E001395

ORIGINAL

Transcript of Proceedings

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

REGIONAL MEDICAL PROGRAM SERVICE COUNCIL MEETING

Rockville, Maryland
Wednesday, 10 November 1971

ACE - FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

Official Reporters

415 Second Street, N.E.
Washington, D. C. 20002

Telephone:
(Code 202) 547-6222

NATION-WIDE COVERAGE

CR-4158
GIBSON
ng

1 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

11 REGIONAL MEDICAL PROGRAM SERVICE COUNCIL MEETING

12
13
14

15 Conference Room GH
16 Parklawn Building
5600 Fishers Lane
17 Rockville, Maryland

18 Wednesday, November 10, 1971

19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

CONTENTS

APPLICATIONS:	PAGE:
Indiana	3
Virginia	4
Iowa	7
New York Metropolitan	14
Tennessee/Mid-South	18
Washington/Alaska	30
West Virginia	38
Missouri - Special Action	41
OTHER:	
Cancer Center in Region X	65
KIDNEY PROPOSALS:	
Colorado/Wyoming	71
ARIZONA	
Ohio Valley	73
Iowa	77
California	80
Georgia	86
Rochester	88

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 DR. PAHL: May we come to order for the morning's
3 meeting.
4 We have a reasonable amount of business on the
5 applications, but if we proceed in good order I suspect we
6 can finish before we get too far into the early afternoon,
7 and I would suggest that we start this morning with the Indiana
8 triennial application with Dr. Brennan as the principal
9 reviewer and Dr. Musser as the backup reviewer, and Mr.
10 Torbert as our staff resource individual; and following that
11 application we will then proceed with the "Virginia" application
12 and I would appreciate knowing if there are early departures
13 contemplated by other council members so that we'll be able
14 to rearrange matters, but please don't all depart.
15 Dr. Brennan, would you like to proceed with the
16 Indiana findings?
17 DR. BRENNAN: I will move that the recommendations
18 of the Review Committee and the Site Visit Committee, which
19 are identical, be accepted by the Council.
20 DR. PAHL: Dr. Musser is not here at the moment.
21 Is there a second to the motion?
22 MRS. WYCKOFF: Second.
23 DR. PAHL: The motion has been made and seconded
24 to accept the Committee's recommendation on the Indiana
25 application on the triennial application. Is there discussion

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 by the Council? Staff? If not, all in favor of the motion
2 please say "Aye."
3 ("Ayes")
4 DR. PAHL: Opposed?
5 (No Response)
6 DR. PAHL: The motion is carried.
7 Dr. Merrill, since you and Dr. Schreiner have
8 both had the opportunity now to review all of the kidney
9 aspects and since this motion did include a kidney recommen-
10 dation, it is my understanding that the motion includes, with
11 your concurrence, the kidney proposal; is that correct?
12 DR. MERRILL: Yes.
13 DR. PAHL: Okay.
14 Let's take the "Virginia" application, which is an
15 anniversary application, with Dr. Everist as principal
16 reviewer and Mr. Hines as backup reviewer and Mr. Hinkle
17 from our staff.
18 DR. EVERIST: This is an anniversary continuation
19 grant application for the 03 operational year that was site
20 visited by the reviewer and others on September 13 and 14
21 last. This application has not had a staff anniversary
22 review panel study but has been reviewed by the Review
23 Committee, and there is general agreement between the site
24 visit team and the Review Committee's report. The region has
25 had a slow start with the original grantee designated as the

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 University of Virginia School of Medicine in Charlottesville,
2 then changed to the Medical College of Virginia in Richmond,
3 now known as the Virginia Commonwealth University, and in
4 March of 1971 the grantee became the Virginia Regional
5 Medical Program, Inc.

6 The region has had a developmental component
7 disapproved in the February 1971 review cycle; and this marks
8 the difference between the recommendations of the site visit
9 team and the Review Committee, although the site team did
10 withhold total commitment for the developmental component
11 to await further information from Doctor Perez, the director
12 of the region.

13 The Virginia Regional Medical Program has had a
14 rather difficult time establishing good rapport with the
15 medical establishment in Virginia. They have done this on the
16 basis of categorical emphasis and are now accepted as a
17 viable agency. The redirection of Regional Medical Programs
18 has caused some difficulty in Virginia, and we were appraised
19 of this, with refreshing candor, by the director. Despite
20 the difficulties, the region has accepted the challenge and
21 will proceed, albeit cautiously, into this decade. However,
22 at the moment the program is categorical; the projects are
23 categorical; but the outlook is new. The site visit team
24 was impressed with the enthusiasm of the director and staff
25 and came away from the visit with the feeling that the program

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 is going to move as rapidly as possible in the face of some
2 rather overwhelming archaic anchors. They have a strange
3 review and management system, but it is legal and apparently
4 works. The region requested $1,551,251. The site visit
5 recommended $1,050,000, and the Review Committee, $1,010,000,
6 deleting the $80,000 developmental component but adding
7 $40,000 to core to be used as catalytic funds. This tangential
8 method of handling discretionary funds is rather disheartening
9 but it is the Review Committee's opinion that the region
10 needs another year of maturity before the status of the
11 developmental component is awarded. I could find no major
12 fault with the description of how the developmental component
13 would be used from page 74 through page 78 of the application.
14 However, there could be some question about the maturity of
15 their review process, particularly the inexperienced majority
16 of the RAG.

17 I, therefore, concur with the Review Committee's
18 recommendation to award this region $1,010,000 for the third
19 operational year, from January 1, 1972 through December 31,
20 1972, and I so move.

21 MR. HINES: I second. I have nothing to add.

22 DR. PAHL: Okay. The motion has been made and
23 seconded for approval of the Committee's recommendations on
24 the Virginia application. Is there Council discussion? Any
25 comments from staff?

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 DR. EVERIST: There is a kidney project.

2 DR. DE BAKEY: I'd simply like to say that it is
3 heartening, since I was on the first site visit to the
4 Virginia area, to see the change that has taken place there.
5 It's quite a radical change since I was on the first site
6 visit there, and even the changes that have taken place I
7 think they are moving into this thing.

8 DR. PAHL: If there's no further discussion, all
9 in favor of the motion, please say "Aye."

10 ("Ayes")

11 DR. PAHL: Opposed?

12 (No Response)

13 DR. PAHL: The motion is carried.

14 May we now turn to the triennial application from
15 Iowa with Dr. McPhedran as the principal reviewer, Mr.
16 Milliken as backup reviewer, Mr. Zizlavsky from our staff.

17 DR. MC PHEDRAN: We have a peculiar dilemma in
18 considering this triennial application because the excellent
19 program coordinator and staff felt that they would be
20 embarrassed, even hampered, in pursuit of their excellent
21 program goals, priorities and objectives if they were to
22 receive the full amount request; that is, "requested" in quotes;
23 of $1.147 million because that includes a request for funds
24 to make projects operational which had been previously
25 approved but unfunded and which they now feel are peripheral

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 to their new main objectives.

2 I think that the first sheet in the Review
3 Committee's deliberations which you have in the folder, the
4 first of the blue sheets, summarizes the financial dimensions
5 of this dilemma, and the Review Committee solved their
6 problem by recommending that the coordinator and his staff's
7 request be met and the sum for that would be $800,000 more or
8 less. It is kind of a rough estimate but it includes funding--
9 that's based on funding of $625,000 for the present year --
10 that is level funding between the present year and the
11 upcoming one -- plus development component, plus a certain
12 figure of $100,000 that I'm afraid I don't know exactly how
13 that was arrived at, but it is substantially lower than this
14 total paper request of $1.147 million.

15 Because this might give an erroneous impression
16 about the program as a whole, I'd like to reiterate that the
17 impression of the site visitors was that this was an excellent
18 Regional Medical Program. For example, in the performance
19 category, they have apparently engaged the active interest and
20 participation of the state medical society, of the osteopathic
21 medical school and of the state medical school, so that their
22 cooperative arrangements around the state really appear to be
23 first-rate without any serious exceptions we could find.

24 The process that they use, for example, in
25 Regional Advisory Groups, was imaginative and thoroughly

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 professional. One of the really entertaining things that
2 they had done was to provide a debate forum for some of the
3 important issues of the day in the Regional Advisory Group,
4 and this appears to have been very successful in encouraging
5 participation by members of the Regional Advisory Group.
6 It's difficult to find a serious exception to this
7 praise, this "p" in appraise, except that the evaluation part
8 of it seemed to be weak, but that's something that they
9 shared with many other regional medical programs.
10 On the whole, I think that Dr. Weinberg and his
11 staff may be more nearly correct; that is, that the previously
12 unfunded but approved projects may be more of a millstone
13 around their necks than a help. They are mostly categorical
14 projects. I understand that there has been a great deal of
15 pressure brought to bear on the Regional Advisory Group and
16 on the core staff to see to it that at least one of these
17 projects was funded. Dr. Weinberg thought that he could
18 manage this -- could handle this, so that I guess I'm inclined
19 to support the Review Committee's final recommendation of
20 $800,000 for the first year triennium and then the other
21 figures as noted on the blue sheet.
22 So I move that we accept the Review Committee's
23 recommendation. I would like to hear comments, though, from
24 others, from Dr. Margulies and others, who may have views
25 about this.

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 MR. MILLIKEN: I second the motion.

2 DR. PAHL: The motion has been made and seconded.

3 Mr. Milliken, would you care to make any comments?

4 MR. MILLIKEN: Really, I agree with the doctor.

5 The only thing that I would say is that I think this is an

6 unusual cooperative relationship between VRMP and other state

7 interests in development of their programs and is really far

8 down the road and not just on paper. This would be my only

9 comment.

10 DR. MARGULIES: The only comment I'd like to make

11 is directed to the rather unusual circumstances here. Ideally,

12 one would like to think that the Regional Advisory Group

13 would be in a position to discontinue its approval of what it

14 approved in an earlier era. In fact, the pressure which has

15 been placed on them, particularly on one project, has been

16 from one congressman who represents a district in the state

17 and who has enlisted the support of the speaker of the House

18 of Representatives of the state and who sent his personal

19 representative and the speaker of the House to enter the

20 Regional Advisory Group meeting and tell them that this

21 activity simply had to be funded; and it does place all of

22 them in a terribly difficult position.

23 I'm not sure, however, that judging by the

24 frequent telephone calls we get from the same source, that a

25 reduction of the funding is going to resolve their problem.

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 I would like to think so, but the fact remains that those who
2 are paying attention to the funding will know that there is
3 money there, that the project has been approved, that there's
4 no reason why these funds can't be used for what they insist
5 they ought to be used for. We may be buying some time with
6 this kind of arrangement.
7 There might be other ways of buttressing the
8 coordinator and the staff and the slightly less secure
9 Regional Advisory Group by any action that the Council might
10 want to take; but they are in a very tight spot and it isn't
11 evidenced in my judgment, either, that there is weakness in
12 this program, but rather that the pressure which is being
13 placed upon them is unrelenting.
14 DR. BRENNAN: Well, what's wrong with it? Let's
15 get it out on the table. What's wrong with the things that
16 they wanted to do?
17 DR. MARGULIES: Well, the one that has been most
18 strongly pushed is one of those kinds of projects which in the
19 project review mechanism occasionally went the route that was
20 not expected. It was a simple, familiar mechanism. The
21 Regional Advisory Group at that time, which had a little less
22 vigor, decided that the one project in particular from Red Oak
23 was professionally unsatisfactory and thought that that would
24 become obvious through the review process as it went national.
25 Now, unfortunately, the Review Committee and the Council were

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 not very enthusiastic about it either but they decided to go
2 along with what they assumed was the intent of the Regional
3 Advisory Group and it got approved. So it then became approved
4 but unfunded to everybody's consternation, and it is that
5 particular project that this one congressman is most con-
6 cerned about and he seems to have made a personal commitment
7 to his constituency that that project is going to be approved
8 and this has led on his part to an attack on the whole Iowa
9 RMP with strong threats that he's going to do something about
10 the whole business and so forth, that it isn't representative,
11 that it is not taking care of the needs of Iowa and so on. So
12 they really are under the gun.
13 About the only alternative we might have would be
14 a very strong recommendation to the Iowa RMP that they do not
15 fund those previously approved projects which appear to be
16 inconsistent with their new goals and would be a deterrent
17 rather than a support for what they are attempting to do.
18 DR. MC PHEDRAN: Well, we sort of took that kind
19 of recommendation up with them when we were there. That was
20 an idea that had appealed to me, that perhaps if we recommended
21 that funds be granted and specifically excepted projects that
22 we thought were not consonant with their new goals that this
23 would be a help. Quite to the contrary, Dr. Weinberg didn't
24 think that would be a help at all.
25 His view was that the more appearance there is of

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 direction from here, the less acceptable in the whole state
2 the whole program is; that if he can manage these differences
3 himself, he'll do a good deal better than if he appears to be
4 playing the tune that we write out.

5 So I think maybe it's better to just do what he
6 says, and that is essentially what the Review Committee did.

7 DR. BRENNAN: It's odd that he would make such a
8 big fight over that.

9 DR. MC PHEDRAN: Well, it's a little odd that
10 somehow we didn't catch on to this until last ten minutes of
11 the feedback session. You would have thought that we would
12 have been able to catch the drift of this wind before that,
13 but we didn't.

14 DR. MARGULIES: Just to make sure we all understand
15 how the pressure is mounting, the point of attack right now
16 by the subject congressman is the coordinator, and he is
17 saying that he is dominating and blocking activity; and Dr.
18 Weinberg is willing to take on that responsibility and he's a
19 tough guy who knows what he's doing, so if that's his
20 recommendation, I don't see why we shouldn't respect it.

21 DR. BRENNAN: We've got a job for him in Michigan
22 if he's removed.

23 DR. KOMAROFF: Is there any way that the develop-
24 mental component could be expanded so that we would avoid a
25 reduction in overall funds and we would still keep the focus

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 of the pressure on him which is apparently where he wants it;
2 not ourselves exempt those projects from being funded, but
3 buttress the developmental and let him do what he wants with
4 it?

5 DR. MC PHEDRAN: Well, I don't know how that could
6 be done. This includes a recommendation for developmental
7 funding. I should have said that specifically.

8 DR. PAHL: Is there further discussion? If not,
9 all in favor of the motion to accept the Committee's
10 recommendations for the Iowa application, please say "Aye."

11 ("Ayes")

12 DR. PAHL: Opposed?

13 (No Response)

14 DR. PAHL: The motion is carried.

15 We now turn to the anniversary section of the book
16 and review the "New York Metropolitan RMP" application. Dr.
17 McPhedran is principal reviewer; Dr. Millikan is backup
18 reviewer and Mr. Kline from our staff.

