specifically mentioned.

## Effective Strategies for Rural Arizona

The final topic discussed by breakout groups focused on identifying the best practices to address and create momentum in the fight against substance abuse. These were identified as the best strategies for rural Arizona.

- Develop effective community and regional coalitions throughout rural Arizona, including private sector, government, education, and faith-based organizations
- Establish the “Willcox Model” as a statewide standard for community action, with due consideration of local cultural characteristics
- Limit access (statewide) to pseudoephedrine and ephedrine products
- Develop a “drug abuse factsheet” to effectively inform policy makers about the economic impact of drug abuse
- Provide incentives to establish effective regional treatment centers
- Provide resources for more comprehensive drug testing activities (businesses, schools, etc.)

### **Develop effective community and regional coalitions throughout rural Arizona, including private sector, government, education, and faith-based organizations**

The best anti-drug plans are supported by regional and community coalitions. These include teachers, school administrators, corporations, local businesses, and all possible public agencies. There is really no limit to the amount of people and organizations that should participate.

Effective coalitions need structure and accountability, and they must be based on the uniqueness of specific areas. A community may need to use consensus or democratic models, depending on its cultural aspects. Leadership is as important as the participants. Although each area will require certain unique approaches, the available examples are many, and communities should use the work of others as a model.

It is also important to use the resources that are available through the state and federal governments as well as non-governmental resources such as the Partnership for a Drug-Free America.

### **Establish the “Willcox Model” as a statewide standard for community action, with due consideration of local cultural characteristics**

The approach Willcox took to address its meth problem should serve as a model for the entire state. The city took many of the best practices available and integrated them into a comprehensive and effective plan. Willcox’ Methamphetamine Task Force promoted education at every opportunity. It educated physicians about prevention and identifying meth-related illnesses. It used free advertising donated by the movie theatre, newspaper, and radio station, to reach people all over town. Medical and law-enforcement personnel presented educational forums to community organizations, local businesses and schools. Over-the-counter sales of pseudoephedrine were limited. Many businesses implemented random and pre-employment drug tests. Even the Willcox Unified School District implemented random testing of students. The Task Force facilitated treatment programs through the hospital and partnerships with larger cities.

### **Limit access (statewide) to pseudoephedrine and ephedrine products**

Limiting access to pseudoephedrine has reduced the amount of locally-produced meth in communities across the country. Many states have laws requiring limited access, and some communities in Arizona do as well. Many groups suggested passing a state law to this effect.

### **Develop a “drug abuse factsheet” to effectively inform policymakers about the economic impact of drug abuse**

Because education has proven to be an effective tool in this fight, the groups suggested creating a consistent fact sheet that can focus on different problems associated with drug abuse. While many policy makers may understand the personal toll the drug makes, they may be unaware of the economic impact. It has been proven that the effects of drug use go well beyond the negative personal impacts seen in most anti-drug campaigns. If more people were aware of the costs to government and private enterprises, there might be more community buy-in. Several groups suggested a significant increase in funding aimed at drug abuse education.

### **Provide incentives to establish effective regional treatment centers**

The success of treatment programs moved several groups to advocate for increased incentives for creating treatment centers. This is important in communities as well as the prisons, as drug addicts either check themselves into treatment or do so under the direction of law enforcement. Participants called for

an increase in funds and other resources offered to communities as an incentive to provide more treatment opportunities.

### **Provide resources for more comprehensive drug testing activities (businesses, schools, etc.)**

Drug tests seem to have a dampening effect on drug use rates. Who and when to test is sometimes debated. Groups differed in who they believed should face drug test. Alternately, schools (employees and students), law enforcement, governmental institutions, and certain businesses were mentioned. Different communities will see different priorities and privacy issues. However, because of the proven success of testing programs, communities should be able to test when they decide to do so. Funding, expertise, and other resources should be offered to communities that choose to use drug tests.

### **Other**

Other best practices participants noted are worth mentioning. One group emphasized that many cultures use certain drugs in cultural and religious ceremonies. These culturally-appropriate instances of drug use need to be respected and separated from the definition of drug abuse.

