

VERBATIM PROCEEDINGS

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
GRANT REVIEW

COMMISSIONER DR. ROBERT GALVIN, CHAIRMAN

JUNE 8, 2010

LEGISLATIVE OFFICE BUILDING
300 CAPITOL AVENUE
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT

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

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 . . .Verbatim Proceedings of a meeting of
2 the Connecticut Stem Cell Research Advisory Committee
3 Grant Review held on June 8, 2010 at 8:34 a.m. at the
4 Legislative Office Building, 300 Capitol Avenue, Hartford,
5 Connecticut. . .

6

7

8

9 MS. LYNN TOWNSHEND: Anne Hiskes has sent
10 an email and we can read that into the record. But I'm
11 also trying to see if she will consider -- if we could try
12 Skype -- if we could Skype her in on my computer.

13 COMMISSIONER ROBERT H. GALVIN: Are you
14 talking Hiskes or Kiessling?

15 MS. TOWNSHEND: Oh Kiessling, that's
16 Kiessling, I'm sorry. Oh, I've not gotten anything from
17 Anne Hiskes. Anne Kiessling, yes, Anne Hiskes, no. I'm
18 trying to get her in on Skype because it will probably
19 work better.

20 Chelsey, do you think we could get a phone?

21 As we talked about yesterday the phone connection is bad,
22 she can't hear everyone in the room, we wont be able to
23 hear her on the ends of the table.

24 MS. CHELSEY SARNECKY: -- the feedback from

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 the microphone here and the space phone that they have for
2 the conference calls. So --

3 MS. TOWNSHEND: Let me give her a call and
4 see if she can do Skype.

5 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.

6 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay, do we have
7 everybody here who we anticipate to be physically present?

8 MS. TOWNSHEND: To the best of my
9 knowledge, yes.

10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. If there's
11 anybody who's not here should they answer by saying yes?

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yes, I think that would be
13 --

14 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: If you're not here,
15 raise your hand. We're going to try -- I guess Anne
16 Hiskes has sent in some comments --

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: Anne Kiessling.

18 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, we have two
19 Anne's. Now, Anne Hiskes from the University of
20 Connecticut, has she sent in some comments?

21 MS. MARIANNE HORN: She has.

22 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: She has sent in some
23 comments, okay. And we're making an attempt to get a hold
24 of Anne Kiessling, she had some difficulties up north and

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 told me was very doubtful that she would be able to make
2 the meeting. We have tried early on when we had our early
3 discussions to use remote phones in here with very, very
4 poor success.

5 It just -- you can't hear, and the people
6 at the other end can't -- you know, who are listening
7 can't comprehend the conversations that are happening.
8 So, you can't get an informed opinion. Lynn is trying to
9 reach Dr. Kiessling.

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: Um-hum.

11 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: In the meantime, I
12 spent a good deal of time yesterday and earlier this
13 morning thinking about what we're doing here. And this is
14 probably one of those moments where my legislative liaison
15 person would say please don't say that, Commissioner, but
16 I'm going to say that anyway.

17 And if we look at what we're doing, we
18 basically are distributing a little under 10 million
19 dollars to two different organizations. And I realize
20 there are other folks what would like to get aligned with
21 us. But generally speaking, I think 52 to 54 percent of
22 our funding has gone down to -- has gone to UConn,
23 including the medical school complex, and 48 or 47 percent
24 have gone to Yale.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 And one of the ways you could -- one of the
2 ways you could look at this is, why don't we just send
3 them the money as two unrestricted grants and hold out a
4 million bucks for everybody else and let them decide
5 themselves. Well, I think we probably would not be
6 meeting our statutory responsibilities if we did that.

7 I think on the other hand, if we look at
8 what's happening here, if somebody doesn't get -- an
9 established investigator with a good grant from UConn,
10 shall we say, just -- but it could just as easily be Yale,
11 if they don't get the grant what's going to happen?
12 They'll get the money from someplace else if they're
13 established investigators.

14 Or, the school, you know, the school or the
15 institution will rearrange it's -- if it's that important
16 to Yale or to UConn, though, rearrange their priorities
17 and find a way through the National Institute of Health,
18 or some other organizations to fund this.

19 And I think we should not have, as I have
20 sometimes, the mental impression that if we don't fund
21 these people their grant's going to go away, they're all
22 going to hop on -- hit the next train for the cost, as the
23 song goes, and we'll never see them again. I don't think
24 that's true at all. These are two major teaching

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 institutions and they have resources, other than the five
2 and a half or four and a half million that they get from
3 us.

4 I think theoretically that we need to make
5 good decisions. We spend a lot of time and effort in
6 sending these grants out for review and -- for the best
7 people we could find in the entire scientific world. And
8 so, I heard yesterday multiple times that, I don't know
9 why that grant is so low, I don't think it should be that
10 low.

11 And my opinion is, the grants are so low
12 because they deserve to be low. They're low because three
13 distinguished scientists who work in the field, and I will
14 make an aside here, that around this table I'm not a stem
15 cell -- I happen to be an expert in aerospace medicine,
16 but stem cells are not my forte.

17 And not all of us are scientists, and
18 that's fine, but a lot of us are not qualified, really, to
19 make intricate decisions about stem cells. And so, I have
20 a little difficulty, and Warren and Dr. Weiner have done
21 everything possible to review these things and put an
22 appropriate rating on them and go back and forth. We
23 spend a lot -- there's a lot of time and effort to do
24 this, and these are the world's experts in the field.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 So, if they come back with a 4.3, that's
2 probably what the grant is, is a 4.3. I notice looking at
3 some of the grants, or listening to them, that some of
4 them are -- have logical inconsistencies, and some of them
5 are grants where were say, well if I can do -- the grant
6 says if I can do one then I'll be able to do two and three
7 and it will be terrific, but there's no good evidence or
8 no good theory that the first part of the grant is
9 appropriately done.

10 I will also say that if I were looking for
11 somewhere between 200,000 thousand and a million dollars,
12 I would make very sure that my grant was perfectly
13 written. And if I came from either the University of
14 Connecticut or Yale and I couldn't put together a coherent
15 grant, there's -- I would question the ability of those
16 individuals who want to do that grant, to do the grant
17 correctly, if you can't even write it down correctly.

18 I mean, let's face it, if it was that
19 important -- I have someone in my department who's working
20 on an advanced degree and has to submit some very detailed
21 analytic work. And he reads it and rereads it, and reads
22 it for -- and punctuates it because it's very important,
23 because if he doesn't write it right he's going to get a
24 back grade.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 Well, I mean, you know, I kind of wonder
2 about some guy who's a Department Chairman and lets a
3 grant go out of his department that's not appropriately
4 written. And I notice that some of them are very
5 appropriately written, but there seems to be some where
6 it's difficult to understand what the problem is.

7 We're now at the juncture where we have to
8 make some decisions. I believe that our original charter
9 was to encourage and to be particularly encouraging to new
10 investigators and seed grants. Not that I don't for a
11 minute think that some of these seed grants are simply
12 extensions through a post graduate -- post doctoral
13 student of previous grants.

14 But that's in the nature of the beast, we
15 have a lot of grants, and I'm not sure that these are
16 quite as -- in a group, qualitatively good as the first to
17 iterations. There's money at stake here, there's people
18 who want the money, and so we get a whole flock of grants,
19 you know, basically 40 from each institution. And I'm
20 not sure what that mean, except that you know if you fire
21 a lot of rounds in the air you got to knock something down
22 and -- like money.

23 And so, I think we need to look -- my
24 preference would be to look at the seed grants, and that's

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 an area where without spending a lot of money we can take
2 a chance on something that's theoretically good and
3 reasonably possible. And then I -- then after I think
4 after we decided on those we should go on and look at the
5 established investigator grants, realizing that the
6 established investigators will get the funding one way or
7 another.

8 Now, the first issue is with the core
9 grant. We had agreed that we would not make this a
10 priority, but apparently the feeling of the group is that
11 it is a priority. And it did get a very good grant from
12 our -- a very good score. And I think we need to open our
13 discussion with, what are we doing to do with this?

14 You know, we've raised the topic several times,
15 and now we have to either fish or cut bait and decide
16 we're either going to add a fourth core, which we had
17 decided months ago not to, or we're going to pass this one
18 by.

19 DR. MYRON GENEL: Commissioner, as long as
20 you're philosophizing, can I make some comments?

21 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Certainly, and those
22 are -- my own comments are my own expression and my --
23 expression of them. I'm not trying to be pejorative to
24 anybody. I am tweaked by the fact that we spend so much

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 time getting world's experts to review these things and we
2 keep saying, we'll that's not right. I mean, Leslie
3 Weiner and -- isn't right, and the people we have across
4 the country, I have problems with that. But that's me.

5 DR. GENEL: Well, I would second the notion
6 that the scientific review has been done by impeccable
7 scientists and that it's due all due respect. But our job
8 is not to second guess the scientist, our job is to
9 allocate the money. And the allocation, I think has to be
10 based on some different considerations as to the pure
11 scientific validity of the grants.

12 That is, if we're trying to encourage young
13 investigators, then I think there's a rationale for
14 supporting seed grants. I think the diversity of the
15 research is another issue. I think there are other issues
16 which is what an Advisory Committee's function is, other
17 than the pure science, that I think has to come into
18 consideration, assuming that the difference between a
19 grant that scores 2.5 and 3.5 is really very marginal and
20 not really that much different in terms of its pure
21 science.

22 So, I think those are the other
23 considerations that I think have to take place. And we
24 have to arbitrarily make some decisions that may not be

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 entirely fair, but I think that's our job.

2 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Very well said.

3 DR. RONALD HART: I'll just add one more
4 little bit to this as well. As a scientist, and having
5 been on every side of this argument, both the victim of
6 one of these committees in the past, the beneficiary of
7 one of these committees in the past, one who writes
8 grants, one who mentors writing grants, had scientifically
9 reviewed grants, I understand where you're coming from.

10 The issue about second guessing some of the
11 scientific reviewers you must realize, of course, that for
12 scientists this is a knee-jerk response to question each
13 other. However, I want to point back to the committee to
14 the overview section of the RFP that we issued for these
15 grants.

16 It's the intent of this committee to
17 consider funding of any form of stem cell research, which
18 I believe we have done. We've considered any form of stem
19 cell research. But priority will be given to human
20 embryonic stem cell research that is not currently
21 eligible for federal funding. And I think that that might
22 be a guideline that may help us this morning as one of our
23 criterion to choose for funding one over another.

24 And other stem cell research types will be eligible,

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 but with priority given to studies with clear potential
2 relevance for human health. And I think, again, that that
3 may be a helpful nugget to draw upon. I just -- you know,
4 we wrote that down, we sent it out to all the scientists.

5 I think it wouldn't be out of the ordinary for us to use
6 our own guidelines.

7 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Excellent.

8 DR. MILTON WALLACK: Just picking up on
9 that, I think that in the RFP we clearly stated that two
10 years ago that we wanted to see an emphasis on work --
11 translation of work. This year we added to that by
12 indicating that we wanted to talk in terms of
13 translational work that would lead to clinical
14 application.

15 And I think that if that was our studied
16 intent, then that should be some guidelines to us also as
17 we go forward. And I don't think we have to discuss it
18 right now, but certainly at the end of this when we
19 reflect back upon this whole process today, perhaps we
20 ought to come back to a consideration of what we talked
21 about and how we drew up the RFP before.

22 So, I think we ought to keep that in mind,
23 too, and I think Ron, you lead us to that kind of thought
24 process, as well.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: All ready? Let's go.

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: Just to let you know, Anne
3 Kiessling is on an emergency conference call with Harvard.
4 We will try and put her in through iChat shortly.

5 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: We don't have
6 priority over Harvard?

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: Apparently not.

8 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Gee.

9 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yes, sir?

10 DR. HART: Can I start -- try to start off
11 the proceedings this morning then, with a motion?
12 Following -- I'm reading from Anne Kiessling's email so it
13 gets into the record. One of the points she makes in her
14 email -- we'll come back to the others later, I'm sure, is
15 she "Recommends to approve the core proposal for \$500,000
16 dollars instead of \$600,000 dollars. This will limit
17 technician time and supplies and will take time to get the
18 equipment organized," is her comment.

19 And I'd like to move that we actually do
20 approve the 10SCD01, Antic Core Facility at \$500,000
21 dollars. And for my reason that one, we may not get this
22 opportunity again so quickly with the budget process in
23 the state the way it is. That core facilities are
24 something that are of this type, may be very difficult to

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 fund from other sources. So it's an opportunity to that
2 can't be easily replaced from other sources.

3 Two, it can serve a large number of other
4 funded researchers to get them to a higher quality of
5 neuroscience results that they wouldn't normally be able
6 to get their hands on. And three, in terms of kind of
7 bang for the buck, value, I think that this is a good
8 leveraging opportunity that with this reduced budget can
9 be very effective in this environment.

10 So, I'm moving to approve it a t\$500,000
11 dollars as suggested by Anne Kiessling.

12 DR. HART: I would second the motion and I
13 would second it also because as I've been thinking about
14 this, and I was one who drew attention to our intent not
15 to fund any additional cores, but as I've given further
16 thought to it, I think the guidelines indicate as a
17 necessary extension of existing cores.

18 And I think that at least in my mind I can
19 interpret this as a necessary extension of existing cores
20 and, I second the motion.

21 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Moved and seconded.
22 Any discussion?

23 DR. RICHARD DEES: Can I add just a friendly
24 amendment, which I think we need to have -- just give this

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 -- if we approve this grant, to give an impetus from the
2 committee that we really expect them to be reaching out to
3 all the institutions in the state.

4 DR. HART: I agree.

5 MR. ROBERT MANDELKERN: I would like to
6 speak in favor of the motion. I think it's a well thought
7 out grant, and will add to the capacity of stem cell --

8 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, Gerry?

9 DR. GERALD FISHBONE: I would just like to
10 raise one question. The grants that we've -- I'm losing
11 my voice here -- it's that muffin. The core grants that
12 we've approved in the past have been general core grants
13 to help develop, train people in embryonic stem cell
14 research.

15 My one small concern is not that this is
16 not a worthy grant, but do we open the door for next year
17 coming in with a bone core, the following year a cardiac
18 core? You know, these are very sub-specialized. And I
19 would just raise the question of you know, is that what we
20 want to be doing?

21 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah, I think you're
22 right, that that will open up the opportunity for people
23 who are looking for research money to decide they need a
24 connective tissue core, and this core, and that core. But

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 we can decide what we want to do with the RFP, and if
2 necessary, we would say core grants will not be
3 entertained. But I think that's a very realistic.

4 DR. GENEL: I'm sorry, didn't we fund a
5 genomics core at one point early in the process, at --
6 Mike Schneider at Yale?

7 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: We did.

8 DR. GENEL: That was in the first round.
9 Right, so there is some precedent for that.

10 DR. HART: May I, please? So, one is -- I
11 just want to again, read from the RFP. "Some additional
12 core funding may be considered if applications with novel
13 or -- applications with novel or unusual scientific
14 merit." And I think that this grant has met that
15 challenge. If other groups come in next year with novel,
16 and unusual, and scientifically meritorious proposals,
17 it's up to us to judge them. And that's perfectly
18 appropriate, and I welcome it.

19 I'd like to -- in favor of the previous
20 amendment, I'd like to extend that amendment just a little
21 bit and say, as a condition of funding I would recommend
22 that we require an assembly of a scientific oversight
23 committee, including members of Yale, UConn Storrs, UConn
24 Health Center, and at least one from outside the state,

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 minimum.

2 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I don't understand
3 what that means?

4 DR. HART: A scientific oversight committee
5 to include all funded groups within the state and one from
6 outside as well to supervise the selection of samples for
7 processing, to recommend how to recruit and add
8 collaborators and samples to the core facility. It's a
9 commonly thing -- a common thing that is done for core
10 facilities.

11 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: We haven't done that.
12 That's a whole different question. I mean, if you're
13 going to give the guy a half a million bucks and then
14 you're going to tell him how he can run his grant, that
15 doesn't make any sense to me. So, you either give him his
16 -- from my standpoint, either give him his grant, don't
17 give him his grant, but don't give him his grant and
18 handcuff him.

19 DR. DEES: Do you think we're handcuffing
20 him? It seems like we're directing him in a way that we
21 want this core facility to benefit all the researchers in
22 the state. And so, some sort of oversight is not -- I
23 mean, I don't know how much time does this kind of thing
24 take, Ron, I don't know. I mean, it seems like it's

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 fairly minimal.

2 So, we're not -- we don't need extra money
3 to have this oversight committee, right? I mean, it's
4 just a way of ensuring that as a matter of fact these
5 facilities are open to everybody.

6 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Well, if he doesn't
7 leave -- if he doesn't satisfy reaching out in some ways -
8 - and I think reaching out is -- what does that mean? I
9 don't know what reaching out means. It's -- that's an ill
10 defined proposition.

11 But if we, as with all the grants, if the
12 individual or the group is not doing what they said they'd
13 do, they have to come -- we bring them back in and ask
14 them why they are not doing what they said they would do.
15 And I mean I wouldn't hide it you know, assess this.

16 And I'm not a committee person, and I don't
17 think we need a committee on top of the grant, on top of
18 this. But you know, it's -- I'm not a voter on this so
19 you can vote anything in you want.

20 DR. WALLACK: Yeah, can I maybe say this,
21 that I understand, Richard, the benefit of this, and Ron.
22 And I also agree with the need to have this kind of
23 oversight. I wasn't always in agreement with this, by the
24 way. California, Warren, correct me if I'm wrong, has

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 this very elaborate system, which frankly when I first
2 learned about it and considered it, I thought it was too
3 elaborate.

4 And they had teams of people that go to
5 each institution and review what is happening within the
6 institution. As I've sat now here for the last four years
7 or so, and considered the motive behind what your vote's
8 saying, I've come to the point where I think that this is
9 a necessary requirement of us effectively going forward.

10 And -- but on the other hand, maybe this is
11 -- and I also have some other considerations that I've
12 written down about how we go forward in the future. So,
13 maybe we vote this grant at \$500,000 dollars, which I
14 endorse and support, and hold these other important
15 considerations for discussion after the process of
16 awarding these grants in order to facilitate going forward
17 with the grants.

18 And I think this is something that we can
19 discuss later today, I hope we can. Because I also have
20 some points that I'd like to put on the table or at the
21 next committee meeting. So, therefore I would talk
22 against going forward with not the essence of the
23 amendment, I'm in favor of that, but the positioning of it
24 at this particular juncture.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 DR. HART: Would it help to change
2 "required" to "advise?"

3 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: That would be easier,
4 that would be easier.

5 MR. MANDELKERN: My recollection of the
6 proposal from the investigator that was -- he strongly
7 stressed that he intended to reach out to every stem cell
8 researcher in Connecticut to utilize this core, and he was
9 anxious to do so.

10 I think we should stick to the immediate
11 and not put constraints, and we should proceed to fund
12 this first grant, this core, which has unusual value for
13 Connecticut, at \$500,000 dollars. And I would call the
14 question if the Chair would so entertain without the
15 amendments.

16 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Hang on.

17 MR. WARREN WOLLSCHLAGER: I agree with you,
18 Bob. Just a point of clarification, yesterday in the
19 instructions we were told that no decisions were final
20 until all decisions were made at the end. So, your motion
21 really talks about funding, but I suggest an amendment
22 where you'd move it to the maybe -- I mean, to the yes
23 column with \$500,000 dollars attached to it.

24 DR. HART: I agree, so it's the motion -- I

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 agree to change the motion to move to the yes column. And
2 furthermore, based on the discussion I'd like to withdraw
3 the amendment I proposed.

4 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. I will make
5 one generic comment. Is, do not -- do not think that
6 you're going to ask the State Department of Public Health
7 to form oversight committees. I'm down to the bone on
8 money, I'm short -- how many employees are we short from
9 last year? Almost 100. Yeah, I lost almost 70 to the
10 early retirement, and I've had -- I've replaced five plus
11 additional attrition, maybe I'm only down 95.

12 I'm right down to the bone, so this -- and
13 we're up to our ears in health informatics and so we --
14 putting a committee like this and then say, good old
15 Warren or good old Lynn is going to make sure the
16 committee does what the committee is supposed to do, I
17 don't have anymore capacity for that. I don't have
18 anymore capacity, I'm short almost 100 employees.

19 MR. DAN WAGNER: We do have a number of --
20 and I'm trying to find the document in the -- you know, in
21 the review process of the cores. We do require them to
22 list how many people they've trained, how many people
23 they've supported, lectured, so we really -- I mean, you
24 give them the first year of funding, if they don't meet

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 any of the requirements going forward you can just say no
2 at that point.

3 I mean, that's what that's for without
4 having to build all this stuff on top. So, we do have
5 that built in. Anne has been -- Anne Kiessling was very
6 instrumental in putting those things together.

7 So -- and I would also follow up on
8 Warren's point of view. That if we move this to the yes,
9 we keep the number at whatever they've asked for and come
10 back with the idea that you know, we can -- you know that
11 you are open to dropping it to 500.

12 But I think until you add up everything
13 that you want to fund, I would just leave the numbers as
14 is, that would -- you know, you could -- we'll show you
15 real time what it adds up to. So --

16 DR. WALLACK: With all due respect, Dan, I
17 don see any reason why if we have a considered opinion
18 already, I mean it's going to make it very much more
19 complicated. I'm ready to vote on the \$500,000. the
20 maker of the motion is ready to vote on the \$500,000. I'd
21 like to vote on the \$500,000.

22 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Mr. Mandelkern has
23 called a vote. So, we will --

24 MR. MANDELKERN: I think I called the

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 motion to vote on Dr. Hart's motion in the first -- call
2 the question, which was with a \$500,000 approval into the
3 -- from maybe to yes.

4 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Do you want to do
5 this by consensus or do want to poll?

6 MS. MARIANNE HORN: We can do it by
7 consensus. If there is not consensus then we'll have to
8 do a voice vote, and reminding Dr. Goldhamer is the only
9 person who is not able to vote on this. So, all those in
10 favor of moving -- and Dr. Galvin, yes.

11 All those in favor of moving the core grant
12 10SCD01 from the maybe column to the yes column at
13 \$500,000 dollars please indicate by saying yes.

14 VOICES: Yes.

15 MS. HORN: Opposed? Motion carries.

16 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. Now, next we
17 said yesterday we were going to go through the seed
18 grants. There were seven that we've funded, and there are
19 an additional -- is it 13 that we wanted to look at again?

20 MS. HORN: Twelve.

21 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Seven which we said
22 yes, and we have 13 maybe's? Twelve. Okay, let's start
23 working on those. And I think our agreement was the
24 maybe's would become no unless they had a strong advocate

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 with a good reason for making them yes's. So, do you want
2 to start with A23?

