

VERBATIM PROCEEDINGS

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MARIANNE HORN, ACTING CHAIRPERSON

NOVEMBER 2, 2011

CONNECTICUT INNOVATIONS  
865 BROOK STREET  
ROCKY HILL, CONNECTICUT

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

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 . . .Verbatim Proceedings of a meeting of  
2 the Stem Cell Research Advisory Committee held on November  
3 2, 2011 at 12:15 p.m. at Connecticut Innovations, 865  
4 Brook Street, Rocky Hill, Connecticut...

5  
6  
7  
8 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIANNE HORN: This is  
9 Marianne. The Commissioner has designated me to stand in  
10 for her today since she's involved with numerous emergency  
11 response activities and regrets she can't be here. We do  
12 have a really big agenda. I do want to note that we have  
13 the presence of a quorum. We have David Goldhammer, Ron  
14 Hart, and Paul Pescatello on the phone. And just, please,  
15 identify yourselves when you speak for the Court Reporter.  
16 And Gerry Fishbone and Milt Wallack are here in person. We  
17 should have Dr. Genel joining us about 1:00 and perhaps  
18 some other folks phoning in. But, unless my math is off,  
19 we do have a quorum.

20 So, I apologize in advance if I have to  
21 take a few calls. I also am on the emergency response team  
22 at the Department and I'm expecting a number of calls. So  
23 I will probably hand it over to Chelsey to continue the  
24 chairing if I have to take a call.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1                   With that, may I have a motion on the  
2                   September 20, 2011 minutes?

3                   DR. MILTON WALLACK: So on the minutes, you  
4                   may just want to note on page two in the third paragraph  
5                   it says, "he discussed some of the successes of the core -  
6                   - this is in reference to Marc LeLande -- noting that it  
7                   is a joint operation with Wesleyan, who is the core  
8                   director". I think that that sentence should end, a joint  
9                   operation with Wesleyan period because Wesleyan is not the  
10                  core director. And a few lines later, Marc noted that the  
11                  UCONN core for human embryonic stem cell lines, for human  
12                  embryonic stem cell lines were developed and deposited. I  
13                  think it should be noted that they were not just deposited  
14                  but accepted by the NIH. So those editorial changes. And I  
15                  don't have any others.

16                 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. So do we  
17                 have a motion to accept the minutes with those changes?

18                 DR. WALLACK: I'll move that we accept it  
19                 with those changes.

20                 DR. GERALD FISHBONE: I'll second.

21                 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. Any further  
22                 discussion? All in favor?

23                 ALL VOICES: Aye.

24                 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. The minutes

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 are adopted.

2 So we can move onto the approval of the  
3 2008 annual reports. And I'll turn it over to Chelsey.

4 MS. CHELSEY SARNECKY: So at the last  
5 meeting the way we approved these annual reports, in the  
6 essence of time, was to approve them as one agenda item.  
7 And if any of the Board members had an issue with the  
8 annual reports they could call their specific issue out to  
9 the Committee.

10 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Oaky.

11 MS. SARNECKY: So I think we should  
12 probably do that. So I'll ask if anyone has any  
13 questions, or comments, or requests regarding the 2008  
14 reports?

15 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: And I just would  
16 point out if anybody has a conflict of interest with any  
17 of these that they -- it's noted that they will recuse  
18 themselves from the discussion.

19 DR. WALLACK: I'll move the acceptance.

20 MS. SARNECKY: Second?

21 DR. WALLACK: For approval.

22 MS. SARNECKY: Anyone?

23 DR. FISHBONE: I'll second.

24 MS. SARNECKY: All those in favor?

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 ALL VOICES: Aye.

2 MS. SARNECKY: Opposed? Okay.

3 Moving on to Agenda Item No. 4, we only  
4 have one 2009 report. The reason why this one is kind of  
5 off skew it was sent in a little late so it missed the  
6 cutoff for the last meeting. Does anyone have any  
7 questions, or comments, or requests for the 2009 report?

8 DR. WALLACK: No. Move the acceptance.

9 DR. FISHBONE: Second.

10 MS. SARNECKY: All those in favor?

11 ALL VOICES: Aye.

12 MS. SARNECKY: Opposed? Okay.

13 Moving on.

14 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Is everybody on  
15 the phone able to hear Chelsey okay? Great, thanks.

16 MS. SARNECKY: Wonderful. Agenda Item No.  
17 5, approval of the 2010 annual reports. Comments,  
18 questions, requests?

19 DR. FISHBONE: Some of them had fairly  
20 large budget variances, two of them. Bordey had 42,307,  
21 which is -- 19 percent, I guess that's okay, right.

22 MS. SARNECKY: Yes, that's fairly typical  
23 in the first year. If you guys recall in the past we've  
24 seen the first year of the grants kind of start a little

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 slow.

2 DR. FISHBONE: Yes.

3 DR. WALLACK: Are we going to be discussing  
4 Drazinic, 10SCA47?

5 MS. SARNECKY: Yes. That's later on in the  
6 agenda.

7 DR. WALLACK: Okay.

8 MS. SARNECKY: Do you want to pull that out  
9 and vote on that later on?

10 DR. WALLACK: Yes, I would pull that out  
11 and defer it to later in the meeting, if it's okay with  
12 you.

13 MS. SARNECKY: Good for me. Marianne, is  
14 that --

15 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: -- that's fine  
16 since we're discussing it under Item No. 6.

17 MS. SARNECKY: Great.

18 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Let's take it out  
19 from Item No. 5.

20 DR. WALLACK: So with that change, I would  
21 move the acceptance of the rest of them.

22 DR. FISHBONE: Second.

23 MS. SARNECKY: All those in favor?

24 ALL VOICES: Aye.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 MS. SARNECKY: Opposed? Okay.

2 Moving on, so I'd say we should probably go  
3 through these individually since these were discussed at  
4 the last meeting. We actually have another one to add  
5 that I just had forgotten to put on the agenda as a follow  
6 up from the last meeting.

7 So, we can start with 10SCA22 Rodeheffer.  
8 So, let's see my notes here. The Committee had asked to  
9 provide a justification for his reallocation. He had a  
10 budget and nothing really to justify the changes in the  
11 budget. So I had attached that. I hope everyone saw it.  
12 We have a motion to approve.

13 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Chelsey, is there  
14 a way to bring the justification up on the screen here?

15 MS. SARNECKY: Um, hmm.

16 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: And I don't know  
17 for the people at home that are not here if that's going  
18 to be at all helpful.

19 MS. SARNECKY: Well, this was sent to the  
20 Committee, this --

21 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: -- this  
22 particular one was, okay.

23 MS. SARNECKY: Well, the, this whole  
24 website was sent to the Committee.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1                   ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Great.

2                   MS. SARNECKY: So they could access the  
3 documents.

4                   DR. RON HART: Move to accept. This is Ron  
5 Hart on the phone.

6                   DR. WALLACK: Second.

7                   ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: So Ron Hart moved  
8 and Milt seconded.

9                   DR. WALLACK: Right.

10                  ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. Is there  
11 any further discussion? Okay. All in favor of accepting  
12 this annual report?

13                  ALL VOICES: Aye.

14                  MS. SARNECKY: Okay. So we're going to skip  
15 -- should we skip Drazinic and take care of the rest of  
16 them?

17                  ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: It's up to you  
18 whichever way is the most sufficient use of time. We have  
19 to go through them one at a time anyway.

20                  MS. SARNECKY: So we'll just take on the  
21 next agenda item, Dr. Drazinic, 10SCA47. So, in the -- at  
22 the last meeting we had Dr. Drazinic come and present to  
23 the Committee. And she had discussed some of the issues  
24 that the Committee had brought up. Drs. Fishbone and

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 Wallack kind of spearheaded that request.

2                   And there were some issues still about her  
3 budget and she needed to make sure -- we needed to make  
4 sure that she had her escrow approvals sent to the  
5 Committee so then we could approve her request. The escrow  
6 approval was sent. It was attached in the -- on the  
7 website that I had sent around the password for. But due  
8 to the lack of clarity in the minutes, I thought that we  
9 should just bring it back to the Committee because this is  
10 such a delicate issue I don't want to give her anything  
11 that the Committee doesn't want her to have or approve  
12 anything that the Committee didn't have an intent to  
13 prove.

14                   So, what I pulled from the minutes and the  
15 transcript was that the Committee voted to approve the  
16 extension of her grant. They voted to approve the change  
17 in scope. And they voted to approve to unfreeze her funds  
18 for that time period. So, from what I understand, and  
19 Isolde from UCONN Health Center can correct me if I'm  
20 wrong, the PI wants the second year funds so she can hire  
21 a post-doc. Well, my issue was that she hadn't spent the  
22 first year funds because they were frozen. So, I gave her  
23 approval based on the transcript and the minutes for the  
24 three things I listed just before, but I did not give her

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 approval for the second year funding because I was very  
2 unclear as to what the Committee wanted. So I don't know  
3 if Milt or Gerry if you have anything you want to say  
4 about this to start.

5 DR. WALLACK: Well, she had 80,000 left so  
6 that I don't know -- isn't that right?

7 DR. ISOLDE BATES: She had -- through the  
8 whole year because she was working on the grant so it  
9 didn't start -- so it was below 80,000.

10 DR. WALLACK: So 75, in the ballpark.

11 DR. BATES: Yes.

12 DR. WALLACK: So I think that if she still  
13 has 75, 80, in that ballpark, say 75,000 left I don't  
14 understand why we would be giving her her second year of  
15 funding at this particular point especially since she  
16 hasn't really done anything on the project yet. I have no  
17 problem, based upon our discussion last time, about  
18 releasing the remaining portion for the first year. It  
19 seems like she could hire whomever she needs to hire on  
20 that basis.

21 DR. HART: The question, it's Ron Hart on  
22 the phone, is she asking for the second year support to  
23 give a two-year commitment to a newly hired post-doc? Is  
24 that the issue?

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 DR. BATES: We do one -- to post-docs.

