

VERBATIM PROCEEDINGS

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY
COMMITTEE MEETING

OCTOBER 2, 2012

1:04 P.M.

CONNECTICUT INNOVATIONS
865 BROOK STREET
ROCKY HILL, CT 06067-3444

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 . . .Verbatim proceedings of the
2 Connecticut Stem Cell Research Advisory Committee meeting,
3 held at Connecticut Innovations, 865 Brook Street, Rocky
4 Hill, Connecticut, on October 2, 2012 at 1:04 p.m. . . .

5

6

7

8 CHAIRPERSON MARIANNE HORN: We're ready to
9 go on the record.

10 MS. SARA DONOFRIO: If we could have
11 everybody that's called in just state your name, please?

12 DR. DIANE KRAUSE: Diane Krause.

13 DR. GERALD FISHBONE: Gerry Fishbone.

14 DR. RONALD HART: Ron Hart.

15 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Good afternoon. It's
16 Marianne Horn. I'm representing the Commissioner today,
17 who is not available, and around the table we have Milt
18 Wallack, Jay Hughes and David Goldhammer and Joe Landry
19 and Sara Donofrio. Rick Strauss is hanging back for his
20 presentation later in the meeting.

21 I just want to state at the outset that we
22 do not endorse any particular political (laughter), but
23 Milt had sent something out this afternoon, and he really
24 was pointing to the comment, that Connecticut has one of

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 the greatest stem cell programs in the world, so that was
2 really why that was sent out. We take no political
3 position here.

4 DR. MILT WALLACK: We take no political
5 position at all.

6 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Very good.

7 DR. WALLACK: It was purely informational,
8 purely informational.

9 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Very good.

10 DR. KRAUSE: I like the quote that they had
11 for me.

12 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Did you actually say
13 that?

14 DR. KRAUSE: We needed the money to study.

15 COURT REPORTER: Who is that? I'm sorry.

16 CHAIRPERSON HORN: I'm sorry. Diane
17 Krause.

18 DR. KRAUSE: Because I'm in a study, Diane
19 Krause.

20 DR. HART: I noticed that.

21 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. Are there any
22 other opening remarks? I want to thank everybody for
23 making their schedules available, as we worked around
24 various holidays and programs, and we have a full agenda,

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 so we'll get right to it.

2 The approval of the August 21, 2012
3 minutes, do I have motion for approval?

4 DR. WALLACK: I'll move it.

5 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Milt. Second?

6 DR. JAMES HUGHES: Second.

7 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Dr. Hughes. Is there
8 any discussion? All in favor?

9 VOICES: Aye.

10 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Anybody opposed? Okay,
11 the minutes pass. Number three, the annual reports to be
12 considered for approval, there were a couple of reports
13 that had been sent back for a little additional work, and
14 what we're going to do is just go through them. Sara is
15 going to go through them one-by-one quickly, and, if there
16 are concerns or issues, please feel free to raise them.

17 Again, a reminder, that if you have a
18 conflict of interest with Yale or UConn, do not weigh in
19 on these particular items, and, then, at the end of the
20 day, we will have, at the end of the section, we'll have a
21 vote to approve or not the various grants by institution,
22 so I'll turn it over to Sara now.

23 MS. DONOFRIO: I'll actually give this over
24 to Joe to go over the first item.

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 MR. JOSEPH LANDRY: Hello, everyone. The
2 first one, the grant in 2008 for Carter, we have a little
3 bit of an unusual situation with it, so we wanted to
4 review it with you.

5 They have prepared and submitted the final
6 fiscal report, which should be included in your package,
7 but we have not received the technical report, and they
8 have been working on it for quite some time, trying to get
9 the departed doctor to finish the write-up on it, and I
10 guess have been unsuccessful.

11 They were hoping to be able to attend a
12 meeting to discuss it with us a little bit. The unusual
13 part, though, beyond that is that, in looking through our
14 financial records, we've determined that they never
15 received their second 100,000 funding for the seed grant
16 back over two years ago, and now they're, also, over a
17 year late in providing the technical report, which would
18 show, excuse me, the fiscal report, which would show a
19 small refund due to them, so I'm kind of in a bind of
20 knowing what I should do.

21 Should I send in their funding for the
22 second \$100,000 to satisfy what would have been our
23 requirement back two years ago, and then leads me to the
24 next point, well, they haven't fulfilled their obligation

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 of providing the final technical report, and what would
2 that -- what would the rules or committee feel about being
3 open for not having that information on the technical
4 side?

5 CHAIRPERSON HORN: And, Joe, what was the
6 issue about them coming to the meeting and trying to
7 explain to the Committee what had happened?

8 MR. LANDRY: Well even though the doctor
9 was no longer with the University, I was hoping to procure
10 for you folks a representative, like maybe somebody, who
11 had worked with him on it, or somebody with enough
12 knowledge about it and/or grant manager administrator
13 people, who might have had recollections of what
14 transpired those years ago, so it's like of like an older
15 historical-type problem, but it's come to light now,
16 because we did receive their fiscal report a couple of
17 months ago.

18 DR. KRAUSE: This is Diane Krause. I have
19 a question about that.

20 MR. LANDRY: Yes?

21 DR. KRAUSE: Aren't we really more like
22 contract than grant, in that there are milestones that
23 need to be reached, in order to receive funding?

24 MR. LANDRY: Yes, and, after that first

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 year's report was submitted and approved by the Committee
2 in I think it was back in 2009, that should have triggered
3 our second \$100,000 payment to them, so I believe that
4 we're neglecting our duty now.

5 DR. KRAUSE: I see.

6 CHAIRPERSON HORN: But there was no
7 subsequent request for that money?

8 MR. LANDRY: No, there's no request for the
9 monies. Whether it was UConn or us, we never really
10 caught it. Maybe it's because, at that same time, they
11 believed that they were going to have issues providing the
12 technical report. I don't really know why they might not
13 have followed up with us for why they didn't receive their
14 money.

15 CHAIRPERSON HORN: So up to the time that
16 the second round of funding was due, so after the first
17 year, you did get a technical report and a fiscal report?

18 MR. LANDRY: Only after the year one, but
19 not the year two point. We did not receive the technical
20 report, the finished product, per se.

21 CHAIRPERSON HORN: And this is a two-year
22 grant?

23 MR. LANDRY: This is a two-year seed grant.

24 DR. KRAUSE: Well what's the fiscal report

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 that shows expenditures?

2 COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. Could you
3 please ask people to identify themselves on the phone?

4 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Sure. It's Diane
5 Krause.

6 COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

7 DR. KRAUSE: I'm a little confused. If
8 they've only received the 100,000 of the 200,000, what did
9 they mean by they located a fiscal report of July 1, 2011,
10 showing \$200,000, I'm rounding up, total expenditures?

11 MR. LANDRY: Well, I mean, I can't speak
12 for them, but my feeling is they probably just filled in
13 the form, believing that they had the 200,000 received
14 from us, but, in actuality, hadn't, but had expenditures
15 of \$199,000.

16 DR. KRAUSE: So they actually spent that
17 money?

18 MR. LANDRY: Yes. According to the report,
19 yes.

20 DR. FISHBONE: But we didn't have the
21 money. This is Gerry Fishbone.

22 MR. LANDRY: Hi, Gerry. Well I'm sure -- I
23 mean I don't know how the University accounting systems
24 work, but I'm sure they have all these monies in several

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 places, and I'm not sure if they potentially put them in a
2 separate account to keep track of them by grant number. I
3 mean I'm not really sure.

4 If they're getting millions of dollars in
5 grant dollars beyond even just our stem cell dollars, I
6 don't really know how they would have missed it, but I
7 don't know. Like I said, I don't have something from
8 their department to help us.

9 DR. DAVID GOLDHAMMER: Am I allowed to --
10 can I comment on that?

11 CHAIRPERSON HORN: You can't comment on
12 this particular grant, but, perhaps, on the process.

13 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Right, so, I think it
14 should be quite easy to contact the Office of Sponsored
15 Programs, OSP, and then get an itemized list of
16 expenditures over this period of time. This should not be
17 hard to get.

18 My question is at what -- when should --
19 when, ordinarily, would the money have been released to
20 him? I'm trying to see when, you know, when that is in
21 relation to when he left UConn and whether that's maybe
22 the reason that something kind of, you know,
23 irregularities happened at that time.

24 DR. FISHBONE: This is Gerry Fishbone. Is

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 Matt Cahill still the --

2 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Matt Cahill?

3 DR. FISHBONE: Yeah. He seems to be the
4 one who sent the letter, saying that we didn't get the
5 money, and that -- finished and submitted. Can we not
6 find out from him again if they didn't get the money? How
7 did they spend the extra 100,000?

8 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I know that very well.
9 I'd be happy to follow-up on this, if that would be useful
10 and appropriate or not.

11 CHAIRPERSON HORN: I'm just wondering if we
12 could defer this vote on this grant until the next meeting
13 in October, which is the October 16th, and either get Mr.
14 Cahill on the phone, or in person here to explain the ins
15 and outs of where we are, and I think we'd make a more
16 informed decision at that point.

17 DR. WALLACK: I would move to defer this
18 and, also, to have Mr. Cahill appear to describe the
19 occurrence and what happened with it.

20 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay, so, we'll take a
21 separate motion on that, since this is obviously going to
22 be unique. Milt, that's in the form of a motion?

23 DR. WALLACK: Yeah.

24 CHAIRPERSON HORN: And a second?

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 DR. HUGHES: Second.

2 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Dr. Hughes. All in
3 favor?

4 VOICES: Aye.

5 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Anybody opposed?

6 DR. WALLACK: There's some fundamental
7 problem here, and Gerry Fishbone touched on it, and that
8 is that, somehow or other, \$100,000 is half of what he
9 got, and somehow it got lost.

10 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Correct.

11 DR. WALLACK: And, yet, the research went
12 on, so something went awry.

13 CHAIRPERSON HORN: And we're missing
14 reports.

15 DR. WALLACK: Right.

16 CHAIRPERSON HORN: That would solidify that
17 the research actually got done.

18 DR. WALLACK: Right.

19 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. Dr. Genel just
20 joined us, or is joining us, for those on the phone.
21 Okay, thanks. We'll move onto the next one.

22 MS. DONOFRIO: Okay. The next two agenda
23 items are carryovers from the August meeting. Both of
24 these items we had requested better lay summaries, which

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 were provided.

2 The first item is 09SCBYale13, Sutton, and
3 the second is 09SCBYale14, Wang. Any discussion on either
4 of those items?

5 DR. FISHBONE: This is Gerry Fishbone. Was
6 there a summary on Sutton?

7 DR. WALLACK: Yeah, it's on page two, I
8 believe. Oh, wait a minute. Wait a minute. No. Gerry,
9 it's in section three. It's in section three. It wasn't
10 labeled lay summary.

11 DR. FISHBONE: Okay, but that's what's in
12 three?

13 DR. WALLACK: I believe that that's what
14 that was. It was in section three, without labeling it
15 lay summary. It should have been labeled.

16 DR. FISHBONE: Okay. Can I move we accept
17 the proposal?

18 DR. WALLACK: I'll second it.

19 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. All in favor?

20 VOICES: Aye.

21 CHAIRPERSON HORN: And these are from Yale.
22 Anybody opposed? Okay, so, those are approved with their
23 new improved lay summaries, and we'll move on to the rest.
24 I think we'll just go through these fairly quickly, and

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 then we can vote on them as a block at the end.

2 MS. DONOFRIO: The next item is 10SCB03,
3 Krause. Any discussion on that item? Okay and we'll move
4 on to 10SCA22, Rodenheffer. Any discussion on that item?

5 The next item, 10SCA38. Any discussion on
6 that? The next item, 10SCA13. Any discussion there?
7 10SCB05, any discussion? Next is 10SCB02, then we have
8 10SCA05. 10SCB36. Any discussion?

9 The next item is 10SCB19. And then we have
10 10SCB30. And the last item is 10SCB12. Any discussion on
11 those items?

12 Okay. Do I have a motion for approval on
13 those?

14 DR. FISHBONE: So moved.

15 MS. DONOFRIO: Okay, second?

16 DR. WALLACK: Second.

17 MS. DONOFRIO: Any further discussion?

18 We'll vote first on the Yale proposals. Any further
19 discussion on the Yale proposals? All in favor?

20 VOICES: Aye.

21 MS. DONOFRIO: Opposed? Okay and do I have
22 a motion for approval on UConn annual reports?

23 DR. WALLACK: So moved.

24 MS. DONOFRIO: Second?

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 DR. FISHBONE: Gerry Fishbone. Second.