3 DR. GENEL: I have a simpler solution.

4 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay.

5 DR. GENEL: If you prefer. I think we
6 ought to set a limit or sort of a threshold of how much
7 money we want to spend on these. And I would propose
8 spending -- allocating three million, and then working to
9 trim the margins when we're all finished. So, three
10 million would mean 15 -- we would fund 15 seed grants.
11 And I think if we agree on that to begin with, it's going
12 to make our job a lot easier than going down one by one.

13 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I think that is an
14 excellent suggestion. I was thinking this over last
15 night, I think we -- that probably our greatest effect on
16 the research is going to be with the seeds.

17 DR. GENEL: Well, I think we've seen that
18 in the material that has been submitted --

19 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yes.

20 DR. GENEL: -- in terms of preliminary
21 results from seed grants.

22 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: And the established
23 guys are used to swimming upstream, they'll get funded
24 anyway, but I think that's an excellent suggestion. So, I

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 think Dr. Genel's motion was to approve all the maybe's?

2 DR. GENEL: Well, I would -- for the time
3 being I would say let's approve the top 15 and since I
4 can't figure out any other way of doing it, I would do
5 this by scientific score. But I would be open to funding
6 all -- I think there are 19. I'm just saying, let's
7 decide right now we're going to fund at three million, and
8 then we can trim at the margins when we work through the
9 rest.

10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. And what do
11 you want to do with the bottom four, just drop them off?

12 DR. GENEL: No, no I think keep them in the
13 maybe until we see how we distribute the pool.

14 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, and I lost you
15 at one of the turns there.

16 DR. GENEL: I said, keep them in the maybe
17 pile until we decide how we're going to allocate the pool
18 of 10 million.

19 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Well, I thought we
20 were going to allocate -- I lost you, I thought we were
21 going to allocate three million?

22 DR. GENEL: Well, I said three million to
23 start with, and then we agree on that. And then that
24 leaves us only with three or four that are outside of

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 that. I mean, I really don't care. I mean, I think I
2 would -- I could support funding all of the seeds, if that
3 would simplify things. But I'd rather see what we're left
4 with when we get -- when we work on the established
5 investigator.

6 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, so
7 theoretically we're going to spend three million on the
8 seeds?

9 DR. GENEL: At minimum. Minimum.

10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: So, three million --

11 DR. DEES: So, essentially your motion is
12 to take the eight best scoring maybe's and move them to
13 the yes?

14 DR. GENEL: Yes.

15 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Wait a minute, wait a
16 minute. You're going to take the -- based on the scores
17 take the eight best scores and move them to yes --

18 DR. DEES: The eight best scores in the
19 maybe column and move them to the yes column.

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay.

21 MR. MANDELKERN: The eight best maybe
22 scores.

23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah, okay. Milt?

24 DR. WALLACK: I am absolutely in favor of

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 supporting the seed grants. I think that we absolutely
2 get tremendous bang for our buck, I could not endorse,
3 Bob, what you're saying any more strongly. However, --
4 and if it comes to three million dollars, I will
5 absolutely be thrilled by that.

6 But I think that we do ourselves -- and the
7 reason for being here a disservice if we don't at least
8 look at each individual one and see where it plays out.
9 We have -- I mean, we are bright people, and we can
10 discuss this for five minutes on each particular grant,
11 and if we come to three million dollars, great. If we
12 have to go over the three million dollars, great.

13 But I'd like to have -- I wouldn't -- I
14 don't want to do it carte blanche, I want to be able to
15 consider it.

16 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Going to take a long
17 time, and I don't think we're going to get a third day
18 here.

19 DR. WALLACK: We have to try to do it.

20 MR. MANDELKERN: There are seven seeds that
21 have been given yes's. And there are 12 in the maybe. If
22 we -- that makes a total of 19. If we're looking for 15
23 we can go through the 12 and decide which four we do not
24 wish -- or nobody has a speaking point to move to the yes,

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 and that would leave us with the 15.

2 I don't have a feeling that that should
3 take overly long. If we start with the seven yes's as
4 yes's, if we can do that as a group, I don't know if
5 that's legal. And then, of the 12 seed maybe's quickly if
6 somebody has a good solid reason to move them yes, it's a
7 yes. And if not, it goes from maybe to maybe no
8 -- to no.

9 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, to be fair
10 we've got to go back and do them all over again. So,
11 we'll start with wherever you want to start. You want to
12 go from the highest ranking down, or lowest ranking up, or
13 in the middle or --

14 DR. WALLACK: David made a good point
15 yesterday. And he thought that we were able to get
16 thought, David, more quickly if we went from the top --
17 the best scores down, is that right?

18 DR. DAVID GOLDHAMER: Yeah, yes.

19 DR. WALLACK: So, maybe we would -- maybe -
20 - you can speak to your own point.

21 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: We'll start with A36,
22 is that it -- 36 or 35?

23 MR. MANDELKERN: 35.

24 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Dr. Lee, is that the

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 best ranking -- best ranking of the --

2 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes.

3 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, let's start
4 with that grant. Who is the evaluator?

5 DR. DEES: I'm confused, where are we
6 starting?

7 DR. GOLDHAMER: That was a yes already.

8 DR. DEES: That was a yes already.

9 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: That's a yes, okay.

10 DR. DEES: So unless we have -- I mean, I
11 don't see any reason to discuss those unless somebody
12 objects.

13 DR. WALLACK: We should probably start at
14 CA18, David Wells.

15 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: That's the best -- is
16 that the top ranking \$200,000 dollar grant? Yeah, okay.

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: Fishbone and Goldhamer.

18 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, if we're not
19 ready, let's go to the next one while people are getting
20 their notes ready.

21 DR. FISHBONE: We're ready. You just want
22 a description of what the grant is?

23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: No, what we're
24 looking for is, is there justification to remove -- to

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 take this from a maybe and make it a yes? So, at this
2 time we have to go and --

3 DR. FISHBONE: So, we have to state what
4 the grant is, and what the pros and cons were?

5 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Right, briefly --

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: I think just as you had
7 done yesterday --

8 DR. FISHBONE: Yeah.

9 MS. TOWNSHEND: -- only briefly.

10 DR. FISHBONE: Alright, do you want to do
11 Wells, or you want me to?

12 DR. GOLDHAMER: Well, I just wanted to make
13 one comment. My understanding was that we were going to
14 go through these and if there was someone who wanted to
15 specifically advocate for a grant then we would bring it
16 forward and move it to the yes. Not to go through the re-
17 view and the re-description of the grant and the two
18 people who are most familiar would be probably those who
19 would advocate and -- at least initially.

20 Do we really need to go through these and
21 talk about the specific science again, if the two primary
22 reviewers aren't strongly in favor of moving it to the yes
23 or someone else on the committee?

24 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah, we have to go

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 through them and have some reasonable -- a reasonable
2 consideration, we can't just say no, no, no, no, no, yes,
3 no. Because then we'll have a challenge to the integrity
4 of the committee. But I think we can go back to the
5 original reviewers and have one of them advocate or give
6 us an explanation of why they think it should become at
7 this point, either a yes or a no.

8 MS. TOWNSHEND: So, we're looking at A18.

9 DR. FISHBONE: I can go ahead with Wells?

10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yes.

11 DR. FISHBONE: He wants to examine the role
12 of two specific M-RNA binding proteins and the regulation
13 of human embryonic stem cell differentiation towards
14 neural fate. And the strengths were, he's highly
15 qualified, familiar with the concepts, as well as
16 experimental approaches required for pursuit of the
17 proposed changes. The only negative was that he will need
18 significant help to start the line of human embryonic stem
19 cell research, perhaps a collaborator.

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. Comment?

21 DR. GOLDHAMER: Well, I'll follow up on
22 that as the other reviewer. I had put this in the maybe
23 category because I thought it was risky. But there was
24 -- this investigator wants to study translational control

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 and how it relates to adopting the neural cell fate in
2 embryonic stem cells. But there's no indication that the
3 protein that he's interested in studying has any role in
4 that in this specific setting.

5 So, I -- you know, I just didn't see it as
6 being a very compelling grant without the first bit of
7 preliminary data. So, I had put it in the maybe and I
8 still think that's where -- well, I would move it to the
9 no rather than maybe.

10 DR. FISHBONE: But he did have a very high
11 rating scientifically, it's a 3.0. So --

12 DR. GOLDHAMER: Well, that's the issue.
13 And I -- I mean, I -- I don't like the suggestion, I guess
14 we're beyond that point, but the suggestion of taking the
15 top number and putting them automatically into the yes
16 category. Realistically there's really no difference
17 between a 3.0, a 3.5, a 2.8. This is not such a fine
18 tuned process that we can really make judgments within
19 that kind of a narrow range.

20 So, the fact that it got a very good score
21 certainly has to be taken into account. But I would not
22 put it ahead of, for instance, something that's a 3.3,
23 3.4, 3.5.

24 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah, I think that's

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 a good point, the numerical values become meaningless when
2 they're that closely grouped, particularly at the end of
3 the -- at this end, where the good grants are. I'm
4 concerned about having to find a collaborator. That
5 bothers me, but you know, if it's the opinion of the group
6 that this should be funded let's fund it.

7 MR. MANDELKERN: I have the feeling that
8 there was no compelling reason offered by the reviewers to
9 move it from maybe to yes. But I did hear a compelling
10 reason to move it from maybe to no. And I think if that
11 reviewer would put it as a motion we could move forward
12 from this seed grant.

13 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Well, I -- just a point
14 of -- are you going to need motions on those? I thought
15 you were doing consensus?

16 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah, we are doing
17 consensus.

18 MS. HORN: We'll try to do consensus. If
19 there's no consensus we'll do a voice vote. But I think
20 we need a motion to move this from --

21 DR. GOLDHAMER: I'll move to go to no.

22 MR. MANDELKERN: It's not moving it
23 considered --

24 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Is there a second?

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 DR. GOLDHAMER: I second.

2 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, all in favor of
3 Dr. Wells' grant going from maybe to no, indicate by
4 saying aye?

5 VOICES: Aye.

6 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, any nays?
7 Okay, grant's gone.

8 DR. FISHBONE: Nay -- one nay.

9 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. Okay, let's go
10 to the -- and we're just doing these in -- we can do them
11 alphabetically if you feel better about that?

12 MS. HORN: Yeah, that one was clear that we
13 had one nay and all the rest were yea's. If we have
14 -- well, otherwise, we're going to have to take a voice
15 count if we can't make out who was voting no, thank you.

16 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, next grant is -
17 -

18 DR. GENEL: Well, I should be listed as
19 abstaining.

20 MS. HORN: Yes.

21 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yes. Okay, do we
22 have somebody to speak?

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: That would be Goldhamer and
24 Wallack.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 DR. WALLACK: I would move to move this to
2 the yes column. I believe that the grant is a well
3 thought out, potentially very important avenue of
4 research. He's a young, apparently accomplished
5 researcher who can be potentially a major contributor to
6 stem cell research. And to the point that we just were
7 discussing, he is in fact working with an excellent P.I.,
8 he has a number of significant letters of support, and I
9 would move this to the yes column.

10 DR. GOLDHAMER: And I'll make a comment. I
11 was the second reviewer. Although I do have specific and
12 significant concerns about some of the approaches that
13 were taken -- that the investigator is taking. Milt's
14 points are well taken, it's a new investigator and a very
15 good lab. And I have confidence that good science will
16 come of this, so I would favor a yes.

17 MR. MANDELKERN: Could you just tell us
18 what the grant is about?

19 DR. WALLACK: The project goal is to
20 identify the regulatory mechanisms that control the
21 initial steps of germ layer specification in human
22 embryonic stem cells.

23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, are we ready to
24 vote by acclamation?

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 MS. HORN: The recommendation is to move
2 this to yes. Do we have consensus on that? All in favor?

3 VOICES: Aye.

4 MS. HORN: Any dissenters?

5 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, that's a yes.

6 MS. HORN: Goldhamer and Pescatello.

7 DR. GOLDHAMER: There's a theme emerging
8 here. Alright, so this is a grant -- this was the grant
9 that I presented yesterday where the investigator is
10 trying to identify multipotent stem cells in fat. I had
11 some reservations yesterday, but I -- after hearing the
12 arguments and thinking about it more, I think that most of
13 my concerns were those of grantsmanship.

14 This is a new investigator at Yale who
15 doesn't have -- except for startup funds, does not have
16 grant funding at this point. It's a very doable project,
17 it follows up on some very nice work that he did, I guess
18 as post-doc in the mouse. And so, I'm more favorable than
19 I was yesterday, and I would move this from maybe to a
20 yes.

21 MS. HORN: And I did get an email -- we did
22 get an email from Paul Pescatello, who is running a little
23 bit late this morning. He's indicated that of all the
24 seed grants he reviewed, there are none in the maybe

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 category he would advocate for inclusion in the yes
2 category.

3 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Let's -- is that a
4 roundabout way of saying no?

5 MS. HORN: That's just a comment.

6 DR. GOLDHAMER: Well, I'll remind the
7 committee that yesterday I was less enthusiastic than Paul
8 was about this particular grant.

9 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay.

10 DR. WALLACK: I have a question to David. I
11 didn't review the grant, but looking at the review, not
12 the score, but rather the various elements of it, in
13 significance -- the significance of the proposal is not
14 clearly defined. It had some other issues of it's only
15 moderately innovative, so that in reading the text of
16 this, I had some questions. You've read the same text,
17 are you satisfied now because if you are, I'll go along
18 with the vote. But I just feel that I have to raise those
19 points.

20 DR. GOLDHAMER: No, those are important
21 points, and those I took into account in putting this in
22 the maybe category yesterday. I think this is clearly
23 potentially significant. The problem was that I don't
24 think the applicant conveyed that sufficiently, so that's

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 why I started off by saying that this is more a matter of
2 grantsmanship than anything else.

3 Other places in that review, the review --
4 at least one reviewer indicates that the application is
5 worth funding for some of the reasons that I conveyed and
6 others that I didn't.

7 DR. WALLACK: Okay.

8 MS. HORN: So, the recommendation is to
9 move this from the maybe to the yes. All in favor?

10 VOICES: Aye.

11 MS. HORN: Any dissenters? Dr. Dees we'll
12 note as a dissenter. Thank you.

13 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, the next grant
14 is --

15 MS. TOWNSHEND: A12?

16 MS. HORN: Yes.

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: A12 would be Arinzeh and
18 Fishbone.

19 DR. FISHBONE: Dr. Wang wants to test the
20 hypothesis that knockdown of Lin28 may decrease
21 proliferation and induce differentiation of human
22 embryonic stem cells and IPF cells. It's a basic biology
23 grant.

24 One weakness, project doesn't appear to

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 articulate much of a project beyond performing the
2 knockdown experiments. It's more of a hypothesis of
3 generating than a hypothesis driven project. Some concern
4 about overlap with already funded research. I'm very much
5 on the fence with this one.

6 DR. TREENA ARINZEH: So, I was going to
7 move it to the no category. I think that we have funded
8 this investigator last year with a similar type of grant.
9 He's using methods in that grant -- the reviewers actually
10 note this. He's using methods in that grant that would be
11 supported -- in his proposal that would be supported by
12 this other grant.

13 So, it seems like there is significant
14 overlap here. The knockdown part is probably what's
15 different. But the rest of it seems to be very similar.
16 So -- and given some of the weaknesses, I vote to move it
17 to no.

18 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I didn't get the last
19 comment.

20 DR. ARINZEH: Oh, okay sorry. So, other
21 than -- well, the proposals overlap, and then also again,
22 the weaknesses that were mentioned.

23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: So, you're saying no?

24 DR. ARINZEH: So, I'm saying no.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay.

2 MS. HORN: So, the recommendation is to
3 move this to no. Yes, Dr. Hart?

4 DR. HART: Is this an independent
5 investigator or post-doc?

6 DR. ARINZEH: This is an independent
7 investigator.

8 DR. HART: Okay. just want to remind you
9 that there is an established investigator grant from
10 (indiscernible) that is different in scope, but uses the
11 same Lin28 knockout concept. Just a similarity.

12 MS. HORN: Okay. So, the recommendation is
13 to move this to no. Do we have consensus on that? All in
14 favor of moving this to no?

15 VOICES: Aye.

16 MS. HORN: Anybody opposed to moving it to
17 no?

18 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes, I'm opposed.

19 MS. HORN: Dr. Mandelkern, noted. Okay, be
20 moved to no. A16?

21 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dees and Fishbone, A16.

22 DR. DEES: Yeah, this is a grant that was
23 going to look at trying to figure out whether the
24 regenerator cells from brain cells, or induced pluripotent

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 cells, or human embryonic stem cells work most effectively
2 both using lab models and animal models. I think that in
3 this grant the link to therapy is actually pretty clear
4 and it's going to tell us something fairly important. So,
5 I would move that we put it in the yes column.

6 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. Any other
7 comments?

8 MS. HORN: Okay, the recommendation is to
9 move this to the yes. Anybody who objects to that? Okay,
10 then by consensus it's moved to yes. Next is A13.

11 MS. TOWNSHEND: Arinzeh and Mandelkern.

12 MR. MANDELKERN: On this grant originally
13 Dr. Arinzeh -- we had decided on a yes consideration. But
14 in the discussion there was some movement and it was put
15 into the maybe. I would propose moving it to the yes, it
16 has a very fine peer review with words like, novel,
17 produced interesting results, environment is good, they're
18 qualified.

19 It's a seed, and it again looks at using
20 gene to find out what happens in embryonic stem cell self
21 renewal. So, I would move to put this from a maybe to a
22 yes.

23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Further discussion?

24 DR. ARINZEH: Yeah, same here. I think it

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 should go to the yes. You know, I was a little worried
2 about some of the reviewer's comments saying that this
3 might be ambitious work. But in light of some of the
4 discussion that we had yesterday about this word,
5 ambitious, you know I think what the, you know, what the
6 applicant is proposing is significant work.

7 So, -- and he is a -- it's a he, right, a
8 post-doc in a very well established laboratory. So, I
9 think this is appropriate funding. So, yes.

10 MS. HORN: The recommendation is to move
11 this to yes. Any objection? Hearing none, it's moved to
12 yes.

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: Next is 10SCA47, Kiessling
14 and Mandelkern. And Anne is on my phone listening in, and
15 she's on speaker phone.

16 DR. ANNE KIESSLING: Can you hear me?

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yes, I can. Not sure if
18 they can, but --

19 DR. KIESSLING: If you put the phone up to
20 the microphone can everybody else hear me?

21 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yes, they can.

22 DR. KIESSLING: Yeah, I would very much
23 like to move this to the yes category. This is the
24 application that relates to Huntington's disease, and

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 they're trying to derive some cell lines to study
2 Huntington's disease. This is a young clinician
3 scientist, I thought this was a really good application.

4 The reviewer's comments about this grant
5 were much more positive than the scorers was. So, from
6 -- relative to their other comments the score on this
7 would be closer to a 3.0. I would very much like to move
8 this to the yes funded category.

9 MR. MANDELKERN: I would agree with Dr.
10 Kiessling --

11 MS. HORN: Dr. Mandelkern, you are recused.
12 The recommendation is to move this to yes.

13 MR. MANDELKERN: But I'm the other
14 reviewer.

15 MS. HORN: You're the other reviewer, but
16 you're recused.

17 MR. MANDELKERN: This is not the --

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: That's not the --

19 MS. HORN: Oh, I'm sorry, I apologize. I
20 thought this was the Parkinson's -- oh, Huntington's I
21 apologize.

22 MR. MANDELKERN: I beg your pardon --

23 MS. HORN: I am sorry, I misheard.

24 MR. MANDELKERN: -- it is not the

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 Parkinson's. This is a seed which got very enthusiastic
2 peer review write up, which was not reflected in the
3 score. And I agree with Dr. Kiessling. As we indicated
4 yesterday, we had a strong tendency for yes, and we wound
5 up in maybe. But today I agree fully that it should go
6 from the maybe to the yes category.

7 MS. HORN: Recommendation is to move this
8 grant to yes. Any objection? Okay, it's moved to the
9 yes.

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: Next up is -- next up is
11 A36, Genel and Hart.

12 DR. HART: This was a post-doc -- I think
13 it was a post-doc from -- yes, post-doc from the Drissi
14 Lab, using induced pluripotent cells to study -- to treat
15 cartilage degeneration. This one was a real -- in my mind
16 was a real borderline grant. I think we're getting to
17 that real kind of borderline condition.

18 However, there was a lot of clear
19 application to you know direct clinical applicability of
20 their work. You could pull out some specific faults if
21 you wish to, but overall the reviews were very good.
22 Furthermore, the P.I. of this grant is sitting right now
23 at the edge of our yes category for the established
24 investigator grants.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 And so what I propose to do later is to
2 reduce the established investigator's award slightly to
3 compensate for our funding this one. So, I'd like to see
4 this one funded.

5 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, I lost you
6 there. And I don't think we've ever linked issues like
7 that. That's --

8 DR. HART: I'm not linking them, I'm just
9 suggesting it may come up later. I don't wish to link
10 them, I'm just saying I'm in favor of this one thinking in
11 the future.

12 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, what I heard
13 was that this person has an established investigator grant
14 and a seed grant both?

15 DR. HART: No, no --

16 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: No.

17 DR. HART: -- the P.I. of this post-doc has
18 an established investigator grant before us that is
19 currently in a yes category on a different project, on a
20 complimentary project.

21 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I still -- I don't
22 understand.

23 DR. WALLACK: I didn't hear, Ron, the thing
24 that you said but I'm following your lead, I agree.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 DR. HART: I'm arguing in favor of this
2 particular grant, no further issues.

3 DR. GENEL: I think we also have a role to
4 try and support the emerging centers of excellence and
5 this is clearly an area of excellence -- of potential
6 excellence in the state. So, I fully -- I totally agree
7 with Ron's comments and I would move this to the yes
8 category.

9 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Now, is this person
10 trying to create chondrocytes from stem cells, is that it?

11 DR. HART: They're trying to use induced
12 pluripotent protocols on chondrocytes to replace
13 cartilage.

14 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I think that's a big
15 reach. As unacquainted as I am. I thought about this,
16 that I'm not acquainted with this science in depth.
17 However, I think that that's a huge leap. But I would
18 defer to your judgment.

19 DR. GENEL: Well, that's what I would think
20 these grants are for. It is for a bit of reach.

21 DR. HART: And furthermore, there's -- I
22 know there is work from Rudy's Lab at MIT that shows that
23 virtually any tissue in the body can be converted using
24 this protocol.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: It virtually bothers
2 me. And I don't know, if some guy wanted to build a
3 locomotive would they give him enough money to build part
4 of the chassis and -- or the breaks? But I'll defer to
5 your judgment.

