

VERBATIM PROCEEDINGS

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE

APRIL 15, 2008

1:10 P.M.

805 BROOK STREET
ROCKY HILL, CONNECTICUT

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

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 . . .Continued verbatim proceedings of
2 Connecticut Stem Cell Research Advisory Committee, held at
3 805 Brook Street, Building Four, Rocky Hill, Connecticut,
4 on April 15, 2008 at 1:10 p.m. . . .

5

6

7

8

COMMISSIONER ROBERT GALVIN: Are we live?
9 Okay. Thank you for your forbearance. I had a couple of
10 phone calls that I had to take when I stopped the vehicle.

11 We do have a new committee member. Jerry Yang has
12 resigned. I have not had any reports, as to his health.
13 I presume he's still -- is he still in the mainland, China
14 mainland?

15

A MALE VOICE: Yeah.

16

COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Paul Pescatello has
17 been gracious enough to join us. I think most of us have
18 been acquainted with him within our system of trying to do
19 the right things and the right time at the right place.
20 I'm pleased to have him here with us to give us the
21 benefit of his knowledge and experience. Do you want to
22 say a few words?

23

MR. PAUL PESCATELLO: Just happy to be here

24

--

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Thank you very much.

2 COURT REPORTER: You need a microphone.

3 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Can you repeat that,
4 sir?

5 MR. PESCATELLO: I just said I was happy to
6 be here and join the good work that's going on.

7 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Well that was
8 succinct and correct. Thank you very much. Amy Wagers
9 has called in by telephone, so if anyone is going to
10 speak, they'll have to make sure they have microphone, so
11 that Amy can hear what's happening.

12 Our first order of business, or second
13 order of business is approval of the minutes from the
14 March 18, 2008 meeting. Do I have a motion to approve the
15 minutes of that meeting?

16 A MALE VOICE: So moved.

17 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: And a second?

18 A MALE VOICE: Second.

19 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: And any discussion,
20 additions, or subtractions from that particular report?
21 You should all have a copy of it. Okay. Does anyone need
22 a copy of the minutes of the March 18, 2008?

23 MS. MARIANNE HORN: Hello?

24 DR. TREENA ARINZEH: Hi. This is Treena

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 Arinzeh.

2 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Hi, Treena.

3 DR. ARINZEH: Hi. How are you?

4 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Good.

5 MS. HORN: Welcome. We just got started.

6 We're just reviewing the minutes from the last meeting.

7 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Are there any
8 additions or deletions? Do you need some more time with
9 that document, Dr. Wallack? Okay. That's been moved and
10 seconded. I'll call for a vote. All in favor of adopting
11 the minutes, as typed, from 3/18/08, indicate by saying
12 aye.

13 VOICES: Aye.

14 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Opposed? The motion
15 is carried. The minutes are adopted. Item number three,
16 Update Receipt of 2006 Annual Reports, Fiscal Audits and
17 Technical Progress Reports, are you giving that?

18 MR. DAN WAGNER: I am.

19 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay.

20 MR. WAGNER: All right, so, we have
21 received all of the fiscal reports and technical progress
22 reports from the 2006 grants. C.I. will be reviewing the
23 budgets and preparing just a one-page checklist cover
24 letter, any comments that might be regarding what is

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 provided, and soon the -- well we're going to do that
2 Thursday. Hopefully, that will be done by the end of the
3 week, and then, by the end of this week or beginning of
4 next week, we will then post that on the website with the
5 fiscal reports, our review of them, and the technical
6 progress reports, so the committee members can then get
7 after them like they did the peer reviews and the
8 proposals earlier last month.

9 And when they're posted, we'll send out an
10 e-mail to everybody, letting you know that it's posted and
11 the directions on how to get that.

12 So, with that, that's all of the 2006
13 reports, and hopefully we'll have that, the committee will
14 review those, and on our next meeting we can approve all
15 the progress reports and move forward with the next round
16 of funding for those. Okay? I'll keep going.

17 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Questions? You can
18 move right onto your next topic.

19 DR. MYRON GENEL: Oh.

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Mike?

21 DR. GENEL: Was there an assignment of who
22 on the committee was to review these? Has that been
23 circulated?

24 MR. WAGNER: I believe it has in the past,

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

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 but we will re-circulate it.

2 DR. GENEL: You'll re-circulate that?

3 MR. WAGNER: I think it was based on who
4 did the initial reviews last year, and then we
5 substituted, based on people leaving the committee and
6 joining.

7 MR. ROBERT MANDELKERN: Do I understand,
8 then, you'll be putting all the reports in the same form
9 that all the grant proposals were put in?

10 MR. WAGNER: Correct.

11 MR. MANDELKERN: So that you can enter any
12 one of them?

13 MR. WAGNER: Yeah, I believe so, just like
14 they were on the website previously, right.

15 MR. MANDELKERN: Okay. That worked very
16 well. Once I mastered it, it worked very nicely.

17 MR. WAGNER: Okay. And, again, we'll send
18 out an e-mail when those are posted and with any
19 directions that may be needed for that.

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Any other questions?
21 If not, we'll move onto fiscal audits.

22 MR. WAGNER: We'll go right to the 2008
23 approved projects.

24 DR. ANN KIESSLING: Hello. It's Ann

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 Kiessling calling in.

2 MS. HORN: Hello, Ann. We just started the
3 meeting. We are moving up to item number four on the
4 agenda.

5 MR. WAGNER: Okay, so, we have prepared
6 letters of approval for the yeses and the nos for the
7 projects that we reviewed earlier this month, and those
8 will be sent out this week.

9 What we'll be doing is, for those approved
10 with revised budgets, we'll be asking them to reply with
11 new budgets that address the cuts in the funding and any
12 adjusted milestones that they may need to do, and we'll be
13 asking the recipients to return that within two weeks,
14 which will allow us to then have the committee review
15 those revisions.

16 Again, on our next meeting, we should be
17 able to approve those going forward, and with the approval
18 of the new contracts, we should be able to begin
19 contracting the next day from the approval.

20 DR. AMY WAGERS: Excuse me. This is Amy
21 Wagers.

22 MR. WAGNER: Hi, Amy.

23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yes, Amy?

24 DR. WAGERS: Sorry. I'm having a little

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 bit of trouble hearing, and I just wanted to clarify.
2 Were you saying that we'll now need to re-review all of
3 the revisions of the budget for all of the grants that we
4 previously approved?

5 MR. WAGNER: I think we just need to --

6 MR. HENRY SALTON: Wait a minute. Let her
7 --

8 MR. WAGNER: Yeah. Once they resubmit
9 their milestones in and the budget to coincide with what
10 was granted, I think that the committee members that
11 reviewed those should just check them to make sure there's
12 nothing totally new or different from the proposal.

13 I assume they'll just modify some things,
14 but I just want to have that double checked before we go
15 ahead and approve those new budgets.

16 DR. WAGERS: All right. And what if we do
17 find something that is --

18 MR. WAGNER: It will come back to the
19 committee in our next month's meeting on the 20th and we
20 can discuss that.

21 DR. WAGERS: Okay and did you say a
22 timeline for this review?

23 MR. WAGNER: Well we're going to give the
24 PIs two weeks to get it back to us, so that will get us to

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 the end of the month, and then we have until May 20th for
2 our next meeting, so that 20 days or so to review those
3 handful of grants that were changed.

4 DR. WAGERS: Okay, thanks.

5 DR. KIESSLING: This is Ann Kiessler. I'm
6 sorry to interrupt. Are the red asterisks on our
7 spreadsheet are those the grants that you're referring to?

8 MR. WAGNER: No. The red asterisks are
9 something else. It was cut and pasted to a different.
10 The ones that I'm referring to are the established grants
11 that were cut by 10 percent across the board and, also,
12 the group and the core grants that were approved that were
13 cut down from what they had proposed.

14 DR. KIESSLING: Okay and what do the red
15 asterisks mean?

16 MR. WAGNER: That's a good question.

17 MR. MANDELKERN: The red asterisks mean
18 they are proposals that were submitted last round, but
19 were reworked and resubmitted for approval this round.

20 DR. KIESSLING: Thank you.

21 MR. WAGNER: Okay and that's all, I think.
22 Are there any questions?

23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Any questions?

24 MS. HORN: And I believe that you are going

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 to send out letters to the unapproved --

2 MR. WAGNER: Correct. And we have some
3 language that was from Dr. Wallack through you that we'll
4 put in those letters appropriately.

5 MS. HORN: Okay. Thank you. There were a
6 couple of grants that there were some comments by Dr.
7 Wallack, who wanted to have something sent out to all of
8 the people who had applied, so we'll make sure that
9 language gets in there.

10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: We're going to move
11 on, unless there are no questions. Do you have a
12 question, Bob?

13 MR. MANDELKERN: Just to say good
14 afternoon.

15 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Good afternoon.

16 MR. MANDELKERN: I hope you're in good
17 health.

18 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: As far as I know.
19 I'm afraid to have contact with the medical system.
20 Technical progress reports.

21 MR. WAGNER: So we're actually down to
22 number five, so that's technical progress reports were for
23 the 2006, and those are all in and will be posted with the
24 financials.

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. Everybody all
2 set with items three and four, because we're going to move
3 on. Okay. Dr. Latham?

4 DR. STEPHEN LATHAM: Do the committee
5 members have copies of the revised assistance agreement or
6 no? No? They were sent out, but here's what I'll do. I
7 will just describe the process that we're going through.
8 We will have a vote on approving this and a revised
9 royalty agreement I imagine at the next meeting, so that
10 we can go forward with the awards.

11 Let me just describe to you the process
12 we've been going through. Henry and I and several people
13 from C.I. and several of C.I.'s counsel from Shipman and
14 Goodwin have been meeting a couple of times, oh, and
15 Marianne, have been meeting a couple of times to go
16 through the assistance agreement and shortly, also, the
17 royalty agreement.

18 Donna Brooks, in particular, from Shipman
19 and Goodwin has done a tremendous amount of work in
20 revising the agreement to make it more workable in various
21 ways. Most of the ways, most of the changes are small
22 language changes that are not worth our going over right
23 now in full detail, but I wanted to highlight sort of
24 seven big points of revision that we're proposing and that

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 you'll be asked to approve at the next meeting, along with
2 revisions to the royalty agreement, which are in progress
3 now.

4 The seven major points of revision I wanted
5 to mention, and these are not at all in order of
6 importance, and some of them are not -- some of them are
7 major, only in the sense of the amount of text they move
8 around, rather than their having much substantive import,
9 but I'll explain the seven points to you.