2 MS. DONOFRIO: Okay. Any further
3 discussion? All in favor?

4 VOICES: Aye.

5 MS. DONOFRIO: Opposed? Okay. And if
6 we're going to go through the items to be voted on, that
7 will bring us to item number five, which is a carryover
8 request, and that is Project No. 09SCDUCHC01.

9 This is another item that was carried over
10 from the August meeting, where it was requested for them
11 to provide more specific information about the unspent
12 funds. Is there any discussion on that item? Do I have a
13 motion for approval?

14 DR. KRAUSE: Motion to approve. This is
15 Diane Krause.

16 DR. FISHBONE: Second, Gerry Fishbone.

17 MS. DONOFRIO: Okay. Any further
18 discussion? All in favor?

19 VOICES: Aye.

20 MS. DONOFRIO: Opposed? Okay.

21 CHAIRPERSON HORN: And just to note, the
22 items in number four were final reports received, which we
23 don't vote on as a committee, but if there were any
24 questions or comments that would improve the process, feel

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 free to make any comments on those final reports.

2 Okay. Hearing none, we can move on to
3 number six.

4 MS. DONOFRIO: Number six, the Grant
5 Modification Subcommittee report. The subcommittee was
6 formed to take action on a routine and time-sensitive
7 items that occurred between regular Advisory Committee
8 meetings.

9 The meeting took place on September 21st,
10 and they approved no-cost extensions for three items, that
11 is 10SCA47, Dreznik(phonetic), 10SCA23, Chabra(phonetic),
12 and 10SCD01, Antic(phonetic). Those three were approved
13 at that meeting.

14 CHAIRPERSON HORN: The Grant Review
15 Modification Subcommittee, as many here recall, was set up
16 when we had this kind of a situation, where we had a
17 meeting that was postponed. There were items that needed
18 to be voted on by the end of September, in order to move
19 forward, so the Grant Subcommittee met and approved these
20 items.

21 If there ever is an issue, where they
22 believe it needs to come back to the full committee, it
23 would come back to the full committee for a vote.

24 MS. DONOFRIO: We're up to agenda number

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 seven. These are two no-cost extension requests.

2 DR. WALLACK: Did we do four already?

3 CHAIRPERSON HORN: We don't take a vote on
4 those, Milt.

5 DR. WALLACK: Okay.

6 CHAIRPERSON HORN: If there were any
7 questions or concerns, these are final reports that come
8 in after.

9 DR. WALLACK: Okay.

10 CHAIRPERSON HORN: But if anybody sees
11 anything there they don't like or would like to have done
12 differently --

13 DR. WALLACK: Got it. Got it.

14 CHAIRPERSON HORN: So I didn't hear any
15 comments on that, so we went on.

16 DR. WALLACK: Okay.

17 MS. DONOFRIO: Okay, so, under number
18 seven, the first item, 10SCA06, and, also, 11, there was
19 an incorrect number written for the second item under the
20 no-cost extension request. The correct project number is
21 actually 11SCD02, so I just wanted to make note of that.
22 Are there any discussion on either of those no-cost
23 extensions?

24 CHAIRPERSON HORN: The first one is from

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 UConn, and the second one is from Yale.

2 MS. DONOFRIO: Okay. Do I have a motion
3 for approval?

4 DR. FISHBONE: So moved. Gerry Fishbone.

5 MS. DONOFRIO: Okay, second?

6 DR. MYRON GENEL: I'll second it.

7 MS. DONOFRIO: Any further discussion? All
8 in favor?

9 VOICES: Aye.

10 MS. DONOFRIO: Opposed? Okay. We can move
11 on to number eight. This is an extension of time served
12 as PI. This is also another carryover from the August
13 stem cell meeting.

14 It was requested to gain additional
15 information and a budget related to the extension of time
16 to serve as PI, and that information was provided. Any
17 discussion on that item? Okay. Do I have a motion for
18 approval?

19 CHAIRPERSON HORN: And this is UConn.

20 DR. KRAUSE: I motion to approve.

21 MS. DONOFRIO: Okay.

22 DR. KRAUSE: Diane Krause.

23 MS. DONOFRIO: Second?

24 DR. FISHBONE: Second, Gerry Fishbone.

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 MS. DONOFRIO: Okay. All in favor?

2 DR. WALLACK: Just a question. Are we okay
3 with his lay summary, with the lay summary?

4 DR. FISHBONE: We were okay with his letter
5 of explanation, as to, you know, why this all came about.

6 DR. WALLACK: Okay. Okay.

7 MS. DONOFRIO: Any further discussion? All
8 in favor?

9 VOICES: Aye.

10 MS. DONOFRIO: Opposed? Okay. We'll move
11 on to number nine, and there are three items for a change
12 of key personnel. The first item is 09SCDUCHC01, the
13 second item is 09SCBUCON18, and the third item is 11SCB08,
14 and that is a health care project.

15 Any discussion on those three items? Okay.
16 Do I have a motion for approval?

17 DR. WALLACK: So moved.

18 MS. DONOFRIO: Second?

19 DR. FISHBONE: I'll second.

20 MS. DONOFRIO: Okay. All in favor?

21 VOICES: Aye.

22 MS. DONOFRIO: Opposed? Okay. Number 10,
23 that agenda item was dealt with offline, so we will skip
24 over number 10, and that will take us to agenda number 11,

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 the annual report discussion, and I will send that over to
2 Rick Strauss for his update.

3 MR. RICK STRAUSS: Okay. Does anybody need
4 a copy of the survey that Sara e-mailed out today?
5 Actually, I want to start --

6 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Can everybody on the
7 phone hear Rick?

8 MR. STRAUSS: Can you hear me?

9 DR. FISHBONE: Yeah.

10 MR. STRAUSS: Okay. These are -- you can
11 just pass those around. Let me just start with we've
12 gotten going -- the Connecticut Academy has started work
13 on the project to review the competence of the Stem Cell
14 Research Program, and we're in the process of finalizing
15 the survey that would go out to the principal
16 investigators, as well as we've been talking about an
17 institutional survey and interview process for the major
18 universities involved.

19 So the initial step in the survey was to
20 review the draft with the Department of Public Health,
21 Connecticut Innovations, and then a couple of
22 representatives from the Stem Cell Research Advisory
23 Committee, and, also, the Academy's Study Committee that
24 we just formed, so what I just passed out, and sorry for

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 those of you, who don't have that -- did we e-mail that,
2 as well, Terri?

3 DR. KRAUSE: Is this the same thing that
4 was sent to us earlier today?

5 MR. STRAUSS: I think so. It's a Study
6 Committee list.

7 DR. KRAUSE: I just have the actual
8 questionnaire.

9 MR. STRAUSS: Okay, but I'm talking about a
10 Study Committee list.

11 MS. TERRI CLARK: No, I did not.

12 MR. STRAUSS: Okay, so, sorry for the
13 people on the phone. I'll let you know who we have
14 working on the Study Committee and the role the Study
15 Committee will be to oversee the work of our research team
16 and assist with reviewing our report that will, then, be
17 presented to the Advisory Committee, as well as the
18 Department of Public Health and Connecticut Innovations.

19 For the committee, we have Jane Aubin, who
20 is Chief Scientific Officer and Vice President of Research
21 and Knowledge Translation at the Connecticut Institutes of
22 Health Research.

23 Troy Brennan, who is a corresponding member
24 of the Academy. He's Executive Vice President and Chief

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 Medical Officer at CVS Caremark.

2 Charles Jennings, who is a former member of
3 the Advisory Committee. He's at MIT and is Director of
4 McGovern Institute of Neurotechnology, MINT
5 Neurotechnology Program.

6 Matthew Kohn from New York Stem, Scientific
7 Officer with the New York State Department of Public
8 Health, Wadsworth Center.

9 And Jeanne Loring, who is a Professor of
10 Developmental Neurobiology, Director of their Center of
11 Regenerative Medicine in the Department of Chemical
12 Physiology in the California Campus of the Scripps
13 Research Institute.

14 And for our research team, we have Maria
15 Borowski, who I just think just joined the phone. Do you
16 want to say hi?

17 MS. MARIA BOROWSKI: Hi, everyone.

18 MR. STRAUSS: Good timing. So Maria is
19 with the University of Massachusetts Medical School, and
20 she's going to be the principal researcher for the project
21 and will be writing the report and conducting interviews
22 with key personnel at Yale, UConn and Wesleyan.

23 So, basically, we're in about the fourth
24 generation of draft survey, and I just want to thank David

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 for his assistance on that committee and everybody else
2 that's helped out, including our Study Committee.

3 And, then, I guess we have a problem. Oh,
4 here we go. How do we get -- sorry. We're trying to get
5 the computer back running.

6 I think the people on the phone have the
7 link to be able to get into the survey, if they want to,
8 is that correct?

9 MS. CLARK: They have the actual survey.

10 MR. STRAUSS: Okay. Okay, so, you have --
11 I mean we don't necessarily have to go over all of this,
12 but if any of you have any questions, we can answer it,
13 answer them, but this is actually what it will look like
14 online for somebody filling it out, and you can see like
15 there's some dropdowns, so they don't have to write things
16 in. They can just select numbers and stuff like that.

17 And we're also crossing, as we put out the
18 third version of this this morning, and then started to
19 get comments in from the prior version, so some of what
20 you see in writing has actually been changed reflecting
21 discussions and a review of the comments that we received
22 also today.

23 The intent is that this goes to the
24 principal investigators of the grants. That got a little

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 further complicated, because how do you handle a PI that
2 has received more than one grant?

3 So we didn't know if that was going to be
4 an issue or not, so we thought the first thing we needed
5 to do, you know, if it's one or two people, that might not
6 be too big of a deal, but if it was more than that, then
7 we really needed to make sure we understood what the
8 situation was and how to approach those people.

9 So it turns out that you have 22
10 investigators with more than one grant, so that means 44
11 of the approximate 100 grants are done by, you know, they
12 have either two or more grants. Some have three.

13 That was an interesting initial finding in
14 itself, because, you know, one of your intentions, I
15 think, is to provide seed grants to early investigators,
16 and that they would gain some experience, and then receive
17 established grants, and then move on, so that,
18 essentially, in part, is what has happened.

19 So what we want to do is communicate with
20 those people, and if their subsequent grants are a
21 continuation of their earlier grants, then we would treat
22 that as one survey, but if they changed direction and
23 they're doing different research, then we would look at
24 that as two separate, you know, surveys.

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 We think that that's a fair way to do it,
2 unless all of you have a -- we didn't want to have to have
3 them fill out two -- each person fill out a separate
4 survey for each grant they did. That would be a little
5 complicating, and it gets into, you know, dealing with
6 some of the numbers that would, then, be, you know, not
7 really too accurate.

8 Does that sound like a reasonable approach?

9 Also, this is really for the seed, established and group
10 PIs, as compared to the core. We think we'll handle the
11 core through a separate interview survey with the
12 institutional interview, so we'll kind of combine that up.

13 The core would have, I think, the questions would need to
14 be a little bit different.

15 MS. DONOFRIO: Hi. Could you state your
16 name, please?

17 MS. ANN KIESSLING: Sorry I'm late.

18 COURT REPORTER: Who is that?

19 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Is that Ann Kiessling?

20 MS. KIESSLING: Yes.

21 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes. Hi. Welcome.

22 MS. KIESSLING: Sorry I'm late.

23 CHAIRPERSON HORN: That's okay. We're just
24 talking about the scientific progress during the program,

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 the evaluation of that, and the survey that Rick Strauss
2 had sent out earlier.

3 MS. KIESSLING: Okay.

4 MR. STRAUSS: So, you know, in many of the
5 questions, there's an opportunity for the person filling
6 it out to provide comments, in addition to just responding
7 to the pull-down or the box that they have to check.

8 So that's pretty much the, you know, what
9 we planned for the survey. We will be looking at -- Maria
10 will come down and do some interviews. We're going to try
11 to schedule those on the same day, preferably here and at
12 our offices in Rocky Hill, as compared to having her need
13 to travel around, so we'll make arrangements for doing
14 that probably in November.