2 DR. HART: Okay. So it's not that, okay.

3 DR. BATES: She just want to make sure that  
4 she has three very good candidates that she's interviewing  
5 and getting ready to make an offer. And she just want to  
6 make sure that she can offer them, like I said, the health  
7 and the standard is one year of funding because the no-  
8 cost extension her effort has to continue to come out. So  
9 in addition to the post-doc salary her 10 percent will  
10 also come out of the remaining money. So she's just  
11 worried that she was kind of running short. Maybe a  
12 suggestion would be that she would come back in about six  
13 months or so and then kind of give an update. And then  
14 maybe at that time you can kind of consider to unfreeze  
15 or, you know, the funds or further discuss the matter.

16 DR. FISHBONE: Is there any issue with  
17 UCONN about her going ahead with the project?

18 DR. BATES: No, no. We unfrozen the money  
19 and she's been using it.

20 DR. FISHBONE: I mean we were in the  
21 situation where we had to approve it in order to get was  
22 it escrow support.

23 DR. BATES: Yes.

24 DR. FISHBONE: It was going back and forth.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 Has that all been straightened out?

2 DR. BATES: That's all been taken care of,  
3 yes. Yes, based on the email from Chelsey, Jeff Small  
4 unfroze the current remaining funds and we extended the  
5 date to September 30th, I believe, of 2012.

6 DR. FISHBONE: Yes.

7 DR. WALLACK: So if it makes sense to the  
8 rest of the group I think Isolde's recommendation seems  
9 very reasonable and that is that we make it clear that  
10 we're releasing the funds for the first year and then  
11 she'll be invited back six months from now or at that  
12 meeting around that period of time, whenever that meeting  
13 is. And she will describe the progress that she's made,  
14 both from a standpoint of the research progress and also  
15 the disposition of the dollars that are left, and we can  
16 then consider the release of the second year. That would  
17 be my recommendation.

18 DR. BATES: And I can provide you guys, at  
19 that time, with an interim financial report.

20 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Would we want an  
21 interim progress report as well and perhaps try to set  
22 some kind of a firm date here rather than six months?  
23 Let's say April, May.

24 DR. WALLACK: What if we don't have an

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 April meeting though, that's the only thing.

2 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Well, the closest  
3 to May, but have a date for her report to come in.

4 DR. WALLACK: The April meeting or the  
5 closest date to that April meeting, fine.

6 DR. FISHBONE: I just have one question.  
7 Would it make it hard for her to be able to hire a post-  
8 doc fellow?

9 DR. BATES: Well, we had sufficient funds  
10 for the year.

11 DR. FISHBONE: For the year.

12 DR. BATES: Yes. Because she can -- you  
13 know, part of what you had approved was also a  
14 restructuring where she moved money that she had allocated  
15 for a student, I believe. It all went into payroll for  
16 this -- for the post-doctoral fellow.

17 DR. FISHBONE: Okay. So doing it this way  
18 will not prevent her from getting --

19 DR. BATES: -- it will not prevent her from  
20 hiring.

21 DR. FISHBONE: Okay. Do we need a motion?

22 DR. WALLACK: So can I move that we move on  
23 that basis with the date being April, for the April  
24 meeting? Marianne, did you want a further intermittent

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 report from her or what?

2 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: I think that  
3 would be wise to have an interim progress report.

4 DR. WALLACK: Three months?

5 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: No, I was  
6 thinking in the six months.

7 DR. WALLACK: Oh, at that point.

8 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: So we could set a  
9 firm date for that.

10 DR. WALLACK: Okay.

11 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Say April 1st for  
12 the progress report and fiscal report.

13 DR. WALLACK: Fine.

14 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: And then now if  
15 we have a meeting in April then we'll hear about it and if  
16 not it will be May.

17 DR. FISHBONE: I second it.

18 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: All those in  
19 favor?

20 ALL VOICES: Aye.

21 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Any opposed?

22 DR. DAVID GOLDHAMMER: I abstain, David  
23 Goldhammer.

24 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes, thank you,

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 David.

2 MS. SARNECKY: Okay. So, the next four  
3 were requests to provide a more lay summary. Dr.  
4 Massaro's I didn't not link on the website because I  
5 didn't -- couldn't find it. But I do have it now. I can  
6 send these around. These were all approved contingent  
7 upon the Committee receiving the report. So, I've looked  
8 through them. They seem to be more lay than they were.  
9 So, if I could get a motion to approve those four.

10 DR. FISHBONE: I'll make a motion to  
11 approve them.

12 DR. WALLACK: Second.

13 MS. SARNECKY: All those in favor?

14 ALL VOICES: Aye.

15 MS. SARNECKY: Opposed? Okay.

16 And one additional item just to add into  
17 that section from the last meeting, and I apologize for  
18 the craziness, but trying to pull this meeting together  
19 very quickly resulted in some mishaps on my end.

20 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: That's good. We  
21 just need it in terms of a motion to add it to the agenda.

22 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.

23 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Will someone make  
24 that motion? We'll have somebody approve it and second it.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 Just say what you're going to add to it in terms of a  
2 motion.

3 MS. SARNECKY: So I'd like to add 09SCB-  
4 UCHC-17, Dr. Salvaskati to the agenda. They're -- the  
5 Committee had requested -- let's see. The Committee had  
6 requested more information about the project, and the  
7 progress, and the funding that's been spent to date. So --

8 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: -- so we need a  
9 motion to add that to the agenda.

10 DR. WALLACK: Moved that we add it to the  
11 agenda.

12 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: And a second.

13 DR. FISHBONE: Second.

14 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: All in favor?

15 ALL VOICES: Aye.

16 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. Carry on.

17 MS. SARNECKY: Okay. So, I'm sorry, I'm  
18 just trying to work off of my emails here.

19 DR. HART: Chelsey, it's Ron Hart on the  
20 phone again.

21 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

22 DR. HART: This yet again has one of those  
23 summaries for the public that if you're not a scientist I  
24 bet it doesn't make any sense.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 MS. SARNECKY: Okay. So --

2 DR. HART: -- do other people feel the same  
3 way or not?

4 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Yes.

5 DR. WALLACK: So there is agreement with  
6 you, Ron.

7 DR. HART: I think that we can continue to  
8 come up against this problem that the reports don't  
9 include an appropriate lay summary. I think we should  
10 stick to our policy of asking for a revision when it comes  
11 out like this.

12 MS. SARNECKY: So would the Committee be in  
13 favor of approving this report contingent upon the follow  
14 up with a more lay summary as we've done in the past?

15 DR. HART: So moved, Ron Hart.

16 DR. FISHBONE: Second.

17 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Yes, I agree.

18 MS. SARNECKY: Perfect. All those in favor?

19 ALL VOICES: Aye.

20 MS. SARNECKY: Opposed?

21 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Would the  
22 Committee like that to come back to the Committee or would  
23 we like to delegate that authority to Chelsey to take a  
24 look at it and if she is confident that is more of an

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 adequate lay summary that the approval would be full  
2 approval?

3 DR. FISHBONE: Yes.

4 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes. We're  
5 comfortable with that?

6 DR. HART: Yes. I would just copy all of  
7 us, but that's great.

8 MS. SARNECKY: Okay. Great.

9 Let's see, we are moving right through this  
10 agenda. Agenda Item No. 7, 08-SCC-YSME-005, Redmond,  
11 request to reallocate carryover, Year No. 4 budget and no-  
12 cost extension through August 31st of 2012. I've attached  
13 the letter. The request is to carryover a little over  
14 54,000 dollars in unexpended, indirect and direct costs  
15 from the third year of the project to the final year and  
16 additionally to draw out the end of the grant an  
17 additional six months. The justification is in the  
18 letter. There is a budget attached. Any questions?

19 DR. WALLACK: Move the acceptance.

20 DR. FISHBONE: Second.

21 MS. SARNECKY: All those in favor?

22 ALL VOICES: Aye.

23 MS. SARNECKY: Opposed? Okay. I just need  
24 one minute. So the next request, 08-SCC-UCON-004, Dr.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 Rasmussen, this request -- they've completed their three  
2 years of research under this project. They've requested a  
3 no-cost extension to support the completion of the  
4 research until December 31 of 2012. Any questions?

5 DR. FISHBONE: No.

6 MS. SARNECKY: A motion to approve?

7 DR. WALLACK: Move the acceptance.

8 DR. FISHBONE: Second.

9 MS. SARNECKY: All those in favor?

10 ALL VOICES: Aye.

11 MS. SARNECKY: Opposed? Motion passes.

12 The next one here, 10-SCA-23, Dr. Chhabra.

13 This is request for an increase in effort, carryover, and  
14 the rebudget of funds. The PI wants to increase their  
15 effort from 25 percent to 40 percent effective January of  
16 2012. Additionally, they -- the PI wants to request  
17 approval to carry forward and reallocate 25,000 dollars of  
18 the funds from supplies and travel in order to purchase a  
19 microscope. And there is the quote attached for that  
20 microscope. So the total cost of the microscope is  
21 actually almost 35,000 dollars, but they're only  
22 requesting the reallocation of 25,000. They have grant  
23 funding from another source.

24 DR. WALLACK: So Chelsey.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

2 DR. WALLACK: I understand that they can  
3 cut back on the travel.

4 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

5 DR. WALLACK: How does this work for the  
6 supplies though?

7 MS. SARNECKY: Um.

8 DR. WALLACK: Because if that's what they  
9 anticipated they needed in relation to the supplies what  
10 I'm understanding is that they now don't need those  
11 supplies. I mean I don't know.

12 MS. SARNECKY: I do not have the answer to  
13 that question.

14 DR. WALLACK: Do any of the scientists  
15 understand how this works?

16 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Can you describe the  
17 situation again, Milt?

18 DR. WALLACK: So they want -- he wants to  
19 buy a microscope for 35,000 and he's going to divert  
20 25,000 dollars from the original application. Those 25,000  
21 were going to cover supplies and travel. So I understand  
22 that he doesn't travel, that's fine, but what about the  
23 supplies? I mean if he needed the supplies at the  
24 beginning of the project doesn't he still need the

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 supplies? How does that work? I don't -- that's the  
2 question.