6 DR. ARINZEH: This is IPS into
7 chondrocytes?

8 DR. HART: Well, no it's using the IPS
9 protocol to turn chondrocytes into replacement cartilage
10 for treatment.

11 MS. ARINZEH: Oh, I see.

12 DR. HART: They're suggesting, and this is
13 actually one of the points that the viewers pulled out.
14 They're suggesting that they are going to be more
15 efficient at replacing tissue when starting with
16 chondrocytes.

17 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay.

18 DR. HART: I'm sorry, not starting with
19 chondrocytes -- yes --

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: You think it's a good
21 grant?

22 DR. HART: Yes. Yes, let's not hang on to
23 it.

24 MS. HORN: The recommendation is to move

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 this to the yes category. All in favor?

2 VOICES: Aye.

3 MS. HORN: Okay, any opposed? Moved to the
4 yes.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: Next grant is 10SCA28.
6 Kiessling and Mandelkern. And we now have Kiessling on
7 Skype. I can see her and you can hear her.

8 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Let's go.

9 MS. TOWNSHEND: Anne, you ready?

10 DR. KIESSLING: No, I'm actually not. Ask
11 Bob if he's got his notes on this grant?

12 MR. MANDELKERN: I was the other reviewer
13 on this grant. And I do not feel moved to move it from
14 the maybe to the yes. Only from the feeling that this RNA
15 protein has been reviewed in many applications, and I
16 think there's considerable research work going on in it.
17 And I don't see the great importance of doing it again.
18 So, I would move to put this from a maybe to a no because
19 of redundancy in purpose.

20 DR. FISHBONE: Can you tell us what it is?

21 DR. MANDELKERN: Yes. He wants to
22 investigate RNA proteins to show their role in binding in
23 embryonic stem cells, so far as I can understand. It's a
24 distinct study of RNA binding proteins, which has become

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 from a lay point of view, what I see a very hot area of
2 research in the last year or two. And we've had many
3 proposals on it, and I don't see the need to fund another
4 one.

5 MS. HORN: Anne?

6 DR. KIESSLING: So, Bob's recommendation
7 was to not put this in the yes category?

8 MS. HORN: That's correct.

9 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Bob -- yeah, a no.

10 DR. KIESSLING: I would agree with that.

11 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay.

12 MS. HORN: So, the recommendation is to
13 move this to no. Anybody who objects to having this moved
14 to the no category? Hearing no, it is moved to the no
15 category.

16 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: A-23 I believe, is
17 the next? Reviewer?

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: A-23, that's Genel and
19 Kiessling. A-23, Genel and Kiessling.

20 DR. GENEL: Anne, if you've got that in
21 front of you I'm leafing through my papers.

22 DR. KIESSLING: Hang on.

23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Why don't we move
24 onto the next one?

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 DR. KIESSLING: Yeah, go to the next one
2 while we organize this.

3 MS. TOWNSHEND: Okay, the next one would be
4 --

5 DR. GENEL: Well, no this is what I was
6 looking for.

7 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay.

8 DR. GENEL: The --

9 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: We're back on A-23.

10 DR. KIESSLING: Okay.

11 DR. GENEL: Yeah, this was -- this was a
12 resubmission of a grant that was submitted -- a grant that
13 was submitted last year and that did not make the cut.
14 The score is 4, but the peer reviews are pretty laudatory.
15 And the resubmission has substantially improved, the
16 goals are worthy, the -- we got an enormous amount of
17 information from this investigator, including appendices,
18 and so forth. So, I'm inclined to put this in the yes
19 column.

20 DR. KIESSLING: This is Anne, can you hear
21 me?

22 MS. TOWNSHEND: Now we can.

23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah.

24 DR. KIESSLING: Is this the -- does this

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 investigator have another project? This is the anti-tumor
2 project?

3 DR. GENEL: Yeah, this is to use T-Cell
4 receptors to generate pluripotent stem cells that --

5 DR. KIESSLING: That are -- that fight
6 tumors. Does this investigator have other Connecticut
7 money?

8 DR. GENEL: Well, I was looking through --
9 I'll look at that.

10 DR. DEES: There's another grant, I think,
11 in the established investigators that has a similar theme.

12 DR. GENEL: She's looking for it now.
13 Chelsey's looking for it.

14 MS. TOWNSHEND: Chelsey's looking for it,
15 Anne.

16 DR. GENEL: Well, his resume -- or his
17 application indicates a young investigator award from the
18 Breast Cancer Alliance, in which he's the P.I. And that
19 he's the co-investigator on one, two, -- one, two, three
20 funded NIH grants. Not the first investigator, he's got a
21 pending grant, at least, listed as of the fall. So, yes,
22 he does have other funding.

23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I don't think we've
24 taken that into consideration for everybody else, do they

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 have money here --

2 DR. KIESSLING: No, I was just wondering if
3 there was overlap because this is a very familiar topic.

4 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, but the
5 scientific overlap, you know, we can look at, but we have
6 not made judgments on grants based on whether or not they
7 can get money.

8 DR. KIESSLING: No, no, no, no, I was
9 really just wondering if this application overlapped with
10 somebody else in that lab that was already funded to do
11 the same thing.

12 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I don't think we have
13 a way of telling that. So, I think we have to consider
14 the grant on its own merit unless we have some information
15 otherwise.

16 DR. GENEL: Well, I agree with Anne, that
17 that's a relevant point that I --

18 DR. KIESSLING: And I thought this was an
19 interesting application.

20 DR. GENEL: -- don't see that offhand.

21 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah, I have problems
22 because we might know that anecdotally about X, or Y, or
23 Z, but we don't know about everybody else. So, that
24 interjects a -- that does not keep the playing field

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 level.

2 MS. HORN: Do we have a recommendation on
3 this grant?

4 DR. KIESSLING: I would like to move it to
5 the yes category. It's significantly improved over the
6 last submission.

7 DR. GENEL: I agree.

8 MS. HORN: Okay, we have a recommendation
9 to move this to yes. Is there any objection? Hearing
10 none, move this to yes. Next is 32.

11 MS. TOWNSHEND: Next grant is 10SCA32.
12 That's bone regeneration potential of mesenchymal cells
13 derived from ES cells versus adult mesenchymal stem cells.
14 Hart and Latham -- well, I guess it's just Hart.

15 DR. HART: This was bone regeneration.
16 It's very translational, but they list as support part of
17 the core that runs one more year, according to their dates
18 in the grant, I checked. So, I guess I'm inclined with
19 the score and with that information to move to the no.

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I'm sorry, I don't
21 understand your reason.

22 DR. HART: Both that they're part of a core
23 that has an additional year of funding, according to their
24 own proposal.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah. But I mean,
2 neither of these institutions that we deal with are
3 bankrupt. Go ahead.

4 DR. GOLDHAMER: I just want to make a
5 factual comment. The Rowe Group Grant has ended. And
6 Evo(phonetic) was not part of that group grant, so if he's
7 referring to a core it's some other -- it's something
8 else.

9 MS. HORN: And Dr. Latham did not leave any
10 comments regarding the seed grants. He did remind us that
11 we need to think about alternatives in case any of these
12 grants should fail, so just keep that in the back of your
13 mind as we go through.

14 DR. HART: Well, still I recommend a no.

15 MS. HORN: Recommended no. Any objection?
16 Hearing none --

17 DR. FISHBONE: Can you tell us what the
18 grant is? I missed that.

19 DR. HART: It was the bone regeneration.

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: Bone regeneration,
21 potential of mesenchymal cells derived from ES cells
22 versus adult mesenchymal stem cells.

23 DR. WALLACK: Second the no.

24 MS. HORN: Okay, the recommendation is to

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 no. Any objection? Hearing none, the grant is moved to
2 the no column.

3 MS. TOWNSHEND: The last one is A20?

4 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: 40.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: Oh, A-40, sorry. Next
6 grant is 10SCA40. The lamin (indiscernible) during stem
7 cell differentiation. That would be Latham and Genel? Is
8 that correct?

9 DR. GENEL: Yeah, this is one of two grants
10 that Dr. -- this is one of two seed grants that Dr. Kruger
11 submitted. Neither got high ranking scores. The -- I
12 think this is marginal. He's -- it's -- there are a
13 number of criticisms, including that this was a fairly
14 ambitious study. And not -- and the point was made that
15 it may not be a true model for the mutation.

16 So, I would move this to the no category with some
17 regret, because I you know, all things being equal we'd
18 like to fund it.

19 DR. WALLACK: Second.

20 MS. HORN: The recommendation is to move
21 this grant to the no column. Any objection? Hearing
22 none, it's moved to the no.

23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Dan or Chelsey can we
24 get an idea of -- just in a minute where we are?

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 MR. WAGNER: Yeah, we have -- that's 14
2 seed grants.

3 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: 14?

4 MR. WAGNER: Yeah, at a total of 2.799
5 million, with the core grant it's 3 million, two-hundred
6 ninety-nine and change. Is that what you got?

7 MS. SARNECKY: I have a total with all of
8 the yes's together were at a little over 12 million right
9 now.

10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, but we're at
11 3.7 -- we're at 2.7 with the smaller grants?

12 MR. WAGNER: With the core at 500k --

13 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: 500K.

14 MR. WAGNER: -- it's 3,299,839.

15 DR. WALLACK: What's the seed? The 14
16 seeds come to what, 2.7?

17 MR. WAGNER: 2.7 and change.

18 DR. WALLACK: 2.7.

19 DR. DEES: 2.7 is effectively 2.8.

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah, okay. So, it
21 looks like we've gotten to where we wanted to get in this
22 part of the program. I suggest we take a break and
23 reconvene just before 10 a.m., and we'll tackle some of
24 the others.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 (Off the record)

2 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, and we note
3 with pleasure that Dr. Pescatello is here.

4 MS. TOWNSHEND: And Dr. Kiessling's still
5 on Skype.

6 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. And also with
7 pleasure that she is still on audio and video media, which
8 is no where as good as Dr. Kiessling in person, but we'll
9 have to settle for it. And we have how many dollars now -
10 -

11 DR. KIESSLING: Thank you, Commissioner.

12 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: You're welcome. If
13 everything -- that's a true statement. If we fund
14 everything that's a yes so far, what was the dollar
15 figure? Around 13 million?

16 DR. HART: Yeah, I had 12 million -- just
17 over 12 million.

18 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: If it's over 12
19 million --

20 DR. WALLACK: It's 12.3 million.

21 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: What's \$300,000 bucks
22 to guys like you and I?

23 DR. WALLACK: Right.

24 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah. So, we have a

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 gap here between 9.8 and 12.3, which is two and a half
2 million dollars, I believe.

3 DR. WALLACK: That's exactly right.

4 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. And we're
5 going to go back and start going over established
6 investigator grants. Once again, I don't think any of the
7 -- if we did not fund or partially funded any one of a
8 given number of established investigators, that they would
9 certainly not be without means, both within their own
10 institution or without to come up with another source of
11 funding. So, let us go back over there.

12 I think the other thing, as Mr. Mandelkern
13 and I have discussed, both within and without the halls of
14 this meeting, is that we've put a great deal of time and
15 effort into what our international authorities think is
16 reasonable scores.

17 They've been reviewed, and re-reviewed, so
18 I think that we really need a very cogent reason to take a
19 low scoring grant and say well those guys, you know,
20 really didn't give this grant the type of perusal we
21 thought they should.

22 We may know some things locally, or we may
23 have some gaps in how we want this research to proceed,
24 which might make us move a grant up a slot or two. Once

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 again, Dr. Hart's comments about, you know, don't get hung
2 up on the difference between 2.8 and 3.4, it's probably
3 not worth getting hung up about.

4 And with that we'll move into the
5 established investigator grants. Dr. Wallack?

6 DR. WALLACK: Yeah, so I have a thought, and
7 that is that we have approximately 9 million dollars in
8 the yes category, give or take --

9 DR. DEES: Just for established
10 investigators?

11 DR. WALLACK: For established investigator.
12 For the category we're now going to consider, established
13 investigator, we've approved nine grants. And that is,
14 therefore, approximately - not exactly, a little less than
15 9 million dollars. One of the --

16 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay.

17 DR. WALLACK: -- one of the thoughts that I
18 have, I would hate to see any of these individuals not be
19 funded. I think that was evident yesterday when we gave
20 every due consideration -- extensive consideration and we
21 all agreed that they were all absolutely worthy grants.

22 We could accomplish that if we did
23 something that we've done in the past. And that is, and
24 it has not seemed to interfere with the progress of our

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 program in this state. And that is, we have taken a
2 certain percentage from -- and this is a I think, a good
3 thing, in that it keeps more people in the program.

4 We've taken a certain percentage, if we
5 took \$275,000 dollars from approximately a million dollar
6 grant, it would give us -- it would give each individual
7 approximately \$725,000 dollars -- \$725,000 dollars. That
8 would get us to exactly the point, 9.8 million dollars --
9 9.8 million dollars, that we have to get to.

10 I'm not sure if you're ready to accept that
11 kind of an approach, but I just want to put it out there
12 as a possible thought process. And certainly one that
13 since I know budgets are estimates, that I would be
14 willing to put out there if the Chair wanted at some point
15 in the next hour or so to entertain that kind of motion,
16 or for that matter, now. I'd be willing to do that.

17 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, we'll let's
18 look at that. Let's say we cut 10 grants by \$250,000
19 thousand dollars each --

20 DR. WALLACK: Nine grants.

21 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Nine grants, I'm just
22 saying for the purposes of my observations. So, a million
23 dollar grant turns into a \$750,000 dollar grant. And with
24 direct and indirect overheads and spread out over a couple

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 of years, that's not much operational money, number one.

2 Number two, if we cut 9 grants a total of
3 two and a half million dollars, who's going to make up the
4 difference? I'll tell you who's going to make up the
5 difference, Yale and UConn. So, you can do it that way or
6 if you knock off three grants -- no matter how you do it
7 it's going to be the same thing. There's only two
8 entities involved here, potentially.

9 And if I'm at UConn and I'm looking for a
10 million bucks and I get 750 and I'll be in Dr. Laurencin's
11 the next day and say I need another 250. So, it comes out
12 the same way, except I think there's some practicalities
13 in cutting -- and how were you going to cut the grant down
14 to 750 without doing a whole lot of internal rearranging.

15
16 So, if I'm Dr. Laurencin and I have three
17 million dollar grants and I get two of them, I'll have to
18 cough up a million dollars for one grant, rather than do a
19 lot of machinations with three individual grants. But
20 certainly that -- those are suggestions that are open for
21 discussion.

22 We've done this before, kind of taking the
23 same amount away from everybody, that's a little too
24 ecumenical for me. But that's alright, we can do it that

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 way or we can cut some grants out entirely. Either way,
2 the institution is going to have to make up the
3 difference.

4 DR. GOLDHAMER: I'd like to comment on
5 that. If I had a grant pending that was cut \$250,000
6 dollars and went to my Dean or Provost for that money, it
7 absolutely would not come through. You know I can't speak
8 for Yale, but I assume it's the same there.

9 The institution will not fund my individual
10 research program. I could threaten to leave the
11 university, and maybe then -- well, maybe in my case that
12 wouldn't make a difference either. But -- so you know, I
13 think we need to keep that in mind.

14 If I -- if 250 is cut off it's gone, it's
15 not coming back. And I mean, I think I agree, maybe not -
16 - I agree with Milt's principle of having perhaps some
17 across the board cut in order to free up some money or get
18 down to where we need to be. In my opinion, though,
19 250,000 is way too much to cut. That, you know, maybe 10
20 percent or something would be a more reasonable number,
21 you know, just --

22 DR. WALLACK: David, I understand where
23 you're coming from. And I certainly I see -- respect your
24 judgment -- your scientific judgment on this. And I voted

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 for your recommendation at our Advisory Committee
2 meetings, so I get that.

3 I'm torn however, by the issue of between
4 wanting you to be able to go back and fulfill all of your
5 science, as opposed to somebody else not being able to get
6 to the table at all. And my experience in this, four
7 years now, is that as we've done this, it has not stopped.

8
9 You know, I see the scientists shaking
10 their heads, but the reality is it has not stopped those
11 scientists from somehow proceeding with their research.
12 The -- not one scientist, not one scientist has had to
13 eliminate themselves from their project because we made
14 that kind of an approach, not one.

15 DR. GOLDHAMER: But there's something in
16 between going 100 percent full force ahead, and
17 eliminating the program. If you cut the money the
18 productivity will be less, there's no question about that.

19 So, yeah the projects will go on, but they won't go on at
20 the same rate as they would with more money.

21 MS. TOWNSHEND: Ann, did you have something
22 to say?

23 DR. KIESSLING: Yes, I actually emailed
24 this morning, I have a couple of specific thoughts that

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 relate to Dr. Wallack's suggestion. And one of them was
2 to cut one of the grants that I was concerned about
3 yesterday, the Flavell grant, which is our highest score.

4 Our concern about that is that the
5 reviewers noted that these people don't necessarily have
6 proven expertise in what they're trying to do. It's a
7 very large grant, so if that grant were cut to two years
8 instead of four, that would give them time to figure out
9 how to drive the hematopoietic stem cells without stopping
10 the work. But it wouldn't give them four years of
11 support, which isn't going to be used well if they can't
12 drive the cells they need.

13 So that's one suggestion. The other
14 concern was perhaps to cut the Wesleyan Grant, Dr.
15 Grabel's grant, from four years to three years.

16 DR. WALLACK: The Grabel Grant wasn't--

17 DR. KIESSLING: And that would allow her
18 work to continue and also speak to some of the concerns of
19 the reviewers as to how stem cell related the work was.
20 So, those were my two suggestions.

21 I think if we went through each of the
22 approved established investigator grants, we might be able
23 to find some specific budget recommendations for them that
24 would allow one or two more of the maybe's to be funded.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 I mean, I could make that a motion, should I make that a
2 motion about those two particular grants?

3 DR. WALLACK: The Grabel Grant wasn't one
4 of the yes's, Anne.

5 DR. KIESSLING: It was in a maybe category.

6 DR. WALLACK: It was in the maybe category,
7 that's one of the nine that we're currently discussing.

8 DR. KIESSLING: Okay, so should I make a
9 motion about the one grant that is a yes, the Flavell
10 Grant?

11 DR. WALLACK: It seems to me that would be
12 appropriate.

13 DR. KIESSLING: Then I would like to move
14 that we recommend that that grant be funded for two years
15 instead of four years. That would reduce its budget to
16 \$500,000 from a million.

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: Warren?

18 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: A procedural question. I
19 thought we had agreed that we were going to look at each
20 and every maybe? Instead, we're going right to the yes's.
21 So, we're not following the process. Now, if folks want
22 to change the process, it's fine. But you had laid out a
23 process that we were going to follow.

24 DR. DEES: Well, we didn't actually have a

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 process for these grants, we just decided on the seed
2 grants. So, maybe we need to have a process, but we
3 hadn't --

4 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Well, I did think when
5 we started we said we'd go back and revisit each and every
6 maybe, not specific to this --

7 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: We did, you are
8 correct. And you had a comment, Mr. Mandelkern?

9 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes, I have a comment on
10 process. There are nine yes establishment grants that
11 have been voted yes. They do not equal nine million
12 dollars. Two of them, at least, are only asking for
13 \$500,000.

14 So, we have nine yes's for about 8 million.
15 If we start at the top as we did with the seeds and go
16 down, I think we will find a resolution of our problem.
17 And if we have to go to a blanket cut that should last.
18 But there may be that there's one or two of the yes's that
19 can go to yes/no rather than yes/maybe and that will
20 resolve our situation.

21 DR. WALLACK: I would agree with that, Bob.

22 And I think -- I only put the thought out there as I
23 said, so we would have that as a backup consideration,
24 Bob, as we go through this. But I would certainly agree

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 to go through these nine grants and look for the ways that
2 we can cut each individual one, and then know we can do a
3 fall back percentage cut after we've done exactly what
4 you've suggested. I agree with you.

5 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay.

6 DR. FISHBONE: I think it would be
7 important that we look at the maybe's because of a number
8 of the maybe's I think may turn out to be yes's. And the
9 reason they were maybe's is we went through a whole number
10 and we said, well we want to hold off because we haven't
11 seen the whole portfolio.

12 So, we may not be talking about nine
13 grants, we may be talking about 12 or more. And I think
14 certainly the maybe's need to be decided on before we know
15 how much money we are committing, and therefore, what we
16 have to do to get down to the number that you know, we
17 have to work with.

18 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: It's a great
19 observation. Maryanne, you wanted to read something --

20 MS. HORN: Yes.

21 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: -- Steve into the
22 record.

23 MS. HORN: Steve Latham is bringing up a
24 good point in an email that he sent, which will become

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 part of the record. "With regard to the experienced
2 investigator grants I think it makes sense to look as Paul
3 and Anne were suggesting, for bundles of grants, which
4 address very similar issues. And to fund only some or one
5 of them. This might remove one or two grants from our
6 current experienced investigator yes column."

7 He does have a comment as well on the Laura
8 Grabel grant when we get to that, and to the Fan Grant.

9 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, I'm not sure
10 what bundling in medical terms is a different thing from
11 what we're talking about. And it's also a different thing
12 from what happened in Connecticut in the 1660's to 1720
13 when people got cold at night. And probably into
14 Massachusetts Bay Colony as well.

15 But I think we need to look at maybe grants
16 that are duplicative in nature, rather than -- bundles
17 just kind of a assembling of a bunch of parts. And if
18 there's two grants that do basically the same thing, I
19 think we should look at them and figure let's take one or
20 the other.

21 I'm -- I rally don't think, you know, I --
22 about well, we need to give everybody a little bit of
23 money. I don't -- then if you want to do that, then just
24 figure out the percentages, and we'll send one check to

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 Dr. Laurencin and we'll send one check down to Yale, and
2 we'll adjourn.

3 But that's not -- we're trying to select
4 the best science. And I would -- I find it incredible to
5 think that anybody would really believe that the
6 University of Connecticut or Yale University couldn't fund
7 something that they wanted to fund. So, I -- that
8 knowledge of somebody sitting in his lab weeping and then
9 getting on a train and going to Nebraska or Southern
10 California, whatever, I don't -- that's not true at all. I
11 think they'd find other sources.

12 So, I think we need to go over the maybe's,
13 and then look for duplication, and then pick the best
14 grants. I think if you cut them more than 10 percent I --
15 my personal feeling is it's not the same grant if you cut
16 it more than 10 percent.

17 You know, I can't think of a good analogy,
18 but it's like any other sort of an entity or a creation,
19 you could snip away at it to the point where it doesn't
20 become -- it's so far away from the original that it
21 doesn't count.

