

VERBATIM PROCEEDINGS

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE

APRIL 1, 2008

8:00 A.M.

315 TRUMBULL STREET  
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT

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

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 . . .Continued verbatim proceedings of the  
2 Connecticut Stem Cell Research Advisory Committee, held at  
3 315 Trumbull Street, Hartford, Connecticut, on April 1,  
4 2008 at 8:00 a.m. . . .

5

6

7

8 MS. LYNN TOWNSHEND: Good morning. I am  
9 doing parking. If you have parking validation, I am  
10 collecting the tickets here. Good morning, everyone. I  
11 understand that we do have a quorum at this time. I don't  
12 know, Dr. Galvin, Commissioner Galvin, if you have opening  
13 remarks that you would like to make on the second day of  
14 this meeting, sir.

15 COMMISSIONER ROBERT GALVIN: Thank you. We  
16 have a good bit of work to do today, so I would request  
17 that, rather than take a break, we take a break, as  
18 needed, and bring our box lunch, if we're still here at  
19 that time, to our workplaces, so we can get through this  
20 rather lengthy agenda.

21 I will be holding you to the allotted  
22 amount of time, and I will ask you, please, do not go  
23 over. There was a good bit of the conversations yesterday  
24 that had to do with conjecture about individuals doing the

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 grants, and I think we ended up with an awful lot of  
2 maybes that perhaps we should have made the decision they  
3 were either yes or no at the time, and some of them seemed  
4 to me to be on subjective, rather than scientific basis.

5 I think there were a couple of incidents  
6 where I heard from people on this committee that the  
7 science wasn't sound, or it's already been done in one or  
8 two occasions, and, yet, they became maybe grants. We  
9 need to move along expeditiously, or else we will have to  
10 finish this up at our next meeting, where we'll have a lot  
11 of phone-in individuals, which makes it somewhat  
12 difficult, particularly if we're having trouble  
13 establishing a connection, as we are with Treena this  
14 morning.

15 We will fix that, I am sure, but we will  
16 now move ahead and finish up the remaining five Blue  
17 Grants that are posted on the board and then go back to  
18 some --

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: Is Treena on the line? We  
20 don't have a dial tone. Is there any way to work on that  
21 feedback? Can we just bring down the master a little bit,  
22 because there is some feedback? Test, one, two. Test,  
23 one, two. Can you hear me? What? All right, now we're  
24 just being silly. Dial tone. This is a fourteen-minute

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 time limit, if I recall correctly, this group of grants?  
2 Thank you.

3 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I will just add one  
4 thing. Dr. Kiessling has to leave by half past 12. Her  
5 input, I think, is vitally important. She's also one of  
6 the members who can vote on any proposal. I can't vote on  
7 any, and several of us can't vote either on the Yale or  
8 the UConn ones, so we will need to move expeditiously, or,  
9 as we say in the military, we need to move out smartly.

10 If these grants are not going to go  
11 anyplace, or they're not sound science, we need to say so  
12 and not to have conjectures about them.

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: Very much like a  
14 legislative hearing, when the timer goes off, I will call  
15 time and ask that you complete that statement and conclude  
16 as quickly as possible. Do we have Dr. Arinzeh on the  
17 phone?

18 A FEMALE VOICE: Not yet.

19 A MALE VOICE: We have it set up, but she's  
20 not on.

21 MS. TOWNSHEND: Did you want me to proceed?

22 For consideration at this time, 08SCCUCHC006. Hla is the  
23 investigator, 2.75 the peer review score, and Wagers and  
24 Latham are the members of cognizance. Timer beginning.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 DR. AMY WAGERS: Do you want me to proceed  
2 without Steve here?

3 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yes.

4 DR. WAGERS: Okay. So this is a group  
5 grant. It's a resubmission from last year, and it's  
6 revised, and the peer reviewers make the comment that the  
7 grant is much improved, and the group has addressed many  
8 of the comments in the earlier review.

9 They also have a confidence that there will  
10 be synergy among the projects, and it's a grant that's  
11 really focused around cardiovascular disease and how to  
12 direct human embryonic stem cells into appropriate cell  
13 types that will be beneficial for repairing the heart  
14 after damage.

15 The score was 2.75, and, so, that seemed  
16 like, to me, a score that would not put it in the funding  
17 category, however, I think that the way we've been  
18 discussing these grants I would maybe put it in the maybe,  
19 and I'll describe a little bit more the project.

20 I think, in general, the score was affected  
21 quite a bit by the inclusion of a core facility for human  
22 embryonic stem cells that duplicated what already exists  
23 and is funded by our committee at UConn, so that was, I  
24 think, impaired the score quite a bit, and, if we remove

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 that, we may be able to fund this group.

2 So there are four complementary projects.  
3 The cores are run by Dr. Hla and Wang, and, so, one is the  
4 team and embryonic stem cell core, which I think we should  
5 consider removing from the grant, because it's duplicating  
6 the one that we're funding with Ren-He Xu, who is also a  
7 collaborator on the grant.

8 The other one is an animal model core that  
9 will help the investigator set up the models that they  
10 need in order to study the generation of cardiomyocytes  
11 and, particularly, endothelial cells within the heart.

12 The first project is, the PI is Huang.  
13 It's going to generate human embryonic stem cell derived  
14 endothelial cells, and they're looking at ways, through  
15 genetic engineering, to enhance the differentiation of  
16 those cells into those cell types. They have reasonable  
17 preliminary data to justify the types of manipulations  
18 that they're going to do, and that could be useful in  
19 leading them into other strategies that would be able to  
20 direct these cells into endothelial cells, without the  
21 need for genetic modification, which would, of course, be  
22 more useful when thinking about human therapy.

23 The second project will look at  
24 sphingolipid signaling and its importance in the

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 generation of endothelial cells from human embryonic stem  
2 cells and, also, in sort of how signaling through this  
3 particular sphingolipid receptor will be important in the  
4 formation or the sort of stability of the endothelial  
5 cells that are derived from human embryonic stem cells.

6 This project was cited by the reviewer as  
7 being the weakest portion of the application, but it does  
8 interact with the other projects in its testing a kind of  
9 novel hypothesis, so I think that that would be an  
10 appropriate project to remain in this grant.

11 The third project, the PI is Shapiro,  
12 that's going to look at the adhesion molecules that are  
13 important in directing the homing of endothelial cells  
14 derived from human embryonic stem cells to the heart,  
15 which is an important aspect of this project in the  
16 delivery of these cells. It's going to focus on a  
17 particular molecule, called CD13.

18 And then the fourth project, by Lee  
19 Yang(phonetic), is going to look at other -- at bone  
20 marrow cells and how they are interacting with cells that  
21 are -- sorry. How they're interacting with cells in the  
22 heart and how they might be supporting cardiac therapy.

23 To me, this is a difficult project, in that  
24 it really takes a somewhat slanted view of the data around

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 bone marrow cell contributions to cardiac tissues and  
2 focuses on studies that suggest that there is a  
3 contribution, but it doesn't really discuss other studies  
4 that actually indicate that these cells do not make these  
5 types of outcomes.

6 In general, all the projects fit together  
7 well. They all focus on an important aspect of  
8 cardiovascular disease. The project involves  
9 investigators that are all at the same institution, so I  
10 know one of our criteria for group grants was that those  
11 would stimulate collaboration across institutions, so that  
12 probably marks down the score a little bit, as well.

13 So I guess I would definitely put this in  
14 the maybe category, and I'd like to hear Steve's comments,  
15 as well, as far as his enthusiasm for the grant.

16 DR. STEPHEN LATHAM: Just going by what the  
17 peer reviewers said, they felt the weakest parts of the  
18 grant were the human core element, as opposed to the  
19 animal core element, and the second of the four projects.  
20 I think that's responsible for the relatively low peer  
21 review number, so one option is to fund portions of it.

22 In fact, one of the reviewers recommended  
23 cutting out the funding for the core, but there was some  
24 sentiment around the table yesterday that we shouldn't do

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 partial funding if we don't absolutely have to.

2 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. Why are we  
3 putting it in as a maybe? What is it that we're not sure  
4 of? Is it that there's a piece that has to be removed  
5 before we can consider -- what would change it from a  
6 maybe to a yes?

7 DR. WAGERS: So there are weak elements of  
8 the entire group, and there are strong elements of the  
9 group, and, so, I guess our --

10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: What's -- pardon me  
11 for interrupting. What's going to change by putting it in  
12 the maybe and looking at it later on? If it's weak, it's  
13 weak.

14 DR. WAGERS: Okay, then, we'll put it in  
15 the no category.

16 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I don't know what the  
17 other members think, but what I'm trying to get at is what  
18 would have to change for us to change it from -- if it's  
19 not a yes, it's a maybe, because there's some weak  
20 elements. What would we have to do? Would we have to  
21 rearrange the grant for it to go from maybe to yes? I  
22 don't know. It sounds like we'd have to change pieces of  
23 it, or take pieces out, is that right?

24 DR. WAGERS: So the score was higher,

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 meaning worse, because there are elements of the grant  
2 that are weak and particularly elements of the grant that  
3 replicate core facilities that our committee has already  
4 funded, and, so, that does not seem like a useful way to  
5 spend the limited money that we have.

6 I guess I considered that a discussion in  
7 the funding round, which is why I would put it in the  
8 maybe category, perhaps to see whether there are other  
9 grants in this category that are stronger, in which case  
10 we would be less compelled to try to alter this grant to  
11 support funding it.

12 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. We'll put it  
13 in the maybe.

14 DR. TREENA ARINZEH: I'm just letting you  
15 know I'm actually on my cell phone in transit, so I'll  
16 probably need to call back when I get to a land line,  
17 probably in about 20 minutes. There's a lot of traffic,  
18 so I haven't been able to get to my office yet. Okay, so,  
19 I'll do that. Okay? Thank you.

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Dr. Wagers, I didn't  
21 quite understand. What's the part that's going to be  
22 duplicated? Something we've already granted to the same  
23 institution or --

24 DR. WAGERS: Yes. Yes. So we fund a human

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 embryonic stem cell core, run by Ren-He Xu at UConn.

2 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay.

3 DR. WAGERS: And this grant includes as a  
4 component another human embryonic stem cell core at the  
5 same institution.

6 DR. CHARLES JENNINGS: Mr. Chairman, what  
7 I'm hearing is that we have a core facility that's clearly  
8 redundant. We have the four projects. We have one that  
9 the referees thought was pretty weak. We have another one  
10 that Amy thinks is weak in an area that's really her  
11 central expertise, bone marrow stem cells, and it seems to  
12 me that this grant is getting eviscerated.

13 It, at best, is going to be a marginal  
14 contender for partial funding on the same scale as the  
15 senior investigator grants, and what they're asking for  
16 now is two and a half million dollars, and I'm not hearing  
17 anything to suggest that it's remotely worthy of two and a  
18 half million dollars out of our --

19 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: What is the sense of  
20 the group? Do you want to come back and look at this  
21 again?

22 MR. ROBERT MANDELKERN: No.

23 DR. MILTON WALLACK: Sir?

24 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yes.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 DR. WALLACK: I would recommend that we go  
2 to the maybe --

3 COURT REPORTER: You need to be on the  
4 microphone.

5 DR. WALLACK: Wallack. I would recommend  
6 we go to the maybe, with the idea being that Wagers and  
7 Latham in the rediscussion come up with some specific  
8 ideas about how to take out those portions that would be  
9 able to bring down the cost factors and not duplicate  
10 what's already there.

11 If, at that point, we decide to say no,  
12 well, that's how we'll have to go, but at least it will  
13 give us the opportunity to see it in its pared down  
14 version.

15 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I disagree. I would  
16 hearken to Dr. Jennings' remarks about eviscerating the  
17 grant, which would mean changing it materially. I'm not  
18 sure that's an appropriate role for this group to change  
19 everybody's grant around by taking major portions of it  
20 out.

21 I am concerned with the fact that it  
22 appears that they're trying to get funds for something  
23 that's already been funded. That bothers me, but whatever  
24 the sense of the group is, we'll -- if the sense of the

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 group or significant members would like to make it a  
2 maybe, we'll put it a maybe. What's the sense?

3 DR. WAGERS: So I guess my sympathy goes  
4 with this grant, in the sense that it's an important  
5 problem, important project. The investigators are very  
6 strong, and I think it would be -- I'm sure that important  
7 science will come out of it. It's just perhaps,  
8 unfortunately, the way the grant is structured perhaps was  
9 --

10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: With respect, that's  
11 their fault, not our fault.

12 DR. WAGERS: No. I agree.

13 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: We got 9.8 million  
14 bucks. For attribution, I'll say we're all big boys here  
15 and big girls, and we know how to do grants. If you do it  
16 in a funny, duplicative way and have bad parts of it, you  
17 don't get your grant.

18 DR. WAGERS: So I agree with you, that it's  
19 not this committee's role to restructure their grant, so,  
20 perhaps, in light of that, we should move it to the no  
21 category, because whatever we would do would be, you know,  
22 us stepping in into their project and imposing our views,  
23 which perhaps we shouldn't be doing, so maybe we'll go  
24 with Charles' suggestion and just move it to the no

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 category.

2 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I have no issue with  
3 your wonderful work and your analytical skills. It's just  
4 that I can't -- I don't think we should be second  
5 guessing. But if Dr. Wallack would like to look at it  
6 again, we'll put it into maybe.

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: Please place this grant in  
8 the maybe category. Our next grant for consideration is  
9 08SCC UConn 004. Rasmussen is the principal investigator,  
10 2.75 is the peer review score, and the members of the  
11 Committee of Cognizance are Kiessling and Landwirth.

12 DR. ANN KIESSLING: This is an application  
13 from a group of people at UConn. If you look through this  
14 application, the cover letter to this application is  
15 actually worth the read. I don't know if any of you have  
16 read it.

17 The cover letter to this application is to  
18 us, and it is to Commissioner Galvin and to us, and it  
19 says, "You will find that this grant contains robust  
20 preliminary data and all the records researched to bring  
21 the project to an immediate pre-clinical stage within  
22 three years."

23 What this team proposes to do is reprogram  
24 human cells with the newly reported gene therapy or gene

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 approaches, and this is from -- Rasmussen, actually  
2 trained at MIT with Enrudi Adish's(phonetic) lab. He's  
3 really well positioned to do this. This is a good team at  
4 Storrs.

5                   They have greatly overstated what they can  
6 do in three years, and it is four projects, and my  
7 recommendation for this application would be to fund the  
8 first two. The problem that the peer review had with this  
9 project was that, in contrast to what it says on the cover  
10 letter, they do not provide a new preliminary data, so  
11 this is a team that can probably do the first two  
12 experiments, which are to look at various ways of  
13 reprogramming human fibroblast tissues, and the second one  
14 is to study the cell cycle of those reprogrammed cells.

15                   The last two aims are to differentiate them  
16 into skin and then to use that skin to repair wounds. We  
17 don't even know if they can do the first two yet, so a  
18 good approach for this UConn team would be to fund the  
19 first two projects that they listed and eliminate the last  
20 two.

21                   If everybody agrees with doing that, I'll  
22 actually spend a little time on the budget and come back  
23 with a number to recommend for this project.

24                   COMMISSIONER GALVIN: So you want that over

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 into maybe, Dr. K., or yes, with revisions?

2 DR. KIESSLING: I would do yes. I mean I  
3 would -- the first half of this project is a good team,  
4 and they should be allowed to do it, and this work should  
5 be going on in Connecticut.

6 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah.

7 DR. KIESSLING: It's the other part that's  
8 not going --

9 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I'm personally a  
10 little disenchanted with shotgun approaches, basic science  
11 and applications. I've been a clinician a number of  
12 years, and I will tell you we're a long way from  
13 synthesizing human skin. I have a problem with that being  
14 included in a basic science grant, but that's just my  
15 clinical self speaking.

16 You want to make that as a yes with some  
17 modifications?

18 DR. KIESSLING: The first two aims don't  
19 have anything to do with skin.

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay.

21 DR. KIESSLING: The first two aims are  
22 simply to develop the technologies at UConn for  
23 reprogramming fibroblast without needing human eggs.

24 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. I can live

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 with that. I'm seeing some things I would describe here  
2 as laundry lists, but perhaps that's just me, and maybe  
3 I've dismounted the bed from the wrong side this morning.  
4 I have to try a different side tomorrow.

5 DR. JENNINGS: Mr. Chairman, if I may, if I  
6 could ask Ann for clarification? So they're planning to  
7 make induced potential stem cells from fibroblast, is that  
8 right? I think there's a broad consensus that that's an  
9 extremely important approach.

10 I haven't yet seen any other grant here  
11 that is doing that work. Rasmussen certainly has the  
12 pedigree. And maybe I can preface this by noting that I'm  
13 personally recused from voting on this, but I just make  
14 the general point that induced stem cells are an important  
15 technology. We already got criticism of the nuclear  
16 transplant on the grounds that induced -- cells may  
17 replace those, so I just throw that out.

18 DR. JULIUS LANDWIRTH: I just want to make  
19 exactly the same comment that Charles just made, that, as  
20 far as I could tell, this is the only project before us  
21 that deals with reprogramming. We hit a point yesterday  
22 of, I think, with respect to one of the core grants, of  
23 being overly concerned about over investing in nuclear  
24 transferred technology when this reprogramming seems to

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 hold so much promise. Here, we have, I think, the only  
2 project in that area.

3 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: All right, so, what  
4 is the pleasure of the group? Is what you want to do is  
5 just fund the first two parts? Okay, so, that's a yes,  
6 with the understanding we're not going to get into the  
7 manufacture of human skin parts. That gets moved to a  
8 yes.

9 DR. KIESSLING: I'll come up with a number  
10 for recommendation for funding.

11 MS. TOWNSHEND: All right. The next grant  
12 for consideration is 08SCCGRIN -- I'm sorry, TRIT007.  
13 Restler(phonetic) is the PI of record, 4.25 is the peer  
14 review score, and the members of the Committee of  
15 Cognizance are Canalis and Fishbone.

16 DR. ERNESTO CANALIS: I'm going to start.  
17 This is a company that basically proposes to study the  
18 effect of peptide, which is a product of the proteolytic  
19 cleavage of proinsulin-like growth factor, and the plan is  
20 to study the impact of this peptide on cell  
21 differentiation of umbilical cord cells toward neuronal  
22 cells, so, basically, a switch from the hemotopoetic to  
23 the neuronal cell lineage.

24 Although it is a program project, basically

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 the entire application is a single experiment and,  
2 unfortunately, is not hypothesis driven, and the  
3 preliminary data are rather scant. The peer review was  
4 not favorable to either. Consequently, I would place this  
5 in the no category.

6 COURT REPORTER: Microphone, please? Do  
7 you have a microphone?

8 DR. GERALD FISHBONE: I think I do, yeah.  
9 Yeah, I had similar feelings, that what they're doing is  
10 not specifically related to human embryonic stem cells,  
11 though it could maybe subsequently be applied.

12 One concern, on the positive side, is that  
13 they seem to be collaborating with an investigator, who  
14 we're familiar with and who, you know, who is highly  
15 regarded, so I'm surprised that the very poor level, you  
16 know, the very low level of the scoring.

17 The main reason for the low scoring seems  
18 to be that it doesn't apply to human embryonic stem cells,  
19 and, as Dr. Canalis says, they're going to do a very  
20 limited number of studies.

21 It's really a biochemical, really a  
22 pharmacological project, so unless somebody knows more,  
23 you know, more about it, why it should be approved, I  
24 would have to say no.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. Any other  
2 comments? We'll move that grant -- is that 007? Double  
3 ought seven? We'll move that to a no.

4 MS. TOWNSHEND: Next grant for  
5 consideration is 08SCCNEWH001. Franco is the PI, 4.5 is  
6 the peer review score. This contains proprietary  
7 information, should that come up for discussion. The  
8 members of the Committee of Cognizance are Arinzeh and  
9 Mandelkern.

10 MR. MANDELKERN: This is a project, which  
11 came from the private sectors, one of our successes in  
12 provoking some response in the area we wanted, however,  
13 the quality of this report leaves a great deal to be  
14 desired, and I don't think it warrants the 14 minutes that  
15 are allotted to it, because there's very little science in  
16 this project.

17 It violates ethical standards regarding  
18 human subjects, so it could not possibly get off the  
19 ground, according to the peer review. It misstates  
20 statements about the origin of embryonic stem cells in  
21 relation to placentas and so on, and, in general, there is  
22 very little much to recommend it, particularly since the  
23 budget seems to indicate that one million dollars will be  
24 spent to hire five senior personnel, who will work 100

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 percent on this project, meaning that they'll have no  
2 other time to devote to the company, whatsoever.

3 And since one million is a great part of  
4 what they're requesting and the science is very poorly  
5 indicated on any level, with no suggestion of experiments  
6 and no protocols -- quote from this peer review.

7 This grant application is grossly  
8 insufficient across the board, containing no program  
9 project that I am able to locate within its pages,  
10 therefore, unfortunately, we have to encourage this  
11 private entity to refine its request in the future and to  
12 stress science not hiring the personnel.

13 And I think Dr. Arinzeh concurs with me  
14 when we spoke about it to strongly recommend this going to  
15 the no category. Thank you.

16 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Any further comments?

17 I don't think she's on the -- she's not. No. Put it in  
18 the no category.

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: Next grant for  
20 consideration is 08SCCZBIO002. Chechi(phonetic) is the  
21 PI, 4.5 is the peer review score, and the members of the  
22 Committee of Cognizance are Canalis and Wallack.

23 COURT REPORTER: You need a microphone.

24 MS. TOWNSHEND: For the sake of brevity, he

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 suggests that it be moved to the no category.

2 MR. WALLACK: For the sake of brevity, I  
3 would just move it to the no category.

4 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Dr. Canalis?

5 DR. CANALIS: I agree. It's very vague.  
6 It's the worst score in the category. Basically, they  
7 want to improve cell culture conditions. There are no  
8 real experiments or programs here, so I concur with Dr.  
9 Wallack.

10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay.

11 MS. TOWNSHEND: We will move at this time  
12 to the Established Investigator category, or do we wish to  
13 go to the maybes and the yeses?

14 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Everybody is happy  
15 where the Blue Grants are? One in the yes, two maybes and  
16 four nos?

17 DR. WALLACK: Can we finish with this  
18 category, since it's fresh in our minds, please?

19 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I think that's a good  
20 idea. That's why I'm saying is there anything, anybody  
21 have agita with the four that are no? Okay, then, we'll  
22 work on the -- we were just working on the Blue category  
23 now. Isn't that what you wanted, Dr. Wallack?

24 DR. WALLACK: Yes.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yes. I think that's  
2 a very excellent suggestion. There are a total of seven  
3 Blue Grants, four nos, two maybes and a yes. Everybody  
4 happy with that? Okay, now, we're going to go back and  
5 work on the two maybe Blue Grants.

6 MR. MANDELKERN: Point of information, Dr.  
7 Galvin. The one yes, I gather, is recommended with only  
8 partial funding, is that right, Dr. Kiessling?

9 DR. KIESSLING: Yes.

10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: That's going to be  
11 modified.

12 DR. KIESSLING: Yes. That's a three-year  
13 application, and it looks like it will be for about half  
14 price.

15 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Dr. Canalis, do we  
16 have everybody in the right seat, in the right pew, in the  
17 right church? Now if anyone else has any questions, I  
18 would suggest that you do what Dr. Canalis is doing. He's  
19 looking -- I don't know. I think he's looking for a way  
20 out. (Laughter) Can you read the four Blue Grants for me?

21 COURT REPORTER: Pick up your microphone.

22 MS. TOWNSHEND: I'm happy to do that.

23 DR. CANALIS: There is a yes (coughing)  
24 Rasmussen for roughly two million to be modified. Then

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 you have two maybes, Redmond(phonetic) for a couple of  
2 mills and (indiscernible) for 200,000. Then you have four  
3 nos, which are Aguila, Chechi, Franco and Restler.

4 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. All okay with  
5 that? All right, let's move on.

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: We'll go with the top.  
7 Let's consider, if it's all right with the group,  
8 08SCCYSME005, Redmond, for 1.999514.

9 DR. JENNINGS: I'm sorry. Could somebody  
10 clarify what we're discussing now?

11 MS. TOWNSHEND: Whether or not it should be  
12 a yes or a no.

13 MR. MANDELKERN: Okay, so, what's the  
14 number?

15 MS. TOWNSHEND: It is 08SCCYSME005, the PI  
16 is Redmond.

17 DR. JENNINGS: Mr. Chairman, since I was  
18 the lead reviewer, would you like me to briefly summarize  
19 it?

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: The Committee needs  
21 to vote the way it wants to on this grant. I will not be  
22 able to support the money being spent outside of the  
23 continental United States and outside of the confines of  
24 Connecticut, so if I am queried by members of the General

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 Assembly, I will have to tell them that this is not my  
2 recommendation to spend the money, the taxpayers' money in  
3 this fashion.

4 I understand the science, I understand the  
5 enthusiasm, but I'm here as the Governor's representative  
6 of an Executive Branch department, and I can't get behind  
7 this, so if there's a controversy or a question next year,  
8 then so be it. I will have to tell the group that this  
9 was a group decision, not mine, and that I did not agree  
10 with it.

11 Why don't we go ahead with -- I think this  
12 is the one that got the one rating?

13 DR. JENNINGS: 1.25 rating, so this is the  
14 most highly rated grant, not merely in its own category,  
15 but in any category.

16 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. I think that  
17 the problem here involves where is the research going to  
18 be done, and it is also animal research on a scale that we  
19 have not discussed before. We're talking about mice by  
20 and large, and these are primates, so this is our first  
21 foray into primate research, and the problem revolves  
22 around what are you going to do about the part of the  
23 money that's going to be spent outside of the continental  
24 United States?

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 DR. WALLACK: Sir?

2 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yes, Dr. Wallack?

3 DR. WALLACK: I think that the project is a  
4 very important project. I think that the researchers --  
5 I'm sorry.

6 COURT REPORTER: Place that in front of  
7 you.

8 DR. WALLACK: I think that the project is a  
9 very, very important project. I think the researchers who  
10 are working on the project are very accomplished, very  
11 skillful. I agree that that could be possibly a concern  
12 with that aspect of it, which you just spoke to.

13 I can easily see, however, an argument  
14 being made that, by doing what they're doing, by farming  
15 out that portion, we're actually saving the taxpayers of  
16 the state a considerable amount of money, because it would  
17 cost millions of dollars to set up the apparatus to do  
18 that in state.

19 Having said that, there may be a middle  
20 ground, and the middle ground may be to take out that  
21 portion of the funding for the project that would have to  
22 do with the use of St. Kitts and funding the primate  
23 portion.

24 I think the project could still function,

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 go forward, be beneficial, despite the fact that I think  
2 an argument, as I said, could be made the other way. I  
3 understand the sensitivity, and this may be a way to  
4 proceed, so I would recommend that we ask the reviewers  
5 if, in fact, they could look at this application and  
6 recommend to us how we can do that by taking out I think  
7 about 500,000 dollars of the project. That would be my  
8 recommendation, sir.

9 DR. JENNINGS: As a point of information,  
10 the subcontract to action is approximately 580,000. If  
11 anybody wants it to the last digit, I can look it up, but  
12 it's approximately 580,000 out of the two-million-dollar  
13 grant.

14 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Aren't there some  
15 associated back and forth travel charges? Are they  
16 included in that nearly 600,000 dollars?

17 DR. JENNINGS: All of the indirect costs of  
18 the work at the St. Kitts' facility is included in the  
19 contract, and, to Milt's points, they tabulate the  
20 relative costs of doing this work at St. Kitts versus  
21 comparable primate facilities in the United States. It  
22 costs about 15 percent in St. Kitts of what it would cost  
23 in the United States, and it's not simply a cost factor.  
24 You can make a compelling argument that the primate

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 facilities available in this country simply do not have  
2 the capacity they have.

3 An anecdotal example of the leading  
4 research, you had to wait, I think, two years to get  
5 monkeys, whereas here the monkeys are ready and the  
6 project and begin immediately. I mean I think, in my view  
7 scientifically, there's an absolutely compelling place for  
8 this grant, and I think we're discussing politics at this  
9 point, not science.

10 And I understand that this is a political  
11 judgment, as well as a scientific judgment, but I'd just  
12 like to state for the record my own personal view, which  
13 is that primate research is absolutely essential in order  
14 to translate basic research into human therapeutic  
15 applications, and nowhere is that more true than in the  
16 central nervous system, because what uniquely  
17 distinguishes us from other animals is our brains, of  
18 course.

19 So I think there's a scientifically  
20 compelling case for working with primates. Primate  
21 research is becoming extremely difficult in the United  
22 States. It has been extremely expensive. It is  
23 politically controversial, because of animal rights  
24 extremists.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1                   In Europe, where I'm originally from, it's  
2 becoming almost impossible in many countries, because of  
3 the intense opposition. I believe we have an opportunity  
4 and, indeed, an obligation to make a strong statement in  
5 favor of supporting this research and supporting the  
6 continued existence of this facility.

7                   It's 20 years old. It has had a long track  
8 record of funding from NIH, NIDS, NIMH, other  
9 institutions. The national health has a long record of  
10 receiving public funding from U.S. taxpayer dollars. It  
11 has an extremely impressive productivity record.

12                   They're providing a service that is not  
13 available and could not, I think, be available in the  
14 United States, so my own personal view is that we should  
15 fund this grant in full, and I do respect the views of my  
16 fellow committee members, and I recognize that we are  
17 talking not only about science, but also about Connecticut  
18 politics, which is not an area in which I claim any  
19 special expertise.

20                   COURT REPORTER: One moment, please.

21                   COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Nobody is questioning  
22 the science or the quality of the grant. It's the portion  
23 of the monies that are going be spent outside of the  
24 state. I am a gubernatorial appointee, and my duties are

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 to safeguard monies that are collected and disbursed from  
2 the taxpayers, and, so, anything that I have to testify or  
3 support has to be completely clear to the average person  
4 on the street.

5 There's some spins you'll put. Why are you  
6 spending my money out of the state when things are getting  
7 tough in Connecticut, and I don't understand. What I'll  
8 hear is you got this money to spend in Connecticut. Now  
9 you want to send it out of the country. That's number one.

10 The other pushback I'll get is, oh, you  
11 can't do research on primates in the United States, so  
12 you're taking state money to go outside the country and do  
13 primate research. And I'm not saying these are -- just a  
14 minute, Bob. Let me finish. I'm not saying these are  
15 correct arguments, but whatever we do will have to be  
16 crystal clear to the average guy who is paying 800, or  
17 500, or 1,000 bucks tax to the State of Connecticut, and  
18 it's also hopefully something I can defend, and I hear  
19 some very good justifications.

20 We're at a point here we're going to do one  
21 of two things. We're going to say, look, this is  
22 something that we think we should fund everything in the  
23 grant, except the St. Kitts expedition, or we're going to  
24 say we think that this makes sense, it's justifiable, it's

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 cost effective, which are all the things that Charles just  
2 said.

3                   There's only two ways you can go here. You  
4 either include it and justify it, or put the cost back on  
5 the institution, and that's the problem here. There's no  
6 question about the science, and there's no question about  
7 applying it to central nervous system problems.

8                   We need to figure out as a group what is  
9 our consensus? You want to move forward with this? And I  
10 hear plenty of justification. And if that's the  
11 committee's sense, then we'll move forward with it in that  
12 way, or do we want to go back to the individual and say  
13 we'll fund everything, except what you want to do out of  
14 country?

15                   DR. JENNINGS: Mr. Chairman, can I just add  
16 two points of information?

17                   COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yes.

18                   DR. JENNINGS: One is that I believe that  
19 all of the PIs are Yale faculty members. The other is  
20 that I believe that all the intellectual property and,  
21 therefore, all the downstream benefits of the research  
22 will go to Yale, so there is no, if you like, senior level  
23 intellectual involvement, if I can put it that way, of  
24 people outside --

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: That makes it worse  
2 for me, because -- will go to a private institution. This  
3 is taxpayers' money.

4 DR. JENNINGS: No. It will go to Yale.

5 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah, but it doesn't  
6 help me. People will say, why isn't it going to the state  
7 university? I'm telling you.

8 DR. JENNINGS: With a five percent share.

9 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I understand. I'm  
10 just telling you the realities of life and the world.  
11 Yes, Bob?

12 MR. MANDELKERN: I appreciate your  
13 comments, Dr. Galvin, and I'd just like to, before  
14 agreeing with you on most of them, I would like to say  
15 that the compelling need that can be described to the  
16 public is that this is a very advanced scientific sound  
17 investigation of a very important --

18 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Bob, we realize that.  
19 It's not the science. It's the money being spent outside  
20 of the confines of the state.

21 MR. MANDELKERN: I'm coming to that, Dr.  
22 Galvin. I would assume that some of the scientific minds  
23 here could agree that the science could be done by funding  
24 this for a million and a half and taking out the

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 subcontract for the work in St. Kitts.

2 That would let the science and the clinical  
3 approach, which could have endless benefit to Connecticut,  
4 and put it in the forefront of pioneering stem cell  
5 research and take out the 500,000 subcontract, 500 to  
6 600,000 subcontract with Axion in St. Kitts.

7 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah. That is  
8 alternative one. Alternative two is to go ahead with the  
9 entire grant and justify it to whoever may think that  
10 we've exceeded our charter. Dr. Canalis?

11 DR. CANALIS: I indicated yesterday and I  
12 will restate it today, my position all along has been this  
13 program is a program to enhance stem cell research in  
14 Connecticut, so, frankly, I have difficulties with going  
15 forward with a grant, where significant portions of money  
16 are not used within the state.

17 With all due respect, the chair of this  
18 committee is the Commissioner, and if he's going to have  
19 difficulties getting this through the legislature, I think  
20 that that is also a significant concern in my mind. Maybe  
21 they made a strategic error here and nobody is doubting  
22 the science, but the reality is it does not appear to meet  
23 the criteria for these type of grants.

24 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, so, we have

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 two? Yup.

2 DR. WALLACK: Bob, it's interesting what  
3 Mr. Mandelkern supported, and it's originally sort of  
4 where I left off my opening remarks on this. I think that  
5 it would give us the best opportunity to have the science  
6 done.

7 It would also empower you, which I think is  
8 very important to all of us, frankly, to be able to be  
9 supportive in front of whatever bodies you have to be  
10 appearing before on any and all of this.

11 So I would go back to the fact, and I think  
12 it would take care of Dr. Canalis' concern, also, that we  
13 extricate that portion of it having to do with St. Kitts.

14 I would be able to support that and thereby go forward  
15 with the rest of the science.

16 My sense is, and I can't speak for anybody,  
17 obviously, nor can anybody else do that, but my sense is  
18 that the university, being as supportive of the stem cell  
19 initiative as they have already been and the importance of  
20 the project, they possibly could support that portion,  
21 which we're extricating.

22 I would move that we move forward with it,  
23 but taking out the St. Kitts portion.

24 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I will just add some

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 more. I would imagine the proponents think negative  
2 background, but Mr. Wollschlager and I had a conversation  
3 earlier this morning about the generalities of stem cell  
4 research.

5 We will have a new Chief Executive in the  
6 White House, and some states are already thinking or  
7 giving us some indications that perhaps they don't need to  
8 support stem cells as much as they have in the past,  
9 because the new administration will be pro-stem cell, or  
10 at least permissive.

11 We are heading into a portion where the  
12 Connecticut projected budget inputs are waning this year,  
13 in '09, and potentially in '10, fiscal '10, and it is not  
14 impossible for them to say you don't need 10 million  
15 bucks. You only need eight or seven and a half.

16 You have to put all that into the hopper  
17 and decide what the majority would want to do, and I  
18 think, as Milt outlined, we either approve the grant,  
19 minus the -- is it Axion? The Axion portion or approve  
20 the whole grant and justify -- have a justification, but  
21 that's up to the majority of the group to decide.

22 Has everybody had an opportunity to speak?

23 DR. KIESSLING: I actually didn't look at  
24 the budget on this grant. Is this for three years? Is

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 this a three-year project?

2 DR. JENNINGS: Two million dollars over  
3 four years, so there's basically two cycles of  
4 experimentation, two rounds of producing differentiating  
5 year cells, putting them into one generation of monkeys,  
6 and then they run for two years, and then, based on  
7 lessons learned from that first cycle, they move into the  
8 second.

9 It's a four-year project, the budget is two  
10 million dollars, of which 583,000 goes to the Axion  
11 Foundation, which is a Connecticut based foundation, which  
12 operates a facility in St. Kitts.

13 What I also don't know and some of you just  
14 pointed out to me, it's not broken down in detail, that  
15 583,000 goes to Axion in Connecticut. Now what percentage  
16 of that actually gets converted into whatever they are,  
17 East Caribbean dollars and spent in St. Kitts, that I  
18 don't have that information.

19 At least some of the budget is for either  
20 medical supplies and equipment, which I assume will be  
21 purchased in the United States. It's not like they're  
22 manufacturing supplies and drugs in St. Kitts. My  
23 assumption is the actual money spent in St. Kitts will be  
24 significantly less than that total of 583,000, but I don't

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 have the exact amount on that.

2 DR. KIESSLING: Charles, is there an easy  
3 way to --

4 DR. JENNINGS: That was a long answer to a  
5 short question. Sorry.

6 DR. KIESSLING: Yeah. Is there an easy way  
7 to fund this project in a way that doesn't invoke the St.  
8 Kitts piece?

9 DR. JENNINGS: No. So let me qualify that.  
10 So if the St. Kitts' piece is integral to the -- the  
11 contrast of many of the group projects in which we're  
12 seeing several investigators with sort of loosely  
13 connected -- this is an absolutely coherent package in my  
14 view. You make cells, you characterize them, you put them  
15 into monkeys, you measure the behavioral effects, and then  
16 you do the postmortem pathology. It's a fully integrated  
17 proposal. There's no way that you can just cut that out.

18  
19 The only option that I could imagine would  
20 be saying you have to find the portion that is -- the  
21 portion of the expenses that are incurred out in St. Kitts  
22 would have to be found from other sources. That's the  
23 only. I don't think we can simply say, you know, don't do  
24 the monkey work.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 DR. KIESSLING: There's only one aim.

2 DR. JENNINGS: Well there is one aim, which  
3 is to explore the capacity of embryonic stem cells as a  
4 cellular transplantation therapy for Parkinson's Disease.  
5 It is a single coherent project.

6 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: There's nothing wrong  
7 with the grant. The grant is fine. Who is going to pay  
8 for the St. Kitts? We're going to pay for it, or they're  
9 going to pay for it. That's the question.

10 DR. KIESSLING: Right. It becomes the  
11 logistics now of how do you carve out the controversial  
12 piece and let the work go forward?

13 DR. JENNINGS: I don't endorse your view of  
14 the word controversial, but, yes, I understand. I  
15 continue to feel that primate research is essential and  
16 that they make a compelling case, and I think this meets  
17 Henry's criteria. I think this is more like the particle  
18 accelerator than a junket and (indiscernible) to take  
19 Henry's two extreme examples. I think we need group  
20 discussion on this.

21 I recognize the position that the  
22 Commissioner is in defending this. I think it's  
23 defensible, but I understand their counter arguments, as  
24 well.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 DR. FISHBONE: Was there a motion made by  
2 Dr. Wallack?

3 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yes. Dr. Wallack  
4 moved that we accept the project, minus the monies being  
5 spent outside the country. I don't think there's any  
6 question. We're not saying we want you to do the thing,  
7 but just don't do the primate research. I mean that's  
8 like, you know, entering a bicycle race without a bicycle.  
9 It doesn't make any sense.

10 The project is either do it all, or just  
11 don't do it at all. The question is are we going to go to  
12 the institution and say, hey, any monies you spend out of  
13 the country, that comes out of your pocketbook? That's  
14 the question. It's not complicated. We're going to say  
15 to them, hey, look, you want to spend money in St. Kitts?  
16 You got a checkbook? Big checkbook down there? You  
17 write the checks, because we're not going to do that, or  
18 else we say, you know, this is really a great idea. We  
19 understand about the difficulties in primate labs. We  
20 don't want to create another primate lab, so we're going  
21 to fund the whole thing.

22 If we get some pushback, we'll deal with  
23 it, or maybe we won't get any pushback. I don't know.

24 DR. WALLACK: It's also consistent with our

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 philosophy, and I already talked to this issue, of not  
2 funding out of the state.

