

VERBATIM PROCEEDINGS

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
COMMISSIONER DR. JEWEL MULLEN, CHAIRPERSON  
SEPTEMBER 20, 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  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 . . . Verbatim Proceedings of a meeting  
2 of the Stem Cell Research Advisory Committee held on  
3 September 20, 2011 at 1:12 p.m. at Connecticut  
4 Innovations, 865 Brook Street, in Rocky Hill, Connecticut.  
5 . . .

6  
7  
8  
9 MS. CHELSEY SARNECKY: So, let's see, we  
10 have opening remarks. Commissioner, do you have any  
11 opening remarks?

12 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER DR. JEWEL MULLEN:  
13 I think I made them as I walked in and said hello to Dr.  
14 Lalande. And that's it basically, one year ends and  
15 another years begins. And this is my fourth meeting  
16 maybe.

17 MS. SARNECKY: Yes, I would say.

18 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: And it  
19 continues to be very exciting work. I must say on behalf  
20 of Marianne Horn, who needed to stay at the Department to  
21 attend another meeting today, that she was saying  
22 yesterday how much she loves this part of her job. So,  
23 I'm glad to be able to hear from people today and thank  
24 you and that's about it for me.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 MS. SARNECKY: Okay. Next we have approval  
2 of the minutes from the August 16th meeting. Did everyone  
3 get a chance to review them?

4 DR. GERALD FISHBONE: So I'll make a  
5 motion.

6 DR. MILTON WALLACK: I'll second it, but  
7 with some amendments.

8 MS. SARNECKY: Sure.

9 DR. WALLACK: The formatting still has --  
10 doesn't have your name on it, so I would suggest that on  
11 page seven Dr. Mullen's name be -- and also on page two I  
12 think a statement that is attributed to me it said, "added  
13 back in the RFP", I think I meant to say, further reduced.

14

15 MS. SARNECKY: Okay. So we're looking at  
16 page two.

17 DR. WALLACK: In the middle of the page.

18 MS. SARNECKY: It should be added back in  
19 the RFP.

20 DR. WALLACK: Right.

21 MS. SARNECKY: So you think that you recall  
22 that that should be reduced?

23 DR. WALLACK: Further reduced.

24 MS. SARNECKY: Further reduced.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 DR. WALLACK: Was the intent of this.

2 DR. FISHBONE: That's what you said.

3 DR. WALLACK: I did, right.

4 MS. SARNECKY: Okay. So, do we have a  
5 motion to approve the minutes as amended?

6 DR. WALLACK: So moved.

7 A VOICE: Second.

8 MS. SARNECKY: All those in favor?

9 ALL VOICES: Aye.

10 MS. SARNECKY: Opposed? Okay.

11 Moving on, we have Dr. Lin and Dr. Lalande  
12 here from Yale and UCONN. If you guys want to take the  
13 stage, you're more than welcome to sit here, up here,  
14 wherever you guys are comfortable.

15 DR. KIESSLING: Hello, this is Ann  
16 Kiessling.

17 MS. SARNECKY: We just approved the minutes  
18 from last month.

19 DR. HAIFAN LIN: Marc and I liked to thank  
20 the Commissioner and all the Committee members for giving  
21 us this opportunity to give a brief review of our core  
22 laboratories and to testify why we need the continued  
23 support of the core. I'd also like to start, thank the  
24 Committee for your devotion and tireless effort to stem

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 cell research in Connecticut. And your effort, as you all  
2 know, really has played a crucial role in making the  
3 Connecticut state as the first state in supporting stem  
4 cell research and a leading state in this field. So we  
5 really appreciate that.

6 So, today I'd like to address three  
7 questions that you might have in your mind. The first one  
8 is really, you know, what have we done with the core. And  
9 the second one is why do we need to continue support  
10 cores. And the third one, how much would it take to hold  
11 the course. So, let's start with the first one. So, we'll  
12 do a brief review and Marc will focus on UCONN's  
13 achievement and I will focus on Yale.

14 So, Yale, in the past five years, has  
15 received 4.3 million in total from Connecticut in the form  
16 of core grants. And using this budget we built four core  
17 laboratories to support human embryonic stem cell research  
18 namely the human embryonic stem cell core, the gnomonic  
19 core, the spiral imaging core, and cell mutilation core.  
20 So these cores together over the past four years have  
21 helped 65 labs on the Yale campus and over 400  
22 investigators on the Yale campus plus multiple labs from  
23 UCONN and Wesleyan to conduct stem cell research.

24 And so I'd like to use the human embryonic

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 stem cell core as an example. This core was built in 2007  
2 and in the past four years they've trained over 100  
3 researchers teaching them how to use embryonic stem cells  
4 for research and for potential communicable translations.  
5 And as a result of that Yale's human embryonic stem cell  
6 research community has grown rapidly from one person in  
7 2006 to now 32 labs. And I truly see this as a  
8 transforming impact and we continue to grow our stem cell  
9 communities. Together with UCONN our stem cell community,  
10 to me, really represents one of the largest in the world.  
11 It's very exciting.

12 So in addition to this kind of teaching and  
13 service mission we also have the mission of technology  
14 developments. And, for example, again using the Yale core  
15 as an example, three years ago we developed a new  
16 technology that allowed human embryonic stem cells to be  
17 cultured free of the help of moss feeder fields. So that's  
18 a very big improvement, as you know, a big step towards  
19 using human embryonic stem cells in medical applications  
20 without moss field contaminations. And a year ago we  
21 developed a novel gene knock down method that allowed us  
22 to knock down every individual genes in human embryonic  
23 stem cells and we taught the researchers from Yale, from  
24 Wesleyan, and UCONN to use these technology and just

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 within a year I know that multiple exciting discoveries  
2 have happened given this new technology from multiple  
3 labs.

4 And really another point I'd like to  
5 mention is that this core economically is such an  
6 effective investment, essential resource that otherwise  
7 would be duplicated by many, many other labs. And, two, I  
8 feel on a single dollar per dollar basis among all the  
9 grants we've given out the core grants really by far have  
10 achieved the most. And I will yield to Marc and I'm sure  
11 he will give you his exciting story at UCONN.

12 DR. MARC LALANDE: Thank you, Haifan.  
13 Thanks again also to the Committee. I echo my colleague's  
14 sincerest thanks for your support of our stem cell  
15 program. Sixty million dollars in this state and of  
16 course Yale and the University of Connecticut have been  
17 very major beneficiaries. And our core facility, who is  
18 directed by Dr. Renshea Chu, who is here, and who was  
19 recruited by Y Cell in 2006 to set up the core, have  
20 received also over 4 million dollars of funding from the  
21 state to operate this core. I'd like to make two points,  
22 first to just remind you of some of the successes of the  
23 core and perhaps talk a little bit about economic  
24 development and the importance of having this core

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 facility.

2                   So, the core is a joint operation with  
3 Wesleyan so that Laura Grabel is core director of this  
4 core. Laura is responsible for outreach and Renshea is  
5 responsible for education, training, as well as technology  
6 development as Haifan mentioned. We developed, at the  
7 UCONN core, four human embryonic stem cell lines that have  
8 been deposited at the NIH that are part of the repository  
9 and should federal funding for human embryonic stem cell  
10 survive the various stages of litigation they would be  
11 available to researchers across the country. And I think  
12 this was a great advance for us.

13                   Renshea and his colleagues have trained  
14 over 120 scientists from not only Connecticut but also  
15 from Massachusetts and California. And I would join Haifan  
16 in saying when we go to meetings Connecticut, our joint  
17 program, is recognized as one of the strong ones in the  
18 country. And very well respected because of the way it was  
19 funded by this Committee and transparency. And I think  
20 you'd agree we get a lot of kudos.

21                   The core, the cores work together. We meet  
22 every semester. We have joint core meetings. We serve on  
23 each other's core advisory committees so that we know  
24 what's going on and our work is complementary. While we

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 focus some efforts on deviation of human embryonic stem  
2 cells the Yale core is focused on other areas in  
3 technology development. So both cores are doing technology  
4 development and it's important to realize the cores are  
5 centers for technology development. If you don't do it in  
6 the core each investigator, on their own, will try to  
7 develop these various technologies. And that's a strength  
8 of a core is that the technologies are developed here and  
9 they're shared in our community through our meetings and  
10 through our -- and I think that that's a very important  
11 function of our cores.

12 Another -- the only other thing I'd like to  
13 talk about is economic development. There has been at the  
14 University of Connecticut three companies who are -- that  
15 have been started and are located at the University of  
16 Connecticut in Farmington essentially because the core  
17 facility is there. Two small companies, Kima Pharma and  
18 Mineuvra, have located in the incubator in Farmington  
19 because they have access to the core. And the reason for  
20 that is these small companies can't afford to set up a  
21 core, get the expertise -- the huge investments that needs  
22 to be made you're all aware of. So -- and this company,  
23 Contrageneics, which is run by Carolyn Dielly, who is one  
24 of the -- which is a state -- is funded by the state stem

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 cell obviously makes use of the core.

2           And Haifan and I both sit in groups that  
3 are working with the Governor's office and DECD to promote  
4 life sciences and economic development. And I can tell you  
5 that the cores are the unifying force between Yale and the  
6 University of Connecticut. And the DECD sees our ability  
7 to interact in this way, which is one of the first times  
8 these two universities have really interacted at this  
9 level, as strength. And they're actually using it as a  
10 paradigm for -- to build other models of economic  
11 development. So I would argue that these core facilities  
12 are crucial to continuing this very strong engagement of  
13 both universities. Both universities have engaged, they've  
14 built new buildings for these facilities. They've invested  
15 a lot of their resources. So I think that for this reason  
16 these are extremely important and we need to find a way to  
17 fund them.

18           DR. LIN: So, Marc articulated the part --  
19 he also alluded to the need for continued support of this  
20 core. So, obviously, one of the needs really comes from  
21 the importance of these cores for developing biotech  
22 industry in our state. And another important need, I  
23 would like to add a few more sentences, really is in order  
24 for us to keep to the cutting edge of this state's stem

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 cell research -- so the stem cell field moves at such a  
2 rapid speed. Literally new technologies are surfacing on a  
3 monthly basis and there is no single lab, no matter how  
4 big that lab is, has the resource, manpower, or focus to  
5 catch up with all these technologies. And core is the  
6 place to do that. So, without the continued core support  
7 what will happen is that we'll be falling behind because  
8 the labs in Connecticut will be using the outdated  
9 technology. And eventually the entire research enterprise  
10 in the state will fall behind.

11 And the second issue is about these cores  
12 their innovativeness. As I mentioned to you, both UCONN  
13 and Yale has a lot of new technology development that not  
14 only benefiting our state but also put us in a leadership  
15 position in the field of stem cell research. Again, no  
16 individual labs does that. By nature individual labs are  
17 focused on a particular question or a particular disease.  
18 They are not focused on technology. So core has a unique  
19 contribution of developing technology and that's why these  
20 companies are attracted to UCONN. And in the case of Yale  
21 you probably all know a company called Renends and they  
22 are in charge of multi-million dollar grant for small  
23 business because they justify it in their application that  
24 the Yale core can help them to give out that technology.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 And so these are -- in fact, really it's leveraging a lot  
2 our resources from outside the state to the state already.

3  
4 And core themselves built this way like a  
5 mock setting, a very collaborative fashion, also become a  
6 new model. And, in fact, foundation, The Foundation  
7 decided this month it was so good that they donated 1.6  
8 million dollars as a gift to Yale core to continue this.  
9 They knew that if this 1.6 million dollars goes to  
10 individual labs the impact would be very focused and  
11 limited. And so I really think, you know, echoing Marc's  
12 view this core is very important to be maintained.