10 First, some language has been added on the
11 second page of the agreement to set a hierarchy among the
12 statute, state contracting requirements, the contract
13 instructions for the RFP and the RFP document, itself, so
14 that if there are any conflicting demands among those
15 documents, there will be a hierarchy for interpretations
16 sake, and the hierarchy is, in fact, the one I just named.

17
18 The act is most important, followed by
19 state contracting requirements, followed by the contract,
20 followed by RFP proposal instructions, followed by the
21 proposal, itself.

22 Next point. A huge bulk text change has
23 occurred, but it signifies almost no change, in that the
24 state contracting requirements have been pulled out of the

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 contract and tucked into the back as an appendix just for
2 clarity and ease of reference.

3 Three, probably the most important point
4 here, on page four of the agreement under the category of
5 payments, we're proposing, in the event that we fund a
6 small start up company, and we don't know, I don't know
7 whether Evergen, which we did fund in this round, which is
8 a for profit firm, falls under this description or not,
9 but, in any case, with private firms, in order to avoid
10 the payment gap problem that we faced with the
11 universities in the last round, we're proposing that they
12 be funded for five quarters, and then they'll have the
13 usual reporting requirements at the end of one year, but
14 they'll be sitting on that additional quarter's worth of
15 funding, so that during our time of approving or
16 reapproving their reported materials, they don't run out
17 of money.

18 For small start up firms, they can't absorb
19 the cost the way the universities have told us they can of
20 a funding gap, so we're proposing to fund them for five
21 quarters on the first round, so that then their funding is
22 always going to be a quarter ahead of their reporting
23 requirements, so they don't face the gap that the
24 universities face. Do I see a question coming from Mike?

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

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 DR. GENEL: No. I'm just trying to figure
2 that out. What you're saying is, if it's a two-year
3 grant, the first cycle of funding will be five quarters
4 and the second would be three quarters?

5 DR. LATHAM: Exactly.

6 DR. GENEL: Okay.

7 DR. LATHAM: Whereas the reporting
8 requirements would remain annual, so they don't face the
9 funding gap, and this would only apply if we're talking
10 about private firms, because the universities have already
11 told us that they can handle the funding gap that we've
12 been facing by carry through spending.

13 Point number four related to that. Some
14 language has been added to clarify the ability of the
15 universities to do carryover funding from one term to the
16 next to spend under their proposed budget any unspent
17 funds and to do spending at their own risk into the second
18 year of the grant.

19 These are things that we agreed upon orally
20 at the committee, but now the language is being added to
21 the contract to embody that understanding.

22 DR. WAGERS: Excuse me. Sorry. This is
23 Amy Wagers.

24 DR. LATHAM: Yeah.

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 DR. WAGERS: I was thinking about your
2 previous point, the five quarter and three quarter
3 funding, and I just wanted to ask one question, which is
4 that if, upon our review of the progress report, we find
5 that they're not approved for funding in the second year,
6 how is that dealt with with the five quarter funding?

7 DR. LATHAM: Let me look and see, because
8 we had some discussion about this. Henry, do you remember
9 how that goes?

10 MR. SALTON: Well we're going to make a
11 demand for -- we fund the fifth quarter.

12 DR. WAGERS: Okay.

13 MR. SALTON: If not, I mean, depending on
14 what the nature is of our determination, we might, you
15 know, if it's an event of material default, we will go
16 after them for maybe all the money, but, certainly, it
17 will depend on what the basis of our determination not to
18 approve the second or further years contract.

19 DR. LATHAM: If they're in breach, we have
20 the right to go after all the money. We talked about this
21 a bit in the meeting. It seems as though the most likely
22 thing would be they would be failing to live up to some
23 expectations, but would be okay on others, and there would
24 ensue a kind of a renegotiation process. That's the most

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 likely thing to occur.

2 MR. SALTON: We may want to bring them in
3 to cure it and see, so much of that's going to be driven
4 by the nature of the breach.

5 DR. WAGERS: Okay.

6 DR. GENEL: Excuse me. I thought, at an
7 earlier meeting, when we discussed this, that we agreed
8 that we would move the request up for the annual report
9 earlier, so that there would not be a gap in funding.

10 DR. LATHAM: I think we talked about that,
11 but when the universities came back to C.I., saying that
12 they could handle the gap, I don't think we ever acted on
13 that.

14 DR. GENEL: So it was left where it was,
15 with a one-year -- the reporting requirement begins at the
16 end of the first year, and we did not move up the date.

17 DR. LATHAM: That's right. That's right.
18 We didn't move the date. We did talk about.

19 DR. GENEL: Okay. Yeah.

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Julius?

21 DR. JULIUS LANDWIRTH: And what happens if
22 that report --

23 COURT REPORTER: Move your microphone
24 closer to you, please.

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 DR. LANDWIRTH: What happens if that report
2 does not come in on time, comes in a couple of weeks late?
3 That's it? It just comes in late?

4 DR. LATHAM: Then they have a funding gap.
5 I mean, if it takes us awhile to process it, if they turn
6 in their report late, I suppose they could be in breach
7 and we'd ask them to cure that. If they're really late,
8 they've caused themselves a funding gap, and that's not
9 our problem.

10 All right. My fifth point also applies
11 only to smaller awardees. There was some worry on the
12 part of the Shipman and Goodwin counsel, that requiring a
13 full internal or external audit, as we do for the
14 universities, would be financially too burdensome for a
15 small start up company with venture capital funding,
16 perhaps, to afford, so, instead, in consultation with
17 folks at C.I., who would be really reviewing this, we've
18 settled on some language that allows the awardee to use
19 some sampling methodology to review their project
20 expenditures and have the CFO of the awardee to provide a
21 certificate to the affect that the awardee has been
22 expending the funding in accordance with the budget and is
23 in compliance with the agreement, and C.I. seemed to think
24 that that was adequate assurance for them on review.

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 This is for firms that aren't big enough to
2 have an internal audit function and can't afford the 20 or
3 25,000 dollars it might cost to get an external auditor to
4 come in, so here, again, it's just some language added to
5 address the event in which we fund a small startup firm.

6 Number six, we added some new language
7 about indemnification. The indemnification is basically -
8 - the indemnification section has been rewritten to
9 include some processes to talk about what to do if there's
10 a dispute about whether indemnification is necessary and
11 other technical terms, but I gather that this is pretty
12 standard indemnification language.

13 MR. SALTON: Between our last contracting
14 round and this one, the State came out with a new
15 indemnification basically set of provisions, and this is
16 now the new standardized indemnification clause, so we
17 just imported what is now the statewide version versus
18 what was the old statewide version.

19 DR. LATHAM: All right and now, oh, I've
20 been saying all along seven, but I have eight, so I'm
21 slipping an extra one in. Number seven is on page 29 of
22 the agreement, if you're looking at the, what's it called,
23 the red line version, page 29.

24 There's a new condition that research

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 actually be conducted in Connecticut. That was in the RFP
2 before, but now we're putting it on the face of the
3 contract to make that absolutely clear.

4 MR. SALTON: That's the new paragraph 40.

5 DR. LATHAM: New paragraph 40 of the
6 agreement. And, finally, after paragraph 40, there are a
7 number of covenants for private firms that are again
8 fairly standard covenants that the State demands in
9 contracting with private firms about their record keeping,
10 about keeping their premises in good repair and complying
11 with relevant laws and so on.

12 Fairly standard boilerplate language, but I
13 wanted to flag it, because it adds an additional page or
14 so to the agreement, and it looks like a major change, but
15 I don't think it's a substantive change that the committee
16 needs to worry about.

17 So those are the highlights of what's going
18 to be changed in the assistance agreement. We'll give you
19 an opportunity to review this. I think you have it all in
20 e-mail. Review it before the next meeting. Also, before
21 the next meeting, we'll be sending you a similarly revised
22 royalty agreement, and I'll probably do a memo, similar to
23 what I just did to you orally, pointing out to you what
24 the major important changes are in that, so that we can

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 approve both the assistance agreement and the royalty
2 agreement, as amended, at the next meeting.

3 Also, the Attorney General's office has to
4 pass on this or has to agree with C.I.'s counsel that it
5 won't pass on it, and I'll leave that to C.I.'s counsel.
6 So there's a little process we need to go through, but
7 we're hoping that all these changes will not be terribly
8 controversial and that they'll be approved at our next
9 meeting.

10 DR. GERALD FISHBONE: I have a question.
11 Can you hear me? When you say that the research has to be
12 done in Connecticut, does that mean all aspects of the
13 research, or a certain percentage, number one, and, number
14 two, how does that affect Dr. Redmond's grant?

15 DR. LATHAM: It does say the research has
16 to be conducted in the State. That doesn't preclude your
17 purchasing supplies from out of the state, or other kinds
18 of -- it's like what Henry talked about in connection with
19 Redmond's grant at the last meeting. The way it would
20 affect, I think, Dr. Redmond's grant would be that it
21 would rule out funding the part of the research that's
22 actually being conducted on St. Kitts, but it would not
23 rule out the rest of the research, as the rest of it is
24 being conducted in Connecticut at Yale.

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 So I think the import is no different than
2 the policy we've been working with. It's just being put
3 in the contract instead of in the RFP.

4 MR. SALTON: It will probably be in both
5 places, and, again, the provision in the contract says the
6 research funded by this contract. We're not funding Dr.
7 Redmond's research in St. Kitts.

8 MR. PESCATELLO: I had a similar question,
9 especially in the for profit context. It's common for the
10 companies to have contracts with outside vendors, you
11 know, for certain aspects of all their work, so this was
12 farther along, like the medicinal chemistry would be done,
13 you know, in Massachusetts under some contract for
14 everything the company is doing.

15 Would the company have to carve that out,
16 or would it be subject to audit?

17 MR. SALTON: Again, I know you haven't been
18 here for this talk --

19 MR. PESCATELLO: I apologize.

20 MR. SALTON: -- forgive me for giving the
21 same talk again.

22 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: You're so good at it.
23 That's why.

24 MR. SALTON: The statute and the

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 legislative history is very clear, that the intention was
2 to fund research, stem cell research located and taking
3 place in Connecticut.

4 Now that doesn't apply to acquiring
5 supplies or equipment from out of the state that are being
6 brought in or people that are being brought in, but it
7 would not allow, for example, we had a proposal early on,
8 someone discussed this, the idea of taking our money and
9 funding some of the research here in Connecticut and then
10 funding a doctor in France, who is going to do phase one,
11 phase two, or phase three of the research, and then maybe
12 turn his results back to the university here.

13 We could not pay for the research activity
14 conducted in France. If they wanted to carve it out and
15 say we'll pay -- you pay for phase one and two, phase
16 three will be paid by the Ford Foundation, phase four is
17 back in Connecticut, you pay for that, then that is okay.