15 We also put together a spreadsheet of all
16 the PIs with contact information, looking at the status of
17 their final and annual reports, and, for some of the
18 projects, there are missing reports from what we've
19 received from CI, so we've gone out to both UConn and Yale
20 and asked them to review the information we have for their
21 investigators to provide us with any additional reports
22 that are missing.

23 So we hope that they will get that and make
24 that part of the record. We also, through CI, with Sara's

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 help -- is it Joe Landry? Yeah. Joe provided information
2 on the actual contract value of the grant, and, then, for
3 the grants that have been completed, the actual grant
4 expenditure.

5 And while they're close, there's some
6 difference in actual versus contract, and when you're
7 looking at the grants completed, something like 30 some
8 odd million dollars, the difference is probably less than
9 half a percent, but the actual is a little bit lower than
10 what the contract value was, so they're pretty close,
11 which is good from an administrative standpoint, I guess.

12 DR. WALLACK: So can we ask questions?

13 MR. STRAUSS: Yeah.

14 DR. WALLACK: All right, so, some of the
15 points that I'd like to bring up I've already talked to
16 you, Rick, about earlier in the day, and Rick and I
17 thought it would be a good idea, if I'm not misquoting,
18 for it to be on the table now some of the questions I
19 might have.

20 MR. STRAUSS: Or anybody.

21 DR. WALLACK: Right. So when we first
22 discussed this, and we had discussed it way back in April,
23 and then Claire Leonardi reiterated that and brought that
24 up on her own at the last meeting, and I thought that it

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 was an extremely worthwhile project, and I think it's even
2 more important now than ever, I think the main intent was
3 to position the program and to validate the program, so as
4 to enhance the opportunity that might be in front of us to
5 continue the program over the next 10 years.

6 And, so, there's a few things that Rick and
7 I discussed. We've already discussed 10 questions, 10
8 additional questions, some of which are covered in the 12
9 pages of information that you sent out this morning, but
10 there are some other parts of it that are sort of not
11 really picked up on.

12 In summary, I think that what we're looking
13 at is two major areas, the development of science and what
14 does that mean? I mean have we gotten down the road to
15 clinical trials? Are we getting to an area, where we can
16 have clinical significance, and some of that is, I think,
17 on page 10.

18 MR. STRAUSS: Right.

19 DR. WALLACK: Covered to some degree from
20 my own perspective, though. So that's one area. The
21 second area is job creation and economic enhancement to
22 the State, and I think, early on, page one or two, I'm not
23 sure, you asked for how many jobs have been created in
24 each of the programs.

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 I'm not sure. I'm not sure that we make
2 the kind of impact, Rick, that will resonate, number one,
3 with the public and resonate with the legislature in the
4 format that it's in right now.

5 I think that I would like to see a heavier
6 emphasis, a more direct emphasis of areas to expound,
7 opportunities for, for example, the head of the program at
8 Yale, the head of the program at UConn, Mark Lalande, to
9 really expound, as they've done, as you noted, Rick, at
10 the Appropriations Committee two weeks ago, and some of us
11 have heard them talk about it in front of the legislature
12 when we were going for funding in very expansive ways.

13 I'm not sure the format here is conducive
14 for that. The other thing is --

15 MR. STRAUSS: Can we just --

16 DR. WALLACK: Let me just finish.

17 MR. STRAUSS: Okay.

18 DR. WALLACK: I'm almost finished.

19 MR. STRAUSS: Okay.

20 DR. WALLACK: The other thing is that the
21 program, from what I understand, our program, our stem
22 cell program, has been instrumental in creating different
23 opportunities for all of us in bio-science in the state,
24 and one of them, from what I gather, has to do with

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 Jackson Lab coming to Connecticut.

2 If I remember correctly, one of the
3 original attractions to Jackson Lab expressing any
4 interest at all or responding to any interest was the fact
5 that they perceived great collaboration, because of the
6 stem cell program, between Yale and UConn.

7 That, specifically, I didn't get in the
8 information, unless I missed it and didn't read the new
9 ones. I didn't get that kind of ancillary kind -- not
10 ancillary, but real direct, important results of our stem
11 cell program, the work that we've done since 2005/2006.

12 So I think that we don't get that if we
13 don't ask the right kind of questions, and I'll wind up
14 with this, and that is that I think that you only ask
15 those kinds of questions if you have on the committee
16 assembling the information people who were associated with
17 the program, because the people associated with the
18 program around the table here, some of us who have been on
19 the program since its inception, understand, or see, or we
20 think we understand, you know, that kind of situation.

21 My last point would be not only to sort of
22 -- my suggestion would be to expand the questionnaire in
23 the ways that I've just alluded to to get the kinds of
24 information that would be very, very validating for the

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 program and, hopefully, another 100 million dollars, and,
2 also, to put on the committee, itself, which is a great
3 committee, but the one piece of it I think that, from my
4 perspective, that it lacks is one or two people on the
5 committee that have been with this since its inception and
6 cannot add, because that's not our job, but at least
7 suggest the questions that might highlight some of the
8 answers that are important in validating our program, so
9 that's my complete --

10 MR. STRAUSS: Okay, now I've got to
11 remember everything from the beginning. Okay, so, let me
12 start at the end.

13 This is an independent analysis of the stem
14 cell research program, so while it might be appropriate
15 for our research team to interview people that are on the
16 Stem Cell Research Advisory Committee and the leaders of
17 the Stem Cell Research Program at the different
18 institutions, I don't think it's appropriate that anybody
19 from the Stem Cell Research Advisory Committee be on the
20 Study Committee, so that's number one.

21 In terms of a survey, and I really needed
22 to mention the -- first of all, what we did was to start
23 from scratch, basically, and said, okay, what do we think
24 we need to know, in terms of the accomplishments?

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 So we had like a brainstorming session, and
2 we drafted up a draft survey, then we got a copy of New
3 York Stem Survey, and then we got a copy of the Canadian
4 Survey, and what was interesting was that we found that
5 while the specific wording and the details of some of the
6 questions that we proposed was a little bit different than
7 the other surveys, it was pretty much in line with, you
8 know, what the others were doing, in terms of identifying
9 their accomplishments.

10 So what we wanted to do was, then, improve
11 it, enhance it through further review. This is
12 specifically for the PIs. This is not the big picture
13 that Haifan Lin and Mark Lalande or Laura Grabel would
14 bring from an institutional perspective.

15 The next step, once we get this one down,
16 is to really design, if you will, the interview and/or
17 survey template for the bigger picture from the
18 institutional perspective.

19 The presentation before the Appropriations
20 Committee and several other committees of the General
21 Assembly a couple of weeks ago, which may have been
22 similar to what you have heard, that also included Dr.
23 Lu(phonetic) from Jackson Labs, was fairly informative and
24 provided a foundation for us, looking at, okay, well,

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 they're really setting out the big picture benefits of
2 what they've been able to accomplish in the Stem Cell
3 Research Program.

4 I don't think our job is to look at this
5 from the perspective of selling the Stem Cell Research
6 Program. That would be a marketing document that you
7 might use if you find that the results of this analysis
8 showed that the accomplishments had been significant.

9 I don't think it would be good for us to
10 start from the perspective of saying we're designing this
11 to show that, you know, to be able to secure an additional
12 100 million dollars or 500. Maybe it's a billion dollars.

13 I don't know what the number would be, or maybe it's
14 nothing, because we don't have the information yet, as to
15 how this really comes down.

16 Now what would be interesting, New York
17 Stem is in the middle of doing one of these things, so,
18 and California is doing a big study, which I think is a
19 little bit, has a little bit different focus.

20 Actually, Matthew Kohn has been involved
21 with the California stem review, as well, so he brings
22 that perspective to this review.

23 It's going to be pretty interesting to
24 really see how far this has come, and the little bit we've

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 learned, you know, so far, I mean just the fact that, and
2 this is pretty -- maybe it's minor, maybe it's not.

3 I mean you started with really limited
4 capacity in stem cell research, and the program has really
5 grown, and it's looked at the accomplishments of early
6 investigators, and then decided that their work was worthy
7 to receive additional funding.

8 COURT REPORTER: Let me just interrupt one
9 moment, please, for a tape change.

10 MR. STRAUSS: Okay.

11 (Off the record)

12 MR. STRAUSS: So I think what we're going
13 to do is to take your questions, look at how they're
14 incorporated already into what we have for the PIs, look
15 at them from the perspective of how we would utilize that
16 for the institutional review, and then, you know, draft
17 that up, too.

18 We hope that we would have that ready by
19 the October 16th meeting, and we hope that this, the PI
20 survey, is underway by then.

21 What's really important is that we get the
22 support of the principal investigators to respond as
23 promptly as possible to this, so that we can, you know, do
24 -- we expect Maria may need to do some follow-up to get

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 some questions answered, you know, based upon the survey,
2 and then we need to do some analysis of the data that we
3 receive.

4 It's a pretty fast-track project, based
5 upon the parameters given to us by the agencies
6 contracting for our services, the timing of which may be
7 somewhat tied into the legislative session, or whatever is
8 going on.

9 The important thing is we do a good job on
10 it, and, you know, and whether it's ready by December
11 31st, or January 15th, or February 1st, you know, I think
12 we've made pretty good progress since we're only half
13 under contract at this point. Still waiting for the
14 second half of the contract.

15 DR. WALLACK: Rick?

16 MR. STRAUSS: Yeah?

17 DR. WALLACK: If I can respond, certainly,
18 you obviously know that I'm probably one of your biggest
19 admirers.

20 MR. STRAUSS: Thank you.

21 DR. WALLACK: I think that you, Terri and
22 your office do an amazing, amazing job. So if you're
23 saying that this document over the next two weeks is to be
24 used as the first part only of an approach that will

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 validate our program, then my concerns about this document
2 and what it will expound upon I still have some concerns
3 about it, but it's not -- I don't feel quite as strongly
4 about that, because I think that, when we look at your
5 subsequent document for the institutions and their
6 leadership, I think that that will, then, give us a more
7 global idea, and that's what I think is important for us
8 to see, of the big picture, about what the stem cell
9 initiative has created in Connecticut.

10 So I would still, in this document, see if
11 I could tweak it to some degree to see if we can get more
12 information on patents, publications and so forth from the
13 PIs, but, certainly, from the leadership, as I say,
14 anticipate that that questionnaire will be directed
15 differently to be able to be more extensive in expressing
16 what we've accomplished for the State, for science and for
17 job creation.

18 As far as selling versus validating, I
19 certainly never said, nor would I ever say, that this
20 effort should be used to sell something, but I did say,
21 and I will say, and feel strongly about it, that this
22 effort should be used to validate, to validate what we've
23 done, and to express the opportunities, if you will, and
24 those are the 10 questions that I've submitted to you this

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 morning, and I'm glad that we looked at and hopefully
2 somehow be included, to validate, because that's what
3 we're going to the State legislature for, to validate what
4 we've done, why we should continue to be doing it, and,
5 yes, to get whatever additional support that we can extend
6 the program, together with, by the way, not just this
7 program, not just this program, and I think this should be
8 looked at, also, as it sort of integrates with and merges
9 with, is the right word, with the genomics program that's
10 emerging in the State.

11 I would hope that that document on the 16th
12 that we'll look at will give us some opportunity to really
13 flesh that out, and, yes, to validate that for the State
14 and for the public.

15 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Dr. Hughes?

16 DR. HUGHES: Yeah. Just one of the
17 concerns I hear is that the staffing questions that you
18 have here and one of the answers I heard from you is that
19 that will just be one of the components in an overall
20 economic impact evaluation.

21 MR. STRAUSS: We're not doing an economic
22 impact analysis. We're going to probably produce data
23 that, you know, that could be used to do -- I mean if it
24 was desired that you could do an economic impact analysis

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 from it, but that's not part of this.

2 So, I mean, one component would be let's
3 say the project shows that 200 research scientists are
4 working in stem cell research, and at the beginning of the
5 project there were none, so that would be a starting point
6 to conduct an economic impact analysis.

7 One of the points that they showed, you
8 know, that Haifan Lin and Mark Lalande showed at the
9 General Assembly, was we received, our institution
10 received 32 million dollars' worth of stem cell research
11 grants, and, as a result of the 32 million dollars' worth
12 of Connecticut funding, our institution got 85 million
13 dollars' worth of additional grants to support the
14 research.

