

1998 NATIONAL DROSOPHILA BOARD MEETING

March 25, 1998

1. SUMMARY OF MINUTES
2. APPROVAL OF THE 1997 MINUTES
3. 1998 BOARD MEMBERSHIP AND ELECTIONS
 - a) Current Composition
 - b) Changes for 1999
4. REPORT OF THE 1998 PROGRAM COMMITTEE (Terry Orr-Weaver, Kristen White, Laurel Raftery)
5. REPORT OF THE SANDLER LECTURER COMMITTEE (R. Scott Hawley)
6. REPORT OF THE 1999 PROGRAM COMMITTEE (Barbara Wakimoto, Susan Parkhurst and Marsha Ryan)
7. REPORT OF THE GSA COORDINATOR (Marsha Ryan)
 - a) 1998 meeting summary
 - b) future meetings (1999, 2000, 2001)
8. REPORT OF THE TREASURER (Allan Spradling)
 - a) 1998 meeting finances report
 - b) general account balance
 - c) Sandler account / investment
9. BOARD DISCUSSION OF MEETINGS AND FINANCES
 - a) change to business meeting format
 - b) management of the General Fund - how to avoid the 125 K GSA 'cap'
 - c) management of the Sandler Fund
10. REPORT OF STOCK CENTER ADVISORY COMMITTEE (Hugo Bellen)
 - a) general report
 - b) species stock center
11. BLOOMINGTON STOCK CENTER REPORT (Kathy Matthews and Thom Kaufman)
12. DIS REPORT (Jim Thompson)
13. BERKELEY GENOME PROJECT REPORT (Gerry Rubin)
14. FLYBASE (Bill Gelbart)
15. OTHER BUSINESS

1. SUMMARY OF 1998 MINUTES

The 1998 North American Drosophila Board Meeting convened from 2-6 PM, Wednesday March 25, 1998, at the Omni Shoreham Hotel in Washington, D.C. Here we present the reports from several members of the board, and pertinent discussions, as described in the table of contents. In general, the scientific and financial health of the Drosophila community appears to be solid, and the community resources are performing admirably. Major issues discussed at the board meeting were 1) revamping the business meeting to emphasize yearly reports from various community resources, 2) using saved money for providing funds for graduate students to attend the annual meeting and to seed community resources, 3) the need for user surveys to evaluate the effectiveness of community resources, 4) the need for a nomenclature committee to standardize gene names, and 5) the importance of lobbying NIH, NCI and NSF to obtain funds to maintain and expand community resources. Another major issue concerned the merger of the informatics components of FlyBase, BDGP and EDGP, which the board received with great enthusiasm.

2. APPROVAL OF THE 1997 MINUTES

A motion to approve the minutes of the 1997 Board Meeting, as posted on Flybase by past president Bill Gelbart, was proposed and approved.

3. 1998 BOARD MEMBERSHIP AND ELECTIONS

a) Current Composition

The current composition of the Board is as follows; members not in attendance are indicated with an asterisk.

Regional Representatives:

Arthur Hilliker	Canada	ahillike@uoguelph.ca
Susan Zusman	Great Lakes	zusman@sbz.biology.rochester.edu
Hannele Ruohola-Baker	Northwest	hannele@u.washington.edu
Michael Bender	Southeast	bender@bscr.uga.edu
Scott Hawley	California	shawley@netcom.com
Steve Wasserman	Heartland	stevenw@pooh.swmed.edu
Steve DiNardo	New England	dinardo@rockvax.rockefeller.edu
Debbie Andrew	Mid-Atlantic	debbie_andrew@qmail.bs.jhu.edu
Pamela Geyer	Midwest	pamela-geyer@uiowa.edu

Officers:

Gary Karpen	President	karpen@salk.edu
Bill Gelbart	Past President	gelbart@morgan.harvard.edu
Allan Spradling	Treasurer	spradling@mail1.ciwemb.edu

Ex Officio:

Bill Gelbart	FlyBase	gelbart@morgan.harvard.edu
Gerry Rubin	BDGP	gerry@fruitfly.berkeley.edu
Thom Kaufman	Bloomington SC	kaufman@sunflower.bio.indiana.edu
Kathy Matthews	Bloomington SC	matthewk@indiana.edu
Ronny Woodruff	Mid-America SC	rwoodru@bgnet.bgsu.edu
Jim Thompson	DIS	jthompson@ou.edu
Michael Ashburner	Europe	ma11@gen.cam.ac.uk
Hugo Bellen	SC adv. comm.	hbellen@bcm.tmc.edu
Celeste Berg	at-large	berg@genetics.washington.edu
Claire Cronmiller	at-large	crc2s@virginia.edu

John Lucchesi	at-large	lucchesi@biology.emory.edu
Chuck Langley	at-large	chlangley@ucdavis.edu
Dan Lindsley*	at-large	dlindsley@ucsd.edu
Scott Hawley	Sandler Lect.1998	shawley@netcom.com

1998 Meeting Organizers:

Kristin White	kristin_white@cbrc.mgh.harvard.edu
Laurel Raftery	lraftery@cbrc.mgh.harvard.edu
Terry Orr-Weaver	weaver@wi.mit.edu

1999 Meeting Organizers:

Barbara Wakimoto	wakimoto@u.washington.edu
Susan Parkhurst*	susanp@fred.fhcrc.org

GSA Representatives:

Elaine Strass*	Exec. Dir.	estrass@genetics.faseb.org
Marsha Ryan	Mtg. Coord.	mryan@genetics.faseb.org

b) Changes for 1999

Larry Goldstein was elected by the Board to be President in 1999. Steve Wasserman was elected Treasurer for 3 years, replacing Allan Spradling. Four new regional representatives were inducted.