22 DR. WALLACK: I would move that we follow
23 your suggestion, Bob, and move to the considerations of
24 the maybe's starting from the best graded grant, as we did

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 in the seeds.

2 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, Paul has a
3 comment.

4 DR. PAUL PESCATELLO: Just a quick comment.

5 I mean, if we're going to cut the funding for any given
6 grant, it should be as Anne just suggested, by year. or,
7 it should be -- we should look at the budget and say, this
8 is something -- this looks like you could get it
9 elsewhere, like if it's equipment or something. But not
10 to just -- it's not a negotiation.

11 And to say, we're going to cut it by 5
12 percent, or 10 percent, or 20 percent. It's -- we should
13 look at it substantively and say we -- in our opinion we
14 think this could be found elsewhere, but not just to cut
15 it.

16 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: That's fine, I think
17 we should eliminate the ones that are duplicated --
18 duplicative in nature, after reviewing the maybe's, get
19 rid of the ones that do the same thing, and then look and
20 see where there are some economies, without cutting it
21 back so that it's simply a pro forma payment.

22 And do you want to do these by low scores,
23 high scores, alphabetically, country of origin, whatever
24 you want to do?

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 DR. WALLACK: Best score first, I would
2 recommend.

3 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Best score -- okay.

4 MR. MANDELKERN: We're doing the maybe's
5 first?

6 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: The maybe's first,
7 starting with the best score.

8 MS. TOWNSHEND: So, we're taking a look now
9 at 10SCB29, epigenetic regulation of reprogramming -- 3.0
10 Kiessling and Mandelkern.

11 DR. KIESSLING: Is this the Dr. Park Grant?

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yes, it is. You ready,
13 Bob?

14 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes. This is a grant that
15 I felt very strongly about, it should have been put in the
16 yes at the beginning. He's an experienced investigator
17 with a strong record of publications in very eminent
18 journals, he is trying to finalize some work on IPS, which
19 has been a very dominant theme in stem cell research over
20 the last several years.

21 He's assembled a very good team, as the
22 reviewers say, he's very capable of doing the work, his
23 training is very good. And I think he's come recently to
24 Connecticut, and I think he should be encouraged to move

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 ahead with his research. And I would support moving this
2 maybe to a yes.

3 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: How much of his time
4 are we going to get?

5 DR. KIESSLING: I think this is actually
6 funding a reasonable percentage. My concerns about this
7 application -- and I was the other reviewer, is that this
8 is very similar. We have three applications that are
9 doing reprogramming. And I would like actually to -- I
10 could review these really quickly myself and see how much
11 overlap there is.

12 But my big concern about Dr. Park's grant
13 is that he's never had his own funding before, this is a
14 lot of money for a young investigator. And what he's
15 trying to do, some of it's already been done and a lot of
16 it is ongoing in other laboratories. So, at the minimum
17 if we move him to a yes category, I would not fund him for
18 four years, I would only fund him for three.

19 But I think his grant is very -- his
20 application is very similar to a couple of others in this
21 category. And I'd like a chance to look at those.

22 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Do we need to look at
23 those now?

24 DR. KIESSLING: Yes, probably.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: What are the other
2 two?

3 DR. KIESSLING: I'm trying to remember
4 which ones they were. I think Paul remembers which ones
5 they were. We've got two others that are similar to this.

6 DR. PESCATELLO: Actually, the next one,
7 Andrew Xiao.

8 MS. TOWNSHEND: B22?

9 DR. PESCATELLO: Yes, B22.

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: Is one of those?

11 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: It's the same
12 institution.

13 DR. DEES: And I think 19 was also a
14 reprogramming one that I --

15 DR. KIESSLING: Yes, they're all at the
16 same institution.

17 DR. PESCATELLO: And maybe 16 too?

18 DR. KIESSLING: I'm looking --

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: 16 is a yes.

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Gee, what a
21 coincidence.

22 DR. PESCATELLO: Yes, 19 was reprogramming
23 too.

24 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So, there's four of

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 them, two of which were already rated as yes, two of which
2 were rated as maybe.

3 MS. HORN: All at one institution.

4 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Well, we have four
5 grants all from the same institution doing what appears to
6 be similar things.

7 DR. DEES: Yeah, so, for that reason I
8 would say no to this one.

9 DR. WALLACK: Second no.

10 MS. HORN: The recommendation is to move
11 this grant to the no category. Is there any objection to
12 moving this to the no category? Mr. Mandelkern's
13 objection is noted. Anybody else? Anne?

14 DR. KIESSLING: I'm not comfortable not
15 funding this at all. Because I think that -- but I would
16 really like a chance to kind of look at all four of these
17 applications and see if we can come up with a -- oh,
18 here's my note. If we could come up with a more
19 comprehensive way to do this.

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: How's that?

21 DR. KIESSLING: So, maybe we should go on
22 to another maybe and I'll look over my notes. Maybe Paul
23 and I can do that. I've made notes about each one of
24 these that's reprogramming and I just -- I've just now

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 located them.

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: The next one would be 22,
3 but that's reprogramming also. So, there's 21.

4 MS. HORN: So, we have two options here,
5 one is that we could table this motion and proceed as Anne
6 has suggested. The other is to proceed with a voice vote
7 on the no recommendation. What is the committee's
8 pleasure?

9 DR. DEES: We can table it for now.

10 DR. FISHBONE: I think we should hold off.

11 MS. HORN: Okay.

12 DR. FISHBONE: You know, the -- I think an
13 important question here is obviously reprogramming is a
14 very hot topic, which is why so many people are working on
15 it. And the question would be, are they overlapping or do
16 they have four different approaches to the same thing.
17 Because obviously this is an important area.

18 DR. PESCATELLO: Right, I mean that's how
19 you develop an expertise in something -- a university
20 develops an expertise in something that's having multiple
21 projects. I mean, I think it's a good idea to have Anne,
22 if she could look -- she's looked at two of them and look
23 at the other two and let's go --

24 DR. KIESSLING: I think this comes under

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 the optimizing the use of available funds. And so, to
2 have four laboratories at one institution working on
3 similar areas might not be the best use of funds overall.
4 So, my -- if I could just have 10 minutes I'll look at
5 these four grants again and see how much overlap I think
6 there is.

7 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: My credulity is
8 strained to think that these are four different projects.

9 DR. GOLDHAMER: Let me make a comment. I
10 agree, we do need the time for Anne and whoever else to
11 look through these. Without more information we may find
12 that these four reprogramming grants are no more similar
13 to each other than four human embryonic stem cell grants.

14 Some could be studying disease mechanisms,
15 some may be studying fundamental aspects of the
16 reprogramming process. So, we clearly need more
17 information and we shouldn't -- a grant should not take a
18 hit at this point until we know a lot more information.

19 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, let's move on.

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: So, we're looking at B21?

21 MS. HORN: Yes, could we just have
22 clarification on which four grants are being taken off the
23 table at this point? You've got B29, B22 --

24 DR. WALLACK: 16 and 19.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 MS. HORN: 16 and 19.

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: Which are both yes.

3 MS. HORN: Which were both yes's.

4 MS. TOWNSHEND: Okay, thank you. So, we're
5 going to B21, is that correct?

6 DR. WALLACK: Correct.

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: B21, the epigenetics of
8 Wolf-Hirschhorn Syndrome a stem cell approach, UCHC for
9 \$597,633 dollars. That would be Hart and Latham.

10 DR. HART: This was the grant on Wolf-
11 Hirschhorn Syndrome and trying to use IPS to generate
12 laboratory cell lines to study histone methylation
13 regulators in this disease. Remember, this was one of the
14 smaller established grant budgets, about \$600,000 instead
15 of a million request.

16 But actually in light of the priorities of
17 the committee and the competitiveness at this range of the
18 grants I'd recommend no at this time and suggest this P.I.
19 to submit this to NIH.

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Did Steve have a
21 comment on it?

22 MS. HORN: Steve did not have a comment on
23 this.

24 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 MS. HORN: The recommendation is to move
2 this grant to no. Is there any objection to this? Hearing
3 none, it is moved to the no category.

4 MS. TOWNSHEND: Next grant is 10SCB30 -- is
5 that correct, wait a minute. B1. B1, Regulation of
6 VEGFR2 signaling in -- something gioblast -- something
7 gioblast mechanism --

8 MALE VOICE: Hemangioblast.

9 MS. TOWNSHEND: Hemangioblast mechanism and
10 therapeutics. Yale for a million. Arinzeh and Hiskes.

11 DR. ARINZEH: Okay, so again this proposal
12 was looking at creating these hemangioblasts from
13 embryonic stem cells looking specifically at this VEGF --
14 expression of this VEGF. And this was a resubmission and
15 the P.I. did address the issues. The reviewers just had
16 some minor weaknesses there about it.

17 So, it was hard for me to say -- well, I'm
18 still kind of at a maybe on this one, unfortunately. And
19 just again, looking at the funding, I was more or less
20 looking at how many we could rally fund. So, I'm leaning
21 toward no, based on that. I think the proposal is a very
22 good proposal.

23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: So, do you want to
24 earmark that in case --

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 DR. ARINZEH: So, I'm saying no.

2 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: -- we want to go back
3 and --

4 DR. ARINZEH: I'm saying no.

5 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: -- that as an
6 alternative?

7 DR. ARINZEH: Say it again?

8 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Do you want to put a
9 mark on that -- we're going to have to have a couple of
10 alternatives. And we could put that as a --

11 DR. ARINZEH: You could do that.

12 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: -- somewhere in
13 number one or number two alternative in case a grant fails
14 or they can't do it, or something happens.

15 DR. ARINZEH: Okay.

16 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Is that reasonable?

17 DR. ARINZEH: Sure.

18 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay.

19 MS. HORN: Is that the will of the group?
20 So, the recommendation is that this would be placed in the
21 no category, but also noted as an alternate in case one of
22 the other grants fails. Is there any objection to this
23 recommendation? Hearing none, it will be placed in the no
24 with the recommendation for an alternative.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: Next grant is 07 -- B07.
2 Caroline Dealy, use of hESC and iPSC derived skeletal
3 progenitors from a million limb and digit regeneration.
4 That's a million for UCHC. And I'm having trouble reading
5 my own writing here to see who that is. Genel and
6 Kiessling.

7 DR. GENEL: Well, this actually builds on a
8 seed grant that was -- that expires this spring. And is
9 to use stem cells to generate -- regenerate limbs in a
10 model -- an animal model that has had limbs removed. The
11 reviewers point out that this is a project that they think
12 could be done within two or three years.

13 This investigator has a lot of funding that
14 all seems to expire this year. Including some project
15 grants, in which he is program director of two aspects.
16 I'm ambivalent, so I'll rely on Anne's comment. If I
17 funded it I would put into a category of funding for two
18 years under the -- with that recommendation. But it's --
19 so, I have an equivocal sort of feeling about it.

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Is your feeling like
21 based on the project itself, or the fact that there's a
22 lot of expiring funding?

23 DR. GENEL: Well, I think the expiring
24 funding, I think, is frankly from my perspective, a

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 productive investigator who has some preliminary studies
2 that are well thought of based on a seed grant, would be
3 supportive in terms of providing some funding. But you
4 know, we don't have that much money and there's a lot of
5 competition. And I have other priorities, so --

6 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I think, what you
7 just said, there's some logic if you do a great job on a
8 seed grant we should really take a hard look at giving it
9 some more funding. But maybe what I hear you saying is
10 there are better grants than this.

11 DR. GENEL: Well, there are other
12 priorities.

13 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Other priorities is a
14 good way to say it.

15 DR. KIESSLING: I loved this grant. I
16 thought this is exactly -- this is a really, I think a
17 strong application. I agree with the idea that there
18 wasn't necessarily four years worth of work here that were
19 really well thought out. The earlier aims for this grant
20 which are going to be a couple of years, I thought were
21 really strong.

22 So, my recommendation on this grant, I
23 would love to see this work go forward. This is nice
24 translational work. I'd love to see this go forward, but

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 probably for two years of funding instead of four.

2 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: What do you think?

3 DR. GENEL: I have no problem with that.

4 That was what I said, I --

5 DR. KIESSLING: I would move it to the yes
6 category for two years, but not four.

7 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay.

8 MS. HORN: Okay, all in favor of that
9 recommendation?

10 VOICES: Aye.

11 MS. HORN: Any opposed?

12 MR. MANDELKERN: I'm opposed.

13 MS. HORN: Mr. Mandelkern is opposed.

14 Noted.

15 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, it's two years
16 and \$500,000 just so we don't confuse it.

17 DR. GENEL: For the time being?

18 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah, okay.

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: Next grant for
20 consideration is B06. Stem cell vaccine against cancer, a
21 million dollars, UCHC. Genel and Kiessling. Hang on,
22 please.

23 DR. GENEL: Anne, if you've got your notes
24 in front of you --

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: Hold on, please.

2 MR. WAGNER: This is 06? This P.I.

3 actually has a grant with us that the committee just voted
4 to -- he is leaving Connecticut for South Carolina, and we
5 just changed him as a lead P.I. in one of his current
6 grants. So, I don't know if that -- if you want to judge
7 it on the science, or the P.I. is leaving, so I don't know
8 how you want to address that.

9 DR. GENEL: Oh, this P.I. is leaving?

10 MR. WAGNER: Is leaving Connecticut. He
11 has a current grant from last year that we've changed the
12 lead P.I. because he is leaving.

13 MS. HORN: Do we have any indication on
14 this grant that which P.I. would be taking over?

15 MR. WAGNER: I assume the co -- the other
16 person on that -- on the grant.

17 DR. GENEL: Well, thank you Dan. I think
18 that makes the decision pretty easy from my perspective.

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: Anne --

20 DR. KIESSLING: Yeah, I agree. Yeah, if
21 the P.I.'s leaving, right.

22 MS. HORN: So, the recommendation is to
23 move this to the no category?

24 DR. GENEL: The no category, yes.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 MS. HORN: Any objection? It is moved to
2 the no.

3 MS. TOWNSHEND: The next grant for
4 consideration is B23, Laura Grabel directing
5 differentiation of embryonic stem cells to epiblast.
6 Wesleyan is the institution, \$999,880 dollars. Dees and
7 Genel, is that correct? No. Latham and you? Okay.

8 DR. DEES: Yeah. So, this was a grant that
9 looked at how stem cells lose their pluripotency in the
10 transition to epiblast stage. This was a grant that I
11 relate had a lot of good things to say for it. I guess I
12 was worried that it wasn't high enough rated
13 scientifically to warrant given the competitiveness of this,
14 on the one hand.

15 On the other hand, I mean one of the things
16 that Steve did say in his email -- do I need to read that
17 into the record?

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yes, please.

19 DR. DEES: I mean, what he does say is --
20 it says, "Of the experienced investigator maybe's, I like
21 to -- I'd speak out for the elevation of the fine basic
22 science projects proposed by Wesleyan investigator Laura
23 Grabel. Her being from Wesleyan is an important
24 consideration here, as Mike pointed out yesterday, and she

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 has a great track record."

2 So, I mean, pretty much every grant we
3 funded is either at Yale or UConn, and this is really one
4 of the best rated ones from another institution. And I
5 mean I think what's right here is that this is eminently
6 fundable, and the only reason why we're down this far is
7 because we don't have enough money. We could -- this is
8 certainly worth funding, so that's not the problem. It's
9 just there are other grants. And I guess for those
10 reasons, I be inclined to move this to a yes.

11 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I have -- I heard the
12 comment yesterday about we have to have diversity and --
13 but we don't. You know, we got UConn, Yale, and Wesleyan.
14 And I think one of the things we don't do well is to look
15 at other institutions, you know, Quinnipiac, Trinity,
16 University Hartford, which had one grant.

17 I think that maybe in times to come we
18 should do some things to encourage that type -- those
19 types of investigators from institutions other than the
20 three that we deal with routinely. And that we encourage,
21 of course, business ones who may come up with something
22 that has cash value, a return on investment for us.

23 This grant gets down into the -- towards
24 the lower level, but I think we should look at the grant

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 on its own merits, rather than say we need to say if we're
2 going to give money to UConn and Yale we have to give some
3 to Wesleyan.

4 DR. DEES: Well that, I mean, that wasn't
5 the argument. The argument was that this is very
6 fundable, and that having a goal of supporting stem cell
7 research at other institutions is a worthy goal. So,
8 there are other institutions that you know, I would have
9 loved to give money to the Connecticut College, but the
10 science just isn't there. That's not true of this one.

11 DR. GENEL: No, and may I remind you,
12 Commissioner, the difference between 3.8 and 3.7, which we
13 just moved to the funding category is not all that great.
14 I think I'm -- I think I'm reciting the Chairman's
15 comments earlier.

16 The other thing I think I'd point out, if
17 you really look carefully at the peer review, I sense
18 there is a difference between the two reviewers. And the
19 second reviewer says this is a well written and straight
20 forward proposal. The strengths of this proposal are the
21 P.I.'s experience and expertise, etc. etc.

22 I mean, the only thing he indicates -- or
23 she, is there's a slight concern about the studies
24 evaluating the epiblastic state and the expression of

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 FGF4. So, I don't -- I do not see this as having received
2 a poor scientific review. I think it was a -- certainly a
3 perfectly adequate scientific review that would be
4 fundable. Perhaps not for four years.

5 DR. KIESSLING: Right.

6 DR. GENEL: The other thing I noticed
7 looking at the grant, is that this laboratory is very
8 dependent on funds from Connecticut. There's not a
9 substantial amount of other external funding. And I think
10 it's in the interest -- I think it's in our overall
11 interest to maintain funding at a center of excellence
12 that's outside of the two major institutions.

13 DR. KIESSLING: I really agree with that.
14 This is the grant that I would recommend get funded for
15 three years. I think that speaks to some of the concerns
16 of the reviewers.

17 DR. HART: And actually I disagree. This
18 was -- everything we're talking about now is
19 scientifically sound, everything we're talking about has
20 been reviewed with some quality. We're trying to nitpick
21 among the best of the quality at this point, not say that
22 anyone doesn't deserve funding at all, that's not true at
23 all.

24 But I don't see the concept of -- I mean, I

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 see -- no where in the criteria of funding grants do I see
2 anything about supporting multiple institutions. So, to
3 me it's should stand on its face in terms of the score and
4 the tone of the review. And I feel as though that it
5 didn't quite make the cut in this high quality round.

6 DR. WALLACK: I'd like to speak to that as
7 well. I think that if we set a bad precedent if we're
8 going to say to the scientific community that we're going
9 to have a distribution pattern that will disregard the
10 best science.

11 I'm here to spend 10 million dollars of
12 state money. If it was my money, and I chose because of
13 what I felt -- and do feel very, very strongly and very
14 highly of Laura Grabel, if I wanted to spend my own
15 million dollars to fund her grant, then I have the option
16 of doing that.

17 But I also have a fiduciary responsibility
18 to protect and best use the state money. And I think that
19 we have to use that best state money and as Ron point out,
20 is no where in the documents that we will do otherwise.
21 So that in this instance based on the science, I would
22 have to say the same thing. That we're talking about the
23 crème de la crème, and in that particular way it's just
24 unfortunately this year doesn't make the grant.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 As far as the -- talking to the other issue
2 about the viability of the lab, I'll remind all of us here
3 that that lab was doing embryonic stem cell research
4 before any passage of any state legislation and without
5 any funding. And it was getting institutional support to
6 do that. And I don't see the threat of that lab not being
7 able to go forward. It was here before us, and I'm sure
8 it will continue with us, and continue in fact if it has
9 to be after us.

10 DR. GENEL: Commissioner, may I make a --
11 Milt, I think I recall you saying earlier that it wasn't
12 our job to simply ratify the scientific reviews, that's
13 why we reviewed all the peer review grants -- the -- all
14 the seed grants. I think it is our responsibility as an
15 overview -- as a review committee to make these judgments.

16
17 And I think it's not inappropriate where
18 the difference between the scores is really marginal. And
19 frankly, we're I think there is a discordance between the
20 two reviews to make a decision of this sort.

21 DR. PESCATELLO: I'd like to just point
22 out, too, that while I guess in the instructions -- the
23 criteria about multiple institutions may not have been in
24 there, but certainly in a statute that governs this

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 committee, we have a lot of different considerations,
2 including -- and -- sort of a core one is promoting stem
3 cell research in Connecticut and the economic development
4 that comes from it.

5 So, I would agree that we're dealing on the
6 margins here, this score I agree with what Richard said
7 that -- I mean, some of the other universities and
8 colleges scored so poorly that it was relatively easy to
9 say we're not going to fund them. But now we're getting
10 down to something very close, and then given this other
11 factor of another university.

12 And if you think of the benefits to the
13 students at Wesleyan and then coming sort of down the
14 chain, who'd be involved working on this and how valuable
15 that would be to Connecticut having this third point of
16 stem cell research, I think that that's something we
17 should take very seriously. And it's very much part of
18 our mission.

19 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I don't think that's
20 outlined. I disagree with you. I don't think that's
21 outlined as part of our mission. And I think we need to
22 pick. This is 10 percent of our entire -- more than 10
23 percent of our entire budget. So, I don't think I've ever
24 seen our charter saying that we have to spread the money

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 out, otherwise we'd be giving it to the state university
2 system and a lot of others.

3 And we've seen some very poor grants, and I
4 think probably some of that is our responsibility for not
5 encouraging them or showing them how to do this stuff.
6 But that's for another generation of board members and
7 reviewers and -- to discuss. But --

8 DR. WALLACK: Bob, maybe a compromise --

9 MR. MANDELKERN: I've been trying to give
10 an opinion on this. And it's my recollection that Dr.
11 Grabel's lab has done a very productive work in the
12 embryonic stem cell field. And she's also been out as a
13 scientific spokesman for the Connecticut stem cell
14 research program. And she's inherently respected in the
15 entire scientific community, and my tendency would be to
16 give such a person the benefit of the doubt, since she's
17 working in a field where nobody else is working also.

18 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, that's not what
19 we're in business for, to -- there's all kinds of people,
20 Renshay and our colleagues at Yale, there's all kinds of
21 great and deserving people. Probably in this whole bunch
22 of things there's a couple of Nobel Laureates. But we're
23 trying to consider the grants on the basis of the work and
24 where it fits in overall.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 So, I think that comments -- you know, Dr.
2 Grabel's a great scientist and none of us would dispute --
3 would dispute that. None of us would dispute that Haifan
4 Lin is a great scientist and a hail fellow well met, a
5 wonderful human being, but I think that's ancillary to our
6 considerations. However, we are you know, we're getting
7 off the point, and if we're ready to take a vote on this,
8 we should take a vote on it.

