

VERBATIM PROCEEDINGS

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
WARREN WOLLSCHLAGER, ACTING CHAIRPERSON

FEBRUARY 15, 2011

CONNECTICUT INNOVATIONS
865 BROOK STREET
ROCKY HILL, CONNECTICUT 06067

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

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 . . . Verbatim Proceedings of a meeting of
2 the Stem Cell Research Advisory Committee held on February
3 15, 2011 at 1:13 p.m. at Connecticut Innovations, 865
4 Brook Street, Rocky Hill, Connecticut...

5

6

7

8

9 MR. WARREN WOLLSCHLAGER: So let's call the
10 meeting to order. This is Warren Wollschlager. And really
11 before I turn it over to the specific agenda items I just
12 want to take this opportunity to acknowledge the
13 leadership and the effort of Dr. Galvin. Many of you have
14 come and gone off of this Committee, off of the Peer
15 Review Committee, but it's really been Dr. Galvin who has
16 been the steady force in not just driving this program
17 ahead but actually fighting for its continuation, fighting
18 for continued funding. And I don't think a lot of people
19 know that. And so I wanted to go on the record that I
20 appreciate it, I appreciate your leadership, and the folks
21 in the stem cell community, and the research community in
22 Connecticut should know that as well. And those that do
23 do appreciate your leadership.

24 DR. MILTON WALLACK: Can we just add also -

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 - can we add also --

2 MR. ROBERT MANDELKERN: -- my vote is in
3 there also.

4 DR. ROBERT GALVIN: Thank you, Bob.

5 DR. WALLACK: Could we also that in very,
6 very specific and tangible ways that Bob has done exactly
7 what you've talked about and most recently without him we
8 couldn't have implemented the recent peer review system.
9 And that where there were no funds for peer review Dr.
10 Galvin was able to secure those funds for us.

11 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yes.

12 DR. WALLACK: And in so many specific ways,
13 not just in general ways, he's been instrumental. And so
14 as a long term Board member I'd like to endorse everything
15 that you said also.

16 DR. GALVIN: Thank you very much. And over
17 the years many of you have, are new but we still have some
18 of the original group of folks, and you've all become
19 close and respected friends. And we have people that are
20 no longer with us in this existence, Gerry Yang, and we
21 also had folks who have departed and gone in other
22 directions. And Ernesto has gone off to be in a more
23 comfortable spot than some of the times that we had here
24 in the early parts of the committee, which I think we

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 could look back on now with a smile. And I think it was
2 fortunate that Gerry wasn't very healthy because I think
3 he and Ernie were about ready to duke it out on a couple
4 of occasions. But we did get the job done and we've had
5 enormous contributions from people who have really put
6 themselves on the line. And I think on a couple of
7 occasions we've had somebody who really put his job on the
8 line to do this.

9 And I think that the underlying theme here
10 is this is something that was really, really worth doing,
11 and something that all of us, you know, in our
12 professional lives have done things and saved lives and
13 come up with innovative ideas. And I'm sure that just
14 looking around the table I know Mike Genel has probably
15 saved the lives of several children with his skill and
16 expertise as a commission. But this is a thing I look
17 back on, and I think we all can, as something that was
18 inherently worthwhile doing and I think that we sort of
19 hit the ground running with this at a time when there was
20 a great deal of feeling that perhaps this wasn't something
21 that should be done in the United States. That perhaps the
22 presidents didn't like it or couldn't make it work, and
23 maybe it was better off done in England or Israel or some
24 other country. And as some of you who were here from the

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 beginning recall California had, as it was mentioned
2 yesterday, had a great deal of difficulty getting out of
3 the starting blocks and a great deal of problems with
4 contentious legal opinions and the like. And, you know, I
5 think we just kind of hit the ground running at a very
6 crucially important point in the history of this endeavor.

7 And Gerry and I were having a talk about
8 people coming to Connecticut and bringing jobs here and
9 bringing scientists here. And I think more than anything
10 the initial 20 million and the 10 million aliquots which
11 followed along were -- they were very helpful and very
12 helpful to the three universities involved, but I think it
13 was the environment and the atmosphere that we created
14 that this is a progressive state, that this is good
15 research. This is not murdering embryos. This is moving
16 ahead with things, particularly Yale, who was not really
17 working on -- as much on human embryonic tissues in the
18 early stages as UCONN was. But now we're seeing the fruits
19 of our labor and we're seeing things that are going to
20 happen that are going to save lives.

21 So we were in the right place at the right
22 time. And I've had a wonderful association with a
23 wonderful group of incredibly bright people, technically
24 superb, intellectually stimulating bioethists, really a

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 great bunch of people. I'm not sure -- I believe that my
2 successor, Dr. Mullen, is occupied doing something else.

3 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: At the moment she was
4 called into a budget meeting today.

5 DR. GALVIN: Yes.

6 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: And may try to -- will
7 try to join us either telephonically or in person as the
8 meeting progresses. She may not be able to.

9 DR. GALVIN: I am actually retired. I
10 retired on the 31st of December, but I was asked by the
11 new administration, the Chief of Staff, to stay on for a
12 few weeks to get things going. And I did particularly want
13 to introduce, unfortunately I won't be here next month, to
14 introduce Dr. Mullen. But it's been great. And as they
15 say, the pleasure has been all mine. Warren.

16 DR. MYRON GENEL: I think to reinforce what
17 Commissioner said, let me introduce for the record some
18 items that were in the December issue of Nature of
19 Biotechnology on tracking and assessing the rise of state
20 funded stem cell research, which prominently mentions
21 Connecticut. I don't know have you seen this?

22 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yes.

23 DR. GENEL: And I would ask that this be
24 included in the record.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: And we can pass it
2 around. Those who didn't see it we'll send it out as an
3 attachment or something to all the members of the Board.

4 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes, that hasn't been
5 circulated.

6 DR. GALVIN: While that's going around the
7 room I will say without Warren we wouldn't be sitting here
8 in the position that we are now. And I felt it was very
9 unfortunate that at yesterday's meeting there was not a
10 single word said about Warren Wollschlager's
11 accomplishments and about this Board, this distinguished,
12 distinguished Board present and past. I notice that there
13 are quite many elected officials who were quite puffed up
14 about the whole thing. And I would just submit for your
15 consideration and ask your forbearance that to remember
16 back -- this is part of the same group who tried to take
17 our money away twice. And then followed by a -- in the
18 course of which one of them, not one of the ones who spoke
19 yesterday, tried to take away the unexpended contractual
20 funds and told me that he had the authority because he was
21 elected by the citizens of Dogpatch, or wherever he came
22 from.

23 And also I have to -- I guess I shouldn't
24 mention names but I will, the acting Secretary of OPM

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 Sisco, just simply took the money away last year and I had
2 to go back over to Lisa and the Governor to get the money
3 back. And just flat took it away.

4 And it hasn't been easy, but this Board has
5 -- I can remember the endless amounts of going over small
6 details to make sure this thing worked. And I am going to
7 ask the Governor to have a gubernatorial award or a
8 gubernatorial proclamation recommending the work and
9 appreciating the work of this group, past and present. And
10 I was -- I thought it was -- I guess at my stage in life
11 and my age one gets offended easily. I thought it was
12 quite offensive that nobody mentioned all of the work that
13 we did.

14 DR. PAUL PESCATELLO: Can I take one second
15 for entering something into the record?

16 DR. GALVIN: Hi Anne.

17 DR. PESCATELLO: I would just like to enter
18 into the record some things that are not breaching
19 confidences, but I remember when Governor Rell first came
20 into office after Governor Rowland so dramatically left,
21 having a meeting with Governor Rell and Dr. Galvin, and in
22 his very quiet and trustworthy but persuasive way talking
23 the new Governor through the stem cell research, this
24 whole new area of stem cell research and making the case

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 for it, and earning her trust and therefore her backing
2 for both the overall legislation and the money. And it was
3 your quiet persuasion at the very start. I think she was a
4 month into office.

5 DR. GALVIN: Yes, thank you.

6 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Thank you. So let the
7 record show that Dr. Kiessling has joined us. Hello, how
8 are you? Thank you very much. I appreciate your presence
9 here.

10 So we have a quorum. So we're moving on
11 then to agenda Item No. 2, approval of minutes from the
12 meeting of October 26th. I guess we haven't met since
13 then. I appreciate Chelsey made copies of all these
14 materials for everyone. So, I'll give you a second to
15 take a look at them if you haven't reviewed them to date.

16 DR. WALLACK: Move their acceptance.

17 DR. GALVIN: Second.

18 COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I didn't get
19 that.

20 DR. WALLACK: Moved for acceptance by
21 Wallack.

22 COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

23 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: And seconded by Dr.
24 Galvin. Any discussion? All those in favor, say aye.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 ALL VOICES: Aye.

2 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Opposed? Ayes have it.

3 Proposals received, do you want me to -

4 well, let me turn it over to you, Chelsey.

5 MS. CHELSEY SARNECKY: Okay. So, as you all
6 know we put out an RFP for the 2011 round of funding back
7 in September, was it? And we got our responses. They
8 were due to CI on January 14th. We received 81 proposals,
9 47 of them were seed grants requesting about nine and a
10 half million dollars.

11 DR. WALLACK: 40 what?

12 MS. SARNECKY: 47 were seed grants
13 requesting about nine and a half million dollars. 28 of
14 them were established grants requesting 14 million
15 dollars. There was one group grant requesting 1.7
16 million, four disease directed group grants requesting 5.3
17 million, two core grants requesting 2.7 million. And that
18 totaled a little over 33 million dollars requested.
19 We received proposals from Yale, UCONN, the Health Center,
20 Hartford Hospital, Wesleyan, and two companies, Chem and
21 Pharma, and the Minerva Biotechnologies. And that's all I
22 have for the updates.23 DR. GERALD FISHBONE: Could I ask a
24 question?

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 MS. SARNECKY: Sure.

2 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yes, questions.

3 DR. FISHBONE: For the core, did these
4 directed group grants are they in response to the new
5 wording in the --

6 MS. SARNECKY: -- yes.

7 DR. FISHBONE: Yes.

8 MS. SARNECKY: We had denoted a separate
9 category on the cover sheet for the RFP and these four
10 were responsive to that.

11 DR. FISHBONE: So that was within one of
12 the groups.

13 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

14 DR. ANN KIESSLING: Chelsey, can we have a
15 copy of the RFP? Is it on-line?

16 MS. SARNECKY: Yes, it's on-line.

17 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Other questions? Do we
18 want to move into grant review timing just since we're
19 talking about -- we're talking about what's in now,
20 Chelsey?

21 MS. SARNECKY: Sure.

22 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: We can hold it. I mean
23 that's true. We have folks on the line and we want to use
24 them now. So I take that back. So let's go to Item No. 4

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 then. And, again, so we're going to be looking at a
2 variety of requests either for rebudgeting, reallocation,
3 no cost extension, change of PI, change of scope, a lot of
4 different things. The same ground rules apply. Those of
5 you who are conflicted should not participate in the
6 discussion or the votes involving the facilities. And so
7 I'll turn it over to you, I guess, for that as well,
8 Chelsey.

9 MS. SARNECKY: Sure. Item Agenda No. 4 is
10 from Yale, 09-SBA-Yale-10, Dr. Qyang. This is one of
11 those requests that we love where they're decreasing their
12 salary support for their effort, but they're still putting
13 forward the effort that they had listed originally. We
14 have salary support decrease from 15 percent to 10
15 percent. And the PI is still going to be putting 15
16 percent of the research effort into the project. And this
17 salary is just being decreased accordingly. And there are
18 the attached budget and justification pages to go along
19 with that request. Any questions?

20 DR. FISHBONE: So he's moving the money
21 into research materials is that what --

22 MS. SARNECKY: -- yes. Let's see here.

23 DR. FISHBONE: There is no return of funds,
24 it's just being --

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 MS. SARNECKY: -- no, it's just being
2 reallocated.

3 DR. FISHBONE: Yes.

4 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Other questions on the
5 request from Yale, SCA-Yale-10? If not, do we have a
6 motion to approve?

7 MR. MANDELKERN: So moved.

8 DR. FISHBONE: Second.

9 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: All right, Bob
10 Mandelkern made the motion and Dr. Fishbone seconded. Any
11 more discussion? If not, all those in favor of the Qyang
12 rebudget request say aye.

13 ALL VOICES: Aye.

14 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Opposed? The ayes have
15 it. Thanks.

16 No. 5, SCA-38, Dong, resignation of PI.

17 MS. SARNECKY: Dr. Dong wishes to -- so we
18 have -- Dr. Dong and Dr. Qiu, who are working on this
19 specific grant, and Dr. Dong is leaving his position at
20 Yale as of February 28th. He had received an offer as an
21 associate professor in China. So, Dr. Qiu is actually the
22 sponsor for this grant. She has 5 percent of the effort on
23 this grant currently. She is the one that has worked with
24 Dr. Dong on this grant and has really monitored the

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 progress of this grant from the beginning. So, there is --
2 the request here is to rebudget some of the -- or all of
3 the salaries for Dr. Dong, since he'll no longer be there,
4 and change the PI from Dr. Dong to Dr. Qiu.

5 DR. WALLACK: Move the acceptance.

6 COURT REPORTER: Who seconded? I'm sorry.
7 We have two seconds.

8 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: We'll make it Bob
9 Mandelkern seconded.

10 MS. SARNECKY: I just have one more note
11 before we go on. I apologize I didn't mention this. There
12 is also a request on the table to extend the project by
13 three months due to all of the shuffling around and the
14 changes here. I just want to make sure that's on the
15 record that that's approved as well.

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So we're looking then at
17 really Nos. 5 and 6 are being considered together as well
18 as -- which includes the extension for three months, a no
19 cost extension, correct?

20 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

21 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So was that motion
22 there, Dr. Wallack?

23 DR. WALLACK: Right.

24 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay, good. Any other

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 discussion?

2 DR. FISHBONE: Are they hiring another
3 person? The 40,000 is going to the, to be announced
4 person?5 MS. SARNECKY: I don't think it states in
6 here.

7 DR. FISHBONE: It does on the --

8 MS. SARNECKY: -- oh, there you go. Yes,
9 they are going to be hiring someone else, but it doesn't
10 state in here who they are hiring.

11 DR. FISHBONE: Yes.

12 MS. SARNECKY: So once we do find that out
13 I can let the Committee know.

14 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Other questions?

15 DR. GALVIN: We don't have to re-vote the
16 three month's extension though.17 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Other questions? If
18 not, we've got a motion and a second to accept No. 5 and
19 No. 6 including the three month extension. All those in
20 favor?

21 ALL VOICES: Aye.

22 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Opposed? The ayes have
23 it. Great.

24 No. 7, this is the Redmond reallocation of

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 salaries to supplies.

2 MS. SARNECKY: I put this on the agenda. I
3 felt a little uncomfortable with this request just because
4 I don't think we've ever come across something like this
5 in the past. Dr. Redmond is requesting some changes to
6 the personnel and other direct costs. I don't think the
7 personnel is an issue. There is going to be some increase
8 of effort from Dr. Redmond and then some decrease in
9 effort. I think that, you know, that that's pretty self-
10 explanatory in the letter regarding the doctors working on
11 this grant. But the thing I had the issue with was the
12 request at the end to reallocate some funding for computer
13 costs, but one of the computer costs that I noticed was
14 for one of the grant administrators not for -- Joanne
15 Similoia. She's a grant administrator. She is not a
16 researcher doing research on this grant. And I didn't
17 know if this was something that we would approve regularly
18 or if this is something that kind of a flagged item that
19 we should look into.

20 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Right. And Chelsey
21 raised this question with the Department and we thought,
22 well, let's bring it to -- it's the first time we've
23 looked at something like this. Let's bring it to the
24 Committee.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 DR. KIESSLING: So this is more money going
2 to personnel, department personnel, and calling it
3 computer costs?

