RESEARCH ADVISORY PANEL OF CALIFORNIA
Meeting Minutes
April 18, 2025

OPEN SESSION

1. Call to Order, Establishment of a Quorum, and General Announcements

Panel Members present: Member Boris Heifets, Public Health Officer Designee Cyrus Rangan, Member Daniele Piomelli, Chair Jennifer Mitchell, Member Kelly Lee.

Panel Members absent: Member Martine D'Agostino, Member James Gasper.

A quorum was established.

2. Approval of Panel Meeting Minutes – February 14, 2025

Chair Mitchell asked members to review the February meeting minutes if they had not already done so, and once Panel members had a chance to review them, she asked for a motion to approve the meeting minutes. Member Boris Heifets made a motion to approve, and Member Piomelli seconded the motion.

Vote to approve:
Boris Heifets
Cyrus Rangan
Daniele Piomelli
Jennifer Mitchell
Kelly Lee

3. Genetic Consent

Chair Mitchell said that we were going to talk about the genetic consent form as that is why Agnes [Balla] has joined us for the meeting. Chair Mitchell asked that Agnes [Balla] state her position to the Panel and then the Panel would discuss.

Public Comment

Agnes Balla from University of California said she had a prepared a statement, thanked the Panel for having her, and said she appreciated their time and consideration.

She read the following prepared Statement:

“Dear RAPC Panel Members,

I join the panel today to respectfully ask for RAP-C to reconsider and remove the current requirement for researchers from institutions of higher education to complete a separate RAP-C DNA/Genetic Testing Informed Consent form. My request is based on state law requirements and concern over having a separate consent form altogether.

I. Request to Remove Requirement for Researchers from Institutions of Higher Education to Complete a Separate RAP-C DNA/Genetic Testing Informed Consent Form

A. State Law Considerations

During the last committee meeting, RAP-C noted that the DNA/Genetic Testing Informed Consent form is a requirement under state law. I am assuming RAP-C was referring the California Senate Bill 41 (also known as the Genetic Information Privacy Act) passed in 2021, which provides various protections to a consumer who provides genetic data to a direct-to-consumer genetic testing company.

SB 41 specifically excludes research activities conducted by public or private postsecondary educational institution that holds an assurance with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services from the requirements of SB 41. This exemption recognizes that requiring an additional consent form for studies already reviewed by an IRB operating under a federalwide assurance is outside the intent of the law.

B. Concerns with the Separate Consent Form Requirement

A separate consent form conflicts with the spirit of the Common Rule, which emphasizes clarity, comprehension, and minimization of burden on research participants. By having a separate consent form, there is a burden placed on participants and at some point, the amount of information given to participants is too much. This can both obstruct participant understanding as well as deter research participation.

Separate consent forms raise the potential for discrepancies between documents. Conflicting language or guidance across forms could create confusion for researchers and participants alike and can create risks if they are not congruent (e.g., which form should be followed?)

Many institutional IRBs already address genetic considerations through integrated tools such as consent checklists, which are designed to ensure that IRBs and researchers adequately consider and incorporate appropriate genetic disclosures into the main consent form. These resources are a more effective and flexible alternative than requiring separate consent documents.

C. Recommendation

I strongly recommend that RAP-C remove the requirement for researchers from institutions of higher education to complete a separate RAP-C DNA/Genetic Testing Informed Consent form and instead ensure key elements are covered in the general informed consent process. RAP-C could replace the separate consent form with a checklist to guide researchers in ensuring that appropriate information is included in the primary informed consent form.

II. Feedback on the DNA/Genetic Testing Informed Consent Form

Scope of the Form: *The scope of the current DNA/Genetic Testing Informed Consent Form for is unclear. The document seems to interchangeably use the terms genetic, DNA, and information but in the research context, these terms are understood differently. It may be that DNA analysis in the forensic space is intended to determine an individual's DNA characteristics and be used to identify them, however in the research space, when genetic information is willingly provided by a research participant it is typically collected to rule out certain conditions or syndromes or to better understand the impact of a study drug and any variability in drug responses.*

Recommendation: *It may be beneficial to provide examples or classes of research studies for which this particular type of information should be presented.*