9 DR. WALLACK: Can I make a suggestion maybe
10 that we vote it to the alternate -- a no, into the
11 alternate column so that it's a standby. I mean, would
12 that --

13 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I thought you had a
14 million dollars you were going to send down there?

15 DR. WALLACK: I was thinking about that,
16 but I checked and --

17 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Wasn't there, huh?

18 DR. WALLACK: I'm just trying to look for a
19 compromise, Bob.

20 DR. KIESSLING: I would like to send only
21 \$750,000.

22 DR. PESCATELLO: For fewer years.

23 MS. HORN: We do need some kind of a motion
24 here because I don't think --

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 DR. WALLACK: I would move that we move it
2 to -- do a no, move it to the alternate with a \$750,000
3 dollar budget.

4 DR. GENEL: I would oppose that.

5 MS. HORN: Okay, I think we --

6 DR. GENEL: I violently disagree. I think
7 our job as a review committee is not to ratify the peer
8 review. That is not why we're here. Otherwise, why are
9 we meeting here for two days if our only job is to simply
10 affirm what the peer reviewers -- the scores of the peer
11 reviewers? We could have done that electronically.

12 MS. HORN: Okay, the motion is to move it
13 to no and then to the alternate. We don't have a second,
14 okay. Do we have a second?

15 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Alright, let's put
16 this one aside for a while. And we --

17 DR. DEES: Why, you have a motion, you have
18 a second.

19 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: No second. There's
20 no second.

21 MS. HORN: Yeah, we have a second.

22 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, then vote.

23 MS. HORN: Okay. Warren, would you call
24 the roll, please?

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yeah, so --

2 MS. HORN: Everyone is eligible.

3 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay, so with the
4 exception of Dr. Goldhamer everyone is eligible, and the
5 Chair.

6 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I can vote, it's
7 Wesleyan.

8 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: There you go, okay. Dr.
9 Dees?

10 DR. DEES: Let me get clear what the vote
11 is. So, if I'm voting yes, I'm voting to put it in the no
12 column, right?

13 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: You're voting to put it
14 in the no column with the notation that it's on reserve.

15 DR. DEES: Alright, so I vote no.

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Dr. Arinzeh?

17 DR. ARINZEH: So -- I'm sorry, so it's a
18 yes to put it into the no?

19 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yes.

20 DR. ARINZEH: Yes.

21 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Dr. Wallack?

22 DR. WALLACK: Yes.

23 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Dr. Fishbone?

24 DR. FISHBONE: No.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Mr. Mandelkern?
2 MR. MANDELKERN: No.
3 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Dr. Genel?
4 DR. GENEL: No.
5 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Let me see -- Dr.
6 Galvin?
7 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yes, put it in the no
8 column.
9 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Dr. Hart?
10 DR. HART: Yes.
11 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Dr. Pescatello?
12 DR. PESCATELLO: No.
13 MS. TOWNSHEND: Kiessling?
14 DR. KIESSLING: No.
15 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Motion fails. Is
16 that correct, Warren?
17 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Two, three, four, five,
18 six, one, two, three, four. Yes, the motion does not
19 carry.
20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: The motion fails.
21 DR. GENEL: May I make another motion, Mr.
22 Chairman?
23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Sure.
24 DR. GENEL: I move that this grant be moved

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 into the yes category with three years of funding.

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: For a total of \$750,000?

3 DR. GENEL: Well, \$750,000 for time being,
4 but three years of funding.

5 MS. HORN: Do we have a second?

6 DR. KIESSLING: I'll second that.

7 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: You want to try to get a
8 consensus on it? No, huh. Okay.

9 DR. WALLACK: Is there discussion on the
10 motion?

11 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: No. Richard?

12 DR. WALLACK: Can we have discussion on the
13 motion?

14 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Sure.

15 DR. WALLACK: So, if we were to do that,
16 are we sure that the three year requirement is a
17 requirement that we have to fund, or is it a possibility
18 in order to protect the integrity of some of the other
19 grants that we're considering -- and again I want to be
20 clear.

21 There's nothing that is bad in the science
22 here, I'm trying to protect also some of the integrity of
23 some other wonderful grants. Can we perhaps consider
24 amending the motion to state a two year commitment rather

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 than a three year commitment?

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: Well, none of the --
3 nothing is final until that final vote is taken.

4 DR. WALLACK: I understand, I understand.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: So.

6 DR. WALLACK: I understand.

7 DR. HART: I just want to make it really
8 clear here that if we vote to do this we vote to put this
9 in the yes column, we're already going to have to go back
10 and find the equivalent of three established investigator
11 grants to take off the yes column, already, this will mean
12 four. Just want to make that clear.

13 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: This is a very
14 controversial grant, a very controversial topic. And
15 there is some strong personal feelings. I think that we
16 would be wise to defer discussion of this until we've
17 looked at our -- what we call bundle grants and the like.

18 There are multiple -- there have been
19 multiple different ways of looking at this in proposals. I
20 think it's confusing, I think we ought to let it sit for a
21 little bit and then go back when we've looked at some of
22 those bundle grants.

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: The suggestion I'm making
24 is that we finish the established investigator maybe's,

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 because we only have one more to do. And then go back to
2 the bundling, if that's okay?

3 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah, leave this one
4 alone until we get some of the other information.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: Okay. So --

6 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Table it.

7 DR. DEES: You mean, that we table it?

8 DR. GENEL: Well, I believe there's a
9 motion on the table, Mr. Chairman.

10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, what's the
11 motion?

12 MS. HORN: The motion is to move it to yes
13 but fund it for three years. We have a second on that.

14 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes, I seconded it, and so
15 did Dr. Kiessling.

16 MS. HORN: We know.

17 DR. DEES: And so, I don't know if the
18 Chair can in order here, move to table, but that's the
19 suggestion is that we table that.

20 MS. HORN: I think the motioner would have
21 to withdraw his motion in order for it to be tabled.

22 DR. WALLACK: The motion to table replaces
23 the motion, I would second the motion to table to a
24 specific time to be directed after the other

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 considerations of the established investigators.

2 MS. HORN: Okay, further discussion? Let's
3 have a vote on the motion to table? All in favor?

4 VOICES: Aye.

5 MS. HORN: Opposed? Motion carries.

6 DR. PESCATELLO: Can you do that? I mean,
7 there was a motion -- the order of motion, there was
8 Mike's motion, don't we have to rule on that first? I
9 mean, can you -- unless he withdraws -- he can withdraw
10 it, but --

11 DR. DEES: No, no, no, motion to table will
12 override.

13 DR. WALLACK: Motion to table takes
14 precedence.

15 MS. HORN: The motion to table overrides
16 the motion, Robert's Rules.

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: So, now we're looking at I
18 think, B18, is that correct?

19 DR. HART: Um-hum.

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: Marianne?

21 MS. HORN: Yes.

22 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yes. That is Fan,
23 developing a micro scale artificial stem cell niche, UConn
24 for \$500,000 dollars, 4.3 is the peer review score. Hart

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 and Latham.

2 DR. HART: I have Dr. Latham's comments.
3 Though I like the -- this is Dr. Latham's email. "Though
4 I like its IP potential, in the end I would not argue to
5 elevate the Fan grant from maybe to yes." And this is the
6 one that was for a microchip for ES culture. Again, due
7 to the competitive nature I would suggest no, but I would
8 also suggest this is potential alternate because it has a
9 lower budget that might fit a gap if it was necessary.

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: Discussion?

11 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: What was the last
12 sentence, I'm sorry?

13 DR. HART: That I would like to suggest
14 this as an alternate, in case there's something else that
15 does not pass escrow, because it has a small budget and
16 therefore, may fit a gap in the budgeting.

17 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Not a bad idea.

18 DR. HART: It may not.

19 MS. HORN: Okay, the recommendation is to
20 place this into the no category as an alternative at
21 \$500,000 dollars. All in favor?

22 VOICES: Aye.

23 MS. HORN: Opposed? Motion carries.

24 MS. TOWNSHEND: So, now we're back to the

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 bundles. Anne, you're on.

2 DR. KIESSLING: So, this is -- we'd like to
3 consider B16, B19, B22, and B29. These are four
4 applications from established investigators at all -- all
5 at Yale University and all dealing with some aspect of
6 reprogramming. Can everybody hear me?

7 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah.

8 DR. KIESSLING: Okay, each of these
9 applications has some interesting concerns by the
10 reviewers about one or more of their aims. And you will
11 note that each of these applications span scores from 2.8
12 to 3.2. So, these are very close together in terms of
13 peer review enthusiasm.

14 The two that we have put in the yes
15 category, one scores 3.1 and one scores 2.8. These two
16 both have concerns by the reviewers in one of their aims.
17 So, a really straight forward way to handle those two is
18 to fund them for only three years. Which would take care
19 of the stronger of the aims and allow them to develop
20 stronger last aims.

21 The two that are in the maybe category, the
22 one that's a score of 3.2, and a one of 3.0, both have
23 concerns. My concern about Dr. Parks' grant is stronger
24 than the concerns that are expressed in the reviewer. But

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 the biggest problem is a lot of this work has already been
2 done by Dr. Parks, some of it. And I think that that
3 grant would do really well for the first two aims, which
4 would give it two years of funding. And Xiao from Yale
5 University would have three years of funding because
6 there's also concerns about one of those aims.

7 So, my recommendation would be to move the
8 two maybes that have scores almost identical to the ones
9 in the yes category to yes's with less than four years of
10 funding. Did -- do you want to take those up one at a
11 time?

12 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: What's the total
13 dollar amount to do what you've just proposed?

14 DR. KIESSLING: It's a little over 2
15 million dollars.

16 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: That's 20 percent of
17 our budget going to one place for programs that if not
18 somewhat similar, are at least connected.

19 DR. KIESSLING: Well, this --

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I'm concerned about
21 that.

22 DR. KIESSLING: This is a hot topic. And
23 this needs to be done. But I think that rather than fund
24 the two that we've put in the yes category fully, it makes

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 more sense to look at their peer review concerns, fund
2 them at a lesser level, and then be able to fund the two
3 maybes also at some level.

4 I think that's going to be the biggest bang
5 for the buck. This is a very hot topic, it's an important
6 area for induced pluripotent stem cells.

7 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. What changes -
8 - now, the peer review -- we have some doubts about the
9 peer review for four years but it's okay for two years?
10 What changes it by cutting it in half?

11 DR. KIESSLING: My -- that was my
12 suggestion for Dr. Parks' grant only. I have more
13 concerns about that grant than the peer reviewers did,
14 except they talk about the fact that it's not innovative.
15 And I know that some of that work is you know, is going to
16 be very expensive work, but we're not going to learn that
17 much more than we already know.

18 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: But why are investing
19 in it?

20 DR. KIESSLING: ON the other hand, we need
21 to so do some of the first one or two aims that he has
22 described in order to know where to go after that. So,
23 his grant is weak for the last two years, it's stronger
24 for the first two.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: And the other grants
2 don't cover what he's doing in the first two?

3 DR. KIESSLING: Not exactly. Nobody
4 exactly covers, but each of these applications the
5 reviewers point out that they're not too sure about one of
6 the later aims. So, all four of these applications are in
7 a similar area, they're stronger with the early work that
8 they want to do, they're weaker with the later work. I
9 don't know how else to handle it.

10 I mean I think that the two in the yes
11 category, the B16 and the B19, there's no exact overlap,
12 but there's concerns about the later aims by each of the
13 reviewers. And I think that's the weakness in all of
14 these reprogramming grants, is that until you do the first
15 few, the first part of it, you don't know exactly what
16 experiments to do after that.

17 DR. HART: Just adding up what Anne just
18 suggested, my sums are that that brings us as a total up
19 to about 13.3 million, with over -- just over 10 million
20 dollars in established grants. I think that in light of
21 just the tight budget picture and the percentage of the
22 entire pot that would be devoted to this larger project,
23 and I understand this is four separate projects with no
24 scientific overlap between them. I'm not sure that we can

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 really afford to implement that suggestion fully. That's
2 my concern.

3 And actually I like the idea of taking the
4 two already approved yes's and taking them to \$750,000
5 total for three years instead of four, based on the
6 argument that Anne gave, the scientific arguments that
7 Anne gave. But I'm not so sure about the other two to
8 tell you the truth.

9 MR. WAGNER: I'd also like to point out
10 that if we do start chopping these by year, or a quarter,
11 or half, you know, we talked about making these broad
12 brush percentage decreases. So, if you cut somebody by a
13 half and then you take 20 percent off of it, now all of a
14 sudden you gave them a seed grant to perform the work that
15 they've just you know -- so, you have to keep that in mind
16 that if we're going to cut them down and then make broad
17 brush strokes, you're really going to hamper what they can
18 do in their goals.

19 DR. KIESSLING: Well not for the first two
20 years.

21 DR. FISHBONE: I would point out that if
22 you cut them from a million to 500,000 it's not like a
23 seed grant, it's still 500,000. And you know, I see no
24 reason why they couldn't work for two years and then

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 reapply for additional funding. Because --

2 MR. WAGNER: We're still going to be over
3 and we're going to have to make more cuts, is what my
4 point is. Is that -- and then if you take 20 percent or
5 25 percent off of that to get it to a point where you're
6 funding 12 instead of 8, you might run up into that
7 barrier where you're going to inhibit you know, what they
8 can actually do.

9 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah, and I think
10 with these four, I think what maybe Dan and I are trying
11 to say the same things, is that if you fund all four then
12 you're going to have to take money away from -- either cut
13 across the board or take money away from other grants.

14 And I'm not sure we want 20 percent of the
15 -- once again, 20 percent of the budget -- more than 20
16 percent residing in one generalized area and one
17 institution.

18 DR. DEES: -- on the table is a motion so
19 to say to move the two grants that are in the maybe to no,
20 and to move the two grants that are in yes to funding at
21 \$750,000.

22 MALE VOICE: Second.

23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, we have a
24 motion that's been moved and seconded. Discussion,

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 please?

2 DR. FISHBONE: I have a problem in general
3 with four years of funding in an extraordinarily rapidly
4 developing field. I just don't know, and maybe you know
5 the people involved in research can address that. But I
6 think the things that we think are important today may be
7 totally different in two years or three years.

8 And so, I know we put this out as a
9 proposal for four year, but it seems to me a lot will
10 change I four years. And I would personally feel
11 comfortable with funding people fully for two years or
12 three years, and then come back and see where they are at
13 that point.

14 I realize they would have to change their
15 application somewhat to maybe cut out one of the aims.
16 But I think you're giving them full funding for whatever
17 period of time you decide, and then reevaluate by applying
18 for a further grant at that time.

19 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: But -- I don't think
20 we can change and do that right now at this stage of the
21 deliberations.

22 MS. HORN: The RFP talks about funding up
23 to four years. We have in the past had grant applications
24 that were approved for two years, come back to us with a

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 budget to fund that work at that level for the committee's
2 approval. So, we could proceed along those lines.

3 DR. GENEL: Mr. Chair, I would fully
4 support this. I mean, irrespective of the RFP, we're
5 trying to allocate a small amount of money. And I would
6 support funding at a maximum of three years and I think we
7 might want to look at some of these at two years.

8 MS. HORN: Dr. Genel, you can't participate
9 in the Yale discussions.

10 DR. GENEL: No, I'm talking generally, I'm
11 not talking specifically about the four -- I'm talking
12 about the entire category --

13 MS. HORN: Okay.

14 DR. GENEL: -- of established investigator
15 grants.

16 MS. HORN: Yeah, we have the motion on the
17 table that we're discussing right now pertains to the four
18 Yale grants. Now, we have a motion that -- I'm sorry?

19 DR. GOLDHAMER: A little more discussion?
20 So, in response to Gerry's comment, I mean I don't think
21 that because a field is rapidly moving means that we
22 should not fund it for four years. Any field that's
23 interesting is rapidly moving. And so, I don't think
24 that's a great argument.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 I think these -- and I also haven't heard
2 an argument for why these grants should be grouped or
3 thought of as a group. I think they should all be handled
4 as individual grants, the areas seem distinct enough. I
5 made the point before that grouping them because they're
6 reprogramming grants is like grouping ES cell grants. I
7 haven't heard any argument to the contrary.

8 I have heard good arguments for why some of
9 the aims, especially the latter aims are risky or not well
10 thought out. And for those reasons on an individual
11 basis, I would support the idea of making appropriate cuts
12 in years.

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: Anne?

14 DR. KIESSLING: Yes, I would like --
15 listening to this discussion I'd actually like to move
16 that the B16 and --

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: Anne --

18 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: There's a motion on
19 the floor.

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: We have a motion on the
21 table already.

22 DR. KIESSLING: Oh, I'm sorry.

23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. Now, my
24 understanding of the motion was to change the maybe's to

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 no, and to fund the two yes's at \$750,000 dollars for the
2 duration, what did they ask for, four years each? That's
3 the motion that's on the floor.

4 DR. HART: To fund them for three years was
5 the motion.

6 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Three years, okay.
7 Not fully fund them, fund them for \$750,000. Okay, so the
8 two maybe's are going to go away, the two yes's are going
9 to be funded for what the time they requested, but for
10 only \$750,000 rather than a million.

11 DR. HART: And just in closing, too I
12 really would -- I'd like to see every one of the grants
13 we're arguing about funded. Scientifically they are all
14 meritorious, there is no reason to say that there's any
15 reason there's not a scientific merit to these projects.
16 But in the practical nature of what's in front of us,
17 that's why I suggested what I suggested originally.

18 And lastly, just the issue of two year
19 versus four year grants. Two year grants mean that you're
20 spending a huge amount of your time writing grants.
21 That's really the issue here, is that a three year or four
22 year support means you're significantly more productive
23 over the long haul.

24 MR. MANDELKERN: Dr. Galvin?

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, so what you're
2 saying, let me make sure I understand your remarks, that a
3 three year grant gives you more chance to get started and
4 get into the work. Because what we found practically
5 speaking is the first six to eight months are really dead
6 time. So, you really have like two years and -- 26 months
7 or something like that.

8 So, what you're saying is by -- and the
9 larger grants, which have more spooling up time that you
10 need to have a longer time period in order to get up to
11 speed and do something. Okay, that's understandable, I
12 understand that, yeah.

13 MR. MANDELKERN: On the motion I would echo
14 Dr. Goldhamer's remarks. We have not pooled together in
15 my four year's experience on the committee any grants of
16 any nature, and I wouldn't be surprised with the least bit
17 of effort that many of these grants from similar
18 institutions could be grouped.

19 I do not think that's the way we should go
20 about our work. I think that if the two yes's are
21 scientifically meritorious and we have found them to be so
22 in our discussion yesterday, the peer reviewers certainly
23 found them to be worthy also, we should not limit them by
24 cutting the funds without even considering the other EI

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 grants, whether they should be cut.

2 So, I would speak against the motion
3 because it seems to me capricious, I'm sorry, Dr.
4 Kiessling, and arbitrary, and unnecessary. If the maybe's
5 have to go into the no, if that's the scientific
6 evaluation, I agree. But certainly not to take leverage
7 against the two other grants.

8 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, let me just say
9 that this is not a -- this is not a scientific board per
10 se. That I think that at least half the people here at
11 table are not stem cell scientists, and really don't have
12 the clinical background to make refined decisions about
13 these topics.

14 And therefore, we do what the people always
15 do, is we try to put like things together, we try to make
16 some sense out of this. And it may be that of these four
17 grants none of them is very similar to the other. But
18 we're trying to make sense out of this.

19 I spent some time educating myself in
20 geonomics, as Warren, by taking courses in Boston and on
21 line, so we know a little bit about it. But we certainly
22 don't know what Ron knows. And we have to find some
23 reasonable way of evaluating it, and lumping them or
24 grouping them together rightly or wrongly is one of the

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 ways that people do these kind of things.

2 I tend to think that -- one of my
3 tendencies like Mr. Mandelkern, is if the grant's good,
4 fund it, if it's not so hot don't fund it at all. But we
5 don't do things that way. We give people partial
6 payments, and that's okay too. But there is a motion on
7 the floor, there's some philosophy involved here, that's
8 why I interject my comments.

9 DR. WALLACK: Move to move the motion.

10 MS. HORN: Do you want to say something?
11 Hang on. Anne?

12 DR. KIESSLING: Right, I want to respond
13 really briefly to what Bob said. I think our issue, Bob,
14 was to make sure that there wasn't overlap between these
15 grants at the same institution. And so, I've just gone
16 through them really quickly and there is no overlap.
17 There is -- it's the general area of reprogramming.

18 And I think our concern was that they were
19 actually trying to do some identical work. That doesn't
20 seem to be the case. But they do -- the peer reviewers do
21 have concerns with some of the aims in each one of them.

22 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah, and I think
23 that's just the kind of information we need, but you could
24 probably sit for a half an hour and discuss it with me,

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 and I would not be able to make those kind of distinctions
2 that you're able to make.

3 Having -- in my other life down the street a little
4 bit from here we see lots of grants and we see some stuff
5 that's maybe a little overlap or under lap, etc, etc. So,
6 I bring with me unfortunately a suspicious mind. But I
7 think we're ready to take a vote on this.

8 MS. HORN: Yes, do people need the motion
9 repeated?

10 VOICES: Yes.

11 MS. HORN: Okay, the motion is to take the
12 two yes grants, B16 and B19 and fund them at three years -
13 - a three year level. And to take B22 and B29 and move
14 them from maybe to no.

15 FEMALE VOICE: And a vote in the
16 affirmative endorses this?

17 MS. HORN: Correct. A yes vote would
18 endorse both of those packages. Is that clear? Okay,
19 Warren, would you take the roll please? I'm sorry? Well,
20 I'll take a consensus, sure I'll try. Is there a
21 consensus on this motion? Dr. Genel is recused. Any
22 opposed?

23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: You okay, Ron? Yeah,
24 okay.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: Two opposed.

2 MS. HORN: Okay, we've got two opposed. And
3 the motion passes.

4 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Do you want to take a
5 voice vote on it?

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: No, I think --

7 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Record the votes?
8 No. Do you know who the no's are?

9 MS. HORN: I do.

10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay.

11 MS. HORN: I do.

12 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I shouldn't even have
13 asked.

14 MS. HORN: Dr. Fishbone and Dr. -- or Mr.
15 Mandelkern.

16 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay.

17 MS. HORN: Okay, very good.

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: Where does that put us?
19 Where does that put us in terms of --

20 MS. SARNECKY: Well, I just have a question
21 to clarify. The two grants that were labeled yes that
22 we're planning on now funding for three years, are we
23 cutting that from a million down to \$750? Okay, thank
24 you.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 DR. HART: That puts us back to a total of
2 12,072,000. Right back to where we were when we first got
3 here this morning. I think at this point, it would
4 probably be valuable especially that because Dr. Kiessling
5 had a suggestion we haven't acted on yet. To go back to
6 the top of the yes's and just kind of briefly see if
7 there's any reasons, scientific or otherwise, to make any
8 changes to the yes's.