4 MR. MANDELKERN: Well, what are the
5 percentages involved here? What kind of transfers are we
6 talking about of salary to supplies? Are they
7 significant, Chelsey, insignificant, moderate, or what?

8 MS. SARNECKY: Let me just look here.
9 They're pretty significant about 30,000 dollars from the
10 personnel being dispersed throughout the rest of the
11 budget. But the computer costs, which I think is the
12 thing that we've got in question here, is a little over
13 2,000 dollars.

14 MR. MANDELKERN: 2,000 out of how much is
15 the salary budget?

16 MS. SARNECKY: Well, the salary budget --
17 the salary budget right now is 100,000 dollars from Year 3
18 with the carryover. Do you have the sheet in front of you,
19 Bob, by any chance?

20 MR. MANDELKERN: No, I don't. There was no
21 hard copy sent out until this morning and I could not
22 bring anything in. I don't have the sheet and I could not
23 -- but it seems to me 2,000 out of 100,000 and this is a
24 grant that's made progress. We had a progress report at

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 our last meeting and it's a very important issue, I would
2 speak for allowing a minimal transfer of 2,000 out of
3 100,000 to allow the project to go forward smoothly.

4 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: I think -- Bob, this is
5 Warren. I think the issue that concerned us here or at
6 least that we noted was that, you're right, it's only a
7 couple of thousand for a computer, but the computer is
8 going to be provided to someone who is administrating this
9 grant and other grants. So, it's -- as opposed to a
10 researcher or one of the other folks actually conducting
11 the research. So I don't know if one of the scientists
12 could weigh in on what you think about that.

13 DR. DAVID GOLDHAMMER: I mean I think
14 computer costs for an administrator for the purpose of
15 administering this grant is completely appropriate. Now,
16 if this person is administering this grant and 20 other
17 grants there is, I think, an issue there.

18 MS. SARNECKY: I'm just going to ask for
19 the record, Paula Wilson from Yale, are you aware if Ms.
20 Similoia is working on any other grants besides this
21 grant, off the top of your head? I'm sorry to put you on
22 the spot.

23 MS. PAULA WILSON: I believe she is working
24 on other grants. She's not a 100 percent on this grant.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 However, I was under the understanding that it was for
2 computer services such as network charges if one was to
3 purchase a computer. So he is requesting to purchase a
4 computer.

5 MS. SARNECKY: We had gotten an email prior
6 to the submission of this written request, Dan and I had
7 gotten an email from Joanne Similoia asking pretty much
8 how to go about the process of putting this request in and
9 that's what flagged Dan and I's attention to this. But I
10 think the intent was for her to purchase a computer for
11 herself to use on this grant. And I would imagine she's
12 not just going to be using one computer for this grant.
13 I'm sure she doesn't have multiple computers to use.

14 DR. GOLDHAMMER: But it says to cover the
15 cost of computers, but is it not clear whether that is for
16 a purchase versus services or, Paula, you thought it was
17 for services and not --

18 MS. WILSON: -- I thought services.

19 MS. SARNECKY: It looks -- it looks like
20 here though that the -- under other direct costs, No. 3,
21 computer services it looks like that's not a line item
22 that we normally have, Dan. Am I correct? I think the
23 line item that we normally have in our budget template is
24 computers or something of that sort. I don't think --

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 DR. GOLDHAMMER: -- I mean it's really --
2 it's splitting hairs a little bit. I mean I think if a
3 good portion of her job is directed at this project
4 whether it's service, computer services or the purchase of
5 a computer it's appropriate. If it's a very minor part of
6 her job and she mostly administers for other people then
7 it's not. So if -- I mean if we have some confidence that
8 this is a reasonable part of her job then I think for
9 2,000 dollars we don't want to have to nickel and dime and
10 try to parse out this kind of thing.

11 DR. FISHBONE: That's my feeling too. You
12 know, we have picked at this grant over the years a number
13 of times and I think for this sum of money it wouldn't
14 benefit us to see any more nitpicky --

15 MR. MANDELKERN: -- I think somebody is not
16 talking loud enough.

17 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Dr. Fishbone was
18 agreeing that we've already looked at this grant on
19 numerous occasions and we don't want to be nitpicking.

20 DR. WALLACK: My impression is that it's
21 been brought to our attention not because of the 2,000
22 dollars and not because of the nitpicking, but rather it's
23 been brought to our attention as a precedent for how we
24 should proceed. And I think that it's -- it's wise to be

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 looking at it in a critical way so that things like this
2 when the next computer is not 12,000 dollars or whatever
3 for whatever the various uses we're not faced with that
4 discussion.

5 So I think that we -- I would opt to
6 approve this, but also put on the record that we are going
7 to communicate with this group that we have taken this
8 under consideration. We're going to specifically expect
9 that this -- these dollars are specifically going to be
10 used for the work that we're involved with with stem cell
11 research and specifically with Redmond's grant. And if
12 we're incorrect about our assumption, please, let us know
13 because we'll have to reconsider. We, at least, are then
14 -- we've recorded our intent going forward and we've also
15 not taken away the money.

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Is that a motion?

17 DR. WALLACK: I will make that into a
18 motion that way.

19 DR. PESCATELLO: So, the motion is to have
20 Chelsey or somebody confirm that --

21 DR. WALLACK: -- and for the record, more
22 important than that, to firm the precedent that going --
23 that it is our feeling that we will only want to fund
24 those services relative to the projects that we are

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 funding.

2 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: I need a clarification
3 of the motion myself now. So are you making the motion
4 that we approve this request.

5 DR. WALLACK: Approve it.

6 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: But also follow it up
7 with -- contact --

8 DR. WALLACK: -- right.

9 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Dr. Redmond and note the
10 precedence of this.

11 DR. WALLACK: Right.

12 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: And to reaffirm, ask
13 that they reaffirm that this is being used to support this
14 grant.

15 DR. WALLACK: For the record, exactly.

16 DR. FISHBONE: And by the way it does say
17 computer services.18 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Right. Do we have a
19 second?

20 MR. MANDELKERN: I'll second it.

21 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: All right. Bob
22 Mandelkern, second. Any discussion? No? Those in favor
23 say aye.

24 ALL VOICES: Aye.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Opposed? Ayes have it.

2 DR. RICHARD DEES: For the record, this is
3 Richard Dees. I just wanted to clarify that.4 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Hi Richard, how are you
5 doing? This is Warren Wollschlager. Dr. Bob Galvin is
6 with us as well.7 So, great, so we're moving now onto No. 9,
8 which happens to be 09-Yale-30, the Horsley reallocation
9 request.

10 A VOICE: No. 8.

11 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: You're right, it's No.
12 8. We had a couple of different agendas.13 MS. SARNECKY: That's -- Dr. Horsley's
14 request is to reallocate some funds. Dr. Tedow has been
15 working on this project and she was awarded a fellowship
16 to cover her salary, so this request from Dr. Horsley is
17 to reallocate the funding that was originally intended for
18 Dr. Tedow's salary to reallocate that to purchase a better
19 microscope.

20 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Questions?

21 MR. MANDELKERN: Salary -- are we talking
22 about No. 8?23 MS. SARNECKY: It's just been inverted,
24 Bob, that's my fault. I did send out -- do you want me to

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 send it to you quickly now? Is --

2 DR. DEES: -- I don't think it matters --

3 DR. WALLACK: -- would it suffice, Chelsey
4 for you --5 MR. MANDELKERN: -- supplies to salaries or
6 salaries to supplies?7 MS. SARNECKY: It's salaries to supplies,
8 Bob. The request was inverted. That's my fault.

9 MR. MANDELKERN: Salaries to supplies.

10 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yes.

11 MR. MANDELKERN: Okay.

12 DR. WALLACK: So would it suffice rather
13 than having to do anything more electronically for you
14 just to reiterate exactly what the request is and then we
15 can go on the good faith of what you're talking about.16 MS. SARNECKY: Sure. Should I just read the
17 request?

18 DR. WALLACK: Go ahead.

19 MS. SARNECKY: Would that be okay with
20 everyone? Okay. Should I --

21 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- go ahead.

22 MS. SARNECKY: Okay. "Last year we began a
23 project using human embryonic stem cells to generate" --
24 that's irrelevant. "I was fortunate enough to hire a

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 highly trained post-doctoral fellow, Anna Tedow, to
2 perform the aims of this project. Based on both the
3 project and Dr. Tedow's request -- record a fellowship was
4 awarded to her to cover salary for this upcoming year.
5 Since these aspects and new avenues for this project have
6 opened up the -- Dr. Horsley would like to request that
7 the funds that were originally slated for Dr. Tedow's
8 salary be reallocated to cover another microscope to use
9 in the human embryonic stem cell culture room for basic
10 stem cell maintenance and materials and supplies."

11 DR. GALVIN: What's the dollar amount,
12 Chelsey?

13 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: It's 35.

14 MS. SARNECKY: 35,000.

15 DR. FISHBONE: This sounds like it's a
16 wonderful use of the money instead of going for salary
17 it's going to actually advance the project by getting new
18 and better equipment. I would move that we accept.

19 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Dr. Fishbone moves to
20 accept. Do we have a second?

21 DR. WALLACK: Second.

22 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Milt Wallack. Further
23 discussion? Those in favor say aye.

24 ALL VOICES: Aye.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Ayes have it.

4 MS. SARNECKY: Um, hmm. Drs. Kiessling,
5 Wallack, and Genel had offered to review the few annual
6 reports that we had. So I think I would just like to turn
7 this over to them.

8 DR. WALLACK: I thought that it seemed like
9 a worthwhile proposal to accept and endorse further
10 funding based upon the progress that's been made, based
11 upon the value of the project, and the reference to the
12 direction of stem cell work and being able to direct stem
13 cells to develop into specific stem cell types. The
14 potential, I think, is good and I think that the things,
15 from my perspective at least, to be going along well.
16 There is good collaboration with Renhay, Sho, and Stormy
17 Chamberlain. So, as I read it, it seemed like it was worth
18 accepting and endorsing for the funding.

19 DR. KIESSLING: Are you talking about the
20 Mayer grant?

21 DR. GENEL: Yes, the Mayer.

22 DR. WALLACK: Yes.

23 DR. GENEL: Yes.

24 DR. KIESSLING: We don't have any paperwork

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 about those here, right?

2 DR. GENEL: I had some stuff.

3 DR. WALLACK: Can you use mine?

4 DR. GENEL: I agree. I think they have
5 sufficient progress in two years to warrant a
6 continuation.

7 DR. KIESSLING: Yep.

8 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So is that a motion to -
9 -

10 DR. GENEL: -- yes.

11 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So we have a motion from
12 Dr. Genel to continue the project.

13 DR. WALLACK: Second.

14 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Seconded by Dr. Wallack.

15 Other discussion? Those in favor say aye.

16 ALL VOICES: Aye.

17 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Ayes have it. Thank you.

18 Okay, so that's approved.

19 And we're moving on to No. 10, which is the
20 Aguila no cost extension request.

21 MR. MANDELKERN: No. 11.

22 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: You know there is a
23 little shuffling so it may be your No. 11, but regardless
24 it's the 08-UCHC-003 Aguila, no cost extension.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 MS. SARNECKY: This request is to extend
2 the time that is supposed to end on February 28th of this
3 year for four additional months until June 30 of 2011.
4 There is going to be about 30,000 dollars to carry over to
5 that four month period.

6 DR. GENEL: I recommend approval.

7 DR. WALLACK: second.

8 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Discussion? Those in
9 favor say aye.

10 ALL VOICES: Aye.

11 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Opposed? The ayes have
12 it.

13 So now on my sheet No. 11 is the Rasmussen
14 annual report approval or request.

15 MS. SARNECKY: This one, again, if the
16 three reviewers wouldn't mind.

17 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: And who are the
18 reviewers on this?

19 MS. SARNECKY: Dr. Kiessling, Dr. Genel,
20 and Dr. Wallack have offered to review all of the annual
21 requests.

22 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Oh, all of them? Okay,
23 great.

24 DR. KIESSLING: So this is a group that's

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 doing IPS cells and they've actually gone about it and
2 they have made quite a few IPS cell lines. I can't
3 remember how many, but a remarkable number. And they're
4 doing fine. I mean I think that this is -- was a nice
5 annual report. They've made progress. They've
6 characterized -- they're just chugging along. So our
7 recommendation is that this be accepted and approved.

8 DR. WALLACK: I would endorse and second
9 the approval of the -- the only confusion that there was
10 here is in some budget items and it had to do with the
11 fact that they lost one of the researchers during the
12 course of the year. And there was some money left over in
13 a carry over for the ensuing year. It wasn't made
14 perfectly clear, I don't think, in the way he wrote it,
15 but it does make sense. And -- but I think it should be
16 noted that the variance in the amounts, some 95,000
17 dollars, was due to the salary situation.

18 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So, can I ask, Dr.
19 Wallack, is that addressed both then in Items No. 11 and
20 No. 12?

21 DR. GENEL: No, I think we can -- I would
22 suggest that we approve Item No. 11 and then discuss Item
23 No. 12.

24 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay. So we have a

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 motion to approve and it was seconded by Dr. Wallack.

2 Other discussion? Those -- yes.

3 DR. FISHBONE: It seems like the money came
4 from graduate assistants who are now making 28,000 less
5 than the original budget and that's been put into
6 materials.

7 DR. GENEL: Yes, well, Gerry, I was
8 suggesting we approve the annual report but that we
9 separate --

10 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- the next item.

11 DR. GENEL: Separately review the --

12 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- so only looking at
13 the approval of Item No. 11, the Rasmussen annual report.

14 DR. WALLACK: So move the question for
15 approval of the annual report.

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Those in favor say aye.

17 ALL VOICES: Aye.

18 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Opposed? That's
19 approved.

20 MS. MARIANNE HORN: I would just note for
21 the record that Dr. Goldhammer is recusing himself from
22 the vote.

23 DR. GOLDHAMMER: From all UCONN votes.

24 MS. HORN: From UCONN votes, yes, thank

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 you.

2 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Great. So now we'll move
3 right into No. 12, also involving the same grant, Dr.
4 Rasmussen, the carry over request.5 DR. GENEL: I have some problem with this
6 and I still have a problem with this because we're not
7 given any information as to how that money is going to be
8 rebudgeted or reused. The only thing we're told is that
9 they're going to buy some -- buy a piece of equipment, I
10 believe, for 4,000 dollars, but that still leaves 90,000
11 dollars that is going to be carried over but is not
12 accounted for in terms of how it's going to be allocated.
13 So, I would -- I would suggest that this go back and that
14 we ask for more specifics in terms of how that carry over
15 money is to be spent.16 DR. KIESSLING: Where does that add up to
17 90,000?18 MR. DAN WAGNER: 95.9 at the bottom, total
19 cost.20 DR. WALLACK: It was 90.5 and then there
21 was another --22 DR. GENEL: -- yes, yes. So, I'm sorry,
23 the carry over is not 90, it's 70. There is -- in any
24 event, there is a large amount of money here that is

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 carried over without any explicit information as to how
2 it's to be used.

3 MS. SARNECKY: Usually when we receive
4 carry over requests the carry over is carried over by line
5 item. So what the initial chunk of money is used for the
6 carry over remains on that line item.

7 DR. GENEL: In the same category.

8 MS. SARNECKY: And it stays in that same
9 category, it's just funds that have not been used at the
10 end of this reporting period.

11 DR. GENEL: So the assumption would be that
12 the carry over would not change in terms of --

13 MS. SARNECKY: -- yes. So the 4,000 dollars
14 that they're reallocating that is being reallocated from
15 one line item to another, but then as far as the remaining
16 91 "ish" thousand dollars that money is just being used
17 for the same exact line item it just has not been used
18 within this reporting period. So they have to have the
19 request to carry it over. That's why there is only
20 justification for the 4,000 dollars because that 4,000
21 dollars is being moved from one category to the next
22 whereas the remaining 91,000 is being used for what it was
23 originally slated for.

