

VERBATIM PROCEEDINGS

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE

COMMISSIONER DR. JEWEL MULLEN, CHAIRPERSON

MAY 17, 2011

CONNECTICUT INNOVATIONS
865 BROOK STREET
ROCKY HILL, CONNECTICUT

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

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 . . . Verbatim Proceedings of a meeting of
2 the Connecticut Stem Cell Research Committee held on May
3 17, 2011 at 1:05 p.m. at Connecticut Innovations, 865
4 Brook Street, Rocky Hill, Connecticut. . .

5

6

7

8 MR. WARREN WOLLSCHLAGER: I call the
9 meeting to order. And it's my pleasure to introduce to
10 you, those of you who haven't met Dr. Mullen before, our
11 new Commissioner of Health, Dr. Jewel Mullen. Dr. Mullen
12 is multi-credentialed, is Board certified in internal
13 medicine, and a graduate of Mount Sinai -- you did a
14 little bit of time in Mount Sinai, I think -- Masters and
15 Bachelors in Public Health from Yale as well as public
16 administration from Harvard. So, she brings a breadth, a
17 wealth of both clinic and public health experience to the
18 Department and it's really -- it's going to be an
19 exciting time for the Department really to step back into
20 the public health arena a little more visibly. So we're
21 happy to have her on Board.

22 Dr. Mullen, do you have any comments? Do
23 you want to know who is here? Do you want to go around
24 and make --

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: -- I do, thank you. I
2 was new back in January or February when -- I think
3 January when I was -- Dr. Galvin's last meeting was here
4 and then in February when I think we had a budget meeting
5 or some other conflict. So, I guess I'm still new to the
6 group and I'm really happy to be here. I would say that
7 both Dr. Galvin and Warren have spoken so highly of the
8 work of this committee. They just really have. And I
9 think in that regard Dr. Galvin told me that I was really
10 going to look forward to coming to these meetings.

11 So, I missed one for holidays and one for
12 not really having an agenda, and in spite of the weather
13 we're here and a lot of exciting things have happened
14 since January and February. I had a chance to meet Dr.
15 Wallack at a meeting at the Governor's office advocating
16 on behalf of everyone's work. So I'll just stop there
17 because I'd love for people to introduce themselves.

18 DR. ANNE HISKES: I'm Anne Hiskes from the
19 University of Connecticut, a member of the philosophy
20 department.

21 DR. MILTON WALLACK: Milt Wallack. I've
22 been involved with Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation
23 and that's what got me involved with the stem cell
24 research activities. And I guess Warren and I go back

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 from the first day of this and then with Marianne, so
2 it's been a pleasure and it's been very, very exciting
3 and I can't wait to look to the future.

4 DR. HISKES: I guess Dave and I were part
5 of the stem cell five at the UCONN.

6 DR. MYRON GENEL: I just saw the
7 championship season, I'm not so sure it's great to be
8 recognized as among the five. I'm Mike Genel. I'm
9 various titles. I'm at Yale. I'm also a graduate of Mt.
10 Sinai.

11 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Oh, you are? All
12 right.

13 DR. GENEL: Well, they call me that. I
14 just did an internship there.

15 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Okay.

16 DR. GENEL: Among other things. And like
17 Milt I've been engaged in this from the beginning.

18 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: A pediatrician?

19 DR. DAVID GOLDHAMMER: I'm David
20 Goldhammer. I'm a researcher at UCONN Storrs, and I study
21 muscle stem cells with a focus on muscular disease, and
22 I'm happy to be here.

23 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Great.

24 MS. CHELSEY SARNECKY: We're just going to

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 go around for the Commissioner and introduce ourselves.
2 So if everybody on the line wants to take a shot at that.

3 DR. RICHARD DEES: I'm Richard Dees. I'm
4 from the University of Rochester where I teach philosophy
5 and medical examining.

6 MR. ROBERT MANDELKERN: I'm Bob
7 Mandelkern, delegate from the stem cell work in
8 Connecticut. I represent the Parkinson 's disease
9 community, from which I suffer, and I've been involved in
10 the work, in passing the legislation and in implementing
11 it since 2006. My experience is in 60 years of corporate
12 finance and capitol work and that is the basis of my
13 appointment.

14 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Hello.

15 DR. RON HART: Hi. I'm Ron Hart from
16 Rutgers's University. And I've been a stem cell
17 researcher working on MicroRNA's and nervous system
18 developments.

19 DR. TREENA ARINZEH: This is Treena
20 Arinze and I'm a professor at the New Jersey Institute
21 Technology in biomedical engineering. And I work on stem
22 cells related to orthopedic mostly bone and cartilage
23 regeneration.

24 MS. PAULA WILSON: I'm Paula Wilson. I'm

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 the administrator at the Yale Stem Cell Center.

2 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Nice to meet you.

3 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Great. So let's get
4 cracking. Part of your package that Chelsey sent out, you
5 should have all received a copy of the minutes from the
6 meeting of February 15th. I'll give you a chance to look
7 at those if you can't recall them exactly. They're
8 fairly lengthy. If you want to take just a minute or
9 two, if anyone needs a copy I think we have hard copies
10 available. So can we have a motion to accept the
11 minutes?

12 DR. GENEL: I move approval.

13 DR. WALLACK: Second.

14 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Any discussion? Great.
15 All in favor, aye?

16 ALL VOICES: Aye.

17 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Ayes have it.

18 Chelsey, are you going to walk us through
19 the various modifications and requests?

20 MS. SARNECKY: I sure will.

21 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay.

22 MS. SARNECKY: So the first few items on
23 the agenda are no cost extensions. We've got --I sent
24 around the budget sheets for the no cost extensions.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 Pretty routine. The grant is ending we need to
2 carryover some left over funding. We'll start with
3 09SCBUHC09, Shapiro. This is a carryover of about 31,000
4 dollars. And, you know, I reviewed this one and the
5 carryover is pretty self explanatory, the justification
6 here. There is the cost of living increases and the
7 fringe benefits, which you -- which everyone will see
8 throughout the UCONN Health Center carryovers as well.

9 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Do you want to maybe do
10 these the way we did, you know, act on each individual or
11 we can go through some of the more routine and bundle
12 them up? We can do whatever the will of the group is.

13 MS. SARNECKY: I think Agenda Items No. 3
14 through 7 are pretty routine.

15 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So we want to go
16 through, if that's okay with the group, we'll just ask
17 Chelsey to present No. 3 through No. 7.

18 MS. SARNECKY: Perfect. Agenda Item No.
19 4, Dr. Lichtler at the Health Center, 09SCBUHC20,
20 carryover is about 33 or 43,000 dollars. And, again,
21 there is just the carryover due to furlough adjustments,
22 fringe benefits.

23 (Off the record)

24 MS. SARNECKY: We're not sure what

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 happened, but we could hear everyone but nobody could
2 hear us. So I'm glad we're all together again.

3 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Thank you for your
4 patience hanging in there.

5 MS. SARNECKY: Thank you. Okay.

6 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: We finished everything
7 while you couldn't hear us.

8 MS. SARNECKY: The meeting is over.

9 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So, I believe, did the
10 folks on the phone hear us as we talked about the Shapiro
11 budget carryover request?

12 DR. HART: Yes.

13 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay. So are going to
14 start in with No. 4, Chelsey?

15 MS. SARNECKY: Yes. And just in case
16 anybody missed it what we're going to do is go through
17 Agenda Items No. 3 through 7 and then we'll just need a
18 motion to approve all these carryover requests.

19 Dr. Lichtler, 09SCBUHC20, carryover of
20 about \$43,000 dollars. Like I mentioned with the Shapiro
21 request there were some furlough adjustments and fringe
22 benefit increases so that's why the personnel budgets are
23 off.

24 Agenda Item No. 5, Dr. Xu, 09SCDUCHC001,

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 there is -- this is the UCONN and Wesleyan core so we
2 have two budget carryover requests here. Dr. Xu is a
3 \$167,000 dollar carryover, which over the life of the
4 grant is not a whole lot of money. And, you know, the
5 same justification in this grant as well. The Wesleyan
6 subcontract budget was -- actually most of the --
7 actually carryover most of the budget so out of the
8 \$28,000 dollars for that year they're carrying over about
9 25.

13 Agenda Item No. 7 --

14 DR. HART: -- Chelsey, what's the change
15 in UCONN's fringe benefit costs? What are they doing?
16 What's different?

17 MS. SARNECKY: Well, they -- they are a
18 state funded school so when anything changes at the state
19 level it has to go through UCONN as well. So any -- I
20 don't know what the specific changes have been. I don't
21 know if you can speak to that, Anne.

22 DR. HISKES: These are our Health Center
23 people. They're totally different from the Storrs people
24 in terms of --

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 MS. SARNECKY: -- it just has to do with
2 the way that their benefits -- as Anne said the way their
3 benefits are structured. Is that sufficient or do you
4 want me to get more information on that for you?

5 DR. HART: I was just curious.

6 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.

7 DR. HART: I think that's fine.

8 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.

9 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Did you include the
10 separate carryover request from Dr. Grabel?

11 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

12 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: You did? Okay.

13 MS. SARNECKY: I have the -- did everyone
14 see Dr. Grabel's subcontract budget?

15 And lastly, Dr. -- we'll call him Dr. B
16 because I will not be able to -- okay, 09SCBUHC01, this
17 one is \$28,000 dollar carryover. Did you have a
18 question, Commissioner?

19 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: I was just checking
20 what happened -- I was curious and then I see where it
21 says -- why it wasn't spent. I just didn't know whether
22 or not people wanted to understand that a little bit
23 more.

24 MS. SARNECKY: Yes, that was my note that

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 I put on there.

2 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Right.

3 MS. SARNECKY: But I --

4 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: -- right. And since
5 I didn't have the carryover I didn't understand why it
6 was being carried over.

7 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.