Notice on Family Linkage: *The checklist provides that research participants "may wish to discuss DNA sample with family members given that any risks of providing a sample may also affect a subject's family members, and emphasize this, if applicable, by placing in bold face type, a statement such as, 'The risks of your providing genetic information may also affect members of your family. You may want to discuss your participation in this genetic study with your family.'" The statement is alarming and may be misleading, depending on the way that the genetic information may be used in a study, and ultimately could deter research participation.*

Recommendation: *Explain when this statement may be applicable, such as: If an investigator intends to obtain identifiable private information about the subject's family members, the family members may be considered human research subjects as "secondary subjects." If so, the subject's consent to contact family members may be required. Or: As part of the risk discussion in the general consent form, researchers should consider providing as a potential risk that results from collected genetic information which could cause stigmatization, discrimination, or psychosocial risks to the participant's family. Alternatively, it may be beneficial for RAPC to remove this requirement from the form.*

Broader Implications: *I understand and share the concern to protect research participants' privacy. However, implementing this DNA consent form would create a mismatch of requirements when researchers across different fields conduct genetic research but in one case uses a controlled substances and in another does not use a controlled substance.*

I also just want to acknowledge that researchers working with Schedule I and Schedule II drugs undergo a myriad of reviews, including reviews by the DEA, FDA, IRB/IACUC, and other institutional reviews. Each time they make an adjustment to their protocol or their consent form, it has to then go back to be reviewed by the respective agencies and review bodies. For example, if RAP-C provides that a researcher should include a separate DNA consent form, then once approved by RAP-C has to then go back to the FDA and IRB to get approval for these modifications.

Conclusion

I appreciate RAP-C's dedication to protecting research participants' privacy and rights. However, implementing a separate DNA consent has the possibility to create inconsistencies across research areas and adds unnecessary burden without meaningful added protection. I would welcome the opportunity to further discuss this matter and collaborate on a practical, participant-centered solution.

Sincerely,

Agnes Balla
Director, Research Policy Analysis and Coordination
University of California, Office of the President"

Public Attendee Agnes Balla concluded by saying with that, I'm happy to take any questions, or just open the bar.

Chair Jennifer Mitchell thanked public participant Agnes Balla and said that she would add what she recalled of the inception of the consent form before opening it up to the full Panel to ask questions and have a discussion, and that Panel member Heifets might have additional comments. Chair Mitchell recalled that was enacted in part by the previous RAPC Chair, Enid Camps, and at that time did not recognize that many DNA samples are now dropped into repositories at the behest of the Sponsor, most often NIH. And she was surprised to find that a lot of people didn't really recognize that and that's where their DNA data were going, and of course, DNA is not, no matter what you do, anonymous. There is no way to properly anonymize it, so she felt that at the time that a call-out for a separate consent form was merely giving the residents of the state of California an additional heads-up before they signed on to a research study that involved genetic collection and that their data could end up in a repository, it could end up overseas, and in the case of RAPC, they were study populations that were particularly vulnerable that were often being studied. Sometimes drugs of abuse were being studied that perhaps some people wouldn't want to participate in research where their DNA samples could be stored or shared. Chair Mitchell said that at the time we didn't think it was much different than say a separate video or photo consent form, which some of our UCs (University of California) require as a call out to ensure again, this bit of study information on behalf of the study subject before they sign.

Panel member Boris Heifets asked Agnes Balla whether the California Genetic Research Privacy Act is the only law that she is able to identify that governs this. Public Participant Agnes Balla responded there are several laws around privacy and consent and research participants, but the most specific one to genetic testing is SB41 that she is aware of. Panel member Heifets asked Public participant Balla for more detail in reference to her mention about other potential remedies that would be compliant with state law. Public participant Agnes Balla said she can give feedback on the form itself, maybe to reduce some of the complexity; for example using the terms DNA and genetic information interchangeably is quite confusing because she thinks they have different meanings. She asked whether it is when genetic information is collected, or when DNA samples are collected, and to have more clarity around that. Public participant Agnes Balla also said to reconsider the family linkage statement, as that is too confusing. She said she thinks that rather than having a separate consent form, to provide guidance on what should be included in the original consent form would be more helpful than having a separate consent form altogether. She said there are federal laws that already require seeing so many things, including if information is going to go into a repository that needs to be specified in a typical consent form, and said she thinks integrating the two rather than having a separate consent form and providing guidance or a checklist to researchers on here's what you should ensure that your consent form should say and include within it.

