

VERBATIM PROCEEDINGS

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
COMMISSIONER JEWEL MULLEN, CHAIRPERSON  
MARCH 20, 2012

CONNECTICUT INNOVATIONS  
865 BROOK STREET  
ROCKY HILL, CONNECTICUT 06067

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

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 . . .Verbatim Proceedings of a meeting of  
2 the Stem Cell Research Advisory Committee held on March  
3 20, 2012 at 1:02 p.m. at Connecticut Innovations, 865  
4 Brook Street, Rocky Hill, Connecticut. . .

5  
6  
7  
8 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER JEWEL MULLEN:

9 Okay. Shall we begin? Those were opening remarks. Hello  
10 everyone. I missed the last meeting and -- but the work  
11 has gone on in many different ways. And I'll acknowledge  
12 Marianne, who is on the phone, and just thank you for all  
13 that you've been doing within the Department to  
14 collaborate with the Advisory Committee and with  
15 Connecticut Innovations to keep this going. Your  
16 leadership is such that I know that Warren did a lot, and  
17 as Commissioner I haven't noticed that we skipped a beat  
18 once he left.

19 MS. MARIANNE HORN: Thank you. I  
20 appreciate it.

21 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: You're welcome. So,  
22 we can start with the approval of last month's, last  
23 time's minutes.

24 DR. MILTON WALLACK: I'll move the

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 approval. One thing, I mean are we going to hand out  
2 David's PowerPoint from the meeting of November?

3 MS. HORN: It is posted on-line and I can  
4 make copies of it, but it's on the DPH Stem Cell website.

5 DR. WALLACK: Okay, okay.

6 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Okay?

7 DR. WALLACK: So with that question I'll  
8 move approval.

9 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Do we have a second?

10 DR. DAVID GOLDHAMMER: I'll second.

11 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Okay. All in favor?

12 ALL VOICES: Aye.

13 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Okay. Now, opposed?  
14 That's a reminder that in my opening remarks I could have  
15 at least thanked everyone who is on the phone and asked  
16 you to just say who is there.

17 DR. RICHARD DEES: Richard Dees.

18 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Hi.

19 DR. RON HART: Ron Hart.

20 DR. GERRY FISHBONE: Gerry Fishbone.

21 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Hi. And Marianne,  
22 Okay. So, here we are. Marianne, would you like to do  
23 the update on the application timeline, etcetera?

24 MS. HORN: I think I'd like to -- a little

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 bit, if I could, by doing an update on the grant review  
2 meeting planning.

3 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Okay.

4 MS. HORN: Which is No. 12. And there were  
5 a few folks who typically come in from out of town and  
6 spend the night before the meeting at the Marriott in  
7 Farmington since that's what we did last year. And I will  
8 say that the contact information that you will, if you are  
9 interested in coming in, that make your own reservations  
10 at the government rate and be reimbursed under your  
11 contract with DPH. So that is about it. I believe it's  
12 already posted on the website from 8:30 to 5:00, June  
13 11th, and if necessary going into June 12th at the  
14 Farmington Marriott. And it will pretty much follow the  
15 same routine as last year. I didn't hear too many  
16 complaints about the setup for the food. So without  
17 complaints we're going ahead. It's pretty much what we did  
18 last year.

19 So if you do have any questions or  
20 concerns, or things that felt were missing from last year  
21 let me know and we can try to accommodate that. So any  
22 questions so far as our grant review?

23 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: I guess my one comment  
24 will be I'll do what I can to see whether or not we can

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 actually accomplish it in one day rather than having to  
2 flow into the second day.

3 MS. HORN: Great.

4 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: That's the way we  
5 managed last year.

6 MS. HORN: I think one thing that will help  
7 is at our next meeting, whenever we decide to have that,  
8 to do a run through as we did last year and sort of  
9 establish the process we're going to use and how we're  
10 going to manage the 70 or so grants. Terri Clark will  
11 speak more about the peer review process.

12 Let's see, I wanted to do a little update  
13 on the next --

14 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: -- yes.

15 MS. HORN: I'll now speak on revisions to  
16 request for proposals and Stem -- 13. We're both on that  
17 committee, but he could do it more justice than I. And  
18 that's -- it's a funding agreement authority. It is moving  
19 along in the Public Health Committee. And that will  
20 authorize DPH to enter into an agreement such as the one  
21 that has been offered to us from California. Not to give  
22 us money, but to allow our scientists more opportunities  
23 to collaborate with one another and to do this on a full  
24 time -- and hopefully expand the use of our dollars into

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 research. (Inaudible -- on phone)

2 Let's see the membership update. Thank you  
3 to everybody who has contributed -- we are down a number  
4 of folks, as you know, and Commissioner Mullen has  
5 submitted five names to the legislature. I think that  
6 leaves us just one short if they all get appointed. So I  
7 will follow through and see if I can't get those people  
8 appointed as quickly as possible so that they will be on  
9 board in time to do the reviews. With another month  
10 slippage that was going to be difficult to have happen.  
11 That will leave 10 of you to do 70 grant reviews.

12 DR. MYRON GENTEL: It would be nice to have  
13 more help.

14 MS. HORN: Definitely, yes. We're down one  
15 from last year. I think it will all come out in the wash  
16 because I think Ann Hastings was not able to attend. Oh,  
17 no, she did come back, anyway. I think we're down one from  
18 last year.

19 So, in terms of the update on the 2012  
20 grant applications, No. 10, and the timeline for the  
21 review process that's -- that will depend a little bit on  
22 where the peer review process is. And assuming that they  
23 are kicking along, and then we get the pairings for the  
24 Advisory Committee done, and access to them, the grants to

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 review. So I won't say anything more on that at this  
2 point.

3 And, finally, the statement of financial --  
4 which are due May 1, 2012 to the Office of State Ethics.  
5 I've included the link to the Office of State Ethics'  
6 page. I do have a link to a paper copy if anybody would  
7 like me to send that to them let me know. And if you have  
8 any issues with the electronic filing system, please, let  
9 me know and I can put you in touch with people to work  
10 that through. But they're fairly strict about that May  
11 1st deadline so I don't want anybody to get messed up with  
12 that.

13 Okay, I think that's it for me.

14 MS. SARAH DONOFRIO: So, we'll move on to  
15 Agenda Item No. 8.

16 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Before we do, I know  
17 that as Marianne was speaking Dr. Wallack had a comment,  
18 question.

19 DR. WALLACK: Yes. Marianne, we sort of  
20 touched on Maryland and you alluded to it also having an  
21 arrangement with California.

22 MS. HORN: Yes.

23 DR. WALLACK: Is it possible for us, and  
24 this is just an extension of what we had talked about

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 before, is it possible to have our own arrangement with  
2 the people in Maryland? I mean can that be explored at  
3 all?

