

VERBATIM PROCEEDINGS

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
COMMISSIONER DR. JEWEL MULLEN, CHAIRPERSON
MAY 17, 2011

CONNECTICUT INNOVATIONS
865 BROOK STREET
ROCKY HILL, CONNECTICUT

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

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

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

5
6
7
8 MR. WARREN WOLLSCHLAGER: I call the
9 meeting to order. And it's my pleasure to introduce to
10 you, those of you who haven't met Dr. Mullen before, our
11 new Commissioner of Health, Dr. Jewel Mullen. Dr. Mullen
12 is multi-credentialed, is Board certified in internal
13 medicine, and a graduate of Mount Sinai -- you did a
14 little bit of time in Mount Sinai, I think -- Masters and
15 Bachelors in Public Health from Yale as well as public
16 administration from Harvard. So, she brings a breadth, a
17 wealth of both clinic and public health experience to the
18 Department and it's really -- it's going to be an exciting
19 time for the Department really to step back into the
20 public health arena a little more visibly. So we're happy
21 to have her on Board.

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

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

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

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

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

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

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

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

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

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

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

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

15 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Okay.

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

18 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: A pediatrician?

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

23 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Great.

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

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

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

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

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

13 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Hello.

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

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

23 MS. PAULA WILSON: I'm Paula Wilson. I'm
24 the administrator at the Yale Stem Cell Center.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Nice to meet you.

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

9 So can we have a motion to accept the minutes?

10 DR. GENEL: I move approval.

11 DR. WALLACK: Second.

12 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Any discussion? Great.

13 All in favor, aye?

14 ALL VOICES: Aye.

15 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Ayes have it.

16 Chelsey, are you going to walk us through
17 the various modifications and requests?

18 MS. SARNECKY: I sure will.

19 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay.

20 MS. SARNECKY: So the first few items on
21 the agenda are no cost extensions. We've got --I sent
22 around the budget sheets for the no cost extensions.
23 Pretty routine. The grant is ending we need to carryover
24 some left over funding. We'll start with 09SCBUCHC09,

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 Shapiro. This is a carryover of about 31,000 dollars.
2 And, you know, I reviewed this one and the carryover is
3 pretty self explanatory, the justification here. There is
4 the cost of living increases and the fringe benefits,
5 which you -- which everyone will see throughout the UCONN
6 Health Center carryovers as well.

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

11 MS. SARNECKY: I think Agenda Items No. 3
12 through 7 are pretty routine.

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

16 MS. SARNECKY: Perfect. Agenda Item No. 4,
17 Dr. Lichtler at the Health Center, 09SCBUCHC20, carryover
18 is about 33 or 43,000 dollars. And, again, there is just
19 the carryover due to furlough adjustments, fringe
20 benefits.

21 (Off the record)

22 MS. SARNECKY: We're not sure what
23 happened, but we could hear everyone but nobody could hear
24 us. So I'm glad we're all together again.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Thank you for your
2 patience hanging in there.

3 MS. SARNECKY: Thank you. Okay.

4 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: We finished everything
5 while you couldn't hear us.

6 MS. SARNECKY: The meeting is over.

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

10 DR. HART: Yes.

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

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

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

22 Agenda Item No. 5, Dr. Xu, 09SCDUHC001,
23 there is -- this is the UCONN and Wesleyan core so we have
24 two budget carryover requests here. Dr. Xu is a \$167,000

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 dollar carryover, which over the life of the grant is not
2 a whole lot of money. And, you know, the same
3 justification in this grant as well. The Wesleyan
4 subcontract budget was -- actually most of the -- actually
5 carryover most of the budget so out of the \$28,000 dollars
6 for that year they're carrying over about 25.

7 Agenda Item No. 6, 09SCBUCHC17, Dr.
8 Srivastava, \$43,000 dollar carryover and their
9 justification of the same.

10 Agenda Item No. 7 --

11 DR. HART: -- Chelsey, what's the change in
12 UCONN's fringe benefit costs? What are they doing? What's
13 different?

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

19 DR. HISKES: These are our Health Center
20 people. They're totally different from the Storrs people
21 in terms of --

22 MS. SARNECKY: -- it just has to do with
23 the way that their benefits -- as Anne said the way their
24 benefits are structured. Is that sufficient or do you

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 want me to get more information on that for you?

2 DR. HART: I was just curious.

3 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.

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

5 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.

6 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Did you include the
7 separate carryover request from Dr. Grabel?

8 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

9 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: You did? Okay.

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

12 And lastly, Dr. -- we'll call him Dr. B
13 because I will not be able to -- okay, 09SCBUCHC01, this
14 one is \$28,000 dollar carryover. Did you have a question,
15 Commissioner?

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

20 MS. SARNECKY: Yes, that was my note that I
21 put on there.

22 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Right.

23 MS. SARNECKY: But I --

24 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: -- right. And since I

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 didn't have the carryover I didn't understand why it was
2 being carried over.

3 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.

4 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: So I just wanted to
5 understand. I thought I would ask. Did you get the answer
6 to the question?

7 MS. SARNECKY: No. I don't -- I kind of let
8 the Committee go through the requests if the Committee has
9 any questions then I would follow up with the researcher.
10

11 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Okay. I agree with
12 what you wrote.

13 MS. SARNECKY: Okay, perfect. So, on the
14 Grabel subcontract there is a justification here for the
15 variance for the personnel and it says, funds will be used
16 to cover PI's summer payroll expense. I see the
17 justification as why the money wasn't spent not what it's
18 to be used for, and that's in the original budget what it
19 is to be used for, but there is no mention as to why there
20 was such a big carryover here.

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

24 MS. SARNECKY: -- that's the majority of

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

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

11 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Are there other
12 questions for Chelsey?

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

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

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Got it.

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

4 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: All right.

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

10 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Thanks.

11 MS. SARNECKY: You're welcome.

12 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Other questions? For
13 folks on the phone, any questions?

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

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

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

20 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Do we have a second?

21 DR. WALLACK: Second.

22 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Any discussion? All
23 those in favor?

24 ALL VOICES: Aye.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Ayes have it. Thank
2 you.

3 Okay. So we want to move on to the annual
4 report now, annual and final reports? We have an annual
5 report from Graveley.

6 MS. SARNECKY: Dr. Wallack and Dr.
7 Kiessling were kind enough to offer to review these two
8 annual reports. The original end date on this Graveley
9 project was March of this year. And Dr. Graveley had
10 requested a not cost extension until July of this year.
11 So this covers the -- this last year of their grant and
12 we'll get another final report from March of 2011 through
13 July of 2011, we'll get that in September.