Panel member Heifets referenced video and audio recordings that need to specify that either they are going to be destroyed or how they are going to be shared, and that they can be used for training purposes. He said that is something IRBs would certainly like to know and would most certainly be something that needs to go into consent and added that he doesn't get the distinction between genetic and DNA; that and any biometric data should fall into the same category. Public participant Agnes Balla responded that it should already be addressed in the consent form and having a separate form on top of the existing consent form introduces more complexity to research participants, and that it could introduce inconsistencies between the main document and the separate DNA consent form. Panel member Daniele Piomelli asked Public participant Agnes Balla if the difference she is referring to with DNA and genetic information is that genetic information was available before DNA, and the broad term is genetic information.

Chair Mitchell asked Public participant Agnes Balla if she has any evidence so far if anyone has reported to UCOP that the additional consent form introduces any sort of a burden or complexity that has changed a subject's willingness to participate in research. Public participant

Balla responded that they have not gotten any specific examples, but when this came out, it was a major concern with the IRB directors that it would possibly deter participation, should it become overly complex for research participants.

Panel member Heifets said he is still trying to understand how DNA consent is different from genetic consent and that even under the Genetic Information Privacy Act, that if the data is subject to the HIPAA common rule, and is de-identified and irreversibly bar-coded, you can’t really do that with DNA because it is fundamentally personally identifiable. He said protections like the common rule and HIPAA are going to apply, so he is really trying to pinpoint what the issue is because if this was just like blood tests like a CBC, it would be obvious that you would not need a separate consent form because it is not personally identifiable. Panel member Heifets said now 23 and me is up for sale for whoever wants it and it would be nice to know someone is going to get my permission before doing that. He asked are we going to preserve that protection?

Public participant Agnes Balla said that the difference is that providing genetic information to a 23 and me company is governed by SB41. However, you are following your research protocol that has various layers of regulatory requirements that include the need to get approvals from IRB and elsewhere, right? She said SB41 recognizes that research already has governance over it and therefore does not have to, and that 23 and Me doesn’t have the research protections over it so it separates those two out, if that makes sense.

Panel member Heifets said it sort of makes sense to him that in a research consent form from an academic institution, the genetic information is only going to be used for research purposes and not going to be shared or sold, so that should not require a separate consent, and that is cut and dry. Public participant Agnes Balla agreed. Panel member Heifets said if you have a commercial interest, then it is hard to see how they would be exempt from the Genetic Privacy Act. Public participant Agnes Balla agreed that that is different. Panel member Heifets said that would simplify things for academic research.

Chair Mitchell asked whether this would complicate things for RAPC because it would mean a different path for institutions being in the main consent form and a different path for others. Panel member Heifets responded that we can’t just do a blanket and remove all the protections because all it seems a company needs to do is get an IRB to agree without any specifications to what they are going to do and then sell it and someone sues the State of California because we are violating state law. Chair Mitchell agreed. Public participant Agnes Balla said the exemption would be specifically for post-secondary institutions, and posted information from the bill in the chat: “(4) *Scientific research or educational activities conducted by a public or private nonprofit postsecondary educational institution that holds an assurance with the United States Department of Health and Human Services pursuant to Part 46 of Title 45 of the Code of Federal*

Regulations, to the extent that the scientific research and educational activities conducted by that institution comply with all applicable federal and state laws and regulations for the protection of human subjects in research, including, but not limited to, the Common Rule pursuant to Part 46 (commencing with Section 46.101) of Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations, United States Food and Drug Administration regulations pursuant to Parts 50 and 56 of Title 21 of the Code of Federal Regulations, the federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (20 U.S.C. Sec. 1232g), and the Protection of Human Subjects in Medical Experimentation Act."
*(*https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220SB41)

Panel member Heifets responded that he is not sure that commercial entities doing research in California are all bound by that statute, but he is not a lawyer. Chair Mitchell thanked Agnes Balla for sharing and said it was from 2021, but so much has changed, for example, if a researcher buys something from 23 and Me, what are they beholden to? Chair Mitchell said researchers from UCSF have previously put in requests with 23 and Me and received databases from them, and if you are in that limbo, what happens? Agnes Balla replied that that is a good question, and that SB41 does address that because it does say that when these direct to consumer genetic testing companies are acquiring data from individuals, they do need to get consent, and what they do with that data afterwards should hopefully be in line with whatever consent practices they have in place, and so it would still be on the genetic testing company to adhere to consenting requirements and then if the consent requirements allows for sharing with 3rd parties then we would have to adhere to whatever consent requirements that they had in place for getting that data in the 1st place, and they way that she understands the law, these 23 and Me companies would have to get consent from consumers if they are providing their data, and that these post-secondary institutions should not be seen as 23 and Me, right?