9 Because we have to in the established
10 investigator category, yes. And I say that specifically
11 starting with the highest scored, because I remember that
12 Dr. Kiessling had a suggestion about Dr. Flavell's grant.

13 MR. WAGNER: You still have one maybe on
14 the Board.

15 MS. TOWNSHEND: Where?

16 MR. WAGNER: Grabel.

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: Oh, yes we do. So, we're
18 starting with Flavell. Which is B36, reconstruction of
19 human hemopoietics system and HCS's derived from human
20 embryonic stem cells in humanized mice. One million
21 dollars, Yale University. Kiessling and Mandelkern.

22 DR. KIESSLING: My recommendation -- my
23 concern about this application is that this very
24 established investigator has no experience and provides no

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 data that they can actually derive the metapoeitic stem
2 cells from human HES cells.

3 His collaborator for doing this is in
4 China, and is also a Gates Foundation funded investigator,
5 and I -- the reviewers were concerned about this. For
6 this reason, I would recommend that this application only
7 be funded for two years, which would give the Flavell
8 Laboratory time to demonstrate that they can actually
9 derive the metapoeitic stem cells from HES cells.

10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Who does the
11 gentleman in China work for, because we're supposed to
12 fund only within state?

13 DR. KIESSLING: He doesn't seem to have any
14 say in the budget, it's just that his -- they've used him
15 as the person who has expertise in deriving both the
16 metapoeitic stem cells and hepatocyte stem cells, which is
17 what ruled out an earlier application we discussed. So,
18 it's just a -- it's Dr. Deng who has reported this. He's
19 not part of this Flavell Laboratory's budget.

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Well, how is this
21 supposed to work then?

22 DR. KIESSLING: They just happen to both be
23 also funded by the Gates Foundation.

24 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: That doesn't sound

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 right to me. That makes me apprehensive in a business
2 sense.

3 DR. KIESSLING: Dr. Deng is the consultant?

4 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: What sort of
5 arrangement is -- what does that mean, he's a consultant
6 for no pay?

7 DR. KIESSLING: Right.

8 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: And he's in --

9 DR. KIESSLING: Just says --

10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: -- someplace in
11 China?

12 DR. KIESSLING: I couldn't find anything in
13 the budget about him, he just provides a strong letter
14 that says, you know, I'm very enthusiastic about this
15 work, I'm happy to help you.

16 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: For nothing?

17 DR. KIESSLING: Evidently, I --

18 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I don't think so.

19 DR. KIESSLING: I couldn't find anything in
20 the budget.

21 MS. TOWNSHEND: Bob?

22 MR. MANDELKERN: I'm the other reporter on
23 this grant and I really regret having to disagree with my
24 colleague, Dr. Kiessling on some of these issues.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 DR. KIESSLING: It's alright, Bob.

2 MR. MANDELKERN: Thank, you, Doctor. The
3 score on this grant by the peer reviewers was the highest
4 scientific score out of 90 applicants. That should carry
5 some weight but not all the weight. The peer reviewers
6 also point out that the past work has been exceptional,
7 productive, well funded, lab that's true, well qualified
8 to do the studies. They've done work in this humanized
9 mouse strain.

10 It seems that if we are going to move
11 forward with stem cell work either IPS or embryonic, we're
12 going to have to learn a little bit more about mice and
13 rats, because everything seems to work there, but we can't
14 seem to get it over into a humanize model, even into a
15 human.

16 I think it would be a disservice to our
17 program, and the whole concept of soliciting grant
18 proposals if we were not to respect the work this
19 professor has done, the resources he brings, the
20 experience with this humanized mouse model, the
21 recommendations.

22 All he says about the China connection is,
23 the reviewer says -- the peer reviewer, "The good news is
24 that he is enlisted Professor Deng from Peking

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 University." Period, that's all that is said. So, I
2 would propose leaving this as a yes, and not cutting it in
3 any way.

4 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Well, if he's well
5 qualified, why is it that he needs to get assistance from
6 somebody in Peking? That's a contradiction and I hear --
7 I think it was Dr. Kiessling who said that he hasn't had
8 experience doing this. And then somebody else said, well
9 it's okay because he's got a backup in Peking, and we
10 don't even know what that relationship is.

11 And having had a business background that
12 bothers me. That's a very -- that's fuzzy. And if the
13 guy is well qualified why is it good news that a guy in
14 Peking is going to back him up? That bothersome.

15 DR. GOLDHAMER: I agree with Bob's
16 assessment of the situation, I would recommend that we
17 don't cut the funding up front but we look very carefully
18 after one year in the one year review to make sure they're
19 making adequate progress and they can carry out
20 successfully the initial stages of this project. And if
21 they can, then I think we all agree that it's highly
22 meritorious. So, that would be my recommendation.

23 DR. HART: The unpaid services of a
24 collaborator in Beijing is a very common occurrence, very

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 common occurrence. And it's I think quite reasonable to
2 assume that that kind of back and forth of information
3 doesn't necessarily have to be tied to dollars in science.

4 As long as each person is adequately supported for what
5 they're contributing, any one project I don't think needs
6 to support that.

7 DR. KIESSLING: Given the hemapoietic stem
8 cell expertise at Yale, this seems to be an interesting
9 reach.

10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, let me just --
11 I will conclude by saying my six and a half years in the
12 department, my conclusion is that nobody does something
13 for nothing. There's always --

14 DR. HART: I'm here, I'm here. You're not
15 paying me, I'm here.

16 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: But in the business
17 world, I mean. I don't like that relationship, but I
18 think there's probably enough evidence to move forward on
19 a vote. I'm not going to vote on it. But people don't do
20 things out of the goodness of their heart, by and large.

21 DR. HART: No, but I think that's the wrong
22 way to look at it. There's a relationship between these
23 two, presumably they're sharing all kinds of information
24 about all kinds of things and so they're helping each

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 other out. I mean the fact that they're not exchanging
2 money about this, I don't think they'll do anything.

3 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I don't believe that
4 for a second. Go ahead.

5 DR. DEES: You know, this Dr. Flavell is a
6 world expert in humanized mice, but he has no experience,
7 apparently, according to the reviewers, in the creation of
8 this apparently very difficult process of creating these
9 hemapoietic cells from embryonic stem cells.

10 I think if we are to fund him we need a
11 little more information about what his collaborations are
12 going to be at Yale. Because they have to develop the
13 cells that he wants, right. He's going to transpond them
14 into mice. But does he have the cells, can he produce the
15 cells, it's more than just the consultation, he needs to
16 have a collaborator at Yale that will provide him with the
17 cells that he's going to transpond, if I understand
18 correctly.

19 DR. GOLDHAMER: We do need to keep in mind
20 here that even with this concern that the reviewer's noted
21 they still gave Flavell the highest score by a significant
22 amount, the best score. So, presumably they factored this
23 issue in, and he still came out on top.

24 So, in my mind you know I don't see how we

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 you know, cut this grant by half under these
2 circumstances. But I do agree there are some concerns and
3 I think this can be flagged on the first year review. And
4 we'll know if he's making adequate progress.

5 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah, we don't get
6 much out of the first year review, it takes them --
7 usually takes them -- by the time we get the money out and
8 it gets to where it's going, and they start the -- and the
9 wheels start to turn, it's better to check them at 18
10 months.

11 Because we found that after a year we get
12 out and they're just barely getting into things and
13 getting specialized pieces of equipment. So, I think -- I
14 would agree with your concept. I think 18 months is
15 probably a better time.

16 DR. PESCATELLO: But here we're second
17 guessing the Scientific Peer Review Committee.

18 DR. KIESSLING: Then perhaps one
19 possibility is to not --

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: Hang on, Anne.

21 DR. PESCATELLO: I mean, what we're
22 venturing into here is, we're second guessing the
23 Scientific Peer Review Committee. And unless we have some
24 basis for thinking that they didn't do an adequate job, I

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 don't think -- unless it was in their scientific review
2 these issues that we're kind of raising now, which are
3 certainly beyond my expertise. I'm relying on the
4 Scientific Peer Review Committee for the scientific merit
5 of the proposal.

6 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah, and I think all
7 of what we're -- what Dave and I are trying to say is that
8 let's take a look at 18 months and if they're floundering
9 and they haven't been able to make the right kind of
10 connections and things aren't going well, as we do with
11 all the grants, and we can do it that way.

12 DR. WALLACK: So, in light of that I would
13 like to -- I don't remember if there's a motion on the
14 floor. There is? So, and I think the motion is to fund
15 it for two years, and that would give us the opportunity
16 to in a reasonable time reexamine where we are. So, I
17 would move to call the question on the motion to fund for
18 two years at \$500,000. And Richard, I think that was your
19 motion -- or Ron's motion. But I would move to call the
20 question at this point. I move that.

21 MS. TOWNSHEND: Anne's motion.

22 DR. WALLACK: Anne's motion. So, I move
23 that.

24 MALE VOICE: I'll second it.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. It's been
2 moved and seconded, the motion has been called and we're
3 ready for a vote.

4 MR. MANDELKERN: No discussion on the
5 motion?

6 MS. HORN: The motion has been being
7 discussed since it was made. The motion on the floor
8 right now is to call the question and to have the vote.

9 MR. MANDELKERN: Well, can I ask a point of
10 special privilege as the second reviewer on this grant?

11 MS. HORN: Go ahead.

12 MR. MANDELKERN: I think we're getting into
13 the area here of not looking at research to find results,
14 but saying why don't we have the results before the
15 research has started, to say two years is binding up the
16 best scientific work that was offered in the estimation of
17 the entire peer review committee.

18 It seems to me self defeating to reject
19 this advice, and give this man who has an international
20 reputation, has submitted an outstanding proposal, which
21 can yield great results, give him a chance to do his
22 research. Fund him for his funds, and look at 18 months
23 and if he hasn't come through at that point we can make
24 recommendations.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 But not certainly in the first hand and say
2 you haven't produced anything so therefore don't do the
3 research. Which is what we're saying when we bind him
4 down.

5 MS. HORN: Okay. Thank you. Warren, would
6 you take a roll call please? Yes, the motion is to fund
7 10SCB36, Yale University, for two years instead of four,
8 so that would be \$500,000 dollars instead of a million
9 dollars.

10 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay, and that is Dr.
11 Genel is conflicted, so Dr. Dees?

12 DR. DEES: Can you come back to me, I just
13 want to think about this.

14 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Dr. Arinzeh?

15 DR. ARINZEH: No.

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Dr. Wallack?

17 DR. WALLACK: If we vote yes we're voting
18 for two years, I vote yes.

19 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Dr. Fishbone?

20 DR. FISHBONE: I'll vote yes.

21 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Mr. Mandelkern?

22 MR. MANDELKERN: Vote no.

23 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Dr. Goldhamer?

24 DR. GOLDHAMER: No.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Dr. Hart?
2 DR. HART: Yes.
3 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Dr. Pescatello?
4 DR. PESCATELLO: No.
5 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Dr. Kiessling?
6 DR. KIESSLING: Yes.
7 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Say again?
8 DR. KIESSLING: Yes.
9 DR. DEES: You can come back to me.
10 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Richard?
11 DR. DEES: I'll vote no.
12 MS. HORN: The no's have it.
13 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: One, two, three --
14 DR. FISHBONE: No, he voted no.
15 MS. HORN: Okay. The no's have it.
16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: No's have it.
17 MS. HORN: Okay.
18 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: What do you want to
19 do?
20 MS. HORN: The motion is defeated.
21 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Come on, you've got
22 to do something.
23 DR. FISHBONE: I think we have to let it
24 stand and evaluate in two years.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Would you make a
2 motion to that effect?

3 DR. FISHBONE: I will.

4 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. Is there a
5 second?

6 MR. MANDELKERN: Excuse me, what is let it
7 stand mean?

8 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: As it is, a million
9 dollars for four years, reevaluate it at the end of two.
10 Is there a second?

11 MS. HORN: A second?

12 MR. MANDELKERN: I'll second that.

13 DR. PESCATELLO: We don't have to do it,
14 it's in the yes category. We don't have to do anything.

15 MS. HORN: That's right, we just leave --
16 decided we're going to leave it in the yes category and
17 move on to the next grant. So, the group is interested in
18 reevaluating each of these yes established investigators?

19 DR. HART: We're three million over, right?
20 Three million over budget?

21 MS. HORN: Yes.

22 DR. HART: Okay.

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: Okay. So, we'll go up from
24 the bottom. Next grant for consideration is 10SCB30.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 Modeling Parkinson's disease using human embryonic stem
2 cells in patient derived induced pluripotent stem cells.
3 \$992,500 dollars, UCHC, Genel.

4 DR. GENEL: I'll have to look at my --

5 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Move on to the next
6 one grant.

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: Alrighty, the next one
8 would be 05, mechanical control of neural stem cell fate.
9 Yale University, \$947,975, that's Arinzeh and Hiskes.
10 That's Bordey, Angelique Bordey.

11 DR. ARINZEH: Okay, yeah so, just again a
12 brief overview, it's adult neural stem cells, and they're
13 using a novel -- they're using a novel technique to label
14 these cells in utero using electroporation. So, the
15 reviewers again were very excited about this.

16 Overall a solid grant proposal, they had
17 some minor concerns, but overall they thought it was a
18 very solid and important issue to investigate. So, yes,
19 is still -- yes, it's still yes.

20 MS. HORN: Any discussion? And what do we
21 just -- if the reviewer is recommending a yes we're just
22 moving on to the next one?

23 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Is there any budget? I
24 thought partly we were going back to take a look at the

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 budgets.

2 MS. HORN: Budget, sure.

3 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, we're getting
4 very bogged down here, every single one of these grants is
5 good. Every one of them has an advocate or advocates for
6 it, and we're getting to the point where we have to decide
7 are we -- we're three million bucks over. And where's the
8 three million dollars going to come from?

9 Is it going to come from nibbling away at
10 each grant, you know, for hours until we get down to the
11 right figure? Is it going to come from eliminating some
12 grants entirely and just do the ones -- fully fund the
13 ones we really want, or as Dr. Wallack has frequently
14 suggested, are we going to take a percentage of -- from
15 everybody's grant regardless of whether it's super-duper
16 good or only super good. So, what's your pleasure? The
17 three million bucks is not going away.

18 DR. WALLACK: Bob maybe -- I know there's,
19 in my mind, some rationale reason to approach it this way.
20 There's historical reason, there's precedence to this,
21 and it's enabled the program to go forward. It has not
22 taken any scientists out of the research pool.

23 However, having said all of that, and while I'm
24 very comfortable with it, we all have to be comfortable

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 with where we are. So, maybe although we don't like this
2 idea, in order to keep all of these researchers in play,
3 we think in terms of the years that we're funding.

4 And maybe a way to get to that point is to
5 take all of these four year grants and reduce them to
6 three year grants with appropriate reduction in funding.
7 And at least that -- and I think if we did that that would
8 do exactly -- it would get us to almost exactly where we
9 have to be.

10 I would make that -- I would put that out
11 there as an alternate to what I said before, and for
12 something for us to maybe consider at this point. Because
13 there's no way that anybody's going to stand away from any
14 of these grants at this point.

15 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: No, you are correct.
16 And so what Milt is proposing is to take all the four year
17 grants and reduce them to three.

18 DR. GENEL: I would support that.

19 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Because otherwise
20 we're going to Indian wrestle over each individual grant
21 and we probably won't all be speaking to each other by the
22 time the meeting is over.

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: Anne has also agreed to
24 that.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 MR. MANDELKERN: Can I ask, there have been
2 some grants that have been reduced already, can we get a
3 listing at least of what --

4 MS. TOWNSHEND: Your mike is off.

5 MR. MANDELKERN: -- we're dealing with? I
6 say there are some grants that -- in the E.I. Category
7 that have already been reduced. So, can't we get a clear
8 listing of what we're dealing with? I feel --

9 MS. HORN: Yes, I can get that to you --

10 MR. MANDELKERN: -- I can't see it, Ron,
11 I'm sorry.

12 MS. HORN: -- right here. B16.

13 MR. MANDELKERN: What was that?

14 MS. HORN: B16.

15 MR. MANDELKERN: Can you give a name to it?

16 MS. HORN: Ivanova.

17 MR. MANDELKERN: Ivanova is what -- but
18 wasn't that reduced?

19 MS. HORN: Yes, that's what I'm saying. You
20 asked for what was reduced.

21 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: It is, that's what
22 you asked for.

23 MR. MANDELKERN: Okay, it's a yes for 750?

24 MS. HORN: Correct.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 MR. MANDELKERN: Okay.

2 MS. HORN: B19, Qiu.

3 MR. MANDELKERN: Yeah, is a clear yes.

4 MS. HORN: It's a yes, it was reduced from
5 four years to three, to 750,000. And I don't have
6 anything else here that has been reduced.

7 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Dealy.

8 MR. MANDELKERN: What about Dealy?

9 MS. HORN: I'm sorry.

10 MR. MANDELKERN: What's that? Dealy, I
11 have \$500,000 here on my sheet.

12 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Dealy's \$500,000
13 reduced from three to two?

14 MS. HORN: Correct.

15 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah, okay.

16 MR. MANDELKERN: Dealy is \$500,000.

17 DR. FISHBONE: Well, can we reduce --

18 MR. MANDELKERN: Wait, a minute let's get a
19 run through.

20 DR. FISHBONE: Yeah, that's what we're
21 going to do.

22 MR. MANDELKERN: And Grabel?

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: Grabel we haven't decided
24 on yet.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: We haven't decided
2 about Grabel.

3 MR. MANDELKERN: And what about Fan, is
4 still hanging?

5 DR. WALLACK: No Fan's --

6 MR. MANDELKERN: Fan is a no? Fan is a no.

7 DR. PESCATELLO: But if we cut all the four
8 years that haven't been cut yet, how much -- does that
9 bring us where we need to be?

10 DR. FISHBONE: That's what I was going to
11 ask.

12 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: How would you what?

13 MR. WAGNER: No, it brings us to 10.6 if
14 you cut everything by a quarter.

15 MS. HORN: Everything that hasn't been cut
16 already?

17 MR. WAGNER: Even things that have been cut
18 already, only brings you to 10.6.

19 DR. GOLDHAMER: I'd like to make a comment.
20 I personally am not in favor of across the board cut by
21 one year. This means that after two years of funding the
22 investigator has to apply for additional funding, either
23 through this body or from other sources. Again, we're in
24 this situation of constantly writing grants. Two years is

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 just not enough time.

2 And so, there are specific issues --
3 there's specific grants where it makes sense, I don't
4 think it makes sense to do an across the board cut in
5 years.

6 DR. HART: I agree with what was just said
7 that basically cutting across the board is not the best
8 way to solve our problem, it's the most expedient way to
9 solve our problem. I'd rather see us at least -- even
10 before we start to discuss any across the board cuts go
11 back and try to get rid of -- get off the list at least
12 one or two additional grants.

13 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Never going to
14 happen.

15 MR. MANDELKERN: Dr. Galvin --

16 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Never going to
17 happen.

18 MR. MANDELKERN: I agree with Dr. Goldhamer
19 and Dr. Hart's comments. Particularly, are we certain
20 that -- we just did -- reviewed the first two yes's and we
21 agreed to let them stand at four years. Now, 10 minutes
22 later we are reversing ourselves from what we did. What
23 are we, a committee or just -- I don't know.

24 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: That's the way

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 committee's work.

2 MR. MANDELKERN: Well that's -- okay, then
3 I am protesting the way that committee works as a member
4 of that committee, because we just made a decision which
5 seems to me which carried.

6 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Well, what do you
7 want to do?

8 MR. MANDELKERN: What I want to do is,
9 first of all, Dr. Galvin, find out if any of the yes's
10 that we've approved are asking for less than a million
11 dollars. In other words, the B02, B03, 30, -- well, 19's
12 been cut, 12, 17, Grabel is hanging, no decision. Have
13 any -- are any of those that I just listed asking for less
14 than a million dollars?

15 MR. WAGNER: Yes, they're on the board
16 right there.

17 MR. MANDELKERN: What's that?

18 MR. WAGNER: They're on the --

19 MR. MANDELKERN: I can't see the board,
20 Dan, I'm sorry.

21 DR. WALLACK: Dan, is there a sheet that
22 --

23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, let's clear the
24 boards here, is there a way to get from 13 million down to

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 10 million? And we've got to figure a way to do this. If
2 that means either we do pretty much -- that means we do
3 either pretty much across the board -- we've tried this
4 before, trying to cut this one or that one.

5 Every one of these grants are good and have their
6 advocates who will go to their grave defending the grant.

7 And so, I think what Milt and I have found is that if you
8 cut them across the board that's very obnoxious, but it
9 seems to be more workable than trying to get people to
10 renege and say okay, we won't do this grant. But we've
11 got -- this is arithmetic, folks, we've got to get from 13
12 million to 9.8 million.

13 DR. PESCATELLO: I think we should look
14 again at the core. I mean, that's \$500,000 right there.

15 DR. WALLACK: I don't think we want to do
16 that. And to answer David's question, David, if we were
17 Solomon here, you're right, ideally we would want to do
18 the four years. But you -- give us an alternative of how
19 we're going to get there. There is no alternative.
20 Nobody is going to walk away from the support of these
21 grants.

22 DR. GOLDHAMER: Well, if there's an across
23 the board cut to me it makes more sense to cut a dollar
24 value off of each grant, not the \$250,000, I don't think,

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 I think that's too much. But let's say 10 percent. Now,
2 that won't get us there on its own but it saves a million
3 dollars. I mean, it gets us --

4 DR. WALLACK: But it doesn't get us there.

5 DR. GOLDHAMER: But it gets us --

6 DR. WALLACK: 25 percents doesn't get us
7 there.

8 DR. GOLDHAMER: But we have to start
9 somewhere. It gets us part of the way there. I don't
10 think it makes sense to cut by 20 -- by 30 percent or
11 whatever that would be if it was \$250K.

12 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, Bob?

13 MR. MANDELKERN: The way I count the yes's,
14 leaving out Dr. Grabel, there are only 10 E.I. yes's, not
15 the 12 or whatever number is being tossed around, unless I
16 have a very inaccurate record.

17 DR. FISHBONE: Yeah, but that's 10 million.

18

19 MR. MANDELKERN: I know 10 is 10 million,
20 less a few hundred thousand.

21 DR. FISHBONE: A few hundred, yeah.

22 MR. MANDELKERN: But that's less than the
23 problem --

24 MS. TOWNSHEND: I think we rely on C.I. for

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 -- to have the right numbers.