The 1999 Drosophila Board includes:

Regional Representatives:

Paul Lasko	Canada, 2002	Paul_Lasko@maclan.mcgill.ca
John Belote	Great Lakes, 2001	jbelote@mailbox.syr.edu
Hannele Ruohola-Baker	Northwest, 2000	hannele@u.washington.edu
Rick Fehon	Southeast, 2001	rfehon@acpub.duke.edu
Scott Hawley	California, 1999	shawley@netcom.com
Bob Boswell	Heartland, 2002	boswell@beagle.colorado.edu
Claude Desplan	New England, 2001	desplan@rockvax.rockefeller.edu
Steve Mount	Mid-Atlantic, 2001	sm193@umail.umd.edu
Jeff Simon	Midwest, 2002	simon@molbio.cbs.umn.edu

Officers:

Larry Goldstein	President	lgoldstein@ucsd.edu
Gary Karpen	Past President	karpen@salk.edu
Steve Wasserman	Treasurer	stevenw@ucsd.edu
Allan Spradling	Past-Treasurer	spradling@mail1.ciwemb.edu

Ex Officio:

Bill Gelbart	FlyBase	gelbart@morgan.harvard.edu
Gerry Rubin	BDGP	gerry@fruitfly.berkeley.edu
Thom Kaufman	Bloomington SC	kaufman@sunflower.bio.indiana.edu
Kathy Matthews	Bloomington SC	matthewk@indiana.edu
Ronny Woodruff	Mid-America SC	rwoodru@bgnet.bgsu.edu
Jim Thompson	DIS	jthompson@ou.edu
Michael Ashburner	Europe	ma11@gen.cam.ac.uk
Hugo Bellen	SC adv. comm.	hbellen@bcm.tmc.edu
Celeste Berg	at-large	berg@genetics.washington.edu
Claire Cronmiller	at-large	crc2s@virginia.edu
John Lucchesi	at-large	lucchesi@biology.emory.edu
Chuck Langley	at-large	chlangley@ucdavis.edu

Dan Lindsley at-large dlindsley@ucsd.edu
Bill Sullivan Sandler Lect.1999 sullivan@orchid.ucsc.edu

1999 Meeting Organizers:

Barbara Wakimoto wakimoto@u.washington.edu
Susan Parkhurst* susanp@fred.fhcr.org

2000 Meeting Organizers:

Pam Geyer pamelageyer@uiowa.edu
Lori Wollrath lori-wallrath@uiowa.edu

GSA Representatives:

Elaine Strass Exec. Dir. estrass@genetics.faseb.org
Marsha Ryan Mtg. Coord. mryan@genetics.faseb.org

4. REPORT OF THE 1998 PROGRAM COMMITTEE (Terry Orr-Weaver, Kristen White, Laurel Raftery)

First, we wish to thank Marcia Ryan for her excellent work in organizing all the non-scientific aspects of the meeting, and to commend her to the Flyboard. One large-scale example out of many: last fall she re-negotiated to get larger rooms assigned for the concurrent slide sessions; the original rooms assigned were far too small.

Plenary sessions:

Here is an updated list of the plenary speakers for the last 8 years.

Susan Abmayr	1995	Maurizio Gatti	1991	Kathy Matthews	1991
Kathryn Anderson	1993	Bill Gelbart	1994	Dennis McKearin	1996
Deborah Andrew	1997	Bill Gelbart	1991	Bruce McKee	1991
Chip Aquadro	1994	Pam Geyer	1996	Mike McKeown	1996
Spyros Artavanis	1994	Michael Goldberg	1992	Denise Montell	1993
Bruce Baker	1996	Larry Goldstein	1991	Steve Mount	1992
Utpal Bannerjee	1997	Isvar Hariharan	1998	Ruthann Nichols	1992
Michael Bate	1992	Tom Hayes	1995	Roel Nusse	1997
Phil Beachy	1998	Ulrike Heberlein	1996	David O'Brohta	1997
Hugo Bellen	1997	Martin Heisenberg	1994	Pat O'Farrell	1993
Celeste Berg	1994	Jules Hoffmann	1998	Terry Orr-Weaver	1996
Marianne Bienz	1996	Joan Hooper	1995	Terry Orr-Weaver	1992
Seth Blair	1997	John Jaenike	1992	Mike Palazzolo	1995
Andrea Brand	1991	Lily Jan	1993	Susan Parkhurst	1991
Ross Cagan	1998	Gary Karpen	1993	Nipam Patel	1991
Sean Carroll	1995	Thom Kaufman	1992	Mark Peifer	1997
Susan Celniker	1992	James Kennison	1991	Karen Perkins	1991
Lynn Cooley	1992	Dan Kiehart	1992	Leslie Pick	1994
Claire Cronmiller	1995	Christian Klommt	1998	Jim Posakony	1991
Claude Desplan	1992	Marty Kreitman	1991	Elizabeth Raff	1991
Michael Dickinson	1995	Mitzi Kuroda	1997	Pernille Rorth	1995
Chris Doe	1996	Chuck Langley	1991	Gerry Rubin	1998
Ian Duncan	1991	Cathy Laurie	1997	Helen Saltz	1994
Walter Eanes	1992	Ruth Lehman	1993	Babis Savakis	1995
Bruce Edgar	1997	Maria Leptin	1994	Paul Schedl	1998
Bill Engels	1992	Mike Levine	1993	Gerald Schubiger	1996
Anne Ephrussi	1992	Bob Levis	1997	Trudi Schupbach	1992
Ron Evans	1993	Haifan Lin	1995	Lillie Searles	1992
Martin Feder	1998	Susan Lindquist	1991	John Sedat	1991
Janice Fischer	1998	Javier Lopez	1991	Amita Sehgal	1996
Barry Ganetzky	1991	Tony Maholwald	1993	Allen Shearn	1994

Mike Simon	1993	Bill Theurkauf	1994	Kalpana White	1992
Marla Sokolowski	1998	Carl Thummel	1992	Eric Wieschaus	1996
Allan Spradling	1991	Bob Tjian	1993	Chung-I Wu	1991
Hermann Steller	1992	James Truman	1992	Carl Wu	1992
Ruth Steward	1996	Tim Tully	1995	C. Ting Wu	1997
Bill Sullivan	1998	Barbara Wakimoto	1991	Tian Xu	1997
John Sved	1997	Steve Wasserman	1996	Larry Zipursky	1991
Barbara Taylor	1996	Kristi Wharton	1994	Susan Zusman	1998

Abstract submissions and selection of talks:

There were 345 requests for 144 slide session talks (42% granted). Overall, we were impressed by the high quality of the science represented in the abstracts submitted for talks.