8 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: So I just wanted to
9 understand. I thought I would ask. Did you get the
10 answer to the question?11 MS. SARNECKY: No. I don't -- I kind of
12 let the Committee go through the requests if the
13 Committee has any questions then I would follow up with
14 the researcher.15 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Okay. I agree with
16 what you wrote.17 MS. SARNECKY: Okay, perfect. So, on the
18 Grabel subcontract there is a justification here for the
19 variance for the personnel and it says, funds will be
20 used to cover PI's summer payroll expense. I see the
21 justification as why the money wasn't spent not what it's
22 to be used for, and that's in the original budget what it
23 is to be used for, but there is no mention as to why
24 there was such a big carryover here.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 DR. GENEL: Is the common theme in all of
2 these UCONN carryover requests money left over from a
3 change in the fringe benefits? Is that --

4 MS. SARNECKY: -- that's the majority of
5 them. You know, if you go through each -- I didn't want
6 to go through and read the justifications because I had
7 thought that everyone had a chance to review them.
8 That's why I didn't go into too much detail. But if you
9 take a look, most of the personnel variances have to do
10 with fringe benefits or cost of living increases. And
11 then when you get down to the other direct costs or the
12 indirect costs there is -- they're actually smaller
13 amounts that are being carried over so that the bulk of
14 the request is for personnel purposes.

15 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Are there other
16 questions for Chelsey?

17 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: And for some things
18 such as where a person receives a different grant and no
19 longer needs salary support from this and they say
20 they'll assign additional personnel and utilize other
21 personnel dollars for supply costs. Does that come back
22 to the Committee or do they just let us know in a follow
23 up budget? It's my first meeting and I'm just asking how
24 this works.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 MS. SARNECKY: A lot of the requests if
2 they're -- if the PI will reallocate money from one part
3 of the budget to the other that usually comes through to
4 CI, if it's under 20 percent CI approves it.

5 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Got it.

6 MS. SARNECKY: If we see that if it's
7 anything over we bring it to the Committee.

8 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: All right.

9 MS. SARNECKY: And if it's under 10
10 percent the PI and the university can, you know -- they
11 can work with that 10 percent on their own, but they
12 usually just, just let us know so we have an idea of
13 what's going on with the grant.

14 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Thanks.

15 MS. SARNECKY: You're welcome.

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Other questions? For
17 folks on the phone, any questions?

18 DR. GENEL: Can I move approval of all of
19 the preceding requests for carryovers?

20 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So that would be to
21 move approval on requests numbered 3 through 7?

22 DR. GENEL: Yes, that's right, No. 3
23 through 7 is correct.

24 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Do we have a second?

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 DR. WALLACK: Second.

2 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Any discussion? All
3 those in favor?

4 ALL VOICES: Aye.

5 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Ayes have it. Thank
6 you.7 Okay. So we want to move on to the annual
8 report now, annual and final reports? We have an annual
9 report from Graveley.10 MS. SARNECKY: Dr. Wallack and Dr.
11 Kiessling were kind enough to offer to review these two
12 annual reports. The original end date on this Graveley
13 project was March of this year. And Dr. Graveley had
14 requested a not cost extension until July of this year.
15 So this covers the -- this last year of their grant and
16 we'll get another final report from March of 2011 through
17 July of 2011, we'll get that in September.18 DR. WALLACK: And Dr. Xu also is working
19 on an extension as well.

20 MS. SARNECKY: Yes, that extension --

21 DR. WALLACK: -- to December, I believe.

22 MS. SARNECKY: Is December. Let me just
23 double check. Yes.

24 DR. WALLACK: Okay. Do you want me to do

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 both at the same time?

2 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

3 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: These are a little
4 bigger, maybe we can just do one at a time just for
5 myself. That would be helpful to me.6 DR. WALLACK: Okay. So if we start with
7 Graveley, Anne and I are basically on the same page with
8 both of these. The Graveley report indicates, again,
9 that the long term goal of the project is to understand
10 the contributions that alternative splicing makes to the
11 gene expression program of human embryonic stem cells.
12 It goes on further to say that this project will
13 therefore allow us to obtain a more thorough
14 understanding of how embryonic stem cells function, which
15 is the essential knowledge for the long term goal of
16 directing the differentiation of human embryonic stem
17 cells into specific cell types.18 They've made good progress on their
19 objectives. They are, however -- they've missed in Year
20 No. 3 some of their milestones, but they anticipate that
21 now that they have all their collaborations worked out
22 that they will be able to, in fact, complete the project
23 as originally anticipated. They have one publication.
24 They have several, probably two in preparation right now.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 And it seems again that we should be very pleased with
2 the collaborations that they've made with a number of
3 people in the state, mostly at the University of
4 Connecticut and also at Wesleyan with Laura Grabel.

5 So, my recommendation, and it's consistent
6 with Anne Kiessling's, is that we accept, acknowledge the
7 acceptance of the annual report as stated. The lay
8 summary is also very, very well done.

9 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So that's a motion?

10 DR. WALLACK: I would move that.

11 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: I'm sorry. Did someone
12 on the phone have a question or a comment?

13 DR. DEES: Richard Dees. Did they do a
14 fairly extensive catalogue of these -- it wasn't clear to
15 me how -- as far as I -- it wasn't clear to me how these
16 catalogues are used by other people. Am I understanding
17 it correctly?

18 DR. HART: This is Ron Hart on the phone.
19 When you're publishing this data it requires you to
20 submit it to a National Institute of Health based data
21 depository, which will be widely -- I mean accessible by
22 anybody else.

23 DR. DEES: And what do other researchers
24 do with it? That's what I wasn't clear about.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 DR. HART: Oh, biotherapeutic groups poll
2 these cite very routinely to do all kinds of things you
3 can't imagine, much of it is very imaginative that's why
4 it's hard to predict. But folks could just focus in on
5 what they're most interested in and find that data very
6 quickly.

7 DR. DEES: Okay. And then this helps them
8 develop what?

9 DR. HART: Oh, knowledge about the --
10 structures that should be expressed. They found --
11 knowledge about changing the form of -- to alter the
12 kinds of -- that are made. It is very important for the
13 functions of the --

14 DR. DEES: -- appreciate that.

15 DR. GENEL: This is a pretty ambiguous
16 project, isn't it?

17 DR. WALLACK: That's why they missed one
18 of their milestones, Mike. They, however, feel as I
19 indicated before that because of the collaborations that
20 they were able to establish and they were working with a
21 very small initial team of people, they didn't anticipate
22 -- well, frankly it was a good problem because they
23 uncovered so much data that they had to be able to then
24 interpret the data and I think that's where they're

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 getting bogged down now. But with the collaborations
2 they'll have a better opportunity to do that. It seems
3 as though from, as I've read it and as Anne read it, that
4 they're on line to accomplish exactly what they set out
5 to do, and even better than they set out because they
6 have set up these collaborations.

7 DR. HART: And actually one more tidbit as
8 well they went through the same transition that almost
9 everyone else in the similar field went through where
10 they tried to do this with a microarray in the first year
11 of the project and that -- and they moved to DC -- and
12 that delay, I think, was inevitable and experienced by
13 almost everyone trying to do similar things.

14 DR. WALLACK: And to that point I think
15 the purchase of the geneomanalizer -- David, you might be
16 familiar with that within your facility, has enabled them
17 to accomplish some of the things that I think was -- Ron
18 just indicated.

19 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Yes, I think that was
20 instrumental.

21 DR. WALLACK: Right.

22 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So we have a motion
23 from Dr. Wallack to accept the annual technical progress
24 report from Dr. Graveley.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 DR. HART: Second.

2 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Who was that that
3 seconded it?

4 DR. HART: Ron Hart.

5 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Thanks, Dr. Hart. Any
6 other discussion? If I could just add one thing, Dr.
7 Gravely is for sure going to submit a final report after
8 the close of the 31st?9 MS. SARNECKY: Once the close of the
10 grant, July 31st of this year, they have 60 days to send
11 in their final report in which case I'll forward it onto
12 the Committee.13 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay, great. All
14 right, all those in favor?

15 ALL VOICES: Aye.

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Opposed? Ayes have it.
17 Thank you.18 DR. WALLACK: So Xu's project, the overall
19 goal of the project is to search for target genes of two
20 essential signaling pathways that control the early fates
21 of human embryonic stem cells. I'll quote from the lay
22 summary also in that regard of the goal where he further
23 goes on to say that "this four year project is aimed to
24 decipher the molecular mechanisms that govern the early

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 fates of human embryonic stem cells." They've made --
2 they are meeting their milestones. They're right on
3 target. They have established great collaborations. I
4 was impressed that one of the collaborations is with
5 Weissel with Jamie Thomson where Reneh comes from,
6 actually, so I'm not surprised, but I'm very happy that
7 they've been able to collaborate. And they've actually
8 published together one of three papers that have already
9 come out of this research. There are several other papers
10 that are in preparation at this particular time.

11 And I also found this to be a very
12 favorable report. Anne had some issue with the lay
13 smarmy and I would think that in speaking on Anne's
14 behalf I think that all we have to do is go back to Reneh
15 and just suggest that in the future he be somewhat
16 clearer on the lay level, from a lay level prospective.
17 But certainly even though the lay summary is basically, I
18 think, fairly well done, but I think, again, we should
19 acknowledge Anne's suggestion and make that
20 recommendation to Reneh.

21 MS. SARNECKY: I did have one question
22 though. Actually for Warren, do these lay summaries go on
23 the DPH website for the public?

24 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yes.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 MS. SARNECKY: So in that case do you
2 think that maybe it ought to be a good idea --

3 DR. WALLACK: -- I think you're right.

4 MS. SARNECKY: To have them revise it a
5 little now.

6 DR. WALLACK: I would agree.

7 MS. SARNECKY: Maybe not to bring back to
8 the Committee as a follow up item, but just for the
9 public purpose.

10 DR. WALLACK: For public consumption,
11 right.

12 MS. SARNECKY: Yes. If that's okay with --

13 DR. WALLACK: -- I think that's great.

14 Yes.

15 DR. GENEL: May I ask, other than posting
16 on the website what do we do with these things?

17 DR. WALLACK: Well, one of the things that
18 -- so on the last review the question came up what
19 happens to these reports and so forth. And there have
20 been, I don't know the number, but a high volume of hits
21 on this research so people are following this research.
22 And I think as Ron was saying to better understand how
23 they should be proceeding as well. So, the publications
24 are of notable journals, but also they've been getting

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 through the Internet some significant correspondence as
2 well. So the bottom line is we're making an impact in
3 the field of stem cell research.