4 MS. HORN: Absolutely. This ability to  
5 contract will allow us to do it not just with California,  
6 but with anybody who comes along.

7 DR. WALLACK: Great, okay.

8 MS. HORN: So that would certainly  
9 authorize us to do it with Maryland.

10 DR. WALLACK: They seem to be running a  
11 really great program as ours is and I think that there are  
12 many similarities. So, I would be enthusiastic, at least  
13 for that exploration, to be opened at an appropriate time.

14  
15 MS. HORN: That's great. I think you're  
16 volunteering.

17 DR. WALLACK: If you wanted me to I  
18 certainly will.

19 MS. HORN: No, that's great. I think it is  
20 definitely worth it.

21 DR. WALLACK: Okay.

22 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Okay, thanks. And just  
23 for the group, we do have hard copies. Sarah, thank you of  
24 the statement of financial interest forms right on the

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 table here.

2 DR. WALLACK: She alluded to the 2013. Do  
3 you want that to be discussed now, or later, or what?

4 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Do you want to do that  
5 while we have you on the phone?

6 MS. HORN: Sure. Let me think -- I was  
7 kind of in and out of that first --

8 DR. WALLACK: -- okay. I think that what  
9 directed some of the thinking, at least, was the expanding  
10 realm of regenerative medicine in Connecticut. And  
11 certainly with Draxon, and certainly with what's going on  
12 in genomics, what's going on with IPS cells, David's  
13 commented upon that at some point in that past, that our  
14 RFP we might want to for 2013 consider if we want to  
15 really take a dramatic shift in how we present our RFP to  
16 specifically include items like I just alluded to, a  
17 consideration of genomics and research in that area. IPS  
18 specifically, we don't really address that in any profound  
19 way, at this point.

20 And one of the other reasons that I'm  
21 thinking that this might be something that we might want  
22 to explore is that with Draxon, and with supposedly 100  
23 million dollars of research monies that will be going for  
24 that kind of research, the oversight of the distribution

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 of the state money somehow, I think, should be addressed  
2 by an agency like ours. And perhaps it's our Advisory  
3 Committee here, since we've done so well with what we've  
4 done in the past, that it would be something that we might  
5 want to look at and have it part of what we're all about.

6 And frankly the other reason for thinking  
7 about this is that it -- there is probably going to be an  
8 increase pool of dollars because of the dollars  
9 specifically assigned to genomic research, research  
10 involving genomics. And I would hope that this would all  
11 be a manner, a way to expand the overall dollars for  
12 genomics as well as cell therapy, cell research. So I  
13 think that there may be some value in looking at a real  
14 significant redirection in the RFP. I think that is  
15 pretty much what we discussed so far, Marianne, is that  
16 right?

17 MS. HORN: Well, I think one thing we  
18 really have to look at is what the legislation ratio we  
19 have right now would report. So I think some of what  
20 you're talking about there would need to have some  
21 different legislation if we're switching directions away  
22 from stem cells.

23 DR. WALLACK: Or adding to stem cell,  
24 right. And you're right that was something that you had

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 pointed out in earlier conversations. And so it would be  
2 appropriate for us to perhaps have a dedicated discussion  
3 on this whole subject. We're not going to do it at this  
4 moment, obviously, but sometime maybe in the next month of  
5 two, literally, and see if we can, picking up on what you  
6 said, Marianne, have legislation that would involve us in  
7 a more expansive way.

8 MS. HORN: Well, just recognize that the  
9 timeline of the legislative session, at this point.

10 DR. WALLACK: Right.

11 MS. HORN: It's a short session and I think  
12 we're probably not able to introduce legislation at this  
13 point. I'm not sure. Commissioner, you probably have a  
14 better sense of the timelines than I do right now.

15 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: It's a little late to  
16 introduce legislation depending on the complexity of  
17 things you could always try to get an amendment to  
18 something, but this sounds a little bit more complex than  
19 that process would allow.

20 DR. WALLACK: So maybe it's not going to  
21 impact 2013 as much as it might 2014.

22 MS. HORN: Correct. It is a dramatic shift.  
23 I think when we talked earlier we were talking about some  
24 changes to the existing RFP that might move us more toward

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 regenerative medicine type of applications, which probably  
2 would be doable within the existing legislation. But a  
3 dramatic shift, I think, obviously is going to bring new  
4 funding strings and --

5 DR. WALLACK: -- right.

6 MS. HORN: Much more complicated.

7 DR. WALLACK: So, maybe, we can look at  
8 doing exactly that, do the thing we can do currently. And  
9 if we're going to do the more dramatic shift, if we feel  
10 it's necessary to do so pick up on that, the easy things  
11 for 2013 and the more expansive for 2014.

12 DR. GOLDHAMMER: No, I think these are  
13 important things to discuss and the key is to start this  
14 process early and not -- because it will take a series of  
15 meetings and discussions to -- I mean I guess we could  
16 discuss this more in later. I mean genomics clearly is a  
17 very important tool. I just kind of see it as a little  
18 separate than stem cells. There is an intersection between  
19 stem cells and genomics and it's an incredibly important  
20 tool. So I guess that's something to discuss is whether  
21 we really wanted to kind of fundamentally change how the  
22 RFP is written, which would take more, adjustments to the  
23 legislation. Or -- and as you said, the easy thing to do  
24 would be to expand, or to modify, and kind of make all

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 more inclusive the RFP to include these technologies that  
2 are -- like IPS and so forth.

3 DR. WALLACK: Right.

4 DR. GOLDHAMMER: But I agree that starting  
5 this really soon is going to be important to make a change  
6 for the next year.

7 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: And I think it's, as  
8 everyone has said, an important conversation for the group  
9 that pretty much embodies the Stem Cell Research Advisory  
10 Committee, which was also established with a pool of money  
11 for a specific purpose. And no matter how we look at it  
12 there are people with vested interests because we're a  
13 potential funding source of them. So, at the same time  
14 that we look at how things might be aligned in the future,  
15 especially as we, in the past year, have talked about what  
16 our funding priorities ought to be for this year, and as  
17 we've tried to anticipate the dissipation of tobacco  
18 settlement dollars to support this, it actually sounds to  
19 me like a much bigger conversation about what else might  
20 happen in the future as part of this or as this could  
21 potentially fade out. So, there are lots of different ways  
22 of looking at it because it's almost like a new scope of  
23 work.

24 DR. WALLACK: Yes.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: And I hear you  
2 identifying that new scope of work as being connected to a  
3 resource pool that is not stem cell money.

4 DR. WALLACK: Not entirely, right.

5 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Um, hmm.