Using the data on slide requests under the 15 topics from the 1997 meeting as guidelines, we provided 11 topics as choices for abstract submission. These topics were maintained for the poster session, but the final slide session topics were selected based on the areas of strength among the submitted abstracts.

Abstract submission topics:	Slides =====	Posters =====	Total 1st choice =====
	1st (2nd)		
1. Pattern formation	60 (38)	79	139
2. Cell biology	63 (108)	106	169
3. Transcriptional and post-transcriptional gene regulation	51 (59)	61	112
4. Neural development	40 (31)	43	83
5. Neurophysiology & behavior	20 (9)	23	43
6. Population and evolution	15 (15)	19	34
7. Transposable elements & DNA repair	18 (10)	12	30
8. Cell cycle	15 (9)	13	28
9. Organogenesis & muscle development	15 (27)	31	46
10. Gametogenesis	21 (17)	48	69
11. Chromosome structure & function	27 (22)	49	76
	====	====	====
	345	484	829

Although we reviewed all abstracts for suitability and topic assignment, we are indebted to the following people for reviewing abstracts in specific fields: John Tower (gene regulation and chromatin structure), Sam Kunes (neural development), Laurie Tompkins (neurophysiology and behavior), Dave Rand (population and evolution), Don Rio (transposable elements and DNA repair), and Sue Abmayr (organogenesis and muscle development).

Workshops:

Of the 8 workshops organized for the meeting, 4 are repeats and 4 are new. Availability of rooms for workshops was initially an issue, but Marcia negotiated for additional rooms last fall.

Projection of videos:

We declined 2 requests for video projection equipment for slide sessions, due to the cost and the room size, outlined below. Given the advances in microscopy of live specimens, we believe that video projection will be an important medium for presenting data in the future.

Computer projection: Recommended for a room seating up to 300 theater style was a Sony Data Projector #1272 (Multisync). Cost per unit per day is \$1275. The cost includes the projector, stand, screen and cable to connect to the speaker's lap top computer.

Standard televised video projection: A big-screen TV would only be visible to about 1/3 the audience, and would cost \$1200/day.

Meeting information on the Web:

Many members of the Drosophila research community turn to FlyBase to obtain information about upcoming meetings. We recommend that the GSA and FlyBase formalize an arrangement so that FlyBase posts the URL's for the GSA fly meeting websites.

Electronic submission of abstracts:

There seemed to be no hitches in the change-over to electronic submission of abstracts.

Keyword search for online abstracts:

We developed a list of keywords that was provided to abstract authors, who could select up to 5 on their abstract submission form. This was intended to facilitate on-line searches of the meeting abstracts. Feedback on the utility of the keywords and any suggested changes should be sent to Marcia Ryan or next year's meeting organizers.

5. REPORT OF THE SANDLER LECTURER COMMITTEE (R. Scott Hawley)

This year's committee was R. Scott Hawley (chair), Ken Burtis, Helen Salz, Allen Shearn, and Paul Szauter. There were 10 nominees (all great), 3 finalists whose theses we read, and 1 winner who lectured at the beginning of the fly meeting.

Next year's chair is Bill Sullivan, UC Santa Cruz.

1998 Sandler Lecturer Results

Finalist/ Advisor-----

Nir Hacohen/Mark Krasnow
Adina Bailey/James Posakony
Lisa Maves/Gerold Schubiger

Lecturer/ Advisor-----

Nir Hacohen/Mark Krasnow

6. REPORT OF THE 1999 PROGRAM COMMITTEE (Barbara Wakimoto, Susan Parkhurst and Marsha Ryan)

The next Drosophila meeting will be held from March 24-28, 1999 in Bellevue Washington, . The major difference from previous meetings is that we will be housed in four hotels, rather than one. Our plenary sessions will be held in the Meydenbauer Convention Center. The facilities are within easy access of each other, with a maximum distance of 5 blocks between the two largest hotels. The Double Tree Inn will serve as our headquarter hotel and will be the site all of the sessions except the plenary sessions on Wednesday and Thursday. The hotel room rates for the four hotels range from \$93 to \$126 per night for double occupancy. Marsha will be finalizing the hotel and convention center contracts within the next month. Over the next 11 months, Susan and Barbara will organize the scientific program and will investigate the restaurants in Bellevue.

7. REPORT OF THE GSA COORDINATOR (Marsha Ryan)

a) 39th Annual Drosophila Research Conference

Advance registrations for the 1998 meeting indicate that overall registration numbers will be approximately equal to 1997. Total registration in 1997, after deducting cancellations, totaled 1,382. Hotel room rates for singles in 1998 are the same as in 1997, at \$128. Room pickup on peak night at the three conference hotels totals 598—slightly lower than the original 625 rooms blocked.

The Omni Shoreham was unable to deliver the number of rooms originally blocked in the contract because renovations are still incomplete. When notified by the Omni last October that they had to reduce our block to from 600 to 435 rooms, we were able to pick up an additional 100 rooms at the Sheraton Washington where we were already holding 25 rooms for overflow. The two hotel blocks were sold out by February 22. By that time we had reserved an additional block of 60 rooms at the Holiday Inn in Chevy Chase, Maryland. Several hotels in various locations of Washington offered room blocks in varying numbers and at various prices. After comparing locations of these hotels and the room rates offered, the Holiday Inn seemed the safest and most economical choice for Drosophila attendees. The rate is \$119 per night. The Holiday Inn is located within less than 2 blocks from a Washington, DC Metro rail station and is on the same line as the Omni. However, because the Metro stops running at 11:00 pm, shuttle vans are being supplied for the 40 or so individuals staying at the Holiday Inn. The shuttle service has been booked beginning at 10:00 pm with the last trip from the Omni scheduled for 1:00 am nightly. The vans will depart the Omni every half hour. The cost is \$1,600 for the vans. Though there is no recourse for this situation included in the Omni contract, it is hoped that we can recoup the cost of the shuttle from the Omni.