4 DR. GENEL: Well, yes, I don't know that
5 the DPH website is necessarily the hottest ticket on the
6 Internet.

7 DR. WALLACK: No, this was through their
8 own --

9 MS. SARNECKY: -- it's getting there
10 though.

11 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: I will say that we -- a
12 lot of this information needs to get incorporated into
13 the annual report.

14 DR. GENEL: Yes.

15 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Which is no longer
16 required by statute. In fact, it was -- it was stopped
17 specifically by legislation last year. So that's not
18 getting out there.

19 DR. GENEL: So that's not, yes. To be
20 continued. I mean the question really is how can this be
21 better discriminated I think in terms of the promotion of
22 the work that's being done. I mean you have something
23 that is already packaged and it would be nice to see if
24 there is some better vehicle with promotion, that's all

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 I'm suggesting.

2 MS. MARIANNE HORN: I think that's a great
3 idea. And Dr. Levine, Erin Levine who came to our
4 STEMCONN Conference, a Yale researcher, and he had taken
5 from all the stem cell states all of the different
6 research that they had done --7 DR. GENEL: -- oh, yes, you're right. He
8 published some early stuff on that.9 MS. HORN: Looked at trends in different
10 states.

11 DR. GENEL: Yes.

12 MS. HORN: That was a good use of it, but
13 I don't know that that's going to be on-going.

14 DR. WALLACK: He's a tech, I think.

15 MS. HORN: Yes.

16 DR. GENEL: Yes, that was in Science -- I
17 recall, something like that.18 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: When you consider
19 that for a site like the Department of Public Health
20 website for posting public information and we want to
21 think about literacy at an 8th grade reading level then
22 it's important for -- and the same thing that doctors
23 have to learn how to talk to patients in real English,
24 it's important for us to be able to impart information

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 through that vehicle in a way that it's meaningful to
2 people. Especially because some people will look and say
3 what's this doing on the Department of Public Health
4 website anyway, what does it have to do with my water, or
5 my immunizations, or other things. And it's obviously
6 important, but it needs to be as accessible as everything
7 else that we think about as for our public communication.
8 So I appreciate the point.

9 DR. WALLACK: Well, if there is no further
10 discussion I would move that we accept this report as
11 presented.

12 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Did we need to come
13 take a look and make sure -- I know this doesn't need to
14 come back to the Committee, but I do want to make sure if
15 we're bothering to ask, to go through the time if you
16 would look or somebody would at least make sure that if
17 we're going to post some thing that --

18 MS. SARNECKY: -- of course. If it would
19 be okay I could send it back to you and Anne.

20 DR. WALLACK: That's fine.

21 MS. SARNECKY: To have you take a look and
22 make sure that --

23 DR. WALLACK: -- I would give them a
24 timeframe also.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

2 DR. WALLACK: Two weeks or three weeks.

3 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So would you accept an
4 amendment, an amendment to your motion?

5 DR. WALLACK: Sure, yes.

6 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: That it be accepted
7 subject to the -- subject to the resubmission of the lay
8 summary?

9 DR. WALLACK: Of the lay summary.

10 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Is there a second to
11 that?12 DR. HISKES: I'll second that if I'm
13 allowed to being a UCONN person.14 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay. So we're going to
15 accept it subject to a directive to resubmit a more lay
16 summary within the time period specified. All those in
17 favor?

18 ALL VOICES: Aye.

19 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Opposed? All right,
20 ayes have it. Thanks.21 DR. GENEL: So if I might add
22 parenthetically, you know, it's not easy for some hard
23 scientists to write something that translates into lay
24 language. And it may well be something we might encourage

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 institutions to do is to provide some assistance to the
2 investigators in doing this. I mean, you know, thinking
3 about -- thinking about this there is the language of
4 science does not necessarily translate easily and it's a
5 language that these people talk about all day. So it
6 might -- maybe a suggestion that the institution's public
7 relations office or something provide assistance.

8 DR. WALLACK: I'll just mention in that
9 regard an antidotal kind of response and that is that I
10 have had the same experience with some people at UCONN
11 and basically how I would describe it, Mike, was try to
12 tell the story as though you're telling it, at least
13 forgive me, to your grandmother who you expect then to
14 take it to their bridge partners and be able to tell
15 them. So, if they can understand it to the point that --
16 and believe me when I tell you it made a difference. It
17 made a huge difference by telling it that way.

18 DR. GENEL: Well, you're right, that's a
19 good example.

20 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: And Graveley's was
21 pretty good where they talked about --

22 DR. WALLACK: -- Graveley's was --

23 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- that helped me
24 understand what he was talking about.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 DR. WALLACK: Right. No question.

2 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay, so we're moving
3 onto the final report then.4 DR. WALLACK: I'm sorry, after the final
5 report I do have a comment.6 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: the final report from
7 Lai.8 MS. SARNECKY: This is very quick. This
9 is a final report that we've received. Feel free to take
10 a look at it. If you have any comments or questions.
11 There is no action item on this specific report. This is
12 more of an FYI, but for the people that either reviewed
13 this grant initially or are interested in this I just
14 wanted to provide the final report. And, again, as the
15 Committee sees fit you're more than welcome to ask any
16 questions that I can bring back to the researcher.17 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Can I ask just a
18 question.

19 MS. SARNECKY: Of course.

20 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So how do we track the
21 patent? We're supposed to be tracking that in terms of
22 potential return back to the state?23 MS. SARNECKY: On a spreadsheet, but since
24 we haven't had any action, so to speak --

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- I just happened to
2 notice he had a U.S. provisional patent application that
3 was filed. I don't know what that means, but --

4 MS. HORN: -- they're required to make a
5 report to CI every year on the application.

6 MS. SARNECKY: Which we receive and most
7 of the time it just says thanks, but --

8 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- okay. So this
9 doesn't require any action?

10 MS. SARNECKY: No, it does not.

11 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: All right, great.

14 DR. WALLACK: So, Warren, can I just ask a
15 question?

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Sure.

17 DR. WALLACK: It's appropriate to the
18 previous discussion and Mike's point and the
19 Commissioner's response about getting it out in front of
20 the public. We've had this discussion because I'm a
21 little concerned that our annual report after four or
22 five years of having it published is not going to be
23 published. And I'm just wondering if somehow or other we
24 could re-examine or have those appropriately involved in

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 this to re-examine the possibility of having it published
2 again. I, personally, have found it very, very valuable
3 and it wasn't just the scientific stuff that was in the
4 report, but economic implications, job creation and so
5 forth. So all stuff that's very, very appropriate to
6 what's going on in the state right now.

7 Is there -- is it worth a discussion about
8 if we can pursue reinstating the publishing of the annual
9 report?

10 DR. HISKES: Who was the audience for that
11 report?

12 DR. WALLACK: Well, certainly all of the
13 stakeholders, researchers, those advocates -- but, and
14 also and most importantly the political, the legislators,
15 the legislators.

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Public health committee
17 and the governor.

18 DR. WALLACK: Right.

19 DR. HISKES: Okay. So they got copied.

20 DR. WALLACK: They got copies. They're
21 not going to get that anymore. I mean it's hard enough to
22 get them to open the book, but at least if you put the
23 book in front of them you have a chance.

24 DR. HISKES: But we're all going paperless

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 these days.

2 DR. DEES: It will be published on the
3 Internet and --4 MS. HORN: -- I'm sorry. If you're on the
5 phone could you identify who you are?

6 DR. DEES: That was Richard Dees.

7 MS. HORN: Thank you.

8 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Well, I mean the fact
9 of the matter is last year's report was not produced in
10 hard copy. It was electronic copies to all mandatory
11 recipients and then posted on our website.

12 DR. DEES: -- (Inaudible, on phone)

13 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Well, there is really
14 no problem. I mean we were submitting it before because
15 it was mandatory by statute. It's very common for a lot
16 of our programs we have to submit annual reports. The
17 genesis for removing this requirement, I don't know, it
18 was in a bill that wasn't related to the stem cell
19 research actually.20 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Was it part of a tech
21 bill, was it --22 MS. HORN: -- what it was, it just seemed
23 to be just the program is running fine and we're going to
24 streamline some of the requirements.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yes.

2 DR. HISKES: It came from this program not
3 in general no one has to report.

4 MS. HORN: No, it was this program and a
5 couple of other programs, but it wasn't across the board.

6 MS. SARNECKY: I think it was in a, if I
7 remember correctly, it was in a tech bill but it had to
8 do with public health statute. I think that was the bill
9 it was in.

10 DR. GENEL: That doesn't preclude you from
11 doing it.

12 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Now, and it's not
13 really -- I mean there is a formula. You cut and paste
14 from the previous and then the heart and sole of the
15 report is prepared by the institution. You've probably
16 written some of them. And of the -- there was a lot of
17 economic info in there. The difference is when it's
18 mandatory you can get a quick response from the
19 institutions. When it's not mandatory it might be a
20 little more challenging, but we could certainly try.

21 DR. WALLACK: If the Commissioner would be
22 receptive, I would move that we, again, this year publish
23 an annual report of the stem cell initiatives.

24 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Are you waiting for

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 me to second? I was waiting to see whether somebody else
2 seconded and then some further discussion. I think the
3 other piece is who does it. And having that clarity
4 around the table with there not being a mandate with our
5 recognition that if it's -- finances we need to identify
6 what those are since they'll sit at DPH right now. And
7 for future consideration as technology and innovation are
8 burgeoning in the state to figure out whether or not this
9 publication or report becomes a part of a larger project
10 that outlines a lot of the evolution of biotechnology in
11 Connecticut. For this year, what will it take?