18 Really, the legislative intent is to make
19 sure. Now we also said there's sort of a rule of reason
20 there, which is, you know, if someone wants to take
21 something and send some tissue samples to some nuclear
22 accelerator that costs a billion dollars to build and
23 there's only one in the world, obviously we're not going
24 to require you to do that.

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 That really would have to be something that
2 the applicant establishes and justifies as an exceptional
3 element, as opposed to -- the financial feasibility is
4 just unreasonable to expect, and it's a small component of
5 the larger research.

6 In Dr. Redmond's case, I think the
7 committee, at least my interpretation with the committee
8 perspective was that really the large part of the research
9 that they're talking about it's not a matter of I'm just
10 farming out one little step. It's really the larger scale
11 of the research is being done in St. Kitts as opposed to
12 we're going to take something that will be there for four
13 days, they'll -- and then they'll send it back to you.

14 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I think, also, if I
15 can -- I don't have a mike. I think I'm correctly
16 paraphrasing Henry's remarks. That wouldn't preclude
17 someone being sent to, say, Wisconsin for a two-week
18 training, or course, or something.

19 MR. SALTON: Right. I mean we just spoke
20 about, for example, we might fund someone to lecture at a
21 conference as a product of the research. That's not
22 something that's an issue.

23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I'll get to you in
24 one second, Bob. I was going to say, Henry, would it be

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 appropriate to say that expenditures out of the state
2 would have to be incidental?

3 MR. SALTON: Right.

4 DR. LATHAM: I wouldn't want to say
5 expenditures. It says the research has to be done here.
6 It may be that the single most expensive thing in the
7 grant is buying the microscope from France, but as long as
8 you get the microscope at UConn and do your research using
9 that microscope at UConn, then you're okay.

10 MR. SALTON: I think it's not the
11 expenditure, but you're really talking about the activity,
12 the research funded, which is different than the
13 expenditure.

14 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: So incidental
15 activities of people coming and going and lecturing would
16 not be precluded.

17 MR. SALTON: But there's sort of a
18 continuum, and the committee has to make judgments of
19 which end are you talking about. You know, you're
20 outsourcing a small little piece to something that it's
21 irrational to create it in Connecticut versus taking a
22 large phase that we're now going to pay for to be done in
23 another country or another state.

24 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yes, Bob?

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 MR. MANDELKERN: It's my recollection, and
2 correct me if I'm wrong, of course, that we had had
3 consensus that when there was no opportunity to do the
4 research in Connecticut, that is equipment needed, lab
5 needed, consultation needed, that we would agree that, in
6 those cases, where it was absolutely not available to do
7 the research that we had funded in Connecticut, that it
8 then could be in a sense farmed out. That's not a legal
9 word, I'm sure. It could be extended to elsewhere.

10 MR. SALTON: I don't think that's correct,
11 no.

12 MR. MANDELKERN: So you're saying I don't
13 recall correctly, or there's been a revision?

14 MR. SALTON: I think you don't recall
15 correctly. I think the thing what you're suggesting is
16 that -- I mean part of what the legislation wants this
17 money to be used for is to seed and be a magnet for people
18 coming into the state, and the idea that, well, it's all
19 being done in California, then we don't have to expend any
20 effort to use this magnet to bring people in the state,
21 because we'll just send it out there and we'll get the --

22 So it's not merely that the legislation
23 wanted stem cell research to be done. Clearly, there's an
24 economic development and biotech focus on bringing people

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 into Connecticut and using this. I mean, they use that
2 terminology, I believe, which is that this is really a
3 carrot that will attract people to bring here, and we want
4 the money to be spent in Connecticut to bring people here.

5 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. We all clear
6 on that? Okay. Are you all set?

7 DR. LATHAM: All set. That's the report.

8 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. Do you have
9 another question, Bob?

10 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes. I wonder, Dr.
11 Latham, if these important revisions that we have to vote
12 on can be sent to us outside of the 30, 40-odd pages. Can
13 you just send us by e-mail the highlighted significant
14 changes for our review?

15 DR. LATHAM: Yes. I'd be happy to send the
16 highlighted changes out, maybe with some bullet points
17 about what they are and then just quoting the changed
18 language. That's fine. Both for this and for the royalty
19 agreement, that will be fine.

20 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes. That would be very
21 helpful, rather than going through the entire documents.
22 Thank you.

23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Julie?

24 DR. LANDWIRTH: Just a question about the

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 accommodations --

2 COURT REPORTER: Can we get a microphone?

3 DR. LANDWIRTH: Just a question about the
4 accommodations that are being inserted for the benefit of
5 the private companies. Is there anything to define a
6 little bit more narrowly what kind of companies will be
7 eligible for those considerations?

8 And I think, as is written, there's private
9 companies on the assumption that they're going to start up
10 small. Is there anything to try to define those, is
11 probably a question to Paul, as well, from your
12 perspective. Is it okay to leave it open like that on the
13 assumption that that's what's going to happen, small
14 startups that really can't handle the same kind of
15 arrangement that the academic institutions can, or do we
16 need to try to define that?

17 DR. LATHAM: I don't think that the term
18 private company is defined, and the two concessions that
19 are being made are, one, about the affordability of the
20 audit function and, two, about this fifth quarter funding.

21
22 I think that it would be a decision for the
23 committee, if suddenly we decided to fund a major
24 pharmaceutical firm, for example, that has decided to

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 write a grant and we funded them, I think it would be a
2 decision for the committee whether to use the language
3 that was inserted for those firms in that case or not,
4 because we are free to revisit the contractual terms each
5 time around, indeed, each individual contract.

6 So if it should happen, I mean, this is
7 drafted on the view that the applicants that we've had so
8 far from the private sector have all followed this
9 description of being small firms, if it should happen that
10 we get a big firm that is more than capable of doing its
11 own internal audit and so on, we can simply say in their
12 contract that they're responsible the way the universities
13 are, because they have the resources.

14 DR. LANDWIRTH: Or perhaps a subsidiary --

15 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Was that a question?

16 DR. LANDWIRTH: It's been answered.

17 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Anything else? Are
18 you satisfied that your questions have been addressed?

19 DR. LANDWIRTH: Yes. Thank you.

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. We will move
21 onto item six, unless someone still has concerns about
22 item five. Dr. Wallack will be speaking to us. Were you
23 at the Interstate meeting?

24 MS. HORN: I was.

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Perhaps Marianne can
2 do some bringing up-to-date. Would you like to make some
3 comments?

4 MS. HORN: So I was privileged enough to be
5 able to attend the Interstate Alliance on stem cell
6 research last week in Washington with Warren and Dr.
7 Wallack and Lynn Townshend, and we were joined there by
8 California and Maryland, New Jersey, Illinois, New York,
9 Massachusetts and Rhode Island.

10 We also had representatives from Minnesota
11 and Missouri, although they don't have active stem cell
12 programs, and Wisconsin did not -- their representative
13 did not arrive.

14 We had representation from Canada, from the
15 United Kingdom, from the International Society for Stem
16 Cell Research and the National Academy of Sciences, who
17 also acts as our secretary. They're a great assistance
18 for us. So the states got together and updated what's
19 happened legislatively, in terms of their program. We
20 went around the room and talked about various things going
21 on.

22 They were very interested in the fact that
23 our legislation is currently being amended to reflect some
24 of the conversations that we've had at this IASCR meeting

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 to bring our legislation in line with what's happening
2 with the NAS guidelines and with activities in California.

3 Then we moved onto, in the afternoon, we
4 had a group discussion, and, at that group, we had the New
5 York Stem Cell Foundation. We had the Harvard Stem Cell
6 Research Institute representative. We had a
7 representative of the Coalition for the Advancement of
8 Medical Research, a lobbying group.

9 We had the Juvenile Diabetes Research
10 Foundation. He spoke separately, and Milt will talk to
11 that, as well. And we had some input from the University
12 of Minnesota.

13 We were interested in what their comments
14 were about the state of stem cell research, and the CAMR,
15 the Coalition for the Advancement of Medical Research,
16 does a great deal of lobbying and is trying to educate the
17 congress, in terms of what the IPS announcement means, not
18 wanting to have that derail the human embryonic stem cell
19 research, and I think they were very positive on that,
20 that people are understanding that the two have to go on
21 side-by-side.

22 There were a couple of comments that, as
23 the states went around and reviewed their programs, that
24 there wasn't a great deal of discussion about why we're

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 all here. There wasn't a great deal of discussion about
2 that we're here for patients, we're here to develop
3 therapies and so on, so a good reminder of that.

4 There was discussion, both by the states
5 and by this panel group, about the difficulty of getting
6 peer review done, and that maybe we need to think outside
7 the box a little bit.

8 In terms of getting people willing to do
9 peer review, we currently don't pay them, except for
10 expenses. Other states do give them a per diem, but even
11 the states that are providing a per diem are finding it
12 difficult to get people to do peer review.

13 And there was mention that maybe the NAS
14 might be an area that would be helpful to put together a
15 peer review that states could tap into and utilize that. I
16 think, for us, that would probably mean a statutory
17 change. Some good minds around the table and lots of
18 creative approaches.

19 There was discussion about stem cell banks
20 and stem cell registries that are being developed, about
21 the need for that and what kind of issues that they raise,
22 in terms of consent and privacy protections.

23 The umbilical cord blood I think is also an
24 area that a couple of states, Rhode Island, particularly,

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 and Connecticut, are interested in, and so while it's not
2 entirely stem cell research, I think that's maybe
3 something that gets folded in, because it's an interest of
4 many states, making sure, again, that the public has
5 access to these banks and not just for people who can
6 afford it.

7 One of the commenters, the woman from CAMR,
8 Amy Rick, mentioned on breaking issues, like IPS. It would
9 be very helpful if the IASCR could develop a message
10 statement and speak with one voice on that.

11 I must say, on IPS at this point, it's a
12 little bit of a wait and see, wait and see what the NAS
13 does. That probably will be on our next meeting agenda,
14 to find out where the NAS is going to go, in terms of
15 regulation of the use of IPS cells.

16 COURT REPORTER: One moment, please.

17 MS. HORN: So our next steps, we do have a
18 couple of products that are going to be posted on the
19 website, one that shows where states are, in terms of the
20 development of stem cell lines, the procurement, the
21 informed consent and payment issues, because they do vary
22 somewhat across the states.

23 We've also put together a document that
24 shows how different states do their grant review, what

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 procedures they use, and I think that's useful for states
2 coming into the stem cell business to take a look at
3 sample legislation and areas where other states have
4 handled FOI issues differently than we have, states that
5 vary from the NIH model, states that comply with that, who
6 is following the NAS, who is going with ISSCR, so it's
7 some interesting products.