As this report is written, it should be noted that the Omni Shoreham reservation department has not equaled the service expected. The Convention Services Manager has been extremely willing to accommodate the meeting's needs, but his department seems to be scantily staffed. However, no significant problems are anticipated due to the hotel's services.

The only notable concerns are the capacity and layout of the concurrent slide session rooms. Rooms set maximum seat only up to 500 and there is no predicting which sessions participants will choose to attend. Secondly, there are columns in some of the concurrent session rooms which could obstruct the some peoples' view of slides.

Geographic distribution statistics follow that were garnered from 1997 and 1998 pre-registration.

	DOMESTIC		FOREIGN		
	1997	1998	1997	1998	
NORTHEAST	307/25.5%	411/35%	EUROPE	139/11.5%	152/12.9%
SOUTHEAST	93/ 7.7%	110/ 9.3%	MEX/SO AMER	3/ .3%	3/.002%
MIDWEST	370/ 30.7%	194/16.5%	CANADA	34/ 2.8%	34/ 2.8%
WEST	205/ 17%	210/17.9%	ASIA/PACIFIC	51/ 4.2%	59/ 5.0%
TOTALS	975/ 80.9%	925/78.8%		227/ 18.8%	248/21.2%

In spite of lowering the registration fee for Drosophila registrants who are members of GSA, the projected net from the meeting is approximately \$20,000. Details of the Conference income and expense are reported by the Treasurer, Allan Spradling.

b) Future meetings

1999 - March 24-28 - Bellevue, WA

The hotel room final rates have been determined but not confirmed in writing at this time. Because of the added expense to rent space at the Meydenbauer center (approximately \$5,000) for the mixer and

plenary sessions, the cost of space rental at the Doubletree (\$4,000) and heating exhibit area (\$1500), all room rates at Conference hotels include \$4 per night that will be paid to the Conference by the hotels to cover these costs. Maximum expected return from hotels, assuming all rooms in the four hotels are filled, would be \$12,825.

Doubletree - \$126 single/ double (250 rooms peak night)
Hyatt - \$137 single/ double (225 rooms peak night)
Hilton - \$124 single/ double (75 rooms peak night)
Best West. - \$95 single/\$105 double (100 rooms peak night)

The original representative from the Belleview area Convention and Visitors Bureau told us the Bureau was going to be capable of handling housing (central office to take reservations for all hotels) and the cost would be little to none to our group. However, that representative is no longer with the Bureau and the Bureau does not have a housing department or staff to handle our reservations. Therefore, adding the cost of paying a housing bureau by the reservation must be taken into consideration. No firm offer is currently in hand for this service but we are awaiting bids. Housing firms typically charge \$10-15 per reservation (not per night).

There is a concern, however, about the fact that the former Bureau representative assured us that the local community was picking up the cost to carpet the garage floor, estimated to be about \$10,000. This was mentioned to the replacement representative who could not confirm that understanding. Since contracts are not signed with convention bureaus, there is no binding instrument to cover this expense. The Doubletree requires that the garage be carpeted.

Though hotels are spread about a 6 block area, shuttle buses will not be provided due to the cost as determined last year by the Fly Board.

Proposals have been requested from 2 decorating companies for the cost of set up and rental of poster boards. I expect the cost of poster boards to be in the neighborhood of \$55 ea.

2000 - Pittsburgh Pennsylvania, March 22-26, 2000

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania was selected and contracted for the 41st Dros Conference. A contracts was signed with the Pittsburgh Convention Center to house all scientific sessions, committee meetings, posters and exhibits. The city of Pittsburgh waived rental fees for the use of the facility as is outlined in the contract.. Additional charges will be incurred for space only if significant changes are made to the program as it currently exists. The Convention Center is directly across the street from the primary hotel, the Doubletree Hotel Pittsburgh, and is connected by a covered walkway. The mixer will be held in the ballroom of the Doubletree.

Contracted hotels are the Doubletree and the Westin William Penn. Contracts were agreed upon with room rates set and guaranteed for 2000 at \$115-118 single and \$115-128 double. Total peak room nights being blocked is 610.

2001 - 42ND Annual Conference - East Coast City - To be determined

East coast cities under consideration and which have been contacted to provide proposals include:

Boston, MA
Philadelphia, PA
Baltimore, MD
Washington, DC
Charleston, SC
Savannah, GA
Jacksonville, FL

Though requests were made for proposals to be delivered by March 20, we have heard only from the following cities:

Baltimore, MD

First, *Baltimore* would not provide any proposals due to the fact that no convention center space is set aside this far in advance for meetings with fewer than 2000 rooms peak night. Additionally, there are no Baltimore hotels with adequate space for posters and plenary sessions to be set up and held simultaneously.

Washington, DC

A similar situation exists in *Washington, DC*. The convention center requires 3000 rooms peak night to book space more than one year out. However, there are two hotels in Washington with adequate space for the Conference-one is the Omni Shoreham, the other is the Marriott Washington (formerly Sheraton Washington). The Omni has not yet been asked to offer a proposal pending the outcome of the 1998 meeting. The Marriott has offered and is holding for the Conference on a first option basis, 650 rooms peak night along with ample poster and session space for March 21-25. The same rooms and space are being held on a 2nd option for April 4-8. Approximate rates based on the Marriott's 1998 standard group rates are \$190 single or double for the March dates and \$206 single or double for April dates. This quote is prior to any negotiations so if pursued, rates could be somewhat lower. The Marriott is currently beginning a multi-million dollar renovation of the meeting space which would be completed by 2000.

Jacksonville, FL

Jacksonville, Florida, has offered a complete package including hotel rooms (625 peak night), convention center and transportation (provided on a complimentary basis by the city) with confirmed rates. Jacksonville offers on a first option basis three sets of dates: March 29-April 1, April 5-9 and April 12-15. The cost of the use of the convention center for all sessions and posters is offered at approximately \$16,000, but is subject to price revision until a contract is signed. To offset the cost of the convention center rental, registration would need to be raised approximately \$15 for all registrants including students; or if added to the cost of hotel room rates, approximately \$6 per room per night would need to be collected by hotels for return to the Conference. On a first option basis, hotels and rates (rates shown are for 2001) currently offered are:

#Rms	Hotel	Rates
200	Jacksonville Hilton and Towers	\$138 single/double
200	Jacksonville Marriott	\$149 single/double
175	Radisson Riverwalk	\$159 single/double
50	Hampton Inn	\$109 single/double

All hotels would be included on the complimentary shuttle bus service route to the Convention Center. The Hilton and Radisson hotels are located on the James River in downtown Jacksonville, and the Hampton a few blocks away in downtown. The Marriott is located in South Jacksonville, a new and prosperous section of the city approximately 7 miles from the Center.