3 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Milt, I don't think  
4 this is a difficult problem. I keep hearing people say  
5 it's wonderful research. I agree. You can't do it  
6 without the primates. I agree. It's who is going to  
7 write the check for it, the taxpayers or the institution?

8 DR. WALLACK: And I would say that we go to  
9 the institution and we indicate to the institution that we  
10 would expect for them to pick up that portion of it. And,  
11 as I alluded to before, you know, we can't speak for the  
12 institution, but the kind of support that the institution  
13 has given to this whole subject, this whole initiative  
14 stem cell research, I would feel comfortable in that they  
15 would have a positive response.

16 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Well if it's that  
17 terrific a project, it's got a great rating, and we're  
18 going to pay for three-quarters of it, that's not bad.  
19 That's not bad. And Bob Mandelkern, I think, wanted to  
20 second.

21 MR. MANDELKERN: I wanted to second Dr.  
22 Wallack's motion in respect to moving ahead, since we have  
23 a considerable amount of other work to do. My  
24 understanding of the motion, Dr. Wallack, is to fund in

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 round numbers 1.5 million dollars of this grant and to not  
2 fund the St. Kitts' Axion contract, which is approximately  
3 500,000 to 600,000, is that correct, sir?

4 DR. WALLACK: I think it would come to 1.4.  
5 I think it would come to 1.4.

6 MR. MANDELKERN: Fine. I was rounding,  
7 given the fact I'm an old business man and looking to make  
8 a profit.

9 DR. JENNINGS: Can I just make a modifying  
10 suggestion? Since we got contracts to Axion, which is a  
11 Connecticut based organization, it's 583,000, what we  
12 don't know is how much of that money will be spent on  
13 expenses in Connecticut and how much will be spent in St.  
14 Kitts, so I would, if we need to make this compromise,  
15 what I will propose to do is to go back to Yale and say  
16 please give us a detailed breakdown of this Axion  
17 contract, and tell us how much of it is going to be spent  
18 in the United States.

19 DR. WALLACK: The only reason I would not  
20 be comfortable with that is it complicates the approach to  
21 it. This is a simple approach to it. We get it done  
22 today, and I'd rather support the project than leaving it  
23 in limbo. I think it's too important a project to not  
24 definitively take care of the issue today.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 DR. JENNINGS: My guess is they would have  
2 the answer very quickly. I'm sure they know where that  
3 money goes.

4 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Well it may evolve  
5 over the course of the grant, so I think whatever we do we  
6 need to make it clear that we're not going to fund  
7 anything now, or in year two, or year three that gets  
8 spent outside of the confines of the state.

9 That's been moved and seconded to accept  
10 the grant, minus an approximate 580,000 dollars, which was  
11 intended to be spent outside the confines of the state, or  
12 in pursuance of that, or going back and forth, and there  
13 are a lot of nuances to this, but I think what we're all  
14 saying is what Dr. Wallack articulated, is we'll fund the  
15 grant, but we won't fund the St. Kitts' part, so you're  
16 responsible. If you want the grant, you've got to kick in  
17 with the other 580,000 dollars. That's not bad. We're  
18 giving you a million-four. Is there a group consensus or  
19 --

20 DR. CANALIS: No. I'm opposed.

21 MR. MANDELKERN: Call the question.

22 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. The question  
23 is are we going to vote for, as I understand it, are we  
24 going to vote for the grant, minus the 580,000 dollars,

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 one way or another, that will be spent outside of the  
2 country?

3 MR. HENRY SALTON: If I may, Commissioner?

4 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yes.

5 MR. SALTON: I want to make sure that this  
6 is clear, that the motion is really a matter of putting  
7 this into the yes category. This is not a motion  
8 approving the final disposition of the grant, which would  
9 then require that we remove from the roll call persons who  
10 are disqualified from voting on a Yale contract.

11 At this point, all we're trying to do, if  
12 that's my understanding, is move it --

13 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: From a maybe to a  
14 yes.

15 MR. SALTON: -- from a maybe to a yes with  
16 this particular condition applied to it, which is that  
17 there's going to be a carve out of out-of-state portion of  
18 the contract. So, with that understanding, then, you  
19 could have the entire committee participate, with the  
20 understanding that this is not a final endorsed vote to  
21 fund the contract on a defined basis.

22 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: That's very clear.  
23 Amy?

24 DR. WAGERS: I'm sorry. I don't want to

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 try to dredge this up again, but there's something that  
2 concerns me about this, and that is that other grants that  
3 we fund we do not hold to the standard of demonstrating  
4 that every dollar that they spend is staying within the  
5 State of Connecticut, and, undoubtedly, there are dollars  
6 that get spent outside the State of Connecticut for buying  
7 enzymes that are only available from a company that  
8 distributes from New Jersey, or something like that.

9 And, so, I'm wondering if we're setting up  
10 a precedent here, that we will not be able to hold up in  
11 all of the grants that we fund, so that concerns me about  
12 this carve out.

13 That said, I want to support this grant. I  
14 would love to fund it in its entirety, with all of these  
15 pieces intact, and I'm just wondering if we can think  
16 about this from that perspective, that it is absolutely  
17 certain that there are dollars being spent outside of the  
18 State of Connecticut in all of these grants.

19 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Thank you. I think -  
20 - just a moment. Just a moment. I think that Henry  
21 Salton has said in the past that there was going to be a  
22 certain amount of coming and going and trips and people  
23 going to California, so, in each and every grant, there's  
24 probably some money spent outside of the State of

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 Connecticut, and we're not nitpicking to figure out did  
2 somebody stay in a Best Western, or in a Hilton, or in a  
3 suite someplace. We're trying to stay within reasonable  
4 confines of doing business.

5 This is a big chunk. This is the better  
6 part of 600,000 dollars. That's not chump change, or  
7 pocket change, however we want to term it. I think  
8 there's a qualitative difference here.

9 DR. JENNINGS: Mr. Chairman?

10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yes.

11 DR. JENNINGS: With all due respect, I  
12 disagree with that, because for some of the substantial  
13 grants, particularly core grants, we're buying large  
14 pieces of equipment that are manufactured outside the  
15 state.

16 MR. SALTON: If I may, since it's been my  
17 job to kind of draw the line here, I think the distinction  
18 is this. You can buy equipment out of state and bring it  
19 in Connecticut and you're doing the research in  
20 Connecticut. That is really the legislative line.

21 You can bring employees, technicians, who  
22 may come and work in Connecticut, you can bring in  
23 equipment, you can buy chemicals, goods to bring in  
24 Connecticut, but the fundamental issue is and the

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 legislative intent is that this money supports stem cell  
2 research, the advancement of stem cell research in  
3 Connecticut.

4 The problem in this particular case, as  
5 I've defined it before, is whether or not, and it's the  
6 committee's decision, whether or not this particular  
7 portion of outsourcing research into St. Kitts crosses  
8 that line. In other contracts, this is not an issue,  
9 because the actual research is done here.

10 DR. JENNINGS: So if I can just respond, I  
11 believe that this does support research in Connecticut.  
12 Basically, what you are doing is creating human embryonic  
13 stem cells, and I remind the committee that these are non-  
14 federal embryonic, human embryonic stem cells,  
15 differentiating them and sending them out of the country  
16 in order to perform a particular test on them, but the  
17 fundamental purpose of this work is to determine the  
18 capacity of human embryonic stem cells developed in  
19 Connecticut, in a Connecticut institution, to determine  
20 that capacity as a human, ultimately a human therapeutic  
21 modality. It's a particular test that cannot be performed  
22 in Connecticut.

23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Dr. Fishbone?

24 DR. FISHBONE: I think Dr. Landwirth had

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 his hand up first.

2 DR. LANDWIRTH: That's okay. Just a  
3 comment and concern that may be a little bit down the  
4 road, but this particular project, in addition to a  
5 financial issue, may have some issues when it comes before  
6 ESCRO review and it purports to be using human embryonic  
7 stem cells in primate brains. It may be a big problem to  
8 get approval.

9 DR. JENNINGS: I imagine not yet.

10 DR. LANDWIRTH: Not yet. It may very well  
11 be a serious barrier.

12 DR. JENNINGS: I don't know. I mean I  
13 would defer to the Yale ESCRO committee on this, but I  
14 would be astonished if it didn't. Just to point out, Dr.  
15 Redmond has been funded to do transplantation work into  
16 monkey brains for many years.

17 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: We're getting into  
18 another issue. The motion on the floor, if I understand  
19 it correctly, and my attorney friends will correct me, I'm  
20 sure, if I don't, is are we going to fund this grant,  
21 minus the plus or minus 580,000 dollars that is going to  
22 be spent outside the confines of the state, yes or no?  
23 It's been moved and seconded.

24 Our vote now is are we going to move this

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 to the yes category, with the understanding that that  
2 means that we are not going to fund the entire grant?

3 DR. FISHBONE: I would just like to make  
4 the observation that this is a dilemma of Solomonic  
5 proportions, and I think that what has been moved and  
6 seconded is about as good as we can do, in terms of  
7 funding this grant, but avoiding the dilemma.

8 I think, once you have to spend hours  
9 justifying your position in your situation, it's a losing  
10 battle in that regard.

11 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Well I lose fair  
12 numbers, Gerry, and I don't, you know --

13 DR. FISHBONE: But this is one that has  
14 implications, in terms of the overall funding for stem  
15 cell research, because, as you pointed out, if somebody  
16 writes a negative article in the press about where the  
17 money is going and so forth, I think that would impact the  
18 whole program.

19 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: That is my concern. I  
20 get beat up from time to time. As they say in the  
21 vernacular, politics is a full contact sport.

22 DR. FISHBONE: Yeah.

23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: But I'm concerned  
24 about the viability of the whole program, so that's my

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 standpoint. There's no question that the research is  
2 good, and Mike's comment is also very well taken, about  
3 using human embryonic cells in primates, etcetera.

4 Is it the consensus of the group that we  
5 should move this into a yes from a maybe, with the agreed  
6 upon modifications?

7 DR. KIESSLING: I would actually like a  
8 follow-up on that, because I think putting human embryonic  
9 stem cells into primate brains has not been challenged  
10 anywhere in the country. That's a serious consideration.

11

12 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Ann, I didn't hear.

13 DR. KIESSLING: I somehow thought that this  
14 project was using monkey cells into monkey brains. I  
15 somehow didn't realize that these are human embryonic stem  
16 cells.

17 DR. JENNINGS: -- embryonic stem cells.

18 DR. KIESSLING: That's not been  
19 accomplished anywhere in the country.

20 DR. JENNINGS: I'm not sure that that's  
21 accurate.

22 DR. KIESSLING: Yeah, that's accurate, and  
23 that's a huge concern. It's certainly a concern all over  
24 California.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: We have a motion on  
2 the floor.

3 DR. KIESSLING: But before I can vote on  
4 this motion, I need some clarity about how far this  
5 project has gone through Yale's ESCRO review.

6 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay.

7 DR. JENNINGS: I'm sorry. It's 164 pages,  
8 and it will take me a little while to get the answer to  
9 that. Let me see if I can find it.

10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: All right. Shall we  
11 table the motion and move on?

12 MR. MANDELKERN: No, no. Can I make a  
13 comment to Dr. Kiessling? In my reading of this grant in  
14 its entirety, the beginning research is in vitro, so it is  
15 not in vivo. Only when the in vitro Petri dish research  
16 has been successful does the grant, in my reading of it,  
17 move to in vivo, so we have a ways to go before we get to  
18 the clinical trial, but the goal is imminently desirable,  
19 to say the least.

20 I think we should move the question, not  
21 table it, it is a clear motion, and that's my --

22 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I don't think so. I  
23 think that Dr. Kiessling cannot make an intelligent  
24 decision, and her decisions are always terrific, until

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 she's got the kind of information she needs to make the  
2 decision.

3 DR. KIESSLING: Yeah. I don't want to hold  
4 up any of the in vitro work, but I will tell you that  
5 there has been a very clear line drawn all over the  
6 country between the fetal brain transplants that have been  
7 done into monkeys in the past and the pending  
8 differentiated -- neurons from human embryonic stem cells.

9  
10 That is a question that's not been  
11 resolved, and the National Academy of Sciences  
12 specifically guards against it.

13 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: We need to take some  
14 time. Hang on. Hang on. I'll get to you. We need to  
15 take some time, so that Charles can peruse this.

16 DR. JENNINGS: I haven't yet found anything  
17 to indicate that it has been approved.

18 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Take your time. Take  
19 your time. If you need to get in a quiet place, we'll do  
20 that, and then we'll resume this. We'll table the motion  
21 and resume the discussion.

22 MR. SALTON: Commissioner, if I may?

23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yes.

24 MR. SALTON: I think that one thing that

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 the committee should maybe recall is that a condition of  
2 funding in every contract that we give is ESCRO committee  
3 approval. If the ESCRO committee does not approve this,  
4 whether it's done it before the application was filed, but  
5 it has to be approved by the ESCRO committee before the  
6 dollar will be released, so that is not something that is  
7 going to go away merely by moving this to --

8 Even if we went to full funding and voted  
9 full funding, there would still have to be an ESCRO  
10 committee approval by the Yale ESCRO.

11 DR. KIESSLING: Henry, my concern about  
12 funding work outside the country could pale in respect to  
13 the fact that Connecticut has funded the very first human  
14 embryonic stem cell transfer into monkey brain project. I  
15 mean if the press could get a hold of that, that would be  
16 -- it's a far greater consideration. It's an overarching  
17 consideration that hasn't been challenged anywhere yet.

18 MR. SALTON: So, then, your concern is not  
19 whether there's been an ESCRO review. Your concern is  
20 this as a concept from the get go, so to speak.

21 DR. KIESSLING: No, no, no. If this has  
22 been ESCRO reviewed and the ESCRO has considered this and  
23 figured out how they're going to monitor it, that's fine.

24 MR. SALTON: Well there's an obligation

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 under our system that the ESCRO must review and approve  
2 and monitor, so if that's not happening, we don't pay a  
3 dollar out.

4 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Do we have a way of  
5 assessing where we are with ESCRO on this particular  
6 proposal? No?

7 DR. FISHBONE: Well Dr. Landwirth is on the  
8 ESCRO committee for Yale.

9 DR. LANDWIRTH: I don't think we've seen  
10 comments about ESCRO review in any of the proposals so  
11 far. That occurs afterwards.

12 DR. JENNINGS: Each institution provides --

13 DR. LANDWIRTH: That happens after the  
14 funding and before the funding is allocated, after our  
15 approval, so I don't think it's been reviewed by any ESCRO  
16 yet.

17 DR. JENNINGS: That would be my guess.  
18 Just to be clear, what has been done is to put human  
19 neural stem cells into --

20 COURT REPORTER: Microphone?

21 DR. JENNINGS: Sorry. What has been done  
22 is to put human neural stem cells into non-human primates.  
23 That's been done, I think, quite a number of times, and  
24 what these researchers are trying to do is to

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 differentiate human embryonic stem cells into neural stem  
2 cells and then, again, further down the lineage.

3 I think the fundamental ethical issue is  
4 not gong to be any different from what it will be putting  
5 human neural cells from either human aborted fetuses or  
6 whatever else. In my view, there is no reason to  
7 anticipate (coughing) with the ESCROs. I don't think it's  
8 the role of this committee to make that judgment or even  
9 to be debating it. I think we have a clear policy, as  
10 Henry just said. We don't fund anything until it's been  
11 approved. I don't see any reason for us to start second  
12 guessing the deliberations of the Yale ESCRO committee.

13 DR. KIESSLING: Charles, this particular  
14 experiment is exactly the reason ESCROs were proposed by  
15 the NIS.

16 DR. JENNINGS: And that's fine.

17 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: We seem to have  
18 reached a relative impasse, and I will ask Professor  
19 Latham, if I might, to see if he has any suggestions, and  
20 perhaps, I know he's been listening intently, perhaps he  
21 can suggest a direction that we should move.

22 We seem to be involved in several  
23 different, two different problems. One has to do with the  
24 type of research. The other has to do with funding. Do

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 you have any words of wisdom for us I hope?

2 DR. LATHAM: I'm afraid I don't. I largely  
3 agree with Charles on this one. Perhaps, as a matter of  
4 political reality, I'd support the motion, but the ESCRO  
5 issue, I guess as Julie said, the ESCRO element of this,  
6 while it's required before funding, is usually not  
7 required in the application phase.

8 If we funded them and they went forward and  
9 they couldn't get the ESCRO approval, they wouldn't get  
10 the money, so maybe it's not our worry. Maybe it's their  
11 worry, except to the extent that we might award a grant  
12 and then find that we had money coming back, because it  
13 couldn't be used. I'm not sure what we do in that case.

14 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Ann, I hear that you  
15 have some fundamental problems with the whole project.

16 DR. KIESSLING: Well I think that this  
17 committee needs to be aware that this a very hot topic,  
18 and I somehow haven't read this grant, but I was under the  
19 impression that we were differentiating monkey stem cells  
20 and putting them into monkey brains.

21 Differentiating human embryonic stem cells  
22 and putting them into monkey brains is a very hot topic.  
23 Differentiating human embryonic stem cells and putting  
24 them into mouse brains is a very hot topic.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: How would you suggest  
2 that we handle this hot topic? And I'm not trying to be  
3 facetious.

4 DR. KIESSLING: Do the reviewers have any?  
5 I mean I, personally, don't have any issues with this. I  
6 just think that we need to be prepared. Do the reviewers  
7 have any ethical concerns?

8 DR. JENNINGS: No. None were raised. Let  
9 me just go back. Can somebody remind me what's the number  
10 of this grant again? It's category C.

11 MR. MANDELKERN: SCC.

12 DR. JENNINGS: There is nothing in the  
13 review to suggest the slightest concern of ethical issues.  
14 They don't mention it. They simply say the proposal is  
15 excellent, very well written. I think the ethical  
16 arguments point towards the obligation to move this  
17 forward.

18 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: So I believe that the  
19 ESCRO review is only an issue to be resolved prior to the  
20 disbursement of funds. Is that a correct assumption?  
21 Okay. I understand that there is some, as Dr. Kiessling  
22 brings up very correctly, there is some feeling about  
23 using human derived cells in non-human mammals or  
24 primates.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 I think that that's undoubtedly a place  
2 that we would have gotten to sooner or later, and we got  
3 to it sooner, rather than later. We hope that we can  
4 present this in such a fashion that the taxpayers and the  
5 citizens understand what it is that is happening.

6 Stem cell research is great, but if there's  
7 no translational portion of it, or no application to human  
8 beings, it's certainly of great interest, but not of great  
9 efficacy. I think that we certainly understand Dr.  
10 Kiessling's concerns. If she has strong feelings about  
11 considering this at a later time, after members have had a  
12 chance to think about it, we can consider it at the next  
13 meeting, which is the 18th of April. Is that correct, Mr.  
14 Wollschlager?

15 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: It's the third Tuesday  
16 of April.

17 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Third Tuesday of  
18 April. We can defer the discussion until then. If Dr.  
19 Kiessling and the members are -- 15th of April. If Dr.  
20 Kiessling and the members are concerned that they need to  
21 peruse the grant and think some more about how they want  
22 to present themselves, then we will defer the discussion.

23 If not, we will proceed with the motion,  
24 which has been moved and seconded. All I need to know is

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 do you want more time to think about this, this particular  
2 step? I know Dr. Kiessling has always done things in a  
3 very thoughtful and scientific way and may need some more  
4 time to think about this and make a decision and give us  
5 your advice. Whatever your pleasure is, we will do.

6 DR. JENNINGS: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I  
7 will just comment that I don't think anything is going to  
8 substantially change between now and April the 15th. I  
9 would favor making the decision now.

10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah. I certainly  
11 am, as you know, in favor of making decisions on this, but  
12 I want to make sure Dr. Kiessling and others have had an  
13 adequate opportunity to explore the problem and understand  
14 it fully.

15 DR. KIESSLING: I think we need to proceed  
16 with great caution on this. I think that approving this  
17 kind of a project on such a topic that's received national  
18 attention and is the subject of many meetings by the  
19 National Academy of Sciences before Yale's fully prepared  
20 committee has had a chance to consider it and give us  
21 their input, I think that that's a big concern to me.

22 That's a much bigger concern than spending  
23 money outside the state. Had their ESCRO committee had an  
24 opportunity to look at this and come back with approvals

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 and talked about how they were going to monitor these  
2 animals, which is the National Academy of Sciences' clear  
3 concern, that would be different.

4 But for us to approve a project that is  
5 ethically challenged and it has not been reviewed by Yale  
6 ethic's body is a problem, I think.

7 DR. JENNINGS: Mr. Chairman, just for the  
8 record, I strongly disagree with that characterization. I  
9 strongly disagree with characterizing this project as  
10 ethically challenged. I would like to say that for the  
11 record.

12 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes, and I would like to  
13 add, if I may, Dr. Galvin?

14 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yes, sir.

15 MR. MANDELKERN: I would like to add that  
16 this project in its full entirety of over 150 pages has  
17 been on the website for a month or two. It was there for  
18 reading and perusal by all of the committee members, and I  
19 think Henry Salton, who is our legal guide, has said this  
20 contract will not be executed unless the ESCRO, ESCRO at  
21 Yale and the IRB fully approves.

22 So to raise an issue that will be  
23 considered before contract and disregard the scientific  
24 merits of what we have before us and to delay further

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 seems to me not prudent for the committee.

2 I think the question should be voted on,  
3 and we have to rely on the discretion of our counsel when  
4 it comes to signing contracts to make sure that every  
5 ethical T and I and dot is crossed. We cannot sit as a  
6 committee of a whole on the ethics of it, Ann. It's  
7 impossible, because there would be wide ranging  
8 divergence.

9 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: We have never moved  
10 forward on anything that I can recall, specifically, where  
11 one or more members of the community have had, of our  
12 scientific community here, have had difficulty with it.

13 I fail to see -- number one, Dr.  
14 Kiessling's comments are always well thought out and well  
15 presented, and she's not comfortable with it, and I don't  
16 think we should move ahead. This is a consensus. I don't  
17 think we should move ahead until she's had an opportunity  
18 to become more comfortable with it, or until we know all  
19 of the nuances and all of the parts of this.

20 If we're criticized, we're criticized. Our  
21 meetings are open, and they're open to the press. I  
22 believe there's press here now. We've always had open  
23 meetings, but I want to make sure this topic is discussed  
24 fairly.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1                   If one member has some real problems with  
2                   it, we need to accommodate that point of view and  
3                   understand it, and then, if we vote one way or the other  
4                   way, we'll have all the information that we need.

5                   MR. SALTON: Commissioner, may I just raise  
6                   a process question for the committee not on this  
7                   particular application?

8                   If there's a decision to defer, we have to  
9                   think about the implications for moving forward with the  
10                  entire grant program, because you'll have to have -- are  
11                  you going to have a carve out to reserve potential  
12                  funding, though it appears to be now partial funding of  
13                  this application, until the April meeting?

14                  And then, if that funding is not voted on  
15                  in the April meeting, are you going to then find -- how  
16                  are you going to allocate those carved out reserved funds?

17                  COURT REPORTER: One moment, please.

18                  MR. SALTON: I'm not trying to assert that  
19                  you shouldn't reserve, but I think we have to make sure  
20                  that we're aware of the implications for the balance of  
21                  today. We're looking at about one and a half million  
22                  dollars for this particular contract.

23                  Now one thing you could do is decide today  
24                  to whether include it in the overall package, with a

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 caveat that at the -- it's conditional upon a  
2 reconfirmation at the April meeting, or you could vote it  
3 out today and not include it at all.

4 If you're going to defer, then we have to  
5 consider how that you address the reservation of this  
6 money from the total budget.

7 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I have no idea how to  
8 do that, but I can think it through and figure it out. I  
9 am not comfortable with a yah or a nay vote at this time,  
10 realizing that it's going to create lots and lots of  
11 problems. This is new science, and we've plowed a lot of  
12 new ground here, and we've encountered a lot of problems.

13 I'm just, once again, I'm not comfortable  
14 if Ann is not comfortable with it. I'm not comfortable  
15 until we air out this issue and look at the whole, much as  
16 attorneys do, look at the entire issue and make a decision  
17 one way or another.

18 I'm concerned about are we doing the right  
19 thing? Are we fulfilling our duties to the taxpayers,  
20 etcetera, etcetera? I don't want to say, well, we took a  
21 vote, and one of the members of the committee had some  
22 difficulty with it, other than on a trivial basis.

23 (Whistling in background)

24 DR. FISHBONE: If I could provide a point

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 of information? I'm just reviewing --

2 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Somebody is whistling  
3 for us?

4 DR. FISHBONE: I'm just reviewing the  
5 funding. I'm reviewing the funding that Dr. Redmond has,  
6 and, in a brief look, I see there are two grants funded by  
7 the NINDS, both dealing with human neuro stem cells in  
8 primate Parkinson's model, and a second one studies  
9 behavioral biochemical, morphological effects of embryonic  
10 tissue grafts in non-human primates with Parkinsonism.

11 It does seem to me that both of these  
12 grants, which are each for five years or more, would have  
13 to have been approved by the Yale -- well, by the NIH  
14 ESCRO, so we do have a question, that these grants effect  
15 funding for -- I don't know if a lot of that is overlap  
16 from what we're funding now, but it does seem to be the  
17 NIH has reviewed it and decided that it was --

18 DR. KIESSLING: But these are fetal. These  
19 are fetal in stem cell.

20 DR. CANALIS: Now you're raising another  
21 issue, a very serious issue of overlap. If you're  
22 suggesting that NIH has funded this work, then we're  
23 dealing with overlap, which is even worse.

24 DR. KIESSLING: I'm actually sorry to open

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 this can of worms, and I personally don't have any ethical  
2 issues with this research. I want to make sure that's  
3 clear. I do think, however, that the State of Connecticut  
4 needs to proceed very carefully on what I know is a very  
5 hot topic.

6 This single experiment is the reason ESCRO  
7 committees were recommended by the National Academy of  
8 Sciences. So I think that for us to fund a project that  
9 had not been reviewed by Yale's ESCRO puts us into a  
10 rather unique position in the country.

11 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. I'm very  
12 unwilling to put this issue through when Dr. Kiessling has  
13 some fundamental objections and things that need to be  
14 talked through. Mr. Wollschlager first, then Dr. Latham,  
15 then Bob.

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Thank you, Commissioner.  
17 Just to address the process issues, certainly there will  
18 be process problems that we'll have to address, should we  
19 wait another month, but it is important for the committee  
20 to know this is a non-lapsing fund. There's no risk of  
21 the funds for this year anyway lapsing if we don't act on  
22 them at this meeting.

23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. Steve?

24 DR. LATHAM: I'm very reluctant to impose a

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 requirement that an ESCRO review a grant before we make  
2 it. We haven't required that for any other grants, and to  
3 put them to the trouble of going through a review,  
4 particularly of what might be a difficult ethics issue,  
5 when there is no guarantee that the grant in question is  
6 going to be funded by anyone, is, I think, to put the cart  
7 before the horse.

8 We do not ask all the other applicants to  
9 show their ESCRO approval before they come in. We ask  
10 them to show it before they get the money, but that's  
11 different. To require the Yale ESCRO to do it to input as  
12 a condition of application would be to require them to  
13 review everything before it comes to us.

14 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Go ahead, Bob.

15 MR. MANDELKERN: I would just like to, from  
16 a personal point of view, make this observation. I feel  
17 that while I am not a scientific vetted member of this  
18 committee, I am an equal member of this committee, who has  
19 done considerable work on all our projects.

20 I would just like the record to say that if  
21 this vote is deferred, that I will be equally concerned  
22 about my work and position on this committee just as  
23 others' opinions of concern have led to certain actions.  
24 Thank you.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 DR. LANDWIRTH: I think the ethical issue,  
2 I think, will be resolved as a go or no go when Yale ESCRO  
3 has an opportunity to look at it. What we are facing here  
4 is how much controversy are we prepared to face on both  
5 fronts, first, a front of spending money outside of the  
6 state, which maybe we can get around by carving it out,  
7 and then on the issue of this implantation of human cells  
8 into primates, and that will get resolved by the Yale  
9 ESCRO.

10 They'll either say no, or yes, and for what  
11 reasons, but between now and then, there may be  
12 considerable controversy of what we have funded, which is  
13 something you have to decide whether you want to face.  
14 The ethical decision will be a supportable and a sound one  
15 once we have the review of the Yale ESCRO, which  
16 appropriately ought to happen next.

17 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Anybody else? Mr.  
18 Wollschlager?

19 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Just to go back to  
20 Attorney Salton's process question, should this body move  
21 forward and approve all or partial funding and then the  
22 Yale ESCRO come back and say no, you're still going to be  
23 facing the same process issue that Henry raised before,  
24 where there will be a pool of money available that will

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 then have to be reconsidered.

2 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yes, Dr. Wallack?

3 DR. WALLACK: I have a question. In the  
4 study that came out in November or December that I read  
5 about from Oregon and they worked on primates, was that  
6 primate embryonic cells, or was that human embryonic cells  
7 that were used with primates? I don't know the answer to  
8 that, but, obviously, I ask the question because there's  
9 an implication there.

10 I know that their study did use primates.  
11 Does anybody here know the answer to that?

12 DR. JENNINGS: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I  
13 don't know the answer, but --

14 DR. WALLACK: Can anybody who is on their  
15 computer Google it up?

16 DR. JENNINGS: I think it's a misplaced  
17 question, because I just don't think this committee in  
18 this meeting has the expertise or authority to delve into  
19 the long literature on neural transplantation, research in  
20 that direction. I don't think we should take over a role  
21 that should be allocated to the Yale ESCRO committee. I  
22 don't think we should be trying for second best.

23 DR. WALLACK: Charles, I agree totally with  
24 you, and I only ask that question because I would think

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 that the answer to that question may free us to some  
2 extent, or at least some people at the table, who don't  
3 feel comfortable with this, to be able to vote, and I,  
4 frankly, would like to vote today.

5 DR. JENNINGS: And so would I. I mean I  
6 guess I would just make a very general point, but diseases  
7 of the nervous system have been one of the areas that have  
8 been like signature issues for the campaign for stem cell  
9 research. The potential of human embryonic stem cells to  
10 treat brain disease is substantial, and that has been  
11 understood and widely and publicly discussed throughout  
12 the political controversies of the stem cell research.

13 I don't believe that we're entering into  
14 such radically new territory that we need to rethink our  
15 procedures. I think the point of establishing ESCROs was  
16 to deal with complicated issues and potential ethical  
17 concerns as they arise, and I'm confident that we have a  
18 structure in place, and that Yale has a structure in place  
19 that will accomplish that.

20 I don't see any reason for making an  
21 exception. I think this is the kind of case for which  
22 those structures have been created. I have every  
23 confidence that they will work.

24 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I'll complicate

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 things a little bit more by saying, quoting from the grant  
2 review write-up. "This proposal is devised to test the  
3 potential therapeutic effect of new AGSC lying derived nSC  
4 and DA neurons in PD primate monkeys. While the study is  
5 thoroughly designed and the PI and co-PIs are well suited  
6 to carry out this line of study, the study, itself, is not  
7 novel, as compared to several other studies using the  
8 known hESC derived cells in a similar approach."

9 DR. JENNINGS: We haven't identified any of  
10 those. I think the review committee score speaks for  
11 itself. This was the highest scored application in any  
12 category.

13 DR. CANALIS: May I speak?

14 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Certainly.

15 DR. CANALIS: I do understand, at the end  
16 of the day, the ESCROs do play a significant role. On the  
17 other hand, I do have difficulty if members of this  
18 committee raise ethical issues with the research that  
19 these are not addressed.

20 It's part of our obligation to consider  
21 those issues, and to rely totally on the ESCRO, when  
22 members do have concerns, is not quite appropriate. The  
23 concerns have been raised, they have not been addressed,  
24 and to defer to the ESCRO may not be the right thing to

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 do.

2 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Thank you for putting  
3 that as succinctly as you have. I am concerned, concerns,  
4 in that those concerns have not been properly elucidated.

5 I can't vote on this anyhow, but, if I could vote, I  
6 would not want to vote until we've satisfied all those  
7 claims, whether we decide in a controversial or non-  
8 controversial fashion.

9 And I'm not saying what we need to do is  
10 try to find some road where we don't do anything  
11 controversial. This was a controversial topic three years  
12 ago. I'm just concerned that one of the members has  
13 raised some issues that we need to more thoroughly  
14 delineate.

15 DR. JENNINGS: Mr. Chairman, can I just  
16 suggest that we should vote on this after lunch, so Dr.  
17 Kiessling and anybody else who wants to examine the grant  
18 during the break can do so?

19 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Dr. Kiessling is  
20 leaving at half past 12:00.

21 DR. JENNINGS: So, then, during the coffee  
22 break. It's quarter of 10:00 right now.

23 DR. KIESSLING: Nothing is going to change,  
24 Charles. This is an issue that hasn't been resolved

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 anywhere. It is the reason ESCRO committees exist. There  
2 is huge concern about human embryonic stem cells, you  
3 know, playing a major role in the brain of a non-human  
4 primate.

5 Now I think the work needs to be done, and  
6 I think it needs to go forward, but I think that this has  
7 to be done after the Yale ESCRO committee has had an  
8 opportunity to deliberate it, and that this committee, I  
9 think, to fund this project before it has been deliberated  
10 by the committee that was recommended by the National  
11 Academy of Sciences to deliberate these matters, I think  
12 that's something that we need to be aware of.

13 DR. JENNINGS: I agree, and I'm not  
14 recommending that, and we don't do that for any grant.  
15 All funding is contingent on approval by the ESCRO, and if  
16 the Yale ESCRO feels that this is a --

17 DR. KIESSLING: There are very few grants  
18 where you're proposed to put a lot of human brain cells  
19 into a non-human primate.

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: We're going back over  
21 ground we've already plowed a couple of times.

22 DR. FISHBONE: Could I ask a question?

23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yes.

24 DR. FISHBONE: Would it help if included in

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 the motion, in order to show that we have not just,  
2 without discussion and thought, put this out there, to  
3 include in the motion, pending -- I mean I know that we do  
4 this for every grant, but specifically to put in it  
5 pending review and approval by the ESCRO committee at  
6 Yale?

7 In other words, it's no different from what  
8 we would do in any grant, except we don't have to put that  
9 in, but just to show that the committee has addressed and  
10 is cognizant of these issues and concerns. It might make  
11 it a little bit easier to, you know, to respond to  
12 questions about it when we approve it.

13 DR. CANALIS: Addressing doesn't mean  
14 resolution. There are issues that have been raised and  
15 have not been resolved, so it's even worse. There are  
16 committee members that have significant ethical issues  
17 with this.

18 DR. LATHAM: I haven't yet heard anyone,  
19 unless you do, Ernie. Do you?

20 DR. CANALIS: Ann has raised issues.

21 DR. LATHAM: Ann has said repeatedly that  
22 she personally doesn't have any ethical issues with this  
23 research.

24 DR. KIESSLING: I don't have any ethical

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 issues with this, but I do believe that the research has  
2 to be monitored in a very unique way.

3 DR. JENNINGS: Nobody disagrees with that.

4 DR. KIESSLING: Right.

5 MR. MANDELKERN: I will say, if I may,  
6 since everybody else is talking without recognition, if we  
7 defer this and carve it out, I cannot conceive of how we  
8 can go ahead with funding the mandates that we have.

9 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: That's not the  
10 question. The ethical issues have been raised, and I  
11 think that Dr. Canalis and I both feel that there are  
12 ethical issues with this project. Am I misquoting you,  
13 Dr. Canalis?

14 DR. CANALIS: I understood, also, Ann had  
15 ethical issues. Evidently, I misunderstood.

16 DR. KIESSLING: This is just such a hot  
17 topic that this committee needs to understand that the  
18 single reason, or one of the biggest reasons that ESCRO  
19 committees were recommended by the National Academy of  
20 Sciences was the experiment involved with putting human  
21 stem cells into primate brains, or primate embryos.

22 So human stem cells into non-human primates  
23 is a topic that has received a lot of ethical debate. I  
24 personally don't have any issues with this. We convened a

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 committee in Harvard a few months ago, and many members --  
2 some people in this room were there, simply to discuss the  
3 problem of reconstituting a human -- a mouse brain with  
4 human embryonic stem cells. This is an area that has  
5 heavy deliberation.

6 DR. JENNINGS: Just as a point of  
7 information, this is not remotely approaching that area.  
8 Filling a mouse skull with human neurons is an utterly  
9 different experiment.

10 DR. KIESSLING: But that's the reason that  
11 Yale has an ESCRO committee, is to deliberate the  
12 experiment and address whatever issues there are and then  
13 make a recommendation, as to how those animals should be  
14 monitored.

15 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Mr. Wollschlager?

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: As a lay observer, I'm  
17 trying to clarify some of the concerns raised not so much  
18 on the ethics by Dr. Kiessling, but the fact that this  
19 body, if we approve it, even just move it to the yes and  
20 not talk about funding it, will be making a policy  
21 decision, which will have serious repercussions, and I'm  
22 not so sure that this body knows what Yale's position is  
23 on that policy.

24 It's not a question of individual concerns

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 about the appropriateness of this research, is that we're  
2 going to be making a call on behalf of the State of  
3 Connecticut before the university, which houses the  
4 researcher, weighs in, as to whether or not they support  
5 it. Is that -- so I have it correct?

6 DR. JENNINGS: They support the submission  
7 of this grant. People at Yale are fully aware of it.

8 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Dr. Genel?

9 DR. MYRON GENEL: I have been hesitant to  
10 speak, because, coming from Yale, I would be perceived to  
11 have a conflict of interest. May I suggest a resolution,  
12 and that is I think the sentiment of the majority of this  
13 committee is to fund this proposal, but there are serious  
14 concerns about making an absolute decision.

15 I would suggest that if that is the feeling  
16 of the committee, that this be put into a reserve category  
17 and that we reserve 1.5 million for its funding and that  
18 we move on, make the rest of our allocations, and have a  
19 reserve list of grants that could be funded, if it turns  
20 out, for any one of the number of reasons, we're unable to  
21 fund this project.

22 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Steve, you had a  
23 question, comment?

24 DR. LATHAM: Yeah. I just want to renew my

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 objection to the idea that university ESCRO committees  
2 have to review research prior to application. I think  
3 Ann's concern will be addressed by the fact that the  
4 ESCRO, before any dollars will flow, will have to look at  
5 the ESCRO content of the research.

6 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I think that Mike's  
7 proposal, and Attorney Horn just handed me something  
8 saying exactly the same, okay, from Mr. Wollschlager,  
9 thank you, Mr. Wollschlager, for your input, I think that  
10 setting aside a million and a half and delaying it until  
11 that particular committee meets, that ESCRO committee  
12 meets on this particular subject, and we're not talking  
13 about on every single grant.

14 I don't think anybody is going to be harmed  
15 by that, and I think it will give us an opportunity to  
16 fully and fairly assess our standpoint. I can't forget,  
17 nor should any of us, that this committee is an executive  
18 branch.

19 Many of us are executive branch, or  
20 senatorial, or a state representative appointees, and so  
21 we are making policy or proposing policy for the State of  
22 Connecticut, and we need every bit of input we can get,  
23 not that I'm shy about things that may have a political  
24 outcry from one group or another. We heard that when we

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 put the initial -- when the initial prospectus and the  
2 initial legislation went through.

3 We just want to make sure, you know, we  
4 want to make sure we have all the facts, that we've  
5 completely explored everything, and then we will adopt a  
6 stance, and that's the policy that we will live with.

7 My personal preference will be to do a set  
8 aside and delay until we hear from the ESCRO group at  
9 Yale. I think that would satisfy most of us, including  
10 myself and Dr. Canalis, that things are being done  
11 appropriately. Yes, Bob?

12 MR. MANDELKERN: If that is the way you're  
13 going to proceed, I'd like to go on record as not being  
14 satisfied.

15 A MALE VOICE: Can't hear you.

16 MR. MANDELKERN: If that is the way the  
17 committee is going to proceed, I would like to go on  
18 record that I am not satisfied with that procedure.

19 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Steve?

20 DR. LATHAM: I wonder whether the set aside  
21 amount is going to be for the full grant proposal amount  
22 or for the amount reduced by the St. Kitts.

23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: A million and a half.

24 DR. WALLACK: Well is that a million-four,

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 actually?

2 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: A million-four.

3 What's 100,000 here or there, Milt?

4 DR. WALLACK: I can go to St. Kitts for  
5 that.

6 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah, and stay.  
7 Okay, so, there is a motion on the floor to adopt the  
8 grant, minus the part that's going to be spent out of the  
9 country, so, first, we need to deal with that, and then,  
10 once we've dealt with that, we need to consider going  
11 forward about are we going to create a reserve fund,  
12 etcetera.