Some suggested reforming legislation that deals with the complex and specific issues off meth use. Because the abuse of this drug leads to such severe consequences, it deserves special consideration in federal, state, and local law. This approach might go as far as using creative sentencing that implements education as well as punishment.

Another suggestion was to tie sobriety in with eligibility for public resources and social privileges, such as the legal right to drive.

Also discussed was the inclusion of “non-traditional” participants in discussing solutions. Some people mentioned were homeowners, mail carriers, families of drug users, and the users themselves.

## **Conclusion**

Nearly all of rural Arizona is touched somehow by the negative effects of illegal drug abuse. The problem crosses all lines, between personal, professional, and community life. The solution to the problem can be found in the many approaches that have been used already around the state and the country. By working together and using all the resources available, communities and the entire state can stop the growth of the drug problem and eventually eradicate it.

This can be accomplished by implementing a combination of incentives, punishments, and cultural pressures. If people living together can successfully apply these three tools, the negative results of drug abuse can be stamped out. Governments and organizations tasked with solving the problem must use their resources to provide the proper tools for locals to tackle their individual situations. The best practices are available to imitate. Strong, current methods can be encouraged and enhanced. With a concentrated, collaborative effort put into place, next year's Rural Policy Forum can include dozens of examples of small victories in Arizona's fight against rural drug abuse.

## Appendix

### *Panel Chairs & Recorders*

| <b>Group</b>      | <b>Moderator</b> | <b>Recorder</b>      |
|-------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| <b>Ponderosa</b>  | Mike Ortega      | Corrie Griffith      |
| <b>Aspen</b>      | Marty Laurel     | Allie Stender-Mrazek |
| <b>Juniper</b>    | Eddie Browning   | Eslir Musta          |
| <b>Pinon</b>      | Carol Sanger     | Jaina Moan           |
| <b>Palo Verde</b> | Jane Whitmire    | Stefanie Kunze       |

## 2008 Forum Participants

|           |                 |   |
|-----------|-----------------|---|
| Mike      | Albertson       | Health Solutions and Market Intelligence                    |
| Arthur    | Batala          | The Hopi Tribe  |
| Tom       | Belshe          | League of Arizona Cities and Towns                          |
| Leslie    | Bloom           | Partnership for Drug Free America                           |
| Larisa    | Bogardus        | Town of Springerville                                       |
| Connie    | Boggs           | Pinetop-Lakeside Main Street/Economic Development           |
| Bill      | Bolin           | Arizona Department of Commerce                              |
| Leah      | Bornstein       | Coconino Community College                                  |
| Sheila    | Breen           | Grand Canyon Unified School District                        |
| Eddie     | Browning        | USDA Rural Development                                      |
| Marc      | Chopin          | NAU - W.A. Franke College of Business                       |
| Madeleine | Coil            | United Way of Yuma County, Inc.                             |
| Glenn     | Cummings        | Gila River Indian Community                                 |
| Aja       | DeZeeuw         | Town of Superior  |
| Teri      | Drew            | NACOG   |
| Suzanne   | Drum            | SEAGO   |
| Eric      | Duthie          | Town of Taylor  |
| Maria     | Echeveste       | Bank of America   |
| Rebecca   | Flanagan        | U.S. Housing and Urban Development                          |
| Keith     | Fish            | Town of Taylor  |
| Wayne     | Fox             | WA Franke College of Business                               |
| Laurie    | Frost           | Navajo County   |
| Richard   | Gaar            | SouthEastern Arizona Governments Organization               |
| Kathy     | Gallagher       | DNA Peoples Legal Services                                  |
| Mason     | Gerety          | NAU   |
| Kathleen  | Gomez           | Southeast Arizona Medical Center                            |
| John      | Grahame         | Coconino County Sustainable Economic Development Initiative |
| Judy      | Gresser         | Arizona Community Foundation                                |
| L. H.     | Hamilton        | Cochise County Facilities Management                        |
| Angie     | Harmon          | Freeport McMoRan Copper and Gold, Inc.                      |
| Peg       | Harmon          | Catholic Community Services of Southern Arizona             |
| Leila     | Help-Tulley     | Navajo Nation Legislative Branch                            |
| Mignonne  | Hollis          | Cochise College   |
| Bill      | Holmes          | Wells Fargo   |
| Todd D.   | Honyaoma, Sr.   | Hopi Tribe  |
| Joyce     | Hospodar        | Rural Health Office, UA MEZCOPH                             |
| Chuck     | Hoyack          | Cochise College   |
| Helen     | Hudgens-Ferrell | Bothands  |
| Matt      | Jewett          | Children's Action Alliance                                  |
| Fred      | Karnas          | Arizona Department of Housing                               |
| Kelley    | Keffer-Marsh    | Mohave Community College                                    |
| Gary      | Kellogg         | Partnership For Economic Development                        |
| Robert    | King            | Arizona Community Foundation                                |
| Carl      | Kinney          | Arizona Housing Finance Authority                           |
| Jeffrey   | Kros            | League of Arizona Cities and Towns                          |
| Romalita  | Laban           | Walpai Housing Management                                   |