Boston, Philadelphia, Charleston and Savannah have not sent complete proposals as this report is written. Additional proposals received before the Board meets will be presented at the meeting.

8. REPORT OF THE TREASURER (Allan Spradling)

a) 1998 meeting finances report

Revenue

Registration	\$ 186,030
Exhibit Fees	4,900
Misc/Program Sales	<u>600</u>
	!;

TOTAL \$ 191,530

Expenditures

Fixed Expenses:

Hotel and Travel - Staff	1,000
Hotel and Travel - Others	1,200
Addressing, mailing and shipping	4,900
Telephone and Fax	150 ¹
Composition/printing (Call, misc)	3,402
Composition/printing(Program&addendum)	16,500
Office Supplies	2,000
Projection/audio-visuals/electrical/sound	13,500
Computer Services	9,800
Exhibit Expense	800
Contracted Services	2,800
Poster Board Rental/Labor Expense	19,500 ²
Registration personnel	700
Rental Equipment	1,300
Insurance Expense	625
Shuttle Expense	1,600 ³

Variable Expenses:

Salaries/Wages/taxes/benefits	39,000
Coffee Breaks/lunches/refreshments	21,300 ⁴
Reception	23,000 ⁴
Credit card/bank fees	3,400
Miscellaneous Expense	<u>500</u>

Total Expenditures **\$ 165,777**

NET REVENUE (EXPENSE) **\$ 25,753**

Actual 1998 Advance Registration

Type	Cost	Number	Amount
Regular member	\$130	407	\$ 52,910
Regular member (on site)	\$150		
Non member	\$235	250	\$58,750
Non-member (onsite)	\$255		
Student member	\$070	091	\$6,370
Student member (on site)	\$100		
Student non member	\$090	386	\$34,740
Student non member (on site)	\$120		
TOTAL Pre-registration		1,134	\$152,770

¹ GSA no longer distributes these charges among its departments and meetings.

² Due to poor condition of exhibit area (an indoor garage), carpeting and draping were necessary and approved by Treasurer and President prior to meeting.

³ Due to Omni Shoreham's inability to deliver contracted rooms (contracted for 600, could supply only 435). Overflow rooms booked at Sheraton were limited in availability to 125 rooms. Therefore, it became necessary to contract for additional rooms at reasonable rate for attendees which are located in nearby suburb. Because the Metro transport closes at 11:00 pm, it became necessary to provide transportation to the suburban hotel nightly for 3 hours.

⁴Menu prices increased after last budget prepared. Substantially more food ordered for Mixer than in 1997.

Projected 1998 Registration

Type	Cost	Number	Amount
Regular member	\$130	397	\$51,610
Regular member (on site)	\$150	058	\$8,700
Non member	\$235	258	\$60,630
Non-member (onsite)	\$255	060	\$15,300
Student member	\$070	076	\$5,320
Student member (on site)	\$100	011	\$1,100
Student non member	\$090	372	\$33,480
Student non member (on site)	\$120	068	\$8,160
Pre-Registration		1,103	\$151,040
TOTAL Registration		1,300	\$184,300

Current 1998 Meeting Estimate

Type	Cost	Number	Amount
Regular member	\$130	407	\$ 52,910
Regular member (on site)	\$150	058	\$8,700
Non member	\$235	250	\$58,750
Non-member (onsite)	\$255	060	\$15,300
Student member	\$070	091	\$6,370
Student member (on site)	\$100	011	\$1,100
Student non member	\$090	386	\$34,740
Student non member (on site)	\$120	068	\$8,160
TOTAL		1,331	\$186,030
PROJECTION DIFFERENCES		31	\$1,730

b) general account balance

Meeting Year	Net Income	Fund Balance	Excess Over Reserve	# Meeting Attendees
1993	\$17,105	\$ 25,146	\$ 146	1,165
1994	2,800	27,946	2,946	1,222
1995	8,417	36,363	11,363	1,103
1996	15,035	51,398	26,398	1,423
1997	31,663	83,061	58,061	1,382
1998 (est.)	25,753	108,814	83,814	1,300

The general fund contains \$108,814 as of March 1998. See discussion of finances section 9.b).

c) Sandler account / investment

Meeting Year	Net Income	Fund Balance	Excess Over Reserve
1993	\$1,417	\$26,720	\$18,720
1994	-1,207	25,513	17,513
1995	1,891	27,404	19,404
1996	1,009	28,413	20,413
1997	1,467	29,880	21,880
1998	1,386	31,266	23,266

The Sandler Fund is quite healthy. See discussion of finances section 9.c.

9. BOARD DISCUSSION OF MEETINGS AND FINANCES

a) change to business meeting format

The board discussed the fact that the format of the annual general business meeting, usually held right before the end of the annual meeting, was no longer serving the needs of the community. As a result most scientists do not attend the meeting, and very little of substance is usually discussed. The board approved a motion from the president to revamp the business meeting. Starting at the 1999 meeting, the 1 hr business meeting will be held at a more convenient time, in the middle of the meeting, and will consist of 15 minute presentations and discussions from representatives of the key community resources. These include FlyBase, the Berkeley and European Genome Projects, the stock centers, and, if necessary, reports on political action and future meetings.

b) management of the general fund - how to avoid the 125 K GSA 'cap'

The GSA has imposed a \$125,000 cap on the amount of money the Drosophila community can hold in savings. Any funds over 125K will be transferred to the general GSA account and would not be available to the Drosophila community. The current account balance is \$85,000, and the board discussed how we should spend some of this money to avoid passing the cap. The board decided to use the funds to support graduate student attendance, using some kind of a 'competition' for best posters or talks, and to seed new community resources, when necessary.

c) management of the Sandler Fund

The Treasurer (Allan Spradling) convened a committee (Michael Bender, Kathy Matthews, Steve Wasserman) to investigate the best way to invest the Sandler Funds. The committee recommended funds should be invested in the Vanguard Index500 fund and the Vanguard Health Care Stock Fund. The Board discussed this plan, questioned the wisdom of investing in Health Care during the HMO era, but recommended the proposed plan to the GSA Board. Subsequently, this recommendation was partly rejected by the GSA Board, which placed all the money in the Index500 fund.