13 There is a motion on the floor. The motion  
14 on the floor has been moved and seconded, and, as I  
15 understand it, the motion is to fund the grant, minus the  
16 580,000 dollars that will be spent potentially in St.  
17 Kitts in the Caribbean. What is the opinion of the group?  
18 Yes or no on that? Do we need to take a voice?

19 DR. JENNINGS: Could we just have the  
20 second part of the motion as clear as possible? So the  
21 money will be set aside, and the grant will be funded,  
22 contingent on what?

23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: There's a motion on  
24 the floor. It's been moved, and prior to any of the ESCRO

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 and human cells in primates, there's an existing motion on  
2 the floor that says are we going to adopt this grant,  
3 minus the money spent in the Caribbean, the 580,000  
4 dollars?

5 Now that's one issue. If the group feels  
6 that they can't approve that issue, or want to vote that  
7 down, or consensus that away, then we can go onto the next  
8 issue with maybe setting money aside. We have to do  
9 something with the motion on the floor.

10 MR. MANDELKERN: Can we have a roll call  
11 vote on that motion?

12 DR. JENNINGS: Mr. Chairman, with some  
13 reluctance, I will agree to support the motion to reduce  
14 the amount of funding by the amount that will be spent  
15 outside.

16 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, now, Henry, is  
17 it possible for us to amend that motion, or should we vote  
18 on that first and then consider the other topics?

19 MR. SALTON: Again, to reiterate, this is  
20 merely a motion to move this to the yes category. It's  
21 not an endorsement of the contract at this point in time,  
22 so I would suggest that you just -- let's see if we get to  
23 a yes, and then, at that point, once it's to a yes, if you  
24 want to add conditions to moving it from the yes category

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 to a contract approval, meaning you're going to defer it  
2 to April or whatever else you guys want to do, then that's  
3 a second motion. I would take one step at a time.

4 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. We're going to  
5 vote. Let's call the roll. Everybody can vote on this,  
6 is that correct? Can everybody vote on this?

7 MR. SALTON: Yes. This is just a matter of  
8 moving it to yes. This is not an endorsement of the  
9 contract. You can just go around the table.

10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Charles?

11 DR. JENNINGS: Yes.

12 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Bob?

13 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes.

14 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Paul?

15 DR. PAUL HUANG: Yes.

16 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Gerry?

17 DR. FISHBONE: Yes.

18 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Ann?

19 DR. KIESSLING: Yes.

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Julie?

21 DR. LANDWIRTH: Yes.

22 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Mike?

23 DR. GENEL: No.

24 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Canalis?

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 DR. CANALIS: No.

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Wagers?

3 DR. WAGERS: Yes.

4 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Wallack?

5 DR. WALLACK: Yes.

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Latham?

7 DR. LATHAM: Yes.

8 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Arinzeh?

9 DR. ARINZEH: Yes.

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: Is that --

11 DR. ARINZEH: Was that a yes vote?

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: It's a majority.

13 DR. ARINZEH: Yes.

14 MS. TOWNSHEND: The motion passes.

15 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Put it in the yes

16 column.

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: Under consideration at this

18 point, I believe, and please correct me if I'm wrong, will

19 be UCHC is that 006?

20 MR. SALTON: Are we going to move to

21 another grant, or are we going to consider the timing,

22 which was raised before? Should we wrap this up?

23 DR. GENEL: I move that funding be deferred

24 until the application has been reviewed by the Yale ESCRO

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 committee and that the funds be put in reserve until a  
2 decision is reached.

3 MS. TOWNSHEND: I'll second that.

4 Discussion?

5 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Roll call vote.

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: Warren?

7 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Just a question, Henry.

8 At this point, do we have folks who have to recuse  
9 themselves? Now we're starting to talk about something  
10 different.

11 MR. SALTON: Yeah. At this point, we need  
12 to eliminate those people who are conflicted voting on  
13 this.

14 MS. TOWNSHEND: And that list I have. Dr.  
15 Fishbone? First of all, we need to, I think, take the  
16 motion off the table and resubmit it. Dr. Fishbone, would  
17 you like to make a motion? You would like to adopt the  
18 motion, as originally submitted by Dr. Genel?

19 DR. GENEL: Essentially, that funding be  
20 deferred until we have a review by the ESCRO committee at  
21 the institution.

22 DR. JENNINGS: The funding be set aside  
23 now.

24 DR. GENEL: The funding be set aside, yes,

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 and that I think we move onto the rest of the funding  
2 allocations and that we reserve this funding. I would  
3 also suggest that we come up with an alternative list of  
4 grants that could be funded.

5 MR. MANDELKERN: Point of information from  
6 counsel. Can we handle one particular grant in one  
7 particular way and not handle all the other grants in that  
8 particular way?

9 MR. SALTON: Yes.

10 MR. MANDELKERN: What's that?

11 MR. SALTON: Yes.

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: He said yes. Dr. Fishbone,  
13 is that your motion? Do I hear a second of Dr. Fishbone's  
14 motion by those eligible?

15 DR. WALLACK: One clarification. If we  
16 vote down this motion --

17 COURT REPORTER: You need to be on the  
18 mike.

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: If we vote down this  
20 motion, sir, yes?

21 DR. WALLACK: If we vote down this motion,  
22 do we then revert back to the fact that we have already  
23 accepted it?

24 MR. SALTON: It would then be treated like

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 any other, yes.

2 DR. WALLACK: So a no vote puts us back to  
3 the yes?

4 MR. SALTON: Right, and then there will  
5 still have to be, then, a vote, as with all yes contracts,  
6 without disqualified people.

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: Have we had a second of  
8 this motion amongst those who are eligible to vote? And I  
9 will remind you of who is eligible to vote. Dr. Arinzeh,  
10 Dr. Canalis, Dr. Huang, Dr. Jennings, Dr. Kiessling, Dr.  
11 Wagers, Dr. Fishbone, Mr. Mandelkern and Dr. Wallack.

12 DR. KIESSLING: I'll second the motion.

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: Thank you. Roll call vote  
14 at this time on the motion that is currently on the floor.

15 MR. MANDELKERN: Pardon me.

16 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yes, sir?

17 MR. MANDELKERN: What does a yes vote mean  
18 and what does a no vote mean?

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: I was about to ask that of  
20 counsel.

21 MR. MANDELKERN: I'm very confused at this  
22 point.

23 DR. WALLACK: My understanding is that if  
24 we vote no, then it goes back purely to the yes category.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 That's what counsel just told me.

2 MR. MANDELKERN: If we vote no, it goes  
3 back to yes?

4 DR. LATHAM: A yes vote would be to defer  
5 funding and to set aside an amount of funding until  
6 there's been review by the institutional ESCRO.

7 DR. JENNINGS: A no vote basically throws  
8 the whole issue open to further discussion. My own view  
9 is that Mike and Gerry have suggested a way forward, which  
10 I'm willing to support.

11 MS. TOWNSHEND: Do we understand the yes  
12 and the no at this point for anyone who is voting on that?  
13 Mr. Mandelkern, you do not understand. Can you clarify?

14 MR. SALTON: Sure. Okay, so, the motion  
15 now is that the contract, the decision on awarding this  
16 contract will be deferred until the next -- until such  
17 time as the Yale ESCRO committee approves this grant  
18 program, and that, second, money, which has now been  
19 reduced to the amount for in state activities, will be  
20 carved out of the pool and held aside, so that there will  
21 be money available in case there is a determination at a  
22 later time to fund the contract.

23 This motion, if you say yes, will, one,  
24 defer it until ESCRO approves it at Yale, and, two, will

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 make sure there's money available to fund it if we go  
2 forward with the contract after that event takes place.

3 A no vote means that this contract will be  
4 treated like every other contract committees approve until  
5 this process. It is currently in the yes pile, and, at  
6 some point, it, along with all the other contracts, there  
7 will have to be some sorting that goes on to make sure  
8 that we stay within our 10-million-dollar or 9.8-million-  
9 dollar budget, and it will be ranked with everyone else,  
10 and it will be a determination made by the qualified  
11 voters to vote it up or down today, hopefully, or in the  
12 near future.

13 That would be what the effect of a no.  
14 There will be no deferral, there will be no waiting on  
15 Yale ESCRO, and it will be treated just like every other  
16 yes contract.

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: For those voting, is that  
18 clear?

19 MR. SALTON: Is that now clear, Mr.  
20 Mandelkern?

21 DR. JENNINGS: Mr. Chairman, I don't think  
22 the effect of the motion has yet fully been understood by  
23 the committee members, so I think we need to --

24 MR. SALTON: What is unclear?

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 DR. JENNINGS: The effect of a yes and a no  
2 vote.

3 MR. SALTON: Okay. I'll go over it one  
4 more time. Maybe I should start with -- do you understand  
5 the motion, Mr. Mandelkern? Mr. Mandelkern, the motion is  
6 that this application will be taken out of, will not be  
7 decided today. It will be held in abeyance. It will be  
8 tabled until we get confirmation from Yale that the ESCRO  
9 committee has approved it. Is that understood?

10 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes.

11 MR. SALTON: Second thing is, in order to -  
12 - we're going to take money out of our budget that's  
13 available today and reserve it for this particular  
14 contract, so that we will be able to meaningfully fund it  
15 once that approval comes. We're not going to get the  
16 approval and won't be able to see it, at least not any  
17 earlier than April 18th. Is that understood?

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: For April 15th.

19 MR. SALTON: April 15th. So --

20 DR. JENNINGS: Henry, if I can just  
21 paraphrase? So the money will be set aside. The money  
22 will not be otherwise committed. It will be available for  
23 this project in the event that the Yale ESCRO approves it?

24 MR. SALTON: If you vote yes. In the event

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 Yale approves it, and then there has to be, at the meeting  
2 in April, will be a vote saying, well, along with the Yale  
3 vote, we all agree that it should go forward now. There  
4 has to be a second vote actually saying the contract is  
5 hereby awarded.

6 So assuming that that motion carries at the  
7 April meeting, there will be money to pay.

8 DR. JENNINGS: That is assuming that the  
9 Yale ESCRO has approved it before April the 15th?

10 MR. SALTON: What we're doing today is  
11 saying that the contract is tabled. It's almost like  
12 we're adding a requirement to this contract application.  
13 We want approval by the Yale ESCRO before we vote up or  
14 down on funding the contract.

15 So this yes says that the application is  
16 tabled until we get the Yale approval, the Yale ESCRO  
17 approval, and then, at that point, once we get it, we will  
18 vote up or down to award the contract. Assuming that it  
19 is awarded, then the second question is, the second thing  
20 this provides is that there will be money reserved out of  
21 the 10-million-dollar budget to fund the contract at that  
22 point in time.

23 MR. MANDELKERN: And what will a no vote  
24 do, Henry?

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 MR. SALTON: A no vote means that we are  
2 not going to add this additional -- we're not going to  
3 table it. We're not going to defer it waiting for Yale.  
4 It will be treated like every other yes contract that's  
5 been approved by the committee to date.

6 And as we move through the afternoon, when  
7 we have to sit down and go we have approved -- I'm going  
8 to just use an example. Thirteen million dollars worth of  
9 applications. Now we have to sort out where we're going  
10 to cut three million dollars out of our total application  
11 pool.

12 It will be one of the ones that will be  
13 subject to that process. There will be no tabling. There  
14 will be no waiting on Yale, etcetera.

15 MR. MANDELKERN: Thank you.

16 MR. SALTON: Okay. And I'm not going to  
17 have my law professor correct me.

18 DR. LATHAM: Not at all. I just have a  
19 quick question I guess for Julie. Could the Yale ESCRO  
20 committee meet and act on this within two weeks?

21 DR. LANDWIRTH: I'm not on that committee.

22 DR. LATHAM: Oh, you're not? I thought you  
23 were.

24 DR. LANDWIRTH: My suspicion is that's

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 unlikely.

2 MR. MANDELKERN: Call the question.

3 MS. TOWNSHEND: I am now prepared to call  
4 the roll on the motion.

5 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Let me understand  
6 something on the basis of Mike's last remark. If we are  
7 going to wait for the ESCRO committee, then this grant is  
8 not going to be decided until sometime in May at the  
9 earliest. Does that mean that this will be the only grant  
10 we don't decide on?

11 So we are going to set aside 1.5 million  
12 dollars, 1.6, however the mathematics works out. We're  
13 going to set aside this money. Suppose we don't get the  
14 kind of information that satisfies us and we decide we're  
15 just not going to do the grant, then what?

16 DR. LATHAM: We could set aside alternative  
17 candidates for the money in that event.

18 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I think that might be  
19 wise.

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are we ready to call the  
21 roll? Dr. Arinzeh?

22 DR. ARINZEH: Yes.

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Canalis?

24 DR. CANALIS: Yes.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Huang?  
2 DR. HUANG: Yes.  
3 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Jennings?  
4 DR. JENNINGS: Yes.  
5 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Kiessling?  
6 DR. KIESSLING: Yes.  
7 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Wagers?  
8 DR. WAGERS: No.  
9 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Fishbone?  
10 DR. FISHBONE: Yes.  
11 MS. TOWNSHEND: Mr. Mandelkern?  
12 MR. MANDELKERN: No.  
13 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Wallack?  
14 DR. WALLACK: Yes.  
15 MS. TOWNSHEND: The motion passes, seven to  
16 two. I will ask a process question, because I'm sort of  
17 jumping ahead at times, so are we ready to consider the  
18 Hla grant at this time? Thank you. I just want to make  
19 sure.  
20 I also want to let people know that I  
21 understand we are continuing to work through breaks.  
22 There is food set aside, power bars, in particular, and  
23 Frappuccino Starbucks, so if you'd like to indulge in  
24 that, it is available in the room next door.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 For consideration at this time -- are we  
2 talking about discussion of this maybe grant at this time?

3 This is the H1a grant, peer review scored at 2.75 for two  
4 million dollars.

5 DR. WAGERS: I think that this is a grant  
6 that I was asked to make a proposal for reduced funding,  
7 because, based on the comments of the Peer Review  
8 Committee, there were noted some weak elements of the  
9 grant, so I will say I'm a little uncomfortable with doing  
10 this, but I think, based on the comments of the Peer  
11 Review Committee, we could recommend funding the core  
12 component at half the requested amount and then funding  
13 projects one and three, which were rated the most highly.

14 That would approximately have the total  
15 funding to now be one million dollars. Personally, I  
16 don't think I would recommend doing this, and I would  
17 probably be more in favor of moving it to the no category,  
18 but that would be my recommendation if the committee feels  
19 that this would be a way forward with this grant.

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Latham?

21 DR. LATHAM: I would recommend moving it to  
22 the no category, thinking that this is a group grant with  
23 four proposals and two core elements, and to knock out  
24 fully half of the proposal I just assumed say no to it.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: We may need to wait for  
2 return of people from the snack. I should probably not  
3 have encouraged them to do that. Why don't we take a  
4 five-minute break? Thank you.

5 (Off the record)

6 MR. MANDELKERN: Are you looking for her  
7 for a report?

8 MS. TOWNSHEND: No. I just wanted to know  
9 if she was on the phone still.

10 MR. MANDELKERN: Oh, I'm sorry.

11 MS. TOWNSHEND: That's okay. The phone is  
12 on. Do we wish to have Dr. Wagers and Dr. Latham  
13 reiterate their recommendation with regard to this, so  
14 that the entire committee can hear? Dr. Wagers is not  
15 back in the room as of yet. Dr. Latham?

16 DR. LATHAM: Yeah. This is a grant that  
17 proposes a duplicative human core facility for UConn and  
18 an animal core, and it has four project elements, two of  
19 which have been seriously questioned either by the  
20 reviewers or by Dr. Wagers.

21 So if we're looking at eliminating half of  
22 the core proposal and half of the projects proposed, I  
23 think it would be better just to say no to the entire  
24 project.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Wagers, that is what  
2 you stated, but I know a lot of people were out of the  
3 room. Do you agree with Dr. Latham with regard to that  
4 recommendation?

5 DR. WAGERS: We're just restating?

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: Right.

7 DR. WAGERS: I agree. I agree.

8 MS. TOWNSHEND: Do we have discussion with  
9 regard to that? 006, UCHC006 for two million dollars.  
10 Discussion?

11 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Everybody okay?

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: I'm sorry. Henry has --  
13 okay. Is it the consensus of the group to move this grant  
14 from the maybe category to the no category?

15 MR. MANDELKERN: 006 in the SCC?

16 DR. JENNINGS: That's correct. SCC006.

17 COURT REPORTER: One moment, please.

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: Please move this grant from  
19 the maybe category to the no category. Under  
20 consideration at this time is SCDEVER001, Lee is the PI,  
21 and, if I understand the color coding here, we're on the  
22 group. That's core. Two outstanding core. Thank you.  
23 For just over two million dollars. That is 001. Arinzeh  
24 and Latham are the committee members of cognizance. Dr.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 Latham?

2 DR. LATHAM: This is the Evergen core  
3 proposal for SNCT core facility at UConn. I had what I  
4 now think might have been some over picky lawyerly  
5 questions about the corporate entity that was going to be  
6 receiving this grant. I think the more important question  
7 and one that I'm not really capable of addressing is the  
8 value of having a core facility in Storrs for cooperative  
9 work with the UConn researchers, and I think Dr. Kiessling  
10 was planning on looking at this, and I welcome her  
11 comments on it.

12 DR. KIESSLING: This is the somatic cell  
13 nuclear transplant core that reviewed really quite well  
14 last time around, and the big change in this is that the  
15 principal investigator is no longer Dr. Yang, because he  
16 is so ill, but the principal investigator who has been put  
17 in place is Dr. Lee, who is wonderfully trained.

18 He was in the University of Connecticut,  
19 but because this core facility wasn't funded last time, he  
20 went to California. He states in this cover letter that  
21 he is willing to return to Connecticut from California if  
22 this grant is funded.

23 This is a unique facility. I think that  
24 there's some room to cut the budget, but I would really

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 like to see this core funded.

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Arinzeh?

3 DR. ARINZEH: I couldn't really hear what  
4 she said.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: She was strongly  
6 supportive.

7 DR. ARINZEH: Okay, good. So, yeah. I  
8 mean I agree, in that -- I wanted to find out if  
9 Connecticut did they still feel that it's a relevant core  
10 facility, and, if that's the case, then I'm in support of  
11 that.

12 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. I don't  
13 understand. There's already a core facility in  
14 Farmington. This is going to be a second core facility.  
15 How come you need two?

16 DR. KIESSLING: This is for somatic cell  
17 nuclear transfer. This is a unique core. It's like  
18 having a separate core for flow cytometry. This is a  
19 unique opportunity that Connecticut has.

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, but you can't  
21 do this work in Farmington.

22 DR. KIESSLING: In the existing core?

23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: We gave them two and  
24 a half million dollars last year.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 DR. KIESSLING: That was a stem cell  
2 culture core. I don't know what facilities are there,  
3 but, no, this probably could not be done in Farmington.

4 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. That's  
5 something I did not understand. Okay.

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: Further discussion? This  
7 is UConn, Storrs. It is not UConn, Storrs. It is  
8 Evergen.

9 DR. LATHAM: This is Evergen, which is a  
10 private firm, which was started by Jerry and some  
11 colleagues at UConn, as far as I can understand, but the  
12 grant recipient here would not be UConn. It would be  
13 Evergen, so we'd have to address where they're going to  
14 get ESCRO approval if they need it for this, which I think  
15 they do, and there's some talk in the application about  
16 the grant being sent to a newly created non-profit  
17 corporation. We need to clarify those things in the  
18 contracting process for sure.

19 DR. KIESSLING: It says it's located at the  
20 University of Connecticut's Technology Incubator Program.

21 DR. CANALIS: I mean cores are supposed to  
22 serve an institution. What institution are they serving?

23 DR. LATHAM: They say in the application  
24 that they will be open to all Connecticut institutions,

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 and that they have already got a lot of cooperative  
2 projects with the UConn people, partly because Evergen is  
3 the corporate entity that has a number of the licenses  
4 that have been developed by Jerry and his group earlier.

5 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: But isn't this a de  
6 facto UConn program? Let's face it. Yeah. It's another  
7 UConn program. I don't care what you call it, as long as  
8 we understand that.

9 DR. LATHAM: It's another UConn program,  
10 but it's separately incorporated as a for profit  
11 corporation, so the contracting process is going to be a  
12 little different than if it were just the state.

13 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I understand this,  
14 but I think we need some clarity about that --

15 DR. LATHAM: All --

16 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: -- at UConn.

17 DR. LATHAM: All the people there have  
18 strong UConn ties and affiliations and histories. The  
19 lead PI is somebody who has trained at UConn with Jerry.  
20 Yeah, I mean it's very closely affiliated with UConn,  
21 Storrs.

22 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: He's the guy that's  
23 going to come back to Connecticut if he gets the grant,  
24 okay.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: Further discussion?

2 DR. FISHBONE: Could I ask you a question?

3 Any of the for profit corporations that we fund, are there  
4 special rules that apply to them, in terms of what the  
5 State gets out of the profit?

6 DR. LATHAM: Yeah. The contract  
7 subcommittee is looking at revisions to the contracts that  
8 we would have with for profit corporations, because there  
9 do have to be a number of different contractual provisions  
10 made with them than we have either with the State entities  
11 or with big non-profits, like Yale or Wesleyan.

12 The committee, as a whole, will see those  
13 revisions when they're done, but the contract subcommittee  
14 is meeting with attorneys to work those details out.

15 DR. FISHBONE: We're moving this to a yes.  
16 Do we have an idea -- they asked for two million. Do we  
17 have an idea what funding we'd recommend? Because think  
18 we're going to pretty soon be having to slice the pie, and  
19 it would be nice to know how big a slice this needs.

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: -- so far,  
21 potentially?

22 COURT REPORTER: You aren't on the record.  
23 You need a microphone.

24 DR. GENEL: I have a rough idea, if

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 everything is fully funded. I think we have probably a  
2 couple million dollars left over for the investigator  
3 grants, but specifically on this one, I mean I hear that  
4 we ought to fund it, but not at the level requested, and  
5 the level requested was two million, and I'd just like an  
6 idea of what the people would, the reviewers would  
7 recommend for funding of this.

8 DR. KIESSLING: I'm looking at the budget.  
9 They're only asking for two years of funding, and they're  
10 asking for a million dollars a year. I think we can look  
11 at the budget and figure out what are some big ticket  
12 items there. I haven't had a chance to -- I mean I  
13 haven't done that. Have you, Steve?

14 DR. LATHAM: No. No.

15 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I have enough  
16 information to make that decision right now.

17 DR. KIESSLING: But I'll work on it. I  
18 mean I've got the budget in front of me now.

19 DR. CANALIS: What was the scientific  
20 score?

21 DR. KIESSLING: 2.5.

22 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Do you have a  
23 comment, Dr. Canalis?

24 DR. CANALIS: No, just to myself.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I see. You've got an  
2 attentive audience.

3 DR. CANALIS: I'm sorry, Commissioner. I  
4 apologize.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: Any other comment? Is it  
6 the consensus of the group that this grant be moved to the  
7 yes category? Hearing no objection, please move this  
8 grant application to the yes category.

9 Under consideration from the maybe  
10 category, core grant 08SCD UConn, 005, principal  
11 investigator is Hiscus(phonetic), with a peer review score  
12 of four, and the members of the Committee of Cognizance  
13 are Kiessling and Latham.

14 DR. LATHAM: Once again, the peer review  
15 score of four is not reflective of scientific reviews,  
16 since there's no science in the grant. The idea of this  
17 grant is that since ESCRO review is a requirement for the  
18 research that we're funding, that we ought to fund that  
19 part of it, as well.

20 It, therefore, is being pitched as part of  
21 the support for the UConn core. The main objection to it  
22 has been that the funding for ESCRO and educational  
23 support ought to be coming out of the overhead that the  
24 universities get in connection with the other grants we've

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 awarded them.

2 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Second reviewer?

3 DR. KIESSLING: This project has three  
4 aims, and I would actually like to consider funding aim  
5 three, which is to develop -- they wanted to develop some  
6 educational resources, and I don't think that will cost  
7 very much. This is a pretty low budget item.

8 I think other ESCRO activities have got to  
9 come out of indirect costs, but I think these two  
10 investigators are interested in developing a rather unique  
11 educational resource.

12 So I think aim three, that this is a pretty  
13 small budget, I'm guessing aim three could probably be  
14 done for about 50,000 dollars.

15 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I'm just concerned  
16 whether it should be our 50,000 dollars or University of  
17 Connecticut's 50,000 dollars. If this is part of their  
18 development, their ethics and philosophy faculty, that  
19 money probably should come out of another state pocket,  
20 other than this grant. Yes, Milt?

21 DR. WALLACK: Bob, when we passed the  
22 original legislation, we were cognizant of what had  
23 happened in California. Please forgive me. I'm  
24 paraphrasing the thoughts.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1                   What we specifically decided in legislation  
2 was to not fund educational initiatives, but rather stay  
3 to fund the science initiatives, so that while it's only a  
4 small portion, the 50,000, I think that, to be consistent  
5 with, as I recall the legislation and the motives behind  
6 what we did, especially relative to what California was  
7 doing, to stay consistent, I would not vote for this.

8                   COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Well I think you  
9 raise a cogent point and I think the other earlier  
10 comment, that it got a four, because it's not scientific,  
11 and I would agree with you that we're here to, even for a  
12 relatively small amount, we're here to fund scientific  
13 research, and that perhaps this is something that should  
14 be part of President Mike Hogan's general overhead, as he  
15 and the provost develop the new university standards and  
16 as they develop programs.

17                   I don't personally think that it's the  
18 point of this board to develop philosophy courses.

19                   MR. MANDELKERN: Dr. Galvin?

20                   COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Just a moment. Let  
21 me finish, please. I personally don't think that we need  
22 to stick to the science. Go ahead, Bob.

23                   MR. MANDELKERN: I would like to say that I  
24 referenced the law this morning over breakfast, and I

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 could reference the specific section and so on. The  
2 mandate to us is to fund embryonic stem cell research,  
3 adult stem cell research, particularly with emphasis on  
4 work that cannot be funded by the Federal Government now,  
5 and that's a clear mandate to do science and not education  
6 and not procedure.

7 So I would say the law definitely indicates  
8 that we should not support this grant.

9 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. What is the  
10 consensus of the group? No?

11 MS. TOWNSHEND: If I'm understanding  
12 correctly, this application will be moved from the maybe  
13 category to the no category. Do I hear any objections to  
14 that? Please move this grant application from the maybe  
15 to the no category. Thank you.

16 As a process point, are we prepared to move  
17 onto established investigator grants at this time?

18 A MALE VOICE: Yes.

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: Thank you. I understand  
20 that we're starting with the ones or in the one range and  
21 moving towards the five range. Is my understanding  
22 correct?

23 A MALE VOICE: That's correct.

24 MS. TOWNSHEND: Thank you. Just a reminder

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 that anything through the 2.3 rank will be given five  
2 minutes' consideration. We are starting with 08SCB Yale  
3 026. Woo is the principal investigator, 1.45 is the peer  
4 review score, and Wagers and Mandelkern are the members of  
5 cognizance. That is for 496,465 dollars.

6 MR. MANDELKERN: I'm sorry. I lost your  
7 reference.

8 MS. TOWNSHEND: That is Yale 026.

9 DR. JENNINGS: This is B 026.

10 MR. MANDELKERN: B?

11 DR. JENNINGS: B, yeah.

12 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: First reviewer?

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: Five minutes.

14 DR. WAGERS: This is a grant to look at the  
15 differentiation of cardiomyocytes from human embryonic  
16 stem cells, and, particularly, it focuses on the role of  
17 wind signaling in that process. It's a grant from an  
18 investigator with a lot of experience in studying the wind  
19 signaling pathway.

20 It addresses an important need, which is  
21 that protocols give only about 10 to 20 percent  
22 cardiomyocytes after differentiation of human embryonic  
23 stem cells, and there's a low engraftment capacity, and  
24 this grant will address both of these issues by deriving -

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 - using reporter lines and wind exposure assays to try to  
2 promote the differentiation of cardiac cells from ES  
3 cells, and then they're going to make use of a novel  
4 biodegradable scaffold that he's used previously and has  
5 allowed the development of clinical grade vascular grafts  
6 in order to support in vivo engraftment of these cells.

7 Then he's following up these studies with  
8 functional analysis of the activity of the heart after  
9 engraftment. He has novel and innovative small molecules  
10 that he's developed to probe the wind pathway. It has  
11 good preliminary data with both human embryonic stem cells  
12 and with the wind signaling pathway.

13 The peer review was positive, and I think I  
14 would support moving this grant into the yes category.

15 MS. TOWNSHEND: Mr. Mandelkern, as the  
16 second reviewer?

17 MR. MANDELKERN: I'm in concurrence.

18 COURT REPORTER: You need a microphone.

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: Mr. Mandelkern is in  
20 concurrence with Dr. Wagers. Is it the consensus of the  
21 group to move this grant application to the yes category?  
22 Any objections? Please move this to the yes category.

23 Now up for consideration is 08SCB Yale,  
24 013, Vaccarino(phonetic) is the principal investigator,

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 the peer review score is 1.5, and the members of  
2 cognizance are Canalis and Fishbone.

3 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Ernie?

4 DR. CANALIS: Sure. So, basically, what  
5 the investigator attempted to do is to define the impact  
6 of hypoxia on neuronal cells and the regeneration of these  
7 cells. They have a cell model to track the injured cells  
8 by hypoxia. They are going to determine which gene cell,  
9 and then they are going to perform appropriate knock down  
10 experiments to see whether or not they can rescue the  
11 phenotypes.

12 Consequently, it would have impact to  
13 patients with brain injury, and I have ischemia injury,  
14 gene expression. You knock down the genes, you rescue, so  
15 the clinical potential it is there. It has a very good  
16 scientific review. The only concern I have is that the  
17 time commitment of the investigators is quite small. Each  
18 of the investigators is dedicating less than a month per  
19 year to the program.

20 And I know there are no guidelines about  
21 what a minimum time commitment to a grant should be, but  
22 it's thin. So science impact, very nice.

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: Do you have a  
24 recommendation, sir?

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 DR. CANALIS: Yes. We're going to have to  
2 develop some guidelines in the future upon commitment.

3 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Fishbone?

4 DR. FISHBONE: I would agree. It looks  
5 like a very good grant that was well reviewed, and I think  
6 Dr. Canalis' point is well taken about time, but I've  
7 noticed on a lot of the grants there's only one month out  
8 of the year committed by the investigators to have good  
9 help to do the work. I would support the funding.

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections to  
11 moving this to the yes category? Please move this grant  
12 application to the yes category.

13 Now up for consideration is 08SCBUCHC016,  
14 principal investigator is Morist(phonetic), the peer  
15 review score is 1.5, and the members of cognizance are  
16 Kiesslering and Landwirth.

17 DR. KIESSLING: This is a wonderful  
18 application. This is an application for five years of  
19 funding at about 125,000 dollars a year. This is  
20 basically a senior investigator collaborating with a mid  
21 career investigator, and they are basically looking for  
22 funding for supplies and a graduate student or a post-doc,  
23 and they have very carefully laid out how they're going to  
24 use non-Presidential approved human embryonic stem cells

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 to study deafness to study in the mouse model.

2 One problem that the reviewers raised was  
3 that this group also has -- each of these investigators  
4 has one other NIH grant, and the reviewers raised the  
5 issue of how are they going to separate the equipment in  
6 their lab, and they didn't indicate that they have any  
7 guidelines for separating Federally approved from non-  
8 Federally approval lines.

9 I actually don't know how that's been  
10 addressed at Connecticut. I think it has been addressed.  
11 I think there are guidelines in place, so I didn't see  
12 that as the kind of concern that the reviewer saw. This  
13 is a very beautifully written grant that would be  
14 wonderful. It's a perfect use of non-Presidential  
15 approved human embryonic stem cell lines in a mouse model.  
16 I would actually like to see this funded.

17 DR. LANDWIRTH: As the second reviewer, I  
18 agree with wanting to see this funded. I'm quite  
19 confident that the University of Connecticut has pretty  
20 straightforward and specific instructions and  
21 methodologies for separating the two sources of funds.

22 For what it's worth, Dr. Lee, one of the  
23 co-investigators, has received a grant from us last year,  
24 which will run out in 2009. I don't have any way of

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1       ascertaining if there's any duplication or overlap with  
2       that.

3                       And I don't know if it's the same Dr. Lee  
4       who will be coming a little further down the line for this  
5       review.

6                       DR. JENNINGS:   So it is or is not the same?  
7       I didn't hear what you said.

8                       DR. LANDWIRTH:   I don't know.

9                       MS. TOWNSHEND:   The recommendation of the  
10      reviewers is to place this in the yes category.  Do I hear  
11      any objections from the group?  Please move this  
12      application to the yes category.

13                      Now up for consideration 08SCBYSME017, Xu  
14      is the principal investigator, 1.5 is the peer review  
15      score.  Please note that there is proprietary information  
16      within this application, should we need to go into  
17      Executive Session.  The members of the Committee of  
18      Cognizance are Canalis and Fishbone.

19                      COMMISSIONER GALVIN:  Gerry?

20                      DR. FISHBONE:   This is a grant, where the  
21      PI proposes to use the PB transposon system for insertion  
22      of mutagenesis with the aim of modifying the expression of  
23      genes involved in tumor formation.

24                      He's already done a lot of preliminary data

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 in immortalized human airway epithelial cells. It's  
2 interesting, because there are a lot of questions raised  
3 in the review. He has not made a clear convincing  
4 argument about why these cells are better than others.  
5 It's difficult to assess how successful these early  
6 studies were. Somewhat of a fishing expedition, not  
7 driven by a strong hypothesis.

8 It does have a novel aspect, in that it  
9 uses this piggyback or PB transposon system to facilitate  
10 being captured. What concerned me about this one is that  
11 he raised a lot of questions, the reviewer, and says that  
12 they mitigate my enthusiasm, and then he gives it a 1.5.

13 I don't understand how it could get such a  
14 high rating with so many criticisms of what he's trying to  
15 do. And maybe Dr. Canalis has some insight into that.

16 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I think, Gerry, we're  
17 seeing a little bit of a pattern here of reviews that  
18 don't square up with the numerical scores. I'm not sure  
19 why someone would write -- that sounds to me like about a  
20 three score, what you've just described, rather than a one  
21 and a half.

22 DR. FISHBONE: I would have thought the  
23 same.

24 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: So I'm not sure. I

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 think we need to spend some time, spend some more  
2 attention on that. That's difficult, and if it's one or  
3 two reviewers, I think it makes it exceptionally difficult  
4 to look at a good narrative and a low score, or a bad  
5 narrative and a high score. Yes, Warren?

6 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Just as a point of  
7 clarification, the narrative is often reflective of the  
8 primary reviewer's written comments. The final numerical  
9 score is a result of negotiations between primary and  
10 secondary and the approval of the full committee.

11 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Thank you for  
12 clarifying that. As Gerry said, I have a -- these are way  
13 out of sync.

14 DR. CANALIS: I fully agree with whatever  
15 has been said. The total dichotomy between the score and  
16 the review, I mean the review has very little positive  
17 comments, is a project that is not hypothesis driven, has  
18 little impact to stem cell research. It might have more  
19 impact to cancer.

20 The commitment of the investigators, again,  
21 is about three weeks a year. The benefit is doubtful. It  
22 reads like this is a non-convincing fishing expedition, so  
23 you're correct. It sounds more like a three, because of  
24 the reasons that have been discussed. I would put this in

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 the no category.

2 DR. FISHBONE: I would agree.

3 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections to  
4 moving this grant application to the no category? Please  
5 move this grant application to the no category.

6 Now up for consideration is 08SCBUCHC022,  
7 the principal investigator is Lee, the peer review score  
8 is 1.55, and the members of cognizance are Kiessling and  
9 Wallack.

10 DR. WALLACK: I think that it's a well  
11 written application. It's from a young investigator.  
12 There's other implications that, from my perspective,  
13 enhance its strength, and that is that they talk about  
14 certain possibilities of creating platforms for drug  
15 testing.

16 What I will add myself is that, as I read  
17 the application, possible down the road additional  
18 benefits for other neuro muscular kinds of events,  
19 possibly even from Alzheimer's, as the researchers begin  
20 to understand their material more specifically.

21 So I think it's a well written grant by  
22 somebody who, while young, I think, with the collaboration  
23 that person will be having, will probably carry out the  
24 responsibilities, as set forth. I can't comment

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 specifically on the science, of course, but if, Ann, you  
2 can address that, I'd be thrilled.

3 DR. KIESSLING: I agree. This is a very  
4 nice application, and it also fits in the bargain class.  
5 They're asking for four years of support. They're not  
6 asking for a lot of money every year.

7 The principal investigator I was just  
8 looking to see if this is the same Lee that we've seen  
9 applications from before. I don't think so. I think this  
10 is the only application. Okay. Anyway, I thought this  
11 was a very nice application, and she's proposing to do a  
12 lot of work in four years, but she's got the background to  
13 do it.

14 This investigator actually sort of  
15 developed the laboratory techniques for motor neuron  
16 development from ES cells, so this is an extension of some  
17 key work that she actually started.

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: Is it your recommendation  
19 that this be considered as a yes?

20 DR. KIESSLING: Yes.

21 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections to  
22 moving this to the yes category? Please do so. Now up  
23 for consideration is 08SCBUCHC012, Maher(phonetic) is the  
24 principal investigator, the peer review score is 1.6, and

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 the members of cognizance are Jennings and Genel.

2 DR. JENNINGS: So this is from a mid career  
3 investigator at UConn. They are planning to look at the  
4 entire range of phosphor tyrosine -- sites in human  
5 embryonic stem cells, and the PI has developed an  
6 innovative technique to do this, which I can go into if  
7 you're interested, but I think suffice to say that it was  
8 recently published in a couple of journals, and I thought  
9 it was clever.

10 He has another planned technique, which  
11 would be an even more powerful variant on this, which  
12 would allow them simultaneously to watch the, to monitor  
13 the tyrosine phosphor (background noise) site in the cell.

14 This is, I think, helpful, potentially very  
15 powerful technology. I think it's already been  
16 established. They have proof of principle, at least for  
17 the first part of it, that people work with relatively  
18 small numbers of cells.

19 I'm very positive about this. The PI has a  
20 very strong track record, I think stronger than almost any  
21 of the others that I've looked at, in terms of sustained  
22 productivity over a long period of time, so I'm in favor  
23 of this. The referee's comments reflect that, or I should  
24 say my comments reflect those of the referee's, and I'm

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 fumbling to find it, but Warren is helping me here.

2 Overall, bottom line, the PI has been  
3 highly productive, is a pioneer in the development of this  
4 technology. He and his collaborator are well suited and  
5 qualified, very significant enthusiasm for this project,  
6 and I would share that.

7 And just in terms of concerns that have  
8 been raised previously about contribution, we're looking  
9 at 50 percent, I'm sorry, 15, 1-5 percent of the PI, 30  
10 percent of his co-PI, who is a, I think, a junior faculty  
11 member, who has previously worked with the PIs post-doc,  
12 plus 50 percent of the post-doc, and that post-doc is  
13 already identified, so I feel that we're funding known  
14 people.

15 They're looking for half a million dollars  
16 over four years, and I would support this one. I think  
17 it's fundamental research that will, I think, provide a  
18 broad range of information to people interested in  
19 differentiation of human ES cells.

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Thank you.

21 DR. GENEL: I'll only point out that Dr.  
22 Maher's principal collaborator is in Hamburg, Germany, but  
23 he pointedly states that he will be collaborating on a  
24 gratis basis, which I found interesting. I point it out.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 It should be funded. Yes.

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections to  
3 moving this to the yes category? Please move this grant  
4 application to the yes category.

5 Now up for consideration 08SCBUCHC015,  
6 Dealy(phonetic) is the principal investigator, 1.73 is the  
7 peer review score, the members of cognizance are Jennings  
8 and Landwirth.

9 DR. JENNINGS: If I'm going to take the  
10 lead, I need just a second to collect my notes.

11 MS. TOWNSHEND: Now up for consideration  
12 08SCBUCHC021, Rosenberg is the principal investigator,  
13 1.75 is the peer review score, and the members of  
14 cognizance are Kiesslering and Wallack.