3 DR. GOLDHAMMER: He's not completely  
4 eliminating those categories. He's decreasing the totals,  
5 but not eliminating the budget for the categories.

6 DR. WALLACK: Right, and I understand. But  
7 I mean should I be concerned at all about the reduction in  
8 the requirement of that amount of supplies? I don't know.

9  
10 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Is this the UCHC  
11 investigator?

12 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes. Is it,  
13 Chelsey?

14 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

15 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Am I allowed to comment in  
16 general terms or not?

17 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: In general terms  
18 you can, but you can't speak on any specific.

19 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Okay. Let me think about  
20 how to reply to --

21 DR. WALLACK: -- we'll give you a lot of  
22 latitude, David, don't worry about it.

23 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: No, we won't.

24 DR. WALLACK: Marianne said no, she won't.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1                   ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: All right,

2                   DR. GOLDHAMMER: In reading the letter, the  
3 argument kind of that isn't directly stated but is kind of  
4 between the lines, is that the investigator believes that  
5 the microscope is absolutely necessary to complete the  
6 work. And one would then have to assume that he's willing  
7 to cut some of the supplies based work in order to  
8 complete what he's already started and requires --  
9 chemistry or whatever to analyze. And, you know, in a  
10 world of finite budget this is the choice that he's made  
11 for us.

12                  DR. WALLACK: So the scientists are  
13 comfortable with that then?

14                  DR. GOLDHAMMER: I think --

15                  DR. WALLACK: -- I have no issue with it, I  
16 mean I just don't know.

17                  DR. GOLDHAMMER: I think it's commonly done  
18 though.

19                  DR. WALLACK: Okay.

20                  DR. GOLDHAMMER: And I think this comes  
21 back to the issue of how hard it is to predict ahead of  
22 time what one needs. And I guess as science has progressed  
23 a greater need has been identified and they'll just have  
24 to find a way to live with a slower burn rate on the

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 supplies. It is a fair amount of money, you know, to take  
2 away from the supplies, but I think speaking generally I  
3 think we have to give the scientist the little bit of  
4 leeway here and usually, you know, they're the best judge  
5 of the best way to get to the work done.

6 DR. HART: I absolutely agree and let me  
7 add one more piece to that. The other choice would have  
8 been for this PI to come to us and ask us for 25,000  
9 dollars because he didn't get his allocation from the  
10 university source in order to complete the work that was  
11 produced under the grant. I suspect we'd have been even  
12 less happy with that request.

13 MS. SARNECKY: Can I just make a comment?  
14 If you look at the budget there is only 15,000 dollars  
15 coming out of the materials and supplies line item. The  
16 other money is coming out of travel, the 5,000 dollars  
17 from travel. And then there is 5,000 dollars from the  
18 indirect costs. So the exact amount that's coming out of  
19 materials and supplies is 15,000 dollars. If that helps  
20 clarify anything.

21 DR. GOLDHAMMER: It's a one third reduction  
22 in supplies.

23 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: And is there any  
24 concern that this would have such an impact on the project

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 that the work would not get done?

2 DR. GOLDHAMMER: One would have to assume  
3 that the investigator already made that decision by saying  
4 the microscope comes first.

5 DR. FISHBONE: I would move to accept the  
6 request.

7 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Can we have a  
8 second?

9 DR. HART: Second, Ron Hart.

10 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Thanks, Ron. Any  
11 further discussion? All in favor?

12 ALL VOICES: Aye.

13 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. Thank you.

14 MS. SARNECKY: Okay. So moving onto the  
15 next item, okay, so Chondrogenics is the private company  
16 that applied and was awarded a little over 1.2 million  
17 dollars this past, this past round. So, we did have some  
18 changes in their contract that were specific to  
19 Chondrogenics and I can go through them. Before this  
20 contract is fully executed, it's been executed by  
21 Chondrogenics, but before CI can go ahead and sign it we  
22 need approval from the Committee because we did change  
23 some of the things in the contract.

24 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: And, Chelsey,

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 were you working with Shipman and Goodwin on this?

2 MS. SARNECKY: Yes. We were working with  
3 Shipman and Goodwin, who is CI's outside counsel, on some  
4 of these changes. And I'm just going to try to get to my  
5 page here.

6 So under the publication and news release  
7 section, the original language stated that the awardee  
8 shall use its best efforts to ensure the timely  
9 publication of the results of the project. Because  
10 Chondrogenics is a private company we did add some  
11 language in there that says that they must -- they will  
12 use their best efforts to ensure the timely publication of  
13 the results of their project as long as it doesn't  
14 jeopardize the timely filing of patent applications to  
15 protect the company's intellectual property.

16 This is, you know, fairly standard. We've,  
17 obviously, never had a private company that's been awarded  
18 and gotten to this point. So, this is something that the  
19 company felt very strongly about and CI doing the work  
20 that we do understood as well. So we decided to put that  
21 in there for them.

22 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: So, Chelsey, you  
23 said this is standard language that has been in other CI  
24 contracts with private companies?

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

2 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay.

3 MS. SARNECKY: Sorry, I'm just trying to  
4 flip through these sections here. Okay. Under  
5 miscellaneous provisions, there is a section that -- the  
6 page number is No. 9. It's under miscellaneous  
7 provisions, Section 24. So, originally, this provision  
8 says that the awardee will maintain conflict of interest  
9 policies and procedures appropriate to ensure that its  
10 employees and officers do not engage in activity that  
11 would present a conflict of interest. Well, due to the  
12 nature of this grant with Dr. Drazinic being the PI -- I'm  
13 sorry, Dr. Dealy being the PI, and part owner of the  
14 company, using a UCONN space we just wanted to clarify all  
15 of the relationships that have occurred in this grant.  
16 Everyone was well aware of the relationships because they  
17 were all included in the original proposal, but just for  
18 sake of transparency we wanted to make sure that there was  
19 something in the contract.

20 So the language that we added is -- let's  
21 see -- and I don't -- I'm assuming everyone has this in  
22 front of them. I can read it through if you'd like, for  
23 the record. "Notwithstanding the forgoing, the parties  
24 acknowledge that the PI is an owner of awardee and may

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1       derive a personal benefit from the project. And that the  
2       PI is also a researcher at the University of Connecticut  
3       Health Center and acts as PI with respect to other  
4       research funded by the Connecticut Stem Cell Research Fund  
5       in her capacity as a researcher at the University of  
6       Connecticut Health Center. The awardee represents and  
7       warrants that it has obtained all necessary consents from  
8       the University of Connecticut as well as the University of  
9       Connecticut Health Center for the awardee to accept and  
10      utilize this funding as well as to use the facilities at  
11      UCONN, UCONN Health Center to carry out the scope of this  
12      project."

13                   It says that, "the PI is in compliance with  
14      the policies of UCONN and UCONN Health Center with respect  
15      to their ownership and participation with this grant. The  
16      awardee also represents and warrants that it will use the  
17      funding received under this agreement only for the project  
18      and not for any other research related or otherwise funded  
19      by the Connecticut Stem Cell Research Fund or otherwise in  
20      which the PI is involved."

21                   ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: So, Chelsey, how  
22      does the royalty issue play out with this?

23                   MS. SARNECKY: The royalty is our standard  
24      royalty agreement. There is no changes. This language is

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 just to clarify the relationships and whatever happens in  
2 terms of royalties.

3 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay.

4 MS. SARNECKY: The royalty agreement has  
5 been the same for the past --

6 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: -- okay. So  
7 regardless of her joint roles with the private company and  
8 the University there is still the 5 percent accrues to the  
9 state.

10 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

11 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. For  
12 anything that's produced under this grant to --

13 MS. SARNECKY: -- yes, because the awardee  
14 -- the contract is between Connecticut Innovations, as  
15 administrators of this program, and Chondrogenics. The  
16 subcontract and all of that other good stuff is not  
17 Connecticut Innovations. Connecticut Innovations doesn't  
18 hold a contract with them. We have the contract with  
19 Chondrogenics and then they're subcontract is with the  
20 University of Connecticut Health Centers. So the royalties  
21 would then flow through that same order, I suppose, is the  
22 best word.

23 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay.

24 DR. FISHBONE: CI was comfortable with the

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 changes.

2 MS. SARNECKY: Yes. And then one last  
3 change, let's see.

4 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: I need a  
5 proofreader.

6 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

7 DR. FISHBONE: Are these changes that they  
8 requested?

9 MS. SARNECKY: These were changes that they  
10 requested. They actually requested a few other changes  
11 that we did not agree to because our counsel didn't think  
12 that they were necessary. So the last one -- okay, so the  
13 last one, the last change is on page 14 the -- this is the  
14 indemnification piece. There used to be a section F. You  
15 will not see it in this contract because it no longer is  
16 there, but we took it out because it does not apply to the  
17 private company. It has to do with -- it says, "this  
18 section shall not apply to awardees that are entities of  
19 the State of Connecticut including, but not limited to the  
20 University of Connecticut and its constituent units." It  
21 doesn't apply. So we took it out. And those were all of  
22 the changes in the Chondrogenics contract that I am hoping  
23 we can get some approval and then have it executed on the  
24 CI side and then get them their money.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 DR. FISHBONE: So moved.

2 MS. SARNECKY: Thank you.

3 DR. WALLACK: Second.

4 MS. SARNECKY: Is there any further  
5 discussion? All in favor?

6 ALL VOICES: Aye.

7 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Approved. Thank  
8 you.