12 DR. GENEL: What did it take last year,
13 Warren?

14 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Well, it takes -- it
15 takes -- well, it takes a request to each of the
16 institutions and then it requires editing. It's more of a
17 journalism process than it is a scientific process. I
18 mean with the okay of the Commissioner I'd be happy to
19 send, you know, put stuff together and send out requests
20 for information. And then --

21 DR. GENEL: -- that'd be great.

22 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: And then turn it over.

23 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: And then do what?

24 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: And then turn it over

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 to whom?

2 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Right.

3 DR. GENEL: That's what I was --

4 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: -- right.

5 DR. GENEL: Questioning.

6 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: You would have no
7 problem picking it up? So I'm big on if there is a task
8 that there is a hand on the other end of it.9 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So we'll move on that
10 and we'll let folks now -- if you can let folks in your
11 institutions know that we're going to be reaching out to
12 them.

13 DR. WALLACK: Do you need a vote?

14 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Well, you have a motion
15 and a second, but I don't know what the motion was.16 DR. WALLACK: Accept the consensus of the
17 group then.18 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: We're talking about
19 that for this year and then we'll --20 MS. HORN: -- what would the timing of
21 that be? Typically we did it in February.22 DR. GENEL: The end of the year or is it
23 the end --

24 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- it was always

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 February 1. It's February 1st, but it's probably going
2 to be March 1st till --

3 DR. WALLACK: -- the upcoming legislative
4 process.

5 DR. GENEL: Okay.

6 MS. HORN: But we would want to include
7 this round of grants. Once these are completed ask for
8 the institutions to write in and then just cut and paste
9 from what we have.

10 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Right. You'd want to
11 reflect the grants that are going to be approved in July.

12 DR. WALLACK: With the economic
13 implications and all of that.

14 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Chelsey, there was one
15 other request that came in today, I think.

16 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

17 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: And can you walk us
18 through that?

19 MS. SARNECKY: I thought that seeing as
20 we'll be spending the next meeting going over the grants
21 we should just go through and get this request done
22 today. This was a request from Yale -- if I remember
23 here, 10SCA35. This is Dr. Lee is the PI for this grant.
24 She has resigned from her current position at Yale and is

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 going to be starting July 1 at New Jersey Institute of
2 Technology. The co-investigator for the grant has sent
3 in a request letter to move the PI role from Dr. Lee to
4 herself. This is Dr. Gang -- I apologize on the
5 pronunciation, who also has a few grants with the program
6 right now. There is a letter from the PI, Dr. Lee,
7 giving her blessing for Dr. Gang to take over this grant.

8 We have a budget revision sheet and a
9 justification sheet. The budget revision sheet just
10 shows the funding for Dr. Lee being transferred to the
11 new PI as well as a little bit of funding being
12 transferred to the other personnel for this grant that
13 would help out the new PI. And that other personnel's CV
14 is also -- was also sent to -- around to everyone as
15 well.

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Any questions for
17 Chelsey? Hearing none, do we have a motion to accept or
18 approve?

19 DR. WALLACK: Moved.

20 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Moved by Milt. Do we
21 have a second?

22 MR. MANDELKERN: Second.

23 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Seconded by Mr.
24 Mandelkern. Thanks, Bob. Okay, all those in favor aye?

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 ALL VOICES: Aye.

2 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Opposed? Great. The
3 ayes have it. Thank you, Chelsey.

4 MS. SARNECKY: Thank you.

5 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So we're ready to move
6 into a general discussion of how we're going to handle
7 the grant reviews this year.8 MR. MANDELKERN: Warren, one question for
9 Chelsey.

10 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

11 MR. MANDELKERN: Warren.

12 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yes, Bob.

13 MR. MANDELKERN: No. 10 I was not able to
14 open that final report. Did anybody else have that
15 difficulty?16 MS. SARNECKY: I didn't hear from any of
17 the other Committee members that there was an issue, but
18 I can try to send it to you again, Bob, if you'd like.19 MR. MANDELKERN: I just couldn't open it
20 so I'd appreciate that.21 MS. SARNECKY: Of course. I'll send it to
22 you this afternoon.23 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Thanks, Bob. Okay. So
24 talking about the grant review process many of you have

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 gone through it on multiple occasions. I think all of
2 you have gone through it at least once. So, you have
3 some sense of the process.

4 Basically, let me give you an update on
5 the peer review. At this point, there are ten peer
6 reviewers. We had three resignations right when the peer
7 review process started. So we're working with a group of
8 ten. And I would say that they are moving more quickly
9 than they ever did before. We anticipate that there will
10 be a teleconference, a tele-meeting on next Thursday,
11 which will be the 26th. And hopefully at that point the
12 peer review committee will be moving on their
13 recommendations.

14 I can tell you that there are, all of the
15 reviews have been submitted, both primary and secondary,
16 with the exception of one reviewer. So we've got 90
17 percent of the reviews in. And there are only, out of
18 the 77, 77 applications there are only eight or nine that
19 are out of sync, that is that there is more than a three
20 point difference in the scoring. So those that are out
21 of sync will get an additional tertiary level review.

22 So we're going to be in good shape and
23 we're certainly going to be able to get you narratives
24 and scores well in advance of the July meeting. Our

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 goal, actually, is to have the peer reviews, at least the
2 routine, primary and secondary reviews, completed in the
3 month of May candidly so that we can process payment for
4 them during the current fiscal year.

5 DR. GENEL: Okay. You mentioned --

6 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- we just talked about
7 the peer review that should be done by this -- by the end
8 of next week, Dr. Genel. And then the dates for the --
9 you may remember at the last meeting we talked about
10 pushing the review meeting out to July. That was for a
11 lot of different reasons. And the dates that we're --
12 are being held are the 19th and 20th of July. The 19th is
13 a date of a regular Stem Cell Research Advisory Committee
14 meeting. It's a Tuesday. So, that works. Hopefully, this
15 process can get done in one day. We've done that on a
16 couple of occasions and there are less reviews this time,
17 less applications this time. We've had 80, 90 before.
18 But we do have some disease specific ones that I'm sure
19 are going to require some detailed discussion.

20 So, it's a Tuesday and a Wednesday, the
21 18th and 19th. So far, we've only heard, Chelsey, from
22 one member of the Committee. Originally Paul said he
23 could make it and then has since said he is not available
24 either of those days. We also have concerns -- you're

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 going to be out of the area.

2 DR. HISKES: In Michigan.

3 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: You know, and we didn't
4 know if we could try to hook you in electronically,
5 Skype. I mean certainly it's not going to productive for
6 you to sit on the telephone. I mean that doesn't work,
7 but if we can hook you in through a computer that might
8 be a little more --

9 DR. HISKES: -- a little more feasible.

10 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So those are the dates.
11 I don't know if anyone else has responded to those dates.
12 Okay. So, we'll go with those dates.

13 Last year, for the folks who came from
14 out-of-state, you may remember last year we met in
15 Hartford and you stayed at a hotel in downtown Hartford,
16 but then there was some logistics where you had to be
17 transported over to the Legislative office building. I
18 thought that was more of a hassle than previous years
19 when we met in the hotel, and we stayed in the hotel, and
20 we ate in the hotel. And so I was going to recommend
21 that we -- that we do that this year instead. That will
22 allow us to do like a bulk payment as well so I wouldn't
23 need individual contracts in order to reimburse somebody
24 for overnight stay.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 One suggestion, we've used them a lot, is
2 the Sheraton in Farmington.

3 MS. SARNECKY: The Farmington Marriott.

4 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: I'm sorry, it's the
5 Marriott.

6 DR. GENEL: Out in Farmington.

7 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: I think we met there
8 one time.

9 DR. WALLACK: Logistics was very good
10 there.

11 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yes. So, if folks are
12 okay with that we'd begin our planning on -- we're going
13 to ask that Gladys help us on that because the folks who
14 have done that for the Department -- well, not Marianne.

15 MS. SARNECKY: We've got lots of
16 experience in that.

17 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay. Well, we do have
18 money left in the stem cell account to cover the costs
19 associated with that.

20 MR. MANDELKERN: What is the hotel,
21 Warren?

22 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: It's a Marriott in
23 Farmington.

24 MR. MANDELKERN: Okay.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: We met there once
2 before.

3 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes. I think last year.

4 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: No, a couple of years
5 ago maybe. So, do you want to give us an update as to
6 where you stand with this, Chelsey, or CI in terms of the
7 pairings or --

8 MS. SARNECKY: -- well, I had a
9 conversation with Marianne this morning about the
10 pairings and I did do one run through of assigning each
11 grant to two Board members. Learning that now the July
12 dates are firm and Paul Pescatello will not be in
13 attendance I have to do some shuffling. Marianne and I
14 discussed whether or not we would have Dr. Pescatello
15 review grants and submit a report on each of his grants
16 although he won't be available to vote or be there. I
17 don't know if that would be beneficial to everyone. Or
18 if we do not include Dr. Pescatello in the review process
19 at all. But either way, I would need to know what we
20 need to do so I can get these pairs assigned and give
21 everyone the password and everyone can start reviewing
22 each of their grants.

23 DR. GENEL: How many grants are there?

24 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: 77.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 DR. GENEL: 77?

2 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: And it's --

3 MS. SARNECKY: -- 79.

4 DR. GENEL: 79? So that's 158 reviews.

5 How many -- without Paul how many are there on the

6 Committee?

7 MS. SARNECKY: Ten.

8 DR. GENEL: So that's 15, 16 each. It's a
9 sizeable number.

10 DR. GOLDHAMMER: It is.

11 DR. GENEL: That's a sizeable number.

12 DR. HISKES: Last year I was unable to
13 attend physically, but --14 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- you were there in
15 spirit.

16 DR. HISKES: But I shared my results.

17 DR. GENEL: With your alternate.

18 DR. HISKES: I don't know who those
19 alternates are.20 DR. GENEL: That might be the way. It's
21 one way around it.22 DR. GOLDHAMMER: It gives Paul input into
23 the process and I think that will work.

