

Herman M. Roth, Director  
Research and Development Division

September 17, 1962

C. S. Shoup, Chief, Biology Branch  
Research and Development Division

AEC BIOMEDICAL DIRECTORS' MEETING, GERMANTOWN, MARYLAND  
SEPTEMBER 13-14, 1962

ORB:CSS

The subject extra meeting of the AEC Biomedical Directors had been announced in the early spring at which time DEM had stated the meeting would include some review of program and budget plans. For this reason I carried budget information with me, but the agenda did not really provide for such review and was almost entirely taken up with statements on DEM's problems, desires, and how they operate. Following is a summary report on this meetings:

Thursday, September 13:

Meeting was called to order at 9:00 A.M., by H. D. Bruner, Acting Director, DEM, not in the Auditorium as earlier indicated, but in the Commissioners' conference room, fourth floor, HQ Building. Bruner's introductory remarks included a statement that it was expected Dr. Dunham would be back at work in a couple of weeks or so, the budget is now being held to 1/12th of last year's, month by month, but it is yet hoped that the FY 1963 increase will remain at about 15% or the \$61,077,000 in the Congressional submission. The following were then called on in order:

1. James L. Liverman, Chief, Biology Branch. Liverman, for the benefit of those less acquainted with Government operations, compared DEM budget and grant handling with that of PHS. Stated, among other things, that now with overall R&D reaching \$12-15 billion, it is causing Congress to take a harder look, so it was felt present meeting would assist Directors in understanding how DEM works, how DEM makes considered judgments, and what facts on budget and program should be made known in Forms 189 and in other justification statements. Liverman described the machinery for handling on-site and off-site proposals, as per attached outline. John C. Whitnah, Chief, Program Coordination Branch, DEM, was called on for a short statement on the budget cycle, illustrated with slides.

REPOSITORY NARA Atlanta Archives  
 COLLECTION RG 326-68A1096  
 (BOX No. 387) DR Research Div.  
 FOLDER Organization and Management-6  
 Bio-MED

X 5946

OFFICE ▶

*Resp* SEP 20 1962

2. J. B. Hartgering, M.D., Life Sciences Program, Office of Science and Technology. Hartgering gave a brief on the President's committees and on current reports that will appear and on efforts made in reviews of current research and development efforts.
3. Office of Peaceful Explosives presented a short movie on Project Sedan with good slow-motion color shots of the earth rise, break through, base surge, etc. Fallout patterns were shown indicating the very limited close-in total-dose levels.
4. Walter D. Claus, Special Assistant to the Director, DBM. Claus emphasized that more than ever the program director must see to it that the research under way conforms with the general aims and policies of the supporting agency. There must be an increased trend to prevent duplication of effort. Whitnah added that henceforth the 189's must be improved, have much more descriptive detail on program needs and why, with manpower, equipment needs, etc., clearly stated. DBM encourages personal communication of laboratory directors with the DBM staff, stating by all means write or phone! Claus continued, to emphasize also the addition of introductory statements on each 189 (each project) that can be bodily picked out and transcribed onto the Science Information Exchange sheets. These are the so-called 200-word summaries.

In midmorning I was requested by Dr. R. S. Poor to talk with him for a few moments and at the noon adjournment conferred with Dr. Poor and Dr. S. G. English on matters of interest to the new Division of Nuclear Education and Training.

Claus' talk was on the afternoon program, and at its conclusion I left the meeting in company of Noble Simpson of DBM and we drove to Bethesda to the National Institutes of Health. Here we met with Dr. Arthur L. Schipper, Training Grants Specialist, in his office, and then with Dr. James F. Haggerty, Chief, Research Grants Branch. I was interested in again meeting these old friends and to gain from them the attitude that NIH would take toward training and research grant proposals from Puerto Rico. Proposals for research and proposals for training programs

in the field of cancer and related subjects are welcomed. I have been provided with a supply of the special forms that NIH uses for these purposes. NIH, will, however, make grants only to the non-governmental installations, hence grant proposals in any category for NIH should come from the University of Puerto Rico, requesting appropriate funds with overhead, to enable qualified university staff to work in PRNC. With regard to Latin American appointments under these grants, it would be up to the grantee, the University, to make selections of those who would work within the confines of the grant funds. Grants are not made to individuals in this case, but to the institution.

Later I talked with Herbert A. Stanwood, Assistant Director for Administration DBM, regarding the attitude of DBM and its policy toward welcoming continued proposals from PRNC. The policy has not changed from that previously stated, Stanwood says, by Dunham to Bugher. PRNC proposals will be handled by DBM in the manner in which they process any off-site proposals. Each will be welcomed as a statement on work to be performed in a discreet project with its budget, and each proposal will be considered on its merits in regard timing and competition with any other incoming off-site proposal. My discussions continued with John N. Wolfe, Chief, Environmental Sciences Branch, on the matter of the current Section I of the three-part PRNC proposal for radiation studies in the tropical forest areas near El Yunque. I reviewed with Wolfe the problem of perimeter fencing around the 10,000 curie source. Our estimates agree quite well with the fencing around the 9000-curie source now in use at Brookhaven, and of course BNL had the same problem in meeting the MPL for exposure to the general population. Wolfe recognizes perfectly well that some other site other than El Verde may need to be used, a longer access road may need to be built, or else Teas may have to use a smaller source. Wolfe prefers that we immediately forward the proposal copies with our transmittal memorandum as is, point out the problems.