9 MS. SARNECKY: Okay. So the next issue I'm  
10 going to be honest and tell you that I don't know much  
11 about it. This is a -- I'll try and explain it as best  
12 can. So the UCONN contracts, the Associate Vice President  
13 of Research Administration and Finance has agreed to sign  
14 the contracts as they are, but wanted to discuss some sort  
15 of amendment to the contract. So, if you go on to page 7  
16 under records and inspections, Section 15, this section  
17 says that the Connecticut Stem Cell Research Fund and its  
18 representatives shall, for the purpose of determining the  
19 proper disposition of the funding, have the right to make  
20 site visits and all that fun stuff. It discusses audit  
21 procedures. And, let's see, so it says that the Stem Cell  
22 Research Fund shall bear the cost and expenses of this  
23 audit in addition to all other rights and remedies of this  
24 fund. The awardee shall be responsible for the cost and

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 expenses of any such audit and reimburse the fund by wire  
2 transfer.

3           So here is where -- I apologize. I'm just  
4 trying to get my bearings here. So, in this section here,  
5 there is a rate that the awardee must pay interest on of 4  
6 percent. The University of Connecticut Health Center did  
7 not think that 4 percent was the percentage that should be  
8 in there. He thought that the rate should match the  
9 short-term investment fund interest rate, which is the  
10 Treasurer's money market fund that the state has. They  
11 refer to it as STIF. So, you know, in these cases the  
12 state entity will park their money in this account and  
13 earn interest and the rate on this account changes day to  
14 day. And the University of Connecticut wants to make sure  
15 that that rate matches up with what's in this contract.  
16 And right now it's at a standard 4 percent.

17           So, I do not know anything other than that.

18       I don't know if this is something that -- this is always  
19 -- this 4 percent has always been in the contracts since  
20 2006. In 2006 this was the rate that the universities  
21 actually asked for in 2006. So, this email that I have  
22 here, Jeff Small, who is the Associate Vice President of  
23 Research Administration and Finance, he explains that in  
24 the past that this 4 percent was probably within the range

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 of prime. Lately that has not been the case and the  
2 contract should reflect a standard which would be flexible  
3 regardless of if and when it would be utilized. To this  
4 date, this has -- this section has never come into play.

5 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Right.

6 MS. SARNECKY: So --

7 DR. WALLACK: -- so I would suggest that  
8 he's talking about fluctuations in market circumstances  
9 and so forth, and I would suggest that there is risk on  
10 both sides, their side as well as our side. And that since  
11 the 4 percent was an agreed upon percent in 2006 and we've  
12 gone through certain variances in market rates and so  
13 forth and it seems to have worked out okay, my  
14 recommendation would be to leave it at the 4 percent. And  
15 I would move that we deny the request and leave it at the  
16 4 percent.

17 MS. SARNECKY: Do we have a second?

18 DR. FISHBONE: What are the circumstances  
19 under which this would come into effect?

20 MS. SARNECKY: Um.

21 DR. WALLACK: What he's saying I believe,  
22 Gerry, is that if the market rates vary he wants this rate  
23 to vary, coincide with that.

24 DR. FISHBONE: I understand that. But what

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 are the circumstances under which they would have to pay  
2 us back for -- I mean are -- why would they be paying us  
3 interest on the money?

4 DR. HART: In the letter he's saying it's  
5 just for unauthorized expenses after an audit. Is that  
6 right?

7 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

8 DR. HART: If we determine upon audit that  
9 they have misused our funds they pay us back with this  
10 interest.

11 MS. SARNECKY: Thank you, Ron.

12 DR. FISHBONE: And he's saying that that's  
13 not fair because they're not getting that interest rate?

14 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: I think it's just  
15 that the interest rate is higher than the, where the state  
16 parks its money right now.

17 DR. FISHBONE: Right.

18 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Usurious, I  
19 think, was the term he used.

20 DR. WALLACK: But by the same token, in  
21 other circumstances it may be the reverse and over time I  
22 would imagine that this is going to, as it has been, level  
23 out.

24 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Um, hmm.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 DR. WALLACK: And that's why I, with all  
2 due respect, make the motion that for now we leave it at  
3 the arranged 4 percent.

4 DR. HART: Can I offer an amendment to the  
5 motion?

6 DR. WALLACK: Sure.

7 DR. HART: That we leave all existing  
8 contracts as written and going forward we switch to the  
9 FCIF method, which is a variable rate.

10 MS. SARNECKY: Are you saying that the 2011  
11 contracts that are waiting for CI signature to leave those  
12 at 4 percent and the 2012 going forward?

13 DR. HART: That was my intent. I don't know  
14 what dates we're at, but that's my intent, yes.

15 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.

16 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Again, Chelsey,  
17 did Shipman and Goodwin weigh in on this request?

18 DR. HART: Well, was that an acceptable  
19 amendment to the person who made the motion?

20 DR. WALLACK: Well, it's not acceptable to  
21 me personally only because I think that, Ron, we can  
22 discuss this, you know, later in 2012. I don't know if we  
23 need to commit ourselves at this time. He's making a  
24 specific request having to do with where we are now. And

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1           therefore I think we ought to respond to where we are now.

2

3                         DR. HART:   If I may, I'll withdraw the  
4           amendment then.

5                         ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN:   I think it would  
6           be a good idea to get Shipman and Goodwin to weigh in on  
7           this 4 percent and see what their take is and how they're  
8           amending other contracts, if they are, to reflect the  
9           lower interest rates that are available.

10                        MS. SARNECKY:   And this will not hold up  
11           the contracts because UCONN Health Center has agreed to go  
12           forward with the assistance agreements so we don't push  
13           back the date any further.   So it's not going to hold up  
14           the assistance agreements or getting these contracts  
15           executed.   So, that might be a good idea to have this sent  
16           over to Shipman and just have them take a look at it.

17                        DR. WALLACK:   So maybe then for our own due  
18           diligence on this matter we keep this at 4 percent  
19           currently, but also without a motion to that effect we  
20           will then check with counsel about how this should be  
21           handled going forward.

22                        ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN:   Yes.   Just as an  
23           addendum to the motion, but not really part of the motion.

24

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 DR. WALLACK: Yes, right.

2 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: So the motion  
3 that you made is that we just leave the 2011 contracts as  
4 they are right now not to amend them for this year.

5 DR. WALLACK: Right.

6 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: And then as an  
7 aside that we will do some looking into what might need to  
8 be amended for 2012.

9 DR. WALLACK: Right.

10 DR. FISHBONE: I would second that.

11 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. Any further  
12 discussion? All in favor?

13 ALL VOICES: Aye.

14 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Great, thank you.  
15 So, Chelsey, you'll give them a little feedback on that.

16

17 MS. SARNECKY: I will

18 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Thank you.

19 MS. SARNECKY: I'm looking forward to it.

20 So Agenda Item No. 12, we have the 2012  
21 RFP. Just a few changes, the -- on the first page we just  
22 changed some of the dates from last year. We included, on  
23 the second page, some information about the applicant's  
24 conference or what we're calling the Stem Cell Workshop

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 just so everyone who receives the RFP is aware that there  
2 is this workshop if they're able to attend on the 17th.  
3 Looking through this, on page four I changed the core  
4 facilities' language to read that the applications will be  
5 considered for additional support for new technology  
6 development or to sustain the works in progress at the  
7 facilities that are already established with the support  
8 of core grant funding under the stem cell research  
9 program. Just to reflect, I don't actually recall if it  
10 was last meeting or the meeting before where the Committee  
11 had voted to change some of the core funding language. So  
12 that language in there is just to reflect that.

13 And then I added additionally a plan for  
14 each existing core to attain future funding from sources  
15 other than the State of Connecticut must be noted in the  
16 budget justification section of the proposal to reflect  
17 your concerns there. And I believe the rest of the  
18 changes in the RFP were just technical and --

19 DR. WALLACK: -- so on the core.

20 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

21 DR. WALLACK: Does -- can you check and see  
22 if it says anything about that we would fund the cores to  
23 a maximum of 10 percent of the annual distribution --

24 MS. SARNECKY: -- yes, it does and I

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 apologize. It was such a small change here. I have added  
2 in there, requested funding for a core facility's award  
3 may be up to one million.

4 DR. WALLACK: Right.

5 MS. SARNECKY: Which is 10 percent of our  
6 funding pool.

7 DR. WALLACK: Right.

8 MS. SARNECKY: And may be budgeted for up  
9 to two years.

10 DR. WALLACK: Right. Okay.

11 DR. FISHBONE: So each core could get up to  
12 10 percent?

13 DR. WALLACK: No, a total of 10 percent for  
14 the --

15 DR. FISHBONE: -- a total, okay. I wasn't  
16 quite sure.

17 MS. SARNECKY: So, you can have one core  
18 that gets a million dollars. You could have one core that  
19 gets five hundred and another that gets 500,000.

20 DR. WALLACK: So to Gerry's point is it  
21 clear that it will go through the same peer review  
22 process? In other words, we're going to spend up to 10  
23 percent for cores.

24 DR. FISHBONE: Cores, yes.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 DR. WALLACK: But that will be -- it will  
2 have to go through the same peer review process?  
3 MS. SARNECKY: Yes. All of the --  
4 DR. WALLACK: -- okay.  
5 MS. SARNECKY: Applicants have to go  
6 through the same peer review process.  
7 DR. WALLACK: Okay.  
8 DR. HART: The language for that limit  
9 though, the language for that limit sounds like it's up to  
10 one million per award the way it reads. It doesn't say it  
11 specifically, but it sounds that way to me reading it.  
12 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.  
13 DR. WALLACK: So add the word total.  
14 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.  
15 DR. HART: Yes.  
16 MS. SARNECKY: Any other questions or  
17 comments?  
18 DR. WALLACK: Does that make it clear now,  
19 Ron?  
20 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.  
21 DR. HART: I think so, yes.  
22 DR. WALLACK: Okay.  
23 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.  
24 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I had a couple of possible

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 changes to just discuss with the Committee.