24 DR. HISKES: Actually, I had a full

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 conversation with my --

2 MS. SARNECKY: -- we can read Dr.
3 Pescatello's comments into the record.

4 DR. GENEL: That's right.

5 MS. SARNECKY: So we're certain that he
6 has his two cents in.7 MS. HORN: He won't count as a vote, but
8 his opinion will certainly be considered. The difficulty
9 is when we get into the second and third rounds if we
10 wanted to go back to him and say, well, with respect to
11 that grant he won't have the ability to have input. But
12 that weighed against the workload I think it all needs to
13 get factored in.

14 DR. WALLACK: You just can't pull a man.

15 MS. HORN: He's going to be --

16 MS. SARNECKY: -- I see what I can do.

17 DR. HISKES: We'll have to buy a little
18 camera.19 MR. MANDELKERN: 15 to 16 reviews each is
20 much more than we've done in the past and therefore we
21 should allow, I think, for the two day period to do
22 justice to the reviews.23 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Well, we're scheduling
24 it for two days so certainly we're not going to give

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 anybody a rush job, Bob, but your point is well made.
2 Last year was about the same. We had the same number of
3 reviewers. We actually had more applications. The bigger
4 deal is whether or not they are seed grants, or they are
5 disease specific grants, or core grants. Those,
6 obviously, the work involved in them, reviewing them is
7 quite different. I think -- so I think like about 60
8 percent of these, 44 something like that, are seed
9 grants.

10 MS. SARNECKY: We have 44 seed grants. And
11 we just have to keep in mind too that we now have the new
12 disease directed group grants. So, again, I think
13 everyone will be in a slight learning curve because no
14 one has reviewed any sort of grant like this before. So,
15 we just have to keep that in mind as well.

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay. We have a basic
17 script and stuff that probably can be tweaked and it
18 would still work from previous years.

19 DR. WALLACK: Wasn't it our intent to
20 hopefully not have to review any core grants this year?
21 I seem to remember that that was --

22 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- well, it was in the
23 RFP that it was not a priority this year, but that it
24 would be accepted. The actual language was "core funding

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 is not a priority for this round of funding. Some
2 additional core funding may be considered for
3 applications with novel or unusual scientific merit."

4 DR. GOLDHAMMER: It's similar language to
5 last time.

6 MS. SARNECKY: Um, hmm.

7 MS. HORN: And any enhancements or
8 existing cores would be considered as well.

9 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Other questions about
10 the upcoming process? Good.

11 MS. HORN: If anybody wants to weigh in on
12 how we did it last year in terms of the cutoff points or
13 the amount of time that was given to grants. Remember we
14 took things and took a peer review and put them -- gave
15 them a minute or five minutes depending on the length of
16 the grant. I know we did a yes, no, maybe based on a
17 quick consensus.

18 DR. GENEL: Didn't we -- there was some
19 arbitrary cutoffs to begin with so that we decided that
20 below a certain level we would limit the discussion.

21 MS. HORN: Yes.

22 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Anything six or less
23 was limited to a minute of discussion.

24 DR. GENEL: Yes. I think that was -- I

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 think that went well. I think that's not unreasonable.

2 MR. MANDELKERN: A part of the information
3 is the scale change this year.4 MS. SARNECKY: The scale is the same as
5 last year.6 MR. MANDELKERN: I don't remember any
7 sixes.

8 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yes, there were.

9 MS. SARNECKY: Last year, if you remember,
10 Bob, it was the first year that it was based on a scale
11 of one to ten, I believe, ten being the lowest score. One
12 being --13 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- NIH had moved to
14 that. Whatever the current NIH system is that's what
15 they should be using.16 MS. SARNECKY: And I have a sheet of the
17 new scoring system that I can send around. I found that
18 this morning. I have copies here if anyone wants to grab
19 one, but I can send -- to the people phoning in I can
20 send them around.21 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes, I would appreciate
22 that, Chelsey.

23 MS. SARNECKY: Sure.

24 DR. GENEL: There is also a discussion

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 that we've had before, and I think we need to have again
2 before the meeting, regarding whether or not we should
3 perhaps not use strict peer review scores in terms of
4 awarding grants particularly to institutions that are not
5 as well represented. I think it's -- we need -- I think
6 we need to have a little bit of clarity, at least among
7 ourselves, about that. Well, obviously among ourselves
8 about that. I would argue that that's really -- there is
9 a factor that we should take strongly into consideration.

10 DR. WALLACK: But if I remember correctly
11 we actually were somewhat flexible last year. There were
12 some scores that were better than scores that we funded
13 that we did not fund actually, and I think that speaks to
14 your point. I remember the conversation that you're
15 specifically referring to, but in general we -- I think
16 we did use wisely the peer review scores, but then we
17 used our own judgment as well on some of those.

18 DR. GENEL: I think there was dispute
19 among us, as I recall, that there were some of us who
20 really felt strongly that the peer review scores should
21 hold and I would argue that's not why we're on the
22 advisory committee.

23 MS. HORN: Well, there are all the other
24 criteria that we listed in the RFP, scientific merit

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 being the top one listed here, but a lot of other
2 criteria, collaboration, benefits the State of
3 Connecticut, align with other funding priorities that
4 we've established.

5 DR. GENEL: Okay.

6 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: One -- Marianne and I
7 were speaking this morning about perhaps providing some
8 kind of checklist or something so that folks remember
9 that it's not just scientific and ethical merit, we have
10 identified, in writing, six other criteria.

11 DR. GENEL: I think that's an -- I think
12 that's a great idea. I think a score sheet that would
13 require us to identify the -- have that available when we
14 discuss this. That's a good idea.

15 MS. HORN: Chelsey and I were talking
16 about that this morning that we could have that on the
17 checklist with a narrative below. And the peer review are
18 fairly objective.

19 DR. GENEL: As they should be. As they
20 should be.

21 MS. HORN: And a very good description of
22 why they are giving this particular -- that particular
23 score. And I think the Advisory Committee, while we
24 usually keep notes, has not maybe been as --

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 DR. GENEL: -- as explicit.

2 MS. HORN: -- as explicit.

3 DR. HISKES: I have a question. Are these
4 the same peer reviewers as last year?

5 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Some.

6 DR. HISKES: Some.

7 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: But not all.

8 DR. HISKES: What I found was very useful
9 with some of us who have been around for a long time is
10 they were -- we've funded this project already, or there
11 is some duplicate something that so and so did. And so
12 that's another area where you might deviate from peer
13 reviewers.14 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Three of the ten are
15 new.

16 DR. HISKES: Okay.

17 MS. SARNECKY: I can actually go through
18 and determine which new applications have received
19 funding from our program in the past. I can go through
20 and do that for everyone. In terms of the science I can
21 do that on a very --22 DR. HISKES: -- I'm not talking about a
23 particular PI resubmitting work that's already funded,
24 but somebody -- an independent person, two people who are

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 independently sort of pursuing similar projects. If
2 somebody who independently this year is submitting a
3 proposal very similar to something that had been done two
4 years ago.

5 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.

6 DR. HISKES: And then if you have sort of
7 institutional memory that keep that in mind.

8 DR. WALLACK: And there were some
9 discussions about on the skeletal research we
10 specifically talked about Dave Arel and his team and the
11 offshoots of that.

12 DR. HISKES: Yes.

13 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I agree with you in
14 theory. I think in practice though it's really hard to
15 know the degree of overlap unless you do a very serious
16 scientific review. Things that look similar by title or
17 by abstract really might not be. So I just worry -- I
18 agree with the idea, but it might, in practice, be
19 difficult to really use that to separate one grant from
20 another and say this is --

21 DR. HISKES: -- do you think that would be
22 something that the advisory can do. I have another
23 question are there biotech companies submitting this
24 year?

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 MS. SARNECKY: There are. We have one,
2 two, three, four, four applications from those private
3 companies. Yes, from three different companies.

4 DR. HISKES: And are the escrow issues
5 settled for private companies? Did somebody who will
6 review them --

7 MS. HORN: -- that's what we understand.
8 We haven't tested it.

9 DR. HISKES: Okay. That has been a
10 sticking point in the past.

11 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Supposedly that was
12 resolved not in time for the --

13 MS. HORN: -- I think -- pulled something
14 together. That's a good question.

15 DR. HISKES: Right.

16 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I just want to state an
17 impression I've had from past peer reviews and I want
18 people's kind of reflection on this. I've got -- so we
19 start with the particular type of grant and we move to
20 the next category, and the next category, and finally the
21 final category, which is, I think, one year it was the
22 group grants, maybe last year it was also -- maybe it was
23 the cores, I don't remember. I get -- I kind of get the
24 impression that the grants at the end maybe don't get

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 quite as much review time or consideration as early
2 grants. What I mean by that is the monies is already
3 allocated fairly early in the process. And if we have
4 already committed 20 million and we have ten, and we
5 haven't gotten to the -- I'm making up the numbers -- but
6 as an example, when we get to the group grants each of
7 which is -- what's the limit on groups this year? I
8 think -- I don't want to state this too strongly, but I
9 think there is some bias against these large money grants
10 when we have already allocated more than we have
11 conditionally, not for decisions made.

12 And so I'm -- so where I'm going with this
13 is I'm wondering if we want to consider another possible
14 way to do this. And one way to do this is to -- is to
15 review them by priority score instead of by subject. So
16 you mix them all up and you review them by priority
17 score. And you know immediately what the -- you can see
18 immediately where the cutoff, where the 10 million dollar
19 cutoff, or the 15 million, or the 20 million cutoff is.
20 And I think, you know, although we don't, Mike as you
21 said, we don't want to -- we're not a rubber stamp.
22 There is -- it's based on other criteria than scientific
23 merit to award.

24 For the best grants we typically follow

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 the criteria and it's only in this cutoff range, this
2 gray area where it's really -- where we come into play.