14 DR. WALLACK: And Dr. Xu also is working on
15 an extension as well.

16 MS. SARNECKY: Yes, that extension --

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

18 MS. SARNECKY: Is December. Let me just
19 double check. Yes.

20 DR. WALLACK: Okay. Do you want me to do
21 both at the same time?

22 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

23 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: These are a little
24 bigger, maybe we can just do one at a time just for

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 myself. That would be helpful to me.

2 DR. WALLACK: Okay. So if we start with
3 Graveley, Anne and I are basically on the same page with
4 both of these. The Graveley report indicates, again, that
5 the long term goal of the project is to understand the
6 contributions that alternative splicing makes to the gene
7 expression program of human embryonic stem cells. It goes
8 on further to say that this project will therefore allow
9 us to obtain a more thorough understanding of how
10 embryonic stem cells function, which is the essential
11 knowledge for the long term goal of directing the
12 differentiation of human embryonic stem cells into
13 specific cell types.

14 They've made good progress on their
15 objectives. They are, however -- they've missed in Year
16 No. 3 some of their milestones, but they anticipate that
17 now that they have all their collaborations worked out
18 that they will be able to, in fact, complete the project
19 as originally anticipated. They have one publication.
20 They have several, probably two in preparation right now.
21 And it seems again that we should be very pleased with the
22 collaborations that they've made with a number of people
23 in the state, mostly at the University of Connecticut and
24 also at Wesleyan with Laura Gabel.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

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

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

6 DR. WALLACK: I would move that.

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

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

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

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

21 DR. HART: Oh, biothermatic groups poll
22 these cites very routinely to do all kinds of things you
23 can't imagine, much of it is very imaginative that's why
24 it's hard to predict. But folks could just focus in on

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 what they're most interested in and find that data very
2 quickly.

3 DR. DEES: Okay. And then this helps them
4 develop what?

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

10 DR. DEES: -- appreciate that.

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

13 DR. WALLACK: That's why they missed one of
14 their milestones, Mike. They, however, feel as I
15 indicated before that because of the collaborations that
16 they were able to establish and they were working with a
17 very small initial team of people, they didn't anticipate
18 -- well, frankly it was a good problem because they
19 uncovered so much data that they had to be able to then
20 interpret the data and I think that's where they're
21 getting bogged down now. But with the collaborations
22 they'll have a better opportunity to do that. It seems as
23 though from, as I've read it and as Anne read it, that
24 they're on line to accomplish exactly what they set out to

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 do, and even better than they set out because they have
2 set up these collaborations.

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

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

15 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Yes, I think that was
16 instrumental.

17 DR. WALLACK: Right.

18 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So we have a motion from
19 Dr. Wallack to accept the annual technical progress report
20 from Dr. Graveley.

21 DR. HART: Second.

22 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Who was that that
23 seconded it?

24 DR. HART: Ron Hart.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Thanks, Dr. Hart. Any
2 other discussion? If I could just add one thing, Dr.
3 Gravely is for sure going to submit a final report after
4 the close of the 31st?

5 MS. SARNECKY: Once the close of the grant,
6 July 31st of this year, they have 60 days to send in their
7 final report in which case I'll forward it onto the
8 Committee.

9 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay, great. All right,
10 all those in favor?

11 ALL VOICES: Aye.

12 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Opposed? Ayes have it.
13 Thank you.

14 DR. WALLACK: So Xu's project, the overall
15 goal of the project is to search for target genes of two
16 essential signaling pathways that control the early fates
17 of human embryonic stem cells. I'll quote from the lay
18 summary also in that regard of the goal where he further
19 goes on to say that "this four year project is aimed to
20 decipher the molecular mechanisms that govern the early
21 fates of human embryonic stem cells." They've made -- they
22 are meeting their milestones. They're right on target.
23 They have established great collaborations. I was
24 impressed that one of the collaborations is with Weissel

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 with Jamie Thomson where Reneh comes from, actually, so
2 I'm not surprised, but I'm very happy that they've been
3 able to collaborate. And they've actually published
4 together one of three papers that have already come out of
5 this research. There are several other papers that are in
6 preparation at this particular time.

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

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

19 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yes.

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

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

23 MS. SARNECKY: To have them revise it a
24 little now.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 DR. WALLACK: I would agree.

2 MS. SARNECKY: Maybe not to bring back to
3 the Committee as a follow up item, but just for the public
4 purpose.

5 DR. WALLACK: For public consumption,
6 right.

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

8 DR. WALLACK: -- I think that's great.
9 Yes.

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

12 DR. WALLACK: Well, one of the things that
13 -- so on the last review the question came up what happens
14 to these reports and so forth. And there have been, I
15 don't know the number, but a high volume of hits on this
16 research so people are following this research. And I
17 think as Ron was saying to better understand how they
18 should be proceeding as well. So, the publications are of
19 notable journals, but also they've been getting through
20 the Internet some significant correspondence as well. So
21 the bottom line is we're making an impact in the field of
22 stem cell research.

23 DR. GENEL: Well, yes, I don't know that
24 the DPH website is necessarily the hottest ticket on the

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 Internet.

2 DR. WALLACK: No, this was through their
3 own --

4 MS. SARNECKY: -- it's getting there
5 though.

6 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: I will say that we -- a
7 lot of this information needs to get incorporated into the
8 annual report.

9 DR. GENEL: Yes.

10 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Which is no longer
11 required by statute. In fact, it was -- it was stopped
12 specifically by legislation last year. So that's not
13 getting out there.

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

21 MS. MARIANNE HORN: I think that's a great
22 idea. And Dr. Levine, Erin Levine who came to our
23 STEMCONN Conference, a Yale researcher, and he had taken
24 from all the stem cell states all of the different

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 research that they had done --

2 DR. GENEL: -- oh, yes, you're right. He
3 published some early stuff on that.

4 MS. HORN: Looked at trends in different
5 states.

6 DR. GENEL: Yes.

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

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

10 MS. HORN: Yes.

11 DR. GENEL: Yes, that was in Science -- I
12 recall, something like that.

13 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: When you consider that
14 for a site like the Department of Public Health website
15 for posting public information and we want to think about
16 literacy at an 8th grade reading level then it's important
17 for -- and the same thing that doctors have to learn how
18 to talk to patients in real English, it's important for us
19 to be able to impart information through that vehicle in a
20 way that it's meaningful to people. Especially because
21 some people will look and say what's this doing on the
22 Department of Public Health website anyway, what does it
23 have to do with my water, or my immunizations, or other
24 things. And it's obviously important, but it needs to be

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 as accessible as everything else that we think about as
2 for our public communication. So I appreciate the point.