Panel member Kelly Lee asked whether it matters if the PI of an academic institution has holding rights to a commercial entity, and whether we need to start looking at conflicts of interest. Public participant Agnes Balla replied that if researchers are conducting research, that is already part of the consideration and there are COI considerations made during the review of research. Panel member Kelly Lee clarified that it is not necessarily for the purposes of getting consent. Public participant Agnes Balla said she's not sure she understands. Chair Mitchell said she thinks she gets it because when you're applying for a new study protocol, your COI is not typically reviewed as a part of that process, so she thinks that is the point; if she has to file the COI with UCSF that no-one is going to look at, and Kelly's question is, shouldn't somebody be looking at that if I have a stake in a company that plans to do something with genetic data. Public participant Balla replied that she sits at the Office of the President and not at the campus, but from her understanding these are happening because in your consent form as a PI, you already have to make certain disclosures if you need to disclose anything. Panel member Heifets asked whether the liability is for the investigator if they are misrepresenting. Panel member Kelly Lee clarified that she is not saying that the COI process is not appropriately reviewed, she is just saying that for the purposes of whether that seems like we're trying to look at academic versus non-academic, and that in certain cases, there could be some blurred lines.

Chair Mitchell asked Public participant Balla if she would prefer the genetic consent form went away completely, or if there is a path with some modifications that might make it clearer, and if that is a middle ground that she would be willing to consider because she is not sure if there is evidence yet that it induces a level of complexity that precludes people from contributing to research in the State of California. Public participant Balla responded that she can work with her IRB directors to provide some feedback to simplify the form, but she believes two things are confusing, one is that there is overlap between what's required in the RAPC consent form and what's required in the main study consent form and what do you do to rectify that and are you saying things in different places and saying it twice and is everyone okay with that and is that something to consider, but also stepping back and taking the broader context as there are many other studies that collect genetic information that don't use controlled substances and don't have this altogether separate RAPC consent form, and it makes it a very confusing space. Panel member Heifets responded that he wants to agree with her and asked whether they are in violation of state law because they are separate and a specific written consent form that describes it like genetic analysis and what's going to happen with it. Public participant Agnes Balla asked to help her understand the violation. Panel member Borsi Heifets said he would go through the text of the law.

Chair Mitchell responded to Public participant Balla's prior question and said what is typically done is to pull it (genetic consent) out of the main consent if people leave it in both places, and this comes up and even last week a study had forgotten to remove it and was asked to pull the genetic consent out of the main consent so that it's clear. It isn't left in the main consent form, it is pulled out as done with video and photography. Public participant Agnes Balla said she assumes the researcher needs to go back to the IRB to get approval again for the consent form that was provided to them by their IRB, because they are making modifications to the consent form that was approved by the IRB. Chair Mitchell responded that the last two she recalls were industry and they went through WRB and weren't concerned about it, so that's different than going back to an institutional IRB in terms of speed.

Panel member Heifets said he is looking over it again and is inclined to agree with Agnes in principle that there's nothing that suggests that post-secondary institutions, non-profit, etc. assuming they retain their non-profit status, would be subject to chapter 596, and he asked if anyone read it differently. Chair Mitchell said she is reading it very quickly herself and doesn't see anything so far that suggests it has to be a separate call-out. Panel member Heifets said it is scientific research or educational activities conducted by public or private non-profit secondary education institutions. Public participant Agnes Balla replied that the chapter does not apply to those institutions. Chair Mitchell said that reading through it quickly, it says that the company shall destroy a consumer biological sample within 30 days of receipt or revocation of consent to store a sample. She asked if that doesn't apply to an institutional site either, right? Once the sample is in NIH, a repository, you can't get it back. Public participant Agnes Balla replied that she thinks they are governed by a different policy, NIH's policy, but this is specific to like the 23 and Me's collecting information directly from consumers.

