

VERBATIM PROCEEDINGS

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE

COMMISSIONER JEWEL MULLEN, CHAIRPERSON

OCTOBER 16, 2012

CONNECTICUT INNOVATIONS
865 BROOK STREET
ROCKY HILL, CONNECTICUT

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

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 . . .Verbatim proceedings of a meeting of
2 the Connecticut Stem Cell Research Advisory Committee held
3 on October 16, 2012 at 1:10 p.m. at Connecticut
4 Innovations, 865 Brook Street, Rocky Hill, Connecticut. . .
5 .

6
7
8
9 CHAIRPERSON MARIANNE HORN: We can go on
10 the record. We have a number of other people who will be
11 joining us. So welcome to our second October stem cell
12 meeting. We don't generally have two meetings in a month,
13 but we have an awful lot of work to do.

14 I am the Commissioner's designee for the
15 time that she is not here. She is anticipating that she
16 will get here, but not for the entire meeting.

17 I wanted to take a moment to acknowledge
18 the Nobel Prize that was awarded to two stem cell
19 scientists this month, so it's a very exciting field to be
20 in and for this process -- and I will not probably get
21 this right, process of developing iPS and I do feel very
22 privileged that actually one of the first meetings that
23 this program went to trying to promote -- let the world
24 know that Connecticut had a program -- was up in Toronto

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 at the ISSCR meeting, and I believe that's when Professor
2 Yamanaka made his announcement about this -- there was a
3 big paper that he delivered and the whole hall was abuzz
4 with this new development of iPS. And it's very exciting
5 so I feel very proud to be a part of this work and I think
6 it's just wonderful work we all do. So thank you for
7 taking the time to come here and help us to do this
8 program. We couldn't do it without you.

9 And some very exciting news, we got an
10 award certificate from the Ethics Department, Office of
11 State Ethics, 100 percent compliance on time for
12 statements of financial interest last year. So
13 congratulations to everybody. I know it can be a
14 challenge.

15 DR. MYRON GENEL: It's only because you
16 hounded us.

17 (Laughter)

18 CHAIRPERSON HORN: I will continue to do so
19 because look what we get.

20 DR. GENEL: It's not quite the Nobel Prize,
21 but second.

22 (Laughter)

23 CHAIRPERSON HORN: A near second. It was
24 certainly an accomplishment. So let's go for it this year

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 too. It won't be too long before we'll start hounding you
2 again for your next one. Hopefully we have ironed out the
3 wrinkles and it's not so difficult to get them.

4 Okay. Any other -- further announcements
5 people would like to make before we get started?

6 The approval of the October 2nd, 2012
7 minutes, could I have a motion and a second please?

8 DR. MILTON WALLACK: I'll move.

9 A MALE VOICE: Second.

10 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Second. Any discussion?
11 Corrections, comments? All in favor of adoption --
12 approval of the October 2nd, 2012 minutes?

13 VOICES: Aye.

14 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Any opposed? Any
15 recusals? Abstentions? The minutes pass. We had a
16 couple of items that came in late to the agenda. We had
17 already amended it once and then we got one in the last --
18 end of last week after the amended agenda had already been
19 posted and filed and we got one today. And rather than
20 have either a subcommittee meet or have to re-post an
21 amended-amended agenda we decided that what we would do is
22 amend the agenda today, which is perfectly legal, and hear
23 those two items so that they can get dealt with at this
24 meeting. And hopefully we will not have to meet then in

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 November. Maybe not even in December depending on what
2 comes in.

3 So the first one we wanted to deal with was
4 -- I think it was just sent out this morning. It's core
5 grant number 12-SCDUCHC01, deferral of start date to March
6 1st, 2013. Could I have a motion to amend the agenda to
7 take out this item?

8 DR. WALLACK: So moved.

9 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. And Diane second?
10 Okay. All in favor?

11 VOICES: Aye.

12 MS. SARA DONOFRIO: So for this particular
13 item the request is to rather than have a start date of
14 November 1st of this year to defer the date to March 1st
15 of 2013. Is there any discussion on that item?

16 DR. WALLACK: Move the request.

17 MS. DONOFRIO: Okay. Do I have a second?

18 DR. JAMES HUGHES: Second.

19 MS. DONOFRIO: Okay. Any further
20 discussion? All in favor?

21 VOICES: Aye.

22 MS. DONOFRIO: Opposed? Okay. Then we
23 will move onto the annual reports to be considered for
24 approval. The first report is for UConn, that's number

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 11SCDIS02. Any discussion on that item?

2 CHAIRPERSON HORN: I'm going to just remind
3 Committee members not to participate in discussion on the
4 grant with which they have a conflict and not to vote on
5 it.

6 MS. DONOFRIO: Okay. Do I have a motion
7 for approval?

8 DR. GENEL: So moved.

9 MS. DONOFRIO: Second?

10 DR. WALLACK: Second.

11 MS. DONOFRIO: Any further discussion? All
12 in favor?

13 VOICES: Aye.

14 MS. DONOFRIO: Opposed? Okay.

15 CHAIRPERSON HORN: And the next item we
16 need to have added to the agenda, it's 11SCD04 and it's a
17 University of Connecticut Health Center. The P.I. is
18 Gordon Carmichael. So went up relatively late this
19 morning so if you want to take a moment, and we have extra
20 copies up here if people would like to take a look at it.
21 David, do you need -- you can't --

22 DR. DAVID GOLDHAMER: I can't vote on it.

23 CHAIRPERSON HORN: -- sorry. So first I
24 need a motion to add this to the agenda.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 DR. WALLACK: So moved.

2 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Second?

3 DR. HUGH: Second.

4 CHAIRPERSON HORN: All in favor?

5 VOICES: Aye.

6 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Do you want to take a
7 minute and take a look at it?

8 DR. WALLACK: So can I just question while
9 we're reading it Marianne?

10 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Sure.

11 DR. WALLACK: In the lay summary can
12 somebody explain a little bit more about at the end of it
13 where he's referring to, finally we discovered that stem
14 cells lack of genetic pathway that allows most cells to
15 respond to viral infections and other pathogens.

