

## BROOKHAVEN NATIONAL LABORATORY

## MEMORANDUM

718303

DATE: August 27, 1984  
 TO: R. E. Hughes  
 FROM: N. P. Samios *nes*  
 SUBJECT: Response to the Report of the Medical Visiting Committee for 1984

REPOSITORY *Associated Univ Inc (WASH. D.C.)*  
 COLLECTION *Board of Trustees & its Executive Committee's Mtg Minutes*  
 BOX No. *locked filing cabinets in Internal Audit office*  
 FOLDER ~~\_\_\_\_\_~~

Dr. V. P. Bond, Dr. D. C. Borg, and I have the following comments on the 1984 Visiting Committee Report.<sup>1</sup>

The Committee's summary of the Department's fiscal status is an accurate representation of the situation that existed at the time of its visit and reflects its deep comprehension of the gravity of the FY 85 budget crisis, which it viewed "with alarm". Hence it is very reassuring that the Committee strongly recommended that the Department continue as an organizational unit that can be expected to capitalize on the unique and special resources of BNL to accomplish distinguished research in the future, as it has in the past.

The recommendation that recruitment of successors for the Associate Director for Life Sciences and for the Department Chairman and the assessment of a crucial need for far-sighted leadership at this particular time are both emphatically endorsed. In light of the Department's huge fiscal deficit, however, budgetary support for the research program of a successor to the Chairman will require a new commitment by OHER, despite its own severe financial limitations. OHER has been requested by BNL to support this aspect of the recruitment, with strong indications of favorable intent. Brookhaven agrees with and will continue to emphasize to DOE the Committee's conclusion that "without sufficient core support for key investigators and programs, recruitment of a new Associate Laboratory Director and Department Chairman will not be feasible" and that this is necessary for "safeguarding the future of the Department".

Those recommendations referring to systematic consultation with the Health Sciences Center at Stony Brook in future planning and to enhancing interactions with other research groups at BNL, respectively, are both meritorious and will be pursued to the maximum extent feasible.

<sup>1</sup> Based on the draft of the report circulated by Dr. Upton on 1 June, and an addendum to the supplement dated 8 June, Dr. Upton has indicated that the final report is unlikely to be significantly different.

1124942

Most of the Committee's comments upon specific research programs are well taken, but several points warrant comment:

The possible use of the 200 MeV Linac for proton therapy is in the planning stage and has not been endorsed by the Directorate. The Harvard and Berkeley experience have indeed demonstrated the feasibility of treating ocular melanoma with protons. However, the full implication of the multiple use of the Linac, namely, with the high energy program, BLIP, as well as the availability of clinicians and patients, has to be evaluated before proceeding any further. The Committee's comments were to the point.

The situation with the neutron capture therapy and photon activation projects is also complex. Because these programs are not among those most affected by the impending budget reductions, projects were only briefly presented, and there may have been insufficient emphasis on the proposed collaborative arrangements which include provisions for the required medical physics and oncology personnel. Because the Visiting Committee deemed these programs worth pursuing if such talent is available to the program, definitive plans have been made to continue and extend this research. The program will be reviewed additionally with Dr. Hellman.

The Committee's enthusiasm for the nuclear medicine and medical physics programs is gratifying. Despite prospects for sharply reduced funding overall and some reduction in the level of effort supported by DOE, the Department will continue to stress medical applications of Brookhaven's nuclear technology as the Committee urges.

It is true that some aspects of hematology that "are not highly innovative or at the cutting edge of research" do "reflect the funding directions dictated by DOE" or other funding agencies. However, responding to such needs is an appropriate part of maintaining balanced research programs at national laboratories. The Committee's urging that building "a critical mass in hematology should... be a major goal for the Department" is consistent with the Department's own priorities.

The extremely strong support for the pulmonary biology and inhalation toxicology programs is especially welcome because BNL has given the highest priority to counteracting the serious impacts on these programs threatened by the projected DOE budget reductions. At this time it appears very likely that a combination of supplementary OHER assistance plus new support from both the National Toxicology Program and commercial sponsors of research will carry the effort through FY 85. It is also expected that the program will in fact be sufficiently robust to fulfill the future promise expected by the Committee.