15 So that resonates that what we're doing is
16 leveraging Connecticut dollars for additional funding,
17 which would not necessarily have been available to
18 Connecticut institutions without the stem cell research
19 program.

20 Now we saw what was up on the screen at the
21 presentation, so that leads to some additional questions
22 to confirm, you know, when asked the questions behind
23 that, as to, okay, well, was it directly related to the
24 stem cell research program, or is it other biomedical

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 research, and is it indirect, is it direct, so that we can
2 present, you know, a good picture of what the actual
3 accomplishments were.

4 I'm not exactly sure about the terminology
5 you're using when you talk about validating and things.
6 We're looking at assessing the accomplishments, and that
7 makes me more comfortable than saying we're going to
8 validate the program, because we have to get some
9 findings, based upon what's actually occurred, and it may
10 validate the program.

11 I mean I would think it would validate the
12 program, but we're assessing what the accomplishments are,
13 and maybe that's just picking, but I get nervous about the
14 terminology, because we want to be careful that we're, you
15 know, we're in a neutral position to really determine what
16 accomplishments have occurred as a result of the funding.

17 DR. WALLACK: I said before I really
18 respect everything that you do, and you know this, and I
19 said it for a reason, because you approach your projects
20 in that manner, and I respect that.

21 However, you have to, I think, appreciate
22 where I'm coming from with what I'd like to see happening
23 from the survey.

24 MR. STRAUSS: Well --

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 DR. WALLACK: Let me just finish. So I'm
2 not ashamed or hesitant to say, yes, I would like to see
3 validation from it, because I think that we do have
4 validation.

5 MR. STRAUSS: Okay.

6 DR. WALLACK: And my only question, my only
7 point was that I'm not sure that the current -- the first
8 survey, this one that we're looking at today, gives us
9 enough of the opportunity.

10 We don't ask the questions possibly in a
11 way that will express the best that we are, number one,
12 but I'm okay with that, Rick, if you're telling us that
13 when we convene again on October 16th, that that survey
14 will hopefully be more global and give us that additional
15 global overview of the accomplishments and, therefore, the
16 validation of the program, so we're very close to being on
17 the same page.

18 MR. STRAUSS: Before we get to Mike, let me
19 just say what is in here, there are a couple of questions
20 on the importance of collaboration, so it gives people
21 from the principal investigator's standpoint an
22 opportunity to deal, you know, to respond to that.

23 There are -- I mean there's a whole
24 question on what did your research accomplish, so it's

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 tell us about the number of patents, tell us about the
2 papers you did, what are the significant results from your
3 research?

4 Maybe, you know, we've been tweaking the
5 language pretty well over the last several weeks, so it's
6 still tweakable. Mike?

7 DR. GENEL: Well, Milt, I know where you're
8 coming from, but I think it's important to keep this
9 survey where it was originally intended, and that was as a
10 survey of investigators.

11 And if you're going to do that, you have to
12 construct some sort of a questionnaire that they're going
13 to respond to.

14 And I think, if you start adding to this
15 and putting in more subjective types of comments, you're
16 not going to get any kind of response that you would from
17 the investigators.

18 It's important that there be a credible
19 scientific review of the accomplishments of the program.
20 One can build on that easily, and maybe this is something
21 that the Advisory Committee should do. I think it's
22 important to keep it separate.

23 I think to the extent that whatever CASE
24 comes up with is scientifically credible, it only enhances

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 any advocacy that we do later on.

2 DR. WALLACK: I'm more comfortable, Mike,
3 with the 12-page presentation, because I just found out,
4 we all have just found out, that this will be a subsequent
5 parallel survey of a more global context.

6 DR. GENEL: Is that going to be a survey,
7 Rick, or are you going to do a questionnaire, or are you
8 just going to interview?

9 MR. STRAUSS: Well we have to -- it's a
10 survey interview template. I think we're still in the
11 process of determining whether we want to do one, or the
12 other, or both.

13 Again, we're going to -- we started with
14 the one that's before you being also used for the core,
15 but, then, when we started to look at the questions and
16 said, okay, now I'm the leader of the core, how am I going
17 to fill this out, it really wasn't designed for that, so I
18 think we want to combine the core up with the institution
19 and look at it.

20 We'll think about whether -- we may want to
21 provide questions in advance of the interview to the
22 people that will be interviewed, so that they will be able
23 to prepare, and then, you know, that will help in guiding
24 the discussion and making it as efficient as possible,

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 but, you know, that's something, where now that we, you
2 know, we're in the final stages of finalizing the PI
3 survey, it puts us in a better position to move forward on
4 the institutional side, plus, again, the presentation, you
5 know, a couple of weeks ago with the Appropriations
6 Committee was very helpful in having us frame the
7 questions for the institutions.

8 DR. WALLACK: So, Mike, I don't think we
9 did this originally when we discussed it in April, and
10 then, when Claire Leonardi brought it up again, brought it
11 up in their own context at the last meeting, just as a
12 survey of the PIs and so on, and I think that the reason
13 that I'm -- and I do think that the next aspect of this
14 assessment, if you will, to the institutions and their
15 leadership has to have a subjective perspective, because
16 the PIs, with all due respect, for the most part, they
17 don't have the context that this program, for example, at
18 Yale has led to 200 some odd --

19 DR. GENEL: -- yeah.

20 DR. WALLACK: They don't have the economic
21 context, James, to your point, the leadership of those
22 programs. Mark Lalande, Haifan, Laura Grabel, they have
23 those aspects, and we're doing ourselves and, frankly, the
24 State a disservice if we don't highlight and have all of

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 that information come out, and that's why the next part of
2 this assessment, whether it be survey, interview, or
3 whatever it is, is crucial to give them the opportunity.

4 No one is going to talk. Mark Lalande can
5 talk, for example, about the fact that, yes, because he
6 was involved in stem cell, he was involved in the Life
7 Science Group, and that, in fact, was one of the impetuses
8 that allowed for the conversation to go further down the
9 road with Jackson Lab to what we all know is now a very
10 positive outcome, so that's what I'm really talking about,
11 a more expansive opportunity to put on the table things
12 that are real.

13 I'm not saying put anything on the table
14 that's not real, but it's not fair to have things that are
15 out there that are real that we don't bring to the table,
16 and that's the only point I'm trying to make.

17 MR. STRAUSS: Well I think our intent is to
18 make sure we cover all of that.

19 DR. WALLACK: Okay. Well that wasn't --
20 when this document was --

21 MR. STRAUSS: No. Well I understand your
22 perspective. We probably didn't exactly explain what was
23 coming before you, which, you know -- I mean, at the last
24 meeting, we talked about, you know, what we were going to

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 be doing and the components of it, but, then, this was the
2 only piece that you saw. That's because we were going to
3 talk about it here.

4 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Anybody on the phone
5 have any questions or comments for Rick?

6 DR. KRAUSE: Yes. This is Diane Krause.
7 First of all, I think this is a tremendous effort, so
8 thank you very much to everybody, who has been involved in
9 making this questionnaire.

10 I had wanted to do something like this, but
11 had such smaller plans, so this is just great.

12 I did have a couple of comments, and, Rick,
13 I actually e-mailed them to you earlier today. One is, at
14 the very beginning, you asked about translational
15 research, and then you actually asked for the investigator
16 to say what percentage of their time is spent on
17 translational research before and after the grant, and I
18 think that translational research is a vague term that has
19 different meanings in different people's minds in
20 different settings.

21 For example, my work is related to
22 leukemia. Is that translational, or is it translational
23 when I'm gearing it up to actually start a clinical trial,
24 or is it translational when I'm actually doing the

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 clinical trial?

2 So I have a little bit of a problem with
3 what you're calling translational, and that's a big part
4 of the early questions.

5 And then the other concern I had is that
6 there wasn't just a separate question, where you said list
7 your peer reviews, scientific publications that were
8 supported, at least in part, with this funding, because
9 you're really going to like count the publications that
10 result. That's a true test, in addition to the additional
11 grants that you've already acted on, a true test of
12 productivity, is whether we publish peer review articles.

13 I didn't see a separate section, where you
14 just said list the peer reviewed articles, maybe I missed
15 it, that resulted from this funding.

16 DR. GOLDHAMMER: That was in a previous
17 version, and I think it was omitted not on purpose.

18 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Right.

19 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Right? So that was
20 definitely in.

21 MR. STRAUSS: I think it's back in there.

22 MS. CLARK: Yeah, it's back in.

23 DR. GENEL: I thought it was in.

24 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yeah, thanks for picking

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 that up, and David had picked that up, as well, that it
2 was left out.

3 DR. KRAUSE: Okay.

4 MR. STRAUSS: What we did, in looking at
5 putting down basic translational and clinical, was
6 basically to use the language from the RFP, I mean the RFP
7 in its initial purpose of what your funding talks a lot
8 about translational research.

9 So if that's vague, then how do we better
10 explain, you know, what are the categories of research
11 that we should be putting down there, so we get an
12 understanding of, you know, the type of research that is
13 being done?

14 DR. KRAUSE: That's a really good question.

15 I guess you would be asking whether it's moving towards
16 clinical trials? Is that the question you want to
17 address, or do you want to say is it directly relevant
18 towards human disease? We're all trying to find relevance
19 to human disease in our work. Even though we're doing
20 very basic work with healthy cells, it's relevant to what
21 goes wrong in disease, so I don't know. David, do you have
22 a suggestion?

23 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Well I don't have a
24 suggestion, but a comment. I mean I agree there's no kind

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 of definition, specific definition that everyone agrees on
2 what translational means. To some, it might mean some
3 disease relevance. To others, it could be animal models
4 of disease.

5 Others, as you said, Diane, clinical trials
6 or gearing up, you know, a step away from clinical trials,
7 so it's inherently a vague term, but it's used, everyone
8 used it.

9 I think you'll probably find that most
10 people feel that their research is highly clinically
11 relevant, and I think you'll see a skewing. I think
12 you'll see that most people will put down translational,
13 but I don't know that there's a way around it to really
14 circumscribe it in a way that will -- because the term is
15 inherently vague.

16 MR. STRAUSS: Well let me ask you all a
17 question. If it's vague and not clear and yet you define
18 it as one of the principal purposes of applying for a stem
19 cell research grant, is that a concern?

20 DR. WALLACK: No. Well I think that we
21 specifically began to address some of that with the
22 disease-directed category, because we did put specific
23 wording in that, you know, that within four years there
24 will be hopefully the possibility of clinical trials.

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 MS. CLAIRE LEONARDI: Could we solve this
2 issue a little, just for our purposes of the survey, by
3 creating a definition that we can agree to, and say, in
4 this context, translational shall mean, and then it helps
5 with the survey, but, back to your question, you know,
6 what do we consider as translational?

7 DR. KRAUSE: What can we say it is?

8 MS. LEONARDI: I don't know. We're all
9 just trying to find a solution.

10 DR. GENEL: I think that's absolutely
11 right, and I would suggest something like a definition,
12 and we can work on it, that would research that is in some
13 fashion directly related to normal or abnormal human
14 physiology, or normal physiology or human disease,
15 something of that sort, as opposed to basic biochemical
16 research to understand mechanisms of basic biological
17 mechanisms.

18 And, yes, I think most of the research,
19 most investigators will use that, will use that to say
20 it's translational, but that is a commonly-accepted
21 definition of translational research, as opposed to
22 clinical research, which is research directly in human
23 subjects.

24 CHAIRPERSON HORN: So, Rick, you seem to

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 have a fairly ready-made committee here with Diane, who
2 has worked on this, and David, and Mike to help you put a
3 definition together.

4 MR. STRAUSS: Okay. Sounds good.

5 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Is that acceptable to
6 everybody, to take this offline?

7 MR. GENEL: Diane, do you agree with that?

8 DR. KRAUSE: I think it needs a little more
9 discussion. I like where you were headed with this, but
10 it was so, so vague that, for example, if I study
11 mitochondria, you would say that's basic, basic, basic
12 science at all biology levels, that they're diseases of
13 the mitochondria to treat.

14 DR. GENEL: Oh, of course.

15 DR. KRAUSE: So we're going to have to get
16 maybe a little more specific, but I agree, that maybe
17 doing it offline and coming up with some verbiage that
18 we're all somewhat comfortable with is the way to go.