8 For me, it's wonderful to go and talk to
9 people who are regulating in the same kind of way, and
10 we're all feeling our way along this way.

11 The next meeting, I think, will be in
12 October or November, and we don't have a place yet. Maybe
13 Baltimore. Again, the NAS seems to be able to come up
14 with some funding to offset the costs to pay for states
15 who are not able to attend. Milt?

16 DR. WALLACK: Thanks. The meeting was
17 really, I think, an excellent meeting. It was probably --
18 this is now the third IASCR meeting that we've had. One
19 was in Irvine, California, one was in Cambridge,
20 Massachusetts, and now this one in Washington, D.C., and
21 we really are beginning to get into some nuts and bolts of
22 the issues that we're all interested in.

23 So the meeting was really excellent, and
24 the management of the meeting, I think, for the record, we

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 would be very proud to recognize the fact that Warren
2 Wollschlager, Warren is chairing that. He has a co-
3 chairman, Geoff Lomax, from California, and Warren really
4 did a very, very, very skillful job of running the
5 meeting.

6 Our other participants, I think, from
7 Connecticut also did very well, I believe, at the meeting.

8 Marianne had some crucial issues having to do with the
9 legal aspects of some of the items. Lynn Townshend, I
10 don't know if she's in the room now --

11 MS. LYNN TOWNSHEND: Right here.

12 DR. WALLACK: There you are. Spoke in
13 terms of education processes, and I think there was a
14 great deal of support and interest in that area, and I
15 believe that Lynn and Geoff Lomax from California will be
16 trying to put together an initiative, because one of the
17 themes that came out of the meeting, the two-day meeting,
18 was the fact that communication is extremely important for
19 everything that we're doing.

20 What also came out of the meeting, I
21 thought, which I think we should be proud of, is the fact
22 that Connecticut seems to be clearly a model for what's
23 going on in the United States relative to stem cell
24 research.

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 We had a representative from one of the
2 watch dog groups, stem cell watch dog groups, John
3 Simpson, and he does a lot of writing for the Sacramento
4 Bee, does blogging and so forth, and has now been, I
5 believe, at each of the three meetings, also. On a number
6 of occasions he noted what I just indicated, and others at
7 the table also did the same thing, that we're really the
8 envy of what's going on.

9 There were clear distinctions made between
10 what we're doing here and in other states, and it's not
11 necessary to mention the other states, but we can leave it
12 at that.

13 You already heard that the attendance was
14 excellent. We had not only the groups representing the
15 states, but we had other groups that are interested,
16 obviously, in the various aspects of what we're doing
17 having to do with advocacy and so forth.

18 The plea from all of those groups was, all
19 of the guests that were on the panel or just guests in
20 what we were doing, is that we are really the only
21 organization that is doing for stem cell research what
22 we're doing relative to interstate collaboration and
23 getting the message out and potentially having an impact
24 as we go forward.

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 So we were obviously encouraged, those of
2 us who invested time and energy into it, to hear that, and
3 we will, obviously, continue to stay on track. You
4 already heard that there was a next meeting that we'll be
5 going forward in the fall.

6 One of the other things that came out of
7 all of this was the fact that -- and, by the way, as we go
8 forward, and Marianne touched upon what we did in the
9 past, the meeting themes that will be touched upon have to
10 do with reprogramming, or IPS, having to do with banking
11 and registries, having to do with cord blood technical
12 assistance groups, having to do with policies involved
13 with egg sharing, hybrids and so forth, and greater
14 utilization of the website, as well, was discussed, and
15 that goes back relative to communication and getting the
16 message out. And in getting the message out, there was a
17 discussion about reaching out to other states that are not
18 yet in the coalition.

19 We have all the states in the coalition
20 that are actively involved in stem cell research, but
21 there are some states that would hopefully want to be
22 involved, and there was a thought that somehow, while it
23 would not be part of the process to bring them in
24 officially if they expressed an interest in coming on

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 board, we would be receptive to them coming on board. I
2 think I got that right.

3 MS. HORN: Yeah. I think there's going to
4 be some outreach effort to states like Florida and so on,
5 where they're battling to get some legislation passed.

6 DR. WALLACK: Right. Missouri, New Mexico
7 was talked about, Nebraska and so forth. So the themes of
8 the next meeting, you know, we just discussed, and the
9 only other thing -- there's one other point that I wanted
10 to make on this.

11 Oh, the other thing was this. In the next
12 meetings, you already heard that there will be a full
13 meeting, probably in the Baltimore area, but we also then
14 talked about a subsequent meeting. We're meeting about
15 twice a year or so, and Warren brought up the idea of that
16 Stem Conn was going to be occurring in March of '09. He
17 put it in the context that we weren't anticipating having
18 an Interstate meeting at that meeting, however, there was,
19 in fact, interest in coming to Connecticut, even though we
20 were here in March of '07.

21 There is discussion now back on the table
22 that, at Stem Conn '09, that, around that meeting, we
23 would hopefully be able to get together an Interstate Stem
24 Cell Alliance meeting, and, Paul, that's of interest to

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 you, of course, and that just happened last week, so that
2 will be reported, actually, at the next Stem Conn meeting.

3 And the very last thing I want to mention
4 is this. One of the guests, and Marianne alluded to the
5 fact that I'll talk, that I was going to make additional
6 reference to this, Dr. Bob Goldstein, who is the head of
7 science, he's the Chief Scientific Officer at JDRF, made
8 some statements, and what he indicated is that he would
9 like to see JDRF help to fund research in stem cell
10 research.

11 He offered to go to whatever states were
12 interested, and Warren asked me to make sure that I made
13 this request, and that is the following, that we invite
14 Bob Goldstein to Connecticut, and I believe that it was
15 Warren's idea to have him at the next meeting.

16 The purpose of that was for Bob Goldstein,
17 Dr. Goldstein, to discuss with us how he can envision
18 helping to fund stem cell research and maybe even be
19 involved in some bridging, bridge funding for projects,
20 Steve, that you were alluding to out of state or something
21 of that nature, and he knew of the Kevin Herald grant
22 request that involved Nova Cell in California, and he felt
23 that that's the kind of project, where if we could fund
24 the parts that were going on in Connecticut, he can easily

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 see himself as a bridge funding kind of thing work with us
2 if we were interested and if we could work out the
3 technical aspects of that.

4 So whether that happens or not, the bottom
5 line is that he clearly expressed a desire to reach out to
6 the various constituencies, and he knows of us, so,
7 therefore, he wanted -- and then Warren asked me to do
8 this, to invite him to the May meeting. Bob, that would
9 be up to you, as you set your agenda.

10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah. I have no
11 problems with him coming to the meeting and addressing the
12 group, unless someone else does. I think we have to make
13 sure that our attorneys listen very carefully to this,
14 because it sounds like we may be changing the ways that we
15 fund things, and we can't do that without a legislative
16 change. Marianne?

17 MS. HORN: I think it's a very interesting
18 proposal, and I would be very interested in having him
19 come. Maybe the May meeting is a little ambitious,
20 because we have a pretty full agenda, as well.

21 I was speaking with Henry briefly before
22 the meeting, and I think there are some ways that, without
23 changing the legislation, we might be able to get him to
24 contribute to research that may take place outside the

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 state while we fund the research that takes place in the
2 state, more of a collaborative type of thing, but we'd
3 have to hear the details.

4 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah. I'm just
5 concerned that it would, in some way, alter the process
6 where we disburse funding, so we'd have to make very sure
7 that we stay on the soccer field and understand.

8 DR. KIESSLING: This is Ann Kiessler.

9 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yes, Ann?

10 DR. KIESSLING: I have a question for
11 Marianne or Warren.

12 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Warren is away, but -
13 -

14 DR. KIESSLING: The Ellison Foundation
15 awarded, or someone associated with the Ellison
16 Foundation, awarded the National Academy of Sciences about
17 a million dollars to support these kinds of ethical -- is
18 that where the money is coming from, do you think?

19 MS. HORN: The funding for the NAS
20 supporting the IASCR?

21 DR. KIESSLING: Yes.

22 MS. HORN: I don't know. I don't think
23 they have anywhere close to that amount of money that
24 they're allocating to us. I know that Fran

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 Sharples(phonetic) goes to her board and asks for one year
2 or two years' worth of funding, but the source of that
3 funding I'm not familiar with. I could try to find out.

4 DR. KIESSLING: The Ellison Foundation is
5 keenly interested in this type of research.

6 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Which foundation?
7 I'm sorry.

8 MS. HORN: Ellison, as in E-L-L-I-S-O-N?

9 DR. KIESSLING: Yes, and then the person
10 who owns Oracle Corporation.

11 MS. HORN: Okay. We'll do some digging.
12 Thank you, Ann.

13 DR. WALLACK: You know, Ann, that was very
14 important, because the NAS, who has helped us to fund the
15 last three meetings, I'm not quite sure about this, maybe
16 Lynn or Marianne have a different feeling about this, but
17 the impression I got from them is that they're okay to
18 help us to fund at least the next three such meetings as
19 we've been having, and then the whole question of
20 sustainability becomes somewhat of a question.

21 We did talk about, and this is why it was
22 appropriate, Ann, for you to make that suggestion, we did
23 talk about foundations and whether or not Hughs Foundation
24 or whoever else could be helpful in doing this, so

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 certainly the Ellison your recommendation is right on and
2 very consistent with what the discussion was all about.

3 DR. KIESSLING: It might even be
4 appropriate for CURE to contact the Ellison Foundation. I
5 know they're interested in moving this forward.

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: Paul has left the room, but
7 I'm sure we'll get that message to him at some point. This
8 is Lynn Townshend, Ann. Thank you. I just wanted to
9 comment briefly, as Dr. Wallack and Marianne had
10 mentioned, I was also at the meeting, and my main goal
11 was, A, to learn as much as I could about what goes on in
12 other states, which it was very informative to be at this
13 meeting to do that, but, also, to find out what was going
14 on communication and education wise within those states.

15 The message I seemed to get was IASCR,
16 being a policy and regulatory body, may not be the best
17 body for a communications subcommittee. They are willing
18 to work with me, California, in particular, in putting
19 together some sort of lists, at least to start, to look at
20 what communications are out there, work with ISSCR, work
21 with NAS, work with our research institutions in state and
22 their research institutions out of state to see what best
23 practices there are, because there are -- we work at a
24 level where we understand, some of us understand better

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 than others, and scientists much more than I, what stem
2 cell research is, what embryonic stem cell research is,
3 what IPS is.

