

VERBATIM PROCEEDINGS

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
GRANT REVIEW

COMMISSIONER DR. ROBERT GALVIN, CHAIRMAN

MARCH 31, 2009

FARMINGTON MARRIOTT CONFERENCE CENTER
15 FARM SPRINGS ROAD
FARMINGTON, CONNECTICUT

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

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 . . .Verbatim Proceedings of a meeting of
2 the Connecticut Stem Cell Research Advisory Committee
3 Grant Review held on March 31, 2009 at 8:00 a.m. at the
4 Farmington Marriott Conference Center, 15 Farm Springs
5 Road, Farmington, Connecticut. . .

6
7
8
9 MS. LYNN TOWNSHEND: First and foremost my
10 name is Lynn Townshend, I'm the Executive Aide to the
11 Commissioner, who is to my right. Thank you for joining
12 us this morning. I know it's an early morning. And I
13 wanted to just let you know a couple of things. A, we're
14 trying because there are lots of papers and lots of
15 computers on the table I'm going to go at the break and
16 see if we can get an extra table added in on this side so
17 we can spread out a little bit for your own comfort.

18 If you do have -- B, if you do have
19 anything that you have of concern with regard to the
20 hotel, the accommodations, the food, please let me know
21 and we can do our best to help you resolve that. C, I
22 wanted to let you know about the seating arrangements.
23 For the convenience of the Commissioner we have done
24 assigned seats this time around and the purpose of that

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 is for voting. So everyone who is to the left of the
2 Commissioner, from this side on down, Mr. Pescatello --
3 Dr. Pescatello down to Dr. Wallack is eligible to vote on
4 every grant.

5 On the other side of Chelsey we have three
6 people who are ineligible to vote on Yale, but can vote
7 on UConn. And then we have the three people who are
8 ineligible to vote on UConn but may vote on Yale. So
9 you're all kind of grouped together by how you can vote,
10 etcetera, etcetera. So actually now I'm going to hand
11 this over to Commissioner Galvin for a few opening
12 comments.

13 CHAIRMAN ROBERT GALVIN: Good morning and
14 thank you all for taking time from your frenetic
15 schedules to come and do this very important task. We
16 have worked very hard and I think effectively to arrange
17 things as best we can. We are also working very hard to
18 protect our funding and to explain to the Legislative
19 body that although we have over \$12,000,000 in the
20 account it's all been obligated and it's been a bit of a
21 task to make them understand that they can't appropriate
22 the money that's already been contracted.

23 Before we get started I'd like to take a
24 few minutes and let Ann Kiessling share with us some of

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 her newest research, which I believe is quite noteworthy.

2 DR. ANN KIESSLING: Thank you. I sort of
3 didn't know we were going to talk about this this
4 morning. What we have been able to do for the last year
5 or so is look at gene expression in eight cell human
6 embryos and this hasn't been done before for all kinds of
7 reasons. We chose that stage of embryo development
8 because that's the penultimate toady potent cell. So an
9 eight cell human embryo has already activated it's gene
10 expression. It is -- has not undergone any
11 differentiation yet so each cell in that embryo is
12 totally committed to nothing at all.

13 We're able to do this because we have some
14 collaborators in Athens, Greece that have never initiated
15 in the university hospital an embryo cryo preservation
16 program. So they occasionally have couples who come
17 through in vitro fertilization and there's no Greek law
18 that they can only return three fertilized eggs to each
19 couple and so occasionally there was a couple who had
20 more than three fertilized eggs. And that's a staff in
21 that particular -- I -- the person who runs that program
22 actually trained in my lab at Harvard about 25 years ago.
23 So I know how they do things there.

24 We visited there from time to time and

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 they had a wonderful group of people that were able to
2 once the embryos were transferred the ones that were left
3 if they developed normally one more day they were flash
4 frozen so that we could isolate the RNAs and we took
5 advantage of some new technology and what we discovered
6 actually is that these cells have a cell cycle unlike any
7 other. So we hope that this is actually going to lead
8 the way in terms of what induce pluripotent stem cells
9 should be -- what should be the aim of that.

10 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Outstanding. Thank you
11 for sharing that with us. Before we transact any other
12 business I'm going to yield the floor to Dr. Latham who
13 has some -- a suggestion, which I think is a good one.

14 DR. STEPHEN LATHAM: Thank you
15 Commissioner. Yes, I have two suggestions. The first is
16 that we delay any consideration of any of the grants that
17 are in the lower half of the available peer review score.

18 That is to say, above 2.5, unless someone has a
19 particular favorite grant in that range. There's more
20 than enough of the better peer review ranked grants for
21 us to consider with the amount of funding that we have
22 above that level.

23 And the second thing I would recommend is
24 that the first thing we consider be the core grant which

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 is one of the highest peer reviewed, but also two and a
2 half million dollars. The reason I think we ought to go
3 with that one first is that if we do decide to grant the
4 core grant then we'll have a much better idea of how much
5 money we're working with for the remainder of the grants
6 and how high the bar ought to be set there.

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: Just one note for the
8 record. Please note that Investigative Grant B-21, Chen
9 Ju (phonetic), is peer reviewed scored at 2.0. There was
10 a mistake in what was distributed to you. It had been in
11 there as a 3.0. It is a 2.0, which I think would be
12 relevant to the conversation at hand.

13 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Now I presume you'll all
14 make that change and I presume you all understand what
15 Steve is trying to say. One is that we postpone
16 consideration of lower ranking grants because we have so
17 many higher ranking grants, but that we do this large
18 grant first to give us a sense of such a large financial
19 commitment and then it will give us some perspective
20 about what we're going to do with the rest of the money.

21 This is a procedural change or adaptation. I'm not sure
22 we need a motion unless the remainder of the members
23 would like to discuss what we're going to do. Everybody
24 understand what we're going to do potentially? Okay. Do

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 you want it as a motion?

2 VOICE: Commissioner?

3 DR. MYRON GENEL: (Indiscernible, too far
4 from mic.)

5 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Wait a minute. Okay.

6 DR. GENEL: Just one proviso and that is
7 that we revisit the funding overall at the end of this.
8 We may decide after we've reviewed the other grants that
9 we need to -- if we need more money, we may want to cut
10 more back from -- we may want to cut some funding back or
11 cut more funding back from the stem cell.

12 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yeah. What I -- my
13 understanding Mike is that that's what we would do. But
14 this would at least give us a start point and then say
15 well, we may at some point in the procedure decide we're
16 going to look at that in another fashion. Yes Bob?

17 MR. ROBERT MANDELKERN: Commissioner? I
18 think we shouldn't be thrown off by the two and a half
19 million that's been requested for the core extension
20 because we know that in past years we've gone through
21 from beginning to end and then come down by shaving
22 proportionately. So my only caution would be that I have
23 no objection to the procedure if the Chair chooses it,
24 but for the new members that's not a firm commitment to

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 2.5.

2 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. I think Dr. Genel
3 already said that though. We're just going to use this
4 as a potential starting point and then we may come back
5 and adjust this or when we look at the whole package of
6 grants I think this kind of makes -- this is actually --
7 we must have had a telepathic connection between Mike and
8 myself because I kind of thought -- was thinking this
9 through yesterday. Yes Bob?

10 MR. MANDELKERN: One other point. On the
11 higher scores from 2.5 and up are we not obligated to at
12 least give them the one minute of reporting out of
13 respect? Is that not a legal obligation?

14 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: No. We don't have a
15 legal obligation. We can read them into the record, but
16 we don't have an obligation to consider and vote on every
17 single grant. We can procedurally just read them into
18 the record, particularly if they're threes and a half's
19 and fours, I don't think any of us would seriously
20 consider a grant like that unless there was some special
21 reason. And without further adieu we will then consider
22 the big grant.

23 MS. TOWNSEND: This is Core Grant
24 SCDUCHC1, Ren-He Xu, which is peer review scored at 1.3

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 and is asking for \$2.5 million.

2 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: We have some new members
3 here, would you want to just briefly go -- let them know
4 how we do things?

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: Well, how we do things,
6 and I can read the whole -- all of the pages. One thing
7 I do need to note is that any decisions made here are
8 contingent upon receipt of available funds from the
9 Tobacco Trust Fund, which is certainly noted and needs to
10 go into the record.

11 Regarding discussion and voting please
12 note that only Committee members who are eligible to vote
13 on a grant may participate in discussion of the grant,
14 which goes back to the whole seating arrangement issue.
15 If you are not eligible to vote on a grant due to
16 conflict of interest please do not participate in the
17 discussion of that grant.

18 If you have an objection and are eligible
19 to vote on a grant and wish to see an application placed
20 in a category other than that of the consensus of the
21 eligible group, the three categories being yes, no and
22 maybe, please make your objections known immediately.
23 That objection automatically places the application under
24 the maybe category so the grant may be considered during

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 the second phase of this process.

2 Right now we're going to start with the
3 core grant and I believe the procedure from there would
4 be going back to seed, is that the will of the group?
5 Yes sir?

6 DR. GERALD FISHBONE: Is it possible to
7 have these lights turned on? It's a little dark to --

8 MS. TOWNSHEND: There you go.

9 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: There you go.

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: Let there be light said
11 Dan.

12 DR. FISHBONE: -- fee on the lights.

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: We do have a 10 minute --
14 two 10 minute breaks today, a 45 minute lunch. Lunch is
15 provided at 12:15 in a separate room and your adherence
16 to these time limits is certainly appreciated. You do
17 have one microphone per person, please speak directly
18 into the microphone so that all of you can hear one
19 another. And I think it was Dr. Latham who asked for and
20 received his dream come true of mics. for all.

21 For the audience, thank you for being here
22 today. There are 77 grant proposals that this group will
23 be considering. A lot of work to be completed by our
24 members in the next two days. We ask that any

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 conversation within the audience itself be kept to a
2 minimum. You can certainly go out in the hallway if you
3 need to converse for any length of time and return when
4 you are finished.

5 We thank you in advance for not addressing
6 questions about the grants under consideration to
7 Committee members on break, during lunch and between days
8 of the meeting, which would be tonight into tomorrow.
9 Should it become necessary for the Committee to move into
10 Executive Session a period of two minutes will be
11 allotted for audience members to move into the hallway
12 and we will make certain that we notify you that that
13 Executive Session has ended and you will be allowed to
14 reenter the room at that time.

15 We will have a period of public comment at
16 the end of this meeting after all the grant funding
17 decisions have been made. We ask that you refrain from
18 comment until that time unless specifically called upon
19 by members of the Committee for the purpose of clarity
20 regarding a grant application. If you have not found the
21 restrooms they are -- welcome, you're right here sir. If
22 you have not found the restrooms they are down this
23 hallway to the left, men's room and women's room are next
24 to one another. And we do ask that you silence your cell

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 phones, Blackberries, pagers and laptops. So there's an
2 abbreviated version of the opening comments.

3 And now onto --

4 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Let me just say one
5 thing. Please be aware that this is an open meeting to
6 the press and to the citizenry of the state. If you have
7 some personal feelings about something or someone it
8 would probably be best to carefully consider how you
9 express those personal feelings because you may see them
10 someplace that you didn't expect to see them. I would
11 also like to say that with the intellectual power in this
12 room if it were a little dimmer you'd light up the whole
13 -- this whole part of Connecticut and I appreciate all of
14 your contributions. Go ahead.

15 MS. TOWNSHEND: -- with core group
16 proposals, and we're looking at a core proposal right
17 now, receives 14 minutes description and discussion and I
18 believe whoever is -- there are two reviewers on each
19 grant and the two reviewers for this grant are -- and I
20 don't have that list, Latham and Kiessling. So you now
21 have 14 minutes to present your review or brief synopsis
22 thereof.

23 DR. KIESSLING: I actually thought it was
24 interesting that I was assigned this since I'm the most

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 vocal person in this group against over funding cores.
2 And so perhaps that's the reason I was given this job. I
3 think that one of the things to keep in perspective is
4 that core facilities need to serve mostly senior
5 investigators in other laboratories and junior
6 investigators and that they shouldn't be an entity unto
7 themselves far more than they are necessary.

8 Having said that, this is a beautiful
9 application. Ren-He Xu was trained in Wisconsin with
10 Jerry Thompson. He has set up an absolutely marvelous
11 facility. As nearly as I can tell this has the highest
12 score from our peer review group of any of the
13 applications, it was scored at a 1.3. And I think the
14 next highest was a 1.4 or 5 or something. So the peer
15 reviewers they even didn't say very much about it. This
16 is just a beautiful application.

17 One of the things that they want to add --
18 they want to add two things to their core that they don't
19 have -- haven't had before. They want to add a genomics
20 facility, which is very timely and totally appropriate
21 and they want to add a facility for induced pluripotent
22 stem cell derivation, which is also very timely.

23 This core serves the University of
24 Connecticut and it also serves Wesleyan. They

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 demonstrated -- if you look on page 12 of this
2 application you can see there's a little flow chart of
3 how they interact with other institutions in Connecticut.

4 So this core I think meets and exceeds everything that
5 we hoped it would do when it was initially funded a
6 couple of years ago. It definitely deserves support.

7 So the only thing we're going to have to
8 consider today is how much money we can actually give
9 this core relative to everything else. I don't know if
10 Steve found anything, but I couldn't find anything with
11 this application that wasn't just perfect. Ren-He is a
12 detail-oriented very accomplished scientist and I thought
13 that this was just a beautiful application.

14 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Ann, would there be -- I
15 was interested in hearing your comment about the genomics
16 and since I attended a three-day course at Harvard I'm
17 now an expert on genomics.

18 (Laughter)

19 DR. KIESSLING: Good. I can ask you some
20 questions.

21 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: But I tell everybody I
22 meet at cocktail parties that I know everything about
23 genomics. But it is such an expanding science with so
24 many interesting people. I'm just very interested that

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 that's involved. As you look at this grant if you had to
2 reduce it are there pieces that are easily paired off or
3 would reducing it to a certain level if we had to make
4 the whole thing not function right?

5 DR. KIESSLING: I think one of the things
6 that needs to be considered about this is how much money
7 can this core find from other sources? It isn't -- it
8 doesn't have -- I didn't find anyway, I didn't find in it
9 a fee for service component. It's possible as many
10 cores, many institutions support part of their work by a
11 fee for service kind of thing. Genomics -- the genomics
12 core I think in a few years might be as important as the
13 embryonic stem cells they want to derive in terms of a
14 statewide useful function.

15 So hopefully we will in the future see
16 more grant applications from companies than we saw this
17 time around and a core like the one that they're setting
18 up at UConn could serve broad public function if they
19 would put in a fee for service component. So I'd have to
20 go back and look and kind of think about what pieces we
21 could carve out and I could certainly do that again by
22 tomorrow.

23 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yeah. I kind of hate to
24 see the genomics piece get knocked off.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 DR. KIESSLING: That's right. I think
2 that's going to be a really important one. How much help
3 people are going to need to derive iPS cells I think is a
4 question and that's something that could be NIH funded,
5 it could be funded from other sources, and people are
6 going to want to do that themselves in their own labs.
7 So that might be one piece we could consider, but I think
8 the genomics core is intimate -- is important.

9 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Steve?

10 DR. LATHAM: I have very little to add to
11 that. I was very impressed with the track record -- oh,
12 there we are. I have very little to add to what Ann
13 said. I was very impressed with their track record, the
14 number of people they've trained, the efforts they've
15 gone to to coordinate their core's functions with the
16 Yale core facility so there's lack of duplication.
17 They've been running summer workshops to train people
18 from other universities besides even UConn, Wesleyan and
19 Yale.

20 They've derived two of their own lines
21 using the Connecticut funding that they got. I just --
22 I'm very impressed and would be happy to see them get
23 their funding. If there are logical bits to carve off of
24 course that could free up money for others, but I thought

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 this was an excellent application.

2 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Comments? Yes Bob?

3 MR. MANDELKERN: I would like to add that
4 they've been successful at this core in developing two
5 new stem cell lines, Connecticut One and Connecticut Two,
6 which were very impressive and got very good coverage in
7 all the press in Connecticut and gave us very good
8 publicity as a result of their scientific work.

9 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Any other
10 comments? Okay. So we have -- could we have a motion on
11 this grant?

12 DR. LATHAM: Move to approve it.

13 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay.

14 DR. KIESSLING: Second.

15 MR. MANDELKERN: I'll second.

16 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. The --

17 COURT REPORTER: Could you identify who is
18 making motions?

19 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: -- Dr. Latham made the
20 motion and Dr. Kiessling is the second.

21 COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. We're now open
23 for discussion.

24 DR. FISHBONE: Gerald Fishbone. If we

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 approve it it does not mean I assume that we are
2 approving the sums of money requested at this time?

3 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: No. We may return to
4 that when we have a broader picture and see if we want to
5 fund the two and a half million. That's why I asked Ann
6 that question if we wanted to reduce it by 500,000 is
7 there a way to do that without jeopardizing the whole
8 vehicle. Any further comment on this grant? And we're
9 going to vote now with the understanding that as we
10 always do return to this grant when we get a better
11 overall picture. Okay. We have a consensus that the --

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: All in favor of moving
13 this to the yes category?

14 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes.

15 MR. DAN WAGNER: Do we want to put it in
16 yes/maybe/no file first or do we just -- are we just
17 doing yes?

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: Well, yes would mean -- my
19 understanding is yes would mean we fund it to some
20 extent. And it sounds like -- does that make sense to
21 everybody? And the maybe pile is, we may or may not fund
22 it, we're going to figure that out at the end of things.

23 And then no is an absolute no. So does that make sense?

24 VOICE: Yes.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: Okay. So all in favor of
2 moving the core grant which is SCDUCHC1, Ren-He Xu at
3 peer review score of 1.3 please say aye?

4 VOICES: Aye.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: Opposed? Motion carries.

6 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Next?

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are we headed back to seed
8 grants at this point?

9 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Back to seed grants.

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: And the question is are we
11 looking first at the 2.5 -- anything over 2.5?

12 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Now we're talking
13 about over --

14 MS. TOWNSHEND: Under --

15 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: -- less than --

16 MS. TOWNSHEND: -- less than 2.5.

17 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: -- yeah.

18 VOICE: Higher than.

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: Now I think the motion on
20 the floor according to Dr. Latham --

21 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: I think we've agreed
22 that we're going to --

23 DR. JULIUS LANDWIRTH: Better than. Which
24 is lower.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: -- going towards one.

2 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Starting at two and a
3 half, 2.5, and working backwards to the one with the
4 lowest numerical score.

5 MR. MANDELKERN: Excuse me. Is that a
6 ruling then at 2.5 and higher are not to be reported on?

7 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: I don't understand --
8 what's the question Bob?

9 MR. MANDELKERN: Well, there are 45 seed
10 grants --

11 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yep.

12 MR. MANDELKERN: -- and I have the numbers
13 but I can't get them out. There are quite a few above
14 2.5 and higher. Are we saying that we're not going to
15 report on them at all?

16 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: We will have them -- we
17 will look at 2.5 down to the lowest numerical value and
18 then decide whether we're going to have someone speak on
19 those grants or simply have them read into the record the
20 grants that go from two and a half to numerically larger
21 down to four.

22 MS. TOWNSHEND: Can we do anything about
23 the feedback?

24 (Discussion off the record.)

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: If for some reason --

2 VOICE: Numerically less, which is a
3 higher score.

4 VOICE: Higher score, right.

5 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: -- if for some reason
6 someone in the group would -- identifies a grant that
7 they think has particular merit that got a relatively
8 high numerical value, that is to say a low score, we can
9 certainly discuss that. But I would ask that those
10 discussions be around the merits of the grant and not
11 around personalities or things other than the merit of
12 the grant that are extraneous to the merit of the grant
13 itself. So let's begin with grant number --

14 MS. TOWNSHEND: SCAUCHC8, Ivo Kalajzic,
15 peer review scored at 2.35. Dr. Seemann and Dr. Genel.

16 MR. MANDELKERN: Could you repeat the
17 number?

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: That's --

19 MR. MANDELKERN: Could you repeat the
20 number?

21 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: That grant is marked 21.
22 Okay? Okay. Have we got it all? Everybody got that?

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: The number is UCHC8,
24 SCAUCHC No. 8. Peer review scored at 2.5 and that would

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 be Doctors --

2 DR. GENEL: It's at 2.35.

3 MS. TOWNSHEND: -- I'm sorry, 2.35. Dr.
4 Seemann and Dr. Genel.

5 DR. JEFFREY SEEMANN: One moment. All my
6 years of education haven't quite prepared me for the
7 order --

8 MS. TOWNSHEND: I'm sorry.

9 DR. LATHAM: Well, would you like me to
10 start?

11 DR. SEEMANN: -- go ahead. Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Everybody ready? David,
13 did you have a comment? I think your mic. is off David.

14 DR. DAVID GOLDHAMER: It's on now.

15 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay.

16 DR. GOLDHAMER: I didn't appreciate that
17 we're actually going in order from 2.5 down. That's --
18 is there any reason that we're not following the order
19 that the grants are listed? It might be easier to go in
20 that order.

21 MS. TOWNSHEND: Because that's not the
22 peer review score order.

23 DR. GOLDHAMER: Not the peer review score
24 order, the order that the grants are listed on our

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 computer file and numerically.

2 DR. SEEMANN: I have all my information
3 sorted based upon the original list and I'm prepared to
4 do it, but I'm slow because of a completely different
5 order.

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: Whatever is the will of
7 the group.

8 DR. KIESSLING: We'll get used to it.

9 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay.

10 MR. MANDELKERN: I would propose that we
11 follow the order that we've been following all along from
12 one going on because that's what everything has been
13 sorted, peer reviews and the one page summaries.
14 Everything has been done that way and we'll lose much
15 time trying to track. We can go very quickly SCAUCOC No.
16 1, no, three, and go to the next one.

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: In previous years we've
18 been doing it as peer review score broken out at that 2.5
19 break level.

20 MR. MANDELKERN: Well, I would like to
21 move that we stick in the order that everything has been
22 coming to us so that we can move and we're not wasting
23 time in looking through and this way everyone can follow
24 very efficiently.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 VOICE: We can just skip over the ones
2 that are too numerically high.

3 DR. PAUL PESCATELLO: It might be valuable
4 just to go through in order of, you know, from beginning
5 to end and have a record of these, even the ones that are
6 over 2.5 that we choose not to discuss but just so that
7 on the record we've clearly -- we haven't overlooked that
8 we've addressed it and we may very well choose not to
9 discuss it at all. But that we show on the record that
10 we looked at it and decided to move on.

11 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. We have two
12 choices. One is to start with grant No. 21 and work back
13 to the lowest ranking that is the best scores, or else to
14 start numerically with the low ranking grants and work --
15 what's the other -- what did we do last year?

16 MS. TOWNSHEND: We can go -- last year we
17 did peer review score.

18 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yeah.

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: We started at 2.5 and
20 actually went up in number, down in quality. The
21 proposal on the table right now is either to go by the
22 actual grant title, number, under a particular category,
23 which right now is C grant. Or we can do it again by
24 peer review score, which seems to be the will of the

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 group, or the arrangements that people have made, they
2 seem to be used to going in the order of SCAUCONN1,
3 UCONN2.

4 DR. KIESSLING: Well, that's how we have
5 all our notes.

6 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Let's go --

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: Okay. Let's go.

8 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: -- we'll do it that way.

9 MS. TOWNSHEND: Alright. SCAUCONN1, Yong
10 Wang, peer review scored at three. And that would be Dr.
11 Arinzeh and Dr. Nair. One minute.

12 DR. SARASWATHI NAIR: Okay. This is a
13 seed grant. This is my first time, so bear with me.
14 Development of artificial antibodies regarded in human
15 cancer stem cells and the score was three by the Peer
16 Review Committee. They basically felt that the two
17 targeted specific items that were CD-44 and E-chem were
18 ones that were already studied and they were really using
19 an artificial antibody so as not to change the stem cell,
20 the cancer stem cells.

21 And I tended to agree with the peer review
22 that this was really not a particularly novel idea.

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: Your recommendation?

24 DR. NAIR: My recommendation would be no.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Any further
2 discussion?

3 MS. TOWNSHEND: All those in favor of
4 placing this -- oh, discussion? All those in favor of
5 placing this in the no category please say aye?

6 VOICES: Aye.

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: Opposed? This grant is
8 placed in the no category. Next up is --

9 MR. HENRY SALTON: Commissioner, may I
10 just interject for a moment?

11 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yeah.

12 MR. SALTON: Let me just make a couple of
13 suggestions based on past practice. First of all, in
14 this round of review what we did in the past was there
15 was sort of a consensus. If someone based on score I
16 think the Committee said for example someone with a three
17 would say, does anyone have any feeling that this should
18 go anywhere other than a no? If there was no indication
19 that they'd like to move it -- if no member spoke up and
20 said, I'd like it in a yes or maybe, there was no call
21 for a vote, it was just put in the no based on the
22 ranking.

23 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Good.

24 MR. SALTON: Similarly if you had someone

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 who was based on a review, a 2.5, we might have a
2 consensus request for maybe. And if there was no one who
3 said, wait a minute, or if there was a request for yes
4 and someone felt a little less than comfortable they
5 would say, I'm not comfortable with yes, it would
6 automatically go to a maybe and then we would revisit it
7 instead of voting on each one of these. Once we got to a
8 final list there would be a vote on that final list
9 rather than continue calls for motions and votes.
10 That'll save time.

11 The other suggestion is since it seems to
12 be the consensus of the Committee at this time that
13 anyone with a score below a score which is -- or a rank
14 below 2.5, below meaning that you are not considered to
15 be in the upper tier, meaning between 1 and 2.49 but
16 you're in the lower tier but below 2.5 that you may want
17 to just say, listen, we'll go through these by number but
18 if someone has a 3 we're just going to pass over that one
19 and move to the next score that is 2. -- between 1 and
20 2.5.

21 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: I think that's an
22 excellent suggestion.

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: So we're just for
24 clarification say, we're not considering the ones at 3 or

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 should I call them and then --

2 MR. SALTON: Well, for example, I think
3 you should -- maybe you could announce that when you get
4 to No. 4 here, the -- Mr. White's thing, you could say
5 his score was 3.75. Unless I hear otherwise we'll move
6 to the next application.

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: -- and it gets put into
8 no?

9 MR. SALTON: And it just gets put into no.

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: Works for me.

11 MR. SALTON: And you give the Committee a
12 moment for someone to stand up and say, wait a minute,
13 this Peer Review Committee had it wrong here, this is a
14 very good application, let's discuss it.

15 MS. TOWNSHEND: Okay.

16 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay?

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: Alright. So we're on to
18 number -- thank you Henry.

19 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Thank you Henry.

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: We're on to No. 2,
21 UCAUCONN02, which is Yong Wang at a peer review score of
22 1.85, Arinzeh and Mandelkern.

23 MR. MANDELKERN: Mandelkern reporting on
24 this. This is an interesting proposal given what is a

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 very hot topic in embryonic stem cell research, small
2 RNAs. They are very important in determining silencing
3 of certain genes and also I believe in developing certain
4 proteins. The reviewers are high on it and it got a
5 score of 1.85, which ranks it 11 out of 45 applications.

6 I discussed this with Dr. Arinzeh and I
7 think I speak in her behalf also that we recommend
8 putting this grant into the yes area. Do you want to add
9 anything Dr. Arinzeh?

10 DR. TREENA ARINZEH: Other than this is,
11 you know, the P.I. is a junior faculty that's a very good
12 -- very good track record. So I think this should be
13 funded.

14 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Any other feelings about
15 it? If not I'll ask for a consensus to put it into the
16 yes category. Okay. The yes category.

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: Consensus in the yes
18 category. Next grant is UCAUCHC3, Guo-Hua Fong, peer
19 review scored at 2.3 and this is again Arinzeh and
20 Mandelkern.

21 DR. ARINZEH: Okay. This is an
22 investigator that's looking at ways to develop -- well,
23 differentiate iPS cells into endothelial cells for
24 developing blood vessels or regeneration of blood

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 vessels. And the P.I. has an extensive expertise in
2 angiogenesis, but the reviewers have commented and I have
3 also looked at it, the P.I. doesn't seem to have much in
4 terms of iPS related experience as well as demonstrating
5 some preliminary data showing that you can actually get
6 endothelial differentiation using them. So the score was
7 2.3 and so the recommendation is to not fund.

8 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Further comment? Is
9 there a consensus to move this grant over to the no
10 category? Okay. No. 22.

11 MS. TOWNSHEND: So moved. SCAUCHC04,
12 Bruce White is the P.I., 3.75 is the peer review score.
13 Unless I hear otherwise we move this to the no category.

14 DR. MILTON WALLACK: Vote for no.

15 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay.

16 MS. TOWNSHEND: So moved.

17 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Any further comment?

18 Nope.

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: Next grant is SCAYALE5.
20 Yong Chi Cheng, 2.25 is the peer review score and the
21 reviewers are Canalis and Nair.

22 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Dr. Canalis, would you
23 care to comment?

24 DR. ERNESTO CANALIS: No problem. So

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 using transactivation experiments Cheng has demonstrated
2 that flavonoids regulate when signaling. This has not
3 been confirmed by other methods, such as gene expression,
4 which is a shortcoming. Using that observation he plans
5 to study basically the mechanisms by which flavonoids
6 were regulated when signaling, which is a critical signal
7 in cell differentiation. So in principle, you know, it's
8 somewhat applicable, but not directly applicable to stem
9 cell research.

10 The study is somewhat preliminary and the
11 mechanistic experiments are somewhat superficially
12 described. Cheng is a well-known pharmacologist. Has
13 not been indirectly involved in stem cell research in the
14 past and the reviewers, the scientific reviewers give or
15 take agree with -- with this position. So it's sort of
16 borderline. The other concern is he's spending only five
17 percent of time in this application.

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: Your recommendation?

19 DR. CANALIS: It's iffy. It's borderline.

20 It's not a definite no with a 2.25, but it's not a
21 definite yes. I'd like to hear the other reviewer
22 frankly.

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Nair?

24 DR. NAIR: I also thought that this review

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 also had the issue that they were only using one -- the
2 responsive stem line only. They were not using others as
3 well and that was one of the things that the reviewers
4 found as being disappointing. I thought the only thing
5 that had something to say for this was the fact that the
6 Wnt3 activity is very expensive and using some other form
7 might reduce the expense. But still it is not truly
8 using stem cell research. So that's -- I would put it
9 into a maybe category, not to a definite yes.

10 DR. CANALIS: They make a lot of argument
11 that Wnt is expensive to buy, but they can use expression
12 vectors to do many of the experiments.

13 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Dr. Canalis, what would
14 change your mind to move this into a yes? It sounds like
15 very tepid reviews of content and the fact that the
16 investigator is only spending a small amount of his or
17 her time. Is there something that would happen that
18 could move it from a maybe to a yes?

19 DR. CANALIS: Probably not.

20 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Well, let's put no.

21 DR. CANALIS: Okay. No.

22 MS. TOWNSHEND: Is that the will of the
23 group?

24 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yeah. I think generally

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 speaking as we look at these things I think we have to --
2 Dr. Canalis and Dr. Nair have both presented us with
3 excellent analyses and we could try to prognosticate what
4 might happen or what the investigator might do, but I
5 think that we should be limited -- try to limit ourselves
6 to look at what's happening and as the Chair I'm not
7 completely happy with investigators who are only going to
8 spend a small amount of their time on the grant. And
9 particularly when there seems to be some severe
10 structural flaws with this one. So David?

11 DR. GOLDHAMER: Just a note that this was
12 ranked 22nd in the seed grants, so by all accounts it's
13 going to fall out of the funding range unless there's
14 some mitigating circumstance, which there doesn't appear
15 to be in this case.

16 DR. WALLACK: Move to place it in the no
17 please?

18 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Is that alright?

19 DR. NAIR: Yes.

20 DR. CANALIS: I vote no.

21 MS. TOWNSHEND: So noted. Next grant is
22 UCHC6, Christopher Heinen, peer review scored at 3.
23 Unless I hear otherwise that will be placed in the no
24 category. Thank you.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Gerry?

2 DR. FISHBONE: Yes. Commissioner, is it
3 possible just to have a brief comment on what the grant
4 is? Because by the time we shuffle through everything,
5 you know, I don't know who we're talking about.

6 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Sure.

7 DR. FISHBONE: Am I the only one who has
8 that problem?

9 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: No. I think that's a
10 very reasonable plan.

11 DR. FISHBONE: Just to know what it is
12 that we're --

13 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: What was that grant?

14 MS. TOWNSHEND: I'd have to ask either Dr.
15 Seemann or Dr. Latham.

16 DR. NAIR: Embryonic stem cell as a model
17 to study early stage tumorigenesis.

18 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Are we okay -- Gerry,
19 are you okay with that or do you need some further
20 clarification?

21 DR. FISHBONE: No, that's fine. Thank
22 you.

23 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay.

24 MS. TOWNSHEND: The next grant is

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 SCAYALE07, Ketu Mishra, with a 3.85 peer review score.
2 That is to be placed in the no category.

3 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. I think Gerry
4 would like us to say what -- would like us to just state
5 what the purpose of the grant is. I think that would
6 make us all a little more comfortable.

7 DR. NAIR: I can do that.

8 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay.

9 DR. NAIR: You see, I have reviewed this
10 one, so I can read it out if you want.

11 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay.

12 DR. NAIR: This is the Pigg5rBac
13 transposon goes on to identify transcription factors that
14 are involved in neuron differentiation of stem cells.

15 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Well, I'm not any wiser
16 after hearing that.

17 DR. NAIR: But that's what it says.

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: I guess the question is
19 would you like me to read that from now on rather than --

20 DR. PESCATELLO: I think we could just
21 have the reviewers (indiscernible, too far from mic.).

22 MS. TOWNSHEND: Absolutely.

23 DR. PESCATELLO: The investigators who
24 made the applications you can use your minute and 30

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 seconds of --

2 DR. CANALIS: Frankly, with a priority
3 score of 3.85 we're wasting time.

4 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: We're wasting time.

5 DR. CANALIS: But we don't have the time
6 to waste, you know, I mean --

7 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: If that's the consensus
8 of the Board, but I agree with my esteemed colleague that
9 if the grant is not going to, you know, a 3.8 or
10 something it doesn't have it, it's not going to be one of
11 the ones chosen and so what -- we need to concentrate our
12 efforts on the good grants. This is not to say as
13 Attorney Horn just mentioned to me that if somebody
14 really feels that a grant was mislocated or that someone
15 has missed something that needs to be called to our
16 attention then we're fine with that. But I would agree
17 with Dr. Canalis that if it ain't gonna get accepted why
18 discuss it?

19 I think what we would like to do now in
20 the future grants just to have one of the reviewers give
21 a very brief summary of what the grant is for those of us
22 who are not stem cell scientists.

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: We are on Yale SCA07, peer
24 review score of 3.85, Canalis, Nair.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 DR. CANALIS: It's a no go. I mean, it's
2 someone who has not published a paper in seven years,
3 their review is very negative and I tend to agree with
4 the review.

5 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Maybe they were on
6 sabbatical --

7 (Laughter)

8 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: -- for seven years,
9 don't you people go on sabbatical?

10 (Discussion off the record.)

11 MS. TOWNSHEND: The grant is placed in the
12 no category. SCAUCHC08, which is Ivo Kalajzic, 2.35 is
13 the peer review score. Dr. Seemann and Dr. Genel are the
14 reviewers.