19 DR. WALLACK: So I just want to put one
20 thought on the table, and that is translational, I think,
21 to the public at least has a component that we're going to
22 translate to some kind of clinical usage, clinical trials,
23 and, so, I don't know if we should not somehow try to
24 incorporate that concept.

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 DR. GENEL: That has nothing to do with
2 translational research, Milt.

3 DR. WALLACK: Well I'm not sure I agree
4 with that.

5 DR. KRAUSE: I think it might already be
6 addressed in there, because I don't remember all the
7 questions, but we can make sure that there's a separate --

8 DR. GENEL: There needs to be --

9 DR. KRAUSE: -- intended towards clinical
10 trials in the next X amount of time.

11 DR. WALLACK: Right. Okay. That, Diane,
12 is exactly where I'm trying to go with that. Thank you.

13 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Yeah.

14 MS. KIESSLING: This is Ann Kiessling. I'd
15 like to weigh in just a little bit. I agree with what
16 Diane said. We're going to need some kind of definition.
17 When we put out the RFP last time, I think we talked
18 about language that was going to lead to clinical trial,
19 so we actually may have already made that language that we
20 spoke about already.

21 CHAIRPERSON HORN: We have the language in
22 the group project award.

23 MS. KIESSLING: Right.

24 CHAIRPERSON HORN: And it talks about

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 collaborations, and then goes on with the intention of
2 beginning Federal Food and Drug Administration review
3 within four years of the awarding of the grant.

4 MS. KIESSLING: Right, and that was sort of
5 all about the idea of how quickly is this, whatever you're
6 doing.

7 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Although I wouldn't feel
8 comfortable putting it --

9 MS. KIESSLING: -- talked about doing the
10 surveys. We talked about wanting to know a couple of
11 basic things about what kinds of publications have been
12 presented and whether they're, you know, kinds of major
13 accomplishments. And now that's fairly detailed and I
14 think you're asking principal investigators to fill this
15 out, correct?

16 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Correct.

17 MS. KIESSLING: Right. I'm a little
18 concerned that it's too long and how you spend the time of
19 the principal investigators, but I think there's more in
20 it than maybe that you need, and I think our original
21 intention was more along ideas that we were going to be
22 able to go back to the legislature with some really brief
23 snapshots of how important this program was in
24 Connecticut.

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 MR. STRAUSS: Well I think what we did was
2 try to identify key questions that would provide answers
3 in that regard. Some of what you're seeing, depending
4 upon how you would answer a question, I think there's a
5 skip to another question, so not every investigator is
6 going to be answering all these questions, but, you know,
7 one of the things that came up at the Appropriations
8 Committee hearing a couple of weeks ago from
9 Representative Walker was how do I explain this to my
10 constituents, so that they could see what the value was?

11 This is a \$100,000,000, and I'm sure the
12 State can use \$100,000,000. That was \$100,000,000 when
13 this program runs out 10 years ago, so, you know, taking
14 into consideration inflation, deflation, stagflation,
15 whatever you want to call it, so what would be an
16 appropriate amount of funding in four years to provide for
17 the next 10 years?

18 We're probably not talking about
19 \$100,000,000 if the State wanted to stay on an equal
20 basis, so let's say that number is, just to be level,
21 \$150,000,000, so that's a lot of money, and, frankly, you
22 know, we have about -- there's about 100 grants, there's
23 about 80 grants that are in process, there's probably
24 about 40 grants that have been completed.

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 The focus is on the grants that have been
2 completed, because, really, the ones that you funded in
3 '11 are only through their first year. The ones that you
4 funded in '12 aren't even going. That's 40 grants, so
5 we're really talking about 60 grants.

6 You know, the people that are part of this
7 program, if they see value in it, if this took them three
8 or four hours to do, I don't see how it's not worthy of
9 their time to provide a really good snapshot, no matter
10 how long the thing is.

11 And if they don't want to do it, then, you
12 know I don't --

13 MS. KIESSLING: Who knows. Everybody will
14 do it, but, for instance, question number 13.

15 MR. STRAUSS: Okay.

16 MS. KIESSLING: I think it's going to take
17 a long time to -- and I'm not sure what issue is really
18 going to be an advocate so you can have your -- you know,
19 in a quicker -- in a quicker way. I think what you're
20 doing is very good, but I also know that constructive --
21 somebody's got to properly --

22 MR. STRAUSS: You know, if you have a seed
23 grant, is it going to -- and half the grants are seed
24 grants that we're talking about, is that going to be that

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 difficult for a PI to estimate the amount of staffing that
2 they had as a result of the grant, or even the established
3 grants? That's going to be hard? They don't know that?

4 MS. KIESSLING: Well a lot of staffing is
5 part on this project and part on another project.

6 MR. STRAUSS: Okay, but --

7 MS. KIESSLING: So this is kind of --

8 MR. STRAUSS: But don't they report that?

9 MS. KIESSLING: Well, yes, but, I mean,
10 they're going to have to sit down and go back through, but
11 I'm not even too sure what you're going to gain from
12 question number 13. You're going to have some kind of a
13 number of people with that.

14 MS. LEONARDI: Well I guess, you know, this
15 is clearly a part of what we're trying to talk about.
16 There's a science side, but there's also the economic
17 development side, and when you think about trying to
18 create an industry with density and with the capacity and
19 the people with the skill sets, if we can really show on
20 the side of, you know, before this program started, we had
21 this capacity in the State to do this kind of research
22 with this number of people, and, then, through this
23 \$100,000,000 or 60 so far, you know, we've been able to
24 increase the density of these kind of scientists by X

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 percent I think is very powerful, because it really has,
2 you know, really shows that we have the capacity to move
3 forward into the other areas of bioscience.

4 MS. KIESSLING: I agree with that. And I
5 think that's one of the strongest things that we need to
6 do with this clinical survey, so that we can estimate
7 pretty much what percentage of the \$50,000,000 is for the
8 dollars -- and we could estimate how many people that
9 would have added.

10 It doesn't mean necessarily brought new
11 people into Connecticut's to work on that. I mean you
12 didn't recruit people from another field necessarily --

13 DR. WALLACK: And that's where your program
14 leaders have an idea of that, because Haifan and Mark and
15 Laura Grabel they know where they got their people from.

16 MS. KIESSLING: Right, and I think that --
17 I'm taking issue with question 13, because I looked at
18 that and I thought who is going to tabulate this and how
19 long is it going to take to sit down and figure this out.
20 The bigger picture you can estimate how much money is
21 spent on people and probably there are going to be other
22 ways of trying to understand how many new scientists are
23 recruited in Connecticut from other places.

24 I think, rather than go through your survey

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 point-by-point, is there a really easy way for me to just
2 jot my comments down in an e-mail and ship them to
3 somebody?

4 CHAIRMAN HORN: That would be great, Ann.
5 If you could send them to Rick Strauss? Do you have his
6 e-mail, rstrauss?

7 MS. KIESSLING: It's in the e-mail stream,
8 right?

9 MS. KRAUSE: It's in the e-mail. He was e-
10 mailed when we got the documents.

11 MS. KIESSLING: Thank you, Rick, for your
12 efforts. I don't want to sound negative about this, but I
13 sort of agree with, you know, we kind of had a plan when
14 we first talked about how important it is to provide
15 details.

16 CHAIRMAN HORN: Ann, thank you. There's
17 certainly been that tension on the committee developing
18 the survey between having too much and not enough detail
19 and looking at how some of the other states have done
20 this, and it's estimated 45 to 60 minutes, which is a good
21 piece of time, but, as Rick said, it's a lot of money that
22 we're handing out, and it would be good to have a good,
23 solid evaluation.

24 MR. STRAUSS: Maybe, Sara, could we just e-

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 mail everybody with our contact information?

2 CHAIRMAN HORN: So we will e-mail out,
3 through Sara, Rick's contact information, and anybody, who
4 has comments on the survey, please send them to him, and
5 he will take them under advisement through his committee
6 and revise the --

7 MR. STRAUSS: And please keep in mind we're
8 on a rather tight schedule, so we need this quickly.

9 DR. WALLACK: So one of the sections or
10 sectors of the survey that we'll be looking at on October
11 16th, somehow we might want to keep an account, take into
12 account that, for example, certain of the things that
13 happened.

14 Yale, for example, has built the
15 \$82,000,000 Amistad building, and the great impetus of
16 that building, which I think the stem cell group basically
17 takes about 30 percent of that building, was because of
18 our stem cell initiative, so that that somehow has to --
19 there has to be an opportunity for that kind of
20 information to come out, also.

21 MR. STRAUSS: Well that's the institutional
22 review. I mean the question for those guys is tell us
23 what you have achieved and the value of the stem cell
24 research to Connecticut, based on what your

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 accomplishments are, and what are they?

2 I mean, in general, you know, we're going
3 to get more detail than that, but I can't believe that
4 Haifan Lin wouldn't mention the importance of that
5 facility, or Mark Lalande talking about the linkage to --

6 DR. WALLACK: The Promtec(phonetic)
7 building.

8 MR. STRAUSS: Well, whatever, plus Jackson
9 Lab. It seems like, if they think there's a linkage, then
10 they're going to talk about it.

11 DR. FISHBONE: This is Gerry Fishbone. Are
12 we continuing the talk about this? I just had a few
13 points to make.

14 CHAIRMAN HORN: Sure.

15 DR. FISHBONE: My feeling, listening to all
16 the discussion, is we really need two documents. One is a
17 scientific one that explains what we have done, what we've
18 accomplished that scientists could look at and say, you
19 know, this is very good work. And then I think we need a
20 second document, which is to show the people, who are
21 provided the money, which is the people of Connecticut and
22 the legislature, with a lot of the numbers and figures
23 that I think were in (indiscernible) article, without all
24 the political implications, but those are numbers that I

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 think are very important, because, while one is a
2 scientific document, the other is a document that we need
3 to present, in order to see whether we should continue to
4 do work on stem cells, whether we should get into
5 genomics, and that's going to have to be a document that
6 people, who don't have a scientific background, can
7 understand and appreciate and feel that, yes, we're doing
8 a very good thing, and it needs to be continued to be
9 supported, so maybe we need two things.

10 MR. STRAUSS: Well the PI survey does ask
11 them to provide, you know, this is primarily for the
12 people that have completed their grants, because those are
13 the people that have identified their accomplishment,
14 based on the funding they received, so they're asked to
15 provide, basically, a really clear lay summary, as to
16 their accomplishment.

17 Now I know that might be in the final
18 report, but the final report lay summaries are sometimes
19 designed for scientific review, as compared to for the
20 more generalist person being able to look at it and say
21 this is what I accomplished.

22 I know that's hard for him to do, but, you
23 know, that's included in there, and he'll have an
24 opportunity. Our job, then, is to look at that and

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 determine if we need any more information to make it
2 clearer, or more technical information to make it clearer
3 and understand what the accomplishments are. That's why
4 we have -- it's one of the roles our committee will serve,
5 along with Maria.

6 DR. FISHBONE: I think what we need to do
7 for the second document is not take the scientific
8 summaries, because those of us, who have just read through
9 like 50 of them for this meeting, many of them are not,
10 while they're scientifically very valid, they don't help
11 our case if one feels that our case is to present a
12 picture to the legislature that they can understand, so
13 there obviously has to be a lot of work go into that to
14 make it a document that would help us to see whether we
15 can -- what we're doing, whether we need to start the
16 program.

17 I think the program has been very good, but
18 I think we have to present it in a way that will make the
19 legislature feel that it's very good and the people of
20 Connecticut feel that it's good, so, hopefully, that can
21 be achieved.

22 MS. LEONARDI: I think, if we only end up
23 with a scientific summary, if we don't sort of synthesize
24 that into a story that we can tell that really inspires

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 people, that we will get nowhere with the scientific
2 summary, but I think you have to start with the raw
3 material, the scientific summary, which is where I think
4 we all are, but I think what we end up talking to the
5 legislature about, in going in and really promoting, will
6 not necessarily be science, but it will be built off
7 those scientific summaries.

8 I think that's kind of not a second
9 document. It will be a second document, but it's probably
10 phase two of the basic stuff that we're asking CASE to do
11 at this point.

12 DR. WALLACK: I agree.

13 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I agree.