3 DR. WALLACK: Well, if there is no further
4 discussion I would move that we accept this report as
5 presented.

6 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Did we need to come
7 take a look and make sure -- I know this doesn't need to
8 come back to the Committee, but I do want to make sure if
9 we're bothering to ask, to go through the time if you
10 would look or somebody would at least make sure that if
11 we're going to post some thing that --

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

14 DR. WALLACK: That's fine.

15 MS. SARNECKY: To have you take a look and
16 make sure that --

17 DR. WALLACK: -- I would give them a
18 timeframe also.

19 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

20 DR. WALLACK: Two weeks or three weeks.

21 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So would you accept an
22 amendment, an amendment to your motion?

23 DR. WALLACK: Sure, yes.

24 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: That it be accepted

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 subject to the -- subject to the resubmission of the lay
2 summary?

3 DR. WALLACK: Of the lay summary.

4 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Is there a second to
5 that?

6 DR. HISKES: I'll second that if I'm
7 allowed to being a UCONN person.

8 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay. So we're going to
9 accept it subject to a directive to resubmit a more lay
10 summary within the time period specified. All those in
11 favor?

12 ALL VOICES: Aye.

13 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Opposed? All right,
14 ayes have it. Thanks.

15 DR. GENEL: So if I might add
16 parenthetically, you know, it's not easy for some hard
17 scientists to write something that translates into lay
18 language. And it may well be something we might encourage
19 institutions to do is to provide some assistance to the
20 investigators in doing this. I mean, you know, thinking
21 about -- thinking about this there is the language of
22 science does not necessarily translate easily and it's a
23 language that these people talk about all day. So it
24 might -- maybe a suggestion that the institution's public

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 relations office or something provide assistance.

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

12 DR. GENEL: Well, you're right, that's a
13 good example.

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

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

17 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- that helped me
18 understand what he was talking about.

19 DR. WALLACK: Right. No question.

20 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay, so we're moving
21 onto the final report then.

22 DR. WALLACK: I'm sorry, after the final
23 report I do have a comment.

24 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: the final report from

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 Lai.

2 MS. SARNECKY: This is very quick. This is
3 a final report that we've received. Feel free to take a
4 look at it. If you have any comments or questions. There
5 is no action item on this specific report. This is more
6 of an FYI, but for the people that either reviewed this
7 grant initially or are interested in this I just wanted to
8 provide the final report. And, again, as the Committee
9 sees fit you're more than welcome to ask any questions
10 that I can bring back to the researcher.

11 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Can I ask just a
12 question.

13 MS. SARNECKY: Of course.

14 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So how do we track the
15 patent? We're supposed to be tracking that in terms of
16 potential return back to the state?

17 MS. SARNECKY: On a spreadsheet, but since
18 we haven't had any action, so to speak --

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

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

24 MS. SARNECKY: Which we receive and most of

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 the time it just says thanks, but --

2 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- okay. So this
3 doesn't require any action?

4 MS. SARNECKY: No, it does not.

5 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: All right, great.

6 Moving then to Agenda Item No. 11, the
7 grant review discussion.

8 DR. WALLACK: So, Warren, can I just ask a
9 question?

10 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Sure.

11 DR. WALLACK: It's appropriate to the
12 previous discussion and Mike's point and the
13 Commissioner's response about getting it out in front of
14 the public. We've had this discussion because I'm a
15 little concerned that our annual report after four or five
16 years of having it published is not going to be published.
17 And I'm just wondering if somehow or other we could re-
18 examine or have those appropriately involved in this to
19 re-examine the possibility of having it published again.
20 I, personally, have found it very, very valuable and it
21 wasn't just the scientific stuff that was in the report,
22 but economic implications, job creation and so forth. So
23 all stuff that's very, very appropriate to what's going on
24 in the state right now.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 Is there -- is it worth a discussion about
2 if we can pursue reinstating the publishing of the annual
3 report?

4 DR. HISKES: Who was the audience for that
5 report?

6 DR. WALLACK: Well, certainly all of the
7 stakeholders, researchers, those advocates -- but, and
8 also and most importantly the political, the legislators,
9 the legislators.

10 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Public health committee
11 and the governor.

12 DR. WALLACK: Right.

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

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

18 DR. HISKES: But we're all going paperless
19 these days.

20 DR. DEES: It will be published on the
21 Internet and --

22 MS. HORN: -- I'm sorry. If you're on the
23 phone could you identify who you are?

24 DR. DEES: That was Richard Dees.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 MS. HORN: Thank you.

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

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

7 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Well, there is really no
8 problem. I mean we were submitting it before because it
9 was mandatory by statute. It's very common for a lot of
10 our programs we have to submit annual reports. The
11 genesis for removing this requirement, I don't know, it
12 was in a bill that wasn't related to the stem cell
13 research actually.

14 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Was it part of a tech
15 bill, was it --

16 MS. HORN: -- what it was, it just seemed
17 to be just the program is running fine and we're going to
18 streamline some of the requirements.

19 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yes.

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

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

24 MS. SARNECKY: I think it was in a, if I

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 remember correctly, it was in a tech bill but it had to do
2 with public health statute. I think that was the bill it
3 was in.

4 DR. GENEL: That doesn't preclude you from
5 doing it.

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

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

18 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Are you waiting for me
19 to second? I was waiting to see whether somebody else
20 seconded and then some further discussion. I think the
21 other piece is who does it. And having that clarity
22 around the table with there not being a mandate with our
23 recognition that if it's -- finances we need to identify
24 what those are since they'll sit at DPH right now. And for

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 future consideration as technology and innovation are
2 burgeoning in the state to figure out whether or not this
3 publication or report becomes a part of a larger project
4 that outlines a lot of the evolution of biotechnology in
5 Connecticut. For this year, what will it take?

6 DR. GENEL: What did it take last year,
7 Warren?

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

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

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: And then turn it over.

17 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: And then do what?

18 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: And then turn it over to
19 whom?

20 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Right.

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

22 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: -- right.

23 DR. GENEL: Questioning.

24 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: You would have no

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 problem picking it up? So I'm big on if there is a task
2 that there is a hand on the other end of it.

3 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So we'll move on that
4 and we'll let folks now -- if you can let folks in your
5 institutions know that we're going to be reaching out to
6 them.

7 DR. WALLACK: Do you need a vote?

8 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Well, you have a motion
9 and a second, but I don't know what the motion was.

10 DR. WALLACK: Accept the consensus of the
11 group then.

12 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: We're talking about
13 that for this year and then we'll --

14 MS. HORN: -- what would the timing of that
15 be? Typically we did it in February.

16 DR. GENEL: The end of the year or is it
17 the end --

18 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- it was always
19 February 1. It's February 1st, but it's probably going to
20 be March 1st till --

21 DR. WALLACK: -- the upcoming legislative
22 process.

23 DR. GENEL: Okay.

24 MS. HORN: But we would want to include

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 this round of grants. Once these are completed ask for
2 the institutions to write in and then just cut and paste
3 from what we have.