16 CHAIRPERSON HORN: What's the question?

17 DR. WALLACK: Can somebody explain that
18 sentence to me please?

19 DR. DIANE KRAUSE: Well, he's looking at an
20 intracellular response that -- I actually didn't read it
21 in detail what he sent here, but just from what I remember
22 intracellular response to double-stranded RNA and some
23 viruses are double-stranded RNA, so we have this innate
24 immune system within ourselves that when they see double-

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 stranded RNA they react and say, hey, we've got to get rid
2 of this double-stranded RNA, there's a virus. And every
3 cell has that. But Gordon's been working on embryonic
4 stem cells and showing that in fact they use double-
5 stranded RNAs for their normal function. So they have to
6 not respond to the virus because they have to allow this
7 double-stranded RNA that they make themselves to do what
8 it's doing. I did not read that fresh, but that's close.
9 Is that close?

10 DR. GOLDHAMER: Yes, very good.

11 DR. KRAUSE: Okay.

12 DR. WALLACK: Thank you.

13 DR. HUGHES: Does that mean that they're
14 more prone to viral infection?

15 DR. KRAUSE: Theoretically, but I wasn't
16 aware of that ever being an issue. I mean, these are cells
17 that we grow in vitro, so it's not the same as thinking
18 about you and me getting a virus. I mean, maybe
19 theoretically he can test whether they are more prone to
20 viral infection. In vitro viral infection is not
21 generally an issue because we try to keep them sterile.

22 So I think this is fine. I'd vote to
23 approve it.

24 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Recommend approval?

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 DR. KRAUSE: Recommend. Thank you.

2 MS. DONOFRIO: Is there a second?

3 DR. WALLACK: Second.

4 MS. DONOFRIO: Any further discussion? All
5 in favor?

6 VOICES: Aye.

7 MS. DONOFRIO: Opposed? Okay. Now we'll
8 move on to the Health Center annual reports that were
9 received. The first item is 11SCC01, any discussion on
10 that item? Okay. The next item, 11SCA24, any discussion
11 on that? The next item, 11SCB08, any discussion on that
12 item?

13 Next is 11SCB11, any discussion on that
14 item? The next is 11SCA03, any discussion? Next is
15 11SCA39, any discussion there? And the last item for the
16 Health Center is 11SCA28, any discussion on that item?
17 Okay. Do I have a motion for approval on the Health
18 Center grants?

19 DR. GENEL: So moved.

20 MS. DONOFRIO: Second?

21 DR. HUGHES: Second.

22 MS. DONOFRIO: Any further discussion? All
23 in favor?

24 VOICES: Aye.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 MS. DONOFRIO: Opposed? Okay. And the
2 last group of annual reports received are from Yale. The
3 first item is 11SCD02, any discussion for that item?

4 DR. WALLACK: Just a comment that I thought
5 it was an excellent lay summary and also I know we're
6 going to get a report from Rick on the validation process,
7 the survey that he's doing. I think that the lay summary
8 includes information in it that from my perspective at
9 least can be used in the validation of our program that
10 Dr. Lin noted in the summary. So I wanted to bring
11 attention to that.

12 MS. DONOFRIO: Any other discussion on that
13 item? Okay. We'll move onto the next item which is
14 11SCA15, any discussion there?

15 DR. WALLACK: A similar comment and that is
16 that on this one they talk about patent applications and
17 so forth and many of them talk about publications. Some
18 are the ones from Connecticut that we just heard and as we
19 go through the Yale ones I think, again, we should be
20 keeping some of this in mind as we go forward -- go
21 forward to Rick's conversation and the survey.

22 MS. DONOFRIO: Okay. The next item
23 11SCB18, any discussion on that? Okay. We can move onto
24 11SCA34, any discussion there? The next item is 11SCA37,

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 any discussion?

2 DR. WALLACK: I didn't think the lay
3 summary was really a lay summary and maybe I'm wrong and
4 didn't read it properly, but -- anyway, that's my only
5 comment. It wouldn't prohibit me from voting on accepting
6 it, but I just wanted to make that notation.

7 MS. DONOFRIO: Okay. The next item is
8 11SCA40, any discussion on that item?

9 DR. WALLACK: Sara, on the one I didn't
10 find a lay summary. There is a summary of activities of
11 the award period. Unless I missed it I can't find --

12 MS. DONOFRIO: Caller, could you state your
13 name please?

14 DR. MARIA BOROWSKI: Sure. This is Maria
15 Borowski from UMass Medical School.

16 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Hi Maria.

17 DR. BOROWSKI: How are you?

18 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Good. How are you? No
19 lay summary?

20 DR. WALLACK: I don't see it. So I would
21 deferred this and ask for a lay summary before we act on
22 it.

23 CHAIRPERSON HORN: I'm just thinking
24 logistically if we don't meet for a month or two is this

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 something that the rest of the report would be approvable
2 if there was a lay summary submitted that was acceptable
3 to the CI?

4 DR. WALLACK: (Indiscernible, multiple
5 voices.)

6 MS. DONOFRIO: We'll move onto the next
7 item, which is 11SCB19, any discussion on that item? And
8 the last item, 11SCB23, any discussion on that item?

9 DR. WALLACK: I think Laura should be
10 commended for a very good lay summary and also for
11 achievement of certain milestone goals.

12 DR. HUGHES: If we go back to 11SCA40, on
13 page seven it has the statement for Connecticut state
14 website, I think that's what they intended as the lay
15 summary.

16 DR. WALLACK: Yeah. I think Jay is right
17 and I noted that when I read it, but I do think that we
18 still ought to ask for it to fall within the context of
19 what we're expecting.

20 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes. Is this a little
21 more sophisticated than you would be wanting in a lay
22 summary?

23 DR. WALLACK: Right.

24 CHAIRPERSON HORN: It should be clearly

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 labeled, lay summary.

2 MS. DONOFRIO: Okay. Do I have a motion
3 for approval on all items with the exception of an updated
4 lay summary for 11SCA40?

5 DR. WALLACK: So moved.

6 MS. DONOFRIO: Okay. Second?

7 A MALE VOICE: Second.

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

10 VOICES: Aye.

11 MS. DONOFRIO: Opposed? Okay. So we'll
12 move onto agenda number four, this is a no-cost extension
13 request. The project number is 10SCA18. The request is
14 for a three-month no-cost extension which would extend it
15 out until December 31st of 2012. This additional time
16 will be used for data analysis. Is there any discussion
17 on that item? Okay. Could I have a motion for approval?