14 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Great. Any further
15 comments before we move on?

16 MR. STRAUSS: Well I can either do this now
17 or do this later, but we just want an update on where we
18 are with the stem cell review process.

19 So Terri and I visited with Dr. Stein, he's
20 Chair of the Peer Review Committee, Friday, up at
21 University of Vermont. We had a nice drive in the rain
22 for nine hours. The colors were good. We saw bear
23 crossings and moose crossing and Ben and Jerry's. How can
24 you beat that?

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 So, anyway, we went over, basically, the
2 recommendations that were provided to the Advisory
3 Committee, based on the last year's review, and he's in
4 agreement with implementing the recommendations that we've
5 put forth that we've discussed with you and had that
6 exchange, so he's all set with that.

7 And then the Peer Review Committee terms
8 have been reviewed, and there's three members that need to
9 be reappointed, so Gary took a look at who is reappointed
10 and saw no reason why they shouldn't be offered the
11 opportunity to serve again, so we're now in the process of
12 contacting all the reviewers to, one, see if those three
13 would like to be reappointed, and then, to the others,
14 that they are willing to serve for another year under
15 their current terms.

16 That's all in process, and we're going to
17 be starting putting together the orientation session for
18 the reviewers that we'll probably hold after you finalize
19 the RPF, maybe after the letters of intent are received,
20 so we have a handle on about how many proposals might come
21 in. That's it.

22 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. Thank you, Rick.
23 So we can just move right into the RFP discussion, since
24 it's that time of year again.

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 You should have a copy of a revised RFP
2 that Sara and I worked on, and I'd just like to walk
3 through the key parts of that, so that we're all aware of
4 what's in there and where there might have been changes.

5 DR. WALLACK: This is 2013.

6 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes, so, it says 2013 at
7 the top. The due date of the letter of intent submission
8 deadline is November 16, 2012, so we do want to get this
9 approved at this meeting, if possible, and then get it out
10 and posted.

11 The proposal submission deadline would be
12 January 4, 2013. I think that's right about where we were
13 last year, maybe a little bit earlier than last year.

14 The proposal instructions are the same. No
15 changes in the purpose. Definitions remain the same. Who
16 may submit is the same. When to submit, the only thing
17 that has changed are the dates there.

18 Let's see. Special considerations for
19 human embryonic stem cell research, we still have the line
20 in there that a priority is to support research on human
21 embryonic stem cell that is not currently eligible for
22 federal funding. Is that still a relevant consideration?

23 DR. WALLACK: What page are you on?

24 CHAIRPERSON HORN: I'm on page two, under

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 Special Considerations for Human Embryonic Stem Cell
2 Research.

3 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I don't personally think
4 that is relevant. Last year, we talked about taking that
5 out.

6 CHAIRPERSON HORN: We did.

7 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I guess that stayed in.

8 CHAIRPERSON HORN: The case was still
9 pending, and I think that CASE has determined the
10 litigation.

11 DR. GOLDHAMMER: The vast majority of cells
12 that people will use are approved on the registry, so I
13 would say that's not --

14 DR. HART: This is Ron Hart on the phone. I
15 actually argue that we should retain it, even though it
16 may represent a very, very small minority of submissions,
17 just because, if there are any people in the states that
18 are creating new lines prior to approval by NIH or have
19 lines that for whatever reason cannot be approved by NIH,
20 there is an outlet for supporting it if it's
21 scientifically justified.

22 MS. KIESSLING: I agree with Ron.

23 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay.

24 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Wait, so, you're saying

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 that if one or two grants come in that are not -- use ES
2 cells that are represented by already approved lines, that
3 those grants should receive priority in some way?

4 CHAIRPERSON HORN: That's how that's
5 phrased right now.

6 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I don't think the
7 phrasing, if you want to keep that sentiment in, that we
8 encourage, or I don't know what the right word is, but I
9 don't know that priority should be in there.

10 DR. KRAUSE: I agree. I think that -- this
11 is Diane Krause. I think that it's important to let
12 anybody applying know that that is fundable through the
13 Connecticut Stem Cell funds, but it doesn't need to be a
14 priority, because the priority, at least over the last two
15 years, has really been to fund the grants with the best
16 scores.

17 Why go through them for things that might
18 not be allowed to be funded with federal dollars, so I
19 want to say that the idea of just changing the wording a
20 little bit, to say we welcome those, as opposed to we
21 prioritize those.

22 COURT REPORTER: One moment, please, for a
23 tape change.

24 DR. HART: -- to changing the wording to

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 welcome, as long as there's just some provision for
2 knowing that we're -- we have the capability of supporting
3 that kind of work, and I agree, that we should be funding,
4 based on scientific priority.

5 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay, so, we're going to
6 have a tape change here for a second.

7 COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

8 (Off the record)

9 CHAIRPERSON HORN: We're back on. So the
10 way that that sentence reads right now is that a priority
11 for the Connecticut Stem Cell Research Grants Program is
12 to support research on human embryonic stem cells that is
13 not currently eligible for federal funding.

14 I can see a way of subordinating that that
15 is not currently, and just making sure that it's including
16 research that's not eligible for federal funding. Do you
17 still want the priority to be on supporting research on
18 human embryonic stem cells, or do you want to change that
19 to the best scientific research, something like that?

20 DR. HUGHES: Why would you take human
21 embryonic stem cells out?

22 CHAIRPERSON HORN: I don't think it's
23 probably the best idea, since that's the reason that we
24 got the funding in the first place.

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 DR. HUGHES: Right.

2 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay, so, if we just
3 take that sentence and have it including research, this
4 may not be eligible for federal funding.

5 DR. HUGHES: Welcomes? I thought that was
6 the operative, the Connecticut Stem Cell Research Grants
7 Program welcomes proposals for human embryonic stem cell
8 research, which is not currently eligible for federal
9 funding.

10 DR. WALLACK: I would endorse what James
11 just said.

12 DR. HUGHES: Yeah.

13 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. We'll make that
14 change. Let's see. The next paragraph talks about the
15 ESCRO Committee. No change there from last year.

16 And, again, the final paragraph under
17 special considerations for human embryonic stem cell
18 research we have research on non-federal human embryonic
19 stem cell lines is to be conducted in a research
20 environment and also receives federal funding support,
21 that they have to have a segregation of funding. Is that
22 still a requirement for the institution, still something
23 that we should leave in?

24 DR. HART: It is, if it starts off with

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 research on non-federal hESC lines, yes.

2 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. All right, so,
3 we'll just leave that in. We still have the four types of
4 grants, seed, established, two types of group projects,
5 and core facilities, and I'll just remind you of the
6 limits that we have dollar-wise, in terms of the seed
7 grants. They may be up to 200,000 expended over two
8 years, with a yearly budget not to exceed 100,000. Are
9 people still content with those limits?

10 DR. FISHBONE: Yes.

11 DR. WALLACK: So we've, Marianne, dealt
12 with the established investigator awards in the past, and
13 we've actually reduced it to \$750,000?

14 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes.

15 DR. WALLACK: And the reason that we did is
16 because we wanted to do the best we could to try to
17 involve more people in this type of research, and a
18 perfect example of the need to do that was this last
19 round, where there were so many scores that were so
20 similar, and it was very difficult to exclude anyone.

21 I'm wondering, and the scientists will have
22 a better idea about this than I have, is there room to
23 reduce the 750,000 even further to say 650,000? I don't
24 know.

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 And I'm only using that 650, because I know
2 there were a couple of grants that we awarded 650 to, and
3 it didn't seem to interfere with their desire to move
4 forward with their projects, so I would offer that as a
5 suggestion for this go around.

6 DR. KRAUSE: It's just not a lot of money
7 for doing the amount of work that is put into an
8 established investigator award. Even just to 650,000, and
9 then remove 20 percent of that, which is essentially for
10 the 25 percent (papers on microphone), you're over that
11 three years in funding.

12 MS. LEONARDI: But does this committee have
13 -- this committee has at its discretion to award 650 if
14 there are a lot of competing grants that make sense to
15 award, so why put that limitation? I mean if the
16 committee decides that 650 makes sense?

17 DR. KRAUSE: I think that it should not be
18 changed, and then, again, when we can't decide what to do
19 with the end, and we're doing all the grants, some people
20 are going to get shortchanged, in order to give grants to
21 more than one person, but I wouldn't make it the norm.

22 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. Sounds like the
23 consensus is to leave that, and, then, if we get to the
24 end of the day and would like to do some adjusting on a

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 grant where it seems appropriate, we can do that.

2 The group project awards, again, these are
3 the larger grants, and the first one is for disease-
4 directed collaboration group project awards, and they may
5 be up to \$2,000,000 and may be budgeted for four years,
6 and these are the projects that are formed collaboratively
7 with the intention of beginning FDA administration review
8 within four years of awarding of the grant, and then the
9 regular group project award may be up to 1.5 million
10 budgeted for four years.

11 Is there any desire to change in any way
12 those two categories of group grants?

13 DR. FISHBONE: I think they seem pretty
14 correct for the amount of work they're going to put in.

15 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. The core
16 facilities awards, we've not changed the wording here from
17 last year, where the language was requested funding for a
18 core facilities award may be up to one million dollars,
19 including indirect costs, and may be budgeted for up to
20 two years, so, again, that was the limit.

21 The funding, the total available for a core
22 facility award, will not exceed one million, so this is
23 the only category grant where we have an actual dollar
24 amount limit on the total dollars to be expended for that

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 category, so we might have a core that requests a million,
2 but the total award cannot exceed one million.

3 Is there any comment, discussion, or desire
4 to change that?

5 DR. FISHBONE: Well what happens if one
6 core comes in for a million? That means no other core can
7 get any money, is that correct?

8 DR. WALLACK: Well, as Claire just
9 indicated, Gerry, we can always, if they come in for a
10 million, we can choose to give them 500,000 and allow the
11 other 500,000 if the core presentation deemed appropriate
12 to give the other one 500,000, also. I don't know.

13 MS. LEONARDI: Why does the committee limit
14 the amount on this part of the program and not the others?

15 CHAIRPERSON HORN: The committee --

16 DR. GENEL: It's --

17 MS. LEONARDI: Okay, sorry. I mean the
18 thing is that you can internally limit it.

19 DR. WALLACK: Right.

20 MS. LEONARDI: Maybe I'm reacting to a lot
21 of this other -- you tend to say, okay, you know, you can
22 always make your decision, so when you put in the RFP, you
23 basically said this is all I can do, as opposed to saying,
24 you know, you can internally say we're going to limit

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 this, but, then, also, when you get two really great
2 proposals, you've got to choose between.

3 DR. WALLACK: I think the idea it's been
4 discussed extensively, and it was felt that we have given,
5 what, between, Marianne, help me, three or four million
6 dollars along the way to the cores.

7 CHAIRPERSON HORN: At least.

8 DR. WALLACK: And, at this particular
9 point, we felt that the cores were up and running. We did
10 that initially to get them up and running, and, in order
11 to sustain their operation, Haifan and Mark came to us,
12 did a presentation, and they sort of indicated that we
13 need approximately \$500,000 to now sustain what you've
14 helped us to create, and that's how the 500,000 to each
15 institution, and, to be very honest with you, Gerry raises
16 a good point, but there's such collaboration between the
17 two institutions and such cooperation that I don't see
18 that, frankly, as happening.

19 They both came in last year at 500,000,
20 because they understand what's in front of them.

21 DR. GENEL: I think the initial notion,
22 when we set up the program, was to invest heavily in the
23 cores to get them established, but with an expectation
24 that over the course of several years, they would become

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 self-sustaining by generating other revenue.

2 MS. LEONARDI: But that's not happening.

3 DR. GENEL: Well I think it's unrealistic,
4 and when we really seriously considered not funding the
5 cores at all, they came to us, and I think made a very
6 compelling case, that some sustaining funding from the
7 program --

8 DR. WALLACK: Well Claire's response --

9 DR. GENEL: -- we thought we needed to set
10 some sort of a fixed limit, because we had only a small
11 pot to share.

12 MS. LEONARDI: I thought you'd say 10
13 million is a small pot.

14 DR. WALLACK: But Claire's point is a very
15 good point, and that is that, at some point, the idea is
16 hopefully for the institutions to develop philanthropic
17 giving that will sustain the core.