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

6 DR. WALLACK: With the economic
7 implications and all of that.

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

10 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

11 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: And can you walk us
12 through that?

13 MS. SARNECKY: I thought that seeing as
14 we'll be spending the next meeting going over the grants
15 we should just go through and get this request done today.

16 This was a request from Yale -- if I remember here,
17 10SCA35. This is Dr. Lee is the PI for this grant. She has
18 resigned from her current position at Yale and is going to
19 be starting July 1 at New Jersey Institute of Technology.

20 The co-investigator for the grant has sent in a request
21 letter to move the PI role from Dr. Lee to herself. This
22 is Dr. Gang -- I apologize on the pronunciation, who also
23 has a few grants with the program right now. There is a
24 letter from the PI, Dr. Lee, giving her blessing for Dr.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 Gang to take over this grant. We have a budget
2 revision sheet and a justification sheet. The budget
3 revision sheet just shows the funding for Dr. Lee being
4 transferred to the new PI as well as a little bit of
5 funding being transferred to the other personnel for this
6 grant that would help out the new PI. And that other
7 personnel's CV is also -- was also sent to -- around to
8 everyone as well.

9 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Any questions for
10 Chelsey? Hearing none, do we have a motion to accept or
11 approve?

12 DR. WALLACK: Moved.

13 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Moved by Milt. Do we
14 have a second?

15 MR. MANDELKERN: Second.

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

18 ALL VOICES: Aye.

19 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Opposed? Great. The
20 ayes have it. Thank you, Chelsey.

21 MS. SARNECKY: Thank you.

22 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So we're ready to move
23 into a general discussion of how we're going to handle the
24 grant reviews this year.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 MR. MANDELKERN: Warren, one question for
2 Chelsey.

3 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

4 MR. MANDELKERN: Warren.

5 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yes, Bob.

6 MR. MANDELKERN: No. 10 I was not able to
7 open that final report. Did anybody else have that
8 difficulty?

9 MS. SARNECKY: I didn't hear from any of
10 the other Committee members that there was an issue, but I
11 can try to send it to you again, Bob, if you'd like.

12 MR. MANDELKERN: I just couldn't open it so
13 I'd appreciate that.

14 MS. SARNECKY: Of course. I'll send it to
15 you this afternoon.

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Thanks, Bob. Okay. So
17 talking about the grant review process many of you have
18 gone through it on multiple occasions. I think all of you
19 have gone through it at least once. So, you have some
20 sense of the process.

21 Basically, let me give you an update on the
22 peer review. At this point, there are ten peer reviewers.
23 We had three resignations right when the peer review
24 process started. So we're working with a group of ten.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 And I would say that they are moving more quickly than
2 they ever did before. We anticipate that there will be a
3 teleconference, a tele-meeting on next Thursday, which
4 will be the 26th. And hopefully at that point the peer
5 review committee will be moving on their recommendations.

6
7 I can tell you that there are, all of the
8 reviews have been submitted, both primary and secondary,
9 with the exception of one reviewer. So we've got 90
10 percent of the reviews in. And there are only, out of the
11 77, 77 applications there are only eight or nine that are
12 out of sync, that is that there is more than a three point
13 difference in the scoring. So those that are out of sync
14 will get an additional tertiary level review.

15 So we're going to be in good shape and
16 we're certainly going to be able to get you narratives and
17 scores well in advance of the July meeting. Our goal,
18 actually, is to have the peer reviews, at least the
19 routine, primary and secondary reviews, completed in the
20 month of May candidly so that we can process payment for
21 them during the current fiscal year.

22 DR. GENEL: Okay. You mentioned --

23 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- we just talked about
24 the peer review that should be done by this -- by the end

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

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

13 So, it's a Tuesday and a Wednesday, the
14 18th and 19th. So far, we've only heard, Chelsey, from one
15 member of the Committee. Originally Paul said he could
16 make it and then has since said he is not available either
17 of those days. We also have concerns -- you're going to
18 be out of the area.

19 DR. HISKES: In Michigan.

20 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: You know, and we didn't
21 know if we could try to hook you in electronically, Skype.

22 I mean certainly it's not going to be productive for you to
23 sit on the telephone. I mean that doesn't work, but if we
24 can hook you in through a computer that might be a little

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 more --

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

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

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

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

20 MS. SARNECKY: The Farmington Marriott.

21 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: I'm sorry, it's the
22 Marriott.

23 DR. GENEL: Out in Farmington.

24 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: I think we met there one

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 time.

2 DR. WALLACK: Logistics was very good
3 there.

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

8 MS. SARNECKY: We've got lots of experience
9 in that.

10 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay. Well, we do have
11 money left in the stem cell account to cover the costs
12 associated with that.

13 MR. MANDELKERN: What is the hotel, Warren?

14 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: It's a Marriott in
15 Farmington.

16 MR. MANDELKERN: Okay.

17 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: We met there once
18 before.

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

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

24 MS. SARNECKY: -- well, I had a

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

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

14 DR. GENEL: How many grants are there?

15 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: 77.

16 DR. GENEL: 77?

17 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: And it's --

18 MS. SARNECKY: -- 79.

19 DR. GENEL: 79? So that's 158 reviews. How
20 many -- without Paul how many are there on the Committee?

21

22 MS. SARNECKY: Ten.

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

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 DR. GOLDHAMMER: It is.
2 DR. GENEL: That's a sizeable number.
3 DR. HISKES: Last year I was unable to
4 attend physically, but --
5 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- you were there in
6 spirit.
7 DR. HISKES: But I shared my results.
8 DR. GENEL: With your alternate.
9 DR. HISKES: I don't know who those
10 alternates are.
11 DR. GENEL: That might be the way. It's
12 one way around it.
13 DR. GOLDHAMMER: It gives Paul input into
14 the process and I think that will work.
15 DR. HISKES: Actually, I had a full
16 conversation with my --
17 MS. SARNECKY: -- we can read Dr.
18 Pescatello's comments into the record.
19 DR. GENEL: That's right.
20 MS. SARNECKY: So we're certain that he has
21 his two cents in.
22 MS. HORN: He won't count as a vote, but
23 his opinion will certainly be considered. The difficulty
24 is when we get into the second and third rounds if we

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 wanted to go back to him and say, well, with respect to
2 that grant he won't have the ability to have input. But
3 that weighed against the workload I think it all needs to
4 get factored in.

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

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

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

8 DR. HISKES: We'll have to buy a little
9 camera.

10 MR. MANDELKERN: 15 to 16 reviews each is
11 much more than we've done in the past and therefore we
12 should allow, I think, for the two day period to do
13 justice to the reviews.

