

VERBATIM PROCEEDINGS

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

PAUL PESCATELLO, CHAIRPERSON

JUNE 16, 2009

CONNECTICUT ECONOMIC RESOURCE CENTER  
805 BROOK STREET  
ROCKY HILL, CONNECTICUT 06067

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

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 . . .Verbatim Proceedings of a meeting of  
2 the Connecticut Stem Cell Research Advisory Committee  
3 held on June 16, 2009 at 1:06 p.m. at the Connecticut  
4 Economic Resource Center, 805 Brook Street, Rocky Hill,  
5 Connecticut. . .

6  
7  
8  
9 CHAIRMAN PAUL PESCATELLO: Shall we call  
10 the meeting to order and I think Warren wants to make  
11 some comments about some resignations to the Stem Cell  
12 Research Advisory Committee.

13 MR. WARREN WOLLSCHLAGER: Right. Well, I  
14 think the group knew about Warren, I'm not sure they knew  
15 about both of these. Julius Landwirth, Dr. Landwirth has  
16 -- one of the original members of this body, did a great  
17 job, has been with us for three plus years now, he's had  
18 to resign for a number of reasons involving his current  
19 schedule. His resignation letter was actually effective  
20 a couple of weeks ago so he's off.

21 And in addition, Dr. Seeman, who has  
22 already been with us for a couple of months, out of the  
23 University -- the Dean from the University of Rhode  
24 Island, just accepted a position with Texas A&M as the

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 head of research out there. It's sort of like a position  
2 that UCONN had been talking about for a while there where  
3 they were talking about establishing a head of the  
4 research, and I guess it didn't go forward, so that  
5 appointment is effective the beginning of the fiscal  
6 year, July 1, so he has also tendered his resignation.  
7 So two big losses, Julius is a founding member and Dr.  
8 Seeman is a guy very competent, but also able to vote on  
9 any action in front of the group. He wasn't conflicted  
10 out of any of the actions. So I think that's a  
11 significant loss as well plus it cuts us out of the  
12 biotech sector from Rhode Island, which is, I think, a  
13 place we're trying to penetrate.

14 So on behalf of the Commissioner and the  
15 Department I would certainly want to thank both gentlemen  
16 for their service to the State of Connecticut and to this  
17 body.

18 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Who are the  
19 appointing authorities for those two positions?

20 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Dr. Landwirth is the  
21 Governor's office. And it's -- he's there as an ethicist  
22 director. And I believe it was -- I'm thinking it was --  
23 I'm not sure exactly who it was. I'll have to double  
24 check. It may have been McKinnely for Dr. Seeman,

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1       although I'm not -- and so we will be looking to replace  
2       both of those. If you have any suggestions, if you want  
3       to recruit folks to both of those positions. One was a  
4       researcher familiar with biotech research and the other  
5       is a bio-ethicist familiar with stem cell research.

6                   DR. MILT WALLACK: Warren, can we offer a  
7       suggestion of somebody who I know that Marianne and you  
8       have talked to before? And that's a friend of ours from  
9       New Jersey, he's a scientist, and he's very anxious to be  
10      part of this. He has family in Connecticut and he can  
11      vote on anything also.

12                   MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yes, that's a great  
13      idea. I mean his name has gone forward so we'll resubmit  
14      it.

15                   DR. WALLACK: Okay.

16                   MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: We want to try to catch  
17      them while they're going back into session. It's very  
18      difficult to get appointments when they're out of  
19      session.

20                   CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: So suggestions  
21      should go?

22                   MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: To the Department. I  
23      mean --

24                   CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: -- copying you?

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yes, whatever. I mean  
2 it can come to me or Marianne. And -- or folks can go --  
3 and it's also effective to go directly to the appointing  
4 authorities, that's the other way to go. I will get out  
5 an e-mail tomorrow about who the appointing authority was  
6 for Dr. Seeman. I'm sorry, I'm not positive about that.

7 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Okay, let's approve  
8 the minutes from the May meeting. Do I have a motion to  
9 approve? Everyone has got them and reviewed them. A  
10 motion to approve?

11 DR. GERRY FISHBONE: Well, there was one  
12 correction, which I had spoke to --

13 MR. DAN WAGNER: -- yes. On page two, in  
14 the second paragraph down starts Mr. Wagner, the numbers  
15 in the last sentence are just switched and we'll take  
16 care of that.

17 DR. WALLACK: One other thing, also there  
18 is references to the ISSCR on page two and page five.  
19 And I believe that the references referred really to  
20 IASCR, which is the Interstate Stem Cell Research group.

21 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Okay. So with those  
22 changes?

23 DR. WALLACK: I move it with those  
24 changes.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Okay. With those  
2 changes. Okay, all in favor?

3 ALL VOICES: Aye.

4 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: All opposed? The  
5 minutes are approved.

6 Moving onto to Items No. 3 and No. 4, a  
7 change in PI's. Dan, are you going to --

8 MR. WAGNER: -- sure.

9 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Talk about that.

10 MR. WAGNER: So the first one is the Yale  
11 2006, I believe, it was a hybrid grant with Dr. Synder,  
12 Mike Synder as the lead PI. The letter that was  
13 forwarded around the Committee stating that Dr. Synder is  
14 leaving his post at Yale and moving out west. So there --  
15 through discussion to who would take the lead that  
16 project has multiple pieces to it. I think there is six  
17 or seven different projects within that one grant. And  
18 one of the other project lead PI's, Dr. Zhong, is going  
19 to be the -- is going to step up and be the lead PI for  
20 the entire hybrid grant.

21 DR. ANNE KIESSLING: Hello, it's Anne  
22 Kiessling.

23 MS. MARIANNE HORN: Welcome Anne. We're  
24 just in the middle of the -- reviewing the Synder change

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 in PI request, No. 3 on the agenda.

2 MR. WAGNER: As Marianne pointed out  
3 before the meeting I did not forward along the CV of the  
4 researcher. They are included in the previous grant  
5 application and we funded him for the last two years. So  
6 I didn't -- he wasn't new to the whole ball of wax here.

7 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Good.

8 MR. BOB MANDELKERN: I have a comment of  
9 the Synder grant is one of the -- is the most significant  
10 hybrid group grant that we've made. And I don't mean to -  
11 - I know the problems we have with administration, but  
12 the letter was received May -- it's dated May 13th and  
13 the first advice that I was aware of it was yesterday.  
14 It seems to me that even with the administration problems  
15 something of this importance should be put forward the  
16 Committee not 24 hours before because it's a very  
17 significant part of the work that we've done. And I would  
18 hope that there is some way that we could get better  
19 notification on these things.

20 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Good point. So,  
21 Dan, do you want to talk about the --

22 DR. MYRON GENEL: -- just from a way of  
23 background, Dr. Synder was the 2008 -- 2007 Medal of  
24 Science winner in the State of Connecticut. And he will

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 be Chair of the Department of Genetics at Stanford. I  
2 have a release -- I have a release from Stanford that I  
3 can pass around and share with you. I think, obviously,  
4 to a good -- to some extent I think his attraction to  
5 Stanford may very well have been related to the stem cell  
6 work as well as his work in genomics.

7 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: So actually before  
8 we go on to UCONN should we vote on that to accept this  
9 change? Or is there any discussion, any more  
10 information?

11 DR. ERNIE CANALIS: Do we have the CV of  
12 this person? It would be the --

13 MR. WAGNER: -- I didn't forward it along,  
14 but he is a Co-IT, a Co-PI on this grant. So his CV was  
15 included in the original grant proposals and everything.

16 MS. ANNE HISKES: I would like to know a  
17 little bit about him besides -- I didn't see the original  
18 grant. What's his rank? How long has he been at Yale,  
19 roughly? How many publications?

20 DR. CANALIS: Sure. Can we pull that  
21 today? No?

22 MR. WAGNER: Not right now, no.

23 DR. CANALIS: Okay, I would have to  
24 abstain myself from voting. I mean I don't know the

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 person. I mean I don't know him.

2 MS. HORN: Do you have a sense of the  
3 urgency of a vote on this? That would give me some idea  
4 of what our options might be.

5 MR. WAGNER: I don't think our vote is  
6 going to stop Dr. Synder from leaving. So he is, as  
7 according to the letter, he is going to be involved with  
8 the projects as they go forward by teleconference. He  
9 still has post-doc's at Yale that he is charged with, I  
10 assume, and leading towards their graduation. And so I'm  
11 not sure what else -- I mean he -- they've gone along  
12 with -- you know, it was one of the three Co-PI's and I  
13 don't have an idea of why they were picked. If he had the  
14 most sonority, the least seniority, the less, you know,  
15 the least to do and he could take on these  
16 responsibilities. I don't have a sense for that.

17 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: So the plan is that  
18 they would end up with two PI's then?

19 MR. WAGNER: Well, they'd have one lead  
20 and then the other Lin-Weissman and Dr. Zhong would  
21 continue on with their work and pick up.

22 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Does this impact any  
23 continuation of funding or any action we need to take?

24 MR. WAGNER: Well, we'll talk on the

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 funding for the third year today. Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: So if we don't  
3 approve this and we approve the funding how does that  
4 affect that?

5 MS. HORN: I think they're separate  
6 decisions. One is that the change of PI. The other is  
7 the progress that they've made on their grant thus far  
8 technically and fiscally. They can -- we can have two  
9 different calls on that. Put this over. I know one of the  
10 considerations is that we have been thinking about  
11 putting some subcommittees together and not having to  
12 have monthly meetings. So that's the only consideration  
13 there. I don't know whether we could craft something  
14 there. The CV is provided to people. If there are  
15 concerns then it will be -- they can be expressed and we  
16 would put this on the agenda for the next scheduled  
17 meeting. They would just have to wait.

18 If that's the only concern about this  
19 change and when people look at the CV and they're  
20 comfortable with the change then this could be approved  
21 contingent on that -- the approval of the CV.

22 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Ernie.

23 DR. CANALIS: This is not a trivial  
24 change. I'm sure that when we decide on a grant the

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 investigator plays a significant role. And this is a  
2 fairly large grant. It's not a fellowship. It's a  
3 significant grant where, obviously, the PI -- you know,  
4 the track record of the PI had some bearing on the grant  
5 being funded. So I'm a little bit uncomfortable, you  
6 know, to make any decisions. We would want to have a PI  
7 that is of the same stature or has -- and is clearly  
8 capable of carrying out what Synder has done.

9 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Dr. Zhong has been  
10 part of this from the start. And Dr. Lin/Weissman have  
11 also been part of it. I mean we know them and --

12 DR. CANALIS: -- you see in the State of  
13 Connecticut, but if this were federal money it would be  
14 handled quite differently.

15 MS. HORN: I just offered that Paul Wilson  
16 from Yale has gone out to try to get the CV for us today.

17 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Okay.

18 MR. MANDELKERN: Paul?

19 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Yes.

20 MR. MANDELKERN: At Dr. Fishbone's urging  
21 I went in and looked up the progress report on the  
22 website and Dr. Zhong is very fully and actively involved  
23 in all of the research. He occurs quite frequently. So  
24 he's deeply involved in it. And I feel satisfied with

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 that and the recommendation of Dr. Synder.