24 DR. GENEL: For a post-doc associate?

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 MS. SARNECKY: It's just being moved over
2 from one year to the next. It has to do with the
3 reporting. The money is not going to be used for anything
4 different. It's just that since this report was due at the
5 end of September --

6 DR. GENEL: -- but the report indicates --
7 but the report indicates, but the report indicates, page
8 two or three, "going forward I propose to fill this post-
9 doc person deficit by in case contributions from Dr.
10 Kruger and by hiring another post-doctorate graduate
11 student." So, that isn't quite the same, is it? I mean
12 there is an additional investigator who is going to get
13 partial support from the grant.

14 DR. WALLACK: I think that Mike is
15 absolutely right and that's what I was alluding to before
16 myself in that it's unclear -- and Chelsey, you tried to
17 address that, but it's unclear about is -- does that mean
18 he's going to be spending X number of dollars for whom,
19 and that part is not clear.

20 MS. SARNECKY: I can have --

21 MR. WAGNER: -- if I can interject,
22 everyday has this piece of paper.

23 DR. KIESSLING: Yes.

24 MR. WAGNER: I mean the carryover is in

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 Column No. 2, so 95.9. The Year 3 budget that was approved
2 and --

3 DR. GENEL: -- with carryover.

4 MR. WAGNER: And then the Year 3 budget
5 with the carryover is added in the far right column. So
6 you can see they're not adding any more individuals. The
7 things are sliding over. The 29,000 is added to the 28,000
8 for materials and supplies. They're adding -- so you can
9 kind of get an idea that they're not adding more people
10 where the dollars kind of add up.

11 DR. WALLACK: So, you're saying from your
12 perspective it's okay?

13 MR. WAGNER: It's -- that's how I read it.

14 DR. WALLACK: Okay.

15 MR. WAGNER: I mean I'm not saying that
16 it's okay or not okay, it's just that you can see where
17 they -- where they kind of slide over, as Chelsey said,
18 you know they stay in the same line items. There is 28.9
19 left over in the second column under materials and
20 supplies, they're adding to the 29. One that was already
21 approved in the budget and it just slides across.

22 DR. KIESSLING: Is this a four year grant
23 or a three year grant?

24 MR. WAGNER: I don't know about that.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 DR. KIESSLING: It says start date of '08
2 and then it says end date is '11. I don't know if that is
3 just the end date for this period or if it's the end of
4 the grant.

5 DR. GENEL: It's a "B", it's a -- it's Stem
6 Cell B, which is the established investigator grants so
7 that would be --

8 DR. KIESSLING: -- it would be a four year
9 grant.

10 DR. GENEL: That would be a four year
11 grant.

12 DR. KIESSLING: So they're going to have a
13 bunch of money left over from Year 3 to Year 4.

14 MR. WAGNER: This is the last year.

15 DR. GENEL: Oh, it's three years or that's
16 the current year.

17 MR. WAGNER: Right. This would be the last
18 budgeted year.

19 DR. KIESSLING: It's a three year grant?

20 MR. WAGNER: Right.

21 DR. KIESSLING: Maybe they're going to try
22 to stretch it into a four year grant.

23 DR. GENEL: Is this one of the ones that we
24 reduced last year from four to three years to stretch the

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 budget?

2 DR. KIESSLING: This started in '08.

3 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Right.

4 DR. GENEL: Well --

5 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- so --

6 DR. GENEL: -- well, I guess I'm all right
7 with that.8 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: You're all right with
9 it?10 DR. KIESSLING: Well, they're doing -- I
11 mean it says --

12 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- they're doing --

13 DR. KIESSLING: -- if the report is
14 accurate they're chugging.

15 DR. GENEL: Yes.

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Do we have a motion to
17 approve?18 DR. GENEL: I have no problem with the
19 scientific work and I'm not going to quibble so much about
20 the reallocation. If staff is comfortable with it, I'm
21 comfortable with it.

22 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So, is that the motion?

23 DR. GENEL: Yes.

24 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Do we have a second?

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 DR. KIESSLING: I'll second it.

2 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Any more discussion? If
3 not, those in favor?

4 ALL VOICES: Aye.

5 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Opposed? The ayes have
6 it. Great. Thank you.

7 So, we're moving now to Item No. 13,
8 LoTurco's reduction in effort and a reallocation, I guess,
9 it's combined in one request.

10 DR. KIESSLING: I have the budget page I
11 don't have the letter.

12 MS. SARNECKY: I don't have the letter in
13 front of me.

14 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: All right, so we're
15 going to move past this as we'll look for that and try to
16 share copies or read it into the record. So we'll move on
17 then to the next item, which is the Gravely decrease in
18 effort and no cost extension, Item No. 14.

19 MS. SARNECKY: This request is to extend
20 the -- Dr. Gravely's established investigator grant
21 currently ending on March 1, 2011 extended until July 31,
22 2011. They've got some of the research still to complete
23 within this period. The majority of the funds that they
24 have left over will be used to continue to support the

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 salary for one student, one research assistant, one post-
2 doc, one bioinformatics person to complete these
3 experiments. Dr. Gravely is also requesting to decrease
4 his current effort from 1.8 person months, about 15
5 percent, to 1.2 person months, which is about 10 percent
6 during this -- the no cost extension period. So that's
7 effective March 1, 2011 to July 31, 2011.

8 DR. WALLACK: Move the acceptance.

9 DR. KIESSLING: Yes, I second that.

10 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Seconded by Dr.
11 Kiessling. Any discussion? If not, those in favor?

12 ALL VOICES: Aye.

13 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Opposed? Great. So
14 that's all set. That's approved, Item No. 14.

15 Item No. 15, the Xu no cost extension.

16 MS. SARNECKY: Dr. Xu is requesting to
17 extend his established investigator grant currently ending
18 on March 1, 2011 and he wishes to extend it to December
19 31, 2011. There is also a request to approve the
20 reallocation of about 10,000 dollars from salary and
21 fringe to supplies to cover some unanticipated material
22 and supply expenses.

23 DR. WALLACK: So moved.

24 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Do I have a second?

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 DR. KIESSLING: This is not his core. This
2 is his established investigator grant.

3 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

4 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: We have a motion from
5 Dr. Wallack. Do we have a second?

6 DR. KIESSLING: I'll second it.

7 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Any discussion? If not,
8 those in favor?

9 ALL VOICES: Aye.

10 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Opposed? The ayes have
11 it.

12 So, we will move onto No. 16, the Lai
13 effort increase. And, again, in the meantime we're tabling
14 No. 13 until we try to find the narrative correspondence.

15 So, No. 16, Lai effort increase.

16 MS. SARNECKY: Dr. Lai wishes to increase
17 the effort as PI on this project from about 40 percent to
18 50 percent effective March 1, 2011. He is going to
19 increase the effort based on another stem cell grant that
20 they have with our program ending he'll have more time to
21 put towards this grant. And just as a side note, it says
22 in the original grant application Dr. Lai had intended on
23 hiring personnel and at this time Dr. Lai has not
24 recruited any additional staff so the funds allocated for

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 personnel originally will be used to cover his increased
2 effort.

3 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: This is one of the
4 investigators you started off with a stem -- or with a
5 seed grant and moved into an established.

6 MS. SARNECKY: Um, hmm.

7 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Any questions for
8 Chelsey? Do we have a motion to accept?

9 DR. GENEL: Move for approval.

10 DR. FISHBONE: Second.

11 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Seconded by Dr.
12 Fishbone. Any discussion? If not, all in favor say aye.

13 ALL VOICES: Aye.

14 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Opposed? Thank you very
15 much. It passes.

16 Now that will move us to agenda Item No.
17 17, Antic change of scope, UCHC-012. I'm sorry, 013.
18 It's wrong on the agenda. It's 013.

19 MS. SARNECKY: Dr. Antic wants to, as
20 stated in the agenda item, change the scope of -- I'm
21 sorry, of his project. In the letter -- has everyone had
22 a chance to read Dr. Antic's letter?

23 DR. KIESSLING: No, I didn't.

24 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Do we need copies of it?

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 Does anyone need a copy of it? Dr. Kiessling?

2 MS. SARNECKY: I think the gist of this --
3 the gist of this request is that Dr. Antic's original
4 research that he had proposed because of -- because of
5 things that he has found out based on his research the
6 path of his research seems to have taken a different
7 course. And, you know, as stated in our contracts we have
8 to bring any change of scope of the research to the
9 committee because it's not what was originally voted on
10 and approved by the committee at the original grant review
11 meeting. So, I don't know if anybody wants me to read the
12 letter again into what exactly is being changed or if
13 everyone has the chance to review it.

14 DR. DEES: If I understand this right, he
15 completed the work that was originally contracted for the
16 grant, right, and then he wants to extend the work. Is
17 that basically right?

18 MS. SARNECKY: Just one second, I'm sorry.

19 DR. KIESSLING: What's the title of this
20 project?

21 MS. SARNECKY: Dan, can you pull up the
22 title of this project, the Antic project? I took it -- I
23 took it a little differently. Is that Dr. Dees, was that
24 you that --

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 DR. DEES: -- yes.

2 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.

3 DR. DEES: I will complete my original
4 research goals.5 MS. SARNECKY: I just think the next
6 paragraph is what throws me. He says, in the first -- the
7 end of the first paragraph he says that he'll complete his
8 original research goals, but then he goes on to say, my
9 new goal will be to evaluate the use of induced -- stem
10 cells derived from schizophrenic patients to see how these
11 neurons respond to dopamine receptor and antagonists. I
12 don't know if that was the original.13 DR. DEES: I'm assuming that's the looping.
14 He says, I'm finished what I was going to do with this
15 money and I've got the money left over and I'd like to
16 continue the work that I've been doing.

17 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Right.

18 MS. SARNECKY: I think we need the guidance
19 from the committee to really know if the scope of his
20 original goal is somewhat aligned with what he intends to
21 do with his new goal.22 DR. KIESSLING: I mean I don't think we
23 care, do we? I mean --

24 MS. SARNECKY: -- I don't know.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 DR. KIESSLING: I don't think we care if he
2 completed his original research goals, right? I mean I'm
3 not sure we care if he completed his original research
4 goals if he's found something and now he's going to change
5 direction and he's still looking at -- so his -- first he
6 wanted to see if neuromodulators improved differentiation
7 of stem cells into neurons. He's done some of that.

8 But in the meantime he's been able to get
9 some stem cells derived from patients with schizophrenia
10 and/or healthy controls and now he's probably going to
11 look at the effect of neuromodulators on those cells that
12 he doesn't have to derive. I think he's just -- it's nice
13 of him to bring this to us, but --

14 DR. FISHBONE: -- for the same amount of
15 money.

16 DR. KIESSLING: Yes, he isn't asking for
17 any more money. He just wants to let you know that he's
18 no longer going to try to derive neuro precursors from
19 stem cells, what he's going to do now is look at some
20 lines that have been derived from patients with specific
21 diseases.

22 DR. GENEL: And he will generate
23 preliminary data that we will see in the spring.

24 DR. KIESSLING: Right.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 DR. GENEL: New for --

2 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- we've seen it
3 already.4 DR. KIESSLING: He had to talk to his human
5 subjects committee about this, but this is all well within
6 his scope of what he wants to do.7 DR. GENEL: See the bottom line here is
8 that this -- his stem cell research committee wants
9 approval from us in order for them to -- for him to
10 proceed. So, I say yes, sure.

11 DR. KIESSLING: Sure.

12 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So we have a motion.

13 DR. PESCATELLO: If I can just make a
14 comment that this is my pet peeve on the lay summaries. I
15 mean if we have to take this much time to figure out -- I
16 certainly couldn't. I don't think any of the staff could
17 figure out that -- I wouldn't be opposed to approving
18 this, but I also wouldn't be opposed to just kicking it
19 back and saying, write it in common sense English for us,
20 for this lay committee and the lay staff to understand,
21 and we'll approve it next time. I mean if we have to
22 waste this much time trying to figure out, frankly -- I
23 don't want to be too --

24 DR. KIESSLING: -- why did -- want to kick

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 this back to us?

2 MS. ISOLDE BATES: That was the committee's
3 decision they would not approve it until the body of the
4 grant gave permission.5 DR. KIESSLING: So is there something we're
6 missing here?7 MS. BATES: No, no. At the committee's
8 evaluation they needed approval from you.9 DR. GENEL: Committee dynamics are always
10 very interesting. And I can --

11 DR. KIESSLING: -- so I can --

12 DR. GENEL: -- I can imagine the
13 discussion.14 MS. BATES: He's been waiting for two
15 months to get approval now. He's been very anxious to
16 keep going.

17 DR. GENEL: Yes, I think it's fine.

18 DR. FISHBONE: Mike, is it because if he
19 doesn't get the money there is no point in --20 DR. KIESSLING: -- but what he wants to do
21 -- what he wants to do now is not really SCRO issue. He's
22 going to look at IPS lines from people with schizophrenia.
23 He's no longer looking at human embryonic stem cells.

24 MS. HORN: I think they still look at IPS.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 DR. GENEL: Well, I think this is a topic
2 for another day.

3 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So we have a motion and
4 a second to approve. Any other discussion?

5 DR. KIESSLING: I move that we approve this
6 redirection of research efforts.

7 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Great. And I believe
8 that was seconded by Dr. Genel. If no other discussion,
9 those in favor say aye.

10 ALL VOICES: Aye.

11 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Opposed? Ayes have it.

12 DR. PESCATELLO: Can I just say, I think
13 it's perfectly all right for the staff when you get a
14 letter like this and you can't understand it, instead of
15 spending a lot of your time trying to figure it out, just
16 say, I don't know what you're talking about.

17 DR. GALVIN: Send it back. Say I don't
18 understand.

19 DR. PESCATELLO: You're --

20 DR. GALVIN: -- please clarify.

21 DR. PESCATELLO: You're intelligent,
22 educated people and if you can't understand it then on the
23 second or third go around then --

24 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- okay, great. Thank

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 you.

2 Item -- agenda Item No. 18 then, we're
3 moving onto, it's Carmichael, a no cost extension.

4 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.

5 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: It wasn't in this pile
6 over there. It was sent out.

7 DR. KIESSLING: Thank you.

8 MS. SARNECKY: So this request is to extend
9 the established investigator grant currently ending on
10 March 1 until September 30, 2011. I believe that's the
11 only request that needs to be approved.12 DR. WALLACK: I think it is and it would
13 seem like a reasonable request and I would move the
14 approval.15 DR. KIESSLING: We just got a press release
16 about him, right, this lab? This is a really good example
17 of Connecticut stem cell money being really well used.
18 It's a good investigator who didn't have as much funding
19 as he could utilize before.20 MR. MANDELKERN: Somebody turned off the
21 telephone connection?22 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: No, we can still hear
23 you, Bob.

24 DR. KIESSLING: I'm sorry, I wasn't talking

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 loud enough, Bob. I was just talking about how this is --
2 this laboratory is a good example of good use of
3 Connecticut stem cell money.

4 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So do we have -- so we
5 had a motion to approve.

6 DR. WALLACK: Moved.

7 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: And do we have a second?
8 Is that a second there?

9 DR. KIESSLING: I'll second it.

10 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Any other discussion? If
11 not, those in favor?

12 ALL VOICES: Aye.

13 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Ayes have it. Great.

14 No. 19 is Zecevic carryover request and I
15 notice that No. 20 is also the Zecevic annual report. I
16 don't know if there is --

17 DR. GENEL: -- the three of us reviewed
18 this.

19 DR. KIESSLING: Which one is this one?

20 DR. GENEL: This is the --

21 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- do you want to start
22 with the carryover?