13 And the last point I'd like to, you know,  
14 just kind of give you an example NIH. NIH is the largest  
15 medical research foundation in a way and it's suppose --  
16 all big medical research. And one big effort that they're  
17 trying to push is so called the collaborative effort. And  
18 the cores are so important that for any collaborative  
19 effort that is three or four investigators in a mechanism  
20 called, POM mechanism that David knows, they actually  
21 require and support a core. And the budget of the core is  
22 about 25 percent of total budget equal to every individual  
23 component's budget. And that shows the importance of this  
24 core. In fact, if you don't organize a core they wouldn't

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 give you money.

2                   And so I think, you know, obviously that  
3 naturally leads to the last question, how much it takes to  
4 support our cores. And Marc and I and our teams have done  
5 a lot of calculations because in all honesty we are in a  
6 conflict of interest situation. On one hand we argue for  
7 the support of cores. But on the other hand, we are all  
8 individual investigators. We know that more money goes to  
9 core it means less money comes to say my lab. So, what's  
10 the perfect balance?

11                   You know, over the years some of you know  
12 who visited the cores we've devised a very effective cost  
13 of recovery system. So a lot of services now can be  
14 charged and recovered from individual grants. So because  
15 of that we can reduce the burden of state's support of  
16 cores. However, two critical components that still cannot  
17 be recovered one is technology development. And we need  
18 that. And another component is really major equipment  
19 upgrades and innovation and maintenance. And if these are  
20 attached to that these cores will be charging more what a  
21 company would charge and then we lose the synergizing and  
22 leveraging effect.

23                   So, for that we did some calculations and  
24 we thought one proposal, at least, we should put on the

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 table for your entertainment, which is instead of writing  
2 these big core grants and, you know, labor through all of  
3 this because we know clearly in this case the mission of  
4 the cores and to have you guys spend so much time  
5 reviewing this, if each year the state can allocate 5  
6 percent of the budget to support Yale's core and 5 percent  
7 to support UCONN's core. As Marc said these cores are not  
8 duplicating, they're complementary. And so with that  
9 total of 10 percent of support then these cores should be  
10 able to run well. And that's obviously a partial support,  
11 but we can recover the rest from cost recovery.

12 And we also request the state to hold us  
13 accountable because without a review mechanism then how  
14 can you do that. We invite the state to establish formal  
15 systems to annual review of progress report, to inspect  
16 and visit us if necessary, and to put corresponding  
17 recommendations and advises. Or even to yank away our  
18 money if we are really doing so poorly. And so this way I  
19 think there is a check and balance system still there,  
20 however, it becomes a -- the system that we're guaranteed  
21 the success of Connecticut stem cell research through the  
22 support of cores. And overall the budget will be reduced  
23 too. Initially each year UCONN apply or my place apply we  
24 asked for 2.5 million. So that's 25 percent. Now the total

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 would be reduced to 10 percent. And that's one proposal  
2 we have. We think it might be workable and, obviously,  
3 it's upon the Committee's decision.

4 Marc.

5 DR. LALANDE: I think Haifan has summarized  
6 it well. I think for us to accomplish our mission, which  
7 is not only scientific but is going to be increasingly to  
8 insure that we're contributing to the state's economic  
9 development we need a strong core facility to attract  
10 companies and we're willing to do what it takes, but I  
11 think this is the minimum level of support. I mean this  
12 state stem cell program is a giant program project for the  
13 state and we think that the cores at 10 percent, quite  
14 honestly, is a very reasonable sum to expend and two cores  
15 that now have a world reputation in this area.

16 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Thank  
17 you. I imagine there are questions.

18 DR. FISHBONE: You have, as it stands, four  
19 more years of support. What is your anticipation about  
20 what would happen at the end of those four years to the  
21 cores assuming that we're unable to get additional funds.

22 DR. LALANDE: Well, we'd have four more  
23 years of technology development, which is crucial if we're  
24 going to stay cutting edge. And it would allow us to

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 transition to look at other funding mechanisms. It's going  
2 to take awhile because of the litigation at the federal  
3 level it blocks -- it does block our ability. It reduces  
4 our ability to apply for federal funding because we're not  
5 going to go in and not have human embryonic stem cells as  
6 part of this. And, you know, just today there is another -  
7 - there has been appeal to the appeal to the appeal and if  
8 that stays up it does really reduce our ability to compete  
9 for federal grants because our mission remains to  
10 guarantee the highest technology in human embryonic stem  
11 cell.

12 DR. LIN: I completely agree with Marc.  
13 And, of course, we are trying our best to look beyond  
14 these four years because we want to enterprise through --  
15 in long term. And we are looking to alternative sources  
16 and this partial support of 5 percent for each core to me  
17 it's all a transition. And hopefully in four years there  
18 will be new technology developed through new licensing or,  
19 you know, extended -- recovery hopefully that can be  
20 further increased on the recovery side.

21 If the core really has no support from  
22 Connecticut after four years the worst possible scenario  
23 is actually these cores will have to be shut down. But  
24 that would be really bad. I hope that industry will come

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 up and they realize the importance of core to them too and  
2 will be willing to chip in. And one thing, Marc speak for  
3 the good scenario I will speak for the worst possible  
4 scenario. I, personally, know if this core shuts down we  
5 will have a big hit in the State of Connecticut in stem  
6 cell research. And so we are trying our best, Marc, and  
7 I, and our teams, are going everywhere to try to raise  
8 funds, do things to support these cores in long term. And  
9 meanwhile in this four years to me it really is a  
10 transition period, you know, for state supported and  
11 hopefully eventually self-run and this transitional  
12 support is crucial.

13 DR. MYRON GENEL: I should have these  
14 numbers on my fingertips, but just what's the ballpark  
15 figure of the operating costs for the two cores on an  
16 annual basis? Are we talking about two to three million  
17 dollars?

18 DR. LALANDE: Well, if we look at --  
19 they're roughly four million dollars over six, seven years  
20 so that's a ballpark of what the operating costs are. I  
21 mean they're non-insignificant personnel costs, as you all  
22 know, so when you review grants you have 70 to 80 percent  
23 of your budget is on personnel costs. And we have highly  
24 qualified people that we have to keep otherwise they'll go

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 to other places that do stem cell research, but 500,000  
2 dollars, at this stage, a year. And don't forget that some  
3 of that goes to the institution. We lose 25 percent of  
4 those funds to the institution so they keep the lights on  
5 and do everything that they do. So, it's actually a net  
6 more like 375,000. We can't run it -- we can't run -- how  
7 much is it? Did I calculate it wrong?

8 DR. LIN: No, you got it right.

9 DR. LALANDE: I always check with my  
10 colleague. So I think to run a core facility of  
11 international stature on this I don't think we can ask for  
12 much less. And a lot of this is -- we've developed a  
13 store. You know, we're getting revenues back from  
14 investigators who use reagents in the two cores. We have  
15 joint sequencing. We share resources. And all these are  
16 revenue, but we have to keep -- you know, if you want to  
17 expend the maximum dollar on research we have to try to  
18 keep these recovery costs down and I think this is, in our  
19 opinion, this is a reasonable sum. I don't know if you  
20 have anything else to add.

21 DR. LIN: Yes, I just want to give an  
22 event, just the simplest example, culture medium for human  
23 embryonic stem cell these individual researchers call a  
24 company and they don't have the bargaining power and a

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 bottle say is 500 dollars. We buy box through -- and  
2 individual researchers. We do so at 500 dollars to 300  
3 dollars. And that's a lot of savings for -- in addition  
4 to that, we often, the company's quality varies from  
5 batches to batches. It's a new field. And then here,  
6 through the core, we do quality assurance for -- to make  
7 sure it's a good batch. If it's a bad one, we do write the  
8 company. We are more than willing to change one. And that  
9 quality assurance is a very big plus and many, many of  
10 these kind of examples. So for Yale, to answer your  
11 question, Mike, we use about one million a year, so we  
12 have 4.3 million dollars. Knock off 25 percent, but we  
13 have a bit of private donations so they make-up about 25  
14 percent or 20 percent, so roughly --

15 DR. GENEL: -- roughly a million dollars a  
16 year.

17 DR. LIN: Yes.

18 DR. GENEL: Is that, Marc, is about the  
19 same? So we're talking about two million dollars a year  
20 operating costs.

21 DR. LIN: Right. Now, we can recover, you  
22 know, through private donations -- so far because the  
23 economy is tight, but through recovery we can recover a  
24 half million. If the state can support the half million --

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 DR. WALLACK: So, obviously, your  
2 statements are, as usual, very compelling, and very  
3 exciting and not only in what you say but I think the  
4 uniqueness of our program and what we do in the state is  
5 the fact that the both of you work so well together. And  
6 that's -- you both are to be commended for that. I mean  
7 it's a very unique situation to have what otherwise could  
8 be competitive agencies or institutions sitting side by  
9 side and almost being able to finish each other's  
10 sentences in a way. I mean it's marvelous and certainly  
11 we understand the need for cores. The largest amount of  
12 money that we have given through the last six years, or  
13 five years, has certainly been to cores. And that's a  
14 statement, I think, of how we feel about cores.

15 There is -- however, there are restrictions  
16 that we're faced with and what I find very interesting is  
17 that you're here to hopefully share in the solutions  
18 because we can't solve the problem alone. You can't solve  
19 the problem alone, the problem being one of financing.  
20 But as we go forward, Gerry indicated this, there is the  
21 possibility in four years that we won't have funding.  
22 There is the possibility as we all remember two years ago  
23 we had to go to Appropriations and so forth that they were  
24 going to cut us out, give us five, give us 7.5, and

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 finally thank goodness the full ten because it's not  
2 promised at all. So the ten million dollars that we have  
3 been fortunate to give out we've been very, very  
4 fortunate. My anticipation is that it's going to be  
5 there.

6 But I think there is a bigger picture, if  
7 you will, and it's not just the maintenance of what you're  
8 all doing and what we're all doing together. And, Marc,  
9 you alluded to this when you talk about attracting  
10 companies, going the next step and so forth. So, I guess  
11 in the atmosphere of shared solutions is there a way of  
12 not having the kind of formula that you've presented, but  
13 -- which is a maintenance amount. It's not a growth  
14 amount, I don't think.

15 DR. LIN: A maintenance amount you compute  
16 it like for the purpose of growth. So the other half  
17 million we are going to do cost recovery to --

18 DR. WALLACK: -- well, that's what I'm  
19 leading to.

20 DR. LIN: Right.

21 DR. WALLACK: So, I think Richard Dees is  
22 on the call. Richard, are you here?

23 DR. RICHARD DEES: Yes, I'm here.

24 DR. WALLACK: And I think it was -- Richard

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 was involved in this conversation as well as some others  
2 of us in the past. Is there a way of leveraging whatever  
3 the amount might be, 300,000, 400,000, 500,000, whatever  
4 the amount may be -- and there was a discussion of zero  
5 funding, is there a way of leveraging whatever funding we  
6 could find appropriate to put out there into even more  
7 funding? And I guess what I'm picking up on is the idea  
8 of pushing the envelope, if you will, of philanthropic  
9 giving of some sort whether from the outside or from the  
10 inside. The inside, obviously, would be institutional  
11 giving. The outside would be true philanthropy like you  
12 were able to come back from China with with the 1.6  
13 million dollars for the core.