19 DR. MC PHEDRAN: The items requiring Council action
20 in the New York Metropolitan anniversary request are on this
21 white sheet, and do all the Council members have that little
22 yellow appendix on theirs? I think they do. The items
23 requiring Council action are noted on the white sheet and the
24 stapled yellow attachment.

25 The amount of $2.235 million which is recommended

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 by the staff anniversary review panel for the third year is
2 the same amount that had been received by the New York
3 Metropolitan Regional Medical Program for their second year.
4 It includes ten percent developmental component and I was on
5 the site visit team that went there in December 1970 that
6 approved developmental funding for this region.

7 This amount of $2.235 million is within the limit
8 that Council had previously recommended.

9 What specifically requires Council action now
10 really is a request for new funds, a separate request; that
11 is, in Project 29, a Long Island Jewish Medical Center Queens
12 Hospital Center affiliated request; and this is to revamp a
13 big city out-patient department. The request is really a very
14 good one I think. It's well written. It goes over problems
15 of big city out-patient departments that are familiar to many
16 people here and proposes solutions for them that seem to be
17 sensible and intelligent.

18 This is essentially a project review, as it has to
19 be. It was felt by the staff anniversary review panel that
20 because of health testing equipment and health testing that
21 was proposed in this Project 29 that it fell outside of our
22 Council limitation on multiphasic health testing, but on
23 further discussion it appears that's not the case; that whatever
24 equipment is to be purchased is really part of changing the
25 whole out-patient setup in this hospital and it really is not

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 an automated health testing system in the sense that we have
2 discussed it a time or two ago.
3 A series of meetings have taken place between
4 RMPS staff and the New York Metropolitan staff and they have
5 come up with the recommendation that's on this little yellow
6 appendage here, which is that Project 29 be approved in
7 principle, as Dr. Brightman from New York had recommended,
8 and that a sum of money, $100,000, from RMPS would be
9 requested as new money. This is in addition to the previously
10 suggested $2.235 million; that this $100,000 be approved;
11 and that other funds could be got from other sources. This
12 was actually the original intention of the New York Metropoli-
13 tan Regional Medical Program and they feel that they can make
14 this project go if they have this assistance from RMPS.
15 So, to reiterate, the request is for $2.235 million
16 for the third year; for $100,000 in addition to that for the
17 Queens' project.
18 These discussions enabled staff here and staff at
19 the New York Metropolitan Regional Medical Program to discuss
20 together a number of things that apparently will be useful in
21 preparing their triennial application which will come to us
22 about a year from now.
23 This is another, I think, very good regional
24 medical program. They have made great strides in reorganizing
25 their relationships with the several medical schools. They

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 have changed their affiliation of these medical schools
2 materially, especially in the last year, so that now the
3 arrangement is that the medical schools must come to the
4 Metropolitan Regional Medical Program with project proposals
5 with specific objectives in mind, and there is no longer going
6 to be simply the support of somebody who is nominally RMP at
7 the several medical schools, and it appears that the Regional
8 Medical Program office has made this stick so that, for example,
9 in some of their latest deliberations when medical schools
10 didn't come in with a project at all or didn't come in with it
11 specified well enough, they didn't get -- the support was not
12 forthcoming. So it appears that this is really a good progam.
13 I think it's worthy of our support and I move recommendation
14 of the figures which you see here and which I just went over.
15 The $2.235 million includes a ten percent developmental
16 component.
17 DR. MILLIKAN: Second the motion.
18 DR. PAHL: The motion has been made and seconded.
19 Is there Council discussion?
20 DR. BRENNAN: I think this is the first time we've
21 heard of a project in a major metropolitan area RMP described
22 as very good organization. That's encouraging.
23 DR. PAHL: Is there further Council discussion on
24 the motion? Comments from staff? If not, all in favor of the
25 motion, please say "Aye."

("Ayes")

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 DR. PAHL: Opposed?

2 (No Response)

3 DR. PAHL: The motion is carried.

4 Before we turn to the "Tennessee/Mid-South" anniver-
5 sary application, I'd like to have the record show that
6 Mrs. Mars was absent during the Virginia application pro-
7 ceedings and I would also like to indicate for the record that
8 the kidney proposals in today's motions are assumed to have
9 received the endorsement of Drs. Merrill and Schreiner unless
10 discussions indicate otherwise. We will be coming, of course,
11 to some specific kidney proposals. I'm referring to the ones
12 which are included in the recommendations we have already
13 made on this morning's applications.

14 If we may now turn to the "Tennessee/Mid-South"
15 application, Mrs. Wyckoff as principal reviewer; Mr. Milliken
16 as backup reviewer; Mr. Reist from staff.

17 MRS. WYCKOFF: This is a request for $2,530,459
18 for the fifth operational year. The project exceeds Council's
19 previously approved level of funding at $2.19 million. It
20 requires no action.

21 In this request is included the developmental
22 component of $190,620 and a renal disease patient care system
23 group of projects totaling $266,342.

24 The staff anniversary review panel recommends that
25 the region be funded at the present rate of support, namely,

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 $1,906,203. This does not include funds for the renal project.
2 If Council approves these, then the sum recommended should be
3 added to this level.
4 The panel does not recommend approval of the
5 developmental component of $190,620. This recommendation
6 disappointed me very much because at our last site visit we
7 thought that the developmental work being done by core was not
8 only a new dynamic thrust but was within line with the national
9 goal and was, in many ways, the best part of the program. You
10 may remember that we encouraged Dr. Shapiro to pursue this
11 developmental work as a core activity.
12 This past year, approximately $105,000 has been
13 used for this purpose, for such activities as the community
14 outreach program, the practice assistants model in a rural
15 area and the Meharry and Vanderbilt student coalition activities
16 in Appalachia. For this, we recommended core support only and
17 suggested the region reapply for a developmental component
18 later.
19 The heart of the problem in making the developmental
20 grant was in the fact that it is now regarded as a merit award
21 for a genuine creative ability in decision making by the RAG.
22 Regrettably, this degree of maturity and balanced self-
23 government does not appear to have been achieved here quite
24 yet. The excellent developmental work done by this region has
25 been the result of a creative core staff and director with the

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

RAG in a minor role; one of the principal disadvantages being the RAG's narrow representation heavily weighted with medical school and practicing physicians, mainly from Nashville; and due to the domination of the grantee in selecting appointments to the RAG.

The net result has been that a few large projects remain on dead center and have not moved forward with national priorities, nor do they conform to objectives and goals focused on health care delivery, local goals and objectives.

RMPS staff has made several site visits and has found a need to reexamine the region's goals and update them in the light of new national priorities. RAG by-laws need to be updated to be consistent with current legislation and to provide better working relationships among the institutions sponsoring RMP.

Progress has been made in the decentralization of this program and the establishment of seven area advisory committees which are now using hard data in their program planning. The region now has a health data joint working group with CHP and the state health department.

RMP site visitors evidently found that the project monitoring and review was excellent. New activities proposed for implementation are within the scope of the goals and objectives established at the beginning of this triennium.

I think I concur with the staff panel's recommendation

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 of the RAG of the Tennessee/Mid-South be given the hard
2 choice of funding the excellent developmental proposal within
3 a limited budget or pursuing the old course. This means
4 approving a grant of only the present current rate of
5 $1,906,203; not including the renal program; but I hope this
6 will be the last time we have to use this method, because
7 somehow, ostensibly, I feel we get better mileage out of
8 judicious reward plus guidance than we do from prolonged
9 punishment.
10 The Ad Hoc Panel on Renal Disease reported its
11 findings on Project #58 and recommended a considerably
12 reduced amount. Perhaps one of our genuine renal experts
13 would like to report on this and explain the reasons for these
14 recommendations.
15 DR. PAHL: Thank you, Mrs. Wyckoff.
16 DR. SCHREINER: Which one is genuine?
17 DR. PAHL: While we're deciding that issue, perhaps
18 Mr. Milliken would have some comments.
19 MR. MILLIKEN: I agree with Mrs. Wyckoff's report
20 and again I think this has the basis for a strong program
21 development and I am likewise concerned with the approach to
22 them in terms of holding them back rather than some positive
23 support on new activities.
24 DR. PAHL: Thank you.
25 MR. MILLIKEN: I would second the motion.

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 DR. PAHL: The motion has been made and seconded.
2 May we have a comment from Dr. Schreiner or Dr. Merrill
3 relative to the kidney?
4 DR. SCHREINER: I think in general the comments
5 are good. I'm a little disturbed about one which shows the
6 fine hand of a consistent prejudice. There are a couple of
7 individuals on our ad hoc review panel who are just completely
8 blindly rigid about in-center dialysis. I happen to agree
9 with where the emphasis should be, and if you're going to
10 talk about community planning and large extension there's no
11 question about the fact that you should have home training
12 and you should be shooting for that; but I think it's
13 idiotic to say that you're going to home-dialyze 100 percent
14 of the people, because there are many areas where the homes
15 are unsuitable and many areas where you can't have a dialysis
16 partner and many areas do require center backup.
17 In the general opinion of the people who have
18 worked in these areas, when you go into the poor economic
19 areas, you're probably going to have increasingly a higher
20 percentage of people requiring center dialysis and the reverse
21 in the more affluent areas.
22 So it seems to me they have chopped out Meharry
23 Center principally on the basis that they're not moving
24 toward home dialysis. If there's no motion toward home
25 dialysis I can see this as a criticism, but it seems to me

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 that to wipe them out is hurting the area in which we want
2 to help and reflects a little bit too much rigidity I think
3 in the application of that concept.
4 DR. MERRILL: Well, I'm disturbed by a couple of
5 things. First of all, the initial report of the Ad Hoc Panel
6 on Renal Disease states -- this was on September 28, 1971,
7 whereas the site visit was October 28 -- and they state that
8 the region -- they have a large budget request for trans-
9 plantation and intercommunication and typing and so on -- and
10 states -- the Ad Hoc Committee states that the region has lost
11 a transplant surgeon and the application has not clearly
12 indicated its desire to increase transplantation; the surgical
13 capability is thin.
14 Now, the site visit of the kidney disease group
15 does not touch on that that I can see, but they do stress
16 that the planned program for transplantation, organ procure-
17 ment and tissue-typing is reasonable and acceptable and
18 generally recognized; and I find it difficult to reconcile.
19 The other thing which is of some interest to me in
20 view of the discussion yesterday is the fact that Component
21 58-B is deferred apparently because there's going to be a
22 conference by RMPS and the Division of Chronic Kidney Disease
23 Study Group on whether renal biopsies are or are not within
24 the purview of sponsorship by the RMP.
25 I, myself, have a prejudice -- and this may only

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 be a personal one and I'd like to hear Dr. Schreiner's comment
2 on it -- about the ultimate value of the detection of
3 bacteruria by a screening program and urinalysis. But I think
4 the thing that disturbs me most, while the proposal is good
5 for the transplantation and tissue-typing and computer
6 coordination and so on, I see no refutation of the of the
7 statement that they have lost -- the region has lost its
8 transplant surgeon and the application does not clearly
9 indicate a desire to increase transplantation. Is there
10 anyone on staff who has any more information on that?
11 DR. PAHL: Bill, do you have any information?
12 MR. REIST: I don't know. Mr. Anderson might know.
13 DR. DE BAKEY: Where is the transplant center,
14 Danville?
15 DR. MERRILL: Yes.
16 DR. DE BAKEY: I'm amazed because they've got two
17 or three people there that I know do this, so I have serious
18 doubts that this would hurt their ability to do it.
19 MR. ANDERSON: Itwas very difficult to hear you,
20 Dr. Merrill. Would you repeat the question, please?
21 DR. MERRILL: My question was as follows: On the
22 second page of the ad hoc panel survey and summary, the
23 statement is made that the region has lost its transplant
24 surgeon and application does not clearly indicate a desire to
25 increase transplantation; the surgical capability is thin. I

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 see no mention of the fact that this has been taken into
2 consideration by the site visit people. Maybe Dr. DeBakey
3 can enlighten me. Is Bill Scott interested in transplantation?
4 DR. DE BAKEY: Very much so, and I know of at
5 least three of the surgeons on his staff who are interested
6 in it and are doing it. That's why I find it difficult to
7 understand.
8 DR. MERRILL: I think that would answer that
9 question.
10 MR. ANDERSON: Well, we met with Dr. Scott -- or
11 the site visit team did -- and Dr. Scott assured us that he
12 was definitely interested in transplantation and is now
13 actively recruiting for a full-time transplantation surgeon.
14 MRS. WYCKOFF: You know, I hate to raise this
15 issue, but it does seem to me that where you have two medical
16 centers as near as Memphis and Nashville, why you have to have
17 two underused systems of transplantation when you might have
18 one good one. I just can't understand it. Do we have some
19 way to examine the strength of these things and where the
20 emphases are regardless of the region?
21 DR. MARGULIES: We have been making an effort, as
22 you remember in the past meetings of Council, to try to
23 identify on a geographic basis the relative need for a
24 transplant centers which is based upon local resources and
25 population requirements and potential need which can be fairly

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 well identified for dialysis and transplants; and whether this
2 has been applied in the review process -- maybe again, Mr.
3 Anderson, you could respond to that particular question. The
4 issue was whether this represents an excessive development
5 of capacity when there are medical centers in Memphis and
6 in Nashville which would presumably serve the same population.
7 MR. ANDERSON: Well, geographically, I don't think
8 this would be true, and the transplantation capability in
9 Memphis is extremely limited, whereas Nashville has really
10 established themselves as a transplant center in the Mid-South
11 and they have been very actively in a transplant effort for a
12 number of years. This would help them to perpetuate their
13 complete comprehensive program.
14 DR. CANNON: What was that about the Memphis
15 capability being limited? He said that the capabilities in
16 Memphis were extremely limited and I just wanted to know if
17 that is a true statement because I --
18 MR. ANDERSON: Maybe my choice of words is not a
19 very good one. They haven't been too active in transplant.
20 DR. CANNON: Because they haven't had funds.
21 MR. ANDERSON: Yes, sir.
22 DR. MERRILL: Does Memphis have a computer to
23 organize their organ procurement and typing?
24 DR. CANNON: Dr. Merrill, I really don't know. All
25 I know is that Dr. Britt and Dr. Hatches has got a program

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 they've been working on for some time but it's limited in
2 funding.
3 DR. PAHL: Is there further discussion?
4 DR. EVERIST: It would seem to me that this might
5 be a time for us to again bring up the possibility of 910
6 money for the southeastern area of the country, working
7 together on some of these projects and it would probably save
8 RMPS a considerable amount of money and get a better quality
9 of care. It seems to be a natural with all the talent, with
10 McDonald in New Orleans and Hume in Richmond and the people
11 that are scattered around this area, would have a ball I think
12 if they could get together and cooperate.
13 DR. DE BAKEY: Well, there is an effort being made
14 to do that in the whole mid-south and deep south and southwestern
15 area in an effort to provide coordinated programs, particularly
16 in terms of utilizing the computer for donors and that sort of
17 thing. There's considerable effort I know in our part of the
18 country to do this, so I think a little push on the part of
19 helping them do this would be good.
20 Another comment I would like to make about this, as
21 far as surgical capability for transplant, there's no lack of
22 surgical capability. The problem lies primarily in finding
23 the funds to support a good center organization where you have
24 all of the resources available. A kidney transplant program
25 from the surgical standpoint becomes completely inadequate

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 unless it has all the total resources, particularly in terms
2 of kidney dialysis and support of immunologists and others to
3 create the total center.