15 DR. GENEL: Yeah. This is a study to
16 evaluate the ability of adult mesenchymal stem cells
17 compared to embryonic stem cells to form osteogenic
18 cells. The peer review is 2.35. The major criticism
19 from the peer review is that the -- there is really poor
20 agreement on the derivation of mesenchymal stem cells
21 from embryonic stem cells and that there's a mention that
22 the methods chosen by the applicant may not be optimum.
23 The environment for this study is excellent, this is an
24 investigator who's working with the bone regeneration

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 unit at UConn.

2 I would probably put it in the maybe. The
3 peer review score is 2.35, which I think as was mentioned
4 would fall within the 20, 22 of the peer review scores.
5 So I might put it in the maybe, but I wouldn't be -- I
6 wouldn't argue if somebody wanted to put it in the no
7 category.

8 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Mike, it sounds like the
9 theory is not sound on this?

10 DR. GENEL: Well, I can't comment on that.
11 I'm really citing the peer review score.

12 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay.

13 DR. GENEL: They question -- there's
14 question as to whether or not this is doable within a two
15 year period.

16 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: This grant is going to
17 be placed in the maybe category to be reviewed at a later
18 time. Is there anybody who has further comment?

19 DR. GOLDHAMER: I would have in fact -- I
20 probably would have placed it in the no. I thought it
21 was sufficiently weak around the question of number one,
22 preliminary data, and two, the methodologies that were to
23 be applied that you referred to, sort of the two classic
24 weaknesses of grants. So --

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

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

2 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Now we've
3 changed, this is going to be a no?

4 DR. GENEL: No.

5 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: No.

6 MR. MANDELKERN: I think also that it's
7 ranked number 23 out of 45 seed grants would indicate a
8 no.

9 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Off it goes.

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: This grant is placed in
11 the no category. On to SCAUCONN09, Brian Aneskievich,
12 1.95 is the peer review score. Doctors Arinzeh and Genel
13 are the reviewers.

14 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Treena?

15 DR. GENEL: Well, I can start.

16 DR. ARINZEH: Yes. Go ahead.

17 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Mike?

18 DR. GENEL: The investigator is a fairly
19 senior investigator at the -- at Storrs who wants to
20 study the development and characterization of
21 keratinocytes and other skin cells in a -- and the role
22 of praxis on proliferators in their maturation. The peer
23 review score is 1.95, which isn't bad, but the funding
24 for this study is almost entirely for post-doc. and for

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 supplies. The investigator has an RO-1 grant that seems
2 to cover very much the same subject and I am not sure
3 that it fits within our guidelines of encouraging young
4 investigators or new investigators for seed grants. I
5 would go -- I would vote no on this one.

6 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: I was just reading
7 through out notes Mike in the past, these grants really
8 are to encourage new faculty, new investigators. It
9 doesn't seem like this fits.

10 DR. GENEL: That was my sense.

11 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yeah.

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Arinzeh? I agree.

13 DR. ARINZEH: I agree.

14 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. We're going to --
15 that goes in the no unless somebody has another comment?
16 Yes Bob?

17 MR. MANDELKERN: Well, I would argue to
18 place it in the maybe because it does rank very high
19 among the seed grants, No. 13, and I think we should at
20 least keep it up for consideration possibly for another
21 minute or two tomorrow.

22 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Well, you can go back to
23 it but I think the consensus of the group is that this is
24 not a junior investigator, it's a senior investigator

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 that most of the money is going for post-doctoral stuff
2 and he's already got another grant on the same subject.
3 So if you want to reopen that one we'll make a note, but
4 I don't see what would change. He wouldn't become a
5 junior investigator overnight nor would the -- nor would
6 the allocation of the funds change.

7 MR. MANDELKERN: Okay. I withdraw my
8 comment.

9 DR. GOLDHAMER: I'd like to make a comment
10 not about this grant, it's a UConn person, but a general
11 comment about the use of seed money. And that is that I
12 would think that a senior investigator who's not a stem
13 cell biologist, but wants to get into the stem cell field
14 should be every bit as competitive for these as a new
15 investigator. I think this is -- falls directly in line
16 with what the priorities of this program and I'd like
17 some other comments on this.

18 DR. KIESSLING: That's actually been the
19 case in the past. Senior stem cell scientists have not
20 been encouraged to apply for seed grants, but
21 investigators in other fields have.

22 MS. MARIANNE HORN: In fact, our request
23 for proposal does say that, that senior investigators new
24 to the stem cell field are eligible for funding, but

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 priority would be given to junior investigators.

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: Is it the consensus of the
3 group that this moves to the no category?

4 DR. WALLACK: No.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: It's not the consensus of
6 the group?

7 DR. WALLACK: No, I'm agreeing.

8 (Laughter)

9 MS. TOWNSHEND: This grant goes into the
10 no category.

11 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. We'll make a note
12 that if there's reconsideration we'll --

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: Possible reserve?

14 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: -- yeah.

15 MS. TOWNSHEND: SCAYALE No. 10, Yibing
16 Qyang, 1.65 is the peer review score, Canalis and Nair.

17 DR. CANALIS: This is a young investigator
18 who does not have any other sources of funding. He's
19 dedicating about 15 percent of his time to this grant.
20 The priority score is 1.65 and the aim of the proposal is
21 to develop two same culture methods to generate cardiac
22 regenerator cells and cardiomyocytes from human ES cells.

23 The grant is very well presented and it is relevant to
24 ES cell research. The young investigator has an

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 appropriate track record and the peer review -- the
2 scientific review is quite positive.

3 So I would favor placing this grant in the
4 yes category. It ranks among the top 10 actually.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Nair?

6 DR. NAIR: I would agree with that. I
7 think this is a very well written grant and I think the
8 better of the grants. I would put it into the yes
9 category.

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: Is it the consensus of the
11 group to move this to the yes category? This grant will
12 be placed in the yes category. The next grant is
13 SCAYALE11, Stephanie Massaro, 1.55 peer review score,
14 Goldhamer and Mandelkern.

15 DR. GOLDHAMER: So I'll report on this
16 one. Dr. Massaro is a clinical fellow. She is in Diane
17 Kraus' lab at Yale and the goal of this project is to
18 define the mechanisms underlying Acute Megakaryoblast
19 Leukemia or AMKL. And there's been two genes that have
20 been implicated in this disease that are -- and the
21 disease result probably by a fusion of these genes in
22 patients. Little is known about the normal functions of
23 these genes in Megakaryo site development or in this
24 disease and so Dr. Massaro seeks to use human embryonic

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 stem cells as a model to understand the functions of
2 these genes and how they impact the cell cycle through
3 two well-known pathways, one of which is notch signaling.

4 So this in my opinion is a really strong
5 grant. It scored sixth among the seed grants. A very
6 good case is presented for using human embryonic stem
7 cells and that this disease is a pediatric disease and to
8 really understand the transition from -- to this state
9 requires I believe that or a strong argument is made to
10 start with embryonic cells rather than adult stem cell.
11 And so I thought this was excellent. It's a really
12 excellent training environment. The budget goes mostly
13 to salary although Dr. Kraus has written a very strong
14 letter that says she will support all additional --
15 support the research with all additional funds that are
16 needed to accomplish the goals. So I put this squarely
17 in the yes column.

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: Bob?

19 MR. MANDELKERN: We discussed this and I
20 concur. I concur with Dr. Goldhamer's presentation.

21 MS. TOWNSHEND: Any further discussion?

22 DR. KIESSLING: Does this person have a
23 seed grant from last year? This is a familiar name or is
24 this a resubmission?

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 VOICE: I think this is a resubmission.

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: Any other discussion? Is
3 it the will of the group to move this as recommended into
4 the yes category?

5 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes.

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: This grant is moved into
7 the yes category. The next grant for consideration is
8 SCAYALE12, Sandra Wolin is the P.I., 1.3 is the peer
9 review score and it is Dr. Goldhamer and Mr. Mandelkern
10 again.

11 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes. I'm reporting on
12 this one very happily because this of the 45 grants
13 received the lowest score of 1.3. It's a proposal to
14 further study the pathways that embryonic stem cells
15 follow for pluripotency and self-renewal as she
16 particularly targets a pathway called the tram pathway
17 and proposes various means to follow out the study. The
18 peer reviewers call it outstanding, innovative proposal.
19 She is fully qualified, is experienced, has published
20 and has an excellent stem cell environment to support her
21 work where she is now turning more rapidly to stem cell
22 work.

23 So I would follow along with the peer
24 review which calls it create and novel, patiently

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 important proposal to study RNA biology of embryonic stem
2 cells. She's highly experienced and I think it would be
3 wonderful to put her in the yes category.

4 MS. TOWNSHEND: David?

5 DR. GOLDHAMER: I agree with the
6 reviewers' strong critiques and Bob's synopsis.

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: Is it the will of the
8 group to move this grant into the yes category -- or
9 discussion I should say. I apologize. Is it the will of
10 the group to move this to the yes category?

11 VOICES: Yes.

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: Thank you. So moved.
13 This grant is in the yes category. The next grant is
14 UCHC13, Srdjan Antic, 1.9 is the peer review score and
15 the reviewers are Kiessling and Pescatello.

16 DR. KIESSLING: This is an application
17 from a physician scientist and I'm not -- I couldn't
18 figure out from the application whether he's trying to
19 see patients. He's foreign-trained physician. But
20 anyway, this got a good score because this is a good
21 application and this person is exactly in his place in
22 his career where you would like to see him have a seed
23 grant. He's an assistant professor. He's trying to set
24 up his own lab. This would be his first source of

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 funding for this. He's a good neuroscientist, he's
2 experienced in the kinds of pathways that they're trying
3 to monitor and I would recommend that this be placed in
4 the funding category.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: Paul?

6 DR. PESCATELLO: Yes.

7 MR. MANDELKERN: I'm sorry. What number
8 is this?

9 MS. TOWNSHEND: We are on UCHC13.

10 MR. MANDELKERN: Okay.

11 DR. PESCATELLO: I agree and I was also
12 struck by there's a little bit of a transitional
13 potential with the use of existing drugs for Parkinson's.
14 So I agree.

15 MS. TOWNSHEND: Discussion? Is it the
16 will of the group to move this grant to the yes category?

17 So moved. The next grant consideration is UCHC14,
18 Stormy Chamberlain is the P.I., 1.55 is the peer review
19 score, Kiessling and Pescatello.

20 DR. PESCATELLO: This relates to Angelman
21 Syndrome, mental retardation issue. I thought it was a
22 good -- obviously had a good score. The main goal is to
23 come up with a human cell culture model and I would be in
24 favor of it.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 DR. KIESSLING: I thought the strength of
2 this application was the fact that this person is a post-
3 doc. in Mark Leland's lab and I thought that was the
4 strongest part of the proposal. I don't think this
5 proposal is much stronger than one we have two down from
6 us which has the same kind of age problem. So this is
7 not an independent investigator, this would be supporting
8 a post-doc. in Mark Leland's lab, which is already pretty
9 well funded. This is a reasonable application. The
10 reviewers I thought scored it numerically higher than
11 their comments indicated so I think that we should
12 realize that this is a post-doc.

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: Further discussion?

14 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Would you put that in
15 the maybe category?

16 DR. KIESSLING: This is a nice grant. I
17 think that we've got a couple of problems with
18 interesting issues with post-docs. and I think it's
19 something that we're going to have to consider as a group
20 because No. 16 is I think a stronger grant. Those
21 reviewers gave it a much higher numerical score, it's
22 scored at 2.6, but it's a very good grant. They scored
23 it that high because this person has just barely finished
24 their Ph.D.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay.

2 DR. SEEMANN: The question about that then
3 would be are they asking for their own salary or are they
4 funded off -- is that post-doc. asking for their own
5 salary or are they funded on another grant and that's why
6 this is --

7 DR. KIESSLING: They're asking -- they're
8 asking for salary.

9 DR. SEEMANN: -- okay.

10 DR. KIESSLING: And there's a reasonable
11 amount of crossover from this application to what else is
12 going on in Mark's lab. I mean, this is a very good lab.
13 This is a good project. This would get done. It's a
14 matter of do we want to put our resources into well
15 funded laboratories for post-doc. support or do we want
16 to put our resources into new independent investigators
17 with the seed money. You're smiling at me Mike.

18 DR. GENEL: No, no. I'm -- I had the same
19 thoughts.

20 DR. KIESSLING: Yeah.

21 DR. PESCATELLO: I would just say that
22 it's good enough that we should keep it -- put it in the
23 yes category to keep discussing it.

24 DR. KIESSLING: We can -- let's put it in

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 -- right.

2 MR. MANDELKERN: (Indiscernible, too far
3 from mic.) Whose lab does she work in?

4 DR. KIESSLING: Mark Leland.

5 MR. MANDELKERN: Oh, Mark Leland.

6 DR. KIESSLING: Which is a great lab.

7 MR. MANDELKERN: Which is a great lab so I
8 think we have to keep it in yes based upon the ranking
9 and the score and we can talk about it later on if we're
10 over in money. I would say to keep it in the yes.

11 DR. WALLACK: I would endorse also putting
12 it in the yes category. I would call the question on
13 yes.

14 MR. MANDELKERN: You're calling the
15 question?

16 MS. TOWNSHEND: Gerry?

17 DR. FISHBONE: My one concern is that the
18 outcome of this research will effect a very tiny group of
19 people. I think Angelman Syndrome is --

20 DR. KIESSLING: Yeah, but it's a really
21 interesting model system.

22 DR. FISHBONE: -- it is? Okay. So you're
23 more interested in the model system than the specific --

24 DR. KIESSLING: Yeah.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 DR. FISHBONE: -- okay. Thank you.

2 DR. KIESSLING: I think these really
3 interesting genetic diseases give us a lot of insight
4 into similar kinds of model systems. So I think -- I
5 don't think that's a criticism. I think we have to
6 decide as a group how best to utilize that \$10,000,000 we
7 have.

8 MS. TOWNSHEND: If there is to be further
9 discussion on it it would go into the maybe category. Is
10 that correct Henry?

11 MR. SALTON: I think that if there's no
12 consensus on any, either a yes or a no right off the bat,
13 just stick it in maybe and we'll go back to it.

14 DR. WALLACK: I would look for a consensus
15 by moving a yes on it and seeing if there is a consensus.

16 MS. TOWNSHEND: Is there a consensus to
17 move this grant to the yes category?

18 VOICES: Aye.

19 MR. SALTON: I guess the question would be
20 is there anyone who says -- does not want it to go to
21 yes? But that's --

22 MS. TOWNSHEND: Is there anyone who does
23 not want it to go to yes?

24 DR. GENEL: I don't. I want to be able to

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 discuss this after we --

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: It goes to maybe.

3 DR. KIESSLING: Yeah. I agree with Mike.

4 MS. TOWNSHEND: This grant goes in the
5 maybe category. The next grant is UCAYALE15, Bing Su,
6 2.15 is the peer review score, Goldhamer and Wallack.

7 DR. WALLACK: The grant is -- it's purpose
8 is to understand how stress kinase pathways are involved
9 in maintaining a healthy human embryonic stem cell
10 situation during long-term culture in vitro and determine
11 the downstream target genes that are regulated by these
12 stress kinase pathways in this process. It has a 2.15
13 peer review mark and it -- it has experienced
14 investigators. The rationale for these studies however
15 do not appear to be clear. There's a vagueness in
16 understanding where this all might lead to. The study
17 does not seem to be well developed and there seems to be
18 a lack of clarity at least from my perspective. I would
19 recommend not funding it.

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: David?

21 DR. GOLDHAMER: I agree with that
22 assessment.

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: Is it the consensus of the
24 group to move this -- or I'm sorry, discussion? Gerry?

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 DR. FISHBONE: Looking at the two reviews
2 they're almost identically opposite -- not identically,
3 but they're almost opposite. One says it's terrific and
4 the other one says it's not very good, which makes me
5 wonder a little bit about it.

6 DR. WALLACK: I was aware of that in
7 reading through the proposal as well and it seems to me
8 the observations that I made, at least to me, seems to
9 still be valid.

10 DR. GOLDHAMER: Yeah. And I think the
11 score of 2.15 reflects the little bit of difference of
12 opinion on that, which wasn't the case for all grants
13 that I looked at. It seems like it's right in the middle
14 and one was positive, although not effusive, and the
15 other one was quite negative. So I was comfortable with
16 a no score on that with the ranking.

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections
18 to placing this in the no category? This grant is placed
19 in the no category. The next grant is UCHC16, Ling-Ling
20 Chen, the peer review score is 2.65, Kiessling and
21 Landwirth.

22 DR. KIESSLING: This is an application
23 from somebody who just received his or her Ph.D. in
24 February of this year. So this is actually a nice

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 application. The reviewers, both of the reviewers liked
2 this application. It's an interesting project to look at
3 RNAI, expression and retention in embryonic stem cells.
4 Their only concerns about this application is the
5 youngness of the investigator. The scientific concerns
6 were this may be not scientifically quite as strong as
7 Stormy Chamberlain's application, but the main criticism
8 of this work was the fact that this is a very young
9 investigator and there is some overlap with the work
10 that's ongoing in the mentor. So the science is strong,
11 the circumstances they thought did not warrant an
12 independent grant to this individual.

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Landwirth?

14 DR. LANDWIRTH: I was struck by that same
15 point. You made the point with respect to the earlier
16 grant that we just reviewed, that is the junior, very
17 junior investigator working under the mentor who had
18 received a grant on the same subject before. The other
19 comment that the reviewer made that struck me -- the
20 other reviewer made that struck me was that it was not
21 clear how important the observation would be in advancing
22 stem cell science as a basic science project. So I -- it
23 was put at 2.654 --

24 DR. KIESSLING: Well, that was just --

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 yeah. I'd like to read the sentences that really struck
2 me about this was that overall the proposal is very
3 interesting and well written. It would score very highly
4 if it is a post-doctoral fellowship.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: What is your
6 recommendation?

7 DR. KIESSLING: This go into a maybe.

8 DR. LANDWIRTH: Agreed.

9 MS. TOWNSHEND: Consensus to group maybe?
10 The grant goes into a maybe category.

11 VOICE: Where are we putting that one?

12 MR. MANDELKERN: You can't put a 2.65 in
13 maybe.

14 MS. TOWNSHEND: If there's anyone who says
15 maybe it goes into the maybe category, is that correct
16 Henry?

17 MR. SALTON: You're correct.

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: Thank you. The next grant
19 is SCAYALE17, Choukri Ben Mamoun, 2.0 is the peer review
20 score, Hiskes and Wallack are the reviewers.

21 DR. WALLACK: Yeah. The purpose is to
22 generate hepatocytes -- hepatocytes in human embryonic
23 stem cells in order to characterize the initial steps of
24 malaria, an infection caused by plasmodium species in

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 humans. The study had a fairly good peer review rating
2 of 2.0. It however had -- it seemed to have some
3 deficiencies in how it was structured. There also seems
4 to be questions about the methodology. I would recommend
5 that we put it in the no category even though it has a
6 fairly good score.

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Hiskes?

8 DR. ANNE HISKES: I guess I would like
9 personally would like to leave it open and put it into
10 the maybe. One comment by the reviewers that struck me
11 was they questioned the researchers familiarity with
12 hepatocytes differentiation, but the investigator has
13 colleagues and other resources who can help him and this
14 was a similar comment made by reviewers of other Yale
15 investigators that although they themselves didn't have
16 the experience they had the support of a good team. And
17 so I think, you know, given the balance I would want to
18 put this into the maybe.

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: Discussion? Dr. Seemann?

20 DR. SEEMANN: I would just add that given
21 the global impacts of malaria here you might want to hold
22 off on this one for just a little while here.

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: So this moves to the maybe
24 category. Thank you. Next grant is SCAUCHC18, Kristen

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 Martins-Taylor, 2.0 is the peer review score, Fishbone
2 and Landwirth the reviewers.

3 DR. FISHBONE: The central goal of this
4 proposal is to understand the role of DNMT3B, which is
5 something that produces DNA methylation. It may play an
6 important role in the initial steps of progenitor cell
7 differentiation during early neuro-genesis and there's
8 two, there's an A and a B and she's interested in the B
9 because the A is expressed more during later stages of
10 development and in adults. And deficiency of this DNMT3B
11 methylation pattern contributes to immuno-deficiency,
12 facial anomalies syndrome and others. So it sounds like
13 it's worthwhile to study this and because of it's role in
14 early neuro-genesis.

15 She's going to give 100 percent of her
16 time, she's a Ph.D. She has experience in a number of
17 things, proficient in molecular biology and culture. And
18 in general it's a good lab, good investigator, Ren-He Xu
19 and Mark Leland are, you know, responsible for the lab
20 and is expected her to achieve her goals. So it sounds
21 to me like a very good project.

22 DR. LANDWIRTH: I would just add to that
23 that the reviewers made a strong point about the
24 triangulation or potential of this particular project and

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 although the P.I. has relatively little experience in
2 this particular field of neuro-genesis the lab in which
3 she'd be working has a lot of experience in that and so
4 felt that the goals, both goals of the project were
5 achievable. And I would recommend that it be a yes.

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: Discussion? Yes sir?

7 DR. GENEL: Well, we already noted a grant
8 where the funding was to a post-doctoral fellow and put
9 it in a maybe because they were working in a very
10 qualified laboratory. I think this sounds to me like a
11 similar situation. If one is a maybe this ought to be a
12 maybe. The last paragraph of the peer review outlines
13 the P.I. is a post-doctor fellow whose track record is in
14 gene regulation studies. She clearly has extensive
15 experience in culturing cells, but does not yet have a
16 publication record during her time as a post-doc. at
17 UConn. The relative junior status of the P.I. and lack
18 of publication record in stem cells raises concerns about
19 her serving as a P.I. for this grant at this time. So I
20 mean, if the shoe fits on one it ought to fit on the
21 other. I would put it into a maybe.

22 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: I think that's -- I
23 think that's an interesting comment. I'll add another of
24 mine. Is there anybody at Yale or UConn who doesn't have

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 a good lab and is sending us grants and doesn't have
2 somebody like Dr. Shu and Dr. Len? I mean, yeah, of
3 course -- I mean, you know, this is like saying, you
4 know, the water is up to everybody's neck. Well --

5 DR. KIESSLING: I think -- Dr. Galvin, I
6 think the difference is -- I think we need to discuss and
7 look at our overall pot because you'd like to fund new
8 projects for new investigators and if we have money to
9 fund post-docs. that's great. I don't think you want to
10 fund a post-doc. in a well-funded lab at the expense of
11 a, you know, another project that would launch another
12 laboratory.

13 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: -- that's an excellent
14 comment and I think what I -- it appears to me that some
15 of these are -- a grant is going to that lab and then
16 this one -- some of these seem to be sort of an extension
17 of the first grant in a way. So I think it can --

18 DR. KIESSLING: It's nothing wrong with
19 these applications, they're wonderful, it's just we only
20 have \$10,000,000 to spend.

21 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: -- yeah, and I think
22 that that's -- that we should take, you know, focus a
23 little more carefully on some of these Ann. I think
24 you're entirely right. Yes Bob?

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 MR. MANDELKERN: I would suggest maybe
2 since one of the reviewers wanted yes and we can go
3 further on it tomorrow.

4 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yeah. Put it in maybe.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: This grant goes in the
6 maybe category. The next grant is SCAUCHC19, Arvind
7 Chhabra, 2.6 is the peer review score, Fishbone and
8 Landwirth are the reviewers.

9 DR. CANALIS: I didn't speak because of
10 conflict. Can a post-doctoral fellow be a new
11 investigator in this category?

12 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Well, Ernie -- Dr.
13 Canalis, what I hear is that we -- listening to some of
14 the material that doesn't have a track record is new and
15 I would think that a post-doctoral fellow could -- if the
16 idea was good I thought -- my feeling has been if this
17 grant were to be in place to encourage post-doctoral
18 fellows or new investigators I see some of them kind of
19 tailending onto something that's already being done. The
20 established -- I'm reading from my notes. Established
21 investigators new to stem cell research may apply for
22 seed grant. Post-doctoral fellows or equivalent may
23 apply with the support of a faculty sponsor or
24 equivalent.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 DR. CANALIS: Yeah, I didn't remember
2 that. I'm sorry.

3 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yeah. Yep. Okay.

4 DR. CANALIS: Sorry for the interruption.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: UCHC19 SCA. Fishbone and
6 Landwirth are the reviewers. It's a 2.6 peer review
7 score.

8 DR. FISHBONE: Do you want me to try
9 again? Okay. This is a resubmission and there were many
10 criticisms of the first grant and the reviewer -- the
11 applicant believes he's onto them. However, let me tell
12 you what the nature of the grant is. The goal is to
13 educate peripheral blood derived CD-4 T cells to
14 recognize and kill human tumor cells by engineering human
15 iPS cells and human embryonic stem cells in the tumor
16 specific T lymphocytes sites against the given antigens.
17 It sounds like an interesting project, but the major
18 critique is that many issues in the proposal remain
19 unresolved. The efficiency of generating these cells has
20 been extremely low and basically they really didn't feel
21 that he had answered the initial questions and did not
22 feel that we should be funding it. That's about it. And
23 they're wondering are iPS cells a feasible source of T
24 lymphoid cells and basically both reviewers say the

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 criticisms have not been adequately addressed.

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Landwirth?

3 DR. LANDWIRTH: I was struck by the same
4 comments that the reviewers made and particularly that
5 the technique and the goals that they've established and
6 technique that they've set out to achieve those goals
7 have been tried over and over again in other labs before
8 without success and there's no indication of what they're
9 adding to the equation that would make this more likely
10 to succeed. It was the gist that I thought would take
11 and based on that with a 2.64 I don't think we can afford
12 it.

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: The recommendation is?

14 DR. LANDWIRTH: No.

15 MS. TOWNSHEND: Is that the will of the
16 group? This grant is placed in the no category. The
17 next grant is SCS Western Connecticut State University,
18 No. 20, Thomas Lonergan, 3.25 is the peer review score
19 and Goldhamer and Mandelkern are the reviewers.

20 DR. GOLDHAMER: And given the score I'll
21 just say a couple of comments. First of all it's 38 so
22 it's well out of the funding range. Both reviewers did
23 like the innovation aspect of this though, they used
24 nanoparticles, fluorescently labeled nanoparticles to

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 follow stem cells in divo models. And they want to see
2 the toxicity and growth characteristics that are
3 conferred or the deleterious effects of the quano-
4 particles on these stem cells. However, although there
5 was significant innovation both reviewers had significant
6 and numerous problems or criticisms of the grant and so
7 there's really no reason to move it up from it's current
8 position.

9 MS. TOWNSHEND: Bob?

10 MR. MANDELKERN: I will simply say this is
11 the only proposal from Western Connecticut.
12 Unfortunately it didn't rank up scientifically too high.

13 I would like to say to encourage them to keep trying
14 submitting seed proposals and hopefully next year the
15 science will be better.

16 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: So noted. David, do
17 they have -- I wasn't aware they had a laboratory that
18 could deal with sophisticated subjects out at Western.
19 Or were they going to use something -- some other place?

20 DR. GOLDHAMER: I believe it's being done
21 in-house. I'm not sure how the nanoparticles are derived
22 but the actual analysis of the cells is not terribly
23 sophisticated.

24 DR. KIESSLING: Is this the quantum dot?

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 DR. GOLDHAMER: This is the quantum dot.

2 DR. KIESSLING: You buy them.

3 DR. GOLDHAMER: Okay.

4 DR. KIESSLING: You buy them out of a
5 catalogue.

6 DR. GOLDHAMER: Alright. Great.

7 DR. KIESSLING: Any color you want.

8 (Laughter)

9 DR. GOLDHAMER: Alright. Any color. And
10 I didn't like the color they chose so I -- no, seriously
11 though, the analysis is not terribly sophisticated and I
12 should add that they're going to use adult stem cells,
13 mesenchymal stem cells and umbilical cord stem cells, so
14 they're not using human embryonic stem cells which in my
15 mind doesn't matter so much except that the science was
16 just not rated highly enough to warrant further
17 consideration.

18 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Got it. That's going
19 over in no in case -- unless there's any demurs.

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: The next grant is
21 SCAUCHC21, David Dorsky is the P.I., 2.55 is the peer
22 review score, Fishbone and Landwirth are the reviewers.

23 DR. LANDWIRTH: This project -- the
24 purpose of this project is try to make -- create a safer

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 and a more simplified process for reprogramming somatic
2 cells in the iPS process and instead of using fibroblast
3 to start this where they want to they propose to use
4 hemopoietic cells and the -- part of the reviewers'
5 comments that I was particularly concerned about was they
6 pointed out that apparently this -- these steps have
7 already been successfully reported in the literature
8 recently revised and they didn't see that there was
9 anything at this point particularly innovative about what
10 they were trying to do.

11 I think that was largely the basis upon
12 which they scored it as a 2.55. I don't know if that's a
13 valid reason or not.

14 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Fishbone?

15 DR. FISHBONE: Yeah. They said that
16 unfortunately between submission and our review all these
17 papers have come out so he may not have even known that
18 there's been so much progress and their summary is --
19 unfortunately leaves the application in a position of low
20 scientific novelty and therefore low priority as well.
21 So I don't think we should fund it.

22 MS. TOWNSHEND: Is that the will of the
23 group? This grant is placed in the no category. The
24 next grant is UCAYALE22, Emre Seli is the P.I., 2.5 is

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 the peer review score. Canalis and Nair are the
2 reviewers.

3 DR. CANALIS: So the P.I. is an assistant
4 professor in OB/GYN at Yale University and what proposes
5 is to study the role of non-coding micro RNAs in ESC
6 function. So the P.I. has identified micro RNAs
7 expressed during maternal to zygotic transition and now
8 she plans or he plans to use that reporter assay to
9 screen micro RNAs expressed in stem cells. And then will
10 pursue to determine the function by injecting these micro
11 RNAs and identifying their activities.

12 The proposal is reasonable. The
13 scientific review is sort of split. One reviewer liked
14 the proposal, the other reviewer had mixed emotions and
15 the major concern was that it was peripheral to stem cell
16 research. And it ended in a score of 2.5 which places
17 this in the 26th slot.

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: So the recommendation from
19 the reviewers? Dr. Nair?

20 DR. CANALIS: It's so far out that
21 unfortunately the recommendations is no.

22 DR. NAIR: I would agree because two of
23 their objectives were really not related specifically to
24 embryonic stem cells and that's the crux of the issue

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 here. And so I would put it into the no category just
2 based on that fact.

3 MS. TOWNSHEND: Is that the consensus of
4 the group? This grant is moved into the no category.
5 Next grant is SCAUCHC23, Carolyn Drazinic, 4.5 is the
6 peer review score, Arinzeh and Genel are the reviewers.
7 Dr. Arinzeh?

8 DR. ARINZEH: Okay. The score was very
9 low on this proposal so I'll just say a few words. Just
10 an overview is that -- okay, the P.I. would like -- the
11 P.I. has a background in Schizophrenia so they would like
12 to develop a cell culture model to study mental illness,
13 kind of a patient specific cell culture model. So the
14 idea is to use white blood cells and fuse them with
15 embryonic stem cells and/or look at the keratinocyte
16 derived iPS cells and then turning those into neurons and
17 then studying gene expression, etcetera.

18 But the reviewers were very -- very hard
19 on this proposal because the assistant professor had a
20 background in Schizophrenia but no background in iPS and
21 this type of reprogramming using -- this type of
22 reprogramming will essentially whip out the gene
23 expression that you would see in mental illness. So
24 very, very negative.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Genel?

2 DR. GENEL: Am I on this? I agree.

3 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yes. So the
4 recommendation is no and are there any objections to
5 placing this in the no category? So be it. Next grant
6 is SCAYALE24, Anna Szekely, 3.8 is the peer review score,
7 Kiesslering and Hiskes are the reviewers.

8 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Would you care to
9 comment?

10 DR. HISKES: Well, the reviewers again
11 were very hard on this proposal. It's a 3.8. Normal and
12 disease-related neuronal differentiation of human
13 embryonic stem cells into the pathogenesis of Autism.
14 The reviewers said that there were no relevant details
15 provided, very vague on end points and on the relation of
16 them to Autism. So I would recommend a no.

17 DR. KIESSLING: Okay. This is a mid-
18 career clinician scientist who's seeing patients and
19 trying to fund a laboratory I think. Isn't this --
20 didn't we get a grant from her last year?

21 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: I don't remember that.

22 DR. KIESSLING: It doesn't say that this
23 is a reapplication but the name is familiar. Anyway,
24 she's essentially an instructor I think at Yale and she's

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 not going to be able to spend very much time on this
2 project anyway. But the reviewers thought the science
3 was really poor. This is a no, I would place this in the
4 no category.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: Is there an objection to
6 placing this in the no category? This grant goes into
7 the no category. Next grant is SCAUHC25, Paul Epstein
8 is the P.I., the peer review score is 2.5, the reviewers
9 are Kiessling and Genel.

10 DR. KIESSLING: This is actually a senior
11 investigator, this is a cancer biologist who has a number
12 of grants that are expiring this year. And I can't
13 remember if this is a resubmission, but the score of 2.5
14 I thought was a relatively good score compared to the
15 negative responses of the reviewers. This is basically a
16 leukemia grant. He wants to look at leukemia stem cells,
17 but it has nothing to do with human embryonic stem cells.

18 He has no preliminary data, which is kind of curious
19 because -- and this is basically to fund a post-doc. in
20 his lab. So I would actually recommend that this be put
21 in the no category.

22 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Genel?

23 DR. GENEL: No, I agree.

24 MS. TOWNSHEND: Any objection from the

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 group to placing this in the no category? This grant is
2 placed in the no category. The next grant is SCAUHC26,
3 Zhibo Wang is the P.I., 3.0 is the peer review score,
4 Kiessling and Genel.

5 DR. KIESSLING: This is actually another
6 post-doc. application only this one doesn't have very
7 good science associated with it. This is actually Dr.
8 Wang's third post-doc. and he is seeking funding for a
9 project that has pretty shaky science. So I would --
10 it's a muscular -- neuromuscular -- he's going to use --
11 make iPS cells and try to make them into a model for
12 spinal neuromuscular disease or something. But I know
13 the science was pretty shaky and this is actually a
14 proposed doc. support. So I would actually recommend
15 this go in the no category.

16 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Genel?

17 DR. GENEL: No, I was intrigued by the
18 idea of trying to generate iPS cells from spinal muscular
19 atrophies and dystrophy. So that was a -- neat
20 conceptually, but the peer review scores are -- they are
21 not very positive. So I would put it in the no category.

22 MS. TOWNSHEND: Any objection to placing
23 this grant in the no category? This grant goes into the
24 no category. Next grant is SCAYALE27, Guo is the P.I.,

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 2.0 is the peer review score, Hiskes and Mandelkern.

2 DR. HISKES: Okay. Well, the title of
3 this proposal is Engineering a Supportive Environment for
4 Human Embryonic Stem Cell Differentiation. The P.I. is
5 an associate research professor at Yale. He was a post-
6 doc. until 2007 at the Albert Einstein School of Medicine
7 and is now located at Yale. He proposes to use a
8 hemopoietic differentiation system to test the idea that
9 engineering of supporting cells can provide a favorable
10 environment for better test differentiation. The project
11 has two aims, the first is to develop a library of stromo
12 cell with micro something-or-other expression vectors.
13 The second aim is to use this library to assess
14 hemopoietic differentiation efficiency, preliminary data
15 demonstrate the loss of dicer in the niche altered blood
16 cell output thus lending support to the proposal.

