Verbatim proceedings of the Connecticut Stem Cell Research Advisory Committee meeting, held at Connecticut Innovations, 865 Brook Street, Rocky Hill, Connecticut, on January 17, 2012 at 1:06 p.m. . . .

CHAIRPERSON MARIANNE HORN: This is Marianne Horn. I am the Commissioner’s designee today, so I’ll be chairing the meeting. The Commissioner sends her regrets. She had to be at another meeting, or she would certainly be here.

Happy New Year, everybody. We’ve had a little changing of the guard here. For those of you who have not met Emily Smith, Emily is -- what is your position, Emily?

MS. EMILY SMITH: They call me Managing Director of External Relations. That just means I get to do stem cell. Government Relations, I do all of the marketing and media and public relations for Connecticut Innovations.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: All right and you were Chelsea’s boss?

MS. SMITH: Yes, I was. Yes.
CHAIRPERSON HORN: And Sarah Donofrio is -- oh, we have Dr. Genel joining us. Also from CI is going to be helping us get organized. If this meeting is any indication of how things will happen in the future, we’re off to a great start, so we very much appreciate their assistance.

MS. SMITH: We’re learning the ropes, so if anyone has any advice for us, just let us know, please.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: And if anybody thinks that we are not doing things the way we had done before, please speak up.

Okay. In terms of the minutes, the last official meeting we had was November 2, 2011. We had a Bidder’s Conference after that, which Milt will talk about a little bit later.

Have you all had a chance to take a look at the minutes? Do we have a motion?

DR. MILTON WALLACK: Move.

DR. GERRY FISHBONE: Second.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Any discussion? Okay.

All in favor?

VOICES: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. We’ll move into the agenda. Much of this does not require a vote. It’s
really information for your information as these -- some of the 2006, 2008 and 2009 grants come to a close, but certainly an opportunity to raise any questions that you might have as we go through the final report.

So the first one is a receipt of 2006 final report, 06 SCB 08, Carmichael. I’ll ask CI whether they had any comments.

MS. SMITH: We didn’t have any comments. I looked through this. I reviewed it with some folks here on staff, who have been involved in this program in the past, so they could guide me a little bit, and nothing jumped out at us.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. Any further comment on Carmichael?

DR. FISHBONE: One thing that was interesting he submitted a final report for the ’06 grant and, also, for the ’09 grant, and the overall progress summary was almost identical. I think he added one sentence. They’re sort of word-for-word the same.

MS. SMITH: ’09?

DR. FISHBONE: This is not to say there’s anything wrong with that, but it was kind of -- I thought I was reading the same report.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: So his first, the SCB,
was an established investigator grant, and the '09 grant was a seed grant.

DR. FISHBONE: They are different. It’s just a lot of the wording. I guess that’s sort of probably basic wording that people use in reports.


MS. SMITH: Again, nothing looked out of the ordinary. It was a lot of documentation here, but it looked fine to us.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: One of the issues we’ve had in the past has been with the level at which the lay summaries are written, and against that comment I want to point out that at DPH our staff has been reduced significantly, and we’re going to have some difficulty getting the lay summaries posted on the DPH website with regularity, so we will attempt to.

We did file the annual report, which is no longer required with the legislature. We did file that, so there is some overview of the whole program.

DR. DAVID GOLDFHAMMER: Do we have any idea how many --

CHAIRPERSON HORN: I don’t know, and I
don’t know if they count on each individual. I can ask that question.

DR. GOLDHAMMER: Just for curiosity.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: I certainly go there a lot.

MS. SMITH: They can tell if it’s all coming from you, or if it’s coming from someone else.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. Any comments on Zaccarino? Number five, receipt of 2009 final report, 09 SCA UCHC 16, Carmichael. So this is the report that we were just discussing.

MS. SMITH: This looked fine.

DR. FISHBONE: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: 09 SCA Yale 11, Masine (phonetic).

MS. SMITH: We reviewed this. There was nothing in this one either that seemed out of the ordinary. The lay summaries, does that get posted on the DPH website?

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Up to this year we were able to post them. We’ve had staff to cut and paste and post them with the individual grants. 09 SCA Yale 45, Garcia Castro.

MS. SMITH: There was nothing out of the
ordinary from our perspective on this one either.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Any further comments on the 2009 final reports? Okay, moving on, number six is the receipt of six-month fiscal reports, and, again, my understanding is that these are for your information. These are reviewed by CI financial and the DPH financial, and they reconcile their reports with one another.

MS. SMITH: Yes, and I did have a couple of these that I would be going back to get additional information. For instance, one here from Yale for Zhang Xu (phonetic). There was some information missing, and the other person that we had didn’t name who the graduate student was, and there seemed to be a large budget variance that we were going to look for additional information on.

On Laura Grabel (phonetic), this is the Wesleyan piece of the UConn/Wesleyan stem cell core, there was some formatting issues with the columns, so that the dollar amounts didn’t show up, so we’re just going back and asking for some clarity there, and that’s the same issue on Alexander Richter (phonetic) at the University of Connecticut Health Center. There were some formatting issues that prevented us from seeing the budget variance, so we would go back and ask for some -- just asked them to
kind of reprint that with the column wider.

Other than that, there were two of these that we did not receive that we should have, and that was for the 09 SCB UConn 18, Rasmussen(phonetic), and 09 SCB, these are the established grants, Wesleyan.

We did not receive these six-month reports for these two projects, and we’ll be going back and asking them to make sure that they send those. And that’s all I have to report on.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: I didn’t see Grabel listed here under number six.

MS. SMITH: Oh, I’m sorry. It’s actually listed as 09 SCD UCHC 01, Xu, X-U, because it’s the UConn/Wesleyan core, and it’s listed under the UConn name, but that’s the one that it is. I’m sorry.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Thank you.

DR. WALLACK: Marianne, where is Ted Rasmussen?

CHAIRPERSON HORN: And Rasmussen we don’t have.

MS. SMITH: I did not receive Rasmussen. That’s one of the ones. The other one was Nagal(phonetic) from Wesleyan. Those were the two I did not receive, so I will be contacting them following this meeting and asking
them to submit them.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: So those would appear on
a subsequent --

MS. SMITH: Agenda, yeah.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Again, if the committee
has any questions, concerns, comments, feel free to raise
them, even though we’re not voting on these.

Okay. Hearing none, we’ll move on to
number seven. It’s a carryover request, 08 SCB UTH 011,
Vecovich (phonetic), and this is a UConn grant, so I would
ask anybody with a conflict with UConn not to vote on
this.

MS. SMITH: And I believe we included this
carryover request in the board packet, and, basically, it
says that the carryover in other personnel is due to Dr.
Xu leaving the position at the University.

