

**MINUTES OF THE
MARYLAND STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMISSION**

Tuesday, January 16, 2007
techcenter@UMBC
Catonsville, MD

Members in attendance:

Brenda Crabbs
Diane Griffin
John Kellermann
Suzanne Ostrand-Rosenberg
Linda Powers, Chair
Karen Rothenberg
Murray Sachs
Steven Salzberg
Bowen Weisheit
Joel Zaiman

Members absent:

Joseph Capizzi
Jack Chow
Gloria Marrow
Jeremy Sugarman
Jack Schwartz

Others in attendance:

Steven Fritz, TEDCO
Ira Schwartz, Counsel to TEDCO
Renee Winsky, TEDCO

The Commission meeting was called to order at 2:10 p.m.

I. Approval of Minutes

A motion was moved and seconded that the minutes of the September 14, 2006 Commission Meeting be approved as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was moved and seconded that the Commission direct all administrative duties relating to the Commission to TEDCO, including but not limited to: preparation

and circulation of minutes as soon as practicable, scheduling of meetings three months in advance, and circulation of agenda items and supporting material at least one week prior to a meeting, and in general disseminating information relating to the work of the Commission to all Commissioners in a timely fashion. The motion passed unanimously.

II. Conflict of Interest Rules

Draft “Guidelines on Disclosure and Recusal” were prepared by Mr. Jack Schwartz and provided in advance to Commission members. A question was posed regarding the “Professional Relationships” section of the guidelines that would require recusal in the event of a “material scientific or ethical disagreement with an applicant.” A motion was made and seconded that Mr. Schwartz consider the word “recusal” in this section be replaced with the word “disclosure.” The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the “Guidelines on Disclosure and Recusal” as they affect the Scientific Peer Review Committee only, subject to Mr. Schwartz’s agreement with the prior motion. The motion passed unanimously. Application of these guidelines and how they affect the Commission will be addressed at the next meeting.

The Commission discussed various aspects of conflict of interest, including laws governed by the State Ethics Commission, and the Commission’s role in addressing the results of the Scientific Peer Review Committee’s work.

Members suggested the possibility of a waiver, an exception or clarification from the State Ethics Commission regarding the Commission’s review of the Committee’s work. The Commission agreed in consensus on this approach. Mr. Ira Schwartz suggested that the State Ethics Commission would be better able to assist if the review procedures of the Commission were fully developed in advance.

A motion was moved and seconded that an ad hoc subcommittee be formed to suggest how the Commission will review what is received from the Scientific Peer Review Committee, and what types of circumstances will be considered for balancing of grant awards, i.e., facilities, disease relevance, distribution among institutions, etc. The motion passed unanimously. The ad hoc subcommittee draft document will be addressed at the next meeting. Members interested in serving on this ad hoc subcommittee were asked indicate their interest to the Chairman or TEDCO staff.

III. Summary of Applications Received

TEDCO staff reported on the types of stem cells covered in the applications (adult, embryonic, cord blood and cancer), as well as the disease targets (neural, Alzheimer’s, Lou Gehrig’s, tumors, spinal cord injury, Parkinson’s, multiple sclerosis, heart and vascular disease, kidney disease, diabetes, muscle repair, bone repair, lung

disease, liver disease, and Gaucher's disease). There were two applications that were not disease specific.

Forty-one (41) investigator-initiated grant applications were received which, if fully funded, would total \$70,725,000. Forty-four (44) exploratory research grant applications were received, which would total \$10,120,000 if fully funded. The total if all were funded is \$80,845,000.

IV. Scientific Peer Review Committee

TEDCO undertook a broad search of literature, conferences and other sources to identify candidates for the Scientific Peer Review Committee, and identified over 120 candidates. The candidates were asked if they were interested, if they were available in early February 2007, and if they could refer other individuals. A pool of 24 candidates met the criteria.

The Scientific Peer Review Committee will meet in person, in two NIH-style study sections. TEDCO has made arrangements with a travel firm, has contracted for meeting space and hotel accommodations, and has arranged for laptops with a dedicated server for their use during the meetings.

A motion was made and seconded that the pool of candidates for the Scientific Peer Review Committee can include any scientist with demonstrable stem cell expertise. The motion passed with 9 members present voting for the motion and 1 opposed.

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.