23 DR. KIESSLING: Oh, yes.

24 DR. GENEL: It's a modest amount of money

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 that she's requesting to be carried over. I don't have any
2 problem with it. I'm trying to remember what the exact --
3 what the exact amount is. I think it's 16,000? Am I
4 correct? Dan is 16,000?

5 MR. WAGNER: 56.

6 DR. GENEL: Oh, 56,000.

7 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay, it's up on the
8 board for those looking for it. This is the same
9 situation where any monies carried over will stay in the
10 same line item, is that right? Folks are shaking their
11 heads yes.

12 DR. GENEL: The sense I got is that a
13 number of these grants did not actually get implemented.
14 State monies were not available and then the institutional
15 process so that while -- so the carryovers in almost all
16 of these truly reflect about a four or five month delay in
17 getting started. So I don't see any problem with that.

18 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So, you've moving to
19 approve that?

20 DR. GENEL: I move.

21 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Do we have a second?

22 DR. WALLACK: Second.

23 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Second by Dr. Wallack.
24 Any other discussion? If not, all in favor?

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 ALL VOICES: Aye.

2 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Opposed?

3 DR. WALLACK: Warren, this is a point of
4 order here and that is that the justification for the
5 carryover, apropos the Rasmussen grant request, was very,
6 very well done. And it should be somewhat of a model for
7 how we want to see this happen.

8 DR. GENEL: You mean in the annual report.

9 DR. WALLACK: Right, yes, right.

10 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So noted. Okay. So now
11 we're moving onto the annual report also by the same PI
12 Zecevic.13 DR. WALLACK: He seems to be making good
14 progress. Things seem to be in order, progressing well. I
15 would move to accept the annual report and move to further
16 continue the funding.

17 DR. GENEL: Second.

18 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Seconded by Dr. Genel.

19 DR. GENEL: Yes.

20 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Any other comments?

21 DR. KIESSLING: This is just neat, this is
22 a neat project.23 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: This is a good one? All
24 right. Discussion? If not, then we have a motion and

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 seconded to approve. All those in favor say aye.

2 ALL VOICES: Aye.

3 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Opposed? The ayes have
4 it.

5 No. 21, Chen change of PI.

6 MS. SARNECKY: This request is from Dr.
7 Chen effective February 1, 2011 Dr. Chen is resigning her
8 position, I believe it's a female, her position at the
9 Health Center to accept a position in China. The current
10 date of this -- the current end date of this grant is May
11 31st and Dr. Chen is requesting that from February 1 to
12 May 31st Dr. Carmichael take on this project as the
13 Principle Investigator. He's going to devote 5 percent of
14 his effort to finalize the experiments laid out in this
15 grant. And, you know, everyone, I believe, is pretty
16 familiar with Dr. Carmichael's work because he's had a few
17 grants with us. He's co-PI on a few grants with us as
18 well.

19 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Questions for Chelsey?
20 No questions. Do we have a motion to approve?

21 DR. GENEL: So moved.

22 DR. FISHBONE: Seconded.

23 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Seconded. Further
24 discussion? If not, all those in favor aye?

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 ALL VOICES: Aye.

2 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Opposed? The ayes have
3 it. Thanks.

4 DR. FISHBONE: How many people have we lost
5 going back?

6 DR. PESCATELLO: I was thinking the same.

7 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: A few.

8 DR. FISHBONE: Yes, they're getting very
9 good positions.

10 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yes. Heavily funded
11 research. So we're on No. 22, is that correct, Carter
12 reallocation request?

13 MS. SARNECKY: Yes. Dr. Carter is
14 requesting a reallocation on his original 2006 seed grant.
15 There is no budget page with this, but their reallocation
16 is laid out in the text not necessarily by a budget sheet.
17 If that's not sufficient then I can get a budget sheet
18 from --

19 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- we have a budget
20 sheet on the annual report.

21 MS. SARNECKY: Oh, I was doing the
22 reallocation request.

23 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Right.

24 MS. SARNECKY: Do we want to take care of

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 the annual report first and then if the reviewers of the
2 annual report --

3 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- are comfortable with
4 the --

5 MS. SARNECKY: -- approve that report than
6 that would be, I suppose, the approval of that report is
7 contingent upon whether or not this can be approved.

8 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: All right. So with the
9 Board's authorization then we move to Item No. 23, the
10 Carter annual report approval. Reviewers?

11 DR. KIESSLING: Is that us again?

12 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yes, it is.

13 DR. KIESSLING: Which grant?

14 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: It's UCONN --

15 DR. WALLACK: -- I think she has it now.

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: The Carter annual and
17 the Carter reallocation is two different ones. So let's
18 stick with the annual report right now anyways. So what
19 we're dealing with right now is 08-UCONN-040, Carter
20 annual report.

21 DR. KIESSLING: Is this the one that you
22 sent me, Chelsey? I don't remember this at all.

23 MS. SARNECKY: Yes, I sent. There --

24 DR. KIESSLING: -- you sent me this one and

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 not the other one that he has.

2 MS. SARNECKY: I sent all three of them to
3 all three of you.

4 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: This one here? Dr.
5 Kiessling, I don't know if you've seen it.

6 DR. KIESSLING: Yes. I'm sorry this
7 doesn't look familiar. So you guys -- I hope you guys
8 read it. I mean I could look at it really quick, but this
9 one I didn't --

10 DR. WALLACK: -- I was confused by the
11 presentation especially the request for -- if I'm looking
12 -- Chelsey, is this the -- is this the request for funding
13 change from Cahill that came from Cahill?

14 MS. SARNECKY: It is, but these are two
15 different --

16 DR. WALLACK: -- well, no, that's the other
17 piece I have that I just gave to Ann. But --

18 MS. SARNECKY: -- no, they're two different
19 grants. The annual report, the Carter annual report that
20 needs to be reviewed is a 2008 grant. This reallocation
21 request is a 2006 grant.

22 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Right, under discussion
23 right now is the 08-SCA-UCONN-040.

24 DR. KIESSLING: So this is the same --

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 we've got --

2 DR. GENEL: -- it's the same thing.

3 DR. KIESSLING: This is the same thing.

4 DR. GENEL: Yes, I think yours is on two
5 pages.6 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Why don't we consider
7 tabling this one while folks have a chance to take a look
8 at it?9 DR. KIESSLING: I mean I looked at a grant
10 from Carter, but it was a different one.11 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Well, Carter also had
12 the reallocation request, but that was a different grant.

13 DR. GENEL: Right.

14 DR. WALLACK: So, I think that the annual
15 report seemed to be okay. I don't think I had any
16 questions about the annual report.17 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Your questions were
18 about the reallocation.19 DR. WALLACK: Yes. So you're asking to go
20 in order then I think that I would be comfortable making a
21 motion to accept the annual report with the recommendation
22 of continued funding.

23 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay.

24 DR. WALLACK: But when we get to the

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 reallocation --

2 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- we haven't looked at
3 the reallocation. So --4 MS. SARNECKY: -- just to clarify, the
5 reallocation is completely separate from --

6 DR. WALLACK: -- okay, right.

7 MS. SARNECKY: I think Marianne and I had -
8 -9 DR. WALLACK: -- so what I just said then -
10 -11 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- so there is a motion
12 from Dr. Wallack to accept the annual report and go for a
13 continuation.

14 DR. WALLACK: Right.

15 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Do we have a second on
16 that or comments from the other reviewers who are
17 reviewing as we speak?

18 DR. GENEL: I'll second it.

19 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: We have a second from
20 Dr. Genel. Any discussion? All those in favor of
21 accepting and approving the annual Carter annual report
22 aye?

23 ALL VOICES: Aye.

24 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Opposed? No opposition,

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 so the No. 23 is approved. Let's go back now to No. 22,
2 which was the other Carter reallocation, the other Carter
3 grant, reallocation regarding 06-SCA-26.

4 MS. SARNECKY: So this reallocation, like I
5 had said, there is no budget page for this, but the
6 reallocation is listed out in the text of the letter. A
7 little -- about 10,000 dollars is being reallocated from
8 other personnel, about 2,000 dollars from publication
9 costs, and 145 dollars from others, or the other category
10 all of that is going to the other direct costs category.
11 The reason for this, the justification there was a portion
12 of funds set aside for Jason Gibson. They were not paid
13 out as planned. They needed Jason, Jason's area of
14 expertise on another project so the funds that they were
15 originally going to use for him became available and now
16 they're just reallocating those.

17 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: This was a '06 seed
18 grant?

19 MS. SARNECKY: Um, hmm.

20 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: It's still on-going?

21 MS. SARNECKY: It is because --

22 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- was this one of the
23 ones that we --

24 MS. SARNECKY: -- no, this grant -- this

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 was actually Dr. Yang's original 2006 grant and they were
2 a lot of issues with this grant that it got pushed back.
3 And I believe, I don't want to misspeak, but I believe
4 that then it went to Dr. Xu, and then Dr. Xu sent it over
5 to Dr. Carter. And there were just a lot of issues not
6 necessarily in the research, but I think in the management
7 of the project for various reasons. And, at this point
8 now, we've got to --

9 DR. KIESSLING: -- did Dr. Xu ever come to
10 UCONN?

11 MS. SARNECKY: I don't know.

12 DR. WALLACK: So, one of the questions,
13 Warren, just from a procedural -- on a procedural basis it
14 sounds like he wants to do the reallocation, but it also
15 sounds like he already did his own reallocation. It says,
16 "the additional funds", I don't know how to read this.
17 "The additional funds were used", were used, "were used to
18 purchase necessary lab supplies." So, he's asking us to
19 approve the reallocation, if I'm reading that right, yet
20 it seems as though he's already done that.

21 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So -- and there is no
22 budget provided with this one, right?

23 DR. WALLACK: No.

24 MS. SARNECKY: No.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 DR. WALLACK: Certainly from -- I don't
2 know, if I'm reading this right, unless I'm missing
3 something --

4 MS. SARNECKY: -- I think you're reading it
5 correctly.

6 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So, I understand your
7 concerns absent a budget.

8 DR. WALLACK: Yes.

9 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: To advise what's going
10 on.

11 DR. WALLACK: It's terribly inappropriate.

12 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Other comments
13 regarding, regarding this reallocation request? So, Dr.
14 Wallack, what do you suggest?

15 DR. WALLACK: I wouldn't approve it. I
16 would ask for further explanation, documentation about
17 what's going on with this. And it's a project that I
18 would be very -- I'm saying that it's a project I like.

19 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Right.

20 DR. WALLACK: Obviously.

21 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Right.

22 DR. WALLACK: I feel very badly.

23 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So, would you put that
24 in the form of a motion?

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 DR. WALLACK: Yes.

2 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Do we have a second for
3 that to not approve at this point and request additional
4 information including a budget?

5 DR. GALVIN: Second.

6 DR. KIESSLING: Would that make it easier
7 for you, Chelsey?

8 MS. SARNECKY: I don't think, if I could be
9 completely honest, I don't think that this text here, the
10 9,000 dollars from other personnel, I don't think having
11 this in the form of a budget sheet is really going to make
12 a difference about what the request is. I think the
13 bigger issue, to your point, is they are requesting these
14 changes but in the last paragraph they've --

15 DR. WALLACK: -- they've done it.

16 MS. SARNECKY: They've done it, correct.

17 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: They've already done it,
18 right.

19 MS. SARNECKY: So I think that is a bigger
20 issue. In terms of, like I said, the budget just having it
21 in a different format the numbers are still the same. It
22 still turns out that they're reallocating a little over
23 12,000 dollars and pushing it to the direct costs. They're
24 still reallocating the same amount of money. I don't think

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 the format really makes a difference to me. But the fact
2 that Milt brings up about them requesting it, but then
3 saying that they're already used their additional funds
4 for necessary lab supplies I think that's where the issue
5 might lie. So, I would -- I could get more clarification
6 on that if that's something that the committee wants.

7 DR. WALLACK: I think they have to be held
8 accountable for what they did.

9 DR. FISHBONE: Do we know where the money
10 came from that --

11 MS. SARNECKY: -- other personnel. The
12 money where it originally came from?

13 DR. FISHBONE: Yes.

14 MS. SARNECKY: It was directed from other
15 personnel to the other direct cost category.

16 DR. PESCATELLO: Yes, the other personnel
17 category went to buy more lab equipment.

18 DR. FISHBONE: Which they're asking us now
19 to approve doing.

20 DR. KIESSLING: How much do they have to
21 bring to us? It has to be -- you guys could approve --

22 MS. SARNECKY: -- we can approve up to 20 -
23 - so 19.9 percent.

24 DR. KIESSLING: So you could have approved

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 this if they had bothered to tell you.

2 MR. WAGNER: This is also under 10,000,
3 which they can approve themselves.4 MS. SARNECKY: Yes, they can approve
5 themselves.6 DR. FISHBONE: So they're just informing us
7 of what they did. Is that okay?8 DR. PESCATELLO: So, they are allowed to do
9 this under the rules.

10 MS. SARNECKY: I think --

11 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- it's more than
12 10,000, right?

13 MS. SARNECKY: Yes. 12.

14 DR. WALLACK: It seems as though they
15 understand that in order to do the amount they did they
16 have to request a budget reallocation. So they're
17 formatting a budget reallocation, but then they're letting
18 us know regardless what you guys say we did it.

19 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Right.

20 DR. KIESSLING: We did it and we didn't
21 know it was going to be above 10,000 when we started out.
22 It grew.23 DR. WALLACK: You know what? It's just
24 that this whole project, again, one that I'm probably as

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 much interested in as project here, has put us through
2 this whole problem throughout.

3 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yes.

4 DR. KIESSLING: Yes.

5 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: That's true. I think
6 that you're right. Jason was going to -- we were all
7 happy about Jason joining this project and he never shows
8 up.

9 DR. WALLACK: Right.

10 DR. PESCATELLO: I think, too, in a way
11 when it goes from personnel to supplies that we have more
12 comfort, but as I see more and more of these I wonder
13 sometimes are we buying equipment and we're paying for it
14 just for this project or are we paying for equipment
15 that's going to be used for all sorts of things other than
16 stem cell research.

17 DR. KIESSLING: Well, there is a difference
18 between --

19 DR. PESCATELLO: -- and that's never quite
20 clear.

21 DR. FISHBONE: They say here, lab supplies
22 and animals -- so they have a slight deficit --

23 DR. KIESSLING: -- so the problem is they
24 owe -- they owe the project the delta between what they

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 did and what they were allowed to do. So they could have
2 done 9,999 dollars, right? So they owed the project 2,000
3 dollars, 3,000 dollars?

4 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Right. I mean pretty
5 much the second -- the last two items the 1,000 and the
6 145, they just did the personnel from --

7 DR. GALVIN: -- let me interject, if you
8 don't mind, Warren.

9 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Please.

10 DR. GALVIN: And inject a comment. And I
11 think it was Milt and Paul also who are speaking about the
12 concept of things beginning to get a little loose in this
13 grant and exceeding, you know, the amount of internal
14 reallocation that's appropriate. And ever since I've been
15 at the Department of Public Health we've got a grant
16 called a FEMER grant. And I don't know, Warren maybe knows
17 what the acronym means, but being a physician I think of
18 it as the bone in your upper leg. At any rate, the grant
19 was designed to do things about investigating and helping
20 and understanding peri-natal mortality. And like things
21 that happen in state government, it just got completely
22 out of control. And it got a little out of control and it
23 got a little more out of control. And then we found out
24 that many people began to see the grant as an opportunity

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 to fund something to do with peri-natal mortality. One --
2 there is only two or three municipalities or four that
3 have been involved and one of them somehow allocated the
4 money to provide sympathy cards for funeral homes dealing
5 with people who had this peri-natal -- the tragedy of
6 peri-natal mortality.