6 DR. WALLACK: One last part of it is that  
7 in November we had the Bidder's Conference and part of  
8 that was -- and we really didn't do it that well. It  
9 wasn't that well attended from the standpoint of business  
10 and industry, but, Marianne, Maryland, again, has made --  
11 Dan Ginsall has made, I think, some major steps in trying  
12 to connect with the business community. We're talking  
13 about farmers and so forth. That might be another aspect  
14 of if we're going to redirect some of our thinking and  
15 approach how do we do that as they're trying to do in  
16 Baltimore because it's going to attract possibly business  
17 in that regard. We might -- could we possibly be looking  
18 at that in the, in looking at the overall picture with  
19 this.

20 You know the reference I'm making to what  
21 Ginsall is doing down there with business, Marianne?

22 MS. HORN: Yes, absolutely. And I guess my  
23 first thought is the -- I hate -- they do have a dedicated  
24 person to do this kind of work. But he's doing some

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 wonderful things and has a wonderful conference every year  
2 as well. They're very professional.

3 DR. GENTEL: Remind me when does the  
4 current legislation expire?

5 MS. HORN: 2015.

6 DR. GENTEL: 15?

7 MS. HORN: 15, the funding --

8 DR. GENTEL: -- so that's really two years.

9 MS. HORN: The Committee will have some  
10 oversights over the money that has already been given out  
11 until those 2015 grants are finished.

12 DR. GENTEL: Yes.

13 DR. WALLACK: And to that point, Mike,  
14 that's exactly why I think that it's really very  
15 appropriate for us to have that on our horizon for  
16 discussion and to see if we can't begin to look past 2015  
17 and that this would certainly take us in that direction.

18 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: So, more for future  
19 discussion. Does anyone on the phone want to add anything?

20

21 DR. FISHBONE: This is Gerry Fishbone and I  
22 just have a question. Does anybody know how the  
23 legislature deals -- about everything that's being --  
24 (inaudible) --

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 MS. EMILY SMITH: -- I can honestly say I  
2 have not been following this as a legislative item. I'm  
3 happy to do that and report back at the next meeting, but  
4 I have not been doing that.

5 DR. WALLACK: Gerry, Emily having said  
6 that, the -- you would have to surmise that with the  
7 Governor and the administration having such an emphasis on  
8 bioscience you would have to surmise that we will probably  
9 be looked upon, at this particular point, fairly favorably  
10 or as favorably as we'll be looked upon at any point in  
11 the future and that's another reason, I think, why a more  
12 expansive viewpoint or involvement by us is timely and  
13 appropriate, I think. I mean that's deductive reasoning,  
14 but I think there may be some grounds to feel that there  
15 is some substance to that.

16 DR. FISHBONE: (Inaudible)

17 DR. WALLACK: And while these are very  
18 attractive discussions I mean you're bringing Jacks in.  
19 Jacks is going to be revving up. They've already hired  
20 architects and so forth. The building will be begun in  
21 the next six to nine months. And, yes, I think that's  
22 exactly the point.

23 DR. FISHBONE: Thank you.

24 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: I don't have any

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 insight either, but I do know that someone, it wasn't the  
2 Department of Public Health, someone was proposing  
3 legislation this year advocating for more use of tobacco  
4 settlement monies to be used for chronic disease  
5 prevention and other core public health initiatives. So  
6 some -- another way to be see what the spirit is would be  
7 to track what happens with that proposed legislation.

8 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I guess the question is  
9 whether stem cells and genomics should be kind of legally,  
10 legislatively tied together. And I'm not sure how I feel  
11 about that, but it's certainly something that we should  
12 start talking about to see if it makes sense or not.

13 DR. WALLACK: So, I know you want to get on  
14 to other things, maybe the only thing we leave it with  
15 right now is the idea that perhaps as your calendar  
16 permits, Commissioner, if we could put it on as a major  
17 item for discussion.

18 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Um, hmm.

19 DR. WALLACK: Perhaps inviting appropriate  
20 people, as you see fit, to the table for this discussion  
21 besides ourselves.

22 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Um, hmm.

23 DR. WALLACK: If you feel it's necessary,  
24 if not just by ourselves, but at least to have some

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 dedicated time.

2 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Yes, I think it would  
3 be important for the Committee to have some more  
4 discussion before inviting people in.

5 DR. WALLACK: Okay.

6 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: I think there are some  
7 other issues that we might want to grapple with here  
8 first.

9 DR. WALLACK: Okay.

10 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Before skipping to the  
11 next part of the discussion. And people are pretty quiet  
12 as they finish their lunch, so I'm not quite able to read  
13 the spirit of the room and the phone, much less tell you  
14 what the legislature is feeling right now. So, maybe  
15 we'll figure that out in the meeting after the meeting or  
16 something.

17 DR. WALLACK: Okay.

18 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: And figure out where  
19 to go. What do you think the best way would be to follow  
20 up on that, Sarah?

21 MS. DONOFRIO: Just --

22 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: -- okay, thanks. And  
23 then we'll figure that out.

24 DR. WALLACK: Thanks.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 MS. DONOFRIO: Any further comments? If  
2 not, we can move on to Agenda No. 8, report on the six  
3 month fiscal reports.

4 MS. SMITH: So these were two reports that  
5 we had not received in time for the last meeting. And we  
6 went back to both of the institutions and were able to get  
7 the reports. We included them in your packets as an FYI.  
8 There is no approval necessary for them, but you have  
9 them.

10 MS. DONOFRIO: And the next agenda item,  
11 the annual reports to be considered for approval.

12 MS. SMITH: There are two annual reports.  
13 They were included in your packets. We reviewed them.  
14 They seem to be in order and I would recommend approval  
15 and acceptance of the annual reports by the Committee.

16 DR. PESCATELLO: So moved.

17 DR. GENTEL: Remind me, was -- is it  
18 Zakovic, is that her name? Is that the investigator that  
19 asked us for a change in the -- it's not. Because, as I  
20 recall, there is a -- okay, I'm thinking of somebody else.  
21 The total costs are substantially less. No, they're not.  
22 I'm thinking of somebody else. Okay, withdrawn.

23 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Okay, withdrawn. Any  
24 other comments, questions?

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 DR. DEES: (Inaudible) -- This is Richard  
2 Dees. So they kind of change who is working on the  
3 project. They changed from who is working as a -- yet  
4 somehow it ended up being more expensive. I'm just kind  
5 of puzzled by it, that's all. (Inaudible)

6 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Any idea on your part?

7

8 MS. SMITH: No.

9 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Shall we go back and  
10 ask?

11 DR. ISOLDE BATES: I can explain. Isolde  
12 Bates from UCONN Stem Cell Institute, Nicole Clinton Maya  
13 is a research assistant. She's more expensive than a post-  
14 doctoral fellow.