|           |                 |   |
|-----------|-----------------|---|
| Marty     | Laurel          | Blue Cross Blue Shield of Arizona               |
| Connie    | Leto            | Citizens Against Substance Abuse                |
| Todd      | Madeksza        | County Supervisors Association of Arizona       |
| Gary      | Marks           | Prescott Valley Economic Development Foundation |
| Chris     | Martin          | Southern Gila County EDC                        |
| David     | Maurer          | Prescott Chamber of Commerce                    |
| Cindy     | May             | APS   |
| Jeff      | McCormick       | Arizona Department of Commerce                  |
| Mike      | McElmury        | APS   |
| Stephanie | McKinney        | National Bank of Arizona                        |
| Nancy     | McLain          | AZ House of Representatives                     |
| Jen       | Miles           | Mohave County                                   |
| Randy     | Nelson          | AWC SBDC  |
| George    | Nerhan          | Town of Huachuca City                           |
| Lloyd     | Notah, Jr.      | Office of Planning and Evaluation               |
| Sally     | Odette          | APS   |
| Michael   | Ortega          | Cochise County                                  |
| Dana      | Overson         | EDAC Corporation                                |
| Rayna     | Palmer          | Apache Junction Chamber of Commerce             |
| Lynne     | Pancrazi        | Arizona State Legislation                       |
| Julie     | Pastrick        | Flagstaff Chamber of Commerce                   |
| Gaye      | Perry           | Central Arizona College                         |
| Donna     | Phipps          | APS   |
| Barbara   | Poley           | The Hopi Foundation                             |
| Sara      | Presler         | Mayor, City of Flagstaff                        |
| Mike      | Proctor         | University of Arizona - CALS                    |
| Colleen   | Pyra            | Partnership for a Drug Free America             |
| Renee     | RedDog          | Tohono O'odham Ki:Ki Association                |
| Bill      | Regner          | Clarkdale Planning & Zoning                     |
| Daniel    | Rhodes          | Yuma Police Department                          |
| Everett   | Rhodes          | Project CENTRL                                  |
| Jean      | Richmond-Bowman | Toltec Strategies                               |
| Carla     | Roberts         | ACF/AZRDC                                       |
| Chris     | Romiti          | Central Arizona College                         |
| Casey     | Rooney          | City of Cottonwood Economic Development         |
| James     | Rounds          | Elliott D. Pollack                              |
| Jody      | Ryan            | AZ Department of Commerce                       |
| Carol     | Sanger          | Arizona Community Foundation                    |
| Don       | Schoening       | Arizona Western College                         |
| Lynne     | Skelton         | Town of Sahuarita                               |
| Danny     | Smith           | City of Safford                                 |
| Gary      | Smith           | Unisource Energy Services                       |
| Richard   | Smith           | Flagstaff Medical Center                        |
| Ken       | Sweet           | NACOG   |
| Carl      | Taylor          | Coconino County                                 |
| Charlie   | Thompson        | Community Advisor                               |
| Kathy     | Turner          | United Way of Northern Arizona                  |
| Nils      | Urman           | City of Nogales                                 |

|          |          |  |
|----------|----------|--|
| Ken      | Volz     | Payson Regional Economic Development Corporation |
| Dawn     | Walker   | Northern Coconino Community Hospital             |
| Heather  | Walker   | HWC  |
| Ron      | Walker   | Mohave County                                    |
| Kim      | Winter   | Williams Chamber of Commerce                     |
| Nancy    | Welch    | Morrison Institute for Public Policy, ASU        |
| Marshall | Whitmire | RCI Surveys, Inc.                                |
| Annette  | Zinky    | Small Business Development Center                |