18 DR. WALLACK: So moved.

19 MS. DONOFRIO: Second?

20 DR. HUGHES: Second.

21 MS. DONOFRIO: Okay. Any further
22 discussion? All in favor?

23 VOICES: Aye.

24 MS. DONOFRIO: Opposed? Okay. The next

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 item is number five, change of PI request.

2 DR. KRAUSE: I'm going to step out for this
3 one because it involves me. Is that okay?

4 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes.

5 MS. DONOFRIO: Okay. This request is to
6 change the current PI, Julianne Sosa to Diane Krause. Dr.
7 Sosa has accepted a leadership position at Duke and will
8 be leaving Yale in early 2012 -- I'm sorry, 2013. Is
9 there any discussion on that item?

10 DR. GOLDHAMER: Yeah. I have a couple of
11 comments. My understanding is that this is a seed grant
12 and most of the funds are going to fund Betty Laudin
13 (phonetic), who is a researcher at Yale. If Betty doesn't
14 have the academic title to allow her to be PI on a grant
15 according to Yale's policies, she works, she does a lot of
16 her work in Diane's lab, so this is really an
17 administrative shift and the money is going to, from my
18 understanding, go primarily for salary for Betty and to me
19 seems entirely appropriate. It's not really an additional
20 grant for Diane, it's really to fund this ongoing work
21 that Betty is really leading the efforts to.

22 MS. DONOFRIO: Okay. Any further
23 discussion? Do I have a motion for approval?

24 DR. GOLDHAMER: So moved.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 MS. DONOFRIO: Second?

2 DR. HUGHES: Second.

3 MS. DONOFRIO: Okay. All in favor?

4 VOICES: Aye.

5 MS. DONOFRIO: Opposed? The next item,
6 number six, discussion on a past-due grant. I'll refer
7 that to Joe.

8 MR. JOE LANDRY: The last time we started
9 discussion about this particular -- this prior year's
10 grant and at that time the Committee made a motion to
11 defer and tabled a conversation about second-year funding,
12 which we had omitted a couple of years ago pending receipt
13 of the technical report, on the technical report that
14 hasn't been received yet. And to help to explain the
15 situation, to update us all on where we stand, we have
16 asked or reached out to UConn to provide us some more
17 information and graciously Matt Cahill has come here today
18 to help with your thoughts on it. So if Matt had anything
19 to offer or to impart on the people please come up and
20 speak into the microphone. You might get a question or
21 two thrown at you.

22 MR. MATT CAHILL: Thank you. The update as
23 of late last night was Dr. Carter, I did speak to him via
24 e-mail, he is not going to complete the report. I've

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 reached out to another investigator who helped out Dr.
2 Carter with this project and he's agreed to help out Dr.
3 Craig Nelson, also at UConn, and from his background with
4 his knowledge about Carter's project he is going to
5 complete as best he can a report, which will hopefully be
6 acceptable to the Committee.

7 I spoke to him this morning. He didn't
8 have enough time to call-in to schedule or put anything on
9 paper, so I'm hoping that this is something that we can --
10 he can graciously help out and forward sooner rather than
11 later so this can be all cleaned up.

12 DR. WALLACK: Is there a reason why Dr.
13 Carter didn't want to do the technical report?

14 MR. CAHILL: Separation from the
15 University, that's pretty much the explanation he gave to
16 me yesterday afternoon in an e-mail. He didn't seem like
17 he was willing to help out complete the report.

18 DR. GENEL: Where is he now?

19 MR. CAHILL: I believe he's in a small
20 company within the Health Center, UConn Health Center, I
21 believe.

22 DR. GENEL: So he's still involved with the
23 Health Center?

24 MR. CAHILL: I believe so, yes.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 DR. WALLACK: And yet, he didn't want to
2 author the report?

3 MR. CAHILL: He did not want to. He did
4 not want to author the report, no.

5 DR. GOLDHAMER: If I can just comment? I
6 think he's at the Health Center in incubator space, so
7 that's rented space, you know, companies coming to rent
8 space. He's not -- doesn't have an official affiliation
9 with UConn.

10 DR. CLAIRE LEONARDI: Did he leave UConn on
11 his own accord or was he asked to leave?

12 MR. CAHILL: That detail I don't know. I
13 don't know. He was on --

14 DR. LEONARDI: You don't have to answer
15 that.

16 MR. CAHILL: -- well, but it's an easy
17 answer. It was a soft-money position and the money dried
18 -- there was no money to continue his discipline.

19 DR. LEONARDI: Not knowing the background,
20 other than you all have details -- the obligation to
21 provide the report, was that part of the original grant
22 and we paid for that?

23 CHAIRPERSON HORN: That's the interesting
24 piece of this is that we're asking for the final report,

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 and yet we haven't released the second year of the
2 funding. So it was always confusing to me about -- so we
3 release the second year of funding but it seems that this
4 is complete. Where is that funding going to go?

5 MR. CAHILL: UConn had upon confirmation of
6 -- I think it was the first annual report submission and
7 approval we had released the year two money to him so he
8 could continue his project. Obviously, without knowing
9 what would happen would happen and we'd be out at second
10 payment.

11 DR. WALLACK: So you released the money
12 without getting the money from us?

13 MR. CAHILL: Yes. We advanced him money
14 for -- yes, to keep his project going.

15 DR. WALLACK: And no one ever came back to
16 us to ask for the money? So he was able to do the project
17 supposedly because he and resources of some sort that came
18 from you guys from another source, not from us?

19 MR. CAHILL: Right, right. So essentially,
20 in the end we would be reimbursed for any expenses for
21 that additional money. That is normally how the
22 University operates. In this case it just hadn't gone
23 over smoothing it off which is how we are where we are.
24 We normally -- standard practice is to forward money to

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 researchers and get reimbursed, most of the time it's
2 after the fact. In this case it's, you're right, that
3 second payment never came.

4 DR. WALLACK: It was never requested?

5 DR. KRAUSE: Can I clarify something? At
6 least at Yale they won't start funding a grant until
7 they've received the notice of award. But when it comes
8 to subsequent years of funding, for example, I have
9 currently a Connecticut grant that the next year starts on
10 October 1. Yale has put that in my budget and I'm using
11 it. The funds have not yet been received at Yale for the
12 year two funds on my proposal. That's just standard. We
13 don't watch the nitty-gritty. Somebody behind the scenes
14 is making sure that the second-year funding arrives and
15 somehow that didn't happen. But it's not something that
16 the PI sees at all.