14 And could we look at possibly or discuss or  
15 could you react to the idea that whether it be three,  
16 four, or 500,000, 200,000, whatever that number may be,  
17 that that number be predicated on a -- on the idea that  
18 you guys would have to somehow raise a comparable amount.  
19 That would be a target amount, dollar for dollar so that -  
20 - what I'm getting at is that say we allocate 250,000.  
21 That 250,000 could be used as leverage, if you will, for  
22 you guys to go out and really have a very serious  
23 philanthropic effort to match. You'd have to match the 250  
24 dollar for dollar in order to get our 250. Maybe the

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 figure is 500,000 that would give you even more and that's  
2 the growth factor. So that if the core therefore can get  
3 a million dollars a year and expand what you're doing even  
4 more than you're putting on the table there is not -- does  
5 that not begin to put us into an area that's even more  
6 than what we're anticipating? So that's my question. Can  
7 we look at a different model, a matching model if you will  
8 --

9 DR. LALANDE: -- so you want me to go to  
10 China with Haifan.

11 DR. WALLACK: You could probably go to  
12 Canada, go to --

13 DR. LALANDE: -- okay, I'm going to tell  
14 you that's not going to work well. But, anyway, let me  
15 respond in two ways. The first is that, you know, we  
16 built these cores in five years. We went from zero to  
17 essentially what's world class core facilities in five  
18 years. I think that's admirable. Obviously, we had a lot  
19 of support, but none the less we had to build up a lot of  
20 -- so I think that now we have a change of slope. We had  
21 a learning curve. We had a certain, we had certain  
22 functions we had to fill. We had to sort out what the two  
23 cores would do. So now I think maintenance is a bit harsh.  
24 I think what you have is that we've increased our

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 efficiency to the point where we can function at a very  
2 high level with the technologies and the personnel we can  
3 develop and we have the personnel in place, that we've  
4 recruited over those five years, that can develop the new  
5 technologies.

6 As for matching funds I think, yes, in the  
7 ideal world that's true, but I don't -- I think, to be  
8 honest, for me to commit the University of Connecticut  
9 philanthropy people to raising money for the core I can't  
10 do that. I mean the UCONN Foundation is a separate  
11 foundation from the university and it takes its directions  
12 from their leadership. So we can certainly work with them,  
13 but there is absolutely -- it would be -- there would be  
14 no guarantee of us matching with philanthropic funds. I  
15 think that would be -- I think that would be a challenge  
16 because the university has other priorities that it wants  
17 to fund. And we're just along the line with everybody  
18 else. And I can't speak for Yale because that's a very  
19 different philanthropy situation.

20 So I think, you know, what we want to do is  
21 develop technology. We want to attract companies. We want  
22 to try to work with more companies. I think that we're  
23 giving a benefit to the state, which is part of our  
24 mission, and I think we can do this, but we require a

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 minimum level of funding. We, obviously, have other  
2 people working in association with the core who are highly  
3 talented or are funded by other agencies, and so on and so  
4 forth. So, I think that in the ideal world that would be a  
5 workable proposal, but the other thing, to be honest, if  
6 you want us to work on research don't send us out to raise  
7 money. That's not our job. And I would rather focus on  
8 developing new techniques to make IPS cells, and work on  
9 diseases, and try to work on mechanisms of drug discovery  
10 then being under some pressure to raise philanthropic  
11 funds as a matching fund. Really, I highly doubt that I  
12 would be successful.

13 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: I wonder  
14 how many professors have told their deans that they just  
15 wanted to do research and they shouldn't raise money and  
16 then went back and tried to get another grant.

17 DR. LALANDE: The grant is my business.

18 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: I  
19 understand that.

20 DR. LALANDE: I know how to do that.

21 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: It's just  
22 an interesting --

23 DR. LALANDE: -- philanthropy is very hard  
24 for me.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: I

2 understand that and I get it. I get it.

3 DR. LALANDE: It's a special profession.

4 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: I totally  
5 get that. But I was just thinking there probably would be  
6 a lot of people who would wish they could say that to  
7 their deans sometimes. Right? But one of the questions I  
8 have though is just about what we're discussing right now  
9 linking last month's meeting and today's conversations  
10 because I know that this Committee in part was wrestling  
11 with the question of for how much longer to support a core  
12 if we could and what that would look like. And it's almost  
13 as if part of this conversation is about a plan to support  
14 the core for the rest of the duration of the stem cell  
15 program, which is a little bit different. And probably  
16 people acknowledge that, but I just need to put that on  
17 the table that it's a bit of a shift in the conversation.

18 And I wanted to then ensure that we have some clarity  
19 around what we're talking about for this year at the same  
20 time that I hear you telling me that we almost need to  
21 think about -- and you didn't put it this way -- sort of  
22 what the fixed grants and the variable type grants are in  
23 this program or what our fixed and variable costs might be  
24 in terms of believing that every year there is a certain

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 amount of money that would go into funding core and then  
2 there is the rest that also generates what you refer to as  
3 a conflict of interest in a way because if you're funding  
4 one part then you can fund less of the other part. So, I  
5 just wanted to pull that out a little bit in the  
6 conversation so that we can maybe deal with the issue of  
7 2011-2012. And then it's probably going to be for us to,  
8 in the future, also think about where we go after that.  
9 But I appreciate what you're saying and I'll share with  
10 you that any time people ask me to participate in  
11 something I tell them just don't ask me to raise money.

12 DR. GENEL: It strikes me if we're asking  
13 the cores to generate money through philanthropy we're  
14 talking to the wrong people. We need to talk to the  
15 institutional people.

16 DR. LIN: Yes.

17 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Right.

18 DR. GENEL: I think the question being  
19 raised is what is the institutional commitment and to what  
20 extent --

21 DR. LIN: -- I know -- I will now address  
22 that question because in all of your minds probably asking  
23 that a lot. For example, the indirect cost is 65 percent.  
24 Dan, every time he sees me he asks, every dollar you get

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 from Connecticut I substitute you with 40 cents. And he  
2 want to make me feel very guilty. But truly that was a big  
3 support and that to him is not the biggest because, you  
4 know, he build the one and only building ever since Bob  
5 becomes the dean and that building was given largely to  
6 stem cell research.

7 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Yes.

8 DR. LIN: And that's a huge leverage we  
9 already leveraged from -- he always say, I give more than  
10 20 million dollars already. At medical school at Yale we  
11 survive on research grants and on patient -- seeing  
12 patient -- we're limited, but really there is no missing -  
13 - it's a soft institution within the -- so I really think  
14 he's doing his best.

15 And now I want to add a second perspective,  
16 which is if you take -- about supporting this core and  
17 what it does for Connecticut. This is a key  
18 infrastructure. If our state want to move to the next  
19 stage of biotech industry development we need to provide  
20 people with infrastructure, two kinds, one is -- and the  
21 other I would propose to the state government, one stop  
22 shopping to make people feel this is an efficient state.  
23 The second thing is a technical platform and  
24 infrastructure. And for that kind of a big picture to me

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 this investment really is almost nothing, together one  
2 million dollars a year to build an infrastructure for the  
3 state centered around biotech industry. And I cannot  
4 predict exactly the long term benefit of this, but one  
5 thing I can predict is definitely it would be very, very  
6 beneficial, much beyond what we are talking today and  
7 that's why I also have the hope that this core will run  
8 beyond year four, year five. Eventually, hopefully the  
9 biotech industry will help.

10 DR. WALLACK: So can I just pick up,  
11 certainly I don't think anybody would ever question the  
12 value of the core.

13 DR. LIN: Right.

14 DR. WALLACK: And I mentioned it earlier in  
15 my remarks that certainly in recognition of that we were  
16 very responsible in providing those kinds of funds.

17 DR. LIN: Right.

18 DR. WALLACK: And certainly no one expects  
19 you guys, yourselves, to be taking out of the lab and to  
20 go out yourselves and raise funds. You had a unique  
21 situation, maybe that can be -- but that's irrelevant.  
22 That's irrelevant.

23 DR. LIN: Actually, that's interesting you  
24 bring up.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 DR. WALLACK: And so and I don't know what  
2 the formula is if there is -- the idea of putting on the  
3 table the idea of some type of philanthropic giving is  
4 intended to take the core and build it, as I indicated  
5 before, even to a stronger position than it is today to  
6 accommodate what I know we all share and you guys know I  
7 share this, the idea of economic development. And so --  
8 but I know that you guys have institutions, because I've  
9 talked to those people, who are involved with the fund  
10 raising side of it. And if -- and I know what you're  
11 saying because even before the 82 million dollars for the  
12 Amistad building Carolyn Sliman promised 50 million  
13 dollars in an undefined manner to the whole stem cell  
14 initiative. So no one will ever question what you guys  
15 have, what you represent and what your institutions have  
16 done. It's incredible that 50 some odd million dollars  
17 was put into the Fontec building. I say that all the time  
18 and you guys have heard me say that. Okay?

19 The Commissioner indicated this is a  
20 discussion and it's a good discussion. At some point  
21 philanthropy has to play an increasing large role. And I  
22 guess what I'm saying is you guys can use us, if you will,  
23 through your appropriate agencies, not the two of you  
24 obviously, but through your appropriate -- you can use us

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 to leverage in your -- your development people, give them  
2 the tools. And maybe it's not dollar for dollar in year  
3 one, maybe it's dollar to 25 cents. But eventually over  
4 time maybe it does become a different ratio. And I know  
5 in California, for example, they use philanthropy, from  
6 what I understand and Ann is on the phone, to a greater  
7 extent than we do. So maybe what can come out of this is  
8 our ability together help you guys to do even more. That's  
9 the whole purpose of it.

10 DR. LIN: I think this is a great idea. The  
11 only issue is if we have a strategic planning we have to  
12 build on something that's accountable and if we can raise  
13 philanthropic money that would be wonderful. And the 1.6  
14 million dollars I got was pure luck because a guy -- the  
15 foundation visited our core and got so impressed and they  
16 realized that we actually have a piece of machine that  
17 really needed to be upgraded. And you're seeing that big  
18 number actually was mostly for buying a new piece of  
19 equipment to replace an old one. And usually another  
20 issue is these private donations come with a specific  
21 requirement that even if you have certain money, like the  
22 1.6 million dollars I had to buy that piece of equipment.

23 DR. WALLACK: I understand that.

24 DR. LIN: And so I think I'm more than

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 happy, and I assume Marc too, to work with you guys  
2 because you guys are helping us not we are helping you.

3 DR. RON HART: Ron Hart on the phone, can I  
4 ask a question, please?

5 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Go ahead.

6 DR. HART: Okay. I just want to be sure  
7 it's clear. I truly understand the discussion in terms of  
8 thinking about what happens four years from now, but I'm a  
9 little puzzled as to why the Commission feels as though  
10 there is a reason to specify how the cores continue  
11 operation come the end of four years. Why can't we just  
12 set the goal of saying that one of the conditions of  
13 continued funding is development of some plan, not up to  
14 us, to establish a continued model of success?

15 DR. WALLACK: That's a reasonable --

16 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: -- that  
17 sounds like another consideration. My recollection is  
18 part of the conversation that we needed to have was after  
19 what time period we would continue to fund cores when  
20 people thought they were only funded for a certain amount  
21 of time. And that's how we got to this conversation  
22 today, which I think has been really helpful. And I'll  
23 continue to say given today's conversation I think that  
24 the Advisory Committee will have more discussion about

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 what to do going forward, but that we should also, because  
2 I really do appreciate -- I feel a lot clearer, and I hope  
3 others too, ask ourselves whether or not we have enough  
4 information to at least finish our thinking about this  
5 year, which is what we -- the reason that we wanted to  
6 talk to you in the first place. But you certainly give us  
7 some other thinking for the coming year.

8 You look you want to say something,  
9 Chelsey. No?

10 MS. SARNECKY: No. I'm okay. I was just  
11 thinking to your point we have the RFP that needs to go  
12 out and I think in addition to Commissioner Mullen's point  
13 about taking what we learned from the last meeting and  
14 bringing it here and continuing that conversation, the  
15 Committee needs to have another conversation, whether it's  
16 later this afternoon or at another meeting, or at a  
17 teleconference about the RFP because we want to make sure  
18 we get the RFP out in time so they can either apply or not  
19 apply.

20 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Right.

21 MS. SARNECKY: To the program.

22 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Right. So  
23 I wonder whether or not anyone has another question that  
24 we need to ask now before we conclude this part of the

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 discussion and move forward, but it's been really helpful  
2 for us. Anyone on the phone?

3 MS. SARNECKY: Thank you.

4 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: But you  
5 did give us some other things to think about.

6 DR. LALANDE: Thank you very much.

7 DR. LIN: Thank you.

8 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Thank  
9 you. Take care.