The PI is in the process of reassigning a
technician to work on the project, and the remaining funds
here will be used for that, and then there were some other
variances in the other direct costs. As the project moves
into the final project, your cost we’ll anticipate to
increase for research-related material, supplies and
service-related expenses.

I did review these with actually with Dan
Wagner, who has some experience looking at these from when he used to work on the program, and he didn’t seem to feel that any of this was out of the ordinary.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: One of the concerns the committee has had in the past is whether any reallocation carryover is indicative of any issues with getting the goals met or work the done.

MS. SMITH: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: So no concerns there.

DR. FISHBONE: It’s a very large carryover, isn’t it?

CHAIRPERSON HORN: It is.

DR. FISHBONE: Fifty percent of the grant. It does make you wonder what was achieved.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: And what was the rationale for the carryover?

MS. SMITH: A lot of it was that Dr. Xu left her position at the University, and the PI is in the process of reassigning a technician to work on the project. We could follow-up in six months.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: We do have a representative here from UConn, who would be interested in shedding some light on that, if the committee is interested.
DR. MYRON GENEL: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. Isolde? Come up to a microphone.

MS. ISOLDE BATES: Just to clarify, Dr. (indiscernible) is in process of sending the final report, and the carryover in personnel is actually after she reassigned the technician, Ms. Glispin (phonetic) or Maya (phonetic).

It’s really only going to be $5,000. It was such at the time, then we had to sending the carryover request. Those were the numbers we had to use, but, as you see, at the end of the month, when the annual report is due, you will see that the amount is very, very low.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Thank you. Okay. Do we have a motion on number seven?

DR. FISHBONE: We accept the report. So moved.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay.

DR. GOLDHAMMER: Second.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: All in favor?

VOICES: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: The motion passes.

Number eight, the reallocation request, 08 SCB UCH 021, Rosenberg, and, again, a UCHC grant.
MS. SMITH: So, again, we included this in your packet. There was a cover letter here that indicated that they would like to reallocate $27,000, $10,000 from other expenses and $17,000 from supplies, and, basically, the reallocation is needed, because they’re hoping to accelerate their efforts to, you know, move the project forward.

And, again, I’ve reviewed this with Dan Wagner, and he seemed to think that the reallocation was not anything out of the ordinary, is appropriate and so on.

DR. WALLACK: Move acceptance of the request.

DR. FISHBONE: Second.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Second? Any further discussion? Okay. All in favor?

VOICES: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Receipt of Storrs and UCHC final audit report. These were included in the packet.

MS. SMITH: So those were included in your packet, and, let’s see, Storrs? Well I’ll pull it out of here. What was unclear to me was whether these audit reports needed to be voted on.
I didn’t think that they did, but I wasn’t sure, so we included these in your packet. I went through these. There was a comment in one of them about continuously monitoring the budget allocations for all of these projects.

There seems to be a little bit of a discrepancy, but nothing major, and I think, overall, the auditors were satisfied with the program and the way it’s being managed on behalf of UConn.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: I don’t think these need to be voted on. They’re just here for your information.

MS. SMITH: Okay.

DR. FISHBONE: Sounds like they made recommendations and management responded.

MS. SMITH: Responded, yeah. Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Similarly, the receipt of the 2011 Yale audit report.

MS. SMITH: Right, and it was the opinion of the auditor in that one that Yale is in compliance with all the terms and conditions of the program.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Have you received anything from Wesleyan?

MS. SMITH: No, I have not. I did not receive anything from Wesleyan.
CHAIRPERSON HORN: Could I ask you if you’d follow-up on that?

MS. SMITH: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: They have a different kind of audit system. I’m not quite sure where that ended up.

MS. SMITH: Okay. And then I would put that on the agenda for the next meeting, whatever we receive from them.

DR. WALLACK: The nature of the two reports is a little different. I mean is that a problem or not?

CHAIRPERSON HORN: I think just go by what the institution does. These are institutional audits, and Wesleyan does not have the capacity to do an institutional project, so they were getting outside audits.

DR. WALLACK: So there’s three different approaches, is what you’re saying happened. Okay.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: But if there are any recommendations that the committee has for a different method of auditing --

DR. WALLACK: No. I personally like the UConn audit. I mean it’s very, very clear and very complete. I’m just wondering if there wasn’t the ability, even though the University, Yale University has their own
approach to it, if there could be consistency on it.

Anyway, that’s my question.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: You can ask Yale and UConn to look into perhaps providing a similar audit form, whether that’s a possibility. The recommendation would be to look at UConn’s audit report, as it seems to give more information than the Yale.

Thank you. That message has been conveyed to all in the audience.

DR. WALLACK: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. Milt, you want to update us on the 2011 Bidder’s Conference?

DR. WALLACK: Sure. First of all, it should be noted, especially with the CI people here, that we were very, very happy that Chelsea was able to arrange her schedule to stay on an extra I think three days, or something like that, in order to do this.

I think that the conference went well. The attendance was not what we had anticipated, but I think the goals of the conference were achieved. We basically wanted to try to create, as, Marianne, you put it, a level playing field for all aspirants, all people, who wanted to be involved in stem cell research, the motivating factor being that we had heard in the past there were a few
motivating factors.

One of them was that we had heard in the past from some Universities and some Institutions, in general, that it wasn’t a level playing field, and, so, the purpose of the meeting was to give them a format, if you will, an updated format about how they should approach applying for State funding.

The other aspect of it is that, and this came to light in the last distribution of funds in July, that there were some issues having to do with how the applications were really being put together and whether or not they were following the guidelines, specifically, of what we had hoped to see, so we thought that a conference, such as this, would enable us to get the message out, and getting the message out also identifies not only the opportunities, but the obligations that the various constituency had going forward, one of the things being, for example, the lay reports.

It may not be a big thing to the scientists, but for those of us, who are trying to discern what’s going on, it becomes an important, I think, component to it.

There’s actually a third component, and that is that we wanted to see -- we had heard in the past
through the years that the business and industry community have had a difficult time identifying with how they can enter the process. Just getting ESCRO approvals, for example, there have been issues in the past, so we felt that that would enable us to get the message out to them.

I think that was the overall goal to open up the process. Other side issues had to do with the fact that we wanted to get the message out to the legislators, that we were trying to be as open and transparent in the process as we possibly could, and to send that kind of message we felt that it was important.

We did not have any legislators there, but it was held in the LOB, the meeting, and, certainly, the fact that the meeting was going on was posted.

So I think that on all of those levels we achieved our goals, but it was only achieved, because of some excellent reports that were shared with those in attendance that day.

Marianne, your report, Chelsea’s report, and I have to say, most specifically, and I gave an update, most specifically, and the Commissioner opened the meeting with remarks and welcoming, but, most specifically, David Goldhammer, I think it should be noted for the minutes, made a really excellent PowerPoint
presentation, which I think was very, very meaningful to those who were there.