4 As far as the technical aspects of it from the
5 surgical standpoint, that really constitutes the easiest
6 component of the whole thing and there's no lack of trained
7 personnel for this purpose. It's putting together the total
8 organization and the supporting organization, and this
9 requires funding of the center. Frequently it's not
10 available to the center's resources and this is the main
11 deterrent to providing the best kind of organization.

12 I know in our own setup, where we have been doing
13 kidney transplants for a long time, 10 or 12 years now, and
14 continuously doing it, we have to scratch to get the funds to
15 support the total activity.

16 DR. MARGULIES: I think that the idea of the 910
17 mechanism is most appropriate. The Southeast coordinators
18 have been meeting together to develop a common approach to
19 kidney problems and, as Dr. DeBakey indicated, that is not
20 confined to the southeast area.

21 We will, in the process of developing the new kind
22 of protocol which we described yesterday, lay emphasis on the
23 utilization of the 910 approach because it provides a mechanism
24 for getting around exactly the issue which you have raised,
25 Mrs. Wyckoff, and I think we should promote the idea now rather

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 than wait for any further development.

2 DR. SCHREINER: I wonder if Mr. Anderson could put

3 a dollar value on it.--I can't break it down -- from 58-C,

4 which is the dialysis component, is approved in general at

5 reduced funding; but I can't break down the figures. I think

6 you ought to put that back in and recommend to them that they

7 expand for a four-bed unit and that they come back in with a

8 supplemental application and try to initiate a home-training

9 program as an adjunct to that.

10 Following your philosophy, I think it's better to

11 reward them. If they don't have a nurse that two-bed unit

12 may be wiped out.

13 DR. PAHL: Mr. Anderson, can you place a dollar

14 figure on that?

15 MR. ANDERSON: It's in the neighborhood of $10,000.

16 MRS. WYCKOFF: So $58,000 would be $68,000. Do

17 you need a motion on this to approve the sum of $176,000 for

18 the renal project?

19 DR. PAHL: Well, the Chair understands that the

20 motion on the Tennessee/Mid-South application is to approve

21 the recommendations of the staff anniversary review panel

22 together with the recommendations of the technical kidney site

23 visit team, to which is added $10,000 for section 58-C of the

24 kidney proposal.

25 DR. SCHREINER: For Meharry.

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 MRS. WYCKOFF: For Meharry.

2 DR. PAHL: For Meharry. If that is the motion

3 which has already been seconded, may I ask if there is further

4 Council discussion?

5 MR. HINES: Question.

6 DR. PAHL: All in favor of the motion, please say

7 "Aye."

8 DR. PAHL: Opposed?

9 (No Response)

10 DR. PAHL: The motion is carried.

11 We now turn to the "Washington/Alaska" anniversary

12 application. Dr. Komaroff is the principal reviewer and

13 Mrs. Mars is backup reviewer and Mr. Moore from our staff.

14 Dr. Watkins, I apologize for not noting your

15 absence from the room during the New York Metropolitan review

16 procedure.

17 DR. KOMAROFF: This region is currently funded at a

18 level of $1.45 million. The Council has already approved the

19 level for next year of $1.96 million. The commitment that the

20 region understands it has from the director for next year is

21 $1.51 million, and it is requesting somewhat more than that

22 but somewhat less than the Council approved level, $1.68 million.

23 The main reason that the region is requesting

24 additional funds and the reason that the staff anniversary

25 review panel has agreed with that request is that they have

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 five new activities and they wish to expand their developmental
2 component.
3 Since the Council last looked at this region
4 there's been several changes that are encouraging. The
5 organizational structure has changed so that five associate
6 coordinators for each of their five key program areas have
7 been designated and there are five corresponding advisory
8 councils that work closely with the core staff in these areas.
9 Their general goal statement has been decategorized. They
10 have moved further away from a primary emphasis on continuing
11 education and into newer areas, some of which we've already
12 heard about yesterday and I'll briefly allude to.
13 Rhetorically, they are pointing more towards the
14 delivery of care to the poor, development of new types of
15 paramedical personnel, screening and prevention activities,
16 public health education activities, increasing the rural/urban
17 linkages which have already characterized the region, the
18 stimulation of HMOs, the stimulation of area health education
19 centers which they have an ideal opportunity to promote as part
20 of the University of Washington peripheralization medical
21 school program called WAMI, which has a kind of zing to that
22 achronym that's uncharacteristic of most of the achronyms we
23 deal with.
24 They're also encouraging medical audit programs in
25 several private practice settings. They have the satellite

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 transmission of various kinds of medical information to remote
2 areas, primarily in Alaska; and their activities with the
3 proposed Northwest Cancer Center we talked about yesterday.
4 So this is a very attractive agenda that has impressed everyone
5 who knows the region and who has worked with it from staff.
6 They also have an extremely vigorous advisory
7 council under the leadership of Mr. Ogden who is on our
8 Council, and this has been a major change since our last
9 review.
10 Lastly, their core management staff has developed
11 what they call the programmatic approach in which various
12 program goals and objectives are outlined specifically and
13 budgetary allocations are made to each one. This looks on
14 paper as if it should allow them a very tight and effective
15 management of the program.
16 Their current request includes support for seven
17 projects which already we have approved; the three small
18 projects for which they request an additional year's funding
19 b ut which will terminate after that year; and for five new
20 projects, one of which is a vital statistics program to
21 coordinate the various kidney activities already funded. One
22 proposes to upgrade comprehensive care in two small rural
23 Alaskan villages; a third to develop a comprehensive care
24 system for an urban Indian population in Seattle; the fourth
25 to expand the role of the stroke nurse specialist which has

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 been developed in an already funded project; and last, to
2 support activities of the Allied Health Association in Alaska
3 to expand and train new kinds of paramedical personnel for a
4 region which cannot likely look forward to many new physicians.
5 The region appears to be very well run. The
6 advisory group is extraordinary, and the new activities seem
7 to fit with the region's honest priorities and the national
8 priorities.
9 Therefore, I concur with the recommendation that we
10 recommend to the director expanded support of $1.68 million,
11 including a developmental award for $110,000, and including
12 support for all five new project proposals.
13 The one aspect of their request which I think we
14 cannot approve is support beyond the next year for project
15 number five which is their large continuing education medical
16 film and television program. I think Council should look at
17 that project in the context of the triennial application which
18 is expected next year; but otherwise, I concur with the
19 recommendations of the staff anniversary panel.
20 DR. PAHL: Thank you, Dr. Komaroff. Mrs. Mars.
21 MRS. MARS: I certainly concur with the recommen-
22 dations, but I think all their continuing education programs
23 are especially excellent. The only thing that did occur to
24 me in going through the program is the fact that there doesn't
25 seem to be very many programs targeted toward the minority

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 groups and I believe that there's a very large population of
2 Eskimos and Indians. The last project, the Allied Health one,
3 certainly is targeted in that degree, but also, in going
4 through their RAG there doesn't seem to be any representation
5 for minority groups at all. I don't know just what the
6 figures are on the Indian and Eskimo group in population.
7 Does the staff know?

8 MRS. RESNICK: 55,000 in the Alaskan natives.

9 DR. KOMAROFF: Six of the 40 members of their
10 advisory group are designated as minorities, about 12 percent
11 of the total membership.

12 MRS. MARS: They're designated as more or less
13 minority representatives rather than actually minorities.
14 Surely, there must be one educated Indian or one educated
15 Eskimo that could speak for themselves as to their needs, I
16 would think, on the RAG. I felt this was really a very
17 serious lack in the programming and something should be done
18 about it. So I would like to see a directive to that added
19 to the recommendation.

20 Another thing that came to my mind was that there
21 seems to be a concentration of the projects being carried out
22 in Seattle rather than Spokane. There are some certainly
23 headquartered there, but all the activity seems to be centered
24 in Seattle and I wondered why this was. Perhaps because of
25 medical facilities, or what is the reason; and also, a good

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 many of the RAG are mostly concentrated from Seattle.
2 So those were my criticisms more or less in going
3 through the program. It seems that there could be a few more
4 innovative programs started. It looks to me as though they
5 need more airplane service in carrying out health programs and
6 this type of thing. I think it's a very constructive program,
7 very sound program, but I just didn't think it was terribly
8 innovative. So that's my criticism, however, I do concur
9 with the recommendation of the Review Committee.
10 DR. PAHL: Thank you, Mrs. Mars. Are there comments
11 from Council or staff?
12 DR. BRENNAN: Regarding Mrs. Mars' point on
13 representation, I think it certainly is desirable that there
14 be people who can speak with authority about the needs of the
15 minorities; but sometimes the best that you can do is get a
16 missionary or someone of that sort who's working with the
17 people and is very much identified with them if there isn't
18 interest or if there's a lack of -- division amongst the
19 minority groups, which has happened sometimes, so that you
20 can't select one representative without getting other groups
21 angry.
22 So I wonder whether it is as unrepresentative as
23 it looks on surface or whether there are people who really
24 do speak out in an informed and concerned way for the interests
25 of the minority groups in Alaska.

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 MRS. WYCKOFF: I think one of their problems has
2 been the fact that distance of that region is as big as
3 one-third of the whole United States.
4 MRS. MARS: Exactly. That's why I say I think there
5 should be more programming targeted toward servicing, such as
6 airplane services and this type of thing.
7 DR. MARGULIES: In their defense, let me point out
8 what contributions Washington/Alaska has had to the develop-
9 ment of WAMI; and incidentally, Tony, I wonder if you have any
10 feelings about the impact of WAMI on WICHE.
11 (Laughter)
12 DR. MARGULIES: The primary contribution of that
13 program to the development of WAMI is completely relevant to
14 the issues you just raised, Mrs. Mars. What they have
15 designed and for which they have gained the support of the
16 legislatures of all of the states involved, the governors, the
17 leading medical people and so on, is a method of developing a
18 total medical educational system which is based upon prognostic
19 health needs over the next few decades derived from demographic
20 information, extending to the greatest periphery of the Alaska
21 area, taking into account the needs of the Eskimos, looking at
22 the problems of Montana and Idaho as well as Washington and
23 Alaska, was a most imaginative kind of a concept.
24 This has attracted a $1 million grant from the
25 Commonwealth Fund to extend this activity. What they expect

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 to be able to do is place educational activities in areas of
2 service with the hope that people who learn to manage patient
3 care problems in a given environment will remain there and
4 that this will develop local competence which will be fostered
5 over a period of time.
6 The distances are extreme and yet it always
7 surprises me when I talk with people up there how frequently
8 they are in Alaska, for example, and how much they deal with
9 the problems which are there. They haven't done all we would
10 like to have them do, but they are not unaware of these kinds
11 of issues.
12 I think what they're trying to build is more
13 profound and something which will influence events for a
14 long period of time through the so-called WAMI activity.
15 MRS. MARS: Thank you.
16 MRS. WYCKOFF: Could I ask a question about the
17 extent of the Medex program and how it's being used in the
18 RMP program?
19 DR. KOMAROFF: They don't speak to it in the
20 application. I think they have Medex personnel in 14 physician's
21 offices already since the last time I read about that Medex
22 program, but there's no information on it in the application
23 and I have never been to the region.
24 DR. MARGULIES: The Medex program is separately
25 funded by R & D but the working relationships are extremely

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 close there.

2 MRS. WYCKOFF: This is why I was wondering if we

3 were somehow involved in placing them or in any kind of

4 relationship in the outposts.

5 DR. KOMAROFF: Yes.

6 MRS. MARS: Then you have all these Aleuts, too,

7 I don't know how many of them there are, that seem to be

8 absolutely ignored completely.

9 DR. PAHL: Is there further discussion by Council

10 or staff? The motion has been made and seconded to accept the

11 recommendations of the staff anniversary review panel on the

12 Washington/Alaska application. If there's no further dis-

13 cussion, all in favor of the motion, please say "Aye."

14 ("Ayes")

15 DR. PAHL: Opposed?

16 (No Response)

17 DR. PAHL: The motion is carried.

18 The record will show that Mr. Ogden was absent

19 from the room during these proceedings.

20 May we now turn to the last of the anniversary

21 applications, from "West Virginia." Dr. Everist is principal

22 reviewer; Dr. Watkins, backup reviewer; Mrs. Faatz from our

23 staff.