10 DR. GENEL: If I may before we drop this  
11 subject, for the record, I never recall any discussion  
12 that indicated we were going to eliminate funding for the  
13 cores when we started. I know this has been said, but I  
14 do not recall anything that ever said explicitly that we  
15 were planning to do that.

16 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: And I  
17 can't say --

18 DR. GENEL: -- that doesn't mean that we  
19 can't decide the time has come to do that, but I don't  
20 recall ever explicitly saying that we were going to limit  
21 the timing of the funding for the cores.

22 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: And I  
23 think that's important to keep on the table as we look at  
24 the --

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 DR. GENEL: -- yes, no, no. It's been said  
2 that we decided that. I never -- I don't recall any  
3 conversation of that sort. Milt?

4 DR. WALLACK: Was that said today?

5 DR. GENEL: Huh?

6 DR. WALLACK: Was that said today?

7 DR. GENEL: We've been saying it --

8 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: -- we've  
9 been talking around that.

10 DR. GENEL: We've been saying there is a  
11 presumption that we were going to, at some point, phase  
12 out funding of the cores and I don't recall ever having  
13 that said so explicitly.

14 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: I didn't  
15 just make that up that we have been talking around that  
16 issue, did I?

17 DR. GENEL: No, no. I know it was said at  
18 the last month too that --

19 DR. WALLACK: -- I think that we had hoped  
20 that they would be able to be self-sustaining.

21 DR. GENEL: I'd have to go back, we'd have  
22 go -- I'd have to go back and look at the minutes. I don't  
23 recall that ever being --

24 DR. FISHBONE: -- but by virtue of the

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 people using the core --

2 DR. DEES: This is Richard Dees. Now my  
3 recollection is that we were trying to figure a way  
4 basically -- our commitment to them and have them be self-  
5 sustaining -- that was the gist of the discussion as I  
6 recall it--

7 DR. GENEL: Yeah, and that would seem like  
8 more of the context in which we discussed it.

9 DR. WALLACK: So we really have had -- we  
10 have had a discussion for awhile, and I'm not sure if Ann  
11 Kiessling is on the phone, but using the California model  
12 that philanthropic giving should become, should play a  
13 larger and larger role. And I guess probably why I ask  
14 that question is that I don't see that at all as being  
15 part of what is going on within the institutions other  
16 than that one situation which was a very unique situation.

17

18 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Can I ask  
19 a question in the interest of time? Do we want to make a  
20 decision about this year for these grantees and know that  
21 we need to continue to have the rest of the conversation  
22 in forming the RFP for example?

23 DR. FISHBONE: Yes.

24 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Yes.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 DR. ANN KIESSLING: This is Ann Kiessling.  
2 I did want to weigh in a little bit about the philanthropy  
3 because I do think this is a topic that -- although I can  
4 understand the meaning of the core -- (inaudible) plan the  
5 budget -- it's difficult for us to say we can commit some  
6 percentage of our state funding each year to core. I  
7 think that's just not something that wouldn't be popular  
8 or a good idea.

9 In California they have really leveraged  
10 philanthropy in terms of a physical plant. They wanted to  
11 build new buildings. They were challenged to come up with  
12 matching funds. And this applied to their core  
13 facilities. One of the things that hasn't been brought up  
14 in this discussion is that every year when we discuss this  
15 with respect to the RFP the idea is that our dedicated  
16 state funds are really -- it would be totally appropriate  
17 for a core that needed to develop new technology or  
18 replace some specific kind of -- replace a piece of  
19 equipment. I think Haifan mentioned something like that.  
20 So I think that we've always been open to the idea of  
21 keeping the technology at the very forefront of the  
22 science to the cores. But I think it's not comfortable to  
23 ask to provide some kind of -- funding every year to keep  
24 the core going without some higher justification.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: People  
2 are nodding their heads. So for the purpose of today's  
3 discussion and this year's award are there any other  
4 thoughts, questions?

5 DR. WALLACK: I think we have to set an  
6 amount.

7 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Um, hmm.

8 DR. WALLACK: And it has to be very clear  
9 because last year we got into some difficulty because the  
10 RFP was not specific at all. And we have an amount for  
11 every other category.

12 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Right.

13 DR. WALLACK: I don't think we can go any  
14 more, any higher than 500,000 dollars. But I don't -- each  
15 institution is running on a different schedule.

16 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Um, hmm.

17 DR. WALLACK: So that all of a sudden now  
18 we're falling into a trap and if you allow -- that's  
19 probably too strong a word, but we're falling into a  
20 situation, a situation where when we might not have had a  
21 request for core all of a sudden now we're going to be  
22 funding core, if we took up on exactly what they said. For  
23 example, the core funding for UCONN runs out at the end of  
24 the 2011-2012 year. They would have come back in this

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 period for funding.

2 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Um, hmm.

3 DR. WALLACK: Obviously, they're going to  
4 need some funding. We gave 500,000 to Yale last year.

5 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Um, hmm.

6 DR. WALLACK: It's really a little bit of a  
7 dilemma. I mean -- so I'm not sure if we want to tie them  
8 together. We have to look at them independently, I think.

9

10 DR. GENEL: Is that 500,000 dollars for  
11 operating or is that a renewal?

12 DR. FISHBONE: No, for continuing to  
13 operate.

14 DR. GENEL: That was -- was that a renewal?

15

16 DR. WALLACK: No. So what happened with  
17 Yale --

18 DR. GENEL: -- that wasn't a --

19 DR. WALLACK: -- no, what happened with  
20 Yale is they came in and asked for 2.5 million dollars.  
21 And we said that, after much discussion, very good  
22 discussion, we finally decided on 500,000 dollars. And I  
23 think, David, you may have been instrumental in that  
24 discussion because that would have covered some operating

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 components, I think was your argument, the bottom line  
2 operating components. So, it was for operating.

3 DR. FISHBONE: That's what they're asking  
4 for is 500,000 a year for just the basic amount that would  
5 -- to keep the cores running. And, obviously, anything  
6 beyond that they would need to either come to us for a  
7 specific request or at the university or a private donor  
8 like replacing a one million dollar piece of equipment.  
9 So, I mean to me it's make a lot of sense. We're giving 20  
10 million each year, we're trying to give 20 percent to seed  
11 grants. I would personally not have a problem of saying  
12 that we will give 10 percent to core, to core grants.  
13 That is like 500,000 a year to keep them afloat. Anything  
14 beyond that they have to either come back with a specific  
15 request or get it from some other source.

16 DR. DEES: -- (inaudible at times, on  
17 phone) 500,000 a year. I mean -- an application process  
18 then that's a different story -- is that we give them  
19 500,000 a year and --

20 DR. FISHBONE: -- that's what they were  
21 saying, I think, yes.

22 DR. DEES: That's what they were saying.

23 DR. FISHBONE: And that's what I'm saying  
24 too.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 DR. DEES: Yes. I wouldn't let them come  
2 back for anything else.

3 DR. DAVID GOLDHAMMER: I'm not quite --  
4 what the 500,000 is for is a little unclear to me. Haifan,  
5 I think, stated or implied, I think he stated, that what  
6 is critical is technology development and replacement of  
7 critical equipment. And that through cost recovery basis  
8 they can maintain, you know, have funds for maintenance of  
9 current infrastructure. That's -- so I'm not sure.  
10 Actually when they mentioned a certain percentage of the  
11 yearly budget I kind of liked that idea. On one hand  
12 because I think, you know, with adequate progress  
13 monitoring I think it's somewhat of a waste of time for  
14 them to come in with 100 page grants even for something  
15 that we all know is useful and may have proven over the  
16 years. So I liked that on the one hand. But if Haifan  
17 would like us to consider funding for the purpose of  
18 specific new technologies and equipment that's periodic  
19 then I'm not sure that a percentage of the total --

20 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: -- a  
21 rolling core, almost it's a rolling core.

22 DR. FISHBONE: I thought what they said was  
23 they need a million dollars a year to run the cores. And  
24 they're getting 500,000 from reimbursement from people who

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 use the core and they would need another 500,000 in order  
2 just to maintain and do whatever was needed. I don't know  
3 if they would buy -- they would buy a million dollar piece  
4 of equipment. And I could see saying if you want a million  
5 dollar piece of equipment you might have to go to the  
6 university or private funding. But, you know, we would be  
7 willing to sustain the core so the core doesn't have to  
8 close. And then whatever they need to do more they could  
9 try to fund elsewhere. I mean I don't think 10 percent of  
10 what we're giving out is too much considering how  
11 important the cores are to everybody in the program.

12 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: I'm  
13 comfortable with the percentage in that it gives us a  
14 little bit of room in the event that we don't have the  
15 full amount rather than just saying a dollar figure. I  
16 think I'm comfortable saying up to 10 percent and I'm  
17 comfortable specifying core, you know, support for certain  
18 things. So maybe you wouldn't want to say new  
19 technologies or, you know, but just to sustain work in  
20 progress.

21 DR. DEES: One more question, one of the  
22 things that we talked about last month is what I'm worried  
23 about -- and one of the things that was -- or I wonder if  
24 there is some mechanism we can find to encourage them to

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 be developing ways to sustain this project funding after  
2 the -- runs out. (Inaudible at times -- on phone) --  
3 developing a plan to -- a condition for our funding them.

4  
5 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I think this was Ron's  
6 point, wasn't it, wasn't that -- I mean I like that idea.  
7 I like as a concept the idea of matching funds, but I  
8 think in practice it's too risky that they could try as  
9 hard as they can try and maybe the university, you know,  
10 UCONN's research foundation doesn't get behind them to  
11 really do much effort on this part. So I think somehow to  
12 hold them accountable to a real plan of attack, and I  
13 don't know what that exactly would look like, but that's  
14 probably a better solution than holding them to a specific  
15 matching amount which, you know, may, in any given year,  
16 may be impossible to get and then that would put  
17 everything in jeopardy.

18 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Okay,  
19 folks it's about 2:15. We need to move on. I think we're  
20 pretty comfortable with what we're doing with them for  
21 this year. And some of this discussion is going to ensue  
22 as we make our plans for next year anyway, but I feel that  
23 we're more fully informed about what we should consider.

24 DR. WALLACK: Just one point though, I'm in

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 agreement with you. I think the 10 percent is fine.

2 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Um, hmm.

3 DR. WALLACK: And as Gerry points out, you  
4 know, we have categories for seeds, the only thing that I  
5 would like to see included in the process is that they do  
6 make application for the funding.

7 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Okay.

8 DR. WALLACK: Because I think they have to  
9 authenticate and it has to go through peer review and it  
10 has to come through Advisory Committee so we can justify in  
11 our own minds and to the people who we represent so it has  
12 to go through us. And it doesn't mean, in my mind at  
13 least, that each school gets, each university gets 500,000  
14 each. It may be 350. It may be 650. But that's how I  
15 would personally feel more comfortable.

16 DR. FISHBONE: Would you say a maximum of  
17 10 percent?

18 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: But a  
19 maximum of 10 percent.

20 DR. WALLACK: Right.

21 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: We are  
22 allowed to appropriate as opposed to they are allowed to  
23 get.

24 DR. WALLACK: Right.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Okay.

2 DR. WALLACK: And after peer review and --  
3 right, okay.

4 DR. GENEL: That would be exclusive of new  
5 initiatives or measures? I mean we're talking -- are we  
6 talking about operating --

7 DR. FISHBONE: -- existing cores.

8 DR. WALLACK: No, they can come in, Mike,  
9 and it can be for new initiatives. It can be for  
10 continuation and new equipment. They -- that's what they  
11 have to make application for.

12 DR. GENEL: Yes, but the question I'm  
13 raising are we saying that we are going to limit funding  
14 for the cores to a total of 10 percent or are we talking  
15 about operating costs?

16 DR. WALLACK: No, I'm picking up what the  
17 Commissioner said. I'm in total agreement with what the  
18 Commissioner said, 10 percent was the maximum amount that  
19 we're putting to the cores.

20 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Right. So  
21 we're making it about what we do as opposed to what  
22 they're asking.