14 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Well, we're scheduling
15 it for two days so certainly we're not going to give
16 anybody a rush job, Bob, but your point is well made.
17 Last year was about the same. We had the same number of
18 reviewers. We actually had more applications. The bigger
19 deal is whether or not they are seed grants, or they are
20 disease specific grants, or core grants. Those, obviously,
21 the work involved in them, reviewing them is quite
22 different. I think -- so I think like about 60 percent of
23 these, 44 something like that, are seed grants.

24 MS. SARNECKY: We have 44 seed grants. And

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 we just have to keep in mind too that we now have the new
2 disease directed group grants. So, again, I think everyone
3 will be in a slight learning curve because no one has
4 reviewed any sort of grant like this before. So, we just
5 have to keep that in mind as well.

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

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

12 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- well, it was in the
13 RFP that it was not a priority this year, but that it
14 would be accepted. The actual language was "core funding
15 is not a priority for this round of funding. Some
16 additional core funding may be considered for applications
17 with novel or unusual scientific merit."

18 DR. GOLDHAMMER: It's similar language to
19 last time.

20 MS. SARNECKY: Um, hmm.

21 MS. HORN: And any enhancements or existing
22 cores would be considered as well.

23 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Other questions about
24 the upcoming process? Good.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 MS. HORN: If anybody wants to weigh in on
2 how we did it last year in terms of the cutoff points or
3 the amount of time that was given to grants. Remember we
4 took things and took a peer review and put them -- gave
5 them a minute or five minutes depending on the length of
6 the grant. I know we did a yes, no, maybe based on a quick
7 consensus.

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

11 MS. HORN: Yes.

12 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Anything six or less was
13 limited to a minute of discussion.

14 DR. GENEL: Yes. I think that was -- I
15 think that went well. I think that's not unreasonable.

16 MR. MANDELKERN: A part of the information
17 is the scale change this year.

18 MS. SARNECKY: The scale is the same as
19 last year.

20 MR. MANDELKERN: I don't remember any
21 sixes.

22 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yes, there were.

23 MS. SARNECKY: Last year, if you remember,
24 Bob, it was the first year that it was based on a scale of

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 one to ten, I believe, ten being the lowest score. One
2 being --

3 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- NIH had moved to
4 that. Whatever the current NIH system is that's what they
5 should be using.

6 MS. SARNECKY: And I have a sheet of the
7 new scoring system that I can send around. I found that
8 this morning. I have copies here if anyone wants to grab
9 one, but I can send -- to the people phoning in I can send
10 them around.

11 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes, I would appreciate
12 that, Chelsey.

13 MS. SARNECKY: Sure.

14 DR. GENEL: There is also a discussion that
15 we've had before, and I think we need to have again before
16 the meeting, regarding whether or not we should perhaps
17 not use strict peer review scores in terms of awarding
18 grants particularly to institutions that are not as well
19 represented. I think it's -- we need -- I think we need
20 to have a little bit of clarity, at least among ourselves,
21 about that. Well, obviously among ourselves about that.
22 I would argue that that's really -- there is a factor that
23 we should take strongly into consideration.

24 DR. WALLACK: But if I remember correctly we actually

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 were somewhat flexible last year. There were some scores
2 that were better than scores that we funded that we did
3 not fund actually, and I think that speaks to your point.
4 I remember the conversation that you're specifically
5 referring to, but in general we -- I think we did use
6 wisely the peer review scores, but then we used our own
7 judgment as well on some of those.

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

13 MS. HORN: Well, there are all the other
14 criteria that we listed in the RFP, scientific merit being
15 the top one listed here, but a lot of other criteria,
16 collaboration, benefits the State of Connecticut, align
17 with other funding priorities that we've established.

18 DR. GENEL: Okay.

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

24 DR. GENEL: I think that's an -- I think

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 that's a great idea. I think a score sheet that would
2 require us to identify the -- have that available when we
3 discuss this. That's a good idea.

4 MS. HORN: Chelsey and I were talking about
5 that this morning that we could have that on the checklist
6 with a narrative below. And the peer review are fairly
7 objective.

8 DR. GENEL: As they should be. As they
9 should be.

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

14 DR. GENEL: -- as explicit.

15 MS. HORN: -- as explicit.

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

18 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Some.

19 DR. HISKES: Some.

20 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: But not all.

21 DR. HISKES: What I found was very useful
22 with some of us who have been around for a long time is
23 they were -- we've funded this project already, or there
24 is some duplicate something that so and so did. And so

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 that's another area where you might deviate from peer
2 reviewers.

3 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Three of the ten are
4 new.

5 DR. HISKES: Okay.

6 MS. SARNECKY: I can actually go through
7 and determine which new applications have received funding
8 from our program in the past. I can go through and do
9 that for everyone. In terms of the science I can do that
10 on a very --

11 DR. HISKES: -- I'm not talking about a
12 particular PI resubmitting work that's already funded, but
13 somebody -- an independent person, two people who are
14 independently sort of pursuing similar projects. If
15 somebody who independently this year is submitting a
16 proposal very similar to something that had been done two
17 years ago.

18 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.

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

21 DR. WALLACK: And there were some
22 discussions about on the skeletal research we specifically
23 talked about Dave Arel and his team and the offshoots of
24 that.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 DR. HISKES: Yes.

2 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I agree with you in
3 theory. I think in practice though it's really hard to
4 know the degree of overlap unless you do a very serious
5 scientific review. Things that look similar by title or
6 by abstract really might not be. So I just worry -- I
7 agree with the idea, but it might, in practice, be
8 difficult to really use that to separate one grant from
9 another and say this is --

10 DR. HISKES: -- do you think that would be
11 something that the advisory can do. I have another
12 question are there biotech companies submitting this year?

13 MS. SARNECKY: There are. We have one,
14 two, three, four, four applications from those private
15 companies. Yes, from three different companies.

16 DR. HISKES: And are the escrow issues
17 settled for private companies? Did somebody who will
18 review them --

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

21 DR. HISKES: Okay. That has been a
22 sticking point in the past.

23 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Supposedly that was
24 resolved not in time for the --

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

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

3 DR. HISKES: Right.

4 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I just want to state an
5 impression I've had from past peer reviews and I want
6 people's kind of reflection on this. I've got -- so we
7 start with the particular type of grant and we move to the
8 next category, and the next category, and finally the
9 final category, which is, I think, one year it was the
10 group grants, maybe last year it was also -- maybe it was
11 the cores, I don't remember. I get -- I kind of get the
12 impression that the grants at the end maybe don't get
13 quite as much review time or consideration as early
14 grants. What I mean by that is the monies is already
15 allocated fairly early in the process. And if we have
16 already committed 20 million and we have ten, and we
17 haven't gotten to the -- I'm making up the numbers -- but
18 as an example, when we get to the group grants each of
19 which is -- what's the limit on groups this year? I think
20 -- I don't want to state this too strongly, but I think
21 there is some bias against these large money grants when
22 we have already allocated more than we have conditionally,
23 not for decisions made.