24 DR. EVERIST: This is an anniversary application

25 before triennium and concerns only the region's third

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 operational year. The new review mechanism is particularly
2 applicable and successful forthis region. The staff review
3 and the staff anniversary review panel are in almost total
4 agreement. They differ by $46,771. They both disapprove a
5 developmental component, but the staff review would allow the
6 $46,771 to remain in the approved amount as a supplement to
7 core. The staff anniversary review panel refuses to play.
8 The total amount recommended to the director was $929,810, and
9 this amount has been accepted by him and is presented to
10 Council for confirmation. The developmental component would
11 have been well placed in the five-area liaison offices and
12 probably would have been spent in small amounts of $1,500 or
13 less without approval by the Executive Committee and the
14 advisory group. The two paragraphs describing the spending
15 of this money are vague. I agree that the developmental
16 component can well await the triennial application next year.
17 I would call to Council's attention two of West
18 Virginia's projects that are unique. One is the helicopter
19 feasibility emergency study in Regional Medical Services.
20 This project could well supply information applicable to many
21 rural sections of the country. The project has been terminated,
22 except for a $30,000 request for a part of that project. I
23 sincerely hope the staff will see fit to encourage recon-
24 sideration of this project.
25 The second project of interest is the physicians
self-audit peer review. This project has been slow in getting

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 started, and there have been no audits to date. However, the
2 plan is sound and c-uld well be the prototype for a future
3 system of quality control and continuing education of
4 physicians.
5 There's also a vignette on a project that will be
6 funded with cooperation with lawyers in changing the state
7 law in some areas that the vignettes found interesting; I
8 didn't find it particularly interesting.
9 But I move we accept the recommendation of the
10 director, approving $929,810 for the third operational year.
11 As an aside, for future reference, Council should
12 recognize that West Virginia is a poor state with a paucity of
13 super specialists in all fields. Like Arkansas, they really
14 can't afford a medical school; but they do, and they try, and
15 they are effective. Staffing will always be a problem since
16 Morgantown is isolated from the rest of the world. The West
17 Virginia Regional Medical Program will need your help to make
18 a difference in that rugged state.
19 DR. PAHL: Thank you, Dr. Everist. Dr. Watkins?
20 DR. WATKINS: I concur with Dr. Everist's state-
21 ment.
22 DR. PAHL: Is there Council discussion?
23 DR. DE BAKEY: Let me just say that having spent
24 some time in Morgantown, West Virginia School of Medicine, I
25 really think they deserve the greatest amount of help. It's

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 very difficult situation there to provide the kind of
2 resources that are needed, and yet they make a very strong
3 effort to do so and I've never seen a place that has better
4 spirit among their personnel in their efforts to try to help,
5 and particularly the medical school's faculty in their effort
6 to try to provide community support in taking care of the
7 needs of that region which are difficult to meet.
8 Their funding is quite limited and they've always
9 developed a very good spirit about the Regional Medical
10 Program, and I must say that they deserve all the help that
11 we can give them.
12 DR. PAHL: Thank you, Dr. DeBakey. Is there
13 further discussion from staff or Council? If not, the Chair
14 understands that there is a motion made and seconded by the
15 principal and backup reviewers to accept the recommendations
16 of the panel on the West Virginia application. If there's no
17 further discussion, I'd like the question of all those in
18 favor, please say "Aye."
19 ("Ayes")
20 DR. PAHL: Opposed?
21 (No Response)
22 DR. PAHL: The motion is carried.
23 May we now turn to the last application in the book
24 under Special Action, which is an application from Missouri,
25 and we have asked Dr. Komaroff to be the principal reviewer;

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 Dr. McPhedran to be the backup reviewer; Miss Houseal from our
2 staff.
3 DR. KOMAROFF: This is a request for a small amount
4 of money that has an importance beyond that sum. Because of
5 the new members of the Council may not be familiar with the
6 saga of this Regional Medical Program, particularly its
7 computer efforts, let me just briefly refresh our minds on the
8 history.
9 From 1967 to '70, the region under the leadership
10 of Dr. Wilson, established eight computer bioengineering
11 projects which were funded at a level of approximately
12 $2 million each year. Site visits in October of 1968 and
13 1969 by computer experts and others raised serious about much
14 of this effort but recognized the potential of some of it.
15 Although the original plan called for a three-year
16 effort, the Council at that point, two years ago, agreed to
17 an additional year's support at a level of $1 million,
18 guaranteeing no support beyond July '71 but not foreclosing
19 the possibility of support either.
20 Another site visit in March of this year felt that
21 the maximum support for a fifth year could be justified
22 purely on technical bases and not on any other overall
23 considerations, would be $600,000. The Council, acting last
24 spring, reduced this level to $300,000 roughly. $150,000 of
25 that money was for the Bass project which is at issue today.

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 I want to point out that that project requested only $150,000
2 and was the only part of the Missouri application to be
3 funded -- approved and funded at the level requested. All
4 other parts of the application were reduced.
5 What is the Bass project? Well, it is an attempt
6 to move out into a rural practitioner's office, a solo
7 practitioner, several of the computer efforts which had been
8 developed individually over the last three to four years.
9 These included an automated history project and computerized
10 EKG interpretation project, a biomedical information project
11 which allows for the instant or relatively rapid retrieval
12 of information for a practitioner, and a radiology interpre-
13 tation project and a multiphasic screening project which
14 really is a blood chemistry screening project.
15 Now, the request for a special action before you
16 today results from a series of unusual actions taken by the
17 region and I think these raise in themselves some serious
18 procedural issues.
19 First of all, the region appears to have made a
20 deliberate decision at the time of receiving this award last
21 July to overspend beyond its $150,000 budget in the 12-month
22 period. They did not let the RMPS staff know about this
23 decision, however, until November or October of this year, at
24 which point they said, "We'll be out of money in six months
25 and we'll need $150,000 more."

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 They then sent in a request in which they did not
2 state how the money that had been spent in six months had
3 been spent other than to say "Improvements beyond those
4 anticipated initially had been done," and they gave very few
5 details as to how the additional $150,000 requested would be
6 spent.
7 There was an "other" item on the budget, a line
8 item for $80,000 for "other," which was obviously computer
9 and information transmission charges which was really not
10 itemized.
11 There are also some more fundamental problems
12 beyond the procedural ones. There has been no evaluation of
13 the project goals of improving quality or efficiency and none
14 is yet contemplated. Furthermore, none of the component
15 projects which have been ongoing now for four and a half years
16 have been evaluated and there is no -- we asked the region
17 within the last few days whether there was any ongoing
18 evaluation proposed, and they indicated that there was not.
19 Furthermore, there's no sense in the supplemental
20 request here as to their view of the relative worth of these
21 five subcomponent projects. They don't deal with the issue
22 raised by Council last time of whether putting all of this
23 machinery into solo practitioner's office in a rural area
24 could ever become cost effective and whether that's the kind
25 of setting in which the experiment should be tried; and they

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 don't discuss in their formal application any plans for how
2 they would continue this effort or in what kind of setting
3 next year. They have subsequently responded to our questions
4 by indicating several possibilities toward other rural
5 settings, one multispecialty practice in Columbia, but none
6 of these are developed beyond a sentence or two description.
7 Another complicating factor has been that Dr. Bass,
8 the physician in whose office these activities are located,
9 had a second myocardial infarction this fall and has been out
10 of practice and will be until the first of the year. Three
11 physicians have taken over on an interim basis and are using
12 to some degree the component projects.
13 Now, there were some encouraging signs that was
14 evident in the responses to our questions. There is a
15 preliminary market survey being done on the information system
16 which has been called Fact Bank which indicates there's a
17 high level of interest among physicians in the state and that
18 this might become self-supporting in a year or two. The EKG
19 effort also appears to be attracting national recognition,
20 particularly in Sanazaro's shop, and its leader, Dr. Russell
21 Sandberg, is outstanding; but it still has not solved the
22 problems of recognizing arrhythmias, particularly P waves;
23 still has not solved the problem of recognizing ischemia
24 changes in ST segments, depressions and elevations.
25 DR. BRENNAN: What has it solved?

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 DR. KOMAROFF: Dr. Bass uses the project but every
2 computerized interpretation is concurrently interpreted by a
3 cardiologist and this joint interpretation will apparently
4 continue for the next year or two.
5 The radiology project has proved its worth as an
6 in-hospital aid to a radiologist, but its meaning in a
7 setting of a rural general practitioner's office is not
8 apparent to me.
9 Therefore, my recommendation is that Council deny
10 this request for additional funding, but not deny the region
11 the option of rebudgeting within its overall $2 million grant
12 into this activity to keep it alive if the region really
13 believes that this is what it wants to do.
14 Before defending this recommendation, let me
15 raise several problems which could arise in taking this
16 action. The first is that the regions says if we do so that
17 the whole effort will die and that $7 million of activities
18 will -- much of it will have gone down the drain.
19 The other possible objection is that our action
20 might run counter to the interest in health technology
21 expressed yesterday in which I think all of us have a great
22 deal of hope. Nevertheless, I think the acquiescing to the
23 unusual procedures that result in this request for special
24 action and the more fundamental questions that I have dis-
25 cussed, make it reasonable to deny the request; and it's my

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 personal belief, from having seen the region make similar
2 statements in the past as to what would happen if funding
3 requests were denied or reduced, is that in fact the effort
4 will continue as the other efforts for which they requested
5 $1 million this year have continued despite a $200,000 budget.
6 I raise the possibility that perhaps this whole
7 effort has now reached a stage where it could be more
8 reasonably supported on a contract rather than a grant basis,
9 so that tighter control of the activity could be instigated.
10 A contract from where, I do not know; perhaps from RMP or
11 elsewhere. There's obviously a great deal of money down the
12 pike for this kind of activity and Missouri has a great deal
13 of competence in the area.
14 DR. PAHL: Thank you, Dr. Komaroff. Dr. McPhedran?
15 DR. MC PHEDRAN: I just emphatically concur.
16 DR. KOMAROFF: That's a motion.
17 DR. CANNON: Tony, you mentioned several times that
18 the information was absolutely lacking or not displayed or
19 something. Are we sure that we've made the effort, our RMPS
20 staff has made the effort to see that any lack of information
21 is being brought forth? I just want to make sure because if
22 this moves up the line there might be some things -- well,
23 repercussions.
24 DR. KOMAROFF: I had an opportunity to look at this
25 material a week and a half ago and Dr. McPhedran did, too; and

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 we asked Donna Houseal, who was out in Missouri the last five
2 days, to raise a whole host of questions. It took about an
3 hour to transmit them over the telephone. We have back a
4 series of replies, much of which I've incorporated into my
5 comments, but none of which answers the fundamental questions
6 which were posed through Miss Houseal.

7 MISS HOUSEAL: Dr. Cannon, an extensive advice
8 letter went out to this region after last Council review.
9 I've had continuing conversations with this region since then
10 about the points raised at that time, so there's been a
11 continuing dialogue with this region almost weekly about these
12 activities. They are aware of our concerns.

13 DR. PAHL: Is there further discussion?

14 DR. BRENNAN: An interesting sidelight on this,
15 there's a fellow by the name of Jack something or other who is
16 in Vern Wilson's office, and he's in charge of biomedical
17 technological development and that group and he's written a
18 number of books on the subject.

19 DR. PAHL: Dr. Jack Brown?

20 DR. BRENNAN: Yes, Dr. Jack Brown. He was out to
21 the Engineering Society in Detroit last week addressing their
22 biomedical committee, and to hear Jack talk, it appeared that
23 there was great feeling on the part of everyone down here that
24 schemes like the Bass project had a great deal of support and
25 that much was to be looked for from them.

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 I took occasion to ask him a few questions about
2 the impact of this project at that meeting, but I would say
3 that it's clear to me that there are in various quarters
4 great enthusiasm for this type of effort.
5 Now, I hesitated, though, to see RMP so much
6 identified with what I would call an instrument-determined
7 type of activity in a public way. It made the papers all
8 over Detroit and it's going to complicate our lives no end
9 in the RMP in Michigan. I note that this is described as
10 favorable publicity, this project, if someone puts some
11 quotation marks around it; and I would, for one, like to see
12 a little downplaying of this until we're sure that we're not
13 all going to be embarrassed by what $7 million in expenditures
14 has yielded.
15 DR. PAHL: Thank you, Dr. Brennan. Is there
16 further discussion?
17 MRS. WYCKOFF: What's the early history of the
18 planning of this in terms of reporting systems and how did it
19 get into this condition?
20 DR. KOMAROFF: Well, at an early stage -- there are
21 other people on the Council that can answer this much better --
22 in the early stage in RMP's history, there was a good deal of
23 money to spend and there was a great deal of magnetism and
24 enthusiasm on the part of Dr. Wilson in the area of health
25 technology in which I think everyone shared, and he said he

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 could get and, in fact, he did get a very large and very
2 ambitious effort off the ground in short order that has
3 produced some very nice results.
4 MRS. WYCKOFF: What about the reporting and the
5 evaluating and the reviewing and the record of annual
6 accomplishments on this particular thing? You seem to have
7 had correspondence just recently about it and I wondered what
8 happened a year ago and two years ago?
9 DR. KOMAROFF: Well, we site visited three or four
10 times during this period and the questions that I have alluded
11 to were raised at each point, and the decision was made that
12 this was a new area and there was promise to protect and that
13 certain investments should be continued. It phased down
14 substantially after the third year; first, $1 million and
15 then, closer to half a million dollars; but there was constant
16 feedback I think -- Miss Houseal can speak to that -- between
17 the Division and the region during this period.
18 DR. PAHL: Donna, may we have Dr. Millikan's
19 comments? I think he was trying to get a statement in.
20 DR. MILLIKAN: This is in partial response to your
21 question, Florence. When this idea was brought to the Council
22 originally, the decision to fund it was made under the word
23 "experiment," and it was decided that the funding of this
24 computer research or research concerning computer applicability
25 to medical practice and medical service should not be construed

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 as a precedent for this Council at all, but that we wanted to
2 see what an organization could do with this kind of an
3 experiment; and several of you will recall that we funded a
4 number of different kinds of experiments. There was one
5 having to do with intensive cardiac care unit linkage, for
6 instance, in which we bought them the computer, etc., as an
7 experiment.

8 In the original grant action, it was decided that
9 approximately three years after that action there should be
10 full evaluation of the results of this experiment and the
11 project site visits, as I understand them -- I haven't been on
12 any of them -- but as I understand them, have addressed
13 themselves to that kind of evaluation; and it simply was
14 determined that the original described possibilities of the
15 experiment had not been fulfilled.

16 So I don't think there's any great chagrin about
17 that because as we understood the whole issue at that point in
18 time, it was an honest use of the word "experiment." In other
19 words, the results of it were not predetermined and we didn't
20 know what they would be able to accomplish in that experiment,
21 any more than in some of the others that have gone on. There
22 have been a series of these kinds of things take place. My
23 own institution and Lockheed conducted one where millions of
24 dollars have been spent and it has not come off either, I
25 might say, in terms of producing a result in terms of an

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 automated history, automated record system, etc., etc.

2 So that's a little bit of Council background.

3 DR. DE BAKEY: May I ask how much total money --

4 do you have any idea of how much total money RMP has spent in

5 all of these computer projects that we did approve and then

6 called a halt on in terms of evaluation?

7 DR. MARGULIES: We gathered some data on that. Ed,

8 do you recall offhand how much we spent? It's a very signifi-

9 cant sum of money. We can pull it together again for you.

10 DR. DE BAKEY: The reason I'm asking is that I'm

11 wondering if RMP hasn't invested enough money now to be able

12 to say, well, this justifies a thorough review in trying to

13 determine just what has been accomplished by it. The reason

14 I say this is because I know that there is a strong interest

15 on the part of Jack Brown and people in Vern Wilson's office

16 to move this program ahead and invest more money in the

17 clinical application of computer engineering for health-related

18 activities.

19 Having some interest in this area and having

20 actually a research program of my own, which is a research

21 program really designed to try and determine just how best to

22 apply this technology, I have been a little concerned with

23 this effort to push ahead in the application of this requiring

24 huge sums of money and yet, with no good evidence that I have

25 seen anyway -- and certainly in our own program that I've been

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 able to see -- for justifying that expenditure of funds.