10. REPORT OF STOCK CENTER ADVISORY COMMITTEE (Hugo Bellen)

a) general report

Due to illness, the chair of the committee, Dan Lindsley resigned. Hugo Bellen, former member of the advisory committee now chairs the committee. Kent Golic has accepted to replace Hugo Bellen as a member and join the committee. The committee consists of Michael Ashburner, Norbet Perimon, Kent Golic, Scott Hawley, and Hugo Bellen. Also invited to the following meeting are Kathy Mattew's, Kevin Cook, Thom Kaufman, and Ron Woodruf. We will have a lunch on Friday to discuss future matters.

Last year, an NSF review panel recommended that the Mid-America Stock Center be replaced by another Stock center as its operation and management were judged unsatisfactory. The Bowling Green Stock Center (Mid-America stock center) is thus being phased out. The committee was in favor of consolidating all the stocks in Bloomington as nobody volunteered to start a new stock center. Kathy Matthews kindly agreed to consolidate all the useful Mid-America Stocks in Bloomington.

The Bloomington Stock center is being expanded. It is estimated that the collection will slowly grow to 8,000 to 10,000 stocks. The NSF agreed to fund the transition costs associated with the move and to support the expansion of the Bloomington Stock Center. Kathy asked to be helped in her endeavors by hiring a senior staff member will share the operation and management of the expanded stock center. Kevin Cook (Ph.D. and currently a postdoc at Caltech) will share the responsibilities with Kathy in the near future.

The new stocks that will be added to the present collection and the pruned Bowling Green Collection will carefully be screened by the advisory board in consultation with Kathy and Thom. The main aims of the expanded stock center are as follows.

- to maintain the high standard of service stock keeping and mail delivery that has been achieved in the past five years.

- to provide as much as possible access to the content of the stock center via Flybase.

- to expand the collection with useful stocks: i.e. one null allele of each of the lethal complementation groups, specific sets of characterized GAL4 lines, new P{w+} insertions that cause lethality and are revertible, new useful deficiencies, etc.

b) species stock center

There have been long-standing problems with the species stock center. This is a critical resource, especially for evolution studies. The center is no longer funded, and an attempt to move it to another location failed because NSF did not fund the grant. Hugo Bellen told the board that NSF has decided to breath new life into the center, and will likely reconsider funding it in the near future.

11. BLOOMINGTON STOCK CENTER REPORT (Kathy Matthews and Thom Kaufman)

A. HOLDINGS

Total stocks as of 3/9/98	6,234	
Main collection	4,406	(71%)
P collection	1,828	(29%)

1,798 stocks were added to the collection in 1997 and early 1998. 967 were transferred from Mid-America (an additional 56 stocks are expected soon), 660 came from the Berkeley Drosophila Genome Project, and 171 came from 33 other donors. Included among the 171 stocks added from a variety of sources were 19 deficiencies, 10 *f⁺* transgenic stocks for clonal analysis, 32 *GAL4/UAS* lines, 2 *GFP* stocks, 4 *P{Delta2-3}* stocks, 5 *ry⁻* stocks with useful markers and balancers, and an assortment of stocks with useful *lacZ* expression patterns, better mutant alleles, or mutant alleles of genes not previously represented in the collection.

41 stocks were removed or lost from the collection during 1997. 16 of these were removed as redundant, 12 as 'not-as-represented', and 13 were lost to inviability despite rescue attempts.

B. TRANSFER OF MID-AMERICA STOCKS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The transfer of stocks from Mid-America is largely complete. One final shipment of 56 stocks is expected in the near future. The numbers of duplicate, transferred, and orphan (not transferred) stocks are shown below.

Total Mid-America stocks	4,198
Already at Bloomington	914 (22%)
Unique Mid-A. stocks	3,284
Moved to Bloomington	1,016 (31%)
Orphan stocks	2,268 (69%)

Stocks that were declined for transfer to Bloomington include seldom used or redundant aberration breakpoints, redundant alleles of a given gene, uncharacterized alleles, unidentified alleles or aberrations, and stocks that are sufficiently similar to others in the collection that they were judged redundant. Lists of orphan stocks and their components were made available to the community through FlyBase. We posted announcements of these lists to the bionet.drosophila newsgroup and sent e-mail announcements to each Bloomington BUN-holder encouraging drosophilists to look through these lists for stocks that they might want to receive before the Mid-America center closes, or that they think should be added to the Bloomington collection. Four individuals contacted us about adding additional stocks from the orphan list.

Rather than providing standard teaching stocks to high schools and colleges free of charge as was the custom of Mid-America, we have been referring teachers seeking these basic stocks to commercial sources. All but one of the high-use Mid-America stocks are currently available from three different biological supply houses at very reasonable prices (about \$5 per stock for a larger culture than we can provide). These businesses provide media and other necessary supplies as well, and provide good basic information about Drosophila culture geared toward the classroom.

C. USE OF THE CENTER

In 1997 the number of requests for stocks or information increased by 28%, the number of shipments increased by 32%, and the number of stocks shipped increased by 17%. Use of the collection over the past 5 years is summarized below. Funding shown below includes indirect costs; direct costs for the current fiscal year, 97/98 - the first year with full expansion funding, are \$302,116.