24 And so I'm -- so where I'm going with this

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 is I'm wondering if we want to consider another possible
2 way to do this. And one way to do this is to -- is to
3 review them by priority score instead of by subject. So
4 you mix them all up and you review them by priority score.
5 And you know immediately what the -- you can see
6 immediately where the cutoff, where the 10 million dollar
7 cutoff, or the 15 million, or the 20 million cutoff is.
8 And I think, you know, although we don't, Mike as you
9 said, we don't want to -- we're not a rubber stamp. There
10 is -- it's based on other criteria than scientific merit
11 to award.

12 For the best grants we typically follow the
13 criteria and it's only in this cutoff range, this gray
14 area where it's really -- where we come into play.

15 DR. GENEL: Exactly.

16 DR. GOLDHAMMER: And so I'm wondering,
17 since there will be agreement for most of the money, and
18 it's only at that cutoff where there is an issue, we might
19 streamline the process greatly by going through grants
20 based on priority scores, making sure we agree that these
21 are really quality grants. We agree with the peer reviews
22 and we're comfortable awarding the funds. And then extend
23 the deliberation into the gray area, I don't know how many
24 millions, you know, if it's 5 million dollars into the

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 gray area, whatever it might be. And then maybe not review
2 all the grants past that, but allow the advisory committee
3 members to bring one into play that would otherwise not
4 get consideration. Instead of giving each grant a minute
5 or two minutes, we can nominate, bring into the discussion
6 grants that are below what we would consider the gray
7 area.

8 And so we really might get through the
9 process more quickly that way. And after we have a
10 collection then the hard kind of discussion begins where
11 we have to decide if a grant in the gray area should bump
12 a grant that's in the top ten million. But I think we can
13 get to that point earlier in the day and still do our job
14 more efficiently that way. So I'm just throwing that out
15 there. You know, we don't have -- we don't have specific
16 numbers of dollars allocated for any category other than
17 for seeds, right, so we have to go back and make sure once
18 we had our rank order that there was ten seeds and there
19 are at least ten seeds. So those kinds of things would
20 have to be dealt with.

21 We would also look and make sure that in
22 the top -- well, you know, I'm of the opinion that
23 probably one investigator should not get two large grants.
24 I mean let's just say that there is -- my opinion is it's

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 better to spread the money out a little bit. So, we go
2 back and we look, okay, does any investigator have
3 multiple grants in the top ten. Should we fund both?
4 Should we fund one? So where would be a lengthy discussion
5 on these kinds of issues later, but I think we can get
6 through the first process more quickly by doing it by rank
7 order rather than going through every grant in every
8 category.

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

13 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I'd go probably through
14 until we spent 15 million knowing that we have to come
15 back and make decisions at that -- in that gray area. We
16 have to go enough beyond it so that we eliminate a group
17 grant that frees up two. We then bring someone in from
18 that -- anyway, just I was thinking about this as ways --
19 you know, we were asked to think of ways to streamline the
20 process and still give appropriate consideration to all
21 grants. And I'm not saying that we definitely wouldn't
22 consider grants beyond some cutoff, but that would be by
23 nomination or -- and anyone could bring any grant that
24 they want whether it's in their pile or someone else's up

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 for discussion even though the priority score would not
2 dictate that. But that would be -- that would insure that
3 every grant had a fair review.

4 MR. MANDELKERN: How do you a define
5 priority score?

6 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Well, it's the score that
7 -- it's the average score that the peer reviewers gave to
8 each grant and, you know, so ones are conversed and then
9 the twos, and so forth. So is that what your question is
10 or did you want --

11 MR. MANDELKERN: -- well, I'm just
12 wondering in the process if you did not review many grants
13 you might wind up with many complaints.

14 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Well, all the grants have
15 been reviewed. You know, if you look at other advisory
16 committees they're not agent advisory committees. They
17 don't sit there and look at every single grant that's been
18 submitted. They have a decision to make about, based on
19 their priorities and their programmatic issues about
20 grants that scored really, really well. Maybe they bring a
21 grant in that was below cutoff but was in line with some
22 expressed programmatic program priority. But they don't --
23 they don't review all the grants. That's the peer review's
24 job and it's -- and it really streamlines the process, I

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 think, but -- it's something to consider. I'd like to --

2 DR. GENEL: -- I like it. That would mean
3 that we could come to the meeting and basically stop and
4 draw the line at Paul was 35 million dollars requesting
5 and we have 10 million to allocate. So if you drew a line
6 -- I don't know, say 15 million is as good as anything,
7 you drew a line there that would mean that those are the
8 ones that we are going to consider seriously plus those
9 that are nominated by those of us who are reviewing. I
10 mean that would come obviously from those of us who have
11 been assigned to review to be added to that list. Then
12 it's a matter of nailing down, cutting out a third --

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

16 DR. GOLDHAMMER: -- right.

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

18 DR. GOLDHAMMER: -- exactly.

19 DR. HISKES: So then the oneness is on a
20 large grant to be funded you have to decide which of these
21 would you like to fund.

22 DR. GENEL: Or you don't fund all of the
23 requests for the large grant, which would then -- which
24 we've done also.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 DR. HISKES: But I like your approach.
2 It's sort of mixing up the categories towards the
3 beginning so that fatigue doesn't take over and they all
4 have an even chance.

5 DR. GOLDHAMMER: And if this was a peer
6 review I wouldn't suggest doing it this way. For a peer
7 review I think it's very important to keep -- to review
8 all the grants from a certain kind together for comparison
9 sake. Here we're not -- you know, the criteria are
10 different or at least in addition to scientific merit. So,
11 I think we start at scientific merit as number one
12 category and so that's how they're first arranged. But I
13 have gotten the sense in the past that the group grants,
14 you know, just maybe don't get as much -- you know, we're
15 already -- it's the end of the day. We're tired. We've
16 already allocated 20 million dollars. But it will take
17 revisiting, you know, if the group grants do tremendously
18 well and we have four group grants in the top ten we're
19 not going to fund four group grants because that's ten
20 million. So we do have to come back and re-evaluate. But
21 at least it seems to me a reasonable starting place.

22 DR. HISKES: I have a question about how
23 the peer reviewers are assigned. Does a peer reviewer do
24 just seed grants and then some other one, somebody else

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 will do the ROI's or does a particular peer reviewer do a
2 mix?

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

4 DR. HISKES: Okay.

5 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Where there is any they
6 try to do subject matter expertise.

7 DR. HISKES: Okay.

8 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Like if you had two
9 neuro and one was seed and one from the group you'd
10 probably --

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

12 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: You'd want your expert
13 to review.