2 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Okay. Well, let's  
3 table it for a moment at least and see if we can secure  
4 the CV and then move on. Let's talk about --

5 DR. FISHBONE: -- can I ask a question?

6 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Yes.

7 DR. FISHBONE: What are the options  
8 available to us? I mean if we decide he is not  
9 appropriate for a PI what about the various grants that  
10 are subdivisions of that that are going on by Sherman and  
11 by Lin and his own grant. Do we have any thoughts on  
12 that?

13 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: I think you'd probably  
14 have to yank them in. I mean you'd pull Yale in front of  
15 this body and try to reach an agreement as to an  
16 acceptable replacement PI. But I think it would hold up  
17 continuation funding for everybody.

18 DR. CANALIS: It's a single grant.

19 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: It's a single grant so  
20 we can't parse it out.

21 MR. MANDELKERN: Paul, I'm having  
22 difficulty hearing.

23 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Let's try to speak  
24 up louder so we can all hear.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 MR. WAGNER: We can move on to the second  
2 one. And this part of the 2006 group grant with Dr. Rowe.  
3 This is project No. 7 within that grant. And it's Dr.  
4 Kosher is going to be retiring, I believe, and taking  
5 over as the lead PI is the current Co-PI Dr. Eli and I  
6 believe that CV was attached to the e-mail. And we have  
7 it here. I think we have that one here if anybody needs  
8 that one.

9 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Is there any  
10 comments about the request?

11 DR. CANALIS: I'm in conflict.

12 DR. GENEL: Me too.

13 MS. HORN: That's why the people who are  
14 eligible to vote, who are not recused from the UCONN.

15 DR. FISHBONE: I reviewed all the sub  
16 things of the Rowe grant. This, apparently his grant has  
17 made very good progress. It's going on very well although  
18 there was some issues with Dr. Kosher himself, which I  
19 guess will no longer exist. But Dr. Rowe made comments in  
20 his administrative report that of the nine projects that  
21 were under him only one refused to be part of the group  
22 meetings and attend them. That was Dr. Kosher's group,  
23 which I think Dr. Rowe was not very happy about. But that  
24 should, obviously, not affect what happens in the future.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 And I think that his replacement sounds extremely well --  
2 extremely well, I can't think of the word, but very  
3 capable of handling the project.

4 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Any other comments?

5 MR. MANDELKERN: I have the vita here if  
6 anybody wants to see a copy of it.

7 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: I reviewed this  
8 project too. Who is the --

9 DR. KIESSLING: -- does somebody have her  
10 CV?

11 MR. WAGNER: Yes, we all received it,  
12 Anne, I think.

13 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Did you get a copy  
14 of the e-mail?

15 DR. KIESSLING: Can I find it in the e-  
16 mail?

17 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Yes. I think it was  
18 sent yesterday.

19 MR. WAGNER: Monday.

20 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Monday.

21 MR. STEVE LATHAM: From Chelsey and it's  
22 called -- sketch.

23 DR. FISHBONE: She appears to be very  
24 accomplished and was on all of the papers that Rowe

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 wrote. I mean that Kosher wrote and also on many that  
2 Rowe wrote. And I think she must have changed her name  
3 by marriage or divorce. She became --

4 DR. KIESSLING: -- I'm sorry, I don't have  
5 that.

6 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Can you try to send  
7 that now?

8 MS. CHELSEY SAVNECKY: I don't have it on  
9 my --

10 MR. LATHAM: -- I have Anne as the first  
11 addressee on the copy that I have, and it was sent  
12 Monday.

13 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Is there any way we  
14 can tell you? I have the CV in front of me.

15 DR. KIESSLING: I think most importantly  
16 I'd be interested in her publication records in this  
17 particular area of research.

18 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Steve, can you try  
19 to forward it on?

20 MR. LATHAM: I'm working on it. I'm about  
21 to forward it to you, Anne. Hang on.

22 DR. KIESSLING: Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: So let's table both  
24 of these.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 DR. GENEL: It looks like nine or ten  
2 papers.

3 MR. MANDELKERN: She has three pages of  
4 publication at least.

5 DR. FISHBONE: Anne, there are nine or ten  
6 papers on limb development in this same general area with  
7 Dr. Kosher and Dr. Rowe.

8 DR. KIESSLING: Okay. Is it the impression  
9 that she's probably doing most of this already anyway?

10 MR. MANDELKERN: She is.

11 DR. KIESSLING: That Dr. Kosher was not as  
12 involved as everybody had hoped?

13 MR. MANDELKERN: If you recall from the  
14 letter she was involved in the development of the project  
15 from the start. She has worked closely with Kosher in  
16 directing the project including experimental design, data  
17 analysis and interpretation. She has 20 years experience  
18 in investigating the regulation of skeletal development  
19 and cartilage differentiation. And she is imminently  
20 qualified to take over as principle on this one piece.

21 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Right, and there are  
22 four signatures for this letter of endorsement.

23 DR. GENEL: Anne, she is going to be the  
24 program director on a program project that looks like

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 it's funded through NICHD. It's a -- in it's ninth or  
2 tenth year.

3 MR. LATHAM: Anne, I forwarded the e-mail  
4 to you about a minute ago. You should be getting it in a  
5 second.

6 DR. KIESSLING: Yes, I have it now.

7 MR. LATHAM: Okay, it's the third  
8 attachment.

9 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Okay. So why don't  
10 we let you, Anne, look at that. We're also waiting for  
11 the CV, so let's move on. And let me ask -- so we're now  
12 going onto the annual reports.

13 MS. HORN: We can do that or we can move  
14 to the update on the 2009 contracts. This is an amended  
15 agenda item that might take a few minutes if Dan could --

16 MR. WAGNER: -- the 2009 contracts have  
17 been finished. Sent to all the schools. We have received  
18 all the contracts back and co-executed them from the  
19 health centers, from Yale, and we will be receiving the  
20 Storrs', two Storrs' contracts tomorrow via Fed X. The  
21 only one that I'm not a 100 percent sure on when we're  
22 going to get back is the Wesleyan grant. So this meeting  
23 with the approvals of the third year. I'll be requesting  
24 -- the monies for 2009 grants, the third year funding

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 from the 2006 grants tomorrow or Thursday. And then the  
2 money will be allocated out to the schools as soon as we  
3 get the money.

4 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Is there -- there is  
5 no action that we need to take. We've taken all that we  
6 need to do. You will make sure the dollars get out by  
7 June 30th.

8 MR. WAGNER: Right.

9 DR. WALLACK: Can we, though, as a  
10 Committee make a statement that we urge that all of this  
11 funding occur by June 30th? So that I understand that  
12 you guys want to have it happen, but I'm trying to be  
13 very, very positive in what I'm saying because it's  
14 extremely important under -- in the climate that we're in  
15 to make sure that we don't miss that June 30th date. So I  
16 would move, as a Committee member, that the funding for  
17 the continuation as well as the funding for the '09  
18 grants that we aim to get those out no later than June  
19 30th.

20 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Right. I would even  
21 go further, Milt, and say that if for -- if there is  
22 anything that comes up by some date, let's say like June  
23 24th, next Wednesday, that you call a special meeting of  
24 our Committee.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 DR. WALLACK: Right. That's fine. And if  
2 there is any problem with that then I would go along with  
3 that fully that they should get in touch with us and  
4 we'll respond immediately.

5 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Yes.

6 DR. WALLACK: So I move that as a motion.

7 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: All in favor?

8 MR. MANDELKERN: Well, I don't want to  
9 delay. I want it to move very quickly also. But we have  
10 had in the past questions about escrow approval. Are all  
11 these escrow approvals in order?

12 MR. WAGNER: There are two outstanding  
13 grants from the UCONN system that is awaiting RIB  
14 approval, which then will get the escrow approval, which  
15 then will allow us to send contracts out.

16 DR. WALLACK: So to pick up on then I  
17 would -- as part of this motion I would urge that  
18 wherever those approvals need to still come forward that  
19 we e-mail them tomorrow requesting that those e-mail  
20 approvals be sent to us no later than three days from  
21 now, working days.

22 MS. HISKES: I'm the escrow chair of  
23 UCONN. I know all the intimate details of all of these.  
24 So these are two grants that require IRB approval. The

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 escrow committee had the bio-safeties in order, animal  
2 use in order. The escrow committee voted to approve these  
3 things. There is no ethical problems contingent on  
4 getting a final letter from the IRB's. The PI's put in  
5 their proposal to the IRB. The IRB said, well, in essence  
6 fine, but here's a list of eight minor things we want you  
7 to fix and revise. You can't move the IRB to have extra  
8 meetings.

9 DR. WALLACK: I understand that, but we're  
10 talking about a critical --

11 MS. HISKES: -- I know.

12 DR. WALLACK: Emergency situation, so I  
13 can't accept the fact that we can't move them. I mean  
14 we're talking about -- you know, I don't know the exact  
15 amount but probably over a million dollars of grants.

16 MS. HISKES: I agree. So we will try and  
17 rubber them into action.

18 MR. MANDELKERN: Paul, I think they can be  
19 reminded that within the last year a grant that we  
20 awarded was not funded because of not getting the proper  
21 approval. So they should be reminded that --

22 MS. HISKES: -- that was very different.

23 MR. MANDELKERN: I know. I'm saying it's  
24 something that has happened and it should spark them to

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 respond very promptly.

2 DR. WALLACK: Can I just make one last  
3 point on this and that is that we're urging this as a  
4 friend of the institution and as a friend of the  
5 researchers. This is a friendly enthusiastic endorsement  
6 of what has to happen.

7 MS. HISKES: Right. The escrow chair will  
8 not lie.

9 DR. GENEL: If I may, I know something  
10 about IRB since I was Vice Chair of Yale's for a number  
11 of years. These are minor -- if these are minor changes  
12 they can get it -- they should be able to get  
13 administrative approval without going -- without it going  
14 to a full committee review.

15 DR. KIESSLING: This is Anne Kiessling.  
16 What two grants are we talking about?

17 MS. HORN: There are two UCONN grants. Do  
18 you want to know more specifics on that, Anne?

19 DR. KIESSLING: Please. Which grants are  
20 these?

21 MS. HISKES: They're the  
22 Lickenberger/Lickler grant and the Vireration grant.  
23 They're both on the same IRB protocol to obtain skin  
24 biopsies from patients around the country who have

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 certain muscular skeletal disorders. And so in essence  
2 things are good, we have the consent in place. They  
3 wanted the size of the biopsies decreased. They wanted  
4 assurance that the patients won't be billed for this.  
5 They wanted assurance of this, and that, and the other  
6 thing. So I've been told they're minor revisions. And so  
7 what we would need to do is to get the IRB Chair to  
8 quickly look at that document, and say that those  
9 revisions have been in order. I believe the revisions  
10 have been submitted to the IRB Committee. Our letter is  
11 ready to go as soon as we get the green light from the  
12 IRB.

13 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: So, again, so we  
14 have a motion of this Committee to get the funding in  
15 place with all due haste.

16 DR. WALLACK: With all due haste.

17 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: If it's not place by  
18 next Wednesday, the 24th, to call a special meeting.

19 DR. WALLACK: Right.

20 MS. HISKES: But certainly I've been  
21 sending e-mails all along to all the parties.

22 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: So that's a motion  
23 moved by Milt. All in favor?