4 When reaching out to the general public, I
5 know that, as an industry, if you will, we could certainly
6 do a better job, and that's my interest in going to this
7 particular meeting and seeing if we can get some sort of
8 nationwide system to do that and report back to IASCR at
9 some point in the near future, but sort of independent,
10 but working with IASCR to see what best practices are out
11 there.

12 With California, we're going to reach out
13 to the other states and see what we can find out.

14 DR. LATHAM: I have a couple of questions,
15 one for Marianne. When will those various products be
16 available that you mentioned? I found the website just
17 the other day. I didn't see anything.

18 MS. HORN: Right. We were getting finality
19 on a couple of these. Geoff Lomax is doing the donation,
20 the payment, the acceptably derived chart, and he seemed
21 to think that -- he wanted to write up a little narrative
22 about that.

23 I think, within the month, you're going to
24 see his product, minus the grant review product, which is

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 basically finalized. I need to send it out to people one
2 more time, so, again, we set ourselves about a month time
3 frame on that.

4 DR. LATHAM: And then a question for Milt.

5 DR. WALLACK: What you'll notice, also, is
6 that NAS and, also, a representative from Stamford is
7 going to write the narrative, descriptive narrative,
8 having to do with what Marianne was talking about to make
9 it as user friendly as possible.

10 MR. MANDELKERN: Where are we going to see
11 that?

12 MS. HORN: This is on the IASCR website.
13 It's www. --

14 MR. MANDELKERN: I would like to make a
15 suggestion.

16 MS. HORN: Um-hum.

17 MR. MANDELKERN: I would like to wait for
18 the Chair to come back. I'll hold mine until the Chair
19 comes back.

20 DR. LATHAM: My other question is was this
21 JDRF funding for stem cell research generally, or for stem
22 cell research that has some close nexus to diabetes
23 therapies?

24 DR. WALLACK: Their preference, clearly, is

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 in beta cell regeneration, and my clear understanding, at
2 least my understanding of what Bob Goldstein was talking
3 about, was that that would be the area that he would be
4 mostly interested in seeing go forward, but, having said
5 that, he also mentioned the fact that there are other
6 areas that get affected positively by the kind of research
7 that would be going on relative to beta cell regeneration,
8 so that while he didn't go into this in great detail,
9 there was certainly, you know, at least some feeling about
10 the fact that there would be other areas that could
11 benefit, as well, but let's not lose sight of who he
12 represents and what he would really like to see happen. I
13 think that's accurate.

14 MS. HORN: Yeah.

15 DR. LATHAM: I'm just afraid that that will
16 make it a little bit harder to fit into the existing
17 statutory scheme and peer review process and so on. If we
18 have a pot of money that's only available if we decide to
19 fund a certain kind of research, that might require more
20 engineering in order to achieve.

21 DR. WALLACK: He knows that, and while he
22 would like to come to the state and talk to the state, as
23 it's represented by the Advisory Committee, he's also
24 anxious to talk, because of exactly what you're

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 intimating, with the individual institutions, as well, so
2 he will be hopefully making contact with the various
3 institutions, academic institutions.

4 MR. MANDELKERN: The preamble to our RFP,
5 which was carefully put out for this last grant award
6 session, clearly indicates that there's no limitation of
7 any sort, that the best science in any area of stem cell
8 research is what we're interested, and it coincides with
9 the quote of the Chairman when he put out the press
10 release, so I think we have to be quite aware of any
11 limitations on any money, or any joint ventures, or
12 anything of the sort that can strain us in any way.

13 DR. WALLACK: I think, as I just indicated
14 -

15 COURT REPORTER: The microphone, please.

16 DR. WALLACK: I think he's perfectly aware
17 of that, and, as I just indicated, that's precisely why he
18 would be anxious not just to talk to us, but to talk
19 individually to the institutions, which wouldn't be
20 restricted in the same manner that, Bob, you rightly
21 indicate is the driving force behind what we're doing.

22 MR. MANDELKERN: Well I had a question.
23 The Chair hasn't returned. I'll just make it generally,
24 in case Henry or Marianne can answer until the Chair

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 returns. Since my appointment in the spring of 2006, I
2 have not missed a meeting of the Stem Cell Research
3 Advisory Committee or any subcommittee on which I've been
4 serving.

5 I am thoroughly confused by the work that's
6 going forward very admirably and very successfully on the
7 Interstate Alliance on Stem Cell Research, which acronym
8 escapes me, so I'll use the full name. At any of these
9 meetings, which I've attended without missing any session,
10 I do not recall any discussion of what sort of
11 administrative connection our Intestate Alliance has with
12 the Stem Cell Research Advisory Committee, so I am
13 somewhat confused, completely, as to how this work is
14 going forward so admirably and so quickly, and, yet, I
15 have no idea, as having sat at every meeting since I've
16 been appointed, what kind of administrative structure, or
17 coordination, or rapport, or anything exists between our
18 formal Research Advisory Committee, by statute, and this
19 Interstate Alliance.

20 I really would like some clarification on
21 that somehow, somewhere.

22 MS. HORN: I'm not sure I'm quite
23 understanding your question. You're wondering what the
24 utility is of our attending the IASCR?

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 MR. MANDELKERN: Well, no, not the utility
2 at all. The utility is quite apparent, but there are
3 reports coming forward. There's indication that we'll
4 have to vote on things. I've never heard a discussion of
5 what administrative connection we have with the Interstate
6 Alliance or anything.

7 MS. HORN: Well I don't recall anything
8 that you're going to have to vote on. We're bringing this
9 information to you as an organization that we co-founded
10 as something that is useful to all of the stem cell states
11 and certainly is useful to those of us administering this
12 program and reporting back to the Advisory Committee
13 issues that we either are facing now or will be facing in
14 the future, in terms of ethics, or regulation in other
15 areas, so that we can minimize barriers to stem cell
16 research throughout the state in the absence of any
17 Federal guidance.

18 DR. WALLACK: I'd just add, also, that,
19 Bob, Warren, who Chairs this and he has a co-Chair in
20 Geoff Lomax, who is in charge --

21 MR. MANDELKERN: A little louder, Milt,
22 please?

23 DR. WALLACK: Let me just add, also, that
24 consistent with what your feelings, I believe, are, Warren

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 co-Chairs this, and Warren, whose co-Chair is Geoff Lomax,
2 and I believe that Geoff feels just as strongly about this
3 as Warren does, he specifically reminds the group and
4 comes back to the group an enumerable amount of times that
5 we are not a body that sets official policy.

6 We can cover and state what the various
7 issues are all about and having to do with, for example,
8 the payment for egg donations. We can articulate in a
9 narrative report, for example, you know, those particular
10 issues, but by no stretch of the imagination would Warren
11 ever or any of the State representatives, because they all
12 understand that they are there just to help forge together
13 better understanding, better collaboration, but that they
14 can't, as they say at the meetings, create a cookbook
15 approach for what's going on across the country, and,
16 therefore, they can't be -- and, as a matter of fact,
17 they've also said there will not be a formal vote on any
18 of the issues, that there will only be a consensus
19 acknowledgement of a direction to go in.

20 I believe, Marianne, that I'm fairly
21 accurate in what I've just represented.

22 MR. MANDELKERN: May I, Dr. Galvin? That's
23 not the point of my question. I understand that the
24 Interstate Alliance can consider these very important

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 issues as representatives from the states, not as
2 representatives of the states, however, I don't see
3 exactly, except in its intellectual capacity in our need
4 to know and the knowledge that we all want to have, what
5 official organic tie this Research Advisory Committee has
6 with this Interstate group. Is there any?

7 DR. WALLACK: No.

8 MS. HORN: No.

9 MR. MANDELKERN: No? Okay, then, that's
10 clear, that this information is being passed to us as
11 information.

12 MS. HORN: Correct.

13 MR. MANDELKERN: As knowledge to increase
14 our fund of knowledge about stem cell research, to
15 increase our awareness, to inform us.

16 MS. HORN: Correct.

17 MR. MANDELKERN: To keep us from making
18 gross errors of judgment.

19 MS. HORN: Correct.

20 MR. MANDELKERN: To keep us from doing
21 anything we shouldn't do, but it has no relevance to our
22 actual sitting as members of the research, Stem Cell
23 Research Advisory Committee, except in an advisory
24 capacity to an Advisory Committee.

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 MS. HORN: Correct, except that it may
2 inform decisions that you are going to be making down the
3 road.

4 DR. WALLACK: You know, even to the point
5 where the name was changed. The original name of the
6 group was the Interstate Alliance For Stem Cell Research.
7 The name that we've officially adopted is the Interstate
8 Alliance On Stem Cell Research, so I think this further
9 explains exactly the points that we're trying to make.

10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. Milt, did you
11 have anything else?

12 DR. WALLACK: Thank you very much.

13 DR. LANDWIRTH: I just had one question
14 about the meeting. Was there any discussion at all about
15 the potential impact of changes in Federal funding with
16 administration, etcetera, etcetera, and, if so, what was
17 that about?

18 DR. WALLACK: As a matter of fact, the
19 panel on Wednesday, and one of the panel groups was CAMR,
20 and, by the way, Bob --

21 MR. MANDELKERN: I'm quite aware of Amy --

22 DR. WALLACK: Obviously, you weren't aware
23 of the fact that people spoke very highly of you to Amy,
24 and Amy is the Chair of the Parkinson's group nationally.

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 Anyway, so, they spoke about exactly that
2 and the need for advocacy. They had their lobbyist there
3 in the room practically the entire two days, and they kept
4 coming back to the point that they needed us to be doing
5 what we were doing, because it gave them, even though we
6 weren't taking official positions, but we were giving them
7 intellectual review positions, it gave them the capacity
8 to then, as she said, the advocate, the lobbyist, go back
9 literally in front of 100 people or so that she talks to
10 and have, you know, the wisdom of what we're talking about
11 available to her to articulate.

12 In that regard, she made reference to --
13 they made reference to some of the candidates, and they
14 cautioned us to be aware of the fact that, as you look at
15 the candidates, be cognizant of what they're saying
16 relative to stem cell research and relative to whether or
17 not maybe a position on reprogramming may be a position
18 that will be superseding a position on embryonic stem cell
19 research, so they did go into the nuances of those types
20 of things to some extent.

21 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Ms. Townshend, did
22 you have a comment?

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: I did, just ever so
24 briefly, with regard to whatever President is chosen in

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 January, or comes into office in January of 2009. It will
2 be -- there will be some run up time to get the NIH
3 policy. It won't be the very first thing that is taken
4 care of once the new President is inaugurated, so there
5 will be some preparation time, some run up time before
6 policies may be changed, if they are changed at all.