15 DR. KIESSLING: This is an interesting  
16 application, and I'm just struggling now to see how many  
17 years of money they're asking for, to study colon cells  
18 and the regeneration of colon. This actually is another  
19 example of an excellent use of embryonic stem cells for a  
20 disease condition that's pretty widespread.

21 It got very high reviews. The only  
22 criticism by the peer review group was lack of preliminary  
23 data. I actually thought there was quite a bit of  
24 preliminary data in this grant application, so I think

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 this is an excellent project. I would like to see this  
2 funded.

3 DR. WALLACK: I agree. I think that is a  
4 strong application, strong investigators. Ann, if I read  
5 this correctly, I think that it also demonstrated  
6 collaboration between the Health Center and the Storrs  
7 regenerative campus activities, which I think is something  
8 -- that kind of collaboration is what we want to  
9 encourage.

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: The recommendation is yes?

11 DR. WALLACK: Yes.

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections to  
13 placing this grant application in the yes category?  
14 Please move this grant application to the yes category.  
15 Dr. Jennings, would you like to wait?

16 DR. JENNINGS: Yes. Okay. So now we're  
17 back to --

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: SCBUCHC015, Dealy, 1.73.

19 DR. JENNINGS: Okay, so, the point here is  
20 to study the regeneration of the tips of limbs and they're  
21 primarily going to use chicklings, or I think there are  
22 also some experiments with mice and -- I'm sorry. My  
23 notes are slightly inadequate on this.

24 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Would you like to

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 take some more time?

2 DR. JENNINGS: No, no, no.

3 MS. TOWNSHEND: The recommendation from  
4 Marianne is just to -- why don't we hold off again on this  
5 one?

6 DR. JENNINGS: I apologize.

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: That's okay.

8 DR. JENNINGS: Are they doing it just in  
9 chicks?

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: We're going to move onto  
11 08SCBYSME025, Nicholason(phonetic) is the primary  
12 investigator, 1.75 is the peer review score, and the  
13 members of cognizance are Wagers and Wallack.

14 DR. WAGERS: So this is a grant whose  
15 primary aim is to develop ways of using stem cells to  
16 generate new arteries.

17 DR. JENNINGS: New what?

18 DR. WAGERS: New arteries, new blood  
19 vessels. And, so, the investigator is going to take a  
20 comparative approach using both human mozancamal(phonetic)  
21 stem cells, as well as human embryonic stem cells that  
22 will be differentiated into mozancamal stem cell like  
23 cells to look at the factors that are involved in driving  
24 these cells into smooth muscle cell fates.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1                   That's the first aim, and the second aim  
2 will then probe specifically the signaling pathways that  
3 are involved, and the third aim will actually test the  
4 functionality of bioengineered vessels derived from  
5 whichever of these cells turns out to be the most robust  
6 source of cell types that are important for this using a  
7 bioreactor and in vivo grafting into --

8                   So the peer review is overall very  
9 positive. It cites, particularly, the strong expertise of  
10 the investigator in this area and the importance of this  
11 area of investigation. It's an interdisciplinary study  
12 that really has potential to push forward our  
13 understanding of how to derive these types of cells and  
14 how to engraft them productively in an in vivo setting.

15                   There are some concerns that are raised  
16 regarding exactly how efficient the process will be, but  
17 probably we won't find that out at all, unless the work  
18 goes forward, and so I think that the preliminary data  
19 supports the fact that there will be enough of a  
20 production of these cells that really there will be  
21 insights into the signaling pathways that are involved,  
22 and, so, I would move this into the yes category.

23                   MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Wallack?

24                   DR. WALLACK: I would endorse moving it

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 into the yes category. I think it's a very strong  
2 application, a very strong researcher. The peer review  
3 notes are very supportive, talking about the very  
4 interesting and worthwhile application, which it is, and  
5 those are breakthroughs that we can potentially obtain  
6 through this research.

7 It's interesting, picking up on Mike  
8 Genel's comment on the previous application, that Dr.  
9 Khu(phonetic) seems to be donating this commitment towards  
10 this research, because there's no obvious implication of  
11 his time in the budget.

12 As with the other one, we get a little bit  
13 of a bonus. Even without that, I would vote yes.

14 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections to  
15 moving this to the yes category? Please move this  
16 application to the yes category. All set?

17 DR. JENNINGS: I apologize for delaying  
18 this.

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: This is 015, Dealy, 1.73.  
20 Dr. Jennings?

21 DR. JENNINGS: Yes. Okay, so, they're  
22 looking at the regeneration of limbs, the tips of limbs,  
23 and they are, indeed, going to study both chick and mouse  
24 embryos, and they're going to inject human embryonic stem

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 cells and monitor their contribution to regeneration and  
2 to primary growth during embryonic development, and the  
3 overall rationale is that you may learn something that  
4 will help in the future with bone and cartilage grafting  
5 therapies.

6 I think it's a solid application. My own  
7 bottom line is it doesn't quite make the cut. We already  
8 have seven things up here that we just voted yes on that's  
9 appropriate, three and a half million, and even  
10 recognizing the fact that this has fallen behind a couple  
11 of places because of discussion, that doesn't alter my  
12 view.

13 The review, the peer review, they note, the  
14 authors propose to, blah, blah, blah. It is not  
15 immediately apparent how they know that their genes will  
16 faithfully recapitulate the lineage. They don't discuss  
17 whether they think that the embryonic stem cells  
18 contribute particularly to all --

19 There's a number of questions about how  
20 it's going to be interpreted. I feel that it's not a  
21 terribly focused scientific question. It's quite a long  
22 way from therapy. I think it's solid, but I recognize we  
23 are approaching a point where we have to make a lot of  
24 tough funding decisions, and, in my judgment, this one

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 doesn't quite make the cut.

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Landwirth?

3 DR. JENNINGS: So I vote no.

4 DR. LANDWIRTH: I would concur with that,  
5 and, also, I just want to point out that both the PI and  
6 the co-PI were recipients of group grants last year. I  
7 guess this may continue from year to year as we get more  
8 proposals in, and if we want to have a serious look about  
9 possible overlap, which they state here does not exist, we  
10 probably need a more structured way to scrutinize for  
11 that.

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: Your recommendation is also  
13 no?

14 DR. LANDWIRTH: Yes.

15 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections to  
16 moving this grant to the no category? Please move this  
17 grant to the no category.

18 Now for consideration 08SCBUCHC011,  
19 Sestic(phonetic) is the principal investigator, 1.9 is  
20 the peer review score, and the members of cognizance are  
21 Jennings and Genel.

22 COURT REPORTER: One moment, please.

23 DR. GENEL: Well this is a well received  
24 grant that was to look at human embryonic stem cells as a

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 source of neurological cells, specifically radio glial  
2 cells. The investigator requests 10 percent effort and is  
3 well regarded in the field with 100 percent effort by an  
4 M.D., Ph.D. post-doc. She's well supported. She has an  
5 NIH grant. I would move this to a yes category.

6 DR. JENNINGS: I don't disagree with that.  
7 I feel it's a little bit marginal compared to some of the  
8 ones that we've discussed towards the top of this list.  
9 To me, this in the nice to fund category, rather than the  
10 must fund category.

11 MS. TOWNSHEND: Your recommendation?

12 DR. JENNINGS: It certainly would not be a  
13 waste of our money to fund it, but it would not be  
14 disastrous.

15 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yes or maybe?

16 DR. JENNINGS: I'm sorry. I'm hedging on  
17 maybe.

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections to  
19 moving this grant application to the maybe category?  
20 Please move this grant application to the maybe category.

21 Now up is 08SCB Yale 023, Sustan(phonetic)  
22 is the principal investigator, 2.0 is the peer review  
23 score, and the members of cognizance are Wagers and  
24 Mandelkern.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes. This is an  
2 interesting grant, with a score of two. It ranks 11 among  
3 24 principal investigator grants. The write up by the  
4 peer review is very complimentary, and I apologize to Dr.  
5 Wagers personally for misnaming you when you did your  
6 first review that we did together.

7 Dr. Wagers and I, as partners, discussed  
8 this, and she brought forward some serious questions about  
9 the science, as to whether the gene that the investigator  
10 thought would drive neuronal fate could actually do it,  
11 and, if not, the rest of the experiments are in jeopardy.

12 Also, there were certain discussions of use  
13 of primate model for function analysis, but no behavioral  
14 testing proposed, therefore, our recommendation on this is  
15 no.

16 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Wagers?

17 DR. WAGERS: So that succinctly summarizes  
18 our discussion, and I would support that position.

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections to  
20 moving this grant application to the no category? Please  
21 move this grant application to the no category.

22 Next up, 08SCB UConn 024, Nelson is the  
23 primary investigator, 2.03 is the peer review score, and  
24 the members of cognizance are Wagers and Landwirth.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 DR. WAGERS: So this is Nelson?

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: Correct.

3 DR. WAGERS: Number 24.

4 MS. TOWNSHEND: Correct.

5 DR. WAGERS: And the primary goal of this  
6 application will be to perform single cell analysis of  
7 stem cell differentiation, looking at gene expression,  
8 profiling to identify new cell surface markers that might  
9 be useful to isolate the distinct populations of cells  
10 that are derived from embryonic stem cells, sorry, mouse  
11 embryonic stem cells.

12 It's a very descriptive study, and an  
13 issue, which we discussed yesterday, as well, is that it's  
14 not clear exactly how determining the RNA levels for these  
15 receptors will relate to the actual protein levels of the  
16 receptors, because there's often a disconnect between  
17 those two. It also -- as far as their expression on the  
18 surface and their activity.

19 It is focused primarily on the use of mouse  
20 embryonic stem cells, which lowers, I think, the priority  
21 according to our criteria, and there's no indication that  
22 human embryonic stem cells will eventually be used,  
23 although there is a request for monies to license to  
24 embryonic stem cell lines from --

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1                   However, there's no obvious commitment that  
2 that's really going to be done, and the personnel that are  
3 listed are not already trained in the use of human  
4 embryonic stem cells, and it's not suggested that they  
5 will be.

6                   So, basically, on the basis of all of that  
7 and the comments that the peer review, I would move this  
8 to a no category.

9                   MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Landwirth?

10                  DR. LANDWIRTH: I would concur with that,  
11 in particular concern that the reviewer's comment, about  
12 their planned use of human cells, was very little past  
13 experience in that area.

14                  MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections to  
15 moving this grant application to the no category? Please  
16 do so.

17                  The next two grants, in discussion with  
18 Attorney Horn and with the support of the group as a  
19 whole, we would like to skip, as Dr. Arinzeh is one of two  
20 members of cognizance with regard to this and she is not  
21 on the phone at this time, so with your permission, we  
22 would like to continue with 08SCBYSME020. Is that all  
23 right with the group?

24                  DR. JENNINGS: This is Harold.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: Harold, correct. 2.25 is  
2 the peer review score, and the members of cognizance are  
3 Canalis and Wallack.

4 DR. WALLACK: I thought that it was a --  
5 it's an application from a very, very strong researcher,  
6 and I have to admit that, for the record, that, as many of  
7 you know, I have a personal interest in this kind of  
8 research going forward.

9 He demonstrates a certain add on benefit to  
10 the research. The researcher has worked on the antibody  
11 factors. I think that this project could further  
12 elucidate on that. I have some problems with the  
13 application. I don't understand, for example, why there  
14 was the need for the collaborative effort with Novacell.

15 I went back, I read the proposal a few  
16 times, actually, and, in reading that, I also remain less  
17 than fully understanding of the focus of where he's trying  
18 to go with the project.

19 I think that I would probably not be able  
20 to put it in the yes category, and if it was not to be  
21 funded, I think this is an instance where the overall  
22 research is so important and the researcher has such a  
23 great track history that I would want, I think, to have a  
24 letter sent to him describing why we couldn't go forward

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 with the research.

2 For the science part, Ernie, if I could  
3 turn to you, please?

4 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Canalis?

5 DR. CANALIS: I was turning to the  
6 scientific review, and, basically, what the investigator  
7 is going to do is going to see if embryonic stem cells can  
8 differentiate into pancreatic beta cells in a pancreatic  
9 environment, where he can direct these cells to  
10 differentiate.

11 The problem is that the review, the  
12 scientific review, just like Dr. Wallack expressed, felt  
13 that it was a good idea, but, unfortunately, I felt it was  
14 basically flawed in design. Basically, they felt that a  
15 glucose controlled environment does not exist in embryos  
16 and that the overall research plan was considered not  
17 quite viable, so, because of that, I have difficulties  
18 with moving forward.

19 I have no difficulties in sending a letter  
20 to the investigator. In fact, I think that the peer  
21 reviews are shared with -- can be shared with the  
22 investigators.

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: Is that correct?

24 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah. We can always

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 just send them a copy of the notes.

2 DR. CANALIS: But the peer review is fairly  
3 explicit on where the flaws are. I mean I have  
4 difficulties when the peer review tells me it's flawed.

5 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: If it's flawed, it's  
6 flawed.

7 DR. WALLACK: I think what we're both  
8 trying to say is that there are so many elements of the  
9 project that do seem to have such potential and the track  
10 record of the researcher is so strong that when you read  
11 the application, it makes you want to move forward with  
12 it, because of the various elements, but there's certain  
13 underlying, as Ernie said, design problems and lack of  
14 focus problems.

15 Again, why he can't do it all in his own  
16 lab, rather than getting back to that whole subject about  
17 working out of state and so forth that we discussed in  
18 such detail earlier in the day, I think that also should  
19 be -- he should be aware of the context of that  
20 conversation in redeveloping this and hopefully be  
21 encouraged to come back next year with a redesigned  
22 project.

23 I think that's very, very important for us  
24 to communicate to him.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. I understand.  
2 I don't think this individual is going to stop doing his  
3 research just because he didn't get one grant from us, and  
4 that he probably will come forward next year. I'm hearing  
5 negative recommendations from you two gentlemen.

6 DR. WALLACK: Yes.

7 DR. CANALIS: That is unfortunately  
8 correct, Commissioner.

9 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections to  
10 moving this grant application to the no category? Please  
11 move this grant application to the no category.

12 Now up for consideration 08SCB UConn 006,  
13 Barr(phonetic) is the principal investigator, 2.3 is the  
14 peer review score, and the members of cognizance are Huang  
15 and Genel.

16 DR. HUANG: Okay. This is a grant to treat  
17 Alzheimer's disease by transplanting embryonic stem cell  
18 derived neurons into a mouse model, which is a transgenic  
19 human and mouse Alzheimer precursor protein in human  
20 (indiscernible) one model of Alzheimer disease, and then,  
21 after transplantation, to study the viability of those  
22 neurons in the brain and how they decline or survive.

23 The second part of the proposal is to use  
24 those neurons to screen novel agents for cell survival.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 The proposal received a score of 2.3. The peer review  
2 says this is technically an excellent proposal with minor  
3 issues that could be addressed, specifically the cell  
4 types that they're transplanting, how homogenous they are,  
5 how long (papers on microphone) the mouse brain, and,  
6 also, whether they're dying because of rejection versus  
7 cell death, and, finally, how specifically this model can  
8 be used to screen agents.

9 So I think, overall, while it's an  
10 interesting proposal and technically thought to be very  
11 good by the peer reviewers, I would put it in the maybe  
12 category, so much as it may be as a next tier to the yes  
13 in case we have sufficient funding. I think it's worth  
14 funding. I don't want to put it into the no category, but  
15 I think, because we have to have a fallback, in terms of  
16 what we would do with funds if they're available, I would  
17 put this in the maybe category.

18 DR. GENEL: I agree completely.

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections to  
20 moving this grant application to the maybe category?  
21 Please do so. Yes, sir? I'm sorry.

22 DR. JENNINGS: This, just from what I've  
23 heard so far, sounds like a weaker proposal than the one  
24 that I advocated in the maybe category. I doubt that I

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 will be voting in favor of this one.

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: So we're good with putting  
3 this in the maybe category?

4 DR. JENNINGS: Yes.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: Okay. I will remind the  
6 group at this time we are at the 2.5 threshold, which  
7 means consideration, and discussion is one minute long.  
8 Now up for consideration is 08SCBUCHC008, Hawk(phonetic)  
9 is the principal investigator, 2.5 is the peer review  
10 score, Huang and Mandelkern.

11 MR. MANDELKERN: This is an interesting  
12 proposal, however, the peer review definitely says it's  
13 over ambitious, and they predict very clearly what will  
14 happen to it. It may compete poorly against other  
15 projects seeking to address specific hypothesis since this  
16 one is largely descriptive and highly exploratory, so that  
17 it needs further description in terms of the science  
18 questions that would be addressed and various other issues  
19 in relation to the science.

20 Therefore, my partner and I both have  
21 agreed to recommend a no vote on this.

22 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections to  
23 moving this grant application to the no category? Please  
24 do so.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 Our next grant application is 08SCBUCHC009,  
2 Campagnuolo(phonetic) is the principal investigator, 2.5  
3 is the peer review score, Huang and Mandelkern.

4 DR. HUANG: So this is a revised  
5 application to devise a micro environment for tissue  
6 engineering for muscles and musculoskeletal tissues. It  
7 was ranked at a 2.5.

8 It's an important clinical problem, and the  
9 project has strengths, including sophisticated use of  
10 imaging, to look at interactions between the scaffolds and  
11 the cells, but the peer reviewers also noted significant  
12 concerns about minimal biochemical or molecular analysis  
13 of the tissue.

14 And, also, most strikingly, the applicant  
15 does not have adequate experience with human embryonic  
16 stem cells and their culture conditions, which may be very  
17 different from the cell types that they have worked with  
18 before, so Mr. Mandelkern and I feel that this should be  
19 in the no category.

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections to  
21 placing this application in the no category? Please do  
22 so.

23 Our next grant application is 08SCBUCHC014,  
24 Kosher(phonetic) is the PI, 2.63 is the peer review score,

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 and the members of cognizance are Jennings and Latham.

2 DR. JENNINGS: Okay, so, the theme of this  
3 proposal is to use human embryonic stem cells as a source  
4 of material for repairing damaged cartilage, and so  
5 they're planning to use these reporter genes as genes that  
6 are known to be expressed during the development of  
7 cartilage lineage, specifically at the joints.

8 My take on this is it doesn't reach our  
9 threshold at this point. The referees have raised a  
10 number of concerns. They say although the aims are  
11 important, there is discussion on the potential problems  
12 in the experimental design. It's not discussed how well  
13 the reporter gene, which is a mouse gene, will work in  
14 human cells, which is obviously a critical issue, and how  
15 they'll evaluate the specificity, the expression.

16 They haven't looked at the efficiency of  
17 transfection. I'm just seeing a lot of questions, both  
18 about the technical --

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: That's time. May I have  
20 your recommendation?

21 DR. JENNINGS: I vote no.

22 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections to  
23 moving this grant application to the no category? Please  
24 move this application to the no category. One moment,

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 please.

2 Again, this is a grant that involves Dr.  
3 Arinzeh, and we will move to the next grant that does not  
4 have her as a member of cognizance, which would be  
5 08SCBUCHC018, sorry, 08SCB UConn 005, Conover(phonetic) is  
6 the PI, 3.25 is the peer review score, members of  
7 cognizance are Huang and Genel.

8 DR. GENEL: The peer review is very short,  
9 very concise and very dismissive. I think we move this to  
10 the no category.

11 DR. HUANG: I concur.

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections to  
13 moving this application to the no category? Please move  
14 this application to the no category.

15 Our next grant application for  
16 consideration is 08SCBYSME010, Powolic(phonetic), I  
17 apologize if I mispronounce that, 3.4 is the peer review  
18 score, and the members of cognizance are Canalis and  
19 Fishbone.

20 DR. CANALIS: What do I have, 30 seconds?  
21 These are donor cells from hemotopoetic stem cell  
22 transplants, and he wants to determine whether or not they  
23 were trans-differentiating to malignant cells. The  
24 scientific review considers the proposal diffused and

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 really not pertinent to stem cell research, and they feel  
2 that the experimental design is not as compelling as it  
3 should be, so I would favor this to go in the no category.

4 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections to  
5 moving this?

6 DR. CANALIS: He needs to comment. I'm  
7 sorry.

8 DR. FISHBONE: No, I have no objections.  
9 They're recommending that the authors are advised to  
10 change their approach.

11 MS. TOWNSHEND: Would that be a no  
12 recommendation, sir? Are there any objections to moving  
13 this to the no category? Please move this grant  
14 application to the no category. Do we have Dr. Arinzeh  
15 back on the phone?

16 MS. HORN: Dr. Arinzeh? We do not.

17 A MALE VOICE: I think we can probably  
18 speak to this last one fairly quickly.

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: All right. This is grant  
20 application 01SCBEVER001, Dew(phonetic) is the principal  
21 investigator, 3.5 is the peer review score. Please note  
22 propriety information.

23 DR. LATHAM: The peer reviewers describe  
24 this as a very poor application with very descriptive

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 speculative and non-novel aims and says that the major  
2 limitations of this application are all four of its  
3 specific aims.

4 I don't think I'd be willing to go forward  
5 with funding this one.

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections to  
7 placing this grant application in the no category? Please  
8 do so. Process recommendation at this point from  
9 Marianne, please?

10 MS. HORN: Let's move back onto 003.

11 DR. LATHAM: Is that the one that was set  
12 aside earlier that was Charles'?

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: No. 003 is  
14 Dorski(phonetic). All right. Under consideration at this  
15 time, this is a five-minute consideration and discussion,  
16 08SCBUCHC003, Dorski is the principal investigator, 2.1 is  
17 the peer review score, Arinzeh and Latham are the members  
18 of cognizance.

19 DR. LATHAM: I'll do the best I can with  
20 this. This is a project to use human embryonic stem cells  
21 to create regulatory T cells. It has three aims, first,  
22 to generate the T cells, secondly, to determine whether  
23 they undergo normal phonic(phonetic) maturation, and,  
24 finally, to further characterize the T cells generated

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 from human embryonic stem cells to assure that regulatory  
2 CD 4 plus T cells can be generated.

3 The reviewers on this are extremely  
4 enthusiastic about the capacity in the lab, about the  
5 particular reviewers and their relevant experience.  
6 Several times, the approaches mapped out in this project  
7 are described as state of the art.

8 The relatively poor score seems to be  
9 explained by the reviewer's feeling that the project may  
10 just not work out, that they may not be able to generate T  
11 cells from human embryonic stem cells that are not --  
12 that, when implanted, don't induce cancers, or that don't  
13 mature normally.

14 This is described by the peer reviewer as  
15 being an excellent proposal that exploits the strengths of  
16 several investigators in the areas at UConn. These  
17 studies appear state of the art, but high risk, but worth  
18 pursuing.

19 On that basis, I would favor putting it in  
20 the yes category, but I wish that a better scientist could  
21 speak to this.

22 DR. JENNINGS: Mr. Chairman, not having  
23 read the proposal at all, I see at the end it says Dr.  
24 Dorski appears to have published --

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 COURT REPORTER: Microphone?

2 DR. JENNINGS: Dr. Dorski appears to have  
3 published relatively little in the last several years and  
4 has only modest grant funding, however, his co-  
5 investigators have very strong track records.

6 I'm a little concerned about giving a high  
7 priority to something that's going to be led by somebody  
8 who has specifically been flagged by the referees as not  
9 having a strong track record, particularly as Stephen has  
10 drawn our attention to the fact that this is a high risk  
11 project.

12 In my view, the principal investigator's  
13 track record is a key consideration in funding decisions.  
14 It sounds like this one doesn't score as highly as some  
15 others.

16 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Charles, I think that  
17 this individual is an infectious disease -- is it an M.D.?

18 DR. JENNINGS: I defer to those who have  
19 read the review.

20 DR. LATHAM: Yes. He's an M.D., Ph.D.,  
21 David Dorski.

22 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: What's his first  
23 name?

24 DR. LATHAM: David.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah. I think he's  
2 the guy who is basically an infectious disease HIV guy, so  
3 he may -- I'm acquainted with him. He may not have done  
4 some research for considerable time after his --

5 DR. JENNINGS: -- doctor, but this cutting  
6 edge research with a high risk of failure. I think we'd  
7 do better to invest our money in people with a track  
8 record.

9 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Arinze, are you back  
10 on the line?

11 DR. ARINZE: I'm back, yes.

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: Thank you. Your timing is  
13 excellent. We are considering 08SCBUHC003, which is --

14 DR. ARINZE: I couldn't hear that.

15 MS. TOWNSHEND: Oh, I'm sorry. UCHC003 in  
16 the established investigator grant category. Dorski is  
17 the PI.

18 DR. ARINZE: Okay.

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: And there has been  
20 discussion. Dr. Latham, your recommendation once again?

21 DR. LATHAM: I was recommending yes. It  
22 was characterized solely really on the basis of the peer  
23 reviewer's characterizations of it as exploiting some  
24 skills that are available at UConn being very promising

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 and important research, but, at the same time, highly  
2 risky.

3 Dr. Jennings has pointed out that the PI on  
4 the grant is mentioned as not having produced a lot of  
5 research in recent years, and he wonders whether we ought  
6 to be funding a high risk grant with a PI whose  
7 productivity has been questioned by the peer reviewers.  
8 That's where it stands at this moment.

9 MS. TOWNSHEND: And your comments, Dr.  
10 Arinzeh?

11 DR. ARINZEH: I agree with what was said. I  
12 think it's a high risk proposal, so I agree. I would vote  
13 no.

14 MS. TOWNSHEND: It sounds like a maybe to  
15 me at this point, unless -- well we have a yes and a no.

16 DR. JENNINGS: I'm calling for a no.

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Latham was calling for  
18 a yes.

19 DR. LATHAM: I guess, realistically,  
20 looking at the amount of money that we have to spend here,  
21 I would be willing to convert over to a no.

22 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I also want to  
23 clarify my remarks, that if this is the same Dr. Dorski  
24 I'm acquainted with, he's a very accomplished clinician. I

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 was not aware that he was a researcher, so this may be a  
2 branching off of some of his activity in HIV. Since we're  
3 talking about CD 4 and T lymphocytes, I think this may be  
4 an avenue where he's branching out, but I happen to know  
5 him, and I don't think he's done an awful lot of this  
6 recently.

7 That was my only comment, that he's a very  
8 competent physician.

9 MS. TOWNSHEND: I believe the  
10 recommendation is no. Are there any objections to moving  
11 this grant application to the no category?

12 DR. HUANG: I have a recommendation. I  
13 recommend that we put it in the maybe category, because  
14 we're compiling a list of second tier grants that should  
15 we have the money become available, that we would know  
16 what to do with it.

17 And I think even though it's high risk,  
18 that it might be worthwhile.

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections to  
20 moving this to the maybe category? Please move this  
21 application to the maybe category.

22 Now up for consideration is 08SCB Yale 004,  
23 Coksis(phonetic) is the PI, the peer review score is 2.25,  
24 and the members of cognizance are Arinzeh and Fishbone.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 Five minutes.

2 DR. JENNINGS: Could I just clarify? This  
3 is sounding very familiar from a discussion yesterday,  
4 Coksis stem cell therapy in the spinal cord. They're  
5 implanting into the spinal cord and looking at the effects  
6 in the brain of the -- (multiple conversations).

7 A MALE VOICE: I reviewed that, but I don't  
8 think that was Coksis.

9 DR. JENNINGS: No. Coksis was a co-  
10 investigator on that grant. His name came up as a source  
11 of credibility for that.

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Fishbone or Dr.  
13 Arinzeh?

14 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I don't think we  
15 funded it.

16 DR. JENNINGS: Which one was it first? Can  
17 anybody figure that out? I thought it might have been in  
18 the yes seed grants category.

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: I do not have a list of the  
20 yes seed grants. I'll turn to my colleagues at CI.

21 DR. JENNINGS: We should discuss this one  
22 at its merits. If it looks like it might fly, we can  
23 evaluate the overlap.

24 MS. TOWNSHEND: Before the group right now

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 is this grant application. If we could have either Dr.  
2 Arinzeh or Dr. Fishbone give us some background with  
3 regard to this?

4 DR. FISHBONE: I could start, since I'm  
5 here. The project's purpose is to study the potential  
6 therapeutic effect of stem cell transplantation into the  
7 ingent spinal cord of non-human primates, so these are  
8 monkeys, and I think they're located at Yale.

9 I think it's a different kind of animal,  
10 non-human primate, than the ones we were discussing  
11 earlier. They want to basically derive neurospheres from  
12 human embryonic stem cells and, also, adult bone marrow  
13 derived human mesen chymal stem cells and inject them to  
14 promote functional recovery after spinal cord injury that  
15 they've created in the monkeys.

16 I think it's a four-year grant, and this is  
17 another one, where I had a little bit of problem between  
18 what the reviewer said and the number that it was given,  
19 in that they had many criticisms. One of them was the  
20 number of animals. There are four monkeys per year.

21 Another was in the controls. There's only  
22 one animal in control. The data, statistical analysis  
23 will not be good. They don't know how much they have to  
24 do to get a clear cut result. There are a lot of

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 criticisms, and I would have thought that this would have  
2 come in with a significantly higher score than it has,  
3 higher in number, not higher in rating, and I would put  
4 this in the no fund category.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Arinzeh?

6 DR. ARINZEH: Yeah, I agree with the  
7 reviewer and the comments about the lack of statistical  
8 power, so I would say no.

9 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections to  
10 moving this grant application to the no category?

11 DR. HUANG: I have a point of clarification  
12 in response to Dr. Jennings' question. Yesterday, the  
13 grant that he mentioned was Sosoki(phonetic), which is  
14 from the Yale Medical School. There is no overlap. That  
15 was to put human ES cell derived neurospheres into a rat  
16 model.

17 The only overlap is that they're using the  
18 same kind of cells.

19 DR. JENNINGS: Putting them in the spinal  
20 cord?

21 DR. HUANG: In the spinal cord, right.  
22 This is a (indiscernible) monkey proposal that we're  
23 dealing with now, and the investigators do not overlap.

24 DR. JENNINGS: Okay, great. Thank you.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: Thank you for the  
2 clarification. Are there any objections to moving grant  
3 application, I believe it's Yale 004, to the no category?  
4 Please move this grant application to the no category.

5 Still outstanding is 08SCBACTI002, Haney is  
6 the principal investigator, 3.0 is the peer review score,  
7 and the members of cognizance are Arinzeh and Latham.  
8 Just a reminder, this is below or above the 2.5, so it's a  
9 one-minute consideration.

10 DR. LATHAM: Dr. Arinzeh, you want to go?

11 DR. ARINZEH: Yeah.

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: I don't start the clock  
13 until you all start speaking, so you've got time.

14 DR. ARINZEH: Find my information. It's  
15 ACTI002, right?

16 MS. TOWNSHEND: Correct.

17 DR. ARINZEH: Okay. You want me to  
18 summarize?

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: Please.

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Please.

21 DR. ARINZEH: Okay. The purpose of this  
22 grant is to -- well, let's see. I guess improve the  
23 maintenance and expansion of stem cells by using an  
24 extracellular matrix that is being developed by this

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 company, Artificial Cell Technology, Inc., looking at the  
2 adult bone marrow derived, chymal stem cells, or the  
3 umbilical cord --

4 And, so, the matrix, itself, is  
5 interesting, however, the team, itself, lacks expertise in  
6 stem cell work, and so that's a major concern there, and  
7 then some of the experimental approaches are not correct.  
8 I would vote no.

9 MS. TOWNSHEND: Your recommendation is no?  
10 Are there any objections to moving this grant application  
11 to the no category? Please do so.

12 Up for consideration is 08SCBUCHC018,  
13 Antic(phonetic) is the PI, 3.0 is the peer review score,  
14 and the members of cognizance are Kiessling and Landwirth.

15 DR. KIESSLING: This goes in the category  
16 of it's really too bad we don't have more money. This is  
17 a very interesting application that takes advantage of the  
18 fact that somebody has shown that antidepressants actually  
19 stimulate new nerve development in the brain, and they  
20 want to use this antidepressant therapy to enhance  
21 transfer of hES cells differentiated into (indiscernible)  
22 neurons as a treatment for Parkinson's Disease.

23 So the idea is that one of the problems  
24 with Parkinson's disease treatment is that the transferred

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 stem cells don't do very well, and the idea is that if you  
2 could treat the animals with antidepressants, perhaps they  
3 would do better, and you would enhance their effect.

4 There's a lot of problems, there's a lot of  
5 technical problems with this grant, which it's a very,  
6 very long review, and I think the reviewers were struck by  
7 the fact that it would be wonderful if this worked.

8 One of the biggest problems is that they're  
9 using normal animals. They're not using diseased animals  
10 for their studies.

11 MS. TOWNSHEND: Do you have a  
12 recommendation?

13 DR. KIESSLING: Pardon me?

14 MS. TOWNSHEND: Do you have a  
15 recommendation? I'm sorry. The time is up.

16 DR. KIESSLING: We're going to have to put  
17 this in the no category.

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections to  
19 moving this grant application to the no category? Please  
20 move this grant application to the no category.

21 We'll go back to maybes, as I understand  
22 it.

23 DR. JENNINGS: What are we back to, please?

24 A MALE VOICE: We're going to do the

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 maybes.

2 MS. HORN: Dr. Arinzeh, just for your  
3 information, we already did one of your grants, which was  
4 the EVER001, and voted it no.

5 DR. ARINZEH: Okay. That's fine.

6 MS. HORN: Okay. We're moving onto maybes  
7 now.

8 MS. TOWNSHEND: We have three applications  
9 in the maybe category. I'm assuming we'll take them in  
10 the order, top to bottom here.

11 DR. HUANG: I have a procedural question.

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yes.

13 DR. HUANG: I think we've been treating the  
14 maybe category as a second tier yes. They don't have as  
15 high priority as the ones in the yes, but I'm not sure  
16 that we're going to have a final disposition one way or  
17 the other. They are the next ranking grants, so that if  
18 we have the money, we would fund them, so I'm not sure if  
19 it's worth further discussion at this point.

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: I'm going to look to the  
21 lawyers to see what our options are here.

22 MR. SALTON: Up until now, we have taken  
23 every maybe and made a determination of whether to move it  
24 to a yes or no. The only thing that's different, that has

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 changed, is that the committee has voted this concept of  
2 having reserve for the Redmond application, which is now  
3 going to be tabled until after we hear from Yale ESCRO.

4 So the issue would be whether or not --  
5 somehow you want to hold a maybe of this category as  
6 something that could pick up the 1.5 million dollars that  
7 in case the Redmond is not approved.

8 I would suggest, and that's not a legal  
9 issue, is that with the disposition of these maybes,  
10 you're still going to have, from all categories, more yes  
11 projects than you have money to spend, and what you will  
12 do in the next phase is sort out among the yes projects  
13 those which will be funded with the 10 million, and then  
14 you may have, for example, I don't know exactly if someone  
15 is keeping tally, you may have four or five million  
16 dollars of yes projects across all categories that are not  
17 approved or not funded, because we don't have sufficient  
18 funds.

19 Based on that, you may want to look at  
20 those as being the ones that are available to take up, be  
21 on the waiting list, so to speak, in case Redmond is not  
22 voted or Yale doesn't come across with an ESCRO approval  
23 of the Redmond program.

24 DR. JENNINGS: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, if

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 I may? Thank you, Henry. Could somebody tell us how much  
2 money we have committed at this stage to the yes category  
3 across all grant types?

4 MS. TOWNSHEND: I'll turn to my colleagues  
5 at CI.

6 DR. JENNINGS: And that's including  
7 Redmond.

8 DR. DAN WAGNER: Yes. With the maybes  
9 included, we have 16 million, 81,000 dollars, and that's  
10 including parts of the Rasmussen one that we were only  
11 going to fund parts one and two. I didn't know how that  
12 was divvied out, so we're on the high side of 16 million.

13 DR. JENNINGS: So we're over by 60 percent  
14 relative to where we need to be?

15 MR. SALTON: That includes these three  
16 maybes, though. Those three maybes are about a million,  
17 five.

18 DR. JENNINGS: And then that brings us down  
19 to 14 and a half million, so we're still 45 percent over  
20 where we need to be.

21 MR. SALTON: Correct.

22 DR. JENNINGS: We need to start making some  
23 harder decisions at this point, or at some point.

24 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah. Is it logical

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 to continue to consider the maybes when we know that we  
2 will have several million dollars worth of yes grants that  
3 are unfunded and --

4 DR. JENNINGS: That's my question.

5 MR. SALTON: If I may, Commissioner, I  
6 think it's not a matter of, unfortunately, of logic. We  
7 have to have a consistent process. In every other  
8 category we voted maybes into or out of -- into yes or no,  
9 and, so, these particular three projects, these  
10 researchers would have a legitimate claim that we kind of  
11 change our process midstream, and this is the same process  
12 we used last year.

13 We ended up voting all the maybes into yes  
14 or no, and we also ended up with yes applications that far  
15 exceeded the 20 million or 19.8 we had last year.

16 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, so, we're going  
17 to decide yes or no.

18 MR. SALTON: Decide these three, and then  
19 we will continue.

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay.

21 DR. LATHAM: So just as a strategic matter,  
22 what this means is if you want some of the things that are  
23 in the maybe category to be in the pot to be traded off  
24 against earlier core or other kinds of grants that we've

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 approved, some of which, by the way, have lower peer  
2 review scores than some of the things that are currently  
3 in the maybe category, then you would vote them into the  
4 yes, and then they'd be in the pot for additional  
5 deliberation.

6 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. Let's start to  
7 discuss those. I think the first one was the Dr. Dorski  
8 grant, which, as I understand, was a very interesting  
9 grant, but there was some doubt about whether the results  
10 could be achieved. Do we want to go back over that?

11 DR. WALLACK: Bob, if you want to go --  
12 didn't we have a maybe on 011 first?

13 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: What difference does  
14 it make? We've got to consider all three of them. Go  
15 ahead. Do 011 first. Do the one in the middle if you  
16 want first.

17 MS. TOWNSEND: We need lunch. We are  
18 considering UCHC011, 500,000 dollars, and the peer review  
19 score on that is 1.9. I apologize for my lack of  
20 organization. And the members of cognizance on that are  
21 Jennings and Genel.

22 DR. JENNINGS: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I  
23 think the --

24 COURT REPORTER: You've got to move the

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 microphone closer.

2 DR. JENNINGS: My own view as the reviewer  
3 is that it's probably stronger than some of the ones in  
4 the yes category, but I think that, just as a practical  
5 matter, we are going to have to triage everything in the  
6 maybe category, and probably something is going to have to  
7 yield in the yes category, as well.

8 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I just lost you.  
9 Something is going to have to yield in the yes category?

10 DR. JENNINGS: Yes, because even if we  
11 ditch the three maybes, we are still looking at 14 and a  
12 half million when we only have 10 million to spend.

13 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: We're not thinking  
14 about that. As Henry recapitulated very appropriately, we  
15 have to fish or cut bait with these three grants. Are  
16 they yes or no?

17 DR. JENNINGS: Okay. I'll vote no.

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Latham?

19 DR. LATHAM: I just wanted to make the same  
20 point I just made again to Charles, which is that this is  
21 a -- peer review score was what, 1.9? If it were voted  
22 yes and it gets into the pot, it will be going up against,  
23 for example, the Evergen core grant, which had a peer  
24 review score of 2.7 something, right?

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1                   So we're not having -- if you vote yes, you  
2 don't have to trade this against other grants here.  
3 You're trading them against the whole field.

4                   DR. JENNINGS: No. I understand that.

5                   MS. TOWNSHEND: So at consideration right  
6 now UCHC011.

7                   DR. JENNINGS: Who is the other reviewer?

8                   MS. TOWNSHEND: Genel.

9                   DR. GENEL: Well I think, for discussion  
10 purposes, I'd move it into the yes category.

11                   DR. JENNINGS: That's fine with me. I  
12 don't object.

13                   MS. TOWNSHEND: Do I hear any objections to  
14 moving this application to the yes category? Please do  
15 so.

16                   COMMISSIONER GALVIN: So everybody  
17 understand which one that is? Okay.

18                   COURT REPORTER: One moment, please.

19                   MS. TOWNSHEND: Up for consideration is  
20 UConn 006, Baher(phonetic) is the PI, 2.3 is the peer  
21 review score, and the members of cognizance are Huang and  
22 Genel.

23                   DR. HUANG: So I like this, and the reason  
24 I put it in the maybe was because I wanted to indicate

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 that it does not receive as high a priority as the ones  
2 that were originally listed under yes.