And even for those who weren’t there, and this is the point I’m getting to, I think that, unless you have already taken care of this, or have another idea how you want to manage this point, I think it would be worthwhile to take the printed deliberations, specifically, the PowerPoint that David Goldhammer created, and somehow be able to post it as part of the minutes of maybe the report from this meeting about the meeting on November 18th, so we can enter David’s presentation into these minutes, unless you have a better idea what to do with it.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: No. It is on the website somewhere, but I have to track it down, whether it got into a special presentation section, or whether it was noted on the November 17th date of the meeting, which was posted.

DR. WALLACK: I don’t know.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: So I’ll double check. It is there, but we’ll post it in a couple of different places.

DR. WALLACK: Would it be a problem to also have it as an attachment to these minutes, since the
report is being made at this meeting?

    CHAIRPERSON HORN: Not at all. I will forward those on.

    DR. WALLACK: And, Marianne, the things you talked about, if you wanted to have that included, could be included, as well, in that.

    Chelsea had a more informal presentation, so I don’t think that we’d want to go there. One of the other results was that I had an article published in the New Haven Register, a forum article, that was basically Mike’s suggestion, frankly, that addressed many of the subjects that we tried to talk about from our agenda of the program, now getting into the whole biomedical life science whole thing, so these are all the results, so I think it was very positive.

    The attendance should have been, could have been better, so that’s my report.

    CHAIRPERSON HORN: Very good. Any questions?

    DR. GENEL: Just a comment. Judging by the submissions for this year’s grant, I think it’s a good idea we did this, since the usual suspects are back.

    DR. FISHBONE: There’s a lot of new names, as well. A lot of new names.
DR. GENEL: Yeah, but the institutions are the same.

DR. WALLACK: And Mike’s point is really the crux of the matter, and that is that the two major institutions are maintaining the intensity of their interest, I think on a par with where we were, and I’m sure you’ll get into this, in the past.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay, very good. Well thank you for organizing that, Milt. I think it was a worthwhile effort, and I think that the key players from the institutions were there, and it was, I think, great to get everybody on one page and very clear presentations about what the expectations were.

DR. FISHBONE: Can I ask a question of David?

DR. GOLDHAMMER: Sure.

DR. FISHBONE: What’s happening on the NIH, you know, what’s happening with the NIH now, in terms of funding? Are they funding embryonic stem cell research at similar levels? Are they cutting back?

DR. GOLDHAMMER: I haven’t specifically looked at funding to embryonic stem cell research. They’re certainly funding it. I don’t know the precise levels.
I do know that, overall, NIH funding across the board is trouble, you know, it’s troubling. It’s low. The cutoff for funding is extremely competitive, so it’s a challenge for researchers right now and has been.

DR. FISHBONE: Yeah. The Dickey-Wicker Amendment is coming up again in the courts, which, depending on how that works out, that may affect even more funding of stem cells.

DR. GOLDHAMMER: Do you know the timeline for that?

DR. WALLACK: It’s there now.

DR. GOLDHAMMER: Okay.

DR. FISHBONE: It’s going on now. It’s the same two people, who have been suing somebody for --

DR. WALLACK: Well it’s really the church that is acting on behalf of Sherley and Deisher.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Is there any new dates, Milt?

DR. WALLACK: I have that. No, I don’t have it with me. Yeah. I think they -- do you remember the dates? I think they’re posting the appeals now, as we’re speaking. I don’t know if that means this week or next week, but it’s right at this point.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay.
DR. WALLACK: Without a specific date.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay, we’ll send something around when we see it.

DR. WALLACK: I’ll forward you not the whole thing on Dickey-Wicker, but one page.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: That would be great.

And we’ll send it out to everybody.

DR. WALLACK: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. The next item is an update on 2012 grant applications and timeline for review process, and I’ll turn that over to Emily.

MS. SMITH: Sure. So the grant applications were due 4:30 Friday, and, so, Friday was a busy day here. We received 87 proposals, totaling $38,631,019.

We received two core applications, two disease directed, 29 established investigator applications, one group, and 53 seed proposals.

By school, we received 36 from UConn Health Center, one was a UConn Health Center/Wesleyan combination, that’s in addition to the 36 from UConn Health Center, five from UConn, one from Wesleyan, 32 from Yale, and 12 from the Yale School of Medicine.

We have them all ready to be reviewed by
Marianne and her folks, and we’ll get right on that. My understanding is the grant review meeting we’re hoping to have that in June.

I think the next presenter is going to go over the peer review timeline and process, and I think what we have to do is get the reviewers assigned, so we’ll be working on that, and I think there’s a June --hopefully at the June meeting or sometime soon. Around that time is when we’ll actually make a decision on these.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: So, great. Thank you so much for getting those on so quickly.

MS. SMITH: You’re welcome.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: So what I will do, in conjunction with CI, is just to go through these grants and make sure that all the pieces are there, make sure that they’re actually talking about something related to stem cell research that we could actually fund, make sure that the research is going on in Connecticut, and that nothing else would overtly take them out of the running.

DR. FISHBONE: What’s our current status with the wording? We are funding now induced pluripotent stem cell grants. Is there some sort of ratio or anything that we should be looking at or thinking about? Do you know?
CHAIRPERSON HORN: I don’t think we established any ratio, just excellent science.

DR. FISHBONE: Yeah, but we are going beyond embryonic stem cell, and that’s within the wording of the legislation.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes.

DR. WALLACK: Gerry brings up an interesting point, though, and that is that a lot of the work that’s being done, at least at some institutions, in the area of IPS is clearly an acknowledgement or nod towards what David was saying before, and that is that it’s been very, very difficult to access funds for embryonic stem cell research, and how our RFP specifically talks about the issue, and we’ve historically taken this position, that we supposedly are interested in funding research in the area of embryonic/adult stem cell research that could not otherwise be easily funded or funded by the federal government, so that what, Gerry, you bring up is certainly, you know, it shouldn’t not allow the IPS applications to come in, but I think that we’re still a bastion.

Unless we change our vision or our mission statement, we’re still a bastion of embryonic, I think.

DR. GENEL: Yeah. How would you implement
that, Milt? I’m thinking that if there were two competing applications, one of which was embryonic and one of which was induced pluripotent, we would lean to the embryonic, but would you dip down into a priority score in order to preferentially fund an embryonic?

DR. WALLACK: No, and we specifically have always stated that we would never do that. And even with the disease directed, when we put that on, we specifically said there’s not a certain amount of dollars that we’re going to put aside for disease directed. We’re going to do the best science, and if no disease directed qualified, we wouldn’t fund it.

We can do, I think, a couple of things. Number one, we could reemphasize that in the RFP, if we chose to do that. I think the institutions, the Universities, understand that the only place they can get the embryonic funding at least more easily is from us. We can restate that.