23 DR. WALLACK: Right.

24 DR. GENEL: No, no, I know that. I'm trying

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 to sort out --

2 DR. WALLACK: -- that's how I feel about  
3 it, at least.

4 MS. SARNECKY: Are you -- go ahead.

5 DR. GOLDHAMMER: So in the application they  
6 would specify what fraction of that is for operating  
7 costs, what is for the initiative, what is for equipment  
8 and they'll make the determination which is --

9 DR. WALLACK: -- right.

10 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Um, hmm.

11 MS. SARNECKY: So I can incorporate these  
12 comments into the RFP and get that sent around to the  
13 Committee.

14 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Great.

15 MS. SARNECKY: But just to -- does the  
16 Committee want me to make reference in the RFP about up to  
17 10 percent for core facilities for some of the words that  
18 were thrown around here, new technology, to sustain the  
19 works in progress, you know. Is there anything specific  
20 that the Committee wants me to stay away from in terms of  
21 the requirements for the cores to apply to this?

22 DR. WALLACK: That's what basically -- what  
23 this says already and, no, I'm comfortable with that.

24 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 DR. WALLACK: But with a maximum --

2 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: -- we'll  
3 look at it.

4 MS. SARNECKY: Wonderful.

5 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: That was  
6 really helpful though.

7 MS. SARNECKY: I think it was too.

8 DR. WALLACK: Is there a way that we could  
9 reiterate, please forgive me, this idea that we would like  
10 to reinforce in the institution's mind the need to begin  
11 the process of philanthropic giving as an side letter to  
12 all of this.

13 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: I guess  
14 it's hard for us to tell them how to get the money.

15 DR. FISHBONE: How about alternate?

16 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: We just  
17 want them to get some -- yes.

18 DR. FISHBONE: Alternate.

19 DR. DEES: A plan for how they hope to --if  
20 some of them are thinking about it then they can --

21 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: -- well,  
22 I guess that gives them --

23 DR. KIESSLING: -- this is Ann Kiessling. I  
24 really agree with that thought. I think that what we're

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 really interested in is some kind of long term plan from  
2 them.

3 DR. ANNE HISKES: Who is the them here?  
4 This is Anne Hiskes speaking.

5 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Well,  
6 that's where the them might be the parent institution as  
7 opposed to the researcher.

8 DR. FISHBONE: Right.

9 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: So let's  
10 think about that because we need to go on --

11 DR. HISKES: -- I'm on the Board of the  
12 Foundation at UCONN and the them would have to be, I  
13 think, the dean of the medical school or the dean of the -  
14 - the Vice President for Economic Development. Each dean  
15 has their own agenda or their own charge and then the  
16 President sort of decides how things -- what the goals are  
17 and how they are going to be allocated in terms of the  
18 responsibilities to the fundraisers. We don't want to  
19 start intervening into the fundraising of a very large  
20 institution.

21 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Well,  
22 let's talk about this some more in the future. We've all,  
23 including last month and the month before, really talked  
24 about wanting to see the researchers and the research be

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 self-sustaining. So we get that. And we can talk more  
2 about what that looks like and how much we can dictate it.  
3 If somebody gives them more money than they have ever  
4 wanted, that's great wherever it came from. And can we  
5 move on to No. 4?

6 DR. DEES: Right.

7 MS. SARNECKY: So, No. 4, 10-SCA-47, Dr.  
8 Drazinic, if you guys recall last meeting we were  
9 reviewing a request from Dr. Drazinic to -- she had  
10 various requests for her grant. There was an issue with  
11 acquiring the stem cell lines, and the IRB approval, and  
12 the continuation of the escrow approval. So --

13 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: -- and  
14 she had already spent most of.

15 MS. SARNECKY: Yes. We had asked Dr.  
16 Drazinic to come in and discuss the progress on her  
17 project. So, if you guys wouldn't mind we'll have Dr.  
18 Drazinic come on up.

19 DR. CAROLYN DRAZINIC: Hello.

20 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Thank you  
21 for your patience.

22 DR. DRAZINIC: Oh, no problem. It's been an  
23 interesting discussion.

24 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Were you

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 taking notes?

2 DR. DRAZINIC: Not quite. All I know is  
3 that it's very hard to get funding these days from all  
4 different kinds of sources. So thank you so much for the  
5 opportunity to talk with you about my project and, again,  
6 thank you so much for the initial funding. I really,  
7 really appreciate it.

8 When I first got funding I certainly was  
9 applying to the RFP's, etcetera to get things going and I  
10 didn't anticipate as many problems as I had encountered  
11 along the way. And -- but fortunately during the course  
12 of the past year it turns out that there were some human  
13 embryonic stem cells that were made available to the  
14 public from the Sydney In Vitro Fertilization Institute in  
15 Australia. And that was a really exciting development  
16 because then it allows us to basically use human embryonic  
17 stem cell lines from -- that are positive for the  
18 Huntington's Disease gene and use them for scientific  
19 research. And that's even perhaps more rigorous than using  
20 induced Pori potent stem cells.

21 So, anyway, with that opportunity having  
22 come along I did request from the Foundation that was  
23 behind this research in Australia, and in fact behind a  
24 lot of the Huntington's Disease research, the CHDI

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 Foundation, a private foundation, I specifically asked  
2 them if I would be able to have access to those cell  
3 lines. And I'm very pleased to report to you that they  
4 gave those cell lines to me for free in order to proceed  
5 to do research with them. And they have been shipped over  
6 to the UCONN stem cell core and they are there as of last  
7 month. And so I have the source material to proceed with  
8 the research and that's a tremendous, tremendous  
9 opportunity for me especially given the nervousness of our  
10 IRB supporting stem cell research and obtaining biopsy,  
11 etcetera.

12 So, anyway, so that -- so basically I'm  
13 requesting just in very simple, in simple terms, I'm  
14 requesting that there be an amendment to my original  
15 application, which was made before these stem cells ever  
16 existed, and to allow for me to use the human embryonic  
17 stem cell lines that I have obtained from Australia in  
18 order to do this research. And I think it would be much  
19 more rigorous and it's certainly available, and I think it  
20 will be a very exciting opportunity to make progress.

21 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: It must  
22 be really big relief to have gotten to this point now.

23 DR. DRAZINIC: I'm sorry.

24 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: It must

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 be a relief for you to have gotten to this point.

2 DR. DRAZINIC: It was a miracle,  
3 absolutely.

4 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: My  
5 recollection is that you are also awaiting IRB approval.

6 DR. DRAZINIC: Yes. So I have good news on  
7 that front too.

8 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Um, hmm.

9 DR. DRAZINIC: The behavioral gene bank,  
10 which was the original protocol that I had applied for  
11 this grant under, I was approved as of September 15th.  
12 However, the IRB has all these caveats, etcetera. They  
13 wanted me to split up the behavioral gene bank into a  
14 protocol for putting cells in and then another for taking  
15 cells out and so a lot of different stipulations. I think,  
16 again, it speaks to their nervousness about stem cell  
17 research and just the whole process. But the escrow  
18 committee at UCONN has approved using the anonymous cell  
19 lines from Australia pending approval of this Committee.  
20 So, I think that is where -- I think that is going to be  
21 the most reasonable approach, at this time, given the two  
22 year window for doing this research basically.

23 DR. GENEL: So does that mean essentially  
24 that you've given up on using cells that you derived from

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 patients here and you'll concentrate on using the cell  
2 lines from the, the Australian cell lines?

3 DR. DRAZINIC: I plan to concentrate on  
4 using the Australian cell lines from this point forward.  
5 Now, like I said, the behavioral gene bank has finally  
6 been approved as of last week. So I would be able to  
7 obtain skin biopsies from patients with Huntington's, but  
8 I think given how much time it's going to take now to get  
9 that going and to also have that go through the -- on GCRC,  
10 the -- now it's the CRC, Clinical Research Center, their  
11 IRB, so that's a second IRB I have to go through. And  
12 really I need their resources in order to make the fiber  
13 blast and bank them, and then the stem cell core would  
14 also be involved in making the IPC's themselves, and then  
15 the expense of all of that, etcetera.

16 I think it just makes more sense to use the  
17 cells that I have for this in terms of the expense, the  
18 time, more IRB approvals. Using these anonymous cell  
19 lines it's approved pending this Committee's approval.  
20 It's ready to go. All I would need to do is for you all  
21 to say, yes, I can do this. Then the grant funds would be  
22 unfrozen. I would be able to hire a post-doc and get  
23 going.

24 DR. GENEL: Remind me, was your initial

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 proposal primarily an in vitro one? It did not require --

2 DR. DRAZINIC: -- yes, that's correct.

3 DR. GENEL: It did not require implantation  
4 back --

5 DR. DRAZINIC: -- no, no, no. this is all  
6 laboratory based, basic research, absolutely.

7 DR. GENEL: Yes.

8 DR. DRAZINIC: All molecular biological  
9 research in the laboratory. The only thing involving the  
10 patients is taking a little piece of skin, that's it.

11 DR. FISHBONE: Carolyn, I couldn't quite  
12 follow, I couldn't quite understand why, you know, we've  
13 funded a lot of grants over the five years we've been  
14 giving out money. Why were you specifically running into  
15 so much problem with the IRB and --

16 DR. DRAZINIC: -- it's -- it beats me  
17 actually. But, you know, that's the short answer. The  
18 longer answer would be I think this particular panel,  
19 there just some fundamental things that maybe they didn't  
20 quite understand about stem cells. For example, they were  
21 not aware that we already bank induced pluri-potent stem  
22 cells at UCONN. They just weren't aware and they were  
23 saying, I'm not allowed to bank. So I basically educated  
24 them about that. They were insisting, at one point, that

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 I remove the word research from the behavioral gene bank  
2 consent form. And I said, well, the whole purpose of  
3 collecting the samples is for future research and so I had  
4 a little bit of a struggle with them around that.

5 And then there were more mundane kind of  
6 issues that, such as they wanted everything in 8th grade  
7 language, you know, and those kinds of things. So every  
8 deferral they did was over these things like that. Some of  
9 it was just educating the Committee members about stem  
10 cell research and what is involved. And some it was just  
11 things at a more federal, global IRB movement level like  
12 the 8th grade language, those kinds of things.

13 DR. FISHBONE: I just don't recall -- does  
14 anybody recall any other grant that's had --

15 DR. GENEL: -- yes, we had another one that  
16 discussed that --

17 DR. FISHBONE: -- this much problem?

18 DR. GENEL: Yes.

19 DR. DRAZINIC: Mainly it's because other  
20 grants are usually using anonymous cell lines. I mean I  
21 think that's the primary difference. In this case, I'm  
22 actually getting skin biopsies and I think, for instance,  
23 the head of the IRB is a nurse. I don't think she  
24 necessarily, you know, certainly has reviewed many

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 protocols, but, you know, does she really understand, you  
2 know, it's minimal risk. It's all of those things. I  
3 think stem cell research still has this kind of enigma  
4 around it that can be scary for an IRB that's not familiar  
5 with it.

6 DR. GENEL: The consent was to get the skin  
7 biopsy.

8 DR. DRAZINIC: Yes, that's it exactly. And  
9 actually the IRB had approved it back in March of 2010  
10 before getting these skin biopsies from Huntington's  
11 patients, before I ever learned that I received this  
12 grant. And so they were totally fine with it, but then  
13 suddenly when I received funding, they said, oh, no, now  
14 we're thinking about, you know, changing the rules on me  
15 basically. So -- and then the GCRC got nervous about it  
16 too and so, you know, so between one IRB making them happy  
17 and another IRB making them happy, and they're all being  
18 happy at the same time it was really difficult to do that.  
19 So that's why I think it was just a real blessing that the  
20 anonymous cell lines came through and I was able to get  
21 those. And I can move past the issues. I can still  
22 continue to work on those issues in parallel, but I really  
23 want to put my focus on the anonymous cell lines.

24 DR. WALLACK: I have some confusion and so,

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 please, forgive me.