24 ALL VOICES: Aye.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: And I have a  
2 question for CI, so is there anything that we can do  
3 differently? So it seems like a lot of -- these went out  
4 in March, I mean the approvals were in March. Is there  
5 anything that could have been done mechanically,  
6 administratively to -- so we wouldn't be so tight coming  
7 up against June 30th?

8 MS. SAVNECKY: I don't believe so.

9 DR. KIESSLING: This is Anne Kiessling. I  
10 think that one of the problems is that these  
11 investigators are not encouraged to begin the committee  
12 approval before they hear back from their funding  
13 possibilities. I think the concept of waiting until the  
14 grant is approved before you seek these committee  
15 approvals is what's slowing it down.

16 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: But there is nothing  
17 in the process that we could do differently next year?

18 MR. WAGNER: Instead of collecting all the  
19 thesis --

20 DR. WALLACK: -- the only thing we can do  
21 is to, again, urge them to move the process more quickly.  
22 Now --

23 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: -- who?

24 DR. WALLACK: The researchers and those of

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 us involved in making sure that the funding goes out.  
2 Now, having said that I think I'm right in reminding us  
3 that this year we're a few months, Warren, ahead of where  
4 we were last year on this process, aren't we not?

5 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: We redid the contracts  
6 --

7 DR. WALLACK: Right. So the only reason  
8 I'm bringing that up is that I think that we are getting  
9 better at it and that should be appreciated. But Paul's  
10 statement still is in order and that is even though we're  
11 getting better we have to make sure that we can still  
12 move it even more quickly.

13 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Yes. I'm just asking  
14 if there is anything that can be done should be done to -  
15 -

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- going to Dr.  
17 Kiessling's point, this is Warren, we could in the RFP  
18 process require approvals of various committees. If you  
19 think about the percentage of applications and applicants  
20 that we turn down it's going to create a lot of work for  
21 the IRB escrows that don't necessarily result in funding.

22 DR. CANALIS: Yes, and no. If you have an  
23 on going investigation, you know, which you usually have  
24 to collect preliminary data for a specific grant it takes

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 little effort to submit the grant in an application form  
2 and a consent form to the IRB. I mean this is, you know,  
3 the investigator's responsibility. And they should have  
4 done that. I have little sympathy. I really do. It was  
5 a responsibility to do and they did not meet it.

6 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Do you think it would  
7 be reasonable, Dr., to ask that or require that people  
8 get approvals before they --

9 DR. CANALIS: -- well, at least --

10 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- before they submit  
11 an application.

12 DR. CANALIS: It's tough.

13 DR. KIESSLING: I'm not sure they need the  
14 entire approval before they submit the application. But  
15 it certainly -- they should give on the application an  
16 indication of the date that they think approval will be  
17 obtained. That means that they would have started the  
18 process.

19 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: I think that's a  
20 good suggestion. Look, is there anything that we could  
21 do, CI, in terms of bugging people, reminding them -- I  
22 mean even a week would make a difference this year.

23 DR. KIESSLING: I mean Ernie's comment is  
24 correct. He said it's the principle investigator

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 responsibility and they usually get all the committee  
2 forms submitted at about the same time or before the  
3 application.

4 MR. WAGNER: This is also a different  
5 year.

6 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Yes.

7 MR. WAGNER: So there are barriers that  
8 we're trying to overcome obviously.

9 MR. DAVID GOLDHAMMER: I think a lot of  
10 these contracts represent new projects and so I don't  
11 know that necessarily this process has been started for a  
12 lot of the work that's submitted to the state. And it  
13 does seem to me to be too much of a burden on escrow and  
14 IRB and other committees to expect all applications to be  
15 -- to go through the process prior to a final decision.  
16 So I -- it would be great if it can be streamlined. But  
17 I would not be in favor of demanding that approvals be in  
18 place prior to a funding decision.

19 DR. WALLACK: So, Paul, to pick up on  
20 Warren's point what about if we in the RFP indicate, let  
21 them know ahead of time, that we'll have an expectation  
22 that the approvals will be in place at a set time. What's  
23 reasonable, David, a month after approval? Is that a  
24 reasonable time?

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 MR. GOLDHAMMER: Well, if it's a month  
2 after then that -- that's fairly quick. That would  
3 require that they did it, a considerable amount on it  
4 before they knew what the result was.

5 DR. WALLACK: So give me a time, six  
6 weeks, eight weeks?

7 MR. GOLDHAMMER: Anne, how often does  
8 escrow meet? How often does IRB meet?

9 MS. HISKES: IRB's generally meet once a  
10 month, and the schedule is published a year in advance.

11 MR. GOLDHAMMER: I'm on the IRB committee.

12 MS. HISKES: IBC's meet four times a year.  
13 But the PI's know the schedule.

14 DR. WALLACK: So let me just finish my  
15 thought process. So maybe what we did in the RFP indicate  
16 that we will be asking for the approvals to come back to  
17 us no later than six to eight weeks after they've been  
18 notified of the approval. And then when they get the  
19 approval we will then remind them again and when we do  
20 remind them again it won't be a surprise because that  
21 will be a part of the RFP statement.

22 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Well, I think we can  
23 disuses this when we do --

24 MR. MANDELKERN: -- but, Paul, I would

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 like to make one point that the IRB that's holding this  
2 up we are ten to eleven weeks from when the grants were  
3 awarded. The grants were awarded the first day of April  
4 or the last day of March. You've got April, May, and two  
5 weeks into June. So the IRB should be reminded of that.  
6 That's quite a period of time.

7 DR. CANALIS: The investigator might have  
8 submitted two weeks ago. I mean we do not know that. I  
9 mean it's not necessarily the fault of the IRB. And it  
10 could very well be the fault of the investigator. I mean  
11 actually the IRB at Storrs, they're a very good IRB.

12 MS. HISKES: This is the Health Center.

13 DR. CANALIS: The Health Center, I mean.

14 MS. HISKES: And everybody thinks that, I  
15 think as far as an unusual year, there was the stimulus  
16 package. Everybody was putting in grants about the time  
17 I know our grant came out, that the paperwork was due,  
18 and if they have to chose between taking the chance  
19 permanently on meeting the deadline to submit a grant  
20 versus getting escrow paperwork in I think the rationale  
21 is to get your grant application in. So it's a very  
22 unusual year and I think maybe we just need to go -- me,  
23 my colleagues, the escrow IRB, we need to do a better job  
24 of educating the people. We can send -- there is nothing

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 like face-to-face confrontation. If you send out e-mails  
2 and they get deleted. But we just, I think, need to do a  
3 better job of face-to-face coaching.

4 DR. KIESSLING: This is Anne Kiessling. I  
5 agree with Ernie. The PI's generally are not submitting  
6 a grant application to just one funding agency. So if  
7 you have a project, and you want to do this work, and you  
8 want to get it funded you're going to be continuing to  
9 seek funding for it. And so it needs to go through the  
10 proper committees for review of your research independent  
11 of whether or not this particular body funds the project.

12 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: I think this is  
13 something for the next round to bring up again and maybe  
14 work into the RFP process some kind of reminder about  
15 this potential road block.

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: And if I could just get  
17 on the record, though, just to close, I mean again to  
18 reiterate CI has moved these contracts much -- has been  
19 able to move on these much quicker than last year, and so  
20 there has been a significant improvement in the time,  
21 turn around time.

22 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Yes. Okay.

23 DR. FISHBONE: Can I ask one question?

24 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Yes.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 DR. FISHBONE: Were these particular  
2 grants the reason we're giving a deadline is because the  
3 money may not be available after that date?

4 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: There is a slight  
5 probability of that, right.

6 DR. FISHBONE: Yes.

7 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: So in order to be  
8 safe we're --

9 DR. FISHBONE: -- right. So if they don't  
10 come through with it by that time they can still,  
11 assuming the money is not taken way, they can still be  
12 funded.

13 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Yes.

14 DR. FISHBONE: But the chances of it being  
15 there are less.

16 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: There is that --  
17 right, in order to just not --

18 DR. FISHBONE: -- not to have stuff left  
19 in the --

20 MR. MANDELKERN: -- what were the --

21 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: -- because of the on  
22 going budget problems in the state and the budget not  
23 having been worked out I think it behooves us to get  
24 these grants, these dollars out the door by June 30th.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 MR. MANDELKERN: Is there a motion on the  
2 floor?

3 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: I think we voted.  
4 Okay? So let's go back. Did we receive the CV of Weissman  
5 --

6 MS. HORN: -- and I apologize to the  
7 people on the phone. You won't -- we received this by  
8 fax and made copies here so we'll try to digest it.

9 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: So those who wanted  
10 to see the CV. Ernie, did you -- any questions, any  
11 comments about --

12 DR. KIESSLING: -- could we just have a  
13 little thumbnail sketch?

14 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Sure. What would  
15 you like to --

16 DR. CANALIS: -- I'll try to give it to  
17 you, Anne, the best way I can. He's an associate  
18 professor in medicine and cell developmental biology at  
19 Yale since 2004. His degree is out of Rockefeller  
20 University in molecular biology in '93. He provides 20  
21 some -- 21 publications, a couple of them are in -- are  
22 still being revised. The publications are in outstanding  
23 journals. We're talking MCB. His research support - -  
24 2006. He did March of Dimes through May of 2009. And --

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 I do not know this foundation, is it BCO 51033 grant,  
2 Department of Defense, I'm sorry, through February of  
3 2009. The State of Connecticut stem cell -- he doesn't  
4 appear to have current findings.

5 DR. GENEL: This is an old CV. It's from  
6 the original grant.

7 DR. CANALIS: In that case I'm speechless,  
8 Anne. I have no information to comment.

9 DR. GENEL: The last publication listed  
10 here is 2006. And it indicates PI name Michael Synder.  
11 So this is from the original application.

12 DR. CANALIS: So we were given the wrong  
13 CV. Anne, I have no idea. You had better delete whatever  
14 I said.

15 DR. KIESSLING: 2006 is not exactly the  
16 dark ages.

17 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: I think that Dr.  
18 Zhong is obviously very well credentialed. He's been on  
19 this project. He's been endorsed by Mike Synder. He's  
20 very well credentialed. So I, for one, would be inclined  
21 to accept the replacement. But I'm -- we can have a  
22 discussion --

23 MR. GOLDHAMMER: -- maybe we can get -  
24 just one comment, it's clear from his CV why he was

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 chosen as the PI and he is the neurobiologist of the  
2 group. And the grant focuses on neuro genesis. So he,  
3 for that reason, was probably why he was chosen.

4 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: We have a letter  
5 from Mike Synder.

6 MR. WAGNER: He did sign that letter. I  
7 mean there are --

8 MR. GOLDHAMMER: -- did he sign with  
9 enthusiasm though?

10 MS. HORN: It looks like with enthusiasm.

11 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Oh, I didn't see the  
12 second page, yes, okay. So let's -- Anne?

13 MS. HISKES: One relevant fact is that Dr.  
14 Synder will continue to be the PI for the component that  
15 he's working on. And so the new duties of this  
16 individual, Dr. Zhong, will be to be the coordinator. So  
17 if there is two core components that will get going.  
18 There is a total of four projects. Their PI's stay the  
19 same. So Dr. Zhong will simply serve as the coordinator.