The other thing, from what I’ve been told, is that part of the problem is that the cores need support for -- if they’re going to continue to do the embryonic, so while we’ve had huge discussions over the last two years having to do with do we fund cores, or do we not fund it, and how much and so forth, and there were two
marvelous presentations, you know, a few months back from (indiscernible) and from Mark Laronde (phonetic), and we decided that we would put aside a million dollars on a competitive basis for the cores, we may have to be cognizant of, as we go forward, not in this cycle, as we go forward, do we want to do something with the cores, as far as funding goes, in a more positive way, so as to help them to sustain the ability to do embryonic stem cell research.

DR. GENEL: I agree.

DR. WALLACK: So I think, and I’ve been sort of always on the side of maybe, you know, trying to see if they can cut back, cut back on the core funding, but this awareness, because of, Gerry, what you’re bringing up at the IPS and, David, what you’re saying about the federal, may put a different component into how we address that, so it may be something we want to consider on a future agenda item area. I don’t know. Does that answer it, Mike?

DR. GENEL: Well I think -- yes. I think at both levels. I think probably the most important level is the second one, and that is that if this is something we want to call attention to, then we need to make sure that that’s in the next RFP in some fashion.
The issue with the stem cell, with cores I think is a valid one.

DR. WALLACK: You know it may be that we might, and this is a recommendation now, we might want to have the institutions make an updated -- create an updated discussion, have an updated discussion with us relative to if we were to consider increased funding for the cores, if it would and how it would affect their work in the area of embryonic stem cell research, they can tell us, as part of our discussion, if, in fact, it would have a meaningful impact.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: So look at after we regroup after our next round?

DR. WALLACK: Right.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: So probably September or so next year.

DR. GENEL: I suspect we’ll have a better idea of this when we actually see the applications, because it’s not entirely clear from the titles to what extent IPS cells are being used and embryonic or both. I think we’ll have a better sense of that.

DR. GOLDBUMMER: And even if there’s a shift of ES cells to IPS cells, the cores are still invaluable. They’re needed in the same ways for IPS work.
as they are for ES cell work, so I think the cores are really needed in either case.

I think, in the RFP, did we not change the language to take out the language about priority for funding projects that cannot be funded federally? I thought we took that out, because there are so many more ES cell lines that can now be funded federally, that that raises an interesting point.

You can get money for IPS cells, adult stem cells, and most embryonic stem cell lines federally now.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: We did leave that language in. I think we had some discussion about --

DR. WALLACK: That was still in?

CHAIRPERSON HORN: It is.

DR. GOLDFALLER: Yes. My desire to take it out, given the fact that there are so many lines --

DR. WALLACK: I think you were going to work with Chelsea with some wording.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: He did, and I think we just deferred it to this next year.

DR. WALLACK: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: It was going to require another committee meeting to discuss the language of the RFP, and we were coming up against the deadline.
DR. GOLDHAMMER: But I think this will sort itself out, in terms of how the grants score. If someone makes a strong case for why using IPS cells was preferable to ES cells, then I think that will be reflected in a good priority score, which then has a better chance of funding, so I don't know that we have to kind of our priority, you know, have in our minds a bias towards the embryonic cells versus the IPS cells, because, clearly, IPS cells have a number of unknowns, but, also, some advantages, clear advantages.

DR. FISHBONE: Yeah. I think our goal is to fund the best research out there to achieve the disease-oriented results, and my own feeling would be that we should fund the best of whatever is out there, since, as you say, more embryonic stem cell lines are now available to people.

When this all started, there were, basically, there was nothing out there, so it's very important to stress embryonic stem cells, but it seems to me like the field is moving a lot into the induced pluripotent stem cells. I think, if there are good applications, we should, you know --

DR. GOLDHAMMER: Yes. I agree.

DR. WALLACK: But just to push back on what
you just said a little bit, some of the discussions,
again, in a very ad hoc basis, anecdotal way, that I’ve
had with some of the scientists, it sounds like part of
that movement to IPS, and you and I were discussing this
before, relative to Europe, for example, is that there’s
been an increasing wall being put up on the embryonic
side, so it may be an issue of convenience for the
scientist and a greater certainty, if you will, that they
can get funding than they could for embryonic.

The feds aren’t doing it, and we’re, like I
said, the only place right now, I don’t know what Maryland
is doing, or California, that is still doing this.

DR. RON HART: Can I speak? This is Ron
Hart on the phone.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Please.

DR. HART: I still have funding for both
ESCs and IPS, and, to me, there are many reasons to think
about going to IPS. Some of them are practical. It
requires oversight regulations work with IPS and ESC, but
that’s relatively minor.

The great, huge advantage, of course, is
the variety of disease and genetic backgrounds that are
easily obtained from sources to make into IPS to solve
problems of human disease. That’s something that really
(coughing) can’t be done with embryonic stem cells, and, yet, you’re doing what seems like the exact same culture and the exact same method, so it just doesn’t seem to be an evolution of the field.

I’m sure there will still be projects reliant upon ESCs, but I think those will be few.

DR. GOLDHAMMER: Yes, and I think there will be even fewer. It will probably be a very rare application we get that uses ESCs that are not eligible for NIH funding, so I think almost everything we get is going to be eligible for NIH funding, so, again, it comes down to the best rationale for the experiments, the best science that we should be looking at.

DR. HART: Unless you’re creating a new embryonic stem cell line, which is not supported by federal dollars, or wanting to use a line that can’t be approved by federal regulations, and that’s very, very, very rare.

We’re not going to see things that can’t be funded federally.

DR. FISHBONE: We were just discussing before, Milt and I, that some of the big supporters, like Ian Wilmont(phonetic) of embryonic stem cell, are now talking about moving to IPS. For whatever reasons, I
don’t know, but they’re satisfied with the results of IPS, in terms of where it’s leading.

DR. GOLDHAMMER: Let me make one other comment. Even, you know, yes, initially, we were one of the few states that would fund research on ES cells that could not be funded federally, and this is extremely important. Now things have evolved, and IPS is here, and more ES cell lines can be funded federally. This, in my mind, though, doesn’t minimize at all the impact of this program.

The fact that we’re getting 80 plus applications year in and year out tells us how important this program is, and what it’s allowing is for Connecticut scientists to become more competitive for next steps for federal dollars, and we know that this, you know, we have a number of cases, where this is exactly what has happened, so we’re still growing the stem cell enterprise in Connecticut and sustaining it by this program, even if that kind of that initial intent is not as important as it once was.

DR. WALLACK: Well put.

DR. GENEL: Marianne, if I may make a comment?
CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes.

DR. GENEL: I suspect your division into Yale University and Yale School of Medicine is very artificial. Looking at the titles, they are just coincidences to whether or not somebody designated their grant as coming from the School of Medicine or from the University. I would suggest you lump them together.