2 DR. DRAZINIC: Sure, no problem.

3 DR. WALLACK: The escrow approval.

4 DR. DRAZINIC: Yes .

5 DR. WALLACK: Is that a provisional  
6 approval based upon our approval?

7 DR. DRAZINIC: That's correct.

8 DR. WALLACK: David, don't we normally get  
9 the escrow first?

10 DR. GOLDHAMMER: It's usually the other way  
11 around.

12 DR. FISHBONE: Our approval is based on  
13 their approval.

14 DR. DRAZINIC: They basically wanted this  
15 Committee, your committee to say that it was okay for me  
16 to use these anonymous cell lines, because they didn't  
17 exist when I made the original grant, and say that it's  
18 okay for me to use the funds from this grant to support  
19 this work using these anonymous cell lines. And that this  
20 is okay for us to do and then they will unfreeze the grant  
21 funds.

22 DR. WALLACK: Okay. I hear that. I  
23 understand what you said.

24 DR. DRAZINIC: Yes.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 DR. WALLACK: But it -- I still don't  
2 understand why the process is being developed as it is and  
3 what we normally get is the escrow approval --

4 DR. DEES: -- it's different than what we  
5 approved originally.

6 DR. DRAZINIC: You had approved -- and  
7 these are the Australian cell lines which didn't exist  
8 when I did the original grant.

9 DR. WALLACK: So the IPS.

10 DR. DRAZINIC: Um, hmm. Yes.

11 DR. WALLACK: Cells, so there is some sense  
12 that there was confusion. I guess I'm confused because  
13 there is a lot of IPS work that's being done at UCONN. I  
14 mean -- I have not heard that there was any confusion with  
15 the subject of IPS at UCONN. I mean --

16 DR. DRAZINIC: -- so, IPS cell lines they  
17 can also be anonymous. For instance, I'm trying to get  
18 some from the Harvard Stem Cell Institute and those are  
19 IPS cell lines, etcetera. And so that has -- that has  
20 also encountered some bureaucratic delays, you know, not  
21 in my control. It's just the institutions debating on  
22 contract language, who owns what, you know, etcetera,  
23 those kinds of things. But -- and then there are the IPS  
24 cell lines that you obtain from patients that you see in

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 the clinic at the institution, at UCONN. And so that's a  
2 different kind of IPS cell line. And, so, yes, that kind  
3 of work has been done previously but I think there has  
4 been overall a movement to be more conservative by the  
5 IRB's. I think they're just becoming more conservative  
6 over the years and I think -- I think what I am  
7 experiencing is just a symptom of that. And I have talked  
8 with colleagues at other institutions and they have  
9 encountered the same issues with their IRB's. There is  
10 just a general increased fear and increased, increased  
11 difficulties in terms of getting what used to be very  
12 straightforward protocols through the IRB's. So it's  
13 taking a long time.

14 DR. WALLACK: The last question.

15 DR. DRAZINIC: Sure.

16 DR. WALLACK: On the budget.

17 DR. DRAZINIC: Yes.

18 DR. WALLACK: It seems as though there has  
19 been a 14,000 dollar -- what has the expenditure been so  
20 far from the 100,000 dollars?

21 DR. DRAZINIC: It has only been -- I have  
22 not purchased any equipment. I have not paid any salary.  
23 And the institution chose to use the 10 percent to support  
24 my salary to get all of these institutional approvals.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 That's pretty much it. So everything else is in tact.

2 DR. FISHBONE: So, it's a matter of  
3 unfreezing the 77 percent.

4 DR. DRAZINIC: Exactly.

5 DR. FISHBONE: That's left so you can do -  
6 - is it a two year grant?

7 DR. DRAZINIC: Yes, it's a two year grant  
8 so I haven't really started it.

9 DR. GENEL: So you'll be asking for an  
10 extension.

11 DR. DRAZINIC: Absolutely. Absolutely. If  
12 you could give it to me now that would be great.

13 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: As you  
14 look down the road do you think the bugs are behind you?  
15 Is there anything that you wanted to say to us you hope  
16 you don't reach this hurdle?

17 DR. DRAZINIC: I hope -- you know, you all  
18 are the grant funding agency. I hope that when, you know -  
19 - I think there ought to be maybe some discussion and  
20 collaboration with IRB panels about, you know, not  
21 changing the rules in midstream when you all have agreed  
22 to fund and support a project that they don't suddenly  
23 change the rules. You know, that there is some kind of  
24 grandfathering. And I think that's something that would

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 have certainly helped in my situation.

2 DR. FISHBONE: Well, we don't know the  
3 rules. We approve the scientific --

4 DR. DRAZINIC: -- exactly.

5 DR. FISHBONE: And then you have to have  
6 the escrow approval.

7 DR. DRAZINIC: Right, no problem there.

8 DR. FISHBONE: We never had a situation  
9 where they said, well, they won't give you the escrow  
10 until -- that's a little unusual.

11 DR. DRAZINIC: Yes, I think it's unusual  
12 too.

13 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Any  
14 questions from anyone on the telephone?

15 DR. HART: It sounds like all we need is a  
16 motion to approve, right?

17 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Was that  
18 it?

19 DR. HART: Yes, sure.

20 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Okay.

21 DR. HART: It's Ron Hart. I move to approve  
22 the modification to the protocol using the Australian stem  
23 cells.

24 A VOICE: I'll second that.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Okay.

2 Moved and seconded. Any discussion?

3 DR. GOLDHAMMER: So the Committee is not  
4 approving the release of funds, per say, because that  
5 really should wait until formal escrow approval is in.  
6 We're approving the change in scope to include these lines  
7 and the provisional then on escrow and IRB approval.

8 DR. HART: The intent of the motion was  
9 just to approve the modification to the original grant.

10 DR. HISKES: And will somebody in authority  
11 notify the escrow committee, the escrow committee at  
12 UCONN?

13 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

14 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Yes.

15 DR. HISKES: Okay.

16 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Chelsey  
17 said yes.

18 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.

19 DR. GENEL: And it's only the escrow  
20 approval we need it's not the --

21 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: -- at  
22 this point for --

23 DR. GENEL: -- it's not the IRB.

24 DR. DRAZINIC: That's right.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 DR. GENEL: Because there is no human  
2 contact involved at this point.

3 (Whereupon, inaudible discussion occurred  
4 between Ron Hart and Anne Hiskes)

5 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Okay.  
6 So, for the transcription purposes, we need the telephone  
7 speakers to identify themselves. I think we're pretty  
8 accurate, but not accurate enough.

9 DR. HART: You're right, I'm sorry.

10 DR. HISKES: Anne Hiskes speaking.

11 DR. HART: And I was responding as Ron  
12 Hart.

13 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Thank  
14 you. Would you like to hear the motion repeated?  
15 Everybody is okay? All right.

16 DR. GENEL: Call the question.

17 MS. SARNECKY: All those in favor?

18 ALL VOICES: Aye.

19 MS. SARNECKY: Any opposed? Okay.

20 DR. DRAZINIC: Thank you so much.

21 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: One  
22 abstention. Anne Hiskes and David Goldhammer are  
23 abstaining.

24 DR. DRAZINIC: Thank you so much. I

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 appreciate it.

2 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Thank  
3 you.

4 MS. SARNECKY: Okay. So, in the essence of  
5 time it's almost 20 minutes to 3:00, I'm hoping that the  
6 Committee would agree with me that it might be a little  
7 bit easier if we go through Items 5 through 26. These are  
8 the annual reports. And the only reason why I figured it  
9 wouldn't be too terrible to group them off is that I've  
10 reviewed these annual reports. They've been  
11 institutionally endorsed. And the Committee has reviewed  
12 the reports. So I think this might be a good forum just to  
13 say if there is Items 5 through 26 if anyone has any  
14 issues with any of those annual reports.

15 DR. GENEL: I do.

16 MS. SARNECKY: Okay. Which one do you want  
17 to discuss?

18 DR. GENEL: It's the Srivastava grant.

19 MS. SARNECKY: Okay. We're talking about  
20 appear on the agenda, Item 19.

21 DR. GENEL: Is that 19 on the agenda?

22 MS. SARNECKY: 09-SCB-UCHC 17. Okay.

23 DR. GENEL: Well, this is now in the third  
24 year. It's in its third year of funding and they haven't

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 accomplished anything from what I gathered primarily for  
2 the same issues that we just discussed.

3 MS. SARNECKY: All right.

4 DR. GENEL: They're still waiting for  
5 escrow approval for lines. And --

6 DR. FISHBONE: -- they did a lot of  
7 administrative stuff.

8 DR. GENEL: Yes. It's a three year grant  
9 that started in '09. It expires next year. Of the amount  
10 that has been allocated they've already spent 333,000  
11 dollars and are still waiting for approval. And I'm not  
12 sure where the balk is here, but it seems to me to be  
13 generically very similar to what we just discussed and it  
14 makes me wonder what the administrative -- what the  
15 administrative capacities are at the health center for  
16 this to go on so long.

17 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Are the aims of the grant  
18 that could be accomplished without the approval or is that  
19 very dependent on approval?

20 DR. GENEL: Well, I can't -- I honestly  
21 can't tell. It does say that they have just begun to do  
22 some of the -- some of the --

23 DR. ISOLDE BATES: -- I don't know what  
24 happens initially it was the -- and I resent a corrected

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 report. So I don't know right now which report the  
2 Committee received. It is whatever --

3 MS. SARNECKY: -- this is the correct one.

4 DR. BATES: It was the correct?

5 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

6 DR. WALLACK: So, Mike, you want them to  
7 come before this group also?

8 DR. GENEL: Yes. I'd like to know how they  
9 spent two years getting approval and spending 333,000  
10 dollars?

11 DR. WALLACK: Right.

12 DR. BATES: And also, just to clarify, this  
13 grant initially belonged to Dr. C. Hi Lee, who left UCONN  
14 and then Dr. Srivastava took over midstream.

15 DR. GENEL: Ah, hah. Yes, I do recall  
16 that.

17 DR. BATES: He went down to South Carolina  
18 and Dr. Srivastava took the project on. He hired Dr.  
19 Basso to come in and assist with the -- you know, to take  
20 on over the stem cell work because Dr. -- I don't know if  
21 you're aware Dr. Srivastava is now the head of the campus  
22 at UCONN.

23 DR. GENEL: I still would like to find out  
24 --

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 MS. SARNECKY: -- okay. So would you like  
2 me to discuss that. Isolde and I can talk off line and  
3 would an email or a letter to the Committee help or do you  
4 want the researcher to come in and speak with us two  
5 months from now?

6 DR. GENEL: I think that's a good first  
7 step.

8 MS. SARNECKY: The email?

9 DR. GENEL: Yes.

10 MS. SARNECKY: Letter?

11 DR. GENEL: Yes. I think that's a good  
12 first step and then we can decide.

13 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.

14 DR. GENEL: Then we can decide if we need  
15 to go further.

16 MS. SARNECKY: Great.

17 DR. GENEL: I mean I'm just saying we're  
18 going into the third year of a three year grant and  
19 333,000 dollars -- I mean two third of the money has  
20 already been spent.

21 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.

22 DR. FISHBONE: I had one question about  
23 Massaro.

24 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 DR. FISHBONE: And that is I couldn't  
2 understand that they didn't seem to follow any format.  
3 Now, most of them say what their progress is, what  
4 problems they had, you know, etcetera. And this was just  
5 almost like a new application or I mean I'm sure there is  
6 a lot of stuff in there I couldn't get it out of it.

7 DR. DEES: Which one?

8 DR. FISHBONE: Massaro. Massaro, that's  
9 the number -- Yale 11. It's the sixth one on the agenda.

10 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I reviewed Massaro and I  
11 agree it's -- the format is not great. You can't tell --  
12 it's written like a new grant in a sense. You don't know -  
13 - but there is, in my reading of it, there was sufficient  
14 progress not be worried about it. She's a post-doc --

15 DR. FISHBONE: -- okay.

16 DR. GOLDHAMMER: It sounds like she's doing  
17 fine. I was not sure though, Chelsey, if she had requested  
18 a no-cost extension because it looks like there is -- the  
19 budget was also a little bit of a --

20 MS. SARNECKY: -- I can't remember of the  
21 top of my head.

22 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Anyway, but I agree.