20 DR. CANALIS: Can he do that? I mean  
21 being out of state?

22 MS. HISKES: No money will be spent  
23 outside of Connecticut.

24 MR. GOLDHAMMER: He has an appointment at

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 Yale and his students and post-doc's who are doing the  
2 project will still be at Yale for that period of time,  
3 for the remainder of the grant.

4 DR. CANALIS: But he will not have an  
5 appointment at Yale.

6 MR. GOLDHAMMER: His letter says he will.

7 DR. CANALIS: He will maintain an  
8 appointment at Yale.

9 MS. HISKES: For one year.

10 MR. MANDELKERN: For one year.

11 DR. KIESSLING: The most efficient way to  
12 keep this project going in the change is to appoint this  
13 new qualified individual to replace the former one.

14 DR. FISHBONE: Could I move that we  
15 approve the change?

16 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Can we have a  
17 second?

18 DR. KIESSLING: I second.

19 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Okay. All in favor  
20 of -- do you want to do a roll call for those who are not  
21 eligible?

22 MS. HORN: We can do a voice vote. Just  
23 anybody who is not conflicted with Yale may vote on this.  
24 So by voice vote?

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: All in favor?  
2 ALL VOICES: Aye.  
3 DR. CANALIS: I abstain?  
4 MS. HORN: Yes.  
5 DR. CANALIS: I abstain.  
6 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: All opposed? Okay.  
7 We're all set. The David Rowe, University of  
8 Connecticut, change of PI. Anne, have you had a chance to  
9 look it over?  
10 DR. KIESSLING: Yes, I removed Dr. Diely  
11 replaced Dr. Rowe on his grant application.  
12 MS. HORN: Dr. Kosher?  
13 DR. GENEL: Dr. Kosher.  
14 DR. KIESSLING: Dr. Kosher, sorry.  
15 DR. WALLACK: Second.  
16 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: All in favor?  
17 ALL VOICES: Aye.  
18 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: All opposed? The  
19 motion passes.  
20 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: We move onto the  
21 last item. The annual reviews, annual reports, how did  
22 you want to do this? In terms of -- does somebody want  
23 to go through -- is there some order --  
24 MR. WAGNER: -- those are just from top to

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 bottom that we had signed out. The first one is '06 SCB  
2 03 from UCONN. This is the Nishiyama grant. And Trina and  
3 Steve Latham were assigned to be reviewers of the annual  
4 report. We did receive an e-mail from Trina this morning.  
5 She is unable to attend due to a conflict. I believe she  
6 said she had spoken with Steve. Is that right, Steve?

7 MS. SAVNECKY: No, this is just on the  
8 Nishiyama.

9 MR. LATHAM: No, she hasn't spoken with  
10 me.

11 MS. SAVNECKY: I can just read Dr.  
12 Arinze's e-mail. It says, "I approve both of my grants  
13 for renewal, Nishiyama and Synder. Anne Hiskes and I  
14 discussed concerns about the Synder grant. I believe she  
15 may bring this forth for discussion." And that's all  
16 that's pertinent.

17 MR. WAGNER: Steve, I don't know if you  
18 have any comments?

19 MR. LATHAM: Sure. I thought that while  
20 they are a little bit behind their benchmark goal it  
21 seems to me that their explanation for why that was true  
22 are quite reasonable and that they plan to be back on  
23 target by the end of the coming year. And I didn't see  
24 anything wrong with the reasonable budgetary

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 reallocation. So I would be inclined to approve it.

2 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Any discussion? Do  
3 we want to do it -- so let's it do a voice one. A motion  
4 to approve.

5 MS. HORN: And this is a UCONN grant, so,  
6 please, do not vote on it if you have a conflict with  
7 UCONN.

8 DR. CANALIS: Yale.

9 MR. WAGNER: It's UCONN's.

10 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Do we have a motion  
11 to approve?

12 DR. GENEL: So moved.

13 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: All in favor?

14 ALL VOICES: Aye.

15 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: All opposed? Dan,  
16 the next.

17 MR. WAGNER: The next one is 06 SCB 05  
18 from Wesleyan, Dr. Grabel. Dr. Goldhammer and Steve,  
19 again, were the reviewers.

20 MR. GOLDHAMMER: I guess I'll go. I  
21 wasn't quite sure the level of detail that the Committee  
22 expects on these approvals. I just say that Dr. Grabel,  
23 my assessment is she has met all of her milestones. She's  
24 made very good progress. She has a paper published on

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 work that's highly related to what she proposed. There  
2 was, I think, a very minor surplus in budget in one  
3 category that was then used because of a short, a small  
4 shortfall in supplies and that was explained. So I  
5 thought she had -- I was in favor of continuation.

6 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Any other comments?

7 MR. LATHAM: I'll say that I completely  
8 agree with that assessment and I am also very grateful  
9 for someone who can write a lay summary that a layman can  
10 read.

11 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: So a motion to  
12 approved?

13 MR. LATHAM: I move.

14 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: All in favor?

15 ALL VOICES: Aye.

16 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: All opposed? It  
17 passes. All right.

18 MR. WAGNER: Next up is 06 SCB 08 from  
19 UCONN Health Center, Dr. Carmichael. And Dr. Genel and  
20 Mr. Mandelkern were reviewers on this one.

21 DR. GENEL: Yes, correct me this is the  
22 report on year two of three years of funding, is that  
23 correct?

24 MR. WAGNER: Um.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 DR. GENEL: Or is two years of two? I  
2 couldn't recall.

3 MR. WAGNER: I think it's four.

4 DR. GENEL: Four?

5 MR. WAGNER: All of these are four except  
6 for four.

7 DR. GENEL: They're four years, okay.  
8 Okay.

9 MR. MANDELKERN: They only used half of  
10 the grant money.

11 DR. GENEL: Well, this -- I looked this  
12 over actually it's been over twice since Bob asked me  
13 about it and I had read it a week ago and forgot. I  
14 think they made quite good progress. They have, I think,  
15 four papers published.

16 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes.

17 DR. GENEL: It has -- and progress  
18 particularly in an area of the significance of double  
19 stranded RNA and some of the other genetic phenomenon of  
20 stem cells such that they have -- they have delayed work  
21 on one of their aims in order to pursue this. They  
22 indicate that they will go back and work on that in year  
23 three. Their funding seems to be on target and so I  
24 think this is approvable. They -- the lay summary could,

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 perhaps, be better written, but it's certainly better  
2 than a lot of others I recall seeing a year ago.

3 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Dan, I just have a  
4 question on the funded on the budgets, so are you -- you  
5 are checking that when the reports come in and the  
6 variation --

7 MR. WAGNER: -- we checked all the  
8 financial reports. We have a little cheat sheet here.  
9 Each of the grants except for one had some -- had kept  
10 monies to carry over. You know, most of them had --  
11 almost all of them had justifications on what they've  
12 spent or what they have outstanding. At this time we are  
13 two and a half months past so probably most of those  
14 excessive monies have been spent if not more. So in terms  
15 of the financials, we reviewed them last week on Friday.  
16 There was nothing that stood out as of last year. We had  
17 equipment issues where they weren't budgeted for and what  
18 not, so we've reviewed those, yes, and we will,  
19 obviously, pass those along to DPH.

20 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: If there was  
21 anything.

22 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: At this point you're  
23 comfortable with recommending continuation for all these  
24 on a fiscal perspective?

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 MR. WAGNER: Yes, on a fiscal perspective.  
2 We had one comment on one grant later that's just a  
3 comment for the Committee to discuss.

4 MR. MANDELKERN: Well, in the Carmichael,  
5 Mike and I had discussed it. We both felt positive about  
6 the progress that had been made. There are four  
7 significant publications, and they seem to have met  
8 milestones. And as a layman I actually understood the  
9 lay summary here. So I would move the continuation of  
10 the funding for the Carmichael grant, SCB 08.

11 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: All in favor?

12 ALL VOICES: Aye.

13 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: All opposed?

14 MR. WAGNER: We go down to No. 06 SCB 11  
15 at UCONN Storrs, Dr. LoTurco. I skipped Gravely, I'm  
16 sorry, at the Health Center, '09. Anne Kiessling and  
17 Milt Wallack were assigned to review that one.

18 DR. WALLACK: Anne, do you want me to  
19 start or what? Is Anne there?

20 DR. KIESSLING: And I just recommended to  
21 sign based on the --

22 MS. HORN: -- she said they've done and  
23 they need to go on.

24 DR. WALLACK: She recommends -- I have to

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 just offer some other thoughts and that is that on the  
2 Gravelly research project I don't know if we should have  
3 any concern about the fact that they don't seem to have  
4 met certain milestones. They seem to be behind on their  
5 stated expectations and goals. And they have -- I think  
6 because of this, and I applaud this part of it, that  
7 they've resorted to fund originally unstated need for  
8 collaboration. I believe unstated need for collaboration  
9 with Ren-He Xu, Laura Grabel, and Shu Jon Le. Again, I  
10 always applaud collaborations.

11 So my main question here is whether or not  
12 we, as a group, have any concern about the situation with  
13 the unmet milestones.

14 DR. KIESSLING: And I think what happened  
15 to this group is probably a good thing. They decided that  
16 what they wanted to do could not be accomplished by  
17 microanalysis and they switched technologies. So now  
18 they're doing a sequencing technology for this.  
19 Considering that I think this project has been up and  
20 running for about eight or nine months I think it's fine.  
21 Because they had to switch technology it's going to take  
22 them a while to catch up.

23 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Okay, do I have a  
24 motion to approve?

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 DR. WALLACK: One other comment before we  
2 vote on it, like Steve's comment on the lay summary I  
3 would suggest that -- and Anne probably did not have a  
4 problem, the same problem that I did, but I thought that  
5 the lay summary should have been in more lay language.

6 DR. KIESSLING: And actually my comment on  
7 this page is the lay summary is too technical.

8 DR. WALLACK: Right.

9 DR. KIESSLING: I think he needs to be  
10 encouraged to write it so that everybody can read it.

11 DR. WALLACK: And I would suggest that  
12 what Anne and I both are saying now is that that be  
13 communicated back to him so that in the future he  
14 understands that we have to have lay summaries that are,  
15 in fact, lay summaries to be understood by the lay  
16 public.

17 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: So, Dan, everyone is  
18 going to get notice --

19 MR. WAGNER: -- well.

20 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: That's the type of  
21 thing you'll pass along.

22 MR. WAGNER: Yes.

23 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: So do I have a  
24 motion to approve?

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 DR. KIESSLING: I so move.

2 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: All in favor?

3 DR. WALLACK: Second.

4 ALL VOICES: Aye.

5 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Motion carries. No.

6 5.

7 MR. WAGNER: The next one is 06 SCB 11,  
8 UCONN LoTurco. I guess these were in order. Again, it's  
9 Anne and Dr. Wallack.

10 DR. WALLACK: Go ahead, Anne.

11 DR. KIESSLING: I have to find my notes  
12 here.

13 DR. WALLACK: Let me just, while she's  
14 looking for her notes, that they also had some problems  
15 in their approach. They are -- they did develop somewhat  
16 of a new approach, I think. New meaning unlike what they  
17 originally had projected in the original request for  
18 funding.