17 Our reviewers regard this as interesting,
18 an idea worth exploring, but there seem to be certain
19 logical flaws in the proposal. One reviewer says that
20 the proposal is not complete because the P.I. doesn't
21 consider alternative cult culture methods. Also bemoans
22 the lack of engraftment studies. A second reviewer notes
23 that the described protocol may yield false negatives and
24 it will be extremely difficult to further assess and

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 determine whether those are false negatives or not.

2 Bob and I discussed this and, you know, we
3 decided to put it into a maybe at this point. It ranks
4 tied numbers 14 through 17 in terms of ranking.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: Any objection to placing
6 this in the maybe category?

7 VOICE: What's the score?

8 MS. TOWNSHEND: 2.0.

9 DR. HISKES: It's a 2.0.

10 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: It sounds like that's a
11 relatively high score.

12 DR. HISKES: Yeah, right.

13 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: But the score doesn't
14 fit the narrative.

15 DR. HISKES: Right.

16 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: So I have some concerns
17 about that. When we look at it again we'll make a note.

18 But that always bothers me when something gets a fairly
19 high score and it's got kind of a very wishy-washy
20 narrative.

21 DR. HISKES: Right. So some logical
22 flaws.

23 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yeah. Yeah. I don't --
24 logical flaws bother me.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 DR. HISKES: Well, I don't like those
2 either.

3 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Well, you of all of us
4 should --

5 (Laughter)

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: This grant is placed in
7 the maybe category. Next grant is SCAUCONN28, Xudong Yao
8 is the P.I. The peer review score is 3.0, Arinzeh and
9 Landwirth are the reviewers.

10 DR. ARINZEH: So the proposal here is
11 looking at protein analysis and would like to do protein
12 analysis of iPS, pre-iPS, iPS and then embryonic stem
13 cells. The reviewers were a little harsh on this
14 proposal because this junior investigator really has the
15 expertise in using these protein tools, okay? Mass-spec.
16 quantitative proteomics but really doesn't have the
17 knowledge of what iPS cells are all about and embryonic
18 stem cells. So they came down pretty hard on this
19 proposal. So 3.0 I would say not recommend.

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Landwirth?

21 DR. LANDWIRTH: I agree with that.

22 MS. TOWNSHEND: Is it the will of the
23 group to move this to the no category? This grant moves
24 to the no category. Next grant is SCAUCHC29, Liisa Kuhn

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 is the P.I., 2.65 is the peer review score, Arinzeh and
2 Landwirth.

3 MS. HORN: Just before we get started I
4 would note that this grant has much of the project
5 description marked as proprietary, so that if you are
6 going to get into a detailed description of what the
7 grant is then we would have a motion to go into Executive
8 Session. So the lay summary is fine to discuss, but it
9 does look like much of it is marked as proprietary.

10 DR. ARINZEH: Did you want to?

11 DR. LANDWIRTH: Well, basically as I
12 understand the science of the proposal here to attempt to
13 develop a substrate for embryonic stem cells, which is a
14 novel substrate using bio materials rather than other
15 kinds of cells which influence -- neighboring cells that
16 influence the progress of the differentiation of cells --
17 of stem cells. And I think the reviewers were pretty
18 high on it despite scoring it 2.65. They emphasize it's
19 relevance and it's importance in the field and the
20 science seemed to be okay. I'm not sure I understand --
21 the comments were a little bit better than the score in
22 this case. I don't know how you feel about that Treena?

23 DR. ARINZEH: The same here. The
24 reviewers actually didn't comment a whole lot. I mean,

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 they seemed to be okay with it. I think, you know, this
2 investigator has strengthened the bond materials area and
3 that's definitely needed I think and they recognize that
4 for maintaining, you know, stiffness in these cells. So I
5 would like to put it in the maybe category because I
6 think the score should be better.

7 DR. LANDWIRTH: Yeah. Agreed. Maybe,
8 yeah.

9 MS. TOWNSHEND: This grant is moved to the
10 maybe category. The next grant is SCAYALE30, Valerie
11 Horsley is the P.I., the peer review score is 1.7,
12 Goldhamer and Wallack are the reviewers.

13 DR. GOLDHAMER: So I'll report on this
14 one. This was the ninth best scoring seed grant. Dr.
15 Horsley is a new faculty member at Yale. She comes from
16 one of the best skin labs in the country, Elaine Fuch's
17 Lab at Rockefeller. And what she and her expertise is in
18 skin development and she wants to apply what's known in
19 mouse embryo genesis in terms of skin development to coax
20 human embryonic stem cells to a keratinocyte lineage.
21 And the rationale for this is that although skin grafts
22 can be made from patient's skin they are not perfect,
23 they lack sweat glands and hair follicles and she hopes
24 to be able to use a cell with greater potency to coax

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 them down that lineage.

2 She doesn't have specific experience with
3 human embryonic stem cells as far as I can tell at this
4 point, but she's a brand new faculty member at Yale and
5 Yale has an excellent core that can help her with this.
6 In addition, there are protocols in place for development
7 of keratinocytes from human embryonic stem cells, so that
8 was not a worry of mine.

9 She has two aims. One is to develop so-
10 called reporter lines where she has a read out for skin
11 development based on bacterial artificial chromosomes. I
12 don't want to go into the details at this point, but
13 suffice it to say that she'll be able to track cells as
14 they enter the keratinocyte lineage and mature and she'll
15 be able to sort those cells based on GFP pre and
16 florescent protein expression. And so what she wants to
17 do with those cells is then do an unbiased transcriptome
18 analysis to really define the gene expression changes as
19 a function of time or progression down this developmental
20 pathway.

21 So those are basically the -- in a
22 nutshell the two aims. One is to develop the reporter
23 lines to do this and second is to do transcriptional
24 analysis of these cells. She also from vast experience

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 at her former lab has in skin development wants to test
2 candidate genes that have been implicated in mouse skin
3 development and test their effects in human embryonic
4 stem cells to promote or inhibit skin development based
5 on over expression studies and knock out experiments or
6 RNAI knock down experiments.

7 So I thought this -- she's really has an
8 excellent track record from a fantastic lab and I thought
9 this was certainly a yes.

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Wallack?

11 DR. WALLACK: I found that the grant was
12 extremely well done. It could provide important insights
13 and was clearly stated and I would move enthusiastically
14 a yes on this.

15 MS. TOWNSHEND: Any objection to placing
16 this one in the yes category? This grant is placed in
17 the yes category.

18 DR. WALLACK: And it should also be noted
19 that all of David Goldhamer's comments were without a
20 teleprompter.

21 (Laughter)

22 DR. GOLDHAMER: Thank you Milt.

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: Next grant is SCAYALE31,
24 Richard Flavell, 1.8 is the peer review score, the

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 reviewers are Hiskes and Wallack.

2 DR. HISKES: From my perspective this
3 project has a very interesting title, Reconstitution of
4 Human Hemopoietic System by HSCs Derived from Human
5 Embryonic Stem Cells in Humanized Mice. But it's not
6 what you might think. This got a score of 1.8. The
7 project aims to use an improved strain of mouse to assess
8 the graftment of S derived hemopoietic progenitors. The
9 mouse has been developed by the P.I. The reviewers were
10 ecstatic about this mouse model because it will -- it
11 says the difficulty in generating functional cells of
12 this type from pluripotent cells has been a major
13 bottleneck for the field and they're hoping that this new
14 humanized mouse will break open that bottleneck.

15 The researcher is very experienced in this
16 line of sort of adult stem cell research having been
17 funded in the past by the Howard Hughes Medical
18 Institute. This will be his first excursion into the
19 pluripotent field. He will be devoting three percent of
20 his effort to this project.

21 So the reviewers are enthusiastic about
22 the P.I. on the one hand, but have several concerns that
23 there's no data to support the claim that this particular
24 kind of mouse facilitates engraftment and no discussion

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 of how to proceed if the mouse doesn't work. So --

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Wallack?

3 DR. WALLACK: Yeah. I reviewed it also
4 and I think that the grant has great potential, great
5 value. There are some questions, Anne just noted one of
6 those questions. My feeling about that is that's why you
7 do the experiment and the -- the project is very well
8 described. There's a strong likelihood that the P.I. can
9 carry out the project and I would put it in the category
10 of funding it.

11 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: It seems to me there's
12 some built-in design flaws in this and, you know, from my
13 practical standpoint if you don't ask the right questions
14 what kind of answers are you going to get? I thought
15 Anne was outline, there wasn't a terribly strong
16 theoretical basis, or at least the outside reviewers. It
17 sounds like from the point of if it works this is great,
18 but if you get the wrong kind of mouse it ain't going to
19 work and there was another theoretical problem. And I'm
20 having problems this morning with -- maybe because Anne's
21 here, but with some logical progressions of -- the end
22 point about, well, if we develop this then that's good
23 and that'll happen and this'll happen and it will lead to
24 that. But the premises seem a little flawed on these

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 things. But if I may get into the logic, yeah --

2 DR. HISKES: Well, it does have risks. If
3 it works it'll be a great breakthrough, if it doesn't
4 work, I don't know.

5 DR. FISHBONE: Gerald Fishbone. If I can
6 make an observation? This may be one of the situations
7 where the seed grant is particularly applicable because
8 this man is an internationally known immunologist who is
9 starting to do work in stem cells and is very highly
10 funded. He may only have three percent of his time to
11 give because he is, you know, a Howard Hughes scholar and
12 many other things. But if one could attract somebody of
13 his stature and brilliance into the field this might be a
14 good situation for a seed grant.

15 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: I agree with a lot of
16 what you're saying. I'm a little concerned about the
17 three percent. That means that a lot of the work is
18 going to be done by proxies. And I have no problem with
19 us as a group deciding that a grant is novel and may lead
20 us in an entirely new direction and that at some point
21 we're going to say, well, we tried that and it didn't
22 work. But I think everybody who's a scientist here at
23 the table has tried things that didn't work. And I don't
24 have any problem, I think that's part of the risk that we

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 have to be willing to accept. I do get a little -- it
2 bothers me a little when I see this kind of shaky, you
3 know, the premise of the work is shaky or not well
4 understood and -- but you know, I'll go along with the
5 feeling of the group of course, but a couple of things
6 bother me about this.

7 DR. HISKES: Well, we can always take it
8 out later.

9 DR. WALLACK: One of the -- I think one of
10 the elements that we've tried to keep in mind is the fact
11 of whether or not the researcher and his lab has the
12 capabilities of achieving the goals that are stated. I
13 think with this particular individual there seems to be
14 from my reading of it, my understanding of it that
15 capacity and the value of it is such that if in fact he
16 can achieve his goals it's going to mean a lot going
17 forward in this whole area. So -- and it's a seed grant,
18 and again, my perspective I think that this is why we do
19 the seed grants, to involve these people and to -- if
20 we're going to take a shot at a success I'd rather do it
21 here than in a much larger grant. I think it's
22 worthwhile but if the group wants to put it in the maybe
23 for now --

24 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: I have no problem with

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 that Milt. Once again, are there labs down at Yale where
2 people don't have the capacity to do this kind of work?
3 I mean, come on folks. It's Yale and the University of
4 Connecticut. Who's going to let -- are people applying
5 who don't -- who have just little empty rooms?

6 DR. WALLACK: No, that's true.

7 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yeah. Yes Dr. Canalis?

8 DR. CANALIS: I have serious difficulties
9 with a three percent commitment. This is a 1.2 hour a
10 week to carry out a project and it's very worrisome.

11 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: David?

12 DR. GOLDHAMER: I was actually going to
13 say the opposite. For someone of that stature and his
14 level of funding a seed grant is really not a lot of
15 money and I wouldn't think an investigator of his stature
16 would be able to put that much more than three percent.
17 I mean, maybe five percent, but that really doesn't --

18 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: I'd argue with you.
19 Maybe we need to find an investigator with stature who
20 was willing to put a little bit more time into it. But
21 we can make that -- I'm just telling you my personal
22 feelings. We can put that in the maybe and come back to
23 it. If it works it's great, but if the mouse doesn't
24 perform then --

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 DR. WALLACK: You just send the mouse out
2 to pasture.

3 (Laughter)

4 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: -- they have those down
5 at Yale too Milt.

6 DR. KIESSLING: Does he need the money to
7 do this?

8 DR. GOLDHAMER: Well, that's a question,
9 yeah.

10 MR. MANDELKERN: I move we keep it in the
11 maybes so we can discuss it further and move onto the
12 next grant.

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: This grant is placed in
14 the maybe category. The next grant is SCAUCONN32,
15 Radmila Filipovic is the P.I., the peer review score is
16 2.1, Seemann and Latham are the reviewers.

17 DR. SEEMANN: Yeah. Actually this was a
18 very interesting grant on exploring the differentiation -
19 - the potential differentiation of human embryonic stem
20 cells into particular classes of brain neurons, cortical
21 neurons and then using those for ultimately therapeutic
22 tissue replacement. The first challenge is to show that
23 you can get human embryonic stem cells to differentiate
24 into two classes of neurons, upper layer and deep layer,

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 and then -- and then see that you can have them actually
2 function in host brain tissue in an in vitro system.

3 So the score of 2.1 I think sort of turned
4 upon the two reviewers' impressions of the obvious
5 critical question, and that is can you get the first part
6 of the science to work on which everything else depends.

7 So they're going to use a mouse protocol for cellular
8 conversion to these two -- to these neuronal types and of
9 course and everything else doesn't go if that doesn't
10 work. And the first reviewer calls that sort of point
11 quite substantially. The second reviewer seems to except
12 that there's enough data about it I think in the mouse
13 system that it's going to work. So good science, good
14 plan to go forward, important problem, not sure where
15 that falls in.

16 DR. LATHAM: Yeah, I agree. There's a bit
17 of kind of strange post-modern split between the
18 reviewers' impressions that would be a critical question.

19 One of them says -- the first one say, as to the first
20 subbing, which is actually producing the two kinds of
21 neurons in their -- subbing 1A, the first reviewer says
22 that the successful completion of this aim is likely, but
23 the entire proposal is based on the successful completion
24 and the authors do not provide any preliminary data

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 demonstrating this crucial step has been achieved. The
2 second reviewer oddly says, the investigator shows
3 abundant preliminary data about the feasibility of hESC
4 differentiation to neuro-rosettes in her lab as well as
5 efficient transvex -- whatever. So there's -- to the --
6 at least to the lay reader there's a strange split on
7 this crucial question. Both reviewers are incredibly
8 enthusiastic about the overall project and if step one
9 goes forward one of them says this will have important
10 consequences for translation into therapies and so on.

11 I'm left thinking it has to be a maybe.

12 DR. SEEMANN: Well, this is certainly
13 classic reviewer conservatism. They want to see half the
14 grant done in terms of data in the grant. So it's
15 definitely a maybe.

16 (Laughter)

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: A definite maybe. So
18 moved. It is in the maybe category. The next grant is
19 SCAYALE33, Brett Lindenbach, 2.1 is the peer review
20 score, Hiskes and Wallack are the reviewers.

21 DR. WALLACK: The project is to engineer
22 human stem cells that are resistant to Hepatitis C virus.

23 I found that the impression I get is that it's a very --
24 it's not a -- it's not a very innovative approach and

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 it's doubtful if the approach will yield positive
2 results. There's some risks involved. There are
3 weaknesses involved. It has a fairly good rating of 2.1.
4 I would however not recommend funding.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Hiskes?

6 DR. HISKES: I concur with everything Milt
7 said.

8 MS. TOWNSHEND: Any objection to placing
9 this in the no category?

10 DR. KIESSLING: Why don't -- why do you
11 not recommend it? I mean, this is a basic stem cell
12 grant, isn't it?

13 DR. HISKES: Right. Well, the reviewers
14 were very skeptical.

15 DR. KIESSLING: And they scored it 2.1?

16 DR. HISKES: Well, maybe they had a
17 glitch.

18 (Laughter)

19 DR. WALLACK: The answer is yes Ann. If
20 you read the narratives you get a totally different
21 impression.

22 DR. HISKES: Not innovative, not likely to
23 work, the tools used to assess are resistance to
24 infection are faulty. And so I don't know how they came

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 up with the 2.1.

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: Does anyone want to place
3 this -- oh, I'm sorry.

4 DR. FISHBONE: Yeah. I'd like to place it
5 in the maybe because one of the reviewers says that it's
6 likely to succeed and enthusiasm is high. You know, we
7 always have a problem which of the two reviewers is
8 right? If the one who's enthusiastic and, you know,
9 likes it very much I think it's worthy of a little more
10 discussion and a maybe.

11 MS. TOWNSHEND: This grant is placed in
12 the maybe category. Next grant is SCAUCHC34, April
13 Schumacher is the P.I., 1.45 is the peer review score,
14 Fishbone and Latham are the reviewers.

15 DR. LATHAM: Go ahead.

16 DR. FISHBONE: What she wants to do is to
17 evaluate the frequency of genetic exchange events in
18 human embryonic stem cells compared to other human cell
19 lines and usually the efficiency of these things is low.
20 And she wants to test the hypothesis that a newly
21 identified viral protein, I think from the Herpes virus,
22 can significantly improve the efficiency of gene
23 replacement and gene targeting in human embryonic stem
24 cells. She's giving 100 percent of her time to this, has

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 four publications, Ph.D. in '08 and now a post-doctoral
2 fellow at UCHC.

3 Critiques are, important problem and if
4 successful would be a significant advance. Well written,
5 sound and logical approach. Pitfalls and alternatives
6 are well thought out and technically feasible. She's had
7 good training, two excellent first authored papers in a
8 superb environment. And I think the second reviewer was
9 also quite supportive. So it's got a good review from
10 the two reviewers, a high mark, and I think should be
11 funded.

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Latham?

13 DR. LATHAM: I agree with that. My only
14 hesitancy is that it is another post-doctoral fellow, so
15 that's sort of a policy question that we have to address.

16 DR. FISHBONE: Yes.

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: The recommendation of the
18 reviewers is to move this to the yes category. Does
19 anyone have an objection to that?

20 DR. KIESSLING: I think it should go in
21 the maybe with the other post-docs.

22 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yeah. Okay. Ann, did
23 you have further comment?

24 DR. KIESSLING: I just think it should go

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 in the maybe with the other post-docs. I think we should
2 consider all the post-doc. support --

3 DR. PESCATELLO: Let's figure out what is
4 our policy on post-docs. anyway?

5 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yeah. This would be a
6 good time to --

7 DR. PESCATELLO: This would be not in the
8 university culture per se, so what's -- what's the issue
9 there? Is it that there's in every case there's a funded
10 senior person that can fund the post-doc. or is already
11 nurturing the post-doc. so to speak?

12 DR. KIESSLING: I think the idea is that
13 if you want to make the best use of the \$10,000,000 we
14 have we want to see if post-docs. fit into that mission,
15 post-doc. support. Maybe they do. It depends on whether
16 applications there are that you could fund an independent
17 investigator starting to launch a lab rather than fund an
18 existing funded lab. It's really a matter of resources,
19 it isn't a matter of, you know, whether you like post-
20 docs. or not. They're very productive people. It's a
21 matter of we've got \$10,000,000 to stretch as far as we
22 can for Connecticut.

23 DR. PESCATELLO: If you're a value
24 investor are you getting -- is the opportunity for a big

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 pay out high? Is that big pay out likely in a post-doc.
2 versus a young P.I.?

3 DR. KIESSLING: Yes. The answer to that
4 is yes.

5 DR. PESCATELLO: So isn't that kind of the
6 nature of what we're supposed to be --

7 MR. MANDELKERN: There's a policy in the
8 RFP.

9 MS. HORN: Yes. There are two sentences
10 here that apply for the -- just so that the Committee
11 understands what we put in the RFP and what people
12 responded to. Post-doctoral fellows or equivalent may
13 apply with the support of a faculty sponsor or
14 equivalent. A letter from the sponsor indicating support
15 of proposal must be included with the application and
16 must describe the applicant's level of independence as
17 well as other resources/funding available for the
18 project.

19 DR. LATHAM: That's an invitation to apply
20 though. I don't think it binds us to --

21 MR. MANDELKERN: No, but it doesn't --
22 it's saying to apply and then you raise an arbitrary
23 barrier and you're talking about putting a proposal that
24 ranked four out of 45 proposals out of the barrier that

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 it's a post-doc. I think we're on very shaky grounds
2 because you indicate one thing in the RFP. We have a
3 rank of four out of 45 and well recommended by both. I
4 don't see the basis of putting it in the maybe.

5 DR. GENEL: Well, you know, I would
6 disagree Bob. I think that's our function because if it
7 was only -- if we were only going to award grants based
8 on peer review scores we're spending two days wasting our
9 time. I think our role is to try and come up with
10 priorities in terms of how do we utilize what is really a
11 very limited amount of money for the amount of research
12 proposals that we have to deal with.

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Canalis?

14 DR. CANALIS: Whether I agree or not
15 regarding, you know, the issue of funding post-docs. we
16 have encouraged them to apply and that is a problem, you
17 know? They invested the time in writing the application.

18 It is in the RFP and I think we established that policy
19 a long time ago and to change policy at this stage is
20 problematic. You know, whether I agree with the policy
21 or not it's a different issue.

22 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Let's describe what our
23 policy is. We can read it once more, do you want to hear
24 it once more?

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 MS. HORN: Okay. This is one of the -- in
2 the seed grants we indicate that junior researchers and
3 hospitals and companies are particularly encouraged to
4 apply. In academic institutions priority will be given
5 to junior faculty members at the start of their
6 independent careers. Established investigators new to
7 stem cell research may apply for seed grants. Post-
8 doctoral fellows or equivalent may apply with the support
9 of a faculty sponsor or equivalent. A letter from the
10 sponsor indicating support of the proposal must be
11 included with the application and must describe the
12 applicant's level of independence as well as other
13 resources/funding available for the project.

14 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Milt?

15 DR. WALLACK: Yeah. I very strongly
16 endorse supporting this application. You have --

17 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Milt, we're talking
18 about what we're going to do about post-docs. Let's see
19 if we can --

20 DR. WALLACK: -- alright. So let me
21 comment on that then.

22 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: -- yeah.

23 DR. WALLACK: And I would endorse funding
24 post-docs. My understanding of -- and I think what was

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 just read, what Marianne just read, endorses what I'm
2 going to say and that is that the purpose of the seed
3 grants was to engage young researchers who would spend
4 the time, build their careers, and hopefully create
5 breakthroughs for us that would not otherwise be
6 realized. I don't see any problem if you have a post-
7 doc. who is -- who is devoted to it, who is -- and was
8 already publishing and shown great promise to be a
9 recipient of the seed grant. I would argue differently
10 if that person was going to be in the position to head a
11 core. I don't think that person would have the
12 experience at that point to do that, but for a seed grant
13 I think that's why we created this category of seed
14 grants and I would -- I don't have any problem supporting
15 the post-doc. in that capacity.

16 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Henry?

17 MR. SALTON: Yeah. As Counsel to the
18 Committee I think that it's important that at this point
19 in time the RFP has been published and we're applying the
20 RFP, applying now a general rule of applicability against
21 the whole pool of contracts is not permissible. You have
22 a set of criteria that you apply individually on each one
23 of these things. So if you're going to carve out all
24 post-doc. cases from these applications that would not be

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 consistent with the RFP. You can however once you get to
2 the point where you start to look at and compare various
3 categories you may say, well, this is, you know, this is
4 more -- this is a better application because it's got
5 more involvement of the senior investigator, vis-a-vis,
6 the amount of time that a post-doc. will put in. So you
7 may use those kind of general -- general thumb as far as
8 saying, well, let's compare some roles, but I don't think
9 -- you have to now look at what you have in front of you
10 and not apply a general rule of applicability -- a
11 general applicable rule to say, these are now kind of
12 second class applications.

13 (Indiscernible, multiple voices.)

14 MR. SALTON: Well, I'm just suggesting
15 that you can't do it now.

16 DR. WALLACK: I agree.

17 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay.

18 DR. PESCATELLO: My question is just in
19 the academic culture, I'm just trying to get a sense of
20 it. So when you -- when you fund a post-doc. are you
21 nurturing and supporting and facilitating the post-doc.
22 in giving perhaps some career independence or is the
23 concern that you are facilitating the senior person under
24 whom the post-doc. works and so you're really not --

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 DR. KIESSLING: The reason I --

2 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Hang on Ann. Before we
3 go any further I think Henry has made an excellent point.
4 We sent out this RFP with these criteria so we can't now
5 change how we look at it.

6 DR. KIESSLING: Dr. Galvin?

7 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yeah?

8 DR. KIESSLING: The big problem here that
9 I -- the reason I raised this to begin with is that one
10 of our peer reviewers really dinged one of our grants
11 because it was a post-doc. So this was a perfectly good
12 application that was given a score above the ones we want
13 to consider.

14 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Well, that's an
15 interesting comment because --

16 DR. KIESSLING: Okay? And they
17 specifically said that. That this would have scored much
18 better if this person were not a post-doc.

19 VOICE: The criticism based on -- I'm
20 sorry.

21 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: But you will notice that
22 this year that the scores are all grouped around two.

23 DR. KIESSLING: Yeah.

24 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: We've had a real

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 contraction. This is, you know, at the rate we're going
2 maybe next year we'll be looking at things that are
3 1.5532 because people are -- they all seem to be
4 clustered around two. This is not the way it was the
5 first two times we looked at these things. So I think
6 our review process is not -- it seems to be going in a
7 different direction and what I hear is grants that, you
8 know, grants getting a 1.55 is a yes and a 2 is a no. So
9 there may be something inherent in that system of -- you
10 can't call it regressing to the mean, but it's --
11 everything is two minus, you know, the range is getting
12 much, much narrow. And then what I hear, and I'm not
13 commenting on anybody's particular grant, what I hear is
14 that there seems to be some disconnect between the
15 outside reviewers and what appears to be reasonable to us
16 here and that bothers me.

17 DR. GENEL: Bob, if I may? I sense a -- I
18 detect a sense of hierarchy in the RFP we sent out, which
19 I think is really important. We said that priority will
20 be given to junior investigators and to senior
21 investigators entering the field. And then we say that
22 post-doctoral fellows may apply. Now I think it's
23 entirely consistent with that RFP for us to consider all
24 of these nuances at a point when we have to decide among

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 a large group of maybes and those that we've already
2 funded. I think it's really a matter of how we get down
3 to the amount that we can fund. Not whether or not post-
4 doctoral fellows should get money or not. It's just
5 really a matter of our trying to determine priorities and
6 I think the RFP implies that.

7 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yeah. Steve, did you
8 have a comment you wanted to make?

9 DR. LATHAM: I was going to say exactly
10 what Mike just said.

11 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Anne?

12 DR. HISKES: Well, I think it's a matter
13 of balancing different criteria. One of the criteria is
14 what's good for the state of Connecticut. And so there
15 is an emphasis on faculty, who might have tenure, tenure-
16 track jobs who are going to have a career in this state.

17 Post-docs. are valid and so if you have a very high
18 scoring post-doc. grant certainly the high score carries
19 a lot of weight. Being a post-doc. is something else in
20 the mix and, you know, they're not going to have the
21 commitment to the institution that a faculty member may
22 have.

23 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: I think we're going to
24 have a lively discussion when we cut to the final

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 numbers.

2 DR. HISKES: Right.

3 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yes David?

4 DR. GOLDHAMER: In response to that
5 comment, I mean, it is also true though that post-docs.
6 can launch a certain lab into the stem cell field, which
7 then would benefit Connecticut. I think that post-docs.
8 should be -- I think primarily it should be based on
9 merit and a score of 1.4, 1.5. I don't think the post-
10 docs. should be penalized for being a post-doc. I think
11 maybe in the range of a two or whatever that gray area is
12 then we now look to the RFP and see that there is at
13 least some degree of priority given to new investigators
14 and make that decision later. But the slam dunk 1.4's,
15 1.5's I really don't think that post-docs. should be
16 penalized for being post-docs. Procedurally since we may
17 end up with more than 10, which has been the number of
18 funded seed grants in the past, after this review if we
19 put post-docs. in the maybe category they may not get a
20 serious second look. I think the best post-doc. grants
21 should be yes's then we can sort out later how we get
22 down to 10 or whatever that number turns out to be.

23 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yeah. We can also move
24 a yes to a maybe or to a no. Yes Mr. Mandelkern?

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 MR. MANDELKERN: I would like to make one
2 comment in that in the overall looking at the money there
3 is only one core grant request and four group requests.
4 So in terms of balancing the money we can think in terms
5 of more funding of seed and established investigator
6 because in the heavy money there aren't so many
7 proposals, a total of five. So I do not think we should
8 start by putting 1.45's in maybe because we'll get no
9 progress. I think it has to go into a yes because
10 otherwise we'll be winding up with everything maybe and
11 starting over again tomorrow. So thinking overall of the
12 money we do have to commit to some yes's in the seeds,
13 especially if it's a 1.45.

14 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Seemann?

15 DR. SEEMANN: Yeah. I actually made the
16 mistake of going back and looking at the RFP here because
17 I was sort of thinking along different lines with regard
18 to the definition of seed grants and in my mind they're
19 about seeding ideas, not specifically seeding people, and
20 that's actually how this reads. The first sentences
21 actually makes primary the idea and not the person. This
22 is about -- this is fundamentally not about funding
23 junior faculty, this is about -- these awards are
24 intended to support the early stages of projects that are

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 not ready for larger scale funding whether from Federal
2 or non-Federal sources.

3 So it is fundamentally about the idea and
4 then there's a secondary hierarchy with regard to people.

5 But I would suggest that if it was me, if it was a
6 graduate student who sent in something here that was a
7 brilliant idea I would be prepared as a group to think
8 about funding them. So I think that you've got to look
9 at that idea first, and secondarily who it's coming from.

10 DR. KIESSLING: The problem is that one of
11 our grants got really dinged because she was a new
12 graduate.

13 DR. SEEMANN: Again, I would say is the --
14 you know, what is the quality of the idea? What is the
15 quality of the science? And then --

16 DR. LANDWIRTH: Are we talking about the
17 same grant that was criticized for being a post-doc., the
18 secondary comment about that was that the topic of the
19 research overlapped with the senior researcher and funded
20 researcher in that field. So that really speaks to the
21 question of independence and novelty.

22 DR. KIESSLING: But that's true for all
23 post-doc. positions.

24 DR. LANDWIRTH: Yeah.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 DR. KIESSLING: I mean, I think we have to
2 look at that carefully for each one of the people that's
3 a post-doc. How much overlap is this in the lab?

4 DR. LANDWIRTH: Right.

5 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yes Milt?

6 DR. WALLACK: I go back to what I said
7 before and what Henry mentioned also and I think it
8 should be an equal playing field. It should be based on
9 the idea, the ability to perform and to get a positive --
10 hopefully a positive result. I see absolutely no reason
11 why we should not be funding this particular grant. If
12 we did something earlier in the day that was
13 inappropriate well I feel badly about that, but I don't
14 want to compound that by doing something inappropriate
15 for this grant and I would put on the floor a motion to
16 put this in the yes category.

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: Is there any objection
18 from the group of moving this to the yes category?

19 DR. KIESSLING: Can we move it back
20 tomorrow?

21 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yeah.

22 MS. TOWNSHEND: Henry? Put it in yes? It
23 sounds like there's a maybe on the table.

24 MR. SALTON: Again, does anyone object to

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 putting it to yes? No objection goes to yes.

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Thank you.

4 MR. MANDELKERN: Just a point of
5 information Dr. Galvin?

6 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yes?

7 MR. MANDELKERN: If there is a previous
8 grant that was dinged because it contained post-doc. was
9 that put in no or maybe?

10 DR. KIESSLING: Maybe.

11 MR. MANDELKERN: Well, that means
12 automatically we will reconsider it tomorrow since it is
13 in maybe --

14 DR. KIESSLING: Right.

15 MR. MANDELKERN: -- and it will get full
16 careful consideration if it's in maybe. So it wasn't
17 dinked, it was just put back a little in the line.

18 DR. KIESSLING: But that's only because I
19 defended it.

20 MR. MANDELKERN: Well, you are a strong
21 defender but we all will have to face it tomorrow because
22 it's maybe.

23 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: I think this is a good
24 time to take a break. I think that this particular topic

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 is very important. I am unsure as to whether or not we
2 will have \$10,000,000 next year. The economic straits
3 are dire and we may not have all of that or we might not
4 even have any of it. So I think the things you do now
5 generally speaking for new projects and young
6 investigators are really critically important at this
7 time. I do remain unhappy that the scores are scattered
8 around, you know, two plus or minus a half. I don't
9 think that was properly done. Adjourned for 15 minutes.

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: 15 minutes. We'll return
11 at 10:24.

12 (Off the record)

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: Housekeeping. I've been
14 told by the hotel that the AV wiring, which was very
15 intricate this year, is going to prevent us from actually
16 moving this table out and adding extra tables in between
17 as we had planned, but we are going to add some end
18 tables so that people can put papers on them. As you'll
19 see over by Dan and Milt they've already placed one of
20 those tables so that we can spread out a little bit more
21 and do the best that we can with regard to paperwork and
22 not elbowing each other too too much.

23 Do we have enough people to resume or
24 shall we wait? Alright. So here we go.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Let me make -- as we're
2 seating a couple of people, my earlier remarks were not
3 intended to impugn any of our outside reviewers. In my
4 Master's Degree in Public Health my emphasis and major
5 was in statistics and epidemiology, which made me very
6 suspicious and so I look at -- I look at things sometimes
7 in a jaundiced fashion because of my experience in that
8 realm and also having practiced medicine for 44 years I
9 tend to take things with a grain of salt. But that was
10 not meant to impugn any particular group of reviewers.

11 MS. TOWNSHEND: Alright. We are ready to
12 go resuming with SCAYALE35, Kevan Herold is the P.I., 1.5
13 is the peer review score, and the reviewers are Canalis
14 and Pescatello.

15 DR. PESCATELLO: This deals with diabetes,
16 very interesting research to separate and identify
17 glucose responsive cells from tumor developing cells. I
18 think the score speaks for itself, 1.5, very highly
19 rated. So I endorse a yes.

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Canalis?

21 DR. CANALIS: I don't have a problem with
22 that.

23 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay.

24 MS. TOWNSHEND: Any objection with placing

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 this grant in the yes category? This grant is placed in
2 the yes category. The next grant is SCAYALE36, Pasquale
3 Patrizio is the P.I., 4.0 is the peer review score, the
4 reviewers from the Committee are Hiskes and Pescatello.

5 DR. HISKES: Well, the four speaks for
6 itself.

7 DR. PESCATELLO: Yeah. I was going to
8 say, yeah.

9 DR. HISKES: Human oocyte enucleation,
10 freezing and reconstruction towards the creation of a
11 ooplasm bank for stem cell research. In my mind the
12 reviewers raised some damning ethical issues.

13 DR. PESCATELLO: I agree.

14 DR. HISKES: So this is an absolute no.

15 MS. TOWNSHEND: This grant is moved to the
16 no category.

17 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Incidentally, I like the
18 way you pronounce the double O. I never know whether to
19 o-o or oh-oh, but I like the o-o.

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: She says she has voice
21 lessons later.

22 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yeah.

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: SCAYALE37 is the next
24 grant for consideration, Matthew Rodeheffer is the P.I.,

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 2.0 is the peer review score, Goldhamer and Wallack are
2 the reviewers.