2 Now, it seems to me that the Regional Medical

3 Program has made a serious effort to experiment in this

4 field. We set up a program. We had a policy about it. We

5 said we're not going to spend any more money in this area

6 until we find out just what can be accomplished. It seems to

7 me, not only from a standpoint of the Regional Medical Program,

8 but also from the standpoint of the total federal funds that

9 are being expended in this area, it would serve a useful

10 purpose to have a good, in-depth study, a special study, by

11 the Regional Medical Program of what has come out of the funds

12 that we've put into this area.

13 DR. MARGULIES: Yesterday we described briefly two

14 efforts which are now underway to look at two major aspects

15 of it. One of them is ECG monitoring, and we have a study

16 which we'll be able to report to the Council next time; and

17 the other is on so-called multiphasic health testing which is

18 also undergoing study and we'll be reporting back to the

19 Council. But these are only parts of what we're talking

20 about.

21 DR. DE BAKEY: These are rather special parts

22 and they can perhaps be evaluated specifically and separately,

23 but I'm talking about the broadly designed type of program

24 such as the one in Missouri, which is a very good example,

25 and a few others, in which the technology is designed to, in a

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 sense, replace or to make more efficient the sort of diagnosis
2 and management of disease and illnesses and computerized
3 history, physical examination and the diagnosis, going on even
4 to treatment.
5 There has been a tremendous amount of money that's
6 already been put into this, particularly in terms of even
7 computerized or closing of loops, so-called, in treatment that
8 hasn't panned out at all. It seems to me we have spent enough
9 money to be able now to justify spending a little more money
10 to do a really thorough study of this. Enough time has
11 elapsed. This has gone on for over three years now. It seems
12 to me that the Council should request -- and this is really
13 what I am asking -- if we haven't reached the point where we
14 can request such a study be made. And I don't much care how
15 the Director designs or develops the study. I think I would
16 leave this entirely up to you, but I think it would be very
17 worthwhile to do.
18 DR. BRENNAN: It seems to me that I would certainly
19 like to second the motion of Dr. DeBakey, and in this sense:
20 I think we did look at another areas that has been consuming
21 a large part of our investment and had been under operation
22 for a while. We took a tack of convening a conference on
23 multiphasic screening and we came out with a review of the
24 problem and brought it back to Council.
25 I think that it's high time that, by this means or

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 some other, that Council be presented with a studied result
2 of these things before we even make a final decision on this.
3 Now, the reason I'd like to do that is because I
4 recognize the wide interest that there is in many engineering
5 schools and in many ranks of government in this kind of
6 effort, and I believe that if we take Galbraith seriously
7 when he says it took American Airlines $30 million, along
8 with IBM, to develop their reservations system for just giving
9 tickets at the airline counter, we have to realize that
10 perhaps what looks to us like a very large investment may be
11 the kind of investment you have to make in order to pass to
12 the point where you can use this kind of technology effectively.
13 But our problem now is that we have to decide
14 where we're at. Do we know enough to abandon this or should
15 we concentrate the effort in perhaps 910 or something else,
16 and keep it going even though it is expensive, because we can
17 reasonably anticipate a very large system benefit out of it
18 when it's done?
19 DR. MARGULIES: Well, in fact, I think the idea
20 is not only an important and useful one, but I would like to
21 believe, particularly in light of the reorganization that was
22 described yesterday, that we can expand that effort and bring
23 back some level of understanding to the Council of activities
24 which are not only in RMP but in other parts of the whole
25 structure that we work with; and I think we can move toward

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 that kind of a goal. R&D has been in it; Community Health
2 Services; NIMH; they all have these investments; and I would
3 be delighted to puch this concept with Riso and with Dr.
4 Wilson so that we can begin to get a sense of the state of
5 the art and progress and failure and so forth and know what
6 we're doing.

7 DR. BRENNAN: Exactly what we did with multiphasic
8 screening, and I think it helped us a great deal, and I think
9 we have to do that now and spend a part of one of the next
10 sessions, an hour or so, discussing such a report that we've
11 had a chance to look into before we get to the meeting.

12 DR. SCHREINER: What would you propose to do with
13 this proposal?

14 DR. BRENNAN: Defer it.

15 DR. SCHREINER: Defer action?

16 DR. MARGULIES: It won't work.

17 DR. DE BAKEY: That would mean that you're not
18 going to give them the money. As I understand it, it's an
19 emergency situation, isn't it?

20 DR. KOMAROFF: Right. From January 1st through
21 June 30th, they won't have any additional money. The question
22 is whether they can redirect money that they have in their
23 overall grant into this activity.

24 DR. DE BAKEY: I don't see any reason to defer it.
25 You have made a motion which seems to me a positive motion.

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 It's just a question of whether or not we want to approve
2 that motion.
3 DR. BRENNAN: Well, I feel it would be more
4 prudent for us to think this thing out. I think that the
5 proposition of turning this into a contract, perhaps a 910
6 contract, appeals to me more than shutting off something in
7 which we have invested $7 million.
8 DR. DE BAKEY: Well, his motion doesn't really shut
9 it off. It simply says "find the money within your own
10 budget."
11 DR. KOMAROFF: There's no reason why we couldn't
12 make this explicit that this shouldn't be interpreted as a
13 bias toward a future request for money.
14 DR. PAHL: Are you ready for the question?
15 DR. CANNON: We did substantially cut that funding,
16 though, you see, so that they may not -- it may not be easy
17 for them to redirect funds. I mean, they are on a budget
18 which is substantially lower than they had contemplated, you
19 remember, not even enough to continue the salaried physicians
20 that they had.
21 DR. BRENNAN: They could end up, given their
22 fixation on this program, cutting out things that we really
23 think are important in order to keep it operating. That's a
24 problem with this. We know the way that Regional Advisory
25 Group feels about this thing. It's obviously been a kingpin

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 of their program right from the outset. So I think what
2 you're really saying is that they're going to cut other
3 programs in order to do this.

4 DR. MC PHEDRAN: I wonder whether we really do
5 know how they feel about it, because I would have thought that
6 if they felt that strongly about it that the repeated
7 suggestion that they show us some evaluation would have been
8 followed. The suggestions are after every site visit. How
9 do they feel about it? The impression that we have gotten is
10 that this present request and the decision, as Dr. Komaroff
11 says, overspend for the last six months, really were -- support
12 for the idea really of doing it really was gotten because of
13 some favorable publicity for this project. So I really wonder
14 whether we're misinterpreting strong feelings of the Regional
15 Advisory Group. I wonder if that isn't putting it a little
16 too strongly.

17 MRS. MARS: Is there any possibility of getting
18 funds from any other source to carry it on?

19 DR. KOMAROFF: Some of the activities have already
20 gotten funds from other sources, V.A.

21 MRS. MARS: I mean this project.

22 DR. KOMAROFF: The region apparently pursued other
23 sources of funding within HSMHA before indicating to us that
24 they had to request an additional $150,000.

25 DR. MARGULIES: Let me also remind you that one of

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 the implications of Dr. Komaroff's report -- two of them --
2 one of them is that what they're asking for is money to carry
3 them through until the end of the fiscal year with no indi-
4 cation of what happens thereafter, so one can assume that
5 there will be a continued request for RMPS support for this;
6 and not only that, but this carries with it at least a verbal
7 intent to expand that activity into other settings. So it
8 would very possibly lead to a multiplication of these kinds of
9 activities within the Missouri Regional Medical Program. That
10 has not yet been presented but there has been a clear state-
11 ment they'd like to move it into a multi-member practice
12 setting, etc.
13 DR. PAHL: Donna, do you have anything further to
14 add?
15 MISS HOUSEAL: I just want to concur with Dr.
16 Margulies' comments. I discussed with the region their plans
17 for these activities for the next one to three years, and they
18 have two budget plans for next year; the larger one, which
19 would include approximately a $1.4 million request for these
20 types of activities, would include field testing it in a
21 community hospital setting, and two group specialty settings,
22 and then possibly, also, putting a module in a small community
23 without a physician and linking it to Dr. Bass' office.
24 DR. PAHL: Thank you. Is there further discussion
25 on the motion? If not, the motion is for disapproval of the

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 request by Missouri. All in favor of the motion, please say
2 "Aye."
3 ("Ayes")
4 DR. PAHL: Opposed?
5 DR. BRENNAN: No.
6 DR. CANNON: No.
7 DR. PAHL: Two opposed. The motion is carried.
8 MR. OGDEN: Would it not be appropriate immediately
9 following this action for the adoption of the motion along the
10 lines that Dr. DeBakey has suggested; that there be an analysis
11 of this whole sort of thing now done?
12 DR. DE BAKEY: You make it and I would second it.
13 MR. OGDEN: I will make such a motion.
14 DR. DE BAKEY: I second it.
15 DR. PAHL: Does the Chair understand the motion to
16 be an analysis by staff of the current state of activity of
17 our overall effort in this area?
18 MR. OGDEN: Yes.
19 DR. DE BAKEY: Yes.
20 DR. PAHL: All right. You've heard the motion.
21 DR. DE BAKEY: Well, I think an analysis designed
22 by staff. Let me be sure that youunderstand that I'm
23 interested, and I hope the Council would be interested, in
24 having the Director determine how best to do this and call
25 upon whatever resources he may wish to do it.

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 MRS. WYCKOFF: And could we have a report at the
2 next meeting?
3 DR. PAHL: Yes. This would be an agenda item at
4 our next Council meeting.
5 DR. KOMAROFF: Is it understood that the motion
6 includes a statement that this should not be construed as the
7 final dismissal of this kind of activity in Missouri, but only
8 a denial of a specific request for additional funds?
9 DR. PAHL: Yes. This is the understanding of the
10 motion.
11 DR. BRENNAN: Would it be possible for Council to
12 sit still for the suggestion that having done this with
13 respect to a regular grant application that they've made to
14 us, that we transfer this function to a contract arrangement
15 under 910 and negotiate with Missouri to determine the funding
16 required under such a contract for the supervised continuance
17 of this general program on an interim basis until June?
18 DR. CANNON: Not until we hear the results of the
19 study.
20 DR. BRENNAN: Well, wait. All I'm proposing in
21 this is that we remove this from a loosely administered
22 relationship with RMP central office. This thing, after all,
23 has inter-regional significance if it ever works out, and it
24 seems to me that it's the kind of thing that you could contract
25 for under a 910.

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 Now, if we no longer follow the loose structure
2 that apparently hasn't worked out well in terms of getting us
3 reports and real status on what has been accomplished or even
4 a control of what's been accomplished, move over into a
5 contract mechanism and put a good contract officer on it;
6 wouldn't we then kind of have the best of both worlds? We
7 wouldn't tape down the team that's operating here. We
8 wouldn't lose the impetus of the program if subsequently we
9 judged that it is good; and at the same time, we would have
10 given the region a message that there's going to have to be a
11 different approach to the administration and evaluation of
12 this effort.
13 I think that this would be a prudent compromise
14 for us to make in view of the high levels of interest amongst
15 people with policy-making authority on medical development
16 work in the government at the present time. I don't see any
17 reason not to try to accommodate ourselves to the division
18 of people who are certainly as bright as we are about the
19 potentiality of these things and overrule them, in essence,
20 here.
21 DR. DE BAKEY: It's hard for me to believe that
22 the interest is that high at that level that they couldn't
23 find $150,000 for this.
24 DR. BRENNAN: Well, I'm sure that Sanazaro could
25 write him a contract just like that.

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 DR. DE BAKEY: That's exactly the point I'm making
2 and I'm sure they have already gone to that source. I would
3 say it would be more prudent for us to await the assessment of
4 this study before we make any decision of any kind one way or
5 the other. That's another reason why I think it's important
6 to make this study. After all, if there is that kind of
7 interest at the level you're talking about, I'm sure that
8 within that area they could find money to survive, $150,000.
9 DR. MILLIKAN: Well, I was just going to say in a
10 sense this activity is the Missouri RMP, and I don't know how
11 much of that we want to contract andhow much we want to keep
12 in the traditional pattern of support for an RMP. You see
13 what I'm getting at? I think it would be wise to hear the
14 report of our study and then make a decision about whether we
15 want to support it at current levels or an increased level or
16 whatever.
17 DR. MARGULIES: I think that at the very least you
18 have offered us some alternatives and some negotiating
19 instruments. There are a variety of ways in which we could
20 pursue the contract issue with RMPS funds, with other kinds
21 of funds. If the level of interest is high enough and the
22 contract route seems reasonable, then I agree it should not
23 be difficult to locate the funds to continue it.
24 MRS. WYCKOFF: Do you need a resolution for a
25 contract if we decide that it's necessary?

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 DR. MARGULIES: No.

2 DR. BRENNAN: I'd ask whether you wanted to enter-
3 tain such a motion. There is no formal motion on the floor.

4 MR. MILLIKEN: Don't we have a motion to study
5 this thing?

6 DR. PAHL: Yes. All in favor of the motion to
7 conduct a study and report the progress of the design of the
8 study to the Council at the next meeting, please say "Aye."

9 ("Aye")

10 DR. PAHL: Opposed?

11 (No Response)

12 DR. PAHL: The motion is carried.

13 May we adjourn and get our coffee and doughnuts,
14 and then following coffee, we will primarily be concerned
15 with the "kidney proposals" and some items of business from
16 yesterday.

17 (Recess)

18 DR. PAHL: May we reconvene, please.

19 DR. MARGULIES: We have some other issues which we
20 must address at the present time. I'd like to have just a
21 quick report back to you on one of the questions that was
22 raised before the coffee break. During the '67-70 period of
23 RMP, if you combined automated technology and other major
24 equipment purchases, the total comes to over $18.4 million.
25 This seems to be large enough to justify some understanding

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 of what we got out of it.

2 Ohio underwent some discussion yesterday and we

3 agreed that since they have made the proposed changes that I

4 reported to you that we would ask two members of the Council

5 and, if we can, one member of the Review Committee who pre-

6 viously visited the region, to go out there. I have asked

7 Bruce Everist and Clark Millikan, who have done something

8 similar for us, to again perform that kind of a duty in Ohio

9 and they agreed. One of the people who was on the previous

10 site visit from the Review Committee was George Miller, and

11 if we can get him to join the team we can get some information

12 reported back to you.

13 Now, we also have distributed for you to consider

14 with the understanding that it was well-written, I altered

15 it slightly and it was less well-written as a consequence, a

16 resolution -- or not really so much a resolution as a proposed

17 Council action regarding the creation of a cancer center in

18 the northwest part of the United States. I think maybe we

19 should read it aloud for the record, which I'll be glad to do.

20 "The National Advisory Council on Regional Medical

21 Programs approves the granting of $5 million for the con-

22 struction of a cancer center located in a major medical

23 center in the area served by HEW Region X.

24 "The Center, while it is to be an independent,

25 nonprofit corporation, should have, to ensure its perpetuity

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 and achieve its ultimate objectives, organizational relation-
2 ships with a University Health Science Center and other
3 medical educational, training and research facilities in
4 Public Health Service Region X.