Year	Collection Size	Requests	Shipments	Subcultures Shipped	NSF+NIH Funding	Cost per Subculture
1993	5,374	2,618	2,198	16,768	\$255,979	\$15.27
1994	5,140	3,086	2,654	23,274	\$266,205	\$11.44
1995	4,451	2,812	2,353	25,551	\$240,539	\$9.41
1996	4,482	3,610	3,118	32,502	\$253,424	\$7.80
1997	6,234	4,608	4,104	38,147	\$341,020	\$8.93

Increase or decrease in use of P collection and Main collection stock for years 1993 through 1997, compared to the previous year (the P collection was added to the center in August of 1990) are shown below.

Years	Change in use of P Collection	Change in use of Main Collection
1993 vs. 1992	+ 70%	+ 19%
1994 vs. 1995	+ 44%	+ 36%
1995 vs. 1994	- 4%	+ 19%
1996 vs. 1995	+ 1%	+ 42%
1997 vs. 1996	+ 13%	+ 19%

D. COST RECOVERY

The number and percent of user groups in each use category for 1997 compared to 1996 is shown below.

Year	Minimal Use 1 - 20 stocks, 4 shipments	Moderate Use 21 - 100 stocks, 12 shipments	Heavy Use >100 stocks, >12 shipments	Total
------	--	--	--	-------

1996	283 (52%)	159 (29%)	99 (18%)	541
1997	298 (47%)	206 (33%)	123 (19%)	627

53 user groups in the Minimal Use category (payment optional) chose to pay for their use of the center in 1997. Fees were waived for 16 groups in the Moderate Use category and 3 in the Heavy Use category (two were other stock centers). We will invoice users approximately \$92,000 for their use of the center during 1997. The stock center endowment account now stands at \$136,565.

12. DIS REPORT (Jim Thompson)

Volume 80 of Drosophila Information Service was printed last summer and included research and technique notes, new mutant reports, conference notes, and the stock list of the Moscow Regional Drosophila melanogaster Stock Center, Dubna, Russia. A new section for teaching laboratory experiments was also initiated. Contributions are now being accepted for volume 81, which will be printed and distributed in August, 1998. Submissions will be accepted until about 15 May, and the subscription cost remains unchanged at \$12.00 per copy plus shipping and handling of \$3.00. One area that has been generated very supportive comments is the inclusion of information about presentations at regional genetics meetings that include talks on Drosophila research. These can serve as a way for researchers to identify others with common interests or sources of material. I encourage conference organizers or participants to provide a copy of the proceedings so that this information can be made more widely available.

13. BERKELEY GENOME PROJECT REPORT (Gerry Rubin)

1. Recent history of the Drosophila Genome Center.

The second competitive renewal for the Drosophila Genome Center was submitted for a March 1, 1988 deadline. The major aim for the three years covered by this proposal is to complete the genomic sequencing of the 120 Mb euchromatic portion of the Drosophila genome. We also proposed to continue our modest efforts to annotate this genomic sequence by experimental and computational methods and to develop effective means to transfer information and reagents to the biological research community through our new role in FlyBase.

In the summer of 1997 the Drosophila Genome Center underwent a major restructuring, largely in response to the DOE's reorganization to create the Joint Genome Institute (JGI). Prior to that time NIH-funded Drosophila genomic sequencing and DOE-funded human sequencing were performed side-by-side at LBNL by a common staff and the DOE provided significant support for technology development and informatics that benefited both projects. In August 1997 production sequencing staff were divided between the Drosophila project and the JGI, and Chris Martin became a full-time member of the JGI. At the end of November, Mike Palazzolo left to accept a senior position at Amgen, Inc. With the beginning of the grant year that started December 1, 1997, Bruce Kimmel, who had been managing the DOE-funded technology development effort, became the PI of the genomic mapping and sequencing components of the Drosophila Genome Center. At the same time, Susan Celniker became co-manager of these efforts. As of January 1, 1998, Roger Hoskins joined our team of Ph.D. level scientists; Roger will initially focus his efforts on generation of the sequence ready map.

2. Plan for completing the genomic sequence.

Our goal in planning our renewal application was to devise a credible plan for finishing the Drosophila genome sequence by the end of the next three year funding period on November 30, 2001. To accomplish this objective we have proposed to expand the genomic sequencing effort by adding a second production sequencing group to our Center, that of Richard Gibbs at Baylor. We are confident that the current Berkeley-based sequencing group will be able to meet the NHGRI cost/base sequencing goals, but the present space at LBNL (9,500 sq. ft.) will not permit sufficient expansion to complete the genome in the next funding period. Approximately 11.5 Mb of genomic sequence has

been completed in Berkeley to date. With the approximately 1 MB completed by the EDGP (D. Glover, PI), this means that we have reached the 10% mark. We expect to reach 20Mb by the time our current grant ends on November 30, 1998.

Under the plan proposed in this application, the sequencing group at LBNL would remain at the size that it has been authorized to expand to by our recent supplement (\$7M per year for sequence production and related technology development). The additional expansion of the sequencing effort which will be necessary to complete sequencing the genome by the end of the grant period (\$5M per year in production sequencing) would occur at Baylor where there is adequate space for expansion. Physical map completion would be carried out by a coordinated effort to assemble BAC (and if necessary additional P1) contigs in Berkeley by STS content mapping and by fingerprinting in Baylor. Detailed post-sequence analysis would continue to be performed at the Berkeley campus site, taking advantage of our existing infrastructure, *Drosophila* expertise, and role in FlyBase.

3. Biological annotation of the genomic DNA sequence.

Our work in this area has four components: (1) P-element-mediated insertional mutagenesis. The Spradling and Rubin labs are now in the final stages of their analysis of lethal P elements and a paper reporting these data will be submitted in the next few months. About 1000 different genes have been hit. In our continuing studies we will map both viable and lethal lines by sequencing element-genome junctions of unselected insertions using IPCR. We will use Rorth's EP element so that both loss-of-function and misexpression phenotypes generated by these insertions can be assessed.

(2) Characterization of the sequence and expression pattern of cDNA molecules. We will determine the start sites and extents of transcription units, as well as their intron-exon structure, by comparing full-length cDNA and genomic sequences. The cDNAs will be identified by comparing the genomic sequence as it emerges to a collection of 5' ESTs made from full length cDNAs as part of a project funded by the HHMI. (Over 25,000 ESTs have been deposited in dbEST to date.) These cDNAs will be sequenced only on one strand with only sufficient accuracy to allow unambiguous alignment with the high quality genomic sequence, which can then be used to "correct" the accuracy of the cDNA sequence. Our EST resource is expected to represent full-length cDNAs corresponding to approximately 60% of all *Drosophila* genes by the end of 1998.