3 DR. WALLACK: The project is to identify
4 and characterize a population of cells from human adipose
5 tissue which will provide superior starting material for
6 use in tissue engineering and regenerative medicine.
7 It's a project that is not very, very well described.
8 It's a -- the project does have some deficiencies in it's
9 structure and also it may well be a project that could
10 find funding elsewhere. If I'm thinking back Marianne to
11 some of the things that we are driving ourselves by and
12 that is embryonic stem cell work and certainly this falls
13 more into the adult stem cell area and therefore for a
14 variety of reasons I would vote that this should not be
15 funded.

16 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Goldhamer?

17 DR. GOLDHAMER: Yes. I do agree with that
18 assessment. I did not mark it down for not using human
19 embryonic stem cells, although there was quite
20 significant -- the reviewers had quite significant
21 criticisms and they spoke to a lack of true understanding
22 of stem cells in human adipose tissue, although this is
23 a, you know, a new investigator who has studied and
24 published on adipose tissue in mouse -- stem cell and

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 adipose tissue of the mouse, but they make certain leaps
2 and assumptions that the reviewers rightly point out and
3 it just didn't read like a strong fundable grant to me.

4 MS. TOWNSHEND: Discussion? Any
5 objections to placing this in the no category? This
6 grant is placed in the no category. The next grant is
7 SCAYALE38, Jun Lu is the P.I., 2.15 is the peer review
8 score, Canalis and Nair are the reviewers.

9 DR. NAIR: This was a proposal to develop
10 high through-put gene-expression assays for human stem
11 cells. I think actually the reviewers had quite a bit of
12 negative comments on this. They said that some of it was
13 a fishing expedition and then the P.I. -- though the P.I.
14 was qualified to carry out the proposal there was concern
15 about the effort of the newly hired post-doctoral fellow
16 and the 50 percent time commitment of the new technician.

17 Actually the reviewers were sort of split,
18 the two -- though they said that there was a nonspecific
19 time spent on it and that this may not be the way to go,
20 and that was reflected in the score. The second reviewer
21 did feel that the Yale Stem Cell Core provided an
22 excellent environment to carry out this type of thing. I
23 actually would put it into the no category.

24 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Canalis?

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 DR. CANALIS: Yes. I agree putting it in
2 the no category. It is not hypothesis driven, it's just
3 doing micro RNA and expression profiling in stem cells
4 and you know, it's technology driven, it's not science
5 driven. So I vote for a no.

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: Any objection to placing
7 this in the no category? This grant is placed in the no
8 category. The next grant is SCAYALE39, Qi Li is the
9 P.I., 1.4 is the peer review score, the reviewers again
10 are Canalis and Nair.

11 DR. CANALIS: Alright, it's my turn. Can
12 we skip one second and look at on my notes and come back?
13 I just finished --

14 MS. TOWNSHEND: The next grant would be
15 SCAUCONN40, Shiva P. Kotha is the P.I., 2.5 is the peer
16 review score, the reviewers are Seemann and Latham.

17 MS. HORN: I would note that this grant
18 does have parts of pages six, seven and eight marked as
19 proprietary. So please take note of that as you do your
20 discussion.

21 DR. LATHAM: This is a proposal to deliver
22 mRNA to cells by encapsulating it in biodegradable beads
23 to reprogram the cells to iPSC in a way that would not
24 cause integration on the genome of the reprogramming

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 factors and would make it safer than using CDNAs
2 introduced via plasmates. Both reviewers were -- agreed
3 on the importance of this. If it worked they thought it
4 would be very good. They both had questions about a
5 latter portion of the protocol that involved
6 (indiscernible, coughing) programming on the skins of
7 animals and one reviewer had some questions about earlier
8 portions of the experiment that I won't just read aloud
9 into the record.

10 All in all I would say it's probably a no
11 only for the reasons articulated by the scientific peer
12 review.

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Seemann?

14 DR. SEEMANN: Yeah, I would agree with
15 that. You know, one of the comments of the peer
16 reviewers even then tend to sort of put a stake in the
17 coffin unclear that the method if of clinical and
18 practical importance on topic. So some scientific
19 challenges in there.

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: Any objections to placing
21 this grant in the no category? This grant is placed in
22 the no category. Dr. Canalis?

23 DR. CANALIS: Yeah, I'm ready.

24 MS. TOWNSHEND: We're back to SCAYALE39,

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 again, this is Qi Li, 1.4 is the peer review score,
2 Doctors Canalis and Nair.

3 DR. CANALIS: So what Qi Li intends to do
4 is to study the influence of endothelial cells under
5 neuronal cell differentiation using established co-
6 culture models. Are going to be doing gene profiling of
7 the two study -- two cell populations and trying to
8 determine factors that effect on neuronal cell
9 differentiation for the endothelia cells. The
10 investigator is a post-doctoral fellow of Dr. Madry, who
11 is an established investigator at Yale. There is over 50
12 percent time commitment.

13 The only concern is that Qi Li has been a
14 post-doc. since 1999 and, you know, a 10-year post-
15 doctoral fellowship and increases some doubts about the
16 independence. On the other hand, the scientific review
17 is extremely positive resulting in a priority score of
18 1.4 placing this grant on the merit of number two.
19 Because of that reason I would favor it's funding.

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Nair?

21 DR. NAIR: I would agree. I thought the
22 merits of this type of research should be funded.

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: Any objections to placing
24 this in the yes category? Yes sir?

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 DR. GENEL: Not an objection just a
2 clarification. Dr. Li is not a post-doctoral fellow, he
3 is an associate research scientist which is a faculty
4 position at Yale.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: Thank you. Any objections
6 to placing this in the yes category? This grant is
7 placed in the yes category. Our next grant is SCAUCHC41,
8 Feng Gu is the P.I., 2.3 is the peer review score, the
9 reviewers are Seemann and Latham.

10 DR. SEEMANN: This one is just to create
11 an expressional area to look at expression in pancreatic
12 systems this is one of those where one of the reviewers
13 beat it up so badly then I think they sort of felt bad
14 and gave it a relatively speaking good score. It's one
15 of those where I'm not sure anybody has the experience
16 with the technology and we're not sure they have the
17 equipment and we're not sure of the background and if his
18 data is any good, and etcetera, etcetera. So -- and the
19 other reviewer really didn't have much to say. So pretty
20 fundamental things in there.

21 DR. LATHAM: Yeah. One of the reviewers
22 says there's manuscripts attached that seem to have
23 nothing to do with the application and there is
24 possibility of collaboration with a lab at Texas A&M, but

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 no letter of support from that lab. So I think it's got
2 to go no.

3 MS. TOWNSHEND: Any objection to placing
4 this grant in the no category? This grant is placed in
5 the no category. The next grant is -- excuse me,
6 SCAYALE42, Valentina Greco is the P.I., 2.75 is the peer
7 review score, Fishbone and Nair are the reviewers.

8 DR. FISHBONE: Greco has a score of 2.75.
9 She has made an observation that the epithelial stem
10 cells in hair follicles are an amenable source of
11 reprogramming and have potential comparable to embryonic
12 stem cells. She points out that they contain two of the
13 four genes needed for easy reprogramming, although the
14 two that it contains happen to be the oncogenes. Her
15 commitment is 100 percent. She's worked on skin stem
16 cells since 2003 and has been a major player in
17 demonstrating that hair follicle stem cells can be
18 reprogrammed into iPS cells.

19 The concern is that the proposal is not
20 novel enough. Others have already done it and the latest
21 manuscripts that have been published show that the
22 reprogramming can be done without viral transfection, but
23 she's planning to use viral transfection.

24 So it sounds like a lot of the work has

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 been done in terms of the reprogramming how to do it.
2 Her feeling is that the stem cells in hair follicles
3 might be a good source to work with. But I have some
4 concerns about it because of the oncogenes that these
5 cells seem to have a lot of.

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Nair?

7 DR. NAIR: I think the other concern here
8 for the reviewers was the fact that the reprogramming
9 evidentially affirmative and differentiated cells have
10 not been demonstrated. So that was the other issue that
11 the reviewers found and so I would put this in the no
12 category.

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections
14 to placing this grant in the no category? This grant is
15 placed in the no category.

16 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Well, I've got to
17 comment that there are several of us at the table who
18 would probably be very interested in hair follicle
19 regeneration, but perhaps not in this particular venue.

20 (Laughter)

21 DR. NAIR: I that they're using oncogenes.

22 DR. SEEMANN: I'm afraid out \$10,000,000
23 may run out before that gets to be a priority.

24 MS. TOWNSHEND: Our next grant is SCA --

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 SCARECO43, Ranjini Sundaram is the P.I., 4.5 is the peer
2 review score, Kiessling and Hiskes are the reviewers.

3 DR. KIESSLING: This grant was a huge
4 disappointment because I think it's one of our only small
5 company grants. Did we have more than one small company
6 grant? We were really hoping that some small companies
7 in Connecticut get funded. This is a group of -- it's
8 actually -- I don't know if it's a brother team or a
9 husband and wife team, they're from India. They did some
10 of their training in Connecticut. They formed this
11 little company called Recombinant Technologies and they
12 have successfully competed for a couple of SBIR funds,
13 but this application they're not stem cell scientists and
14 this application is actually really bad. It's a couple
15 of ways they were going to put some genes in to make
16 Parkinson's Disease neurons. It was a huge
17 disappointment and I would really like to see more grants
18 like this that were better. That's why it has a 4.5. I
19 recommend that this not be funded.

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: Is there any objection to
21 placing this in the no category? This grant is placed in
22 the no category. The last grant under the seed grant
23 category is SCAYALE45, Martin Garcia-Castro, 1.45 is the
24 peer review score, Hiskes and Mandelkern are the

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 reviewers.

2 MR. MANDELKERN: Well, I'm very happy to
3 report on the last of the seed grants by Martin Garcia-
4 Castro, which received a remarkable score of 1.4, which
5 gives it the rank of three out of 45 seed grants. It has
6 to do with research on early neural crest precursors,
7 which I'm not quite sure what they are, but the
8 investigator has done some work and he feels that the
9 work that has been done by he and others is at a later
10 stage of development and he intends to go back and find
11 early crest markers that have -- some of which have
12 already been discovered in his lab.

13 He also has a lot of emphasis on a certain
14 protein relating to neuro crest precursors. Quoting the
15 peer reviewers the proposal is very good, it's science
16 appropriate and monitoring the identity and testing the
17 possible cell phase will give good information. And the
18 costs are justifiable that P.I. has a strong background
19 in development and biology and a strong publication
20 record as a student post-doc. and research faculty. It
21 also implies that requested money for a post-doc.
22 associate also gives us a person with an excellent list
23 of publications and background related to this proposal.

24 So with all of that strong history,

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 progress and future potential I propose we put this in
2 the yes category.

3 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Hiskes?

4 DR. HISKES: And I concur.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: Any objections to placing
6 this in the yes category? This grant is placed in the
7 yes category and that concludes the first round of
8 consideration for the seed grants. We'll move onto
9 established investigator grants.

10 DR. WALLACK: Can I ask a question?

11 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yes sir?

12 DR. WALLACK: I'm thinking back with the
13 clarification that we had having to do with the post-doc.
14 discussions and so forth and there was a previous grant,
15 number 14 it was, UCONN14, with a peer review rank of
16 1.55 and I think there was some comments about the fact
17 that this was the senior investigator -- no, this one --
18 oh, I'm sorry, senior post-doc. That's exactly right.
19 Senior post-doc. That's what I wanted to comment on.

20 And let me finish. Relative to the
21 discussion that we had just a moment ago relative to
22 post-docs. I think that it would be appropriate at this
23 time since there was nothing other than this
24 consideration about the senior post-doc. position that

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 put him in the maybe category I would be more comfortable
2 going back, especially in light of Henry's comments and
3 some of our own feelings and put him in the yes category.

4 MS. TOWNSHEND: My understanding from the
5 legal counsel is that we've considered all of the seed
6 grants, we've placed them in categories and we'll discuss
7 the maybes again and the yes's again tomorrow.

8 DR. WALLACK: Would Henry -- Henry, would
9 that -- what I just commented about be an inappropriate
10 approach to this? Especially -- I'm putting that in the
11 context of the discussion that we had relative to post-
12 docs.

13 MR. SALTON: Inappropriate is a value
14 weighted term. I mean, you're just departing from
15 procedure. The procedure is not written in stone here.
16 So if you want to -- I mean, I think the thing is what
17 you leave yourself open to is anyone at this point in
18 time now going, well, you know, I put something in maybe.
19 I want to rediscuss it now. I think it's just a matter
20 of efficiencies. It's in a maybe now and the design of
21 the process is that we're going to all revisit -- or you
22 all are going to revisit maybes and look at whether they
23 should go to yes or no.

24 DR. WALLACK: I just feel that there's

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 more consistency --

2 MR. SALTON: I don't think anyone will
3 forget what the discussion was today when you get to the
4 maybes. It's not a legal issue from my perspective.

5 DR. GOLDHAMER: Can I ask a procedural
6 question here? If for example there are 20 grants that
7 are in the yes category in the seed category and the
8 target is to fund 10, hypothetically, will those in the
9 maybe get the full weight of review that the -- all the
10 yes's will or not?

11 DR. KIESSLING: Yes.

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yes they will. Yes sir?

13 DR. GENEL: May I ask what number do we
14 have in those categories now that we are going to the
15 next group?

16 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: We have 10 in the yes.

17 DR. GENEL: We have 10 yes? And how many
18 maybe?

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: 10 yes.

20 DR. GENEL: And nine maybes?

21 MS. TOWNSHEND: Nine maybes.

22 DR. GENEL: Okay.

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are we going onto the
24 established investigators? Milt had asked whether or not

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 we could go back and talk about some of the seed grants,
2 but procedurally we've always gone on to consider --

3 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yep.

4 MS. TOWNSHEND: -- our next grant we're
5 going into the established investigator grants, it is
6 SCBUCHC01. I'm not even going to try that name. Peer
7 review score 1.7 and Arinzeh and Genel are the reviewers.

8 DR. ARINZEH: Okay. This proposal is
9 looking at to investigate the genetic status of Williams
10 Syndrome derived iPS cells. So Williams Syndrome is a
11 complex disorder. It's features are cranial facial
12 defects, mental retardation, microcephaly and short
13 stature. So they propose to -- well, they've identified
14 a candidate gene, this TTFII-I and then also a
15 transcription factor as the initial area to look at. And
16 so they're going to be looking at a series of
17 experiments, primarily looking at gene expression using
18 various tools.

19 So the reviewers were very favorable and
20 I'm surprise they didn't give it a better score than 1.7.

21 I really didn't see any -- they didn't mention any
22 weaknesses, unless I overlooked that, but I didn't even
23 see any weaknesses mentioned. This is actually a
24 proposal that is by a young investigator who has an

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 excellent track record so far. So I put it in the yes
2 category.

3 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Genel?

4 DR. GENEL: Yeah. This is -- this fellow
5 worked in Frank Ruddle's lab before he went to UConn and
6 which is one of the premiere genetics labs. I mean, just
7 reading from the reviewer's comments this is an
8 outstanding proposal by a young investigator. The
9 strengths of the proposal are substantial, so forth. I
10 mean, I think this -- I would fund this.

11 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections
12 to placing this in the yes category? The grant is placed
13 in the yes category. Our next grant is -- thank you.
14 Our next grant is SCBUCHC02, Stephen Crocker is the P.I.,
15 3.8 the peer review score, Arinzeh and Landwirth.

16 DR. LANDWIRTH: This grant proposes to
17 study how intravenously administered neural precursor
18 cells derived from embryonic stem cells and repair
19 chemically damaged myelin in mice. And this is an
20 example I think of what Dr. Galvin was talking about
21 earlier where the logic of the proposal is undermined by
22 a false premise and that is that stem cells will migrate
23 intravenously into the central nervous system, which
24 apparently has never been shown to be the case and that's

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 the basic reason why it received a score of 3.8. And so
2 I recommend -- Ann, do you want to comment?

3 MS. TOWNSHEND: The recommendation is?

4 DR. LANDWIRTH: Is that it be in the no
5 column.

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: Is there any objections to
7 placing this grant in the no category? This grant is
8 placed in the no category. Grant SCBYALE03, Chris
9 Breuer, 3 -- I'm sorry, 2.8 is the peer review score,
10 Canalis and Hiskes are the reviewers.

11 DR. CANALIS: The P.I. plans to use
12 biodegradable scaffolds of vascular tissue to implant ES
13 cells so that the attempt will be to develop new vessels
14 in mouse models. This is a high tech engineering model
15 that, you know, it has potential. However, it has
16 potential for the development in new vessels. The
17 reviewers had significant concerns in this -- about the
18 model and this is reflected on a priority score of 2.8.

19 There are some additional concerns. The
20 total commitment of the P.I. time is less than -- is
21 about one percent, which is really minimal. So in view
22 of the negative scientific review and the -- and the
23 other concerns that I mentioned I would favor placing
24 this in the no category.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Hiskes?

2 DR. HISKES: I concur with the no. The
3 reviewer -- one reviewer said the proposal is based on
4 unrealistic expectations about the behavior of hES. So I
5 think that's --

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections
7 to placing this in the no category? This grant is placed
8 in the no category. The next one is SCBUCONN04, the P.I.
9 is Tai-His Fan, 2.3 is the peer review score, Seemann and
10 Latham are the reviewers.

11 DR. SEEMANN: I think it's your turn
12 Steve.

13 DR. LATHAM: Dr. Fan wants to develop
14 microfluidic culture systems they initially developed
15 with a grant from this program which will allow expansion
16 of human embryonic stem cells and human induced
17 pluripotent stem cells as well as differentiation toward
18 neuroectodermal cells. Both of the reviewers had
19 significant questions about the basis in the plans for
20 the degeneration of neuroectodermal cells and I think
21 actually reading the reviews it seems as if the final
22 score is more positive than the text of the reviews. I
23 would say no for this one.

24 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Seemann?

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 DR. SEEMANN: Yeah. I read the same stuff
2 and I sort of came to the opposite conclusion, but I
3 don't disagree with what the words actually are there.
4 It's in one sense I didn't see the reviewers getting
5 terribly excited, but maybe more because it was about
6 technology development than dealing with any very
7 specific approach to a disease being able to examine in
8 great detail in a microculture system the development of
9 stem cells in a neuro-pathway and being able to
10 manipulate that. And to one degree that, you know, one
11 of the reviewer's questions was about whether they could
12 do that and that in fact is the question. So I -- this --
13 -- I have this one in the maybe category Steve. It is --
14 it is -- I didn't see anything majorly wrong with it. It
15 looks like it could be a reasonable, if not powerful
16 tool, for looking at stem cell development in a whole lot
17 of systems. So it might take somebody here who's got
18 more horsepower than I on this subject.

19 MS. TOWNSEND: Are there any objections
20 to placing this in the maybe category? This grant is
21 placed in the maybe category. The next grant is
22 SCBUCHC05, Hector L. Aguila, 2.5 is the peer review
23 score, Fishbone and Wallack.

24 DR. WALLACK: He's handsomer than I am.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 DR. SEEMANN: Oh, God, it's touch and go
2 here around these guys.

3 DR. FISHBONE: In this grant there are two
4 objectives to establish methods for directing development
5 of human embryonic stem cells to hemopoietic lineage --
6 progenitors, excuse me that could be used in adaptive
7 transfer based therapies. He aims to develop these
8 hemopoietic progenitors along myeloid pathway
9 concentrating on conditions to generate osteoclast and
10 dendritic cells.

11 One thing I didn't realize was that the
12 same progenitors that produce blood cells also produce
13 osteoclast and dendritic cells. And they both come from
14 a common progenitor and their functional properties make
15 them excellent candidates for development of novel
16 therapies. The osteoclastic cells would have to do with
17 bone growth and the dendritic cells would have to do with
18 development of the immune system.

19 So in terms of the critiques -- if I can
20 find where the critiques are, yeah, very lengthy and
21 difficult to isolate precise objectives, theme one is not
22 clear. Does he need to repeat work done by others? Aim
23 too uncertainty as to which promoters would be best for
24 the purpose. Cost is too high. Consumables are high.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 Let's see, they don't describe the number of animals that
2 would be needed and I don't think it got an
3 overwhelmingly good report from the reviewers and it's
4 grade is 2.5 the score, so I would not recommend it for
5 funding.

6 DR. WALLACK: I would concur.

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections
8 to placing this in the no category? This grant is placed
9 in the no category. The next up is SCBYALE06, Jeffery
10 Kocsis is the P.I., 1.25 the peer review score, Canalis
11 and Pescatello.

12 DR. CANALIS: The process is basically two
13 aims. He's going to determine whether neurospheres can
14 remyelinate in vivo and whether this will result in a
15 functional -- a functional myelin using electro-
16 physiological studies. The -- he will do this in
17 monkeys, which is a rather expensive experimental model.

18 The reviewers loved it. I mean, they had no -- no
19 negative comments. They felt that this was highly
20 relevant to stem cell research and I had little
21 difficulties placing this in the yes category. It ranks
22 as number one in this category of grants.

23 DR. PESCATELLO: I agree completely.

24 MS. TOWNSHEND: Any objection to placing

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 this in the yes category? This grant is placed in the
2 yes category.

3 DR. KIESSLING: Does this have escrow
4 approval?

5 DR. CANALIS: It will have to before it's
6 funded.

7 DR. KIESSLING: Has it been escrow
8 reviewed?

9 DR. CANALIS: I'm sorry? I did not look
10 for -- I can go back to the grant and look for it.

11 MS. TOWNSHEND: My understanding is that
12 that does not happen until after the grant has been
13 approved, but before the contracting takes place.

14 MR. MANDELKERN: A point? This grant that
15 was just reviewed received the highest score of all 77
16 grants proposed this time.

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections
18 to placing this in the yes category? This grant is moved
19 to the yes category. The next grant is SCBUHC7, Jeff
20 Hoch is the P.I., 3.1 the peer review score and Kiessling
21 and Latham are the reviewers.

22 DR. KIESSLING: Okay. This is a mid-
23 career scientist who is a physical chemist who runs a
24 core at UConn and he appears to be a very good physical

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 chemist. This grant did not get a good score by the
2 reviewers and I sort of agreed with them. He wants to do
3 -- wants to use a technique called Nuclear Magnetic
4 Resonance to profile metabolites of stem cells and
5 there's no particular reason to believe that profiling
6 metabolites is going to be any improvement over profiling
7 gene expression or protein expression. So there was
8 really no justification for why he wanted to do this.

9 And although -- and this is also a grant
10 that I didn't get a budget page. The budget page for me
11 is blank, but I think he basically wants to fund a post-
12 doc. in his lab to do this, which would be nice, but he's
13 got to come back with some justification as to why this
14 expensive approach would give us any information. So I
15 recommend a no for this project.

16 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Latham?

17 DR. LATHAM: I agree.

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: Any objection to placing
19 this in the no category? This grant is placed in the no
20 category. Next up, SCBUCHC08, Changping Zou is the P.I.,
21 3.24 is the peer review score, Seemann and Landwirth are
22 the reviewers.

23 DR. SEEMANN: This one as far as I'm
24 concerned isn't going anywhere. The first reviewer

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 wasn't crazy about it, the second reviewer really didn't
2 like it at all for a variety of important reasons.

3 DR. LANDWIRTH: It did receive a poor
4 score. I think it was mostly on very valid reasons that
5 have to do with how much detail, technical detail was
6 provided in the application itself. Unfortunately it's
7 an interesting collaboration between a ovarian cancer
8 researcher and a stem cell researcher and it may have
9 from what we've heard so far the highest translational
10 potential we've been presented so far. But the
11 application was weak in the opinion of both reviewers and
12 so it's got a 3.25 and probably isn't going anywhere. So
13 it's -- I guess we're recommending going in the no
14 column.

15 DR. SEEMANN: I agree.

16 MS. TOWNSHEND: Any objection to placing
17 this grant in the no category? This grant is placed in
18 the no category. Next, SCBUCHC09, Linda Shapiro is the
19 P.I., 1.9 the peer review score, Arinzeh and Nair.

20 DR. NAIR: This is the mechanism of stem
21 cell homing to injured heart tissue and it received a
22 score of 1.9. The P.I. has discovered CD 13, which is a
23 self-service marker that is expressed by not just
24 hormonal cells, but by the female cells and also in

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 damaged tissue and favorable in homing of our cells.

2 So it is an interesting experiment because
3 in the event of cardiac ischemia to try to get the stem
4 cells to regenerate in the site of injury and to get them
5 to form to that site becomes a significant issue. One of
6 the reviewers did have a concern regarding the fact that
7 CD 13 over expression may skew the level event of human
8 embryonic stem cells in vitro and interfere with cardiac
9 function post-recovery. So they did suggest that if this
10 application is funded it is requested that an alternate
11 expression method should be used. However, they did --
12 they were excited about this project and they did give
13 this a very high score of 1.9.

14 I do think that the model is very
15 interesting and it has significant practical value. So I
16 feel that this should be funded.

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Arinzeh?

18 DR. ARINZEH: Just a further comment. I
19 think the first reviewer's comment on the fact that maybe
20 they should consider using the adult stem cells also in
21 the model, but you know, that's not there because that's
22 currently within clinical trial and that's what they're
23 trying to see if there's some similarity with the
24 embryonic stem cells in terms of mechanism. But -- yeah,

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 so that was a weakness -- a weakness there. But I do
2 think it should be -- should be funded.

3 MS. TOWNSHEND: The recommendation from
4 the reviewers is to place this in the yes category. Are
5 there any objections to placing this in the yes category?

6 This grant is placed in the yes category. The next
7 grant is SCBYALE10, Zhiwei Hu is the P.I., 4.0 is the
8 peer review score, Goldhamer and Mandelkern.

9 MR. MANDELKERN: This is a proposal in
10 reference to cancer stem cells, however, it is very
11 poorly reviewed by both reviewers, one saying there is
12 significant deficiencies in the proposal, the other
13 saying there is no background, the author has not
14 published a paper in seven years and therefore is
15 overreaching and therefore I suggest the no category.

16 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Goldhamer?

17 DR. GOLDHAMER: I agree with that.

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections
19 to placing this grant in the no category? This grant is
20 placed in the no category. Next is SCBYALE11, Erica
21 Herzog is the P.I., 2.35 the peer review score, Canalis
22 an Pescatello are the reviewers.

23 DR. PESCATELLO: This (indiscernible, too
24 far from mic.) stem cells that interfere with lung

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 damage. (Indiscernible, too far from mic.). The
2 reviewers weren't in fact positive about this. I would
3 vote no.

4 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Canalis?

5 DR. CANALIS: Yeah, I concur.

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections
7 to placing this in the no category? This grant is placed
8 in the no category. Next, SCBUCHC12, Mina Mina is the
9 P.I., 2.2 is the peer review score, Seemann and Genel are
10 the reviewers.

11 DR. GENEL: Yeah, this is a proposal from
12 one of the members of the UConn Bone Biology Unit. She
13 is I think Chair of pediatric dentistry at UConn. And is
14 a study of the derivation of neural crest cells from
15 human embryonic stem cells which are primarily
16 responsible for dental tissue and the cranial facial
17 development. The review is pretty favorable and -- oh, I
18 should say a co-investigator of this is Hector Aguila who
19 is the -- we funded last year for the flow cytometry
20 unit. I would put this in the maybe category.

21 One concern I have, and this is something
22 that I think we may wish to discuss is that these
23 investigators have already been heavily funded by the
24 Stem Cell Research Program and I think there's a question

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 here, do we keep putting resources, additional resources
2 into investigators who have been very productive and who
3 we have already funded or do we use the money
4 differently? So I think this is something we're going to
5 need to discuss. For the time being I would put it in
6 the maybe category.

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Seemann?

8 DR. SEEMANN: Yeah, that's the issue and
9 in fact it's all in the paragraph of the primary reviewer
10 that begins, these preliminary studies, and to a degree I
11 had a little trouble getting my head around exactly what
12 the reviewer meant, but they have -- they cite the
13 previous funding. They say however, the question is why
14 the applicants use muscular embryonic stem cells to gain
15 important experience and data from both applications. I
16 presume they mean that one and this one, the one
17 previously granted, plus when previous applications aim
18 to derive muscular skeletal lineage using stem cells and
19 this reviewer has been missing more preliminary and
20 convincing data using -- I'm a little confused by what
21 they're trying to say there. Was that clear to you?

22 DR. GENEL: No. No, I couldn't quite
23 figure that out other than I think they were pointing us
24 to the fact that there is some overlap with the projects

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 already ongoing. I have no problem with that. In theory
2 I think that one can make a case where we demonstrated
3 excellent productivity and a significant research niche
4 that the money is better invested by putting those
5 resources there. Alternatively then the question is,
6 well, we've already invested a great deal and perhaps we
7 ought to put the money somewhere else.

8 I think there is a priority type of
9 decision here, which is why I'd like to put it in the
10 maybe category and then reconsider it.

11 DR. SEEMANN: I would agree. I mean, to a
12 degree this sort of falls into the general category of
13 the post-doc. discussion is what are the priorities, you
14 know, one should decide on the quality of science. So I
15 would agree with that.

16 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections
17 to placing this in the maybe category? Then it goes into
18 maybe. The next grant is SCBYALE14, Yingqun Huang, 1.75
19 is the peer review score, Goldhamer and Mandelkern.

20 DR. SEEMANN: Did you --

21 MS. TOWNSHEND: I skipped one, I
22 apologize. I've been so good.

23 DR. SEEMANN: -- 13.

24 MS. TOWNSHEND: SCBYALE13, Richard Sutton

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 is the P.I., 2.1 is the peer review score, Seemann and
2 Wallack are the reviewers.

3 DR. WALLACK: I'll defer to start with my
4 friend from the great state of Rhode Island.

5 DR. SEEMANN: Ah, yes, you don't know what
6 budgetary difficulties look like.

7 (Laughter)

8 DR. SEEMANN: This is in a sense a
9 technology project, a molecular technology project to
10 identify genome-wide enhanced or DNA enhancer elements in
11 human embryonic stem cells and to create that library I
12 believe it expressed in an HIV-based vector and to use
13 that then for characterizing expression. And this to me
14 is again the flip -- this gets pretty good reviews, in
15 effect better reviews than the number 2.1 would suggest.

16 One -- the conclusion of the primary reviewer is
17 fundamentally that it's a very good project. I think the
18 only thing that trips it up for the secondary is not a
19 bad thing, innovative, but risky. The world could use a
20 few innovative, but risky kinds of grants. So this
21 actually jumps into the yes category for me.

22 DR. WALLACK: I would concur. I think
23 that it appears to be a very good project. It looks like
24 an innovative project. As with all innovation there is

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 some risk involved but there's also a high side
2 possibility of really accomplishing something very, very
3 worthwhile here. The person is working with two well-
4 known collaborators, Mike Schneider and Sherman Weissman
5 at Yale and I think there is value in putting this in the
6 yes category.

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections
8 to placing this grant in the yes category? This grant is
9 moved to the yes category. Next is SCBYALE14, Ying Quan
10 -- I'm sorry, Yingqun Huang, 1.75 is the peer review
11 score, Goldhamer and Mandelkern are the reviewers.

12 DR. GOLDHAMER: It looks like Bob has
13 stepped out. Should we --

14 MS. TOWNSHEND: Do we want to --

15 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Who's the reviewer?

16 MS. TOWNSHEND: -- David.

17 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Go on to the next one
18 and wait till Bob comes back. How's that?

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: Okay. That works for me.

20 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Makes sense.

21 MS. TOWNSHEND: SCBUCONN15, Winfreid
22 Krueger is the P.I., 2.5 is the peer review score,
23 Kiessling and Wallack are the reviewers.

24 DR. KIESSLING: This is a review by a mid-

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 career scientist in the -- a really good department in
2 Connecticut, the Regenerative Medicine Clinic Department.

3 This -- it's a technically kind of complex application.

4 I'm assuming that Winfreid is a woman?

5 MS. HORN: No.

6 DR. KIESSLING: Winfreid is a man? Oh.

7 That confused me.

8 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Oh, oh.

9 DR. KIESSLING: I know, it confused one of
10 the reviewers too. One of the reviewers said he and one
11 of the reviewers said she. So I -- the bottom line is I
12 recommend that we put this in the maybe category. This
13 is -- it's got some technical difficulties. This is
14 exactly what you would like to see for a young
15 investigator. She -- he already has a seed grant. One
16 of the reviewers mentioned that this project was more
17 appropriate as a seed grant, he's asking for a big budget
18 for some kind of complicated aims, but on the other hand
19 it's a really -- it's what needs to be done next. This
20 is a grant that's trying to compare what she's calling
21 bivalent domains, which is a special type of -- some of
22 the histones on chromatin, get one or two bivalation
23 points and that seems to determine whether you act like a
24 pluripotent cell or an adult cell. She wants to compare

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 embryonic stem cells with induced pluripotent cells.
2 It's an important thing to do. This would give her a
3 measure of independence. I would like to put this in the
4 maybe category.

5 DR. WALLACK: I thought that in reading
6 this there were a number of questions about the approach.
7 There were a number of questions about the starting
8 hypothesis actually and there were also some questions
9 about whether or not the researcher, and this is relevant
10 to the RFP, is in fact ready to accomplish the goals that
11 were stated. I think that especially because it's an
12 established investigator grant that at \$500,000 that I
13 would put it in the no category. If this were a seed
14 grant and we were trying to encourage certain things
15 worthwhile in nature but not sure about where it's going
16 to wind up I might feel differently. But considering all
17 the elements that I just touched upon I would put it in
18 the no category.

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: I'm heaving a maybe and a
20 no. A maybe puts it in the maybe category?

21 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Do we want to discuss,
22 you know, we've got a lot of stuff we're going to have to
23 go back and look at. Ann, do you still want to keep it
24 in the maybes? If you do that's alright.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 DR. KIESSLING: Yeah.

2 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay.

3 DR. KIESSLING: Mostly because it's a
4 human embryonic stem cell grant. We don't have as many
5 of those as I thought we might have this time.

6 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Good comment.

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: We're going to go back to
8 SCBYALE14, Yingqun Huang, 1.75 is the peer review score,
9 Goldhamer and Mandelkern are the reviewers.

10 DR. GOLDHAMER: Okay. So I'll present
11 this one. This application got the seventh best score.
12 The investigator is an assistant professor at Yale where
13 she's been since 2003. So this grant focuses on protein
14 Lin28 and Lin28 is famous because it's one of the
15 reprogramming proteins and not that much is known about
16 the biological mechanisms by which it collaborates with
17 the other reprogramming proteins to produce pluripotent
18 cells from adult cells.

19 So this grant I thought was interesting.
20 It is basically designed to identify new targets of
21 Lin28. Lin28 binds to messenger RNAs and controls their
22 translation, the production of protein from the messenger
23 RNA. And they've already identified certain targets in
24 preliminary experiments, those being a couple of histones

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 which are structural proteins in chromatin whose
2 expression is tied to the proliferative DNA synthesis
3 phase of the cell cycle.

4 This investigator has published one paper
5 on this work that was partially funded by a seed grant.
6 That work was -- that work was on mouse embryonic stem
7 cells and she wants to now move her expertise to study
8 and expand her efforts on human embryonic stem cells. So
9 I thought this was grounded in lots of preliminary data.