Chair Mitchell clarified that her question is whether it jives with federal policy or does it run in contrast to federal policy, because if she was about to participate in a study that somebody was going to pull a genetic sample and she didn't understand that it was going to be stored forever, she would want to understand that. Public participant Agnes Balla replied that it should already be outlined in the consent form. Chair Mitchell responded that if it says in perpetuity and on a national level and they don't see that, that's them. Panel member Heifets asked if it is going to be given to NIH because that is part of the agreement, then it has to go into the consent? Chair Mitchell agreed.

Panel member Heifets said he doesn't see any reason (not) to stop requiring it for educational institutions, so then the question is direct to consumer, and if Compass, for example, is doing a study that is not direct to consumer, it's not clear that this is exempt from the requirement. Chair Mitchell asked whether he meant this is a gray area if working with a company that is collecting genetic data and they go through WRB, but at an institutional site, what do you have to do? Panel member Heifets agreed.

Panel member Piomelli thanked public participant Balla for bringing it up, but said it requires more conversation and discussion, and he feels there are not many (panel members present) today and requires more conversation and discussion. He asked the Executive Officer whether it is something appropriate for non-public discussion, or whether it has to be done in public. The Executive Officer responded that it does have to be done in public. Panel member Piomelli asked to have time to think about it, and then have a public discussion at the next meeting, as he feels he will be better prepared and have more time to think about it. Panel member Lee agreed. Chair Mitchell asked public participant Balla how she feels about that. Public participant Balla said she is on board and asked for a reminder when the next meeting is. The Executive Officer confirmed the meeting is on Friday June 13th.

Public participant Agnes Balla referenced the gray area and said she works very closely with UC legal to understand what the regulatory requirements are for conducting research, including what should be said in the consent forms, and she thinks it is important to engage council on these conversations. Panel member Heifets said bring council and he would just raise a motion to perform a motion to remove the requirement for a separate consent form for post-secondary institutions meeting these criteria, and he would love to hear a legal opinion so that it could be put on record. Chair Mitchell agreed that that would be helpful. Public attendee Agnes Balla said they can speak on behalf of UC, but she doesn't think their council can speak on behalf of everyone else; they can speak on behalf of UC, so that would be one perspective, but not everyone's interpretation.

Chair Mitchell asked whether public participant Balla has spoken to other institutions with the state of California like Stanford about this policy and what do they think, and is it fair to assume that they agree with her. Public participant Agnes Balla said that she remembers looking at this bill when it came out in 2021 and reviewing it with Stanford and USC, and they were all of the same mind. Panel member Heifets asked, to wrap it up, what would it take and what would be the steps to remove the requirement. Chair Mitchell replied that it would just be to move and vote, because they didn't move and vote that it was enacted in the first place. Chair Mitchell asked whether he needed more discussion prior to putting in a motion. Panel member Heifets said not for this piece, but for the rest of it, for any sort of for-profit commercial entity, is a different and more complicated question, and it would be nice to get a legal opinion and he guesses [Panel member] Martine [D'Agostino] would be a great person to apply on this.

Chair Mitchell concluded that maybe [public participant] Agnes [Balla] could present her reasoning to the entirety of the committee so that they could share it with Martine and maybe she could give some comments from the State's perspective just to ensure that we are opening up some hole that we didn't foresee. Public member Agnes Balla asked to share her opening statement, and Chair Mitchell agreed so that Martine has something to work with and requested another few minutes to address the gray areas that might come up if there is an institutional site working with a private entity that is collecting our data. Public participant Agnes Balla responded that she is talking through the UC lens and she doesn't know practices of other institutions or is not familiar with them. She said the whole point of the consent form is if there are standard requirements that need to be met but there also needs to be flexibility to address the nuances of each study and if you have let's say UCSF is the lead site working with a company that's conducting genetic information and in the consent form that UCSF is putting forward for the genetic, she is assuming that they would be working with the genetic testing company to kind of develop that and they would need to in that consent form explain exactly what's going on to research participants, including if genetic testing information is being collected, what's going to happen with that , precautions to put on that data, how long it is going to be maintained and stored and if there's going to be commercial profit derived from that data collection; so all that already needs to be addressed in the form.