17 CHAIRPERSON HORN: So up -- at the end of
18 the first year than a report was submitted and approved by
19 the Committee and then for some reason the funding was not
20 released. And what we don't have now is the final report
21 that would confirm that that work was actually done even
22 though we should have paid for that after the first
23 technical report was submitted.

24 DR. JOE LANDRY: Well, we did receive the

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 fiscal report, which is their budget, you know, telling us
2 the numbers that they had spent. We did not receive a
3 technical report.

4 CHAIRPERSON HORN: After the first year?

5 DR. LANDRY: Even after the second year.

6 CHAIRPERSON HORN: After the second year.

7 DR. KRAUSE: But see, that's very
8 important.

9 DR. LANDRY: I mean, we did receive the
10 final accounting, but we --

11 DR. KRAUSE: But the accounting just says
12 the money was spent, we don't know what it was spent on.

13 DR. LANDRY: -- right. We don't have the
14 technical report, right.

15 MR. CAHILL: So if everything had gone as
16 scheduled UConn would have been, you know, Yale didn't pay
17 that second piece, but then -- so we would have all of the
18 money the report would still be missing, so there would
19 still be an issue about the report.

20 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes. But we would have
21 given you all of the money and we would be talking about
22 just not the report, but the money.

23 MR. CAHILL: Correct.

24 DR. WALLACK: So Nelson was never on the

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 project then?

2 MR. CAHILL: He was, yes, for a brief
3 period. He helped out Dr. Carter, yes.

4 DR. WALLACK: Short period. Okay.
5 Marianne, I don't think that we -- I know that Matt didn't
6 bring this up yet, but I don't think we in anticipation of
7 that may be coming up could release any additional funds
8 without a report. And I'm sort of surprised that someone
9 who we've worked with through the years, I mean, this
10 isn't the first situation with Carter, that he is somehow
11 for some reason hesitant about submitting that final
12 report. I mean, something doesn't sound right. And you
13 even noted Matt, with all due respect, that there was some
14 money issue, some sort of money issue that made him go
15 over to the incubator space.

16 MR. CAHILL: Yes.

17 DR. WALLACK: I think we need really hard
18 clarification.

19 DR. GOLDHAMER: We need to separate the
20 responsibilities of the PI from the fiscal issue of -- I
21 mean, it seems to me though that if the money should have
22 been released and wasn't, and the University is out that
23 money, they didn't do anything -- the University didn't do
24 anything wrong, I'm not sure why we would hold up the

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 release of that money to the University in the absence of
2 a technical report, which happens after the fact at the
3 end of the project anyway, we're talking about something
4 that should've happened at the beginning of year two. So
5 the University in good faith pre-advanced the money.

6 CHAIRPERSON HORN: It is -- it is an
7 unusual situation where now we are at the end of the day
8 and we don't have this report and so to release the money
9 without the assurance that all went well and that second
10 year I think it's probably prudent although I do see your
11 point that had we released it back in the first year they
12 would have had the money.

13 DR. LEONARDI: Are there two issues here
14 that there was money already spent that was requested that
15 we didn't release and that's in addition to the 75,000 to
16 subcontract to do the analysis? Or am I looking at the
17 wrong thing?

18 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Right.

19 DR. LEONARDI: That's a different thing?

20 CHAIRPERSON HORN: That's a second.

21 DR. LEONARDI: Okay.

22 CHAIRPERSON HORN: This is just about a
23 two-year grant where the second year of funding -- the
24 reporting was submitted, but we didn't release the

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 funding, and now they're at the end of the grant and the
2 PI has moved on and isn't wanting to submit the final --

3 DR. LEONARDI: Did we get a request that
4 was in the ordinary course that we didn't fund?

5 MR. LANDRY: Well, no. It wasn't brought
6 to our attention that we didn't fund, but they're not
7 obligated to do that I don't believe. It's just our
8 responsibility when we get that first annual report
9 requesting then get the second funding to then supply the
10 awarding institution.

11 DR. LEONARDI: So we might have made a
12 mistake?

13 MR. LANDRY: We slipped up back then a
14 couple of years ago not sending the second \$100,000
15 amount. It wasn't noted by our people and it wasn't noted
16 by UConn's people based on however they do their
17 accounting or how we did ours back then either. Okay. So
18 now we've found that we didn't send them their 100,000.
19 It's the only one in the whole program that I found that,
20 I mean, we've missed.

21 DR. GENEL: I was going to ask, we don't
22 have any other --

23 MR. LANDRY: No, I've scoured through and
24 there aren't any others that haven't been made, no. And

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 you would think that normally they would note that they
2 haven't received money, but it's only \$100,000 and in the
3 big scheme of things it's probably not in their million
4 dollars worth of buckets and something that they were able
5 to cover and they funded the PI and, you know, on that
6 project. So unfortunately now though we're at this point
7 where they also haven't provided that last fiscal report,
8 which usually buttons up the contract and then you're all
9 set. So now we're at this -- we're at a little bit of an
10 impasse here of what to do.

11 CHAIRPERSON HORN: And again, one of the
12 investigators has volunteered to put some kind of a report
13 together, not the PI?

14 MR. CAHILL: Right, not the PI, yes. And
15 I'm hoping to work with him to bring something to the
16 committee that will be enough to wrap the project up.

17 DR. GENEL: I would suggest that we defer
18 any action until we see whatever emerges as a final
19 technical report. The money -- the money should have been
20 sent two years ago, another couple of months is not going
21 to make any difference I would think. And at least we
22 have something -- then at least we have something tangible
23 that we can talk about.

24 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yeah. We'll have to

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 look at whether there needs to be some kind of
2 substitution for the PI in order for that to have that
3 person sign off on it.

4 DR. KRAUSE: I don't remember the financial
5 report. Is there anything in there that looks surprising
6 or just paid his salary -- this was just a seed grant,
7 right?

8 MR. LANDRY: Yes it was.

9 DR. KRAUSE: So, that covers salary and
10 just a little bit in terms of supplies.

11 DR. HUGHES: A point of information. Is
12 there anything in the agreement with the researchers when
13 the money is disbursed that if there -- it was completely,
14 you know, if no research was done that they would be
15 obliged to return the money?