7 And it was so far away from what we thought
8 or what I thought the grant should be that I objected to
9 it. We found out another university was using it to buy
10 furniture or something. And so we sort of stopped the
11 grant and then Representative Dillon was very concerned
12 about it in the New Haven area and reinstated it. But it
13 got -- and I think we're watching it more closely. But I
14 think maybe what we're talking about is, you know, if you
15 don't keep these things reigned in pretty tightly, you
16 know, it's a little bit and then, you know, it's like the
17 camel getting the nose in your tent and the next thing you
18 know you've got 12 camels in there.

19 So I think my feeling would be that they
20 need a rather tartly worded letter saying, you know, what
21 are you trying to do? You did this -- you're asking us to
22 approve something you've already done. We don't operate
23 that way and, please, explain yourself. But I think that's
24 sort of -- and I think that if we do that it probably gets

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 across to the community that -- the scientific community
2 that, you know, you've got to be careful because whether
3 it's 9900 dollars or then 99 dollars, you can't do it with
4 -- but I think perhaps a strong, not an insulting letter,
5 but partially that we couldn't understand what you were
6 trying -- it looks like this is what you're trying to do,
7 please, explain why you're trying to do this.

8 DR. KIESSLING: Well, but, I mean can't you
9 just make them put it back? Is the grant out of money?

10 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Well, we don't have the
11 budget at this time.

12 DR. FISHBONE: Is it over or it's still
13 going on.

14 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: I think the point made
15 before they already did this.

16 DR. KIESSLING: Yes.

17 DR. PESCATELLO: They allocated it from
18 personnel to supplies.

19 DR. WALLACK: So, can we do --

20 DR. KIESSLING: -- but that doesn't mean
21 they've spent it.

22 DR. WALLACK: But can we take what Bob
23 said, put it in the form of a motion, which I would
24 second, and ask for that report back to us.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Right.

2 DR. GALVIN: Yes, we don't want to spend
3 5,000 dollars to get back 2,000 or 1900, whatever the
4 difference is, but I do think we want to say, heh, don't
5 do this kind of -- we watch this very closely, don't do
6 this and don't let your colleagues do this because this is
7 the way our FERMA, people got a little off base and way
8 off base and then next we were putting out 300,000 dollars
9 for furniture and stuff that had nothing to do with peri-
10 natal mortality.

11 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yeah.

12 DR. KIESSLING: But what our -- but what is
13 the -- what can we do? What can we do?

14 DR. WALLACK: One of the things we can do,
15 maybe we can't retrieve the money, but --

16 DR. KIESSLING: -- but why not?

17 DR. WALLACK: Well, maybe we can, but the
18 first thing that we can do is send the message --

19 DR. KIESSLING: -- that we don't approve
20 this.

21 DR. WALLACK: That we didn't approve the
22 reallocation.

23 DR. KIESSLING: The reallocation.

24 DR. WALLACK: And maybe to make the point,

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 I don't know how you want to -- how we -- how comfortable
2 we are with doing this, but maybe copy appropriate people
3 that we want to inform of what we did on this particular
4 request. Now, I don't know, Dave is already here.

5 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Yes, and you can cc me on
6 that.

7 DR. WALLACK: Right. No, but I mean for
8 official reasons.

9 DR. KIESSLING: Well, it needs to go to
10 their grant person.

11 DR. GENEL: It goes to the grant --

12 DR. KIESSLING: -- the grants person should
13 have picked up on a few.

14 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I have to recuse myself so
15 I'm not going to speak to this directly. I just want to
16 know, be reminded of the precise policy on reallocation.
17 You mentioned the number of 10,000 dollars. Is that total
18 reallocation allowed without CI approval or is it from one
19 category to another category?

20 MS. HORN: It's a percentage actually of
21 the grant.

22 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Right, in this case it's a
23 100,000 near 10,000, but is that from one category to
24 another or total reallocation because that makes a

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 difference in this particular case because there is
2 nothing that's over 10 percent in any one transfer from a
3 category.

4 MS. HORN: It's total reallocation.

5 DR. KIESSLING: And then they can
6 reallocate with CI permission up to what percentage?

7 MS. HORN: 20 percent.

8 DR. KIESSLING: 20 percent. They just have
9 to write a letter to these guys and say this is what we
10 want to do. So, all they had to do was write a letter.

11 DR. PESCATELLO: Right.

12 DR. KIESSLING: And I think that's been
13 really clear and very consistent from the very beginning
14 of the grant application process. So, somebody just wasn't
15 watching.

16 DR. GENEL: That doesn't preclude CI
17 bringing material to us.

18 DR. KIESSLING: Right.

19 DR. GENEL: Even if it's within those
20 guidelines if -- and this might very well have been the
21 case where even though it's within the percentages there
22 is some questions raised in terms of specificity and how
23 this was done that would have required review by this
24 committee.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 DR. KIESSLING: But those are pretty loose
2 guidelines to begin with.

3 DR. WALLACK: So, for these reasons I would
4 again second Bob's recommendation and that is to deny the
5 reallocation and to ask for them to come back with an
6 explanation about specifically what they are trying to do
7 here and the order of how they're trying to do it.

8 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: All right, so we have a
9 motion and a second. Further discussion?

10 DR. DEES: Heh, can I just ask a question?

11 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Sure.

12 DR. DEES: I mean it looks like they've
13 already done this.

14 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Right.

15 DR. DEES: So their explanation is going to
16 be, well, you know, they're going to give us a more
17 elaborate version of what's in the last paragraph there.
18 And then what are we going to do? We're going to say,
19 it's no good. We're not going to allow it. Give the money
20 back. I'm curious.

21 DR. KIESSLING: I think we have a number of
22 options depending on whether how much hardball we want to
23 play, but certainly that's one of the options we could ask
24 for the money back.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 DR. PESCATELLO: I mean they could get the
2 money from some other source and --

3 DR. KIESSLING: -- right.

4 DR. PESCATELLO: I mean it might have been
5 a very good use of it so I think -- and if you would have
6 approved it administratively anyway then we just want to
7 give them a -- I mean they might have done a very good
8 thing. They might have been very efficient with their time
9 and resources.

10 DR. GALVIN: Yes, I think the message we
11 want to get out there to their grant supervisor at that
12 institution and the other institutions don't do this kind
13 of thing.

14 DR. KIESSLING: Right, written prior
15 approval means that.

16 DR. GALVIN: Yes.

17 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Right.

18 DR. GALVIN: Yes, that's all.

19 DR. FISHBONE: So there isn't anything you
20 can do about the money. I mean this sounds like it was --

21 DR. GALVIN: -- the money is not worth
22 worrying about. It's --

23 DR. FISHBONE: -- it's a bad seed grant
24 from the beginning with so many changes that nobody is in

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 control anymore.

2 DR. KIESSLING: What's the name of this
3 grant? Does anybody remember the name of this grant?

4 DR. DEES: It's in the letter.

5 MS. HORN: It's in the letter.

6 DR. GENEL: Generation of insulin producing
7 -- you see that there, Ann?

8 DR. KIESSLING: Yes.

9 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Great.

10 DR. PESCATELLO: As you and I remember, the
11 attorney, the former Attorney General interjected into the
12 legislation to have his ability to review so you could
13 also -- if you want to scare them, you could say we may
14 turn this over to the Attorney General's office.15 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So, we have a motion and
16 a second to deny the request and to write a sternly worded
17 letter --18 DR. KIESSLING: -- who is going to write
19 the letter?

20 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: That would come from CI.

21

22 DR. WALLACK: Chelsey, can you be tough,
23 Chelsey?

24 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Dan, you got the

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 language, right? Ask -- not just giving them a sternly
2 worded letter, but asking for a response and an
3 explanation so we have something on the record. Further
4 discussion? No? All those in favor of the motion, again,
5 to deny -- rejecting the request and writing back with a
6 stern letter.

7 ALL VOICES: Aye.

8 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Opposed? All right, the
9 ayes have it.

10 DR. GALVIN: Warren, I think I'm going to
11 inject -- I know I'm going to inject a remark that you
12 mentioned the Attorney General. We do have a new Attorney
13 General and we have a dynamite Deputy Attorney General
14 Nora Dennehy I happen to know personally is just
15 absolutely fantastic. I think it might be wise to invite
16 one or both, invite both of them to our annual meet the
17 grant meeting or if they are not interested in that
18 perhaps they'd go in and do a briefing particularly with
19 Nora, who is a really fine person, and -- because there
20 isn't really anybody over there who has functioned except
21 as what does Mr. Blumenthal want.

22 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yes.

23 DR. GALVIN: And Nora Dennehy and the
24 Attorney General are not those kinds of people, but I

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 think it would be nice to get in there for -- perhaps get
2 in there for a brief or see if they would like to come to
3 attend a little bit of the grant meeting.

4 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yes.

5 DR. GALVIN: But I think we need to brief,
6 particularly brief Nora --

7 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- maybe we could work
8 that through Henry because he really knows what we did,
9 Henry Salton, and he's running Dick Clinch's unit now.

10 DR. GALVIN: Yes.

11 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So, it might be
12 something --

13 DR. GALVIN: -- yes, but what I'm saying is
14 No. 1 and No. 2 in that department --

15 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- right, thank you.
16 All right, so we were going to go back then, if we can,
17 Chelsey, to the No. 13, the -- which was the LoTurco
18 reduction in effort.

19 MR. MANDELKERN: The LoTurco reduction.

20 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Right. And we were
21 looking to see if we could find correspondence to cover
22 that that we could either read into the record or pass
23 out.

24 MS. SARNECKY: Yes. Just a minute if you

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 don't mind.

2 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: I don't mind.

3 MS. SARNECKY: Does anybody else mind?

4 DR. KIESSLING: Anything else, so they are
5 looking that over now, right?6 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Right. If you're still
7 looking we can move on to another item. So let's look at
8 -- let's look at the -- why don't we hold that one too.
9 Just for informational purposes my understanding that Dr.
10 Nelson has notified us about a publication either pending
11 or an actual publication that he's going to share with CI
12 and we'll share with this body. So I think it's just an
13 informational piece. Does anybody else know anything about
14 that?15 In terms of the grant review timeline, so
16 we have the grants in now which isn't too much off the
17 pace of what we -- where we were last year. And what is a
18 little bit different this year is where we stand in terms
19 of our availability of peer reviewers. As you pointed out
20 the Commissioner was able to secure written authorization
21 for us to reimburse the peer reviewers up to 29.5 is what
22 we're going to do it to.

23 DR. GALVIN: 29.5 total?

24 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Which is the same as

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 last year. We've done this the last couple of years, but
2 folks came to us and said, well, I know you got
3 authorization -- we had it, but anyways. So, we're up to
4 eleven. Six of the peer reviewers left this past round
5 including all of the originals.

6 MR. MANDELKERN: A little louder, please.

7 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So, we lost all -- we
8 lost six peer reviewers and we've been successful in
9 recruiting back three of them, I guess, and we started off
10 with fourteen. So right now we have eleven reviewers,
11 which is pretty good, and contracts are getting worked up
12 for them. I don't know what folks are thinking about for
13 timeframes, but the peer reviewers -- oh, Dr. Weiner, who
14 is the chair of peer review, is one of those who resigned.
15 And so we have a lot of new members, a new chair. Folks
16 think that they're going to try to keep to the same
17 timeframe, which means like mid-May or so when they might
18 be done with their work and then another bit of time to
19 get them over to us in good form. So we're probably
20 looking at June again at best.

21 DR. KIESSLING: What was it last year?

22 DR. WALLACK: June.

23 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Last year we did it, I
24 think, on June 6th and 7th.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 DR. WALLACK: Right.

2 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Or 7th and 8th or
3 something like that. I'm thinking there could be a little
4 slippage to maybe like the middle of June when we have a
5 meeting scheduled anyway.6 DR. WALLACK: So, can I just -- a personal
7 note for what it's worth, my June schedule this year
8 unfortunately, and I'm saying this as a person who has
9 never missed a meeting, has also slipped so that I am
10 going to be unavailable on Tuesday the 21st, which would
11 be the third Tuesday. I'll be out of the country. Would
12 the 14th still work for you, Warren, which is the previous
13 Tuesday?14 DR. KIESSLING: Oh, you mean for our
15 meeting.

16 DR. WALLACK: Right.

17 DR. KIESSLING: Not the grants review, but
18 the --

19 DR. WALLACK: -- yes, the grants review.

20 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: The grants review.

21 DR. WALLACK: That would be the grants
22 review. In other words, Monday the 13th and --

23 DR. KIESSLING: -- oh, okay.

24 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: I mean we certainly aim

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 for that, again, it's not on Dr. Mullen's schedule and so
2 we'd have to confirm her availability.

3 DR. WALLACK: So, can we --

4 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- but it gives us one
5 more week than we had last year.

6 DR. WALLACK: Right.

7 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: It gives us a little bit
8 of wiggle room.

9 DR. WALLACK: So, can I request that we do
10 that? That we aim for the 13th and 14th instead of, you
11 know, any other time?

12 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Keep in mind, the ISSCR
13 meeting in Canada starts on the 15th.

14 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: That's not going to be
15 good.

16 DR. GOLDHAMMER: So that's going to be
17 tight for --

18 DR. WALLACK: So --

19 DR. FISHBONE: -- what about the week
20 before?

21 DR. WALLACK: Well, that gets us back to
22 the same week that we were last year.

23 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Well, we can shoot for
24 it with the understanding that, you know, we'll get a

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 better sense as we get into April --

2 DR. KIESSLING: -- when are the grants --

3 DR. GENEL: -- we're talking about Monday
4 and Tuesday, again.

5 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Right.

6 DR. KIESSLING: When are the peer reviewers
7 going to get the applications?

8 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Well, that depends on
9 when they can get uploaded and be made available
10 electronically.

11 MR. WAGNER: Which we're working on.

12 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Which is no easy task,
13 you know.

14 DR. WALLACK: Do days mean anything in
15 this? In other words, we've done Monday and Tuesday in
16 the past. If we did Thursday and Friday does that make any
17 difference at all?

18 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Well, it does, I think -
19 - I don't mean to speak for our out-of-state colleagues,
20 but I think coming in on a Wednesday evening to be here on
21 a Thursday morning does impact an extra work day.

22 DR. WALLACK: So that's good?

23 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Right. I'm coming in on
24 a Wednesday night might be better, easier for somebody who

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 has a got a six hour drive than coming in on Wednesday
2 night so now you're impacting Wednesday, Thursday, and
3 Friday. So that's why we've tried to do it on weekends
4 historically.

5 DR. WALLACK: Monday, Tuesday.

6 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Monday, Tuesday, yes.

7 DR. DEES: For my part, I will say it
8 doesn't make any difference.

9 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Oh.

10 MR. MANDELKERN: Last year we completed our
11 work in one day.

12 DR. KIESSLING: No, we didn't.

13 DR. WALLACK: The year before we did.

14 DR. KIESSLING: The year before we did, but
15 last year --

16 DR. GENEL: -- I would ask that the date be
17 set as far in advance as possible because I think all of
18 us have schedules that need to be adjusted and so that if
19 it's -- if we have a date set six weeks in advance I think
20 it's a lot easier to --

21 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- well, again, a lot of
22 it can be -- all of it's going to be dependent on when can
23 we get the peer review and peer review is dependent,
24 unfortunately, on being able to access and assign the

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 grants. So, it's all sort of a moving target.

2 DR. GENEL: Is it your expectation with
3 such a turnover in the committee and with less members
4 that it's likely to take longer than it has in the past?

5 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Well, the good news is
6 that there are less grants. There is only 81 this year
7 versus 90 something last year, right.

8 DR. GENEL: 89.

9 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: 89. But the bad news is
10 that the -- I have a sense those disease specific
11 applications are going to be very complicated and
12 certainly going to require a lot of expertise. I hope so
13 anyways.

14 DR. WALLACK: So, Warren, let me ask you a
15 question. We've always been pretty good about ending at a
16 certain point in the day. And then we've gone the next
17 day and finished up in a couple of hours like last year.
18 What if we, to accommodate what David said, he has to be
19 out of the country on the 15th, if we met on -- aimed for
20 Monday the 13th and just -- and agreed to go through
21 dinner, if necessary, I personally would feel that I'd
22 rather do it that way rather than come back.