18 That's in its infancy, but there's some
19 indication that at least it's in its infancy.

20 MS. LEONARDI: Well it sounds like part of
21 future planning should be that they -- that you have a
22 declining amount that comes out of the fund, and they
23 actually do start to --

24 DR. WALLACK: Right.

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 MS. LEONARDI: Or let's just say the
2 program does not go forward. All the sudden you have two
3 institutions with half a million dollar holes every year.

4 DR. WALLACK: Right.

5 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Right, right, and I
6 think we also wanted to maintain a placeholder for a new
7 core. That might be something unique that we didn't have,
8 and be able to fund that, as well.

9 MS. LEONARDI: Sorry to bring up old
10 issues.

11 CHAIRPERSON HORN: No, that's fine.

12 DR. KRAUSE: This is Diane Krause. Just in
13 response to that last comment, both cores really have
14 continued to expand and add additional core functions, so
15 I think, to some extent, that's happened, what you just
16 said.

17 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes.

18 DR. KRAUSE: A placeholder for new cores,
19 that's really the same thing as expanding these existing
20 cores.

21 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay, so, we'll leave
22 that at a one-million-dollar cap, divided according to how
23 the applications come in and are judged.

24 Okay. I wanted to skip down to the

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 selection criteria and just have us spend a little bit of
2 time here on these criteria, because I think this is part
3 of the discussion that happens in the open forum at the
4 grants, when we decide them in June or July, and I want to
5 make sure that these are all criteria that you think are
6 useful.

7 It seemed to me that there were some other
8 emerging criteria that were being used, and I wanted to
9 make sure that the committee was comfortable with those.

10 Specifically, what I'm thinking about is
11 that someone has funding from a different source, or has
12 an adequate source of funding, or has been funded before,
13 those kinds of questions that come up, and I wanted to
14 have a discussion about the relevance of other sources of
15 funding, as opposed to looking strictly at the scientific
16 merit or these other categories of criteria that we have.

17 DR. GENEL: Later on, you do have a section
18 that was highlighted.

19 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes, and that was for
20 discussion, as well.

21 DR. GENEL: Regarding that the
22 investigators indicate previous awards from the program.
23 It's interesting that the CASE survey comes up with some
24 answers that I really have not even imagined was quite so

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 high. Was it 44?

2 MR. STRAUSS: Twenty-two investigators
3 received more than one grant.

4 DR. GENEL: Yeah. I had really not
5 realized it was that high.

6 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Did the folks here on
7 the phone hear that 22 investigators --

8 DR. GENEL: Had more than one grant.

9 CHAIRPERSON HORN: -- received more than
10 one grant?

11 DR. GENEL: That's in five years.

12 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Well, six.

13 DR. GENEL: Six years. That's striking,
14 and I think, you know, we've had applications for when we
15 did have that information available. I think it really
16 could make a difference. I'm not sure I would add it to
17 the selection criteria explicitly.

18 I think, simply, to some extent, I think
19 it's implicit, simply because we ask for that information,
20 so we have to be more explicit than that.

21 CHAIRPERSON HORN: What Mike is talking
22 about is over on page six, the highlighted language there.

23 I think it was Dr. Kiessling, who had asked to have this
24 put in.

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 Applicants shall indicate if they have been
2 a recipient of the research grant awarded by the
3 Connecticut Stem Cell Research Grants Program. If so, the
4 applicant should include specific information about the
5 grant award.

6 Applicant should also indicate whether they
7 have submitted any other proposals for the current
8 proposal cycle.

9 I just wanted to have the committee to have
10 a discussion about the relevance of other funding, and the
11 relevance of funding from this program, or having received
12 another grant. I'm not sure what the intent of that is.

13 MS. KIESSLING: This is Ann Kiessler. I'm
14 actually not surprised that 20 investigators are receiving
15 more than one grant. The role of our seed program was to
16 foster that.

17 DR. GENEL: Well, yeah, but I don't think
18 we know whether or not the second grants were full
19 investigator grants or just another seed. I have a
20 suspicion there might be a little bit of both in there.

21 MS. KIESSLING: Right.

22 DR. FISHBONE: Yeah, we had a number of
23 applicants that had both seeds and established
24 investigator grants in the same year applied for.

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 DR. WALLACK: I think Gerry's point is the
2 main point, and this is that the whole idea of a seed
3 grant was for those people entering the field, even
4 whether they be senior investigators, if they've never
5 been in the field, but, by the same token, if they were,
6 therefore, trying to obtain a seed grant, they shouldn't
7 be trying to obtain a senior investigator grant or vice-
8 versa, so that's, I think, what we were trying to clarify
9 and make sure did not happen, that a senior investigator
10 would, in fact, be looking to get the seed grant, which
11 would be inappropriate.

12 I'm not so sure there should be any impact
13 if an investigator has additional grants, for example,
14 from the federal government, NIH, or anything like that.

15 If that investigator is working 36 hours a
16 day, nine days a week, and is willing to have that kind of
17 schedule, and do multiple tasks, and is doing productive
18 work, I don't see an issue with that part of it, but I
19 think the thought that Gerry brought up that I tried to
20 add to, probably poorly, is the area that we were
21 concerned about.

22 MS. LEONARDI: I look at it almost like the
23 opposite, that if a federal grant, or someone else is
24 willing to put dollars in alongside my dollars, kind of

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 leveraging it for a larger project, that I see that as a
2 positive.

3 DR. WALLACK: Right.

4 MS. LEONARDI: Oh, okay. I thought you
5 were talking about that as negative.

6 DR. WALLACK: No, no, no. That's great.
7 That's great. That's absolutely fantastic.

8 MS. LEONARDI: Okay.

9 DR. WALLACK: And that's the whole point.
10 Rick actually highlighted something before, and that is
11 that the 32 million dollars, I don't know which
12 institution he was referring to, obtained led to 81
13 million dollars in federal funds. That's absolutely
14 fantastic.

15 MS. LEONARDI: Okay.

16 DR. WALLACK: No issue at all.

17 MS. LEONARDI: I interpreted that
18 differently.

19 DR. WALLACK: No, no. No issue at all.
20 That should happen, and the power of what we're doing
21 should lead to that, and that's the value that we want to
22 --

23 MR. STRAUSS: Sorry. Rick Strauss. I mean
24 I'm not exactly sure what those numbers were, so please

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 don't quote them, but the scale was something similar to
2 that.

3 MS. LEONARDI: This was from the --

4 MR. STRAUSS: From their presentation,
5 yeah.

6 MS. LEONARDI: Yeah. I remember something
7 like that.

8 MR. STRAUSS: It was like that. The point
9 was that it was -- the leverage dollars were significant
10 compared to the dollars that Connecticut Stem Cell was
11 funding versus the total received, and the scale was about
12 that, but I don't know if the number was 32 million.

13 Both institutions had similar numbers that
14 were pretty significant, in terms of what was leveraged,
15 as reported.

16 CHAIRPERSON HORN: So I may be the only
17 person, who is still confused about this, but I just want
18 to understand the language that we're talking about
19 putting in here.

20 It seems like there are two pieces we're
21 looking at. One is whether they had received a grant from
22 Connecticut Stem Cell Program in the past, and we want
23 specific information about that grant award, so we're
24 looking to say, you know, how did you do with that, so

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 we're sort of seeing whether they were somewhat successful
2 with that funding, and then whether they have submitted
3 any other proposals for the current proposal cycle, and I
4 guess that's where I'm a little concerned.

5 And I understand, Milt, your point, about
6 if somebody is really a seed investigator, they maybe
7 shouldn't be also submitting an established. I'm not sure
8 that's necessarily exclusive, but are we concerned with
9 somebody, who submits an excellent established
10 investigator protocol and who is also part of the group
11 grant and is submitting?

12 For that, are we going to say that we were
13 trying to spread the money around as far as we can, or are
14 we trying to fund the best research? And this person, who
15 put in two proposals, really deserves both of those to be
16 funded.

17 The last grant award meeting I wasn't clear
18 where we were coming down on that.

19 DR. WALLACK: That's a good question.

20 DR. GENEL: I don't know that we have to
21 decide that until we have to deal with it.

22 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay.

23 DR. GENEL: I think, depending upon the
24 research and depending upon what is being proposed, we

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 might come up with entirely different conclusions.

2 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yeah. I just think, in
3 fairness to the people being evaluated, I think they need
4 to know what the criteria are that we're using.

5 We have those listed under selection
6 criteria, but this funding piece was a little confusing to
7 me.

8 DR. GENEL: I think it ought to be more
9 explicit. I initially read that as being other proposals,
10 not including Connecticut, but not exclusive to
11 Connecticut.

12 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. I think there's a
13 part of the budget, where we ask for, or somewhere in the
14 project description, what other sources of funding that
15 they do have, but we can add that in if it's other sources
16 of funding.

17 DR. KRAUSE: This is Diane Krause. I can
18 make just a suggestion, based on how it's done with the
19 NIH.

20 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay.

21 DR. KRAUSE: Which is the bio sketch needs
22 to include their current funding and any other grants you
23 currently submitted.

24 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay.

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 DR. KRAUSE: And then you're supposed to
2 indicate whether there's any overlap with the existing
3 proposal. We could require that they make sure they
4 include in that any prior funding from the State of
5 Connecticut, so even if it's something that's already
6 over, that they would indicate that grant and make a
7 sentence about it in their bio sketch.

8 DR. GENEL: I like that. I think that's a
9 very appropriate way to deal with that, Diane.

10 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay.

11 DR. GENEL: In other words, it's
12 incorporated within another part of the application, and
13 it doesn't stand out on its own.

14 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay and that becomes
15 part of the evaluation, then, of the grant, how much other
16 funding they have that's available, how much they've been
17 funded by our program. It's all just part of the mix.

18 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I don't know. I mean I
19 should -- if someone has four NIH grants unrelated to this
20 proposal and they get a one on this proposal, should the
21 other four grants come into play? I guess, Milt, you
22 would say?

23 DR. WALLACK: No.

24 DR. GOLDHAMMER: No. And I would agree

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 with that, but we list, on our bio sketches, we list all
2 of our other funding with the titles and the objectives,
3 so that the reviewer can the best they can, and it's
4 really difficult to do, but at least be comfortable with
5 the idea that there is no scientific overlap between
6 what's already funded and what is being applied for,
7 because you can't double-dip.

8 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Right.

9 DR. GOLDHAMMER: So that's really the
10 reason for that inclusion in the bio sketch.

11 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Right.

12 DR. WALLACK: I'm assuming that it will be
13 for some other kind of work.

14 DR. GOLDHAMMER: For some other, yeah.
15 Well it's a gray area. It can be related, but not
16 directly have the same names.

17 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Right.

18 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Right. Okay and just
19 indulge me one more second. So we have one grant over
20 here that, looking at the other sources of funding, is an
21 excellent proposal, so that's on the right.

22 On the left, we have one that it's an
23 excellent proposal and has lots of other funding, so that
24 funding, then, enters into our decision, or is it drilled

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 down to the science, or the other criteria that we have?

2 DR. GOLDHAMMER: So, in your example,
3 there's no difference in our judgment or the peer review
4 judgment, in terms of the quality of the science?

5 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Correct.

6 DR. GOLDHAMMER: So it has to come down to
7 other criteria.

8 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Right. Right.

9 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Well I don't know. I mean
10 I don't know if we want to specify in this document, but I
11 think, from my standpoint, a new startup person is trying
12 to establish their lab and is looking for seed funding,
13 compared to someone, who is established with four NIH
14 grants, you know, I'd like to see the junior person get
15 funding, but that's kind of a little bit off the record
16 and not one of the criteria that we're using, but I think
17 it has to come down to something, other than the quality
18 of science, if that's judged to be the same.

19 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Um-hum.

20 DR. HART: Can I jump in? This is Ron Hart
21 on the phone. I haven't really -- the last few years, I
22 believe that the issue of unique needs to complete a
23 project, let me put it in broad terms, have been
24 considered in some cases, and it's not a listed criteria,

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 and I think it could be.

2 We might want to say something like --
3 well, certainly, for seed grants, it's obvious that (phone
4 feedback) need to make a person trained in the right
5 field, but for an established grant or something else,
6 demonstration of needs to complete the project, you know,
7 helps the approval process.