MS. SMITH: All right.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. I was hoping the other two might join us for the peer review process, but I think we’ll go ahead with that anyway.

I think most of you know Rick Strauss from Connecticut Association of Science and Engineering, and we mentioned at an earlier meeting that Rick is going to be helping the Department to perform the peer review process this year with some of the administrative funds that the Department receives to do stem cell work.

And I think it’s going to lead to a process that is very considered and very thorough, and that we will have much more assurance that a seed is ranked comparably to the other seeds within that category, and the same with the established, and the same the core and the group.

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

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay, so, Rick, why don’t you take it away?

MR. RICK STRAUSS: Okay, well, it’s great to be here. Rick Strauss from the Connecticut Academy of Science and Engineering, and, also, Terry Clark, our Associate Director, is here. Ann Bertini(phonetic) will also be assisting. She’s our Assistant Program Director, so we have a team working on the project.

We actually had some additional meetings and development of our proposal for consideration by DPH back in November. I think we are under contract as of sometime in early January and got that go ahead to get started, so what we’ve done so far is have an initial meeting with Marianne to have her explain what the process was.

That got followed up with a meeting I think on January 5th with Gary Stein and his assistant, Priscilla, by phone with Marianne, going over some initial ideas that we had for this year’s review process.

We, then, followed up with development of materials, draft materials, and then went up to meet with Gary and Priscilla at UMass last Tuesday, followed that up with revisions and back and forth discussion on documents.
and process, and I’ll go over the results of all of that now.

So, first of all, from a timeline perspective, thanks to CI we’re a little ahead of schedule. As you know, the proposals were submitted last Friday. They’re now posted, so Marianne can get going on her work for the compliance review, and we have a date for that to be completed by around January 27th, so get started.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: It will be done by the 20th.

MR. STRAUSS: Okay, good. But, at the same time, now that we have the, you know, the summary of the proposals that are in and they’re available for Gary Stein to start looking at, he’ll be able to start thinking about the reviewer assignments, so we hope to complete the reviewer assignments by February 8th.

And we’re also in the process now of selecting the reviewers, and I’ll go over that in a minute.

So the proposal review period will essentially be as soon as possible through April 4th, and between April 4th and April 11th we’ll complete the reconciliation process, which I’ll describe in greater detail at a later date.
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detail, by April 11th, and then we anticipate conducting
study sections for the various types of grants between
April 16th and April 20th and transmitting the final
results of the review process to you and DPH by the end of
April, April 27th, or thereabouts, so that will give you
time to get your June meeting scheduled.

So, first of all, we’ll talk about
selection of peer reviewers, so our first job is we need
reviewers. Last year, I think you had a total of 10, so
the first step was, with Marianne’s assistance, to go out
and see how many of those reviewers that were eligible to
come back that Gary wanted to re-invite would agree to
come back, so eight of the 10 have accepted the invite to
come back. One has a medical issue and can only do a
partial number of reviews, so she’s on the bench in case
we need her.

MS. SMITH: Is she part of the eight?

MR. STRAUSS: No.

MS. SMITH: No, so, it’s like eight and a
half?

MR. STRAUSS: So that’s the status of last
year. Now what we looked at was, in the review process
and discussed this with Marianne and Gary, is getting more
support for the Chair, because what we want to do is to
really get prepared for the study sections for developing questions on the proposals for the reviewers, so we’ve come up with the idea to have four co-Chairs, so there will be the Chair, four co-Chairs, and 10 reviewers, a total of 15.

So that means, with the eight coming back, we need seven additional reviewers. Now, you know, we have the Academy staff that can go out and identify potential reviewers, but we wanted to develop a process that would provide the Commissioner with candidates that have been reviewed, so what we did was to think about creating a Peer Reviewer Screening Committee, so a committee that will review the candidates that we identified through a variety of processes, and they will essentially provide their consent for the submittal of candidates to the Commissioner for her approval.

Generally, we go to our Academy members. That’s a great idea, except for 99.9 percent of them are from Yale and UConn that have stem cell experience, so that created a little bit of a problem.

We do have -- well let me back up. We have been doing a peer review process for the Department’s Biomedical Research Grant Program. A little bit smaller.

This last year was about a million dollars instead of 10
million dollars, and, in that process, we get somewhere between -- well it varies by year.

I mean there’s been up to like 30 or 40 proposals, but, generally, less than 20 proposals. The peer reviewers serve on a pro bono basis, so we need many more reviewers, because we can’t have them do so many reviews, so we have about 20 or so reviewers to review, like last year, you know, 14 proposals, with a two-level process.

So, in that process, one of our members is a retired scientist from Bristol-Myers Squibb, Dr. Dias (phonetic), so he’s agreed to serve on the committee, and we reached out to others, but we weren’t able to find anybody, and I thought, okay, well, let’s see who are the stakeholders here?

Well it would be good to have Gary on the committee, because, you know, he’s going to be working with these people as the Chairperson, so Gary Stein accepted, and then I said, well, maybe we need somebody from the Stem Cell Research Advisory Committee, so Marianne and I talked over a couple of names, and Milt Wallack has graciously agreed to serve as a member of that screening committee, so we have a three-member team that will receive the bios, bio sketches, you know, CVs, web
information on the candidates that we identify, and then they will essentially provide their consent, or ask questions of each other to review the candidates.

And then whoever they pass, if you will, will go to the Commissioner for approval. This may actually be more than the number that we need, so we’ll have a bench that if something happens in the period, we can always draw on somebody else to fill in, or use them as candidates for next year to fill in for others.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Or fill in for the Advisory Committee. I’ve got my eyes on them today.

MR. STRAUSS: Well there may be a fee associated with --

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yeah, okay.

MR. STRAUSS: But, anyway, so the process we used to start with was to go out to all prior and current peer reviewers for their recommendations on who they might suggest for additional reviewers, and then, also, go through those responses, and if somebody said no, then we would ask them, so that kind of leads us away.

And then we also had submitted a request to members of this Advisory Committee that are essentially not from Connecticut, because you guys are all sort of like involved here, so we’ve gotten some additional names
from those people, and then we also have our Biomedical Peer Reviewers that we’ve used, and there’s a lot of UConn and Yale people there, so we’re not going to be going to those. We’ll just be going to the people that are out of state.

So that process has resulted so far in 14 possible candidates. Four have said that they are interested in serving, five, not at this time, two, considering, and we’re waiting for three responses, so the Screening Committee is now, right now, reviewing, well, except for Milt, he’s here, four candidates, so that would bring us to a total of 12, meaning three more.

The end of this week, whatever that number is that we have will get submitted to Marianne, that the committee provides their consent for, will get submitted to Marianne for her to forward to the Commissioner for her approval, so we can get started with contracting and those kind of things.