2 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah, Dan, what --

3 MR. WAGNER: With Grabel, everybody cut by
4 20 percent in the established investigators from the
5 numbers that are up there, it's still 10.6. So, you still
6 have to cut out -- with Grabel.

7 MALE VOICE: With Grabel?

8 MR. WAGNER: Right, and if you want to keep
9 the ones that you decided on two and three years at \$500
10 and \$750 that number goes up.

11 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, I don't know.
12 Are you saying, Dan, that without the Grabel grant we're
13 okay -- we fall within our 9.8 million?

14 MR. WAGNER: No.

15 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: How close does that
16 make us?

17 MR. WAGNER: We're off by \$679,000 thousand
18 dollars.

19 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, so we need a
20 scheme to get down to where we need to be. Ron?

21 DR. HART: I'd like to try just once. I
22 mean, I think the real philosophical thing here is do we
23 cut three grants or do we cut a percentage. That's the
24 question. And I'd like to suggest that we stick to our

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 RFP where we offer it up to a million dollars, four years
2 of support, and cut three grants, and do it in order of
3 the scientific scores.

4 Sorry to say it again, they're all worthy
5 grants, but I'd like to just say let's take the top
6 scoring grants up to the budget we have. We're
7 comfortable with 3 million dollars per seed, we've already
8 said that, we've got that. We're comfortable with the
9 core facility, we've already devoted on that. Why don't
10 we try just funding in order of scientific merit, among
11 the grants we've already approved that we already like?

12 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Does everybody
13 understand that? Okay --

14 DR. FISHBONE: I understand it, but I'm not
15 sure that I agree with it. I would personally rather fund
16 --

17 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: That's not what I'm
18 asking.

19 DR. FISHBONE: Yeah, I would prefer to fund
20 more grants for a shorter period of time, because they
21 could cut back on one of the aims. And I know everybody
22 has to -- I think the nature of research, you would know
23 better than I, is you most spend much of your time just
24 writing for grant applications.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 DR. HART: But realize, too, that when
2 you're doing that you're taking about rate of progress as
3 well. So, to cut the grant means you're cutting the rate
4 of progress, you're making that person less competitive.
5 By fully funding a project you're making it the most
6 competitive it can be nationally.

7 DR. FISHBONE: Yeah, but if you're not
8 cutting 25 percent a year, if you're allowing them to work
9 for three years, I don't think -- well, I don't know
10 whether it makes them less competitive, but I -- is there
11 a way to take a vote?

12 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Would you care to
13 make that as a motion, sir?

14 DR. HART: I'd like to make that as a
15 motion, that we fund the established investigator grants
16 in order of scientific merit to the point where we run out
17 of money.

18 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: To the point where?

19 DR. HART: We run out of money.

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Run out of money.
21 How much money do we have to spend on that category?

22 MALE VOICE: Nine million dollars.

23 DR. WALLACK: No.

24 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: No, how much money do

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 we -- can we spend without going over?

2 MR. WAGNER: Approximately 6 million -- six
3 million.

4 DR. HART: Oh, 6.5.

5 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, does that
6 include or exclude Dr. Grabel?

7 DR. HART: That excludes, because of
8 scientific merit.

9 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay.

10 DR. HART: And that would mean that we
11 would fund from Flavell down the list to Linheng
12 Li(phonetic).

13 MS. HORN: And is that --

14 DR. HART: By the way I calculate it.

15 MS. HORN: And that is fully funding --

16 DR. HART: Fully fund those grants.

17 MS. HORN: The ones that we had cut back to
18 three years would be now four years?

19 DR. HART: We'd be funding from 1.8 down to
20 3 on the scientific merit scale.

21 MS. HORN: And that would mean that
22 Caroline Dealy, who we funded this morning, is -- would be
23 de-funded?

24 FEMALE VOICE: Where is the cut off?

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 DR. HART: The lowest funded grant by my
2 calculation is B12, Linheng Li.

3 DR. DEES: Are we -- --

4 MR. WAGNER: We would get to 9.822 and then
5 922. So you would be over by \$22,000 -- \$23,000 dollars.

6

7 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: We could -- what's
8 that Warren?

9 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: We can take that --

10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah, we'll take that
11 out of our 200, if that happens.

12 DR. DEES: So, just to be clear here. Of
13 those grants that are in that category, one was one we had
14 decided to cut back to -- are we including that, or are we
15 now fully funding that again?

16 DR. HART: To make it kind of uniform
17 rational and based on scientific merit, I think that we go
18 by score alone which means that the one that we decided
19 this morning from the maybe category is changed to a no.

20 DR. DEES: No, no, not the one we decided
21 from the maybe category, the one we decided from the yes
22 category that we reduced to 750.

23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Why don't you --

24 DR. HART: Still would be in that category

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 but one would fall below the cutoff and one of them falls
2 above the cutoff.

3 MALE VOICE: You're correct, B19 which we
4 suggested at \$750,000 dollars earlier -- well, B16 didn't
5 make the cut the way I proposed it, right.

6 DR. DEES: Cut off, B16 doesn't make the
7 new cutoff?

8 MR. MANDELKERN: The cutoff is at B12?

9 MS. HORN: Yeah.

10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Can we read the
11 grants so that everybody here understands, and the
12 amounts?

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: The grants would be, and
14 this is just from the established investigator group, 36
15 Flavell, Yale, one million. 30 -- B30, Lee, UCHC,
16 \$992,500. B05, Bordey, \$947,975, Yale. B03, Kraus, Yale
17 University, one million. B02, Risolo, Yale University,
18 \$832,608. Caihong Qiu, Yale University, one million.

19 DR. KIESSLING: No, that was already --

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: No, no, no, no, what we're
21 proposing -- what the proposal on the table is, and we
22 still need a second on that, as well. Let me just finish
23 the roll call here. And the last one would be, B12, Lee
24 UCHC for one million. Dr. Hart has suggested that all of

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 those be fully funded, and that would put us along with
2 all of the seed grants and the core at 9.8 million, 22,000
3 is that correct?

4 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: 9.8 plus --

5 MALE VOICE: We want to be sure of that
6 before we take a vote.

7 DR. KIESSLING: But we already voted to
8 reduce two of those grants to three years based on their -
9 -

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: But nothing is final until
11 the final vote is taken.

12 MR. WAGNER: If we increase B19 to the
13 million we are over again. So, my calculation was with
14 that at \$750 for three years.

15 DR. HART: I have no trouble changing the
16 motion to include B19 at the proposed -- approved \$750,000
17 dollar level.

18 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Can we pull those all
19 up separately?

20 MR. WAGNER: At a million.

21 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Can you pull all
22 those up separately on the -- so we can see. Okay, now
23 every grant on this screen is going to be funded? No,
24 let's just put -- how about putting just the ones that are

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 going to be funded? Can we do that?

2 DR. DEES: From B30 down.

3 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. These are the
4 ones -- take the ones we're not going to fund off so it's
5 --

6 DR. DEES: B12.

7 DR. GOLDHAMER: I'd like to make a comment
8 on this approach. I think we have to do something. This
9 has a lot of merit, but I think we should also look for
10 natural breaks in the scores. And what I mean by that is
11 when you're at 2.5 and better there's clearly not an
12 issue. But when you get into funding a 3.0 but not
13 funding a 3.1, now it's an entirely arbitrary decision.
14 Yes, it is. There's no --

15 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Well, we have to make
16 some --

17 DR. GOLDHAMER: No, I understand, but
18 there's one at 3.0, 3.1, 3.2, and I would say it -- we
19 need to evaluate -- we need to chose one of those. That
20 there's no reason that the 3.0 should get funded and the
21 3.1 not get funded, because there's no real difference in
22 the quality of a grant based on a tenth of point.

23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: There's not enough
24 money, you can't do that. If you're going to fund a 3.1

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 what about the poor guy who gets a 3.3 and the one that
2 gets a 3.5, well this is very obnoxious business. But
3 there's only so much money.

4 DR. GOLDHAMER: But there is a break after
5 the 3.2, I believe there's a break to 3.7 or -- so, I just
6 don't feel comfortable making that distinction. And it
7 just comes down to spending a little bit of time picking
8 one of those three that are grouped together. It's not
9 you know, the additional burden is not that great.

10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: You're never going to
11 get the people who support those grants to back off.

12 DR. KIESSLING: Right.

13 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I would say after
14 having done this for three years. Yes?

15 DR. WALLACK: Exactly why -- that's exactly
16 why I'm suggesting that we go to the three years. I mean,
17 it's no less expedient to go to the four years and cut it
18 off at 3.0 than it is -- and I think that it's fairer to a
19 larger number of people. I still strongly feel, and I
20 heard before that if you're going to come back every two
21 years it's really a problem.

22 But I also heard at this table that a three
23 year span is something that is somewhat doable. And we've
24 seen in the past that that has worked. I would stay with

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 the three years and do the most that we can in that
2 manner.

3 DR. PESCATELLO: I have to just reiterate
4 what some others have said, David, there's nothing more
5 disheartening to the public than the amount of money --
6 the amount of time that's spent on administration and
7 overhead. And this is essentially overhead. Grant
8 writing and grant review is overhead, it doesn't produce
9 any scientific value. And so, I would endorse not cutting
10 it down.

11 I mean, the amount -- when people drill
12 down and see how much time these scientists spend in front
13 of their computers word processing applications and the
14 staff involved in processing those applications, it's such
15 a waste. I mean, it's a complete waste of scientific
16 money.

17 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, now we're
18 veering off from the proposal that was made, and so we
19 have to have a scheme. We can't be arguing all afternoon
20 about well, this guy's grant is a little better than that
21 guy's, but not as good as this guy's. And we have strong
22 advocates for all the grants.

23 So, you all put your heads -- collective
24 heads together, and tell me how you want to get this down

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 to 9.8 million dollars?

2 DR. PESCATELLO: We have a motion before
3 us.

4 MS. TOWNSHEND: We need it seconded.

5 MR. MANDELKERN: I seconded Dr. Hart's
6 motion, which is on the table, which does just what you're
7 requesting.

8 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, so we're going
9 to call a vote. Unless, is there more discussion?

10 DR. FISHBONE: Would you repeat the motion?

11 DR. KIESSLING: What's the question? Was
12 there -- what are we voting on?

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: We're voting on the
14 established investigator grants that we will fund fully
15 with the exception of B19, which would be at \$750,000
16 dollars that we would fund fully -- or you would fund
17 fully, B36, B30, 05, 03, 02, and 12, and then B19 at 750.
18 Is that correct? Thank you.

19 DR. KIESSLING: So, that eliminates B17 and
20 B16?

21 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yes.

22 DR. KIESSLING: So, we're going to fully
23 fund all of those other grants and we're going to
24 eliminate those two grants?

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: With the exception of B19,
2 which would be funded at 750.

3 DR. HART: May I just make a closing
4 comment before we vote on this. And one is, I absolutely
5 agree with the previous comment that these scores are so
6 close as to be nearly indistinguishable. Of course, the
7 problem is it's the only kind of metric we have to rank
8 order the grants. And I think that's the unfortunate
9 truth always in grant writing.

10 It's down to a philosophy of which way do
11 we go with this. Do we fund a fewer number of researchers
12 at the full requested amount, or do we go back to the
13 proposal earlier of funding all of the researchers that
14 have been approved at a reduced amount. And that's just
15 the choice we have to make.

16 And so, in my mind we vote on this, if it
17 gets voted down, we take the percentage, and that's all
18 there is.

19 MS. HORN: And Dan, do we have a total on
20 what the motion would result in that's accurate?

21 MR. WAGNER: There is -- you know we did
22 move five seed grants to no, which would equal a million
23 dollars. So, if you were looking for a break, I don't
24 know, there are options, it's just a matter of how you

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 want to --

2 DR. KIESSLING: Is this motion up for
3 discussion?

4 MS. HORN: We are about to take a vote on
5 it. If you have one parting comment?

6 DR. KIESSLING: I must say I'm very opposed
7 to this method. I think that fully funding this small
8 number of grants as opposed to having all these
9 investigators share the fact that there isn't enough money
10 for everything they want to do, I'm very opposed to that.

11

12 DR. HART: and just realize that this --

13 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Well, then we ought
14 to cut a check and mail one to -- up to Farmington -- or
15 Storrs, and mail the other one down to New Haven.

16 DR. HART: This is the situation we got
17 ourselves into when we approved one million dollar
18 established investigator grants. This had to happen,
19 based on that discussion.

20 MS. HORN: Let's take roll call, Warren.
21 Can you call the roll please?

22 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Well, just before we do
23 that, who is conflicted out here? Because we're counting
24 a lot of different -- we're counting a lot of different

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 applications here.

2 MS. HORN: No, this is not the final vote.

3 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So, I just wanted to --
4 Dr. Genel is conflicted out, right?

5 MS. HORN: Correct.

6 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: No, no, Dr. Goldhamer
7 and Dr. Genel are both ineligible to vote.

8 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Why are they
9 ineligible?

10 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Because we're voting on
11 -- because we're doing it by group.

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: And if I understand
13 correctly Mr. Mandelkern also recused himself on B30.

14 DR. FISHBONE: But aren't we voting on a
15 general process?

16 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: We're voting on a
17 general process.

18 MS. HORN: Yeah, yeah.

19 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: It's fine by me, I just
20 --

21 DR. FISHBONE: I don't think that would
22 recuse people specifically.

23 MS. HORN: That's true.

24 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I think everybody is

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 entitled to vote.

2 MS. HORN: I think we are, okay. Let's
3 take the roll call, please?

4 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay, so Dr. Dees, yes
5 or no?

6 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Warren would you
7 restate -- or Marianne, restate what -- what are we voting
8 on?

9 MS. HORN: Okay, we are voting to fully
10 fund with the exception of B19, which will be funded at
11 \$750,000 dollars, the established investigator grants B12,
12 B19, B02, B03, B05, B30, and B36.

13 FEMALE VOICE: And a vote in the
14 affirmative endorses that?

15 MS. HORN: Correct.

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Dr. Dees?

17 DR. DEES: Yes.

18 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Dr. Arinzeh?

19 DR. ARINZEH: Yes.

20 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Dr. Wallack?

21 DR. WALLACK: So if I vote -- I'm opposed
22 to doing this.

23 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So you should vote no.

24 DR. WALLACK: I vote no.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Dr. Fishbone?
2 DR. FISHBONE: No.
3 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Dr. Genel?
4 DR. GENEL: No.
5 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Mr. Mandelkern?
6 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes.
7 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Dr. Goldhamer?
8 DR. GOLDHAMER: No.
9 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Dr. Hart?
10 DR. HART: Yes.
11 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Dr. Pescatello?
12 DR. PESCATELLO: I just want to make one
13 comment before -- I just -- don't you want to make the
14 motion so that it's -- the cutoff is at a certain --
15 rather than -- you're doing it for the specific grants?
16 MS. HORN: Correct.
17 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah --
18 DR. PESCATELLO: So, if you do it by a
19 cutoff then it's a generic --
20 MS. HORN: No.
21 DR. PESCATELLO: Just so people aren't
22 conflicted.
23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I vote yes.
24 DR. PESCATELLO: I'll vote yes, too.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 MS. HORN: Okay, to clarify --
2 FEMALE VOICE: Anne?
3 DR. KIESSLING: No.
4 MS. HORN: -- to clarify the motion that is
5 before you, it is to cutoff the funding at 3.0 in the peer
6 review score.
7 DR. KIESSLING: No.
8 MR. MANDELKERN: No, because there's
9 another 3.0 that we're not funding.
10 MS. HORN: No, there's a --
11 MR. MANDELKERN: At B12. We're cutting the
12 line at the B12.
13 MS. HORN: No, 3.0 is in there.
14 MS. TOWNSHEND: Where's the other 3.0?
15 MR. MANDELKERN: Park is 3.0.
16 MS. TOWNSHEND: Oh, that's correct.
17 DR. DEES: But among the ones that we have
18 already determined on the yes category, we're cutting it
19 off at 3.0.
20 MS. HORN: Thank you, yes.
21 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Thank you. Okay. Dr.
22 Kiessling?
23 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Kiessling is a no.
24 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: One, two, three, four,

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 five, six, one, two, three, four, five, the yes's have it.
2 It's six to five. If you want to review it, Dr. Dees,
3 Dr. Arinzeh, Mr. Mandelkern, Dr. Hart, Dr. Pescatello, you
4 said yes, right? And Dr. Galvin all said yes.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: We understood fully what
6 the motion was. The motion has carried. So, I guess the
7 next step would be to move onto a final vote on all of the
8 grants. Is that correct, Marianne?

9 DR. GENEL: Are we going to vote on the
10 backup grants, or do we do that after we vote?

11 MS. TOWNSHEND: Well, it's up to the
12 committee. Your pleasure.

13 DR. GENEL: Well, I would move that the top
14 three unfunded seed grants be put into a hold category by
15 score -- by score, the top three --

16 DR. DEES: Seed grants?

17 DR. GENEL: The top three unapproved seed
18 grants.

19 DR. DEES: Seed grants, or established --

20 DR. GENEL: Seed, seed, seed by score, as
21 back up, and I would also move that the Grabel grant be
22 moved into a backup.

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: Was there not another
24 established investigator in the backup category?

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 MS. HORN: Yes.

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: There were two, B18, Fan,
3 and B01, Min. Fan was for \$500,000 and --

4 MS. TOWNSHEND: If -- may I make a
5 suggestion? Can we take a final vote on this series of
6 grants that the committee is proposing to fund before we
7 start getting confused on what might go into the reserve
8 category? Let's take a little break. Let's take 45
9 minutes for lunch, since it is noon time, and we'll resume
10 --

11 DR. DEES: Can we not do that?

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: They don't want to?

13 MS. HORN: No, let's just take a refresh

14 --

15 MS. TOWNSHEND: How about five minutes?

16 MS. HORN: A five minute break.

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: Bathroom break.

18 DR. DEES: Five minutes is fine.

19 (Off the record)

20 MS. HORN: Go ahead, Milt.

21 DR. WALLACK: So, I'm still troubled by
22 what we just did. And I'm troubled by it because of an
23 inadvertent reminder, if you will, of where we are. And I
24 know this -- what I'm going to say can be argued both

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 ways, also as all of our discussion can be argued both
2 ways.

3 But from what I understand, and I think we
4 ought to keep this in mind, that there's a strong feeling
5 going forward that we may not be at this table next year
6 in the ability to fund any research at all. And if that's
7 true, then again from my own perspective it would behoove
8 us this year to bring more people into the discussion and
9 into the ability to do research than less people.

10 We're only allowing seven people -- seven
11 established investigators to go forward. And if we are in
12 fact in that situation next year and the years after that
13 we're not any longer able to fund, I think that would be a
14 terrible travesty in cutting back on the numbers of
15 people.

16 And if that is of any concern of anybody
17 else, then perhaps we should have a short discussion about
18 reconsidering the vote that we've just taken. Maybe no
19 one else is concerned with that.

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Well, I certainly
21 share some apprehension about the funding level for the
22 2011 deliberations. We certainly duked it out and rassled
23 around for -- on three separate occasion to get to 10
24 million.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 (Off the record)

2 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: My dear wife of many
3 years locked herself out of the house with the dog, so it
4 went from the sublime to the ridiculous and mundane.

5 At any rate, we did a good deal of
6 screaming and yelling and lobbying, but we got the money
7 back after we lost it twice, I think, Warren, and then it
8 suddenly appeared. So, I think that indicates that there
9 is a will in the legislative body to move this forward.

10 And I think that it's incumbent on us to,
11 as the administration changes and as people begin to talk
12 about health care, is to point out how important this is
13 to the people of the state of Connecticut. We all realize
14 that the budget cuts are deep and hurtful and we have to
15 take unpaid days and the like.

16 But all in all, from what we've got rolling
17 and what we try to accomplish, and you know in the overall
18 multibillion dollar budget, I think it's what, 17 billion?
19 The total budget. I mean, 10 million isn't going to
20 break the bank.

21 So, I think we need to -- I think we need
22 to make sure that people who are respected individuals who
23 have a group, or a cliental, or circle of friends who are
24 politically influential, unfortunately we have to say

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 that, need to talk to those people.

2 And the -- the Milt Wallack's, and the Paul
3 Pescatello's need to be talking to people and say, you
4 know, as you're developing this don't forget the stem
5 cell, look at all the great work that's being done. So,
6 our work is cut out for us then.

7 I would be most surprised if we don't get
8 some money next year, it may not be 10 million, it may be
9 five million. But it's not -- in the overall, I mean 10
10 million is a lot of money, but in the overall scheme of
11 things, that's not going to break the bank.

12 MR. MANDELKERN: I think that we've had a
13 very full and complete discussion about the funding
14 process of the E.I. grants. And we also had a vote where
15 the majority voted one way. I think the travesty would be
16 to reopen it in an attempt to overthrow the majority rule,
17 even though it was a slim majority.

18 My tendency would be to say, we've worked
19 hard, we've done a good job, and the will of the majority
20 should hold and we should begin to proceed to fund the
21 individual grants. It seems to me self evident that
22 that's what the work of this committee should terminate
23 in, in the next hour or two, rather than reopening the
24 discussion that has lasted at least an hour or two.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: And I think we have
2 funded 22 grants, I think that's usually what we -- what
3 do we fund usually, about a third?

4 MS. HORN: 18 to 21.

5 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: 18 to 21, we're
6 pretty much ballpark. I think NIH is what, 10 percent or
7 less of all grants get funded? So, I think we've exceeded
8 you know -- exceeded that percentage. I think we've got a
9 good deal of the money out where they're going to do a lot
10 of good. Would I be surprised if we're cut back next
11 year? I'm not surprised.

12 But I am surprised that of the sensitivity
13 of the administration but in particularly the legislative
14 body who put the money back in, oddly enough, for some
15 reason without telling us. And one of the accountants
16 happened to discover we were about 10 million dollars over
17 in an account and it was the money which arrived what,
18 about the second week in April? Yeah, so I think we'll
19 continue to move forward.

20 Bob Mandelkern and I had a little sidebar
21 discussion about are we doing enough to encourage people
22 like the Quinnipiac's and the Trinity's and the UHart's,
23 and the Conn Colleges of the world to somehow get involved
24 in at least part of the process, and how would we do that.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1

2

We're in the process of redesigning and relocating our state laboratory with a distinguished scientist and researcher leading it. And should we be talking about collaborations between the lab and other individuals, should -- how should we start involving people other than the three major universities involved, etc.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

But I think we'll be okay, I think there's enough -- but you've got to work when they ask you to go to the cocktail party and write the check, you know, as Paul Pescatello knows as he gives the check and they say thank you, and he hangs on to the edge of the check and says don't forget stem cell. And then when they say I'm not going to forget that and then he releases the check, you know.