15 DR. DEES: Okay, all right. (Inaudible)

16 DR. BATES: Which explanation are you  
17 looking at?

18 DR. DEES: Well, the explanation on the  
19 salary. (Inaudible)

20 DR. BATES: Yes.

21 DR. DEES: Was replaced by somebody else.

22 DR. BATES: Yes. Nicole was --

23 DR. DEES: -- (inaudible) the salary amount  
24 that was paid to \$17,000 above the budget. So the person

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 who left got paid nearly twice as much money as the budget  
2 called for.

3 DR. BATES: I think that's --

4 DR. DEES: -- (inaudible)

5 DR. BATES: It's just the way internally  
6 our accounting system handles the salaries. And she was  
7 paid a total of -- she was the longest on the project.

8 DR. DEES: Okay.

9 DR. BATES: And the budgets are  
10 accumulative.

11 DR. DEES: Yes. I see the budget line for  
12 was (inaudible) -- I don't think there is anything funny  
13 going on I was curious.

14 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Okay.

15 MS. SMITH: So there's a motion to accept  
16 these, to approve them.

17 DR. WALLACK: So moved.

18 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: So, we've had -- I  
19 think we had moved and seconded, right?

20 DR. WALLACK: Right.

21 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: We've had our  
22 discussion. Any other questions? Okay.

23 MS. DONOFRIO: So we'll move onto to No. 8,  
24 I'm sorry, No. 9 -- I apologize, it's No. 10, final

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 reports received.

2 MS. SMITH: Okay. So we did receive final  
3 reports for these five projects. They were included in  
4 your packet. They are included as, for informational  
5 purposes. There is no approval needed on any of those.  
6 Did anyone have any comments on any of them? No comments,  
7 okay.

8 MS. DONOFRIO: The next item rebudgeting  
9 requests, No. 11.

10 MS. SMITH: Okay. So there were four  
11 rebudgeting requests submitted. We reviewed them with our  
12 finance folks and everything seemed to be in order and I  
13 would recommend approval of them by the Committee.

14 DR. DEES: So moved.

15 COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, you need to  
16 identify yourselves.

17 DR. DEES: Richard Dee.

18 COURT REPORTER: Before you speak so I know  
19 who has seconded and moved, etcetera. Could we start that  
20 again, please?

21 DR. DEES: This is Richard Dees. I will  
22 move.

23 DR. FISHBONE: Second.

24 DR. WALLACK: That's okay, Gerry. Dr.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 Fishbone did.

2 COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

3 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Okay. Any discussion?  
4 Further? Do we need a formal vote for these, by the way?

5 MS. SMITH: Sure. Any opposition? Okay.

6 MS. DONOFRIO: Okay. The next agenda item,  
7 No. 12, carryover requests.

8 MS. SMITH: There was one carryover  
9 request. It was a UCONN project and we reviewed that. It  
10 seemed to be in order. I would recommend approval by the  
11 Committee.

12 DR. WALLACK: So moved.

13 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Second?

14 DR. FISHBONE: Second, Gerry Fishbone.

15 MS. SMITH: Any discussion on that? Any  
16 opposition?

17 MS. DONOFRIO: Agenda No. 13, no cost  
18 extension request.

19 MS. SMITH: There were two no cost  
20 extension requests and we reviewed those. I'm just trying  
21 to see -- one was from the University of Connecticut. One  
22 was from Yale. So I reviewed both of those and would  
23 recommend approval by the Committee.

24 DR. FISHBONE: So moved, Gerry Fishbone.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 DR. WALLACK: Second.

2 MS. SMITH: Any discussion? Anyone in  
3 opposition?

4 DR. DEES: Richard Dees, that would be  
5 fine.

6 MS. DONOFRIO: Moving on to No. 14, annual  
7 audit reports received from Wesleyan University.

8 MS. SMITH: So this was included in your  
9 packet for your information. If you recall at the last  
10 meeting we received the annual audit reports from both  
11 Yale and UCONN, but we were missing Wesleyan, so they did  
12 submit it. And it was submitted -- it was included in your  
13 packet. I don't know if there were any questions about it.  
14 It seemed to be in order. So there is no approval  
15 necessary on that.

16 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Um, hmm.

17 MS. SMITH: Thank you.

18 MS. DONOFRIO: And next we'll move on to  
19 No. 15, update on the peer review process.

20 MR. RICK STRAUSS: Okay. I guess -- and  
21 the peer review process is moving along. I don't know  
22 whether or not we're moving along well or just moving  
23 along until around April 4th when we get all the reviews  
24 in from the reviewers. But in your packets you have a list

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 of the chair, co-chairs, and peer reviewers that make up  
2 the peer review team. We implemented the plan. We have  
3 Gary Stein as the chair. We have four co-chairs and ten  
4 peer reviewers. The co-chairs are assigned groups of  
5 grants, grant proposals to review in anticipation of them  
6 coming up for the study section. And also to prepare them  
7 in case they have to assist in the reconciliation of any  
8 proposal review.

9 So, also in the selection process, you  
10 know, we had a number of peer reviewers that carried  
11 forward. And then our search process yielded a number of  
12 potential reviewers. And as you may recall they were  
13 reviewed by our peer review selection committee and Milt  
14 represented the Advisory Committee on that with Gary Stein  
15 and one Academy member, Bill Trey. So, the Academy  
16 identified several and the Committee approved most of  
17 those or provided their consent to most of those. They  
18 did hold back recommendations on a couple. And then the  
19 balance were submitted to the Commissioner and thankfully  
20 the Commissioner approved all the ones that were submitted  
21 to her. So, that process seemed to work out pretty good.

22 The second document that you have is our  
23 timeline proposed and actual completed. The actual  
24 selection and approval of the reviewers, because of the

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 late start, took a little bit longer than we had  
2 anticipated. The proposals were signed. So they're --  
3 that is currently in process. We've kept with the proposed  
4 due date for the proposal reviewer and April, as you can  
5 see, is a very busy month. A study section is scheduled  
6 for April 27th. We'll actually be going up to UMASS to be  
7 with Gary and one or two other reviewers that will  
8 actually be in the room. And the balance will be on the  
9 phone especially those from Australia and Czechoslovakia,  
10 so they're going to not be joining us in the room. So it  
11 will be an interesting telephone call. There is a very  
12 finite window when you can have everybody in relatively  
13 good shape based upon where they are around the world.

14 So, we're scheduled to be done by the end  
15 of April, which gives us a pretty good buffer, like six  
16 weeks, seven weeks buffer in case we run into some issues  
17 this year. So, we're pretty confident that we'll be able  
18 to get the reviews -- you know, the reviews in and any  
19 changes in the rankings of the proposals, you know, and  
20 finalize our work to the Advisory Committee well in time  
21 for the June 12th session.