3 It's an important problem. This is the one  
4 for putting in the neuronal cells into Alzheimer's, mouse  
5 models of Alzheimer's disease, and the peer review said it  
6 was technically an excellent proposal, with just a few  
7 minor issues that could be easily addressed.

8 Those deal with cell death versus rejection  
9 and homogeneated to cell types. So I would put this in  
10 the yes category, but I would like to emphasize that I  
11 think it's not equal to all of the yeses. It's a yes  
12 category at a lower priority, but I think it should be  
13 funded.

14 DR. JENNINGS: Mr. Chairman, if I can just  
15 offer an opinion here? This, to me, looks like a weak  
16 proposal. I'm just reading the peer review comments here,  
17 which seems like the ultimate paragraph has what can be  
18 very serious technical issues, and I think the prospect of  
19 stem cell therapy for Alzheimer's disease is remote in  
20 contrast to Parkinson's, for instance. I would vote to  
21 put this in the no category, given the urgency of the  
22 decisions that we must make.

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Genel?

24 DR. GENEL: Well we've got to draw the line

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 somewhere, so I move it to the no category.

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: Other discussion? Do we  
3 need, at this point, to do a roll call vote with regard to  
4 this? I'm hearing a yes and a no.

5 MR. SALTON: If we don't have consensus,  
6 and we do have an objection from Dr. Huang to moving it to  
7 the no, then I think you have to move that to roll call  
8 vote.

9 DR. JENNINGS: Mr. Chairman, would it help  
10 if I were to read out the relevant sentences from the peer  
11 review?

12 DR. HUANG: Well I've already done that.  
13 This is technically an excellent proposal, with just a few  
14 minor issues that I think could be addressed, and then it  
15 goes over what those issues are. I don't think it's a bad  
16 grant. I think the peer review was actually a very good  
17 peer review.

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: At this time, we will take,  
19 unless I hear further discussion, we will take a roll call  
20 vote. A vote of yes would place this in the yes category.  
21 A vote of no would place this in the no category. Is  
22 that clear? Thank you.

23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Dr. Jennings, yes or  
24 no?

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: I'm sorry. Dr. Jennings?  
2 DR. JENNINGS: No.  
3 MS. TOWNSHEND: Mr. Mandelkern?  
4 MR. MANDELKERN: No.  
5 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: That's two nos? Dr.  
6 Huang?  
7 DR. HUANG: Yes.  
8 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yes. Gerry?  
9 DR. FISHBONE: Yes.  
10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Ann?  
11 DR. KIESSLING: Yes.  
12 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Julie?  
13 DR. LANDWIRTH: No.  
14 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Mike?  
15 MS. TOWNSHEND: Mike is a no? Dr. Galvin?  
16 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: No.  
17 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Arinzeh?  
18 DR. ARINZEH: No.  
19 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Canalis?  
20 DR. CANALIS: Abstain.  
21 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Wagers?  
22 DR. WAGERS: Yes.  
23 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Wallack?  
24 DR. WALLACK: Yes.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Latham?

2 DR. LATHAM: Yes.

3 MS. TOWNSHEND: We are at a tie. Dr.  
4 Canalis?

5 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: We have a tie.

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: We are considering  
7 application 006, which is Baher, peer review scored at  
8 2.3. A yes vote would place this in the yes category for  
9 consideration for funding at the end of this meeting, or a  
10 no vote would place this in the no category, which would  
11 put it out of consideration.

12 Do you need further information? It's just  
13 a yes or no, as to whether or not it should be considered  
14 for funding at the end. All members are eligible to vote.

15 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Is that a no vote,  
16 Dr. Canalis?

17 DR. CANALIS: It's an I abstain.

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: We're tied at six apiece.

19 DR. CANALIS: I don't have enough  
20 information.

21 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Genel?

22 DR. GENEL: I'm going to change my vote to  
23 yes.

24 MS. TOWNSHEND: Seven in favor.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 Abstentions are counted with the majority, so the motion  
2 passes. Please place this application in the yes  
3 category.

4 For consideration at this time is UCHC003,  
5 Dorski is the PI, 2.1 is the peer review score, members of  
6 cognizance are Arinzeh and Latham.

7 DR. LATHAM: Just to recap, this was  
8 characterized as an excellent study. This is to generate  
9 T cells from human embryonic stem cells and to test them  
10 in various ways. It was characterized as a fine study by  
11 the peer reviewers. The lead PI has not been academically  
12 productive recently, and Dr. Jennings raised a question  
13 about that.

14 The study was characterized as using UConn  
15 personnel and resources very well, being state of the art  
16 study, but being high risk of having -- of not succeeding.

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: Do you have a  
18 recommendation?

19 DR. LATHAM: My recommendation is no.

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: Further discussion?

21 MS. HORN: Dr. Arinzeh?

22 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Arinzeh?

23 DR. ARINZEH: Still no.

24 MS. TOWNSHEND: Further discussion?

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I would just like to  
2 comment that Dr. Dorski is a full-time academician that  
3 has been involved in academic matters. I'm just unaware  
4 whether in the last two or three years he's been involved  
5 in this different kind of research, although he does have  
6 the availability of the entire campus to support it.

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: Any further discussion?  
8 Are there any objections to placing this application in  
9 the no category? Please do so. One moment. Dr.  
10 Fishbone?

11 DR. FISHBONE: I have an objection on the  
12 basis that it may be a high risk study, but if it has a  
13 lot of merit to it, I mean you sometimes have to support  
14 things that are high flyers, you know, that don't  
15 necessarily -- that are going to be difficult to do, but  
16 if the results are there, it would be worthwhile of  
17 putting it on the list.

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: At this time, a roll call  
19 vote of the entire committee, unless there is further  
20 discussion. Yes, meaning it will be placed in the yes  
21 category. No, meaning it will be placed in the no  
22 category. Dr. Jennings?

23 DR. JENNINGS: No.

24 MS. TOWNSHEND: Mr. Mandelkern?

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 MR. MANDELKERN: No.  
2 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Huang?  
3 DR. HUANG: No.  
4 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Fishbone?  
5 DR. FISHBONE: Yes.  
6 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Kiessling?  
7 DR. KIESSLING: No.  
8 A MALE VOICE: No.  
9 A MALE VOICE: No.  
10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yes.  
11 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Arinzeh?  
12 DR. ARINZEH: No.  
13 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Canalis?  
14 DR. CANALIS: Abstain.  
15 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Wagers?  
16 DR. WAGERS: No.  
17 A MALE VOICE: No.  
18 MS. TOWNSHEND: This application will be  
19 placed in the no category, just in time for lunch. Mr.  
20 Chair?  
21 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I would suggest that  
22 we secure what lunches we want and either eat  
23 expeditiously or bring your chow back with you, so we can  
24 get into the afternoon part of the program, so 15 minutes,

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 if you can. I don't want anybody to get indigestion or  
2 need a Heimlich maneuver. We don't need to wander. We  
3 need to get back here at about 10 after 12:00.

4 MS. HORN: Dr. Arinzeh, we're going to  
5 reconvene about 10 after 12:00.

6 DR. ARINZEH: Okay.

7 MS. HORN: Thank you. Thanks for hanging  
8 in there.

9 (Lunch recess)

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: If anyone, Mr.  
11 Wollschlager, in particular, has another suggestion, we  
12 would like to hear it, but this is the way we anticipate  
13 proceeding for this afternoon, that you consider first the  
14 group applications, followed by the core applications.  
15 I'm sorry. Core first, followed by group, so it looks  
16 like we're actually working from right to left here.

17 Henry, perhaps you can explain the  
18 rationale better than I with regard to the procedural  
19 aspects of this. Also, one note from the  
20 transcriptionist, please do not eat chips while you are on  
21 microphone.

22 MR. SALTON: What we did last year was to  
23 look at core and then group, I think on the fundamental  
24 basis that these grants are very large amounts of money,

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 and we can consider whether we want to fully fund or not  
2 fund these, and that would then provide the greatest  
3 benefit for creating room underneath the cap for the other  
4 projects.

5                   So if you start with seeds and you go,  
6 well, we're going to take 20 percent off a 200,000-dollar  
7 grant, it's only 40,000. It really doesn't have a big  
8 impact of trying to reach our budget number, but if you  
9 start with a core that's two and a half million dollars  
10 and you say I'm going to cut it by one million, that's  
11 going to have a substantial impact on funding the smaller  
12 scale projects. That's the rationale. Something I made  
13 up.

14                   MS. TOWNSHEND: Is that satisfactory to the  
15 group? Also, my understanding is that when considering  
16 the grants at this point, consensus consideration is no  
17 longer in play, and that we will use only the list of  
18 people who are eligible to vote on each grant when  
19 considering the funding for that grant.

20                   So if you are ineligible, and I do have  
21 lists of who is eligible, I will announce, will do a roll  
22 call, I suppose, and clarify how people will be voting  
23 based on the motion at hand. Dr. Latham?

24                   DR. LATHAM: Is there any limitation on

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 participating in the discussion prior to the vote?

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: I don't believe there has  
3 been in the past.

4 MR. SALTON: The answer to that question is  
5 yes, that I think, if you're disqualified, because we're  
6 now making funding allocations and voting on funding, if  
7 you're disqualified, you should not be participating in  
8 the discussion on the application.

9 MS. TOWNSHEND: I apologize. I thought he  
10 meant talking with regard to how much time would be  
11 allotted. Is there a time limit that we are allotting for  
12 each --

13 MR. SALTON: No.

14 MS. TOWNSHEND: Okay.

15 DR. GENEL: I think it's important if you  
16 remind us what the peer review scores were on these  
17 applications, and I think that that has to be a factor  
18 that we take very seriously in the consideration.

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: So noted. When looking at  
20 these applications, are we taking them in the peer review  
21 score lowest to highest? Best to worst? (Multiple  
22 conversations) Core is right there. Those are the three  
23 cores that are in the yes category?

24 A MALE VOICE: Yes.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: So the available cash  
2 is nine million, eight hundred thousand dollars, minus 10  
3 percent. 9.8 is the 10 million, minus 200,000 dollars for  
4 expenses, and then we have at least 10 percent must go to  
5 seed grants, is that correct?

6 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: That's correct.

7 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, so, we actually  
8 have 9.8 minus 1.9, so we have about 8.8?

9 DR. JENNINGS: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman.  
10 Can you clarify the 1.9?

11 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. Ten percent.  
12 We don't have 10 million. We have 9,800,000, because we  
13 have to take our expenses out. Of that 9,800,000 dollars,  
14 10 percent must, at least must go to seed grants, which is  
15 980,000 dollars, is that correct, Warren?

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yes.

17 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, so, we actually  
18 have 8.1. So we have 8.82 available if we consider that  
19 10 percent is reserved for seed grants.

20 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Again, this body already  
21 decided to put in ESCRO about 1.42 million that is not  
22 going to be available for awarding today.

23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, so, we got  
24 about 7.4, 7.42.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 DR. GENEL: With regard to the contingency,  
2 I thought we agreed that we would come up with a secondary  
3 list of grants that would be funded in the event that the  
4 Redmond grant cannot be funded, so that we ought to have a  
5 contingency. While we're here, we ought to develop a  
6 contingency, so that we know what we would do  
7 automatically.

8 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I think that came up  
9 last year, what would we do if a grant just fell apart and  
10 we didn't fund one for some reason, and I think our  
11 consensus at that time was we would probably have three or  
12 four alternative grants ranked one, two, three and four,  
13 and if something happened and the 1.42 million wasn't  
14 funded, then we would go into this group of four, and  
15 maybe we'd need five, just to make sure we have enough to  
16 take the first -- and I think we would want to designate  
17 at the first alternate, the second alternate, or maybe  
18 not, but we need to figure, okay, if we have five that  
19 were not funded, but were top of the list, are we going to  
20 rank them individually, or by category, or the like, but  
21 we can discuss that. Yes, Dr. Canalis?

22 DR. CANALIS: I was thinking for a change,  
23 Commissioner --

24 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I thought I asked you

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 to stop that.

2 DR. CANALIS: It's a bad habit. Even  
3 though we put the money in reserve, what we need to make  
4 sure at the end of the day that that grant receives equal  
5 treatment. So if this committee were to decide to, let's  
6 say, make a 20 percent cut across the board, that should  
7 be also incurred in that particular grant.

8 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: That's an excellent  
9 suggestion.

10 DR. CANALIS: The thing that we need to  
11 keep in mind that we do not need to -- we can debate, as  
12 well, but the fact that we set money aside doesn't mean  
13 that this particular grant should receive any preferential  
14 treatment or we're going to start making cuts.

15 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: That's a very good  
16 point. Thank you, and I would really like you to keep on  
17 thinking like that. That's helpful.

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: Any other comments,  
19 questions, concerns? Then we will begin with the core  
20 grant funding considerations, those eligible for  
21 discussion, and I do want to know if Dr. Arinzeh and Dr.  
22 Kiessling are on line.

23 MS. HORN: I don't believe so. Dr.  
24 Arinzeh? Dr. Kiessling?

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: I think they will be key to  
2 this process, if we can somehow -- so she's not on the  
3 phone yet?

4 MS. HORN: Can you just check and make sure  
5 the phone didn't do one of its expiration things while we  
6 were at lunch? It looks green. It looks like everything  
7 is on.

8 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: While we're doing  
9 that, maybe Henry and Marianne can refresh my memory. To  
10 approve funding, it would have to be a majority of those  
11 able to vote?

12 MR. SALTON: Yes.

13 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, so, not a  
14 majority of members, but a majority of those individuals  
15 able to vote.

16 MR. SALTON: I'm sorry. Say that again?

17 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: If we approve  
18 something, it has to be approved by a majority of the  
19 individuals who are able to vote on it, or a majority of  
20 the entire committee. In other words, if there's 16 of us  
21 and five can't vote, it has to be a majority, six out of  
22 11?

23 MR. SALTON: Okay, so, let me go over the  
24 rules briefly. A quorum, first of all, must be assembled

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 among those who are qualified to vote. So we have,  
2 correct me, our committee is made up of 13 members?

3 MS. HORN: Yes.

4 MR. SALTON: Okay, so, you have to have at  
5 least seven persons qualified to vote here to vote. If  
6 you don't have seven people, then you can't call quorum.

7 Assuming that you have seven qualified  
8 members present to vote on the particular application, you  
9 need a majority of seven to pass a grant application. You  
10 need four.

11 MS. TOWNSHEND: If we take Dr.  
12 Lin's(phonetic) core application right now, we have nine  
13 members of the committee without conflict, who are able to  
14 vote on this. I'm just trying to clarify this.

15 MR. SALTON: You need a majority of those  
16 voting to pass anything, so you have to have seven is the  
17 minimum, but let's say that everybody was here to vote, no  
18 one was disqualified, then you need seven, that would be a  
19 majority of those present and voting to get it passed.  
20 Four would be the minimum.

21 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Why don't we  
22 delineate who could vote on everything?

23 A MALE VOICE: We've lost two voters,  
24 though, right?

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah.

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: That's my concern, is that  
3 there are -- I'm just taking as an example Yale 004. We  
4 have nine members of the committee eligible to vote on it,  
5 seven who are physically present, two who would be joining  
6 us by phone, so we can proceed with --

7 MS. HORN: Yes. On the Lin grant, we have  
8 seven. We'll have to go grant-by-grant.

9 MS. TOWNSHEND: All right, so, for  
10 consideration at this time is 08SCD Yale 004, Dr. Lin is  
11 the principal investigator, 1.45 is the peer review score,  
12 the request for monetary funding is 2.5 million dollars.

13 DR. WALLACK: I was involved in yesterday's  
14 discussion, and I supported the grant. I still support  
15 the grant. I support it for a variety of reasons. It  
16 insures the continuation of the work at Yale, however,  
17 from my perspective, it has added elements, and the added  
18 elements that we're talking about, and it's noted in the  
19 peer review summary, is that the project is essential to  
20 the future of stem cell research at Yale, but it goes on  
21 to say and, also, in the state in general.

22 I think that part of the rationale behind  
23 that is that this particular grant, as I understand it at  
24 least, identifies two major advances in technology, which

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 is going to be accessible, again, as I understand it, to  
2 the entire state.

3 That's the Celexa DNA sequencing technology  
4 that will be housed at Yale and, also, the  
5 illumigenome(phonetic) analyzer, which goes hand-in-hand  
6 with another aspect of what I think will be happening as  
7 we go forward, and that's the consideration of where we  
8 are with the whole project on genomics.

9 So I think that, for a variety of reasons,  
10 as I tried to discuss yesterday, it has a tremendous value  
11 in going forward, not only for itself, but added value for  
12 the entire state, so I would recommend the funding of the  
13 project, as stated, 2.5.

14 MS. TOWNSHEND: Just for point of  
15 clarification, those who may debate on this particular and  
16 discuss on this particular application, and those are only  
17 the people who may vote on it, is that correct, would be  
18 Dr. Arinzeh, Dr. Canalis, Dr. Huang, Dr. Jennings, Dr.  
19 Kiessling, Dr. Wagers, Dr. Fishbone, Mr. Mandelkern and  
20 Dr. Wallack. Further discussion?

21 DR. CANALIS: I was the other reviewer, and  
22 I do concur with the funding of this core grant. I cannot  
23 concur with the funding of the grant in its totality,  
24 because of the limited amount of funds available for the

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 program.

2 Basically, we are shy of about six million  
3 dollars, so, you know, if we were to fund all the grants  
4 that are in the yes category, they would be funded at the  
5 62 percent level. So since core grants represent such a  
6 large proportion of the funds, before we made a decision  
7 on the amount to be funded, we need to look at the entire  
8 program.

9 So whereas I am in full agreement that this  
10 core grant must be funded, the issue is at what level? In  
11 fairness to the other grants, I mean, we need to be  
12 uniform with the rest of the core grants.

13 DR. WALLACK: I think what Ernie has  
14 indicated is it's a reality that we deal with. I  
15 specifically identified a significant portion of the  
16 monies that would be allocated by identifying how the  
17 technology would aid not only Yale, but the rest of the  
18 state.

19 Now in finalizing the amounts, if we have  
20 to go in that direction, as I'm sure we'll have to do,  
21 readdress the exact number as Ernie suggests, I think that  
22 that should be an open question.

23 DR. JENNINGS: Mr. Chairman, if I can  
24 comment? I broadly agree with Ernie's comments. I think

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 we should be clearly funding this, but if we ask where are  
2 we going to save 5.8 million dollars, this is a large  
3 grant, and I think there's an opportunity to do so here.

4 We already are strongly supportive of  
5 continuing to fund this core, but there will be another  
6 cycle we hope next year, and, as I understand, this is for  
7 is it two years for funding or is it for four years?

8 DR. CANALIS: I believe two.

9 DR. JENNINGS: This is two years. I don't  
10 see that --

11 MS. TOWNSHEND: I understand it's three  
12 years.

13 DR. JENNINGS: Three years. I don't think  
14 that we have to commit at this stage to supporting it in  
15 full at the requested level for three years, so I do see  
16 an opportunity to cut here, recognizing that we are  
17 likely, as long as the core continues to provide good  
18 service, that we're likely to want to continue funding it.

19 DR. WALLACK: The only thing that I would  
20 note, though, Charles, in your comments is that I was  
21 impressed with the letters of support, if you will, having  
22 to do with one part of the technology. I'm not into the  
23 stem cell research, the research, itself, but it appeared  
24 to me in reading the grant that the inclusion of the

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 celexa DNA sequencing technology capability would be  
2 something that we would probably want to leave in.

3 As I read that, that was an item in the  
4 ballpark of 500,000 dollars.

5 DR. JENNINGS: That would be nice upgrade.  
6 I mean a lot of other people have, apart from stem cell  
7 researchers, who wanted to use sequencing technology, and  
8 they would question, I mean not having read the grant, I  
9 wonder to what extent that would be used to support  
10 things, other than stem cell research, but I think, you  
11 know, the bottom line is that we must save five and a  
12 half, 5.8 million dollars, and this core is going to  
13 continue even if we don't give them the full two and a  
14 half at this point.

15 MR. MANDELKERN: I would like to take a  
16 moment to also, aside from the science, when we looked at,  
17 well, when I looked at yesterday the correlation between  
18 all of the commitments across institutions, the possible  
19 benefits of the State of Connecticut, the entire core  
20 grant was very closely correlated with all of our goals.

21 Aside with the science standing so high and  
22 all the correlation with Connecticut goal standing so  
23 high, I would propose that we go ahead and put it in the  
24 full funded and see where we can possibly not full fund

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 others, and then see what the totals are, and then see  
2 what we have to cut, rather than starting what I feel, and  
3 this will be my final comment, is an outstanding core  
4 continuation, which is necessary for the continuation of  
5 outstanding scientific stem cell research in the State of  
6 Connecticut to lead us to a state of excellence, we should  
7 fund full, because of its great merit, and then look later  
8 to cut, if necessary.

9 MS. TOWNSHEND: Comments from the --

10 DR. WALLACK: -- comfortable with Bob's  
11 comment.

12 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I think I can  
13 comment. As a generality, I'm just going to say that I  
14 think that the group has to make a decision, as to whether  
15 they're going to look at grants individually and cut them  
16 by or change them by various fractions, or is the group  
17 going to look at categories and apply a percentage to  
18 everything in the category, I think we did that with some  
19 of the grants last year, or are we going to do it grant by  
20 grant by grant?

21 I think there are some qualitative  
22 differences, and I think, as we proceed, we need to  
23 consider are we going to look at one grant and then  
24 consider where some other grants fall out, and some other

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 grants fall out, and then keep going back?

2 I can see a process of going back and forth  
3 and adjusting these things, rather than having an overall  
4 scheme, so I'm not advocating cutting or not cutting any  
5 grant, but I think we need what is the scheme and what is  
6 our protocol for looking at, as Dr. Canalis says, we have  
7 60 percent?

8 DR. CANALIS: Sixty-two percent.

9 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: We can fund six out  
10 of every 10 on the average.

11 DR. JENNINGS: Mr. Chairman, if I can  
12 comment? I'm opposed to the idea of cutting across the  
13 board. I regard that as the last resort, if we can't come  
14 up with anything better. I think there's wide divergence  
15 between these grants, in terms of the amount that could be  
16 cut. I favor a grant-by-grant approach, at least  
17 initially, and if we finally have to cut across the board,  
18 then --

19 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yes. I think, as  
20 long as we -- I don't think we can -- maybe Henry can  
21 advise me. I think, if we start doing it one way, we  
22 can't change. We get to the point where we'd say, okay,  
23 now we're going to cut everybody else by 28 and a half  
24 percent. I think we need to know in the beginning how

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 we're going to do this. Yes, Mike?

2 DR. GENEL: May I make a suggestion to  
3 expedite our work? I would suggest that we set some  
4 rather open-ended limits to the various categories, so  
5 that we have an idea of what we're working with, and then  
6 fine tune that, so, in other words, if we can agree that  
7 we will allocate, all be it arbitrary, five million --  
8 huh?

9 DR. CANALIS: Did you read?

10 DR. GENEL: I can see what's there. That's  
11 what we've approved. What I'm suggesting is that we  
12 define a number for each of those categories, define what  
13 we're going to work within that, and then fine tune after  
14 we get through that, so if we're going to allocate 50  
15 percent of our allocated money to core grants, let's agree  
16 with that now and then work from that.

17 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: That's what I'm  
18 saying.

19 DR. GENEL: Yeah, so, I think we ought to  
20 do that before we start chipping away at the individual  
21 grants.

22 DR. LANDWIRTH: If at all possible, I would  
23 suggest that we -- whatever calculation route we take is  
24 that we leave the seed grants for last. In other words,

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 try to protect those seed grants as long as we can.

2 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I think that is  
3 reasonable. Dr. Canalis and Bob is next.

4 DR. CANALIS: We also need some uniformity  
5 the categories. Some of these grants scored virtually the  
6 same score, so we could become very subjective in saying  
7 this grant deserves all the funds and the other one does  
8 not. I think we have to be careful with that.

9 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: What I'm saying is --

10 DR. CANALIS: We made decisions. We can  
11 become very subjective, and I know you guys don't like  
12 across the board decisions, but those are less subjective.

13 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Well I think there is  
14 a good deal of subjectivity that I've seen introduced  
15 about who the researcher is, and who is going to come from  
16 another place, and what percentage of time, so there are a  
17 lot of things that are difficult to quantify, and I think  
18 --

19 DR. KIESSLING: Hello?

20 MS. HORN: Dr. Kiessling?

21 DR. KIESSLING: Yes. This 84 north  
22 calling.

23 MS. HORN: Thank you.

24 DR. KIESSLING: 84 east, I guess.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. I think that  
2 what we need is as fair a scheme for allocating things for  
3 the various groups as possible and to see if we get as far  
4 away from subjectivity as we can, as long as we know how  
5 we're going to do this and then don't stop in the middle  
6 and say I guess we got to do it some different kind of  
7 way. Yes, Mr. Mandelkern?

8 MR. MANDELKERN: I think if we proceed on a  
9 grant-by-grant consideration without limitation, there are  
10 three core grants that we voted yes, and there are exactly  
11 two group grants. We could have already been through  
12 those considerations if we had not been focusing on  
13 procedure.

14 I think we should move rapidly through the  
15 grant-by-grant what we feel is the most worthwhile  
16 funding, then, when we've gone through that, we can take  
17 an overall view, rather than taking an overall view before  
18 we make our first step.

19 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I don't think that's  
20 the sentiment of the other members around the table. As  
21 long as we know how you're going to do it, then do it the  
22 same way throughout. So if you want to do it grant-by-  
23 grant, go ahead.

24 DR. FISHBONE: I think -- if I may speak?

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yes.

2 DR. FISHBONE: I think the suggestion that  
3 Mike had, Dr. Genel had, is a very good one, and that is  
4 we decide how much we're going to allocate to cores and  
5 how much we're going to allocate to groups, otherwise, we  
6 could use up all the money in the cores and the project  
7 grants, and then there's nothing left for anything else.

8 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yes?

9 DR. GENEL: We can play all day. I just  
10 want to throw out some numbers here. Schematically, what  
11 I would do is put the seed, put one large group of seed  
12 grants and established investigators, and it's basically,  
13 if you will, individual investigator grants, and  
14 arbitrarily allocate half of the money available.

15 That can be split in those categories and  
16 the other half for the core grants and for the group  
17 projects. So I come up with the number of 4.8 million  
18 that would be available for seed and established  
19 investigators and five million that would be available for  
20 group and core grants, because, as I understand it, we're  
21 going to reserve 200,000 dollars for that, and I'm  
22 including the potential funding for the Redmond grant  
23 within that.

24 And then, just being arbitrary, I'd break

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 it down, seed grants, 1.6 million. That's more than 10  
2 percent, which was what our minimum was. It's less than  
3 we have, but 1.6 million, establish 3.2 million, which is  
4 double, just arbitrarily double the seed grant money, two  
5 million for group and three million for cores, and use  
6 that as just sort of rough boundaries and see if we can  
7 get to there and then work at the margins.

8 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Ernesto?

9 DR. CANALIS: What I was going to propose  
10 is not that different. I would have proposed to make 62  
11 percent of each category. Mike is proposing 50 percent,  
12 two different splits, but the reality is that we have 62  
13 percent of the funds, so you can allocate 62 percent, that  
14 would be 2.2, 62. In each category, you allocate 62  
15 percent, and then you debate each category individually.

16 So we're not that far. We're talking 50,  
17 two different splits. I'm talking 60, you know, across  
18 the board, and then deciding by category.

19 DR. GENEL: The only difference is I was  
20 trying to do it on theoretical categorical grants.

21 DR. CANALIS: I'll go along with what you  
22 suggested.

23 DR. GENEL: And then using that at least to  
24 come up with some sort of rough idea of where we want to

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 be.

2 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Amy?

3 DR. WAGERS: I guess I wanted to say two  
4 things. One is that I wanted to bring up the point that  
5 we started with about the importance of the peer review  
6 score and looking across the board more globally at the  
7 peer review scores, not necessarily in a per category way,  
8 but maybe perhaps a ranking of all of the proposals  
9 together, based on peer review score, to see whether we  
10 might -- we might end up having to lose some grants that  
11 we wanted to fund, simply because the funding line that  
12 we've drawn is beyond what we can afford to support.

13 And then the second point that I wanted to  
14 make, and this is sort of a discussion for later, when we  
15 really decide on funding allocation, is that I would  
16 actually favor, instead of us deciding which parts of a  
17 grant we will and won't fund, allowing, you know, if  
18 they're going to cut funding, allowing the investigators  
19 to come back with a revised budget, because they may have  
20 knowledge of alternative sources of support for certain  
21 elements of their proposal that we don't know.

22 If we decide that cutting the proposed  
23 funding is necessary, I would argue that we should allow  
24 them to make a decision in which areas that funding will

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 be cut.

2 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I think Henry --  
3 thank you, Amy. I think Henry made the, Attorney Salton,  
4 made the comment last year about you could cut the grant  
5 back so much that it wouldn't resemble anything like the  
6 original proposal, and I think he had some apprehensions  
7 that we would, if a certain grant were a million and a  
8 half dollars and we cut them back to 650, they might make  
9 changes such that it wasn't really the grant that we voted  
10 on, so there's some difficulties there. I will get to you  
11 in a moment, Bob.

12 I think there is a great merit of deciding  
13 what percentage of our monies we want to go in one place  
14 or another and then rearranging within the groups. We may  
15 end up not funding something that has a very good rating,  
16 because something else is more in line with our thinking,  
17 or is innovative, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera.

18 I do think that Mike's comments about  
19 dividing the monies and Ernie's comments about dividing  
20 the monies into certain categories and then at least  
21 having a go at working out what we need to do in the  
22 categories, otherwise, we're going to be going back and  
23 forth.

24 If we take some money from this one and

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 fund the next one, what about the third one, or do we want  
2 to go back to the first one and give them a little less,  
3 it's going to be a long afternoon.

4 DR. WALLACK: Let me make one other point,  
5 Amy. I think that peer review scores need to be looked at  
6 differently in the various categories, because the peer  
7 review for a core grant or a project grant is not likely  
8 to have the same degree of variability or magnitude that  
9 would be for, say, a seed grant, so I think they need to  
10 be looked at separately.

11 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah. I think that  
12 if we took one of the major universities and cut them  
13 750,000 dollars, they would, not picking out one or the  
14 other, that they would find a way to make up the deficit,  
15 but if we cut three seed grants, 22 hundred, 50,000  
16 dollars each, that's three new scientists that we don't  
17 attract to Connecticut, so there's some qualitative  
18 difference in that.

19 I don't lose much sleep at night worrying  
20 about whether the two major universities can make up  
21 financial shortfalls. That's up to their presidents and  
22 their medical structure and the like.

23 I am concerned about brain drain and  
24 bringing new innovative sciences to the state and keeping

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 post-docs here. Did you have a comment, Bob?

2 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes, I did have a comment.

3 COURT REPORTER: One moment, please.

4 MR. MANDELKERN: We have now 25 grants in  
5 total in the yes category. I have every confidence that  
6 if we were to proceed to look grant-by-grant, evaluate  
7 them, fund them, we could discriminate between many maybes  
8 that we pushed into yeses and say that they now don't  
9 warrant funding.

10 I have confidence in this committee that if  
11 we will begin to move through this process, rather than  
12 arbitrarily say this takes so much, that takes so much, or  
13 to cut dramatically through the whole bunch, would defeat  
14 our purpose of being challenged to do this with the best  
15 of our ability.

16 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: All right. What is  
17 the sense of the group? Do you want to do these piecemeal  
18 and seriatim, or do them underneath the scheme of our  
19 modified Mike Genel scheme?

20 MR. SALTON: Commissioner, can I make just  
21 one observation? I take it that Mr. Genel's scheme is  
22 just -- these are just rough caps. These are not fixed  
23 caps for the committee, because if we did fixed caps, that  
24 should have been something we -- these are just targets,

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 general targets.

2 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: First cut.

3 MR. SALTON: These are just general  
4 targets, and if it turns out that -- if you find something  
5 that's critically good that you want to expand in one  
6 category by, you know, we said we're going stay two  
7 million, well let's go to 2.5, because we really want to  
8 do this, these are just targets.

9 The only minimum is the 980,000 for the  
10 seeds. Nothing else is fixed here. We're just doing  
11 targets.

12 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. It seems to me  
13 the consensus of the group -- no? You're just waving to  
14 me? Hi, Warren.

15 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Thank you. I would only  
16 point out that I heard folks say that the seed grants are  
17 a priority, and that you can't cut from those seed grants.

18 I like to try to get at the bottom line by eliminating  
19 the available funds.

20 If, for instance, you knew you were going  
21 to fund all of those seed grants out there and you  
22 couldn't cut them, because you need 200,000, or you can't  
23 cut more than 10 percent, whatever the number would be  
24 across, you would know how much money is off the table,

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 and then I would proceed by category, so I'm just making a  
2 minor suggestion to Dr. Genel.

3 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Your suggestion is to  
4 decide on the seed grants.

5 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Right.

6 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: A dollar amount.

7 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Did the group want to  
8 fund all the seed grants, because it's a priority for this  
9 group? If so, well, we just took 200, or whatever it is,  
10 2.2 million off the table.

11 DR. JENNINGS: I don't favor that approach.  
12 I think we need to look at the big grants first. Our  
13 first priority is to take a first cut at having 5.8  
14 million, and I think everything is on the table until  
15 we've figured out how we're going to do that.

16 I'm happy to go with Mike's proposal, since  
17 it gives us some sort of framework that we can get  
18 started. The only thing I'm not happy with is continuing  
19 to debate procedural --

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yes.

21 DR. JENNINGS: It's now 1:00 almost.

22 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: All right. Mike, do  
23 you want to put your scheme up, or maybe Warren could put  
24 the --

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 DR. GENEL: These were intended to be  
2 targets, and the targets would be in four categories, two  
3 general categories, first of all, and that is individual  
4 investigator grants, and then group and core grants, so  
5 individual investigators I would have a target of 1.6  
6 million, established investigators, 3.2 million, and then  
7 the second category, group grants, 2.0 million, and core  
8 grants, 3.0.

9 2.0 as a target for the group, and my  
10 suggestion is that we try and get close to that, and then  
11 work at the margins to refine that.

12 DR. JENNINGS: I support that.

13 MR. MANDELKERN: Warren, could you move  
14 that to the center, please?

15 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Sure.

16 MS. HORN: I'm just going to take a moment  
17 here to read this to the folks on the phone. Do we still  
18 have Dr. Arinzeh and Dr. Kiessling?

19 DR. KIESSLING: Yes.

20 MS. HORN: Dr. Arinzeh? We have Dr.  
21 Kiessling. Did you hear any of that? We have a proposal  
22 that we fund as targets individual seed grants for  
23 individual investigators, 1.6 million, for established  
24 investigators, 3.2 million, group, 2.0 million, and core,

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 3.0 million.

2 DR. KIESSLING: How many for group grants?

3 MS. HORN: Two million. These are just  
4 rough targets. They can be adjusted, but it gives us a  
5 starting point.

6 DR. KIESSLING: I'm sorry. Tell me again,  
7 what was the seed grant target and core grant target?

8 MS. HORN: Okay. The seed grant is 1.6  
9 million, and the core is three million.

10 DR. KIESSLING: Okay.

11 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Do you want to start  
12 with core?

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: We will start with the core  
14 grant. Again, under consideration is 08SCD Yale 004, Lin  
15 is the principal investigator, 1.45 is the peer review  
16 score, the request for funding was two and a half million  
17 dollars.

18 DR. WALLACK: Back to the discussion that  
19 we initiated at the outset, picking up on the idea of what  
20 we're looking at here. I would think that if we looked at  
21 trying to trim some of the technology, I think that, and,  
22 please, somebody, if they can help me with this, I think,  
23 if you trim the illuminigenome analyzer, you're trimming  
24 about 500,000 dollars.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1                   That would bring the Yale core, if I'm  
2 right on what I'm talking about with this, down to two  
3 million dollars, so that rather than -- I would try the  
4 whole the celexa DNA sequencing technology for the reasons  
5 that we've also discussed, and that is that there's a  
6 benefit not only to Yale with that technology, but also to  
7 the University of Connecticut.

8                   DR. FISHBONE: Could I raise a question?  
9 Could I ask a question?

10                  MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Fishbone?

11                  DR. FISHBONE: Thank you. It seems to me  
12 one of the problems here is that we're sort of comparing  
13 apples and oranges in some ways, and that some of the  
14 grants are for four years, some of the established  
15 investigators are for four years, and, if I recall last  
16 year, because we were relatively short of funds, we  
17 decided to fund the core grant for a two-year period. Is  
18 my recollection correct?

19                  MS. TOWNSHEND: Yes.

20                  DR. FISHBONE: And what I'm wondering is if  
21 one way -- you know, I think it's hard when you're funding  
22 every year and you have a limited fund to fund somebody  
23 for four years, and if maybe we took that similar  
24 approach, which was to fund for two years, we might be

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 able to have the money go significantly further.

2 DR. WALLACK: I'm going to make a  
3 correction, and that is that the technology, I think, is  
4 the same technology, so that Amy brought up a direction  
5 that we may want to go into and to eliminate this whole  
6 discussion about what aspect of the grants that we would  
7 be asking anybody to cut, I think that was Amy's  
8 suggestion, that we just cut it to a certain amount.

9 I would still maybe recommend to fit into  
10 what we're trying to accomplish here, maybe cut the Yale  
11 grant to that same two-million-dollar figure, and let the  
12 institution, itself, figure out how to best work within  
13 those parameters.

14 DR. JENNINGS: Mr. Chairman, if I can just  
15 suggest the quick way to move forward? If we have that as  
16 a provisional plan, that we cut them from two and a half  
17 to two, and then go through the other discussion and see  
18 how it feels.

19 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Let me just  
20 procedurally make sure I understand. I think I understand  
21 what Milt is trying to say, is that you decide on a dollar  
22 amount and say we're going to give you a check, here's a  
23 check for umpteen hundred thousand dollars, you figure out  
24 what part of your projects you're going to fund with our

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 money, and then your university pays the rest.

2 We're dealing with major entities, and I  
3 think we would have the caveat is, if you tell us you  
4 can't do it, or if we give you half of what you ask for  
5 and can't get the other half, then you have to tell us and  
6 we won't send you anything.

7 MR. SALTON: We have built flexibility, but  
8 we don't have to have flexibility, I guess. That's the  
9 answer. Dr. Wagers says this. Last year, that was our  
10 position, and what we said was here's the amount of money.

11 You have to do the full contract, show us where you're  
12 getting extra money, so if we cut you by 50 percent, you  
13 still have to do 100 percent of the job, but you have to  
14 demonstrate that you have funding for 100 percent of the  
15 job.

16 In this year, we've changed our  
17 flexibility, so it's up to you, of course, to say we're  
18 going to pay for 50 percent of -- here's 50 percent of the  
19 money, and here's 50 percent of the project work that  
20 you're actually going to be required to do. The other  
21 half of the project work you don't have to do, because  
22 we're not funding it.

23 On each contract, that will be something  
24 that we'd have to decide. When you make this cut, what is

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 the nature of what you're going to offer in the grant  
2 contract? So, for example, in a core, you could say this  
3 core has asked for three years. We have a three-year  
4 budget. We will fund two years of the budget, and they  
5 can come back to us in year three with whatever they want  
6 to do.

7 If they have a three-year payout on the  
8 equipment they're buying, well they take the risk that  
9 they may not get the money in year three to make that  
10 third year's worth of payments, but that's something that  
11 they can come back to us next year to try to pick up that  
12 third year. I think that's clear.

13 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. That's well  
14 said. I don't have any doubt that these two major  
15 universities will, if they want to do the project, will be  
16 able to make up the difference. We're talking about two  
17 major entities. One is a several billion dollar  
18 endowment, so I don't have any feelings that the project  
19 will just fizzle.

20 DR. WALLACK: Bob, to move the process, I  
21 would move the two million to Yale's core.

22 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I can't comment on  
23 that. I'm just commenting generally.

24 MS. TOWNSHEND: Is that a formal motion,

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 sir?

2 DR. WALLACK: Yes.

3 MS. TOWNSHEND: Is that seconded?

4 MR. MANDELKERN: Second.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: Discussion?

6 MR. SALTON: Let me just go back to  
7 something I think that Charles said, which is you may want  
8 to go now and discuss the other two and see whether or not  
9 leaving the other two with a million is reasonable, and  
10 you may say, you know what, let's not have the formal vote  
11 yet, but let's say that you decide that Yale should get  
12 1.8, because you want to have 1.2 for the other two, and  
13 then, with the category, complete the voting on the, you  
14 know, piece-by-piece on every one in the category.