10 It's clearly an important protein. The reviewers were
11 positive but they were not -- they didn't fall over each
12 other to praise it. I mean, it didn't get some of the
13 dramatically positive comments of some of the others, but
14 they were positive reviews. There was really nothing
15 significantly negative about the reviews and I think it's
16 an important problem that should be investigated.

17 So I had placed this in the yes category.

18 MR. MANDELKERN: Well, I concur. We
19 discussed this, Dr. Goldhamer and I, and felt it was a
20 good grant on a specific subject. Excuse me, my partner
21 got a call from his wife. And they praised the work that
22 has been done. Funding is well justified. I also agree
23 putting it into the yes category.

24 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections?

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 DR. GOLDHAMER: I just wanted to make one
2 other comment and that is that the investigator is
3 planning on putting 70 percent of her effort into this
4 grant in the first year and then once it gets going to
5 drop her effort down to 20 percent, but a very major,
6 significant effort on this grant.

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections
8 to placing this in the yes category? This grant is
9 placed in the yes category. Onto SCBUCHC16, David Dorsky
10 is the P.I., 2.65 is the peer review score, Arinzeh and
11 Latham.

12 DR. LATHAM: This is a physician
13 researcher, an associate professor at UConn. The study
14 is to -- is to try to generate T cells that will
15 recognize a particular melanoma from human embryonic stem
16 cells. Both the reviewers had significant questions
17 about the ability of this lab to generate the T cells
18 from human embryonic stem cells. They say it's been
19 tried by other labs, they didn't see anything innovative
20 in this proposal. The efficiency in other labs with
21 human embryonic stem cells as opposed to mouse cells has
22 been low and there's some technical problems with the
23 framing of the thing in that the P.I. wants to spend 10
24 percent of his time on it and there's supposed to be a

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 post-doc. devoting 100 percent of time but the post-doc.
2 is not identified in the grant.

3 So for those -- primarily for the major
4 reason about the failure to address the documented
5 difficulty in creating T cells from human embryonic stem
6 cells I would say no.

7 DR. ARINZEH: Yeah. And just additional
8 the P.I.'s publication record, track record overall is
9 pretty low. So no.

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections
11 to placing this in the no category? This grant goes into
12 the no category. Next is SCBUCHC17, Zihai Li is the
13 P.I., 1.65 is the peer review score, Fishbone and
14 Landwirth.

15 DR. LANDWIRTH: The purpose of this
16 project is to attempt to generate a sub-population of
17 immune -- of T cells, the regulatory T cells in large
18 numbers so that they can be theoretically used in
19 clinical purposes in helping to control auto immune
20 diseases. It's apparently a novel approach to doing
21 that. The researchers are experienced. It's got a
22 pretty high score, 1.65. Very brief comments but
23 positive ones by both reviewers. It seems to me it ought
24 to be in the yes column.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 DR. FISHBONE: I would agree that they
2 have a hypothesis that Foxp3 is a key perimeter in all
3 this and the reviewers are saying even if it doesn't turn
4 out to be so they still think this should provide very
5 good information and contribute to this critical area.

6 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: I'm a little confused.
7 Weren't we just talking about another grant that was
8 going to generate T cells and there was some talk --

9 DR. FISHBONE: Yeah, but that wasn't a
10 very good one. This is a good one.

11 (Laughter)

12 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: -- wasn't the question
13 that there was doubt -- there was doubt about being able
14 to generate the T cells? Maybe I misheard.

15 DR. KIESSLING: No, it was whether you
16 could make them Hepatitis C resistant or something like
17 that.

18 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: I thought that was a
19 major criticism. Let it go.

20 DR. FISHBONE: Yeah, I remember that one,
21 but I think the methodology and the way that he was
22 trying to raise them were not considered to be very good
23 whereas this seems to be a good methodology.

24 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Is it a different

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 institution?

2 DR. FISHBONE: I don't know.

3 VOICE: No, it's the same one.

4 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Oh, okay.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: The recommendation is yes.

6 Is there any objection to placing this grant in the yes
7 category? This grant is placed in the yes category.

8 Next is SCBUCONN18, Theodore Rasmussen is the P.I., 1.5
9 the peer review score, Fishbone and Latham.

10 DR. LATHAM: This is a very highly ranked
11 grant building on a previous seed grant from this body.
12 The application is to engineer human embryonic stem cells
13 and iPS cells which will contain a florescent reporter
14 gene which will indicate the maintenance of the cells
15 pluripotency and also indicate it's loss for epigenetic
16 reasons. And the ability to track the maintenance of
17 pluripotency or to discover factors which lead to it's
18 epigenetic loss is characterized by the reviewers as
19 really important and helpful in trying to prevent the
20 spontaneous loss of differentiation of cells in vitro and
21 trying to maintain pluripotency.

22 So both reviewers are extremely
23 enthusiastic and I would say yes.

24 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Fishbone?

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 DR. FISHBONE: Yeah, I would agree that
2 this seems like a very worthwhile project. They raise a
3 couple of criticisms, but overall they like the grant a
4 lot.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections
6 to placing this in the yes category? This grant is
7 placed in the yes category. The next grant is SCB
8 University of Hartford 19, Hemchandra Shertukde, 4.0 is
9 the peer review score, Fishbone and Pescatello.

10 DR. FISHBONE: I can take this. He is
11 trying to develop a novel system to increase accuracy in
12 identification of stem cells using near infrared cameras
13 which he believes will allow one to choose the
14 appropriate cells to be replaced -- to be placed for
15 therapies. The critiques about it is that it would have
16 been a lot more convincing if he had detailed the exact
17 antigens that they wanted to detect and the times at
18 which they expected to find them.

19 He needs to show that this system would be
20 better than the current techniques that already are
21 available and they're not clear what properties will be
22 measured. They gave him a 4.0. And the only thing about
23 it that made me -- I don't think it would move to the
24 doable range, but Dr. Grabel and Dr. Rowe both gave

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 letters of support saying they would provide images of
2 cells that he could use to work on. But I think there
3 was enough negative criticism that it's not worthy of
4 support.

5 DR. PESCATELLO: Yeah, I would agree. I
6 mean, it's disappointing, it would be nice to see another
7 university, this is the second time he's tried -- second
8 or third, but I agree with the peer reviewers.

9 MS. TOWNSHEND: Is there any objection to
10 placing this in the no category? This grant is placed in
11 the no category. Next is SCBUHC20, Alex Lichtler, 1.75
12 is the peer review score, Genel and Seemann are the
13 reviewers.

14 DR. GENEL: Yeah, this is another
15 application from the bone marrow group at UConn which
16 would plan to study and -- well, first of all, develop
17 induced for pluripotential cells from patients with a
18 rare genetic -- with a very rare genetic disorder with
19 which they have a unique set of experience. The P.I. is
20 listed as Lichtler, but it's essentially -- there are
21 essentially two co-investigators here. The second
22 investigator, Ernst Richenburger (phonetic), has written
23 extensively about this disease and has a number of
24 probably with the Seminal publications in describing this

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 order and the basic underlying biology.

2 The goal here is to develop induced
3 pluripotential cells that will allow them to conduct
4 further studies on the cellular mechanism of this
5 disease. The major criticism by the reviewers was that
6 osteoblast had not yet been demonstrated to have -- to be
7 developed from iPS cell lines, but they also suggest in
8 conclusion that the potential rewards of new insights
9 into disease ideology and potential novel therapies far
10 outweigh the risks. So I would be -- I would put this in
11 the funding category.

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Seemann?

13 DR. SEEMANN: Absolutely. This was the
14 only grant that I got with a score below 2, so I've got
15 to go with one of these.

16 (Laughter)

17 DR. SEEMANN: Very well reviewed, you
18 know, very good science, yes.

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: Is there anyone who
20 objects to this being placed in the yes category?

21 DR. FISHBONE: Could I ask a question?

22 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yes sir?

23 DR. SEEMANN: Don't take it away from me.

24 (Laughter)

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 DR. FISHBONE: Well, what I was going to
2 ask is it's the same question as the one that came up
3 before about Angelman's Disease and so on. Is the
4 quality of the research such that it would be applicable
5 to more general things or is it just for the
6 craniometaphyseal dysplasia which is a rare disease?

7 DR. GENEL: Yeah, no, I think so because I
8 think by understanding the mechanisms of rare genetic
9 diseases one uncovers any number of mechanisms that are
10 relevant much more beyond the disease and they serve as
11 models of nature to evaluate normal physiology and
12 function. So yeah.

13 DR. FISHBONE: Mike, does it also help in
14 the development of the iPS cells for patient specific
15 diseases?

16 DR. GENEL: I think -- no, I don't think
17 so in this case because I don't see, I mean, the
18 developmental abnormality is not going to be corrected by
19 say --

20 DR. FISHBONE: Yep.

21 DR. GENEL: -- iPS cells, but I think you
22 can get a much better understanding of the mechanisms
23 that go on by looking at these cells. This is in fact
24 what a lot of people are suggesting is going to be one of

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 the first uses of iPS cells and that is to actually study
2 the cellular mechanism of disease. And this is probably
3 one of the leading groups nationally that would -- to
4 study this particular disease. So I think it's a unique
5 opportunity.

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections
7 to placing this in the yes?

8 VOICE: No.

9 MS. TOWNSHEND: Next one is SCBYALE21,
10 Tian Xu, peer review score is 2.0, Goldhamer and
11 Pescatello.

12 DR. GOLDHAMER: Yes. And this was a grant
13 that I was prepared to come in and say that the score did
14 not match the reviews at all and it turns out that was
15 true, it didn't, the score of 3 was wrong and 2 is the
16 correct score from the peer review.

17 MS. HORN: Excuse me Dr. Goldhamer, if I
18 can just point out that much of the project plan has been
19 marked as proprietary information so if you need to get
20 into a discussion about the details of the plan we'd have
21 to go into an Executive Session.

22 DR. GOLDHAMER: Understood.

23 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Why don't we go into
24 Executive Session so David can say what he needs to say?

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 MS. HORN: Do you need to get into the
2 description?

3 DR. GOLDHAMER: I don't think I will
4 reveal any secrets.

5 MS. HORN: Okay. Thank you.

6 DR. GOLDHAMER: At least about this. So
7 this is an interesting grant, it scored a 2.0. It
8 basically uses Transposon, piggyBac Transposon, which is
9 a mobile genetic element to interrogate genes of
10 importance in human embryonic stem cell biology. So the
11 idea is that you transect the cell with this element, it
12 jumps in randomly to genes in the genome and then you
13 score those cells for some phenotype, a loss of growth
14 control, differentiation defect or what have you. And
15 this is called a forward genetic screen where you make a
16 mutation and then you figure out after the fact what the
17 genus that's responsible for the mutation. So this is a
18 very powerful technique to kind of interrogate the entire
19 human ESL genome, both coding sequences that make protein
20 as well as non-coding sequences.

21 So I was enthusiastic about this
22 particular approach. He is a very well funded
23 investigator who has pioneered this methodology in mouse
24 cells including mouse embryonic stem cells as well as

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 human cells, adult stem cells. So I thought that was
2 really highly meritorious and he has again, a lot of
3 preliminary data that supports that he can do this.

4 The second aim -- so that's the first aim
5 is to just to develop this technology. The second aim is
6 to use this to identify genes that cause tumor genesis in
7 mice. So his idea is that he can -- that this element
8 will hop into certain genes that are important for growth
9 control and that when a certain gene is inactivated or
10 expressed when it shouldn't be expressed that's also
11 something that you can do with this Transposon element
12 that you'll get a transformed phenotype and he can then
13 identify what those genes are after the fact.

14 So I was -- I was, you know, at first I
15 wasn't sure whether studying transformation would have
16 been the highest priority. I might have rather have seen
17 some thing that -- where he was trying to direct the
18 differentiation of human -- of these cells to some
19 lineage. But on the other hand, one of the concerns with
20 this therapy is transformation of undifferentiated
21 embryonic stem cells and so if we can learn something
22 about what transforms these cells we might be able to
23 mitigate that concern.

24 So I was enthusiastic. It did receive a

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 score of 2, which, you know, I don't know exactly what
2 that ranking is. So I didn't want to -- hadn't given an
3 outright yes, but I thought a maybe was certainly in line
4 for this grant.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: Paul?

6 DR. PESCATELLO: I agree. I mean, I was
7 going to give it a yes, but I think maybe given the
8 score.

9 MS. TOWNSHEND: So we're moving this to
10 the maybe category?

11 DR. PESCATELLO: To the maybe.

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: This one goes to maybe.
13 Next is SCBYALE22, Wang Min, 1.6 is the peer review
14 score, Goldhamer and Nair.

15 DR. NAIR: Okay. This one, I had trouble
16 with this one. I -- actually the concept here I thought
17 was very interesting because this is sort of developing
18 hemangioblast from embryonic stem cells and the idea is
19 that if you can develop the skeletal structure of the
20 vasculature where you can get the endothelial cells but
21 you cannot develop the vascular structure, sort of the
22 skeleton or the scaffolding to grow the endothelial cells
23 you have leaky vessels. The first reviewer here was
24 actually gave rave reviews to this project. The second

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 reviewer was much less -- was not as enthusiastic at all.

2 And so there was -- so I could -- the score doesn't
3 justify the two reviews. If you said the score of 1.6
4 which puts it very high on the category of saying yes,
5 but if you read the two reviews they don't really support
6 the findings.

7 One of the issues for the second reviewer
8 was the fact that even though the P.I. was highly
9 productive they felt that the funding was not
10 appropriate, that there was a lot of money involved.
11 They felt that the proposal here of the cell biology that
12 was conveyed was poorly articulated, that the
13 foundational technology to generate hemangioblast from
14 human embryonic stem cells was questionable. So I'm sort
15 of -- I don't really know.

16 MS. TOWNSHEND: David?

17 DR. GOLDHAMER: Yes. I had troubles with
18 this as well, particularly the comments of reviewer two
19 were so negative, they read like maybe a 3.0 grant. And
20 they were -- various aspects of the work was criticized.

21 The applicant didn't do a very good job of actually
22 describing how they're going to make these hemangioblast
23 from embryonic stem cells. There is a concern that
24 they're only using one marker to classify these as

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 hemangioblast, that being VEGF Receptor 2. The reviewer
2 also says, let's see, key publications of central
3 relevance for this study were not cited and some other
4 things and absence such foundational characterization of
5 the system the application is questionable. And the
6 second reviewer goes on and on and just really, you know,
7 really criticized this grant.

8 There's no way with these two reviews that
9 it should get a 1.6 and it would have been nice if the
10 review committee was able to kind of bring the critiques
11 together a little bit or had a score that reflected an
12 average of the two opinions. So it did get the third
13 best score so I wouldn't want to just say no, but I think
14 a maybe so that we can revisit it in reference to other
15 grants is appropriate.

16 MS. TOWNSHEND: This grant is moved to the
17 maybe category. Next is SCBUCHC23, David Han, 2.823 is
18 the peer review score, Arinzeh and Genel are the
19 reviewers.

20 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Let me stop you for a
21 moment. That's ridiculous. Three points beyond the
22 decimal. Give me a break. Give me a break. I mean, who
23 can differentiate three one thousandths of a point on a
24 narrative document. Come on.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 (Laughter)

2 VOICE: Was it 2.65?

3 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Well, I think we need to
4 tell -- we need to inform our raters that we're not going
5 to go to thousandths of a point. I suppose that would
6 differentiate between one that was 2.825 and one that was
7 2.822.

8 DR. GENEL: Commissioner, I think that's a
9 typo because the peer review -- the peer review that I
10 have indicates just a 2.8. So I think the --

11 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: So the 23 was --

12 DR. GENEL: -- I think the 23 was added --

13 VOICE: It was a bonus.

14 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: A bonus. Let's keep it
15 -- let's keep it to a point beyond the decimal. I mean,
16 come on. Okay.

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: Arinzeh and Genel.

18 DR. ARINZEH: Okay. So the P.I.'s on this
19 proposal would like to characterize the intercellular
20 signaling network for pluripotency of iPS cells and so
21 they're looking at in particular the intrinsic
22 transcription factors and extrinsic growth factors such
23 as fiberglass growth factor in TGF beta. And so they're
24 going to be using various tools to do this. Protein

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 analysis, proteomics and this new -- well, they're
2 calling it relatively new technology that they've been
3 developing, phosphoproteomic technology.

4 The major criticism and why this I believe
5 got a poor score, relatively poor score is grantsmanship,
6 very poorly written, a lot of errors, the budget is
7 terrible, no clear hypothesis. Again, a specific --
8 specific aims were not clearly identified and then other
9 criticisms were that the P.I. didn't appear to have
10 enough background in iPS and embryonic stem cells. So I
11 would say no.

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Genel?

13 DR. GENEL: Yeah. No, I agree. The
14 criticisms actually are scathing on the review and they
15 particularly point out that some 538,000 of a 500,000
16 total award goes towards personnel. In other words, a
17 substantial amount of this is for funding of personnel
18 and -- well, I mean, without going into more detail I
19 have some questions about that and I would put this in
20 the no category.

21 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections
22 to placing this in the no category? This grant is placed
23 in the no category. Next up is SCBYALE24, Alan Garen is
24 the P.I., 2.5 is the peer review score, Canalis and

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 Pescatello.

2 DR. CANALIS: So the P.I. is trying to
3 define what determines an early cell to differentiate
4 normally or to become a tumor cell. So, you know, it has
5 medical relevance and but it has little to do with stem
6 cell research. The P.I. is concentrating on a -- called
7 it PSF, a cellular protein that has binding capacity for
8 both DNA and RNA and is going to attempt to determine the
9 role of this protein in the determination of an early
10 cell towards one pathway, the tumoragenic pathway or a
11 normal pathway.

12 The proposal is really very speculative
13 and it's sketchy and at times it is difficult to follow.

14 The reviewers are not very positive because of these
15 reasons and in addition it lacks sufficient detail to
16 know in which direction, you know, how the P.I. is going
17 to conduct the experiments. Because of these reasons I
18 would go in the no category.

19 DR. PESCATELLO: I agree. For this level
20 of funding the lack of detail and specificity a no.

21 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections
22 to placing this in the no category? This grant is going
23 into the no category. Next is SCBUCONN25, Craig Nelson
24 is the P.I., 2.2 is the peer review score, Kiessling and

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 Landwirth.

2 DR. KIESSLING: This grant is a real
3 cliffhanger. This is an assistant professor who has a
4 really marginal publication record. He got a seed grant.

5 I can't tell from the preliminary studies exactly what
6 work was done with that seed grant, there doesn't seem to
7 be any publications from it yet, which is not too
8 surprising because he hasn't had it that long.

9 The reviewers, this is a very, very
10 technical grant. It's difficult to read. This is
11 clearly a person who's a technocrat and he's not looking
12 at the big picture. The biggest problem I had with this
13 grant is he doesn't tell us what cells he's going to use.

14 So what he wants to do is a very detailed profiling of
15 gene expression during the differentiation from the
16 embryonic stem cell state into the -- what he calls the
17 Mesendoderm, which is actually the next thing that
18 happens after the inner cell mass.

19 So it's a nice -- it's beautifully
20 written. It's a nice mixture of reproductive biology and
21 stem cell biology. The reviewers were really lukewarm,
22 that's why it has a score of 2.2. It would have a lower
23 score except it's very well written. So this is a
24 scholarly person. If he doesn't get this grant I don't

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 think he has any funding for his laboratory and so he
2 needs this. This would be much better and have a high
3 level of enthusiasm if it were a seed grant.

4 So I don't know how independent this
5 person is. He does have some support, he's got some
6 letters of support, but this is a real cliffhanger and I
7 think it should go in the maybe application, in the maybe
8 spot.

9 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Landwirth?

10 DR. LANDWIRTH: Yeah, I'll go with that.

11 MS. TOWNSHEND: This grant is placed in
12 the maybe category.

13 DR. GENEL: What number is this?

14 MS. TOWNSHEND: This is SCBUCONN25.

15 DR. GENEL: Because the review notes that
16 he does have a seed grant.

17 DR. KIESSLING: Yeah, right. He has a
18 seed grant. I don't know if that still -- he still has
19 funding from it. He indicates it's gone this year I
20 think.

21 DR. GENEL: It's only two years.

22 DR. FISHBONE: Could I ask a question
23 about Dr. Nelson? Did Dr. Nelson take over Jerry Yang's
24 grant?

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 VOICE: That was Dr. Carter.

2 DR. FISHBONE: Oh, that was Carter? I'm
3 sorry, that was Dr. Carter.

4 DR. KIESSLING: No, he only indicates that
5 his only source of funding -- he had some post-doc.
6 funding several years ago, but his only -- he's
7 beautifully educated and this is well written and highly
8 technical and I just don't know what he's going to do
9 with the information. Nor do I know what cells he's
10 going to use, which is the most disturbing.

11 DR. GOLDHAMER: Am I allowed to make a
12 factual comment about this? It's a UConn investigator.

13 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yes.

14 DR. GOLDHAMER: He -- in reference to your
15 questioning about publications, I know -- I happen to
16 know him well. He has just submitted his first
17 publication, it's under review. And all of the work in
18 that publication was based on the seed fund grant.

19 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay.

20 DR. KIESSLING: You know, he lists that I
21 think as maybe submitted on this application. He has a
22 few publications but, you know, there's years in between.
23 If this were a woman I would have thought he would have
24 had a lot of babies is what I thought.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 (Laughter)

2 DR. KIESSLING: There are holes in my
3 records every time I had a baby.

4 MS. TOWNSHEND: So that one's going into
5 the maybe category. Next up is SCB Wesleyan 26, Janice
6 Naegele is the P.I., 1.8 is the peer review score, Hiskes
7 and Mandelkern.

8 DR. HISKES: Okay. The P.I. is a
9 professor and chair of the Department of Developmental
10 Biology at Wesleyan. She's an expert in GABAergic neuron
11 development, morphology and molecular diversity. She's
12 part of the team at Wesleyan consisting of Laura Grabel.
13 The project has two aims. The first aim is to generate
14 GABA neurons from mouse and human ES cells. She's going
15 to try three different strategies for enhancing GABA
16 output and consistency.

17 A reviewer describes this third approach
18 as somewhat ambiguous. The second aim of the project is
19 to evaluate epileptic seizures in a mouse model following
20 transplantation of the GABA neurons. Seizures will be
21 induced by systematic injection of some chemical I won't
22 pronounce, which causes cell death of inter neurons in
23 the hipa-campus.

24 This grant builds on a previously awarded

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 seed grant. Reviewers are very enthusiastic. The
2 preliminary data is good. The record of the P.I.'s is
3 very good. The project is important and the probability
4 of generating interesting data is high. And then there
5 are a few recommendations of how to improve procedures.
6 So Bob and I conferred on this and we recommend that it
7 be funded.

8 MR. MANDELKERN: I agree with that
9 especially since it is in another disease area where no
10 grants have been proposed and it keeps another university
11 in the mix. So I also support the yes placement.

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: The recommendation is that
13 this be placed in the yes category. Is there any
14 objection to this being placed in the yes category? So
15 be it. Last in the established investigator group is
16 SCBYALE27, Jun Lu is the P.I., 1.6 is the peer review
17 core, Goldhamer and Mandelkern.

18 MR. MANDELKERN: This is a highly
19 recommended proposal by the peer reviewers and it again
20 deals with the small RNA regulations of human embryonic
21 stem cells, which is a -- from some of the scientists
22 I've spoken to a very hot topic in research and the peer
23 reviews both are very strong. There's been a lot of
24 preliminary work that this researcher has done. It's

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 well articulated with clear milestones and represents,
2 quote, "the cutting edge of this field." It would seem
3 that this is a very important area to research because it
4 talks about maintenance of pluripotency and the
5 initiation of differentiation.

6 If they could come near to making some
7 progress on this topic of initiating differentiation from
8 a stem cell line we would hit bingo and we would go off
9 the map. So I clearly think with a high score of 1.6,
10 I'm not a scientist Genel, it has a potential of
11 differentiation and that is tremendous. So I propose it
12 go into the yes category.

13 DR. GOLDHAMER: I had also put this in the
14 yes category. It's the third best scoring grant. Both
15 reviewers were very positive and it is a hot area that
16 deserves attention.

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are there any objections
18 to placing this in the yes category? This grant is
19 placed in the yes category. That concludes the first
20 consideration of established investigator grants.

21 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Before -- we're going to
22 take a lunch break.

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: We're going to break for
24 lunch.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Let me say -- give you
2 my observations and take them for, you know, as you will.
3 I'm seeing a couple of disturbing things here. I'm
4 seeing some dislocation of the grant narratives from the
5 score and it bothers me in terms of some projects that
6 seem very worthwhile but, you know, despite I've been
7 told by a couple of people but the grants aren't bunched
8 around 2. They are bunched around 2. Look where they
9 are, 2.1, 2.2, 2.5, 1.9, 1.8, and you know when you're
10 all bunched around that 1.9 or 2 figure it's important --
11 if a good grant gets a 2.3 they're liable -- I think it
12 prejudices in some way looking at it or a 2.4 or a 2.5
13 and I see that some of the reviewers just seem to -- I
14 don't know how I can put it but they seem to decide that
15 they just don't like the grant in any way, shape or form
16 and which just doesn't seem to agree with the other
17 reviewer. And then I see the reviews that I see I'm
18 listening to seem to be dislocated from -- from the
19 numerical scores and so I -- at the risk of making lots
20 of enemies I question the validity and the
21 reproducibility of some of these results and I'm not sure
22 whether we're not asking the right questions. Maybe we
23 should ask the reviewers to say, yes, no or maybe and
24 then make our own decisions.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 But, you know, I think the scores kind of
2 send us initially off in a direction that I'm not sure is
3 a very good -- a very good way to go. And my other topic
4 is very briefly, I received a bunch of grants which I had
5 to review and I got one. We -- when we put out our
6 requests for proposals we give them a numerical rating,
7 100 is wonderful, 90 is great, 65 is lousy, below 60 is
8 no funding. I got one in from a very well known
9 education, which is very, very poorly written and it gets
10 a 60 and the director of the institutions calls me up and
11 says, we were very busy that day and they had someone
12 down in -- who had no connection between the science, the
13 grant or anything else write the grant up because that
14 person happened to have a light caseload that day. And
15 I'm concerned about that.

16 I'm concerned when I see grants come from
17 major institutions that aren't very well written and you
18 would think that the management of either of the two big
19 universities would say this is not well written. You
20 won't get -- you know, you could have some really good
21 ideas and not have the thing well written or couched in
22 understandable terms and not get your grant just because
23 of the way you prepared the piece of paper. So perhaps
24 some of these grants should be screened more carefully

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 before they get out of the parent because I think it's a
2 shame to come in and ask for \$500,000 and have something
3 that's poorly written. I don't think either of the two
4 big -- either of the three universities want to lose half
5 a million dollars because -- just because of technical
6 factors of preparing a piece of paper.

7 We'll adjourn for lunch.

8 MS. TOWNSHEND: Lunch is being served in
9 the room, come out here, take a left, and in the room
10 right behind this wall basically. And we will resume at
11 12:45.

12 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: 10 minutes.

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: 12:45.

14 (Whereupon, a 45 minute lunch break was
15 taken.)

16 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Resume. Dr. Wallack,
17 get in your seat. The question has been raised Dr.
18 Wallack about can we finish today and since there's about
19 \$100,000 worth of talent per day parked in this room it
20 might be nice if we could finish today, but I don't want
21 anybody to be rushed. I am willing to stay a bit later
22 and extend till 5:00 if --

23 DR. GOLDHAMER: Does that mean I can't
24 stay in the hotel room? I have a room reserved.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: -- you can stay in the
2 room. My next comment was going to be anybody who would
3 like to stay overnight if we finish today stay overnight.

4 DR. WALLACK: I'll give up my room, that's
5 okay. Jeff is willing to give up his room.

6 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. So we are going
7 to move ahead. I would suggest -- do we have a break
8 scheduled this afternoon?

9 MS. HORN: 2:15.

10 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. I would suggest
11 that if we want to move along expeditiously then during
12 the break you go out and do what you want and come back
13 and sit down and keep working. Alright? With that we'll
14 get -- we'll move along to our next grant unless anybody
15 has something that they're dying to say. Okay.

16 MS. TOWNSHEND: The next grant for
17 consideration is group grant SCCUCHC01, Robert Koshier is
18 the P.I., 2.9 is the peer review score and it's Seemann
19 and Pescatello.

20 DR. PESCATELLO: Sure, I'll start.
21 Alright. So this is a cartilage repair and looking at
22 joint progenitor cells. It also talks about limb
23 regeneration. Very interesting work. I was impressed
24 with the kind of full spectrum from basic research,

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 translational research, clinical application. So that
2 was impressive, but the score unfortunately was not. So
3 I guess at this point I would put it in the maybe
4 category as we discuss the four large grants. I don't
5 know Jeff if you want to --

6 DR. SEEMANN: Yeah, maybe it -- excuse me,
7 maybe at best. It was the -- it is a nice connection of
8 projects as you say, to take it from developing the
9 appropriate applicable cell lines through creating their
10 application, creating the scaffold framework and actually
11 getting them to work. The second reviewer finds a number
12 of issues there. And again, it's -- it is one of those
13 where of course all the projects depend upon the first
14 one working and that is developing the appropriate cell
15 line that's going to work in there. And so a few other
16 issues about budgets and what have you, but it's
17 ambitious, yeah. A weak maybe.

18 DR. PESCATELLO: It's ambitious but what?

19 VOICE: It's a weak maybe.

20 DR. SEEMANN: I said a weak maybe. I
21 didn't want to say definitely maybe.

22 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Dr. Wallack?

23 DR. WALLACK: Bob, can I ask a question?

24 If we have a weak maybe could we maybe agree to a no with

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 that one? Because I don't know --

2 DR. SEEMANN: Maybe.

3 (Laughter)

4 DR. WALLACK: -- no? Is that a no?

5 DR. SEEMANN: No, that was a maybe.

6 VOICE: That was maybe.

7 DR. SEEMANN: Well, I guess I would say to
8 the scores on the others are not stellar, you know, we're
9 not knocking them out of the park. So I guess I would
10 like to hear those.

11 MR. MANDELKERN: But this is the poorest.

12 DR. SEEMANN: This is the poorest. But I
13 guess I'd like to hear if there was a, you know, 1.5 in
14 the group of these -- anyway, but I'm -- I will bow to
15 the --

16 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Do we have to take one
17 from this category? I mean --

18 VOICE: No.

19 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: -- okay. So we don't
20 have to take the best of the litter, but we may decide we
21 want to do something else. Yes Mr. Mandelkern?

22 MR. MANDELKERN: It seems to me that this
23 grant proposal repeats a lot of the work that we granted
24 two years ago to Dr. Rowe at UConn with a big amount of

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 money, I don't have it right off the top of my head,
2 though I could find it.

3 DR. WALLACK: 3.3 I think Bob.

4 MR. MANDELKERN: Yeah. Big amount of
5 money for the similar work. I think this is a little bit
6 excessive in my opinion.

7 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. It only takes one
8 maybe to keep it from being a no. Do we have one maybe?
9 Okay.

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: So this is placed in the
11 no category.

12 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay.

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: The next grant is
14 SCCUCHC2, Michael Gryk is the P.I., the peer review score
15 is 2.5, the reviewers are Fishbone and Genel.

16 DR. FISHBONE: Alright. He wants to
17 produce a web accessible database and web site called the
18 CT Stem Cell Database, a compiled source of information
19 on receptors, ligands, drugs that turn receptors on and
20 off and all those kinds of things. He'll do it for human
21 embryonic stem cells, stem cell lines, developmental
22 lineages.

23 He's already started to do this and has
24 done some of the groundwork, but the structure of it is a

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 little hard to understand in that he has subcontracted to
2 Craig Nelson I think if I've got it right --

3 VOICE: Yes.

4 DR. FISHBONE: -- for about 1.2 million
5 who will be doing some work at one place and he and some
6 other P.I.'s will be doing some work at UCHC I think.
7 And I couldn't quite get the feeling of what they were
8 each doing. They're going to meet every week and discuss
9 and so on, but you know, one of the reviewers said that -
10 - let's see, why is Craig Nelson listed as a
11 subcontractor?

12 MR. MANDELKERN: A quarter of a million.

13 DR. FISHBONE: A quarter of a million, I'm
14 sorry. And it doesn't seem much like a group project.
15 There is a single overarching project that they have
16 people in the two different places working on. One
17 question I had is what happens after the grant expires,
18 what will they do to keep it going? Where will the money
19 come from for that?

20 So I think while the idea of having -- one
21 other question that the reviewers asked is that this
22 seems to be available only to people in Connecticut on
23 the web site and he wondered if that was a reasonable use
24 of funds to produce something that's just used by stem

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 researchers in Connecticut. And so I think the idea is
2 very good but if I remember correctly this came up once
3 before for funding and I think we did not fund it. Is
4 that correct? Does anybody remember? It came up a
5 couple of years ago to build this database? I didn't see
6 that being critical, but I vaguely remember it.

7 DR. KIESSLING: Yes.

8 DR. FISHBONE: Yeah.

9 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Gerry, there's no
10 existing database that does this?

11 DR. FISHBONE: Yeah, there are a number of
12 them. There are a number of them, but they want to
13 integrate the information in each of those and produce
14 one --

15 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: So this is going to be a
16 super network?

17 DR. FISHBONE: -- a super database.

18 DR. KIESSLING: I don't think there's any
19 stem cell specific databases, right?

20 DR. GENEL: Well, that I don't know, but
21 the reviewers refer to the fact that there are a number
22 of --

23 DR. KIESSLING: Lots of databases.

24 DR. GENEL: -- a number of databases. How

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 specific they are I --

2 DR. KIESSLING: Pretty soon we'll need a
3 database of databases at this point.

4 DR. GENEL: -- so --

5 MR. MANDELKERN: They're actually talking
6 of using established databases and insights from the
7 literature to build more specific second generation
8 databases that address specific questions. And also I
9 have a big question. On one sheet I have the proposal
10 asking for \$250,000 and I also have something asking for
11 a half a million.

12 DR. GENEL: Subcontract (indiscernible,
13 talking over each other). That's a subcontract.

14 MR. MANDELKERN: No, no, this is --

15 DR. GENEL: The 250 I believe is the
16 subcontract.

17 MR. MANDELKERN: -- under the whole grant
18 of -- so it's 500,000,000 or is it 250,000?

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: 500,000.

20 DR. GENEL: 500.

21 MR. MANDELKERN: Okay.

22 DR. GENEL: That's the subcontract to --

23 MR. MANDELKERN: To Craig Nelson.

24 DR. GENEL: -- Craig Nelson.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 MR. MANDELKERN: The same person who came
2 up previously.

3 DR. GENEL: Yeah. You know, if we had --
4 if we had \$30,000,000 to spend it might be worthwhile.
5 It seems to me this is the sort of thing that belongs
6 with one of the core facilities as a core project rather
7 than as an individual project. This is in theory -- but
8 there are a number of criticisms and I won't repeat them
9 of the peer reviewers. I would put this in a no
10 category.

11 DR. WALLACK: I would second that.

12 MR. MANDELKERN: I would third it.

13 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Any disagreement?

14 MS. TOWNSHEND: This grant is placed in
15 the no category. Next up is SCC Cell Design 3, John
16 Hambor is the P.I., 2.1 is the peer review score, the
17 reviewers are Canalis and Wallack.