16 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes.

17 DR. HUGHES: There is?

18 CHAIRPERSON HORN: With interest.

19 DR. LEONARDI: I feel like this was a
20 change in process, I mean, it was our -- it sounds like it
21 was our error and the requirement of a technical report
22 isn't typically required, you know, to receive that second
23 year of funding. So I'm wondering if this -- again, I
24 don't have the same experience, but if this is off process

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 you're here asking for something you don't usually ask for
2 to get the funding.

3 DR. GENEL: No, but they haven't had the
4 funding for a couple of years so I don't see that a couple
5 of months is going to make any difference. But at least
6 will have some sort of a document.

7 DR. LEONARDI: Is it a decision point?
8 Let's say you don't like the document. It's just a what-
9 if?

10 DR. GENEL: Okay. Well, that's -- question
11 -- but I'd rather raise it before the money is spent --

12 VOICE: I'm sorry, could you move closer to
13 the microphone?

14 MR. LANDRY: Then we need you to request a
15 change in that this new PI will take over and finish the
16 report properly and have it approved by --

17 MR. CAHILL: Well, that would be -- that's
18 a concern of mine as well. If he can provide something
19 what would you guys need to be -- make it acceptable from
20 him. Normally the PI signs it, forwards it to our office,
21 our director signs it and that comes here. We just --
22 because this particular individual is just helping out
23 would it be acceptable to just have our director on behalf
24 of UConn sign it approving the report without the second

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 signature? Because he doesn't want to become the actual
2 PI on this project. He doesn't want to become responsible
3 for it. He's just offered to help out, complete the
4 report based on his familiarity with Dr. Carter's work.

5 A MALE VOICE: Just as a favor to him.

6 DR. WALLACK: It's not a favor him, he's
7 doing it as a favor to you guys.

8 MR. CAHILL: Absolutely. Yes, yes, yes.
9 So would it be necessary to do a PI change --

10 CHAIRPERSON HORN: We need somebody who's
11 responsible for signing off on the report and that the
12 work was done and that typically is a PI. It's not a huge
13 thing to change the PI, we just had one here, and I think
14 it would be kind of a formality at this point to do that.
15 We could have a discussion off line, I could look at it a
16 little bit more and see whether there isn't somebody else
17 who could step in to do that because I know that becoming
18 a retroactive PI is probably not something that he's
19 really wanting to do.

20 MR. CAHILL: Right.

21 DR. HUGHES: It seems like there's two
22 questions. One is, are we trying to establish some new --
23 that to get money you have to submit this report and I
24 don't think we want to say that. But it seems like we do

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 want to say that our fiduciary responsibility vis-a-vis
2 the state monies requires that we investigate whether
3 research was actually done in this situation and once
4 we're certain that it has been that we can proceed with
5 it.

6 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes.

7 DR. LEONARDI: But one of the obligations
8 of the money is the final technical report, correct?

9 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes.

10 DR. LEONARDI: -- figure out how --

11 MR. LANDRY: (Indiscernible, too far from
12 mic.).

13 MR. CAHILL: Right. Absolutely, right.

14 DR. KRAUSE: It sounds to me, and I agree
15 that we need to get additional information before deciding
16 whether the technical report that we get from Craig Nelson
17 is adequate, but it sounds to me that the work was -- this
18 is the first technical report after year one, the very
19 first sentence says, we're collaborating with Craig
20 Nelson. So that makes a lot of sense that as the work
21 continued in year two and monies were spent on grad
22 students, on Dr. Carter's salary, and on materials that
23 those things went to research. And the question is, was
24 it appropriate research, and I would imagine Craig might

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 know, it would depend on, you know, where those materials
2 were bought. But I don't think it's going to be too
3 difficult for Craig to say yes, the research continued in
4 year two. We just kind of need to hear that from him.

5 MR. CAHILL: Absolutely.

6 DR. KRAUSE: That, you know, the money
7 didn't go to another project altogether, because that
8 would be a misspending of the money.

9 DR. WALLACK: This would be a very easy
10 solution, I mean, to just move forward and give UConn the
11 other \$100,000. But I think the thing that sort of is of
12 concern to me, this is the first time that I remember in
13 six-some-odd years that a PI was unwilling to do a final
14 report. I mean, many of the PI's -- some PI's have left
15 and they've still done final reports. This individual
16 hasn't even left, I mean, I know it's different, the
17 incubator space in the back there, but it's still within
18 the confines of 400 Farmington, I mean, he's still there.

19 So, yeah, I would -- I understand
20 Claire, what you said about some of its our responsibility
21 and so forth, but I would still look at this point for
22 that issue alone, the fact that we can't get information,
23 I want more information before we release anything else.
24 That's me personally.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. I'm hearing a
2 consensus. Could we have a motion to that effect?

3 DR. WALLACK: I'll move that we do not at
4 this time accept the Carter -- the final report that's so
5 far been presented and we ask for further clarification on
6 the technical report and that once we receive that we will
7 then consider, however you want to say that, the
8 distribution of the last \$100,000 back to UConn.

9 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Do I have a second?

10 DR. HUGHES: Second.

11 CHAIRPERSON HORN: All in favor?

12 VOICES: Aye.

13 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Any opposed? The motion
14 carries. And if there are concerns about who can actually
15 sign that we can have a conversation off-line and figure
16 that out. It should be a PI, so let's go for that.

17 MR. CAHILL: Okay. Thank you.

18 MS. DONOFRIO: The next agenda item, number
19 seven, request to subcontract. The number is 10SCB12.
20 They have requested approval to subcontract just over
21 75,000 of their total awarded amount. This is to allow
22 for the project's co-PI's to assist the research team to
23 analyze data experiments. Is there any discussion on that
24 item?

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 DR. KRAUSE: I didn't have a chance to read
2 it. I apologize. Is this Yale or UConn?