17

18

19

20

21

But there's a quid pro quo for this, for the people who sit in this building, they want to continue to sit here and to legislate. And that's what they're interested in having happening -- happen. They're all running this year, everybody's running.

22

23

24

And what we're interested in with Paul, and I, and everybody else who lives in Connecticut is interested, in pushing our program forward so it doesn't

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 get dislocated for computers and roads and all kinds of
2 stuff. And so, but you've got to push it.

3 I -- is there any -- are there any other
4 folks who would like to reconsider the motion just voted
5 on? If not, we'll move on.

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: Before we took the break I
7 -- and I'm not a member of the committee, but the
8 suggestion was that we move forward with voting on the
9 final -- taking the final vote with regard to the grants
10 that will be funded. Marianne, do you have that list?
11 And that list is up on the screen. And the total is, if
12 you could scroll down? \$9,822,922 dollars.

13 MS. HORN: And we do do it grant by grant,
14 and we take it by consensus and making sure that we are
15 wanting to fund each one of these. So, bear with us.
16 There's no discussion, it's just a vote. So, Lynn if you
17 want to call them out, and then we'll --

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: Bottom up --

19 MS. HORN: Or, town top?

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: Top down.

21 MS. HORN: Top down's fine, bottom up's
22 fine.

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: Bottom up. This is
24 10SCD01, for University of Connecticut Health Center at

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 \$500,000 dollars. Please remember, consensus, even with
2 the consensus vote if you are conflicted please do not say
3 anything. All those in favor of funding 10SCD01 please
4 say yes.

5 VOICES: Yes.

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: All opposed? This grant is
7 funded. Next is --

8 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Excuse me, Dan would
9 you and Chelsey make sure we don't omit something? Okay,
10 we have a total of 22?

11 MR. WAGNER: Correct.

12 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay.

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: Next grant for
14 consideration for funding is 10SCB12, University of
15 Connecticut for one million dollars. All those in favor
16 of funding this grant for one million dollars please say
17 yes.

18 VOICES: Yes.

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: Opposed? This grant is
20 funded. Next is 10SCB19 for Yale University at \$750,000
21 dollars, is that right, Dan?

22 MR. WAGNER: Yes.

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: Okay. All those in favor
24 of funding 10SCB19 please say yes?

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 VOICES: Yes.

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: Opposed? This grant is
3 funded. 10 -- the next one for consideration is 10SCB30,
4 University of Connecticut Health Center for \$992,500
5 dollars. All those in favor of funding this grant please
6 say yes.

7 VOICES: Yes.

8 MS. TOWNSHEND: Opposed? This grant is
9 funded. Next is 10SCB05 for Yale University in the amount
10 of \$947,975 dollars. All those in favor of funding this
11 grant please say yes?

12 VOICES: Yes.

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: Opposed? This grant is
14 funded. Next is 10SCB03 for Yale University in the amount
15 of one million dollars. All those in favor of funding
16 this grant to the tune of one million dollars, please say
17 yes?

18 VOICES: Yes.

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: Opposed? This grant is
20 funded. Next is 10SCB02 for Yale University in the amount
21 of \$832,608 dollars. All those in favor of funding this
22 grant please say yes.

23 VOICES: Yes.

24 MS. TOWNSHEND: Opposed? This grant is

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 funded. Next is 10SCB36 for Yale University for the
2 amount of one million dollars. All those in favor of
3 funding this grant please say yes,

4 VOICES: Yes.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: Opposed?

6 DR. KIESSLING: Yes.

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: Please note that -- you're
8 opposed or yes?

9 DR. KIESSLING: I'm opposed.

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: You're opposed. So, Anne
11 Kiessling is opposed. So noted. This carries? This
12 grant is funded.

13 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, now that's all
14 our established and the core?

15 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yes.

16 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay.

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: Alright.

18 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: We're sure?

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yes, sir.

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay.

21 MS. TOWNSHEND: Next is 10SCA23 for the
22 University of Connecticut Health Center for the amount of
23 \$200,000 dollars. All those in favor of funding this
24 grant please say yes.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 VOICES: Yes.

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: Opposed say no. This grant
3 is funded. Next is 10SCA36, University of Connecticut
4 Health Center for the amount of \$200,000 dollars. All
5 those in favor of funding this grant please say yes.

6 VOICES: Yes.

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: Opposed say no. This grant
8 is funded. 10SCA47 is next for the University of
9 Connecticut Health Care Center in the amount of \$200,000
10 dollars. All those in favor of funding this grant please
11 say yes.

12 VOICES: Yes.

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: Opposed say no. This grant
14 is funded. Next is 10SCA16, Yale University for the
15 amount of \$200,000 dollars. All those in favor of funding
16 this grant please say yes?

17 VOICES: Yes.

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: Opposed say no. This grant
19 is funded. Where are we now, 13? Grant number 10SCA13,
20 Yale University for \$200,000 dollars. All those in favor
21 of funding this grant please say yes.

22 VOICES: Yes.

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: Opposed say no. This grant
24 is funded. Next is 10SCA38 for Yale University in the

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 amount of \$200,000. All those in favor of funding this
2 grant please say yes.

3 VOICES: Yes.

4 MS. TOWNSHEND: Opposed say no. This grant
5 is funded. Next is 10SCA22 for Yale University in the
6 amount of \$200,000 dollars. All those in favor of funding
7 this grant please say yes.

8 VOICES: Yes.

9 MS. TOWNSHEND: Opposed say no. This grant
10 is funded. Next is 10SCA30 for Yale University in the
11 amount of \$200,000 dollars. All those in favor of funding
12 this grant please say yes.

13 VOICES: Yes.

14 MS. TOWNSHEND: Opposed say no. This grant
15 is funded. Next is 10SCA24, University of Connecticut
16 Health Center in the amount of \$200,000 dollars. All
17 those in favor of funding this grant please say yes.

18 VOICES: Yes.

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: Opposed say no. This grant
20 is funded. Next is 10SCA21 for the University of
21 Connecticut Health Center for the amount of \$200,000
22 dollars. All those in favor of funding this grant please
23 say yes.

24 VOICES: Yes.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: Opposed say no. This grant
2 is funded. Next is 10SCA06 for UConn in the amount of
3 \$199,894 dollars. All those in favor of funding this
4 grant please say yes.

5 VOICES: Yes.

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: Opposed say no. This grant
7 is funded. Next is 10SCA29 for UConn in the amount of
8 \$199,945 dollars. All those in favor please say -- all
9 those in favor of funding this grant please say yes.

10 VOICES: Yes.

11 MS. TOWNSHEND: Opposed say no. This grant
12 is funded. Next is 10SCA05 for Yale University in the
13 amount of \$200,000 dollars. All those in favor of funding
14 this grant please say yes.

15 VOICES: Yes.

16 MS. TOWNSHEND: Opposed say no. This grant
17 is funded. Next is SCA -- 10SCA35 for Yale University in
18 the amount of \$200,000 dollars. All those in favor of
19 funding this grant please say yes.

20 VOICES: Yes.

21 MS. TOWNSHEND: Opposed say no. This grant
22 is funded.

23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Now, do our dollar
24 amounts --

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: You funded a little bit
2 more than we have, but again that can come out of the
3 other account.

4 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, so the math
5 works, the number of grants work.

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: The next consideration
7 would be the reserve list. I would need somebody to make
8 a --

9 DR. WALLACK: Can I ask a question about
10 the grants that we've just awarded? We heard one grant,
11 Dr. Lee's grant, that we said no to and some of that had
12 to do with the fact that he is no longer the P.I. on that
13 grant, if you recall. He's going to North Carolina. It
14 doesn't matter, one of the grants -- one of the grants we
15 said --

16 FEMALE VOICE: But that's not a funded
17 grant.

18 DR. HART: The one that was the P.I. that
19 was leaving the state had previously gotten a no.

20 DR. WALLACK: Right, that's what I'm
21 saying.

22 DR. HART: Oh, okay.

23 DR. WALLACK: I'm agreeing. And so, that's
24 my point. Of all the grants, these grant applications

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 were put in Warren, by when, December 31st? When were they
2 submitted? When?

3 MS. TOWNSHEND: December 9th.

4 DR. WALLACK: December 9th. My question
5 is, should we not -- because we ran into this in previous
6 years, where P.I.'s have left the state and so forth,
7 would it behoove us to make sure that -- and all the
8 grants that we just voted yes to, that those P.I.'s in
9 fact are still on board and still will remain as P.I.'s
10 going forward, or do we know that at this particular
11 point?

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: I'm not sure if we know
13 that. I think part of the grant -- of the contract
14 writing process, because these do end up as being
15 contracts and C.I. can speak to this a little bit better
16 than I, is making sure that they write into the contract
17 that they are delivering what they have proposed to
18 deliver.

19 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Right, and we haven't
20 heard from any of our colleagues from the two institutions
21 that these scientists are no longer at their institutions.

22 MS. TOWNSHEND: Correct, but I think that's
23 a detail that C.I. would probably and always look into.

24 DR. WALLACK: Alright, so my recommendation

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 would be to be thankful. I would say that I'm happy that
2 that's the case, obviously. But I would also caution us
3 to be absolutely sure going forward, because again it's
4 happened to us with the Carter Grants and some other
5 grants, that the P.I.'s before we release any funds, come
6 back -- that they're still available to us as the P.I.'s
7 on the projects.

8 And if not, before we release the funds my
9 recommendation would be to have us reconsider. And that's
10 why I think we're going to go into the alternates right
11 now.

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: Correct.

13 DR. WALLACK: So, I thought my comment was
14 appropriate at this point relative to our next step.

15 MS. TOWNSHEND: It's always good to have
16 that on the record. C.I., I think does a wonderful job
17 with making sure that those details are taken care of.

18 DR. WALLACK: I agree, but I just thought
19 that it would be important to put it on the record.

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: There you go. So, we need
21 from the committee -- yes, sir?

22 DR. HART: So, there were two grants that
23 we had previously approved as yes, B16 and B17 that I'd
24 like to propose as alternates. These have now become no's

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 due to the cutoff.

2 DR. DEES: And we had also put B07.

3 DR. GENEL: Which one?

4 DR. HART: B16, Ivanova, B17, Drissi, and
5 B07, Dealy.

6 DR. DEES: Now, two of those we had
7 approved at lower rates. Do you want to -- should we
8 leave that in place or not?

9 DR. HART: Yes, I think that realistically
10 within what we decided to do in the past we should be
11 consistent and approve the alternates at the reduced rates
12 when we did so.

13 DR. GENEL: So, I'm not sure, what are we -
14 - which are those two? 16 and 17?

15 MS. SARNECKY: I think the two that the
16 committee was originally planning on cutting down to
17 \$750,000 were B16 and B19.

18 DR. DEES: Right, right.

19 DR. HART: And then we also approved Dealy,
20 B07 at two years, \$500,000. So, that's what we're
21 suggesting now. So, let me go through one more time just
22 to be clear. B16, to move it to the alternate list at
23 \$750,000 dollars, three years of funding. B17, Drissi,
24 which was previously a yes and is now a no, at full

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 funding for its request, and B07, Dealy at two years,
2 \$500,000 dollars, all on the alternate list.

3 MR. MANDELKERN: Well, 01 was also
4 recommended as an alternate.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: Min, 01.

6 DR. HART: I'm adding not replacing.

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: So, do we have -- does
8 someone know what the full alternate list would be? Is
9 that what's up there now?

10 MS. SARNECKY: I'm working on it now.

11 MS. TOWNSHEND: Okay. Anne, I can't hear
12 you.

13 DR. KIESSLING: Is the Wesleyan grant in
14 there?

15 MS. TOWNSHEND: The question is, is the
16 Wesleyan Grant still there? No.

17 DR. GENEL: May I suggest that the Wesleyan
18 grant be added to the list. I don't know how we want to
19 number them, I think probably the only fair way to do it
20 is to number them by priority -- scientific priority
21 score. And I would recommend that the Wesleyan grant be
22 added to the three.

23 DR. WALLACK: I would second adding the
24 Grabel grant as an alternate.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: Discussion?

2 MS. SARNECKY: Okay, can we just have a
3 minute to --

4 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yeah, why don't we give
5 them about five minutes, actually. I suppose if you want
6 to take a bathroom break again, or stretch.

7 (Off the record)

8 MS. TOWNSHEND: Alright, so we're ready to
9 roll. What's up on the screen is the alternate list, and
10 is that -- do we want to put that in order of peer review
11 score, or would that -- there's one more, okay.

12 MS. SARNECKY: Is the motion's still on the
13 table for Grabel or --

14 MS. TOWNSHEND: Well, we haven't taken a
15 vote yes. Is there a discussion on placing Grabel in the
16 reserve category?

17 DR. HART: My understanding is we had the
18 suggestion of Grabel as an amendment.

19 DR. GENEL: I think we agreed --

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: All those --

21 DR. GENEL: -- I think I was --

22 MS. TOWNSHEND: Okay, put Grabel up there.
23 Yes, Warren?

24 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Before you get to the

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 final, I'm sure somebody will bring it up, but are you
2 going to consider any seed grants for -- in case we lose
3 some seed grants?

4 DR. WALLACK: So, are these grants going to
5 be judged the same way on the alternate basis, by
6 scientific score, is that what we're hearing?

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yes.

8 DR. WALLACK: Okay, good, okay.

9 MS. TOWNSHEND: I think Dr. Hart had also
10 mentioned perhaps the -- was it you who mentioned the top
11 two or three -- no, somebody mentioned the top two or
12 three non funded seed.

13 DR. GENEL: Yes, yes, but I thought -- I
14 had recommended that earlier, but I think let's do it one
15 at a time and then we can -- yeah. I mean, if we agree on
16 this then we'll move to the seed.

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: Well, are we putting
18 together a full reserve list with --

19 DR. GENEL: Well, we're putting --

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: -- seed and established
21 investigators --

22 DR. GENEL: -- a reserve list with the --

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: -- that was my --

24 DR. HART: Why don't you go ahead and add

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 that as an amendment as well just so we get this over with
2 now?

3 DR. GENEL: Okay, and I will suggest that
4 we take the top three unfunded seed grants and rank them
5 in order of scientific priority as backup -- as reserves
6 for the seed grants.

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: Now, would that be top
8 three peer reviewed, or top three that were maybe or yes?

9 DR. GENEL: Top three peer review.

10 DR. DEES: I think you want the top three -
11 --

12 DR. GENEL: That were on a -- excuse me,
13 that were on our maybe list.

14 DR. DEES: That were on our maybe list.

15 DR. GENEL: The top three that were on our
16 maybe list. Or top four, I don't -- you know, how many of
17 the --

18 MR. WAGNER: There was five that we went
19 from maybe to no today.

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: So, how about those five?

21 DR. GENEL: Then put -- if there are only
22 five I would put them in order and just say they're -- and
23 rank them in order, scientific priority as -- that's all.
24 It's -- rather than split hairs.

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 DR. DEES: Second.

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: All those in favor say yes.

3 VOICES: Yes.

4 MS. TOWNSHEND: Okay, so once the reserve
5 list is done and I'm sure Chelsey will let me know, we
6 will do a consensus vote on that being the list, and then
7 public comment.

8 DR. DEES: Do we need to have a vote on the
9 Grabel grant?

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: No, we're going to do the
11 whole list.

12 DR. DEES: Oh, we're going to do the whole
13 list, okay.

14 MS. TOWNSHEND: As soon as it's ready.

15 DR. DEES: There was an amendment to Dr.
16 Hart's original suggestion, so I was just wondering if we
17 had to formally say we're including it on the list. But I
18 guess he's accepting it as a friendly amendment, so -- he
19 just wants to get out of here.

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: He wants to beat the
21 Hartford traffic is what he wants.

22 MS. HORN: And you accepted the seeds in
23 addition. And I'm sure that you seconded or accepted all
24 of those additions, so we have a full complete motion

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 seconded.

2 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Although it's really
3 unlikely that we will have to go to our alternate list, I
4 think we should spend some attention, particularly for the
5 seed grants about who's the first alternate. I think
6 we've only had one grant that didn't make it, and I think
7 that was an established investigator grant that couldn't
8 get their human experimentation committee together
9 properly and we had to go to a secondary grant.

10 But the first one in each of those
11 categories -- make it -- something can happen. The other
12 thing that could happen is the whole investigative -- the
13 whole team could move away and -- but it's unlikely.

14 MS. TOWNSHEND: Also, wouldn't it be if
15 there is an alternate -- an opportunity for an alternate
16 off the reserve list to be funded that would come to the
17 committee in a regular meeting, would it not, a monthly
18 meeting? Okay.

19 DR. FISHBONE: Do we know anything about
20 whether -- in many funding situations the applicants have
21 applied to multiple sources for funding. And now with the
22 NIH being more open to receiving funding, is it possible
23 that we may lose some of these applicants because they get
24 funded by NIH, which I've seen in a lot of other granting

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 situations. So you know you need to have a good
2 contingency list because you just don't know what's going
3 to happen.

4 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Never had anybody
5 turn back money to -- so far.

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are we set with the list?

7 DR. FISHBONE: Well, the reason for that
8 was there wasn't anywhere else, many of them to go. But
9 it has become a little bit easier.

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: So, I need a committee
11 member to make a motion that the grants that are currently
12 on the screen, which are in order of scientific peer
13 review, would -- yes, ma'am?

14 MS. SARNECKY: Do you want them in order of
15 peer review -- the established and the seed in order of
16 peer review or --

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: That would be -- well, up
18 to the committee.

19 DR. HART: By category.

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: By category.

21 MS. SARNECKY: Okay.

22 MS. TOWNSHEND: So, by category that the
23 list that currently is on the screen which is by
24 scientific peer review ranking within each category seed

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 or established investigator, be the list that is reserved
2 in this order. And I will run them down for the record.

3 Under the established investigator grants
4 it would be SCB16, B17, B1, B7, B23, and B18. And in the
5 seed grants it would be A12, A18, A28, A32, and A40. All
6 those in favor of making this the reserve list at this
7 time please say yes.

8 DR. DEES: Wait a second, could I just --

9 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: How are you
10 differentiating between when you're -- oh, so A12 and A18,
11 whether A12 and A18, who's the number one alternative?

12 DR. HART: For the priority you're rounding
13 to the whole number.

14 DR. DEES: I'd like to say, it's yeah, that
15 they're in the wrong order.

16 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay.

17 DR. DEES: So, it should be -- it should be
18 ahead of --

19 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, So Wells is
20 first and Wang is second, okay. Alright.

21 MS. TOWNSHEND: Is there any discussion?
22 All those in favor of creating this list -- or making this
23 list the reserve list in the event that any of our first
24 grant prize winners are unable to fulfill their duties,

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 please say aye?

2 VOICES: Aye.

3 MS. TOWNSHEND: Opposed? Motion is
4 carried, this is the reserve list. We are now open for
5 public comment.

6 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Mr. Wollschlager?

7 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Just two things really
8 quickly as a member of the public. First of all, I had to
9 wait until today to finish up the annual report, which is
10 due this year. So, you'll be getting a copy of a draft
11 annual report.

12 I don't know if we'll be meeting this month
13 at all formally or informally to approve that annual
14 report. It's the last one we'll ever put in because the
15 law changed eliminating annual reports effective October.
16 So, anyways, look for that in the mail electronically.

17 And just finally for the record, I want to
18 put in that a person who really has been instrumental in
19 setting this program up that many of you don't know, is
20 Denise Leiber. She's worked in the Office of Research and
21 Development with me since day one on this particular
22 program. For quite a while it was just the two of us.
23 She's retiring at the end of this month, so for the record
24 I just wanted to acknowledge her efforts, and thank you

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 all as well.

2 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Thank you, Warren.

3 And I just -- I presume that our -- the list runs out when
4 the new RFP's come out. I think -- the list expires.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: Is that how it has worked
6 previously?

7 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: A list of alternate
8 grants runs out or it expires automatically when the new
9 grant cycle begins?

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: It would run through the
11 --

12 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: No, I would think it was
13 until after all the -- until after the contracts were
14 executed. And usually what happens after that is they'll
15 come in for a change of a P.I. or something like that.
16 But once we have the 22 contracts executed, I mean the
17 list is still there but there's really not an opportunity
18 to --

19 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: But it doesn't go
20 into the next funding year?

21 MS. HORN: No.

22 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: NO, okay. And are
23 there any -- is there any other public comment? Yes?

24 MS. TOWNSHEND: Step up to the mike please?

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 MS. PAULA WILSON: On behalf of the Yale
2 Cancer Center I'd like to thank all of you for all of your
3 hard work in putting this program and these grants
4 together. Thank you very much.

5 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Thank you. And I
6 would like to add my personal thanks to all of you that
7 have worked so hard on these programs and donated so much
8 of your personal time and expertise. This is a committee,
9 and it is a committee of -- that has diversity in many
10 ways, including points of view and the scientific
11 background, or -- and -- or non scientific background.

12 I think you've all done admirably, my duty
13 has been trying to try to move -- to clarify and move the
14 process along. And in order to do that on occasions I
15 have to push a little harder than I'm sure many of you
16 like to be pushed. But you have done an admirable job.

17 I think it's very difficult as Dr.
18 Goldhamer, and Dr. Hart, and Dr. Pescatello, and all the
19 others, it's very difficult to make these decisions when
20 you're down in that very densely packed area of really
21 good grants, 2.5 to 3.3 or 3.4. I mean, it's on a
22 personal basis, it's on an intellectual basis, it's on a
23 kind of a seat of their pants basis, if you will.

24 Extremely difficult and as Kenny Rogers

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1 says in his song, "Every hand's a winner, but every hand's
2 a loser." So, you can't help it when you have less money
3 than you have good grants to fund. And you got some
4 winners and you got some losers.

5 I think our track record has been good, I
6 think we have put our money pretty much on the right
7 horses. Here and there things haven't gone exactly the
8 way we've liked but it's not from lack of will, or effort,
9 or expertise from all you folks.

10 And I particularly appreciate folks who
11 come from a distance, Treena, and Anne, who schlepped down
12 here and -- because they're interested in science and
13 progress. And I thank you all very much and I will see
14 you soon.

15 MS. TOWNSHEND: Is there anymore public
16 comment? We'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

17 MR. MANDELKERN: So moved.

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: So moved and seconded.

19 Anyone?

20 MALE VOICE: Seconded.

21 MS. TOWNSHEND: Seconded. We are
22 dismissed, thank you so much.

23 (Whereupon, the hearing was adjourned at
24 12:46 p.m.)

MEETING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 2010

1