18 DR. WALLACK: Okay. The purpose of the
19 project is focused on developing a new approach to
20 treating obesity by investigating the differences between
21 brown and white fat with the ultimate goal of being able
22 to promote the growth of metabolically more favorable
23 brown fat. An interesting concept. I found the proposal
24 somewhat confusing. There was a very, very long

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 narrative, which was very interesting, about general
2 things but nothing specific to the project.

3 I thought that there were some elements of
4 the study that were weak. There were many challenges to
5 the study. There were questions by the reviewers and in
6 going through it myself about the amount of money that
7 was being requested and the use of that money. There
8 were questions for example if other institutions -- other
9 -- if this work is not already to some extent being done,
10 for example by Pfizer where this individual actually
11 comes from, the reviewers were not enthusiastic in
12 general and there were three reviewers. Marianne or
13 Warren, you were talking earlier, why were there three
14 reviewers on this one?

15 DR. WARREN WOLLSCHLAGER: It's
16 complicated.

17 DR. WALLACK: Okay. That's what I
18 thought. Okay. So it got a 2.1 but frankly I thought
19 that was a high rating for a number of reasons, for the
20 project as it was presented and also from the peer review
21 standpoint and I would vote not to fund this. The other
22 reason I think that I'm sort of a little bit more
23 comfortable, although there's some interesting elements
24 to it in saying that it's basically I think from what I

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 understand a project involving adult stem cell work and
2 the \$1.3 million or more actually that they're asking for
3 it seems to me -- I'm not ready to extend those kinds of
4 dollars for all the reasons I just indicated and so I'll
5 stop there by indicating a no to this particular project.

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Canalis?

7 DR. CANALIS: I tend to agree. They --
8 when you read the document it's a beautiful description
9 of adipogenic cell differentiation. I mean, it goes into
10 about 15, 20 pages. But when you look into what they are
11 really going to do it falls a little bit short and the
12 consequence we get sort of a mixed scientific review. We
13 have a reviewer who loves it, one that -- and the other
14 reviewer sort of question it.

15 Basically at the center of the question
16 is, you know, how sure you are that the white adipocytic
17 cell line is well established and cannot go into brown
18 adipocytic cell line and vice versa. You know, they take
19 this for granted, you know, you're going this pathway,
20 you're going in the other pathway. And two of the other
21 reviewers sort of questioned this.

22 The -- and then basically they go on
23 describing, you know, basically they're going to use gene
24 expression and then they are going to try to block the

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 effects, you know, using fairly standard technology or
2 reproduce the effects by using lentil-viral (phonetic)
3 approaches, which is standard. So you know, I mean, as
4 compelling as it is to look at adipocytic cell
5 differentiation, you know, there are some issues.

6 The other problem I have is it's really
7 not a program project. It's one grant, you know? I
8 mean, I understood that group grant projects were
9 multiple projects that were submitted as, you know, as
10 part of this unit. Here there is just three aims. It
11 looks like, you know, very expensive independent
12 investigator type of award. There are two sites, that is
13 true, but they are not two projects. So, you know, I
14 mean, there's some good strengths about it, you know, the
15 area of study is important and is interesting to see, you
16 know, university combined with a business. But there are
17 these issues so, you know, I mean, I have struggled with
18 this but, you know, I have to line up with Milton.

19 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. We have a no and
20 a no and a comment from Mr. Mandelkern.

21 MR. MANDELKERN: I would -- I would like
22 to see it put in the maybes so we can have more
23 discussion. I can discuss it now if you'd permit.

24 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Let's discuss it now.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 If we're going to finish expeditiously we can't keep
2 going -- do the maybes now.

3 MR. MANDELKERN: I would make the
4 following comments. First of all, they ask for 1,350,000
5 doesn't mean that we have to fund the grant if we choose
6 to fund it for that amount of money. Secondly, it is a
7 very interesting subject to be researching, why do some
8 cells burn and why do some cells store? If some progress
9 could be made on that in elucidating the problem of
10 obesity this would be a tremendously valuable commercial
11 entity that would be shared with the state of
12 Connecticut. It has the potential of being a barn burner
13 if it works. But that's what research is.

14 Thirdly I would say this of the four
15 groups seem to attract the peer reviewers the most
16 looking at the scores. And fourthly, we have an
17 opportunity again to fund a commercial entity and to keep
18 the interest of the commercial entities high in applying
19 for proposals, especially when they come through with
20 such worthwhile ones. So I would strongly urge a yes to
21 keep it in and then see how many dollars we decide to
22 commit to it.

23 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Dr. Canalis?

24 DR. CANALIS: I have a couple of comments.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 Even though -- even though it scores a 2.1 and in this
2 category it's the better scoring grant when you look at
3 the overall distribution of grants, really there are 30
4 grants that scored better than this. So just to put
5 things in the right context. You know, when you look at
6 stem cell approach they are looking at cells that are
7 fairly differentiated, these are aren't just human cells,
8 they're already committed. We're not looking really --
9 if you look at the guidelines we're not looking really at
10 an early cell in determining whether this cell is going
11 to go one route or the other.

12 And, you know, as important as it is -- as
13 it is to study the pocytic cell differentiation, you
14 know, it's not quite in line with, you know, the
15 guidelines that we have. And I still have a fundamental
16 problem. It's not a group project grant. It's not what
17 it is, you know, that is --

18 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Milt? You had another
19 thing to say?

20 DR. WALLACK: Yeah. No, I agree with
21 this. It's not a group grant. It's almost, you know, I
22 don't know why they classified it as a group grant. I
23 can imagine -- the figure here is \$1.3 million. I think
24 I said this before. I don't have any concern at all

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 about funding a grant that shows promise but that has
2 some issues with it if it's a seed grant. My belief is
3 that that's what we're supposed to be doing. Encouraging
4 the out of the box initiatives that could be significant
5 contributors to the field.

6 This at the figure even if we reduce it
7 back to a group grant of \$500,000 we just went through a
8 discussion of some very, very good grants. This doesn't
9 warrant the same level of enthusiasm I don't feel. I
10 endorse what Ernie is saying. And there are issues in
11 how the grant is structured.

12 As far as the work being done and whether
13 or not the goals will be accomplished I'm not that
14 concerned about that because it's my understanding in
15 reading through the material that companies such as
16 Pfizer where these individuals come from will be doing
17 that kind of work anyway. So I'm not concerned about
18 that aspect of it. And in light of all of the other
19 grants that I think that are important to fund I strongly
20 feel that we have to continue to keep this on the side of
21 no.

22 MR. MANDELKERN: May I respond since Ernie
23 responded to me Chairman?

24 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Go ahead.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 MR. MANDELKERN: First of all, there is a
2 co-applicant on this grant which hasn't been mentioned.
3 There is a co-applicant, Gerald Chadel (phonetic), a
4 professor of pathology at Yale who is a mitochondrial
5 expert. So that is a sense of a group at Yale and a
6 group at Cell Design and we every year considered group
7 grants. I don't see why we can't put some effort in that
8 direction for the reasons I gave.

9 The man has 25 publications in this field.
10 He's not looking to start up with our grant, he's had 17
11 years of experience in this research in his previous
12 position at Pfizer. I think we have a valuable grant in
13 an interesting field with a good potential and we should
14 consider committing some dollars to keep this going.

15 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: And the objections
16 raised by Dr. Canalis and Milt is that this does not meet
17 our working definition of a group project and that the
18 research is fairly far downstream. If I may be -- may
19 take the liberty of trying to paraphrase those. Those
20 seem to be the objections to it. I don't think we -- and
21 with other grants we've got into co-applicants or trying
22 to work out what the structure is, but are we ready to
23 vote on this or do you want to -- I'm not sure what would
24 change if we went back and looked at it a second or a

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 third time.

2 DR. WALLACK: I think you're right and
3 therefore I would call the question on this particular
4 grant at this time.

5 MR. MANDELKERN: With a formal vote or
6 consensus vote?

7 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Well, you can't have a
8 consensus vote because you want to put it in maybe. So
9 you can either put it in maybe or vote on it.

10 DR. WALLACK: I would move to vote on it.

11 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: You need a second on
12 that.

13 MR. MANDELKERN: I second.

14 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Now we're voting
15 on the Hambor grant, which is CCELL --

16 MS. TOWNSHEND: CCELL03.

17 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: -- okay. And the vote
18 is whether to put it in yes or no, is that -- am I
19 paraphrasing --

20 DR. WALLACK: Right.

21 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: -- okay. All in favor
22 of approving the grant and putting it in the yes column
23 indicate by saying aye?

24 VOICES: Aye.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: All opposed?

2 VOICES: Nay.

3 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: The nays have it.

4 MR. MANDELKERN: Well don't you have to
5 have a roll call vote if it's --

6 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: We'll have a roll call
7 vote then right around the room. Everybody can vote on
8 this because it's not Yale.

9 DR. CANALIS: Yeah, there is an
10 investigator from Yale.

11 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: There's an investigator
12 from Yale?

13 DR. CANALIS: Yep.

14 MR. MANDELKERN: There's a co-investigator
15 from Yale, yes.

16 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay.

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: Okay. So yea would be in
18 favor of what exactly?

19 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: I can't vote because I
20 don't think --

21 VOICE: No, because of Yale.

22 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: -- I don't think this is
23 connected to Yale, give me a break here.

24 MS. HORN: Oh, I'm sorry, I thought they

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 said there was a Yale investigator?

2 VOICE: There is.

3 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: How far down are we
4 going to go? Do you want to go down to the tertiary
5 level? Go ahead. It's not being presented, it's being
6 presented as a private grant. Go ahead.

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: I guess the question is --
8 the question on the table is putting money towards this
9 and putting it in the yes category so if somebody votes
10 yes they are putting it in the yes -- voting for putting
11 it in the yes category, is that everyone's understanding?
12 Okay.

13 DR. KIESSLING: Yes means we're going to
14 fund it?

15 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yes means some funding.

16 MS. TOWNSHEND: To put it in the yes
17 category.

18 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Or change it to no later
19 on.

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: Correct. Arinzeh?

21 DR. ARINZEH: A no is no or no maybe?

22 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: No means it's not
23 funded.

24 MR. MANDELKERN: There's no maybe.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: Okay. There's no maybe at
2 this point.
3 DR. ARINZEH: Okay. No.
4 MS. TOWNSHEND: Arinzeh is a no. Canalis?
5 DR. CANALIS: No.
6 MS. TOWNSHEND: Goldhamer?
7 DR. GOLDHAMER: No.
8 MS. TOWNSHEND: Seemann?
9 VOICE: He just left.
10 MS. TOWNSHEND: Kiessling?
11 DR. KIESSLING: No.
12 MS. TOWNSHEND: Fishbone?
13 DR. FISHBONE: No.
14 MS. TOWNSHEND: Hiskes?
15 DR. HISKES: No.
16 MS. TOWNSHEND: You three are not included
17 in this. Okay. Mandelkern?
18 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes.
19 MS. TOWNSHEND: Wallack?
20 DR. WALLACK: No.
21 MS. TOWNSHEND: Pescatello abstains.
22 Nair?
23 DR. NAIR: No.
24 MS. TOWNSHEND: Shall we wait for Dr.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 Seemann? It's eight in favor --

2 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Eight in favor of not
3 funding it.

4 MS. TOWNSHEND: -- eight in favor of not
5 funding it, that is correct.

6 (Laughter)

7 MR. MANDELKERN: Dave and Ann, don't you -
8 -

9 MS. TOWNSHEND: They voted.

10 MR. MANDELKERN: -- they voted? Oh, I
11 didn't catch it.

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: One yes and eight no and
13 one abstain. The motion is -- the vote is to put it in
14 the no category and that was by roll call vote. So we're
15 onto SCU -- SCCUCONN04.

16 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Before we go any
17 further my not voting on UConn is obviously because I
18 have a faculty appointment there and I'm a Director. My
19 not voting on Yale is because of my own preference
20 thinking that might somehow tip the wheel one way or
21 another because of my position to dispense funds and
22 other things. That's why I abstained from all the
23 voting. I was not prepared to abstain from voting on
24 private corporations, but I will.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 And my initial suggestions when this
2 Committee was put together and I was appointed as the
3 Chairperson was to make it a non-voting position, but I
4 was as they say in Great Britain shouted down from the
5 back benches. But I don't vote anyway.

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: So we're going to
7 SCCUCONN4, Rachel O'Neill is the P.I., peer review score
8 of 2.2, the reviewers from the Committee are Fishbone and
9 Nair.

10 DR. FISHBONE: This is a group project
11 asking for 1.866 million and it's about epigenetic
12 control of transcriptional profiles, which are a major
13 component of the regulatory network responsible for the
14 program differentiation of embryonic stem cells. And
15 there are several different classes of small RNAs that
16 are potent epigenetic regulators that modulate gene
17 expression. And they want to examine the expression
18 profiles of all these classes of RNAs using massively
19 parallel sequencing.

20 The -- it seems to me this is a terrific
21 group and they have a terrific program, but some of the
22 criticisms that are raised are that first of all it's
23 probably significantly over budgeted because it's divided
24 into two groups. One is Rachel O'Neill and company and

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 the other is Brenton Graveley who is at UConn Health
2 Center. Rachel O'Neill is at UConn Storrs.

3 And the reviewers are sort of saying these
4 are both very well funded labs. That although this is a
5 good project they're probably asking for too much money
6 and that they should be doing it for less. One of the
7 reviewers says, I am sure it is the best investment of
8 nearly 3,000,000 out of less than 10,000,000. I think he
9 means to say I am not sure it's the best investment. He
10 said, I would be more positive if the total request were
11 around 1,000,000.

12 So the program they spelled out was
13 excellent, particularly their way of interdigitating what
14 they're all doing. There are several different
15 investigators in both places and they seem to have worked
16 out a very good plan for management of the grant. But my
17 own feeling would be that we probably should fund this
18 but not at the level that they're asking for.

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: Dr. Nair?

20 DR. NAIR: The -- I think there were three
21 reviewers on this and one of the reviewers had a concern
22 that two of the -- two of the areas were already funded
23 by stem cell grants from here, from the Connecticut Stem
24 Cell Program. That was one issue. And again, the money

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 was an issue. The primary reviewer also had a concern
2 regarding the relationship that would be established
3 between the expression of small RNAs and the other
4 components of the epigenetic control.

5 But again, the money I think was a big
6 issue and I think it is actually a very well written
7 proposal and it is a very interesting concept. I would
8 be in favor of funding it but probably not at 1.8
9 million.

10 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Other comments?

11 DR. KIESSLING: Can we ask the two
12 reviewers how would you cut it?

13 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Solomon.

14 DR. KIESSLING: You would give these
15 people another million?

16 DR. FISHBONE: You know, I think the fact
17 that they have grants in that general category doesn't
18 necessarily mean that they are exactly reproducing --

19 MR. MANDELKERN: They're asking for
20 2,000,000 together.

21 DR. FISHBONE: -- yeah, 1.86.

22 MR. MANDELKERN: 1.8 and 1.2 -- 1.1. Read
23 the last paragraph.

24 DR. FISHBONE: Yeah. I'm only going by

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 the numbers in their budget, it says 1.86 or something.

2 MR. MANDELKERN: No. Read the last --

3 DR. NAIR: No. The first group is 1.8 and
4 then --

5 MR. MANDELKERN: -- of the review -- of
6 the peer review, the last paragraph of the third peer
7 review.

8 DR. FISHBONE: Total costs including the
9 Graveley thing is 1.866430 and that's in the budget. I
10 question whether maybe that whether they're including the
11 1.12 that Graveley is going to get in the total? And
12 when they do it comes to 1.866 on the actual budget.

13 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Now I'm a little
14 confused about what's being asked for. Two entities,
15 both of whom are part of the University of Connecticut
16 system, are asking for a total of 186 -- a million eight
17 sixty six and change, is that correct Gerry?

18 DR. FISHBONE: I think so, yeah.

19 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay.

20 DR. FISHBONE: It's a little hard to be
21 sure, but you know, they have separate budgets for each
22 group. Graveley is 1.120 and the other one I'm not sure
23 I can --

24 MR. MANDELKERN: 1.866.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 DR. NAIR: 1.86, they want \$3,000,000.

2 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: They want \$3,000,000?

3 DR. FISHBONE: -- no, no, the 1.866

4 includes 1.120 for Graveley at UCHC Farmington.

5 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: I'm having trouble

6 understanding that.

7 MR. MANDELKERN: It's clearly not stated

8 that way by a peer review.

9 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yeah.

10 MR. MANDELKERN: The peer review did not

11 state it that way.

12 DR. FISHBONE: The peer review may have it

13 incorrect.

14 MR. WAGNER: The application states 1.866.

15 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: I'm sorry Dan, say that

16 again?

17 MR. WAGNER: The application states

18 1.866430.

19 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. So 1.866 is the

20 total. And there's two pieces to it. One of them is

21 going to get a million and what?

22 DR. FISHBONE: One is going to get

23 1,120,000.

24 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: 1,120,000 goes to the

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 other, so the other one is going to get about 700,000,
2 something like that?

3 DR. FISHBONE: Yeah. I don't have that
4 exact breakdown, but --

5 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: 120 from 856 should
6 leave you about 750, 740, somewhere in there.

7 DR. FISHBONE: -- yeah.

8 DR. KIESSLING: Is this a group project?

9 DR. FISHBONE: Yes.

10 DR. NAIR: It's a group project, yes.

11 DR. KIESSLING: And two people makes it a
12 group?

13 DR. FISHBONE: No, there's O'Neill,
14 Mandoiu, Yufeng Wu, there's a whole bunch of people.
15 Some are computer experts, some are -- they're each
16 experts in different aspects. Graveley has his own
17 budget here but when you look at their budget it seems to
18 include a total -- the 1.120 -- 1,120,000 in the total
19 request cumulative budget for years one to three. So --

20 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: I don't get it. Do you
21 Bob?

22 MR. MANDELKERN: Excuse me. I don't get
23 it. In addition to which both of these researchers have
24 previously been funded by the stem cell research fund.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 Again, I think it's overreaching. We have many seed
2 grants, many established, we have a core that we've
3 approved. These people have already received their
4 grants, the work is ongoing and I don't see the need to
5 fund them further.

6 MR. WAGNER: Gerry's correct. The --

7 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay.

8 MR. WAGNER: -- contract is rolled into
9 the 1.8.

10 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. So let me see if
11 I can understand and articulate the issue that this is a
12 group project with a total of 1,866,430 that has support
13 from our two reviewers and a score of 2.2, but the
14 division of the money seems to be 1,200,000 in one
15 direction and 700 and something thousand in the other --
16 in the other -- in another direction and there seems to
17 be sentiment among the reviewers to make the total grant
18 smaller and some sentiment not to grant it at all. Is
19 that a correct summary?

20 DR. FISHBONE: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: So if we were going to
22 make it smaller how would you make it smaller?

23 DR. GENEL: Well, we could ask them to do
24 that and get back to us if we elected -- I don't think

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 we're going to be able to do that here if we decide to
2 fund it. I'm reading from the grant. It says a major
3 strength of this proposal is that it brings together a
4 diverse group of researchers from different departments
5 and campus. So to answer the question about whether it's
6 a group project or not I'm satisfied that it fulfills
7 those criteria.

8 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Well, so am I. Another
9 suggestion has been made Mike that we put it in the yes
10 category and then as we evaluate the total package come
11 back and decide how much we're going to fund it.

12 DR. GENEL: I'm alright with that.

13 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Is that okay?

14 DR. WALLACK: What are you going to do
15 Bob?

16 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: We're going to approve -
17 - give it a yes and then as we look at our total package
18 decide -- we're probably in all likelihood going to fund
19 it at some fraction of a million eight sixty six --

20 DR. WALLACK: Okay.

21 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: -- which will be decided
22 at the time that we look at the whole package of grants.
23 Does that sound reasonable?

24 DR. WALLACK: Yep.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay.

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: So 2. -- SCCUCONN04 is
3 going in the yes category?

4 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: With the proviso we're
5 going to come back and look at how much of it we're going
6 to fund.

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: That's the first pass.
8 Congratulations.

9 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: First pass.

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: Where to now sir?

11 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: I'll go home and come
12 back next week?

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: Okay.

14 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: No. Alright. Now I
15 think we need -- I think in the past -- can we take a
16 look at the whole picture about what -- how much do we
17 have committed to seed grants?

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: Do you want yes's?

19 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yes on seed grants, how
20 many yes's?

21 MS. TOWNSHEND: 2,000,000.

22 MR. WAGNER: 10 seed grants in yes.

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: Which should be 2,000,000.

24 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: 2,000,000 on seed

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 grants. We will probably have kept two back and at least
2 pick two alternative grants should somebody fail as last
3 year to get the grant off the ground. And how many on --
4 and we have --

5 MR. WALLACK: 10.

6 MR. MANDELKERN: 10 established
7 investigators.

8 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: -- established
9 investigators how many we got?

10 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes, 10 yes's.

11 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. And what's the
12 total on that?

13 MR. MANDELKERN: 5,000,000.

14 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. That's 7,000,000
15 and we've got Dr. Xu's project at two and a half. That's
16 --

17 MR. MANDELKERN: Nine and a half.

18 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: -- okay.

19 MR. MANDELKERN: But that's if we fund --

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: If we fund all the yes's.

21 MR. MANDELKERN: -- in the past Dr. Galvin
22 we have funded the seeds full and we've squeezed down
23 E.I.'s and groups and core to make the budget.

24 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: That's correct. Now

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 does anybody have any problem doing that this year? That
2 is fund the seeds, the \$200,000 seeds fully and then cut
3 -- do any cuts usually proportionately on the other
4 grants?

5 DR. KIESSLING: What's the year guidelines
6 for the established investigators? I had some that were
7 three years and some that were four year budgets.

8 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: I don't think we've
9 approved -- I was discussing that with some of the
10 Legislative people and I don't think we have any four
11 years.

12 MS. HORN: They can be funded for up to
13 four years but I don't believe we've done that.

14 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: I don't think we have.

15 DR. WALLACK: The one that was a three we
16 didn't fund.

17 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: No. In the past Milt.

18 DR. WALLACK: No, this year.

19 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: This year.

20 DR. KIESSLING: So it's \$500,000 for three
21 years or it's 500,000 --

22 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Or two.

23 DR. KIESSLING: -- \$500,000 a year for
24 three years? The total award is \$500,000.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: 500 over three years.

2 DR. KIESSLING: For two to three years.

3 Okay.

4 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: The first year, which is
5 usually used for start up and, you know, spooling up so
6 it's really spread over -- it's spread over two years
7 really, two and a half, two and a quarter.

8 DR. WALLACK: Bob, I have a question?

9 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yeah.

10 DR. WALLACK: When we were doing the seeds
11 we fund -- I'm sorry, the cores, we funded the cores
12 substantially but for some reason I want to say that I
13 thought I remembered that we took about 10 percent off
14 that somehow and that would --

15 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: I think last year we
16 took 10 percent off everything except the seeds.

17 MR. MANDELKERN: We took more of the core
18 than 10 percent.

19 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: We took some more off
20 the cores?

21 MR. MANDELKERN: Right. We went from two-
22 five to one-eight.

23 DR. WALLACK: So what I'm suggesting is
24 that if he's asking two-five, the sense is we want to

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 fund him but if we need to free up money for other things
2 can we start with the idea that we're going to say take
3 \$300,000 from him, put it aside, and then come back to
4 that so that we would have a better idea if we can fund
5 some of these other things?

6 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Well, that's a very
7 question Milt and when you look at it that's a very high
8 scoring grant and a continuation of stuff we've funded.

9 DR. WALLACK: Right.

10 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: How do we want to look
11 at that? See, you could look at it one way and say, you
12 know, you already had your shot, we're not going -- we'll
13 give the funding to somebody else. Or you could look at
14 it and say, well, this is -- this is moving along in a
15 potent direction. But I think that we should look at
16 anything other than the seed grants are subject to
17 reduction. And so maybe if we go back to the O'Neill
18 grant that might give us -- start giving us an idea of
19 what we have left to spend. Yes Paul?

20 DR. PESCATELLO: Maybe -- what would be
21 the harm in funding all the seed grants and all the
22 \$500,000 grants? That's roughly \$7,000,000 and then just
23 spend the rest of our time with that 3,000,000 block and
24 how we want to spend that. Because those were --

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 DR. KIESSLING: Because we've got a number
2 of seeds in maybe.

3 MR. WAGNER: We've got to go through the
4 maybes.

5 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yeah.

6 MR. MANDELKERN: Dr. Galvin?

7 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Hang on. I think
8 there's some -- there's some merit in that. We have to
9 pick at least two more seeds just so we have some
10 redundancy should we not get a grant off the ground. Now
11 Paul's way is one way of doing it. We probably before we
12 would do that we'd want to go back and review some of the
13 maybes. But, you know, with the understanding -- if
14 that's what you want to do with the understanding that,
15 you know, the maybes, the things that make the maybes
16 maybe haven't changed since 10:00 o'clock this morning.

17 DR. WALLACK: Bob, can we think of one
18 other thing?

19 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yes.

20 DR. WALLACK: And that is that if you have
21 a 500,000 senior investigator over four years, and I
22 think Marianne most of those were four years this year?

23 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: No.

24 MS. HORN: Three years.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 DR. WALLACK: Were most of them three
2 years?

3 VOICE: Yes.

4 DR. WALLACK: I thought -- I don't know.
5 What I was going to say if it was mostly four years then
6 they're getting 125,000 so if we took off -- if we gave
7 them 100,000 a year for four years that would be 400,000
8 and it would free up what? 25 -- it would free up
9 \$250,000.

10 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Well, we need
11 some sort of -- David, some sort of scheme.

12 DR. GOLDHAMER: Personally I'm not in
13 favor of squeezing the established investigator grants
14 anymore. They've been squeezed considerably from last
15 year to this year. 500,000 over four years --

16 DR. KIESSLING: No, it's three. Two or
17 three.

18 DR. GOLDHAMER: -- well, it could -- no,
19 it's three or four.

20 MS. HORN: It's up to four.

21 DR. GOLDHAMER: It's up to four years that
22 it's really not much different than a seed grant and it
23 doesn't allow you to fund the program in a way to make
24 progress quickly like an established grant should have

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 the capacity to do. If it's four years and it's a
2 hundred and a quarter a year and that doesn't include
3 overhead or overhead still needs to be taken out of that
4 that is a small grant for an established project.

5 DR. PESCATELLO: I agree. I don't see the
6 need. If I add the math we're up to \$7,000,000 pretty
7 much if we do everything we've voted yes for because none
8 of the larger grants zinged us at this point. We still
9 have \$3,000,000 to give towards those three, so we could
10 just, you know, cordon off seven and say we've agreed on
11 \$7,000,000.

12 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: But that -- there are
13 folks who want to go back to the maybes and see if you
14 can move a maybe to a yes.

15 DR. PESCATELLO: Well, we could do that as
16 we say how do we want to spend that last \$3,000,000? We
17 put the maybes in that category.

18 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: You can do it that way
19 but if you put a maybe in as a yes you've got to knock
20 something off the other end. It's like a bookshelf, you
21 know, you put a book on this end something falls off.

22 DR. PESCATELLO: Is my math incorrect?

23 DR. WALLACK: Can we see how many -- can
24 we see how many maybes we want to fund and go --

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yes Bob?

2 MR. MANDELKERN: I think we have a scheme
3 or a plan that can do our work very efficiently and very
4 properly. We can proceed to take formal votes just
5 caucusing, formal votes on the 10 stems -- seeds, which
6 if they went through on the yes basis would be 2,000,000.
7 We do the same on the 10 established investigators,
8 which would give us 7,000,000. If we can decide in the
9 process that the core should be extended for 2,000,000 we
10 then still have \$1,000,000 to consider the maybes in the
11 seeds and the maybes in the established. And that I
12 would like to make as a motion because otherwise we won't
13 get off the dime today, that's my feeling. Henry, can we
14 do that arbitrarily? Reduce --

15 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: There's a group grant in
16 there Bob that you've forgotten about.

17 DR. NAIR: But we don't know --

18 MR. MANDELKERN: But there's no numbers on
19 it.

20 DR. NAIR: -- the group grant, the O'Neill
21 grant. That's the one that we don't know whether we're
22 going to fund that at 1.8 or less than 1.8 and what we
23 had suggested was that that grant should not be funded at
24 1.8. So if you say because they've already received two

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 other grants from the Connecticut Stem Cell if we say
2 that that grant is approximately a million, a million
3 two, you free up \$600,000 at that time. That could go to
4 fund the seeds or the established maybe.

5 DR. KIESSLING: Or we could cut it more.

6 DR. NAIR: Or we could cut it more.

7 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Here's the problem, as
8 we always get into, is that we've got more meritorious
9 projects than we have dollar bills to pay for them. So
10 we've got to come up with some mutually acceptable way of
11 deciding which of these -- or first of all, we've agreed
12 we're going to -- pretty much agreed we're going to fund
13 the group project and the core. We have to agree on the
14 monies for that and then we have to look at the
15 established and the seed and decide are we're going to
16 sit with the ones we have or start to juggle back and
17 forth from maybe to yes.

18 DR. CANALIS: Can I ask a quick question?

19 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yes.

20 DR. CANALIS: The total amount of money
21 requested by the program project --

22 DR. NAIR: 1.8.

23 DR. CANALIS: -- I'm sorry?

24 VOICE: 1.8.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 DR. NAIR: 1.8. 1.86.

2 DR. CANALIS: The total is 1.8? I'm
3 sorry, I was off. So 1.8 and the core is 2.5?

4 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yep.

5 DR. CANALIS: I'm sorry. My fault. Okay.

6 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: So if we fund all the
7 yes's and then we've got to make some adjustments to the
8 core and the group project because we'll exceed.

9 DR. KIESSLING: I have one more question.

10 DR. WALLACK: Bob, can we -- can we --
11 would it be possible --

12 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Anything's possible Dr.
13 Wallack, you know that.

14 DR. WALLACK: -- just to work it through
15 slowly? If we go back to the seeds --

16 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yep.

17 DR. WALLACK: -- and see where -- let's
18 get that out of the way, see where we are in the dollars
19 with that and then we can work through it and we'll see
20 where we have to give up money. I mean, can we do that?

21 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: That sounds very
22 reasonable to me. I would say with the seeds is --
23 what's going to turn a maybe into a yes and a yes to a
24 no?

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 DR. WALLACK: Alright. I would personally
2 be willing to go with all of the yes's that you have here
3 and convert one maybe and that's 14 --

4 (Laughter)

5 DR. WALLACK: -- which is that young
6 investigator that we talked about earlier.

7 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Chamberlain?

8 DR. NAIR: Chamberlain.

9 MR. SALTON: We're going have a process
10 that has been consistent against all the applicants and
11 fair to all the applicants. If you're going to go
12 through the maybes, let's go through them one at a time
13 and do a very brief process and just say --

14 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Henry, I have no problem
15 with that.

16 MR. SALTON: -- okay. But you can't just
17 start with 14, I think you need to make sure --

18 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: That's fine.

19 MR. MANDELKERN: That's the first maybe.

20 DR. NAIR: But that's the first maybe.

21 MR. SALTON: -- that's the first maybe?
22 That's fine.

23 DR. WALLACK: So can we move to do that?

24 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. We've got nine

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 maybes to go through.

2 DR. WALLACK: Okay.

3 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: We -- I need to --
4 whoever is going to speak needs to say this should become
5 a yes because, you know, and speculate, you know, I don't
6 know what's changed from this morning, but if things have
7 changed we need to know why it changes categories. And
8 if it's going to go over to the left it'll displace
9 somebody else who will become a no.

10 DR. PESCATELLO: Not to be too thickheaded
11 about this, maybe I'm not getting it, but if we were to
12 fund everything we said yes to and we were to fund the
13 core we would still be less than \$10,000,000.

14 MR. MANDELKERN: The core at two-five?

15 VOICE: No.

16 VOICE: No, Paul, you've got --

17 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: It's 7,000,000. If
18 everything -- what Paul is saying if everything that's
19 yes on the established investigator and seed were funded
20 it's seven million bucks. If you fund the core is two
21 and a half million. That's nine and a half million.

22 MS. TOWNSHEND: Nine and a half million.

23 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Then it gives you the
24 better part of a half a million dollars left.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 DR. PESCATELLO: And the group -- none of
2 the group -- we weren't zinged by any of the -- we put a
3 yes on the fourth.

4 DR. NAIR: On the fourth one because
5 that's the one --

6 COURT REPORTER: Folks, you have to speak
7 one at a time. I have to keep a record.

8 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yeah, one at a time.

9 DR. KIESSLING: Paul, we've got to do
10 this. We've got to go through the maybes.

11 MR. MANDELKERN: Yeah, let's go. You've
12 got to --

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: So we're doing -- we're
14 doing --

15 DR. PESCATELLO: You don't have to go
16 through --

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: -- yeah we do.

18 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: No, you don't. I don't
19 think you do. I agree with Paul, but you know, we
20 already went through it once now we're going to go back
21 over it again. You know, George Patton said he didn't
22 like to pay for the same real estate twice, he never
23 liked to retreat. But go ahead, we'll take the same real
24 estate again.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 MR. SALTON: I would just suggest the
2 following. That the process that the Committee followed
3 and Committee members adhered to was that there would be
4 a second bite of the apple on maybes.

5 VOICES: Yes.

6 MR. SALTON: Okay. So if people were told
7 at the beginning of the process it's a yes or no and no
8 maybes are involved because then that's the process. So
9 it's not fair to applicants to be subject to having the
10 adjudicator of their application to changing rules just
11 in order to expedite the process.

12 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Alright. Let's do them
13 quick.

14 MS. TOWNSHEND: Okay. If we could do one
15 at a time I think our attorney --

16 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yeah, sure.

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: -- alright.

18 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yeah, let me understand
19 once more because Pescatello and I are thickheaded. If
20 you move somebody from a maybe to a yes does that
21 displace the yes or are we going to have --

22 VOICES: No.

23 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: -- okay. So you're
24 going to have more total seed grants. Okay?

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: I have on my notes if we
2 could just -- I'd like to check this with the group --
3 DR. GENEL: May I ask a question? Do we
4 actually have 10,000,000 or is there going to be --
5 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Nine-eight.
6 MS. TOWNSHEND: -- nine-eight.
7 DR. GENEL: Nine-eight. Okay.
8 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: We'd like to do
9 everything for free but --
10 DR. GENEL: Yeah, okay. Okay. So it's
11 9.8.
12 MS. TOWNSHEND: 9.8. I have SCAUCONN09 as
13 a no and then a maybe and then a reserve. Are we
14 considering that one again?
15 MR. MANDELKERN: Which one, UCONN09?
16 MS. TOWNSHEND: UCONN09.
17 MR. MANDELKERN: Aneskievich? It's a no.
18 DR. CANALIS: No, that's a no.
19 MS. TOWNSHEND: That's a no.
20 VOICE: That's a no.
21 DR. CANALIS: That's a no.
22 DR. NAIR: We moved that to a no.
23 MS. TOWNSHEND: So we are going onto
24 number 14, SCAUCHC14, which is Yale 14, 1.75 is the peer

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 review score.

2 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Henry just had a great
3 idea. We're going to -- let's go through the maybe list
4 first and if there's one that nobody wants we'll get rid
5 of those, okay?

6 MR. SALTON: Save discussion on maybes to
7 the point where if someone wants to move it to a yes.

8 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay.

9 MS. TOWNSEND: I've got it.

10 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yes Ann?