7 And there was even discussion with regard
8 to whether or not the next IASCR meeting should be before
9 or after the election, and the balance of that I don't
10 think has even been decided, so there was quite a bit of
11 discussion. I don't know if there was very, very much
12 outcome, but it certainly was forefront in the minds of
13 many, if not, all of the participants.

14 DR. GENEL: May I comment on that, and then
15 I just have a brief question. I think, irrespective of
16 whatever changes are made administratively, the reality is
17 that the amount of money that's available to provide
18 additional funding for stem cell research is just not
19 there.

20 The NIH budget has been flat for three
21 years. In terms of real dollars, in terms of actual
22 dollars, in terms of inflation related dollars, the NIH
23 budget has decreased by 15 percent in the last three or
24 four years.

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 There is, I can tell you from the trenches,
2 a serious, serious problem, in terms of funding of
3 established, not to mention young investigators, so this
4 is a potential crisis in the making.

5 A MALE VOICE: Louder into the microphone,
6 please?

7 DR. GENEL: Oh, well, what I was saying is
8 I think that the financial realities of the NIH budget are
9 such that even an administrative overturn of the ruling on
10 stem cell research is not going to by no means open the
11 flood gates.

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: Right.

13 DR. GENEL: Is the URL for the coalition on
14 the NIS, the Academy?

15 MS. HORN: I think it's IASCR.org. There
16 is a link to it from the NAS website, but it's IASCR.org.

17 DR. GENEL: Thank you.

18 DR. WALLACK: Also, having to do with that,
19 it was noted that only 41 million dollars was spent by NIH
20 on embryonic stem cell research in the last year, and
21 that's why it has been so important for us to be doing
22 what we're doing.

23 And consistent with what Mike has said and
24 Lynn has said, it's urgent, and this was the plea that we

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 heard continuously, and I've said this now about three
2 times in different ways, that we stay together, that we
3 expand what we're trying to do, because without the states
4 doing what they're doing and have the knowledge, the
5 ability, the resources to do what we're doing here in
6 Connecticut, this could very well fall by the wayside, and
7 we have to, in fact, and this was the plea, also, expand,
8 if we can, what we're doing state-by-state.

9 DR. GENEL: Let me just add to that, that a
10 number of commentators have noted that the stem cell
11 research funding by states may serve as a model of how
12 states will pick up the gap on funding for medical
13 research generally if the Federal Government is not able
14 to carry that.

15 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Bob?

16 MR. MANDELKERN: I would just like to add
17 one personal comment, and that is to say that I am very
18 not optimistic about a pickup in embryonic stem cell
19 research for the NIH for a simple reason.

20 Regardless of the wishes of an incoming
21 administration in January '09, we are facing a Federal
22 budget deficit that runs anywhere between 400 billion and
23 possibly 800, 900 billion dollars, so before that
24 budgetary deficit will reflect itself in increased

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

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 budgeting for embryonic stem cell research is questionable
2 in my mind.

3 I hate to be the pessimist in the group or
4 in the country, but I would keep my eyes focused
5 completely on our mandate to fund embryonic stem cell
6 research as completely and as efficiently as we can given
7 our legislative mandate. Thank you.

8 DR. WALLACK: Bob, you know, I think you're
9 absolutely on the mark with that, and, as a matter of
10 fact, again, that's why the plea was also that we try to
11 go back to our states and do more and more in that area.

12 For those of you who may have missed it,
13 because all of us here at the table missed it, this just
14 happened the day before we got to Washington, two days
15 before, but you will remember that Maryland, because of,
16 Bob, because of what you're talking about, the budgetary
17 crises in the various states, was going to take out the
18 embryonic stem cell budgetary item.

19 They had put in for 24 million dollars.
20 Well, on Monday of last week, they went back to that, and
21 they didn't fund the entire 24, but they funded 19 million
22 dollars for embryonic stem cell research, and (coughing)
23 in acknowledgement of all the things you're saying and
24 hopefully here in Connecticut, too, will be picking up the

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 kinds of things that you indicate have to be picked up
2 state-by-state. We talked about that.

3 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Milt, do you want to
4 comment? I understand there's going to be a meeting
5 Friday that concerns this, and would you comment on that,
6 please?

7 DR. WALLACK: In the same regard, some of
8 you are aware that there's been discussions having to do
9 with whether or not we can, in fact, get -- first of all,
10 the discussion is that there's great appreciation, and
11 this, I think, has to be noted in every way possible,
12 there's great appreciation for what has been done for
13 embryonic stem cell research in the State of Connecticut
14 and, most notably, from the initiative of Governor Rell.

15 She was out there first. She was out there
16 with 100 million dollars. Without her, it would have been
17 very difficult to get to the point where we are.

18 Having said that and in recognition of what
19 has been said at this table on a number of occasions, that
20 you never could predict, you never can predict what will
21 happen in the next year or two, especially with budgetary
22 problems, as it occurred in Jersey, where they turned down
23 a 450 million dollar initiative in November, where they
24 almost lost the initiative in Maryland, where Missouri has

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 not been funded, where there's been no funding yet from
2 Massachusetts, even though they passed some type of
3 legislation, but not exactly what we have.

4 So there's been some interest in trying to
5 accelerate the amount of money coming into the embryonic
6 stem cell research arena, and this is going back to last
7 February.

8 In November or October, when we had the
9 dedication of the registry book, which was dedicated to
10 embryonic stem cell research by Secretary of State Susan
11 Bysiewicz, there were conversations at that time that
12 talked about these various issues that I just highlighted,
13 and that led to other discussions recently with Speaker of
14 the House, Jim Amann.

15 COURT REPORTER: One moment, please.

16 DR. WALLACK: Out of that came the
17 following, and that is that, on this Friday, April 18th at
18 11:30 a.m., the Secretary of State, Susan Bysiewicz, will
19 host a press conference that will be addressed by Susan
20 Bysiewicz and by Speaker Jim Amann.

21 I believe that the subject that they're
22 going to address is the accelerated payment down of the
23 remaining 70 million dollars, so that, hopefully, over the
24 next couple of years, we can see the realization of all of

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 that money, not eight years down the road or seven years
2 down the road, but in the next couple of years for us to
3 consider relative to distribution.

4 That leaves, however, the question about
5 what happens in the years of five to 10, so I think the
6 other part of what might be talked about at that meeting,
7 at that press conference, is the idea of then creating
8 additional funding, which would be above and beyond the
9 100 million dollars, so that those funds could be
10 distributed at a later date, so it's the acceleration and
11 the addition.

12 From what I understand, this Advisory
13 Committee, when we go home this afternoon, should have in
14 their e-mail an invitation. This entire Advisory
15 Committee is being invited to that press conference, and,
16 again, that will be at 11:30 at Susan Bysiewicz's office
17 at the State Capitol for the reasons I've just discussed.

18 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Thank you. I will
19 not be attending that. As you all understand, I'm an
20 executive branch employee, and I support Governor Rell's
21 budget.

22 Back in the fall, the Departments get
23 together with the Secretary, Secretary Gennario(phonetic)
24 of the Office of Policy and Management, and we determine

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 all the things that we want to do, and then we're also
2 offered an opportunity to include whatever things we might
3 think, you know, perhaps in our more expansive moments, if
4 we had an additional 100 million or so, what the
5 Department would like to do.

6 I don't do that. I come up with my top 10,
7 or maybe 12, if people have a good case for them, and we
8 pass those initiatives onto the Secretary, then there's
9 some dialogue, and then that all becomes a part of the
10 negotiation around the Governor's budget.

11 I understand that the budget is very
12 complicated, and that only the Governor and her most
13 senior financial advisors have access to information about
14 what needs to be in or what needs to be out of the budget.

15 As they used to say in the Army, those decisions are
16 above my pay grade. However, they're very large
17 decisions.

18 I know there's some considerable concern
19 with the Office of Policy and Management about how much
20 income will come into the state, particularly at this
21 present time, when state income tax is being paid.

22 Be that, all those things, as they may be,
23 once the budget is determined, I support the Governor's
24 budget, and we make no further additions or subtractions.

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 I know that, as the co-Chair of the Health
2 Committee, Senator Hanley advised me that it was Governor
3 Rell, as the presiding officer in the senate, who pushed
4 forward the vote that got stem cell established, and I
5 know she's a very strong supporter.

6 Unfortunately, I cannot, nor would I,
7 support anything that's not in the Governor's budget,
8 unless I did not want to continue as your Commissioner of
9 Health. Be that as it may, I respect her point of view,
10 and I respect her priorities and what she has to do in the
11 state.

12 I think, not to be longwinded about it, but
13 we're in a state where there's probably 700 to 800 million
14 dollars or closer to a billion dollars worth of
15 infrastructure that hasn't been done, or infrastructure
16 requirement in the 31 hospitals, some of whom are doing
17 very poorly financially.

18 There are very large infrastructure
19 problems with the multiple, over 200 convalescent homes,
20 which need to be attended to, roads have to be built,
21 driver education has to be included. I don't have the
22 point of view to make those decisions, but I do strongly
23 endorse Governor Rell's philosophy and her decisions, so I
24 will not attend that meeting.

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

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 And I've made it clear it is not the
2 decision -- this is not a decision that this group has
3 made that was presented to the good Secretary and Mr.
4 Speaker Amann. Anybody who is here who wants to go to the
5 meeting as a private individual is free to go to the
6 meeting, but they need to, when addressing the press or
7 anyone else, they need to make sure that they are
8 expressing their opinion and not the opinion of the
9 committee or the Chair.

10 DR. WALLACK: So the speech that we had,
11 that all this came from your initiative, Bob, we should
12 strike? That's off the record. I'm sorry.

13 MS. HORN: That was on the record.

14 DR. KIESSLING: Mr. Commissioner?

15 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yes.

16 DR. KIESSLING: Just for the record,
17 Massachusetts hasn't passed any laws yet. The House has
18 passed a law, the Senate has passed a law, the Governor
19 has his wishes, and they're all --

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah. The other
21 problem with this, my understanding is this is going to
22 be, this request is going to be appended to a Bill, which
23 we proposed, that would line us up technically for stem
24 cell lines, so that all the states and their consortium

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 would have the same operating rules for stem cell lines.

2 If the 10-million-dollar proposal is
3 defeated, the Bill, and I testified there was no financial
4 note on the Bill, the Bill will be defeated and we'll have
5 to go after these kind of technical changes, which we need
6 next year. Marianne knows the technical changes a little
7 better than I do, but the technical change. If the Bill
8 goes down, so do the technical changes.