5 "In addition, liaison and coordination with the
6 Regional Medical Programs in its area and with the CHP (a)
7 agencies in the various states in Region X should be fostered.

8 "To fulfill its unique potential for making
9 available to those persons suffering from neoplastic diseases
10 subject to curative intervention through cooperative multi-
11 disciplinary treatment efforts in the area, a mechanism for
12 communication, interaction and cooperation with existing
13 cancer research and cancer related agencies in the region,
14 including the existing medical services and the hospitals and
15 voluntary societies, should be developed.

16 "The Center should be recognized as a regional
17 cooperative cancer center rather than the single most
18 important institution in its field, and every effort should
19 be made to ensure adequate regional representation at the
20 Center.

21 "The Center's planning and programs should have a
22 goal of making feasible for all persons in need of cancer
23 treatment facilities available at a humanistic level.

24 "Other goals of this facility should be education
25 of all health professionals for, and the coordination,

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 research and demonstration of, optimal patient care in the
2 field of cancer treatment. This Center would be the
3 appropriate recipient of a grant from the National Advisory
4 Council on Regional Medical Programs insofar as these
5 objectives are equally pursued.

6 "This Center would have the function of focusing
7 on the problems of cancer research and cancer treatment all
8 the relevant resources of the advanced technological community
9 of the northwest region of the United States.

10 "The National Advisory Council recommends that this
11 Center include on its Board a representative group of
12 recognized leaders in the field of cancer in its region, and,
13 further, that it convene to advise a Regional Cancer Council
14 comprised of persons throughout Region X as well as a
15 Scientific Committee to coordinate cancer research, education
16 and service and promote regional cooperative arrangements.

17 "And finally, the National Advisory Council
18 recommends that the efforts sponsored by this Center be
19 afforded the advantage of periodic review and consultation by
20 an Advisory Committee of nationally and internationally
21 recognized authorities in this field."

22 DR. MERRILL: Should we include in this some
23 statement about provision for its continuing operational
24 funding; that it is our understanding that additional
25 arrangements for its continued operational funding?

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 DR. DE BAKEY: Harold, I presume you have already
2 discussed the basis of this and I'm not familiar with it and
3 I don't want to waste the time of everybody, but the only
4 question I would ask is, is this setting a precedent for the
5 Regional Medical Program? I don't mind setting it. I'm not
6 questioning whether or not we should. Personally, I think
7 it's great. In fact, I'm glad to see us set a precedent.
8 DR. MARGULIES: Right. I see no reason not to regard
9 it as precedent-setting. I think the one thing that has not
10 clearly been in here and which Dr. Merrill appropriately
11 brought up is some statement regarding the necessity for an
12 effective source of funding and technical assistance to main-
13 tain the professional activities within this Center after it
14 has been constructed of the kind, of course, that the National
15 Cancer Institute could provide; and we could add that kind of
16 wording.
17 DR. DE BAKEY: That's good.
18 DR. EVERIST: With that added, I move we accept
19 this.
20 DR. DE BAKEY: Second.
21 DR. MARGULIES: With that addition, the motion is
22 that this be accepted. It's been moved and seconded. Any
23 further discussion? All in favor, say "Aye."
24 ("Ayes")
25 DR. MARGULIES: Opposed?
(No Response)

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 DR. MARGULIES: Thank you.

2 DR. PAHL: We have before us in terms of formal
3 applications the "kidney proposals" which were deferred from
4 yesterday's consideration and I would like to now return to
5 those, the first one being that from Arizona; and if I might
6 just ask Dr. Schreiner and Dr. Merrill to lead the discussion
7 and make appropriate motions on these kidney applications which
8 remain before us.

9 DR. EVERIST: Does that require action?

10 DR. PAHL: Yes. These are parts of the formal
11 requests of the regions which were not taken up yesterday in
12 the motions. We have three from yesterday which were not
13 acted upon, and then three supplemental kidney proposals.

14 DR. EVERIST: All right.

15 DR. PAHL: Dr. Schreiner, may I ask you to start
16 the discussion on the "Arizona" kidney proposal?

17 DR. SCHREINER: I thought in this instance the
18 general review of the Ad Hoc Panel on Renal Disease was
19 satisfactory. They have had a rapid buildup in good personnel
20 in this area, I suppose the most outstanding person being
21 David Ogden who has moved there from the University of
22 Colorado at Denver.

23 DR. MERRILL: And Stokowsky.

24 DR. SCHREINER: Yes, Stokowsky also. I think they
25 have got the professional capability of mounting a good program.

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

The site visitors recommended approval with some budget modification, and they particularly threw out the physician education component which apparently would not be one of the strongest aspects of their proposal.

I thought maybe we ought to have some discussion about the loan program because it seemed to me that this was rather summarily dismissed by the Review Committee. What they're proposing is kind of a, as far as I know, innovative -- but I haven't been here too long -- in that they're proposing a revolving loan setup with a bank, properly supervised, in order to initiate transplant, with the idea that the rehabilitated patient then will pay back out of his earnings, if he is rehabilitated. This is kind of a positive feedback system that appeals to me, if workable, and I wonder if other people had some views, whether this would be a workable experimentation.

DR. MERRILL: They do state in their discussion of that that there is no guarantee that the total amount of the loan would be repaid, and that would put us in the position of paying, at least in part, directly for patient care; and I think that's almost exactly what would happen; and that may be the reason for the unfavorable look at it.

I would agree with George on that. They do have good people. Their ideas are good. I think the Ad Hoc Committee has quite correctly thrown out not only the physician

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 education, but the so-called detection program, which is a very
2 difficult one to implement and get any meaningful data from.
3 But the rest of it I think certainly bears support
4 and I would agree with the recommendation of the Ad Hoc
5 Committee.
6 DR. PAHL: Is there a motion?
7 DR. SCHREINER: I move to approve.
8 DR. PAHL: There is a motion to approve the
9 recommendations of the site visitors for the kidney proposal
10 in the Arizona application. Is there further discussion by
11 Council? If not, all in favor of the motion, please say "Aye."
12 ("Ayes")
13 DR. PAHL: Opposed?
14 (No Response)
15 DR. PAHL: The motion is carried.
16 Dr. Merrill, would you please lead the discussion
17 on the "Colorado/Wyoming" triennial application kidney proposal?
18 DR. MERRILL: I must confess that when I looked at
19 that review yesterday I was unimpressed, but the original
20 application I think gives a much fuller description of what
21 they're trying to do. I had initially envisaged simply from
22 the summary that what they were going to do was to set out to
23 dialyze children as an end in itself, which I would heartily
24 disagree with and I think Dr. Schreiner would, too; but they're
25 not, if one reads the full proposal.

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 They are going to have cooperation with Colorado
2 Transplantation Center and that certainly has a tremendous
3 capability, and although they do not mention the people
4 involved by name, I'm sure that they are going to get involved
5 in that -- I'm sorry, they do here -- so that would complete
6 my approval of it.
7 Now, some question was raised about the fact as to
8 whether or not there should be separate facilities for children,
9 and I'm absolutely convinced there should. Our own experience
10 leads us to believe that it's just impossible to take care of
11 six-year-old kids in an adult ward.
12 They do have a good pediatrician in charge. They
13 have all the capabilities for dialysis and transplantation, and
14 I think the experience in California with pediatric transplan-
15 tation done under the supervision of pediatricians has been a
16 good one, as perhaps opposed to our own; and I would think
17 this was well worthwhile.
18 DR. PAHL: Thank you. Dr. Schreiner?
19 DR. SCHREINER: When we discussed this, as you
20 remember, we talked about the number of beds and I've since
21 had a chance to discuss this with staff, and apparently this
22 unit is continguous with an acute unit, and while funds are
23 not being sought for the acute unit, the actual arrangement of
24 nurses is going to be such that they will be or can be spread
25 over an adjacent unit, so that helps a little bit.

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 DR. PAHL: The Chair understands that there is a
2 motion for approval and it has been seconded for acceptance of
3 the site visit team recommendations on Project 29 of the
4 Colorado/Wyoming application. Is there further discussion by
5 Council? If not, all in favor of the motion, please say "Aye."
6 ("Ayes")
7 DR. PAHL: Opposed?
8 (No Response)
9 DR. PAHL: The motion is carried.
10 The last one which was deferred from yesterday,
11 Dr. Schreiner, is the "Ohio Valley" kidney proposal, and I wonder
12 if you would lead the discussion on that.
13 DR. SCHREINER: Well, to be perfectly honest with
14 you, I'm not wild about mobile transport units for organs.
15 They might work in a close geographical area, but it seems to
16 me that the goal of most of what we're doing -- for example,
17 the goal of the southeastern network, and the negotiations
18 that have gone on with other multiregional programs -- suggests
19 that motion be in the other direction; and that is to enlarge
20 the dialysis applicant pool or candidate pool if we're going
21 to seriously try to apply typing; and if you're goingto do
22 that, the idea of having a truck just doesn't work. You have
23 to be able to fly them around to the various areas and you
24 have to get them there in a reasonable hurry and there's a lot
25 of portable containers that are suitable for this activity.

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 It's true you can't profuse them, but I guess some of the new
2 smaller incubates -- maybe John has had some experience with--
3 they're a small fraction of the size of a Belsor and it may be
4 that they would be suitable even for air transportation with
5 profusion going on. But at the present time, it seems to me
6 that you tie up a fairly large piece of expensive equipment
7 that's only working a small part of the time.
8 I think of the difficulties that we've had locally
9 here funding the Heartmobile and how you can drive by that
10 hospital many times and see it parked there in the driveway
11 doing nothing. It does some things, but it's a lot of
12 expensive equipment to have for the short time that it's being
13 used. I'm not too warm about that.
14 DR. PAHL: Are you making a specific motion?
15 DR. SCHREINER: I'd like to hear John first.
16 DR. MERRILL: I think in general I would agree with
17 you. I think the California experience has shown pretty clearly
18 that with simple profusion and cooling alone you can get eight
19 hours survivals and good function, and the Belsor apparatus
20 will take you up to 48 hours or even longer sometimes; and it
21 seems to me that their program should be pretty well established
22 before they can document the need for preservation beyond six
23 or eight hour period.
24 If they can do that, they're really getting into
25 more than a regional; they're getting into almost a -- if you

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 need to hold something for 48 hours, you can fly it to
2 Australia if need be. So I agree, that I would rather see
3 documentation of the necessity for this and have them show us
4 the fact that they cannot do it with simply eight hour preser-
5 vation.

6 For instance, we have had kidneys from Rochester and
7 as far as Minneapolis which have not been put on the Belsor
8 type of apparatus.

9 DR. SCHREINER: This year, here in Washington, we've
10 had transplants from Atlanta, Charlottesville, Chapel Hill,
11 Richmond and Baltimore since last January, and we flew most of
12 them in on commercial airlines. The one from Atlanta came in
13 on a commercial airline in a picnic basket.

14 DR. DE BAKEY: I would certainly agree with what
15 has been said. We have done the same thing and, in fact, have
16 been working experimentally with various methods of preservation
17 and have even developed one in our own shop where we can
18 preserve them and get along and function. I say, we have also
19 had the same experience and we've been working with preservation
20 chambers of various kinds, some of which have been developed
21 in our own shop; and while they certainly can be effective up
22 to 48 hours easily -- in fact, in one example it was longer --
23 we have yet to demonstrate the need for them. It's a nice
24 sort of experimental activity and it's good to be able to
25 write a paper about it and talk about it, but -- and we've

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 spent quite a little bit of money on it, but we haven't
2 demonstrated the real need for it.
3 DR. MERRILL: It's a little bit like the pole vault
4 record. Everybody tries to get an inch or an hour beyond the
5 next fellow. It really doesn't have all that meaning when you
6 get up to 48 hours.
7 DR. PAHL: Is there further discussion?
8 DR. MERRILL: There is one other kidney project in
9 here, and that is the dialysis technologist; and I would
10 gather that that was approved. I would think that the man on
11 the scene would be the important man to know about that. Do
12 they need a dialysis technologist? And that's already been
13 approved by someone on the scene and I would think it's all
14 right.
15 DR. PAHL: May the Chair have a motion for this
16 proposal.
17 DR. SCHREINER: I move for rejection.
18 DR. PAHL: Is there a second?
19 DR. MERRILL: Second.
20 MRS. KYTTLE: That then has the effect of amending
21 the dollar amount previously recommended three years downward.
22 DR. SCHREINER: That would go down by the 69?
23 DR. PAHL: The dollar amount recommended yesterday.
24 MRS. KYTTLE: Providing that this was approved today.
25 DR. PAHL: All right. There is no misunderstanding

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 that the final recommended level by Council for this appli-
2 cation is such as to exclude the kidney proposal if this
3 motion carries. Is there further discussion on the motion?
4 DR. MERRILL: The kidney preservation transportation
5 system, because there is another one which is dialysis
6 technologist?
7 DR. PAHL: Yes, sir, the one under present dis-
8 cussion.
9 Is there further discussion on this motion? If
10 not, all in favor of the motion, please say "Aye."
11 ("Ayes")
12 DR. PAHL: Opposed?
13 (No Response)
14 DR. PAHL: The motion is carried.
15 Dr. McPhedran has asked that we discuss the "Iowa"
16 application with respect to the kidney proposal. I was under
17 the impression that we had taken action on this yesterday, but
18 if it is the Council's wish we may reopen this for consideration
19 Dr. McPhedran, would you care to make a comment?
20 DR. MC PHEDRAN: No, I'm sorry, I think I should
21 have excepted it from my original recommendation because I
22 think that it, as set up in the previous discussions, looked
23 as if it required special discussion.
24 DR. PAHL: I see. I'm sorry about the misunder-
25 standing. I think the record should show, then, that the

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 action taken yesterday by the Council does not include the sum
2 requested for the kidney aspect of that proposal. Dr. Schreiner
3 or Dr. Merrill, would you be prepared to lead the discussion
4 on this aspect then?

5 DR. SCHREINER: I looked at this one. The only
6 thing that I would raise a question about in terms of the
7 review is whether or not -- and I'm not sure mechanically
8 whether they received a previous grant for subregional centers.
9 If they have, and they're in the business of setting up sub-
10 regional centers, then it seems to me that the staff forces
11 who are subregional center management might be a worthwhile
12 investment.

13 I think the short-term teaching programs don't
14 really excite me and apparently didn't excite the Review
15 Committee and didn't excite the site visitors. So I think I
16 would agree with their disapproval but I would ask whether we
17 are funding subregional dialysis center establishment in the
18 state; and if so, then we might revive that aspect, although
19 it was relatively small.