22 I did want to pass out and we'll provide  
23 this electronically as well. You did receive copies of  
24 the sheets that are being used by the reviewers to

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 evaluate the proposals. But this is what you will  
2 actually see as like the cover sheet. So, it starts with  
3 the initial review summary. And if there is a  
4 reconciliation required that would be the next item that's  
5 identified here. So there is a primary reviewer, secondary  
6 reviewer, reconciliation review. And if there is a change  
7 in the score you'll see that and then there will be a  
8 statement there. And then that may then need to go forward  
9 based on what happens through the -- to the co-chairs, if  
10 the reviewers are unable to reconcile then the co-chair  
11 gets involved to reconcile the proposal with a  
12 reconciliation statement and then a comment by the chair.

13 And then the final step is to study section  
14 review and if there is any change of the score as well as  
15 any comment for why they made the change. So you'll see a  
16 full record of what's happening moving from the initial  
17 reviews, which you'll get, to this study sheet. So,  
18 hopefully it will be pretty concise and it will work out.  
19 Hopefully there won't be too many reconciliation stated,  
20 but we'll see.

21 DR. PESCATELLO: Bottom to top?

22 MR. STRAUSS: Bottom to top. We could make  
23 it top to bottom, but we thought you'd be most interested  
24 seeing the final proposal score so that's at the top. And

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 then you can -- so you can track it either way whatever  
2 your preference might be.

3 So, that's pretty much it. We also assisted  
4 Marianne in trying to identify a couple of people for the  
5 Stem Cell Research Advisory Committee. So I don't know  
6 where that's it.

7 MS. HORN: That was very helpful.

8 MR. STRAUSS: Okay, any questions for us?

9 DR. PESCATELLO: I'd just like to make a  
10 quick comment. So when we get our packages with the  
11 various proposals, this comes up every year, that the  
12 layman's description of -- I hope you guys really work on  
13 that to really force them to come back with a three, four,  
14 or five sentence description both for our use and for the  
15 public's when they look at these things. I think they're  
16 always not that great in terms of being able to  
17 communicate to the relatively sophisticated public what  
18 they're proposing to do.

19 MR. STRAUSS: Okay. Well, we're going to be  
20 going out with a reminder to the reviewers and we'll make  
21 an added plea for that.

22 DR. PESCATELLO: And I would encourage you  
23 to go back to it. It's not -- you know, somebody on your  
24 staff who doesn't know anything about stem cell research,

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 but it a reasonably intelligent looks at it and still  
2 couldn't explain to somebody, a peer, their own non-  
3 science peer what it was about then they should go back  
4 and work on it. All the -- all the universities, they all  
5 have communication staffs who could help on this.

6 MR. STRAUSS: Well, we definitely have  
7 staff that don't know anything about stem cell research.  
8 Now, regarding their smartness I can't tell you whether we  
9 are or we aren't.

10 DR. HART: This is Ron Hart. If it helps at  
11 all, the goal in writing grants is usually to try to take  
12 a reasonably intelligent -- (inaudible)

13 DR. PESCATELLO: Okay.

14 DR. GENTEL: Well, what we need are some  
15 reasonably intelligent high school students to try to  
16 understand it.

17 DR. HART: Yes, they're hard to find.

18 MS. SMITH: Rick, on the timeline, I notice  
19 you have the meeting to determine the funding as June  
20 12th. I think it's June 11th.

21 MR. STRAUSS: Is it? June 11th. So 12th  
22 is the backup.

23 MS. SMITH: That's the backup.

24 MR. STRAUSS: Okay. We'll make the change

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 on this.

2 MS. DONOFRIO: Further comments? Okay.

3 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Just thank you. And I  
4 remember when we first talked about -- when we first met  
5 you, when I did, and then making Marianne, Marianne talk  
6 about having you really take this on this way and it's  
7 made a big difference. So thank you.

8 MR. STRAUSS: Well, let's see what the  
9 results are.

10 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: That's my opinion.  
11 Well, the process is already palpably different.

12 MR. STRAUSS: Yes.

13 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: So thank you.

14 MR. STRAUSS: You know, just one question  
15 as to whether you think it would be at all valuable to  
16 have like Gary available on June 11th if there are any  
17 questions. Or whether it was Gary or a co-chair, you  
18 know, someone that, one of the members of the team or a  
19 couple of members of the team. I don't know whether --  
20 I've only been to one of the actual review sessions so I  
21 don't know whether that would be a helpful thing. It just  
22 -- I just wanted to bring it up in case you thought it  
23 might be valuable.

24 DR. GENTEL: I'm ambivalent because I think

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 the process is intended to separate --

2 MR. STRAUSS: -- separating.

3 DR. GENTEL: You know, Advisory Committee  
4 review from peer review.

5 DR. GOLDHAMMER: And particularly because  
6 of this process in place, which is a real improvement from  
7 the past, I think anything that the chair could contribute  
8 he's contributed to get to this point in terms of  
9 reconciliation and so forth. So I think, in my eyes, I'm a  
10 little bit ambivalent, but I think that probably it's not  
11 in --

12 MR. STRAUSS: -- all right.

13 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: One thing you make me  
14 wonder as I -- as we went through last year's review it  
15 was an opportunity for people to also critique the  
16 reviewers. And some of the information that had come  
17 back. I don't know if you all recall that, but I imagine  
18 there were some instances in which people said, I wish  
19 this had been imparted to us more clearly. So, I should  
20 ask the group whether or not there is anything that you  
21 want to send to Gary so that he has a good understanding  
22 of what we hope to get from them based on some previous  
23 experience with the reviews that have come to us. And it  
24 might be as simple as just looking back at the proceedings

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 from last June to do that. It might be unnecessary.

2 MS. DONOFRIO: The next agenda item,  
3 revisions to request for proposals.

4 MS. HORN: I think that was rolled into  
5 what Bill was talking about unless people want to get  
6 involved in revising the RFP today. It sounds like that  
7 might part of the bigger conversation that we have down  
8 the road.

9 MS. SMITH: All right.

10 MS. DONOFRIO: We can move on to No. 17,  
11 Stem Conn '13.

12 MS. SMITH: That was the 2013.

13 MS. DONOFRIO: And next is public comment.

14 MR. STRAUSS: Okay.

15 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Please identify  
16 yourself.

17 MR. STRAUSS: Rick Strauss, Connecticut  
18 Academy of Science and Engineering. I just wanted to  
19 mention work on a project we're involved in through the  
20 General Assembly, Workforce Alignment. Now, in a couple  
21 of months I might be able to tell you what that really  
22 means. We're working on the definition with our committee.

23 But basically -- and there are also several bills before  
24 the General Assembly this year dealing with this issue of

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 workforce alignment. And actually Paul is on our  
2 committee. But it really looks at the connection between  
3 the education continuum, the workforce employers, the  
4 employees whether they're just job seekers, whether  
5 they're dislocated workers, people that are unemployed, or  
6 retraining. It really deals with the whole spectrum.