23 DR. GENEL: I would as well.

24 DR. PESCATELLO: But we're saying we don't

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 have the peer review --

2 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- well, on that I can't
3 speak for the Commissioner, but I will go to Dr. Galvin's
4 points and I do think that at the end of the day some of
5 those last reviews are -- discussions of some of those
6 last grants are a little more terse than in the beginning
7 of the day. So I wouldn't want to give a short shift to
8 anybody's application. So, I agreed with that decision.

9 DR. GALVIN: Let me just say something, a
10 couple of things. One is if I were a scientist submitting
11 a grant I'd want to get it in, have it looked at before
12 10:00 or 11:00 in the morning. I wouldn't be too anxious
13 to have it looked at right after lunch. It might be a
14 little better, a little better about mid afternoon, but I
15 am afraid of having a truncated end of the day session
16 where we do ten grants in 30 minutes and not only do we
17 not properly consider some grant, but we give some
18 disappointed potential grant person an opportunity to say,
19 well, you talked about Rasmussen's grant for 20 minutes
20 and I got three.

21 DR. KIESSLING: There are ways around that
22 and, you know, people who have done study section reviews,
23 I mean, we're used to just sticking it out until it's
24 over. So I don't think --

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 DR. GALVIN: -- be aware that Warren will
2 most likely not be here for that, at least the way things
3 look right now. I don't know whether -- Marianne, is
4 this, the position of chairperson can that be delegated or
5 is that fixed legislatively?

6 MS. HORN: It's fixed legislatively at this
7 point.

8 DR. GALVIN: Okay. So you will have to
9 accommodate Dr. Mullen's schedule and I don't know if
10 she's done these kinds of grants before as Chairperson. So
11 you may have a little spool up time with trying to figure
12 out, you know -- it may be -- it may be a longer session
13 without Warren and with the new chairperson it may be
14 longer than you anticipate.

15 DR. PESCATELLO: June 8th is the end of the
16 legislative session.

17 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So that's definitely --
18 we're not doing it then.

19 DR. PESCATELLO: It's going to be -- right.
20 I mean we might want to just set an earlier date, a date
21 in May, actually the last week of May, just to get
22 everybody around a more aggressive timeframe rather than -
23 - June seems problematic for a lot of people.

24 DR. KIESSLING: It's the peer reviewers

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 that are at the top.

2 MS. HORN: Right.

3 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: And I hate to give them
4 less time this year than we gave them last year.

5 DR. KIESSLING: See, they're going to have

6 --

7 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- they just barely made
8 it last year.9 DR. KIESSLING: They're going to have eight
10 applications or sixteen. How many are --11 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- double or triple
12 depending on the complexity. So they may have more. They
13 may have twenty.

14 DR. GENEL: We have less reviewers.

15 DR. KIESSLING: Yes.

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Including ten very
17 complex ones.18 DR. PESCATELLO: Can I just ask too that it
19 gets on the agenda at some point that the committee meet
20 and formally think through the criteria that we're going
21 to use because I think that comes up. That takes up some
22 of the time too because we're kind of -- we're a little
23 unclear ourselves on the criteria we're going to use and
24 how we want to weight certain things, and decide that

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 ahead of time. We could even get a preview of sort of
2 what we're going to do.

3 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So, maybe put that on
4 the agenda for whatever meeting occurs before.

5 DR. PESCATELLO: Yes, the month before.

6 DR. GALVIN: I think that's an excellent
7 idea. You might also want to see if our lab director, Dr.
8 Fontana, who will probably replace Warren in this research
9 and development mode would be available because he is your
10 research scientist, although not a stem cell research
11 scientist, but he is a research scientist by training. And
12 parenthetically there are some feelings and perhaps with a
13 brand new medical lab being built we may want to figure
14 out how we're going to work in facilities that that lab
15 with some of the things that people want to do,
16 particularly folks who are getting started on grants and
17 don't have a whole of lot of money would the lab be
18 willing to let them use some of the materials. It's going
19 to be a brand new lab with brand new equipment. And if I
20 could get Paul a 200,000 dollar grant that he didn't have
21 to buy a brand new machine that costs 50,000 dollars that
22 might give him a better leg up on doing research.

23 So I know we've been talking about that.
24 Dr. Fontana, who is a wonderful person, just as bright a

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 guy as you'd hope to meet, had some conversations a couple
2 of years ago with folks in mainland China who were quite
3 interested in some joint ventures. And I notice that some
4 of our talent is going to be over there and I think there
5 may be some very fertile, parenthetically, some very
6 fertile ground. I got to go to a meeting in Anchorage,
7 Alaska a couple of years ago and, of course, we all got
8 shot down. We couldn't -- we couldn't go to Wal-Mart
9 without special permission. And we sort of let that go
10 foul, but I think hopefully he'll be involved in this --
11 get him involved early because he's a very thorough and
12 patient researcher.

13 DR. WALLACK: So, Bob, shouldn't that --
14 those comments since they are potentially a structural
15 change shouldn't that maybe be recorded as part of the
16 minutes.

17 DR. GALVIN: Oh, yes. Certainly it's my
18 indication that this should be part of the minutes.

19 DR. WALLACK: Good. Okay.

20 DR. GALVIN: I'm just -- a rehired retiree
21 and I, other than my interest in this committee I don't
22 have any authority to put changes in, but I think that it
23 would be best to get Dr. Fontana involved earlier rather
24 than later. And I think that you're going to notice a big

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 difference without Warren. And --

2 DR. WALLACK: -- well, that's why the
3 earlier the better.

4 DR. GALVIN: Yes, I agree.

5 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Can I make the
6 suggestion? I don't want to waste a lot of time just
7 throwing dates out there. When I touch base with Dr.
8 Mullen and see what's her availability that may drive it
9 right here. I mean -- and this, as you say, Commissioner,
10 this will be brand new for her. The first briefing she
11 had on stem cell was yesterday afternoon.12 DR. WALLACK: So, I think it's a good idea
13 for you to do that. Would you be able to do it with the
14 idea that earlier the better in June?15 DR. GALVIN: Well, the problem with that is
16 --

17 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- not with the session.

18 DR. GALVIN: I think she's being -- she is
19 more involved -- she's apparently involved with the budget
20 today. I was simply told to take what I got and be very
21 grateful for it, but I think that she's more involved in
22 some of these deliberations and towards the end of that
23 session --

24 MR. MANDELKERN: -- nobody is talking loud

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 enough.

2 DR. GALVIN: Well, I'll talk a little
3 louder. I think that Dr. Mullen may very well be involved
4 with stuff towards the end of the legislative period.
5 They may ask her to come over and talk about things. They
6 -- this is a whole different regime and a whole -- it's a
7 different way of operation. I think we're seeing much more
8 collaboration and much more of a broad scope approach
9 rather than sort of a pipeline about it comes from the
10 Governor, to the Chief of Staff, to the Secretary of OPM,
11 down to the departments. I think that -- my -- the long
12 and the short of it is I wouldn't depend on Dr. Mullen
13 being available. She may not be able to tell you until the
14 last minute that she's not available because she's got to
15 go over to the legislature. I think if you don't do it
16 early in May you may not be able to do it until back until
17 the session is concluded.

18 DR. KIESSLING: But let's go back -- I
19 think we can spend a little time on the peer review
20 process because that's going to really drive this, right?
21 So the peer reviewers are going to be able to say that
22 they can get everything that they need by March 1st. Is
23 that -- that's two weeks, is that a possibility?

24 DR. GALVIN: Get everything to them by

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 March 1st?

2 DR. KIESSLING: No, I mean uploaded and
3 assigned.4 DR. GALVIN: Yes. Get the raw material --
5 the materials to them by March 1st?6 MS. SARNECKY: As far as -- I mean, Warren,
7 you coordinate the peer review stuff. The only thing I've
8 got on my end is to put the 81 or so proposals on our
9 website, which can be done -- let's say it's Tuesday, I
10 can have it done by the end of the week.11 DR. KIESSLING: But let's go March 1, just
12 for -- okay.

13 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Right.

14 DR. KIESSLING: So that gives them March
15 and April, say, which is like nine weeks.16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Well, no, it gives the
17 chair a couple of weeks to try to assign appropriately.18 DR. KIESSLING: Okay, so the chair is going
19 to assign it.20 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Right. It's not like
21 everyone -- I mean certain people have primary, secondary,
22 and tertiary responsibilities.

23 DR. KIESSLING: Okay. And so everybody --

24 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- so that take awhile.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 DR. KIESSLING: So, everybody is going to
2 look at three. You've got eleven people and they're each
3 going to look at three.

4 DR. FISHBONE: You've got 81 grants.

5 DR. KIESSLING: No, I know, but I mean each
6 grant is going to be looked at by three reviewers.

7 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: No, no, two or three
8 depending on complexity.

9 DR. KIESSLING: Two or three, okay.

10 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: I mean if they're
11 sitting down together face to face it's one thing, but
12 that's about the timeframe it's taken before.

13 DR. KIESSLING: Yes, I was going to say --

14 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- you start in March
15 and --

16 DR. KIESSLING: -- it's got to be at least
17 eight weeks for that.

18 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Right.

19 DR. KIESSLING: Kind of a load. So,
20 they're not going to be done -- they'll be done --

21 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- mid May, if we're
22 lucky.

23 DR. KIESSLING: If we're lucky by mid May.

24 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: I'm going to suggest

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 that we're going to shoot for then -- let's go for the
2 meeting on the -- when are we not going to be here, the --

3 DR. WALLACK: -- I'm not going to be here
4 that Tuesday, the 21st.

5 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So we'll go for the next
6 week.

7 DR. GOLDHAMMER: But let's keep the 13th
8 and the 14th on the table. ISSCR starts the following day
9 and I'm probably going. I don't know what other
10 researchers are going, but I could fly out after this --
11 if this meeting goes to a second day I'll fly out after
12 that.

13 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay. So, we'll shoot
14 for the -- we'll shoot for the 13th, 14th. I'll touch
15 base with Dr. Mullen as quickly as I can.

16 DR. KIESSLING: And that's after --

17 DR. PESCATELLO: -- FYI, I've got a bunch
18 of things so that's going to be really hard for me, but --

19 DR. KIESSLING: -- the 13th and the 14th?

20 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: What, the 13th and the
21 14th?

22 DR. PESCATELLO: Yes, after the 13th there
23 is a -- Bio has a convention. And there is just a lot of
24 stuff.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Bio is on the 14th?

2 DR. PESCATELLO: It's the last week of
3 June, but then there is stuff leading up to it. I just
4 have a bunch of things, personally.

5 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: But are you available
6 the 14th or not?

7 DR. PESCATELLO: I'm not.

8 DR. GENEL: Why don't we do it the 4th of
9 July? No, but more seriously is there any reason why we
10 can't do it in July?

11 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: No.

12 DR. GENEL: Huh?

13 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: There is none.

14 DR. GENEL: It seems to me we're pushing it
15 -- we're really pushing a --

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- that's a good point.

17 DR. KIESSLING: Yes.

18 DR. GENEL: Maybe the better thing to do
19 would be to plan on doing it --

20 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- right.

21 DR. GENEL: The week after the 4th or --

22 DR. KIESSLING: -- the 28th of June?

23 DR. GENEL: Well, that's Bio.

24 MR. MANDELKERN: May I make a suggestion

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 that we pay attention to Dr. Galvin's remarks and maybe
2 try to get some input from the new procedures that he
3 refers to and the new Commissioner. I mean we may be
4 getting into great details, but it may not be suitable to
5 the new person who is running the committee.

6 DR. KIESSLING: Okay.

7 MR. MANDELKERN: We're kind of putting the
8 horse a little bit ahead.

9 DR. KIESSLING: But it's clear we can't get
10 this done by the end of May.

11 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: No.

12 DR. KIESSLING: So it's either going to be
13 the --

14 MR. MANDELKERN: -- what's that?

15 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: We can't get it done by
16 the end of May.

17 DR. PESCATELLO: But if the peer review has
18 all of March, all of April, even if you give them two
19 weeks in May that means you could still do it in the
20 middle of May.

21 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: They're not going to
22 have all of March, Paul.

23 DR. KIESSLING: They've got to compile all
24 the comments.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Turn it into a document
2 and then we have to meet.

3 DR. KIESSLING: Yes.

4 DR. GOLDHAMMER: We have to prepare to
5 meet.

6 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: No, we, peer review have
7 to meet.

8 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Oh, peer review.

9 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: And they have to
10 reconcile differences. I mean it's not just --

11 DR. GALVIN: -- so, Milt, excuse me for a
12 moment, but let me make another comment that particularly
13 the folks who are present today on line or on the phone
14 line and sitting around the table we really don't want to
15 make these decisions without Ann, and we don't want to
16 make them without Paul, and we don't want to make them
17 without Mike, or Milt, or Gerry. I mean we have a world of
18 experience here. We have a -- I think you're a marvelous
19 group of people, but, you know, I don't think we would
20 have moved a long as far and as cooperatively as we have
21 if we didn't have Paul has a very measured input and looks
22 with sort of a broader picture at the commercial ventures
23 and the like. Ann is frequently the foil on these things,
24 I think this is -- you've got to pay attention to this

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 part and that part. And I think it makes a meld of what
2 we do -- and Trinia and Richard and everybody, they're --
3 we're sort of much more than the sum of the individuals
4 involved.

5 I think we have to work at a time when we
6 get the -- some people just can't do it certain -- if
7 you're going to go to a resort for July you're not going
8 to cancel to some to stem cell, but I think we ought to
9 work it where we can get our prime movers and not disturb
10 the balance that we have here. It's enough of a
11 disturbance not to have Warren here and having a new R&D
12 director should Warren decide to go elsewhere. But I think
13 we ought to set this up so -- we just can't -- there is
14 nobody here at this table that we can do without except me
15 and Warren we'll have to do without anyway.

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: All right. So, let's
17 just plan on -- let's -- you know, we're not going to be
18 in session, we're not going to do it during the session.

19 DR. PESCATELLO: So it definitely ends on
20 the 8th and it may very well -- if things all come
21 together and everything is decided really easily and it's
22 done. Most people probably wouldn't bet on that this
23 year.

24 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Right.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 DR. PESCATELLO: And so usually what they
2 do is they take a week off and then they come back.

3 DR. GALVIN: Yes, and have another go at
4 it.

5 DR. PESCATELLO: Yes. For like the last
6 two weeks. So it would be like -- so that's why I was
7 pushing for the middle of May.

8 (Many voices talking over each other)

9 DR. GALVIN: I think July is better.

10 DR. WALLACK: Yes, I do too. So what's
11 important about the conversation, Warren, if I'm hearing
12 this right that what you've gotten out of this is that
13 hopefully now maybe we can look for something early July.

14 DR. GALVIN: Yes.

15 DR. WALLACK: Is that right?

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: You can all come to
17 Bristol to the most patriotic parade in America.

18 MR. MANDELKERN: It's my birthday also.

19 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So I'll get back to
20 folks about that. Let's move on then to -- Chelsey is
21 just back, it's perfect timing. We're going to go back to
22 No. 13, LoTurco, reduction in effort and reallocation
23 request.

24 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Maybe you can explain to
2 us what this is, Chelsey.

3 MS. SARNECKY: Sorry this has taken so
4 long. This is one of these issues we've got multiple
5 projects with the same PI and they all have requests at
6 the same time. So, this request is actually a no cost
7 extension and this budget supports the reallocation for
8 this no cost extension. They're -- this grant is ending on
9 the 28th of this month and they -- Dr. LoTurco is
10 requesting a no cost extension for an additional year
11 until February 28th of 2012. Dr. LoTurco will use the
12 remaining funds to support the graduate assistant working
13 on finishing up some items in this -- some research items
14 in this project.