2 MS. SARNECKY: Go ahead.

3 DR. GOLDHAMMER: They're relatively minor  
4 changes.

5 MS. SARNECKY: Perfect.

6 DR. GOLDHAMMER: One thought on page 1 on  
7 the overview when you say that priority will be given to  
8 human embryonic stem cell research that is not currently  
9 eligible for federal funding. Is that statement still  
10 true? It would seem that with the inclusion of all of  
11 these additional lines that are eligible that a grave  
12 majority of people will be proposing studies with the  
13 ESL's that in theory could get funded by other, by federal  
14 sources. Do we need to have that line anymore? Perhaps -  
15 -

16 DR. HART: -- you're right. I mean the only  
17 thing that that line would address now is if someone was  
18 working on a new line or deriving a new line that hadn't  
19 yet been approved or could not be approved and that's  
20 going to be fairly rare.

21 DR. GOLDHAMMER: So we could put that  
22 priority will be given to human and possibly add adult  
23 because that's in the legislation, but human and adult  
24 embryonic stem cell research and research with clear

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 potential relative to human health or something like that,  
2 that would be a melding of two sentences and would take  
3 out the issue of eligibility.

4 DR. HART: Does it make sense at this point  
5 to say human stem cell research and take out, remove the  
6 rest of that sentence? That way IPS lines and everything  
7 else that fits all the other categories works well.

8 DR. WALLACK: I think Ron makes a good  
9 point, David.

10 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Yes, yes .

11 DR. HART: It would be priority given to  
12 human stem cell research period.

13 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Right, I agree with that.  
14 To flow we might want to incorporate aspects of the next  
15 sentence that deal with potential relevance, but that's  
16 just a --

17 DR. HART: -- either way, yes.

18 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Paul, I'm going  
19 to call on you on this one. Just going back to the  
20 original intent of the legislation, and I think that was  
21 where we did the RFP, where clearly the intent was to  
22 focus on embryonic stem cell research because it was so  
23 restricted otherwise. And also to the specific areas that  
24 Connecticut could research in terms of the SCNT and so

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 they may have outlived their usefulness, but I don't want  
2 to put something in there that would be contrary to the  
3 intent of the legislation.

4 DR. PAUL PESCATELLO: But, Marianne, I  
5 think that that's exactly why it's worth just taking out  
6 the label because by saying just human stem cell research  
7 it keeps the original intent of focusing on human health  
8 and disease. And you're a little more flexible reflecting  
9 the current status, but it doesn't take away from the  
10 original. If someone wants to come into us and propose a  
11 project to derive a new human stem cell line, which is not  
12 federally fundable, we would probably put that on top of  
13 our list if it was well justified. But there is going to  
14 be so few of those that it's not worth asking for everyone  
15 to do that.

16 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Or saying that  
17 it's a priority.

18 DR. PESCATELLO: Yes, because it's going to  
19 be the vast, rare exception rather than the rule.

20 DR. GOLDHAMMER: The statute is very broad  
21 in terms of -- there is definitely a focus on, especially  
22 at the time, of embryonic, but it certainly was drafted to  
23 be, to include really a broad array of research.

24 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Um, hmm.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 DR. PESCATELLO: And if you want to keep  
2 the language changes to a limit I mean original intent of  
3 including traumatic cell -- normally ITF cells are the  
4 stepchild of traumatic cell nuclear transplants. So it's  
5 kind of following your original intent to go to these --  
6 stem cells, it's just a -- it's a minor point.

7 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Um, hmm.

8 DR. FISHBONE: Is there currently, you  
9 know, with the new stuff from the New York stem cell  
10 foundation, you know, with the somatic cell nuclear  
11 transfer stuff would that be eligible for funding by us?

12 DR. PESCATELLO: Of course, yes, right?

13 DR. WALLACK: I would think so.

14 DR. FISHBONE: Because didn't you say that  
15 excluding -- the original one excluded somatic cell  
16 nuclear transfer?

17 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: No, ours  
18 included it.

19 DR. WALLACK: We included it, okay.

20 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: We included it.  
21 The only issue would be whether there was payment for the  
22 egg donation in New York.

23 DR. WALLACK: Yes, yes. So, I think the  
24 language that Ron and with David's help is good language.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 Does it take into -- are we comfortable with the idea  
2 that we're positioning ourselves so if the federal  
3 government has a halt in funding for whatever law suit is  
4 going to appear that we're still going to do that which  
5 cannot be funded federally. That was one of the original  
6 intents. Are we still covered on that basis?

7 DR. PESCATELLO: I think so. By just not  
8 saying that were priority given to things not eligible  
9 for federal funding doesn't mean that if federal funding  
10 is withdrawn for all stem cell research, for example,  
11 that that doesn't mean that that -- that still fits our  
12 priority for funding human stem cell research.

13 DR. WALLACK: Okay.

14 DR. PESCATELLO: I don't think it excludes  
15 anything.

16 DR. WALLACK: Okay, good.

17 DR. PESCATELLO: That's a great point  
18 however.

19 DR. WALLACK: Right.

20 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: So, Chelsey, are  
21 you clear on the language there?

22 MS. SARNECKY: No, if we could run through  
23 that.

24 DR. PESCATELLO: Priority will be given to

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 human stem cell research. Dave, did you want to stop here  
2 or do you want to extend that to the next sentence?

3 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I don't have strong  
4 feelings. I just thought it would be better to do that,  
5 but it could be -- I don't care if it's own sentence that  
6 might be a --

7 DR. PESCATELLO: -- Chelsey, my intent was  
8 to take out the rest of the sentence that is not  
9 currently eligible for federal funding would be deleted.

10 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.

11 DR. GOLDHAMMER: That's the most important  
12 aspect, right.

13 DR. PESCATELLO: Right -- for English is  
14 immaterial.

15 MS. SARNECKY: Perfect.

16 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Any other  
17 comments? David, I think you said you had a couple.

18 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Yes. And mine are one at  
19 the end of page two under seed grants it talks about  
20 established investigators, you know, developing new  
21 research directions may apply for seed grants. And then  
22 it moves on to junior researchers and hospitals and  
23 companies are also encouraged to apply. There seems to be  
24 -- but academic researchers aren't listed there. They

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 are listed next, but in a specific situation it sounds  
2 like they're encouraged to apply as well. It seems like  
3 we could combine junior researchers in academic  
4 institutions, hospitals, and companies are also  
5 encouraged to apply. It's a minor point, but I --

6 DR. WALLACK: -- no, I think it's a good  
7 clarification, David.

8 DR. GOLDHAMMER: So that's -- okay. Is  
9 that clear, do I need to repeat that or no?

10 MS. SARNECKY: Can you just repeat it one  
11 more time? I just want to make sure I'm putting it in the  
12 right spot.

13 DR. GOLDHAMMER: So that the sentence  
14 starts with junior researchers.

15 MS. SARNECKY: Um, hmm.

16 DR. GOLDHAMMER: That could be junior  
17 researchers in academic institutions, hospitals, and  
18 companies are also encouraged to apply.

19 MS. SARNECKY: Perfect.

20 DR. GOLDHAMMER: And then I think in the  
21 following sentence then we probably don't need that in  
22 academic institutions we can just say priority will be  
23 given to junior -- well, junior faculty members, I'm not  
24 sure about that. I guess I could -- I guess that could

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 stay how it is. Sorry, that's my printer making noise.

2 MS. SARNECKY: That's okay.

3 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Well, I guess the rest is  
4 fine there.

5 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.

6 DR. GOLDHAMMER: And then one more, let's  
7 see here, I did have a comment under the group projects  
8 in terms of how that section organized. To me it reads  
9 rather under -- so under No. 3, group project awards, you  
10 know, the initial paragraph describes in general terms  
11 what the group project awards were. And then under that  
12 paragraph this issue of priority will be given to the  
13 diseased directed collaborative arrangements. That  
14 second sentence that starts with priority could be  
15 combined with what is engrained after a and b and put at  
16 the -- put somewhere. Let's see here. Maybe put at the  
17 end, like towards the end of that first paragraph there  
18 the sentence the could stay two separate types of group  
19 project awards are available, blah, blah, blah, and then  
20 a and b are listed. And in that context we could then put  
21 priority will be given to projects involving these  
22 diseased directed collaborative arrangements. I just  
23 think structurally it will is a little better than  
24 interrupting the general idea of the group projects in

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 the sentence and then getting back to it in the third  
2 sentence. Now, was that clear at all to anybody?

3 MS. SARNECKY: How about, Dr. Goldhammer,  
4 if I draw something up that I think you want, and then I  
5 can send it to you and make sure that is what you want,  
6 and then I can send it to the full committee.

7 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I mean this is not a big  
8 deal. It's just a wording change, but I just think it  
9 would flow better. I'm -- that's fine with me.

10 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.

11 DR. WALLACK: So, Chelsey, can I suggest  
12 that you make the changes and send them to both Ron and  
13 to David.

14 MS. SARNECKY: Um, hmm.

15 DR. WALLACK: Since they've both made some  
16 specific requests.

17 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

18 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Hello, did  
19 somebody just join us?

20 DR. MYRON GENEL: Yes, it's Mike Genel.

21 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Hi, Mike.

22 DR. WALLACK: And then, so after they  
23 approve it, Chelsey, you'll be getting it out to the rest  
24 of us.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 MS. SARNECKY: Um, hmm.

2 DR. WALLACK: Okay.

3 DR. FISHBONE: Is there a time frame in  
4 which we need to get this out?

5 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: As soon as  
6 possible. Yes, this is going to be a very quick  
7 turnaround. I'd say by the end of the week, well, we are  
8 on Wednesday.

9 DR. FISHBONE: Good.

10 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes.

11 DR. GOLDHAMMER: One more thing about  
12 this, you know, we had a discussion last year about this  
13 sentence about that, the sentence that starts with  
14 priority, the last clause, with the intention of getting  
15 FDA review in four years which I wasn't crazy about  
16 initially because I didn't know how that would be  
17 incorporated into the review process and whether the  
18 reviewers had the necessary background and knowledge to  
19 be able to evaluate that. My question is, did this issue  
20 of this four year timeline come up in any of their -- in  
21 the reviews of this category and was it used in any way  
22 to evaluate the quality of and the efficacy of this  
23 category? Did those group projects know what, the reviews  
24 know whether that came up?