Friday, September 14:

The Friday meeting was in the AEC Auditorium as previously announced. Bruner presided. This phase of the meeting dealt with statements from DBM staff, mostly, on areas they felt should be highlighted in research, as follows:

5. John Totter, Assistant Director for the Biological Sciences.  
Out of the biological category areas, some increase is  
expected in radiation botany, comparative species differences

OFFICE ►

in radiation response, and it appears the radiation-protection compounds need now more basic research.

6. H. D. Bruner. On internal emitters, DBM has some 22 projects on fallout radioisotopes. It is felt that more work should be done on deposits as cancer causes. Also, epidemiological studies ought to be increased among the AEC plant workers in perhaps the manner uranium body burdens are being tackled by MCW and NLO.
7. M. K. Berkut. On protective agents and internal emitters, DBM is now spending \$2.5M on-site on 33 projects. Walter Reed, University of Chicago AF Laboratory, SAM, ONR, are all doing screening of protective compounds. Standards are now needed for the bioassay of chemical protection by these compounds.
8. William A. Lotz. Under 06 01 03 on removal of materials from the body, less than \$100,000 in support is going to TITex Corporation, Jefferson Medical College, Columbia, Rice, and Hines V.A. Hospital for this work. On-site work is being done at Hanford, Argonne, University of Utah, LASL, and Brookhaven.
9. Paul S. Henshaw. Described central nervous system studies, but did not indicate at all an awareness UT-AEC has an interest in head irradiation work. There are about 20 projects or contracts totaling \$0.5M, mostly off-site. Feels that more work should be done on studies of the central responses to radiation.
10. James L. Liverman. Speaking on biophysics, indicated work in this field has grown from \$0.4M when Leroy Augenstine came to DBM four or five years ago, to the current \$2.5M. The cytology of transmission in biological systems and the origin of cell particulates appear to be areas deserving work. The \$2.5M includes all of Michael Kasha's program at FSU.
11. Melvin P. Stulberg. Spoke on molecular biology, 0604. Feels that more work is needed on low doses, especially as affecting DNA and related compounds, on the protein fraction, and on control of differentiation and growth.
12. John N. Wolfe. Spoke on ecology in general, describing the program and some of the principal sites, and emphasized the Alaska studies prelude to Chariot.

13. Raymond K. Appleyard, EURATOM. Appleyard is heading up the biological research planning for EURATOM. This will involve the 6 countries of the Common Market, and the program will be budgeted through a series of 5-Year plans, on a financial basis of \$3.5M annually. Dosimetry, toxicology, cell research, and radioecology will be emphasized first. Present programs include microbiology with Brachet at Brussels, the development of genetics with Buzzati-Traverso at Naples, agriculture at Wanengen, Holland, a mammalian laboratory near Munich. Also proposed are programs on the internal emitters, diet surveys, cytogenetics work including blood studies, and a survey of population attitudes toward nuclear hazards.
14. S. Allen Lough, Assistant Director for Radiological Physics and Instrumentation, DBM. It is felt more effort should be put into radiological physics. Interest include detectors, calorimetry, energy absorption studies, scintillators, and mixed-radiation dosimetry.
15. J. Z. Holland, Chief, Fallout Studies Branch. Program costs run \$1.8M on-site and \$2.8M off-site. Most active are HASL and the Air Force Cambridge Research Center. Sandia will do some rocket sampling.

This ended the specific presentations and Liverman spoke up to state that the next program assumptions will be due on January 10, 1963. The notice will be sent to program directors in December 1962. All were admonished to be sure and include specific and accurate statements on increases and decreases, why, and the dollars involved.

There were some further general discussions and it was suggested by Hollaender that each meeting include a section or panel on some one biological topic that could be briefly but thoroughly reviewed. Howard Curtis added that each meeting should include statements from Laboratory Directors briefly highlighting some momentous advance in each laboratory. It was generally agreed the suggestions had merit but would be left up to each host director to carry out. It was agreed also that the meeting planned for October 1-2, 1962, would be postponed to November 26-27, 1962, with Brookhaven National Laboratory being the host installation. Meeting adjourned at 3:45 P.M.

Herman M. Roth

- 6 -

Remarks: This meeting seemed to lack direction in absence of Dunham, but gained momentum after what seemed to be faltering starts. To the Operations Office people, the 189's and budgeting were an old story, but from laboratory people afterwards I gained the impression they were feeling grateful for some of the explanatory points and the suggestions on budget timing and preparation. The individual DBM comments on research needs were well-backed in some instances but appeared to be guesses in others. The meeting was, in general, worthwhile.

C. S. Shoup

CC: R. C. Armstrong

OFFICE ▶	Rio. Br.					
SURNAME ▶	Shoup:ef					
DATE ▶	9/17/62					

2003312