23 MS. SARNECKY: She did request a no-cost  
24 extension.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 DR. HART: Ron Hart, on the phone, actually  
2 it's worse than that. The box is checked for a lay summary  
3 and there really is nothing in lay language.

4 DR. WALLACK: So, to Ron's point, and we  
5 say this all the time, can we then request back to her a  
6 lay summary and that will be our approval of her annual  
7 report will be contingent upon receiving of her annual  
8 summary.

9 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.

10 DR. HART: In 8th grade language.

11 DR. WALLACK: In lay language.

12 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.

13 DR. FISHBONE: Does that mean she won't get  
14 the next years until she does that?

15 MS. SARNECKY: I think she'll turn it  
16 around fairly quickly.

17 DR. GOLDHAMMER: So, Ron, you read Section  
18 3?

19 DR. HART: I was looking at it, yes.

20 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Okay. I mean it starts  
21 off quite good in lay language, I thought, and it gets a  
22 little more technical.

23 DR. HART: Exactly.

24 DR. GOLDHAMMER: But, yes, hers was

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 actually better than another one I read.

2 MS. SARNECKY: Okay. So, I have 09-SC-Yale-  
3 11, Massaro, I'm going to request a lay summary. The next  
4 year's funding is contingent upon that. 09-SCB-CHCH-17 for  
5 Srivastava send a letter from the Committee requesting an  
6 explanation, a better explanation. Were there any other  
7 issues? Did anyone --

8 DR. GOLDHAMMER: -- with other reports?

9 MS. SARNECKY: With other reports?

10 DR. GOLDHAMMER: In the issue of lay  
11 summary --

12 MS. SARNECKY: -- okay.

13 DR. GOLDHAMMER: It is Li, Ki Li from Yale.

14

15 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.

16 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I don't know which one it  
17 was on the item.

18 MS. SARNECKY: Agenda.

19 DR. GOLDHAMMER: On the agenda.

20 MS. SARNECKY: Item No. 8.

21 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Okay.

22 DR. HART: I'm sorry.

23 DR. GOLDHAMMER: No. 8 on our agenda, Lee.

24 DR. HART: Okay.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 DR. GOLDHAMMER: That one really does need  
2 --  
3 MS. SARNECKY: -- another lay summary.  
4 DR. GENEL: I have one too, Chelsey.  
5 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.  
6 DR. GENEL: And let me just see here, I  
7 think it's Lichtler's grant?  
8 MS. SARNECKY: 09-SCB-UCHC20?  
9 DR. GENEL: Yes. First of all the lay  
10 summary has a number of missing words.  
11 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.  
12 DR. GENEL: I mean this needs to be -- it  
13 needs to be spell checked. It needs to be -- just to read  
14 it, "in the previous year had been working on such a  
15 method which we thought had produced a lot of bone." I'm  
16 reading it verbatim. "The past year we have tested  
17 several antibodies that hope would be specific for human",  
18 etcetera, etcetera.  
19 MS. SARNECKY: So, I'll add that to the  
20 list for a revised lay summary.  
21 DR. GENEL: Please use spell check.  
22 MS. SARNECKY: I'll make sure to note that.  
23  
24 DR. FISHBONE: I had one question, a budget

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 just sort of appeared out of the blue for Naegele.

2 MS. SARNECKY: Um, hmm.

3 DR. FISHBONE: And nothing else. And I  
4 don't -- yes, Naegele, No. 15. And it was a whole  
5 different format that said it was a Microsoft something or  
6 other. Or was that just an error in the way it came out?

7 MS. SARNECKY: Yes. Wesleyan, because  
8 Wesleyan had so few grants, and I don't mean this is in  
9 any negative way, but just because they have so few grants  
10 it's a little more difficult to keep up on the formatting  
11 and the way that they submit their reports and whereas I  
12 speak with Yale and UCONN on a more regular basis, so I  
13 think that it was the formatting issue.

14 DR. FISHBONE: Okay.

15 MS. SARNECKY: Okay. So any other  
16 questions?

17 DR. DEES: Richard Dees here, I have a  
18 question -- I'm looking at --

19 MS. SARNECKY: -- um, huh.

20 DR. DEES: And when I was reading it felt  
21 like I was reading the grant application and I couldn't  
22 figure out whether they had actually made any progress.

23 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.

24 DR. DEES: Maybe I had missed something,

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 but --

2 MS. SARNECKY: -- I think that was another,  
3 a similar issue that Dr. Genel had or, I'm sorry, Dr.  
4 Fishbone had noted with one of the earlier grants that it  
5 seemed as though it was very similar to their initial  
6 proposal.

7 DR. DEES: I couldn't figure out what they  
8 had actually done.

9 MS. SARNECKY: Okay. So I can do the same  
10 thing for that grant as well and ask, send them a letter  
11 from the Committee asking for more information.

12 DR. FISHBONE: Which one is that?

13 DR. DEES: All right.

14 MS. SARNECKY: Agenda 17, 09-SCB-CHC07.

15 DR. FISHBONE: Oh, yes.

16 MS. SARNECKY: Any other comments?

17 DR. WALLACK: So with the -- can we move  
18 then the acceptance of the annual reports except for those  
19 that we're expecting further lay summaries and  
20 explanations for?

21 MS. SARNECKY: That sounds great.

22 DR. WALLACK: Okay.

23 MS. SARNECKY: Is that your motion?

24 DR. WALLACK: Yes.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 MS. SARNECKY: Second? All those in favor?

2 ALL VOICES: Aye.

3 MS. SARNECKY: Opposed? Okay. Great. So,  
4 moving onto, let's see here, moving onto Agenda No. 27,  
5 10-SCA-22, this is a budget reallocation request from  
6 Yale. The researcher has -- had budgeted for a post-doc  
7 associate and they decided to revise this, the post-doc  
8 associate salary due to them being awarded another grant  
9 within the institution. So, they wanted to reallocate the  
10 post-doc associate salary from the personnel category to  
11 the other category.

12 DR. DEES: Richard Dees here, I guess I'm  
13 not very comfortable with that. It says other, are --

14 MS. SARNECKY: -- no, the other category,  
15 if you look at the budget, the other category has -- oh, I  
16 see what you're saying.

17 DR. DEES: It's a ton of money, right?  
18 It's 50,000 dollars. It sounds like they're putting it in  
19 a slush fund.

20 MS. SARNECKY: Yes. Well, I can request  
21 clarification on that.

22 DR. DEES: I don't want to hold up the  
23 money.

24 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 DR. DEES: But I'd like to hear what  
2 they're going to use it for.

3 MS. SARNECKY: Okay. So are you saying  
4 that we can approve this request?

5 DR. FISHBONE: I have a question.

6 MS. SARNECKY: Sure.

7 DR. FISHBONE: The total sum of the grant  
8 was 100 dollars for the year.

9 MS. SARNECKY: Um, hmm.

10 DR. FISHBONE: And they've come up with  
11 50,000 extra. Should that go back to them or should that  
12 come back to us?

13 DR. DEES: If they have some use for it I'm  
14 happy to hear about it, but --

15 MS. SARNECKY: -- okay.

16 DR. FISHBONE: Do you have any thoughts on  
17 that, David?

18 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I think I would like to  
19 take the first step and see what they plan to use the  
20 money for.

21 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.

22 DR. HISKES: I agree with that, this is  
23 Anne Hiskes.

24 MS. SARNECKY: Great.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I mean if they're  
2 fortunate enough to have this post-doc salary come from  
3 other sources and they can use this money, hopefully, to  
4 good effect and make progress more quickly. So it's  
5 probably -- you know, it's probably fine, but they  
6 certainly need a justification of 50,000 extra dollars.

7 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.

8 DR. HISKES: I don't think we want to send  
9 mixed messages if you are successful getting extra money  
10 we're going to cut your grant.

11 DR. GOLDHAMMER: All right.

12 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.

13 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Put it in  
14 the core fund.

15 DR. WALLACK: So, I guess we're not  
16 approving --

17 MS. SARNECKY: -- okay, we're not going to  
18 approve this. Okay, great. Moving on to 28-10-SCB19, Dr.  
19 Qiu, another budget reallocation. So, Dr. Qiu wants to  
20 rebudget to -- this proposal was originally budgeted for  
21 four years. She gives a background, some background  
22 information here. The proposal is originally budgeted for  
23 four years and she was asked to take a budget cut and  
24 complete the project in three years. So, she wants to

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 move about 34,000 dollars from the materials and supplies  
2 category to the other personnel category and fringe  
3 benefits category. She'd like to hire a part time  
4 technician for a half a year. And that technician has  
5 various experience in human embryonic stem cell culture  
6 and molecular biology. And she can start working right  
7 away without any additional training, which is a plus.  
8 And then there is a request to rebudget 2,000 dollars from  
9 material and supplies to computer services to cover some  
10 of those costs.

11 DR. FISHBONE: This one is a little  
12 different than the last one because they save money by the  
13 way they did things so I think they're entitled to use it.

14 DR. HISKES: I'm in favor of the  
15 modification myself. This is Anne Hiskes speaking.

16 MS. SARNECKY: Great. So do we have a  
17 motion to approve?

18 DR. HISKES: I move to approve this budget  
19 modification.

20 DR. FISHBONE: I'll second it.

21 MS. SARNECKY: Great. All those in favor?

22 ALL VOICES: Aye.

23 MS. SARNECKY: Opposed?

24 DR. GENEL: Abstain. I abstained from the

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 previous one as well.

2 MS. SARNECKY: So, I have at the bottom of  
3 the agenda here this is an edited agenda for those on the  
4 phone. I just wanted to give an update on the 2011  
5 contracts. So, all of those contracts have been drawn up.

6 And they -- I actually spoke with Marianne this morning  
7 and she and I intend to sit down and just review them once  
8 more before we send them to the universities for  
9 execution. So that's where we are on the contract process.  
10 I just wanted to give you guys a little update.

11 And then as far as the 2012 RFP, we had discussed  
12 earlier about adding some of that language in and I will -  
13 - once I add that language in and discuss with Marianne we  
14 can get that out to the Committee hopefully for approval  
15 and we can send that RFP out to all of our people that  
16 have applied to the program, people that we think should  
17 apply to the program, and we'll get that process started.

18 And then lastly, the stem cell workshop  
19 committee update. I don't know if, Milt, you wanted to  
20 discuss this.

21 DR. WALLACK: Yes. Before I do that,  
22 though, can I just ask on the RFP.

23 MS. SARNECKY: Um, hmm.

24 DR. WALLACK: So, we had discussed before

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 maybe you relooking at the amounts to distribute for each  
2 category. We already did that with the cores before.  
3 This is crucial to what you will be sending out. And last  
4 year we, for example, on the established investigator we  
5 reduced the grant from million dollars to 750,000 dollars.  
6 And during the process on July 18th there was discussion  
7 about the possibility of whether or not we could reduce  
8 any of the amounts even further.

9                   And so I'm just putting that on the table  
10 if the Commissioner wants to pursue the conversation, but  
11 my own sense is that, again, for the same reasons as I  
12 indicated before that is there are a lot of very good  
13 grants that are out there that we, unfortunately, can not  
14 fund. And I'm just wondering if a further reduction in the  
15 various categories, not just one category but the various  
16 remaining categories is something we shouldn't look at.  
17 I'll give you an example. The -- we're 750,000 out. We  
18 reduced -- my sense is that if we reduced it to 650 there  
19 is a 25,000 dollar difference there. It's 187 to 162. We  
20 did that, for example, with Theresa's grant. And there was  
21 no issue at all, no problem at all in his acceptance of  
22 the grant. And, in fact, if I remember correctly he  
23 expressed great appreciation for receiving the grant.

