

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

Wednesday, April 25, 2007
TEDCO Offices
Columbia, MD

Members in attendance:

Joseph Capizzi
Brenda Crabbs
Diane Griffin
John Kellermann
Gloria Marrow
Suzanne Ostrand-Rosenberg
Linda Powers, Chair
Karen Rothenberg
Murray Sachs
Steven Salzberg
Jack Schwartz
Jeremy Sugarman
Bowen Weisheit
Joel Zaiman

Others in attendance:

Jacqueline Du Bois, TEDCO
Linda Saffer, TEDCO
Ira Schwartz, OAG
Renee Winsky, TEDCO

The Commission meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m.

I. Approval of Minutes

The Commission considered the minutes of February 21 and March 7, 2007. One typo was noted on the February 21, 2007 minutes. A motion was moved and seconded that the minutes be approved as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

II. Statement for Closing the Meeting

A motion was moved and seconded that the Commission go in to a closed session. The motion stated the following:

Statutory Authority to Close Session

State Government Article Sec.10-503(a)(1)(i):

This subtitle does not apply to ... a public body when it is carrying out ... an administrative function.

State Government Article Sec.10-508(a)(5):

A public body may meet in closed session ... to consider the investment of public funds.

State Government Article Sec.10-508(a)(13):

A public body may meet in closed session ... to comply with a specific constitutional, statutory, or judicially imposed requirement that prevents public disclosures about a particular proceeding or matter.

TOPICS TO BE DISCUSSED:

The discussion will concern the implementation of the commission's previously adopted criteria for grant funding. The Commission will discuss which applications to consider, given the scientific rankings and other relevant factors. The discussion might also relate to the characteristic of specific applications.

REASON FOR CLOSING:

Paralleling the NIH process for considering funding applications, the commission believes that confidentiality is essential to protect the sensitive information about plans and processes that applicants divulge, to avoid a chilling effect on future submissions, and to enable the most candid Commission discussion of how best to invest limited resources.

The motion passed unanimously. The Commission went into a closed session.

In the closed session, the same persons were present as are listed above. The Commission reviewed tables showing the scientific ranking of, and key information about, each application within the two categories (Investigator-Initiated and Exploratory). The application entries did not identify the applicants. The Commission focused on applications that received competitive, meritorious scores.

The Commission took no final action on applications but will continue and conclude its decision-making process after it receives more detailed (but still anonymous) information about the applications.