19 There has also been, under adjustments, I  
20 guess this was a good thing where they've been able to  
21 find funding for personnel changes and so on. My only  
22 question would be -- and Dan, I don't know if they have  
23 to come back to us for this, but they had originally, I  
24 believe, projected travel expenses within the United

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 States and this is --

2 MR. WAGNER: -- they went to --

3 DR. WALLACK: -- they went to Greece.

4 MR. WAGNER: I believe we had discussed  
5 that last year and approved that if it was under the --

6 DR. WALLACK: -- so we're okay with that  
7 then?

8 MR. WAGNER: Yes.

9 DR. WALLACK: Okay. And my last comment  
10 would be, as with the Gravely grant, that this grant also  
11 in the lay summary section No. 3 I believe they should be  
12 notified that their lay summary should be more of a lay  
13 summary rather than as technical as it was.

14 DR. KIESSLING: I agree with that. This --  
15 I remember now this grant actually came across a problem  
16 that has been reported and I think it's very useful. They  
17 found tumor formation by their stem cell -- put them into  
18 the brain. So they've now changed the way they're doing  
19 -- and I actually thought this was a very useful  
20 observation and I thought their data behind that was  
21 quite good. So although it had to change the way they're  
22 doing things it was for a really good and productive  
23 reason.

24 DR. WALLACK: Anne, if it's okay with you

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 I'll move that we accept that?

2 DR. KIESSLING: Yes.

3 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: All in favor?

4 ALL VOICES: Aye.

5 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: All opposed? Motion  
6 carries.

7 MR. WAGNER: The next one is 06 SCB 14 at  
8 the UCONN Health Center. And this is the grant with Ren  
9 He Xu, and Dr. Fishbone and Mr. Mandelkern were the  
10 reviewers.

11 MR. MANDELKERN: To the best of my  
12 understanding progress has been made. There have been  
13 four very significant publications listed. Collaborative  
14 work has gone on with Thompson Lab with Dr. Hugh Zincrom  
15 and so far as I can understand it the using of the -- of  
16 proteins and so forth has gone forward. And I think it's  
17 worth -- it's worth supporting. The lay summary is  
18 rather technical, but the whole work is rather complex so  
19 I would have no comment on that. And I would propose  
20 continuing this work. I would

21 DR. FISHBONE: I would agree although  
22 it's a little hard to understand the names of everything  
23 it seems like they made all their goals and they're  
24 progressing very well, and their budget was fine. And

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 we'd recommend for approval.

2 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Second?

3 MR. MANDELKERN: I'll second it.

4 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: All in favor?

5 ALL VOICES: Aye.

6 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: All opposed? Motion  
7 carries.

8 MR. WAGNER: So that's the end of the  
9 established grants.

10 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: No?

11 MR. WAGNER: No, we have one more. 06 SCB  
12 18, Yale, Dr. Kraus, Ernie and Paul were the reviewers.

13 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Go ahead.

14 DR. CANALIS: It's shortly brief. I mean  
15 she works on -- disorders. Last year we had some concerns  
16 about the progress that she had made. She's corrected  
17 this. She's started to publish on the work proposed and  
18 she seems to carry along her goals. So I really did not  
19 have any difficulties with this one.

20 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: I agree. I think  
21 she's made great progress. It's very detailed. And I  
22 guess the thing I would raise or question the way the  
23 summary, which I thought was good, I have -- I don't have  
24 last year's, but it looks very similar to -- but I would

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 move to approve it. Second? All in favor?

2 ALL VOICES: Aye.

3 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: All opposed? Motion  
4 carries. And we're on to --

5 MR. WAGNER: -- we're on to Dr. Rose,  
6 group grant 06 SCC 04 from the Health Center, and this is  
7 Dr. Rowe in this project. It has multiple pieces and  
8 parts, nine plus projects, administration. Anne, Gerry  
9 were doing this one.

10 MR. GOLDHAMMER: And I'll excuse myself  
11 for this one since I'm an investigator on this grant. So  
12 I'll just step out. I know I don't have to, but I will.

13

14 DR. FISHBONE: Anne, did you want to  
15 start?

16 DR. KIESSLING: I don't know how long --  
17 but this is actually nine projects.

18 DR. FISHBONE: Yes.

19 DR. KIESSLING: Including their  
20 administrative core. And although some of them seemed to  
21 have made better progress than others I actually didn't  
22 find any of these projects lacking in some kind of  
23 progress and in -- and I think all of them should be  
24 funded. Now, Gerry, you had come across something I

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 didn't see.

2 DR. FISHBONE: Well, I would agree that  
3 most of them were moving very well. A few of them had  
4 some problems, about three or four had problems. Some  
5 related to technical personnel leaving. One had a brain  
6 tumor that took him out of commission for quite a while.  
7 But they all seemed to be moving along and trying to meet  
8 their goals and most of them did meet their goals. The  
9 one problem in the grant -- well, in Dr. Goldhammer's  
10 part of the grant where he was trying to create a mouse  
11 model that several of the other investigators were  
12 dependent on in order for their work to move along. In  
13 the additional model it produced they were very  
14 disappointed to find that it didn't have the -- that they  
15 needed. And so they had to start again from scratch and I  
16 think made significant progress in doing that.

17 And the fact that there was just that one  
18 model I think several of the other researchers were  
19 delayed as well. But everybody seemed to recover very  
20 well. I think we're moving -- most of them achieved their  
21 goals, those that hadn't had plans to achieve them fairly  
22 soon. The budgets generally seemed to be in order.

23 One that had some problems was Dr. Meaner  
24 and she had trouble with the -- stem cells. And she

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 believes that when they move on to human embryonic stem  
2 cells these particular problems of they're not being I  
3 think appropriate antibodies for them will no longer  
4 apply. But she probably had the least progress of all, I  
5 think. Kosher was one of those. His project went very  
6 well, and we know of the change of PI. And all of them  
7 otherwise, I think, were pretty good. The budgets were  
8 fine for all of them. So I would recommend approval.

9 DR. KIESSLING: There is a problem with  
10 the Goldhammer project. I mean the dependence on this new  
11 mouse was actually discussed when this research program  
12 project was first approved. And we kind of knew that  
13 there might have to be a couple of tries for this. So I  
14 think that's what's happening.

15 DR. FISHBONE: I would move that we  
16 accept.

17 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Do you have a  
18 second? All in favor?

19 ALL VOICES: Aye.

20 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: All opposed? The  
21 motion carries.

22 DR. FISHBONE: I must say I was very  
23 excited when I saw I only had two grants to review.

24 MR. WAGNER: All right. We can move on to

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 06 SCD 01, and this is one of the cores at Yale, Dr. Lin,  
2 and Paul and Dr. Goldhammer were the reviewers on this  
3 one. And just to remind everybody, this is a grant  
4 that's been extended. I believe it was a two-year grant  
5 and now we've had a no cost extension for the third year.

6 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: David, do you have  
7 any comments on the Yale core?

8 MR. GOLDHAMMER: Well, I got right thrown  
9 into it. I agree, I think there is no issues.

10 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Yes.

11 MR. GOLDHAMMER: And it's doing very well,  
12 so I absolutely recommend a continuation.

13 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: All in favor?

14 ALL VOICES: Aye.

15 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: All opposed? And on  
16 to the next one.

17 MR. WAGNER: On to the other core, this is  
18 the Health Center core, Dr. Ren He Xu, and this was Anne  
19 Kiessling and Dr. Genel.

20 DR. GENEL: Anne, do you want to go?

21 DR. KIESSLING: I did -- one of the things  
22 I'm confused about is that we just voted to renew the  
23 funding for this core and now I'm a little confused as to  
24 what years we're talking about. I have no problems

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 continuing the renewal on this particular part, but what  
2 did we just do at our last meeting? Was that for the  
3 beginning of 2010? So what we're doing now is looking at  
4 the budget for 2009 and 2010?

5 MS. HORN: Are you talking about funding  
6 for a new grant out of this 2009?

7 DR. KIESSLING: Oh, we just voted, I  
8 thought at our meeting in March, to renew UCONN's stem  
9 cell core for an additional two years.

10 MS. HORN: Oh, UCONN.

11 DR. GENEL: I think this only is for two  
12 years. I think we only -- this is the original -- this  
13 is the original grant, which I think only was for two  
14 years. So it's really essentially a final report, isn't  
15 it?

16 MR. WAGNER: This is a three-year grant.

17 DR. GENEL: Oh, okay.

18 MR. WAGNER: And the one that was approved  
19 for, at the end of March this year was approved for three  
20 years. We addressed it at, when he sent in his revised  
21 budget he had changed it to a four-year grant, and that's  
22 what we voted on, and we accepted the new budget. So  
23 this will -- he's going to draw very little on the '09  
24 grant for year one while this grant is in place. So he

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 has year three locked on this one. And then in that  
2 point where this grant, that we're going -- the '06 grant  
3 is going to end they're going to be able to draw 30 grand  
4 against the '09 grant and then continue the core facility  
5 on the '09 grant for those following years.

6 DR. GENEL: That's helpful.

7 DR. KIESSLING: I didn't quite understand  
8 that. So this -- the grant that we're continuing funding  
9 for now ends in '10 or ends this year?

10 DR. GENEL: 10.

11 MR. WAGNER: 10.

12 DR. GENEL: 10.

13 DR. KIESSLING: It ends in 10. So he's  
14 going to have -- he has -- he's in the enviable position  
15 of having a little money left over?

16 DR. GENEL: Well, he has one year left on  
17 this grant.

18 MR. WAGNER: Right. And so he'll have --  
19 this grant will end April 1 of '10 and his -- and he will  
20 have whatever first year dollars to then draw upon till  
21 June 1st for his second year of '09.

22 DR. KIESSLING: But, again, you're  
23 comfortable with all of this? And then this -- and then  
24 after this he has funding until 2013?

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 MR. WAGNER: Correct.

2 DR. KIESSLING: Okay. That was my only  
3 concern. I mean this is a beautifully written progress  
4 report. They've made some progress. He's actually  
5 teaching lots of people. It's one of the few grants I  
6 saw that actually had some publications which appear to  
7 have come during the time period, although there is some  
8 overlap with his own personal grant in terms of the  
9 publications reported. But I would move that this be  
10 funded.

11 DR. FISHBONE: Could I just ask one  
12 question?

13 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Sure.

14 DR. FISHBONE: Did he end up getting an  
15 extra year of funding out of this whole process?

16 MR. WAGNER: He got -- yes, he got an  
17 extra year with no -- we approved the dollars for three  
18 years. He's making those three years funding stretch for  
19 four years.

20 DR. GENEL: For four years.

21 MR. WAGNER: Yes.

22 DR. GENEL: While the other one phases in.

23 DR. FISHBONE: Okay. Thank you.

24 DR. GENEL: I agree with Anne. The only

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 thing I do feel I'm obliged to comment on is I could have  
2 done with a little less self-congratulatory language in  
3 the review, which talks about our extraordinary  
4 performance and impressive new protocol. I think it could  
5 have been a little -- I think that could have been toned  
6 down a little bit and have said the same thing.

7 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: You're not going to  
8 congratulate yourself.

9 DR. GENEL: Other than that, yes, I,  
10 obviously, the budget -- as I looked at the budget there  
11 was only a 5 percent variance. So I mean I think they're  
12 pretty much on target.