15 MS. TOWNSHEND: The motion is tabled.

16 DR. FISHBONE: Could anybody enlighten us,  
17 as to whether all of the core grants are for four years,  
18 or some for one year and some for four?

19 DR. JENNINGS: Actually, that is for four  
20 years. Lin, I think, is for three years.

21 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yes.

22 DR. JENNINGS: And Lee I don't know.

23 A MALE VOICE: Lee is for two, isn't that  
24 right, Ann?

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 MS. HORN: Dr. Kiessling? Bob, can you  
2 hold on one moment, please? Dr. Kiessling? On the Lee  
3 grant, the Evergen, do you recall how many years that was  
4 for?

5 DR. KIESSLING: It's for two.

6 MS. HORN: Thank you.

7 DR. KIESSLING: You're talking about the  
8 nuclear transplant stem cell core?

9 MS. HORN: Yes.

10 DR. KIESSLING: That's for two years.

11 MS. HORN: Thank you.

12 MS. TOWNSEND: Mr. Mandelkern?

13 MR. MANDELKERN: I just wanted to point out  
14 that --

15 MS. TOWNSEND: Into the microphone,  
16 please?

17 MR. MANDELKERN: UHC 003 is a core grant  
18 that's only requesting slightly less than one million  
19 dollars.

20 DR. JENNINGS: Are we ready to discuss that  
21 one yet?

22 MR. MANDELKERN: Well I'm just pointing  
23 that out as part of the thinking.

24 MS. TOWNSEND: My understanding at this

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 time is that consideration of the motion regarding Yale  
2 004 for funding at two million dollars has been tabled.  
3 Are we moving onto UCHC 003?

4 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: That is Agula(phonetic),  
6 peer review scored at 1.5. Those eligible to debate this  
7 are Arinzeh, Huang, Jennings, Kiessling, Wagers, Fishbone,  
8 Genel, Landwirth, Latham, Mandelkern and Wallack. Would  
9 anyone --

10 DR. JENNINGS: I will take the lead, since  
11 I was one of the original reviewers.

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: Absolutely.

13 DR. JENNINGS: This scored well, and I  
14 think we discussed it quite extensively in the first  
15 round. I think we agreed that flow cytometry is a worthy  
16 goal and that UConn should be supported in that. They've  
17 shown a significant commitment by buying a half-million-  
18 dollar faxaria(phonetic) machine, however, this is too  
19 much money, and there's some problems with the budget, so  
20 I have two concerns about it.

21 One is, this is a core facility, with four  
22 years' worth of funding, and I just don't think it's  
23 appropriate for us to commit at this stage to funding four  
24 years' worth of continuous provision, so I'm in favor of

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 cutting the number of years, and I would actually  
2 recommend that we cut it from four to two years.

3 I was also concerned and the referees were  
4 concerned about the budget and the fact that the PI has a  
5 20 percent, there's a 20 percent time commitment from the  
6 PI. I do not believe and the referees, simply, that --  
7 I'm sorry. I, at least, do not believe that you need 20  
8 percent of the PI's time in order to oversee a core  
9 facility of this kind.

10 I'm not confident that this core will not  
11 also be used for a variety of other purposes, in addition  
12 to embryonic stem cell research. The referees also  
13 specifically flagged that there is a postdoctoral fellow  
14 was on the budget, and that providing core services it's  
15 not really an appropriate training activity for a  
16 postdoctoral fellow.

17 There was some sort of development work in  
18 association with the core, which is not unreasonable, but,  
19 to me, that should be evaluated on its merits of --  
20 proposal, rather than the core facility.

21 In other circumstances, I might be on the  
22 fence about this, but since we are under considerable  
23 pressure to cut the money, I'm going to vote to cut this,  
24 voting that we should cut it by a factor of four, and my

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 rationale for that is that we should cut it from four  
2 years to two years, and we should cut the funding per year  
3 by 50 percent, so I would support funding this at the  
4 250,000 level for two years, with the expectation that we  
5 will want to look to keep this core facility going in  
6 future years.

7 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Are you saying  
8 250,000 per year?

9 DR. JENNINGS: No. 250,000 over --

10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Over two years?

11 DR. JENNINGS: That's correct. Just to be  
12 clear, so that what they're proposing to spend the money  
13 on is not the acquisition of new equipment. They already  
14 have the equipment, with a few minor exceptions, but this  
15 is not a major piece of equipment. These are continuous  
16 expenses that are incurred at the time. Maintenance  
17 contracts are a significant part.

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: Would you like to make that  
19 a formal motion, sir?

20 DR. JENNINGS: I put a formal motion that  
21 we cut this from one million to 250,000 over a two-year  
22 funding period. I'm sorry. Did I misspeak?

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: 250,000 over a two-year  
24 period.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 DR. JENNINGS: They can come back with the  
2 details, but I would like to see a two-year proposal  
3 that's funded at about half the annual rate of the current  
4 proposal.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: Do I hear a second?  
6 250,000 dollars' funding over two years.

7 DR. GENEL: I don't want to second it, but  
8 what I'd suggest is that we leave this until we have all  
9 three of them up, and then discuss how we're going to do  
10 this.

11 DR. HUANG: If I may, about the personnel,  
12 whether or not the PI should spend 20 percent of his time  
13 or a postdoctoral fellow should be on there, there needs  
14 to be personnel for the project.

15 So, in other words, if you take out the  
16 postdoctoral fellow and use a technician, it could cost  
17 the same amount.

18 DR. JENNINGS: I'm not proposing cutting  
19 that.

20 DR. HUANG: But you're proposing cutting  
21 total personnel budget total manpower on the program, so  
22 I'm not comfortable with cutting it down to one-quarter of  
23 what it was.

24 MS. TOWNSHEND: Do I hear a second on the

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 motion that is at hand? Hearing no second, the motion is  
2 dismissed. Any further discussion with regard to this  
3 grant?

4 DR. WAGERS: Maybe I could chime in here a  
5 little bit. So I guess, to put this in perspective, I  
6 personally run a flow cytometry core that is dedicated to  
7 stem cell sorting. We operate with an annual budget of  
8 70,000 dollars, so this is quite a bit more than what we  
9 operate with, and we operate in exactly the same way to  
10 provide sorting training availability of machinery for  
11 non-federally approved, as well as federally approved,  
12 human embryonic stem cells.

13 A dedicated technician is, generally  
14 speaking, sufficient to maintain a core facility like  
15 this. It would require a reduction in the developmental  
16 aspects that were proposed under the grant, which were  
17 basically to identify new and test specifically in the  
18 core monoclonal antibodies that were developed by  
19 investigators at UConn for their reactivity toward  
20 embryonic stem cells.

21 How important that type of activity is for  
22 a core facility to provide a person to do that, instead of  
23 having the labs, themselves, do that kind of testing in  
24 collaboration with the UConn human embryonic stem cell

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 core that we also fund that is adjacent to this flow  
2 sorting facility, I think that that kind of work will  
3 actually continue to go on.

4 I actually do personally have some concerns  
5 about having a postdoctoral fellow, whose project it is to  
6 take other people's antibodies and stay in the  
7 (indiscernible) with them, because I don't think that  
8 that's a good training program for a postdoctoral fellow.

9 The core would still be staffed by a  
10 percent effort of the PI, as well as a full-time operator,  
11 who is dedicated and trained in flow cytometry.

12 The other point that I'll make is that they  
13 discuss in the grant charging user fees for the users who  
14 will use the core, and there's a sliding scale with users  
15 who are part of -- who are funded by the State of  
16 Connecticut in their grants, being charged a lower rate  
17 than other investigators who use the core, but it's not  
18 incorporated into the budget in any way where those user  
19 fees are going, or how that money will be used.

20 It presumably gets returned to the core, in  
21 that the standard operating practice is that you can't run  
22 a surplus in those kinds of user fees, because then you  
23 end up accumulating money that you'll then spend on other  
24 users, not on the ones who paid you.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 I would suggest that they need to revise  
2 their budget in any case to reflect how that revenue is  
3 going to be used in the core. This money that we're  
4 talking about cutting to is not the total revenue of the  
5 core, because in addition to what we're funding -- sorry.  
6 I'll finish.

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: Any further discussion on  
8 this grant or a motion with regard to this grant?

9 DR. JENNINGS: Can I just ask Amy a factual  
10 question? What percent --

11 DR. WAGERS: Sorry. I'm sorry?

12 DR. JENNINGS: What percentage of your time  
13 is allocated to overseeing the core that you're the PI?

14 DR. WAGERS: Five percent.

15 DR. JENNINGS: Five percent?

16 DR. WAGERS: Five percent.

17 DR. JENNINGS: Not 20 percent?

18 DR. WAGERS: No.

19 DR. JENNINGS: They're not identical.

20 DR. WAGERS: They're not identical cores. I  
21 just bring this up as a comparison, that one might be  
22 interested in sort of how things work in another  
23 institution.

24 DR. JENNINGS: But just to be clear,

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 they're asking for four times as much PI time as you have  
2 (indiscernible) and they're asking for about three and a  
3 half times the annual budget. To me, that's excessive,  
4 and, also, asking for four years' worth of commitment to  
5 that. I think that's too much.

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Wallack?

7 DR. WALLACK: Through the Chair, may I ask  
8 Dr. Wagers, based upon what she's indicated, what she  
9 would see as a suitable figure here?

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Wagers?

11 DR. WAGERS: So I actually came to the same  
12 number that Charles did independently. I was sitting here  
13 doing this while we were having a break and 250,000. I  
14 was sort of on the fence between two or three years, but I  
15 came to the same number.

16 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. Are Dr.  
17 Kiessling and Treena, are they on line, or off line, or  
18 what's the story?

19 DR. KIESSLING: I'm here. It's very  
20 difficult to hear.

21 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay.

22 MS. HORN: The proposal is to fund this  
23 003, the UConn flow cytometry lab for 250 --

24 MS. TOWNSHEND: There's no formal motion,

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1           though.

2                           COMMISSIONER GALVIN: No motion on the  
3 floor.

4                           MS. HORN: No. I'm just trying to bring  
5 her up to speed.

6                           DR. JENNINGS: If somebody will second it,  
7 I will reintroduce it.

8                           COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Wait a minute. Wait  
9 a minute. Wait a minute. Stop the music for a second.  
10 Let's get Dr. Kiessling up to speed here, because we're  
11 going to lose her in another hour.

12                           MS. TOWNSHEND: And we do not have Dr.  
13 Arinzeh?

14                           MS. HORN: No.

15                           COMMISSIONER GALVIN: We're starting to  
16 lose voters already, so we need to make some decisions.  
17 She's going to be testifying in front of another body at  
18 2:30. It's 1:15.

19                           MS. HORN: Okay, so, 250,000 dollars for  
20 two years is the proposal.

21                           DR. KIESSLING: For which core?

22                           MS. HORN: This is for the Agula, the flow  
23 cytometry at UConn.

24                           MS. TOWNSHEND: Do we have a formal motion

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 from either Dr. Jennings or Dr. Wagers to put that back in  
2 front of the group?

3 DR. WAGERS: My understanding is, so, we're  
4 going to make a motion, then table it to come back, is  
5 that the idea?

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: If that is your desire.

7 DR. WAGERS: Okay.

8 MS. TOWNSHEND: I need a formal motion from  
9 --

10 DR. KIESSLING: Does Dr. Wagers think this  
11 is a good compromise?

12 DR. WAGERS: Sorry. What did you say?

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: I just need to go  
14 procedurally, yes. Personally, I think it's a great  
15 compromise, but I need a motion.

16 DR. GENEL: The motion was made. I'll  
17 second it.

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: A motion from Charles  
19 Jennings.

20 DR. JENNINGS: I will remake the motion, if  
21 that helps procedurally. Mike has agreed to second it.

22 MS. TOWNSHEND: Thank you. We will table  
23 that and now consider, if that is the will of the group,  
24 thank you, I want to make sure I'm following procedure,

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 08SCDEVER001, with a peer review score of 2.5, Lee is the  
2 principal investigator, the request for funding is  
3 2,005,689 dollars.

4 Those eligible to discuss and vote are  
5 Arinzeh, Canalis, Huang, Kiessling, Wagers, Fishbone,  
6 Genel, Landwirth, Latham, Mandelkern, Wallack. Members of  
7 cognizance are Arinzeh and Latham. Discussion?

8 DR. LATHAM: So I'll start it off, and then  
9 I want Ann to participate by phone. This is a core  
10 proposal for a nuclear transfer core for the UConn,  
11 Storrs, campus, so it's not duplicative of previous UConn  
12 cores.

13 It is a strong area of comparative  
14 expertise in Connecticut, and one which I know Dr.  
15 Kiessling feels strongly ought to be funded in order to  
16 maintain and then reattract some of the expertise that  
17 Connecticut has in this area.

18 I both have hesitation about the overall  
19 size of the budget, however, the vast majority of the  
20 budget is for people, including three techs and three  
21 post-docs, each year. We might consider funding it for a  
22 single year, or asking them to cut back on the amount of  
23 manpower to be devoted to running the core.

24 MS. TOWNSEND: Further discussion?

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 DR. GENEL: Steve, how long was the request  
2 for?

3 DR. LATHAM: It's a two-year proposal.

4 DR. GENEL: It was a two-year proposal,  
5 okay.

6 DR. LATHAM: And I know Dr. Kiessling has  
7 some feelings about this, if she wants to.

8 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yes. Dr. Kiessling?

9 DR. KIESSLING: Yes. Are we discussing the  
10 --

11 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yes.

12 DR. KIESSLING: Okay.

13 MR. SALTON: Do you have something to say,  
14 Dr. Kiessling, about it?

15 DR. KIESSLING: Well, as everybody knows,  
16 I'm enthusiastic about having this go forward in some  
17 fashion. I think they are to either fund this core for a  
18 million dollars and see what they can do with it. I don't  
19 know exactly how it should be structured so it fits --

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: Would you like to make that  
21 a formal motion, Dr. Kiessling? Would you like to make  
22 that a formal motion, Dr. Kiessling?

23 DR. KIESSLING: It would be easier if  
24 someone there could make the motion. I can barely hear

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 what's going on.

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: Okay. Dr. Fishbone?

3 DR. FISHBONE: I would make that motion,  
4 that we fund them for a million dollars for one year.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: One moment. Do we have a  
6 second on Dr. Fishbone's?

7 DR. FISHBONE: I would like to modify it.

8 MS. TOWNSHEND: Certainly, sir.

9 DR. FISHBONE: I would like to fund them  
10 for one million dollars.

11 MS. TOWNSHEND: For?

12 DR. FISHBONE: For their project.

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: How many years?

14 DR. FISHBONE: I'm suggesting it be for two  
15 years.

16 MS. TOWNSHEND: Is that your motion, that  
17 this committee fund this at one million dollars for two  
18 years?

19 DR. FISHBONE: Yes.

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: Do I hear a second?

21 MR. MANDELKERN: Second.

22 MS. TOWNSHEND: Seconded by Mr. Mandelkern.  
23 Further discussion? Would we like to --

24 DR. FISHBONE: Could I just add one thing?

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yes, sir.

2 DR. FISHBONE: I think within the two-year  
3 time frame we should know whether nuclear transfer has any  
4 role or whether it's going to be completely replaced by  
5 other methodology.

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: Do we treat that as part of  
7 the motion?

8 MR. SALTON: Dr. Kiessling, there is a  
9 motion that was seconded to fund it for one million  
10 dollars for two years.

11 DR. KIESSLING: That's fine.

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: Mr. Mandelkern?

13 MR. MANDELKERN: Well we've come to the end  
14 of the consideration of the cores --

15 COURT REPORTER: You need to speak into the  
16 microphone.

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: Please speak into the  
18 microphone, sir.

19 MR. MANDELKERN: I'm sorry. We've come to  
20 the end of consideration of the three cores that we voted  
21 yes, and our esteemed Dr. Genel has come very close to the  
22 target, and we have come close to the target. If we take  
23 the recommendations that were made, Yale 004, Lin, at two  
24 million, UCHC 003, Agula, at a quarter of a million,

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 SCDEVER, Lee, for one million, we have a total of  
2 3,250,000 dollars in core grants. Is that the way to  
3 proceed, Henry, or not?

4 MR. SALTON: You have to vote on each grant  
5 individually, unless you want to go back and try to jigger  
6 some numbers on these things again.

7 DR. GENEL: I think we ought to leave this  
8 and go onto the other categories, and then we can do our  
9 jiggling after we've done all four categories.

10 DR. JENNINGS: Could we write down on the  
11 board?

12 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah, let's write it  
13 down.

14 MS. TOWNSHEND: I'm writing it down, as  
15 well, in my notes. Absolutely. We have three individual  
16 motions out before the committee at this point, each of  
17 which has been tabled. The procedural suggestion at this  
18 point is that we move onto the group grants.

19 MS. HORN: Dr. Kiessling, we are tabling  
20 the three motions that we've made on the core grants,  
21 which would be to fund the Yale grant at two million, the  
22 UCHC flow cytometry at 250,000 for two years, and the  
23 Evergen, Lee, SCNT, at one million for two years, and  
24 we're moving now onto the group projects.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 DR. KIESSLING: Okay. Thank you.

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: For consideration at this  
3 time is 08SCCYSME005, Redmond is the principal  
4 investigator, the amount of funding requested is 1,999,514  
5 dollars. This is peer review scored at 1.25. Those  
6 eligible to debate this are Arinzeh, Canalis, Huang,  
7 Jennings, Kiessling, Wagers, Fishbone, Mandelkern and  
8 Wallack, with members of cognizance being Drs. Jennings  
9 and Fishbone.

10 If one of you would like to give a short  
11 overview again and remind us what this grant is about?

12 MR. SALTON: Before we go there, I think  
13 it's important to note that there has been a motion voted  
14 by qualified members of the committee to reduce this grant  
15 application already to 1.42 million, I believe, right?

16 The actual amount has already been reduced  
17 from 1.99 to 1.42 million. You can certainly reduce it  
18 additionally, as you choose, but we're not starting at  
19 1.9. We're starting at 1.42.

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: Thank you.

21 DR. KIESSLING: Is this the Yale primate  
22 grant?

23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yes.

24 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yes.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 DR. JENNINGS: This is the one we discussed  
2 at length this morning. Just to remind you, the idea is  
3 to turn human embryonic stem cells into dopamine neurons  
4 and transplant them into monkeys as a potential therapy  
5 for Parkinson's Disease.

6 My own view is that we should fund. I mean  
7 my original view remains unchanged, that we ought to be  
8 funding it in full, but since I think we've already agreed  
9 we're not going to do that, my view is that we should  
10 stick with the 1.42. This was the highest scoring project  
11 in any category, and I believe for good reason.

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: Further discussion? The  
13 amount now stands at 1.42 million, with the caveat, I  
14 understand, that the ESCRO committee from Yale must make a  
15 decision with regard to the ethical end of things. Mr.  
16 Mandelkern?

17 MR. MANDELKERN: I second that --

18 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Wait. Does everybody  
19 understand what we're saying, that we are in agreement  
20 that we're going to fund this grant for 1.42 million?  
21 That, however, is contingent upon the ESCRO committee at  
22 the parent university discussing the problem and making a  
23 satisfactory, a recommendation satisfactory for our  
24 purposes, which may not occur in the very immediate

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 future.

2 DR. WALLACK: Bob, can I just suggest that,  
3 as you did with cores, we put that up as a recommendation  
4 and come back to finalize that after we've gone through  
5 all grants, please.

6 DR. CANALIS: The money is not there.

7 DR. WALLACK: Right. That's why I said  
8 that.

9 MR. MANDELKERN: There's only one more  
10 core.

11 MS. TOWNSHEND: Do I have a formal motion  
12 on the floor?

13 MS. HORN: Dr. Arinzeh?

14 DR. ARINZEH: Yeah.

15 MS. HORN: Welcome back.

16 DR. ARINZEH: Unfortunately, I'm not going  
17 to be able to stay, because I have some additional  
18 meetings I have to attend this afternoon.

19 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Thank you for your  
20 help.

21 DR. ARINZEH: Okay. I'm sorry about that.

22 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: That's all right.

23 DR. ARINZEH: All right. Thank you.

24 MS. TOWNSHEND: My understanding, and

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 please correct me if I am incorrect, that the motion,  
2 which has not been moved as of yet, is to fund this grant  
3 application at 1.42 million dollars, on the caveat that  
4 the Yale ESCRO --

5 DR. WALLACK: I'm moving that we table that  
6 to the conclusion of these group projects.

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: Fine. Up for consideration  
8 at this time is 08SCCUCON -- can somebody tell me that  
9 number, 004? Is this Rasmussen? I will not talk about  
10 the amount requested. The peer review score is 2.75.  
11 Those eligible to discuss are Arinzeh, Huang, Kiessling,  
12 Wagers, Fishbone, Genel, Landwirth, Latham, Mandelkern and  
13 Wallack.

14 MS. HORN: Ann, would you care to lead the  
15 discussion on that?

16 DR. KIESSLING: Are you talking to me?

17 MS. HORN: Yes.

18 MR. SALTON: About Rasmussen.

19 DR. KIESSLING: Ah. The Rasmussen grant  
20 was the one that is a four investigator project, and it  
21 can be cut in two ways. The strengths of that application  
22 are the goal of having induced stem cell research go  
23 forward, and Ted Rasmussen is uniquely qualified to do  
24 that.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1                   The project proposed to work out the  
2 methods for doing that. The second project was to study  
3 the cell cycles of the induced cells, and the third and  
4 fourth projects were to transform them into skin cells.

5                   This project should absolutely happen, and  
6 if that's all that can afford to be funded out of that, I  
7 think that project was about 600,000 dollars a year for  
8 four years. The second project is also desirable, but not  
9 as essential. It was at about 500,000 dollars per year.  
10 I left the exact numbers with Julius Landwirth.

11                   MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Landwirth has those  
12 numbers.

13                   DR. KIESSLING: My recommendation would be  
14 that either one or two of those projects be funded, but  
15 not the entire application.

16                   MS. TOWNSHEND: Thank you.

17                   DR. LANDWIRTH: And the other way that can  
18 be cut is by cutting it back from three years to two.

19                   MS. TOWNSHEND: And the amount of that  
20 would be?

21                   DR. LANDWIRTH: If we used --

22                   DR. KIESSLING: Can I interrupt again?

23                   MS. TOWNSHEND: Sure.

24                   DR. KIESSLING: I would be happy to make a

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 motion to fund the first project on that application for  
2 four years. I would be happy to make that motion.

3 DR. LANDWIRTH: It was only three years, I  
4 think.

5 MS. HORN: Dr. Landwirth is commenting that  
6 it's only a three-year proposal.

7 DR. LANDWIRTH: I could be wrong on that.

8 DR. KIESSLING: Three years? Oh, I thought  
9 it was four. Okay.

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: The amount of that would be  
11 -- Dr. Landwirth is working on that.

12 DR. LANDWIRTH: I just wanted to confirm  
13 whether it's three-year or four-year.

14 MS. HORN: We're just confirming whether  
15 it's three or four years.

16 DR. LANDWIRTH: It's a three-year proposal.

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: It's three years?

18 DR. LANDWIRTH: And the totals for funding  
19 the two projects that Ann is recommending we fund comes to  
20 1.2 -- 1218401.

21 MS. TOWNSHEND: As point of clarification,  
22 is she recommending one project or two?

23 DR. LANDWIRTH: Ann, were you recommending  
24 -- I think she just said she wanted to recommend the first

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 project at a full funding cycle.

2 MS. HORN: And you recommended funding the  
3 first project for the full funding cycle?

4 DR. KIESSLING: Three or four years?

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: It's a three-year grant.

6 DR. KIESSLING: Yeah. I would recommend  
7 funding the first project for three years.

8 DR. LANDWIRTH: Okay. That number is  
9 634,880.

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: 634,880. Is that a motion  
11 from Dr. Kiessling?

12 MR. MANDELKERN: How much money?

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: 634,880 dollars.

14 MS. HORN: Yes, that is a motion from Dr.  
15 Kiessling.

16 MS. TOWNSHEND: Do we have a second on  
17 that?

18 DR. LANDWIRTH: Second.

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: Second, Dr. Landwirth.  
20 Okay, so, I just want to make sure that I'm understanding  
21 this correctly, that we will fund project one for three  
22 years in the amount of 634,880 dollars. Is that correct?

23 A MALE VOICE: Yes.

24 A MALE VOICE: Yes.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: We will table this motion,  
2 unless there is further --

3 DR. GENEL: Now we have the second project.

4 MS. TOWNSHEND: Oh, okay.

5 MR. SALTON: Is there any motion on the  
6 second project?

7 DR. GENEL: Ann? Ask Ann.

8 MR. SALTON: Ann, do you want to offer a  
9 motion on the second project?

10 DR. KIESSLING: That project, that entire  
11 group project, really depends on the first one, so if they  
12 can just get the first one funded, they can come back and  
13 ask for funds for the other three.

14 I think, in the interest of making sure  
15 that as much work goes forward as possible, I would be  
16 happy to just move to fund the first project.

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: Which has been seconded by  
18 Dr. Landwirth, so we're looking at a funding of project  
19 one for three years at 634,880 dollars.

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Any further  
21 discussion?

22 MS. TOWNSHEND: Further discussion?

23 MR. MANDELKERN: Commend our commendable  
24 colleague, Dr. Genel. We have approved, tentatively, two

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 million dollars, and that was his target for group.

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: We need to vote on each of  
3 these motions individually. Henry, is that where we're  
4 going?

5 MR. SALTON: I think what we're doing is  
6 what we did with core. We've now sort of done an  
7 allocation, we tabled the motions, we should move onto the  
8 established investigators. We have about 2,050,000 or  
9 something.

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: Thank you. Dr. Kiessling,  
11 we're moving now to the established investigators.

12 DR. KIESSLING: Okay. I, at some point, am  
13 going to have to stop and get gas, and I'll call you back.

14 MS. TOWNSHEND: Okay, thank you.  
15 Established investigator grant 08SCB Yale 026, Woo is the  
16 primary investigator, 1.45 is the peer review score,  
17 496,465 dollars has been requested as part of this  
18 application, and those eligible to discuss this and vote  
19 are Arinzeh, Canalis, Huang, Jennings, Kiessling, Wagers,  
20 Fishbone, Mandelkern and Wallack, with members of  
21 cognizance being Wagers and Mandelkern. I turn this over  
22 to Dr. Genel.

23 DR. GENEL: Well I have a suggestion here.  
24 I think we have some target -- what were the target

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 levels? 3.2 million. Well that would be eight, so I  
2 think we could say (multiple conversations). Let's go  
3 down seven, and that would leave, that would leave, and  
4 then, on the seed grants, the target was 1.6, so let's go  
5 down eight, simply by peer review score, and then let's  
6 talk about whether or not we wanted to fund the  
7 investigator grants or more seed grants, and then play  
8 with the margins there.

9 In other words, what I'm saying is let's  
10 use those targets, go right down to the bottom, and then  
11 talk about where we want to shift, rather than do it by  
12 category.

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: We will consider that a  
14 motion? No?

15 MR. SALTON: We don't need to have a  
16 motion.

17 DR. WALLACK: Through the Chair, we just  
18 finished the group grants. In the Redmond grant, can I  
19 comment now, or do you want me to wait?

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: We've tabled. Go ahead.

21 DR. WALLACK: My comment would be this.  
22 The 1.42 is, in fact, funding the Redmond grant in its  
23 entirety, with the exclusion of the St. Kitts piece. Am I  
24 correct on that?

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Correct.

2 DR. WALLACK: So my comment would be  
3 consistent with what we're doing, what we just did with  
4 the cores, what we're trying to do now with the individual  
5 investigators, I think that we're critically at whether or  
6 not we could cut the Redmond grant, as well, the ESCRO  
7 portion that we're holding, and that would be, in fact, my  
8 recommendation, to free up dollars as we go forward.

9 I don't know exactly how to do that, but if  
10 you did it on a percentage basis, I can easily see us  
11 going down to 1.1 or one million dollars on that, and  
12 that's what I would ask the group to consider as we go  
13 forward into these other categories.

14 DR. GENEL: Well, then, let me modify the  
15 motion, and that is, if we take an arbitrary cutoff of,  
16 say, seven on the established investigators and eight on  
17 the seed grants, then we can look at what number we have  
18 approved that we can't fund, and then look to see whether  
19 to shift money from seed to established or vice-versa and  
20 to draw money out of, or to take some money from Redmond.

21 In other words, then we only -- if you want  
22 to fund three more seed grants, you have only two ways of  
23 doing it.

24 COURT REPORTER: One moment, please.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 DR. GENEL: I would do it the other way. I  
2 would do it by simply saying what do we have left that we  
3 have approved that we have to fund, and then look to where  
4 we can take that, or make a decision, as to whether to  
5 fund them or not, but I don't think we've gotten there  
6 yet. My whole scheme was based on the idea of coming up  
7 with general targets and then --

8 DR. WALLACK: I understand what your scheme  
9 is, but I think that what I'm trying to do is look for a  
10 consistency in how we're going forward, and I would like  
11 to at least see the pool enhanced as we go forward, and we  
12 can always come back to the Redmond and add back in a  
13 certain amount if we have to.

14 Having done that, I still believe that  
15 Redmond will be coming away with a very significant  
16 allocation here.

17 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: However, we've made  
18 cuts in several grants for several reasons. One has been  
19 because of personnel. Another has been for scientific  
20 project appropriateness. Another has been for technique  
21 and equipment. Dr. Redmond's grant has already taken,  
22 basically, a 25 percent cut, because of the location of  
23 the research.

24 The question I would raise is that is this

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 fair to expose him to additional cut, as he's already  
2 taken a 25 percent cut? Dr. Canalis?

3 DR. CANALIS: I'm uncomfortable about  
4 changing process midstream.

5 MR. MANDELKERN: No.

6 DR. CANALIS: Can I finish, please?

7 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes.

8 DR. CANALIS: We have been looking at each  
9 individual grant, and suddenly we're going to start making  
10 lump decisions, and, frankly, I don't think we can do  
11 that. We need to treat, for right or for wrong, everybody  
12 needs to be treated the same way, so, take it or leave it,  
13 that's my opinion.

14 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: So you want to  
15 consider each of --

16 DR. CANALIS: Not quite. I would have done  
17 initially. I think you brought us to this point. We made  
18 the conscious decision to look at each individual grant,  
19 and now we're going to start lumping. I'd be careful  
20 about that.

21 DR. GENEL: May I respond to that? Quite  
22 the opposite. I think we're splitting, because I think  
23 it's a different level of discussion when we're talking  
24 about a dozen seed grants and a dozen potential principal

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 investigator grants, as compared to a handful of core  
2 grants and a handful of program projects.

3 I'm just trying to use the peer review  
4 scores to draw lines, as to which we can decide are  
5 clearly going to be funded under our targets, and then  
6 make decisions on that basis from what is left over.

7 And let me remind everybody that we agreed  
8 that we would also identify grants that would be  
9 potentially fundable if, for one reason, the Redmond grant  
10 could not be funded, so there is a sort of a bullpen that  
11 we can come up with from those that we can't automatically  
12 fund in this way.

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: Mr. Mandelkern?

14 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes. There are only nine  
15 principal investigators in the yes category. Why don't we  
16 just start moving through and see what happens to the nine  
17 grants, instead of wrangling over more procedures? Let's  
18 just get to it.

19 DR. JENNINGS: I'm in favor of that, and I  
20 think our challenge would be, under that scheme, would be  
21 to identify at least two and probably three senior  
22 investigator grants that are not going to get funded or  
23 that are going to go into what Mike describes as our  
24 reserve pile.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: That's the will -- that's  
2 the ticket.

3 MR. SALTON: Why don't we start with the  
4 lowest score?

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are these in rank order?

6 MR. SALTON: The worst score.

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: The worst score, so we're  
8 doing reverse.

9 MR. SALTON: If the consensus of the  
10 committee is that, when we're looking at the next group,  
11 which is the established investigators, if they would like  
12 to, instead of piecemealing a 500,000-dollar or 400,000-  
13 dollar grant to try to reduce it, to looking at which one  
14 should we eliminate out of the pool and try to hit our  
15 target that way, then I suggest you start with the worst  
16 scored, the lowest ranked one in the pool.

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: Is that satisfactory to the  
18 group? Then we will proceed, unless I hear further  
19 discussion. We are looking at 08SCB UConn 006, Barr is  
20 the primary investigator, 2.3 is the peer review score,  
21 the request has been for 499,813 dollars, and let me read  
22 through the people who can debate on this one.

23 Arinzeh, Huang, Jennings, Kiessling,  
24 Wagers, Fishbone, Genel, Landwirth, Latham, Mandelkern and

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 Wallack, with the members of cognizance being Huang and  
2 Genel.

3 DR. HUANG: Just to remind everybody, this  
4 is the one where human embryonic stem cell derived neurons  
5 are put into a mouse model of Alzheimer's disease. I  
6 favor that this be put aside and not left in the yes  
7 category, but put aside as a grant that if there's  
8 sufficient funding at the very end, that we consider.  
9 That was the original intent.

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: Is this a motion?

11 DR. HUANG: Yes.

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: Do I hear a second?

13 DR. WAGERS: Second.

14 MS. TOWNSHEND: Discussion? Then we will  
15 need to vote on that by roll call. We will vote on that  
16 by roll call, a yes meaning it moves into the potential  
17 reserve group for possible funding should the Redmond  
18 grant not be funded. A no vote means what?

19 MR. SALTON: It stays.

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: It stays in the yes. Does  
21 that mean it is funded?

22 MR. SALTON: No.

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: Arinzeh? She's not  
24 present. I'm sorry. Huang?

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 DR. HUANG: Yes.  
2 MS. TOWNSHEND: Jennings?  
3 DR. JENNINGS: Yes.  
4 MS. TOWNSHEND: Kiessling?  
5 MS. HORN: Dr. Kiessling, are you on the  
6 line? Absent.  
7 MS. TOWNSHEND: I need to check and make  
8 sure we have the right number of people, then.  
9 MS. HORN: You have enough.  
10 MS. TOWNSHEND: We do?  
11 MS. HORN: Yeah. We're on top of that.  
12 MS. TOWNSHEND: Wagers?  
13 DR. WAGERS: Yes.  
14 MS. TOWNSHEND: Fishbone?  
15 DR. FISHBONE: Yes.  
16 MS. TOWNSHEND: Genel?  
17 DR. GENEL: Yes.  
18 MS. TOWNSHEND: Landwirth?  
19 DR. LANDWIRTH: Yes.  
20 MS. TOWNSHEND: Latham?  
21 DR. LATHAM: Yes.  
22 MS. TOWNSHEND: Mandelkern?  
23 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes.  
24 MS. TOWNSHEND: Wallack?

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 DR. WALLACK: Yes.

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: The motion passes. 08SCB  
3 UCON 006 will be held in reserve in the event that the  
4 Redmond grant is not funded and does not make it through  
5 the ESCRO process. No. Barr.

6 For consideration at this time,  
7 08SCBUCHC011, with a peer review score of 1.9, Sestic,  
8 which I know I'm saying incorrectly. I apologize. Five  
9 million dollars is the requested funding. I'm sorry.  
10 500,000. Those eligible to discuss and vote are Arinzeh,  
11 Huang, Jennings, Kiessling, Wagers, Fishbone, Genel,  
12 Landwirth, Latham, Mandelkern and Wallack, with members of  
13 cognizance being Jennings and Genel.

14 DR. JENNINGS: I'm a little less  
15 comfortable voting this down, because I thought it was  
16 quite a decent proposal, and I guess I would like to  
17 reserve judgment until we see whether there's other better  
18 candidates for elimination. I thought this was quite a  
19 decent one.

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: Is that a motion? No.

21 DR. JENNINGS: My motion is to keep it in  
22 this category for now.

23 MR. SALTON: So that's basically saying  
24 you're not moving to make any change. There's no motion.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 There's no change.

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: Discussion?

3 DR. JENNINGS: I should just shut up, then.

4 MS. TOWNSHEND: Discussion? Dr. Genel?

5 And you need the microphone.

6 DR. GENEL: I would move this, also, to the  
7 reserve category. In an ideal world, I would like to fund  
8 it, but I think, at this point, I'd just move it to the  
9 reserve category.

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: Is that a motion?

11 DR. GENEL: Yeah, that's a motion.

12 A MALE VOICE: Second.

13 DR. GENEL: The peer review is the lowest  
14 of those standings, well the highest in those standings.

15 MS. TOWNSHEND: Moved and seconded.

16 Discussion? The motion on the floor is to move  
17 application 08SCBUCHC011 to the reserve category to be  
18 funded in the event that the Redmond grant does not make  
19 it through its Yale ESCRO process.

20 Yes means that it will be moved to that  
21 reserve category. No means it will not. I will call the  
22 roll. Arinzeh is not present. Huang?

23 DR. HUANG: Yes.

24 MS. TOWNSHEND: Jennings?

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 DR. JENNINGS: No.  
2 MS. TOWNSHEND: Kiessling?  
3 MS. HORN: Still unavailable.  
4 MS. TOWNSHEND: Wagers?  
5 DR. WAGERS: Yes.  
6 MS. TOWNSHEND: Fishbone?  
7 DR. FISHBONE: Yes.  
8 MS. TOWNSHEND: Genel?  
9 DR. GENEL: Yes.  
10 MS. TOWNSHEND: Landwirth?  
11 DR. LANDWIRTH: Yes.  
12 MS. TOWNSHEND: Latham?  
13 DR. LATHAM: Yes.  
14 MS. TOWNSHEND: Mandelkern?  
15 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes.  
16 MS. TOWNSHEND: Wallack?  
17 DR. WALLACK: Yes.  
18 MS. TOWNSHEND: The motion passes. Grant  
19 application 08SCBUCHC011 is moved to the reserve category  
20 for funding if Redmond is not.  
21 Now for consideration, 08SCBYSME025, 1.75  
22 is the peer review score, McLawson(phonetic) is the  
23 primary investigator, 500,000 dollars is the amount that  
24 has been requested. Those eligible to discuss and vote,

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 Arinzeh, Canalis, Huang, Jennings, Kiessling, Wagers,  
2 Fishbone, Mandelkern and Wallack, with Wagers and Wallack  
3 the members of cognizance. Would one of them like to give  
4 an overview? One moment, please.

5 MR. SALTON: I would just note now you're  
6 at three and a half million dollars in potential yes  
7 grants out of 3.2 million.

8 MS. TOWNSHEND: Thank you.

9 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I was out of the room  
10 for a moment.

11 MS. TOWNSHEND: Do you need a microphone?

12 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Usually, I don't. My  
13 voice is much too loud. I'm unsure what it means, if  
14 you'll pardon me, to be in reserve. I understand the  
15 terms. As a matter of fact, I understand the term  
16 reserve, but are they by -- is the first one the first  
17 reserve, so if somebody defaults or doesn't fulfill the  
18 contract, that automatically moves into the funded, or are  
19 they just in a pool?

20 MR. SALTON: It's a pool if Redmond fails.

21 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Well what if somebody  
22 else fails, or defaults, or says I can't do this?

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: I'm not sure if they've  
24 been ranked in any particular order.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: They are unranked.  
2 So as they sit in reserve, they're all equal?

3 MR. SALTON: Right.

4 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay.

5 DR. FISHBONE: Well, you know, it might  
6 make sense to try to keep them in some ranking order, so  
7 we don't have to meet each time and decide.

8 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I think at least the  
9 first three or four, so if somebody -- I think the  
10 question came up last year about somebody couldn't do a  
11 grant. What's the next one up?

12 DR. FISHBONE: It's like a contingency  
13 fund.

14 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: It's like -- an  
15 alternate at medical school or something.

16 MS. TOWNSHEND: Thank you.

17 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: So we're going to  
18 grant those?

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are we doing that at this  
20 time?

21 MR. SALTON: Why don't we see if we have  
22 any other going to the reserve before we start ranking  
23 them?

24 MS. TOWNSHEND: Excellent point. Is that

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 the will of the group? And we are discussing, I believe,  
2 025. Dr. Wagers or Dr. Wallack, can you give us a brief  
3 overview of that grant, please?

4 DR. WALLACK: I'll just start by  
5 reiterating what I had said before, and that's I would  
6 fund this project, because of the importance of the  
7 project, the expertise of the researchers, the backing of  
8 the institution and the ability to get the project done. I  
9 would still go forward with it.