20 DR. PAHL: Can staff provide us some information
21 on the point raised by Dr. Schreiner?

22 MR. ANDERSON: I'm not sure I can comment on the
23 whole thing. I'm not sure I can answer his entire question.
24 I'll only speak to the issues which I'm familiar with.

25 The renal panel reviewed this application and this

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 was the second application that had been turned down by the
2 Iowa RMP. The Iowa RMP requested a site visit because it did
3 not feel that we had sufficient information or felt like we
4 needed additional information to make a determination.
5 Dr. Ed Lewis did make a site visit out there and I
6 think Council members have his recommendation. This is a
7 request for one year and Dr. Lewis recommended that it be
8 supported -- or that the nurses training portion of this
9 proposal be supported only.
10 DR. PAHL: Thank you.
11 DR. MERRILL: Well, I would certainly agree with
12 that. I think, as has been pointed out, their training program
13 perhaps is not the best written in the world, but I think it's
14 a very important concept and I wonder if a year of experience
15 would not allow them to come back in with a much better
16 proposal. I note that although the Ad Hoc Panel on Renal
17 Disease disapproved it in toto, that the Review Committee
18 suggested that the nurse training portion of the proposal be
19 funded in part.
20 MR. ANDERSON: The panel said that they would go
21 along with the recommendation of the site visitors and the site
22 visit was made after the panel had met, and the committee had
23 the site visitors' report.
24 DR. SCHREINER: So that you're proposing $19,000 of
25 it?

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 DR. MERRILL: Yes.

2 DR. SCHREINER: I would agree with that.

3 DR. PAHL: The motion has been made and seconded

4 to approve the $19,575 amount relative to Project 23. Is

5 there further discussion on this motion? If not, all in favor,

6 say "Aye."

7 ("Ayes")

8 DR. PAHL: Opposed?

9 (No Response)

10 DR. PAHL: The motion is carried.

11 DR. MARGULIES: I just wanted to report to you the

12 fact that when I talked to Jim Musser yesterday he pushed very

13 vigorously the idea of tying in more effectively and more

14 formally the facilities in the Veterans Administration

15 hospitals and we have agreed to get together and to begin to

16 work toward those linkages, which have been casual rather than

17 well-planned; and I think the circumstances are good for that

18 purpose. He has freedom to share his facilities now very

19 fully and we'll be coming back to you with a report of progress

20 on that.

21 DR. PAHL: We have three supplemental kidney

22 applications. The first one is from "California," with Dr.

23 Merrill as principal reviewer. Mrs. Wyckoff, please, if you

24 will leave.

25 MRS. WYCKOFF: Yes.

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 DR. MERRILL: The California proposal is a giant
2 of a proposal. I was reminded in reading it of the story of
3 the little boy who was drawing a picture with his crayons and
4 his older brother looked over his shoulder and said, "What are
5 you doing, Johnny?" And he said, "I'm drawing a picture of
6 God." And his brother said, "Why, that's ridiculous. Nobody
7 knows what God looks like." And Johnny didn't even look up;
8 he said, "They will when I'm through."
9 (Laughter)
10 DR. MERRILL: And this is the kind of thing the
11 California proposal is. Now, let me say, in all seriousness,
12 that California has a tremendous competence. I know most of
13 the people. A number of them have trained with me and they've
14 got a tremendous organization and they're doing extremely well.
15 Perhaps one of the drawbacks of their proposal is that they
16 are already established and doing so well.
17 They have, as you know, some nine areas; and of
18 these nine areas, six of them are already actively engaged in
19 the transplant business and they now propose to link all these
20 together, and they did this as the result of an original
21 application which was originally disapproved because of the
22 absence of an overall California renal program; but they were
23 given $122,000 in seed money with which to start this. They
24 come in now with a large proposal.
25 In essence, what they propose to do is the kind of

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 thing that they have already been doing, but to link it with
2 each other with a computer bank, good tissue-typing facilities,
3 information on what happens to people on dialysis, what happens
4 to people on transplantation; and in addition, they propose
5 one of the most ambitious projects, and that is to have
6 California and California alone organize and set up a supply
7 of antilymphocyte globulin. I presume they will share this,
8 when perfected, with the rest of the world.
9 The proposal itself is rather vague and it has a
10 number of inconsistencies in it. I won't read all of them to
11 you, but I would like just to note a couple of them. They do
12 not tell us about where funds for donor kidney removal are
13 going to be obtained, although they do mention that it should
14 be utilized. They don't tell about which individuals are
15 specifically going to be involved. They do include in their
16 budget in a very large way professional personnel, including
17 transplant surgeons and trainees in each instance, something
18 that we wondered about.
19 They state they're going to have a large conference
20 costing $4,000 for planning the development in antilyphocyte
21 globulin and this is going to be supported by the Upjohn
22 Company, who to date has not been able to provide us with
23 antilymphocyte globulin because they're having trouble. They
24 are going to invite as a consultant Dr. Starzl, who said
25 only two weeks ago at the American College of Surgeons that in

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 spite of the fact he was the first to use antilymphocyte
2 globulin, he had really no evidence that it had made an awful
3 lot of difference in his program.
4 So they've got quite an ambitious plan which really
5 extends a program which is ongoing and ongoing quite effectively,
6 and they themselves point out that one of the reasons it is
7 is because they have done extremely well with third party
8 funding with Medical.
9 They propose to, in the State of California or the
10 California Region, have a number of these Belsor apparatuses
11 running around between hospital and hospital, and I'm quite
12 convinced, since the data itself came from Los Angeles County
13 some time ago -- that is, the data I quoted you -- that that is
14 not necessary.
15 I think the upshot of it all is the recommendation
16 by both the Review Committee and the Site Visit Committee that
17 they be funded, but drastically reduced; and the figure that
18 is quoted here in the blue sheet is $214,500 out of a requested
19 $625,287. I think California in the present state of the art
20 can get along perfectly well on that.
21 DR. PAHL: Thank you, Dr. Merrill. Dr. Schreiner?
22 DR. SCHREINER: I think that what we're going to
23 have to do shortly, that we haven't mentioned in previous
24 Council meetings, is perhaps take into consideration the level
25 of state aid. This has been a rapidly changing situation.

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

Nine states, if I recall the figures correctly, about three years ago had any form of direct dollar aid for renal patients; and it's grown in this period of time to 25, the latest figure that I have.

I think that in states where you have a well-developed program of direct aid by the legislature and where you have a very liberal Medicaid program, that a lot of the kinds of things we're trying to provide to other people can really be provided by that mechanism. In a way, I suppose it's penalizing people for being progressive, but on the other hand, if we have the concept of startup funds, then we ought to be concentrating our shots on the have-nots rather than the haves in this particular area.

So I think this is an area that's done a lot of fine work and they have so many sources now of financial support that they can probably run this program on a reduced amount. I would agree with this.

DR. PAHL: All right. It has been moved and seconded that the Committee recommendations be accepted, which means that this sum of money is included within the existing budget. Is there further discussion on the motion?

DR. OCHSNER: May I just make a statement, Herb? I would feel that we, regarding what you said about funding a transplantation surgeon, that we should not do this in a state such as California where they have a plethora of

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 vascular surgeons. They can get plenty of people to help.
2 I felt the same way about Vanderbilt. They wanted us to
3 underwrite a transplantation surgeon. Now, they've got a
4 fine department of vascular surgery at Vanderbilt, but if they
5 can get money from us to get another faculty member they want
6 to do it.
7 DR. MERRILL: I think they have on their budget
8 something like six transplantation surgeons; that is, their
9 staff member and some six trainees. The Review Committee
10 pointed out that there was a question about the justification
11 of requesting a portion of the salary of every transplantation
12 surgeon in the State of California.
13 By the way, California, which I found out from
14 this, is the first state to have a concrete society of trans-
15 plant surgeons, which is another indication of how medicine
16 is becoming fragmented.
17 DR. PAHL: Is there further discussion?
18 MRS. MARS: I'd just like to ask how much actual
19 duplication is there in the programming here that we're
20 paying for as to what's being done already in the state from
21 other sources?
22 DR. MERRILL: There are two places in the area
23 which are not doing transplantation. One is the Watts area
24 which we discussed at the last meeting, and I think this is
25 certainly justifiable to set this up; and the other is Loma

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 Linda. Whether or not when they get through all of this
2 transplantation will be more than they need to take care of
3 the patients in this area requiring transplantation is
4 anybody's guess, but right now, of course, they're getting a
5 good many patients from out-of-state. I don't think those
6 figures are available. It might be something to look into.
7 DR. PAHL: Thank you. Is there further discussion?
8 If not, all in favor of the motion, please say "Aye."
9 ("Ayes")
10 DR. PAHL: Opposed?
11 (No Response)
12 DR. PAHL: The motion is carried.
13 May we now turn to the "Georgia" application with
14 Dr. Schreiner and Dr. Merrill as discussants. The record
15 will show Dr. McPhedran is out of the room.
16 DR. SCHREINER: In this instance, there are three
17 basic activities that are proposed for support. One is the
18 existing transplant activity. The second is the subregionali-
19 zation and various aspects related to dialysis; and a third is
20 a development of a computerized clinical diagnosis and
21 management of acid base balance.
22 As you may or may not know, such a program is
23 available and it's very cheap to rent. All you have to do is
24 pay for the telephone line and the terminal, and this was done
25 up in Boston several years ago, and it's my understanding it's

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 available any place that you can get a telephone line. So I
2 think this would be a complete waste and duplication of effort
3 and I would be against it.
4 I don't have in the papers that I was given a
5 complete breakdown of the transplantation program. There was
6 $211,000 requested and the Ad Hoc Panel recommended $46,000.
7 If that includes any funds for surgeons, I would second Dr.
8 Ochsner's remark and delete them. If not, it appears to be a
9 reasonable pruning of the request.
10 The area facilities probably are the most construc-
11 tive portion of this. There are good people in Georgia,
12 although they lost the sparkplug of the Brady dialysis effort
13 that was moved to Virginia. They are replacing him and I
14 don't think that the activity will be quite as high gear over
15 the near term but they're developing replacement personnel
16 which will slow them up a little bit I think. So I think
17 providing funds up to $35,000 for the area facilities is a
18 reasonable request, and they recommended deletion of the
19 nephrology component at the centers as being part of the
20 existing resources and this is also a difficult thing. I
21 would go along with my previous remark; that is, if you really
22 expect a center to provide backup, then they are going to have
23 to increase their staff by a little bit. So I would be in
24 favor of putting back at least perhaps a half a salary for each
25 center that is actually open. Now, if they don't open a

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 regional center, then I don't think they need that; but if
2 they actually did open one, I think a half a salary for a
3 faculty person is not unreasonable. The Ad Hoc Panel
4 recommended completely deleting all the in-center personnel
5 and I think I'd put back two half-salaries but make them
6 contingent upon actually opening up an area center.

7 DR. PAHL: Thank you. Dr. Merrill?

8 DR. MERRILL: I think I agree essentially with
9 what Dr. Schreiner said.

10 DR. PAHL: The motion has been made to accept the
11 panel's recommendations with the additional statements
12 Dr. Schreiner added concerning the half-salary contingent
13 upon the opening and functioning of the area centers. Is
14 there further discussion on the motion?

15 DR.SCHREINER: And if the $46,000 does include a
16 surgeon's salary, I would delete that.

17 DR. PAHL: Yes. I'm sorry. I forgot that part.
18 Is there further discussion on this motion? If not, all those
19 in favor of the motion, please say "Aye."

20 ("Ayes")

21 DR. PAHL: Opposed?

22 (No Response)

23 DR. PAHL: The motion is carried.

24 The last supplemental kidney proposal is that from
25 Rochester. Dr. Schreiner, will you please lead the discussion

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 on this.

2 DR. SCHREINER: I think I have here a little dis-

3 agreement with the Review Panel. We have some supplemental

4 material that's dated September 1971, and I'm familiar with

5 this area. Of course, they have a very well-developed medical

6 team in Rochester in terms of both large surgical commitment

7 both in neurology and vascular surgery. It's one of the best

8 coordinated groups to that extent, and they have a good

9 nephrology program with trainees and so forth.

10 At the present time they have 41 patients with

11 terminal renal disease. The estimated area load within the

12 area is about 45 to 50 patients a year. Their total capacity

13 that now exists is for a total of 49 patients and this is

14 restricted principally by two things: the lack of a physical

15 area at the Strong Memorial Hospital for care of transplanta-

16 tion patients; and then, the ability for them to plug in on

17 the Sony-West typing plant.

18 I think it's a well thought out plan. The hospital

19 is willing to contribute the space and it's willing to pay for

20 ten percent of the remodeling; and whereas it was recommended

21 for disapproval, I think that I would like to consider it for

22 approval. I think it needs some staff work on pruning the

23 budget a little bit and I can't make a specific recommendation

24 on that without further study, but I think it probably should

25 be funded at a reduced level.

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 DR. PAHL: Thank you, Dr. Schreiner.

2 DR. MERRILL: I was amazed in reading this over,
3 this proposal, to read that the Ad Hoc Panel on Renal Disease
4 recommended disapproval, primarily on the grounds that the
5 project was unrealistic and not in line with current medical
6 thinking, because I wholly agree with Dr. Schreiner that this
7 is a fine proposal. It's quite realistic and it's completely
8 in line with current medical thinking.

9 I have only a couple of reservations. One is, I
10 agree, first, with Dr. Schreiner's comment about funds for
11 remodeling. I think that that should be looked into very
12 carefully. They're simply going to create a ward apparently
13 for transplant patients so that they won't be scattered
14 around the hospital, and certainly the hospital should bear
15 its share of that.

16 I am not sure that they need four cardiac monitors
17 for a four-bed transplant unit, and I would recommend dis-
18 approval of that item, if one can disapprove an item.

19 The only other thing that bothers me a little bit
20 is the fact that this again, like California, is an established
21 program. Tissue-typing they say was undertaken in the fall of
22 1969 and now they're asking for support of this, and they are
23 asking to tie in with the Sony-West program but I would assume
24 from what they say here that they are, indeed, the center for
25 this whole coordinated program. They state, for instance,

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 that this laboratory, meaning the tissue-typing laboratory,
2 serves the renal transplantation program and a newly
3 developed bone marrow transplantation program and the Sony-
4 West organ exchange program. Now, if that is true, how have
5 they supported this before this; and why is it necessary now
6 to come in with support for it or perhaps we should ask the
7 question, how much in the way of supplementary support do you
8 need for extension of this?

9 Certainly tissue-typing is one of the techniques
10 which is reimbursible, perhaps more reimbursible than chronic
11 dialysis on a long-term basis, and I would think this would
12 be a self-sustaining operation. It has been in our hands.

13 I would recommend that the project be funded but
14 perhaps if these questions could be looked into with reduction
15 in cost in these specific areas.