13 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: All in favor of  
14 approval?

15 ALL VOICES: Aye.

16 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: All opposed? The  
17 motion carries.

18 MR. WAGNER: And the last one is the  
19 hybrid grant 06 SCE 01 Yale, Synder, now Zhong, and Trina  
20 and Anne Hiskes were the reviewers.

21 MS. HISKES: Okay, so this is a hybrid  
22 grant. It consists of four research projects along with a  
23 core. The title of the grant is an integrated approach to  
24 moral differentiation of human embryonic stem cells. The

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 first component of the grant is headed by Dr. Synder and  
2 he has a total of three publications coming out of this.  
3 One in science, one in major genetics, and one in another  
4 journal, and two are in preparation. So it looks like  
5 this is an extremely outstanding discovery.

6 They did something similar to another  
7 grant. They started out with micro array analysis, but  
8 decided that some kind of special -- sequencing would be  
9 more efficient and that was considered a tremendous  
10 breakthrough in terms of analyzing genes. And I think led  
11 to either the major publication or the science  
12 publication. So excellent progress on that component of  
13 the project.

14 Project two also seems to be making  
15 excellent progress, a total of two published publications  
16 and three in press. Discovered in the function of three  
17 master proteins in controlling differentiation into neuro  
18 cells, and that sounds like an excellent discovery. So  
19 they are meeting benchmarks very well.

20 Project three headed by Dr. Weissman  
21 screening for global identification of genes had a lot of  
22 problems finding the correct library. The library they  
23 had initially identified didn't work well for stem cells  
24 it appears. And they have been searching for the right

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 library, and this held them back somewhat, and no  
2 publications have resulted.

3 The fourth project by Renman Zang,  
4 balancing self-renewal and differentiation, has one  
5 manuscript in preparation, asserts progress in meeting  
6 benchmarks. But it seems like overall -- and the core is  
7 running well, it's a core that has neuro-differentiated  
8 cells in it. It seems to be supporting the four projects  
9 very well. So it seems that reasonable progress is being  
10 made.

11 I had one question about the budget and  
12 this is maybe an unusual question. They're under  
13 spending.

14 MR. WAGNER: Yes, this was the one that we  
15 did have comment for the entire project to date they are  
16 close to a half a million dollars under spent.

17 MS. HISKES: And part of it is problems  
18 hiring it seems the appropriate post-docs. Dr. Wang left  
19 the project therefore the money allocated to his  
20 activities wasn't spent. And so in some cases the  
21 percentage of monies not spent under a line item is 40  
22 percent. I don't know what the -- this body -- they  
23 could certainly make it up later.

24 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Did they submit a

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 revised budget?

2 MR. WAGNER: For the next year?

3 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yes.

4 MR. WAGNER: I don't believe so, they just  
5 left it as variances with justifications as --

6 MS. HISKES: -- yes, so and so left. They  
7 couldn't find -- you know, they had trouble purchasing  
8 such and such pieces of equipment and expenditures go  
9 down, the indirects go down proportionately.

10 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: So was there any  
11 sense of -- or just not taking priority or -- I mean is  
12 there any --

13 MS. HISKES: -- I just think it's hard to  
14 move people around in a timely manner. So on materials  
15 and supplies this surplus in supplies was due to lack of  
16 activity on the project when Dr. Wang left. Dr. Ying Yan  
17 has been recruited from the University of Connecticut to  
18 replace Dr. Wang. So there might be a gap there.

19 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Is the funding  
20 likely to be --

21 MS. HISKES: -- so finally our post-doc  
22 was appointed in February 1 '09 and will continue. So  
23 that just affects -- and salary. I don't think there is  
24 any negligence at all. I think it's just the way things

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 worked.

2 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Is there an  
3 expectation that they're going to then over spend?

4 MR. WAGNER: I think they'll be able to  
5 spend the money.

6 MS. HISKES: And they didn't travel as  
7 much as they had thought perhaps.

8 DR. KIESSLING: This is early enough in  
9 this project that I don't know that this should be a big  
10 concern at this review.

11 MS. HISKES: Okay.

12 DR. CANALIS: This is a four-year project,  
13 right?

14 MR. WAGNER: They have a four million  
15 dollar budget.

16 DR. CANALIS: So we're half way.

17 DR. KIESSLING: I know, but if it took  
18 them a little while to get under way they're like a year  
19 and a half into a four year project.

20 DR. CANALIS: That's okay.

21 MS. HISKES: Well --

22 DR. KIESSLING: -- they would have money  
23 left over at the end.

24 MS. HISKES: Well, a 30,450 budgeted for

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 years one and two under direct costs, other. I don't know  
2 what other is. They spent 2,768 dollars leaving 90  
3 percent left over. So I don't know what the other was or  
4 why the other -- what happened to the other. So here it  
5 says delay in hiring post doctorate associates. And that  
6 was due to planned microwave experiments, which I guess  
7 didn't happen because the personnel weren't in place.

8 DR. FISHBONE: I think in a lot of the  
9 budgets the one item that had the most variation was  
10 other, and with no description of what the other was. But  
11 it went from -- a lot of them had 40 to 70 percent  
12 variation in that because usually it's only a small part  
13 of the overall budget.

14 DR. WALLACK: So am I hearing, Anne, that  
15 you have some questions about the progress because  
16 they're -- we have the option, if we so chose, to ask  
17 them to come before us for an explanation.

18 MS. HISKES: But two of the projects seem  
19 to be -- have been making excellent progress in spite of  
20 some of these difficulties in finding the right post doc  
21 or --

22 DR. WALLACK: -- but I'm referring to the  
23 overall speed with which they're moving. I mean I think  
24 -- I assume, as I'm listening I'm left with questions in

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 your mind that you have and I'm not sure if you want to  
2 offer an idea of why we should move ahead and you were on  
3 this grant. I mean I'd be willing to follow your lead,  
4 but if you have some questions maybe we bring them back.

5 I don't know.

6 MS. HISKES: Well, my questions come from  
7 the budget. I don't feel particularly knowledgeable  
8 about the science. And so I miss the presence of my  
9 colleague.

10 MS. HORN: Did Dr. Arinzeh offer any  
11 comments on --

12 MS. SAVNECKY: -- no, what I had read  
13 before were the only comments.

14 DR. CANALIS: You seem to indicate on most  
15 of the progress was done by Synder, right?

16 MS. HISKES: Synder and the second --  
17 measuring by publications, you know.

18 DR. CANALIS: Sure, at the end of the day  
19 that's what counts.

20 MS. HISKES: And so the --

21 DR. CANALIS: -- and Synder is leaving.

22 MS. HISKES: The second -- but he's going  
23 to continue directing that project. The second project  
24 is led by Lin and that's made excellent progress and

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 measured by publications, and discoveries. The third  
2 project is Sherman Weissman. And he says problems  
3 encountered was finding a library. The one they purchased  
4 didn't work in stem cells so then they began looking for  
5 other libraries and seemed to have found something that  
6 works. And then the fourth project, mechanisms for  
7 balancing self-renewal and differentiation is led by Dr.  
8 Zhong. And claims to have made progress towards his  
9 initial aims.

10 MR. WAGNER: 3.8.

11 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: And 500 and they  
12 haven't spent a half a million out of the first two, so -  
13 - that's a pretty significant --

14 MR. WAGNER: -- amount of change.

15 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: I mean I know we would  
16 more concerned if it was over.

17 MS. HISKES: Right.

18 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: But I don't think we  
19 should just say well because you haven't spent it you've  
20 still got the green light. I'm sure you'll be able to  
21 spend it. I'd be interested in knowing what they're  
22 going to be -- will the State of Connecticut be getting a  
23 half a million dollars back because they started late or  
24 were they just going to say, oh, we want that money

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 anyway?

2 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: The two reviewers  
3 are otherwise favorably impressed and are recommending --  
4 and I guess we could recommend, but also ask for some  
5 written further detail on what's going on.

6 DR. WALLACK: Well, the option there -- I  
7 think the next option I believe would be for them to come  
8 before the group.

9 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Well, there is other --  
10 we do six month financials, I think, is that right? I  
11 mean one thing you could do is sort of give them the  
12 green light and then say, but we want significant -- when  
13 you submit the six month we want -- we're going to look  
14 at it closely or we want you here to present it or  
15 something like that.

16 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: So we could give  
17 them the green light and just ask them for their -- that  
18 we're sufficiently satisfied that we --

19 MR. GOLDHAMMER: -- what is this a 25  
20 percent?

21 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: 25 percent.

22 MR. GOLDHAMMER: Just for comparison 25  
23 percent is kind of the cut off the NIH uses above which  
24 you have to explain unspent balances and below which you

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 quite easily slide through into the next year without  
2 having the money taken away.

3 MR. WAGNER: To give some other -- I mean  
4 some of these other ones there were -- some of the other  
5 projects were in the 20 percent also. So it's not  
6 uncommon, you know, to carry over 16 percent. A couple of  
7 the groups, the Rowe group were up there over 20 percent.

8 MS. HISKES: 20 percent unspent.

9 MR. WAGNER: 20 percent unspent.

10 DR. FISHBONE: But they all have plans to  
11 use that funding.

12 DR. FISHBONE: Can I ask a question? Did  
13 we get a new budget after Synder withdrew because I'm  
14 looking at a four-year budget in which he has all the  
15 figures for the third year, and in which he has 10,668  
16 for himself, which obviously he won't be getting.

17 MR. WAGNER: He did not submit a --

18 DR. FISHBONE: -- would it be appropriate  
19 since there are such major changes and some questions for  
20 somebody to submit an appropriate budget for the next  
21 year?

22 MR. WAGNER: Right.

23 DR. CANALIS: There are significant  
24 changes in this -- you approved changes to a significant

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 amount of money. There is a project that apparently has  
2 run into difficulties. I think it was a great grant two  
3 years ago, but we cannot -- I mean there are questions  
4 floating there and the future of the grant.

5 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: I guess the first  
6 question for us, do we want to approve with conditions  
7 for more information to us or do we want to hold the  
8 approval?

9 DR. WALLACK: So let me ask you a  
10 question. Going back to the original discussion today we  
11 stated the reason for wanting the funding to get out by  
12 June 30th. So if I were then to follow that reasoning I  
13 would want to approve to get that out. But perhaps what  
14 we do is -- if we gave them tentative approval do we then  
15 fund them with tentative approval and then --

16 MR. MANDELKERN: -- could we put it --

17 MR. WAGNER: -- you approve it and then  
18 mandate that in addition they also submit -- not make the  
19 monies contingent on that.

20 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: They'll be coming  
21 back next year.

22 MR. WAGNER: Right, in six months.

23 DR. WALLACK: All right, so if that's the  
24 case then I would be in favor of voting to fund them, but

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 I wouldn't wait for myself because I think already --  
2 we've already stated and Anne has these questions. I  
3 would ask them to come back to us at the next meeting so  
4 that we can have them discuss with us how they're going  
5 to address sort of the concerns that are being raised at  
6 this particular time. I don't want to wait six months  
7 because that -- that loses us another year.

8 DR. GENEL: You want a verbal --

9 DR. WALLACK: -- right. So I would move  
10 that we fund them, but that we also while funding them  
11 request that at the next meeting, which I think is July  
12 21st, that they come back with the explanations that  
13 we're asking for.