So that’s pretty much the peer reviewer selection piece of work, so that’s moving along pretty good. Yeah?

DR. GOLDHAMMER: Can you say a few words about what criteria are being used for selection, obviously, not only qualifications, but we also need peer
reviewers, who cover all of the major areas of stem cell research, not just IPS and ES cells, but adult stem cells, animal models and so forth, so are you looking for a mix of people, in order to cover?

MR. STRAUSS: Well we had a discussion about that with Gary, and that’s one of the key roles he’ll be playing in looking at who he needs to maybe fill in in certain areas, although he felt fairly comfortable with what happened in last year’s process, that based upon his review of the letters of intent, that he’s fairly comfortable with the group that had already been there, so we don’t think that that’s really going to be an issue, although he’s got his eye out for that, and that will be a consideration of his and feeding into his comments in the selection process.

DR. GOLDHAMMER: Okay.

MR. STRAUSS: Okay, so, next is the process. This involves the utilization of the co-Chairs, as well as the primary and secondary reviewer, so the primary and secondary reviewer, like last year, will go through the proposals, and then independently submit them through us, and we will get them, and then provide the reviews to Gary and to the co-Chair that he’s assigned to oversee that particular proposal.
So what he plans to do is to divide up whatever number of proposals equally among the co-Chairs, so that they all have an equal load.

If there’s a strong difference of greater than one point, or one point or greater, I’m not sure exactly that fine line, but let’s say one point or greater, then the primary and secondary reviewer would be asked to chat with each other, communicate to reconcile their proposal to bring it closer, and the co-Chair will be informed about what’s happening.

The reconciliation, if they are able to do it, would go to the co-Chair for the co-Chair’s review, the co-Chair may make comments, but that would be the reconciled score.

If it’s not reconciled, then the co-Chair would review the proposal, produce a reconciliation statement and a proposal score that Gary, as Chair, would review, and that’s the proposal that would go to the study section level two.

In addition, the co-Chairs, and we have to see if this really works out, or how Gary plans to utilize them, would be involved with Gary in reviewing the core and the group proposals, so, you know, if you will, the primary and secondary reviewers would be doing the seed
and the established, Gary and the co-Chairs would be doing the cores and the groups, just as a way to divide it, but, you know, he may look at it a little differently.

The point is that we have these four co-Chairs that are assisting in the process, so now we get to, for the level two review, the co-Chair responsible for that particular proposal would have reviewed it, identified questions to ask during the study section for that type of grant, because we would do it, do the study section by type of grant, and, as we move from the lowest ranked proposals to those highest ranked, meaning the lowest score, the questioning would probably get a little more intense, in terms of whether a proposal should be re-ranked for whatever reason.

If there’s any re-ranking done at the study section level, there will be a study section reconciliation statement and a new proposal score, so that’s pretty much the process.

The package that you would get would include, at the bottom, the secondary review, the primary review, and then a cover sheet that would start with the initial primary, secondary reviewer scores and their proposal average score, and then you would see the co-Chair reconciliation statement, if any, with the co-Chair
Well I’m sorry. You would see the primary, secondary reviewer reconciliation statement with the revised scores and revised proposal score, and then, if not reconciled, you would see the co-Chair’s reconciliation statement with the co-Chair’s proposal score, and then the top item would be the study section final score, and the study section reconciliation statement, so they would say, basically, why did they change the ranking?

And these are all statements that are 150 words or less, so you would have the whole history of the review, original, any revisions, and, so, that’s pretty much the process, so, at a glance, you can see here’s the final score.

Now the final study section score might be the same as the original score, with nothing else on the page, because that would be the way it would work.

So, in order to implement this, what we’ve developed is a process outline for the reviewers, instructions for the reviewers, the timeline for the reviewers, as well as forms that they’ll be using that are fillable and all that stuff with strengths and weaknesses identified in bullets, along with the overall narrative
for the overall statement.

I think that’s about it. Any questions?

DR. GOLDSMITH: Sounds terrific.

MS. ANNE HISKES: Hello. This is Anne Hiskes calling in.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Hi, Anne. It’s Marianne. We’re just in the middle of Rick Strauss from CASE outlining the peer review process, so I think it’s going to be very thorough and transparent, and it sounds like it will be very fair.

MR. STRAUSS: Yeah. What’s interesting is, when we started the biomedical review, we had a one-level process, and, you know, the proposers, the reviewers ranked the proposals, and we had a Chair, and then we evolved from that into this two-level process that we’ve been using, and one of the comments initially was, well, you know, don’t do it like NIH does it, because, you know, we have much more ability in the way we were handling the biomedical for the reviewers to really go through an analysis and then make modifications in the rankings, so that they really felt that they were coming up with a product that would rank the top proposals the top.

And then, in the last year, they said you really need to adopt the NIH criteria, but keep your
process the same, so, you know, what we’ve used is that experience and brought into your process, and Gary thought it was going to work pretty good, especially the part where he gets four Chairs to work with to help.

And our job is to make sure he’s not dealing with any of the administrative tasks, that he’s focusing on the proposal work and the assigning of the reviewers and the consistency in the reviews, along with the co-Chairs.

DR. FISHBONE: Are the co-Chairs stem cell researchers?

MR. STRAUSS: What he did was to go back into the -- it’s all part of the reviewers, but, you know, what we said is do you want to go through the current reviewers to see if any of those, if you would like any of those people to be co-Chairs, or do you want to reach out to some of the new ones, so he said, okay, and he looked at them, and he says, okay, here’s the four co-Chairs I’d like.

Now we haven’t been in touch with them yet. That’s pending authorization for how much we’re going to pay him, so we have to get that approval, and, once we get that, then we’ll go back and say, okay.

The proposal is that the primary and
secondary reviewers are paid 3,000 and the Chair and co-Chairs are paid 4,000, so that should work out pretty good. So we have four co-Chairs identified, and they become the bench for, you know, moving into the Chair position.

DR. GOLDHAMMER: Are there any guidelines for the approximate length that a review should be?

MR. STRAUSS: The narratives are 150 words, and then the strengths and weaknesses for the categories are bullets. These are all like draft, so for each of the categories as part of the review, and the secondary reviewers are doing a partial on the total, but they’re looking at the overall proposal, and they’re not ranking the various criteria, but like the significant approach investigators, they are bulleting their strengths and weaknesses, so the narrative is a statement not to exceed 150 words, and the others should just be hopefully, you know, sentences, or, you know, bullets to say this is the strength or weakness.

DR. GOLDHAMMER: I’d say, in past years, there’s been a lot of variability in how much was written, and there’s quite often the case, where the narrative was short and not very informative, and then the scientist gets a score, and it’s really hard to know how that score
correlates with the few sentences that are on the page.

I think the NIH has also gone to much shorter reviews, apparently because it’s hard to attract reviewers if you expect multi-page kinds of narratives.