10 DR. WAGERS: I agree with that.

11 MS. TOWNSHEND: Would you like to make a  
12 motion?

13 DR. WALLACK: I would move that we accept  
14 that one.

15 MS. TOWNSHEND: So we are voting on, you  
16 would be voting on funding? No change? I'm confused.

17 MR. SALTON: If I could recommend to the  
18 committee that if it's not going to be a change in status,  
19 or either moving them off the yes list, or cutting their  
20 amount, I don't think a motion is necessary until we get  
21 around to making final funding decisions.

22 If we just leave them status quo, you're  
23 not -- there's no use to change something that's status  
24 quo by motion.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: Move onto the next grant.  
2 Rosenberg, 08SCBUCHC021, at a 1.75 peer review score. The  
3 amount requested has been 500,000 dollars. Those eligible  
4 to discuss and vote are Arinzeh, Huang, Jennings,  
5 Kiessling, Wagers, Fishbone, Genel, Landwirth, Latham,  
6 Mandelkern and Wallack, with Kiessling and Wallack as the  
7 members of cognizance.

8 DR. WALLACK: I would reiterate, again,  
9 what we said earlier in the day, and that's I would move  
10 that we accept this project and fund it, because, again,  
11 the importance of the project, the strength of the  
12 investigators, and, also, because what appears to be a  
13 unique opportunity to create a collaboration between the  
14 health center and the Storrs campus, as I understand the  
15 project.

16 MS. TOWNSHEND: Discussion?

17 DR. JENNINGS: My reading, and I haven't  
18 read the grant application, this is Rosenberg, right?

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yes, sir.

20 DR. JENNINGS: My reading of the peer  
21 review comments it's that this is not one of the stronger  
22 applications in this pool. Overall evaluation is an  
23 important question, highly qualified investigator,  
24 excellent requirement, however, lack of some necessary

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 preliminary studies to show the feasibility the system is  
2 going to be used reduces a certain level of enthusiasm, so  
3 that --

4 Just based on that, my sense is that this  
5 is one of the weaker of those, and if we have to cut  
6 something, I think this is a candidate.

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: Discussion? Dr. Genel?

8 DR. GENEL: Charles, I'm not sure I read  
9 the same peer review. It says innovative, very innovated,  
10 investigator, excellent, environment, excellent.

11 DR. JENNINGS: Okay, then, turn the page to  
12 the overall evaluation.

13 DR. WALLACK: Just to pick up on what Mike  
14 said, in the overall evaluation on the next page, in fact,  
15 it still talks about the importance of the question, and  
16 the only thing it says, however, it says it lacks some  
17 necessary preliminary studies to show that the feasibility  
18 of the systems going to be used reduces a certain level of  
19 their enthusiasm.

20 I think, however, that's why we're doing  
21 the research, in order to fill in those kind of blanks, so  
22 I would still accept the overall ranking of 1.75 in the  
23 overall description of the innovative project and the  
24 investigator being excellent and the environment being

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 excellent, so I would still fund it.

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: Further discussion? Are we  
3 looking at a no change?

4 DR. WALLACK: I would move no change.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: We don't a move for a no  
6 change I understand, so we will move onto Maher.  
7 08SCBUCHC012, Maher, at a peer review score of 1.6,  
8 500,000 dollars has been requested. Those who may discuss  
9 and vote are Arinzeh, Huang, Jennings, Kiessling, Wagers,  
10 Fishbone, Genel, Landwirth, Latham, Mandelkern and  
11 Wallack, with members of cognizance being Jennings and  
12 Genel.

13 DR. JENNINGS: And, so, to remind you, the  
14 point of this proposal is to do a comprehensive  
15 examination of phosphor tyrosine in human embryonic stem  
16 cells in the undifferentiated and differentiated state. I  
17 was quite impressed with this one. I was impressed with  
18 the PI's track record of productivity. I was impressed by  
19 his technical innovation, and the referees basically said  
20 the same thing.

21 There is significant enthusiasm for this  
22 project, is their bottom line, so I would like to keep  
23 this one where it is. I think this is a good grant.

24 MS. TOWNSHEND: Discussion? Dr. Genel?

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 DR. GENEL: No change.

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: No change.

3 MS. HORN: Dr. Kiessling?

4 DR. KIESSLING: Yes.

5 MS. HORN: Welcome back.

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: We move onto --

7 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Just a second.

8 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yes, sir?

9 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: It appears to me that  
10 we're now in an environment where all the grants are good  
11 grants. I don't know if those last four we're going to  
12 get somebody to suddenly, you know -- these are all grants  
13 that are of 1.75 or less? 1.55 or less, so what are we  
14 going to do, turn around and say good grants, not a good  
15 grant? I'm not trying to be facetious, and I don't think  
16 any of the -- most of these have moved forward, because  
17 the two individuals on the committee who have reviewed it  
18 have recommended that.

19 Are they suddenly going to back off and say  
20 what I thought was a good idea isn't a good idea? I think  
21 you're wasting your time on the last four, but that's just  
22 me.

23 DR. KIESSLING: Can I ask you a question?

24 Have any of the established investigator grants been moved

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 from the yes to the no category?

2 MS. HORN: We did move two grants to the  
3 reserve, in case the Redmond grant does not pass muster.

4 DR. KIESSLING: Okay.

5 MS. HORN: Or some other grant. In case  
6 there's money left over.

7 DR. FISHBONE: The only question I would  
8 have is that nobody is commenting on the budgets, and that  
9 was one of the things that we were kind of looking at them  
10 for, is are there any budgetary issues on any of the  
11 grants we're approving?

12 DR. JENNINGS: So we're approximately  
13 300,000 over our full target allocation for this group.

14 MR. MANDELKERN: It's very close on target.

15 DR. JENNINGS: We're 10 percent over where  
16 we need to be.

17 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I'd like to move on.

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: Is that the will of the  
19 group, to move onto the seed grants? We will start, and  
20 we will do this, again, in reverse order of peer review  
21 score, beginning with 08SCAUCHC014, Chamberlin.

22 DR. JENNINGS: 08?

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: 014.

24 DR. JENNINGS: Number 14?

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: Correct, under the seed  
2 grants. Chamberlin is the primary investigator, and I  
3 need to turn the page.

4 MS. HORN: We have moved to the seed  
5 grants. All of the other established investigators remain  
6 in the funding pool.

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: 2.5 is the peer review  
8 score. Those who may vote and discuss, Arinzeh, Huang,  
9 Jennings, Kiessling, Wagers, Fishbone, Genel, Landwirth,  
10 Latham, Mandelkern and Wallack, with Huang and Genel as  
11 the members of cognizance.

12 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Somebody ready to  
13 talk about that?

14 DR. HUANG: Yes. Chamberlin is the last  
15 seed grant that we had approved. It is to do with PRC.  
16 It's a protein complex that binds the chromatin, and it's  
17 been proven in mice to play a role in embryonic stem cell  
18 differentiation. And the PI was involved in that work and  
19 is now proposing to do the same thing by RNAI in the human  
20 system.

21 So it's tough, because I think of all of  
22 the grants up there, this is the one that received the  
23 worst score, but it was still a very good grant, so I  
24 think, in light of the fact that we're over the limit, our

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 choices would be to reduce, you know, amounts or to reduce  
2 grants, so I would be in favor of putting this, moving  
3 this to the reserve category.

4 MS. TOWNSHEND: Is that a motion?

5 DR. HUANG: Yes. It's a motion to do that.

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: The motion on the floor  
7 right now is to move 08SCAUCHC014, Chamberlin, to the  
8 reserve category. Do I hear a second?

9 A MALE VOICE: Second.

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: So moved. Discussion? We  
11 do need to take a vote with regard to that. Yes means it  
12 will move to the reserve category. No means it will stay  
13 where it is. Dr. Arinzeh? Yes, sir?

14 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Paul said something  
15 very interesting, and I'm not sure I heard him very  
16 clearly, and I think I understood, that he's saying we're  
17 now at a point where we're either going to cut grants or  
18 take a percentage off, fund all the grants at a uniformly  
19 reduced percentage. Is that what you, or did I  
20 misinterpret you?

21 DR. HUANG: Well I was making a comment  
22 about the reality of the amount of money that we have and  
23 the number of grants that are up on the board. And if  
24 we're trying to reach a 1.6-million-dollar target for the

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 seed grants, that's eight grants at 200,000 each, and  
2 we're currently at 11, so that's why I proposed to move  
3 the grant outside of the yes.

4 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Or we could do 10  
5 grants at a reduced, at 175,000 dollars each.

6 DR. HUANG: Yes.

7 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: You know what I'm  
8 saying, is if all of these are worthy and should be done,  
9 should we take the total number of grants, which are 11,  
10 and divide that into the total amount of funding and give  
11 everybody a percentage, or do we want to cut entire grants  
12 completely? I think that's a decision point.

13 DR. GENEL: Well I could speak to both,  
14 both ways. I think, since we are creating a reserve  
15 category, and 200,000 dollars over two years is really not  
16 a heck of a lot of money, I would favor cutting down and  
17 then determining whether or not we want to tinker a little  
18 bit with some of the margins.

19 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: That's fine, as long  
20 as we think that through.

21 DR. JENNINGS: Mr. Chairman, I didn't  
22 understand the proposal. I'm sorry. Mike, your proposal  
23 is uniformly across the board or to eliminate one of these  
24 grants?

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 DR. GENEL: To cut the grants?

2 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Eliminate.

3 DR. GENEL: Well to put it into a reserve  
4 category.

5 DR. JENNINGS: I still don't understand.  
6 Are you saying to identify one grant that moves into the  
7 reserve category?

8 DR. GENEL: That's right.

9 DR. JENNINGS: I agree with that.

10 DR. GENEL: Rather than cutting.

11 DR. JENNINGS: You're opposed to cutting  
12 across the board.

13 DR. GENEL: At this time.

14 DR. JENNINGS: Good. We agree. Good.

15 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, Milt?

16 DR. WALLACK: I would take, as I understand  
17 it, a slightly different viewpoint. I think the strength  
18 of what we're trying to do is involve as many young  
19 researchers in what we're doing as possible. I was just  
20 at a little bit of a retreat a week or so ago, and there  
21 may have been 100 young people in a room extremely excited  
22 about going forward in this new field for them.

23 I can see why we would cut the Chamberlin  
24 grant, because, as, Paul, you indicated, it was the lowest

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 of the ranking ones that we did add it on after, not  
2 during, but after the entire process. Based upon that,  
3 I'm okay with taking the Chamberlin one off.

4 I would hope that, at least what I would  
5 rather see happening, is we keep the other 10 on, cut them  
6 by a certain percentage. If you cut them by 10 percent or  
7 15 percent, if you took them down to 80,000 dollars a  
8 year, or 85,000 dollars a year, I'm not a scientist, but I  
9 have a suspicion they would still be able to go forward  
10 with their work, and we would then retain them in the  
11 whole effort to involve more young people.

12 I would take the entire 10 right now,  
13 decide upon a percentage cut, and go forward with those  
14 10.

15 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: We have 1.6 million  
16 dollars, so if you take -- if you get rid of the --

17 DR. WALLACK: If I took 20 percent --

18 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: No, listen. Wait a  
19 minute. Hold it. You're going to have to cut them 40,000  
20 dollars each on the average.

21 DR. WALLACK: Right. That would be 20  
22 percent.

23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah. All the  
24 200,000-dollar grants become 160,000 times 10 is 1.6

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 million.

2 DR. WALLACK: Right.

3 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: That's another way.

4 DR. WALLACK: That's my 80, 85, you know,  
5 in that ballpark, per year.

6 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah, okay. A 20  
7 percent reduction of the entire grant.

8 DR. WALLACK: And keep them in the process.

9 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. Wait a minute.  
10 Amy?

11 DR. WAGERS: I was just going to say that a  
12 20 percent reduction on a short-term 200,000 dollar grant  
13 is going to be much more difficult than, you know, a 10  
14 percent reduction on a 500,000 dollar grant in the  
15 established investigator category, and, so, if we're going  
16 to do these kinds of percentage cuts, I would actually  
17 protect the seed grants from that and cut in another  
18 category.

19 DR. WALLACK: I wouldn't have any problem  
20 with it, what Amy said at all, as long as I kept, and  
21 that's the main intent here, as long as I kept those 10. I  
22 don't want to see those 10 cut.

23 DR. JENNINGS: Right now, we have 11.

24 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. Yes, Mr.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 Wollschlager?

2 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: If I can just make a  
3 couple of points, Commissioner?

4 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yes.

5 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: One is that there's a  
6 motion on the floor.

7 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yup.

8 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: And that motion is to  
9 move Chamberlin over to the reserve.

10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah.

11 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: We're not talking about  
12 any 10 here.

13 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I can't comment on  
14 that. What I'm trying to say is, I think that Milt and I  
15 are trying to say the same thing, is that aren't we  
16 chartered to try to influence as many new seed grant  
17 investigators as possible, and what is the best way to do  
18 that? Is it by having one less or two less investigators,  
19 or by cutting everybody by a significant fraction, or by  
20 funding them all and cutting someplace else?

21 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Understood,  
22 Commissioner. And just as a reminder to this group, we  
23 had this exact same discussion last year.

24 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: We'll probably have

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 it next year, too.

2 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: And what the body, the  
3 exact same body for the most part, decided was 200,000 was  
4 just barely enough for a two-year seed grant. That's one  
5 year more inflation. If anything, that 200,000 is worth  
6 less than you guys decided it was last year.

7 DR. WALLACK: And I would pick up on what  
8 Amy said, cut it somewhere else, but not --

9 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. Yes, Bob? Let  
10 me finish.

11 MS. HORN: Just a moment, Ann.

12 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Go ahead, Ann.

13 MS. HORN: Go ahead, Ann.

14 DR. KIESSLING: This is Ann Kiessling.

15 Actually, I think we did this last year, we made some  
16 across the board cuts, and I think that in many respects  
17 that's a good idea. Twenty percent is a pretty deep cut  
18 out of a seed grant, so I'm just throwing that out.

19 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. As we proceed,  
20 are we going to fund all of them at the requested rate and  
21 take the money from some other place in the program, are  
22 we going to fund some of them at the requested rate and  
23 not fund any at all, or are we going to fund all of them  
24 at a significant reduction in funding, baring in mind Dr.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 Wagers' comment and Warren's comment, that taking them  
2 from 200 to 160 and not factoring in inflation may really  
3 handicap the grant?

4 Bob, did you have a comment?

5 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes. I agree,  
6 wholeheartedly --

7 COURT REPORTER: Turn your microphone.

8 MR. MANDELKERN: -- as many young  
9 investigators as possible. I think the first thing we  
10 have to do is to deal with Chamberlin and reduce the  
11 number of seeds from 11 to 10. That would give us --  
12 (multiple conversations). We have not. There's been no  
13 vote.

14 And then that would leave us with 10 yes  
15 seed grants, which is double the amount that we committed  
16 to. I feel this keenly, because I was in the  
17 subcommittee, and I put the phrase in at least, so we are  
18 doubling what we committed to, which is commendable.

19 I do not think we should look to cut them  
20 down, because I think 200,000 for two years is a minimum  
21 to get started, however, I would point out that in the  
22 established investigators, we have been very generous,  
23 because of 11 million dollars requested, we are given over  
24 three million tentatively, tentatively, which is a much --

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 I think we can find the reduction in established  
2 investigators, which has been very generously funded so  
3 far.

4 DR. JENNINGS: I agree with Bob.

5 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Let's move on and  
6 take this vote.

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: I'm going to call --

8 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Are we ready to do  
9 that?

10 DR. CANALIS: One sentence?

11 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Canalis?

12 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yeah.

13 DR. CANALIS: If you took 10 percent out of  
14 the seed and 10 percent out of the established  
15 investigators, you could probably fund everybody at the  
16 tune of five million dollars, which is pretty close to  
17 what you have, and then you need to fine tune a couple of  
18 hundred thousand dollars.

19 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. What we're  
20 saying is that we want to fund all of the seed grants.

21 DR. JENNINGS: No. Chamberlin is still on  
22 the table.

23 DR. CANALIS: I am in conflict with  
24 Chamberlin.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: There is a motion for  
2 Chamberlin on the floor, but I don't know who Chamberlin  
3 is, and I wouldn't know him if I met him, but I'd feel  
4 pretty badly if I were the one that got knocked off and  
5 then they decided to fund everybody else. That's a little  
6 different philosophy. Are we going to fund everybody who  
7 is a seed investigator, except me, if I'm Chamberlin?

8 MS. HORN: You need a microphone.

9 COURT REPORTER: You're not on the record.

10 DR. CANALIS: 2.2 plus 35 is 55, less 10  
11 percent is five million. You could probably get a 10  
12 percent reduction. You could fund everybody here for five  
13 million, instead of 4.8, and then you need to make a  
14 couple of hundred thousand dollar adjustment elsewhere.

15 DR. GENEL: I'm okay with that, but let me  
16 remind you that we have cut off the established  
17 investigators at a peer review score of 1.75, and that we  
18 are at a somewhere around a 2.2 in terms of the seed  
19 grants, so there's a discordance there.

20 I recognize, and I will say this right off  
21 the bat, I wouldn't expect to fund at quite the same level  
22 for the seed as I would for the established, but there is  
23 a gap there, and we ought to at least put that into the  
24 picture.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: There is a motion. Dr.  
2 Latham?

3 DR. LATHAM: Right now, with all the stuff  
4 we have on the board, not doing anything yet about  
5 Chamberlin, because we haven't, we're at 10.989 million  
6 dollars spent, which is 1.189, roughly 1.2 million over,  
7 so what we have to be thinking about is getting 1.2  
8 million off the board. It's going to be still some more  
9 serious cuts.

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: The motion on -- any  
11 further discussion? The motion on the floor right now is  
12 to move 08SCAUHC014, Chamberlin, to the reserve category,  
13 should the Redmond grant not make it through its ESCRO  
14 process.

15 A yes vote will put that in the reserve  
16 category. A no vote will leave it where it stands.

17 MS. HORN: Dr. Kiessling, are you with us?

18 DR. KIESSLING: I understand that you're  
19 moving Chamberlin out of the fundable group?

20 MS. HORN: That is the motion. We're going  
21 to do a roll call.

22 DR. KIESSLING: Remind me, what was the  
23 title of that grant?

24 DR. JENNINGS: The role of polycomb

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 repressive complex 2 in the maintenance of poor potency in  
2 human embryonic stem cells.

3 MS. HORN: Did you catch that?

4 DR. KIESSLING: Is that the one that Paul  
5 Huang reviewed?

6 DR. HUANG: Yes, that's right.

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: That's correct.

8 DR. HUANG: And I'm now moving to move it  
9 into the reserve category.

10 MS. HORN: And Dr. Huang is moving to have  
11 it moved into the reserve category.

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: And it has been moved and  
13 seconded. I will call the roll at this time. Arinzeh is  
14 not on the line. Huang?

15 DR. HUANG: Yes.

16 MS. TOWNSHEND: Jennings?

17 DR. JENNINGS: Yes.

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: Kiessling?

19 DR. KIESSLING: Yes.

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: Wagers?

21 DR. WAGERS: Yes.

22 MS. TOWNSHEND: Fishbone?

23 DR. FISHBONE: Yes.

24 MS. TOWNSHEND: Genel?

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 DR. GENEL: Yes.

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: Landwirth?

3 DR. LANDWIRTH: Yes.

4 MS. TOWNSHEND: Latham?

5 DR. LATHAM: Yes.

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: Mandelkern?

7 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes.

8 MS. TOWNSHEND: Wallack?

9 DR. WALLACK: Yes.

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: The motion passes. Please  
11 move 08SCAUCHC014 to the reserve category. Where would we  
12 like to go from here? Are we now going to consider these  
13 the same way we had done the established investigator,  
14 because I know there was a lot of discussion with regard  
15 to percentages. I'm not sure quite where to go. Warren,  
16 I'm going to defer to you on this. Okay.

17 Up for consideration at this time is  
18 08SCAUCHC033, Chuthari(phonetic), with a peer review score  
19 of 2.1, requesting 200,000 dollars.

20 DR. JENNINGS: I'm sorry. The number there  
21 is?

22 MS. TOWNSHEND: 033. Those eligible to  
23 discuss and vote, Arinzeh, Huang, Jennings, Kiessling,  
24 Wagers, Fishbone, Genel, Landwirth, Latham, Mandelkern,

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 Wallack. Members of cognizance are Landwirth and  
2 Kiessling, and if one of them could remind us what this  
3 grant is about?

4 MS. HORN: Dr. Kiessling?

5 DR. KIESSLING: Yes.

6 MS. HORN: We're considering 033.

7 DR. GENEL: This is the one that was  
8 related to people with glaucoma.

9 DR. KIESSLING: Okay, yes.

10 DR. GENEL: They were trying to get cells  
11 to go in the trabecular meshwork to do that. Ann,  
12 remember that now?

13 MS. HORN: Yeah. She's out of the  
14 tollbooth now. I think she can comment. Are you familiar  
15 with what grant we're on?

16 DR. KIESSLING: No.

17 MS. HORN: Okay. It's the Chuthari grant.

18 DR. KIESSLING: Yes, okay.

19 MS. HORN: For glaucoma. If you could make  
20 a brief comment on that, we'd appreciate it.

21 DR. KIESSLING: And that's one that I  
22 reviewed? Can you give me the title of it?

23 DR. JENNINGS: Differentiation of human  
24 embryonic stem cell lines to neural pressed derived

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 trabecular meshwork like cells implication in glaucoma.

2 DR. KIESSLING: Sorry. I can't hear that.

3 It might be a little bit better if my co-reviewer --

4 MS. HORN: Well here's the title.

5 Differentiation of human embryonic stem cell lines to  
6 neural pressed derived trabecular meshwork like cells  
7 implication in glaucoma.

8 DR. KIESSLING: Oh, yeah. That was an  
9 excellent grant. What are we trying to do? We're trying  
10 to decide if it should stay in the yes category?

11 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yes.

12 DR. KIESSLING: Oh, wow. And that's a seed  
13 grant, right?

14 MS. HORN: That's correct.

15 DR. KIESSLING: That's going to be tough  
16 for me to move out of the yes category. That's an  
17 important project, and they had a really good approach.

18 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay.

19 DR. WALLACK: My sense is that we had a  
20 consensus, I believe, that we wanted to keep all 10 of the  
21 seeds, so, with your permission, I would like to recommend  
22 that we go to the individual, back to the individual  
23 investigators now, since we also said that there might be  
24 a little bit more flexibility there to make the cuts of

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 the million dollars that we still have to cut.

2 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: That was my  
3 impression of what we were going to do.

4 DR. WALLACK: I would move that we go back  
5 to the individual investigators at this point.

6 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay.

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: Do we have a second on that  
8 motion?

9 MR. MANDELKERN: Seconded.

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: Now we vote individually  
11 for the entire group, or we just --

12 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Consensus.

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: Consensus. All those in  
14 favor of going back to -- established.

15 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: To established.

16 MS. TOWNSHEND: Thank you. And we will  
17 take that individually? Dr. Canalis?

18 DR. CANALIS: Commissioner, would you  
19 consider the possibility --

20 DR. KIESSLING: -- motion, Marianne?

21 MS. HORN: Yes. We're going to leave all  
22 the seeds where they are right now, and we're going back  
23 to the established investigators and take a look at them  
24 as a whole.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 DR. KIESSLING: Total funding right now for  
2 the seed grants?

3 MS. HORN: The total funding right now for  
4 the seed grants, we have 10 left in the running, so  
5 roughly two million.

6 DR. KIESSLING: We're shooting for 1.6.

7 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Hang on.

8 COURT REPORTER: One moment, please.

9 DR. CANALIS: Commissioner?

10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yes, Dr. Canalis?

11 DR. CANALIS: I would like to make the case  
12 to cut across the board 10 percent. That is a modest  
13 impact on seed grants and established investigators, and  
14 if we were to do that, we would be able to save all the  
15 seed and all the established investigator grants that we  
16 have before us.

17 The reality is that investigator initiated  
18 grants are the ones that usually made the major advances  
19 in science. The reality is we want to protect the new  
20 investigators and new investigators in the field.

21 And the fear I have is that for -- if we  
22 exchange a modest decrease of 10 percent, you know, for an  
23 investigator, this could be the investigator that is going  
24 to make major contributions.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 I would ask you to please reconsider the  
2 possibility of a 10 percent cut in the two categories, so  
3 that everybody could get funded.

4 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Now does everybody  
5 understand what my colleague, Dr. Canalis, is proposing?  
6 If I understand it correctly, he's proposing to cut all  
7 the yellow and would you call that pink or fuchsia?

8 DR. CANALIS: Fuchsia.

9 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Fuchsia. All the  
10 pink and fuchsia grants by 10 percent across the board  
11 versus going into the established investigator grants and  
12 disapproving one or more.

13 DR. WALLACK: I understand exactly where  
14 Ernie is coming from, and I started off there --  
15 convinced, though, that the 200,000 dollars for the junior  
16 investigative seed grants is a very tight budget, and we  
17 still may have to do that.

18 Ernie, could we possibly take the 10  
19 percent off the individual investigative to start with?  
20 That would save us almost 400,000 dollars, 375, 350. It  
21 would give us 350, so now we only have to do another  
22 600,000.

23 DR. CANALIS: The money is not there, Milt.  
24 (Multiple conversations).

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Just a moment.

2 DR. CANALIS: I'm sorry. And you have 5.5  
3 to be left, so we're over 10 million dollars, and the  
4 dollars are not there to do that.

5 DR. WALLACK: All right. You know what,  
6 then? Why can't we then say we'll do the 10 percent,  
7 continue to move down the board --

8 DR. CANALIS: -- come back to the seed,  
9 yeah. (Multiple conversations).

10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Just a moment,  
11 please. Let the other individuals finish.

12 DR. WALLACK: Let's do the 10 percent on  
13 these two categories, move down the rest of the board. If  
14 we can reinstate any of those cuts, we can do that.

15 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I don't understand  
16 what you mean by move down the rest.

17 DR. WALLACK: You still have the group, and  
18 you still have the cores that we have to look at.

19 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Oh. I would say that  
20 was across rather than down. Okay.

21 DR. WALLACK: -- 10 percent off these two,  
22 let's now move to the groups and the cores, we'll see what  
23 we can cut there. If we have room, we can then reinstate  
24 the seed.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. Yes, Bob?

2 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes. I would like to  
3 comment that before we go to group and core cuts, Milt,  
4 which are very important, we should recognize one fact,  
5 that we have 24 applications in established investigators.

6 We are talking of funding seven of 24. That is over 30  
7 percent of the applications. We are funding barely 10  
8 percent of the seeds and much less percentage wise of the  
9 group and core.

10 I think we could look first and foremost to  
11 cuts in the established investigators, where half a  
12 million dollar budgets over short periods would not impact  
13 anywhere near as grossly as cutting the seed grants that  
14 we want to encourage new investigators to attract and come  
15 to Connecticut.

16 Established investigators are here, and  
17 whether they are funded for the full 500, or 450, or 400,  
18 I think they will stay in their spots and take the  
19 funding. We have looked to the established with over 30  
20 percent funding of the group, and I think that's where we  
21 should look first and foremost.

22 DR. JENNINGS: Mr. Chairman, if I may? I  
23 agree with Bob's sentiment. I am opposed to cutting the  
24 seed grants below 200,000. I think we considered that

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 issue very carefully last year, and, as Warren has  
2 reminded us, inflation has further reduced that.

3 I feel that 200,000 over two years is the  
4 minimum reasonable amount to get a substantial project  
5 done, so I'm opposed to 10 percent cut there.

6 I agree with Bob's point about the senior  
7 investigators. I believe that that's where we can look  
8 for further cuts most productively, so that's what I would  
9 like to do.

10 I feel that, just to finish the thought, I  
11 feel that we have already scrutinized both the cores and  
12 the group projects and made substantial cuts, in some  
13 cases draconian cuts to their budgets. I would see it as  
14 a last resort to dig further into that. I think the  
15 senior investigators is where we should be looking in the  
16 first instance to make up the numbers.

17 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I will comment that  
18 if I look at the individuals in the seed grant, seven of  
19 the 10 are from Yale. The other three, I believe, are  
20 UConn, if I'm counting correctly. I don't think they're  
21 going to die on the vine for lack of 10,000 dollars at  
22 major league universities.

23 I'd like to fund them completely, but I  
24 don't think 10 percent is going to deep six their

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 projects, particularly when they're bankrolled by large  
2 corporations or large entities.

3 I wonder if Dr. Wallack would reiterate  
4 what he'd like to do. I thought there was merit in that,  
5 and then we'll move in one direction or another.

6 DR. WALLACK: I would immediately go to the  
7 group and the cores and see how we can cut from the group  
8 and the cores and then reconsider on the seeds, keeping  
9 them at full strength of the 200,000.

10 With your permission, if we're going to do  
11 that, I would make a recommendation on the Redmond grant,  
12 for example, and I indicated this before. I have a  
13 cumbrance on going forward if we did Redmond at one  
14 million dollars. That would give you 420,000 dollars that  
15 would get us very close.

16 I don't know how the science works, but if  
17 we did -- right now, Rasmussen has 628,000, I can't see it  
18 very clearly, for three years. If we cut that to a two-  
19 year, fund them for two years, he can come back at the end  
20 of two years, we'll know if he's making process, he'll  
21 know that, you know, we'll know if there's validity in  
22 funding further. That would give us another 200,000 and  
23 get us to the point that we have to be at.

24 That would give you over 600,000 dollars in

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 cuts. I would be comfortable with that.

2 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. Just a moment.

3 I think, Dr. Canalis, did you have a statement you'd like  
4 to make?

5 DR. CANALIS: I just wanted to respond,  
6 number one, out of all these seed grants that are reviewed  
7 were individuals who already were living in the State of  
8 Connecticut, so I didn't see any import. I might not have  
9 reviewed somebody from outside the country.

10 And the second comment, the ones at least I  
11 reviewed often were, you know, postdoctoral fellows, and  
12 if you include a salary, fringe benefits, and as modest  
13 amount of supplies, a postdoctoral fellow at 90,000  
14 dollars a year is quite sufficient.

15 So I do not think it was inappropriate to  
16 make a 10 percent cut in the seeds.

17 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. Mr.  
18 Mandelkern?

19 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes. I'd like to call the  
20 attention to those who are suggesting cutting the groups  
21 further, that the Rasmussen request for almost two million  
22 dollars has been reduced to 630,000 dollars already.

23 A MALE VOICE: There were four parts to  
24 that.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes, I know, but I'm  
2 saying, in total, the original request was for two  
3 million, and we brought it down to 600 all over. The  
4 Redmond grant originally was for two million. We brought  
5 it down to 1.4.

6 I think we've sufficiently cut the two  
7 groups when we eliminated a subcontract to Axion, which is  
8 debatable, but we eliminated it. And I think we should  
9 look elsewhere, rather than to the groups. I think that  
10 we should look to the cores, possibly, and, again, to the  
11 established investigators.

12 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I would only add that  
13 the proposal would be a 50 percent reduction in Dr.  
14 Redmond's grant.

15 DR. JENNINGS: Mr. Chairman?

16 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Charles?

17 DR. JENNINGS: I'd just like to say I am  
18 strongly opposed to the idea of a 50 percent cut in what  
19 was our most strongly scoring project, which no science  
20 weaknesses were identified, and we made the initial cuts  
21 in reluctance in response to political considerations, so  
22 I'm strongly opposed to further cutting it.

23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay and Steve?

24 DR. LATHAM: I just had a question.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 Charles, how many years is the Redmond grant?

2 DR. JENNINGS: Four years.

3 DR. LATHAM: Four. And it comes in two  
4 phases, right, a first stage, where they do --

5 DR. JENNINGS: Yeah, they're overlapping.  
6 From memory, it was 16 monkeys in the first cycle and then  
7 24 monkeys in the second cycle, the idea being that the  
8 results of the first will inform the second.

9 DR. LATHAM: Would it be possible to fund  
10 it for a period of two years instead of four?

11 DR. JENNINGS: I think that would be a big  
12 mistake. I mean I think you embark on this is an  
13 integrated strategy, learning as you go. I would not  
14 favor doing that. I think you can do that for a core  
15 facility. I think it's much harder to do that for a  
16 grant.

17 Yeah, we could. I'm sure you can do  
18 anything, but why would we want to? Why would we want to  
19 take away from our top grants in order to fund things that  
20 are, by definition, at the margin of things that would  
21 otherwise be not funded. I just don't see the argument.

22 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: All right. I'll take  
23 one more comment from Dr. Canalis. We've got to move  
24 forward, boys and girls. We've got to decide how we're

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 going to get the grants down to the available money. We  
2 had some propositions on the floor, particularly Dr.  
3 Wallack's, which makes sense to me. We've got to move in  
4 some direction.

5 We're plowing the same ground over and over  
6 again about this stuff. We've got to move in one  
7 direction or another, and I'll entertain one more remark  
8 from Dr. Canalis.

9 DR. CANALIS: Two brief comments. One is,  
10 if we did the 10 percent cuts that are recommended, we  
11 would be closer to the 4.8 million dollars that Dr. Genel  
12 recommended. Right now, we're pretty far apart from that  
13 target, so we're not even near the target.

14 Number two, I do endorse Dr. Wallack's  
15 proposal, because with those two cuts, we would be pretty  
16 close to the 9.8 million dollars.

17 DR. LATHAM: With the two 10 percent cuts  
18 in both the areas, we'd still be 441,000 over.

19 DR. CANALIS: If you added the cut of  
20 Redmond, and that would give you --

21 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Would the group  
22 object to moving forward with Dr. Milt Wallack's  
23 suggestion as a trial, and then, if we have to fine tune  
24 or come back, we can do that? Can we try it?

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 DR. JENNINGS: Could somebody repeat the  
2 suggestion?

3 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Well Dr. Wallack can.

4 MS. HORN: And please do it into the  
5 microphone.

6 DR. WALLACK: I suggested that we cut the  
7 Redmond grant to one million dollars. We cut the  
8 Rasmussen grant one-third. At the same time, fund him  
9 for, indicate to him that this is a two-year grant, the  
10 rationale being that once this new area of investigation  
11 proves itself to be valid, having validity, that he can  
12 come back to us for further funding.

13 By the way, I wouldn't be opposed to Steve  
14 Latham's suggestion, that in cutting the Redmond grant,  
15 that perhaps we indicate to him that it be a two-year  
16 grant, and, similarly, he can come back to us. He's an  
17 established guy. He knows how to put together the  
18 applications. He does this all the time.

19 I do not think it would be a problem, and  
20 that's how I would go. That would cut 650 some odd  
21 thousand dollars and get us pretty much to the point that  
22 we have to be at.

23 DR. JENNINGS: That was clear. I can't  
24 support it, but --

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. Do you want to  
2 make that in the form of a motion?

3 DR. WALLACK: I move it.

4 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Is there a second to  
5 that? Is there a second to Dr. Wallack's motion?

6 DR. FISHBONE: Second.

7 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. Discussion?

8 DR. WALLACK: Ten percent is coming off the  
9 individual investigators and, also, the seed or not? Ten  
10 percent individual investigators. We're leaving the seed  
11 alone.

12 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. Can we write  
13 that, or maybe one of our friends from CI write that out  
14 on a piece of the paper up there, so everybody knows, if  
15 they're eligible to vote, what they're voting for?  
16 (Multiple conversations).

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: I stepped out of the room,  
18 so I would love to have clarification on the motion as it  
19 currently stands, and I will write that down.

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I think there's more  
21 than one part to it, so perhaps if you can detail it, Dr.  
22 Wallack?

23 DR. WALLACK: We're going to cut 10 percent  
24 off the individual investigators.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: Cut 10 percent off  
2 established investigator. Hang on.

3 DR. WALLACK: That's 349,000 dollars, is  
4 that right?

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: Okay. Part one of this  
6 motion is to cut 10 percent off the established  
7 investigator group as a whole. The savings would be --

8 MR. WAGNER: 350,000.

9 MS. TOWNSHEND: Thank you. 350,000  
10 dollars. We can always correct. Is there another part to  
11 this motion? Yes, sir?

12 DR. WALLACK: I would cut the -- the  
13 recommendation was to cut the Redmond project to one  
14 million dollars. Now I'm told by our friends from CI that  
15 I believe that gets us to the point we have to get to, is  
16 that correct?

17 MR. WAGNER: I think you're still 220 over.

18 DR. WALLACK: 220 over?

19 MR. WAGNER: Yes.

20 DR. WALLACK: The other recommendation that  
21 we started off with is looking at cutting Rasmussen and  
22 indicate to him that we fund him only for two years  
23 instead of three years. By doing that, you cut about  
24 200,000 dollars there. If, however, we're only 200,000

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 dollars off, and since it's been pointed out that we've  
2 already cut Rasmussen significantly, maybe we should vote  
3 on the first two parts and have other people from the  
4 group recommend where we get the other 200,000 from.

5 DR. JENNINGS: Just for the record, could  
6 somebody say how much we are deeming to save all together?  
7 What is our target?

8 DR. WALLACK: We're 200,000 short.

9 DR. JENNINGS: What is our total target  
10 saving?

11 MS. TOWNSHEND: At this point?

12 DR. JENNINGS: I'm seeing 1.35 -- I'm  
13 sorry. What am I seeing? 1.77 million here in savings.

14 MS. TOWNSHEND: No. It's about 800,000.

15 DR. JENNINGS: 770.

16 MS. TOWNSHEND: 770. (Multiple  
17 conversations)

18 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: One at a time,  
19 please, because I'm having trouble understanding.

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: I think we need to go back  
21 to Dr. Canalis or Wallack. Yes, sir?

22 DR. CANALIS: May I pose one possibility?

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: Certainly.

24 Dr. CANALIS: I think --

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Hang on. There's a  
2 motion on the floor, which is unclear.

3 MS. TOWNSHEND: Which is Dr. Wallack's  
4 motion?

5 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: And it was seconded  
6 by Dr. Fishbone. I'm not sure any of us are -- I'm not  
7 completely clear about what's been moved and seconded, and  
8 we can't entertain another motion until we table this one.

9 DR. WALLACK: Well I think that Gerry  
10 seconded the cut of 10 percent from the senior individual  
11 investigators and, also, the cut of the 420,000 from  
12 Redmond, so what I would do is vote these two first and  
13 then come back to the consideration of the Rasmussen and  
14 the three cores and see where we get the other 200,000  
15 from.

16 MS. TOWNSHEND: So, Dr. Wallack, just to  
17 make crystal clear what the motion is on the floor that  
18 has been moved and seconded by you and Dr. Fishbone, is to  
19 cut 10 percent off of the established investigator group  
20 as a whole?

21 DR. WALLACK: The fuchsia grants.

22 MS. TOWNSHEND: The fuchsia grants as they  
23 stand now, which would produce a savings of approximately  
24 350,000 dollars, as well as cutting the Redmond project

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 back to one million dollars for a savings of 420,000  
2 dollars, a total savings of 770,000 dollars. That is the  
3 motion at hand.

4 DR. CANALIS: How much does that cost?  
5 Where are we?

6 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Where does that leave  
7 us? Where does the 770 leave us?

8 DR. LATHAM: Everything up on the board was  
9 going to be 989,767 dollars too much, less the 10 percent  
10 on the established folks, you get down to being too much  
11 by 640,146, less, again, 420,000 from Redmond, we get down  
12 to being over our target budget of 9.8 million by only  
13 220,146.

14 MS. TOWNSHEND: So the motion on the floor,  
15 is that something we would need to discuss at this point,  
16 Dr. Galvin?

17 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Well I want to make  
18 sure that that's the motion that Dr. Fishbone seconded,  
19 and now we can discuss that motion.

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: We will discuss that motion  
21 exclusively.

22 DR. JENNINGS: For clarification, this  
23 motion is the single package, not the two separate.

24 MS. TOWNSHEND: It is being offered as one

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 single motion. You are voting on the full motion and  
2 discussing the full motion.

3 DR. FISHBONE: Can I just ask a point? My  
4 seconding was that we were cutting him back to two years'  
5 funding, Dr. Redmond?

6 DR. WALLACK: Right. Exactly. Two years'  
7 funding. Exactly.

8 MS. TOWNSHEND: Over two years. Just to be  
9 crystal clear, the Wallack motion, as it now stands, as  
10 seconded by Dr. Fishbone, is to cut 10 percent off of the  
11 established investigator group, the fuchsia group, as it  
12 currently stands now, for 350,000 dollars in savings, to  
13 cut the Redmond project to a million dollars over two  
14 years, saving 420,000 dollars, for a total savings, if  
15 this motion passes, of 770,000 dollars. Please discuss.