3 MS. DONOFRIO: This one is UConn.

4 DR. KRAUSE: Okay. So is this person to
5 whom they're subcontracting in Connecticut?

6 A MALE VOICE: Yes.

7 DR. KRAUSE: Okay. That would be my only
8 concern.

9 MS. DONOFRIO: Any other discussion on that
10 item? Do I have a motion for approval?

11 DR. KRAUSE: I motion for approval.

12 MS. DONOFRIO: Second?

13 A VOICE: Second.

14 MS. DONOFRIO: Okay. All in favor?

15 VOICES: Aye.

16 MS. DONOFRIO: Opposed? Okay. We'll move
17 to agenda number eight and to Rick Strauss for his update.

18 MR. RICK STRAUSS: Okay. Rick Strauss,
19 Executive Director of the Connecticut Academy of Science
20 and Engineering. So we're going to chat about our
21 progress on the Connecticut Stem Cell Research Program
22 Review Accomplishments Project. Over the last couple of
23 weeks we went through several iterations of the principal
24 investigator's survey, finalized it and distributed it

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 last evening to the principal investigators for them to
2 complete the survey. We've already had a couple that have
3 at least started work on entering their survey information
4 into the survey tool.

5 Does anybody need a copy of the current
6 version? We have several. Also, over the last couple of
7 weeks with the assistance of Matt, Isolde and Paula have
8 been verifying the information on the PI's, including
9 collecting final reports and projects that have been
10 completed --

11 MS. DONOFRIO: Caller, would you please
12 state your name?

13 DR. RICHARD DEES: Hi. Richard Dees.

14 MS. DONOFRIO: Okay. Thanks Richard.

15 MR. STRAUSS: -- including having them
16 provide us with copies of final reports for grants that
17 have been completed that were not included in the
18 information that CI sent to us or that we couldn't find
19 any information the CI submitted to us. So they'll become
20 part of the information that we have. We've already been
21 to the cloud information site that could be part of a
22 permanent record of the project.

23 Also, we started work on putting together
24 the survey questionnaire template for interviewing the

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 stem cell research leaders in each of these institutions.

2 Mark LeLand, Laura Graybol (phonetic), and Hyken Lin
3 (phonetic) and we have those interviews scheduled I
4 believe for November 14th and they'll be held at our
5 offices at CERC in Rocky Hill. And that draft template
6 that we are putting together is a work in progress and may
7 be modified after we start getting some results in from
8 the principal investigators because that information may
9 lead us to other questions we may want to ask the
10 institutions.

11 We'll also send this out to the two review
12 teams that we have working on this so that -- so that
13 would go to Marianne, Claire, Mike, David and Paul
14 Pescatello as well as our Study Committee. So they'll be
15 a couple of different reviews of that for comment and then
16 we'll eventually share that over the next couple of weeks
17 with the Advisory Committee.

18 In general, the components of the
19 institutional survey will look for general information
20 such as if the institution has identified a mission or a
21 vision for its stem cell research program, whether they
22 have a strategic plan for that or an action plan for their
23 work. Then looking at the kinds of impact that they
24 believe that Connecticut Stem Cell Research Program has

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 had regarding their institution in stem cell research
2 program, any key strengths that they feel they have and
3 any weaknesses in their program.

4 And then, are they offering any education
5 programs in stem cell research and also trying to identify
6 the extent of that reach activity beyond universities.
7 Regarding funding, we'll be looking at total stem cell
8 research funding received from Connecticut Stem Cell
9 Research Grants, additional leverage funding as that could
10 be attributed to the Connecticut Stem Cell Research
11 Funding. We'll also be looking at total scientific
12 research funding at the institutions to try to identify
13 whether Connecticut Stem Cell Research effort is additive
14 or is the result of changing priorities in research or
15 opportunities for funding.

16 So that can work either way or a
17 combination and including other factors such as breaking
18 out any ARRA funding that the institutions may receive for
19 scientific research over the period of the Connecticut
20 Stem Cell Research Program that might show up less or an
21 increase in scientific research funding so that it's clear
22 as to the components of that to the extent that that's
23 possible. That one we specifically wrote out.

24 And then in terms of facilities we'd be

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 looking at, you know, what's occurred in terms of number
2 of laboratories or square footage of labs, buildings, the
3 same kind of thing. And in a variety of staffing
4 questions looking at, you know, the intellectual resources
5 that came or are now being dedicated to stem cell research
6 or for related activities as a result of the stem cell
7 research program.

8 And then a series of questions on key
9 results at the institutional level that they would cite as
10 being major accomplishments. That's somewhat duplicative
11 of what we might get for the principal investigators that
12 we could use to confirm what we are finding from the
13 principal investigators and how they're viewing
14 priorities.

15 And then a couple of questions dealing with
16 what might occur in the absence of future Connecticut Stem
17 Cell Research funding and what might that result in as
18 well as any Connecticut Stem Cell policies or issues they
19 might have with the policies, how the program might be
20 improved. So those are kind of like the general areas.
21 If anybody had any specific general comments or
22 suggestions. Milt, we took into consideration what you
23 have, you know, what you provided initially in terms of
24 you were thinking maybe of the PI survey, but in general,

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 also the institutional survey.

2 DR. WALLACK: So, I may have missed it in
3 your review of what you'll be doing. Was the issue of
4 economic enhancement addressed at all? I'm specifically
5 thinking in terms of attracting scientists from out-of-
6 state and the overall situation having to do with job
7 creation within the state. I know, at least from what
8 I've gathered, from what I've heard, that there have been
9 people because of the program who have had job
10 opportunities that they otherwise wouldn't have had
11 created vis-a-vis our program, so I have that question.

12 And secondly, going back to the first part
13 of what you are saying, are we going to be looking for
14 information -- I know you talked about achievements,
15 specifically sort of prime the pump if you will, having to
16 do with patents and publications, specifically patents,
17 because obviously publications they'll think of.

18 MR. STRAUSS: I guess the answers would be,
19 yes, yes, and yes.

20 DR. WALLACK: Okay. I understand the yes
21 and the yes to the patents and the publications.

22 MR. STRAUSS: And the first one.

23 DR. WALLACK: Okay.

24 DR. KRAUSE: He specifically asks in the

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 questionnaire, did you come to Connecticut because of the
2 stem cell funding? Did you stay in Connecticut because of
3 the stem cell funding? Both of those, and then he's asked
4 the PI's what jobs were created by the Connecticut Stem
5 Cell Funding?