7 Now, a piece of where Connecticut is going  
8 and how it aligns itself -- I mean really if you want to  
9 start from the beginning this is really a pre-school to  
10 after college and continued learning for making sure that  
11 the workforce is prepared for the jobs for the future.

12 But it also deals with the state being ready for the  
13 future with whatever is emerging. And the research  
14 investments in the state, based on the 100 million, which  
15 is a lot of money, or whatever other areas the state may  
16 be looking at investing in like advanced manufacturing or  
17 fuel cells, or other technologies, and the work of  
18 Connecticut Innovations, and the Connecticut Energy  
19 Finance and Investment Authority, they're all kind of  
20 linked.

21 So how this system -- the new term, I guess  
22 is probably an old term by now, ecosystem and innovation  
23 all fits together is really important. So when you're  
24 deliberating on, you know, genomics and relation to stem

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 cell, and what this group is doing it's -- and then there  
2 is also the biomedical research grant program which, you  
3 know, is a smaller program and it doesn't have the same  
4 visibility like with you people with the stem cells  
5 program. So you may want to think about all that and how  
6 it links up to what the real push is in terms of the  
7 economic well being of the state and moving the state into  
8 the future for the next 20 years and where we go.

9 It's not easy and a lot of people are  
10 talking about it. And they're looking at investing a lot  
11 of money and they're moving fast perhaps without, in some  
12 areas because of the severity of the unemployment at 8 or  
13 9 percent, assuming that's bad, without necessarily a  
14 plan, but looking at pushing programs forward to reduce  
15 the unemployment rate not necessarily aligned with what  
16 might be in the long-term best interest of the state. I'm  
17 not saying whether they are not, but you definitely want  
18 to look at how this all fits into the bigger picture.

19 So, thank you.

20 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Thank you.

21 DR. WALLACK: So, are you working with the  
22 Board of Regents also on this?

23 MR. STRAUSS: This study is for the Higher  
24 Education, Employment Advancement Committee, the Commerce

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 Committee, the Labor Committee, and the Education  
2 Committee. They're the committees -- and it's being done  
3 in consultation with -- and if you ask anybody what that  
4 means you have to -- it's almost a Workforce Alignment --  
5 but that is being in consultation with the Department of  
6 Labor, the Department of Economic and Community  
7 Development, the Board of Regents. And then we threw in  
8 the Department of Education because the General Assembly  
9 left them out. And the Office of Workforce  
10 Competitiveness is tied into the Department of Labor so  
11 they're involved as well.

12 DR. WALLACK: So, Rick, you're going to  
13 come out with a report of how to --

14 MR. STRAUSS: -- well, I didn't -- our job  
15 is to try to evaluate, identify strategies or evaluate  
16 strategies that can be used to assess the effectiveness of  
17 workforce related programs so that the workforce is  
18 prepared for the jobs of the future. So, it gets into  
19 what kind of data and information is being used and how it  
20 is analyzed to direct state investments in certain areas  
21 to assure better alignment of education and training  
22 programs with employer needs. And it's more complicated  
23 than just using the Department of Labor data because  
24 that's -- although, you know, it's a stable source of

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 information, it doesn't necessarily provide you with  
2 enough information to be able to look at what the trends  
3 are in -- people are using more sophisticated and various  
4 sources of data. So we're trying to learn about that to  
5 see what, you know, how others are doing it and what the  
6 best practices are.

7 And then see how Connecticut might utilize  
8 that in, you know, one, looking at where to make  
9 investments because they could see what's emerging. But  
10 also to help in determining when, what the results are for  
11 the -- of the investments. And then when it's time to  
12 start moving in different directions so that you're not  
13 necessarily funding programs where there aren't -- where  
14 the demand isn't there.

15 So, does anybody got any ideas?

16 DR. WALLACK: But what I really feel about  
17 is this is that's incredibly important because antidotally  
18 we've heard stories, obviously, through the years that  
19 manufacturing or whatever initiatives have gone out of  
20 state because of a lack of adequate workforce. And this  
21 would hopefully -- from what I gather this is exactly what  
22 you're trying to make recommendations so that dollars can  
23 be put in the appropriate way for appropriate training and  
24 so forth.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 MR. STRAUSS: Yes. And, of course, one of  
2 the most important things is can you ready by third grade.  
3 So it's --

4 DR. WALLACK: -- when is your report going  
5 to be coming out?

6 MR. STRAUSS: By January 2013. And if you  
7 -- we're actually recording most of our study committee  
8 meetings with guest speakers. So we've had in the  
9 Education Commission of the States, they're based on  
10 Colorado, for a presentation. We had an author in last  
11 week on the next -- he wrote a book on the next American  
12 economy and it deals with innovation and the whole  
13 workforce alignment issue. Next month we are having in  
14 the Georgetown Center for Education in the Workforce to  
15 talk about their use of data and information. In May we  
16 have in the four commissioners and the Office of Workforce  
17 Competitiveness to talk about what they're doing and where  
18 they see the gaps, and there they think they're aligned,  
19 and what the initiatives are in the state.

20 Along with hearing from some companies in  
21 April and also looking at global interest areas in May.  
22 And then in June we hope to hear from Nobel Laureate's  
23 team, not him, from the University of Chicago on early  
24 childhood investments and their role and importance in

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 this whole issue. And then I don't know what we're going  
2 to do after that, but that's a start.

3 DR. WALLACK: One other thing, if I might,  
4 you're going to be look at current capacity vis a vie,  
5 say, community colleges and so forth as well as part of  
6 this? So you can then make appropriate recommendations or  
7 no?

8 MR. STRAUSS: We're really -- it's hard --  
9 we're trying to not get into the weeds of determining what  
10 all the programs are out there, but rather kind of like  
11 where the -- what are the key points of where you need to  
12 be aligned. And what are they doing to assure their  
13 alignment. Like one of the things the community college  
14 system and the Board of Regents did was to come up with  
15 these articulation agreements. So that credits transfer  
16 and you're not going -- students will not lose time and  
17 credit by going from community college into the state  
18 university system. So that's like one of the momentum  
19 points to make sure we can keep the students on track. So  
20 they're looking for better alignment in that area.

21 And then, you know, you have to take that  
22 back into the high schools and you've got to bring that  
23 down into the lower grades. But that's over simplifying  
24 it, of course, but there is certain points in the system

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 that need to be, perhaps, better aligned in order to  
2 achieve the results.