15 So if you go to the budget page here the
16 justification -- they're taking about 32,000 dollars from
17 other personnel and fringe and moving it to the direct
18 costs or other direct costs to scale up the completion of
19 their final experiments, their cell culture experiments.
20 So there is no -- the justification for this budget page
21 should have been attached. I hope everybody saw that as
22 well. There is a --

23 DR. KIESSLING: -- budget page, but we
24 don't have --

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 DR. DEES: -- no, I didn't see that.

2 MS. SARNECKY: There is -- it's -- on the
3 document there is -- I think this is where we actually ran
4 into a problem. On the document there are two tabs in the
5 Excel spreadsheet.

6 DR. DEES: Oh, okay.

7 MS. SARNECKY: So there is a budget
8 document and then there is a justification. So I think
9 that's where the confusion came in. I don't think -- if
10 everyone just saw a bunch of numbers and nothing to go
11 along with it and the justification was actually on the
12 second tab, which I had just gone back to my office and
13 realized.

14 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: That's helpful, thank
15 you. So any questions for Chelsey? So let me just ask
16 you, Chelsey, do you see any problems with this request?
17 Is it similar to the other ones that we --

18 DR. KIESSLING: -- what's the name of this
19 grant? Is this --

20 MS. SARNECKY: -- it sure is. I don't see
21 any issues. This is just one of those straightforward
22 requests, the no cost extension. There is some money left
23 over. They've got some money to spend and they're going to
24 spend it in this next year doing some more research for

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 this -- towards this goal.

2 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay. Other questions
3 for Chelsey? Do I hear a motion to accept?

4 DR. KIESSLING: So moved.

5 MR. MANDELKERN: So moved.

6 DR. KIESSLING: I'll second it.

7 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Great. Let's -- so, any
8 further discussion on the LoTurco request? If not, those
9 in favor say aye.

10 ALL VOICES: Aye.

11 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Opposed? All right, so
12 that's approved.

13 Now, we are going back down to Item No. 24,
14 which is -- it has to do with Dr. Shertukde, who has been
15 an applicant for us before, a couple of times, and now has
16 corresponded with you, Chelsey, directly?

17 MS. SARNECKY: Yes. I think -- so I got
18 this email from Dr. Shertukde. They have, I believe, it's
19 a -- from the University of Hartford. Is this a female?

20 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: This is a male.

21 DR. PESCATELLO: Yes, it's Dr. Shertukde.

22 MS. SARNECKY: Shertukde, okay. So, he was
23 a little upset. I got this email and I get all kinds of
24 emails like this, but when I see, please, bring it to the

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 notice of your seniors and the committee I feel
2 responsible to send this along to you. This is an issue
3 that has been brought up to me numerous times and I think
4 the committee is well aware of it as well, but Dr.
5 Shertukde is a little upset that year after year his
6 proposal doesn't get considered for funding. The merit of
7 his proposal is a different story, but I think he's
8 focused on the fact that the money only goes to fund UCONN
9 and Yale proposals.

10 How I would respond to him and how I've
11 responded in the past is that the peer reviewers have
12 found merit in the Yale and UCONN proposals and they
13 happen to get the highest scores and they happen to be
14 funded.

15 DR. KIESSLING: We talked about this before
16 because I've wondered if there isn't some obligation on
17 the part of -- I mean Yale is a private school, I know,
18 but certainly on the part of UCONN to reach out to the
19 other schools especially the Connecticut funded schools in
20 Connecticut with some kind of assistance to these folks.
21 I mean there was just never the intent to simply fund
22 UCONN and Yale. As a matter of fact there was an intent to
23 really bring this up with a grass roots effort in
24 Connecticut. So I've wondered if, if especially UCONN. I

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 mean Yale would have to do it out of the goodness of its
2 private endowment part, but I think the state schools,
3 this is state funds, and I think the state schools have an
4 obligation to try to help bring along some of the other
5 institutions.

6 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Can I ask? I mean we
7 were at the dedication of the core facility at UCONN
8 yesterday and they talked about the training that's gone
9 on throughout higher ed.

10 DR. KIESSLING: But that's different from
11 reaching out to an investigator and trying to hold their
12 hand and bring them into some kind of fundable work either
13 as a part of their work --

14 DR. GOLDHAMMER: -- I'm not sure how you do
15 that in practice though.

16 DR. KIESSLING: Well --

17 MR. MANDELKERN: -- we've noted this
18 before.

19 DR. KIESSLING: No, Bob, we're not talking
20 about why his grants didn't get funded. They didn't get
21 funded because they weren't up to snuff. The idea is these
22 are public funds and so do the -- do the Connecticut
23 funded institutions have a -- should they be encouraged to
24 reach out to the other institutions and try to bring them

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 into stem cell research. I mean that's the whole big
2 picture.

3 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: What do you think?

4 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Well, I don't know how you
5 do that. I mean in --

6 DR. KIESSLING: -- you'd have to --

7 DR. GOLDHAMMER: -- besides providing
8 infrastructure, which I think is done fantastically well,
9 I'm not sure what form or reach out actually takes. You
10 have to get -- it has to happen kind of at the grass roots
11 level. There has to be individual investigators interested
12 in that work who would like to bring him in. and I'm not -
13 -

14 DR. KIESSLING: -- but you have to make it
15 -- you have to make it a project. I mean you have to make
16 it happen. It will have to have to be made to happen.
17 Mark LeLande may be the person who needs to make it
18 happen. But I think the whole spirit of the funds in the
19 state was to bring small biotech businesses, was to bring
20 stem cell research -- there were two, two purpose. One was
21 to fund work that couldn't be federally funded. And the
22 other was to put Connecticut on the page. And the way to
23 put Connecticut on the page is to put everybody who is
24 interested in the field have an opportunity.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 DR. GOLDHAMMER: And I just don't think
2 it's UCONN's responsibility to really take that on. I
3 mean I don't think we can ignore the peer review process.

4 DR. KIESSLING: No, I understand.

5 DR. GOLDHAMMER: This person got the worst
6 score out of all of the grants.

7 DR. KIESSLING: Oh, I understand.

8 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I mean to ask UCONN or
9 another public institution to reach out and somehow try to
10 bring this grant up to snuff I just don't how that would -
11 -

12 DR. KIESSLING: -- or not even that, just
13 bring this person into --

14 DR. GENEL: -- but I think what Ann is
15 suggesting is not so much important for its scientific
16 results, but for the good will and for whatever it may
17 engender in a community. In other words, a -- providing an
18 opportunity for a workshop for investigators -- we had a
19 grant last year from Connecticut College and I think that
20 a number of us were -- thought it might be funded only
21 because it was from a smaller institution. And I'm
22 wondering if it might not be wise now that UCONN has its
23 new center to have a workshop or open up, provide
24 opportunities for education and for training.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 DR. GOLDHAMMER: They absolutely should and

2 --

3 DR. GENEL: -- that's --

4 DR. GOLDHAMMER: -- the core and the core
5 does do that to some extent. Whether it will help this
6 particular person or some other person depends on what
7 they're interested in working on and --

8 DR. GENEL: -- agreed.

9 DR. KIESSLING: Is Hartford a state funded
10 school?

11 DR. GENEL: No, no.

12 DR. KIESSLING: It's a private school?

13 MS. HORN: It's a private school.

14 DR. PESCATELLO: I have a couple of
15 comments on this because I know him, Shertukde a little
16 bit, I mean. So, and he has brought this up a couple of
17 times over the years. And so a couple of things, so he's
18 scored very low, poorly, and so that's No. 1. I think it
19 goes back to the issue of getting together and deciding
20 how we're going to score things and if we want to have
21 some -- not accept a really poor score, but if we want to
22 have a category of some small amount of money that we're
23 going to say is going to be in a different category or
24 other considerations are going to play into that scoring

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 for a certain amount of money. And maybe then this type of
2 grant might go into that.

3 The second thing is he did, I remember his
4 applications, he included letters. I think one was from
5 Laura Gravel. I think it was somebody from UCONN. And, as
6 I understand it, he has like imaging equipment to image
7 stem cells. And so there were positive letters from Laura
8 Gravel and somebody else from either Yale or UCONN. And I
9 encouraged him to talk -- and I understood -- I'm not a
10 scientist, so but if I understand correctly what the
11 problem was is that the researchers were saying this is
12 really interesting stuff but we don't need it or it's not
13 -- and there was some kind of disconnect between him
14 having really cool imaging stuff that imaged stem cell
15 better than a lot of other imaging equipment. Either he's
16 not indicating to the rest of the research community what
17 he had available and somehow making them see the value of
18 it or they weren't communicating to him that as good as it
19 was for imaging it kind of comes out of UTC Technology
20 that it wasn't really very helpful in stem cell research.

21 So it was organizing some kind of -- especially as to
22 this particular project because it's gone on for several
23 years now and it was a disconnect.

24 And the last point I wanted to make was his

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 other point is, and it's something too that we should have
2 in the back of our minds as we go through this, is that
3 the peer review, that it is a peer review, but from
4 somebody from a -- from the University of Hartford or not
5 from Yale or UCONN, not from an elite university, it can
6 seem like quite a club. You know that everybody -- all the
7 peer reviewers and everybody, and that there is a sense
8 that it's like some task that I don't want to tip anybody
9 off, you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours. And it
10 can seem that way. And that perception, at a minimum, is
11 something we should all be mindful of.

12 DR. GOLDHAMMER: So I'd like to follow up
13 on one of your early comments and Ann's as well, I think
14 there are things that could be done, I think, but I think
15 it probably has to happen at this level in the form of
16 providing different types of opportunities so that they're
17 not, perhaps, directly competing with the other
18 institutions. For instance, I'm involved in a -- there is
19 an NIH program and a NSF program, the NIH one is called
20 IMBREYE, and I don't remember what that stands for, but
21 it's for faculty at universities whose state funding is
22 below some threshold. They just have -- and Rhode Island
23 is one of those states. So NIH provides this IMBREYE
24 funding to universities and colleges in Rhode Island as

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 kind of a separate funding. And I -- it comes with a
2 certain yearly amount that's allocated as the
3 administrators of the fund deem fit. There is a mentor
4 program associated with it, so I'm a mentor for one of the
5 faculty at Rhode Island College.

6 So there are things we could do if we
7 really wanted to. We could have a separate category of
8 funding for smaller, for the smaller institutions, kind of
9 award a seed grant type fund to -- and so they're
10 competing with each other to try to bring in these other
11 groups. So I think it's a really important point. I just
12 don't know -- and something important to do, I just don't
13 -- I was just not sure how UCONN did it.

14 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Or a concept there would
15 be in these institutions sort of applying versus, perhaps,
16 an individual. So it would be UHART might say we have --

17 DR. GOLDHAMMER: -- well, the institution
18 could deal with it any way they want. Sometimes there is
19 an internal competition so they put their best applicant
20 forward or -- they can handle it any way they want, I
21 think.

22 DR. KIESSLING: I visited a small college
23 or a small school in Washington state and those -- there
24 was -- there was a biology department and I was there

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 visiting professors for the day. And they were really
2 frustrated because they need -- they need like 5,000
3 dollars a year or 10,000 dollars a year to fund some of
4 the projects that their undergraduates are doing. There
5 is no mechanism for that. I mean they have Boeing so they
6 frequently go to Boeing and Boeing frequently comes up
7 with those small sums of money. But it was -- it's a big
8 deal to them to have 10,000 dollars to buy supplies for
9 their undergraduate projects.

10 So, it could be something like that. It
11 could be maybe a special percentage of the stem cell money
12 could go to smaller institutions or very small projects.
13 Or I don't know how we would do it, but this kind of
14 frustration doesn't help us at the level of the
15 legislature.

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Dr. Wallack was --

17 DR. WALLACK: -- when we discussed the idea
18 of doing disease directed research I remember very
19 specifically, and I think it's in the minutes actually,
20 that we would only allocate on the basis of best possible
21 research. And we made it a point of saying that. It's in
22 the October 26th minutes. And I think we're doing
23 ourselves, the advocacy groups, the state a terrible
24 disservice if we use our funds to fund anything but the

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 absolute best research.

2 Now having said that, I understand what's
3 being said here. And if we want to set up a mechanism in
4 order to do it tutorly, if you will, and some kind of
5 course, if you will, for people who want to enter the
6 field that's something else. But I am thoroughly opposed
7 to the idea of allocating any number of dollars to
8 anything but the absolute best research.

9 DR. KIESSLING: Yes, the -- I don't think
10 that goes -- I don't think that is different. I don't
11 think that it would have to be not the best research. It
12 just is going to be a much smaller project.

13 DR. GALVIN: This may be an ideal time to
14 raise this issue particularly the Governor who, I thought
15 he came out very strongly for science and research, and in
16 particular for stem cell. Now, as that's going on on the
17 one hand, we're, what would you say 40 percent built in
18 our new lab?

19 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yes, we're on schedule.

20 DR. GALVIN: We're on schedule with a new
21 lab. Maybe this is the time to raise that kind of issue
22 as a join venture between the health department, the stem
23 cell collation, and the laboratory to do some of these
24 kinds of things on a smaller scale rather than say we're

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 going to take a million dollars and give it to -- for 20
2 small projects. And I think with that new lab maybe we
3 can -- we really want the lab to be more of a research
4 entity. I know people worry about drinking water. They
5 should be able to take their drinking water to the lab and
6 say my drinking water smells funny. My well smells funny.
7 They bring it to us and we do it and we do stuff like that
8 for municipalities or viral studies that by the time we
9 get them done are, you know, they'd be much better done in
10 a different kind of lab.

11 Maybe we should look at -- I think the new
12 Connecticut public health lab should be orientated towards
13 research and orientated towards developing products as New
14 York did. They developed an anti-fungal and they made a
15 lot of money on it and funded stuff. So this may be a
16 good time to move that issue forward in conjunction with
17 Dr. Fontana. I think we got a good chance here. A brand
18 new lab, brand new Governor, a pro research Governor,
19 maybe we could do some of those things as a joint venture.

20

21 DR. KIESSLING: So, Milt, maybe it could be
22 extra money.

23 DR. WALLACK: Well, extra money or, you
24 know, as Bob was speaking I can see that one of the

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 objectives of that Fontana's new facility or new operation
2 could be to help bring those scientists, like at
3 University of Hartford, Conn College, and so forth to a
4 point so that they can then conceive of projects that are
5 worthwhile doing and give us the assurance that they, in
6 fact, can then perform the projects properly. Then I have
7 -- I'd be absolutely in support of doing that.

8 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Can I just suggest,
9 under this discussion and it's related somewhat, maybe
10 quite a bit to Dr. Shertukde's concerns, however, if we're
11 ever going to come up with a different paradigm or -- it's
12 going to happen in the context of the next RFP.

13 DR. WALLACK: Yes.

14 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: It's not going to happen
15 now. And so I think there will be plenty of time to
16 discuss it and maybe we discuss -- maybe we mention
17 something to that effect in some kind of response or not,
18 but I don't think we'll have something developed in a
19 timely manner to respond to his concerns.

20 MR. MANDELKERN: What he's asking for I
21 think for us to do is to act in direct contradiction to
22 the legislation because the legislation talks or assigns -
23 -

24 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- yes.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 DR. GALVIN: Well, hang on here, the
2 program is going to end in five years anyway, which is
3 not, in the scheme of things, is not a real long time. It
4 is for me, but -- but I think we need to figure out where
5 is all of this going to go? And then my dream is to
6 develop -- make the state medical lab heavy on research
7 and heavy on training people -- you know, we've formed
8 joint ventures with Storrs to get laboratorians, create
9 jobs, do this kind of thing, and if we have -- you know,
10 we don't have to throw the remaining 10 percent of the
11 remaining five percent in stem cell money, just do a joint
12 venture and say we're really -- and we'd like a little bit
13 more money to do this, but this is a joint venture and if
14 you guys want to invest in it. And between let's say, if
15 we can get the People's Republic of China to be interested
16 in it, they're already interested in things that Dr.
17 Fontana is doing. I think it would be a big job creation
18 multiplier. And all we'd ever have to say is say it's a
19 joint venture. We're in there and maybe we have to buy
20 some kind of a machine that does stuff that I don't even
21 understand and let people train on it. But it will spin
22 off as the jobs and stuff. But I don't think we should
23 dilute our effort. I think we should look at another
24 avenue.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 DR. GENEL: Warren, last year when we
2 reviewed the last cycle of grants and this issue did come
3 up.