14 DR. HISKES: Because then you have the
15 scales more calibrated.

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Exactly. I think they
17 try to do that more so than based on category.

18 DR. HISKES: Right.

19 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Unfortunately, we don't
20 have all the subject matters covered, you know, but to the
21 extent that we do.

22 The only concern I would have, and it's --
23 I just think it places a greater oneness on all of you to
24 really do a very thorough review because now you're going

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 to be relying very heavily on the peer review in setting
2 that first priority group. And there have been occasions
3 where this group has disagreed with the scientific scores
4 given by the peer reviewers.

5 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Well, I would say -- I
6 agree with -- I mean I think the reviews have to be
7 careful regardless of how we do it, but typically with
8 some exceptions, typically when we disagree with the peer
9 reviewers when there is a written -- a real disagreement
10 between the peer reviewers, when the reviewers are -- we
11 tend to -- we -- you know, it's really -- we have to take
12 other criteria into account. And we're not giving these
13 grants full scientific review. It's really a cursory
14 review. And, you know, so I -- I don't think it's our job
15 to really question the scientific review of the -- of our
16 experts unless there is disagreement between them.

17 I mean, you know --

18 DR. WALLACK: -- it doesn't mean that you
19 have to, you know, you know, we don't have to follow the
20 peer review scores exactly, but I think as a first try
21 this is what we -- if the meeting of the -- at the
22 debriefing meeting, if you want, after the last go round I
23 think we specifically agreed that we wanted to expand the
24 seed grant categories. I think that's accurate in some of

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 the minutes that we have. So would we then want to -- if
2 you follow the process, set aside a certain amount up
3 front, it's been 10 percent in the past, two million -- 20
4 percent, two million. So, do we want to leave it at that
5 or in light of our discussion last June or last September
6 we took that -- so we didn't expand the -- our bias
7 towards more seed grants.

8 MS. HORN: No.

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

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

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 the peer review did and specify what we mean.

2 MR. MANDELKERN: Well, my reaction to this
3 that we're going to have to spend more time on the new
4 category of the disease specific grants because these are
5 going to be new to everybody and they're dollar heavy and
6 we're going to have to spend time on it. So the process
7 that we had of moving quickly through the seeds below a
8 certain score and giving them only a minute seems to me
9 quite adequate and I think we have to be certain that we
10 leave sufficient time for the new category, which I
11 understand there were, preliminary at least, three
12 applications.

13 DR. GOLDHAMMER: If I can speak to that, if
14 the group grants, if the disease category group grants,
15 one or more of them, score well then they're going to be
16 discussed in great detail. If they score very poorly then
17 they won't be discussed in great detail. So I think this -
18 - the system that I proposed does take care of that.

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

24 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Sure.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

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

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

7 MS. HORN: And Chelsey and I were speaking
8 this morning about making sure that the reviewers that we
9 assign to those group grants were people who perhaps had
10 that common experience with these specific grants or at
11 least a lot of scientific experience.

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

16 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Okay.

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

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

24 MS. SARNECKY: I have a question. Just in

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 terms of, I think everyone agrees with Dr. Goldhammer's
2 concept, but can we sort of hone in on a score that we're
3 going to cutoff at or a dollar amount that we're going to
4 cutoff at just for -- I just -- I fear that we're going to
5 go into the meeting and then, you know, half the committee
6 members are going to think we should cutoff at six and
7 half the committee members will think we should cutoff at
8 eleven.

9 DR. GENEL: I think the first list ought to
10 cutoff at, I don't know, 15, 16. I don't know 16 would be
11 halfway.

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

15 DR. GENEL: Okay.

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

20 DR. GENEL: And I think that's also true of
21 where you would take that first cutoff too, isn't it? In
22 other words, where you would say these are, these we're
23 going to fund.

24 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Right.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

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

5 DR. GOLDHAMMER: -- I agree.

6 DR. HART: The applications below the
7 cutoff won't be invisible. They'll be on a list in front
8 of us.

9 DR. WALLACK: Right.

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

23 DR. GOLDHAMMER: And I think it's hard to
24 predict how much time each grant will get. If a grant

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 scores a 1.1, you know, and it's not -- and it's not a
2 disease -- well, regardless of what grant that is, we're
3 probably not going to need a lot of time to discuss that
4 grant. It's really not our job, I don't think, to
5 overrule such a strong support by the scientific experts.

6 But if you get towards that gray area and
7 it's a disease grant, and we'll have a tremendous amount
8 of scrutiny of that grant and -- so I think we -- it's
9 really hard to put an amount of time on each grant. But
10 we'll just have to see how it goes.

11 DR. HART: And I think the goal here ought
12 to be to try to reduce that one hour discussion we had
13 last year at the beginning of the day and focus on the one
14 hour discussion at the end of the day.

15 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Right.

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Can I just ask one just
17 for clarification all applicants will be reviewed by a
18 member, two members of this committee regardless of peer
19 review scoring.

20 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

21 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay.

22 MR. MANDELKERN: I think that's a
23 necessity.

24 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

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

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

4 DR. HART: Okay.

5 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Making sure we have -- we
6 go far enough beyond the ten million to give us room to
7 bring one of those grants in. And, again, any grant
8 that's not discussed in the top 15 million, anyone can
9 nominate really any grant, I would say, to make sure that
10 nothing is excluded. Everything is on the table
11 potentially, but it doesn't make sense to, I don't think,
12 to ahead of time allocate a minute, two minutes, whatever
13 it might be to every grant that really doesn't have a
14 chance.

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

23 DR. GOLDHAMMER: -- yes.

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

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Yes.

2 DR. GENEL: With the proviso that if there
3 is really tight clustering around the 15 million mark that
4 you would want to go to a logical cutoff, which could be
5 16 million I mean as far as I'm concerned. I think it is
6 just a matter of recognizing where they fall.

7 MS. HORN: And this list of our own
8 priorities is -- how is that going to play into the
9 decision?

10 DR. GENEL: I think that should go to all
11 the reviewers and I think that I like your suggestion that
12 we have some sort of a numerical code so that we are
13 reminded to, at least, identify all of those.

14 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Is your point that would
15 seem to put less emphasis on that list if we do it this
16 way, is that what you're getting to that point?

17 MS. HORN: Yes, that that would really only
18 come in at the very bottom line kind of thing.

19 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I mean I don't know about
20 bottom line. I mean if scientific merit is number one on
21 that list.

22 MS. HORN: Right.

23 DR. GOLDHAMMER: So we're ranking them
24 according to scientific merit we still have five million

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 dollars worth of grants --

2 DR. HISKES: -- 50 percent more.

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

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

6 DR. GOLDHAMMER: -- because we've never in
7 the past, you know -- you know, we've never in the past
8 taken a grant that scored very poorly and because of
9 potential for collaboration elevated it to funding. I mean
10 so we'd still be taking into those account, but only among
11 the competitive grants that were really in the mix.