8 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. How do other
9 people feel about adding something like that to the
10 selection criteria? I think it's a fairly broad category
11 that might sweep in those intangibles that could include
12 funding, could include --

13 DR. GENEL: What would that be, Marianne?

14 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Demonstration of unique
15 need to complete the project.

16 DR. HART: If we don't like the wording
17 that I gave, you think somebody will fix it?

18 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay.

19 DR. GENEL: Yeah, because I'm not sure what
20 that means.

21 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay.

22 DR. GENEL: That's why I asked.

23 DR. HART: Yeah. It's not very specific. I
24 was hoping Ann would help me out.

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 DR. GENEL: You know, I don't know why what
2 we're talking about doesn't fit loosely into the last
3 bullet.

4 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yeah.

5 DR. HART: It's so broad it's almost beyond
6 formative.

7 DR. GENEL: Well, yeah, but I kind of like
8 a little bit of vagueness.

9 DR. HART: We've seen some of the
10 applicants, who weren't happy with the results.

11 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Right. Yeah, I think we
12 have to be very careful about sticking closely to the
13 selection criteria and not getting too creative with other
14 things midstream.

15 Well I think I'll just leave that alone for
16 the moment. I think it's been helpful to have this
17 discussion, in terms of the funding and what we're looking
18 for. I think I understand better where the committee is
19 coming from when they're looking at funding, so that's
20 helpful.

21 And then we discussed the bolded language
22 over on page six, and we'll add something to the bio
23 sketch that includes funding, and, Diane, I may reach out
24 to you to make sure that language is okay.

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 DR. KRAUSE: Okay.

2 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. I think the only
3 other thing we changed in it was highlighting the heck out
4 of everything that is proprietary. You marked that in
5 yellow highlighted text. I think that is about all of the
6 changes. Were there other concerns or comments about the
7 RFP?

8 Okay, then, we'll make those changes, we'll
9 send it out one final time, and we'll give you a couple of
10 days, probably a very short turnaround time, to take a
11 quick look through and catch any glaring errors, and thank
12 you, and then we'll get it posted. Okay, thank you.

13 I guess we should vote on approval of the
14 RFP, as proposed, with that language.

15 DR. WALLACK: As amended.

16 CHAIRPERSON HORN: As amended, and send it
17 around for one last review. Milt, can you make that
18 motion?

19 DR. WALLACK: I'll move it, as amended.

20 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Dr. Genel, will you
21 second?

22 DR. GENEL: I will.

23 CHAIRPERSON HORN: All in favor?

24 VOICES: Aye.

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Opposed? Okay, thank
2 you very much, everybody. Okay, Sara.

3 MS. DONOFRIO: For item number 13, the
4 update on the 2012 agreements, to date, we have received
5 all of Yale's ESCRO and verification forms, and I received
6 an update from Ezolza(phonetic), indicating that we should
7 have UConns by the next meeting, so we should be in good
8 shape to get those assistance agreements out for November
9 1st. I don't know if there's any other questions on that?

10 MS. LEONARDI: Sara, when we went through
11 the timeline, you know, sort of what told us about the
12 payments, that was a key thing, getting these agreements,
13 and one of the questions we talked about is whether we
14 needed to wait to get all. Let's say we get 50 percent of
15 UConn's. Could we award the grants where we got the
16 agreements, as opposed to waiting for the whole group?

17 I don't know how everybody feels about
18 that, but when you think about the timeline that it takes
19 to get the grants out the door, that's the biggest holdup
20 we have.

21 DR. FISHBONE: This is Gerry Fishbone.
22 Could I interrupt? I have to get off the call, because I
23 have another call coming in.

24 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay.

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 DR. FISHBONE: So I hope that's okay.

2 Nothing else to vote on?

3 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Just adjourning and
4 possible dates in June, so give us Mondays in June a
5 thought, Gerry.

6 DR. FISHBONE: Okay.

7 CHAIRPERSON HORN: For our grant review
8 meeting.

9 DR. FISHBONE: They all sound good.

10 CHAIRPERSON HORN: All right. That's
11 great. Thanks. We got you down for that. Thank you.
12 Thanks, Gerry.

13 DR. FISHBONE: Goodbye.

14 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Bye, bye.

15 MS. LEONARDI: So, anyway, it's a question
16 for process that we might want to address at some point in
17 time, is whether we (phone feedback) for the full amount
18 from each institution before we send any grants out.

19 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. Anything further
20 on the update on the 2012 agreements? The next item is
21 the appeal's process recommendation. We had a brief
22 discussion about the appeal's process last meeting, and
23 decided to form a small group, not even a committee, but
24 just a small group to discuss this in more detail.

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 That was done, and my thanks go to Dr.
2 Hughes, to Rick Strauss, and Dr. Wallack for joining me on
3 that committee, and Sara Donofrio was there, also, from
4 CI.

5 So we met to discuss whether we wanted to
6 have an appeal process, whether we didn't, if we did, what
7 that would look like. I will note that we also read the
8 e-mails from Dr. Krause, Dr. Hart and Dr. Goldhammer,
9 which had also been read at the other, the big meeting,
10 but we took those into consideration.

11 We looked at examples of review processes
12 from the Maryland stem cell research, thanks to Milt. Dr.
13 Hughes talked about the National Institute of Health
14 Appeal Process and the Connecticut -- California Institute
15 of Regenerative Medicine process.

16 And, so, we tried to see what that kind of
17 an appeal process would look like, and came around at the
18 end to a recommendation, that there not be a grant review
19 process and not a formal process at this time.

20 We recognize that there will be issues that
21 come to light between the peer review evaluations going
22 out to the committee or to the scientists, and the vote at
23 the Advisory Committee, the grant review meeting, and, so,
24 if there's any serious issue that is noted either by a PI

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 or by the committee, that that could be handled at the
2 Chair's discretion and probably sent back to the peer
3 review to have them take another look at something,
4 whether they missed something, whether there was an error,
5 or whether there was an issue about something that looked
6 like research misconduct, and leave that to the Chair's
7 discretion to handle, rather than trying to implement some
8 kind of an appeal process.

9 Particularly, once the grant vote has been
10 taken, and the money has been allocated, it's very
11 difficult to have an appeal process.

12 So that was a very thorough discussion, and
13 I think we touched every aspect of how an appeal might
14 take place, and the pros and cons, and then came around to
15 recognizing that, in all these years, we've had very few
16 issues that have come up.

17 And I think one of the things we recognize
18 at the Advisory Committee it is an open meeting, and it's
19 very important to just make sure that we stick to
20 evaluating the grants, and that we're very sure of what's
21 being said about those grants, because it's not often that
22 you have that kind of a grant review with all of the
23 people, who know this application as intimately as the
24 people, who are either going to be funded, based on your

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 words, or not funded.

2 So, keeping that in mind, that is the
3 recommendation to the committee, that we continue,
4 basically, the way we have been going and have the Chair
5 handle any issues that might come up, based on the peer
6 review. Is there any discussion on that?

7 DR. KRAUSE: Yeah. This is Diane Krause. I
8 have a question about it. So I guess I don't understand
9 how this is going to help you, Marianne, because I know
10 that this past year there was a disgruntled investigator,
11 and the comment really was we don't have any way in place,
12 any directions to you, Marianne, of what to do in that
13 situation.

14 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Um-hum.

15 DR. KRAUSE: And it sounds like a decision
16 and something should be said, and we still don't have
17 that.

18 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Well I think it was that
19 it would come back to the Chair, who would then --

20 DR. KRAUSE: Who is the Chair? Which is
21 the Chair?

22 CHAIRPERSON HORN: That's Dr. Mullen.

23 DR. KRAUSE: Okay.

24 CHAIRPERSON HORN: And Dr. Mullen would

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 determine the proper course of events and generally send
2 it back to the peer review to have them take another look
3 at it appears to have been an error or an issue. A lot of
4 the issues we've encountered over the years have just been
5 procedural errors, and I think sometimes, as we did with
6 that particular grant, there is a difference of opinion.

7 DR. KRAUSE: Right.

8 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Between the peer review
9 and the applicant.

10 DR. KRAUSE: Yeah. That one wasn't even
11 quite as complicated as the one from Yale, where there
12 really wasn't a review done, but I guess we're going to
13 try to prevent that from happening, where you get all the
14 way to our committee, without having addressed the
15 concerns of the reviewer.

16 Everyone of them had given it a nine or an
17 eight, saying something can't be plagiarized, but they
18 were wrong, and it never really got addressed.

19 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yeah. There was
20 definitely a difference of opinion there, in terms of that
21 issue.

22 DR. KRAUSE: There was a difference of
23 opinion?

24 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yeah. So that was sent

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 back to the peer review, so we did follow that process in
2 that particular grant. Any other comments? It's not
3 perfect, but it is, given that we award the grants in one
4 day, unless a grant fails, there really is no other money
5 to give out, and I think our track record is pretty good
6 at getting the money allocated, and it never goes far
7 enough, so they're always difficult choices, and always
8 disappointed people, and I think the rollercoaster for
9 PIs, who are there for the whole process, gets very
10 intense.

11 MR. LANDRY: May I make a comment?

12 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes.

13 MR. LANDRY: They may resubmit the next
14 year.

15 CHAIRPERSON HORN: And they may resubmit
16 the next year.

17 MR. LANDRY: The year goes by pretty fast,
18 as we know.

19 CHAIRPERSON HORN: So, then, the next item
20 is the grant review meeting. We're already looking to the
21 next grant review and hoping to have it in June, rather
22 than in July, when it gets difficult for people and their
23 vacation schedules.

24 I know June is not ideal either. The

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 Mondays in June are the 3rd, the 10th, the 17th and the
2 24th, and we've typically done it people coming in Sunday
3 night, if they're out of town, and starting promptly on
4 Monday morning, and attempting to get it done in one day.

5 DR. KRAUSE: This is Diane Krause. I'll be
6 out of town on the 3rd, but the other ones are fine.

7 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay.

8 DR. GENEL: I would prefer the 17th.

9 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay and what we'll do
10 is I'll ask Sara to send around whatever they're called, a
11 Doodle, a Doodle Poll, and we'll get -- and this would
12 basically try to get everybody there on that, so if you
13 really can try to make yourself available as much as
14 possible, we appreciate it.

15 Is there any public comment?

16 MR. STRAUSS: Okay. Actually, I have one
17 question. In putting together this summary of all the
18 proposals, there was one hybrid grant that was issued, and
19 that was early on. It was to Michael Snyder before he
20 left for California.

21 I mean I'm sure I can go back and look at
22 what that was defined as, but, you know, you had a group
23 or a hybrid, so what was the deal with the hybrid? What
24 did that basically mean? Do you recall at all?

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 DR. KRAUSE: Yes. This is Diane Krause.
2 It meant that it was a group of investigators, and they
3 had a core, and I'm sure Mike Snyder would be amenable to
4 responding, but I know that Haifan Lin also knows what's
5 going on with that core.

6 It eventually was supposed to be with our
7 existing core.

8 MR. STRAUSS: Okay. And then, just for an
9 informational item, the Academy has an annual meeting in
10 May, and, for this year, our keynote speakers will be
11 Haifan Lin, Mark Lalande and Laura Grabel, talking on the
12 stem cell research program in Connecticut.

13 DR. KRAUSE: Great.

14 DR. GOLDHAMMER: When is it?

15 MR. STRAUSS: May 22nd. You're all
16 invited. It's at Quinnipiac, featuring their new medical
17 school and engineering programs.

18 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Great. Thanks, Rick.
19 We will need to have our next meeting on October 16th. I
20 know it's a short turnaround, but it is the third Tuesday
21 of October. Hopefully, there are no holidays on the 16th.

22 We're getting to the point, where we have
23 just accumulated enough grants that are coming up for
24 approval, so thank you for your efficiency today, and I

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 2012

1 hope to have a similarly well-organized meeting next time.

2 DR. KRAUSE: That will also be from 1:00 to
3 4:00 on Tuesday, October 16th?

4 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes. Okay, is there
5 anything else before I call for a motion to adjourn?
6 Okay, may I have a motion to adjourn?

7 DR. WALLACK: So moved.

8 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Milt. Second?

9 DR. HUGHES: Second.

10 CHAIRPERSON HORN: And all in favor?

11 VOICES: Aye.

12 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay, thank you,
13 everybody.

14 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 3:11
15 p.m.)