16 DR. SCHREINER: I agree.

17 DR. PAHL: It has been moved and seconded to
18 approve Project 21 but with negotiation by staff on the basis
19 of Council discussion. Is there further discussion on this
20 motion?

21 MRS. MARS: I think that all this brings up again
22 the question of duplication of work and use of funds. We
23 seem to be getting in further and further into these kidney
24 projects, spending money, and we haven't got that much money
25 to spend to be able to throw it around unwisely and duplicate

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 work that is being done.

2 It seems to me that more or less what Dr. DeBakey
3 suggested for the machinery part could more or less be done,
4 a review by staff, to see that we do not duplicate kidney
5 programs that have already started, and some sort of a survey
6 could be made.

7 DR. MARGULIES: Perhaps it's because we haven't
8 adequately brought you up to date on this, but, in fact, that
9 kind of a survey has been conducted and we do maintain a
10 review on a geographic basis of all of these projects before
11 they come in; because the Council has expressed this concern
12 regularly, as you have, so when we identify something like
13 the program in Rochester we very clearly identify any other
14 resources which are available. If there is evidence of
15 duplication or if it appears that someone wants to put some-
16 thing right next to what already exists, we do bring that to
17 the attention of Council.

18 Perhaps we could be more explicit, however, when
19 we bring in these proposals so that you understand it. In the
20 past few Council meetings we have come in regularly with a
21 map of the country with a summary of the resources and it
22 proved to be a little cumbersome, so it may be a good idea
23 to do again the next time around.

24 MRS. MARS: Thank you.

25 DR. SCHREINER: This area is pretty self-sufficient

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

in terms of patient flow. For example, with a transplant center at Rochester, I would be against one at Utica and Syracuse and so forth; but I think as the central area of New York, these patients obviously aren't going to go to New York City; and it also offers the other intriguing thing; that is, it's one of the few programs we have that interdigitates with Canada in terms of sharing. They have an organ-sharing program with Ontario and there are several new medical schools in Canada just over the border who also have a substantial number of American students, by the way; and as you know, if we're going to be talking about health resources, some people don't realize that the third largest medical school in the United States is in Italy in terms of American students, and I think Guadalajara is in the top ten. So if you want to talk about training health personnel, I think you have to look a little bit over the border, because we have a lot of people in training over the border.

This is one program that does interdigitate well with the transplant program in Ontario. I think there are some obvious places -- I agree with John -- if you cut out two monitors you save $8,000; you cut out associate professor of surgery, you save $10,000; but other than that, the budget is not too fat. They propose $51,000 in salaries and we cut out $10,000.

DR. PAHL: Is there further discussion? If not,

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 all in favor of the motion, please say "Aye."

2 ("Ayes")

3 DR. PAHL: Opposed?

4 (No Response)

5 DR. PAHL: The motion is carried.

6 That concludes the business with respect to the

7 specific applications unless staff has further comments.

8 MRS. KYTTLE: Dr. Schreiner, Mr. Jewell and I were

9 wondering, backing up to your Georgia recommendation, if you

10 could expand that for a three-year period of time. It's a

11 three-year proposal, and with the detrimental aspects of it,

12 I think there will have to be some staff work on developing

13 budgets for the next two years.

14 DR. SCHREINER: I would agree with that.

15 DR. PAHL: Before we adjourn, there is one last

16 item of business. We would like to distribute to you at this

17 time a sheet which gives the grouping of regions and the

18 ratings as provided by the Review Committee for those which

19 were reviewed in the July/August review cycle, the ones under

20 current discussion which are listed in the center of the page

21 in a box, and the ones on the right-hand side of the page are

22 those which were reviewed by the staff anniversary review

23 panel.

24 I'd like to make two comments. First of all, the

25 priority ratings are considered highly confidential and

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 privileged information for reasons which we have gone into
2 before.
3 Secondly, there are, for the July/August review
4 cycle, two sets of ratings provided; the raw scores as given
5 by the Review Committee and as accepted by you at the last
6 Council meeting, and the adjusted scores -- that is, adjusted
7 in the sense that Mr. Peterson described yesterday, with a
8 weighted mean in order to normalize them to the October Review
9 Committee's action.
10 So that by looking at the adjusted scores of the
11 July/August review cycle, you will see how they compare with
12 the October/November review cycle for the applications you
13 have been discussing yesterday and today; and how these, in
14 turn, relate to the present applications which were reviewed
15 by our own staff anniversary review panel.
16 I would also like to indicate to you that as a
17 result of using as a baseline the October Review Committee's
18 ratings and adjusting the prior ratings to this baseline, we
19 are able to divide all of the applications that have been
20 reviewed and rated in these two cycles into three categories
21 which are labeled A, B and C; and which encompass in each
22 category, a total of 75 point spread. So what we have is
23 category A, ranging from 400 down to 325 -- that is, there's
24 a 75-point range for category A. Category B would range from
25 a rating of 325 to 250; again, a 75-point spread; and

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 Category C from 250 to 175, a 75-point spread.

2 The applications over the last two review cycles

3 all fall within these ranges.

4 Now, the information is presented to you in this

5 fashion and with your concurrence of the Review Committee's

6 recommendations this time, we would accept these ratings as

7 displayed as being the official ratings by Council for the

8 applications that you have been considering. If you do not

9 wish to concur in the ratings, then this is the appropriate

10 time to bring this to staff's attention.

11 I also would want to affirm again our intention,

12 unless we hear significant news otherwise, of formalizing the

13 rating system over the next few weeks so that it will in the

14 future be stabilized under its present format, which means

15 that at future Council meetings you will have on the summary

16 sheets that come to you from both the staff anniversary

17 review panel and the Review Committee the ratings as given by

18 those review bodies, and this will be made a part of the

19 official file and will constitute one of the management tools

20 in the selective funding process.

21 So I am asking at the present time for Council

22 either to formally endorse the rankings as shown provided by

23 the Review Committee, or to indicate otherwise and reasons

24 therefor.

25 DR. SCHREINER: I'd just like to ask for information.

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 Just from a subjective impression that we get from the
2 presentation, we got a pretty glowing report both from the
3 site visitors and the reviewers on the Connecticut proposal,
4 and yet it comes out in the B category. I think that deserves
5 some comments.
6 DR. PAHL: The only comment I can make is that the
7 Review Committee, of course, viewed this particular proposal
8 in something of a different light, as we had in this dis-
9 cussion on the proposal here at Council, and the rating as
10 provided, at least in my personal estimation, reflects the
11 Review Committee's general tenor.
12 Perhaps, Lorraine, you might wish to add or have
13 someone from staff discuss the particular rating of
14 Connecticut.
15 MRS. KYTTLE: I think that's it precisely.
16 DR. SCHREINER: Looking at this critically, do you
17 see any areas of controversy in the rating system with
18 respect to that case, which seems to be at least the one that
19 stands out to me as being disparate? Certainly we agreed on
20 the Arkansas proposal pretty generally.
21 DR. PAHL: This is a legitimate point to raise at
22 this time with respect to this application because of the
23 discussion held by Council, and Council does have the
24 prerogative of altering upwards or downwards any specific
25 application's rating, and presumably, such action would be

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 transmitted back and the reasons therefor to the Review
2 Committee. So that if you do care to take action, it is your
3 privilege to do so.
4 DR. SCHREINER: No, I didn't mean to take action
5 myself. I just was curious as to whether you had spotted any
6 areas in the rating system.
7 DR. MARGULIES: One way we could resolve any issue
8 like this, because it is impractical to reanalyze it here --
9 and of course, one can't be involved in a review of an area
10 he's from -- we could easily circulate to you, considering the
11 fact that this is a serious question and has a great deal of
12 meaning to Connecticut -- the kinds of rating forms which the
13 Review Committee used, and you could fill them out and we
14 could tabulate the results and see what sort of an outcome we
15 have. It's not an ideal method because the kind of ratings
16 which are followed by the Review Committee have been very
17 carefully outlined to them; they've had some experience with
18 it; and as you've already discovered, there is a changing
19 base level over time in the rating. Nevertheless, it would
20 be one way of getting a more valid representation of your
21 views than to accept this one, particularly in light of
22 yesterday's discussion of the Connecticut program.
23 DR. SCHREINER: I would have no objection to that,
24 but I'd even be satisfied with something short of that. Maybe
25 when we have our commentary at the next Council meeting, if

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 whoever is working most intensively with the scoring system
2 just could go back over the tape of the Council discussion
3 and sort of see if they can spot any problem areas with
4 respect to this kind of a case. I think that would satisfy
5 me.
6 MR. OGDEN: It just strikes me, Doctor, that it
7 would be very difficult for any of us to apply that rating
8 system to any one of these proposals without having been a
9 member of the site visit team and having a great deal more
10 information about the particular Regional Medical Program,
11 because those questions are very pointed and require a
12 considerable background to be able to answer intelligently
13 and weight appropriately.
14 DR. SCHREINER: I'm inclined to agree with you. I
15 was just curious as to whether we could sort of have a retro-
16 look at it.
17 MR. OGDEN: Well, I think what you're asking is,
18 won't somebody on the staff please go back over the Connecticut
19 application and rerate the thing and see whether you think, on
20 the basis of the discussion, it ought to be put someplace else.
21 DR. MARGULIES: I think that would be more practical
22 thing for us to do. As a matter of fact, we really could use
23 the staff panel review technique on this as we have in other
24 circumstances, and bring back to you at least another judgment,
25 one which you could then accept or reject as you please.

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 DR. SCHREINER: I make this not out of criticism
2 but just out of curiosity.
3 DR. OCHSNER: Do you want a motion to approve this?
4 DR. PAHL: Yes. We would like at this time to
5 have a formal motion to adopt the rankings as shown.
6 DR. OCHSNER: I so move.
7 MR. OGDEN: Second.
8 DR. PAHL: It has been moved and seconded. Is
9 there further discussion? All in favor, say "Aye."
10 ("Ayes")
11 DR. PAHL: Opposed?
12 (No Response)
13 DR. PAHL: The motion is carried.
14 Again, let me say that we have now ended the
15 experimental phase, if you will, of the rating system
16 development and unless something untoward happens we will be
17 bringing to you at the time that you review the summary sheets
18 from the preliminary review groups the ratings, so that there
19 will be an opportunity during the discussion toraise points.
20 So there will be an opportunity during the discussion to
21 raise points, which will be an improvement over what we've
22 had to engage in over the last two cycles.
23 Again, we re-emphasize the confidentiality if the
24 microphone didn't pick that up.
25 May I thank the staff for their participation and

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 for those of you who have been able to weather the rather
2 detailed discussion today.
3 MRS. MARS: Before we close this discussion com-
4 pletely, on this criteria sheet under "Process," the
5 coordinator is weighted as eight and the RAG is only weighted
6 as five. Now, just why is this? It seems to me that RAG
7 would deserve the same weighting as the coordinator, so to
8 speak. How did this evolve?
9 DR. PAHL: The best explanation I can give is that
10 the Review Committee specifically requested that something of
11 an increased emphasis be given to the coordinator over what
12 we had initially provided in the relative weighting for
13 coordinator and RAG, and that the present weights reflect a
14 minor modification upwards in strengthening the coordinator's
15 importance. This was a direct result of the kinds of dis-
16 cussion which occur by the Review Committee and site visitors
17 and where they as a group felt that we were underweighting
18 the coordinator.
19 It is a matter of judgment.
20 MRS. MARS: Well, I don't think he should be
21 underweighted, but I certainly think the RAG should carry as
22 much weight as the coordinator does, equal weight.
23 DR. PAHL: The question comes, if we maintain the
24 present overall rating system, from what do we take? We can
25 have the RAG and coordinator equal, and perhaps it should be

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 a point of discussion. The Review Committee was of the
2 definite opinion, as I've mentioned, where they wanted an
3 extra weight given, but we are open to discussion. This is
4 what we'd like to have.
5 MRS. MARS: But this is staff that you're talking
6 about, Review Committee is staff? Is that what you're
7 talking about?
8 DR. PAHL: I'm talking about the actual -- I'm
9 talking about our other consultant group of non-staff
10 reviewers, the official Review Committee.
11 MR. OGDEN: May I interject something here?
12 Speaking from the experience I've had now for five or more
13 years with the Washington/Alaska Regional Medical Program,
14 I frankly feel that the coordinator should have a stronger
15 rating than the Regional Advisory Committee; and from what
16 view I've had in some other Regional Medical Programs, I
17 think this is also true.
18 I think a poor coordinator can pull down a good
19 Regional Advisory Committee.
20 MRS. MARS: I agree. I agree entirely with that.
21 MR. OGDEN: But the strength of the coordinator
22 really is reflected in how well his Regional Advisory
23 Committee moves, the whole organization of the program, the
24 kind of people that he hires, the amount of money that's
25 spent, the way it's spent; and the Regional Advisory

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 Committee meets four or five times a year, perhaps more often
2 in some cases. There's an executive committee that maybe
3 meets more frequently, perhaps monthly; in our case, sometimes
4 more than that. But I frankly think that the strength of the
5 Regional Medical Program lies with the core staff and very
6 greatly with the coordinator of the program.
7 I don't disagree with the fact that the coordinator
8 should have a stronger rating at all.
9 DR. PAHL: May we have an expression from anyone
10 else on this point?
11 MR. MILLIKEN: Well, I'm not sure it's a question
12 of give one more weight than the other. If we're going to
13 go the route of having real citizen involvement in this
14 activity, then I think we've got to deliberately do it,
15 because we have to make an allowance for it; and I think that
16 most of the applications that we've seen since I've been
17 involved could stand more visibility for the function and
18 activities of the RAG.
19 Now, maybe this is administrative and doesn't
20 relate to ratings, I'm not sure, but I think we need somehow
21 to get more importance and more visibility on the role and
22 function of the RAG and how it works in this whole deal.
23 DR. MARGULIES: I think this particular point will
24 require further deliberation and particularly after we bring
25 to you a more complete form of the current draft regulations

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

1 which I described yesterday, because this will bring the
2 Council into a discussion of the relative role of the
3 grantee, the Regional Advisory Group, the coordinator, etc.,
4 and I think that out of that discussion we probably can
5 create a better sense of proportion than we can at the
6 present time because it may crystallize some ideas which
7 have been up to the present time a little vague.
8 MRS. WYCKOFF: I do think we need some guidelines
9 on that.
10 MRS. MARS: I still think this is definitely
11 downgrading RAG's importance. I feel very strongly about it.
12 DR. MARGULIES: We will consider the question
13 still open.
14 DR. PAHL: If there is no further business, then
15 I declare the meeting adjourned. Thank you all.
16 (Whereupon, at 11:55 a.m., the meeting was
17 adjourned.)
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.