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

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

23 MS. HORN: Right.

24 DR. GOLDHAMMER: So we've identified one

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 priority and that's the disease grants, other than that I
2 think it's -- I think it's late to define priorities that
3 we might have because the review, because the writers
4 didn't have an opportunity to take that into account.

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

8 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Okay.

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

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

24 MS. HORN: Well, I think that the role, the

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 whole research that was being done in that large grant
2 that we had funded and then there was spinoffs from that
3 and whether this committee would be looking at one grant
4 that would dovetail nicely with that particular project as
5 opposed to another one that would be somewhere else by
6 itself. I just throw that out there for discussion.

7 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Specific to the point
8 of is there -- does this body and does this work have a
9 notion of what contributions it wants to make to all of
10 the stem cell work in Connecticut and how this fits with
11 what's funded by other opportunities, And that can be
12 driven by people who maybe aren't the ones that would be
13 competing for these or might we end up just enhancing and
14 amplifying the work of the same people. If there is
15 something else that this group is thinking about this
16 Connecticut stem cell work being known for or known to
17 promote and whether or not the -- this evaluative process
18 enables any of that, whether or not it needs to. That's a
19 --

20 DR. HART: -- that was the basis for the
21 disease grants.

22 DR. GENEL: Yes.

23 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: So then we just want
24 people to be able to have enough of a framework as they're

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 reviewing to keep that in mind.

2 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Not the weighting to
3 those criteria's just --

4 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: -- just the framework.

5 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Just the framework.

6 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Just the framework.

7 MS. HORN: I'd be happy to work with
8 Chelsey on the framework and, David, if we could get you
9 to do -- see if there is anything else we could put in in
10 terms of language there that would not jeopardize anything
11 that we haven't put in the RFP, but make it a little
12 clearer what we mean.

13 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay. So the goal then
14 would be to try to get something out to folks on the whole
15 committee, you know -- we haven't talked about it whether
16 or not you're going to meet again next month, but that's
17 the kind of work that can get done in advance, as you're
18 saying, David, it would save a lot of time upfront.

19 MR. MANDELKERN: Well, all the reviewers
20 going to be posted as usual?

21 DR. GENEL: Peer reviews?

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

24 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: No.

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 MS. HORN: Not the peer reviews.

2 DR. GENEL: Well, they weren't posted
3 publically, but they were posted privately for our access.

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

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

7 MS. SARNECKY: -- we can put the peer
8 reviews on that password protected --

9 DR. GENEL: -- yes.

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

12 MS. SARNECKY: -- I think it comes in one -
13 - does it --

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

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

18 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Good.

19 MS. SARNECKY: And this is something I'll
20 make a single PDF.

21 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Yes, I'm sure others would
22 like it too.

23 MS. SARNECKY: Of course.

24 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay. Any other

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 discussion about that?

2 MR. MANDELKERN: I'm still not sold on the
3 idea in general, if I may be -- raise the point. There are
4 77 requests. If we draw the line at a point say with 35
5 get one minute that only leaves us another 35 or 40 which
6 we have plenty of time to consider. I think we have to be
7 quite astute in making sure that any of the applicants
8 don't feel that they did not get full consideration of
9 their grant proposals. And I'm -- I don't see why if we
10 draw the line carefully for a minute for those below the
11 line we should have plenty of time left for another 30 or
12 40 reviews. I'm not so sure that we may not pick up more
13 animosity than we may pick up efficiency.

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

18 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- they get a nice thank
19 you letter.

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

24 DR. WALLACK: The first few years we didn't

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 pay them at all, did we?

2 DR. HISKES: Well, anyway, everybody's
3 grants have been reviewed by a pair of really topnotch
4 experts.

5 MS. HORN: Right.

6 DR. HISKES: So they've been -- that should
7 be sufficient.

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

11 A VOICE: No. 12?

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

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

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yes.

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

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Are there any comments
2 or questions about the minutes that you were provided by
3 Chelsey? These are the minutes of April 15th.

4 DR. GENEL: Well, we basically -- we
5 basically reaffirmed that today, didn't we? I mean those
6 are the same -- many of those were the same -- many of
7 them are the same.

8 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay. If there is no
9 discussion then we'll move onto No. 13, other business.
10 All right.

11 DR. WALLACK: This is somewhat of a sad day
12 and I say that because one of our ranks who has been
13 indispensable to the process, that's Warren, from what I
14 understand is going to be leaving us. And I, for one, and
15 I think all of us, I think I speak for all of us, in
16 saying that there is no words that can -- and I think this
17 should be for the minutes, if we might, I don't know how
18 that will get transmitted into the minutes, but I think
19 that it should be noted that all of us have an incredible
20 sense of gratitude for the leadership that, Warren, you
21 have given to this whole process over the last five years
22 or so. And that it's safe to say that we wouldn't be at
23 the point that we are without that kind of leadership.

24 Some of us go to the IASCR meetings and the

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

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

10 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Thank you, Milt.

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

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

21 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: I third it.

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

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

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

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

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

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

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

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

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

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

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

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

3 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: You started in the
4 mailroom?

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

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

9 CHAIRPERSON MULLEN: Absolutely.

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

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

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

18 MS. WILSON: Well, thank you.

19 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: My pleasure.

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

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 that again.

2 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: We gave access to the
3 peer review scores to the universities before giving them
4 to the --

5 MS. WILSON: -- before the actual review
6 takes place.

7 MS. SARNECKY: I think we had given them to
8 the universities two weeks or so before the grant review
9 meeting.

10 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: I'm not even sure how
11 that process works.

12 MS. HORN: Yes, we treated it like an FOI
13 request and we just give you yours and UCONN theirs.

14 DR. HISKES: This is for the escrow
15 committee to start thinking about.

16 MS. HORN: I think it's really to get the -
17 -

18 MS. WILSON: -- it's just for the PI's so
19 they know --

20 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yes, I mean if we've
21 done in the -- they're published so you're certainly
22 welcome to them.

23 MS. WILSON: Okay, thank you.

24 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Other public comments?

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MAY 17, 2011

1 MS. HORN: Are we meeting next month?

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

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

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

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

9 DR. GENEL: Yes, on how we're going to
10 proceed, yes.

11 MS. SARNECKY: I'm going to try to use the
12 Skype function.

13 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Do we have a motion to
14 adjourn?

15 DR. WALLACK: So moved.

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Second?

17 DR. HISKES: Second.

18 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: All in favor? Thank you
19 very much.

20 (Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at
21 3:00 p.m.)