3 DR. GENEL: Exactly.

4 DR. GOLDHAMMER: And so I'm wondering,
5 since there will be agreement for most of the money, and
6 it's only at that cutoff where there is an issue, we
7 might streamline the process greatly by going through
8 grants based on priority scores, making sure we agree
9 that these are really quality grants. We agree with the
10 peer reviews and we're comfortable awarding the funds.
11 And then extend the deliberation into the gray area, I
12 don't know how many millions, you know, if it's 5 million
13 dollars into the gray area, whatever it might be. And
14 then maybe not review all the grants past that, but allow
15 the advisory committee members to bring one into play
16 that would otherwise not get consideration. Instead of
17 giving each grant a minute or two minutes, we can
18 nominate, bring into the discussion grants that are below
19 what we would consider the gray area.

20 And so we really might get through the
21 process more quickly that way. And after we have a
22 collection then the hard kind of discussion begins where
23 we have to decide if a grant in the gray area should bump
24 a grant that's in the top ten million. But I think we can

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 get to that point earlier in the day and still do our job
2 more efficiently that way. So I'm just throwing that out
3 there. You know, we don't have -- we don't have specific
4 numbers of dollars allocated for any category other than
5 for seeds, right, so we have to go back and make sure
6 once we had our rank order that there was ten seeds and
7 there are at least ten seeds. So those kinds of things
8 would have to be dealt with.

9 We would also look and make sure that in
10 the top -- well, you know, I'm of the opinion that
11 probably one investigator should not get two large
12 grants. I mean let's just say that there is -- my opinion
13 is it's better to spread the money out a little bit. So,
14 we go back and we look, okay, does any investigator have
15 multiple grants in the top ten. Should we found both?
16 Should we fund one? So where would be a lengthy
17 discussion on these kinds of issues later, but I think we
18 can get through the first process more quickly by doing
19 it by rank order rather than going through every grant in
20 every category.

21 DR. GENEL: Would you set a dollar
22 threshold then? Something like say six million, seven
23 million? In other words, we'd rank through until we spent
24 seven million and then the pot is open.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I'd go probably through
2 until we spent 15 million knowing that we have to come
3 back and make decisions at that -- in that gray area. We
4 have to go enough beyond it so that we eliminate a group
5 grant that frees up two. We then bring someone in from
6 that -- anyway, just I was thinking about this as ways --
7 you know, we were asked to think of ways to streamline
8 the process and still give appropriate consideration to
9 all grants. And I'm not saying that we definitely
10 wouldn't consider grants beyond some cutoff, but that
11 would be by nomination or -- and anyone could bring any
12 grant that they want whether it's in their pile or
13 someone else's up for discussion even though the priority
14 score would not dictate that. But that would be -- that
15 would insure that every grant had a fair review.

16 MR. MANDELKERN: How do you define
17 priority score?

18 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Well, it's the score that
19 -- it's the average score that the peer reviewers gave to
20 each grant and, you know, so ones are conversed and then
21 the twos, and so forth. So is that what your question is
22 or did you want --

23 MR. MANDELKERN: -- well, I'm just
24 wondering in the process if you did not review many

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 grants you might wind up with many complaints.

2 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Well, all the grants have
3 been reviewed. You know, if you look at other advisory
4 committees they're not agent advisory committees. They
5 don't sit there and look at every single grant that's
6 been submitted. They have a decision to make about,
7 based on their priorities and their programmatic issues
8 about grants that scored really, really well. Maybe they
9 bring a grant in that was below cutoff but was in line
10 with some expressed programmatic program priority. But
11 they don't -- they don't review all the grants. That's
12 the peer review's job and it's -- and it really
13 streamlines the process, I think, but -- it's something
14 to consider. I'd like to --

15 DR. GENEL: -- I like it. That would mean
16 that we could come to the meeting and basically stop and
17 draw the line at Paul was 35 million dollars requesting
18 and we have 10 million to allocate. So if you drew a line
19 -- I don't know, say 15 million is as good as anything,
20 you drew a line there that would mean that those are the
21 ones that we are going to consider seriously plus those
22 that are nominated by those of us who are reviewing. I
23 mean that would come obviously from those of us who have
24 been assigned to review to be added to that list. Then

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 it's a matter of nailing down, cutting out a third --

2 DR. HISKES: -- well, if I heard correctly
3 the larger grants if they are core grants or seed grants
4 would not be left for the very end --

5 DR. GOLDHAMMER: -- right.

6 DR. HISKES: When they're competing for --

7 DR. GOLDHAMMER: -- exactly.

8 DR. HISKES: So then the oneness is on a
9 large grant to be funded you have to decide which of
10 these would you like to fund.11 DR. GENEL: Or you don't fund all of the
12 requests for the large grant, which would then -- which
13 we've done also.

14 DR. HISKES: But I like your approach.

15 It's sort of mixing up the categories towards the
16 beginning so that fatigue doesn't take over and they all
17 have an even chance.18 DR. GOLDHAMMER: And if this was a peer
19 review I wouldn't suggest doing it this way. For a peer
20 review I think it's very important to keep -- to review
21 all the grants from a certain kind together for
22 comparison sake. Here we're not -- you know, the
23 criteria are different or at least in addition to
24 scientific merit. So, I think we start at scientific

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 merit as number one category and so that's how they're
2 first arranged. But I have gotten the sense in the past
3 that the group grants, you know, just maybe don't get as
4 much -- you know, we're already -- it's the end of the
5 day. We're tired. We've already allocated 20 million
6 dollars. But it will take revisiting, you know, if the
7 group grants do tremendously well and we have four group
8 grants in the top ten we're not going to fund four group
9 grants because that's ten million. So we do have to come
10 back and re-evaluate. But at least it seems to me a
11 reasonable starting place.

12 DR. HISKES: I have a question about how
13 the peer reviewers are assigned. Does a peer reviewer do
14 just seed grants and then some other one, somebody else
15 will do the R01's or does a particular peer reviewer do a
16 mix?

17 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: I'd say they do a mix.

18 DR. HISKES: Okay.

19 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Where there is any they
20 try to do subject matter expertise.

21 DR. HISKES: Okay.

22 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Like if you had two
23 neuro and one was seed and one from the group you'd
24 probably --

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 DR. HISKES: -- okay. Which is good.

2 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: You'd want your expert
3 to review.4 DR. HISKES: Because then you have the
5 scales more calibrated.6 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Exactly. I think they
7 try to do that more so than based on category.

8 DR. HISKES: Right.

9 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Unfortunately, we don't
10 have all the subject matters covered, you know, but to
11 the extent that we do.12 The only concern I would have, and it's --
13 I just think it places a greater oneness on all of you to
14 really do a very thorough review because now you're going
15 to be relying very heavily on the peer review in setting
16 that first priority group. And there have been occasions
17 where this group has disagreed with the scientific scores
18 given by the peer reviewers.19 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Well, I would say -- I
20 agree with -- I mean I think the reviews have to be
21 careful regardless of how we do it, but typically with
22 some exceptions, typically when we disagree with the peer
23 reviewers when there is a written -- a real disagreement
24 between the peer reviewers, when the reviewers are -- we

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 tend to -- we -- you know, it's really -- we have to take
2 other criteria into account. And we're not giving these
3 grants full scientific review. It's really a cursory
4 review. And, you know, so I -- I don't think it's our
5 job to really question the scientific review of the -- of
6 our experts unless there is disagreement between them.

7 I mean, you know --

8 DR. WALLACK: -- it doesn't mean that you
9 have to, you know, you know, we don't have to follow the
10 peer review scores exactly, but I think as a first try
11 this is what we -- if the meeting of the -- at the
12 debriefing meeting, if you want, after the last go round
13 I think we specifically agreed that we wanted to expand
14 the seed grant categories. I think that's accurate in
15 some of the minutes that we have. So would we then want
16 to -- if you follow the process, set aside a certain
17 amount up front, it's been 10 percent in the past, two
18 million -- 20 percent, two million. So, do we want to
19 leave it at that or in light of our discussion last June
20 or last September we took that -- so we didn't expand the
21 -- our bias towards more seed grants.

22 MS. HORN: No.

23 DR. WALLACK: No, okay. So, we're going
24 to leave it at the two million then. So that's not in --

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 MS. HORN: -- one thing, Commissioner
2 Mullen was pointing this out in our criteria that we have
3 in the RFP -- this part we might want to spend a little
4 bit more time developing what we actually mean by the
5 criteria because some of them are pretty vague. In
6 particular there was the one, the last one, the line of
7 funding priorities. And to have to explain that all I
8 could think -- one specific group grant where we were
9 talking about collaborating on specific diseases with
10 different kinds of -- but maybe we need to have a little
11 subcommittee that's going to take a look at developing
12 these if we're going to have an objective scoring sheet
13 and so that we, the advisory committee, can really hone
14 in on what it is that we're evaluating above and beyond
15 what the peer review did and specify what we mean.

16 MR. MANDELKERN: Well, my reaction to this
17 that we're going to have to spend more time on the new
18 category of the disease specific grants because these are
19 going to be new to everybody and they're dollar heavy and
20 we're going to have to spend time on it. So the process
21 that we had of moving quickly through the seeds below a
22 certain score and giving them only a minute seems to me
23 quite adequate and I think we have to be certain that we
24 leave sufficient time for the new category, which I

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 understand there were, preliminary at least, three
2 applications.

3 DR. GOLDHAMMER: If I can speak to that,
4 if the group grants, if the disease category group
5 grants, one or more of them, score well then they're
6 going to be discussed in great detail. If they score very
7 poorly then they won't be discussed in great detail. So I
8 think this -- the system that I proposed does take care
9 of that.

10 MR. MANDELKERN: Well, I can see that,
11 however, since we're going to be new to this whole
12 category I think it's going to -- the two reviewers who
13 do those specifically are going to have a job of leading
14 the rest of us through some of it.

15 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Sure.

16 MR. MANDELKERN: To get a real feel of it.

17 DR. WALLACK: We've always done that
18 before, Bob. In fact, the two advisory board people on
19 each grant have always basically advocated for or against
20 and lead the group through it anyway. So I'm not sure
21 that's anything different.