14 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Is that -- did you  
15 want to have them come before us or do it in writing?

16 DR. WALLACK: No, no, in front of us. I  
17 think this is an important enough -- there is so much  
18 going on here that I think it's important in this  
19 instance for them -- Hy Von came back to us, for example,  
20 just for a redistribution of 200,000 dollars, and we're  
21 talking about a larger consideration here, I think.

22 DR. CANALIS: I would also like a written  
23 plan about, you know, on how this 420,000 some odd  
24 thousand dollars are going to be spent. How -- I mean I

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 think we're entitled to know how this money is going to  
2 be spent.

3 DR. WALLACK: And part of that is  
4 including what we've identified as Snyder's portion of it  
5 since he's not here and so on.

6 DR. CANALIS: It's splitting time.

7 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: And there is one  
8 project, Anne, that has difficulties.

9 MR. MANDELKERN: Well, I second Milt's  
10 motion.

11 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: We're --

12 MS. HISKES: -- most of them have a  
13 significantly unspent amount of money in some area.

14 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: So we want an  
15 explanation of the unspent --

16 DR. WALLACK: -- unspent, how they're  
17 going to spend it.

18 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: And there is one  
19 project in particular that --

20 MS. HISKES: -- well, there it was the  
21 search for the right library.

22 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: It's a further  
23 explanation -- in other words, I'm trying to identify for  
24 them what we --

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 DR. CANALIS: -- who was the investigator  
2 on --

3 MS. HISKES: -- Dr. Weissman.

4 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: A further  
5 explanation of the --

6 MS. HISKES: -- how that's going with the  
7 library. I think what we need, as a Committee, is an  
8 analysis of the budget situation. You know, what was  
9 allocated, where the issues are, sort of a summary of how  
10 much money is unspent versus how much was budgeted so  
11 that we can ask for very specific responses about the  
12 category of -- or the personnel issues.

13 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Okay.

14 MR. MANDELKERN: I'll second Milt's  
15 motion.

16 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: So the motion is to  
17 provide a revised budget.

18 DR. WALLACK: We're going to fund it.

19 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: We're going to fund  
20 it, but --

21 DR. WALLACK: -- we're going to ask them  
22 to come back for these explanations that Anne just said.

23 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: But I think we also  
24 want it in writing.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 DR. WALLACK: And in writing also.

2 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: So what we're asking  
3 them to respond to is a revised budget, explain the  
4 deficit with the under expenditure and how that's going  
5 to be dealt with, and also explain in greater detail the  
6 progress or lack thereof of the Weissman project.

7 DR. WALLACK: And the Synder portion of  
8 the funding also, the dollars allocated to him.

9 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: And how --

10 MR. GOLDHAMMER: -- Milt, are you saying,  
11 though, that you would like to fund it so the point --

12 DR. WALLACK: -- yes, I want to fund it.

13 MR. GOLDHAMMER: You want them to come  
14 forward in explaining how the money will be used,  
15 whatever the answer is won't have any bearing on the --

16 DR. WALLACK: -- right.

17 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: It will help you  
18 going forward.

19 DR. WALLACK: Right, going forward. I  
20 want them to go forward.

21 MR. WAGNER: They do have half a million  
22 dollars to fund themselves with for another month.

23 DR. WALLACK: I understand. We want them  
24 to go forward, but we just want to help them to help

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 themselves in going forward. I mean this is a friendly  
2 way of approaching it.

3 MR. MANDELKERN: But also I would assume  
4 that if the responses don't satisfy the Committee there  
5 would be some mechanism that could be in employed in  
6 regards to the -- there has to be something. So I would  
7 --

8 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: -- Dan will  
9 repossess their equipment.

10 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: There is another  
11 process in six months.

12 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Yes, six months.

13 MR. GOLDHAMMER: I would agree with that  
14 then if there is another process -- if we go through this  
15 again in six months. If we weren't going through it again  
16 and was giving them the money then their explanation  
17 doesn't matter, in a sense. So we want to back it  
18 seriously.

19 MR. WAGNER: I would also recommend that  
20 if they do the update next month that when they do the  
21 six month -- all we request for the six month is a fiscal  
22 report. So all it is a budget with a handful of  
23 justifications. If you want more in that six-month then  
24 we would need to tell them now or next month. So just if

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 you want something more to sink your teeth into besides  
2 numbers, better justifications and what not, then we  
3 should request that when they're here or prior to that.

4 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: So are we clear on  
5 the motion?

6 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yes. May we discuss  
7 it?

8 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Yes.

9 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: I just heard, just in  
10 terms of the schedule of this group although we meet  
11 monthly, if you remember the last couple of summers we  
12 did not meet every month during the summer. In fact we  
13 took off July -- we did not meet in July and --

14 DR. CANALIS: -- so, Warren, why don't we  
15 just say the next meeting.

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Whenever the next  
17 meeting is scheduled.

18 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: The next scheduled  
19 meeting. So, Bob, has made a motion to --

20 DR. WALLACK: -- I made the motion. He  
21 seconded it.

22 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: All in favor?

23 ALL VOICES: Aye.

24 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Any opposed? The

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 motion carries. And that's it.

2 MR. WAGNER: That's it.

3 DR. WALLACK: There is one other grant and  
4 that's the Wesleyan core, Laura Gabel.

5 MR. WAGNER: And that's part of the --

6 DR. WALLACK: -- I think that's part of  
7 the Ren He Xu grant.

8 DR. FISHBONE: Oh, it is?

9 MR. WAGNER: Yes. I just had, just from  
10 listening a number of these technical reviews had  
11 publications listed in preparation, published would we  
12 want those as a bundle? Would you like to see them?

13 ALL VOICES: Yes.

14 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: We will say that some  
15 folks in their publication, Yale in particular, are very  
16 good about acknowledging the State of Connecticut and  
17 this advisory group. That's not true with all of our  
18 PI's.

19 MR. MANDELKERN: Can I ask --

20 DR. CANALIS: -- that's an insult.

21 MR. MANDELKERN: There is one issue that  
22 has come up very frequently here today and that is the  
23 lay summaries. I'm wondering if it wouldn't be  
24 beneficial for us possibly to have some committee work on

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 maybe a template of some sort that we could suggest to  
2 the PI when they make their promise reports that would  
3 help us as lay people and moving forward.

4 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Discussion?

5 DR. GENEL: Well, I'm not sure about that,  
6 but I still don't know what we're doing with them.

7 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: They're up on our  
8 website.

9 DR. GENEL: Are they?

10 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yes, they are. You  
11 were the driving force behind that. And, in fact, we're  
12 in the process of putting these -- getting these ready to  
13 go up as well.

14 DR. WALLACK: Okay.

15 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: That's why we thought  
16 that perhaps with Dr. Kraus's, and they looked almost  
17 identical, that maybe there was a mistake with her lay  
18 summary.

19 DR. WALLACK: You just touched on an  
20 appropriate point in that the publications should have  
21 appropriate references because I know that I've also read  
22 in the past of certain scientists doing certain  
23 publications and some referenced us and some did not. I  
24 think that we ought to e-mail them, for the record, that

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 we feel that on whatever publications they're part of  
2 that an appropriate acknowledgment of their association  
3 with the State initiative should be noted.

4 MR. WAGNER: I think it's in their  
5 contract.

6 MS. HORN: It's in their contract.

7 DR. WALLACK: But they need to be reminded  
8 of that and I would move that we remind them of that.

9 DR. CANALIS: Second. And I would extend  
10 that to presentations at meetings.

11 MS. HORN: Yes.

12 DR. CANALIS: And flyers that we get  
13 reminded all the time.

14 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Posters. Again, it's  
15 inconsistent, I think, just -- I just notice that Yale  
16 seems to be more consistent.

17 DR. GENEL: Is there a standard reference  
18 that we're recommending, I think? If you're going to  
19 send an e-mail out I think we ought to indicate the  
20 preferred citation.

21 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: What's the  
22 requirement now?

23 MS. HORN: The contract language says this  
24 material is based upon work supported by the State of

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 Connecticut under the state stem cell research grants  
2 program, but it does acknowledge the state.

3 MR. GOLDHAMMER: And how do you know  
4 people are not doing that?

5 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Because I've seen some  
6 publications.

7 MR. GOLDHAMMER: Where it's clear that the  
8 work in that publication derived from monies from the  
9 state? Because sometimes in these annual reports people  
10 are a little bit -- they take some liberties when they  
11 list publications, well, they were kind of related to the  
12 -- they want to show progress and maybe it wasn't exactly  
13 the way the --

14 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- it's possible that  
15 they actually come -- they were driven by other funding.

16  
17 MR. GOLDHAMMER: Yes. So it's sometimes  
18 hard to know that. But I --

19 DR. WALLACK: -- I've seen where there has  
20 been -- I'll go further than what David -- what Warren  
21 said. I've seen clear indications that there should have  
22 been a reference to us and there was not.

23 MS. HORN: Right. We're the only funding  
24 source.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 DR. WALLACK: Right.

2 MS. HORN: It's clear.

3 MR. GOLDHAMMER: Okay.

4 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: So you want to send  
5 a message out to the grantees.

6 MS. HORN: Hi, Anne.

7 DR. KIESSLING: If that's the case, if  
8 someone has actually published a paper and the  
9 Connecticut Stem Cell program was the source of funding  
10 if that was not acknowledged in the paper then an erratum  
11 should be sent to that journal so that it is acknowledged  
12 in some future issue.

13 MS. HORN: Okay.

14 DR. FISHBONE: Could I ask a questions  
15 about the allocation of funds probably to Dan, sorry Dan.

16 MR. WAGNER: Sure.

17 DR. FISHBONE: If somebody is -- the  
18 contract gives them a million dollars do they get, for a  
19 year, do they get the million dollars on day one?

20 MR. WAGNER: Yes.

21 DR. CANALIS: Oh, really.

22 DR. FISHBONE: So what happens to the  
23 interest that would accrue on that?

24 MR. WAGNER: The universities eat it.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 DR. FISHBONE: The university gets it?

2 MR. WAGNER: The university -- Yale could  
3 give us whatever it is we want they could tell us what  
4 the interest is today at noon, at 1:00, at 2:00. UCONN  
5 cannot do that according to their accounting departments.  
6 So depending on how we want to require them to report --

7 DR. FISHBONE: -- well, I was just  
8 wondering if the state is short of money, I mean, is it  
9 not possible to give them the money by the month and --

10 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- we give all the  
11 money to CI and then CI would be accumulating the  
12 interest. And then the state would have to try to get it  
13 back from them. On one occasion I will say we've done  
14 this where money went to a contractor and it ended up not  
15 being spent. We got it back through CI and that came  
16 back with interest. So we have done that, but not as a  
17 routine matter.

18 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: I think for the same  
19 reasons of the budget we wouldn't want to hold --

20 MS. HORN: -- right.

21 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Do we have a  
22 tracking on the website, the hits, how many people are  
23 reading?

24 MS. HORN: We have a count on the website

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1       itself. We don't know who is going where within the  
2       website.

3                   MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: We do?

4                   MS. HORN: Yes, we do.

5                   MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: On our general DPH?

6                   CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: So what are the  
7       numbers?

8                   MS. HORN: Oh, not any more? Oh, I'm  
9       sorry, I misspoke. We used to have one on our stem cell.