---

The Arizona Rural Development Council would like to thank Michael Lainoff, Thomas Combrink, Jeff Peterson, and Megan Stalheim of the Arizona Rural Policy Institute for developing the background and final reports for this forum.

The Board of Directors would like to also thank Arizona Public Service Company and Freeport-McMoran Copper and Gold, Inc., for the printing and mailing services they provided for the forum.



# 2008 Board of Directors

---

## FEDERAL

---

**Ms. Debbie Broermann** 2<sup>nd</sup> term, 2009  
Grants Management Director  
HUD SW Office of Native American Programs

**Mr. Eddie Browning** 2<sup>nd</sup> term, 2010  
State Director  
US Department of Agriculture – Rural Development

## STATE

---

**Mr. Bill Bolin** 1<sup>st</sup> term, 2009  
Rural Development Director  
Arizona Department of Commerce

**Mr. Fred Karnas** 1<sup>st</sup> term, 2010  
Director  
Arizona Department of Housing

---

## LOCAL

---

Term ends 2009

**Ms. Jane Bristol** 1<sup>st</sup> term, 2008  
Economic Development Director  
City of Prescott

**Mr. Sheldon Miller** 2<sup>nd</sup> term, 2010  
Executive Director  
Graham County Chamber of Commerce

**Mr. Mike Ortega, Chair** 1<sup>st</sup> term, 2008  
Cochise County Manager

---

**NON-PROFIT**

---

**Ms. Carla Roberts, Vice Chair** 1st term, 2008  
Vice President of Affiliates  
Arizona Community Foundation

**Dr. Kathy Turner** 1<sup>st</sup> term, 2010  
Vice president of Community Initiatives

---

**PRIVATE**

---

**Ms. Angie Harmon** Filling, 2009  
Manager, Community Affairs  
Freeport McMoRan Copper and Gold, Inc

**Mr. Marty Laurel** Filling, 2008  
Vice President for Community Relations  
Blue Cross Blue Shield of Arizona

**Mr. Lee Randall** Filling, 2008  
General Manager  
Apache Gold Casino Resort

Term ends 2010

---

**TRIBAL**

---

**Mr. Royce Jenkins** 1st term 2008  
Director, Office of Community Planning & Economic Development  
The Hopi Tribe

**Mr. Derrick Watchman** 2nd Term, 2009  
Vice President  
JP Morgan Chase Bank, N.A.  
Native American Banking

---

**AT-LARGE**

---

Term ends 2009

|  |                            |
|--|----------------------------|
| <b>Ms. Cathy Connolly</b>  | 1st term, 2009             |
| <b>Ms. Shawn Dralle</b><br>Managing Director<br>RBC Capital Markets  | 1 <sup>st</sup> term, 2010 |
| <b>Mr. Wayne Fox, Treasurer</b><br>Assistant Dean – College of Business Administration<br>Northern Arizona University        | 2nd term, 2010             |
| <b>Mr. Michael Proctor, Secretary</b><br>Assistant Dean<br>College of Agriculture and Life Sciences<br>University of Arizona | 1st term, 2008             |

**COGs: Advisory**

---

**Mr. Rich Gaar**  
Executive Director  
SouthEastern Arizona Government Organization (SEAGO)

**Mr. Richard Kuczek**  
Director  
Western Arizona Economic Development District (WAEDD)

**Mr. Craig Ringer**  
Deputy Director  
Central Arizona Association of Governments (CAAG)

**Ms. Teri Drew**  
Regional Director  
Northern Arizona Council of Governments

**Staff**

---

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Ms. Pat Schroeder, CED</b><br>Executive Director | <b>Kimberly Perez</b><br>HomeTown Competitiveness<br>Coordinator |
|---|--|

**05/17/07**

---