11 DR. WALLACK: 1.4 I would say yes.

12 MR. SALTON: Okay. Move to the next one.
13 What's the next one?

14 MS. TOWNSEND: The next maybe that I have
15 is UCHC16.

16 MR. SALTON: Does anyone want to move this
17 one to the yes?

18 MS. TOWNSEND: 2.65.

19 DR. KIESSLING: Is that the -- you've got
20 to give us the name.

21 MR. SALTON: Does anyone want to discuss
22 this as a potential yes?

23 DR. KIESSLING: Yes.

24 MR. SALTON: Okay.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: UCHC16?

2 DR. KIESSLING: Yes. I want to discuss
3 that.

4 MR. MANDELKERN: You do?

5 DR. KIESSLING: That's the post-doc. who
6 got dinged because she's a post-doc.

7 MR. MANDELKERN: Okay. Go on.

8 DR. KIESSLING: She's a really nice grant
9 that they dinged her because she was a post-doc.

10 MR. SALTON: Okay. Next one?

11 MS. TOWNSHEND: 17.

12 MR. SALTON: Does anyone want to discuss
13 17 as a yes?

14 VOICE: We're now discussing or we're not?

15 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: If you want it -- if you
16 really want to try to make it into a yes discuss it,
17 otherwise it becomes a no.

18 DR. PESCATELLO: UCH16, if we're also -- I
19 thought we were also looking for two additional core if
20 somebody drops out? We can also do that at this point.

21 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yeah, but what Henry
22 suggested was excellent. We're going to go through the
23 list and if we could decide there's some we don't want to
24 discuss fine. Then we'll go back and discuss the ones we

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 need to discuss. Come on, let's go.
2 MS. TOWNSHEND: 17.
3 MR. SALTON: Does anyone want to discuss
4 17?
5 VOICES: Yes.
6 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay.
7 MS. TOWNSHEND: 18.
8 VOICE: No.
9 MS. TOWNSHEND: No? That moves to the no
10 category. 27. 27 is now a no. 29.
11 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Everybody okay? Whoa,
12 whoa, whoa, wait a minute. Okay. Bob, you got a problem
13 with 27?
14 MR. MANDELKERN: Yale 27?
15 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yeah.
16 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yale 27.
17 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yep.
18 MR. MANDELKERN: On the B or an A?
19 MS. TOWNSHEND: We're on the A, we're on
20 the seed grants.
21 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: On the seed grants.
22 (Indiscernible, multiple voices.)
23 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Hold it. Hold it. One
24 person. Milt, please, one person at a time.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 MR. MANDELKERN: I would say I would like
2 to discuss --

3 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Hang on here. One
4 person at a time. Okay. The recorder can't pick it up
5 if you're all going to talk and it's got to be recorded.
6 So Milt, do you have a comment?

7 DR. WALLACK: No.

8 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Gerry?

9 DR. FISHBONE: No.

10 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Bob?

11 MR. MANDELKERN: I would like to discuss
12 it.

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: 27 is for discussion?

14 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay.

16 MS. TOWNSHEND: 29, which is Liisa Kuhn.
17 Place it in the no. Next is 32 -- I'm sorry, 31, my
18 apologies. 31, Richard Flavell.

19 DR. FISHBONE: I would like to move that
20 to the yes.

21 MS. TOWNSHEND: 30 --

22 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Let's get --

23 MR. SALTON: Stays as a maybe.

24 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: -- stays as a maybe.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: -- 32, Radmila Filipovic.

2 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Anybody want to discuss
3 moving it to a yes? Then it's a no.

4 MS. TOWNSHEND: 33.

5 DR. FISHBONE: Can I ask a question? Who
6 made it a maybe in the first place?

7 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Whoever was --

8 MS. TOWNSHEND: Whoever was -- I don't
9 know if we -- maybe we can go back and get that on the
10 transcript.

11 DR. LATHAM: I was one of the reviewers on
12 it and I made it a maybe, but that was partway through
13 the process when we didn't know the price constraints.

14 MS. TOWNSHEND: 33, Brett Lindenbach.

15 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Any support for that?
16 No? It becomes a no.

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: That is the end of maybes
18 for the seed grants.

19 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: That's Yale 33.

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: That's the end of the seed
21 grant maybes.

22 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay?

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: Now we start with the
24 first maybe that we plan on discussing, which is --

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yes Dr. Canalis?

2 DR. CANALIS: How many maybes do we have
3 left?

4 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: I think we've got about
5 eight.

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: Four.

7 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: One, two -- four? Oh,
8 okay. Four. Five. Alright, five. Okay. Is that okay?

9 MS. TOWNSHEND: I've only got four.

10 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Let's see --
11 okay. We've got UCHC16, Yale --

12 VOICE: (Indiscernible, too far from mic.)

13 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: -- what's the one up
14 there that says 16?

15 MS. TOWNSHEND: I can't see that far
16 without my glasses.

17 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: It says, UCHC, Ling-Ling
18 Chen. Ling-Ling Chen. Not 14, it's marked 16.

19 DR. WALLACK: Did we miss 14?

20 DR. NAIR: This is very different.

21 DR. KIESSLING: Could you resort that by
22 number for us?

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: Okay. 14 -- number and
24 then name of the grant. We are looking at --

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: 14, Chamberlain.

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: -- SCAUCHC14, Chamberlain,
3 1.55 is the peer review score, Kiessling and Pescatello.

4 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Okay. Are we
5 going to discuss that?

6 DR. KIESSLING: Are we on 14? We're on 14
7 or 16?

8 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: We're on 14. The
9 Chamberlain grant.

10 DR. KIESSLING: Oh. This is actually a
11 nice application from a post-doc. in Mark Leland's group
12 and I'm going to leave the details to you but this is
13 what I wanted -- we've got to make sure that we want --
14 that this grant actually --

15 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Why would you move it --
16 why would you move it from maybe to yes?

17 DR. KIESSLING: -- I didn't want to move
18 it. I'm not the one who wants to move it from maybe to
19 yes. I wanted us to discuss this one -- I had this one
20 and I had number 16 and in my view and by the peer review
21 notes these were comparable applications.

22 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay.

23 DR. KIESSLING: And the peer reviewers
24 gave Ling-Ling Chen a very poor score because she was a

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 recent post-doctoral graduate in the laboratory.

2 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay.

3 DR. KIESSLING: And her mentor has -- she
4 would be his first post-doc. He is a young investigator
5 and his laboratory needs these resources to keep their
6 work going and it was a good project. So I thought that
7 was a peer review score out of line of their assessment
8 of the science. They really gave her a low score because
9 she was a recent graduate.

10 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Now does
11 everybody realize that we're not talking about the
12 highlighted Chamberlain grant, we're talking about grant
13 14?

14 DR. KIESSLING: Yeah, but the reason I
15 lumped these together is that they are very comparable
16 scientifically and one of them got a really low score
17 because it was a young investigator and the other one did
18 not get scored down because it wasn't post-doc.

19 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. If you took the
20 scores off which one would you pick?

21 DR. KIESSLING: I would fund both of
22 these. I would fund both -- if we have enough money to
23 give more money to Dr. Leland's lab I would fund both of
24 these, these are both good projects. But they are equal

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 projects and the scores don't reflect that.

2 DR. PESCATELLO: And we do have the money.

3 DR. KIESSLING: Right. So that was my big
4 concern. I read both of these grants and I realized one
5 of them is a 1.55 and the other one is also a 1.55. She
6 got scored at 2.6 because she was in the same
7 developmental stage as Stormy. Stormy might be a year
8 older.

9 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Well, fortunately your
10 insight will protect us from making an error on that
11 basis.

12 VOICE: (Indiscernible, too far from mic.)

13 DR. GENEL: Ph.D.'s who are in a post-
14 doctoral situation in established laboratories.

15 DR. KIESSLING: Yes. And the projects are
16 both good.

17 DR. GENEL: And I say it that way
18 explicitly because I think we have to make some sort of
19 priority judgement just based on that compared to the
20 others and I can go either way, but that's the kernel of
21 it.

22 DR. KIESSLING: Right. My only concern
23 was the fact that this was unfair scoring on Ling-Ling
24 Chen.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Well, we've wiped
2 that away so we're going to -- for working purposes we
3 feel that your scientific acumen has indicated to us that
4 these grants are equal even though somebody decided not
5 to score it that way because one of the potential
6 grantees was new.

7 DR. KIESSLING: Yes.

8 DR. GENEL: Well, new, they're new Ph.D.'s
9 but they're post-docs. they're not independent new
10 investigators.

11 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yeah.

12 DR. GENEL: No, I make that just so that
13 we can be sure --

14 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: At my age everything is
15 new. Okay. And who's the second reviewer Ann? Who is
16 the other reviewer?

17 DR. KIESSLING: Paul.

18 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Paul.

19 DR. PESCATELLO: I agree.

20 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. So we have
21 Chamberlain and Ling-Ling Chen.

22 DR. PESCATELLO: So we're moving it into
23 the yes?

24 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yeah. They've gone over

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 into yes.

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: So 16 and 14?

3 VOICE: Yes.

4 DR. GENEL: Did we say we were going to
5 move them? I just said that I think they ought to be
6 reviewed and considered together, but the consideration
7 has to be are we going to fund post-docs., new post-docs.
8 in established laboratories as opposed to some of the
9 others? Because I think there's a priority decision
10 there that goes beyond the scientific scores. So I would
11 not want to make -- I would not vote on these until we've
12 at least considered the others because I think there's
13 some trade-offs here.

14 DR. KIESSLING: Ling-Ling's lab is not so
15 established. They need this grant to keep their -- to
16 keep her work going.

17 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: And Mike, what sort of
18 criteria do you need for a decision? To understand the
19 lab milieu or the relative merits of the individual or
20 the relative merits of the project? What kind of
21 information do we need to make a good decision?

22 DR. GENEL: I can't be that explicit about
23 it except that I think that these are -- if we decide
24 we're going to -- I'm happy with funding two of these.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay.

2 DR. GENEL: But I don't know what two I
3 would fund.

4 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay.

5 DR. GENEL: Until I see what the --

6 DR. PESCATELLO: But I think what Anne is
7 saying is they're both the same -- they should be
8 functionally the same score at 1. whatever.

9 DR. GENEL: -- well, that I agree with.
10 We agree.

11 DR. PESCATELLO: We're not making a
12 decision about post-docs. per se.

13 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay.

14 DR. GENEL: Well, I think we are. I think
15 we are. Because I think for example I think there's some
16 established investigators in there who are moving into
17 the field. I mean, I think there are some different --

18 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. But let's
19 everybody be clear that we'll put a score of 2 on both of
20 them, which means that we're going to disregard the
21 oversees peer review and give them a score that is equal
22 and not numerically different. Is that alright Dr.
23 Kiessling?

24 DR. KIESSLING: Yes.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: But these are both
2 projects of merit that should have the same score.

3 DR. KIESSLING: They should have the same
4 score. I'm not --

5 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay.

6 DR. KIESSLING: -- I'm less enthusiastic
7 about funding the Chamberlain grant because I think that
8 lab has tons of money already. And if we have a choice
9 between funding that person and funding an established
10 investigator whose work will stop I think we need to
11 think about it. That's what Mike and I are talking
12 about.

13 DR. GENEL: Yeah. I agree.

14 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Now we have four
15 others to consider. Milt?

16 DR. WALLACK: Yeah. I just have to say
17 for the record that I'm uncomfortable with Mike's
18 suggestion. I'm not usually in a position to say that
19 because I usually am very, very comfortable with whatever
20 he's saying. And the reason I am goes back to something
21 that Henry talked about very early this morning and that
22 is that with the RFP having gone out the way it did it is
23 very, very inappropriate I think to put that kind of
24 stipulation on a consideration of another grant.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 MR. SALTON: Well, let me clarify my
2 remarks so that we don't have that problem. The RFP says
3 junior investigators -- or junior faculty, I'm sorry,
4 will get priority and then it says, also available for
5 consideration are established investigators in other
6 fields and post-docs. So you have sort of like two-tier
7 priority. Junior faculty members and these other two
8 groups that are on the same page. But it's within the
9 authority of the advisory commission then to look at say
10 among these groups let's weigh then all the facts about
11 these particular applications. This is an individual --
12 what Mike is doing is an individualized analysis as
13 opposed to what was being considered before, should we
14 just put everyone -- at least what I heard was some
15 discussion about moving post-docs. to sort of the third
16 position as opposed to being on the same level as
17 established investigators from outside fields.

18 So at this point I think the discussion is
19 appropriate and within the RFP, which is to say, you
20 know, I'm looking -- I'm preparing this one with the
21 other ones that are in the same category of yes and maybe
22 and this one is not a priority to me as compared to a
23 junior faculty member or another individual established
24 investigator application. So this is an individualized

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 application process as opposed to a rule of general
2 applicability.

3 DR. GENEL: And if I may say so, that's
4 what I read in our language by saying we would give
5 preference to one -- to two of the groups and post-
6 doctoral fellows may apply.

7 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Well, the word, may, is
8 in there Mike.

9 DR. GENEL: Well, that's what I said. So
10 I think there's a nuance there that I think we ought to
11 take into consideration because that is our role as an
12 advisory committee.

13 DR. SEEMANN: So -- but I'm right with you
14 right up until where you begin to distinguish between
15 post-docs. The RFP says we will take applications from
16 post-docs. It doesn't say just to change the tenor of
17 the conversation that we will either favor or
18 discriminate against post-docs. who come from red labs or
19 green labs just to make the point. And you are putting
20 an unfair burden on a particular post-doc. to say because
21 you come from a green laboratory you shall not be as
22 competitive as one who comes from a red laboratory.

23 DR. KIESSLING: I understand that. But
24 we're -- we represent -- we don't represent necessarily

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 the scientists in this committee, we represent
2 Connecticut and what you want to do is take the funds
3 that the taxpayers of Connecticut have so graciously
4 given -- I guess it's the tobacco money or whatever, and
5 spread that to the greatest advantage for science in
6 Connecticut as a whole --

7 DR. SEEMANN: In a fair process.

8 DR. KIESSLING: -- in a fair process.

9 DR. SEEMANN: That reflects the RFP. I
10 know where you're coming -- we can go around on this all
11 day, but --

12 DR. KIESSLING: Right. And I think, I
13 mean, I don't think we're going to -- I think at the end
14 of the day we're going to make a decision everybody's
15 happy with, but I think it's got to be a process and, you
16 know, I'm uncomfortable funding, I mean, Stormy
17 Chamberlain's research is a wonderful protocol. It's
18 about Angelman's Syndrome. It is an interesting nuance.
19 They're going to make iPS cells.

20 This Committee is charged with funding as
21 much human embryonic stem cell research as we possibly
22 can. The derivation of human embryonic stem cells is
23 still not going to be funded by the Federal government so
24 there's a lot that has to go on in Connecticut that must

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 be supported by Connecticut funds. And I think that
2 we've got to keep the people of Connecticut, the over,
3 you know, the real mission here, and if a laboratory is
4 going to down -- a good laboratory is going to go down
5 because they're not going to get funded because their
6 grant maybe wasn't quite as sterling as Stormy's I think
7 it's fair to keep that laboratory going and let Stormy
8 apply again.

9 We don't have to agree on that, that's
10 just my position.

11 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Let's move on and
12 start to evaluate some of these other grants. What's the
13 next one?

14 MR. WAGNER: 17.

15 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: 17. Okay. It's a
16 maybe. Is there somebody who wants -- somebody wanted us
17 to discuss this and see if it could become a yes, so
18 discuss away.

19 DR. SEEMANN: That was me. I'm being
20 prodded here. This was -- just to remind you, this was
21 the proposal that had to do with malaria so the score
22 was, you know, in the 2.0 region, it was 2.0 and the
23 question was with regard to the overall potential impact
24 of this.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yale 17. Any further
2 comments?

3 DR. SEEMANN: And I don't believe there
4 are any post-docs. involved here.

5 DR. KIESSLING: No.

6 DR. FISHBONE: I just have one question
7 and that is following up on what Ann had said from the
8 point of view of the state of Connecticut there isn't
9 really a big malaria problem. So if we're going to be
10 looking at it from the point of view of bang for the buck
11 in terms of Connecticut, although I agree this is very
12 important research, should it be under our aegis?

13 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: That's true. More
14 people die from malaria in the world than many other
15 infectious diseases, I agree.

16 DR. SEEMANN: I'll put my dean hat on. If
17 you don't think that the future of the state of
18 Connecticut depends upon the health of the rest of the
19 world then --

20 (Laughter)

21 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Quite global. Dr.
22 Wallack, yes?

23 DR. WALLACK: The argument about the value
24 of funding something involved with malaria is extremely

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 important, extremely compelling, and I certainly would
2 not want -- I have to keep that in mind. However, I
3 don't have the full proposal in front of me, I only have
4 the summary, and the summary just talks in terms of
5 problems with the application and with the grant
6 proposal. It talks about lack of detail. It talks about
7 concern for the methodology. It has concerns -- as
8 important as this subject is it has concerns for how this
9 proposal will be moving along and we have very, very
10 difficult decisions and from my perspective because of
11 all of what I just said it's a difficult decision, but
12 one which I think we have to make a decision to say no on
13 this one.

14 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Other
15 discussions? Okay. Yes Anne?

16 DR. HISKES: I was one of the reviewers
17 for this and I thought I argued for it to be in the maybe
18 and I would now myself put it into the no given the
19 competitive nature of what we're dealing with. This
20 person can I think find funding for similar projects in
21 other areas.

22 DR. SEEMANN: Then I'll withdraw it. I
23 mean, good science to me always -- the decision on the
24 science trumps everything else. So I respect that.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Do we have a
2 consensus to move that from maybe to no?
3 VOICE: Yes.
4 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. That becomes no.
5 MS. TOWNSHEND: 31 is the next I have.
6 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Flavell.
7 MR. WAGNER: How about 27?
8 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: 27, okay.
9 MS. TOWNSHEND: 27.
10 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay.
11 MS. TOWNSHEND: Which is SCAYALE27, it's
12 Shangqin Guo, 2.0 is the peer review score, Hiskes and
13 Mandelkern.
14 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: What's the grant about?
15 DR. HISKES: So this was the support of
16 environment for differentiation of hemopoietic cells. So
17 it's basically an engineering proposal to create an
18 environment. It's going to first construct a library of
19 stromo cells with micro N/A expression vectors. Then
20 he's going to use this library to assess hemopoietic
21 differentiation efficiency. It had mixed reviews. I
22 thought it was an interesting, valuable project, but it
23 was the one where the reviewer said the proposal is not
24 complete. The protocol may yield false negatives and it

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 would be hard to assess those. So there are certain
2 methodological flaws in the concept.

3 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Other comments?

4 MR. MANDELKERN: Well, when we reviewed it
5 together my tendency was to put it into the yes category
6 but Anne -- we agreed we'd report it as a maybe. I think
7 with the score it has and the content I would put it into
8 a yes because I'm dubious about putting scores of much
9 higher into the yes and leaving a 2 behind.

10 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: I think the scores are
11 reasonable guidelines, but I think we've -- I've noticed
12 today and I will say from my chair that the narratives
13 don't fit some of the scores and we've already had a
14 discussion about someone who appeared not to get a good
15 score because of post-doctoral status. So I think the
16 scores are a good guideline but I think we have to look
17 at what benefits -- what's the best science -- I think
18 Dean Seemann said, what's the best science and what's the
19 best of the program?

20 MR. MANDELKERN: I'll withdraw my comment.
21 I'll go with my co-reviewer.

22 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. We have a no and
23 a change of maybe to no. Is there any further
24 discussion? We're discussing Dr. Guo's grant, Yale 27.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 Okay. And it's the consensus that this goes into the no
2 column. Okay, so be it. Next?

3 MS. TOWNSHEND: 31, SCAYALE31, Richard
4 Flavell, 1.8 is the peer review score, Hiskes and
5 Wallack.

6 DR. WALLACK: I'm looking for my papers
7 and I have them.

8 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Do you want to go onto
9 let -- something else while you're doing that Milt?

10 DR. WALLACK: No, I have them right now.
11 The -- I think one of the main arguments on this grant
12 was having to do with the fact that we were talking about
13 a senior investigator and doing a seed grant. I think we
14 put that to bed though, so we won't go there, I just
15 wanted to remind us. Just to review, the grant seemed to
16 have great potential. It did have some questions. It
17 was a grant that it seemed as though if all that he
18 proposed worked out it would be -- it would be of great
19 value and that there was a strong likelihood that the
20 P.I. because of his experience had a very good
21 opportunity, a good chance, of reaching his goals.

22 The P.R.'s had a fairly good feeling about
23 the proposal and about the investigator. I would like to
24 see this funded. Anne, did you have other comments on

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 it?

2 DR. HISKES: I just think it's exciting.
3 I think it's very innovative and although risky the risk
4 is worth it.

5 DR. FISHBONE: Dr. Canalis had brought up
6 a question about the three percent of time of the P.I.,
7 do you remember that Ernie?

8 DR. CANALIS: Yes.

9 DR. FISHBONE: On Dr. Flavell, you had
10 commented that you weren't happy with somebody only
11 giving three percent of his time to the project.

12 DR. CANALIS: I do have difficulties with
13 someone working 1.2 hours a week on a project. I don't
14 think that that is sufficient frankly.

15 DR. KIESSLING: Anne? What is his total
16 funding?

17 DR. HISKES: Well, over his lifetime?

18 DR. KIESSLING: No, now. Currently.

19 DR. CANALIS: How much money he has in his
20 fund.

21 DR. HISKES: I don't know offhand.

22 DR. KIESSLING: Okay.

23 DR. GENEL: It's substantial.

24 DR. HISKES: It's a lot.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 DR. KIESSLING: It's got to be a lot,
2 right?

3 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: But not in this area?

4 DR. HISKES: Correct.

5 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Now we're going
6 to discuss this -- are we going to discuss this on the
7 basis of whether we think three percent of the senior
8 investigator's time is sufficient or not? Questions like
9 that have been raised in the past.

10 DR. KIESSLING: There's two issues here.
11 Three percent commitment and it's an all or none, it's
12 either going to work or totally fail, right?

13 DR. HISKES: He already has the mouse. He
14 can do other things with the mouse I suppose.

15 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: I'm getting a clear idea
16 of where you folks want to go with this.

17 DR. KIESSLING: I would move to not fund
18 this.

19 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Do I have a
20 consensus to not fund this?

21 MR. MANDELKERN: I would move to fund it.

22 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. We do not have a
23 consensus to not fund it. I'm going to call for a vote.

24 DR. GOLDHAMER: Can I make one comment?

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yes.

2 DR. GOLDHAMER: So in general I don't
3 think that the overall funding of the lab should
4 negatively impact an application, but if you look at his
5 funding he has incredible amounts of money. He's a
6 Howard Hughes' investigator, he has two or three Arrow
7 One grants, he has other sources of money and with Howard
8 Hughes' money my understanding, although I'm not
9 fortunate enough to be a Hughes' investigator, there is
10 quite a bit of discretionary discretion that can be used
11 for that money. So he's asking for a small amount of
12 money and I have it -- it's hard for me to believe that
13 he can't scrape together this kind of money to do some
14 preliminary studies to look at the feasibility of it
15 before it turns into a larger project. So I'm -- so I
16 would in this case vote no on those grounds.

17 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: I have a little bit of
18 incredulity about the two major universities not being
19 able to raise a couple of hundred grand. I mean, I don't
20 really believe that.

21 MS. TOWNSHEND: Roll call?

22 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yep. Roll call vote on
23 this. A yes on this vote means not to accept Dr.
24 Flavell's grant, is that correct?

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yes means no?
2 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Just say how you feel.
3 If you think --
4 (Laughter)
5 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: -- if you think it
6 should be accepted say yes, if you think it shouldn't be
7 accepted say no. Call the roll.
8 MS. TOWNSHEND: By accept it it's funded?
9 Okay.
10 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Call the roll.
11 MS. TOWNSHEND: Arinzeh?
12 DR. ARINZEH: Say it again? I'm sorry.
13 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yes is fund it.
14 VOICE: Yes or no.
15 MS. TOWNSHEND: No is --
16 DR. ARINZEH: Okay. No. I'm sorry.
17 MS. TOWNSHEND: -- no is not fund it.
18 Canalis?
19 DR. CANALIS: No.
20 MS. TOWNSHEND: Goldhamer?
21 DR. GOLDHAMER: No.
22 MS. TOWNSHEND: Seemann?
23 DR. SEEMANN: No.
24 MS. TOWNSHEND: Kiessling?

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 DR. KIESSLING: No funding.
2 MS. TOWNSHEND: Fishbone?
3 DR. FISHBONE: No.
4 MS. TOWNSHEND: Hiskes?
5 DR. HISKES: No. I've been convinced by
6 the justice part of me.
7 MS. TOWNSHEND: Mandelkern?
8 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes.
9 MS. TOWNSHEND: Wallack?
10 DR. WALLACK: No.
11 MS. TOWNSHEND: Pescatello?
12 DR. PESCATELLO: No.
13 MS. TOWNSHEND: Nair?
14 DR. NAIR: No.
15 MS. TOWNSHEND: The vote is 10 no, one
16 yes. This grant goes into the no category.
17 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. What's next? Do
18 you want to discuss Dr. Chen or Dr. Chamberlain? Or some
19 other topic?
20 DR. KIESSLING: Let's do the other
21 investigators.
22 VOICE: Which ones?
23 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: We've got two seeds that
24 are still maybes. Steve?

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 DR. LATHAM: If there's any threat of
2 going onto the established investigators I wanted to
3 inject a fact. Seven of the 10 established investigators
4 are on four year budgets, three are on three year
5 budgets. I just went through while you were talking
6 about Yale things I can't vote on and looked at
7 everybody's budget. Seven of the 10 are four year
8 \$500,000 budgets.

9 DR. KIESSLING: Are there -- how many of
10 those are already in the yes category?

11 DR. LATHAM: Those are the 10 yes's that
12 we have --

13 DR. KIESSLING: Oh, okay.

14 DR. LATHAM: -- seven of the 10 that we've
15 already put in the yes category have a \$500,000 budget
16 spread over four years.

17 DR. GOLDHAMER: I think I know where
18 you're going.

19 DR. FISHBONE: Could I ask a question?
20 Fishbone. About the grant that we approved very early on
21 in the project, one of the seed grants? And he's sort of
22 an out layer and I don't know whether -- if he'd been
23 lower down the list if he would have been put in the yes
24 column and that's Dr. Fong.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 DR. WALLACK: What number?

2 DR. FISHBONE: Three.

3 MS. HORN: That was a no.

4 DR. FISHBONE: I was just reading the
5 reviewers on that and they didn't sound very impressive
6 and it was like the second grant that we looked at and I
7 don't know whether --

8 VOICE: Would number two have gotten --

9 DR. FISHBONE: Number three, Fong.

10 MS. HORN: Fong under the seed grants.

11 VOICE: That's a no.

12 DR. FISHBONE: It's a no? I'm sorry. I
13 was right then, I just had it down as a --

14 (Laughter)

15 MR. MANDELKERN: Fong is a no.

16 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. We still have two
17 maybes. Which one do you want to tackle first,
18 Chamberlain or Chen?

19 DR. WALLACK: I would move the acceptance
20 of both.

21 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Do I have a
22 second?

23 DR. KIESSLING: I'll second that.

24 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Dr. Wallack -- okay, Dr.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 Wallack has suggested that we -- or moved that we accept
2 grant UCHC16 and UCHC14.

3 MR. SALTON: Excuse me. I don't think you
4 can vote for both, you have to give each applicant the
5 ability to go either in or out.

6 DR. KIESSLING: We've done that already.
7 We did that already, didn't we?

8 DR. WALLACK: Alright. So Henry --

9 MR. SALTON: No. You vote one at a time.

10 DR. WALLACK: -- Henry -- alright. So we
11 endorse going with both then we'll vote on each
12 separately. It's no bit deal.

13 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Vote on them separately.
14 Alright. Okay. We're going to vote on Chamberlain's
15 grand first.

16 MS. TOWNSHEND: Which is 14.

17 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: 14. All in favor of
18 accepting the Chamberlain grant of \$200,000, UCHC14,
19 indicate by saying aye?

20 VOICES: Aye.

21 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. We'll now
22 entertain a motion Dr. Wallack to accept --

23 DR. WALLACK: So moved.

24 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: -- thank you Dr.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 Wallack. And a second?

2 DR. NAIR: Second.

3 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Thank you Dr. Nair. And
4 now we're going to vote on the Ling-Ling Chen grant,
5 UCHC16, a \$200,000 grant. All in favor of accepting the
6 grant indicate by saying aye?

7 VOICES: Aye.

8 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Opposed?

9 MR. MANDELKERN: Nay.

10 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Is there a no?

11 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes.

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: Mr. Mandelkern.

13 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Mr. Mandelkern dissents.

14 Okay. We now have two million four in that account.

15 Okay?

16 DR. GENEL: Commissioner may I make --

17 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yes Dr. Genel?

18 DR. GENEL: -- I didn't want to make any
19 comments until we were finished with the voting on this -
20 - on the group of these grants. But I need to make a
21 point with respect to Richard Flavell. I think when you
22 have a grant application, a grant that only awards
23 \$200,000, you have a choice of putting down no percent
24 effort because a percent effort of --

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 MS. HORN: Are you speaking to a Yale
2 grant?

3 DR. GENEL: -- no. I'm just speaking in
4 general.

5 MS. HORN: In general.

6 DR. GENEL: Because I think -- yeah, I
7 think one has to be very careful about equating percent
8 effort in an investigator who's amply funded if in fact
9 we are trying to recruit established investigators to
10 move into stem cell research because a percent of their
11 effort is a significantly different thing than it is for
12 a young investigator. That's the only point I wanted to
13 make.

14 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: I think that's a very
15 worthwhile comment and I think that we get a little bit
16 stuck on numbers here. Because we're looking at stuff
17 that is subject to different opinions and different ideas
18 about what the research at the institution might be like.

19 So I think we're spending some time homing in on
20 percentiles and on oversees reviewers' scores and maybe
21 we have to look at things individually. So it's a point
22 well taken. Thank you.

23 MR. MANDELKERN: Shouldn't we now have 14
24 yes seeds?

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: We have 12.
2 MS. TOWNSHEND: We have 12.
3 MR. MANDELKERN: 12. We only made two
4 yes?
5 MS. HORN: Yes.
6 MS. TOWNSHEND: Are we moving onto the
7 established investigator grants, same process?
8 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: We are. We are.
9 MS. TOWNSHEND: We'll start with the
10 maybes.
11 DR. CANALIS: Are we all done with the
12 seeds?
13 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: We're all done with the
14 seeds.
15 MS. HORN: Yes, that was the seeds.
16 DR. CANALIS: But I mean completely?
17 MS. HORN: Yes.
18 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Well, you know, the
19 opera is not over until the overweight lady sings.
20 DR. CANALIS: She didn't sing though.
21 MS. TOWNSHEND: We are going to
22 SCBUCONN04, which is Tai-Hsi Fan, 2.3 is the peer review
23 score, Seemann and Latham are the reviewers.
24 VOICE: Dr. Seemann just left.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: How about if we go to the
2 next maybe?

3 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Let's go to another
4 grant.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: The next maybe I have is
6 SCBUHC -- oh, that's also Dr. Seemann. Let's go onto
7 15, which is Winfreid Krueger, 2.5, Wallack and
8 Kiessling.

9 DR. KIESSLING: This is the one that I
10 presented before, it's really hard. This is a mid-career
11 scientist. I think she's basically -- well --

12 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: He. He.

13 DR. KIESSLING: -- that's right. I got
14 that part wrong. What do you remember Ed? This is an
15 interesting project. She's not a very productive
16 investigator. She needs this grant I think to do
17 anything, I don't think she's got any other funding.

18 DR. WALLACK: Ann, in the notes that I had
19 was that there was a questionable -- there's a question
20 about the approach. There was a question about the
21 starting hypothesis and there was a question about is the
22 researcher ready to accomplish his goals. There were
23 shortcomings I believe in the grant itself and for those
24 reasons I think more than anything we -- I was originally

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 ready to vote no but we put it on the maybe. I'm still
2 ready to go no on that one.

3 DR. KIESSLING: Alright.

4 DR. NAIR: This is also a three year
5 grant.

6 DR. KIESSLING: Yeah. That's because she
7 needed the salary.

8 DR. NAIR: Salary, right.

9 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: We have a negative. Do
10 we have anymore discussion on this grant? We're talking
11 about the Krueger grant Dr. Seemann. 15, UCONN15.

12 DR. KIESSLING: I hope she tries this
13 again.

14 VOICE: He.

15 DR. KIESSLING: He.

16 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yeah.

17 DR. FISHBONE: Can I make one point?

18 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Gerry?

19 DR. FISHBONE: The first reviewer says
20 perhaps this application is better suited as a seed
21 grant.

22 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay.

23 DR. FISHBONE: There's problems with it.

24 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Well, there's always

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 next year hopefully.

2 DR. FISHBONE: Yep.

3 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Do we have a consensus
4 for no on that? Okay. Move onto the next.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: Do we want to go back?
6 We'll go back to number 4, which is Tai-Hsi Fan, 2.3,
7 Seemann and Latham.

8 DR. LATHAM: I had said no on that and it
9 got pulled into maybe by the argument from Jeff. So it's
10 over to Jeff if he wants to pull it into the yes column.

11 DR. SEEMANN: We're going to dance over
12 here, aren't we? Alright. Yeah. There's nothing --
13 there was nothing compelling here, I mean, unless
14 somebody came up with to clearly move it into a yes. So
15 we'll leave it as a no.

16 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Consensus no on
17 that grant? Okay. There you go.

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: Now we move onto 12, which
19 is Mina Mina, 2.2, Seemann and Genel.

20 DR. GENEL: Well, I would move this to a
21 no category considering the competition. I mean, this is
22 -- this is the study of derivation of neural crest cells
23 from embryonic stem cells. This is really an
24 investigation that is already -- one of the questions was

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 whether there was overlap funding here from the other
2 grants from the stem cell program. I think if we had
3 20,000,000 I'd like to fund this, we have 10,000,000 I
4 think we have to make some decisions somewhere. I would
5 move this to a no category.

6 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Mike, do you want to
7 earmark this as one we might want to put on the --

8 DR. GENEL: Yeah.

9 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: -- you know, if somebody
10 doesn't get -- somebody turns down their slot at medical
11 school you get their slot, you know? That kind of thing.

12 DR. GENEL: Yeah. No, I think in fact we
13 should move some into the reserve category. We probably
14 ought to go back and take another look at our --

15 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yeah. We'll go back and
16 take a quick look. We're going to put Dr. Mina's in
17 reserve.

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: In reserve.

19 DR. GENEL: -- as a reserve.

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: Next is 21, Tian Xu, 2.0,
21 that's Goldhamer and Pescatello.

22 DR. GOLDHAMER: This is a grant I would
23 like to put into the yes category. This was the grant
24 where they used piggyBac transposons to do a genetic

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 screen for mutations in ES cells that are important for
2 growth control. I thought it was highly innovative. The
3 reviews were very positive with not any criticisms that I
4 could remember and I thought it really stood out as an
5 innovative grant. So I thought it was very competitive.

6 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Second reviewer?

7 DR. PESCATELLO: Yeah, I agree. Something
8 came out in our discussion, we agreed, but there was
9 somebody in the larger group who had some reservations.
10 I don't remember who it was.