3 I mean one of the problems that you mention  
4 in advanced manufacturing is that, you know, the employers  
5 are complaining that they can't CNC operators. Well, we  
6 have one employer that says, what they like to do is to  
7 find people that they think are good candidates that have  
8 good backgrounds. And they then want to train them in  
9 their systems and on their machines. Others say I need the  
10 guy to be able to work this CNC machine with this software  
11 and I need them tomorrow. I'm not sure they're moving out  
12 because I'm not sure they're going to get that same person  
13 anywhere else, but that's kind of like the dilemma.

14 So, one of the pilot programs that was  
15 tried recently through Congressman Larsen was a job match  
16 program where it ran through CECAT and they started with  
17 let's say 300 perspective people that were looking for  
18 jobs. And they looked at what their skills were and then  
19 they down selected those to a number of people that could  
20 have additional interviews. And then that went further  
21 down into 30 that were invited to attend this session with  
22 X number of employers and about 20 people got hired. Now,  
23 what did that do for the unemployment rate? Maybe 1,000th  
24 of a point.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1                   But can that be -- can that program be  
2 leveraged and be built up to, in a way that could be  
3 productive for placing people and looking at what people  
4 need, and what kind of skills that they may not be aware  
5 of that they need that they could then get training for,  
6 and the training programs might be designed to do that.  
7 And within all of that what's the state role, and what's  
8 the employer's role, and how could you do it most cost  
9 effectively? I don't know if we're going to get all of  
10 those answers.

11                   But, anyway, it's certainly challenging and  
12 there is a lot of people that are now working together.  
13 The Connecticut Employment and Training Commission is  
14 working on this, you know, in a number of areas including  
15 biotech, which is a big one. They're looking at starting -  
16 - I think you're involved, right, with the biotech cluster  
17 initiative through C-TECH or something or starting to be.

18  
19                   CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: A little bit.

20                   MR. STRAUSS: So, anyway, it's going all  
21 over the place.

22                   MS. DONOFRIO: Any further comments?

23                   CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: So, can we back up?

24                   MS. DONOFRIO: Sure.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: And we have revisions  
2 to the agenda, which was originally mailed out, and we  
3 just wanted to seek approval for a revision to the order.

4 DR. WALLACK: So moved.

5 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: And a second?

6 DR. GENTEL: Second.

7 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Any objections? Okay.  
8 Discussion? Thank you very much.

9 Any other public comment?

10 DR. DEES: This is Richard Dees. I have a  
11 comment, a public comment.

12 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Um, hmm.

13 DR. DEES: We went through the final report  
14 -- the discussion about lay summaries reminded me of some  
15 things in the final report that the lay summaries should  
16 be improved, shall we say, for the lay public.

17 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Yes. All right.

18 MS. SMITH: I can pass that along to the  
19 institutions and let them know that a request has been  
20 made to improve the lay summaries.

21 DR. DEES: I mean I could be more specific.  
22 The Shoemaker report I thought could be made a lot more  
23 clear. The Antic report there were some technicalities  
24 that were hard to follow where some people wouldn't know

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 anything about this. The same is true of the Zew report.

2 MS. SMITH: All right.

3 DR. DEES: And then I would like to say the  
4 Lee lay summary was actually pretty nice.

5 MS. SMITH: All right, that's good. I will  
6 pass that on to the institutions.

7 DR. DEES: Thank you.

8 MS. SMITH: You're welcome.

9 DR. GOLDHAMMER: And this will be passed on  
10 directly to the individuals as well because the  
11 institution, as a body, won't do anything to rectify this.  
12 It really has to be the individual investigator that takes  
13 responsibility for it.

14 MS. SMITH: Sure.

15 DR. DEES: In some of them they were still  
16 talking about what they were proposing to do in their lay  
17 summaries. They didn't revise it for the final report.

18 DR. PESCATELLO: A lot of times, I mean  
19 more so in the past, but they've read like edited versions  
20 of the larger proposal request. And I would just make  
21 another comment -- I've already made this comment over and  
22 over again, but we also get -- there is a lot of  
23 understandable desire on the part of the public for how  
24 this research is connected to ultimate treatments and

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 cures. And so to the extent that in the lay summary that -  
2 - I would make a request -- you know, both what connection  
3 -- there is always a connection to ultimate treatments and  
4 cures, one way or the other. But also if at all possible -  
5 - because I'm a great believer in basic research and that  
6 that's you have to have it. There is really no shortcut to  
7 make a case for why this basic research is so important.  
8 And that kind of description is different from just  
9 editing your overall proposal.

10 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Would it be helpful to  
11 have a little section why is this important to your help?  
12 Why does this matter?

13 DR. PESCATELLO: Yes.

14 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: So that somebody who  
15 maybe would glaze over reading anything else will say,  
16 look at what they're doing. Look at how this might benefit  
17 us.

18 DR. PESCATELLO: Yes. It's a good idea.

19 MS. SMITH: So we will pass that along.

20 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: In plain English.

21 DR. PESCATELLO: Right.

22 DR. DEES: So we'll move onto the next  
23 meeting date. I think we would like to send a poll around  
24 regarding the April meeting to see if anyone felt we

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 needed to have that meeting or if we could wait until May.

2 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Um, hmm.

3 DR. WALLACK: So if we meet in May it's  
4 probably going to be in preparation of -- for the review  
5 process, right? If there is any validity in trying to  
6 have a discussion, as we talked about before, about new  
7 directions for the RFP for 2013 and then 2014, I might  
8 argue that we should have the April meeting and maybe  
9 devote a portion, a significant portion of that meeting  
10 with this discussion.

11 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: So why don't we give  
12 Marianne a chance to tell us whether or not even based on  
13 the legislation that we work with now says we can go very  
14 far away from where we are, and finish that rest of that  
15 email discussion with the idea that if people come to some  
16 consensus that we need to continue the discussion in April  
17 there can be a meeting. Let's do it that way. But let's  
18 be sure first about whether or not there is a possibility.

19 And it is a big discussion and I think that even if we  
20 start it in April it's going to take months after that to  
21 land any place.

22 DR. WALLACK: And that's exactly, I think,  
23 why I said that because after June then we're probably not  
24 going to meet until August, September or thereabouts. So

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 that that discussion will happen way into 2012 if we don't  
2 have it in April.

3 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Have you talked with  
4 anyone at UCONN in the bioscience to see whether or not  
5 this is something they're interested in?

6 DR. WALLACK: So, David, you can maybe talk  
7 more to this than -- better about this than I can.  
8 Certainly the whole area of IPS is -- I'm really beginning  
9 to be a convert to the idea that this is something that we  
10 really have to begin to emphasize in what we're doing.  
11 And it impacts on what we're doing with the core funding.

12 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I think if it's a matter  
13 of just changing the language to make it more inclusive  
14 the new stem cell technologies, like IPS, that's  
15 relatively easy to do with language changes. It's the  
16 intersection of stem cells with genomics that we really  
17 revamp the program which is going to be a very serious  
18 discussion. As you know, I completely agree that we  
19 should change the RFP and include, make it very clear that  
20 IPS and other approaches that aren't specifically written  
21 into the initial RFP are now included.