I’m hoping that’s enough detailed description of the strengths and limitations to really allow the scientist to see that what the reviewer thinks about the proposal is accurately reflected in the priority score. That’s one area that some scientists have been a little bit upset with, and the other, which I think is being dealt with beautifully, is the spread, so you have two reviews, and maybe one of them seems really positive, and then the other may not so much, but then you end up with a score, one score, and you’re not sure, you know, one of the reviews might have glowing remarks to make, but, yet, it’s a score of a four, you know, and it’s not clear how that score of a four was arrived at, so I think this process that you’re bringing to the review system will really be a nice improvement.

MR. STRAUSS: One thing I didn’t mention is that one of the things that we would like to do, and I know that the Stem Cell Research Advisory Committee looks at the scores provided by the Peer Review Committee, and then applies, you know, certain other criteria, in terms
of the funding decision, but it would be valuable to share
with the Peer Review Committee and the Chair what the
final Stem Cell Research Advisory Committee rankings are,
so that they can see whether or not there are things that
they were doing in their rankings that were confusing, or,
you know, whatever it was.

How many proposals were re-ranked or re-
ordered, plus it makes it basically re-ordered by the
Advisory Committee. Right now, there’s no feedback that’s
going back to them, especially to the Chair, because, you
know, I know that they’re looking at the best science, and
you’re making decisions based on, you know, funding
criteria that includes the best science, so not so much
dealing with why you re-rank on the basis of funding, but
if you’re re-ranking, because there’s a disagreement in a
proposal being the best science, then that would be good
for the especially for the Chair to know.

I don’t know how much the other 15
reviewers are going to look at it.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Any --

DR. GOLDFIANCE: I think we tried to stay
away from re-reviewing on a scientific basis. I think
that’s not really what we should be doing, and it really
hasn’t been what we --
DR. FISHBONE: Right.

MR. STRAUSS: So it would just be interesting to see what happens in the process.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. Thank you.

DR. GOLDHAMMER: That’s really great.

MR. STRAUSS: Okay.

DR. FISHBONE: Could I just ask one question?

MR. STRAUSS: Yes.

DR. FISHBONE: In previous years, if the scores by the two reviewers were very different, a third reviewer was brought in.

MR. STRAUSS: Right.

DR. FISHBONE: And what you’re suggesting one of the Chairs --

MR. STRAUSS: One of the co-Chairs.

DR. FISHBONE: Co-Chairs becomes that third reviewer.

MR. STRAUSS: Right, the co-Chair assigned to that proposal, and what’s nice is that with 80 some-odd reviews, each of the primary and secondary reviewers will have a total of about accommodation of 20 reviews, be it primary or secondary.

The co-Chairs will have the responsibility
for familiarizing themselves with 20 proposals, and
they’re looking at it from a slightly different
perspective, but, you know, all the reviewers are
essentially, you know, have about the same number of
proposals that they’re working on, so it should help,
especially with the co-Chair looking at 20, you know, so
we’d have, well, and they may be assigned, you know, each
co-Chair might be assigned one-fourth of the, you know,
about let’s say, if it was perfectly divided, you know,
they’re going to have a combination of seed and
established, although it depends on how Gary handles it.

Maybe he’ll have two reviewers do the
established. I’m sorry, co-Chairs, be the co-Chairs for
the established, so, you know, they may have some other
discussions for the purposes of consistency.

They might each have about 20 or whatever
it is.

DR. GOLDHAMMER: It is good to spread out
the different types of grants among as broad a group of
the peer reviewers as possible. If you don’t, you run the
risk, for instance, if there’s two or three people doing
all of the group grants, or all of one particular funding
method, and they happen to be easier or harder scores than
the average, then you bias in fair or against that
particular funding mechanism, so it is good when possible. I understand there’s limitations on so many people and lots of grants, but it is good, when possible, to try to spread out.

MR. STRAUSS: So, anyway, we’ll see how it works.

DR. FISHBONE: Sounds good.

MR. STRAUSS: Interesting. And we’ll be coming to each of your meetings to give you a progress report on how we’re doing.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: That’s great. Thank you, Rick. It’s such a relief to have you working on this.

MR. STRAUSS: Well, thanks, and you’ll get some names for the Commissioner’s approval by Friday.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: That’s terrific. Thank you.

MR. STRAUSS: I hope.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Are there any questions from anybody on the phone before Rick takes off?

MR. STRAUSS: Or sits over here.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Or sits over here.

DR. WALLACK: That was probably the most comprehensive overview of how the process is going to work.
that we have ever had.

DR. FISHBONE: Yeah. Absolutely.

MR. STRAUSS: Well, thanks.

DR. WALLACK: Great.

MR. STRAUSS: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Thank you, Rick. Okay, just one other item, quickly, an update on the California Collaborative Funding Initiative. This began when I went out to California in October, and a couple of folks out there asked to talk to me, as a representative of Connecticut, about working on some collaborative funding arrangements with them.

Paul Pescatello has been helping me out to do that, and I’ve been working with the Attorney General’s Office to find out whether we could do a Memorandum of Understanding, or how we would do that, so that we can actually sign something with California to indicate that we were interested in collaborative efforts, however that may take place, given the restrictions of California’s grant process and restrictions of Connecticut’s grant process.

They kind of realized that the research would continue to go on in both states. We would still both fund research here. We’re both bound by RFPs, or
RFAs, or whatever they call them, but, somehow, there
would be an understanding, that collaborations would be
fostered, and that the research monies would be leveraged,
and the research would be enriched by the collaboration,
whatever shape it takes, so we’re moving forward with the
possibility of getting legislation that would authorize a
Memorandum of Understanding, that we have to have
authorization to do that one state to another, so that is
going forward.

And Paul is also working with the
scientists to see if, at the next stem cell retreat -- I
believe Yale is hosting?

DR. WALLACK: Wesleyan.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Oh, Wesleyan, okay.

DR. WALLACK: April, I think.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: That we could do some
kind of a video connection, or some way of connecting the
scientists. And I think the purpose of the MOU from
California’s perspective is that they then sense that
we’re serious about doing this, and they, then, are
willing to invest some funds to bring scientists into the
state at their expense and begin the dialogue in person
here.

So we’ve missed a couple of funding
opportunities that California has that we might have been able to vote on funding, as they call it. Maryland has actually done that to some extent. The next one coming up from California is an early translational set of applications, so I’ll keep you posted on this.

Paul and I have another phone conversation with California in another couple of weeks. I think it’s just good to keep talking, keep the scientists talking, and build on the connections that are already there. Any questions on that?

DR. WALLACK: You just briefly touched on Maryland.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Um-hum.

DR. WALLACK: Did you ever want to create the triangle?