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1                   ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: So that would  
2 be, I think, we classified Chondrogenics as a group even  
3 though it was slightly mischaracterized. And then what  
4 was the other one, Chelsey, the other group?

5                   MS. SARNECKY: Dr. Bolles, Dr. Lee.

6                   ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: So we'd have to  
7 look into that and see whether it was underneath the peer  
8 reviews whether they looked at it or whether it was in  
9 any of the discussion. I don't recall it coming up  
10 specifically when this group discussed the grants.

11                   DR. GENEL: This is Mike Genel. Was the  
12 draft language sent to us earlier? I don't seem to have  
13 it.

14                   MS. SARNECKY: Yes, it was.

15                   DR. GENEL: It's in one of your  
16 attachments, Chelsey?

17                   MS. SARNECKY: No, it's on the password  
18 protected website.

19                   DR. GENEL: Okay, all right.

20                   DR. FISHBONE: By the way, I couldn't get  
21 into that one. It kept saying case, you know, I tried  
22 Stst and it wouldn't let me in. So I didn't get some of  
23 this latest stuff downloaded.

24                   MS. SARNECKY: Okay. I can look into it

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 and try to have --

2 DR. GENEL: -- I'll follow along as best I  
3 can, that's okay.

4 DR. GOLDHAMMER: It just seems to me that  
5 investigators will put a sentence or two of language in  
6 there, you know, that states what we want to hear, but  
7 it's not going to really have -- it's not going to be of  
8 much bearing. And I doubt that the reviewers really took  
9 that into account in evaluating these.

10 DR. HART: You know, David I think you've  
11 got a very good point there, however, even if it's true  
12 that no one really paid attention that this really gives  
13 a good intent as to what we mean these projects to be  
14 about. And even if that's a minimally effective component  
15 of the RFP I think it's worth leaving in.

16 DR. WALLACK: And I think that, Ron, to  
17 pick up on that I think that would be consistent with the  
18 discussion we had a year ago. I would opt to leave it in  
19 also.

20 DR. HART: And I realize it's a little bit  
21 ineffectual and difficult to enforce and anyone can make  
22 up anything to fulfill this request, but at least it gets  
23 the mindset into the proposal.

24 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Right.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 DR. WALLACK: All right. It also, Ron,  
2 makes a statement outside of our group to the general  
3 public about what we're trying to at least achieve. So I  
4 think it's --

5 DR. HART: -- I think you're right about  
6 that too.

7 DR. WALLACK: Right.

8 DR. GOLDHAMMER: All right, so should we  
9 move on then if there is general agreement on that point  
10 and I have just a couple of other smaller things?

11 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. I think  
12 you're up to four and I'm not sure. That's an aside.  
13 Keep going.

14 DR. GOLDHAMMER: All right. On page four  
15 in the middle of the -- let's see where are we -- the  
16 second note about group project awards and, let's see,  
17 where am I -- it had to do, right, with the second note  
18 having to do with start up funds.

19 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Um, hmm.

20 DR. GOLDHAMMER: That under special  
21 circumstances could include start up funds. I don't know  
22 the history of why that was put in. I mean start up  
23 funds, you know, are used to, for general set up of labs  
24 and are not specific to any particular project, per say.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1       And it would seem to me that there is probably better  
2       use of the money to be, to make sure that the funds are  
3       used explicitly and specifically for the research that's  
4       proposed. You know, candidates the only time they have  
5       bargaining position is when they have been made an offer  
6       and they negotiate a start up package which tends to be,  
7       you know, depending on the university for 500,000 to  
8       750,000 or it may be even more. To use this money for  
9       that purpose doesn't seem like the best use of it. So I  
10      don't know the history of why that one is in there and I  
11      don't really think it's a big deal. I don't know that  
12      anyone has proposed that yet, but it just caught my eye  
13      and I wasn't sure if it really should be there.

14                   MS. SARNECKY: I can look back to previous  
15      years, the RFP and the changes that we've made to see if  
16      that's something that was in the original RFP or if this  
17      is, has been changed along the way. That might provide  
18      some insight.

19                   DR. GOLDHAMMER: I think it's a really  
20      good idea to have this paragraph to let people know that  
21      as recruits that they're eligible right from, even before  
22      they land for this kind of funding and it could have an  
23      effect on, potentially on their decision. But any money  
24      that they get from us for start up is money the

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 university doesn't then need to give them. And I'd rather  
2 see the money go specifically for the same project rather  
3 than for the lab generally that the universities really  
4 should be setting up for them.

5 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.

6 DR. FISHBONE: It could have been put in  
7 early on when everybody was sort of starting up and there  
8 was nobody working in this area.

9 MS. SARNECKY: Um, hmm.

10 DR. FISHBONE: And maybe doesn't really  
11 apply anymore.

12 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

13 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I mean I guess if the  
14 language isn't there and we've queried about, you know,  
15 if there is a special circumstance that, you know, we  
16 could -- it can be addressed. It's not -- I don't want  
17 exclusionary language in there, but I just don't know  
18 that we need to kind of flag the -- put in people's mind  
19 the idea that the money can be used for that particular  
20 purpose.

21 DR. WALLACK: So, David, would you be  
22 happier if that language was deleted?

23 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Yes, I would be happier.  
24 I'd be even happier if my power came back on.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 MS. SARNECKY: I can check into that too,  
2 David.

3 DR. WALLACK: Why don't we then go with  
4 the idea that when Chelsey checks that and if we can take  
5 it out when we all reread what you two will then be  
6 comfortable with we'll have that in mind. Is that okay?

7 DR. GOLDHAMMER: That's totally fine, yes.  
8 One last little small piece supporting the same idea is  
9 that we're now so late in the years of support that maybe  
10 it's not such a good thing to start to attract a lot of  
11 new people anyway. And then if we're ready to move on  
12 and I don't know if you're still counting, Marianne, but  
13 I have one more.

14 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: I'm definitely  
15 counting even though I'm out of the room.

16 MS. SARNECKY: I'm counting. This is your  
17 last one. No, I'm kidding.

18 DR. GOLDHAMMER: If Chelsey says it's the  
19 last one then it will be the last one. H-10 under  
20 acknowledgments, and I know there is some, you know, I  
21 know there is legal issues and the language was chosen  
22 for a reason. But the -- what's in quotes, and what is  
23 expected of researchers in terms of acknowledgements and  
24 where these acknowledgements have to be including

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 posters, and abstracts, and all presentations there is no  
2 way that people are going to state this or put it  
3 anywhere on a chart or an abstract. There is no room on  
4 an abstract. Did this language, and I don't know the  
5 legal issues, but you really have to have this extensive  
6 language for funding?

7 DR. WALLACK: You know what, David, I've  
8 seen just the opposite happen and that is that where it's  
9 been reported by the universities that they have received  
10 a certain amount from various grants and they've outlined  
11 it specifically for their different researchers, the  
12 acknowledgements may not have been exactly the way I  
13 think we anticipated. Forgive me, Chelsey, but the --  
14 I've seen it where the acknowledgements have been for CI  
15 whereas it should have been for the Connecticut State  
16 Stem Cell Fund. So, if anything, I think that language  
17 should not be deleted, but, in fact, made more clear and  
18 that we should really request that they adhere to that.

19 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes, I think  
20 it's been an issue for the Committee when they go out to  
21 a talk and there is a presentation on a project that's  
22 been funded by the state and it's not acknowledged. I  
23 think that that is --

24 DR. GOLDHAMMER: -- okay, well, let me be

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 clear. I'm in no way suggesting that there not be an  
2 acknowledgement. There absolutely should be an  
3 acknowledgment. The question is what should that  
4 acknowledgement be and this seems extremely long and  
5 cumbersome to have as an acknowledgement.

6 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay, we can  
7 take a look at that. And perhaps for an abstract if there  
8 is a sentence that we could put in that would get the  
9 message across, but I think for articles where there is  
10 enough room we really would like to see the full wording  
11 in there.

12 DR. WALLACK: And for all reporting.

13 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: All reporting,  
14 yes.

15 DR. WALLACK: And for all reporting  
16 because there are times when the universities will report  
17 all of their grants and I sometimes see that there has  
18 not been proper acknowledgement.

19 DR. FISHBONE: For the Yale --

20 DR. WALLACK: -- well, I didn't want to be  
21 specific.

22 DR. GOLDHAMMER: If you expect someone in  
23 an oral presentation to say it's contents are solely --

24 DR. WALLACK: -- I was trying to be good.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 DR. GOLDHAMMER: It's never going to  
2 happen.

3 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay, but I  
4 think the message from the Committee is that  
5 acknowledgement needs to happen as extensively as is  
6 possible. And this is the wording that we would prefer to  
7 see in any kind of a presentation. And I think in an oral  
8 presentation you really can make some verbal presentation  
9 of who funded the research.

10 DR. GOLDHAMMER: While this was going on,  
11 I looked at a couple of publications based on research  
12 grants that have been given and I see the first sentence  
13 almost word for word, but not the second.

14 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay.

15 DR. GOLDHAMMER: The first sentence, it's  
16 fine, I mean usually people would say this work or this  
17 research is what's supported by and not those first few  
18 words, but the length and the intent of the first  
19 sentence is completely fine. It's really the second part  
20 of that that, you know, is not typical.

21 DR. GENEL: This is Mike Genel. I agree  
22 with David. I think if you really want to ensure that  
23 you have citations then the simpler the language the  
24 better.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 DR. WALLACK: As Marianne said, I think  
2 that it's clear that we want to have proper  
3 acknowledgment and in the next version, Chelsey, that you  
4 submit to us for consideration why don't we just leave it  
5 that we will all be looking for that paragraph.

6 MS. SARNECKY: Sounds like a plan to me.

7 DR. WALLACK: Okay.

8 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. Moving  
9 on.