10                  MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: It was taken away.

11                  CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: All right. We are  
12       clearly on other business. Is there any other business?

13                  DR. CANALIS: Yes. I'd like to have --  
14       whenever somebody requests a change in investigators or  
15       any significance I think that we should request a recent,  
16       current curriculum vitae. And I don't think we really  
17       should consider the significant change in a scheme  
18       investigative without knowing who is taking the  
19       responsibilities.

20                  CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Right.

21                  DR. CANALIS: It's impossible to make  
22       judgment unless you know the record of the new  
23       individual. So I'd like that as a policy frankly. And  
24       you can take it or leave it.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: I think I'd -- I  
2 think as soon as that information comes in that there is  
3 a change to ask for that information and get it to us.

4 MR. MANDELKERN: It's in the RFP.

5 MS. HORN: That they have to come to us.  
6 I'm not sure that it spells out what they have to  
7 provide.

8 MR. MANDELKERN: But there is a  
9 recognition that --

10 MS. HORN: -- yes.

11 DR. CANALIS: Well, today there were votes  
12 on two significant changes and in one of them, you know,  
13 the CV was outdated and consequently, you know, it was  
14 difficult to make -- to pronounce judgment on the  
15 qualifications to the individual.

16 MS. HISKES: Would it be out of line to  
17 also require a justification for the proposed  
18 replacement? We can get a bio sketch or whatever, but it  
19 would be nice the rationale --

20 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: -- have a rationale  
21 with an appropriate --

22 MS. HISKES: -- right, or why this person  
23 is appropriate.

24 DR. WALLACK: First of all, I'd like to

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 take the opportunity to thank the Department of Public  
2 Health for a really wonderful summary year in, summary,  
3 I'm sorry, in their report to the Governor. I think, for  
4 the record, that as a Committee member I know this comes  
5 from us, and so it's almost self-congratulatory, but it  
6 really isn't. The staff did it, that they ought to be  
7 commended for a great job.

8 They, I believe, added a couple of points  
9 to it. We talked about economic development. I think that  
10 intentionally it says in the report, as I can piece this  
11 together, there was perhaps something close five million  
12 dollars in monies appropriated for new jobs. And those  
13 new jobs amounted to, I believe -- if I go back and do  
14 the math, over a 100 some odd new jobs. One of the staff  
15 people might help me with this. So I think that they  
16 followed through on that. So I thought it was an  
17 excellent summary.

18 I would make one suggestion and it has  
19 nothing to do with where we were when this was created,  
20 but going forward and that is that in the executive  
21 summary because of the things we've alluded to right at  
22 the beginning of the meeting and what I'm going to bring  
23 up now, and that is because of the economic climate while  
24 it's in the report about the economic enhancements that

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 are -- have occurred, that perhaps we add a component to  
2 the executive summary so that if a legislator, or  
3 Governor, or whomever is only reading, which they  
4 probably will only be reading the executive summary, they  
5 see that directly as far as economic development. But,  
6 again, I would add that to it in the future, but the  
7 overall thing, for the record, I thought was tremendously  
8 well done.

9 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Can I add two points on  
10 it, two things on that? First of all, this group should  
11 really endorse the Protagen. I mean it hasn't really  
12 happened. We talked about it at the last meeting, but I  
13 think this is your product I was going to ask that -- are  
14 you willing to accept it pending any changes or  
15 suggestions in the next week.

16 And to your second point, I think that's a  
17 great idea. You know, we wrote the executive summary  
18 before you guys came up with the idea of going with -- so  
19 we can add that to this --

20 DR. WALLACK: -- I know that and that's  
21 what I tried to say in the --

22 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- so we can do that  
23 this year.

24 DR. WALLACK: So I would move that we

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 accept this with great enthusiasm and that we look  
2 forwarded to the modifications bringing the economic  
3 development piece of it into the executive summary.

4 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: And just one other  
5 point for the record, that's Denise Lieper wrote that, so  
6 that's --

7 MR. MANDELKERN: -- I would like -- I have  
8 something I'd like to speak to and I think the first 38  
9 pages are the most germane in this report. And reading  
10 them as a layperson the impact of the science that's  
11 being funded and researched and looked at is absolutely  
12 overwhelming with significance. I mean I think while I  
13 support the motion to accept and vote if somehow the  
14 first 38 pages would seal with the research that's going  
15 on project by project could be gotten out to the public  
16 in some way it would help our program tremendously  
17 because it's like a blockbuster of information that you  
18 read and it's all impressive information. Even if  
19 possibly a special flyer or something of 10, 12 pages  
20 that somehow could be gotten out somewhere.

21 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: I will say -- it is  
22 powerful stuff, you're right. I will say some of that not  
23 all of it, but some of it was presented to the stem cell  
24 community at StemConn.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 MR. MANDELKERN: Yes.

2 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: During the opening  
3 session I think each of the universities that's where we  
4 saw them touching on the economics of it, how many jobs  
5 were created. But I think it was different degrees of  
6 detail, but at the -- is that -- each of the universities  
7 gave at least an overview of all the activities going on.

8

9 MR. MANDELKERN: Unfortunately I missed  
10 that. I would like to see it somehow, some thought given  
11 to getting it out to the public rather than to the  
12 meetings because it would give us, I think, great support  
13 in the community.

14 DR. WALLACK: And I would be in favor of  
15 that also. That's consistent with what I'm trying to say  
16 also, so you're absolutely right. The more we can get  
17 out there the better it is for everybody.

18 DR. FISHBONE: Does each member of the  
19 legislature get a copy or is it just posted?

20 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Well, for one thing we  
21 don't do hard copies anymore. So everybody is going to  
22 get an electronic copy, which makes it all the more  
23 likely that it will only -- they'll only read the  
24 executive summary. But, no, we send it to the caucuses

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 and to the committees so it's the public health  
2 committee, and to the Governor's office.

3 DR. FISHBONE: So are you saying that they  
4 will get the executive summary?

5 MR. WAGNER: They will, they'll get the  
6 whole thing, but it will all be an electronic version, no  
7 hard copies.

8 DR. GENEL: How do you announce this  
9 electronically?

10 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Announce it to whom?

11 DR. GENEL: That the report is -- or is it  
12 just --

13 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- we announce it on  
14 our website what's new. I mean that's what we've done  
15 historically, in the last two years. There were no --  
16 there is no press event.

17 MS. LYNNE TOWNSHEND: I'm not sure -- I  
18 agree with --

19 DR. GENEL: -- that's why I asked the  
20 question.

21 MS. TOWNSHEND: I'm thinking more, and I  
22 want to kind of put this out on the table because it's --  
23 it is powerful information especially with the economic  
24 component that Milt was talking about -- to get these out

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 to targeted audiences. So if it's okay with Warren, and  
2 of course with the Governor's office and our own  
3 communications office, I would be happy to pursue media  
4 opportunities if that's --

5 DR. WALLACK: -- I would second you doing  
6 that, absolutely.

7 MS. TOWNSHEND: It would be targeted, but  
8 if we can get those opportunities with audiences that  
9 might like -- we could approach maybe --

10 DR. WALLACK: -- that would be great.

11 MR. LATHAM: I'm afraid I have to go. I  
12 heartedly endorse this idea of getting the news out.

13 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Steve, we have a  
14 motion to accept the report with the change to the  
15 executive summary. All in favor?

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: And other changes in  
17 the week.

18 ALL VOICES: Aye.

19 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: All opposed?

20 MR. MANDELKERN: Paul? Lynn?

21 MS. TOWNSHEND: Yes, sir.

22 MR. MANDELKERN: I think we cannot rely --  
23 I don't think the executive summary in itself has enough  
24 impact for what we want to do. It's exactly two and a

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 half paragraphs long. It's got what it has to, but it  
2 doesn't have the punch because it's just straight facts.

3 And I think we should be able to do more than that.

4 MS. TOWNSHEND: If the Committee desires,  
5 and it sounds like what I'm hearing that is the desire of  
6 the Committee, I'll certainly work with Warren and Marianne  
7 and Denise to kind of develop some sort of communication  
8 plan that we can get this information out there. If --  
9 and with everything in the media these days is a tough  
10 challenge, it's not H1, N1 or something like that. So  
11 I'm certainly going to work with, if it's okay with all  
12 of you, to see if we can at least get some coverage of  
13 it. I can't guarantee it's going to be a big splash on  
14 the front of the paper, but if we can get to some of the  
15 influential leaders maybe through some of the higher  
16 level -- I hate to say higher level, but I'm thinking of  
17 the public radio. I'm thinking of some of the blogs to  
18 the Hartford Courant that are often read by influential  
19 people. So those are a few of the ideas. But Warren's  
20 also got a good journalistic sense so I think we can work  
21 together on doing that.

22 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Okay, any other  
23 discussion?

24 MR. GOLDHAMMER: One more nuts and bolts

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 things, can you tell me -- I think Dan knows this, what  
2 is the interval between the end of one grant year and the  
3 release of funds for the subsequent grant year? For  
4 instance, in these 2006 grants is there -- there is a  
5 couple a month?

6 MR. WAGNER: There is a couple of months.

7 MR. GOLDHAMMER: And is there -- and this  
8 gets back to what was raised earlier by you, Paul, about  
9 can that be shortened? There is an issue at the  
10 universities about this. Some people have surpluses that  
11 they can carry over until and so it's not a big deal. But  
12 a lot of people try to very carefully spend their money  
13 so that at the end of the grant year it's gone. And for  
14 those people you can require deficit spending and an  
15 agreement by the university to support your research with  
16 no guarantee, at least in their eyes, that the next year  
17 will come in. And so it's gotten quite hard and  
18 difficult at UCONN to get an agreement to spend money  
19 that they don't have in hand.

20 So if it was somehow possible to maybe ask  
21 for progress reports a little bit earlier so that they  
22 can be approved closer to what should be the beginning of  
23 the third year of funding and reduce that gap that would  
24 be very helpful.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 MR. WAGNER: I've talked to Isolde about  
2 this and hopefully in the new RFP we'll have the money --  
3 the first year report will be a 10 month report or an 11  
4 month report and then allow us to collect everything  
5 because we did not get everything on it. You collect  
6 everything, you get it to the Committee and give us a  
7 month.

8 MR. GOLDHAMMER: That would be great. I  
9 don't know what it's like at Yale, but at UCONN it really  
10 has become difficult and it's been a matter of  
11 considerable anxiety among investigators who are without  
12 funds and waiting for the funds to come, and having to  
13 convince most senior administrators that to back them for  
14 a period of a month or two months or whatever it might  
15 be. So that would be very helpful.

16 MR. WAGNER: I just got a e-mail from  
17 Deborah Keefe at UCONN asking me when the --

18 MR. GOLDHAMMER: -- and that was not  
19 planned.

20 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: All right. Any  
21 other comments for the Committee? Any public comment?  
22 All right, I need a motion to adjourn.

23 A VOICE: So moved.

24 A VOICE: Seconded.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JUNE 16, 2009

1 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: All in favor?  
2 ALL VOICES: Aye.  
3 CHAIRMAN PESCATELLO: Thank you all.  
4 (Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at  
5 3:07 p.m.)  
6