16 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Does everybody  
17 understand that? So that would leave us short 220,000?  
18 Is that right, CI?

19 MR. WAGNER: Yes.

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: So we would, even  
21 after doing this, we would have to go back and cut another  
22 220,000 dollars. Dr. Canalis mentioned to me in passing,  
23 if you cut everybody across the board, you even out the  
24 finances, so a 10 percent cut across the board for

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 everybody would even it out. It's a different way of  
2 doing things. Mr. Mandelkern?

3 MR. MANDELKERN: I am slightly upset with  
4 my colleagues on this committee. We have now proceeded to  
5 consider a motion that cuts the best ranking score, the  
6 best ranking grant out of all 87 grants, by far, the only  
7 one that achieved the score of 1.25.

8 We are leaving intact grants that received  
9 much higher scores. We have taken an axe to the Redmond  
10 from two million now down to one million. I don't  
11 understand the necessity to rush to this judgment when the  
12 cores are still standing at 3,250,000 dollars.

13 Why are we approaching the best grant we  
14 have to emasculate it? This project talks of the best  
15 science that's been presented us in any proposal. It  
16 represents 20 years of research in this field. It  
17 represents significant clinical developments that can  
18 bring glory to the State of Connecticut.

19 It talks of going from in vitro development  
20 into in vivo development. I would heartily suggest to my  
21 colleagues that they think again about cutting this grant  
22 as severely and as shortly as they've suggested and  
23 rethink this motion and defeat it and look elsewhere to  
24 have the savings in the cores, which have hardly been

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 touched at all and could probably use some trimming, and  
2 leave the most viable science that we've been offered  
3 intact.

4 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I disagree with your  
5 remarks. I do not think that this is the most viable  
6 science that has been presented to us. I think it is like  
7 all things associated with stem cell and cellular  
8 research, dicey, and not in a facetious way, but all these  
9 projects have great hope, and someone in that group of  
10 people, whether they're fuchsia, blue, lime, or I don't  
11 know what you call it, corn silk yellow, all of those  
12 individuals have put their hearts and souls into work  
13 publications, doctoral theses and the like, so there is  
14 great hope forever.

15 For everyone on the board, I do not think  
16 that the Redmond grant is the only one that has promise.  
17 Once again, I've been a clinician for a long time, and I'm  
18 not sure that I'm going to see stem cell cures in my  
19 lifetime, however, all these grants have merits.

20 You will all recall that last year we cut  
21 some of the five million dollar cores to two and a half.  
22 They survived. They survived. I will now entertain some  
23 other comments from I think Milt first, then Amy, then  
24 Steve.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 DR. WALLACK: You know, I totally empathize  
2 with my friend, Bob Mandelkern. I understand exactly what  
3 he's saying, however, I just look at it a little  
4 differently. How many years was the grant, a four-year  
5 grant?

6 MR. MANDELKERN: Four years.

7 DR. WALLACK: Four years for two million.  
8 If we now make it a two-year grant for a million dollars,  
9 we have made him whole, especially since we've already  
10 indicated that we can't fund the part of it in St. Kitts,  
11 so I have no reservations about the fact that we've done  
12 the right thing, and he can go forward in this important  
13 research, and Bob should be happy with where we are with  
14 that.

15 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Dr. Wagers, you had a  
16 comment?

17 DR. WAGERS: My comment is basically I was  
18 going to request that we could vote separately on each of  
19 these issues, because I think that there are, obviously,  
20 differences of opinion in grouping them together. It will  
21 probably cause some people to have to vote one way or the  
22 other, based on only half of it, so I was asking that we  
23 sever the two.

24 MR. SALTON: If I may, Commissioner, in

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 fact, I think, because of the disqualifying potential in  
2 each one of these applications, I think you're not going  
3 to vote this motion as it now stands.

4 You're going to have to, because different  
5 people can vote on different ones of the established  
6 contractors, so you're going to have to call on each  
7 established contractor a separate vote to cut it by 10  
8 percent, making sure that you only have the qualified  
9 voters on that 10 percent cut and then call for the vote  
10 on Redmond's proposed cut, if that's what the intention  
11 is.

12 DR. WALLACK: Move that we move forward  
13 with that --

14 DR. JENNINGS: Mr. Chairman?

15 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Hang on. I think  
16 Steve had a comment.

17 DR. JENNINGS: I'm sorry. Mr. Chairman,  
18 I've had my hand up for awhile, as well.

19 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay.

20 DR. JENNINGS: Steve?

21 MS. TOWNSHEND: Steve, please proceed.

22 MR. LATHAM: I'll pass.

23 DR. JENNINGS: Okay. I'll just say I'm  
24 endorsing the suggestion, that we split it. If we're

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 going to package it, I would feel compelled to vote no,  
2 because I strongly object to cutting Redmond for basically  
3 the reasons that Bob has articulated.

4 Yes, we could cut any grant from four to  
5 two years, but if that's the way you want to go, I still  
6 don't see the rationale for picking on the top scoring  
7 grant as opposed to, for example, some of the full  
8 investigator grants, which I believe are also for four  
9 years.

10 We also still have on the table a two  
11 million dollar grant for the core to Yale, and I do think  
12 we should look at that more closely if we are forced to  
13 make further cuts, but I could not support the motion as  
14 it currently appears.

15 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: All right. We'll  
16 need, then, an amendment, I think, to the motion, since it  
17 should be two separate.

18 MR. SALTON: No. Commissioner, I would  
19 suggest that, respectfully, the motion should be  
20 withdrawn, and that we would start out with a motion, for  
21 example, would be motion would be to cut Woo by 10  
22 percent, and that would then be seconded, and then the  
23 appropriate people who can vote on Woo will vote on Woo,  
24 then you would go to, let's say, Lee, and you would vote

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 10 percent off Lee, until you go through all the  
2 established and then vote on Redmond, or you could start  
3 with Redmond and go the other way.

4 It doesn't really matter, but each one of  
5 these things is going to have to be voted on separately.

6 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: That's not what we  
7 did last year. We voted on the categories, unless I  
8 totally disremember it.

9 MR. SALTON: Well I don't know what we did  
10 last year, but we've gone through and done a comparison,  
11 and there are disqualifiers across the board. For  
12 example, on Woo, Dr. Genel, Landwirth and Latham cannot  
13 vote on Woo, but they can vote on Lee. That's the  
14 problem.

15 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Can I ask a  
16 clarification? If the motion was on the floor, saying, as  
17 a policy, we are going to cut any funded individual, you  
18 know, established investigators by 10 percent, that  
19 couldn't be voted on by everybody?

20 MR. SALTON: Well, then you're going to  
21 have to go back and vote again on each individual one  
22 anyone. Now you're sort of doing the same thing anyway.  
23 Might as well vote the funding at this point if you're  
24 going to cut them by 10 percent, as opposed to voting the

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 category. You then have to vote the funding at the  
2 reduced amount individually. Right?

3 MS. TOWNSHEND: Further discussion?

4 DR. FISHBONE: I have a question. One  
5 thing that's troubled me about all of the grants is that  
6 some we're funding for four years, some we're funding for  
7 two years, and it would seem to me it may be a difficult  
8 procedure, but if we gave everybody who requested for four  
9 years funding for two years, it would leave us a lot more  
10 money to fund other things, and it would even out the  
11 playing field.

12 I don't think I've ever seen a review  
13 process where you're mixing all these things together.  
14 Some people could put in for five years, some people put  
15 in for one year, and, clearly, most of the money is going  
16 to go to the five years, because it's five times as much.

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Wagers?

18 DR. WAGERS: Just to respond to that, well,  
19 it is true that in some cases one would go for five years,  
20 because it's a possibility. In some cases, the science  
21 may require that long to accomplish, so cutting a core  
22 facility's tenure is simpler than cutting a research  
23 project's tenure.

24 This is something that I have a concern

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 with, with cutting the Redmond funding down to two years,  
2 is that I haven't read the science, but it is possible  
3 that to accomplish the experiments will require three  
4 years, and, so, we may make it impossible for the science  
5 to go forward by cutting the time of the grant, so that's  
6 my only concern with blanket cutting.

7 DR. FISHBONE: I don't think that's the  
8 case. There are four different sets of experiments doing  
9 one each year and moving on, but I don't see any reason  
10 why a four-year grant can't come back in two years and say  
11 this is what we've achieved, you know, can we get funding  
12 for another two years?

13 We only really have enough to fund  
14 everybody for one year, but we're funding a lot for four  
15 years and other people for nothing.

16 DR. KIESSLING: I'm about to go into the  
17 subway.

18 DR. CANALIS: I agree with Amy. I think,  
19 you know, if you start making arbitrary decisions and cut  
20 the -- (multiple conversations).

21 MS. HORN: I think we have a series of  
22 motions here that need to coalesce around something, so I  
23 think we're not going to be able to utilize your vote  
24 right now.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 DR. KIESSLING: Okay. Bye, bye.

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: Bye, Ann.

3 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Dr. Canalis, I could  
4 not hear you.

5 DR. CANALIS: I agree with Amy. I have  
6 difficulties in cutting the length of funding without very  
7 specific reasons. I mean I think the peer review has  
8 looked at this. We've looked at these grants for two days  
9 already, and suddenly to say you can do the work in half  
10 the time and come back, you know, as an investigator, that  
11 it were to happen to me, frankly, I would be devastated.

12 They made an honest plan for a four-year  
13 proposal, you know, I think we're becoming arbitrary in  
14 telling them now you have to get the work done in two  
15 years, and, if you can't -- you know, I find it much  
16 fairer to go 10 percent across the board than starting to  
17 pick grants and cutting them by 50 percent, particularly,  
18 you know, on a time base cut.

19 I agree with Amy. At this point, I think  
20 it would be difficult for me to support that.

21 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. We have a  
22 problem that is very simple. We have more grants than we  
23 have money, okay? And we have to find a satisfactory way  
24 of getting to the point where the output and the inflow in

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 accounting balance.

2                   There are some ways of doing that. I think  
3 Henry's point is well taken, that since everybody can't  
4 vote on every item, on each item, I can't vote on any  
5 items, then they will have to be subjected to an  
6 individual vote, or a serial vote, do all the ones that  
7 Team A can vote on, all the ones that Team B can vote on,  
8 because, basically, there are people who are recused  
9 because they either have a connection to Yale, or UConn,  
10 or, in my case, both.

11                   DR. WALLACK: Bob, I'd like to take your  
12 recommendation, then, and begin the process of voting on  
13 the fuchsia at 10 percent on each of those, and let's move  
14 forward with those individual --

15                   MS. TOWNSHEND: So are you withdrawing your  
16 motion, as it appears here, and we will resubmit?

17                   DR. WALLACK: I'll withdraw the motion,  
18 because of what Henry has indicated, and go back to the  
19 individual investigators, and I would move that we begin  
20 the process of polling the group on 10 percent for each of  
21 those projects.

22                   MS. TOWNSHEND: Do we have a second?

23                   MR. SALTON: Well I think what we need now  
24 is someone to say -- for example, we'll start with the

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 first one, Woo, vote to approve that in a 10 percent  
2 reduction. That would be the motion.

3 DR. WALLACK: I would so move.

4 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, but, basically,  
5 that's the non-Yale team can vote on Yale stuff, and the  
6 non-UConn team can vote on UConn stuff. There's only two  
7 groups of voters.

8 MS. TOWNSHEND: What I can do is I can call  
9 the roll for each.

10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: We've got to make  
11 this relatively simple, folks.

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: Correct.

13 MS. HORN: Bob, you know who you're recused  
14 from. I think you're the only one with multiple recusals.

15 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I have multiple  
16 recusals.

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: We will call the roll for  
18 each of the established investigator --

19 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Not for each of them.  
20 If they're Yale, it's the same people who can't vote for  
21 Yale. You know, one Yale grant can't vote for the next  
22 one. Lump the Yales and lump the UConns. If you can't  
23 vote for Yale, you can't vote for Yale. If you can't vote  
24 for UConn, you can't vote.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1                   What's going to change from one grant to  
2 the other?

3                   MR. SALTON: Well we might have people who  
4 have different votes on Woo versus another one. That's  
5 the difference.

6                   MS. TOWNSHEND: I hate to ask the question.  
7 Are we starting at the top, or are we starting at the  
8 bottom?

9                   COMMISSIONER GALVIN: What are we voting  
10 on, 10 percent reduction?

11                   MS. TOWNSHEND: We're voting on a 10  
12 percent reduction. Either way, I will make it clear what  
13 the motion is and would ask that a committee member --

14                   COMMISSIONER GALVIN: They're all 10  
15 percent reductions?

16                   MS. TOWNSHEND: That's my understanding.  
17 We start with 08SCB Yale 026, Woo is the principal  
18 investigator, 1.45 is the peer review score, currently at  
19 496,465 dollars. The motion on the table is to reduce  
20 that amount by 10 percent.

21                   Saying yes will agree to reducing the  
22 amount for Dr. Woo's grant by 10 percent. I will call the  
23 roll on Dr. Woo. I'm making sure I have the right one.  
24 Just to clarify, is there anyone on the phone, Arinzeh or

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 Kiessling? Okay. I will skip them. Dr. Canalis?  
2 DR. CANALIS: Yes.  
3 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Huang?  
4 DR. HUANG: Yes.  
5 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Jennings?  
6 DR. JENNINGS: Yes.  
7 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Kiessling? Not here.  
8 Wagers?  
9 DR. WAGERS: Yes.  
10 MS. TOWNSHEND: Fishbone?  
11 DR. FISHBONE: Yes.  
12 MS. TOWNSHEND: Mandelkern?  
13 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes.  
14 MS. TOWNSHEND: Wallack?  
15 DR. WALLACK: Yes.  
16 MS. TOWNSHEND: The motion passes. This  
17 grant is reduced by 10 percent. 08SCB Yale 013, 1.5 peer  
18 review score, Vaccarino(phonetic) is the primary  
19 investigator. The motion on the table is to reduce the  
20 amount of funding by 10 percent. Is that so moved by a  
21 committee member?  
22 A MALE VOICE: Moved.  
23 MS. TOWNSHEND: Seconded?  
24 DR. WAGERS: Seconded.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: Thank you. Canalis?  
2 DR. CANALIS: Yes.  
3 MS. TOWNSHEND: Huang?  
4 DR. HUANG: Yes.  
5 MS. TOWNSHEND: Jennings?  
6 DR. JENNINGS: Yes.  
7 MS. TOWNSHEND: Wagers?  
8 DR. WAGERS: Yes.  
9 MS. TOWNSHEND: Fishbone?  
10 DR. FISHBONE: Yes.  
11 MS. TOWNSHEND: Mandelkern?  
12 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes.  
13 MS. TOWNSHEND: Wallack?  
14 DR. WALLACK: Yes.  
15 MS. TOWNSHEND: The motion is passed.  
16 Vaccarino, Yale 013, is reduced in funding by 10 percent.  
17 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Let's do the last  
18 Yale one down on the right.  
19 MS. TOWNSHEND: 08SCBYSME025, McLawson,  
20 1.75 for 500,000 dollars.  
21 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Motion, please?  
22 MS. TOWNSHEND: Do we have a motion to  
23 reduce the funding for this grant for 10 percent?  
24 MR. MANDELKERN: So moved.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: Do we have this seconded?  
2 Thank you. I will call the roll. Canalis?  
3 DR. CANALIS: Yes.  
4 MS. TOWNSHEND: Huang?  
5 DR. HUANG: Yes.  
6 MS. TOWNSHEND: Jennings?  
7 DR. JENNINGS: Yes.  
8 MS. TOWNSHEND: Wagers?  
9 DR. WAGERS: Yes.  
10 MS. TOWNSHEND: Fishbone?  
11 DR. FISHBONE: Yes.  
12 MS. TOWNSHEND: Mandelkern?  
13 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes.  
14 MS. TOWNSHEND: Wallack?  
15 DR. WALLACK: Yes.  
16 MS. TOWNSHEND: The motion passes.  
17 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay, now do the  
18 first UConn one. I think it's Maher.  
19 A MALE VOICE: I'd like to move to reduce  
20 Maher by 10 percent.  
21 DR. WAGERS: Second.  
22 MS. TOWNSHEND: Okay, so, we're going  
23 across like this? All right. 08SCBUCHC012, Maher,  
24 500,000 dollars. It has been moved to reduce this by 10

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 percent.

2 A MALE VOICE: Second that.

3 MS. TOWNSHEND: It's already been moved and  
4 seconded. Huang?

5 DR. HUANG: Yes.

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: Jennings?

7 DR. JENNINGS: Yes.

8 MS. TOWNSHEND: Wagers?

9 DR. WAGERS: Yes.

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: Fishbone?

11 DR. FISHBONE: Yes.

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: Genel?

13 DR. GENEL: Yes.

14 MS. TOWNSHEND: Landwirth?

15 DR. LANDWIRTH: Yes.

16 MS. TOWNSHEND: Latham?

17 DR. LATHAM: Yes.

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: Mandelkern?

19 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes.

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: Wallack?

21 DR. WALLACK: Yes.

22 MS. TOWNSHEND: The Maher grant is reduced  
23 by 10 percent.

24 A MALE VOICE: I can move to reduce

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 Rosenberg by 10 percent.  
2 DR. WAGERS: Second.  
3 MS. TOWNSHEND: 08SCBUCHC021, Rosenberg,  
4 the motion is to reduce this by 10 percent.  
5 DR. JENNINGS: Are you waiting for a  
6 proposal?  
7 MS. TOWNSHEND: No. I'm just making sure I  
8 have the correct notations in my -- Huang?  
9 DR. HUANG: Yes.  
10 MS. TOWNSHEND: Jennings?  
11 DR. JENNINGS: Yes.  
12 MS. TOWNSHEND: Wagers?  
13 DR. WAGERS: Yes.  
14 MS. TOWNSHEND: Fishbone?  
15 DR. FISHBONE: Yes.  
16 MS. TOWNSHEND: Genel?  
17 DR. GENEL: Yes.  
18 MS. TOWNSHEND: Landwirth?  
19 DR. LANDWIRTH: Yes.  
20 MS. TOWNSHEND: Latham?  
21 DR. LATHAM: Yes.  
22 MS. TOWNSHEND: Mandelkern?  
23 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes.  
24 MS. TOWNSHEND: Wallack?

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 DR. WALLACK: Yes.

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: Motion passes. Next?

3 A MALE VOICE: Move to reduce Morist by 10

4 percent.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: And the number of that is,

6 please?

7 A MALE VOICE: 08SCBUCHC015, 500,000

8 dollars.

9 MS. TOWNSHEND: There's a motion.

10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Second, please?

11 DR. JENNINGS: Seconded.

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: There's a motion to reduce

13 this by 10 percent. Dealy, 015? 016, Morist. I

14 apologize. Huang?

15 DR. HUANG: Yes.

16 MS. TOWNSHEND: Jennings?

17 DR. JENNINGS: Yes.

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: Wagers?

19 DR. WAGERS: Yes.

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: Fishbone?

21 DR. FISHBONE: Yes.

22 MS. TOWNSHEND: Genel?

23 DR. GENEL: Yes.

24 MS. TOWNSHEND: Landwirth?

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 DR. LANDWIRTH: Yes.

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: Latham?

3 DR. LATHAM: Yes.

4 MS. TOWNSHEND: Mandelkern?

5 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes.

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: Wallack?

7 DR. WALLACK: Yes.

8 MS. TOWNSHEND: Motion passes. This is on

9 Morist at 016. Next motion?

10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Is that the last of

11 the fuchsias? One more?

12 A MALE VOICE: Move to reduce Lee by 10

13 percent. That's 08SCBUCHC022, funded at 500,000.

14 MS. TOWNSHEND: Moved. Has this been

15 seconded?

16 A MALE VOICE: Second.

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: Moved and seconded. Huang?

18 DR. HUANG: Yes.

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: Jennings?

20 DR. JENNINGS: Yes.

21 MS. TOWNSHEND: Wagers?

22 DR. WAGERS: Yes.

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: Fishbone?

24 DR. FISHBONE: Yes.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: Genel?  
2 DR. GENEL: Yes.  
3 MS. TOWNSHEND: Landwirth?  
4 DR. LANDWIRTH: Yes.  
5 MS. TOWNSHEND: Latham?  
6 DR. LATHAM: Yes.  
7 MS. TOWNSHEND: Mandelkern?  
8 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes.  
9 MS. TOWNSHEND: Wallack? Wallack?  
10 DR. WALLACK: Yes.  
11 MS. TOWNSHEND: Motion passes. Ten percent  
12 reduction on Lee.  
13 COURT REPORTER: One moment, please.  
14 MS. TOWNSHEND: The next one for  
15 consideration I believe would be Redmond. Are we now  
16 considering Redmond?  
17 DR. WALLACK: I would move cutting Redmond.  
18 I heard that it would be better to leave him for four  
19 years, therefore, instead of cutting him the 420,000, I  
20 would cut him the 300,000 and leave him 1120. 300,000 is  
21 my recommendation.  
22 DR. CANALIS: I second.  
23 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Did you second that,  
24 Dr. Canalis?

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 DR. CANALIS: Seconded.

2 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Moved and seconded.

3 MS. TOWNSHEND: To be clear, this is a cut  
4 of 300,000 dollars?

5 DR. WALLACK: 300,000, but we're leaving it  
6 a four-year project.

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: Four-year project.

8 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay.

9 MS. TOWNSHEND: Everyone understand the  
10 vote? All right. Yes means it would be cut by 300,000  
11 for the four years of the proposal.

12 DR. JENNINGS: This is Redmond?

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: This is Redmond. Canalis?

14 DR. CANALIS: Yes.

15 MS. TOWNSHEND: Huang?

16 DR. HUANG: Yes.

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: Jennings?

18 DR. JENNINGS: No.

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: Wagers?

20 DR. WAGERS: No.

21 MS. TOWNSHEND: Fishbone?

22 DR. FISHBONE: Yes.

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: Mandelkern?

24 MR. MANDELKERN: No.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: Wallack?

2 DR. WALLACK: Yes.

3 MS. TOWNSHEND: Motion passes, four to  
4 three. The Redmond grant is cut by 300,000 dollars over  
5 four years.

6 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: That leaves us 340  
7 off.

8 MR. MANDELKERN: I would make a motion, Dr.  
9 Galvin, if I may?

10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Motion from Mr.  
11 Mandelkern.

12 MR. MANDELKERN: The cores are funded as  
13 rough figures at 3,250,000 dollars, since I proposed a 10-  
14 percent cut in the cores across the board, which would  
15 give us a savings of about 325,000 dollars.

16 A MALE VOICE: Second.

17 MR. SALTON: You'll have to vote them  
18 individually.

19 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: They have to vote  
20 them individually. That still leaves us 15,000 short.

21 DR. WALLACK: I'll second the essence of  
22 what he said, the 10 percent, which we'll be voting  
23 individually.

24 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. Amy?

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 DR. WAGERS: I just wanted to recommend  
2 that we do not cut the Agula grant any further, since that  
3 has already been substantially cut from the requested  
4 funding by, actually, 75 percent.

5 DR. JENNINGS: I agree with that, and I  
6 would recommend that most of our savings at this point  
7 should come from the Yale core, which is still at two  
8 million. It's still a very large grant.

9 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. That means  
10 we'll have to amend the motion on the floor or withdraw  
11 it. What's your pleasure, Dr. --

12 DR. JENNINGS: -- how much we need to save.

13 A MALE VOICE: We need to save 340,146.

14 DR. JENNINGS: 340,000.

15 MS. TOWNSHEND: The motion on the floor  
16 still stands?

17 MR. MANDELKERN: No. Well if it's  
18 agreeable to the Chair, I'll withdraw it, since it seems  
19 to be in --

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: The motion is  
21 withdrawn. There is no motion on the floor.

22 MR. SALTON: There should be a motion. If  
23 we're going to look at cores, there needs to be an  
24 individual core motion.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 DR. WALLACK: I'll move that we cut Yale 10  
2 percent.

3 MS. TOWNSHEND: Say again? I'm sorry.

4 DR. WALLACK: I'll move that we cut Yale 10  
5 percent.

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: Motion on the floor right  
7 now is to cut the Yale grant.

8 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: What's the number?

9 MS. TOWNSHEND: I believe it's 08SCD Yale  
10 004. It currently stands at two million dollars, and the  
11 motion on the floor is to cut that by 10 percent. Do I  
12 hear a second?

13 DR. HUANG: Second.

14 MS. TOWNSHEND: Seconded by Dr. Huang.  
15 Discussion?

16 DR. JENNINGS: Can I just clarify? Once  
17 again, we are trying to lose a total of 340,000?

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: Correct.

19 DR. JENNINGS: I agree with Amy, that we  
20 should not cut Agula any further, because we have cut it  
21 so severely. I would like to propose that we divide the  
22 necessary cuts equally on a percentage basis between the  
23 two remaining ones, between the Lin and the Lee core.

24 And you'll recall that I'm in recusal on

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 the Lee one.

2 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: There's already a  
3 motion on the floor.

4 DR. JENNINGS: Oh, okay.

5 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: To cut the Yale grant  
6 by 10 percent.

7 DR. JENNINGS: I thought that the motion  
8 was up for discussion. I'm proposing a slight --

9 DR. CANALIS: I second it.

10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: More discussion?

11 DR. JENNINGS: I'm proposing an  
12 alternative, an equal percentage cut between the Lin and  
13 the Lee cores.

14 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I will call the  
15 question. We need a vote. This vote only concerns the  
16 Yale grant, which will be cut 10 percent or 200,000  
17 dollars. Would you call the roll, Madam?

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yes, sir.

19 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Thank you.

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: A yes vote would mean that  
21 you are cutting the Lin grant by an additional 10 percent.  
22 I will call the roll. Canalis?

23 DR. CANALIS: Yes.

24 MS. TOWNSHEND: Huang?

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 DR. HUANG: Yes.

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: Jennings?

3 DR. JENNINGS: Yes.

4 MS. TOWNSHEND: Wagers?

5 DR. WAGERS: Yes.

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: Fishbone?

7 DR. FISHBONE: Yes.

8 MS. TOWNSHEND: Mandelkern?

9 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes.

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: Wallack?

11 DR. WALLACK: Yes.

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: The motion carries. The

13 Lin grant, which is Yale 004, is cut by an additional 10

14 percent, putting it 1.8 million. Additional funding cuts

15 necessary to put us on budget, sir?

16 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: 141, I think. It's

17 140 and change?

18 DR. WALLACK: 140 and 146 dollars, so

19 slightly over 140,000.

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: We'll do 140. I

21 think we can make up the difference out of our 20 percent

22 admin. We've got to figure a place to find 140,000.

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: Mr. Mandelkern?

24 MR. MANDELKERN: Would you entertain a

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 motion, Dr. Galvin?

2 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yes.

3 MR. MANDELKERN: I propose that we cut the  
4 SCDEVER Lee grant by 10 percent, which would give us from  
5 a million down to 900,000.

6 A MALE VOICE: Second.

7 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. Any  
8 discussion? What's the number on that? I can't quite see  
9 it.

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: Lee is 004.

11 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: 004.

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: I'm sorry. I apologize.  
13 001 is Lee. I had Lin and Lee. I was confused. I  
14 apologize.

15 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. We understand  
16 that? That's grant 001, one million dollars, which will  
17 be cut by 10 percent to 900,000.

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: Discussion? Call the roll,  
19 sir?

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Yup.

21 MS. TOWNSHEND: A yes vote means that you  
22 would cut Dr. Lee's grant by an additional 10 percent.  
23 Canalis?

24 DR. CANALIS: Yes.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: Huang?  
2 DR. HUANG: Yes.  
3 MS. TOWNSHEND: Wagers?  
4 DR. WAGERS: Yes.  
5 MS. TOWNSHEND: Fishbone?  
6 DR. FISHBONE: Yes.  
7 MS. TOWNSHEND: Genel?  
8 DR. GENEL: Yes.  
9 MS. TOWNSHEND: Landwirth?  
10 DR. LANDWIRTH: Yes.  
11 MS. TOWNSHEND: Latham?  
12 DR. LATHAM: Yes.  
13 MS. TOWNSHEND: Mandelkern?  
14 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes.  
15 MS. TOWNSHEND: Wallack?  
16 DR. WALLACK: Yes.  
17 MS. TOWNSHEND: Motion passes. Grant EVER  
18 001 is cut by an additional 10 percent.  
19 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: We'll take the rest -  
20 -  
21 MR. SALTON: Is it 900,000?  
22 MS. TOWNSHEND: That would be down to  
23 900,000, is that correct?  
24 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yes.

2 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. We all set?

3 DR. CANALIS: No.

4 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: No?

5 A MALE VOICE: That leaves us 40,000.

6 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. We'll take  
7 that out of admin, all right? No? (Multiple  
8 conversations) We'll suck up the -- (Multiple  
9 conversations). Let's back up a little. Where are we  
10 after we took the 10 percent off the million-dollar grant?  
11 How short are we?

12 MR. WAGNER: We still have the two million  
13 point 54 off of the group.

14 A MALE VOICE: The total amount up on the  
15 board was over at 989,767. We took 10 percent out of the  
16 established investigators, which brings us down to  
17 640,146. Then we removed 300,000 more from Redmond, which  
18 gets us down to 340,146 over. Then we removed 200,000  
19 more from Lin, which got us down to 140,146. Then we just  
20 removed an additional 100,000 by cutting that one 10  
21 percent, so we're over by 40,146.

22 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: We'll handle that.  
23 Okay. I think Mr. Wollschlager and I have been doing some  
24 talking, and the fact that we're willing to pay for some

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 of the grant money indicates that a decision that he has  
2 made with my approval, that we should be spending as much  
3 money as possible on grants and not pursuing international  
4 options or putting up booths everywhere. We're doing a lot  
5 of things, which we think are better off done by the two  
6 major universities, rather than a Public Health  
7 Department.

8                   Instead of taking 200 grand, we're going to  
9 take 160 and turn back 40 percent, but we're going to  
10 curtail our activities as a promoter of stem cells, which  
11 we really shouldn't be being a Public Health Department.  
12 Do you have anything to add to that, Mr. Wollschlager?

13                   MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: No. I think that's  
14 consistent with your direction to get the money into the  
15 hands of the researchers.

16                   COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. I would like  
17 to take a five to seven-minute break, so we can get the  
18 math straight here.

19                   DR. WALLACK: Bob, before we take the  
20 break, I think that, as a group, we want to thank you for  
21 getting us through this. Personally, I think that the  
22 whole group should be applauded for the work that we've  
23 done over the last two days and over the last three years.

24                   COMMISSIONER GALVIN: I would agree, that

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 this is a fine bunch of people and a fine bunch of  
2 scientists. It's hard to move the ball forward as we  
3 have. This is not easy. We're not going to adjourn.  
4 We're going to come back. I just want to take a few  
5 minutes, five to seven minutes, to make sure the  
6 arithmetic works.

7 I see Dr. LaLande up there, and he'll let  
8 us know probably to the penny.

9 (Off the record)

10 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: We suggested that rather  
11 than calling the roll again, everyone knows who can vote  
12 for Yale, everyone knows who can vote for UConn, so we're  
13 going to start off maybe either by category or by  
14 institution. Let's start with the Yale. We have to  
15 approve them all. I'm simply going to start with Yale,  
16 anybody who can vote on a Yale proposal, and we're going  
17 to ask whether or not there are any objections or  
18 abstentions for the record, so all we want to hear is a no  
19 or an abstention. Starting with Yale, Renke(phonetic),  
20 010, 200,000. Objections? Abstentions? No.

21 MR. SALTON: Passed.

22 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Wang, 036, 200,000, same  
23 question. Hearing none --

24 MR. SALTON: Passed.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Key, 031, 200,000.

2 MR. SALTON: Any objections? Any  
3 abstentions? Passed.

4 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: There are none.  
5 Cantley(phonetic), 005, 200,000. Objections?  
6 Abstentions? Okay.

7 MR. SALTON: Passed.

8 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Ivanova(phonetic), 019,  
9 200,000. Objections? Abstentions? Pass. Okay.  
10 Runig(phonetic), 022, 188,676. Abstentions? Objections?  
11 Susaki(phonetic)? That's the medical school, I guess,  
12 right, but it's 011, 200,000. Objections or abstentions?  
13 Great. Will I keep going at Yale?

14 MR. SALTON: That's passed, yeah.

15 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: While we've got Yale,  
16 it's Woo, 026, the total is 446,819.

17 MR. SALTON: This is established  
18 investigators now for Yale.

19 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: And that's the amended  
20 amount. Objections or abstentions?

21 MR. SALTON: Passed.

22 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Hearing none. 013,  
23 Vaccarino, 449,771.

24 MR. SALTON: Objections or abstentions

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 only.

2 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Hearing none.

3 MR. SALTON: Passed.

4 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Nicholson(phonetic),  
5 025, 450,000 dollars. Objections? Abstentions? Pass.  
6 That's it for Yale from the established. Going to Yale  
7 for the group, we have, I want to make sure I'm right  
8 here, it's Redmond now, and it's 1,120,000, 005.  
9 Objections? Abstentions? Pass.

10 And, finally, with core, we have Lin, 004,  
11 funded now at 1.8 million. Objections? Abstentions?  
12 Hearing none, pass. Yale is all set. Reserve we're not  
13 going to touch.

14 Moving onto UConn, Carter, 040, 200,000.  
15 Objections? Abstentions?

16 DR. JENNINGS: I'm in recusal on that, for  
17 the record.

18 MR. SALTON: Okay.

19 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay, great. Any other  
20 comments? Pass. Shudery(phonetic), 200,000, 033.  
21 Objections? Abstentions? Let's pass that one.

22 Li(phonetic), 200,000, 009. Objections or abstentions?

23 MR. SALTON: Hearing none, pass.

24 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Ivanova(phonetic). Oh,

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 I'm sorry. That's Yale. That's it for the seed grants.  
2 UConn, Maher, 450,000, 012. Objections or abstentions?

3 MR. SALTON: Hearing none, it's passed.

4 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Rosenberg, 021, 450,000.  
5 Objections? Abstentions?

6 MR. SALTON: Hearing none, it's passed.

7 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Morist, 016, 450,000.  
8 Objections or abstentions?

9 MR. SALTON: Hearing none, it's passed.

10 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: And, finally, Lee, 022,  
11 450,000. Objections or abstentions?

12 MR. SALTON: Hearing none, it's passed.

13 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: All right, super. Going  
14 onto group, we've got Rasmussen, 004, 634,880 dollars,  
15 three years. Objections or abstentions?

16 DR. JENNINGS: And, again, I'm in recusal  
17 on that.

18 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Noted. Any other  
19 comments?

20 MR. SALTON: Hearing no objection, hearing  
21 no abstentions, pass.

22 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay. Still at UConn,  
23 we've got Agula, 003, 250,000 dollars, is that correct,  
24 over there, Dan?

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 MR. WAGNER: Correct.

2 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: 250,000 for two years.

3 Objections or abstentions?

4 MR. SALTON: Hearing none, it's passed.

5 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay.

6 MR. SALTON: Is that it?

7 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: No. Now we still have  
8 EVER. Lee is the PI, 001, 900,000, two years. Objections  
9 or abstentions?

10 DR. JENNINGS: Again, I'm in recusal on  
11 that one.

12 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay, thank you. Any  
13 other comments?

14 MR. SALTON: No objections. No  
15 abstentions. It's passed.

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay. Any other  
17 business, in terms of the approval of the funding amount  
18 for these grants?

19 DR. LATHAM: I will note that the amount  
20 now in reserve exceeds the amount that we have voted to  
21 fund Redmond.

22 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: All right. I will ask.  
23 I'm not so sure we have to do anything, because we never  
24 really gave an amount to these. We just identified these

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 as proposals that would be in reserve.

2 DR. LATHAM: And it could be that someone  
3 else, besides Redmond, fails to come through, or doesn't  
4 want the grant as reduced, or whatever.

5 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: You want to rank the  
6 reserve? Dr. Wagers?

7 DR. WAGERS: I really hate to do this, but  
8 it seems for equity that we should vote on whether or not  
9 we want it reduced by 10 percent, the budget of the  
10 established investigator grants that are held in reserve,  
11 since we did that on all of the ones that are funded.

12 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: There's only two.  
13 They're both UConn, so we're going one at a time. Barr,  
14 006?

15 MR. SALTON: Okay. Is there a motion to --  
16 (multiple conversations).

17 A MALE VOICE: So moved.

18 DR. WAGERS: Seconded.

19 MR. SALTON: And the motion is to reduce  
20 Barr by 10 percent, if it ever gets approved or funded.

21 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So we'd be reducing it  
22 by 49,981 dollars and 30 cents.

23 MR. SALTON: If it ever gets funded.

24 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: If it ever gets funded.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 Objections? Abstentions?

2 MR. SALTON: Hearing none, it's passed.

3 Again, it's only the reductions.

4 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Sestic(phonetic), 011.

5 A MALE VOICE: I'd like to make the same  
6 motion.

7 DR. WAGERS: Seconded.

8 MR. SALTON: Okay. The motion being to  
9 reduce it by --

10 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: 50,000 dollars.

11 MR. SALTON: If it ever gets funded.

12 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: It's 011. Objections or  
13 abstentions? Hearing none, that's good.

14 MR. SALTON: Okay, so, that we'll not  
15 touch.

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Now the final order of  
17 business would be rank ordering of --

18 MR. SALTON: If that's the committee's  
19 wishes.

20 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: It's not necessary.

21 MR. SALTON: Not necessary at this time.

22 DR. WAGERS: I think it's a good idea to  
23 rank them now, and I would move to rank them in order of  
24 their peer review score.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Within category or as a  
2 group?

3 DR. WAGERS: As a group, so with the best  
4 peer review score being ranked number one, the second best  
5 ranked number two, and the third best ranked number three.

6 MR. SALTON: Is there a second?

7 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Do we have a second on  
8 that? We use peer review to rank the three remaining  
9 reserve?

10 A MALE VOICE: Are they all UConn?

11 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yes. As a group, the  
12 UConn voters can vote.

13 MR. SALTON: And only UConn can discuss.

14 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: All right, so, there's a  
15 motion on the floor, that the three reserves would be  
16 ranked according to their peer review score, regardless of  
17 the categorization. So, in this case, it would be 011  
18 would be first, 2.3 would be Barr, 006, and thirdly would  
19 be 014, Chamberlin, at 2.5. Objections?

20 MR. SALTON: I think this motion calls to  
21 see if there's any discussion. Is there any discussion?  
22 Mr. Mandelkern?

23 MR. MANDELKERN: Is this public comment now  
24 afterwards?

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 MR. SALTON: No. It's discussion on a  
2 motion.

3 MR. MANDELKERN: Oh, excuse me. No. I beg  
4 your pardon.

5 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: You can comment on the  
6 motion, if you'd like.

7 MR. MANDELKERN: Well this is the motion of  
8 the last ones in reserve?

9 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yes.

10 MR. MANDELKERN: I support the motion of  
11 Dr. Wagers.

12 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Any other comments? Any  
13 objections or abstentions?

14 MR. SALTON: Hearing none, it's passed.  
15 And that, again, is only a ranking in the event it's  
16 funded.

17 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Our last bit of  
18 business, then, is public comment. Is there any public  
19 comment? Not from committee members, but from the  
20 audience. Hang on.

21 MR. HAIFAN-LIN: This is my first time  
22 attending this committee meeting, and I'm truly impressed  
23 by your professionalism, and I want to extend my personal  
24 thanks for your hard work. Thank you.

HEARING RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 1, 2008

1 MS. HORN: For the record, could you just  
2 say your name?

3 MR. LIN: Oh. I'm Haifan-Lin, Director of  
4 the Yale Stem Cell Center.

5 DR. MARC LaLANDE: I'm Marc LaLande,  
6 Director of the UConn Stem Cell Institute. Thank you very  
7 much for your hard work, and we will do our best to expend  
8 these monies and give you discoveries that make honor to  
9 the State of Connecticut. Thank you very much.

10 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Anyone else? Do we  
11 have a motion to adjourn?

12 VOICES: So moved.

13 COMMISSIONER GALVIN: Okay. Thank you,  
14 all, for your hard work and forbearance.

15 MS. TOWNSHEND: We'll see you on the 15th.  
16 (Whereupon, the hearing adjourned at 3:30  
17 p.m.)