CHAIRPERSON HORN: We certainly could try to do that, yeah. Maryland’s program is very similar to ours. When I talked to Dan, it’s really all the same issues that we’ve run into here may run into, so I’ll certainly pick his brain a little bit more about how they have worked with California.

DR. WALLACK: So the legislation would then empower us to go not just to California, but to go to Maryland, or wherever else we wanted to go.
CHAIRPERSON HORN: Any other country or state.

DR. WALLACK: That’s great.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yeah, because Canada has some collaborations with California right now.

DR. WALLACK: Right.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Looking at going beyond 2015. And is there any public comment?

DR. WALLACK: Before you do, you mentioned, when Rick was speaking, about the need to have some spillover into the Advisory Committee?

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Correct. Good. Yes, we are down to 11 members on the Advisory Committee, so I think we’re down five, five members.

I did receive a couple of names. Milt, I think you tried to strong arm somebody. Dr. Genel, you tried to strong arm somebody, who, unfortunately, was committed elsewhere.

DR. GENEL: He refused to be strong armed.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: But I do have a name of somebody from the University of Hartford, who had expressed some interest, and I will follow-up on that. So if people have other ideas, we’ll look to Rick to hand some people over.
We need a business person, and I know Milt had some idea. Perhaps Paul would have some, as well.

DR. WALLACK: You know, Paul would probably be very, very good for that, because he would have the corporate types that are involved with the health care industry.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Right.

DR. WALLACK: So they may know a little bit of the language.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Um-hum. So that is definitely on my list, so that you folks don’t have to, and to get them on very quickly, so you don’t have to review so many grants.

Coming back, then, to the timeline, June 17th and 18th were the dates we had tentatively.

MS. SMITH: I think 18th and 19th.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: 18th and 19th.

MS. SMITH: The 18th is a Monday, the 19th was Tuesday.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: And we have been able to get it done in one day most of the time. People seem to like to come in on a -- have the option to come in on a Sunday evening, and then spend the day, and then go home, but I understand there are a few people, who might not be
able to do that.

   DR. WALLACK: Could you do it the week before, possibly?

   CHAIRPERSON HORN: I think we’ll have to take a poll and kind of go with that. It’s very hard, when somebody is not going to be around. We just don’t have enough people. So June -- what would that be, 11th?

   DR. GOLDHAMMER: 11th and 12th.

   CHAIRPERSON HORN: And that will give us enough clearance there. Rick, we have May and the beginning of June for stem cell reviews?

   MR. STRAUSS: Sitting here right now.

   CHAIRPERSON HORN: There will be no slippage.

   DR. GOLDHAMMER: So you’re talking about June 11th?

   CHAIRPERSON HORN: June 11th, and then we always have the possibility of going over to the 12th. How does that work for people on the phone?


   CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. Treena, did you have to go? I think I heard her hang up awhile back.

   DR. FISHBONE: Yeah. She said 2:30.

   CHAIRPERSON HORN: Anne? Sorry? Anne?
MS. HISKES: Anne Hiskes is on the phone.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes. Does June 11th, with the potential for the 12th, work for you for our reviews?

MS. HISKES: Yeah, that would be good.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: You’re not going to be anywhere exotic this year?

MS. HISKES: I usually go to Michigan for the month of July. June is good.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. And, David, does that work for you?

DR. GOLDHAMMER: It works for me.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. Milt and Gerry?

DR. WALLACK: Yup.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: And, Dr. Genel, you said okay?

DR. GENEL: Well Monday is my regular-scheduled patient day, so I have to make a change. Whether it’s the 11th or the 18th, I have to make a change.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay.

DR. GENEL: One is as bad as the other.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay.

DR. GENEL: Just don’t change it at the
last minute.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay.

DR. WALLACK: One other date that’s projected is Tuesday, the 18th, September 18th, Tuesday, September 18th. We may not be meeting that day anyway, but it’s the second day of Rosh Hashanah.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Oh, okay. And we will attempt to keep the meetings between now and the grant meeting to those that are necessary, and, at this point, it doesn’t look like we’re going have an awful lot on the agenda for next month.

We’ll send out the review of hearings, and you’ll get conflict of interest forms and all the usual things that go along with that.

If we need to meet, we’ll let you know, but, otherwise, I think we’ll just carry on and save it for June. Yes, Rick?

MR. STRAUSS: Did you go back to public comment?

CHAIRPERSON HORN: We are back in public comment. Yeah.

MR. STRAUSS: Yeah. This is just in regard to the workshop that was held. I believe CTN covered that. They didn’t? I thought it was recorded.
DR. WALLACK: It was supposed to be.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: No.

MR. STRAUSS: Okay, no problem.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Cancelled.

DR. WALLACK: But you know what, though, Rick, we have a report.

MR. STRAUSS: Yeah. No, I just thought, if it was covered, CTN only keeps it up on their website for so long, so you’d want to grab it from them.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Archive it.

MR. STRAUSS: And then you could post it, but you don’t have to worry about that.

DR. WALLACK: So would you want anything done with the verbatim report? Have we done anything with it?

CHAIRPERSON HORN: It will be posted, if it hasn’t already been posted. I think all of that was posted. Okay, so, does the Marriott in Farmington work, if they’ll have us back, since we paid the bill so late last time?

DR. WALLACK: One thing on the committee, just so you know. I know there’s a question you had about Ann Kiessling.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Um-hum.
DR. WALLACK: She e-mailed earlier today that she wasn’t going to be attending today, but it’s only because she is in Greece.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Oh.

DR. WALLACK: And that she also complimented CI for being very, very well-organized leading up to today’s meeting, and she wanted to be sure to be kept in the loop about this meeting and going forward, so it seems as though she’s --

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Good. That’s very good news. Okay, so, we’ll let people know as soon as possible after this meeting. If you could send out the June 11th and 12th are the dates that we’re looking for for a grant meeting.

Let us know as soon as possible if that will not work, and at the Farmington we can make arrangements for overnight for them. I think most people have contracts, so people who need them. David, yours is probably still sitting on somebody’s desk out at UConn, but --

DR. GOLDSMITH: Start --

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay, we could do that.

DR. FISHBONE: We don’t have a March meeting?
CHAIRPERSON HORN: At this point, we don’t have a February meeting.

DR. FISHBONE: February, but we do have a March?

CHAIRPERSON HORN: I don’t know. We’ll have to reassess. I’m thinking, unless we get an awful lot of stuff in, but we don’t know. We may end up having a lot of things that we need to go over. If it’s really just paperwork stuff, we can do it over the phone.

DR. FISHBONE: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Rather than having everybody come in. Okay. The next meeting date will be determined, but, certainly, I would say February, not February. Do we have a motion to adjourn?

DR. WALLACK: So moved.

DR. FISHBONE: Second.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: All in favor?

VOICES: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON HORN: Thank you, everybody.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.)