Chair Mitchell said her question is to say that if studies say they are going to collect genetic information on this (part) and the rest is going to be banked with the Sponsor, what then prevents the sponsor from doing something else with those genetic samples? What is the recourse if the sponsor, not the institution, decides to do something else, like sell it to 23 and Me, and then they sell this genetic database to somebody else in China? Public participant Agnes Balla said it depends on who the sponsors are and what they tell you what they're going to do with the data because what they tell you is what you should be conveying to the research participants, and if it is the NIH, they have a policy on what they do with the data and how they do it, and that is pretty standard, so no one's really concerned about that. She said if it is 23 and Me banking, then 23 and Me is liable for doing something they weren't supposed to with the data that they received. Chair Mitchell said even if they are liable, she doesn't know what that means in terms of recourse. Panel member Heifets said he wants to hear from [Panel member] Martine [D'Agostino]. Chair Mitchell gave an example that if they're gone and then a company in China owns it and then I don't know what we do, so if it is okay with everybody, she would move to table this until the next meeting and then they could entertain a motion to vote to remove the genetic consent form after everyone's had a chance to weigh in, including a lawyer.

Panel member Piomelli said it would be great to have other members of the committee know about this discussion, and perhaps it can be summarized in a few words and highlight the key points, and he asked Agnes if she could share her write-up. Public participant Balla said she will. The Executive Officer said she will share with the Panel members the draft of the meeting minutes, so they will be able to review what transpired in today's meeting. Panel member Piomelli said that perhaps instead of being just a standard, if we could just tell 'this is this is this is this' and items that seem to be important that we aught to have a discussion about so that they can respond to Agnes's concerns in June when they meet, and confirmed they could legally vote in public during the public session. Chair Mitchell confirmed that they could vote on items on the Public Agenda.

Chair Mitchell concluded that it would also again ensure that [panel member] Martine [D'Agostino] looks at commercial entities doing research in California are all bound by the statute, and that would allow Martine a chance to comment, so we can put that at the top of the Agenda for next time. She asked to ensure that Martine has a chance to look through the materials. Public participant Balla asked if she could send her write-up, the statement she gave at the beginning, to the Executive Officer as her ask to the committee, and the Executive Officer agreed.

4. Future Agenda Items

Chair Mitchell thanked Public participant Agnes Balla and asked if besides what was just proposed for the Agenda for the June meeting, if there were any other comments. Public Participant Agnes Balla said she was looking at the other consent checklist that RAPC provides, and there is a statement in there that says that RAPC should be added to the HIPAA form and to the consent form that they are an authorized entity to receive personally identifiable information, and she would like to challenge that because she would like to know what technical safeguards RAPC has in place to protect personally identifiable information and if they are not getting any, then we should not note that they are getting PHI.

Chair Mitchell said she knows that the legislative language around what RAPC is supposed to do is quite antiquated, that it precedes the controlled substances act by a couple of years, and that Bill 1103 is making its way to the health committee and it will have some language that will modify and update the original language. She said certainly it says that RAPC is allowed to perform audits and to do investigations, they are allowed to hold public meetings on particular topics, but these are not typically things that RAPC has done in the past decade, and so some of that language is left over in conjunction with the other sorts of detailed tasks that RAPC is allowed to perform. But it seems that some of that language will be taken out of 1103, but that is assuming this particular bill will become law. So, yes, we don't know, and the Health Committee doesn't meet on it until the 29th, so that again would be a topic to again rejoin after the 29th when we have a little bit of an idea about what the language of the Bill is going to be and what RAPC's purview is going to be like moving forward. The Executive Officer asked whether that should be added as an Agenda item and Chair Mitchell said sure, but it might be unnecessary and asked public attendee Agnes Balla if she want to review the changes in 1103 prior to having that conversation, as it might be a moot point. Public participant Agnes Balla agreed, thanked the Panel for having her, and left.

Hearing no other comments, Chair Mitchell made a move to go into private session.

CLOSED SESSION

Panel members entered closed session pursuant to Government Code section 11126, subd. (c)(20), as added by California AB 2841 (Waldron) (2024).

OPEN SESSION

5. Meeting Adjournment

Panel members present: Chair Jennifer Mitchell, Member Boris Heifets, Member Daniele Piomelli, Member Kelly Lee, Public Health Officer Designee Cyrus Rangan.

Panel members absent: Member James Gasper, Member Martine D’Agostino.

Chair Mitchell provided a reminder that the next Panel meeting is scheduled for June 13, 2025 at 1:00 pm then adjourned the meeting.