9 MS. HORN: If I may, I think they're beyond
10 technical changes, that they're very important for this
11 legislation to stay current. To have these amendments go
12 through, I would be very disappointed, personally, and, on
13 behalf of the committee, I think, if the legislation did
14 not go --

15 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Could you mention
16 some of the --

17 MS. HORN: Yes. It allows us to sign onto
18 the acceptably derived standard that's been developed
19 under the National Academies, so that stem cell lines that
20 are developed outside of the State of Connecticut that do
21 not meet every technicality that's in our Bill, in terms
22 of derivation, can still be used by our researchers.

23 This is being used in California. They are
24 not stem cell lines that have any ethical issues. There's

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 still approval by an IRB, or IRB equivalent, but it would
2 allow us to accept many more lines that might be, because
3 the way our law is written, that we might not be able to
4 utilize in Connecticut. That's one of them.

5 It also puts in there that you must have an
6 ESCRO committee. At this point, we have an ESCRO
7 committee for state funded research through our RPF. This
8 would put in law that you have to have an ESCRO regardless
9 of whether you're funded by state law, or state funding or
10 not, or whether you're using private funds. A couple of
11 other things that are a little more technical.

12 MR. MANDELKERN: Point of information.

13 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yes.

14 MR. MANDELKERN: Are these recommendations
15 going to be in the Bill that's proposed at the press
16 conference on Friday?

17 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: The Bill was proposed
18 earlier in the year, and I testified positively on the
19 Bill. Now there are a couple of ways. Sometimes things -
20 - Bills go forward and get approved. Sometimes they
21 don't.

22 One of the quickest ways to make sure a
23 Bill doesn't move forward would be to put a large
24 financial note on it. So if you have a Bill for mom and

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 apple pie and the American flag and it simply requires a
2 vote, it will probably pass, unless you have somebody who
3 doesn't like apples or apple pie, but if you put a five-
4 million-dollar fiscal note on it, it's going to go down.

5 It frequently does. Even the best
6 intentioned Bills and the best written Bills that start
7 out without a financial note fail, because of a large
8 financial note, and it's sort of one of the ways that, if
9 something comes your way, that you don't think you're
10 going to be able to do within your resources, you just
11 say, well, stick a three-million-dollar fiscal note on it,
12 and we won't have to worry about it.

13 I don't know what will happen to this Bill,
14 but if the Bill fails, our changes that we need to align
15 ourselves up with and the ESCRO changes, they'll fail
16 along with the Bill. It won't be just the financial part
17 that fails. The whole Bill fails, and we'll have to go
18 back next fall and start over again.

19 DR. GENEL: What's the number of that Bill,
20 do you know?

21 MS. HORN: I don't have it. I could find
22 out.

23 DR. WALLACK: Just so -- I can't add
24 anything to what Bob Galvin just added or Marianne, but

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 the little information I have about this going on, I'm not
2 sure, you know, exactly how they will propose going
3 forward.

4 Now I know that the reference that Bob made
5 is right on accurate, that there was a Bill last week, if
6 I'm not mistaken, where there was a 10-million-dollar add-
7 on to that Bill, is that correct, Marianne? You were
8 following it in Washington?

9 MS. HORN: I heard that our Bill had a 10-
10 million-dollar amount attached to it while we were in
11 Washington, but I didn't know. Are there two separate
12 things?

13 DR. WALLACK: Well that's my point. That's
14 my point, and that is that I'm not sure that wherever that
15 came from is what we're talking about here. I'm not sure
16 if that's what we're talking about here.

17 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Well it may be
18 different, Milt.

19 DR. WALLACK: Right.

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: And I'm just telling
21 you, if it gets attached to our Bill and it fails, the
22 Bill fails, just so everybody understands that.

23 DR. WALLACK: Right.

24 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Be that as it may, as

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 a gubernatorial cabinet member, I stand by the Governor's
2 budget, and items that were not in the Governor's budget I
3 can't support. That's the way it is.

4 MS. TOWNSHEND: For the record, that is
5 Senate Bill 464.

6 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, so, we'll see
7 what happens.

8 DR. WALLACK: Senate Bill what? I'm sorry.

9 MS. TOWNSHEND: 464.

10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Milt, it may be done
11 a different way. I still can't support it.

12 DR. WALLACK: No. We all understand that,
13 Bob, and appreciate that. I don't think that Senate Bill
14 464, I could be wrong, is the Bill that they were talking
15 about, because, first of all, the numbers are
16 significantly different. The numbers are significantly
17 different from what I understand will be talked about on
18 Friday, number one.

19 And, number two, I think I'm clear about
20 the fact, I could be wrong, that this Bill is going to be
21 coming out, or amendment, or however they position it, it
22 will be coming out of the House and not through the
23 Senate, so I know about, because Marianne was following it
24 in Washington, we all knew about it, but I think this

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 might be different, but that does not change at all my
2 understanding about Bob's position and Bob's feeling,
3 rightly so, of what other consequences could occur. I
4 totally understand and appreciate that.

5 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. Do you have
6 another comment, Bob, and then we'll move on?

7 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes. I would like to
8 conclude this discussion with a note of levity and remind
9 us all that hell hath no fury as a woman scorned, as
10 Shakespeare once said. I suggest that we move onto item
11 number seven on the agenda.

12 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. Marianne?

13 MS. HORN: Okay. This is a reminder to the
14 committee members that the Statement of Financial
15 Interests that need to be filed with the Office of State
16 Ethics are due May the 1st. There is a link on the agenda
17 that will take you to the Ethics website.

18 From there, you'll need to click on the
19 dropdown menu on the left side and hit forms, and that
20 will take you to the electronic or hardcopy for mailing.
21 So, if anybody wants to see what that looks like, I
22 printed off the screen. If you have any questions, they
23 have a phone number there that you can call or e-mail for
24 any questions that you have.

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 DR. GENEL: Marianne, I recall doing one
2 not very long ago. Do you have a list of who --

3 COURT REPORTER: Can you bring that
4 microphone over, please?

5 DR. GENEL: I was just asking if you have a
6 list of those members that it's due for, because I
7 remember doing one very recently.

8 MS. HORN: There was a supplemental filing
9 last year that was based on a state law that was passed
10 that asked about additional sources of income, so I think
11 we all had to do an additional filing, and some of us were
12 later than others filing that.

13 This one, everybody has to do. If you're
14 required to file the form at all, you're required to file
15 every May 1st, so, I'm sorry, this is the major part of
16 the form that you filed last May that is due again.

17 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. Item eight,
18 scheduling of next six months of our meetings on the third
19 Tuesday of each month, target date, May 20, to vote on
20 approval of annual reports for most 2006 projects, and, on
21 May 21, the contracting process for the 2008 projects will
22 begin. That is not a meeting. That's an informational
23 date.

24 DR. FISHBONE: That's May 31?

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 MS. HORN: Twenty-one.

2 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Twenty-one.

3 MS. HORN: It's changed from an earlier
4 version of the agenda. May 31 is a Saturday, and, so, we
5 backed it up to be the day after you guys approve the
6 contracts and the royalty agreement. C.I. will hit the
7 ground running and start contracting with this year's
8 awardees.

9 DR. LATHAM: Commissioner, I can tell you
10 now that I will not be here for the August meeting.

11 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. I'm not sure
12 we'll have July and August meetings. We may see how our
13 agenda falls out and have a break over the summertime. I
14 would like to say that there are an awful lot of busy
15 people here, and if we don't need to meet, we won't meet,
16 or we can do it in some other fashion, or combine some of
17 the topics.

18 I do want to express my deep gratitude for
19 the quality and the quantity of time people put in on the
20 grants this year. I thought there was excellent
21 discussion. I thought that there was some very difficult
22 topics raised. I'm very pleased that Dr. Arinzeh could
23 make it and contributed vastly to what we did, as did Ann
24 Kiessling and many others.

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 I think a large part of our success and
2 national renowned has to do with the quality of the busy
3 scientists and ethicists who attend these meetings and
4 bring in all their experience at considerable cost to
5 themselves and their parent institutions. I don't know if
6 you could ever put a price tag on getting 14 people of
7 this quality in a room for a day and a half. It's huge,
8 huge, and I appreciate each and every one of you and all
9 of your care and efforts.

10 I would also like to say that we are
11 grateful for any additional funds we can get, that I
12 thought and I think probably Milt felt and some others
13 that there were a lot of new investigator grants that we
14 weren't able to fund, and that's really, I think, a very
15 important part of what we do.

16 It has taken me some considerable time to
17 understand the budgeting process and revenue estimations,
18 even though I have a business background, and to
19 understand how things work. It's a difficult process to
20 master and to understand, and sometimes what we want to do
21 is just get some additional monies for what we know is a
22 good project.

23 It's sometimes difficult to understand why
24 other things have more priorities, but that's the way it

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 is, and I do very much enjoy working for such an
2 outstanding and kindly and farsighted Governor. I would
3 continue to work for her, as long as she's in office. I
4 enjoy it. I find her very fair, very honest, and it's a
5 pleasure to work for her and have enough respect for her
6 and I think she for me, that if we had a topic that we
7 couldn't straighten out between the two of us, I would
8 leave.

9 Any public comment? Yes, ma'am? You're
10 going to have to grab a microphone, if you would, please.

11 MS. HORN: Could you introduce yourself?

12 MS. PAULA WILSON: Oh. Paula Wilson from
13 Yale University. I was just wondering if you have an
14 anticipated start date for these new contracts.

15 MR. WAGNER: Once we get the okay on
16 everything on the 20th, the May 20th meeting, we can
17 start. The following day, we're going to start the
18 process of getting the contracts out and then cutting the
19 checks.

20 MS. WILSON: So they could actually be
21 funded like the 21st of May?

22 MR. WAGNER: No. The contracts have to be
23 prepared and then out to the investigators and then
24 returned.

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 MS. WILSON: Okay.

2 MR. WAGNER: And then the process of
3 cutting the actual checks would then be done, yeah.

4 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Can you give us a
5 time estimate?

6 MR. WAGNER: I don't know. Not having done
7 it in the past, I'm not sure.

8 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: It will probably be
9 six weeks from the 21st of May, something like that? Is
10 that what it was?

11 MR. WAGNER: I believe, when we got the
12 contracts back last year, it was about a two to three-week
13 process before the checks were cut.

14 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah. Three weeks
15 from when the contracts are back.

16 MR. WAGNER: Were returned back to C.I.

17 MS. ISOLDE BATES: Isolde Banks, UConn
18 Health Center. I thought the contract would be in effect
19 when ESCRO, everything is approved. Like last year, the
20 start date was when ESCRO when Ann Hiscus(phonetic) sent a
21 verification to the state that ESCRO mandates have been
22 met.