22 MS. HORN: And Chelsey and I were speaking
23 this morning about making sure that the reviewers that we
24 assign to those group grants were people who perhaps had

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 that common experience with these specific grants or at
2 least a lot of scientific experience.

3 DR. WALLACK: So, do we want a motion to
4 pursue or do you want to just -- it sounds like we have a
5 consensus here about the validity of what you're saying,
6 David.

7 DR. GOLDSHAMMER: Okay.

8 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Other thoughts about
9 it? Any other input from folks on the phone?

10 DR. HART: It's Ron Hart. I agree. I
11 think that if we start off with a prioritized list that's
12 on the scientific rankings it will allow us to put more
13 effort into the higher scored grants. So it makes perfect
14 sense to me.

15 MS. SARNECKY: I have a question. Just in
16 terms of, I think everyone agrees with Dr. Goldhammer's
17 concept, but can we sort of hone in on a score that we're
18 going to cutoff at or a dollar amount that we're going to
19 cutoff at just for -- I just -- I fear that we're going
20 to go into the meeting and then, you know, half the
21 committee members are going to think we should cutoff at
22 six and half the committee members will think we should
23 cutoff at eleven.

24 DR. GENEL: I think the first list ought

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 to cutoff at, I don't know, 15, 16. I don't know 16 would
2 be halfway.

3 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: I would think that
4 you'd do financially not by score because you can't
5 predict the spread of scores.

6 DR. GENEL: Okay.

7 DR. GOLDHAMMER: And I think we need to
8 look at the scores. If we're at that 15, but that 15 is
9 in a bunch of pretty narrowly clustered grants then we
10 bring it down a little bit for --

11 DR. GENEL: And I think that's also true
12 of where you would take that first cutoff too, isn't it?

13 In other words, where you would say these are, these
14 we're going to fund.

15 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Right.

16 DR. GENEL: So, I mean, again, if there is
17 clustering there we may decide to go on one or the other
18 side of the cluster. I think we can't make that decision
19 until we see what --

20 DR. GOLDHAMMER: -- I agree.

21 DR. HART: The applications below the
22 cutoff won't be invisible. They'll be on a list in
23 front of us.

24 DR. WALLACK: Right.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 DR. GENEL: I think what David was
2 suggesting was that we would above a certain level we
3 wouldn't have to go into a great deal of discussion
4 because those are -- we would all agree that these are
5 going to be funded. But I think the initial cut has to
6 be large enough that there is room there for discussion.
7 Then we can look at it and decide well this is where
8 we're going to draw the line and we're going to fund
9 everything above that. And then issues regarding the
10 number of seed grants, number of group grants, number of
11 -- number of grants in each category then come into play
12 because that's going to be those -- I would think those
13 would be the considerations that we are going to have to
14 ferret out.

15 DR. GOLDHAMMER: And I think it's hard to
16 predict how much time each grant will get. If a grant
17 scores a 1.1, you know, and it's not -- and it's not a
18 disease -- well, regardless of what grant that is, we're
19 probably not going to need a lot of time to discuss that
20 grant. It's really not our job, I don't think, to
21 overrule such a strong support by the scientific experts.

22 But if you get towards that gray area and
23 it's a disease grant, and we'll have a tremendous amount
24 of scrutiny of that grant and -- so I think we -- it's

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 really hard to put an amount of time on each grant. But
2 we'll just have to see how it goes.

3 DR. HART: And I think the goal here ought
4 to be to try to reduce that one hour discussion we had
5 last year at the beginning of the day and focus on the
6 one hour discussion at the end of the day.

7 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Right.

8 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Can I just ask one just
9 for clarification all applicants will be reviewed by a
10 member, two members of this committee regardless of peer
11 review scoring.

12 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

13 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay.

14 MR. MANDELKERN: I think that's a
15 necessity.

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay.

17 DR. HART: And are we going to draw that
18 cutoff line based on (inaudible, on phone) --

19 DR. GOLDHAMMER: -- that was the idea.

20 DR. HART: Okay.

21 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Making sure we have -- we
22 go far enough beyond the ten million to give us room to
23 bring one of those grants in. And, again, any grant
24 that's not discussed in the top 15 million, anyone can

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 nominate really any grant, I would say, to make sure that
2 nothing is excluded. Everything is on the table
3 potentially, but it doesn't make sense to, I don't think,
4 to ahead of time allocate a minute, two minutes, whatever
5 it might be to every grant that really doesn't have a
6 chance.

7 MS. HORN: I'm just a little slow on this.
8 So, we're going to take all of the grants and rank them
9 by peer review score. And then go down that list,
10 regardless of whether they're a seed, established,
11 whatever, to 15 million and then those are in the
12 presumptively approved list. And then you begin the
13 discussion about who gets taken out of that. Just
14 starting at the top of the list and then --

15 DR. GOLDHAMMER: -- yes.

16 MS. HORN: And then working our way down.

17 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Yes.

18 DR. GENEL: With the proviso that if there
19 is really tight clustering around the 15 million mark
20 that you would want to go to a logical cutoff, which
21 could be 16 million I mean as far as I'm concerned. I
22 think it is just a matter of recognizing where they fall.

23 MS. HORN: And this list of our own
24 priorities is -- how is that going to play into the

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 decision?

2 DR. GENEL: I think that should go to all
3 the reviewers and I think that I like your suggestion
4 that we have some sort of a numerical code so that we are
5 reminded to, at least, identify all of those.6 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Is your point that would
7 seem to put less emphasis on that list if we do it this
8 way, is that what you're getting to that point?9 MS. HORN: Yes, that that would really
10 only come in at the very bottom line kind of thing.11 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I mean I don't know about
12 bottom line. I mean if scientific merit is number one on
13 that list.

14 MS. HORN: Right.

15 DR. GOLDHAMMER: So we're ranking them
16 according to scientific merit we still have five million
17 dollars worth of grants --

18 DR. HISKES: -- 50 percent more.

19 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Which -- where those
20 other considerations come in, potentially come into play.

21 DR. HISKES: Well, they'd be used to --

22 DR. GOLDHAMMER: -- because we've never in
23 the past, you know -- you know, we've never in the past
24 taken a grant that scored very poorly and because of

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 potential for collaboration elevated it to funding. I
2 mean so we'd still be taking into those account, but only
3 among the competitive grants that were really in the mix.

4 MS. HORN: Um, hmm. Could we get a small
5 group of folks who've done a lot of scientific reviews to
6 talk to me over the phone and just flesh these out a
7 little bit so that we all know -- well, when we're
8 talking about aligning the funding priorities and
9 benefits and the two other ones that are --

10 DR. GOLDHAMMER: -- I mean I'd be happy to
11 take part in that. By aligning with funding priorities
12 though I'm a little uncomfortable with establishing what
13 those priorities are now when they weren't available to
14 the grant writers prior.

15 MS. HORN: Right.

16 DR. GOLDHAMMER: So we've identified one
17 priority and that's the disease grants, other than that I
18 think it's -- I think it's late to define priorities that
19 we might have because the review, because the writers
20 didn't have an opportunity to take that into account.

21 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: If I may though the
22 priorities are identified in the RFP. But there are some
23 such as not fundable by NIE's. That's in this RFP.

24 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Okay.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 MS. HORN: Yeah. And I think there are
2 some things there that we maybe haven't emphasized quite
3 as much. I mean we've got a lot of animal research and --
4 so embryonic stem cell research that is clearly one of
5 the things that the program is aimed at. So would that
6 work if we did that and fleshed that out a little bit
7 more?

8 DR. GOLDHAMMER: And I do like the idea of
9 having this checklist that each person really goes
10 through and considers because I think there is a tendency
11 at these meetings to kind of, you know, when the grant is
12 scored really well and it's a high quality science, well,
13 I think we have a -- we have a tendency to use scientific
14 merit perhaps as maybe use it too much. It's No. 1, but I
15 agree that I think some of these other things aren't
16 necessarily kind of explicitly and concretely considered.

17 MS. HORN: Well, I think that the role,
18 the whole research that was being done in that large
19 grant that we had funded and then there was spinoffs from
20 that and whether this committee would be looking at one
21 grant that would dovetail nicely with that particular
22 project as opposed to another one that would be somewhere
23 else by itself. I just throw that out there for
24 discussion.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Specific to the point
2 of is there -- does this body and does this work have a
3 notion of what contributions it wants to make to all of
4 the stem cell work in Connecticut and how this fits with
5 what's funded by other opportunities, And that can be
6 driven by people who maybe aren't the ones that would be
7 competing for these or might we end up just enhancing and
8 amplifying the work of the same people. If there is
9 something else that this group is thinking about this
10 Connecticut stem cell work being known for or known to
11 promote and whether or not the -- this evaluative process
12 enables any of that, whether or not it needs to. That's
13 a --

14 DR. HART: -- that was the basis for the
15 disease grants.

16 DR. GENEL: Yes.

17 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: So then we just want
18 people to be able to have enough of a framework as
19 they're reviewing to keep that in mind.

20 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Not the weighting to
21 those criteria's just --

22 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: -- just the
23 framework.

24 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Just the framework.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Just the framework.

2 MS. HORN: I'd be happy to work with
3 Chelsey on the framework and, David, if we could get you
4 to do -- see if there is anything else we could put in in
5 terms of language there that would not jeopardize
6 anything that we haven't put in the RFP, but make it a
7 little clearer what we mean.8 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay. So the goal then
9 would be to try to get something out to folks on the
10 whole committee, you know -- we haven't talked about it
11 whether or not you're going to meet again next month, but
12 that's the kind of work that can get done in advance, as
13 you're saying, David, it would save a lot of time
14 upfront.15 MR. MANDELKERN: Well, all the reviewers
16 going to be posted as usual?

17 DR. GENEL: Peer reviews?

18 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes, I mean peer reviews.
19 They're all going to be posted on the site, right?

20 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: No.