(3) the development and testing of computational approaches to the algorithmic identification of features of the DNA sequence

(4) the development of informatics tools both to support the experimental process and to allow the presentation of up-to-date information on the annotated *Drosophila* genomic sequence to the world-wide user research community.

Much of the work on (3) and (4) will be performed as part of our role as "FlyBase-Berkeley".

We are aware from our own previous experiences in review that there has been mixed programmatic enthusiasm for having the NHGRI fund genome-wide biological annotation efforts such as those we are proposing. We are therefore actively seeking funding from the NCI and the DOE.

14. FLYBASE (Bill Gelbart)

1. During the last year, FlyBase initiated a major expansion. The new FlyBase Consortium consists of a merger of the public informatics groups of the Berkeley and European *Drosophila* Genome Projects with the previous FlyBase group. The goal of this merger is to provide the biological community with access to a completely integrated *Drosophila* data set, including everything from sequence level data all the way to organismal and population level data. Experimental and computed data from the genome projects will be seamlessly merged with community data from the literature (including Genbank/EMBL/DDBJ entries). This data set will be available on one FlyBase server that will be mirrored at several sites around the world.

At present, the groundwork is being prepared for the merger, and merged data sets will begin to appear in the next few months. We expect that it will take 2 years to implement a fully merged public view of FlyBase.

2. As part of the merger, we are actively discussing the design of the graphical and text pages of FlyBase, and will actively solicit comments and critiques from the community. The FlyBoard can be especially helpful in this regard. One specific request from FlyBase is that the FlyBoard undertake an electronic survey of the fly community on its view of the past performance of FlyBase, with an aim of getting a better understanding of the things we are doing well or falling short on, both with regard to the data set itself and the public WWW interface. FlyBase feels that such surveys should be one type of periodic review of the *Drosophila* community research resources.

This particular survey would also be helpful to the pending FlyBase competitive grant renewal, which will be reviewed by the Genome Research Review Committee at its June 30-July 1 meeting (see below). FlyBase requests that the FlyBoard designate a subcommittee to carry out this survey, with a timeline of reporting its results to FlyBase by mid to late May, so that we have time to evaluate and address any major areas of concern.

3. As stated in section 2, the FlyBase competitive grant renewal is now pending. At present, the U.S. components of the FlyBase Consortium is funded by NHGRI grants to FlyBase (W. Gelbart, PI) and to the Berkeley *Drosophila* Genome Project (G. Rubin, PI). Michael Ashburner's FlyBase component is jointly funded by NHGRI and a grant from the Medical Research Council (UK). The European *Drosophila* Genome Project (EDGP) is funded by a grant from the European Union. We are seeking 5 years of funding for the expanded FlyBase group in one grant from the NHGRI, with the exception of separate European funding for the EDGP and supplementary funding for Michael Ashburner that he will seek from other non-US sources. Informatics is expensive and we are asking for a substantial level of support, which we believe is appropriate for the importance of *Drosophila* as an experimental system for genetic and genomic research, and necessary for us to sustain the required level of data capture and presentation to the biological community.

One issue that will loom large in the evaluation of FlyBase is how it serves its user community. This community will undoubtedly be viewed as not just the *Drosophila* research community, but the larger research world as well. One way that FlyBase tries to reach out to the larger community is through establishing a very rich set of hyperlinks to other genetic and genomic databases. In addition, FlyBase has been heavily involved in developing controlled vocabularies that will permit more effective querying between databases. We are looking for other ways in which to make FlyBase more broadly accessible, and would again appreciate input from the *Drosophila* Board.

4. An issue that relates to greater accessibility of FlyBase is nomenclature usage. Genetic terminology in *Drosophila* is certainly challenging for the broader community to unravel. This is made more difficult when different groups choose to use alternative naming systems for genes and other genetic objects. It is clear to FlyBase that it would be helpful for the FlyBoard to become involved in establishing and maintaining a standardized nomenclature. The specifics of our proposal will be presented at the Board meeting.

5. Dan Hartl has assembled a group of population and quantitative geneticists who are meeting on Tuesday, March 24, to discuss areas of data capture that FlyBase should undertake in this general area. FlyBase has agreed to work with this community to capture and provide access to such data. This is likely to be a prototype for capturing genetic diversity data in other systems as well.

Other issues:

(1) For the FlyBoard to establish a *Drosophila* nomenclature committee. Its mandate would be to (a) review, modify as appropriate and endorse the nomenclature guidelines, using the current FlyBase guidelines as a starting point, and (b) resolve difficult nomenclature conflicts.

(2) For the FlyBoard to establish a committee to undertake periodic surveys of the community to obtain feedback on the public Drosophila resources. For the future, on some rotational basis, it might be valuable to hold surveys on each of the public resources. However, the immediate survey has some urgency and would focus on FlyBase, which is currently being considered for competitive renewal. Thus, it would be necessary to conduct and evaluate the survey by the end of May, so that FlyBase could have a chance to evaluate and respond to the major issues. (The NIH GRRC study section will hold its review on June 30 - July 1.)

15. OTHER BUSINESS

Gerry Rubin raised an important issue concerning the need for the fly community to lobby NIH, NSF, and NCI for funds to expand support for Drosophila R01 research, and for critical community resources. Gerry pointed out that other communities are making their cases to these agencies, and that we will lose resources if we do not participate. There are many community resources related to the genome projects that are too expensive for individual labs to pursue (e.g. DNA chips). It is important that these agencies be reminded of the important contributions Drosophila research has made to our understanding of biological mechanisms, and that there still are critical contributions in the present and the future that can only come from Drosophila research. The board decided to have Larry Goldstein, the 1999 President, appoint a committee of senior researchers, preferably with useful connections in these agencies, to investigate what needs to be done, and to execute the best plan of action.