24                   The -- when we did the disease directed

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 grant, which was pegged in at two million dollars or  
2 something like that, yes, two million dollars, we actually  
3 wound up funding it, Dealy's grant, for example, 1. --  
4 1,290,000 or something like that. And it did not, from  
5 what I gather, inhibit the project. I don't --

6 DR. FISHBONE: -- we don't know yet.

7 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

8 DR. FISHBONE: She hasn't done it.

9 DR. WALLACK: Well, I don't think you got  
10 any response from Dealy that the project, unless I'm  
11 wrong, that the project couldn't be done.

12 MS. SARNECKY: I wouldn't say that there  
13 was a response that the project couldn't be done because I  
14 think if someone is going to write you a check for 1.2  
15 million dollars you'll get the project done.

16 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: You'll  
17 take the money.

18 MS. SARNECKY: Yes, exactly. You'll do what  
19 you can with the 1.2 million dollars. I wouldn't say that  
20 -- I guess I'll just leave my comments at that.

21 DR. FISHBONE: She expressed some --

22 MS. SARNECKY: -- there is some concern.  
23 There is always going to be concern when someone applies  
24 for a grant that a million dollars over what they

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 received. Well, I wanted to do this and this was  
2 contingent upon that. But, again, you make it work when  
3 you're awarded a certain amount of money and she's not  
4 going to say, you know what, I'm not going to take the  
5 money because it's not what I wanted. So, I think there  
6 is --

7 DR. WALLACK: -- I'm not bringing this up  
8 to not spend the money. I want to spend the money. But I  
9 think what I'm trying to say, and I've said this for the  
10 last two years and that's why we reduced it 250,000  
11 dollars on the established investigator, that I think  
12 there is -- there is some worthiness in expanding the pool  
13 not at the expense of the excellence of the projects out  
14 there. And I guess what I'm seeing, and maybe I'm wrong,  
15 is that some very fine researchers seem to be able to  
16 function at certain levels that we original didn't  
17 anticipate they could. And so that's all I'm saying.

18 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Well,  
19 we've had this conversation though about if you can -- the  
20 feeling is 450,000 maybe people will apply for 449.

21 DR. WALLACK: Right.

22 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: 999, or  
23 something like that. So, I mean there is a part of that.  
24 And, you know, we all -- we have to rely on their telling

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 us whether or not they can do the work or apply for some  
2 modification in the scope of their research. I don't know  
3 how we get around that. I don't know how we get around  
4 it.

5 DR. GOLDHAMMER: You know, I think it's  
6 very difficult to tell if it's project dependent. I think  
7 if we reduce it to 650 and then gave the same investigator  
8 550 he'd write back the same letter with the same tone and  
9 the same -- you wouldn't get a hint that he can't do the  
10 research because you're giving him a half million dollars.

11 So it may be -- I'm sure it's the case that in some cases  
12 researchers can do with a little less than they're being  
13 awarded. But I wouldn't use the tone of their response to  
14 the cut as an indicator of whether or not that's --

15 DR. WALLACK: -- so, maybe I misstated  
16 that. I guess a better way of saying it -- it has not  
17 seemed to impede projects going forward in all the five  
18 years we've been doing this.

19 DR. GOLDHAMMER: It's just hard to know  
20 because we can't, at the end point, we're not kind of  
21 analyzing -- we can't know what would have happened with  
22 the extra money. And we're not really in a position to  
23 kind of look at how the money has influenced progress.  
24 What it means if Dreshy has a 100,000 dollars less he'll

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 hire like 50 percent effort of a technician each year of  
2 the length of the grant. So progress will be slower. I  
3 mean he'll still do good work. He'll get a lot done. He'll  
4 get less done than he would have gotten done.

5 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: You know  
6 what you could do? If you just wanted to float your  
7 curiosity and your interest out there, if people actually  
8 come to the workshop you can say, you know, I was  
9 wondering about this. What do you think? And put it out  
10 there to some of the potential applicants and see what  
11 they tell you.

12 DR. WALLACK: All right.

13 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: It will  
14 be good.

15 DR. GENEL: What were those numbers again  
16 that you were talking about?

17 DR. WALLACK: So, we cut the established  
18 investigator 250,000 last year to 750,000. The original  
19 conversation for last year was at 650 and we compromised  
20 at 750. So, on an annual basis the 750 comes to 187,500  
21 per year. At 650, over four years, it comes to 162,500 or  
22 25,000 differential.

23 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Just one other comment, I  
24 mean I think if you cut the established investigator down

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 further let's say to 650 and so now you're at a level of  
2 funding that's about 50,000 dollars more per year than a  
3 seed grant, which when you take -- when you take fringes  
4 and so forth it's less than the cost of a technician.  
5 There is supposed to be a real fundamental difference,  
6 think, between a seed grant, an exploratory in a new area,  
7 versus an established grant where they're supposed to hit  
8 the ground running. They have a team together. We run the  
9 risk of really turning an established grant into a seed  
10 type grant.

11 So maybe the solution is to, we always  
12 can't fund fewer established grants, only the best of the  
13 best and thereby save money during the final decision  
14 cycle, but to reduce upfront and further -- I just worry  
15 that we're -- that the category is not now satisfying kind  
16 of what we want it to satisfy anymore. That it's really  
17 just not that different from a seed grant. That's what I  
18 worry about.

19 DR. GENEL: No, I agree with Dave. I think  
20 there is always the option, as we've done, to fund some of  
21 the grants totally and to partially fund a few somewhere  
22 down at the bottom of the list. I mean we've done that.

23 DR. FISHBONE: The one thing that I've  
24 always wondered is we have a number of established

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 investigators, I think, that we're funding for four years,  
2 I think. I'm wondering, you know, since the research  
3 changes so much. It's such an actively growing and  
4 changing field whether we could maybe fund more grants by  
5 saying we'll fund you for three years and then reapply  
6 based on, you know, for the next cycle based on what  
7 you've accomplished. Because so many of them seem to  
8 change direction between, you know, year one and year  
9 three or four as new things are discovered. So, I mean  
10 you might save some money by saying, we'll fund the  
11 established investigator for three years.

12 DR. GENEL: In another year we're not going  
13 to have much choice.

14 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Right.

15 DR. GENEL: We're running out of years.

16 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: I've  
17 received a notice that there is another meeting coming in  
18 here.

19 DR. GENEL: Okay. I think we're done.

20 DR. WALLACK: Well, do you want me to do  
21 the workshop real quickly then?

22 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Yes. And  
23 anything that we can do on that electronically, but if you  
24 want to give us the headline.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 DR. WALLACK: I'll give you the headline  
2 and Chelsey can send it out electronically. Basically,  
3 we're looking for a date. It's going to be in November  
4 hopefully. And the purpose will be educational, to share  
5 the knowledge, to open up and be more inclusive of who is  
6 out there.

7 The second purpose of it, and this came out  
8 of a very, very -- it came out of an excellent  
9 subcommittee meeting that we had here about a week ago.  
10 And the attendees were Mike Genel, Gerry Fishbone, and  
11 Paul Piscatello. The second objective was public  
12 relations and that's basically to communicate our  
13 accomplishments and to be expansive and indicate our want  
14 to be more inclusive. The second thing we talked about was  
15 who to invite in an outline fashion an expanded view of  
16 the universities, the hospitals, business and industry,  
17 advocacy groups, and legislators. In the business and  
18 industry we talked about in-state versus of out-of-state  
19 and we have a mechanism that we put together of how to  
20 reach out in-state and also out-of-state. On the  
21 legislators the idea was to do leadership as well as  
22 chairs of the public health, commerce and appropriations,  
23 and then email blast the rest of them.

24 The program would have three components.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 Hopefully the Commissioner giving the overview for the  
2 program and our scientific achievements. A panel of four  
3 people who will talk to the nuts and bolts of the program,  
4 Chelsey and Marianne, I believe, are scheduled for that.  
5 There are some people we have to talk to in addition --  
6 and then the wrap up. The location, we're looking at, is  
7 the LOB. And the last thing was the date and the date will  
8 be dependent on those people who we really desperately  
9 feel is important to be on the program.

10 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Sounds  
11 good. I just looked at my calendar it's not on there yet,  
12 but only one other thing is.

13 MS. SARNECKY: Perfect. So I will send you  
14 an email after this meeting.

15 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Okay.  
16 She's going to send me an email and we'll get it all  
17 straight.

18 DR. WALLACK: Okay, great. Thank you.

19 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: All  
20 right.

21 MS. SARNECKY: The only thing --

22 DR. WALLACK: -- oh, one other thing.

23 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Yes.

24 DR. WALLACK: We need to put that on the

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 RFP. We've been instructed by Marianne Horn to do that.

2 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Right.

3 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

4 DR. GENEL: Put what on it?

5 DR. WALLACK: The fact that this is  
6 available because otherwise it would be -- it was viewed  
7 by Henry Salton as being an unfair advantage to the people  
8 in attendance so therefore we have to open it --

9 DR. GENEL: -- so you put it on the RFP.

10 DR. WALLACK: Yes.

11 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN:

12 Announcing that --

13 DR. GENEL: -- yes.

14 DR. GOLDHAMMER: We had been asked for  
15 other language, potential changes in the RFP and I thought  
16 we were going to discuss them at a meeting. We haven't  
17 done that. Should this be something other -- I'm not  
18 talking about the major kind of changes, is this something  
19 we should do by email then?

20 MS. SARNECKY: Yes, send them to me and  
21 I'll incorporate them if you could send them to me.

22 DR. GOLDHAMMER: And agreed upon by the --

23 MS. SARNECKY: -- go ahead.

24 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Are we allowed to do that

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 by email? I thought that is not --

2 MS. SARNECKY: -- I think you can send me  
3 changes. I can incorporate them into the RFP and then once  
4 there is a full discussion about the RFP and the final RFP  
5 those will be in there that the Committee can discuss at a  
6 later date.

7 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: If you  
8 put them -- if you send us something -- if it shows up in  
9 track changes or some other way that people know where to  
10 look that might be helpful.

11 MS. SARNECKY: Perfect.

12 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Public  
13 comments?

14 A VOICE: I would just like to ask you do  
15 you know when the start date is for the grant deadline for  
16 the new RFP and for the 2011 grants?

17 MS. SARNECKY: So the contract for the new  
18 -- the 2011 grants we were looking for an October 1st  
19 start date. If that doesn't work for the universities or  
20 the Committee then we can alter that. But we had initially  
21 discussed an October 1 start date. I don't know if we can  
22 rush the process in terms of me coordinating with DPH for  
23 funding, if that can help. You know, CI can execute the  
24 contracts very quickly. Just walk down to the President's

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 office and have him sign it. So, he has been in the  
2 process the whole time. So maybe if I can coordinate with  
3 Marianne on expediting the process on that end that could  
4 be good.

5 And then for the 2012 RFP I think we wanted  
6 to stick with the same deadlines as last year or around  
7 the same timeframe. We, obviously, have this RFP workshop  
8 that we want to work around. So I would say probably the  
9 final deadline for a 2012 proposal submission would be  
10 around the January 2012 time period. Does that sound right  
11 to everybody? Last year it was January for the final  
12 submission.

13 A VOICE: Thank you.

14 MS. SARNECKY: You're welcome.

15 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Sounds  
16 great.

17 DR. GENEL: Motion to adjourn.

18 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: I just  
19 wanted to say I really appreciate the work of this  
20 Committee. We started the meeting saying I go to a lot of  
21 meetings, I look forward to these. So thank you everybody  
22 for all that you do.

23 DR. GENEL: Thank you.

24 DR. DEES: Excuse me, our next scheduled

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

1 meeting is when?

2 MS. SARNECKY: I believe October -- let me  
3 just pull up my calendar. I'm sorry. October 18th.

4 DR. DEES: October 18th?

5 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

6 DR. DEES: Okay.

7 CHAIRPERSON COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Great.

8 Okay, thank you. Thank you very much.

9 (Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at  
10 3:14 p.m.)

11