22 And we discussed this before the fact that  
23 when it was first -- when we first put out the RFP the  
24 emphasis was on human stem cell lines that could not

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 receive funding from federal sources. And now that's more  
2 of a mute point now. And so I think it's time to really  
3 expand the language a little bit and make sure that it  
4 incorporates the newest -- it emphasizes the newest  
5 technologies and approaches and isn't so specifically tied  
6 to the more narrow focus that we began with.

7 DR. WALLACK: And there is the -- so I  
8 totally agree with what David said and while it's subtle  
9 in the rewording of it, it's pretty significant from the  
10 standpoint of where we've come from. The other thing is  
11 when we talk about the larger discussion, and more  
12 substantive discussion, it's also consistent, I believe,  
13 with what NIH is doing. From what I gather they have  
14 formed a new institute on regenerative medicine. And --

15 DR. HART: -- yes, they have.

16 DR. GENTEL: It's a center, isn't it?

17 DR. WALLACK: Yes, right.

18 DR. GENTEL: Within NICHD.

19 DR. WALLACK: So, Ron, do you want to  
20 comment on it?

21 DR. HART: We've actually been negotiating  
22 with them to provide repository sources for them. But the  
23 -- they're trying to consolidate several projects that  
24 take advantage of -- and to have some uniformity. But the

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 big advantage of including IPS is the immediate access to  
2 disease and applications. Whereas embryonic stem cells  
3 are largely created from embryos for which we don't know  
4 what their -- types and diseases -- are -- stem cells can  
5 be made from patients with specific conditions and  
6 specific unities. So if the goal is to get toward  
7 treating diseases quicker IPS makes the most sense.

8 DR. GOLDHAMMER: And one more comment as  
9 long -- if we're taking a broader approach, and given the  
10 changes in federal policy and so forth, we should also  
11 have a discussion about adult stem cells or tissue  
12 specific stem cells, which are in the legislation, but  
13 they tend not to be emphasized by this Committee for very  
14 good reasons in the past. But if we're really looking for  
15 the best therapies, the best research to get us to the  
16 point of therapies tissue specific stem cells are every  
17 bit as important as embryonic stem cells. And, in fact,  
18 the only therapies available now with stem cells are with  
19 tissue specific stem cells. And there is cases where it  
20 would be much better to use a tissue specific stem cell  
21 than an embryonic stem cell because of the problems  
22 implied -- they're also seen as advantages, but there is  
23 also problems.

24 Anyway, this is a long way of saying that

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 as long as we're expanding the scope that we should stick  
2 with our goal of funding the best research and not  
3 necessarily emphasize, in my view, embryonic stem cells  
4 over others. And let the best science and the most -- and  
5 the best science and applicability to human health dictate  
6 what we find.

7 DR. WALLACK: And I've been a big proponent  
8 of staying to our original goal of embryonic stem cell  
9 research in the past. Buy by the same token, I mean we're  
10 not where we were when some of us, like myself, were  
11 emphasizing that. And I think what's really, really been  
12 wonderful about what we've done here at the Advisory  
13 Committee is that we've always been in the lead of what's  
14 been going on nationally or for that matter around the  
15 world. And that's why, I think, we have to be having this  
16 kind of discussion and redirection of what we're trying to  
17 do because if we don't we're not going to any longer be in  
18 the lead.

19 And so this is a long winded reason,  
20 explanation about why the April meeting might be an  
21 important discussion, opportunity for discussion  
22 especially if Marianne is prepared -- I think she can be.  
23 I think she can be prepared to indicate what the -- if we  
24 need to go legislatively --

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 MS. HORN: -- um, hmm.

2 DR. WALLACK: But we don't need to have  
3 that to make certain minor changes, but certainly,  
4 Marianne, can help us to guide us through what would be  
5 necessary. And, you're right, Marianne, this is a short  
6 session, but certainly for 2013.

7 MS. HORN: Right. And maybe you and I,  
8 Milt, can have a conversation before I put that together.  
9 I think that we just need to know where the boundaries  
10 would be and then to sort of draw the sphere of what would  
11 be possible. I think the language does allow for quite a  
12 bit of flexibility.

13 DR. WALLACK: Right. I'd be more than  
14 willing to meet with you on that.

15 MS. HORN: Okay.

16 DR. WALLACK: And we can discuss if there  
17 is need, and there well might be, if you feel so, bring  
18 whoever else to the table for that discussion.

19 MS. HORN: Perfect. And then we can come  
20 back -- so I am hearing an April meeting would be a good  
21 time to have that discussion.

22 DR. GENTEL: Yes, a couple of comments.  
23 First of all, I think it's important to maintain some sort  
24 of a central theme behind this. I worry if the program is

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 perceived as becoming too defuse it looses that concept of  
2 something that is a very, very central concept. I mean  
3 that was the nice thing and the beauty of a focus on stem  
4 cells is because there was a central focus. And I think if  
5 we get too far away from that we start -- we start to lose  
6 that sort of very, very central concept.

7 The other thing, I think, it might be  
8 useful if we're going to meet in April is perhaps most  
9 people put together some sort of a concept paper or  
10 something that we can look at and consider in advance of  
11 the meeting.

12 DR. WALLACK: Thanks, Mike, you're always  
13 very helpful, aren't you?

14 DR. GENTEL: Yes. Just talk into a  
15 Dictaphone and put it all those thoughts down on paper.

16 DR. WALLACK: No, I mean we can come in  
17 with certain talking points. And certainly, David, I mean  
18 you would be critical to this discussion, I think.

19 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I'm happy to do whatever  
20 prior to the meeting.

21 DR. WALLACK: Right.

22 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Except maybe not write a  
23 concept paper.

24 DR. WALLACK: You notice I turned to you.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2012

1 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Yes. And that's why I felt  
2 I needed to loop back to you.

3 DR. GENTEL: I'm happy to criticize one.

4 DR. WALLACK: The last time -- twice I  
5 remember he made the suggestion that led to major papers  
6 on our part. Thank you, Mike.

7 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: All the reasons I put  
8 the discussion to the group since I won't be doing any of  
9 that.

10 DR. WALLACK: No, but it's your oversight  
11 and overview and bringing it together that becomes  
12 absolutely critical. And it's what you bring to the table  
13 is very, very important to us for credibility.

14 MS. DONOFRIO: Any further comments or  
15 items to discuss? I think we can move to adjourn.

16 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Anybody want to rush  
17 to move to adjourn? Anybody want to stay?

18 DR. WALLACK: Move to adjourn.

19 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Second. Thank you  
20 everyone.

21 (Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at  
22 2:13 p.m.)