6 DR. WALLACK: All right. So let me pursue
7 that. I don't think that -- that's good. I think we can
8 take one additional step, and that is I think that the
9 directors of the program, because I've heard them talk
10 about this in legislative sessions, can address specific
11 job creations, 150 jobs at Yale or UConn or whatever, and
12 somehow or other, I'm not sure from what I'm hearing, that
13 we are going to get that information, which I think is
14 important for us to get.

15 MR. STRAUSS: That would be in the -- in
16 our questionnaire to them --

17 DR. WALLACK: Of what?

18 MR. STRAUSS: -- regarding staffing. Now,
19 you brought up an interesting point. You're talking about
20 job creation, so what I had indicated was the funding
21 area, which also goes to the staffing area, is that are
22 the jobs we're talking about additive? Or are they moving
23 from some other form of scientific research into stem cell
24 research? Now, it may be that that means that the

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 University -- let's say they are moving and they're not
2 additive, well, that may be a good thing because they're
3 adapting to a changing environment and priority needs and
4 what's the most important research for the university to
5 do.

6 Now, what might be really good if the
7 report showed, and the information showed, that it was
8 additive so all the research over here is continuing in
9 scientific research, but in addition to that there's all
10 this other stem cell research going on that really
11 resulted in job creation as compared to job retention. So
12 we have to try to get to the bottom of that. Now that's
13 not necessarily going to be a real easy thing to do, but
14 that would be a question to have them kind of, you know,
15 tweak out for us. To show us that it really is job
16 creation.

17 COMMISSIONER JEWEL MULLEN: How are you?

18 DR. WALLACK: Good, thank you.

19 COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Hi everybody. I want
20 to encourage us to understand the importance of that
21 question and then give ourselves permission to determine
22 the salience of that question in this work because it's
23 not as if we're about to open up a factory and employ
24 1,000 people. And it might be, and you might've said this

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 while I was out on the phone, helpful to contextualize
2 what job creation means in a report like this, rather than
3 want people to think there is a single measure that can be
4 applied across any job creating effort in the state of
5 Connecticut because they're not comparable. And, you
6 know, people move in and out of science and different
7 endeavors for so many different reasons that we also want
8 to be careful not to be pigeonholed into a single way of
9 thinking about this in an evolving field.

10 You know, even if you look at the numbers
11 of jobs that the Jackson Bioscience Initiative is slated
12 to create over the next decade some people might look and
13 say, is that all, for the investment. If so -- so, you
14 know, it might be that another part of the report is just
15 to help frame that in a way that we're priming people to
16 know what kinds of answers to listen for rather than have
17 them think that there's a single kind of response that's
18 going to be the one for them. That's all.

19 MR. STRAUSS: Well, that's a good point and
20 it goes to one of the comments that Representative Walker
21 made in the Bioscience and Economy Forum where she was
22 looking for, how do I explain this to my -- I'm
23 paraphrasing, how do I explain this to my constituents as
24 to the importance of your programming? You know, for

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 however much money the Jackson lab thing is costing,
2 \$800,000,000, or whatever, we're creating 500 jobs. Well,
3 you know, if unemployment is at eight percent and one
4 percent is 15,000 jobs, you know, what's a couple of
5 hundred jobs? So, you know, it goes beyond simply the job
6 creation and to what are the overall perhaps, societal
7 benefits, of really achieving progress in this field for,
8 you know, the human race?

9 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Any other comments for
10 Rick?

11 DR. WALLACK: So, I totally agree with -- and I think
12 you're going to cover it very, very well, these societal
13 benefits.

14 MR. STRAUSS: I will try.

15 DR. WALLACK: Well, having read the first
16 survey and from what you just said, I know you're going to
17 do that. And I guess, yes, I am driven by something that
18 you referred to from Representative Walker. And
19 Appropriations Committee meetings that I sat in on myself,
20 and I think somehow or other they're looking for more
21 explicit information pertaining to that. And I understand
22 the difference in the matrix and so forth, I really do,
23 but I just hope Rick that when you finalize the survey it
24 doesn't become oblique and looking for that kind of

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 information, but that it becomes very, very direct.
2 Because if it does -- and the reference I made on purpose
3 obviously to Dr. Lin's report, because he does talk about
4 coming from one researcher to 78 labs or some such thing,
5 I think we have to be proud of what we've accomplished but
6 also be able to share that information very, very
7 explicitly and clearly with the public. And I'm a little
8 concerned that we're not getting as explicit, for some
9 reason, I don't know why, in the questions. I don't think
10 that -- and I know you're going to be interpreting it --

11 MR. STRAUSS: Which survey are we talking
12 to?

13 DR. WALLACK: -- I'm talking now about this
14 one.

15 MR. STRAUSS: Well, I didn't give you this
16 one. I just told you about --

17 DR. WALLACK: I understand.

18 MR. STRAUSS: -- I summarized what we're
19 going to do.

20 DR. WALLACK: I get it. I get it. But I
21 just want to make sure that we --

22 MR. STRAUSS: I mean, I could read the
23 three pages of detailed stuff that we're going to
24 specifically ask, but right now this is in draft form and

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 before it shared with the Advisory Committee it needs to
2 before it's shared with the Advisory Committee it needs to
3 go through a multi-step review process so that it's then
4 ready for you to look at.

5 DR. WALLACK: -- I get all of that, but I
6 also know that once we get that in two or three weeks,
7 whenever it is --

8 MR. STRAUSS: It still may not be specific
9 enough for you.

10 DR. WALLACK: -- right. And it's more
11 difficult at that point to create changes from the
12 recommendations that we'll be making. So I'm just
13 offering an idea now --

14 MR. STRAUSS: Let me just -- let me just --

15 DR. WALLACK: -- you go back and
16 (indiscernible, talking over each other).

17 MR. STRAUSS: -- well let me just take a
18 minute about what -- what we're using this for. This is,
19 as I said, interview -- a survey/interview template. This
20 is to be used by us to share with the institutional
21 leaders for them to prepare for the discussion with our
22 research team so that we can then probe without leading.
23 We want them to tell us the story based upon the questions
24 we're going to ask. Based on their responses there's

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 follow-up, this is kind of like a presidential debate.