21 MS. HORN: Not the peer reviews.

22 DR. GENEL: Well, they weren't posted
23 publically, but they were posted privately for our
24 access.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: I think it look at CI
2 and then folks -- I think that's how --

3 DR. GENEL: -- I think that's what --

4 MS. SARNECKY: -- we can put the peer
5 reviews on that password protected --

6 DR. GENEL: -- yes.

7 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Can you make a single PDF
8 with all of the reviews instead of having to click --

9 MS. SARNECKY: -- I think it comes in one
10 -- does it --

11 DR. GOLDHAMMER: -- we've gotten it
12 before, I think, as one file, haven't we?

13 MS. SARNECKY: Yes, that's how it comes to
14 DPH from the peer reviewers, I believe.

15 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Good.

16 MS. SARNECKY: And this is something I'll
17 make a single PDF.

18 DR. GOLDSMITH: Yes, I'm sure others
19 would like it too.

20 MS. SARNECKY: Of course.

21 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay. Any other
22 discussion about that?

23 MR. MANDELKERN: I'm still not sold on the
24 idea in general, if I may be -- raise the point. There

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 are 77 requests. If we draw the line at a point say with
2 35 get one minute that only leaves us another 35 or 40
3 which we have plenty of time to consider. I think we
4 have to be quite astute in making sure that any of the
5 applicants don't feel that they did not get full
6 consideration of their grant proposals. And I'm -- I
7 don't see why if we draw the line carefully for a minute
8 for those below the line we should have plenty of time
9 left for another 30 or 40 reviews. I'm not so sure that
10 we may not pick up more animosity than we may pick up
11 efficiency.

12 DR. HISKES: I think it's smart to use the
13 peer reviewers to their fullest extent. If we tap their
14 expertise. They've been paid well, I hope. Or paid --
15 but anyway that's why we use them and --

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- they get a nice
17 thank you letter.

18 DR. HISKES: It's a resource and if we
19 already have 50 percent more in the list we're talking
20 about and anybody can prevent one that's not on the list
21 I think they don't have a basis for complaining.

22 DR. WALLACK: The first few years we
23 didn't pay them at all, did we?

24 DR. HISKES: Well, anyway, everybody's

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 grants have been reviewed by a pair of really topnotch
2 experts.

3 MS. HORN: Right.

4 DR. HISKES: So they've been -- that
5 should be sufficient.

6 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: All right, if we're
7 done with that discussion then we'll go onto Item No. 13,
8 other business. Anybody have other business?

9 A VOICE: No. 12?

10 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Oh, you're right, I'm
11 sorry, No. 12, grant modification subcommittee update.

12 MS. SARNECKY: Yes. I've sent out the
13 minutes to the grant modification subcommittee.

14 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yes.

15 MS. SARNECKY: That group, if everyone
16 remembers, was put in place to take care of routine
17 requests and this -- the full advisory committee has
18 asked that I keep them informed when the committee has
19 met and the requests that they've approved. So I've sent
20 out the minutes and if anyone wants to see any of the
21 requests specifically then you're more than welcome to
22 ask and I will send those along.

23 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Are there any comments
24 or questions about the minutes that you were provided by

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 Chelsey? These are the minutes of April 15th.

2 DR. GENEL: Well, we basically -- we
3 basically reaffirmed that today, didn't we? I mean those
4 are the same -- many of those were the same -- many of
5 them are the same.6 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay. If there is no
7 discussion then we'll move onto No. 13, other business.
8 All right.9 DR. WALLACK: This is somewhat of a sad
10 day and I say that because one of our ranks who has been
11 indispensable to the process, that's Warren, from what I
12 understand is going to be leaving us. And I, for one,
13 and I think all of us, I think I speak for all of us, in
14 saying that there is no words that can -- and I think
15 this should be for the minutes, if we might, I don't know
16 how that will get transmitted into the minutes, but I
17 think that it should be noted that all of us have an
18 incredible sense of gratitude for the leadership that,
19 Warren, you have given to this whole process over the
20 last five years or so. And that it's safe to say that we
21 wouldn't be at the point that we are without that kind of
22 leadership.23 Some of us go to the IASCR meetings and
24 the one thing that I come away with at each of those

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 meetings is that our process seems to be equal to and
2 superior to most of the other states that we hear reports
3 from. And you're going to be, Warren, very, very --
4 you're going to be missed an awful lot. And I hope that
5 our paths cross more frequently than we're anticipating
6 at this time because, as I said at the outset of these
7 few remarks, your support of this, your contributions to
8 this were indispensable and we thank you. We thank you
9 very much.

10 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Thank you, Milt.

11 DR. GENEL: May I propose resolution on
12 the behalf of the advisory committee that Mr. Warren
13 Wollschlager be praised, thanked for the extraordinary
14 job he's done over five years in moving the stem cell
15 research program to the point where I think now it is a
16 well-weathered, identified -- only this morning that our
17 Governor has the pilot for what he would like to see done
18 in the state.

19 DR. WALLACK: I would second the motion to
20 that effect, Mike.

21 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: I third it.

22 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Thank you. First of
23 all, let me point out six years not five. So just real
24 quickly, thank you very much. Like I said, this has been

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 -- it's not often that you get to do a job that's both
2 rewarding and fun and this has been both. And it was
3 sort of happenstance. You know, many of us were surprised
4 and a little dismayed to even hear that this program was
5 land at DPH. So, it's worked out great.

6 But, I said earlier today to the
7 Commissioner that, you know, this is something that I get
8 paid to do. It's fun when it's something that you like
9 to do, but I'm a paid employee and so I take pride in
10 working for the Department and the state. All of you
11 aren't. Peer reviewers from day one that started off as
12 only a five person peer review, three from New York and
13 they weren't getting paid at all. I mean that was
14 unbelievable the response we got from the peer reviewers.

15 The advisory committee in its current
16 forum and going back to day one it's been a pleasure
17 working with all of you. And really it's the stem cell
18 research community at large, both in the state and in the
19 country, we've worked with a lot of them, Milt, and
20 internationally. I mean we still have members in the
21 international stem cell community working as peer
22 reviewers for us.

23 So it's been a real pleasure working with
24 folks who are so invested in moving forward with a

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 program. So it's been easy to work. I -- folks, I've had
2 the pleasure of getting more than my share, more than I'm
3 due of thanks for this program. There are a lot of other
4 people in the department worked on it as well. Dr.
5 Galvin, you know, we sat in together and had no clue what
6 to do. Denise Leiffer, who retired a year ago, but it's
7 been a very difficult year because neither Marianne nor I
8 knew how to do any of the things that Denise did. And so
9 we've been struggling to get that stuff done.

10 And last but not least, Marianne. Marianne
11 came on board six months into the program when we were
12 really just hitting a bunch of ethical and legal
13 problems. If you remember those first meetings, Milt, we
14 didn't know what we were doing. And Marianne became --
15 has since become really a subject matter expert in
16 biomedical law and ethics as well. So it's been a lot of
17 people and it's been a lot of fun. So thank you all very
18 much. Oh, Chelsey, of course. Chelsey. Thank you,
19 Marianne -- it's actually been a number of people at CI
20 as well starting back with Nancy and now in your capable
21 hands. So it's been fun.

22 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: All in the context of
23 how many years with state service in the bigger realm of
24 what you have done.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: 32 and a half -- it
2 will be 32 and a half.

3 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: You started in the
4 mailroom?

5 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: I started working as an
6 aide.

7 DR. GENEL: May I assume that my
8 resolution is passed by acclamation?

9 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Absolutely.

10 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Thank you. Okay,
11 public comment?

12 MS. WILSON: I have a question. First of
13 all, on behalf of the stem cell -- (inaudible) --

14 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Hyphen was actually the
15 first peer reviewer ever recruited to support us and then
16 he had to resign immediately because he got the job at
17 Yale.

18 MS. WILSON: Well, thank you.

19 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: My pleasure.

20 MS. WILSON: And the second question is
21 both universities are wondering if we are going to get
22 access to the peer review scores before the review
23 committee in July? We did last year and in previous
24 years, but I was just wondering if you were planning to

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 do that again.

2 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: We gave access to the
3 peer review scores to the universities before giving them
4 to the --5 MS. WILSON: -- before the actual review
6 takes place.7 MS. SARNECKY: I think we had given them
8 to the universities two weeks or so before the grant
9 review meeting.10 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: I'm not even sure how
11 that process works.12 MS. HORN: Yes, we treated it like an FOI
13 request and we just give you yours and UCONN theirs.14 DR. HISKES: This is for the escrow
15 committee to start thinking about.16 MS. HORN: I think it's really to get the
17 --18 MS. WILSON: -- it's just for the PI's so
19 they know --20 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yes, I mean if we've
21 done in the -- they're published so you're certainly
22 welcome to them.

23 MS. WILSON: Okay, thank you.

24 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Other public comments?

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 MS. HORN: Are we meeting next month?

2 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Well, I'm not.

3 MS. HORN: I know you're not.

4 DR. GENEL: So it might be wise to spend
5 the first part of the meeting as we're getting everybody
6 on the same page. Even if we take 15 minutes just so that
7 --

8 MS. HORN: -- on the 19th.

9 DR. GENEL: Yes, on how we're going to
10 proceed, yes.11 MS. SARNECKY: I'm going to try to use the
12 Skype function.13 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Do we have a motion to
14 adjourn?

15 DR. WALLACK: So moved.

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Second?

17 DR. HISKES: Second.

18 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: All in favor? Thank you
19 very much.20 (Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at
21 3:00 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE

I, Paul Landman, a Notary Public in and for the State of Connecticut, and President of Post Reporting Service, Inc., do hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, the foregoing record is a correct and verbatim transcription of the audio recording made of the proceeding hereinbefore set forth.

I further certify that neither the audio operator nor I are attorney or counsel for, nor directly related to or employed by any of the parties to the action and/or proceeding in which this action is taken; and further, that neither the audio operator nor I are a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties, thereto, or financially interested in any way in the outcome of this action or proceeding.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and do so attest to the above, this 31st day of May, 2011.



Paul Landman
President

Post Reporting Service
1-800-262-4102