4 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yes.

5 DR. GENEL: And I argued, at that time, and
6 I would argue again and I will argue again that all things
7 being equal if there is a grant from an institution that's
8 not getting a lot of funding I would lean over backwards
9 to try and fund that particularly at a seed grant category
10 because I think we're not talking about a great deal of
11 money. And I would have funded -- there are a couple of
12 issues that come up. And I think the RFP next year could,
13 in fact, include a small, a very small category without
14 even any explicit number, just indicating that
15 consideration will be given to institutions of some type
16 that would fit into the category of not being primarily
17 research orientated institutions that submit a grant.

18 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Can I suggest then that
19 people respond since this was -- his concerns were brought
20 forward to the Board. It resulted in quite a bit of good
21 discussion. The discussion is available, the transcript
22 is right here so you could see what folks said. And it
23 will be a matter of continuing of discussion as we move
24 forward with the next cycle.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 DR. GALVIN: Warren, where is this
2 gentleman from?

3 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: UHART.

4 DR. GALVIN: Is he the guy with the
5 mathematical mind?

6 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yes, he's a math
7 professor. No connection with any stem cell scientist.
8 That's the peer review response.

9 DR. PESCATELLO: I think too, I mean
10 especially in this particular case, because he's been
11 pretty vocal --

12 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- he's a big supporter
13 of the --

14 DR. PESCATELLO: -- if there is some way to
15 have a meeting of the minds where he's -- I mean because I
16 think -- I've talked to him, there is just like a
17 disconnect between what he sees as a value of what he's
18 doing and his perception of like the stem cell research
19 community he doesn't see the value -- because I was
20 surprised -- and hearing about it before I saw his
21 application and saw the score it sounded great to me and
22 then I saw how it was peer reviewed and I went it's really
23 hard when you guys were --

24 DR. KIESSLING: -- but these meetings are

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 public. He could be here.

2 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: He has been here before.

3 DR. GENEL: He said he spoke to us.

4 MS. SARNECKY: It says here in his letter,
5 "the initial presentation made by CI to the Connecticut
6 public in November of 2005 indicated that eventually some
7 monies will be invested in the translational research done
8 by researchers like me after the initial stem cell labs
9 have been set up."

10 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: We can invite him to the
11 meeting.

12 DR. FISHBONE: You know that the one
13 problem that I see is that when we set up a peer review
14 committee they're made up of scientists who have been --
15 and I've seen this in other organizations, that if you're
16 a little bit sort of out of the main stream you always get
17 lousy marks. And then the whole business of the old boy
18 network comes up again. I think it's sort of like asking
19 a small school to play in the Big 10, you know, in
20 football. And I think it is not a bad idea considering the
21 source of the money and the fact that, you know, the way
22 that we are set up if we have some mechanism where people
23 who cannot compete with UCONN or Yale can still be on the
24 playing field and get funded in some way.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 DR. GENEL: You all remember Appalachian
2 State beat Michigan a few years ago.

3 DR. KIESSLING: But that's -- I mean that
4 really gets to student -- to the student level, which I
5 think is important.

6 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So, we will -- so we
7 will agree that this issue is we deal with the RFP next
8 time.

9 DR. GENEL: Yes.

10 DR. WALLACK: I think we ought to involve,
11 as Bob said, Fontana in this discussion, the new facility
12 to bring these people up to date, and up to speed, and get
13 them -- I don't agree with Gerry that we should allocate
14 money, I said this before, if they're not there, but we
15 should make every effort to bring them up to that point.

16 DR. PESCATELLO: I would just say this
17 whole issue also applies to the for profit people too. I
18 think they make the same -- I'm trying to think of a cell
19 design company a couple of years ago. They made the same
20 kind of criticism, this is all academics and they don't
21 understand what we're doing. And it may have been not a
22 great project, there is that issue that hangs out there.

23 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I'd like to just make one
24 more comment to clarify my previous comment if it wasn't

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 clear. I have been as strong a proponent of funding the
2 absolute best science as anyone at this table. I do not
3 want to fund science that is getting 8's in peer review. I
4 think though there is a way that we can -- I think there
5 are ways though when a grant scores well maybe it's in a
6 gray area and as Mike was saying it's in the mix. It might
7 be just above threshold or something, but and it's in the
8 mix with grants from Yale and UCONN that there is a way to
9 take the origin of that grant, the school from which that
10 grant comes into account. I don't -- I said something
11 about setting up a separate mechanism to fund a grant or
12 grants from the smaller schools. I would not be in favor
13 of mandating a certain amount of money into that category
14 because I don't want to fund poor science. But some way
15 to give visibility and encouragement to the smaller
16 schools and I don't know what the mechanism is, but some
17 way if it's right there in the mix of maybe giving it that
18 little --

19 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- it would have to be
20 specified by this body, it's not going to happen at the
21 peer review.

22 DR. GENEL: But that is the function of
23 this committee.

24 DR. FISHBONE: My point is that we don't

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 have any function if we're just going to go on the numbers
2 sent to us by the scientific review we might as well just
3 go down the list and stop at a certain level.

4 MR. MANDELKERN: But haven't members of the
5 committee been approached, as I've been approached, by
6 disgruntled applicants from UCONN and Yale, how come I
7 didn't get the grant? I've had that almost every year
8 from some people who felt that they were worthy on a
9 scientific point of view. If you could start opening the
10 door to disgruntled applicants you are really going to be
11 letting in quite a different concept than I think that the
12 legislation proposed or that we propose in our own RFP's.

13 DR. FISHBONE: My only point, Bob, is that
14 when you get around the middle, obviously if somebody is
15 in the 81st grant you're not going to consider it, but
16 when you get around the middle I think you have to use
17 some other factors besides just the --

18 MR. MANDELKERN: -- well, you have to be
19 very, very careful when you do it because for everyone
20 you're going to elevate that means there is someone you're
21 going to drop.

22 DR. FISHBONE: That's right.

23 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: But this happens every
24 year.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 MR. MANDELKERN: When it's not yours,
2 because every time -- because I have had people say, I
3 know this person's work and mine is better. And I say, go
4 talk to peer review. I have nothing to do with it. I make
5 recommendations and evaluate by Connecticut standards.

6 DR. PESCATELLO: I just want to make --
7 just as a practical matter.

11 DR. PESCATELLO: Just as a practical
12 matter, as to this request, just as the researchers could
13 do a better job sometimes writing in plain English to us
14 we, in turn, especially to this particular researcher,
15 somehow crafting a letter with some help from other
16 researchers clearly explaining why his project is not of
17 value and why it scored so poorly because he clearly
18 doesn't get it. And he's going to keep making this --
19 when it's not good -- because I think even if we -- even
20 if we had a special category he scored so poorly that he --
21 -

22 DR. GOLDHAMMER: -- he wouldn't have gotten
23

DB_PESCATELLO: -- he wouldn't have gotten

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 it anyway, but yet he's out there making these criticism.
2 And so really putting it in a letter, really spelling it
3 out why scientifically it's not valuable.

4 DR. GOLDHAMMER: And let me say one other -
5 - there is plenty of precedents at the NIH for this type
6 of thinking. If you think about funding, pay lines, cut
7 offs for investigators, junior investigators, there is a
8 few percentage points the cut off rises a little bit to
9 get more people into the field. It's not a completely even
10 playing field where the most senior people and the most
11 junior people are treated the same.

12 And this is a similar type of phenomena
13 where I think in small ways, not dramatic ways where we
14 fund an 8, but in small ways we try to open up this to
15 others who might not have a great chance otherwise.

16 DR. GENEL: I think that's well put.

17 DR. DEES: I think we do need to address it
18 at the RFP level because there are some people who may be
19 out there who aren't participating because they know they
20 can't get it given where they are. So it could be
21 difficult to figure out how to do it in a different way
22 where we could keep up the scientific --

23 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- so we need to respond
24 and we could certainly respond and reflect this discussion

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 that's not going as far as you're suggesting, Paul, and
2 I've -- so I would open it up to this committee does -- do
3 we want scientific input on crafting a response.

4 DR. GALVIN: I'm sorry, I had an emergency
5 call, a state policeman. What is this gentleman's
6 objection? He's not getting proper respect?

7 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Well, no, it's just that the
8 monies -- he doesn't really say that his should have been
9 funded. He just says that all the money is going to UCONN
10 and Yale.

11 DR. GALVIN: Yes, right, it is.

12 DR. PESCATELLO: But what I'm saying in
13 terms of responding his criticism sort of hangs out there
14 saying it's going to Yale and UCONN biased towards -- and
15 we should formally respond it's not -- it's not not going
16 to you because there is a decision to go to Yale and
17 UCONN. It's because your proposal scored so poorly. And
18 have it -- so the public -- because right now only his
19 letter stands out there. We haven't responded in plain
20 English explaining so that somebody from the Hartford
21 Courant, a reporter, could understand why -- understand
22 the --

23 DR. GENEL: -- well, Chelsey, if you put
24 together a draft I'd be happy to review it.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.

2 DR. KIESSLING: Does he get the peer review
3 comments?

4 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yes.

5 DR. KIESSLING: So he knows.

6 MR. MANDELKERN: Maybe we should do
7 something about the Chicago Cubs to elevate them into a
8 pennant race.9 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Bob, I'm sorry, Paul is
10 talking right now, Bob.11 DR. PESCATELLO: I was just saying that the
12 more somebody -- it sort of takes on a life of its own.
13 It becomes truth even though there is no --14 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- no, we have an
15 obligation to respond.16 DR. KIESSLING: So you can probably get
17 language out of the peer review.18 MR. MANDELKERN: By the way this is not
19 just one year, I think this is three years in a row that
20 this grant has been given the worst peer review scores of
21 any.22 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Let me suggest, we have
23 a suggestion here to write a letter that Dr. Genel is
24 willing to take a look at. Are you okay with that?

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 MS. SARNECKY: I'm fine with that. To
2 Ann's point, his peer review narrative has been sent to
3 him every year.

4 DR. KIESSLING: So, maybe we just need to
5 pull a few sentence out of the narrative and say this
6 applies to --

7 DR. GENEL: I think we have to get very
8 specific. I think we have to say that, you know, that the
9 grants are reviewed independent of the institution for
10 which they're coming from.

11 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Well, let me suggest I
12 defer to CI. Let them draft something and they'll send it
13 to you, all right.

14 DR. GENEL: But what I'm saying is I don't
15 think we have to get specific in terms of his own peer
16 review.

17 MS. SARNECKY: I think that we're running
18 into the same issue that we've consistently run into
19 because I've spoken to him, I've talked to him, and I've
20 said everything that, you know, I guess it's kind of we're
21 at the last resort at this point. I've told him that it
22 has nothing to do with UCONN. It has nothing to do with
23 Yale. These are peer reviewed projects. This has nothing
24 to do with the committee. Once they're peer reviewed then

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 it comes back to the committee for their review. I said -
2 - I've explained all of that. I think that to your point
3 we may have to go a step further and get more input on the
4 research level that I can't -- I don't have input on that.
5 But I don't know --

6 DR. KIESSLING: -- you've got the comments,
7 right?

8 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

9 DR. GALVIN: Let me -- the last words in
10 this discussion have come from Paul. And one of these
11 things that I've learned even people are completely wrong
12 if you don't respond to them in a language that they can,
13 that's clear then they take up the banner, the banner is
14 you guys wouldn't talk to me. And you guys wouldn't take
15 that courtesy to send me a letter. If you won't write the
16 letter -- and they'll complain about that. But it's all
17 of a sudden, it becomes the perception is, oh, he's a poor
18 guy. He's at a smaller university and the giants have
19 crushed him and you won't talk to him.

20 And I think somebody, either directly or
21 indirectly, would have to say, look, it's pretty hard to
22 compete against Yale University with the third largest
23 endowment in the -- or second in the United States. And
24 it's pretty hard to compete against a major league state

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 university. I mean these are - this is like trying out for
2 the New York Giants and you got 310 pound tackles and you
3 were great at Appalachia State but you weigh 215 with the
4 horseshoes in the back.

5 But I think we need to point out the peer
6 review language, but perhaps Paul should have a look at it
7 and so we say to him -- but not replying or giving him a
8 stock reply or not having -- we'll just -- he'll say -- as
9 you said a life of its own. I can't even get an answer.
10 They're rude. And then you get defeated not on content
11 but on process.

12 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: We've had a lot of
13 discussion on this. I want to really cut this discussion
14 off so we have time for public comments.

15 DR. WALLACK: I'll be very brief. And that
16 is in regard to what you were saying, and I totally
17 support the idea of communicating with him, but what I
18 would think maybe we ought to do is have a consensus
19 agreement here that we will look at a mechanism to see how
20 we can outreach more effectively to the border scientific
21 community and somehow work out a mechanism that they can
22 understand how they can enter this whole arena of research
23 in a more productive way. And I'm going back to something
24 that Bob alluded to maybe use the new operation in Rocky

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 Hill as a means to do that. That would be a new objective.

2 If we agree that that's a consensus position we can even
3 identify the fact that we are exploring methods of how to
4 more effectively reach out.

5 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: I'll just say we can't
6 reach a consensus position that dedicates or even talks
7 about using a DPH resource when the Commissioner of DPH
8 isn't here.

9 DR. WALLACK: Okay.

10 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: I hear what you're
11 saying.

12 DR. WALLACK: But that's a sense of what I
13 would -- at least what I'm thinking, No. 1.

14 No. 2, I just want to make the observation
15 that after five years if we've only heard one or two of
16 these kinds of criticisms --

17 MR. MANDELKERN: -- no.

18 DR. WALLACK: Well, a handful of these
19 criticism. I don't know how many -- there is a lot of
20 these criticism?

21 MS. SARNECKY: There is a lot of criticism,
22 but usually most of the time when I get a phone call
23 saying why I didn't -- I get the day after the release has
24 gone out that these projects have been funded, I get a

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 call from 90 percent of the declined.

2 DR. WALLACK: Oh, those are the ones you
3 don't tell us.

4 MS. SARNECKY: Why was I not funded.

5 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: They come to the
6 Department as well.7 MS. SARNECKY: And I say, because you got a
8 low score or a high score, whichever it is.9 DR. PESCATELLO: In your letter to say, as
10 you know, I've talked to you a zillion times.

11 MS. SARNECKY: Um, hmm.

12 DR. PESCATELLO: And also -- and also just
13 on the theory that it might be picked up on a Freedom of
14 Information like the high score because somebody will --
15 I've heard people say, I got an 8 and to the average
16 person they think of a scale of 1 to 10. And just to even
17 put in there, as you know, 8 is like -- there were so many
18 people ahead of you who didn't get funded and then have
19 that --

20 MS. SARNECKY: -- thank you, Paul.

21 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Other discussion on this
22 issue? Can we move to public comment? Any comment from
23 the public? Do we have a motion to adjourn?

24 DR. GALVIN: So moved.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

1 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Thank you.

2 DR. DEES: A quick question, when is the
3 next meeting?4 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: The next meeting would
5 be on the -- I think it would be March, is it 19th?6 MS. SARNECKY: I have it right here. Yes.
7 The next meeting is the 15th of March.8 (Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at
9 3:47 p.m.)

10