11 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Alright. We're
12 talking about YALE21?

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Dr. Xu's grant?
15 Okay. Do we have a consensus that we want to move this
16 from maybe to yes?

17 DR. PESCATELLO: And if anyone wants more
18 information --

19 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Are we okay?

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: This is moving to yes.

21 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay.

22 MS. TOWNSHEND: The next one is 22, Wang
23 Min, 1.6, Nair, I apologize, and Goldhamer.

24 DR. NAIR: This is the one that had the

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 difference of agreement of reviewers and they were
2 starkly different, their opinions were night and day. I
3 thought it was actually -- I actually liked the project.

4 I thought it was -- I thought the science behind it was
5 good. I thought the proposal was good. I thought -- I
6 actually agreed with the first reviewer more than I did
7 with the second reviewer who sort of panned it.

8 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: David, do you have a
9 comment?

10 DR. GOLDHAMER: Well, I agreed with the
11 second reviewer more than the first reviewer.

12 (Laughter)

13 DR. GOLDHAMER: I think it's a really
14 interesting and important area. I just didn't think the
15 science was that well done or very well developed. I
16 just was not satisfied with how it was presented. I
17 didn't leave with a lot of confidence on this grant.

18 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Any further discussion
19 on this?

20 DR. GOLDHAMER: And I will say, this is
21 one of the -- this is one of the grants where the score
22 is completely out of line with the review, with the
23 second review. The first reviewer liked it, the second
24 reviewer it read to me like a 3.0 or --

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 DR. NAIR: Right. This is true.

2 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: We need to talk about
3 that sometime. Maybe ask our reviewers, is it yes, no or
4 maybe rather than these scores. I think the scores are
5 sometimes --

6 DR. NAIR: Well, maybe this -- I think
7 there be a third reviewer because, you know, they're so
8 starkly different the two reviews that -- before it came
9 to us.

10 DR. GOLDHAMER: Well, I mean, I'm fine --
11 I'm fine with the scoring system. I think it's the job
12 of the Committee to bring the reviews more in line with
13 each other and find some average consensus in terms of
14 score and try to get the narratives to agree a little bit
15 more through discussion and negotiation.

16 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Got it. We'll make you
17 a committee to study that David. You'll be sorry you
18 brought the topic up. A committee of one.

19 (Laughter)

20 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Now I think we're -- we
21 are in agreement to give this grant a no, this is YALE22,
22 Dr. Min's grant, are we agreed?

23 VOICE: Yes.

24 VOICE: Move to no.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Move it to no. Okay.

2 MS. TOWNSHEND: And the last one in this
3 category to the best of my knowledge is 25, Craig Nelson,
4 2.2, Landwirth and Kiessling.

5 DR. KIESSLING: This is the application
6 that we talked about that is highly technical. Dr.
7 Nelson -- this is a combination of developmental biology
8 and stem cell biology. He's going to do lots of gene
9 array analyses. I think a good place -- and my big
10 concern with this grant is that he doesn't tell us what
11 kind of cells he's going to use. He, himself, doesn't
12 have a fire in his belly. He doesn't publish very much,
13 he doesn't get very much done. But this would do a lot
14 for the -- in combination with what's going on in the
15 core would do a lot for the University of Connecticut. I
16 think this goes in the backup pile. I think that if
17 there's any money ever leftover this should be funded,
18 but I don't know that this should, I don't think this
19 should go in a yes.

20 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Do we have general
21 agreement to put it in the backup?

22 DR. KIESSLING: This got -- the reviewers
23 really liked this. They had the same kinds of problems I
24 did. It's so technical it's a little bit difficult to

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 follow. You kind of have to believe that this guy can do
2 this, but he does these kinds of very technical things
3 all the time.

4 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Bob, did you have
5 a comment on that?

6 MR. MANDELKERN: No. Just that he has
7 grants from us.

8 DR. KIESSLING: He has a seed grant.

9 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes, I know, a seed
10 grant.

11 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Now is he going
12 to be number one or number two if we -- if somebody drops
13 out?

14 DR. KIESSLING: Number two.

15 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Number two. Everybody
16 agree with that? So we're moving Dr. Nelson's grant over
17 to the reserve and he will be second in line should there
18 be funding available. Dr. Mina gets the first.

19 DR. KIESSLING: This is the only funding
20 in his lab I believe. This would be it. He's got a seed
21 grant and he would have these funds if it works out.

22 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Well, we had \$900,000
23 become available this year so it could happen again.

24 MR. MANDELKERN: Dr. Galvin?

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yes?

2 MR. MANDELKERN: Are we going to put any
3 seeds in reserve?

4 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: I don't think -- I think
5 we should but we haven't got there yet.

6 MR. MANDELKERN: Okay.

7 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Now let's see where we
8 are. We have 12 seeds for \$2.4 million. We have how
9 many established?

10 MR. WAGNER: 11.

11 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: 11 established grants,
12 \$500,000 each. So that's --

13 DR. NAIR: 5.5.

14 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: -- 5.5

15 MR. MANDELKERN: Seven-nine.

16 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Seven-nine.

17 MR. MANDELKERN: And we have the core that
18 we --

19 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. We have a couple
20 of other things to discuss and then we need to go back
21 and put a couple of backup grants should somebody drop
22 out of the new investigator. Okay.

23 MR. WAGNER: Are we going to discuss the
24 one that was the group grant we put into yes and we were

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 going to discuss it? I don't know if we just want to
2 keep it as a yes?

3 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Well, we have 7.4
4 obligated?

5 DR. NAIR: 7.9.

6 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: 7.9. So we have about
7 \$2,000,000 because we have to take a little bit off the
8 top for that.

9 MR. MANDELKERN: 2,000,000.

10 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yeah, about 2,000,000
11 for the core and Dr. O'Neill's grant.

12 DR. GENEL: Are we going to discuss what
13 Steve brought up about the four and three year funding
14 cycles for the established investigators? I could see
15 how we might free up some money by giving everybody three
16 years.

17 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: I think we've done that
18 in the past. I think we need to come to some conclusions
19 about what kind of money we want to free up.

20 DR. GENEL: Either way.

21 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yeah.

22 DR. WALLACK: Can we -- I wasn't part of
23 the investigator -- one of the people on the grant, but
24 is there a way of cutting that significantly and still

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 give them the ability to start their project?

2 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Which one are you
3 talking about Milt?

4 DR. WALLACK: On 04 of the groups. That's
5 O'Neill.

6 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: O'Neill. Yeah.

7 DR. WALLACK: I mean, that was the one
8 that came in at 1.78 I think --

9 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: .86.

10 DR. WALLACK: -- eight-six, and we -- the
11 original conversation was that we would look to
12 significantly cut that one. Can we talk about that now
13 and what the -- Ann, were you on that grant?

14 DR. KIESSLING: No.

15 DR. WALLACK: Who was on that grant?

16 DR. FISHBONE: I was.

17 DR. WALLACK: Gerry? So is there a way, I
18 mean, is there a sense of --

19 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Well, I think we need a
20 working hypothesis about we have two -- two and a half
21 million and a 1.8 million and we don't have enough money
22 to fund them both completely, so what are we going to do?

23 DR. PESCATELLO: I would advocate for
24 putting the remaining 1.8 in the core UConn grant.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 MR. MANDELKERN: I would like --

2 DR. PESCATELLO: I would be putting -- I
3 would advocate putting the remaining 1.8 million in the
4 core UConn grant not to any of the group.

5 DR. WALLACK: I would second that Paul.

6 DR. GOLDHAMER: Can I make a comment?

7 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Sure.

8 DR. GOLDHAMER: I can't comment
9 specifically on that group grant being from UConn, but I
10 think it should be judged relative to the other grants.
11 We should carve in stone funding of the first two groups
12 and say if there's money left over we'll fund this. It
13 should be compared, the relative merits with the other
14 grants. If we had started with the group grants that
15 would have been in and then the seed grants we would have
16 been looking for leftover money. So I think we should
17 really look at that.

18 DR. PESCATELLO: But the score on the core
19 is so much better than the group -- than the --

20 DR. GOLDHAMER: I'm not arguing the
21 relative merits of that grant. I can't. I'm not
22 allowed. But I'm just saying it should be compared to
23 the other grants that we've said yes to. It's in the yes
24 category. We should decide whether it has merit relative

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 to other grants or there's significant concerns and it
2 shouldn't. But I don't like the idea of, you know, if
3 there's leftover money funding it to some extent. I
4 think it should be on the same playing field as the other
5 grants.

6 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Well, that's certainly a
7 good comment, but you've got to start someplace. You can
8 start at the back and work to the front or start at the
9 middle and work to either end. Yes Dr. Canalis?

10 DR. CANALIS: Maybe I would rephrase this
11 where I have difficulties is to move maybes into the yes
12 category and then lead to a situation where one would
13 preclude to fund a yes. You know, that becomes a little
14 bit arbitrary in my view. I am in conflict. I'm not
15 talking specifically about this grant, it's a UConn
16 grant, but you know, we started to move maybes into yes's
17 and that has displaced funds. So maybe we shouldn't have
18 done that because the money was not there to do that.

19 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Yes Bob?

20 VOICE: Good point.

21 MR. MANDELKERN: I would say that the
22 Committee has in mind always, and I do, the total concept
23 of what's renewing grants, seeds, established, group and
24 core and it's not a question of starting and allocating

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 to one and having nothing left at the end. Because the
2 seeds were very important and they stood out and the one
3 group that we reached for didn't have unanimity in my
4 opinion. It was very ambiguous. There were conflicting
5 dollar amounts and they were well funded already by this
6 Committee. So I think Dr. Pescatello's suggestion to
7 give the impetus to the UConn core, which has been so
8 productive and given us lines that has the future, which
9 would give them 2,000,000 approximately, or 1.9, and I
10 think that would be a remarkable day's work
11 constructively considering every grant on it's merits.

12 DR. GOLDHAMER: Well, I'm just raising a
13 procedural question and do we go back and revisit other
14 grants? If the -- if you would rate the group grant
15 lower than all other funded grants then the decision
16 should stay. But is there, you know, but that's -- we're
17 not approaching this in a way to ask that question.

18 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: But you can't compare
19 them because they're apples and pomegranates. But we
20 have agreed that we're going to fund the O'Neill grant
21 and unless you want to turn around and say we're going to
22 move it back from a yes to a no, which we've never done.

23 And so now I think we're at the point where, you know,
24 we're at the checkout counter and we've got too much

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 stuff in the basket and so something's got to go back or
2 something's got to change. And we could change it by
3 giving 1.9 to Dr. Xu and go back and taking 10 percent
4 off everybody else's grant. We've done that before.
5 There's a lot of different ways we can do this, but we
6 always end up with more things we'd like to pay for then
7 we've got money to pay for.

8 DR. WALLACK: Bob, can I make a
9 suggestion?

10 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yep.

11 DR. WALLACK: If we go back to the P.R.'s
12 comments on the O'Neill grant proposal, they talk about
13 they would be more positive if the total request was
14 \$1,000,000.

15 DR. FISHBONE: Within 1,000,000.

16 DR. WALLACK: Is within 1,000,000, right,
17 within 1,000,000. Can I propose maybe that we look at
18 this grant as a -- as a senior investigator grant and
19 that we consider the possibility of funding this for
20 \$500,000 and maybe looking at doing that for either a two
21 or three year period so that --

22 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: You can't change that.

23 DR. WALLACK: -- you can't -- well, I can
24 change the amount, right?

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Well, we can fund it,
2 not fund it, or fund it for what they ask for or
3 something less than they ask.

4 DR. WALLACK: Okay.

5 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: But we've agreed to fund
6 it.

7 DR. WALLACK. Alright. So let me make a
8 suggestion that we fund this one for \$500,000.

9 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Steve, I think
10 you had a suggestion?

11 DR. LATHAM: I was going to second Paul's
12 suggestion. First, my memory of how the O'Neill grant
13 got into the yes column was that we were all talking
14 about how much money it should get and the idea that we
15 come back to it and cut it a lot later and it kind of got
16 stuck in a yes in a way that other things hadn't gotten
17 stuck in the yes. And as I was going through and
18 thinking about things to move from maybe to yes I
19 actually had in mind that we were chopping away from that
20 grant. I was actually foreseeing that we'd be in the
21 situation that we're in now so I'm not worried about the
22 procedural aspects of it.

23 And I think that the core's rating is so
24 much higher and it's track record is so much better that

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 I -- we're already in a situation where we're cutting the
2 core budget from what they asked for and it was at my
3 request the first thing that we considered. I like
4 Paul's solution best of all, which is that we drop the
5 group grant entirely and put all the remaining funds in
6 the core at UConn.

7 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. There's a couple
8 of suggestions on the floor. Dr. Milt's suggestion is to
9 fund it to \$500,000. Steve's suggestion is to drop it
10 completely. I think we all agree that Dr. Xu's grant is
11 -- has the best rating I believe of any grant on the
12 books today and that there seems to be consensus we
13 should fund that fairly liberally but there's some
14 suggestions on the floor and I think that Dr. Nair had
15 another suggestion.

16 DR. NAIR: I was one of the reviewers on
17 it and the third reviewer clearly had a mistake in the
18 calculation. So when -- because our third reviewer
19 actually brought the amount down to less than 1,000,000
20 from an amount of 3,000,000, which was actually incorrect
21 because it was 1.866.

22 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay.

23 DR. NAIR: So just to clarify that point.
24 So, you know, Dr. Wallack's suggestion that \$500,000 be

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 even consideration that should be considered, but I do
2 agree with Dr. Latham that of all the grants the best
3 score was actually the core grant, which was 1.3. So I
4 think that is the one that really should get the amount
5 of money or at least close to the amount that they ask.

6 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Now does the group want,
7 you know, we're talking about two things at the same
8 time, two different grants. Do we want to consider -- my
9 suggestion would be that we consider what we want to do
10 with Dr. Xu's grant and then make a decision about the
11 O'Neill grant.

12 DR. SEEMANN: One other piece of evidence
13 here. In the O'Neill review, the secondary review, just
14 to bring them together it says, according to the letter
15 of support in the O'Neill grant there is some general
16 overlap with the aims of Dr. Xu, the core grant, in
17 assessing gene expression patterns, etcetera, etcetera.
18 So in a sense by supporting that core grant you could
19 argue that you are providing reasonable support, some
20 degree of support for the other one.

21 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yep.

22 DR. WALLACK: So with what Jeff said and
23 what Steve said if we can meld a thought together perhaps
24 and that is this, that if we figure on what looks like

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 approximately 1.4 or 5,000,000 for the core, if we were
2 to give 500,000 to the -- to the O'Neill grant and if we
3 were to free up dollars to do that we have 11 established
4 investigators. We've looked at this kind of an approach
5 in the past. If we took, forgive me David, I heard very
6 well what you said, but if we look at taking \$50,000 from
7 each of those 11 that would give us \$550,000. That would
8 basically cover -- that would basically cover the
9 Graveley/O'Neill grant and still give Paul's thought that
10 you failed to put all the rest Paul into the Xu core
11 grant. It would not diminish any amount at all from Xu.
12 As a matter of fact, you can take the other 50,000 that
13 would be left and add it to the Xu also.

14 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Can't we just look at Xu
15 thing first? It doesn't make any sense to me to do this.

16 DR. WALLACK: So you want --

17 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: What do you want to do
18 about Dr. Xu's grant?

19 DR. WALLACK: -- so why don't we look at
20 possibly putting 1.5 million, Paul that would be what
21 you'd be left with, 1.5 million to Ren-He, right?

22 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: We have -- when we
23 subtract the first two categories what's the total,
24 seven-four?

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 MR. MANDELKERN: Seven-nine in the first
2 three categories.

3 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Seven-nine. We have
4 seven-nine, that should leave us two-million-one, minus
5 say 200,000. So you have 1.9 million left.

6 DR. WALLACK: Right.

7 DR. LATHAM: Milt, all --

8 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Hang on. Hang on.

9 DR. LATHAM: -- all but one of the
10 established investigator grants are higher ranked than
11 the group grant. There's one that has the same peer
12 review ranking. Ren-He's ranking is substantially higher
13 than the group grant. I don't see cutting \$1,000,000 out
14 a two-and-a-half million dollar proposal for the core
15 when it's so much better ranked than all the others and
16 taking bits of money away from all these investigators
17 who have \$500,000 spread over four years to fund a group
18 project that is lower ranked than all of them.

19 DR. PESCATELLO: I agree completely.

20 VOICE: Forget the O'Neill.

21 DR. LATHAM: Forget the O'Neill.

22 DR. KIESSLING: Let me actually make a
23 couple of comments about the core. This -- I think this
24 is four two years, right? 2.5 million for two years?

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 I'm looking at the budget and it's so complicated because
2 there's so many people involved, but it's for two years,
3 is that right Anne? And the other thing is that the part
4 of this core that I -- it's for three years. The part of
5 this core that I think we can justifiably minimize is
6 they want to set up a core for induced pluripotent stem
7 cell derivation. This is going to replace -- there's two
8 reasons that I think that the budget for this is over
9 extended. One of the people that they're going to derive
10 iPS cells for is the grant that we just funded, is Stormy
11 Chamberlain's grant. They're going to -- the core is
12 down here for deriving those iPS cells from Angelman's
13 Syndrome.

14 So there's a lot of overlap between what
15 the core wants to do for this iPS cells. Now the iPS
16 cells are largely going to be derived at independent
17 investigator's grants and it's going to replace some of
18 these efforts. I mean, if you'll remember, Yale actually
19 came back to us and asked to rebudget their funds because
20 they wanted to divert some funds from ES cell derivation
21 to iPS cell to help investigate it.

22 So I think that this core will do just
23 fine. It spent a lot of money on equipment in the first
24 year. They've got a lot of good people there and I think

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 this core will function just really well at 2,000,000.

2 DR. PESCATELLO: That's what we'd have to
3 do anyway.

4 DR. KIESSLING: Yeah.

5 DR. PESCATELLO: We're already reducing --

6 DR. KIESSLING: But I don't think if we
7 take it down to 1.5 million that we're going to have to
8 tell them that they can come back in two years.

9 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. We don't have
10 2,000,000 to give them.

11 DR. KIESSLING: Well, 1.9. But anyway,
12 that works. So if you want to take it below that then I
13 think we're going to have to have it only be a two year
14 award instead of a three year award.

15 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Bear in mind
16 there may not be an allocation next year. That could
17 happen with the severe budget shortfalls. Yes Bob?

18 MR. MANDELKERN: I would like to support
19 Paul's statement backed up by Steve and I guess by Ann
20 now. The core has been the most productive grant in
21 terms of public result that we have funded since we've
22 been established. Connecticut One and Connecticut Two
23 stem cell lines got headlines in every paper in
24 Connecticut from Hartford to New Haven and elsewhere. I

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 think we should give them the potential we can at 1.9,
2 which keeps them moving forward and on an equal basis
3 with the other core in our state, which we funded also
4 last year with this extension also cutting down on a
5 request from 2.5.

6 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Are we ready to make a
7 decision about Dr. Xu's core?

8 DR. WALLACK: Yep.

9 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. And the decision
10 is to give Dr. Xu the remainder -- the \$1.9 million,
11 which is what remains minus a couple of hundred grand for
12 my poor State employees to function. And so if we have
13 consensus at the table we will -- that is what we will
14 do. Do we have consensus? Do we need a vote?

15 MR. SALTON: If you're going to -- if this
16 is the final funding decision you should have a vote. If
17 you still want to go back and see whether for example the
18 O'Neill project goes out and then you have -- and that
19 gets voted no let's say, then you may want -- you may
20 have enough money to fund this fully. So I don't, you
21 know --

22 VOICE; No, we don't.

23 DR. NAIR: We don't.

24 MR. SALTON: -- okay. Then it's a vote.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 DR. NAIR: Then it's a vote.

2 VOICE: Call the question of the Xu grant.

3 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Can I make --
4 okay. All in favor of funding Dr. Xu for \$1.9 million,
5 which is what remains, minus the operating funds --

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: Do we need a roll call
7 vote on this?

8 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: -- roll call vote.
9 Okay.

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: And that's anyone except
11 the people who cannot vote for UConn obviously. So the
12 question on the table is yes to fund at 1.9 million.

13 DR. GENEL: Mr. Chair?

14 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yes?

15 DR. GENEL: My numbers don't add up
16 because my numbers would be 2.1 for the core grant minus
17 --

18 MR. MANDELKERN: No.

19 DR. GENEL: -- that would be 1.9. We
20 funded 12 -- 12 --

21 MR. MANDELKERN: Seeds and --

22 DR. GENEL: -- 12 seeds, that's 2.4 and we
23 funded 11 --

24 MR. MANDELKERN: -- at five-five.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 DR. GENEL: -- five-five. That adds up to
2 7.9.

3 MR. MANDELKERN: Seven-nine.

4 DR. GENEL: That's 7.9.

5 MR. MANDELKERN: And seven-nine and one-
6 nine is nine-eight, leaving 200,000 for the worthwhile
7 administration that we get beautifully.

8 DR. GENEL: So it isn't 1.9 minus, it's
9 1.9?

10 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: 2.1 minus our expenses.

11 DR. GENEL: It's 2.1 minus --

12 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Minus our expenses, yep.

13 DR. GENEL: -- okay.

14 MS. TOWNSHEND: The question on the table
15 is --

16 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: And just so all of you
17 know we have three people who work basically fulltime on
18 this and Lynn works probably 40 percent of her time and
19 so for 200,000 bucks it's a good deal. Okay. Call the
20 roll now.

21 MS. TOWNSHEND: -- the question on the
22 table if you are voting yes you are voting in favor of
23 \$1.9 million going towards SCDUCHC01, which is the Ren-He
24 Xu core facility, peer review scored at 1.3. If you are

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 voting no you are opposing that \$1.9 million. Arinzeh?
2 DR. ARINZEH: Yes.
3 MS. TOWNSHEND: Seemann?
4 DR. SEEMANN: Yes.
5 MS. TOWNSHEND: Kiessling?
6 DR. KIESSLING: Yes.
7 MS. TOWNSHEND: Fishbone?
8 DR. FISHBONE: Yes.
9 MS. TOWNSHEND: Genel?
10 DR. GENEL: Yes.
11 MS. TOWNSHEND: Landwirth?
12 DR. LANDWIRTH: Yes.
13 MS. TOWNSHEND: Latham?
14 DR. LATHAM: Yes.
15 MS. TOWNSHEND: Mandelkern?
16 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes.
17 MS. TOWNSHEND: Wallack?
18 DR. WALLACK: Yes.
19 MS. TOWNSHEND: Pescatello?
20 DR. PESCATELLO: Yes.
21 MS. TOWNSHEND: Nair?
22 DR. NAIR: Yes.
23 MS. TOWNSHEND: 11 to zero in favor of
24 \$1.9 million going to this grant.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Now the next
2 question is what do you want to do about the O'Neill
3 grant?

4 DR. KIESSLING: Encourage them to apply
5 next year.

6 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Now the O'Neill grant
7 has been approved so in order to -- we can either fund it
8 by taking something away from something else, like Nikita
9 Khrushchev (phonetic) used to do, or we can change it
10 back to a no.

11 DR. LATHAM: I'd like to move that we
12 change it to a no.

13 DR. KIESSLING: Or could we put it in the
14 maybes? Could we put it in the -- if there's funds? No,
15 it's too much money.

16 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: There's no one else in
17 the category, so I think if we move it from where it is
18 it becomes a no.

19 DR. NAIR: I would move it to a no
20 category. I was one of the reviewers, so I would move it
21 to a no category at this point.

22 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. It's been -- I
23 need a second.

24 DR. LANDWIRTH: Second.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Now we're having
2 a vote to take the O'Neill grant UC -- UCONN04?
3 MS. TOWNSHEND: SCCUCONN04.
4 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: 04 that is going to
5 become a no grant and of course not funded?
6 MS. TOWNSHEND: Do you want a roll call
7 for that?
8 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yes.
9 MS. TOWNSHEND: Alright. Yes moves it to
10 no. So if somebody is voting yes they are moving it.
11 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. And these cannot
12 be UConn voters.
13 MS. TOWNSHEND: Right. Arinzeh?
14 DR. ARINZEH: No. No to not fund.
15 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay.
16 MS. TOWNSHEND: No to not fund. Okay.
17 Seemann?
18 DR. SEEMANN: No.
19 MS. TOWNSHEND: Kiessling?
20 DR. KIESSLING: Do not fund.
21 MS. TOWNSHEND: Fishbone?
22 DR. FISHBONE: Abstain.
23 MS. TOWNSHEND: Genel?
24 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Mike?

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 DR. GENEL: Yes.
2 DR. SEEMANN: Yes.
3 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yes to fund?
4 DR. GENEL: Oh, no.
5 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yes, move it to no.
6 MS. TOWNSHEND: Landwirth?
7 DR. LANDWIRTH: No.
8 MS. TOWNSHEND: Latham?
9 DR. LATHAM: No.
10 MS. TOWNSHEND: Mandelkern?
11 MR. MANDELKERN: Not fund.
12 MS. TOWNSHEND: Wallack?
13 DR. WALLACK: No.
14 MS. TOWNSHEND: Pescatello?
15 DR. PESCATELLO: No.
16 MS. TOWNSHEND: Nair?
17 DR. NAIR: No.
18 MS. TOWNSHEND: 10 no do not fund, one
19 abstention.
20 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. Now we have to go
21 back and vote on each individual one.
22 MS. TOWNSHEND: That is correct.
23 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay? We need two seeds
24 for reserve too.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 DR. KIESSLING: No, we need two
2 established --

3 MR. MANDELKERN: Yeah, two established.

4 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Two -- oh.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: We have two established
6 already.

7 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: We have two established.
8 We need --

9 MS. TOWNSHEND: Two seeds.

10 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: -- two seeds. So Mina
11 Mina and Craig Nelson are the two established.

12 MR. WAGNER: The last three didn't get
13 moved from a maybe were 17 was the malaria, 27 was
14 something with the scores, and 31 the Richard Flavell
15 issue.

16 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay.

17 MR. WAGNER: Those were the last three
18 out. I don't know if you want to use those three.

19 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: So we need to exclude
20 one of those three from the wait list.

21 MR. MANDELKERN: Which of the three?

22 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: One is the malaria
23 grant, one is --

24 MR. WAGNER: 17 is the malaria. 27 there

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 was an issue with the scores not matching.

2 DR. SEEMANN: I think we -- I thought we
3 agreed that the malaria moved to no. It was not on the
4 hold list, but it was no based on scientific research.

5 MR. MANDELKERN: We're establishing the
6 hold list now.

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: We're looking at a couple
8 of -- I think the group is considering seed grants that
9 could be put in reserve in the event that any of these
10 contracts don't go through.

11 MR. MANDELKERN: Okay.

12 DR. SEEMANN: I understand. I guess I
13 would say I would not recommend that. I would recommend
14 the Flavell grant because you know you've got something
15 high quality there.

16 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay.

17 MS. TOWNSHEND: What number is that?

18 DR. SEEMANN: Regardless of dollars.

19 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Let's identify that.

20 MR. WAGNER: 31.

21 MS. TOWNSHEND: 31?

22 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: YALE31, Richard Flavell,
23 got a 1.8.

24 MR. MANDELKERN: I move that go into

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 reserve.

2 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. That will be
3 number one reserve. Do we have a second for that?

4 DR. WALLACK: Second.

5 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. All in favor of
6 moving the Flavell grant into reserve, the first reserve,
7 indicate by saying aye?

8 VOICES: Aye.

9 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Opposed? That's number
10 one. We need one more -- one more in reserve.

11 MR. MANDELKERN: I move that SCAYALE17,
12 Mamoun, be put into reserve.

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: Do we have a second?

14 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Do we have a second?
15 Motion fails, it doesn't get a second. Come up with
16 another one to be our second.

17 DR. WALLACK: Bob, was there any
18 consideration for 09?

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: That's one I had had
20 marked as reserve way back in the day.

21 DR. WALLACK: Right. So I would move that
22 we put that one in reserve.

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: 09, UCONN09.

24 DR. SEEMANN: Second.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 MS. TOWNSHEND: All in favor?

2 VOICES: Aye.

3 MS. TOWNSHEND: Opposed?

4 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Carried. Okay. Now
5 we've got to go back and vote individually on all these.

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: Now we're voting on the
7 yes's. These are roll call votes.

8 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: We voted on the reserves
9 so we're all set. We just have to go back and vote the
10 yes's individually.

11 MS. TOWNSHEND: Correct. So yes means you
12 are in favor of funding this grant. No means you are not
13 in favor of funding this grant. It's more for the record
14 than anything else. So we're starting with the seed
15 grant, which would be SCAUCONN02. Only people allowed to
16 vote on UConn, which would start with Arinzeh.

17 DR. ARINZEH: Yes.

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: Seemann?

19 DR. SEEMANN: Yes.

20 MS. TOWNSHEND: Kiessling?

21 DR. KIESSLING: Yes.

22 MS. TOWNSHEND: Fishbone?

23 DR. FISHBONE: Yes.

24 MS. TOWNSHEND: Genel?

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

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: Pescatello?

11 DR. PESCATELLO: Yes.

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: Nair?

13 DR. NAIR: Yes.

14 MS. TOWNSHEND: Motion carries. The next

15 one I have is 10, YALE10.

16 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Yeah, the only people on

17 the Yale -- the Yale folks can't vote on the UConn

18 grants, UConn folks can't vote on the Yale grants. You

19 all know who you are so if the votes are unanimous it'll

20 be the same people each time and you won't have to call

21 the roll each time.

22 MS. TOWNSHEND: How about if I just call

23 the grant?

24 DR. NAIR: Call the grant.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 VOICE: Why don't you just call and ask
2 for a no?

3 MS. TOWNSHEND: Okay. Alright. The next
4 one I have is SCAYALE10. Anyone opposed to funding this?
5 This grant is funded. SCAYALE11, anyone opposed to
6 funding this? This grant is funded. SCAYALE12, anyone
7 opposed to funding this? This grant is funded.
8 SCAUCHC13, anyone opposed to funding this? This grant is
9 funded. SCAUCHC14, anyone opposed to funding this? This
10 grant is funded. SCAUCHC16, anyone opposed to funding
11 this?

12 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes. I vote no.

13 MS. TOWNSHEND: Anyone else? Motion
14 carries, this grant is funded. The next one I have is
15 30? Marianne, 30? SCAYALE No. 30, anyone opposed to
16 funding this? This grant is funded. SCAUCHC34, anyone
17 opposed to funding this? This grant is funded.

18 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Excuse me. Hey Milt?

19 DR. WALLACK: I'm right here.

20 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: I think anybody who is
21 going to stay overnight tonight the hotel room is already
22 obligated, so I think we in good faith if somebody had
23 planned to stay over tonight, I think you might have,
24 then go ahead because we'll pay for the hotel room

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 anyway. So if you want to stay, stay. And for any of
2 our out-of-town visitors who would like to kick off their
3 shoes and relax, well, the room is being paid for and
4 then we'll figure out something maybe to do with the food
5 tomorrow and maybe we'll have --

6 MS. TOWNSHEND: A picnic.

7 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: -- a picnic downtown in
8 the park.

9 MS. TOWNSHEND: Alright. We're at
10 SCAYALE35, anyone opposed to funding this? This grant is
11 funded. SCAYALE39, anyone opposed to funding this? This
12 grant is funded. And this is the last of the seed which
13 would be SCAYALE45, anyone opposed to funding this? This
14 grant is funded. This application is funded.

15 UCBUCHC01, anyone opposed to funding this?
16 This grant is funded. Six?

17 MS. HORN: Six.

18 MS. TOWNSHEND: SCBYALE06, anyone opposed
19 to funding this? This grant is funded.

20 MR. MANDELKERN: That's the best score --

21 MS. TOWNSHEND: SCBUCHC09, anyone opposed
22 to funding this? This grant is funded. SCBYALE13,
23 anyone opposed to funding this? This grant is funded.
24 UCBYALE14, anyone opposed to funding this? It is funded.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 SCBUCHC16, anyone opposed to funding this? The grant is
2 funded.

3 MR. MANDELKERN: -- what was that number?
4 Repeat that last one?

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: 16 is a no?
6 MR. MANDELKERN: 16 is a no. 17 is a yes.
7 MS. TOWNSHEND: My apologies.
8 DR. LATHAM: Go back and ask about 16
9 again.

10 MS. TOWNSHEND: UCHC16?
11 VOICES: No.
12 MR. MANDELKERN: No funding.
13 MS. TOWNSHEND: No funding. Thank you.
14 SCBUCHC17, anyone opposed to funding this? It is funded.
15 The next one I have is 20?

16 MS. HORN: 18.
17 MS. TOWNSHEND: 18?
18 MR. MANDELKERN: 18, UCONN18.
19 MS. TOWNSHEND: UC -- SCBUCONN18, anyone
20 opposed to funding this? It is funded. 20?
21 MR. MANDELKERN: 20.
22 MS. TOWNSHEND: SCBUCHC20, anyone opposed
23 to funding this? It is funded. SCBYALE21, anyone
24 opposed to funding this? It is funded. SCB -- SCB --

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 wait a minute, what do you have?

2 MS. HORN: Wesleyan.

3 MR. MANDELKERN: Wesleyan.

4 MS. TOWNSHEND: Thank you Marianne.

5 Wesleyan 26, anyone opposed to funding this? It is
6 funded. SCBYALE27, anyone opposed to funding this? It
7 is funded. And the other one we've already voted on,
8 have we not? It's already been voted on by roll call.

9 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. I would ask --
10 I'm going to ask Warren and my step-cell crew to do a
11 disc for you guys and a CD and send it out with the
12 results of maybe what was funded so you all have the
13 final results and perhaps a one sentence description of
14 the grant. And I thought it might be worthwhile to put
15 contact information on the Committee members because some
16 of you who are relatively new or have been here for a
17 while may want to contact some of the other Committee
18 members. So we'll get up to date information so you'll
19 all have that.

20 And unless there is anything else for the
21 general good of the order --

22 MS. TOWNSHEND: Public comment.

23 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: -- oh, do we have any
24 public comment? Okay.

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 DR. LATHAM: Do we need to vote on the --

2 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay. We're going to do
3 some addition and subtraction, give us another five
4 minutes.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: I'm sorry. Steve?

6 DR. LATHAM: -- do we need to vote on the
7 ones that are in reserve?

8 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: We already did.

9 MS. TOWNSHEND: We did.

10 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: We voted to put them in
11 reserve.

12 MS. TOWNSHEND: It was a consensus.

13 DR. LATHAM: Okay. So we don't need roll
14 call if they actually are going to go under contract?

15 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: That comes later.

16 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yeah, that's another
17 meeting.

18 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Okay.

19 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yeah, just everybody stick
20 around.

21 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: Stick around for about
22 five minutes while Dan adds things up.

23 MS. TOWNSHEND: While Dan's adding this up
24 I'm going to ask of the people who do have reservations

RE: CT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 31, 2009

1 this evening how many are going to be staying? You
2 aren't going to stay?

3 DR. NAIR: I'm not going to stay because I
4 have another 8:00 o'clock meeting tomorrow morning.

5 MS. TOWNSHEND: Okay.

6 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: That's fine.

7 COURT REPORTER: Do you want to stay on
8 the record for this?

9 MS. TOWNSHEND: No, that's okay.

10 CHAIRMAN GALVIN: No.

11 (Whereupon, the hearing adjourned at 2:58
12 p.m.)