23 MS. HORN: Yeah. There's no funds that are
24 released until we get the ESCRO approval.

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 MS. BATES: So the dates of when we can use
2 the funds is like last year, the day when we get the e-
3 mail, saying all the mandates have been met?

4 MS. HORN: Yes. Yes. So, last year, if we
5 back it up and recognizing that we were developing the
6 template from the beginning, we had the meetings at the
7 end of November, and most of the contracts were finalized
8 and funded at the beginning of April, so probably a fairly
9 comparable time frame from that, but we should move along
10 a little bit more quickly, since we're in good shape with
11 the assistance agreement, and the royalty agreement is
12 almost finished.

13 MR. WAGNER: Correct.

14 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yes, Mr. Mandelkern?
15 You'll need a microphone.

16 MR. MANDELKERN: I gather, under item or
17 number eight, then, we are tentatively scheduled for the
18 third Tuesday of each month for the next six months,
19 subject to revision and consideration?

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: That's correct.

21 MR. MANDELKERN: Thank you, sir.

22 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Any further comment?

23 DR. LANDWIRTH: Just thinking back to the
24 discussion we had earlier, about the invitation to the

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 JDRF person to come here, it strikes me that it might be a
2 wonderful opportunity to perhaps even set a precedent of
3 interest groups being available to help support funding
4 research projects that we would like to fund that may have
5 elements in it that we can't fund if they meet the
6 criteria that fits with the interest group. That wouldn't
7 be funding coming to us, but be coming to help find this
8 bridge. That could be a very useful pattern.

9 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I think that's a
10 marvelous comment, and I've been turning over in my mind
11 how would we do this without people saying, well, you're
12 giving JDRF the inside track. I think another comment
13 that came up is, if we got a grant that came in and was a
14 grant for a million dollars, but it said, if you give us
15 500,000, we'll match it, I mean, should we be thinking
16 about including those grants?

17 I mean, if we get somebody who has a grant
18 and they're willing to match us dollar-for-dollar, would
19 that move it up someplace in our listing of --

20 DR. LANDWIRTH: That's a further escalation
21 of what I was thinking about.

22 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah.

23 DR. LANDWIRTH: I was thinking about the
24 kind of projects that have part of it out of state, for

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 example.

2 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah.

3 DR. LANDWIRTH: And we're saying you can
4 find other funding to fill that gap, well, this might be a
5 way we can be a resource.

6 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah, and I perfectly
7 agree with that. I'm just kind of wondering how do we do
8 this without saying you cut a special deal for them, and I
9 came in with a project about what flavor cheese the moon
10 was made out of, and you just dismissed it, and I would
11 have, if I knew what they knew, you know, this kind of
12 stuff you can get into. Yes, Gerry?

13 DR. FISHBONE: Did we have a list of grants
14 that we approved, but could not fund?

15 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yes.

16 DR. FISHBONE: Because perhaps the way, you
17 know, one could approach it is to say that, well, these
18 are all approved grants. If somebody wanted to -- I mean
19 we're always looking for outside sources of funding. In
20 other words, you wouldn't fund one that was, say, a 5-0,
21 because somebody had money for it. In other words, there
22 were a number of grants that we thought were worthy of
23 approval, but we just didn't have the money and maybe
24 within that framework.

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 DR. WALLACK: You mean the maybes. You're
2 talking about those three in the bullpen.

3 DR. FISHBONE: There were a number that
4 were -- you know, we didn't go beyond three, but there
5 were a number that we had sort of approved that we just
6 didn't have the funds for.

7 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah. I think, if we
8 had 12 million dollars instead of 10 million dollars, we
9 would have had three or four more grants approved. It
10 seemed to me that I think some of the ones we turned down
11 had pretty good scores, and they narrowly missed, because
12 of focus and the like, and I think because of a lot of
13 intangible --

14 I think that we get a lot of very -- you
15 know, actually, some of the grants that didn't get funded
16 down in the four to five area were not very well written,
17 but there was a lot of good stuff there from 2.4 to 3.

18 DR. GENEL: I don't think we came to a
19 decision that a grant was approved, but not funded.

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: That's a good point.

21 DR. GENEL: We had grants that we put into
22 a maybe fund category and then eliminated, but we did not
23 then designate them as approved, but not funded.

24 DR. LATHAM: We did designate a few that

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 would take over in the event that -- there were three.

2 DR. GENEL: Those are still on the table.

3 DR. LATHAM: Right. Yeah.

4 DR. GENEL: Yeah.

5 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay?

6 DR. WALLACK: You know, what Julie said is
7 something that came up in Washington, also, and that there
8 was some surprise that some of the other advocacy groups,
9 and I think it was mentioned the Heart Association, the
10 Cancer Association, some others, that, in fact, have not
11 yet gotten involved as JDRF has indicated they want to get
12 involved.

13 And, so, what you're saying could be, you
14 know, another example to those others, who have not yet
15 gotten involved, may be able to partner with agencies and
16 see themselves, you know, duplicate, not duplicate, but
17 add to the funds that otherwise would be out there.

18 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I think, Milt, I
19 think a lot of them are probably waiting to see where is
20 there an identifiable product that I can use? I think a
21 lot of them are saying something like, as soon as you can
22 find out how to make beta cells, let me know, and I'll
23 give you a grant, and maybe we're some time away from
24 that. Yes, Gerry?

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 DR. FISHBONE: If I may make one more
2 point, we've been talking a lot about trying to get
3 venture capitalists to put money into the process, and
4 maybe, in a sense, that what Milt and Julie are talking
5 about is, instead of venture capitalists, we maybe, you
6 know, look to some of the organizations who have a very
7 strong interest in getting results.

8 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I think we may, in
9 fact, in some areas be far enough along until we can point
10 out this is really to your best interest to move this
11 research on, because it will, you know, eventuate and
12 viable myocytes, or viable beta cells, or whatever you
13 will, and I think we're getting to that point, maybe not
14 today, but shortly. Thank you.

15 DR. LATHAM: I wonder if some of these
16 groups might be interested in joining together and funding
17 peer review.

18 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Oooh. That's
19 excellent.

20 DR. WALLACK: I don't think that -- it
21 didn't seem to me, Marianne, you were there, that Bob
22 Goldstein -- did he make reference to peer review at all?
23 I want to say that that wasn't his interest. His interest
24 was in wanting to put his money directly into research, I

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 believe.

2 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah.

3 MS. HORN: I did talk to him afterwards
4 about how they do peer review, because that was one of the
5 concerns that I had, and it wasn't something he was
6 particularly interested in.

7 DR. WALLACK: Right.

8 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: But I think, Milt, as
9 time goes by and more states get more active, there will
10 be fewer knowledgeable people to do peer review, so if
11 somebody says to somebody, like our good friend, Willy
12 Lensch, look, Willy, why don't you come over and be my
13 peer reviewer, I'll give you five grand, not Willy, who
14 cares nothing and will wear a sack cloth, but there are
15 other individuals. If there was bidding we'd be in a
16 tough place.

17 DR. WALLACK: You know what Bob said --
18 you'd be interested in this. We had a guy there, and I
19 hate to -- I'm not going to mention the name, but you can
20 track it down if you want. There was a guy from Minnesota
21 there, and he specifically, and it almost blew my mind,
22 said I will not do peer review. I don't have the time for
23 it. I don't get anything out of it.

24 MS. TOWNSHEND: He did say that, yes.

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 DR. WALLACK: I mean give me a break.

2 DR. GENEL: Did that shock you?

3 DR. WALLACK: Yeah. I mean, okay, I'm
4 naïve, I understand that. He didn't just say once and
5 make a reference to it. He came back about three times, I
6 would think, and was almost proud about the fact that he's
7 not going to have anything to do with this.

8 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I think maybe we need
9 to look at ways to get paid peer review, one way or
10 another. Is there a foundation that might grant us
11 whatever to do peer review? That's very sad that Willy
12 couldn't stay with us, but he was getting a lot of
13 pressure from the people that he worked for about what are
14 you doing down there?

15 If you want to work down there, work down
16 there. If you want to work for me, work for me.

17 DR. GENEL: These are the simple realities.
18 There's only a certain pool of experts who are available.
19 There is only a certain pool of experts who really are
20 available to serve for peer review. They're being spread
21 between how many number of states now?

22 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Eight now.

23 DR. GENEL: Not to mention their peer
24 review obligations for the National Institutes of Health

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 and others, none of which are compensated. The NIH review
2 panels are not compensated. NIH has a great deal of
3 difficulty in getting an adequate sample of peer review to
4 begin with, so I'm not surprised that somebody would say I
5 don't have the time, I don't have the time, and I'm not so
6 sure any amount of money would have made that fellow from
7 Minnesota agree to service a peer reviewer. I'm
8 surmising.

9 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Lynn?

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: Very quickly, at the IASCR,
11 there was a very lively discussion with regard to peer
12 review, and two of the ideas that I took away from it,
13 which I found to be very interesting and might be
14 pertinent to this discussion, were can Massachusetts
15 reviewers review for Connecticut and we do the same for
16 them? That was one idea.

17 The other was to have a state level
18 national peer review board of paid reviewers, who do it
19 for all of the states. I don't think there was a lot of
20 interest on the part of IASCR to take that up, but it was
21 an idea that came out of that meeting, and I just threw it
22 out here, because it seems to be the right time.

23 DR. LATHAM: It seems to me that another
24 possibility, which is more on the stick side of things

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 than the carrot side of things, would be to ask people, as
2 part of their applications for grants, to include lists of
3 the peer review service that they've done over the last
4 period of time and make it explicit that one of the things
5 that we'll be looking for is good citizenship.

6 I don't know how much difference that would
7 make here in Connecticut. I imagine, if NIH did something
8 like that, they'd find their problem solved in a hurry.

9 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. A topic for
10 further discussion. No more public comment, comment from
11 the group members, then I will entertain a motion to
12 adjourn.

13 DR. WALLACK: Can we just comment for the
14 record? We said something about it the last time, that,
15 Bob, we went through a difficult process two weeks ago,
16 Monday and Tuesday of a couple of weeks ago.

17 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yes.

18 DR. WALLACK: And we got through it,
19 because of a lot of good people putting a lot of good
20 thought and a lot of good feeling to it, but we also could
21 not have gotten through it without a good Chairman doing
22 the work that he had to do, so we appreciate what you did.

23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Thank you.

24 (Applause). Hearing no other comments, I will entertain a

RE: CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 15, 2008

1 motion to adjourn. And a second?

2 VOICES: Second.

3 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: We are adjourned.

4 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 3:05

5 p.m.)