2 DR. GENEL: Well, it's really structured --
3 it's really a structured interview, isn't it? I mean --

4 MR. STRAUSS: Right.

5 DR. GENEL: -- that sort of terminology.

6 MR. STRAUSS: Yeah. And, you know,
7 initially we have an hour and a half with each of the
8 institutional leaders, we're meeting with them
9 individually, and these are the stem cell leaders, based
10 upon what we hear we may also want to interview the
11 institutional research leaders in addition to the stem
12 cell research leaders to gain further, broader
13 perspectives on the program so there may be a third step
14 in the process. But this is for probing, you know, we
15 want to get to information. It may mean that they're
16 going to go back and based on the questions and responses
17 they'll be asked to provide us with some additional
18 information, clarification of data so that we can get to,
19 you know, some more concrete answers if they're not
20 provided. So there's a little bit of trust that this
21 might work.

22 COMMISSIONER MULLEN: That sounds like the
23 earlier stages of qualitative research and a more
24 qualitative than a quantitative.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 MR. STRAUSS: It's both. It's going to be,
2 you know, using the quantitative information to build a
3 story, what's happening and what they're projecting will
4 happen based on, you know, where they see this going over
5 the next several years.

6 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Any other comments for
7 Rick? So Rick, in terms of process, we're anticipating no
8 meeting in November.

9 MR. STRAUSS: No meeting in November?

10 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes, I know, that's very
11 hard, but we're anticipating no meeting. It would be the
12 week of Thanksgiving, so -- in terms of getting this out
13 to people and having them take a quick look at it and give
14 you feedback.

15 MR. STRAUSS: Right. Well, what we'll plan
16 to do is we're going to get the draft more set up for
17 review. There's a couple of things we have to do with it.
18 We'll then send it out to the review teams and get
19 comments in hopefully over the next week and looking at
20 and distributing it to the Advisory Committee for any
21 other comments probably by the end of the month with the
22 intent to wrap this up so that we have the final version
23 of it shortly thereafter. Maybe we can get it out even a
24 little quicker than that so that we can get it in the

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 hands of, you know, the people that are going to be
2 looking at this, you know, no later than like November 4th
3 or 5th so they have about 10 days to get ready.

4 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Just in terms of the
5 process, I would ask you to just send your comments
6 directly back to Rick rather than reply all so we don't
7 get into an illegal meeting. And I don't know that we
8 need to approve this from the Board, I think we've had
9 enough discussion. We've approved the concept of it so
10 that would require another meeting, so if we can just say
11 that we have approved the reporting concept and that any
12 individual comments will be considered by the review team
13 and by Rick and put into the final form and we'll just
14 have to have faith that we're going to get all of the
15 relevant information out from all of these folks and into
16 a really good report.

17 MR. STRAUSS: Okay. Thanks.

18 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Any public comment?

19 MR. STRAUSS: Oh, well, as a matter fact --

20 (Laughter)

21 CHAIRPERSON HORN: You had your chance.

22 You put on your other hat, right?

23 MR. STRAUSS: -- well, it's a public
24 comment, but it's related to background information about

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 process with regard to one of the items that you took up
2 today that I'd just kind of like to get clarified. So we
3 can talk like in general terms.

4 The Stem Cell Research Advisory Committee
5 makes the decision to award a grant to a principal
6 investigator. Let's say it's a seed grant. And they're
7 doing that on the basis of the principle investigator
8 being peer-reviewed, but the grant is not under contract,
9 and the person leaves and then you're in a position where
10 you may get a request for a change in principal
11 investigator. But it's not under contract, the work is
12 not underway and the decision was made based upon -- the
13 whole process was based on who the PI is, which is a
14 different situation than once you're under contract for
15 when you have procedures in place for dealing with the
16 change of principal investigator.

17 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Well, I think we do have
18 the procedure --

19 MR. STRAUSS: Well, maybe you do, I don't
20 know. Maybe there is a procedure for when it's not
21 awarded, it's not a signed agreement, but is awarded.

22 CHAIRPERSON HORN: -- yes, it's either in
23 the RFP or in the assistance agreement for requesting a
24 PI. Because we did have the situation come up where we

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 didn't -- we addressed it after the award was granted, but
2 we didn't have any procedure in place for prior to that.
3 So we do say before or after the execution of the
4 agreement. If there's a change the PI has to come back
5 before the Committee for approval of the PI, which we did
6 it today. I'll pull that language out for you, but you'll
7 have to take it --

8 MR. STRAUSS: No, but well, thanks for
9 that.

10 CHAIRPERSON HORN: -- yeah. Yeah we had
11 exactly that situation and I don't recall what we did with
12 that actually.

13 A MALE VOICE: I don't remember a
14 situation.

15 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yeah. Whether we
16 approved that PI or whether we didn't fund the grants and
17 took one that was standing in line. I think we accepted
18 the change of PI, but we weren't very comfortable about it
19 because of the lack of process.

20 Anybody else have any public comment? So I
21 know we're moving onto -- so we're coalescing around a
22 date in June, so thank you all, I know it's ridiculously
23 early in the year to get this on your calendars, but I
24 appreciate those that could attend because it's a date

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 that seems to be working for everybody, so just hold onto
2 that date.

3 DR. WALLACK: June 10th?

4 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes. And as my boss,
5 Happy Bosses Day.

6 COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Oh, thank you.

7 DR. DEES: This is Richard Dees. Is that
8 June 10th?

9 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes, June 10th.

10 DR. DEES: Thank you.

11 CHAIRPERSON HORN: We'll send out a
12 confirmation on that. And we're going to go for one day
13 this time. Dr. Mullen reminded me that we usually held
14 two days, but the last two years we've gotten it done in
15 one day, so we'll try to get it done again in one day. It
16 may be a little bit of a marathon day, but --

17 DR. HUGHES: 8:00 to 4:00 usually?

18 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yeah, 8:30 to 5:00 or
19 whatever we do, we just ask people not to make heavy dates
20 for the evening.

21 (Laughter)

22 COMMISSIONER MULLEN: But we were finished
23 by 5:00 or shortly thereafter.

24 CHAIRPERSON HORN: We've got a better

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 16, 2012

1 system. People tend to lose the girth a little bit toward
2 the end of the day. Is there anything else anybody wants
3 to say? Do I have a motion to adjourn?

4 DR. WALLACK: So move.

5 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Second?

6 DR. HUGHES: Second.

7 CHAIRPERSON HORN: All in favor?

8 VOICES: Aye.

9 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Thank you very much.

10 (Whereupon, the hearing adjourned at 2:20

11 p.m.)