10 MS. SARNECKY: Okay. So I will draw those  
11 changes up. I'll send them to both Dr. Goldhammer and Dr.  
12 Hart and get you guys to do the first look through, if  
13 you don't mind. I just volunteered you. And then I'll  
14 send to the rest of the Committee once I get a better  
15 idea of what exactly the two of you would like. Okay.

16 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: And, again, with  
17 that sort of almost immediate turnaround, if we can. I  
18 know you've got a lot of stuff going on.

19 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

20 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: But we need to  
21 get this out.

22 MS. SARNECKY: The next two are your  
23 agenda items, Marianne.

24 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Well, the

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 Bidders' Conference, Milt, do you want to -- that's your  
2 stem cell workshop.

3 DR. WALLACK: Yes, the cell -- I think one  
4 of the main things that we have tried to do is make it  
5 clear that the conference, the workshop conference on  
6 November 17th is a conference intended for all past,  
7 current applicants whether they be university, hospital,  
8 business, and so forth. And that there will be no uneven  
9 playing field, that everybody will have the same access  
10 to the information that will be shared on the 17th just  
11 so that no one can claim that anyone had an undue or  
12 unfair advantage.

13 Having said that, the program is set out  
14 so that Commissioner Mullen will give a short overview of  
15 the program, our intent, where we are, and what we're  
16 trying to accomplish. The main bulk of the meeting, the  
17 conference will consist of a panel of two researchers,  
18 David and Anne Kiessling will be on that panel. And  
19 Marianne Horn and Chelsey will be on that panel. And the  
20 intent of that is to, and I'm reading now from what I --  
21 David sent to you, "the former panel to discuss the  
22 various aspects of applying for Connecticut Stem Cell  
23 Research funding and various elements which should be  
24 included in the request." Your panel could hopefully

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 also discuss criteria and process as well as obligations.  
2 And that was put in intentionally as well as obligations  
3 was researchers must fulfill meaning reporting and so  
4 forth.

5 The meeting will close by a short talk  
6 having to do with the merging of science and  
7 commercialization, which, as you know, is something that  
8 currently is very important I know to all of us, but to  
9 the state. So I think that conference could be very  
10 helpful. Invitations have gone out. Chelsey, through CI  
11 has been kind enough to make sure that there has been a  
12 distribution of those names. We have so far 20 some odd -  
13 -

14 MS. SARNECKY: Yes, 25, 30.

15 DR. WALLACK: 25, 30 or something people  
16 who have indicated that they'll be in attendance. While  
17 we have the opportunity, I would urge that our guests  
18 from the two universities share that information with  
19 their researchers because it can be important for as  
20 many, if not all of them, to be in attendance.

21 And one last part is that consistent with  
22 the state's initiative, we have tried to mail to  
23 businesses from outside of the state and see if there is  
24 any interest in them participating as awardees. Clearly

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 the understanding is that they would then have to  
2 relocate to Connecticut and be part of what we're trying  
3 grow in the State of Connecticut. So that's a brief  
4 overview about what we're trying to do on the 17th. And  
5 hopefully it will be a very good meeting.

6 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Now, is this at  
7 the LOB?

8 MS. SARNECKY: It is at the LOB. They have  
9 not assigned us a room yet because we don't know how many  
10 people are going to be there. so once we get a better  
11 idea of how many people are going to attend they'll  
12 assign us a room based on what's going on at the LOB that  
13 day and what size room we need.

14 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: I'm wondering if  
15 we could get CTN interested in --

16 MS. SARNECKY: -- I've called CTN.

17 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay.

18 MS. SARNECKY: To get them to, even if  
19 it's not live.

20 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Right.

21 MS. SARNECKY: To get them to videotape it  
22 for us. And let's see there was something else.

23 DR. WALLACK: So what is that? And the  
24 reporting that was, Marianne, your -- so from a

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 stenographer and regular reporting we'll be having that  
2 available to us?

3 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Minutes, I think  
4 we're going to have minutes from it posted on the DPH  
5 website. And then our presentations so whatever you're  
6 planning to say that day having it condensed into a  
7 report that can be posted.

8 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Can I make a short  
9 request?

10 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Um, hmm.

11 DR. HART: Unfortunately, I can't make it  
12 that day because I'm teaching. I'd love to come up and  
13 see this, but can someone, please, emphasize about lay  
14 language and what that really means.

15 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

16 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes.

17 DR. WALLACK: That's a very, very, very  
18 good point, Ron, and that all has to do with the  
19 obligations which researchers must fulfill.

20 DR. HART: Yes.

21 DR. WALLACK: Absolutely, absolutely.

22 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: So the panel  
23 will have to get together and brainstorm and make sure we  
24 don't miss any of these points that keep coming up.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

2 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Again and again.  
3 But if we can get the local TV. station to tape it and  
4 then we can archive it and have it available for anybody  
5 who wasn't able to attend. And then any allegation that  
6 we weren't -- it wasn't a level playing field will be  
7 hard to maintain.

8 And, Milt, who is doing the merging of  
9 science and commercialization?

10 DR. WALLACK: Who is doing what?

11 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Who is doing the  
12 merging of science and commercialization? That's Milt,  
13 okay.

14 DR. FISHBONE: I'm sorry, would it be  
15 inappropriate to say people who attend will get special  
16 consideration.

17 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: It would be very  
18 inappropriate, yes.

19 MS. SARNECKY: We're actually just going  
20 to strike that from the record.

21 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: That was a joke.  
22 No, as a matter of fact, there is none.

23 DR. WALLACK: But in a serious vein, along  
24 those lines, Marianne, do you want -- should we have

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 RFP's available for distribution that day?

2 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes, yes.

3 MS. SARNECKY: I was thinking of actually  
4 two things. I was thinking of, first, preparing some  
5 sort of packet for each of the attendees. You know, an  
6 RFP, an example budget page, an example escrow letter, an  
7 example assistance and royalty agreement, just so they  
8 have this packet of information that they can take back  
9 and say, yes, these are my responsibilities if I am  
10 awarded. These are the things that I need to contact my  
11 grant manager for. These are the things I need to contact  
12 CI for. So, hopefully, that will be a little more  
13 helpful for the group to have something to take away with  
14 them.

15 DR. WALLACK: So the representatives of  
16 our guests from the universities it would probably make  
17 sense for them to be there to have access to all this  
18 material and so on.

19 MS. SARNECKY: Yes. Oh, and secondly, I  
20 did have a second point, I was also thinking about  
21 sending out a press release from CI probably a week or so  
22 before depending on, you know, what the dates are. I'll  
23 have to look and see. I could send it on a Friday, but  
24 people don't read their press release emails on a Friday

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 afternoon I've come to learn. So I'll send something out  
2 just reminding them where, when, and hopefully we'll have  
3 a room by then, a room number by then so.

4 DR. WALLACK: So can I ask one other  
5 question?

6 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

7 DR. WALLACK: Because I don't know this  
8 part, where did we leave it with the -- we had a select  
9 group of legislators, leadership people.

10 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

11 DR. WALLACK: They've been invited also.

12 MS. SARNECKY: That's been sent too.

13 DR. WALLACK: Great.

14 MS. SARNECKY: I actually sent it as an  
15 FYI to the entire legislature just because even though  
16 there might not be a legislator that is considered in a  
17 leadership position there may be a legislator from the  
18 New Haven area that has a constituent that's a Yale  
19 researcher that, you know, is their neighbor and may want  
20 to pass the word along. So I just sent it to the full  
21 legislator.

22 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: That's great.  
23 Chelsey, do you think you could also bring a listing of  
24 all the grants that we have funded in case people are

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 wondering where the money has gone?

2 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

3 DR. WALLACK: That's a great idea.

4 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: If there is some  
5 way of organizing that into the different kinds of grants  
6 or the different institutions. They always ask how much  
7 has gone where.

8 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

9 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Thank you.

10 MS. SARNECKY: And, additionally, we  
11 should probably have a meeting, our little subcommittee  
12 group, next week or the following week just in  
13 preparation for the meeting on the 17th.

14 DR. HART: That would be good and earlier  
15 is better than later, I think.

16 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.

17 DR. HART: I'm currently available.

18 MS. SARNECKY: Wonderful.

19 DR. WALLACK: Do you want to do it  
20 telephonically or what?

21 MS. SARNECKY: It doesn't matter. I can  
22 contact everyone after the meeting and we'll try to set  
23 some time up for us all to chat.

24 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. Any other

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 discussion on the Bidders' Conference or the Stem Cell  
2 Workshop depending on what you want to call it? Okay.

3 DR. WALLACK: Advocacy groups. Can we  
4 look at the calendar right now actually and as long --  
5 because other than Anne Kiessling we're all in the room.

6 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

7 DR. WALLACK: Would next Tuesday, the 8th,  
8 be okay?

9 MS. SARNECKY: As long as no one is  
10 working the polls, I'm sure.

11 DR. WALLACK: No, seriously.

12 MS. SARNECKY: I will be here and  
13 available.

14 DR. WALLACK: You'll be here?

15 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

16 DR. WALLACK: Okay. Because you're the  
17 closest to working the polls. David, Marianne, myself,  
18 Chelsey, other than Anne are you all available on the  
19 8th?

20 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: What time?

21 DR. WALLACK: Do you want to do it at  
22 12:00?

23 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I teach from 11:00 to  
24 12:15.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 DR. WALLACK: All right. So do you want  
2 to do it at 1:00?

3 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Then I have a meeting  
4 after and I'm really not available until about 3:00 on  
5 Tuesday.

6 DR. WALLACK: At 3:00 I have a meeting.  
7 Can you do it earlier? Can you do it at 9:00?

8 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: I think we'd  
9 better do this off-line. Let's do it at the end of the  
10 meeting if, David, if you can hang around for a little  
11 bit.

12 DR. WALLACK: Yes, hang around, David.

13 DR. GOLDHAMMER: All right.

14 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. Anything  
15 else on the Bidders' Conference?

16 So I wanted to give a brief report on the  
17 World Stem Cell Summit meeting that I went to in October.  
18 This was sponsored by the Genetics Policy Institute. It  
19 was in Pasadena, California and I was invited out there  
20 to, as part of the inner state association -- Inner State  
21 Alliance on stem cell research, the states that fund stem  
22 cell research. And the California group heads that up and  
23 we were co-founders of that group. So I gave a little  
24 talk on Wednesday morning about Connecticut's program and

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 many thanks to the institutions who sent me some great  
2 photos. And I think our presentation was really lively.  
3 It was a plenary talk first thing on Wednesday morning  
4 and there were a lot of advocates and scientists in the  
5 room.

6 On Tuesday morning -- one thing I did want  
7 to mention was one of the advocates came up to me and he  
8 said, have you considered naming one of your grants after  
9 Jerry Yang because he was such an influential figure in  
10 this whole field. So I just throw that out there. I said,  
11 we had not, but maybe to think about and we haven't named  
12 any of our grants, but maybe someday that we could honor  
13 Jerry's role in our program because he's certainly  
14 internationally known.

15 Then I also met with the head of the  
16 California Institute for Regenerative Medicine, Allan  
17 Trounsend, and their attorney, and their head of the  
18 scientific policy to talk about doing some collaborative  
19 funding between California and Connecticut. And I think  
20 it sounds very interesting. It sounds like it would be  
21 kind of side by side funding where we would fund the  
22 portion of the research that would take place in  
23 Connecticut and they would fund the portion of the  
24 research that would take place in California, but it

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 would lead to broader collaborations between the  
2 scientists.

3 It gets a little complicated as you get  
4 into the details. And I'm wondering if I could ask Paul  
5 to help me on this working out some of the details.  
6 They're looking to have a memorandum of understanding  
7 that would be signed by the Governor's office that would  
8 just -- it's really just an intentional document that we  
9 would work together to try to foster the kind of  
10 collaboration between California and Connecticut. So I  
11 guess I want to get --

12 DR. GENEL: Marianne?

13 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes.

14 DR. GENEL: What size funds are they  
15 talking about because we -- it's a different magnitude of  
16 funding in California and Connecticut.

17 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Definitely  
18 different magnitude. So it would really depend,  
19 obviously, they're looking at doing some kind of group  
20 grants, but we didn't talk numbers. One of the things  
21 that they prefer to do is to do a joint RFP, which just  
22 immediately begins to get a little bit complicated and  
23 then you have a joint review team and it does -- I think  
24 it does get a little complicated when we both have

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 competitive bid processes set up in our -- at least we do  
2 in our legislation. So I think probably what we would end  
3 up doing is side by side. You know, we'll get funded and  
4 you get funded and one can -- whoever gets funded first  
5 says we already have collaborative funding from  
6 California in the amount of X to do this portion of the  
7 project and then apply here for the balance of the  
8 project.

9                   But I would like to work with Paul because  
10 I think he a lot of expertise in this type of area and it  
11 also is going to take some coordinating with the  
12 Governor's office to move forward on it and probably with  
13 the AG's office. Then we can bring more information back  
14 to the Committee. And I just wanted to get a sense from  
15 the Committee if they felt that this was at all useful to  
16 do? They've very keen to help with this, to set up  
17 portals where scientists can collaborate. I think that's  
18 really the bottom line although they have a ton of money,  
19 I think they really are looking to get more collaborative  
20 relationships going and more bang for the buck for the  
21 research.

22                   DR. WALLACK: So, Marianne, I think that  
23 it's a great idea. And to help in the process do you  
24 think you might want to look at the MOU, which I imagine

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 exists, between California and Canada?

2 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Well, I have one  
3 between California and Maryland, which I think is  
4 probably the most applicable to our program.

5 DR. WALLACK: Okay.

6 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes, yes,  
7 definitely, good point.

8 DR. WALLACK: Okay.

9 DR. PESCATELLO: I mean I also think it's  
10 a terrific idea. If the details could be worked out that  
11 would be great.

12 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Um, hmm, okay.  
13 All right, so we'll work away on that off-line and bring  
14 it back to the group. And I did explain to them that this  
15 was -- Chris Murphy actually first contacted me although  
16 Milt and I have known about this through the IASCR for a  
17 while. We just had never been able to figure out how we  
18 might actually do it or if they would be interested, but  
19 they're very interested, and very kind to me out there.  
20 And I think it really is something that we should move  
21 ahead on and see if we can't expand our pool of funding  
22 that way.

23 DR. WALLACK: Great idea.

24 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: So, Paul, I'll

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 reach out to you on that and we'll just move forward.

2 Thank you.

3 The other thing -- there were lots of  
4 other good things that went on at the World Stem Cell  
5 Summit and some discussion on oversight of IPS cells and  
6 what's the role of escrow. But it was nothing that was  
7 particularly definitive, just a lot of discussion on it.

8 Okay. Any other questions? Any public  
9 comment?

10 DR. WALLACK: Before you go to public  
11 comments.

12 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes.

13 DR. WALLACK: We were discussing the  
14 upcoming RFP that we'll be finalizing on and apropos what  
15 you were just saying also. So, the peer review process,  
16 2012, will be different?

17 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes.

18 DR. WALLACK: So is there any updated  
19 information about where we are with that?

20 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: No, not at this  
21 meeting, no. But we are looking at ways that we can  
22 better coordinate the peer review and do it in a more  
23 efficient way by using other organizations to actually  
24 oversee how that is done and not -- because I'm the only

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 one standing at DPH that's doing any stem cell and  
2 Chelsey is the only one here so -- and we both have big  
3 other jobs, so we're going to need to do things a little  
4 bit differently. It may cost a little bit more money,  
5 but I think we'll come out with a better process at the  
6 end of the day and less subject to some of the criticism  
7 that the peer review has undergone over the past years.  
8 So when I can talk about that I will. Probably by the  
9 next time we get together we'll have a good plan in  
10 place.

11 DR. WALLACK: Perfect.

12 MS. SARNECKY: Great.

13 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Thank you.

14 DR. WALLACK: That's November 18th or  
15 something like that?

16 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Well, are we  
17 meeting in November? Is there --

18 MS. SARNECKY: -- we do have a regularly  
19 scheduled November Board meeting. I think it's on the  
20 15th.

21 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: So right before  
22 the conference.

23 MS. SARNECKY: That third Tuesday. I don't  
24 know if we'll have anything for the agenda.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1                   ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Right.

2                   MS. SARNECKY: So it's up to the Committee  
3 if they want to keep that meeting scheduled or we can  
4 wait until the December meeting for any pending items  
5 that need approval.

6                   DR. HART: I won't be able to make that  
7 one. I'm in a conference that week.

8                   MS. SARNECKY: Okay.

9                   ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes, I'm  
10 thinking if we don't have an awful lot of, we have some  
11 things that could be handled by the subcommittee in terms  
12 of minor things that we've been meeting pretty steadily  
13 here and by December we'll have an idea of the letters of  
14 intent.

15                   MS. SARNECKY: Um, hmm.

16                   ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: And something to  
17 actually meet on there.

18                   MS. SARNECKY: Yes. The letters of intent  
19 are due December 2nd. And so that's the first week in  
20 December and the meeting is the third week.

21                   ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay.

22                   DR. GENEL: That will be the 13th? Does  
23 that work out to be the 13th or the 20th?

24                   MS. SARNECKY: Let me pull out my

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 calendar. Let's see here.

2 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: We're all  
3 pulling out our various gadgets here.

4 DR. WALLACK: It would be the 20th.

5 MS. SARNECKY: The 20th.

6 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: So the 20th of  
7 December is our next meeting unless something amazing  
8 happens in November and we need to meet, but otherwise  
9 we're just going to do the Bidders' Conference on  
10 November 17th and then we'll all meet back here right  
11 before the holidays and we'll get a sense of what we're  
12 looking at for the applications.

13 Any public comment? Yes, Isolde.

14 DR. BATES: Can I just get an idea of when  
15 the RFP will be out to, available to us and we can send  
16 it out to our investigators? Are we talking like Monday,  
17 Tuesday next week? Because I've been already getting a  
18 lot of phone calls.

19 MS. SARNECKY: I'm going to do my best to  
20 put that stuff together tomorrow. I can send it to Drs.  
21 Goldhammer and Hart.

22 DR. WALLACK: So, Chelsey, to make it --  
23 the process why don't you just distribute it to all of  
24 us?

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.

2 DR. WALLACK: That way we'll -- we can get  
3 -- it will cut out a step.

4 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.

5 DR. WALLACK: Waiting for Hart and David,  
6 for Ron and David to get back and then we see it. We'll  
7 all see it and give you comment.

8 MS. SARNECKY: Great.

9 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Just respond  
10 individually to Chelsey.

11 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

12 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Don't hit reply  
13 to all.

14 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

15 MS. PAULA WILSON: I just have one  
16 question to the Bidders' Conference, is it possible to  
17 video conference that?

18 MS. SARNECKY: Yes. I'm looking into that.  
19 As hard as this may be to believe, the LOB is not as high  
20 tech as one would imagine, which is why I've called CTN  
21 to see if they can videotape it. In terms of a  
22 videoconferencing system I'm still working out some of  
23 the details with legislative management. So I will try to  
24 get an answer for all of the Yale researchers that can't

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

1 attend and we'll try to work something out.

2 MS. WILSON: Thank you.

3 MS. SARNECKY: You're welcome.

4 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Anything else?

5 Okay. We've already done the time and day of the next  
6 meeting. Anything else on anybody else's mind? If not,  
7 could I have a motion to adjourn?

8 DR. FISHBONE: So moved.

9 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay, Gerry.

10 DR. PESCATELLO: Second.

11 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: And Paul. Thank  
12 you. Everybody in favor?

13 ALL VOICES: Aye.

14 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Thank you very  
15 much.

16 MS. SARNECKY: Thank you.

17 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Have a good  
18 Thanksgiving. Good luck with your power.

19 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 2:00  
20 p.m.)

21